

Vertex connectivity of the power graph of a finite cyclic group II

Sriparna Chattopadhyay* Kamal Lochan Patra
Binod Kumar Sahoo

Abstract

The power graph $\mathcal{P}(G)$ of a given finite group G is the simple undirected graph whose vertices are the elements of G , in which two distinct vertices are adjacent if and only if one of them can be obtained as an integral power of the other. The vertex connectivity $\kappa(\mathcal{P}(G))$ of $\mathcal{P}(G)$ is the minimum number of vertices which need to be removed from G so that the induced subgraph of $\mathcal{P}(G)$ on the remaining vertices is disconnected or has only one vertex. For a positive integer n , let C_n be the cyclic group of order n . Suppose that the prime power decomposition of n is given by $n = p_1^{n_1} p_2^{n_2} \cdots p_r^{n_r}$, where $r \geq 1$, n_1, n_2, \dots, n_r are positive integers and p_1, p_2, \dots, p_r are prime numbers with $p_1 < p_2 < \cdots < p_r$. The vertex connectivity $\kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n))$ of $\mathcal{P}(C_n)$ is known for $r \leq 3$, see [22, 9]. In this paper, for $r \geq 4$, we give a new upper bound for $\kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n))$ and determine $\kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n))$ when $n_r \geq 2$. We also determine $\kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n))$ when n is a product of distinct prime numbers.

Key words: Power graph, Vertex connectivity, Cyclic group, Euler's totient function
AMS subject classification. 05C25, 05C40, 20K99

1 Introduction

Let Γ be a simple graph with vertex set V . A subset X of V is called a (vertex) *cut-set* of Γ if the induced subgraph of Γ with vertex set $V \setminus X$ is disconnected. A cut-set X of Γ is called a *minimal cut-set* if $X \setminus \{x\}$ is not a cut-set of Γ for any $x \in X$. If X is a minimal cut-set of Γ , then any proper subset of X is not a cut-set of Γ . A cut-set X of Γ is called a *minimum cut-set* if $|X| \leq |Y|$ for any cut-set Y of Γ . Clearly, every minimum cut-set of Γ is also a minimal cut-set. The *vertex connectivity* of Γ , denoted by $\kappa(\Gamma)$, is the minimum number of vertices which need to be removed from V so that the induced subgraph of Γ on the remaining vertices is disconnected or has only one vertex. The latter case arises only when Γ is a complete graph. If Γ is not a complete graph and X is a minimum cut-set of Γ , then $\kappa(\Gamma) = |X|$. A *separation* of Γ is a pair (A, B) , where A, B are disjoint non-empty subsets of V whose union is V and there is no edge of Γ containing vertices from both A and B . Thus, Γ is disconnected if and only if there exists a separation of it.

*Supported by SERB NPDF scheme (File No. PDF/2017/000908), Department of Science and Technology, Government of India

1.1 Power graph

The notion of directed power graph of a group was introduced in [17], which was further extended to semigroups in [18, 19]. Then the notion of undirected power graph of a semigroup, in particular, of a group was defined in [6]. Many researchers have investigated both the directed and undirected power graphs of groups from different view points. More on these graphs can be found in the survey paper [1] and the references therein.

Let G be a finite group. The *power graph* $\mathcal{P}(G)$ of G is the simple undirected graph with vertex set G , in which two distinct vertices are adjacent if and only if one of them can be obtained as an integral power of the other. Thus two distinct vertices $x, y \in G$ are adjacent in $\mathcal{P}(G)$ if and only if $x \in \langle y \rangle$ or $y \in \langle x \rangle$. Since G is finite, the identity element of G is adjacent to all other vertices and so $\mathcal{P}(G)$ is connected.

The automorphism group of the power graph of a finite group was described in [16, Theorem 2.2]. Clearly, if two finite groups are isomorphic, then they have isomorphic power graphs. The converse statement does not hold in general: two non-isomorphic finite p -groups of the same order and each of exponent p have isomorphic power graphs. However, by [4, Corollary 3], two finite groups with isomorphic power graphs have the same number of elements of each order. It was proved in [5, Theorem 1] that two finite abelian groups are isomorphic if their power graphs are isomorphic. If G and H are two finite groups with isomorphic power graphs, where H is a simple group, a cyclic group, a symmetric group, a dihedral group or a generalized quaternion (dicyclic) group, then G is isomorphic to H [20, Theorem 15]. The power graph of a finite group is complete if and only if the group is cyclic of prime power order [6, Theorem 2.12]. It was proved in [11, Theorem 1.3] and [12, Corollary 3.4] that, among all finite groups of a given order, the cyclic group of that order has the maximum number of edges and has the largest clique in its power graph. By [13, Theorem 5] and [15, Corollary 2.5], the power graph of a finite group is perfect, in particular, the clique number and the chromatic number coincide. Explicit formula for the clique number of the power graph of a finite cyclic group is given in [20, Theorem 2] and [13, Theorem 7].

For a subset A of G , we denote by $\mathcal{P}(A)$ the induced subgraph of $\mathcal{P}(G)$ with vertex set A . The subgraph $\mathcal{P}^*(G) = \mathcal{P}(G \setminus \{1\})$ of $\mathcal{P}(G)$ is called the *proper power graph* of G . The finite groups for which the proper power graph is strongly regular (respectively, planar, bipartite) are characterized in [21]. In the same paper, the authors proved connectedness of the proper power graph of certain groups. For the dihedral group D_{2n} of order $2n$, the identity element is a cut-vertex of $\mathcal{P}(D_{2n})$ and so $\mathcal{P}^*(D_{2n})$ is disconnected. If G is one of the groups $PGL(2, p^n)$ (p an odd prime), $PSL(2, p^n)$ (p prime), or a Suzuki group $Sz(2^{2n+1})$, then $\mathcal{P}^*(G)$ is disconnected [14, Theorems 3.5–3.7]. In [14, Section 4], the authors proved that $\mathcal{P}^*(S_n)$ and $\mathcal{P}^*(A_n)$ are disconnected for many values of n , where S_n, A_n are the symmetric and alternating groups respectively. The number of connected components of $\mathcal{P}^*(S_n)$ and $\mathcal{P}^*(A_n)$ are studied in [2, 3].

1.2 Vertex connectivity

For a given finite group, determining the vertex connectivity of its power graph is an interesting problem. Clearly, every cut-set of the power graph contains the identity element of the group. The vertex connectivity of the power graph is 1 if and only if the group is of order 2 or its proper power graph is disconnected. We recall a few results on the vertex connectivity of the power graph of finite p -groups and cyclic groups. If G is a cyclic p -group, then $\mathcal{P}(G)$ is a complete graph and so $\kappa(\mathcal{P}(G)) = |G| - 1$. If G is a generalized quaternion

2-group (in general, a dicyclic group), then the set consisting of the identity element and the unique involution of G is a minimum cut-set of $\mathcal{P}(G)$ and so $\kappa(\mathcal{P}(G)) = 2$ [7, Theorem 7]. If G is a finite p -group, then $\mathcal{P}^*(G)$ is connected if and only if G is either cyclic or a generalized quaternion 2-group by [21, Corollary 4.1] (also see [14, Theorem 2.6 (1)]). In particular, $\kappa(\mathcal{P}(G)) = 1$ if G is a finite non-cyclic abelian p -group, in this case the number of connected components of $\mathcal{P}^*(G)$ is obtained in [22, Theorem 3.3].

For a given positive integer n , let C_n denote the finite cyclic group of order n . The number of generators of C_n is $\phi(n)$, where ϕ is the Euler's totient function. We assume that n is divisible by at least two distinct primes. The identity element and the generators of C_n are adjacent to all other vertices of $\mathcal{P}(C_n)$. So every cut-set of $\mathcal{P}(C_n)$ must contain these elements, giving $\kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n)) \geq \phi(n) + 1$. Further, equality holds if and only if n is a product of two distinct primes, see [22, Proposition 2.5] and [9, Lemma 2.5]. For $n = p_1^{n_1} p_2^{n_2}$, where p_1, p_2 are distinct primes and n_1, n_2 are positive integers, it was proved in [8, Theorem 2.7] that $\kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n)) \leq \phi(n) + p_1^{n_1-1} p_2^{n_2-1}$. If $n = p_1 p_2 p_3$ is a product of three primes with $p_1 < p_2 < p_3$, then $\kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n)) \leq \phi(n) + p_1 + p_2 - 1$ by [8, Theorem 2.9]. These results were generalized in [9] and [22].

Let $n = p_1^{n_1} p_2^{n_2} \cdots p_r^{n_r}$, where $r \geq 2$, n_1, n_2, \dots, n_r are positive integers and p_1, p_2, \dots, p_r are prime numbers with $p_1 < p_2 < \cdots < p_r$. Consider the integers $\alpha(n)$ and $\beta(n)$, where

$$\alpha(n) := \phi(n) + \frac{n}{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r} \times [p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{r-1} - \phi(p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{r-1})],$$

$$\beta(n) := \phi(n) + \frac{n}{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r} \times \frac{1}{p_r^{n_r-1}} [p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{r-1} + \phi(p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{r-1}) (p_r^{n_r-1} - 2)].$$

By [22, Theorems 2.23, 2.35, 2.36],

$$\kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n)) \leq \alpha(n), \tag{1}$$

$$\kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n)) \leq \beta(n) \tag{2}$$

and the following hold:

- (i) $\alpha(n) < \beta(n)$ if and only if $n_r \geq 2$ and $2\phi(p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{r-1}) > p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{r-1}$,
- (ii) $\alpha(n) > \beta(n)$ if and only if $n_r \geq 2$ and $2\phi(p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{r-1}) < p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{r-1}$,
- (iii) $\alpha(n) = \beta(n)$ if and only if $n_r = 1$ or $(r, p_1) = (2, 2)$.

The authors of the present paper also independently obtained both the upper bounds (1) and (2) in [9]. Moreover, it was proved that if $2\phi(p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{r-1}) \geq p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{r-1}$, then the bound (1) is sharp, that is, $\kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n)) = \alpha(n)$ [9, Theorem 1.3(i),(iii)]. As a consequence, if $p_1 \geq r$, then $\kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n)) = \alpha(n)$ [9, Corollary 1.4]. In particular, if $n = p_1^{n_1} p_2^{n_2}$, then $\kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n)) = \phi(p_1^{n_1} p_2^{n_2}) + p_1^{n_1-1} p_2^{n_2-1}$, also see [22, Theorem 2.38]. It was shown in [9, Theorem 1.5] that the bound (2) is sharp, that is, $\kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n)) = \beta(n)$ for integers $n = p_1^{n_1} p_2^{n_2} p_3^{n_3}$ with $2\phi(p_1 p_2) < p_1 p_2$ (so necessarily $p_1 = 2$). However, by [9, Example 3.4], equality may not hold in (2) in general if $2\phi(p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{r-1}) < p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{r-1}$. In fact, the present paper is an outcome of the study of the behaviour of this example.

