

A weighted Möbius function

Derek Garton

September 19, 2021

1 Introduction

Fix an odd prime ℓ and let \mathcal{G} be the poset of isomorphism classes of finite abelian ℓ -groups, with the relation $[A] \leq [B]$ if and only if there exists an injective group homomorphism $A \hookrightarrow B$. (For notational simplicity, from this point forward we will conflate finite abelian ℓ -groups and the equivalence classes containing them.) In 1984, Cohen and Lenstra [CL84] proved that the function

$$\nu : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$$

$$A \mapsto |\mathrm{Aut} A|^{-1} \prod_{i=1}^{\infty} (1 - \ell^{-i})$$

is a discrete probability distribution on \mathcal{G} . (This fact had already been proved by Hall in [Hal38], who used a different method). They then conjectured that if $A \in \mathcal{G}$, then $\nu(A)$ is the probability that the ℓ -Sylow subgroup of the ideal class group of an imaginary quadratic number field is isomorphic to A . Since then, mathematicians have defined various probability distributions on \mathcal{G} and conjectured that these distributions describe various phenomena, both number-theoretic (e.g., [FW89], [CM90], [EVW09], [Mal10], [Gar15]) and combinatorial (e.g., [Mat14], [CKL⁺]).

Given any discrete probability distribution $\xi : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ and any $A \in \mathcal{G}$, define the *Ath moment of ξ* to be

$$\sum_{B \in \mathcal{G}} |\mathrm{Surj}(B, A)| \xi(B),$$

where for any $B, A \in \mathcal{G}$, we define $\mathrm{Surj}(B, A)$ to be the set of surjective group homomorphisms from B to A . This terminology, which is becoming standard in the literature related to the Cohen-Lenstra heuristics (see, for example, [EVW09] and [Mat14]), is meant to evoke an analogy with the k th moment of a real-valued random variable X : just as the k th moment of X is the expected value of X^k , the A th moment of ξ is the expected value of $|\mathrm{Surj}(B, A)|$, where B is a \mathcal{G} -valued random variable. Moreover, under certain favorable conditions, the set of A th moments of a distribution on \mathcal{G} determines the distribution, making the analogy even stronger.

A precise description of these “favorable conditions”, however, is still elusive. In [EVW09], [Mat14], and [Gar15], for example, the moments of the particular discrete probability distributions on \mathcal{G} in question completely determine the distribution. In [Gar15], a Möbius inversion-type procedure transforms closed formulas for moments of certain distributions on \mathcal{G} into closed formulas for the distribution itself. Some natural questions are:

- what is this Möbius-type function?
- in what ways does it behave like the classical Möbius function?, and
- in what conditions can it transform formulas for moments into formulas for distributions?

In this paper, we focus on the first two questions, leaving the third for later work. In [Section 2](#), we begin by addressing the first question. That is, we define this new Möbius-type function associated to the poset \mathcal{G} , which we denote $S : \mathcal{G} \times \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. We also compare it to the case of the poset of subgroups of a group G , which we denote \mathcal{P}_G , and its associated Möbius function, which we denote $\mu_G : \mathcal{P}_G \times \mathcal{P}_G \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. In particular,

we state a result relating these two functions; see [Remark 2.2](#). We then state the main results of the paper, [Theorems 3.8](#) and [3.9](#), which we prove in [Section 3](#). As an example application of [Theorems 3.8](#) and [3.9](#), we remark that they immediately imply:

Corollary 3.10. *If $A, C \in \mathcal{G}$, then $S(A, C) = 0$ unless there exists an injection $\iota : A \hookrightarrow B$ with $\text{coker}(\iota)$ elementary abelian.*

We would like to note the analogy between [Corollary 3.10](#) and Hall’s result from 1934 [[Hal34](#)]: if G is an ℓ -group of order ℓ^n , then $\mu_G(1, G) = 0$ unless G is elementary abelian, in which case $\mu_G(1, G) = (-1)^n \ell^{\binom{n}{2}}$. In addition to implying [Corollary 3.10](#), [Theorems 3.8](#) and [3.9](#) are both integral to the inversion procedure deployed in [[Gar15](#)], and will be a useful tool in answering the third question mentioned above. In [[Gar](#)], we explore further properties of S , using it to expand on Cohen-Lenstra’s identities on finite abelian ℓ -groups [[CL84](#)]. Moreover, [Corollary 3.10](#) has applications to recent work in group theory: see Lucchini’s [Theorem 2.3](#) [[Luc07](#)], below, and the discussion following it.