In view of the results mentioned in the previous paragraphs, the vertex connectivity of $\mathcal{P}(C_n)$ is completely determined for $r \leq 3$. Define the following integer:

$$\gamma(n) := \phi(n) + \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times [\phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-1}) + \phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-2} p_r) + p_1 \cdots p_{r-2} - \phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-2})].$$

We prove the following three results in this paper.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $n = p_1^{n_1} p_2^{n_2} \cdots p_r^{n_r}$, where $r \geq 3$, n_1, n_2, \dots, n_r are positive integers and p_1, p_2, \dots, p_r are prime numbers with $p_1 < p_2 < \cdots < p_r$. Then $\kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n)) \leq \gamma(n)$.*

Theorem 1.2. *Let $n = p_1^{n_1} p_2^{n_2} \cdots p_r^{n_r}$, where $r \geq 3$, n_1, n_2, \dots, n_r are positive integers and p_1, p_2, \dots, p_r are prime numbers with $p_1 < p_2 < \cdots < p_r$. If $n_r \geq 2$, then*

$$\kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n)) = \min\{\alpha(n), \beta(n)\}.$$

Theorem 1.3. *Let $n = p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r$, where $r \geq 3$ and p_1, p_2, \dots, p_r are prime numbers with $p_1 < p_2 < \cdots < p_r$. Then $\kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n)) = \min\{\alpha(n), \gamma(n)\}$.*

2 Preliminaries

Recall that ϕ is a multiplicative function, that is, $\phi(ab) = \phi(a)\phi(b)$ for any two positive integers a, b which are relatively prime. We have $\phi(p^k) = p^{k-1}(p-1) = p^{k-1}\phi(p)$ for any prime p and positive integer k . Also, $\sum_{d|m} \phi(d) = m$ for every positive integer m .

For an element $x \in C_n$, we denote by $o(x)$ the order of x . Let x, y be two distinct elements of C_n . If x, y are adjacent in $\mathcal{P}(C_n)$, then $o(x) \mid o(y)$ or $o(y) \mid o(x)$ according as $x \in \langle y \rangle$ or $y \in \langle x \rangle$. The converse statement is also true, that is, if $o(x) \mid o(y)$ or $o(y) \mid o(x)$, then x, y are adjacent in $\mathcal{P}(C_n)$. This follows from the fact that C_n (being cyclic) has a unique subgroup of order d for every positive divisor d of n . We shall use the converse statement frequently without mentioning it. For a positive divisor d of n , define the following two sets:

$$E_d := \{x \in C_n : o(x) = d\}, \text{ the set of all elements of } C_n \text{ whose order is } d,$$

$$S_d := \{x \in C_n : o(x) \mid d\}, \text{ the set of all elements of } C_n \text{ whose order divides } d.$$

Then S_d is a cyclic subgroup of C_n of order d and E_d is precisely the set of generators of S_d . So $|S_d| = d$ and $|E_d| = \phi(d)$. Note that any cut-set of $\mathcal{P}(C_n)$ must contain the two sets E_n and E_1 , as each element from these two sets is adjacent with all other elements.

For a given non-empty proper subset X of C_n , we define $\overline{X} := C_n \setminus X$ and denote by $\mathcal{P}(\overline{X})$ the induced subgraph of $\mathcal{P}(C_n)$ with vertex set \overline{X} . The following result is very useful throughout the paper, see [10, Lemma 2.1].

Lemma 2.1. [10] *If X is a minimal cut-set of $\mathcal{P}(C_n)$, then either $E_d \subseteq X$ or $E_d \cap X = \emptyset$ for each positive divisor d of n .*

As a consequence of Lemma 2.1, we have

Corollary 2.2. *Suppose that X is a minimal cut-set of $\mathcal{P}(C_n)$ and $A \cup B$ is a separation of $\mathcal{P}(\overline{X})$. Then for every positive divisor d of n , there are three possibilities for the set E_d : either $E_d \subseteq X$, $E_d \subseteq A$ or $E_d \subseteq B$.*

2.1 Elementary results

The following result can be found in [10, Lemma 3.1].

Lemma 2.3. *Let $p_1 < p_2 < \dots < p_t$ be prime numbers with $t \geq 1$. Then $q\phi(p_1 p_2 \cdots p_t) \geq p_1 p_2 \cdots p_t$ for any integer $q \geq t+1$, with equality when $(t, p_1, q) = (1, 2, 2)$ or $(t, p_1, p_2, q) = (2, 2, 3, 3)$.*

The proof of the following lemma is similar to that of [9, Lemma 2.1].

Lemma 2.4. *Let $m = p_1^{m_1} p_2^{m_2} \cdots p_t^{m_t}$, where $t \geq 2$, m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t are positive integers and p_1, p_2, \dots, p_t are prime numbers with $p_1 < p_2 < \cdots < p_t$. Then*

$$\phi\left(\frac{m}{p_i}\right) \geq p_k^{m_k-1} \phi\left(\frac{m}{p_k}\right)$$

for $2 \leq k \leq t$ and $1 \leq i \leq k-1$, where the inequality is strict except when $k = 2$, $(p_1, p_2) = (2, 3)$ and $m_1 \geq 2$.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $m = p_1^{m_1} p_2^{m_2} \cdots p_t^{m_t}$, where $t \geq 2$, m_1, m_2, \dots, m_t are positive integers and p_1, p_2, \dots, p_t are prime numbers with $p_1 < p_2 < \cdots < p_t$. Then*

$$\phi\left(\frac{m}{p_i}\right) \geq \phi\left(\frac{m}{p_k}\right)$$

for $1 \leq i < k \leq t$, where equality holds if and only if $(k, p_1, p_2) = (2, 2, 3)$ with $m_1 \geq 2$ and $m_2 = 1$.

Proof. Since $k \geq 2$, we have $p_k \geq 3$. Then $p_k^{m_k-1} \phi\left(\frac{m}{p_k}\right) \geq \phi\left(\frac{m}{p_k}\right)$ with equality if and only if $m_k = 1$. Now the result follows from Lemma 2.4. \square

The following lemma follows by expanding $\phi(p_1 p_2 \cdots p_t) = (p_1 - 1)(p_2 - 1) \cdots (p_t - 1)$.

Lemma 2.6. *Let p_1, p_2, \dots, p_t be pairwise distinct prime numbers with $t \geq 1$. Then*

$$p_1 p_2 \cdots p_t - \phi(p_1 p_2 \cdots p_t) = \sum_{i=1}^t \frac{p_1 \cdots p_t}{p_i} - \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i < j}}^t \frac{p_1 \cdots p_t}{p_i p_j} + \sum_{\substack{i,j,k=1 \\ i < j < k}}^t \frac{p_1 \cdots p_t}{p_i p_j p_k} + \cdots + (-1)^{t-1}.$$

We denote by $[m]$ the set $\{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ for a given positive integer m . The following lemma can be seen using the fact that $\sum_{d|m} \phi(d) = m$ for every positive integer m .

Lemma 2.7. *Let p_1, p_2, \dots, p_t be prime numbers with $p_1 < p_2 < \cdots < p_t$. Then $p_{i_1} p_{i_2} \cdots p_{i_k} - \phi(p_{i_1} p_{i_2} \cdots p_{i_k}) \geq p_1 p_2 \cdots p_k - \phi(p_1 p_2 \cdots p_k)$ for any subset $\{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k\}$ of $[t]$, with equality if and only if $k = 1$ or $\{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k\} = [k]$.*

We shall use the following fact throughout the paper. If G_1, G_2, \dots, G_k are subgroups of the cyclic group C_n , then the number of elements in the intersection $G_1 \cap G_2 \cap \cdots \cap G_k$ is equal to the greatest common divisor of the integers $|G_1|, |G_2|, \dots, |G_k|$.

Lemma 2.8. *Let $n = p_1^{n_1} p_2^{n_2} \cdots p_r^{n_r}$, where $r \geq 2$, n_1, n_2, \dots, n_r are positive integers and p_1, p_2, \dots, p_r are pairwise distinct prime numbers. Let $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_s\}$ and $\{b_1, b_2, \dots, b_t\}$ be two disjoint subsets of $[r]$, where $s \geq 1$, $t \geq 1$ and $s + t \leq r$. If K is the union of the subgroups $S_{\frac{n}{p_{a_1} p_{b_1} \cdots p_{b_t}}}, S_{\frac{n}{p_{a_2} p_{b_1} \cdots p_{b_t}}}, \dots, S_{\frac{n}{p_{a_s} p_{b_1} \cdots p_{b_t}}}$ of C_n , then*

$$|K| = \frac{n}{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r} \times \left[\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_{b_1} \cdots p_{b_t}} - p_{c_1} \cdots p_{c_u} \phi(p_{a_1} \cdots p_{a_s}) \right],$$

where $s + t + u = r$ and $\{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_u\} = [r] \setminus \{a_1, \dots, a_s, b_1, \dots, b_t\}$.

Proof. Since $K = \bigcup_{j=1}^s S_{p_{a_j} p_{b_1} \cdots p_{b_t}}^n$, we get that

$$\begin{aligned}
|K| &= \sum_{j=1}^s \left| S_{p_{a_j} p_{b_1} \cdots p_{b_t}}^n \right| - \sum_{\substack{j,k=1 \\ j < k}}^s \left| S_{p_{a_j} p_{b_1} \cdots p_{b_t}}^n \cap S_{p_{a_k} p_{b_1} \cdots p_{b_t}}^n \right| + \cdots + (-1)^{s-1} \left| \bigcap_{j=1}^s S_{p_{a_j} p_{b_1} \cdots p_{b_t}}^n \right| \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^s \frac{n}{p_{a_j} p_{b_1} \cdots p_{b_t}} - \sum_{\substack{j,k=1 \\ j < k}}^s \frac{n}{p_{a_j} p_{a_k} p_{b_1} \cdots p_{b_t}} + \cdots + (-1)^{s-1} \frac{n}{p_{a_1} \cdots p_{a_s} p_{b_1} \cdots p_{b_t}} \\
&= \frac{n}{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r} \times p_{c_1} \cdots p_{c_u} \times \left[\sum_{j=1}^s \frac{p_{a_1} \cdots p_{a_s}}{p_{a_j}} - \sum_{\substack{j,k=1 \\ j < k}}^s \frac{p_{a_1} \cdots p_{a_s}}{p_{a_j} p_{a_k}} + \cdots + (-1)^{s-1} \right] \\
&= \frac{n}{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r} \times p_{c_1} \cdots p_{c_u} \times [p_{a_1} \cdots p_{a_s} - \phi(p_{a_1} \cdots p_{a_s})] \\
&= \frac{n}{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r} \times \left[\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_{b_1} \cdots p_{b_t}} - p_{c_1} \cdots p_{c_u} \phi(p_{a_1} \cdots p_{a_s}) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

We have used Lemma 2.6 in the second last equality above. \square

3 Upper bounds

Let $n = p_1^{n_1} p_2^{n_2} \cdots p_r^{n_r}$, where $r \geq 2$, n_1, n_2, \dots, n_r are positive integers and p_1, p_2, \dots, p_r are prime numbers with $p_1 < p_2 < \cdots < p_r$. For $1 \leq j \leq r$, let Y_j and Z_j be the subsets of C_n defined by

$$Y_j := E_n \cup \left(\bigcup_{\substack{t=1 \\ t \neq j}}^r S_{p_j^{n_j} p_t}^n \right), \quad Z_j := E_n \cup \left(\bigcup_{s=1}^{n_j-1} E_{p_j^s}^n \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{\substack{t=1 \\ t \neq j}}^r S_{p_j^{n_j} p_t}^n \right).$$

Observe that $Z_j = Y_j$ if $n_j = 1$. The following argument showing that Y_j and Z_j are cut-sets of $\mathcal{P}(C_n)$ is similar to the proof of [9, Proposition 3.1].

Y_j is a cut-set of $\mathcal{P}(C_n)$: For an element $x \in \overline{Y_j}$, observe that $o(x)$ is one of the following two types:

(Y1) $p_1^{n_1} \cdots p_{j-1}^{n_{j-1}} p_j^s p_{j+1}^{n_{j+1}} \cdots p_r^{n_r}$ for some $s \in \{0, 1, \dots, n_j - 1\}$,

(Y2) $p_1^{l_1} \cdots p_{j-1}^{l_{j-1}} p_j^{n_j} p_{j+1}^{l_{j+1}} \cdots p_r^{l_r}$, where $0 \leq l_i \leq n_i$ for each $i \in [r] \setminus \{j\}$ and $l_i \neq n_i$ for at least one $i \in [r] \setminus \{j\}$.

Let A_j (respectively, B_j) be the subset of $\overline{Y_j}$ consisting of all the elements whose order is of type (Y1) (respectively, type (Y2)). Then A_j, B_j are nonempty sets and $A_j \cup B_j = \overline{Y_j}$. Since $l_i \neq n_i$ for at least one $i \in [r] \setminus \{j\}$, no element of A_j can be obtained as an integral power of any element of B_j . Since $s < n_j$, no element of B_j can be obtained as a power of any element of A_j . Thus there is no edge of $\mathcal{P}(\overline{Y_j})$ with one vertex from A_j and the other one from B_j . Therefore, $A_j \cup B_j$ is a separation of $\mathcal{P}(\overline{Y_j})$ and hence Y_j is a cut-set of $\mathcal{P}(C_n)$.

Z_j is a cut-set of $\mathcal{P}(C_n)$: For an element $x \in \overline{Z_j}$, observe that $o(x)$ is one of the following two types:

$$(Z1) \ p_1^{n_1} \cdots p_{j-1}^{n_{j-1}} p_{j+1}^{n_{j+1}} \cdots p_r^{n_r},$$

$$(Z2) \ p_1^{l_1} \cdots p_{j-1}^{l_{j-1}} p_j^t p_{j+1}^{l_{j+1}} \cdots p_r^{l_r}, \text{ where } 1 \leq t \leq n_j, 0 \leq l_i \leq n_i \text{ for } i \in [r] \setminus \{j\} \text{ and } l_i \neq n_i \text{ for at least one } i \in [r] \setminus \{j\}.$$

Let K_j (respectively, L_j) be the subset of $\overline{Z_j}$ consisting of all the elements whose order is of type (Z1) (respectively, type (Z2)). A similar argument as in the case of Y_j implies that $K_j \cup L_j$ is a separation of $\mathcal{P}(\overline{Z_j})$ and so Z_j is a cut-set of $\mathcal{P}(C_n)$.

Now, for $1 \leq j \leq r$, consider the integers $\alpha_j(n)$ and $\beta_j(n)$ defined by

$$\alpha_j(n) := \phi(n) + \frac{n}{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r} \times \left[\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_j} - \phi \left(\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_j} \right) \right],$$

$$\beta_j(n) := \phi(n) + \frac{n}{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r} \times \frac{1}{p_j^{n_j-1}} \left[\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_j} + \phi \left(\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_j} \right) \left(p_j^{n_j-1} - 2 \right) \right].$$

Note that $\alpha_r(n) = \alpha(n)$ and $\beta_r(n) = \beta(n)$, where $\alpha(n)$ and $\beta(n)$ are defined in the first section.

Lemma 3.1. $|Y_j| = \alpha_j(n)$ and $|Z_j| = \beta_j(n)$.

Proof. Using Lemma 2.8,

$$|Y_j| = |E_n| + \left| \bigcup_{\substack{t=1 \\ t \neq j}}^r S_{\frac{n}{p_j p_t}} \right| = \phi(n) + \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times \left[\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_j} - \phi \left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_j} \right) \right] = \alpha_j(n).$$

Since the sets $E_{\frac{n}{p_j}}, E_{\frac{n}{p_j^2}}, \dots, E_{\frac{n}{p_j^{n_j-1}}}$ are pairwise disjoint, we have

$$\left| \bigcup_{s=1}^{n_j-1} E_{\frac{n}{p_j^s}} \right| = \sum_{s=1}^{n_j-1} \left| E_{\frac{n}{p_j^s}} \right| = \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times \frac{1}{p_j^{n_j-1}} \times \phi \left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_j} \right) \times \left[\phi \left(p_j^{n_j-1} \right) + \cdots + \phi(p_j) \right]$$

$$= \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times \frac{1}{p_j^{n_j-1}} \times \phi \left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_j} \right) \left[p_j^{n_j-1} - 1 \right].$$

Again using Lemma 2.8, it can be calculated that

$$\left| \bigcup_{\substack{t=1 \\ t \neq j}}^r S_{\frac{n}{p_j p_t}} \right| = \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times \frac{1}{p_j^{n_j-1}} \times \left[\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_j} - \phi \left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_j} \right) \right].$$

Therefore,

$$|Z_j| = |E_n| + \left| \bigcup_{s=1}^{n_j-1} E_{\frac{n}{p_j^s}} \right| + \left| \bigcup_{\substack{t=1 \\ t \neq j}}^r S_{\frac{n}{p_j p_t}} \right|$$

$$= \phi(n) + \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times \frac{1}{p_j^{n_j-1}} \times \left[\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_j} + \phi \left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_j} \right) \left(p_j^{n_j-1} - 2 \right) \right] = \beta_j(n).$$

This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 3.2. *If $r \geq 3$, then $\alpha_1(n) > \alpha_2(n) > \cdots > \alpha_r(n)$.*

Proof. Let $j, k \in [r]$ with $j < k$. Since $p_j < p_k$ and $r \geq 3$, we have

$$\alpha_j(n) - \alpha_k(n) = \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times \left((p_k - p_j) \left[\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_j p_k} - \phi \left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_j p_k} \right) \right] \right) > 0$$

and so the lemma follows. \square

Lemma 3.3. *If $r \geq 3$, then the following hold:*

(i) $\alpha_j(n) = \beta_j(n)$ if and only if $n_j = 1$.

(ii) $\alpha_j(n) < \beta_j(n)$ if and only if $n_j \geq 2$ and $2\phi \left(\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_j} \right) > \frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_j}$.

(iii) $\alpha_j(n) > \beta_j(n)$ if and only if $n_j \geq 2$ and $2\phi \left(\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_j} \right) < \frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_j}$.

Proof. We have

$$\alpha_j(n) - \beta_j(n) = \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times \left(1 - \frac{1}{p_j^{n_j-1}} \right) \left[\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_j} - 2\phi \left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_j} \right) \right].$$

Since $r \geq 3$, $2\phi \left(\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_j} \right) \neq \frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_j}$ for $j \in [r]$, see [9, Theorem 1.3(iii)]. It now follows that (i), (ii) and (iii) hold. \square

Lemma 3.4. *Let $r \geq 3$ and $j, k \in [r]$ with $j < k$. If $2\phi \left(\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_j} \right) < \frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_j}$, then $\beta_j(n) > \beta_k(n)$.*

Proof. Since $2\phi \left(\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_j} \right) < \frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_j}$ and $\frac{\phi(p_j)}{\phi(p_k)} < \frac{p_j}{p_k}$, we have

$$2\phi \left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_k} \right) = 2\phi \left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_j} \right) \times \frac{\phi(p_j)}{\phi(p_k)} < \frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_j} \times \frac{p_j}{p_k} = \frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_k}.$$

Write $\beta_i(n) = \phi(n) + \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times u_i$ for $i \in \{j, k\}$, where

$$u_i = \frac{1}{p_i^{n_i-1}} \times \left[\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_i} - 2\phi \left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_i} \right) \right] + \phi \left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_i} \right).$$

If $p_j^{n_j-1} \leq p_k^{n_k-1}$, then it can be calculated that

$$u_j - u_k \geq \frac{p_k - p_j}{p_j^{n_j-1}} \times \left[\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_j p_k} - \phi \left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_j p_k} \right) + (p_j^{n_j-1} - 1) \phi \left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_j p_k} \right) \right] > 0.$$

The last strict inequality holds as $r \geq 3$. Similarly, if $p_j^{n_j-1} \geq p_k^{n_k-1}$, then

$$u_j - u_k \geq \frac{p_k - p_j}{p_k^{n_k-1}} \times \left[\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_j p_k} - \phi \left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_j p_k} \right) + (p_k^{n_k-1} - 1) \phi \left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_j p_k} \right) \right] > 0.$$

In both cases, it follows that $\beta_j(n) > \beta_k(n)$. \square

3.1 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Assume that $r \geq 3$ and fix $a, b \in [r]$. Let R be the union of the $r - 2$ subgroups $S_{\frac{n}{p_i p_a p_b}}$ of C_n , where $i \in [r] \setminus \{a, b\}$. Now consider the set $X_{a,b}$ defined by

$$X_{a,b} := R \cup E_n \cup E_{\frac{n}{p_a}} \cup E_{\frac{n}{p_a^2}} \cup \dots \cup E_{\frac{n}{p_a^{n_a}}} \cup E_{\frac{n}{p_b}} \cup E_{\frac{n}{p_b^2}} \cup \dots \cup E_{\frac{n}{p_b^{n_b}}}.$$

Observe that the sets involved in the definition of $X_{a,b}$ are pairwise disjoint. Define the integer $\gamma_{a,b}(n)$ by

$$\gamma_{a,b}(n) := \phi(n) + \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times \left[\phi\left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_a}\right) + \phi\left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_b}\right) + \frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_a p_b} - \phi\left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_a p_b}\right) \right].$$

We next show that $X_{a,b}$ is a cut-set of $\mathcal{P}(C_n)$ and that $|X_{a,b}| = \gamma_{a,b}(n)$.