2 Definitions and results

Let \mathcal{P} be a locally finite poset. The *Möbius function* on \mathcal{P} , denoted by $\mu_{\mathcal{P}}$, is defined by the following criteria: for any $x, z \in \mathcal{P}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{\mathcal{P}}(x, z) &= 0 && \text{if } x \not\leq z, \\ \mu_{\mathcal{P}}(x, z) &= 1 && \text{if } x = z, \\ \sum_{x \leq y \leq z} \mu_{\mathcal{P}}(x, y) &= 0 && \text{if } x < z. \end{aligned}$$

A classic reference for Möbius functions is [[Rot64](#)]. Now, for any finite group G , let \mathcal{P}_G be the poset of subgroups of G ordered by inclusion. (To ease notation, let μ_G be the Möbius function on this poset.) For a history of the work on the Möbius function on this particular poset, see [[HIÖ89](#)]. Recall that \mathcal{G} is the poset of isomorphism classes of finite abelian ℓ -groups.

Definition 2.1. For any $A, C \in \mathcal{G}$, let $\text{sub}(A, C)$ be the number of subgroups of C that are isomorphic to A . If $A \in \mathcal{G}$, an *A-chain* is a finite linearly ordered subset of $\{B \in \mathcal{G} \mid B > A\}$. Now, given an *A-chain* $\mathfrak{C} = \{A_j\}_{j=1}^i$, define

$$\text{sub}(\mathfrak{C}) := (-1)^i \text{sub}(A, A_1) \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \text{sub}(A_j, A_{j+1}).$$

Finally, for any $A, C \in \mathcal{G}$, let

$$S(A, C) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } A \not\leq C, \\ 1 & \text{if } A = C, \\ \sum_{\substack{A\text{-chains } \mathfrak{C}, \\ \max \mathfrak{C} = C}} \text{sub}(\mathfrak{C}) & \text{if } A < C. \end{cases}$$

Remark 2.2. Though S is defined on the poset \mathcal{G} , it is closely related to the classical work on the Möbius function on the poset of subgroups of a fixed group. Indeed, by applying Lemma 2.2 of [[HIÖ89](#)], we see that

$$S(A, C) = \sum_{\substack{B \leq C \\ B \cong A}} \mu_C(B, C).$$

There has been recent progress towards describing groups with non-zero Möbius functions. For example, in 2007 Lucchini [[Luc07](#)] proved the following:

Theorem 2.3. *Assume that G is a finite solvable group and that H is a proper subgroup of G with $\mu_G(1, H) \neq 0$. Then there exists a family M_1, \dots, M_t of maximal subgroups of G such that*

- $H = M_1 \cap \dots \cap M_t$, and

- $[G : H] = [G : M_1] \cdots [G : M_t]$.

In the light of [Remark 2.2](#), [Corollary 3.10](#) implies that there exists an infinite family of pairs of finite abelian ℓ -groups with trivial Möbius function:

Corollary 3.11. *If $A, C \in \mathcal{G}$ and C has exactly one subgroup isomorphic to A , then $\mu_C(A, C) = 0$ unless there exists some $\iota : A \hookrightarrow C$ with $\text{coker}(\iota)$ elementary abelian.*

In [Section 3](#), below, we prove the main results of this paper, mentioned in [Section 1](#). (See [Notation 3.4](#) for the definition of rank.)

Theorem 3.8. *Suppose that $A, C \in \mathcal{G}$ and $\text{rank } A < \text{rank } C$. If there exists $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$ and $B \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $A \leq B < C$, $\text{rank } B = \text{rank } A$, and*

$$B \oplus \overbrace{(\mathbb{Z}/\ell) \oplus \cdots \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/\ell)}^{k \text{ times}} = C,$$

then $S(A, C) = S(A, B) \cdot S(B, C)$. Otherwise, $S(A, C) = 0$.

Theorem 3.9. *Suppose that $A, C \in \mathcal{G}$, that $\text{rank } A = \text{rank } C = r$, and that there does not exist an injection $\iota : A \hookrightarrow C$ such that $\text{coker}(\iota)$ is elementary abelian. Then $S(A, C) = 0$.*

3 Proofs of main results

The combinatorics of the proofs that follow will rely on [Lemmas 3.5](#) to [3.7](#), which follow immediately from [Proposition 3.3](#) below. There are many descriptions of the quantity described in [Proposition 3.3](#); one such can be found in [Theorem 8](#) in a recent paper of Delaunay and Jouhet [[DJ14](#)]. The formula we present below is different than theirs; hopefully the ease with which it implies [Lemmas 3.5](#) to [3.7](#) makes up for its unwieldiness. Before we begin, we introduce some notation.

Notation 3.1. Suppose $A \in \mathcal{G}$. Let $\Lambda(A)$ be the set of alternating bilinear forms on A , with A thought of as a $(\mathbb{Z}/\exp(A))$ -module. Next, for any $A, B \in \mathcal{G}$, let $\text{Inj}(A, B)$ be the set of injective group homomorphisms from A into B .

Remark 3.2. In [Section 1](#), we defined moments in terms of surjections, which is standard, but there is an equivalent definition given in terms of injections; see [Section 3](#) of [[Gar15](#)] for more details.

Proposition 3.3. *Suppose $A = \bigoplus_{i=1}^r \mathbb{Z}/\ell^{a_i}$ and $B = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{r'} \mathbb{Z}/\ell^{b_i}$, with $a_i \geq a_j$ and $b_i \geq b_j$ for $i \leq j$. Then*

$$|\text{Inj}(A, B)| = |\Lambda(A)| \cdot \prod_{i=1}^r \left(\ell^{\sum_{j=i}^{r'} \min\{a_i, b_j\}} - \ell^{\sum_{j=i}^{r'} \min\{a_i-1, b_j\}} \right),$$

so

$$\text{sub}(A, B) = \prod_{i=1}^r \left(\frac{\ell^{\sum_{j=i}^{r'} \min\{a_i, b_j\}} - \ell^{\sum_{j=i}^{r'} \min\{a_i-1, b_j\}}}{\ell^{\sum_{j=i}^r a_j} - \ell^{\sum_{j=i}^r \min\{a_i-1, a_j\}}} \right).$$

Before stating some consequences of [Proposition 3.3](#), we need a bit more notation.

Notation 3.4. For any $A \in \mathcal{G}$ and any $i \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$, let

$$A_{\oplus i} := A \oplus \overbrace{(\mathbb{Z}/\ell) \oplus \cdots \oplus (\mathbb{Z}/\ell)}^{i \text{ times}}.$$

If $i \geq 1$, let

$$\text{rank}_{\ell^i} A := \dim_{\mathbb{F}_\ell} (\ell^{i-1} A / \ell^i A).$$

We will abbreviate $\text{rank}_\ell A$ by $\text{rank } A$.

As an example, consider the group $A = \mathbb{Z}/\ell^4 \oplus \mathbb{Z}/\ell^4 \oplus \mathbb{Z}/\ell$. Then $\text{rank}_{\ell^5} A = 0$, $\text{rank}_{\ell^4} A = \text{rank}_{\ell^3} A = \text{rank}_{\ell^2} A = 2$, and $\text{rank } A = 3$. We will use the following three lemmas in the proofs of our main results.

Lemma 3.5. *Suppose $A, B \in \mathcal{G}$. If $\text{rank } B - \text{rank } A = i \geq 0$, then*

$$\text{sub}(A, A_{\oplus i}) \cdot \text{sub}(A_{\oplus i}, B) = \text{sub}(A, B).$$

Proof. Computation following from [Proposition 3.3](#). □

Lemma 3.6. *Suppose $A, B \in \mathcal{G}$ and $\text{rank } A = \text{rank } B$. If*

$$j \leq \max \{i \mid \text{rank}_{\ell^i} A = \text{rank } A\},$$

then

$$\text{sub}(A \oplus \mathbb{Z}/\ell^j, B \oplus \mathbb{Z}/\ell^j) = \text{sub}(A, B).$$

Proof. Computation following from [Proposition 3.3](#). □

Lemma 3.7. *Suppose $A \in \mathcal{G}$. If $i \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$, $\text{rank } A = r$, and $\bigoplus_{j=1}^r (\mathbb{Z}/\ell^i) \leq A$, then*

$$\text{sub}\left(\bigoplus_{j=1}^r (\mathbb{Z}/\ell^i), A\right) = 1.$$

Proof. Computation following from [Proposition 3.3](#). □

We now have the tools to prove [Theorems 3.8](#) and [3.9](#). For any $A, C \in \mathcal{G}$, [Theorem 3.8](#) concerns the case where $\text{rank } A < \text{rank } C$, and [Theorem 3.9](#) concerns the case where $\text{rank } A = \text{rank } C$.