Proposition 3.5. $X_{a,b}$ is a cut-set of $\mathcal{P}(C_n)$.

Proof. We prove the proposition by producing a separation of $\overline{\mathcal{P}(X_{a,b})}$. Without loss, we may assume that $a < b$. For an arbitrary element $x \in \overline{X_{a,b}}$, observe that $o(x)$ is of the form:

$$o(x) = p_1^{l_1} \cdots p_{a-1}^{l_{a-1}} p_a^{l_a} p_{a+1}^{l_{a+1}} \cdots p_{b-1}^{l_{b-1}} p_b^{l_b} p_{b+1}^{l_{b+1}} \cdots p_r^{l_r},$$

where the integers l_i satisfy the following conditions:

(i) $0 \leq l_i \leq n_i$ for each $i \in [r]$.

(ii) If $l_a < n_a$ and $l_b < n_b$, then $l_i = n_i$ for each $i \in [r] \setminus \{a, b\}$.

[Otherwise, x would be in $S_{\frac{n}{p_i p_a p_b}}$ for some $i \in [r] \setminus \{a, b\}$ and so in R .]

(iii) If $l_a = n_a$ or $l_b = n_b$, then $l_i \neq n_i$ for at least one $i \in [r] \setminus \{a, b\}$.

[Otherwise, x would be in E_n if $l_a = n_a$ and $l_b = n_b$, or in $E_{\frac{n}{p_a^j}}$ for some $j \in [n_a]$ if $l_a < n_a$ and $l_b = n_b$, or in $E_{\frac{n}{p_b^k}}$ for some $k \in [n_b]$ if $l_a = n_a$ and $l_b < n_b$.]

Let A be the subset of $\overline{X_{a,b}}$ consisting of all the elements whose order satisfy $l_a < n_a$ and $l_b < n_b$. Take $B := \overline{X_{a,b}} \setminus A$. Then each of A, B is nonempty as $r \geq 3$, and $\overline{X_{a,b}} = A \cup B$ is a disjoint union. Since $l_a = n_a$ or $l_b = n_b$ for the order of each element of B , no element of B can be obtained as an integral power of any element of A . Again, since $l_i \neq n_i$ for at least one $i \in [r] \setminus \{a, b\}$ for the order of each element of B , no element of A can be obtained as an integral power of any element of B . Thus there is no edge of $\mathcal{P}(\overline{X_{a,b}})$ with one vertex from A and the other one from B . Therefore, $A \cup B$ is a separation of $\mathcal{P}(\overline{X_{a,b}})$. \square

Proposition 3.6. $|X_{a,b}| = \gamma_{a,b}(n)$.

Proof. Applying Lemma 2.8, we get

$$|R| = \frac{n}{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r} \times \left[\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_a p_b} - \phi\left(\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_a p_b}\right) \right].$$

Since the sets $E_{\frac{n}{p_a}}, E_{\frac{n}{p_a^2}}, \dots, E_{\frac{n}{p_a^{n_a}}}$ are pairwise disjoint, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \bigcup_{j=1}^{n_a} E_{\frac{n}{p_a^j}} \right| &= \sum_{j=1}^{n_a} \left| E_{\frac{n}{p_a^j}} \right| = \sum_{j=1}^{n_a} \phi\left(\frac{n}{p_a^j}\right) = \phi\left(\frac{n}{p_a^{n_a}}\right) \times \sum_{j=0}^{n_a-1} \phi(p_a^j) \\ &= \phi\left(\frac{n}{p_a^{n_a}}\right) p_a^{n_a-1} = \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times \phi\left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_a}\right). \end{aligned}$$

A similar calculation gives that

$$\left| \bigcup_{j=1}^{n_b} E_{\frac{n}{p_b^j}} \right| = \frac{n}{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r} \times \phi \left(\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_b} \right).$$

Since the right hand side in the definition of the set $X_{a,b}$ is a disjoint union, we have

$$|X_{a,b}| = |E_n| + |R| + \left| \bigcup_{j=1}^{n_a} E_{\frac{n}{p_a^j}} \right| + \left| \bigcup_{j=1}^{n_b} E_{\frac{n}{p_b^j}} \right|.$$

Using $|E_n| = \phi(n)$, it now follows from the above equalities that $|X_{a,b}| = \gamma_{a,b}(n)$. \square

As a consequence of Propositions 3.5 and 3.6, we have

Corollary 3.7. $\kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n)) \leq \gamma_{a,b}(n)$ for any two distinct $a, b \in [r]$.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. The integer $\gamma(n)$ defined in the first section is precisely the integer $\gamma_{r-1,r}(n)$. So the theorem follows from the above corollary. \square

Proposition 3.8. $\gamma_{a,b}(n) > \gamma_{r-1,r}(n) = \gamma(n)$ for $a, b \in [r]$ with $\{a, b\} \neq \{r-1, r\}$.

Proof. Since $\{a, b\} \neq \{r-1, r\}$, we have

$$\phi \left(\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_r} \right) + \phi \left(\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_{r-1}} \right) < \phi \left(\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_a} \right) + \phi \left(\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_b} \right).$$

By Lemma 2.7,

$$\left[\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_{r-1} p_r} - \phi \left(\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_{r-1} p_r} \right) \right] \leq \left[\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_a p_b} - \phi \left(\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_a p_b} \right) \right].$$

Now it can be seen that the proposition holds. \square

Proposition 3.9. *The following hold:*

(i) If $n_r \geq 2$, then $\beta(n) < \gamma(n)$.

(ii) $\alpha(n) \leq \gamma(n)$ if and only if $\left(2 + \frac{p_r - 2}{p_{r-1} - 1}\right) \times \phi(p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{r-2}) \geq p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{r-2}$.

Proof. We have $\beta(n) = \phi(n) + \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times u$ and $\gamma(n) = \phi(n) + \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times v$, where

$$u = \frac{1}{p_r^{n_r-1}} [p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{r-1} + \phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-1}) (p_r^{n_r-1} - 2)],$$

$$v = \phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-1}) + \phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-2} p_r) + p_1 \cdots p_{r-2} - \phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-2}).$$

An easy calculation gives that

$$v - u = \frac{1}{p_r^{n_r-1}} [\phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-2}) (p_r^{n_r-1} (p_r - 2) + 2\phi(p_{r-1})) + p_1 \cdots p_{r-2} (p_r^{n_r-1} - p_{r-1})].$$

Now $n_r \geq 2$ implies that $v - u > 0$ and it follows that $\gamma(n) > \beta(n)$. This proves (i).

It can be calculated that

$$\gamma(n) - \alpha(n) = \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times \phi(p_{r-1}) \left[\left(2 + \frac{p_r - 2}{p_{r-1} - 1}\right) \times \phi(p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{r-2}) - p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{r-2} \right]$$

and (ii) follows from this. \square

3.2 Application of Theorem 1.1

As an application of Theorem 1.1, we prove the following result which is useful while proving Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 in the subsequent sections.

Proposition 3.10. *If X is a minimum cut-set of $\mathcal{P}(C_n)$, then X contains at most two of the sets $E_{\frac{n}{p_1}}, E_{\frac{n}{p_2}}, \dots, E_{\frac{n}{p_r}}$.*

Proof. By Theorem 1.1, we have $|X| = \kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n)) \leq \gamma(n)$. Set $T := X \setminus E_n$. Since E_n is contained in X , we have $|T| = |X| - |E_n| = |X| - \phi(n) \leq \gamma(n) - \phi(n)$. This gives

$$|T| \leq \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times [\phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-1}) + \phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-2} p_r) + p_1 \cdots p_{r-2} - \phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-2})]. \quad (3)$$

Consider the sets $E_{\frac{n}{p_i}}$ for $1 \leq i \leq r$. By Lemma 2.1, each of them is either contained in X or disjoint from X . Note that, if any such set is contained in X , then it must be contained in T .

If possible, suppose that the sets $E_{\frac{n}{p_j}}, E_{\frac{n}{p_k}}$ and $E_{\frac{n}{p_l}}$ are contained in X , where j, k, l are pairwise distinct elements in $[r]$. Without loss, we may assume that $j < k < l$. Since $E_{\frac{n}{p_j}}, E_{\frac{n}{p_k}}, E_{\frac{n}{p_l}}$ are pairwise disjoint and contained in T , we have

$$|T| \geq \left| E_{\frac{n}{p_j}} \right| + \left| E_{\frac{n}{p_k}} \right| + \left| E_{\frac{n}{p_l}} \right| = \phi\left(\frac{n}{p_j}\right) + \phi\left(\frac{n}{p_k}\right) + \phi\left(\frac{n}{p_l}\right).$$

Since $j \leq r-2$ and $k \leq r-1$, Lemma 2.4 gives that

$$\phi\left(\frac{n}{p_j}\right) \geq p_{r-1}^{n_{r-1}-1} \phi\left(\frac{n}{p_{r-1}}\right) = \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times \phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-2} p_r)$$

and

$$\phi\left(\frac{n}{p_k}\right) \geq p_r^{n_r-1} \phi\left(\frac{n}{p_r}\right) = \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times \phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-2} p_{r-1}).$$

If $l < r$, then again using Lemma 2.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi\left(\frac{n}{p_l}\right) &\geq p_r^{n_r-1} \phi\left(\frac{n}{p_r}\right) = \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times \phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-2} p_{r-1}) \\ &= \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times \phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-2}) (p_{r-1} - 1) \\ &> \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times [p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{r-2} - \phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-2})]. \end{aligned}$$

The strict inequality in the above holds by Lemma 2.3 as $p_{r-1} > r-1$. Now suppose that $l = r$. We have $\frac{\phi(p_{r-1} p_r)}{p_r} = \phi(p_{r-1}) - \frac{\phi(p_{r-1})}{p_r} > r-2$. Then using Lemmas 2.3 and 2.4 again, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \phi\left(\frac{n}{p_l}\right) &= \phi\left(\frac{n}{p_r}\right) \geq \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times \frac{\phi(p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{r-1} p_r)}{p_r} \\ &> \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times (r-2) \phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-2}) \\ &= \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times [(r-1) \phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-2}) - \phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-2})] \\ &\geq \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times [p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{r-2} - \phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-2})]. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above inequalities, we get

$$|T| > \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times [\phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-1}) + \phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-2} p_r) + p_1 \cdots p_{r-2} - \phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-2})],$$

which is a contradiction to (3). This completes the proof. \square

4 Proof of Theorem 1.2

Let $n = p_1^{n_1} p_2^{n_2} \cdots p_r^{n_r}$, where $r \geq 3$, n_1, n_2, \dots, n_r are positive integers and p_1, p_2, \dots, p_r are prime numbers with $p_1 < p_2 < \cdots < p_r$. Recall that the set

$$Y_r = E_n \cup \left(\bigcup_{t=1}^{r-1} S_{\frac{n}{p_r p_t}} \right)$$

defined in Section 3 is a cut-set of $\mathcal{P}(C_n)$ which gives the upper bound $\alpha_r(n) = \alpha(n)$ for $\kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n))$.