Theorem 3.8. *Suppose that $A, C \in \mathcal{G}$ and $\text{rank } A < \text{rank } C$. If there exists $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$ and $B \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $A \leq B < C$, $\text{rank } B = \text{rank } A$, and $B_{\oplus k} = C$, then $S(A, C) = S(A, B) \cdot S(B, C)$. Otherwise, $S(A, C) = 0$.*

Proof. By [Definition 2.1](#), we know $S(A, C)$ is a sum of products of subgroup data—one summand for every A -chain with maximum C . Choose some such chain, say $\mathfrak{C} = \{A_i\}_{i=1}^j$, where $j \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$ and $A = A_0 < \dots < A_j = C$. Consider the set

$$M_{\mathfrak{C}} = \{j_0 \in \{1, \dots, j\} \mid \text{there is no } k_{j_0} \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0} \text{ such that } A_{j_0} = A_{\oplus k_{j_0}}\}.$$

If $M_{\mathfrak{C}}$ is empty, then the theorem is trivially true since there is some $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$ such that $C = A_{\oplus k}$. Thus, suppose it is not empty and let $j' = \min(M_{\mathfrak{C}})$.

There are two possibilities for the ranks of $A_{j'}$ and $A_{j'-1}$: either $\text{rank}(A_{j'-1}) = \text{rank}(A_{j'})$ or $\text{rank}(A_{j'-1}) < \text{rank}(A_{j'})$. It turns out that summands in the former case cancel out those in the latter. Indeed, if $\text{rank}(A_{j'}) - \text{rank}(A_{j'-1}) = k_0 > 0$, then we know by [Lemma 3.5](#) that

$$\text{sub}(A_{j'-1}, (A_{j'-1})_{\oplus k_0}) \cdot \text{sub}((A_{j'-1})_{\oplus k_0}, A_{j'}) = \text{sub}(A_{j'-1}, A_{j'}).$$

Thus, $\text{sub}(\mathfrak{C})$ cancels with another summand in $S(A, B)$, one associated to a chain that is longer than \mathfrak{C} by one subgroup; namely, the chain

$$A_1 < \dots < A_{j'-1} < (A_{j'-1})_{\oplus k_0} < A_{j'} < \dots < A_j = B. \tag{\mathfrak{C}'}$$

In contrast to \mathfrak{C} , the first subgroup in \mathfrak{C}' that is not of the form $A_{\oplus k}$ for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$ has the same rank as its predecessor (ie, $\text{rank}((A_{j'-1})_{\oplus k_0}) = \text{rank}(A_{j'})$).

Now suppose that $A_{j'}$ and $A_{j'-1}$ had satisfied the other possibility; ie, that $\text{rank}(A_{j'-1}) = \text{rank}(A_{j'})$. If $j' > 1$, then the summand cancels with a summand whose chain is one shorter. Specifically, we know by [Lemma 3.5](#) that it cancels with the summand associated to the chain $\mathfrak{C} \setminus \{A_{j'-1}\}$. Thus, the only summands of $S(A, B)$ that remain are those associated to chains with minimum element the same rank as A . Using this fact, we can write

$$S(A, C) = - \sum_{\substack{B_0 \in \mathcal{G}, A < B_0 < C, \\ \text{rank } B_0 = \text{rank } A}} \text{sub}(A, B_0) \cdot S(B_0, C).$$

Note that if $\{B_0 \in \mathcal{G} \mid A < B_0 < C, \text{rank } B_0 = \text{rank } A\} = \emptyset$, then the above sum vanishes and we are done. Thus, suppose it is not empty and let

$$B = \max \{B_0 \in \mathcal{G} \mid A < B_0 < C, \text{rank } B_0 = \text{rank } A\}.$$

We can repeat the argument above to see that

$$S(A, C) = S(A, B) \cdot S(B, C).$$

If there is some $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{>0}$ such that $C = B_{\oplus k}$, then we are done. If not, then the argument from the previous paragraphs and the definition of B imply that $S(B, C) = 0$, completing the proof. \square

In the light of [Theorem 3.8](#), we now address $S(A, C)$ in the case where $\text{rank } A = \text{rank } C$.

Theorem 3.9. *Suppose that $A, C \in \mathcal{G}$, that $\text{rank } A = \text{rank } C = r$, and that there does not exist an injection $\iota: A \rightarrow C$ such that $\text{coker}(\iota)$ is elementary abelian. Then $S(A, C) = 0$.*

Proof. Suppose that $A < C$ (otherwise the result is trivial). We will induct on r . To begin, suppose that $r = 1$, and define $a, c \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$ by $\ell^a = |A|$ and $\ell^c = |C|$. Since A and C are cyclic, we see that for any $i \in \{1, \dots, c - a\}$,

$$|\{A\text{-chains } \mathfrak{C} \mid \max \mathfrak{C} = C, |\mathfrak{C}| = i\}| = \binom{c - a - 1}{i - 1}.$$

Moreover, the fact that A and C are cyclic also implies that $\text{sub}(\mathfrak{C}) = (-1)^i$ for any A -chain in the above set. By assumption, we know that $c - a - 1 > 0$, so $\sum_{i=1}^{c-a} (-1)^i \binom{c-a-1}{i-1} = 0$. This completes the base case.

We split the general case into three cases. For the first case, suppose that $\exp A = \exp C$. For any $B \in \mathcal{G}$, let \overline{B} denote $B/\langle b \rangle$, where $b \in B$ is any element of order $\exp B$. Similarly, if \mathfrak{C} is a B -chain, we define $\overline{\mathfrak{C}}$ to be $\{\overline{D} \mid D \in \mathfrak{C}\}$. Now, since $\exp A = \exp C$, we see that $\{A\text{-chains } \mathfrak{C} \mid \max \mathfrak{C} = C\}$ is in bijection with $\{\overline{A}\text{-chains } \mathfrak{C} \mid \max \mathfrak{C} = \overline{C}\}$ under the map $\mathfrak{C} \mapsto \overline{\mathfrak{C}}$. Moreover, given any A -chain \mathfrak{C} with $\max \mathfrak{C} = C$, [Proposition 3.3](#) implies that $\text{sub}(\mathfrak{C}) = K \cdot \text{sub}(\overline{\mathfrak{C}})$, where K is a constant depending only on A and C . The result now follows by induction.

For the second case, suppose that $\ell \cdot \exp A = \exp C$. For any A -chain \mathfrak{C} with $\max \mathfrak{C} = C$, let $\widehat{\mathfrak{C}}$ denote $\min \{B \in \mathfrak{C} \mid \exp B = \exp C\}$. For any $B \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $A < B \leq C$ and $\exp B > \exp A$, let $B_C = B/(\ell^{-1} \exp C)B$. For any such B with $B_C \neq A$, we can partition the set $\{A\text{-chains } \mathfrak{C} \mid \max \mathfrak{C} = C, \widehat{\mathfrak{C}} = B\}$ into two subsets: those chains that contain B_C and those that do not. We remark that these two subsets are in bijection under the following map: if an A -chain does not contain B_C , then add it. The inverse to this map is simply the deletion of B_C from any A -chain. Now, by [Lemmas 3.6](#) and [3.7](#), we know that B has exactly one subgroup isomorphic to B_C . Thus, for any A_0 such that $A \leq A_0 < B_C$, we know that

$$\text{sub}(A_0, B_C) \text{sub}(B_C, B) = \text{sub}(A_0, B).$$

But this means that any summand associated to a chain in the first subset cancels with the summand associated to the image of the chain under the above bijection. Thus,

$$S(A, C) = \sum_{\substack{A\text{-chains } \mathfrak{C} \\ (\overline{\mathfrak{C}})_C = A}} \text{sub}(\mathfrak{C}).$$

Now, for any $B \in \mathcal{G}$ with $A < B \leq C$, $\exp B > \exp A$, and $B_C = A$, note that

$$\sum_{\substack{A\text{-chains } \mathfrak{C} \\ \max \mathfrak{C} = C \\ \widehat{\mathfrak{C}} = B}} \text{sub}(\mathfrak{C}) = S(B, C) \cdot \sum_{\substack{A\text{-chains } \mathfrak{C} \\ \max \mathfrak{C} = B \\ \max \{\exp D \mid D \in \mathfrak{C} \setminus \{B\}\} = \exp A}} \text{sub}(\mathfrak{C}).$$

But $S(B, C) = 0$ for all such B , by the argument of the previous paragraph. Thus,

$$S(A, C) = \sum_{\substack{A\text{-chains } \mathfrak{C} \\ (\overline{\mathfrak{C}})_C = A}} \text{sub}(\mathfrak{C}) = \sum_{\substack{A < B < C \\ \exp B > \exp A \\ B_C = A}} \sum_{\substack{A\text{-chains } \mathfrak{C} \\ \max \mathfrak{C} = C \\ \widehat{\mathfrak{C}} = B}} \text{sub}(\mathfrak{C}) = 0,$$

completing this case.