We shall use the following fact frequently in the rest of the paper. Suppose that X is a cut-set of $\mathcal{P}(C_n)$ and $A \cup B$ is a separation of $\mathcal{P}(\overline{X})$. If A contains an element of order a and B contains an element of order b , then the unique subgroup $S_{(a,b)}$ of C_n must be contained in X , where (a, b) denotes the greatest common divisor of a and b . The following proposition gives a sufficient condition for $\kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n)) = \alpha(n)$.

Proposition 4.1. *Let X be a minimum cut-set of $\mathcal{P}(C_n)$. If X does not contain any of the sets $E_{\frac{n}{p_1}}, E_{\frac{n}{p_2}}, \dots, E_{\frac{n}{p_r}}$, then $X = Y_r$ and so $\kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n)) = \alpha(n)$.*

Proof. Fix a separation $A \cup B$ of $\mathcal{P}(\overline{X})$. Let $P = \left\{ E_{\frac{n}{p_i}} : 1 \leq i \leq r, E_{\frac{n}{p_i}} \subseteq A \right\}$ and $Q = \left\{ E_{\frac{n}{p_j}} : 1 \leq j \leq r, E_{\frac{n}{p_j}} \subseteq B \right\}$. Set $a = |P|$ and $b = |Q|$. Then $a + b = r$ with $1 \leq a \leq r - 1$ and $1 \leq b \leq r - 1$ (these inequalities hold since both A and B are nonempty and E_n is contained in X).

Case 1: $a = 1$ or $b = 1$.

Without loss, we may assume that $a = 1$. Suppose that $P = \left\{ E_{\frac{n}{p_k}} \right\}$ for some $k \in [r]$. Then $Q = \left\{ E_{\frac{n}{p_j}} : j \in [r] \setminus \{k\} \right\}$. We show that $k = r$.

Since $A \cup B$ is a separation of $\mathcal{P}(\overline{X})$, it follows that the subgroups $S_{\frac{n}{p_k p_j}}$, $j \in [r] \setminus \{k\}$, of C_n are contained in X . Let L be the union of these $r - 1$ subgroups of C_n . By Lemma 2.8,

$$|L| = \frac{n}{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r} \times \left[\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_k} - \phi \left(\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_k} \right) \right].$$

Since E_n and L are disjoint and contained in X , we get $|X| \geq \phi(n) + |L|$. If $k \neq r$, then Lemma 2.7 together with the fact that $r \geq 3$ imply

$$\kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n)) = |X| \geq \phi(n) + |L| > \phi(n) + \frac{n}{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r} \times [p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{r-1} - \phi(p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{r-1})] = \alpha(n),$$

a contradiction to (1).

Thus $k = r$ and hence X contains $E_n \cup L = E_n \cup \left(\bigcup_{j=1}^{r-1} S_{\frac{n}{p_r p_j}} \right) = Y_r$. Since both X and Y_r are cut-sets of $\mathcal{P}(C_n)$ with X being of minimum size, we must have $X = Y_r$ and hence $\kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n)) = |X| = |Y_r| = \alpha(n)$.

Case 2: $a \geq 2$ and $b \geq 2$.

We show that this case is not possible. Suppose that $P = \left\{ E_{\frac{n}{p_{i_1}}}, E_{\frac{n}{p_{i_2}}}, \dots, E_{\frac{n}{p_{i_a}}} \right\}$ and $Q = \left\{ E_{\frac{n}{p_{i_{a+1}}}}, E_{\frac{n}{p_{i_{a+2}}}}, \dots, E_{\frac{n}{p_{i_{a+b}}}} \right\}$, where $[r] = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_a, i_{a+1}, i_{a+2}, \dots, i_{a+b}\}$. Without loss, we may assume that $p_{i_1} > p_{i_{a+1}}$. Since $A \cup B$ is a separation of $\mathcal{P}(\bar{X})$, the following subgroups

$$\begin{array}{c} S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_1} p_{i_{a+1}}}}, S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_1} p_{i_{a+2}}}}, \dots, S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_1} p_{i_{a+b}}}} \\ S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_2} p_{i_{a+1}}}}, S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_2} p_{i_{a+2}}}}, \dots, S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_2} p_{i_{a+b}}}} \\ \vdots \\ S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_a} p_{i_{a+1}}}}, S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_a} p_{i_{a+2}}}}, \dots, S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_a} p_{i_{a+b}}}} \end{array}$$

of C_n must be contained in X . Consider the following three subsets of C_n :

$$K_1 = \bigcup_{k=1}^b S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_1} p_{i_{a+k}}}}, \quad K_2 = \bigcup_{l=2}^a S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_l} p_{i_{a+1}}}}, \quad K_3 = \bigcup_{l=2}^a S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_1} p_{i_l}}}$$

Thus K_1 is the union of the subgroups listed above in the first row, and K_2 is the union of the subgroups listed in the first column, except the subgroup $S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_1} p_{i_{a+1}}}}$. The set K_3 is well-defined as $a \geq 2$. Note that K_1 and K_2 are contained in X but K_3 need not be. By Lemma 2.8,

$$\begin{aligned} |K_2| &= \frac{n}{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r} \times p_{i_1} p_{i_{a+2}} \cdots p_{i_{a+b}} [p_{i_2} \cdots p_{i_a} - \phi(p_{i_2} \cdots p_{i_a})], \\ |K_3| &= \frac{n}{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r} \times p_{i_{a+1}} p_{i_{a+2}} \cdots p_{i_{a+b}} [p_{i_2} \cdots p_{i_a} - \phi(p_{i_2} \cdots p_{i_a})]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $p_{i_1} > p_{i_{a+1}}$ by our assumption, it follows that $|K_2| > |K_3|$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} K_1 \cap K_2 &= \left(\bigcup_{l=2}^a S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_1} p_{i_l} p_{i_{a+1}}}} \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{l=2}^a S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_1} p_{i_l} p_{i_{a+1}} p_{i_{a+2}}}} \right) \cup \dots \cup \left(\bigcup_{l=2}^a S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_1} p_{i_l} p_{i_{a+1}} p_{i_{a+b}}}} \right) \\ &\subseteq \left(\bigcup_{l=2}^a S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_1} p_{i_l} p_{i_{a+1}}}} \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{l=2}^a S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_1} p_{i_l} p_{i_{a+2}}}} \right) \cup \dots \cup \left(\bigcup_{l=2}^a S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_1} p_{i_l} p_{i_{a+b}}}} \right) \\ &= K_1 \cap K_3. \end{aligned}$$

So $|K_1 \cap K_2| \leq |K_1 \cap K_3|$ and hence

$$|K_1 \cup K_2| = |K_1| + |K_2| - |K_1 \cap K_2| > |K_1| + |K_3| - |K_1 \cap K_3| = |K_1 \cup K_3|.$$

Therefore, $|X| \geq |E_n| + |K_1 \cup K_2| > \phi(n) + |K_1 \cup K_3|$. Since $K_1 \cup K_3$ is the union of the subgroups $S_{\frac{n}{p_i p_j}}$, $j \in [r] \setminus \{i_1\}$, of C_n , Lemmas 2.8 and Lemma 2.7 give that

$$\begin{aligned} |K_1 \cup K_3| &= \frac{n}{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r} \times [p_{i_2} \cdots p_{i_a} p_{i_{a+1}} \cdots p_{i_{a+b}} - \phi(p_{i_2} \cdots p_{i_a} p_{i_{a+1}} \cdots p_{i_{a+b}})] \\ &\geq \frac{n}{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r} \times [p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{r-1} - \phi(p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{r-1})]. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n)) &= |X| > \phi(n) + |K_1 \cup K_3| \\ &\geq \phi(n) + \frac{n}{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r} \times [p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{r-1} - \phi(p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{r-1})] = \alpha(n), \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction to (1). \square

Proposition 4.2. *Let X be a minimum cut-set of $\mathcal{P}(C_n)$ and $A \cup B$ be a separation of $\mathcal{P}(\overline{X})$. If X contains $E_{\frac{n}{p_s}}$ for exactly one $s \in [r]$, then all the remaining sets $E_{\frac{n}{p_i}}$, $i \in [r] \setminus \{s\}$, are contained either in A or in B .*

Proof. Taking $u = p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{r-1} - \phi(p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{r-1})$, we have

$$|X| = \kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n)) \leq \alpha(n) = \phi(n) + \frac{n}{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r} \times u. \quad (4)$$

Define the following two sets:

$$P := \left\{ E_{\frac{n}{p_i}} : i \in [r] \setminus \{s\}, E_{\frac{n}{p_i}} \subseteq A \right\}, \quad Q := \left\{ E_{\frac{n}{p_j}} : j \in [r] \setminus \{s\}, E_{\frac{n}{p_j}} \subseteq B \right\}.$$

Set $a = |P|$ and $b = |Q|$. Then $a + b = r - 1$ with $0 \leq a \leq r - 1$ and $0 \leq b \leq r - 1$. We show that either $a = 0$ or $b = 0$. Suppose that $a \geq 1$ and $b \geq 1$.

Case 1: $a = 1$ or $b = 1$.