Finally, consider the case where $\ell \cdot \exp A < \exp C$. As in the previous case, we have that

$$S(A, C) = \sum_{\substack{A\text{-chains } \mathfrak{C} \\ (\widehat{\mathfrak{C}})_C = A}} \text{sub}(\mathfrak{C}).$$

The difference in this case is that if \mathfrak{C} is an A -chain with $\max \mathfrak{C} = C$, then it is impossible that $(\widehat{\mathfrak{C}})_C = A$, so the proof is complete. □

Theorems 3.8 and 3.9 immediately imply the following corollary.

Corollary 3.10. *If $A, C \in \mathcal{G}$, then $S(A, C) = 0$ unless there exists an injection $\iota : A \hookrightarrow B$ with $\text{coker}(\iota)$ elementary abelian.*

Finally, Remark 2.2 and Corollary 3.10 imply the following result.

Corollary 3.11. *If $A, C \in \mathcal{G}$ and C has exactly one subgroup isomorphic to A , then $\mu_C(A, C) = 0$ unless there exists some $\iota : A \hookrightarrow C$ with $\text{coker}(\iota)$ elementary abelian.*

References

- [CKL⁺] J. Clancy, N. Kaplan, T. Leake, S. Payne, and M. Matchett Wood, *On a Cohen-Lenstra heuristic for Jacobians of random graphs*, to appear in the *Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics*.
- [CL84] H. Cohen and H. W. Lenstra, Jr., *Heuristics on class groups of number fields*, Number theory, Noordwijkerhout 1983 (Noordwijkerhout, 1983), Lecture Notes in Math., vol. 1068, Springer, Berlin, 1984, pp. 33–62. MR 756082 (85j:11144)
- [CM90] Henri Cohen and Jacques Martinet, *Étude heuristique des groupes de classes des corps de nombres*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **404** (1990), 39–76. MR 1037430 (91k:11097)
- [DJ14] Christophe Delaunay and Frédéric Jouhet, *p^ℓ -torsion points in finite abelian groups and combinatorial identities*, Adv. Math. **258** (2014), 13–45. MR 3190422
- [EVW09] J. S. Ellenberg, A. Venkatesh, and C. Westerland, *Homological stability for Hurwitz spaces and the Cohen-Lenstra conjecture*, ArXiv e-prints (2009).
- [FW89] Eduardo Friedman and Lawrence C. Washington, *On the distribution of divisor class groups of curves over a finite field*, *Théorie des nombres* (Quebec, PQ, 1987), de Gruyter, Berlin, 1989, pp. 227–239. MR 1024565 (91e:11138)
- [Gar] Derek Garton, *Some finite abelian group theory and some q -series identities*, to appear in the *Annals of Combinatorics*.
- [Gar15] ———, *Random matrices, the Cohen-Lenstra heuristics, and roots of unity*, Algebra Number Theory **9** (2015), no. 1, 149–171. MR 3317763
- [Hal34] P. Hall, *A Contribution to the Theory of Groups of Prime-Power Order*, Proc. London Math. Soc. **S2-36** (1934), no. 1, 29. MR 1575964
- [Hal38] ———, *A partition formula connected with Abelian groups*, Comment. Math. Helv. **11** (1938), no. 1, 126–129. MR 1509594
- [HIÖ89] T. Hawkes, I. M. Isaacs, and M. Özaydin, *On the Möbius function of a finite group*, Rocky Mountain J. Math. **19** (1989), no. 4, 1003–1034. MR 1039540 (90k:20046)

- [Luc07] A. Lucchini, *Subgroups of solvable groups with non-zero Möbius function*, J. Group Theory **10** (2007), no. 5, 633–639. MR 2352034 (2008h:20028)
- [Mal10] Gunter Malle, *On the distribution of class groups of number fields*, Experiment. Math. **19** (2010), no. 4, 465–474. MR 2778658 (2011m:11224)
- [Mat14] M. Matchett Wood, *The distribution of sandpile groups of random graphs*, ArXiv e-prints (2014).
- [Rot64] G.-C. Rota, *On the foundations of combinatorial theory. I. Theory of Möbius functions*, Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete **2** (1964), 340–368 (1964). MR 0174487 (30 #4688)