Without loss, we may assume that $a = 1$. Suppose that $P = \left\{ E_{\frac{n}{p_j}} \right\}$ for some $j \in [r]$. Then $Q = \left\{ E_{\frac{n}{p_i}} : i \in [r] \setminus \{j, s\} \right\}$. Since $A \cup B$ is a separation of $\mathcal{P}(\overline{X})$, the subgroups $S_{\frac{n}{p_i p_j}}$, $i \in [r] \setminus \{j, s\}$, of C_n are contained in X . Let L be the union of these $r - 2$ subgroups of C_n . By Lemma 2.8, we have

$$|L| = \frac{n}{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r} \times \left[\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_j} - p_s \phi \left(\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_s p_j} \right) \right].$$

Since E_n , $E_{\frac{n}{p_s}}$ and L are pairwise disjoint and contained in X , we get

$$\begin{aligned} |X| &\geq |E_n| + \left| E_{\frac{n}{p_s}} \right| + |L| \\ &\geq \phi(n) + \phi \left(\frac{n}{p_s} \right) + \frac{n}{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r} \times \left[\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_j} - p_s \phi \left(\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_s p_j} \right) \right] \\ &\geq \phi(n) + \frac{n}{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r} \times \left[\frac{\phi(p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r)}{p_s} + \frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_j} - p_s \phi \left(\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_s p_j} \right) \right] \\ &= \phi(n) + \frac{n}{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r} \times v, \end{aligned}$$

where $v = \frac{\phi(p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r)}{p_s} + \frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_j} - p_s \phi\left(\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_s p_j}\right)$. We have

$$v - u = \frac{\phi(p_1 \cdots p_r)}{p_s} + \frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_j} - p_s \phi\left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_s p_j}\right) - p_1 \cdots p_{r-1} + \phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-1}).$$

If $j = r$, then $v - u = \phi\left(\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_r p_s}\right) \times \left[\frac{\phi(p_r p_s)}{p_s} - 1\right] > 0$. Assume that $s = r$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} v - u &= \frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_r p_j} \times (p_r - p_j) - \phi\left(\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_r p_j}\right) \left[p_r - \frac{\phi(p_j p_r)}{p_r} - \phi(p_j)\right] \\ &= (p_r - p_j) \times \left[\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_r p_j} - \phi\left(\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_r p_j}\right)\right] + \phi\left(\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_r p_j}\right) \times \left(\frac{\phi(p_j p_r)}{p_r} - 1\right). \end{aligned}$$

If $p_j > 2$, then $\frac{\phi(p_j p_r)}{p_r} > 1$ and so $v - u > 0$. Suppose that $p_j = 2$. Then $j = 1$. In this case,

$$\begin{aligned} v - u &= (p_r - 2) \times [p_2 \cdots p_{r-1} - \phi(p_2 \cdots p_{r-1})] - \frac{1}{p_r} \phi(p_2 \cdots p_{r-1}) \\ &\geq (p_r - 2) \times \phi(p_3 \cdots p_{r-1}) - \frac{1}{p_r} \phi(p_2 \cdots p_{r-1}) \\ &= \phi(p_3 \cdots p_{r-1}) \times \left[p_r - 2 - \frac{p_2 - 1}{p_r}\right] > 0. \end{aligned}$$

In the above, $\phi(p_3 \cdots p_{r-1})$ is considered to be 1 if $r = 3$. Now assume that $s \neq r$ and $j \neq r$. Then an easy calculation gives that

$$\begin{aligned} v - u &= \frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_r p_j} \times (p_r - p_j) + \phi\left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_j p_s p_r}\right) \left[\frac{\phi(p_j p_s p_r)}{p_s} - \phi(p_s p_r) - \phi(p_r) + \phi(p_j p_s)\right] \\ &= \frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_r p_j} \times (p_r - p_j) + \phi\left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_j p_s}\right) \left[\frac{\phi(p_j p_s)}{p_s} - 1\right] - \phi\left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_j p_r}\right) (p_r - p_j) \\ &= (p_r - p_j) \times \left[\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_j p_r} - \phi\left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_j p_r}\right)\right] + \phi\left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_j p_s}\right) \left[\frac{\phi(p_j p_s)}{p_s} - 1\right]. \end{aligned}$$

If $p_j > 2$, then $\frac{\phi(p_j p_s)}{p_s} \geq 1$ and it follows that $v - u > 0$. Suppose that $p_j = 2$. Then $j = 1$ and $p_s \geq 3$. In this case, for $r \geq 4$,

$$\begin{aligned} v - u &= (p_r - 2)[p_2 \cdots p_{r-1} - \phi(p_2 \cdots p_{r-1})] - \frac{1}{p_s} \phi\left(\frac{p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_s}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{p_s} \left[p_s(p_r - 2)(p_2 \cdots p_{r-1} - \phi(p_2 \cdots p_{r-1})) - \phi\left(\frac{p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_s}\right)\right] \\ &\geq \frac{1}{p_s} [p_s(p_r - 2)(p_2 \cdots p_{r-1} - \phi(p_2 \cdots p_{r-1})) - \phi(p_3 \cdots p_r)] \\ &> \frac{1}{p_s} [\phi(p_r)(p_2 \cdots p_{r-1} - \phi(p_2 \cdots p_{r-1})) - \phi(p_3 \cdots p_r)] \\ &= \frac{\phi(p_r)}{p_s} \times [p_2 \cdots p_{r-1} - p_2 \phi(p_3 \cdots p_{r-1})] > 0. \end{aligned}$$

If $r = 3$, then $s = 2$ and $v - u = p_3 - 2 - \frac{\phi(p_3)}{p_2} > 0$. In all the cases, we thus have $v > u$ and hence $|X| \geq \phi(n) + \frac{n}{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r} \times v > \phi(n) + \frac{n}{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r} \times u$, a contradiction to (4).

Case 2: $a \geq 2$ and $b \geq 2$.

We shall apply a similar argument used in Case 2 of Proposition 4.1. Suppose that $P = \{E_{\frac{n}{p_{i_1}}}, E_{\frac{n}{p_{i_2}}}, \dots, E_{\frac{n}{p_{i_a}}}\}$ and $Q = \{E_{\frac{n}{p_{i_{a+1}}}}, E_{\frac{n}{p_{i_{a+2}}}}, \dots, E_{\frac{n}{p_{i_{a+b}}}}\}$, where

$$[r] \setminus \{s\} = \{i_1, \dots, i_a, i_{a+1}, \dots, i_{a+b}\}.$$

Without loss, we may assume that $p_{i_1} > p_{i_{a+1}}$. Since $A \cup B$ is a separation of $\mathcal{P}(\overline{X})$, the following subgroups

$$\begin{aligned} & S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_1} p_{i_{a+1}}}}, S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_1} p_{i_{a+2}}}}, \dots, S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_1} p_{i_{a+b}}}} \\ & S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_2} p_{i_{a+1}}}}, S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_2} p_{i_{a+2}}}}, \dots, S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_2} p_{i_{a+b}}}} \\ & \vdots \\ & S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_a} p_{i_{a+1}}}}, S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_a} p_{i_{a+2}}}}, \dots, S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_a} p_{i_{a+b}}}} \end{aligned}$$

of C_n must be contained in X . Consider the following three subsets of C_n :

$$R_1 = \bigcup_{k=1}^b S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_1} p_{i_{a+k}}}}, \quad R_2 = \bigcup_{l=2}^a S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_l} p_{i_{a+1}}}}, \quad R_3 = \bigcup_{l=2}^a S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_1} p_{i_l}}}.$$

Note that R_1 and R_2 are contained in X but R_3 need not be. Also, observe that $R_1 \cup R_3$ is the union of the $r - 2$ subgroups $S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_1} p_{i_j}}}$ with $j \in [r] \setminus \{i_1, s\}$.

In Case 1, if we suppose that $E_{\frac{n}{p_{i_1}}}$ is contained in A and the sets $E_{\frac{n}{p_j}}$, $j \in [r] \setminus \{i_1, s\}$, are contained in B , then X will contain the sets E_n , $E_{\frac{n}{p_s}}$, $R_1 \cup R_3$ and it would follow that

$$|E_n| + \left| E_{\frac{n}{p_s}} \right| + |R_1 \cup R_3| > \phi(n) + \frac{n}{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r} \times u = \alpha(n). \quad (5)$$

We shall use this estimate to get a contradiction. By Lemma 2.8,

$$\begin{aligned} |R_2| &= \frac{n}{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r} \times p_s p_{i_1} p_{i_{a+2}} \cdots p_{i_{a+b}} [p_{i_2} \cdots p_{i_a} - \phi(p_{i_2} \cdots p_{i_a})], \\ |R_3| &= \frac{n}{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r} \times p_s p_{i_{a+1}} p_{i_{a+2}} \cdots p_{i_{a+b}} [p_{i_2} \cdots p_{i_a} - \phi(p_{i_2} \cdots p_{i_a})]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $p_{i_1} > p_{i_{a+1}}$ by our assumption, it follows that $|R_2| > |R_3|$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 \cap R_2 &= \left(\bigcup_{l=2}^a S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_1} p_{i_l} p_{i_{a+1}}}} \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{l=2}^a S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_1} p_{i_l} p_{i_{a+1}} p_{i_{a+2}}}} \right) \cup \dots \cup \left(\bigcup_{l=2}^a S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_1} p_{i_l} p_{i_{a+1}} p_{i_{a+b}}}} \right) \\ &\subseteq \left(\bigcup_{l=2}^a S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_1} p_{i_l} p_{i_{a+1}}}} \right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{l=2}^a S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_1} p_{i_l} p_{i_{a+2}}}} \right) \cup \dots \cup \left(\bigcup_{l=2}^a S_{\frac{n}{p_{i_1} p_{i_l} p_{i_{a+b}}}} \right) \\ &= R_1 \cap R_3. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $|R_1 \cap R_2| \leq |R_1 \cap R_3|$ and hence

$$|R_1 \cup R_2| = |R_1| + |R_2| - |R_1 \cap R_2| > |R_1| + |R_3| - |R_1 \cap R_3| = |R_1 \cup R_3|.$$

Then $|X| \geq |E_n| + \left| E_{\frac{n}{p_s}} \right| + |R_1 \cup R_2| > \phi(n) + \phi\left(\frac{n}{p_s}\right) + |R_1 \cup R_3| > \alpha(n)$ using (5), which is a contradiction to (4). \square

Corollary 4.3. *Let X be a minimum cut-set of $\mathcal{P}(C_n)$. If X contains $E_{\frac{n}{p_s}}$ for exactly one $s \in [r]$, then $n_s \geq 2$.*

Proof. Let $A \cup B$ be a separation of $\mathcal{P}(\overline{X})$. By Proposition 4.2, we may assume that the sets $E_{\frac{n}{p_i}}$, $i \in [r] \setminus \{s\}$, are contained in A . Then an arbitrary element in B must have order of the form $\frac{n}{p_s^k}$, where $0 \leq k \leq n_s$. The sets E_n and $E_{\frac{n}{p_s}}$ are contained in X and the order of the elements in these two sets correspond to $k = 0, 1$ respectively. Since B is non-empty, we must have that $n_s \geq 2$. \square

Theorem 4.4. *Let X be a minimum cut-set of $\mathcal{P}(C_n)$ containing $E_{\frac{n}{p_s}}$ for a unique $s \in [r]$. Then $s = r$ and $\kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n)) = \beta_r(n) = \beta(n)$.*

Proof. Recall that $\beta_s(n) = \phi(n) + \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times \frac{1}{p_s^{n_s-1}} \left[\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_s} + \phi\left(\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_s}\right) (p_s^{n_s-1} - 2) \right]$ and that $|X| = \kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n)) \leq \min\{\alpha(n), \beta_s(n)\}$.

We have $n_s \geq 2$ by Corollary 4.3. Fix a separation $A \cup B$ of $\mathcal{P}(\overline{X})$. By Proposition 4.2, we may assume that all the sets $E_{\frac{n}{p_i}}$, $i \in [r] \setminus \{s\}$, are contained in A . Then any element in B must be of order of the form

$$p_1^{n_1} \cdots p_{s-1}^{n_{s-1}} p_s^t p_{s+1}^{n_{s+1}} \cdots p_r^{n_r}$$

for some t with $0 \leq t \leq n_s - 2$, as E_n and $E_{\frac{n}{p_s}}$ are contained in X . Let $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, n_s - 2\}$ be the largest integer for which B has an element of order $p_1^{n_1} \cdots p_{s-1}^{n_{s-1}} p_s^k p_{s+1}^{n_{s+1}} \cdots p_r^{n_r}$. Then the elements of C_n of order $p_1^{n_1} \cdots p_{s-1}^{n_{s-1}} p_s^j p_{s+1}^{n_{s+1}} \cdots p_r^{n_r}$ with $k + 1 \leq j \leq n_s$ are in X .

Thus the sets E_n , $E_{\frac{n}{p_s^l}}$ with $1 \leq l \leq n_s - k - 1$ and the subgroups $S_{\frac{n}{p_s^{n_s-k} p_i}}$, $i \in [r] \setminus \{s\}$, are contained in X . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \bigcup_{l=1}^{n_s-k-1} E_{\frac{n}{p_s^l}} \right| &= \sum_{l=1}^{n_s-k-1} \left| E_{\frac{n}{p_s^l}} \right| = \phi\left(\frac{n}{p_s^{n_s}}\right) [\phi(p_s^{n_s-1}) + \cdots + \phi(p_s^{k+1})] \\ &= \phi\left(\frac{n}{p_s^{n_s}}\right) [p_s^{n_s-1} - p_s^k] \\ &= \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times \frac{1}{p_s^{n_s-1}} \times \phi\left(\frac{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r}{p_s}\right) [p_s^{n_s-1} - p_s^k]. \end{aligned}$$

Applying a similar argument as in the proof Lemma 2.8, it can be calculated that

$$\left| \bigcup_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq s}}^r S_{\frac{n}{p_s^{n_s-k} p_i}} \right| = \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times \frac{1}{p_s^{n_s-k-1}} \times \left[\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_s} - \phi\left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_s}\right) \right]$$

Therefore, $|X| \geq |E_n| + \left| \bigcup_{l=1}^{n_s-k-1} E_{\frac{n}{p_s^l}} \right| + \left| \bigcup_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq s}}^r S_{\frac{n}{p_s^{n_s-k} p_i}} \right| = \mu_k$, where

$$\mu_k = \phi(n) + \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times \left[\phi\left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_s}\right) + \frac{1}{p_s^{n_s-k-1}} \left[\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_s} - 2\phi\left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_s}\right) \right] \right].$$

Since $r \geq 3$, $\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_s} \neq 2\phi\left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_s}\right)$, see [9, Theorem 1.3(iii)]. If $\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_s} < 2\phi\left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_s}\right)$, then μ_k is minimum when $k = n_s - 2$. In that case,

$$\begin{aligned} |X| &\geq \mu_{n_s-2} = \phi(n) + \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times \left[\phi\left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_s}\right) + \frac{1}{p_s} \left[\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_s} - 2\phi\left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_s}\right) \right] \right] \\ &> \phi(n) + \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times \left[\phi\left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_s}\right) + \frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_s} - 2\phi\left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_s}\right) \right] \\ &= \phi(n) + \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times \left[\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_s} - \phi\left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_s}\right) \right] \\ &\geq \phi(n) + \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times [p_1 \cdots p_{r-1} - \phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-1})] = \alpha(n), \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction to that $|X| \leq \alpha(n)$. In the above, the second last inequality follows from Lemma 2.7.

Thus $\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_s} > 2\phi\left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_s}\right)$. In this case, μ_k is minimum when $k = 0$ and so

$$\begin{aligned} |X| &\geq \mu_0 = \phi(n) + \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times \left[\phi\left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_s}\right) + \frac{1}{p_s^{n_s-1}} \left[\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_s} - 2\phi\left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_s}\right) \right] \right] \\ &= \phi(n) + \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times \frac{1}{p_s^{n_s-1}} \times \left[\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_s} + \phi\left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_s}\right) (p_s^{n_s-1} - 2) \right] \\ &= \beta_s(n). \end{aligned}$$

Since $|X| \leq \beta_s(n)$, it follows that $|X| = \beta_s(n)$.

We now claim that $s = r$. Suppose that $s \neq r$. Then $s < r$. Since $\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_s} > 2\phi\left(\frac{p_1 \cdots p_r}{p_s}\right)$, Lemma 3.4 implies that $\beta_s(n) > \beta_r(n)$. Then $\kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n)) = |X| = \beta_s(n) > \beta_r(n) = \beta(n)$, a contradiction to (2). \square

Proposition 4.5. *If $n_r \geq 2$ and X is a minimum cut-set of $\mathcal{P}(C_n)$, then X contains at most one of the sets $E_{\frac{n}{p_1}}, E_{\frac{n}{p_2}}, \dots, E_{\frac{n}{p_r}}$.*

Proof. If possible, suppose that the sets $E_{\frac{n}{p_k}}$ and $E_{\frac{n}{p_l}}$ are contained in X for some $k, l \in [r]$ with $k \neq l$. We may assume that $k < l$. Then $k \leq r - 1$. Using Lemmas 2.5 and 2.4,

$$\left| E_{\frac{n}{p_l}} \right| = \phi\left(\frac{n}{p_l}\right) \geq \phi\left(\frac{n}{p_r}\right) \geq \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times \frac{\phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-1} p_r)}{p_r}$$

and

$$\left| E_{\frac{n}{p_k}} \right| = \phi\left(\frac{n}{p_k}\right) \geq p_r^{n_r-1} \phi\left(\frac{n}{p_r}\right) = \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times \phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-2} p_{r-1}).$$

We have $|X| = \kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n)) \leq \beta(n) = \phi(n) + \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times u$, where

$$u = \frac{1}{p_r^{n_r-1}} [p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{r-1} + \phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-1}) (p_r^{n_r-1} - 2)].$$

Using Lemma 2.3 and the hypothesis that $n_r \geq 2$, an easy calculation gives that

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-1}) + \frac{\phi(p_1 \cdots p_r)}{p_r} - u &= \frac{1}{p_r^{n_r-1}} [(\phi(p_r^{n_r-1}) + 2) \phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-1}) - p_1 \cdots p_{r-1}] \\ &> \frac{1}{p_r^{n_r-1}} [(r+1) \phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-1}) - p_1 \cdots p_{r-1}] \\ &> 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-1}) + \frac{\phi(p_1 \cdots p_r)}{p_r} > u$. Since $E_n, E_{\frac{n}{p_k}}, E_{\frac{n}{p_l}}$ are pairwise disjoint and contained in X , we get

$$\begin{aligned} |X| &\geq |E_n| + \left| E_{\frac{n}{p_k}} \right| + \left| E_{\frac{n}{p_l}} \right| \\ &= \phi(n) + \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times \left[\phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-1}) + \frac{\phi(p_1 \cdots p_r)}{p_r} \right] \\ &> \phi(n) + \frac{n}{p_1 \cdots p_r} \times u = \beta(n), \end{aligned}$$

a contradiction to that $|X| = \kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n)) \leq \beta(n)$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Since $n_r \geq 2$, X contains at most one of the sets $E_{\frac{n}{p_1}}, \dots, E_{\frac{n}{p_r}}$ by Proposition 4.5. If X does not contain any of these sets, then Proposition 4.1 implies that $\kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n)) = \alpha(n)$. If X contains $E_{\frac{n}{p_s}}$ for a unique $s \in [r]$, then Proposition 4.4 gives that $s = r$ and $\kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n)) = \beta_r(n) = \beta(n)$. It follows that $\kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n)) = \min\{\alpha(n), \beta(n)\}$, thus proving the theorem. \square

5 Proof of Theorem 1.3

Let $n = p_1 p_2 \cdots p_r$, where $r \geq 3$ and p_1, p_2, \dots, p_r are prime numbers with $p_1 < p_2 < \cdots < p_r$. In this case,

$$\alpha(n) = \phi(n) + p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{r-1} - \phi(p_1 p_2 \cdots p_{r-1}),$$

$$\gamma(n) = \phi(n) + \phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-1}) + \phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-2} p_r) + p_1 \cdots p_{r-2} - \phi(p_1 \cdots p_{r-2}).$$

Recall that the set $X_{r-1,r} = E_n \cup E_{\frac{n}{p_{r-1}}} \cup E_{\frac{n}{p_r}} \cup \left(\bigcup_{i=1}^{r-2} S_{\frac{n}{p_i p_{r-1} p_r}} \right)$ defined in Section 3.1 is a cut-set of $\mathcal{P}(C_n)$ which gives the upper bound $\gamma_{r-1,r}(n) = \gamma(n)$ for $\kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n))$. Now, let X be a minimum cut-set of $\mathcal{P}(C_n)$. Then $|X| = \kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n)) \leq \min\{\alpha(n), \gamma(n)\}$.

Proposition 5.1. *X contains none or exactly two of the sets $E_{\frac{n}{p_1}}, E_{\frac{n}{p_2}}, \dots, E_{\frac{n}{p_r}}$.*

Proof. This follows from Proposition 3.10 and Corollary 4.3. \square

Proposition 5.2. *If X contains none of the sets $E_{\frac{n}{p_1}}, \dots, E_{\frac{n}{p_r}}$, then $\kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n)) = \alpha(n)$.*

Proof. This follows from Proposition 4.1. \square

Proposition 5.3. *If X contains exactly two of the sets $E_{\frac{n}{p_1}}, E_{\frac{n}{p_2}}, \dots, E_{\frac{n}{p_r}}$, then the following hold:*

(i) $E_{\frac{n}{p_{r-1}}}$ and $E_{\frac{n}{p_r}}$ are contained in X .

(ii) $X = X_{r-1,r}$ and so $\kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n)) = \gamma_{r-1,r}(n) = \gamma(n)$.

Proof. (i) Let $E_{\frac{n}{p_j}}$ and $E_{\frac{n}{p_k}}$ be the two sets which are contained in X , where $1 \leq j \neq k \leq r$. If possible, suppose that $\{j, k\} \neq \{r-1, r\}$. Without loss, we may assume that $j < k$. Then $j \leq r-2$. By Lemma 2.5,

$$\left| E_{\frac{n}{p_j}} \right| = \phi\left(\frac{n}{p_j}\right) > \phi\left(\frac{n}{p_{r-1}}\right) \quad (6)$$

and

$$\left| E_{\frac{n}{p_k}} \right| = \phi \left(\frac{n}{p_k} \right) \geq \phi \left(\frac{n}{p_r} \right) > \phi \left(\frac{n}{p_r} \right) - \phi \left(\frac{n}{p_{r-1}p_r} \right). \quad (7)$$

Now fix a separation $A \cup B$ of $\mathcal{P}(\overline{X})$. We consider two cases.

Case 1: Each of A and B contains at least one of the sets $E_{\frac{n}{p_i}}$, $i \in [r] \setminus \{j, k\}$.

This possibility occurs only when $r \geq 4$. Suppose that A contains $E_{\frac{n}{p_s}}$ and B contains $E_{\frac{n}{p_t}}$ for some $s, t \in [r] \setminus \{j, k\}$ with $s \neq t$. Then the subgroup $S_{\frac{n}{p_s p_t}}$ is contained in X . We have

$$\left| S_{\frac{n}{p_s p_t}} \right| = \frac{n}{p_s p_t} \geq \frac{n}{p_{r-1} p_r}. \quad (8)$$

Since the sets $E_n, E_{\frac{n}{p_j}}, E_{\frac{n}{p_k}}$ and $S_{\frac{n}{p_s p_t}}$ are pairwise disjoint and contained in X , we get using (6), (7) and (8) that

$$\begin{aligned} |X| &\geq |E_n| + \left| E_{\frac{n}{p_j}} \right| + \left| E_{\frac{n}{p_k}} \right| + \left| S_{\frac{n}{p_s p_t}} \right| \\ &> \phi(n) + \phi \left(\frac{n}{p_r} \right) + \phi \left(\frac{n}{p_{r-1}} \right) + \frac{n}{p_{r-1} p_r} - \phi \left(\frac{n}{p_{r-1} p_r} \right) = \gamma(n), \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction to that $|X| \leq \gamma(n)$.

Case 2: All the sets $E_{\frac{n}{p_i}}$, $i \in [r] \setminus \{j, k\}$, are contained either in A or in B .

Without loss, we may assume that B contains all the sets $E_{\frac{n}{p_i}}$, $i \in [r] \setminus \{j, k\}$. Since $A \cup B$ is a separation of $\mathcal{P}(\overline{X})$, the order of each element of A must be divisible by p_i for every $i \in [r] \setminus \{j, k\}$. Since $E_n, E_{\frac{n}{p_j}}$ and $E_{\frac{n}{p_k}}$ are contained in X , it follows that the order of every element of A is equal to $\frac{n}{p_j p_k}$, thus giving $A = E_{\frac{n}{p_j p_k}}$. Then each of the subgroups $S_{\frac{n}{p_i p_j p_k}}$, $i \in [r] \setminus \{j, k\}$, of C_n is contained in X . Let R be the union of these $r-2$ subgroups. By Lemmas 2.8 and 2.7, we get

$$|R| = \frac{n}{p_j p_k} - \phi \left(\frac{n}{p_j p_k} \right) > \frac{n}{p_{r-1} p_r} - \phi \left(\frac{n}{p_{r-1} p_r} \right), \quad (9)$$

as $\{j, k\} \neq \{r-1, r\}$. Since the sets $E_n, E_{\frac{n}{p_j}}, E_{\frac{n}{p_k}}$ and R are pairwise disjoint and contained in X , we get using (6), (7) and (9) that

$$\begin{aligned} |X| &\geq |E_n| + \left| E_{\frac{n}{p_j}} \right| + \left| E_{\frac{n}{p_k}} \right| + |R| \\ &> \phi(n) + \phi \left(\frac{n}{p_r} \right) + \phi \left(\frac{n}{p_{r-1}} \right) + \frac{n}{p_{r-1} p_r} - \phi \left(\frac{n}{p_{r-1} p_r} \right) = \gamma(n), \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction to that $|X| \leq \gamma(n)$. This completes the proof of (i).

(ii) By (i), $E_{\frac{n}{p_{r-1}}}$ and $E_{\frac{n}{p_r}}$ are contained in X . Fix a separation $A \cup B$ of $\mathcal{P}(\overline{X})$. If $E_{\frac{n}{p_s}} \subseteq A$ and $E_{\frac{n}{p_t}} \subseteq B$ for some $s, t \in [r-2]$ with $s \neq t$ (possible only when $r \geq 4$), then the subgroup $S_{\frac{n}{p_s p_t}}$ is contained in X . We have

$$\left| S_{\frac{n}{p_s p_t}} \right| = \frac{n}{p_s p_t} > \frac{n}{p_{r-1} p_r} > \frac{n}{p_{r-1} p_r} - \phi \left(\frac{n}{p_{r-1} p_r} \right). \quad (10)$$

Since the sets $E_n, E_{\frac{n}{p_r}}, E_{\frac{n}{p_{r-1}}}$ and $S_{\frac{n}{p_s p_t}}$ are pairwise disjoint and contained in X , we get using (10) that

$$\begin{aligned} |X| &\geq |E_n| + \left| E_{\frac{n}{p_r}} \right| + \left| E_{\frac{n}{p_{r-1}}} \right| + \left| S_{\frac{n}{p_s p_t}} \right| \\ &> \phi(n) + \phi\left(\frac{n}{p_r}\right) + \phi\left(\frac{n}{p_{r-1}}\right) + \frac{n}{p_{r-1}p_r} - \phi\left(\frac{n}{p_{r-1}p_r}\right) = \gamma(n), \end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction to that $|X| \leq \gamma(n)$. Therefore, all the sets $E_{\frac{n}{p_i}}, 1 \leq i \leq r-2$, are contained either in A or in B .

Without loss, we may assume that all these $r-2$ sets are contained in B . Applying the argument as in the proof of Case 2 of (i), we get that $A = E_{\frac{n}{p_{r-1}p_r}}$ and that each of the subgroups $S_{\frac{n}{p_i p_{r-1} p_r}}, i \in [r-2]$, is contained in X . Thus X contains the cut-set $X_{r-1,r}$. Since X is a minimum cut-set of $\mathcal{P}(C_n)$, it follows that $X = X_{r-1,r}$ and hence $\kappa(\mathcal{P}(C_n)) = |X| = |X_{r-1,r}| = \gamma(n)$. \square

Now, we can see that Theorem 1.3 follows from Propositions 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3. Note that the comparison between $\alpha(n)$ and $\gamma(n)$ is given in Lemma 3.9(ii).

References

- [1] J. Abawajy, A. Kelarev and M. Chowdhury, Power graphs: a survey, *Electron. J. Graph Theory Appl.* 1 (2013), 125–147.
- [2] D. Bubboloni, Mohammad A. Iranmanesh and S. M. Shaker, On some graphs associated with the finite alternating groups, *Comm. Algebra* 45 (2017), 5355–5373.
- [3] D. Bubboloni, Mohammad A. Iranmanesh, and S. M. Shaker, Quotient graphs for power graphs, *Rend. Semin. Mat. Univ. Padova* 138 (2017), 61–89.
- [4] P. J. Cameron, The power graph of a finite group, II, *J. Group Theory* 13 (2010), 779–783.
- [5] P. J. Cameron and S. Ghosh, The power graph of a finite group, *Discrete Math.* 311 (2011), 1220–1222.
- [6] I. Chakrabarty, S. Ghosh and M. K. Sen, Undirected power graphs of semigroups, *Semigroup Forum* 78 (2009), 410–426.
- [7] S. Chattopadhyay and P. Panigrahi, Connectivity and planarity of power graphs of finite cyclic, dihedral and dicyclic groups, *Algebra Discrete Math.* 18 (2014), 42–49.
- [8] S. Chattopadhyay and P. Panigrahi, On Laplacian spectrum of power graphs of finite cyclic and dihedral groups, *Linear Multilinear Algebra* 63 (2015), 1345–1355.
- [9] S. Chattopadhyay, K. L. Patra and B. K. Sahoo, Vertex connectivity of the power graph of a finite cyclic group, *Discrete Appl. Math.*, to appear, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dam.2018.06.001>.
- [10] S. Chattopadhyay, K. L. Patra and B. K. Sahoo, Minimal cut-sets in the power graph of certain finite non-cyclic groups, communicated, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1802.07646>.

- [11] B. Curtin and G. R. Pourgholi, Edge-maximality of power graphs of finite cyclic groups, *J. Algebraic Combin.* 40 (2014), 313–330.
- [12] B. Curtin and G. R. Pourgholi, An Euler totient sum inequality, *J. Number Theory* 163 (2016), 101–113.
- [13] A. Doostabadi, A. Erfanian and A. Jafarzadeh, Some results on the power graphs of finite groups, *ScienceAsia* 41 (2015), 73–78.
- [14] A. Doostabadi and M. Farrokhi D. Ghouchan, On the connectivity of proper power graphs of finite groups, *Comm. Algebra* 43 (2015), 4305–4319.
- [15] M. Feng, X. Ma and K. Wang, The structure and metric dimension of the power graph of a finite group, *European J. Combin.* 43 (2015), 82–97.
- [16] M. Feng, X. Ma and K. Wang, The full automorphism group of the power (di)graph of a finite group, *European J. Combin.* 52 (2016), 197–206.
- [17] A. V. Kelarev and S. J. Quinn, A combinatorial property and power graphs of groups, in *Contributions to general algebra*, 12 (Vienna, 1999), 229–235, Heyn, Klagenfurt, 2000.
- [18] A. V. Kelarev, S. J. Quinn and R. Smolíková, Power graphs and semigroups of matrices, *Bull. Austral. Math. Soc.* 63 (2001), 341–344.
- [19] A. V. Kelarev and S. J. Quinn, Directed graphs and combinatorial properties of semi-groups, *J. Algebra* 251 (2002), 16–26.
- [20] M. Mirzargar, A. R. Ashrafi and M. J. Nadjafi-Arani, On the power graph of a finite group, *Filomat* 26 (2012), 1201–1208.
- [21] A. R. Moghaddamfar, S. Rahbariyan and W. J. Shi, Certain properties of the power graph associated with a finite group, *J. Algebra Appl.* 13 (2014), no. 7, 1450040, 18 pp.
- [22] R. P. Panda and K. V. Krishna, On connectedness of power graphs of finite groups, *J. Algebra Appl.* 17 (2018), no. 10, 1850184, 20 pp.

Addresses:

Sriparna Chattopadhyay, Kamal Lochan Patra, Binod Kumar Sahoo

1) School of Mathematical Sciences
National Institute of Science Education and Research (NISER), Bhubaneswar
P.O.- Jatni, District- Khurda, Odisha - 752050, India

2) Homi Bhabha National Institute (HBNI)
Training School Complex, Anushakti Nagar
Mumbai - 400094, India

E-mails: sriparna@niser.ac.in, klpatra@niser.ac.in, bksahoo@niser.ac.in