

On Ramanujan smooth expansions for a general arithmetic function

Giovanni Coppola

Abstract. We study in detail the Ramanujan smooth expansions, for arithmetic functions; we start with the most general ones, for which we supply the “ P –local expansions”, for arguments with all prime-factors $p \leq P$ (namely, P –smooth arguments), that are also square-free; then, we supply general results for interesting subsets of arithmetic functions, regarding both their P –local and (global) Ramanujan smooth expansions.

1. Introduction. Definitions and Notations. A local expansion for all arithmetic functions

The history-making paper by Ramanujan [R] studies the RAMANUJAN SUM of *modulus* q and *argument* a :

$$\forall q \in \mathbb{N}, \forall a \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad c_q(a) \stackrel{def}{=} \sum_{\substack{j \leq q \\ (j,q)=1}} \cos \frac{2\pi ja}{q} = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_q^*} e_q(ja),$$

where (j, q) is the greatest common divisor of j and q , \mathbb{Z}_q^* is the set of *reduced residue classes modulo* q and $\forall q \in \mathbb{N}, \forall m \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad e_q(m) \stackrel{def}{=} e^{2\pi im/q}$. In passing, see that $c_q(0) = \varphi(q) \stackrel{def}{=} |\mathbb{Z}_q^*|$ is *Euler’s Totient*. These sums were already known before, but Ramanujan used them in [R] in His “RAMANUJAN EXPANSIONS”, for some arithmetic functions. Of course, He didn’t study these expansions in full theoretical detail, but giving an illuminating example: He expanded the *null-function* $\mathbf{0}$, i.e., $\mathbf{0}(n) \stackrel{def}{=} 0, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$, as

$$\mathbf{0}(a) = \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{q} c_q(a) \stackrel{def}{=} \lim_x \sum_{q \leq x} \frac{1}{q} c_q(a), \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{N}.$$

These “RAMANUJAN COEFFICIENTS”, say $R_0(q) \stackrel{def}{=} 1/q, \forall q \in \mathbb{N}$, for $\mathbf{0}$, ARE NOT UNIQUE, as we’ll see soon. We call, once the arithmetic function $G : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is fixed,

$$\forall a \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \mathcal{R}_G(a) \stackrel{def}{=} \lim_x \sum_{q \leq x} G(q) c_q(a), \quad \text{THE RAMANUJAN SERIES OF COEFFICIENT } G,$$

whenever, $\forall a \in \mathbb{N}$, this limit exists in \mathbb{C} , i.e., the series converges pointwise in all $a \in \mathbb{N}$.

Notice the “CLASSIC SUMMATION”: $q \leq x$. (In the following, $\mathbb{N}_0 \stackrel{def}{=} \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ and \mathbb{P} is the set of primes.) An immediate consequence is :

$$\mathcal{R}_G = \mathcal{R}_{G+\alpha R_0}, \quad \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{C},$$

in other words, if the arithmetic function F has the Ramanujan expansion $F = \mathcal{R}_G$, for some $G : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, then F has, also, AN INFINITY (as $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ varies) OF OTHER RAMANUJAN COEFFICIENTS. See that all of this is implicit in Ramanujan’s paper [R]. Actually, Hardy [H] gave the independent $H_0(q) \stackrel{def}{=} 1/\varphi(q)$ for $\mathbf{0} = \mathcal{R}_{H_0}$; however, we have many-more than $\alpha H_0 + \beta R_0$ as Ramanujan coefficients for $\mathbf{0}$, beyond R_0 : [CG1].

Ramanujan considered expansions with the above, say, CLASSIC method of summation.

We introduce a SMOOTH summation method: our partial sums are not over $q \leq x$, for fixed x , but over $q \in (P)$, for fixed $P \in \mathbb{P}$, a prime, where $(P) \stackrel{def}{=} \{n \in \mathbb{N} : p|n \Rightarrow p \leq P\}$ is the set of P –smooth numbers:

$$\forall a \in \mathbb{N} \text{ AND } \forall P \in \mathbb{P} \text{ FIXED, THE } P\text{–SMOOTH PARTIAL SUM } \sum_{q \in (P)} G(q) c_q(a) \text{ IS FINITE, } \forall G : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}.$$

This follows from the property called “RAMANUJAN VERTICAL LIMIT”: with $v_p(q) \stackrel{def}{=} \max\{K \in \mathbb{N}_0 : p^K | q\}$ the p –adic *valuation* of $q \in \mathbb{N}, \forall p \in \mathbb{P}$,

$$c_q(a) \neq 0 \implies v_p(q) \leq v_p(a) + 1, \quad \forall p|q.$$

MSC 2020: 11N37 - Keywords: Ramanujan expansion, smooth numbers, arithmetic functions

For a Proof of a slightly stronger version (with the equivalence!), see in §3.1.

We introduce, once the arithmetic function $G : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is fixed,

$$\forall a \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_G(a) \stackrel{def}{=} \lim_P \sum_{q \in (P)} G(q)c_q(a), \quad \text{THE RAMANUJAN SMOOTH SERIES OF COEFFICIENT } G,$$

whenever, $\forall a \in \mathbb{N}$, this limit over primes $P \rightarrow \infty$ exists in \mathbb{C} , i.e., P -smooth partial sums converge pointwise in all $a \in \mathbb{N}$.

See that, in general, CLASSIC Ramanujan series are different from SMOOTH Ramanujan series and this can't be appreciated, of course, when we are *in the case of absolute convergence*:

$$\sum_{q=1}^{\infty} |G(q)c_q(a)| < \infty.$$

In fact, as we know, given a fixed $a \in \mathbb{N}$, this property of **absolute convergence of Ramanujan series** in the argument a ENTAILS THE SAME SUM, FOR ALL SUMMATION METHODS, of our series in a .

However, when the absolute convergence of Ramanujan series is not guaranteed, we may have not only different values for $\mathcal{R}_G(a)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_G(a)$, but even that at least one of them doesn't exist : see following example.

We saw above that $R_0(q) = 1/q$ was given by Ramanujan himself as a coefficient, for the null-function. This, of course, with classic summation: $\mathbf{0} = \mathcal{R}_{R_0}$.

Well, we prove now the example of Ramanujan smooth coefficient $\mathbf{1}$, the constant-1-function: $\mathbf{1}(n) \stackrel{def}{=} 1$, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$, for our arithmetic function $\mathbf{0}$; i.e., our first RAMANUJAN SMOOTH EXPANSION, namely $\mathbf{0} = \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\mathbf{1}}$, is:

$$\mathbf{0}(a) = \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\mathbf{1}}(a) = \lim_P \sum_{q \in (P)} \mathbf{1}(q)c_q(a) = \lim_P \sum_{q \in (P)} c_q(a) = \lim_P \prod_{p \leq P} \sum_{K=0}^{\infty} c_{p^K}(a), = \lim_P \prod_{p \leq P} \sum_{K=0}^{v_p(a)+1} c_{p^K}(a), \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{N},$$

because we use: fixed a , $c_q(a)$ is multiplicative w.r.t.(with respect to) q and, then, we apply Ramanujan vertical limit we saw above. Now: ALL these P -smooth partial sums vanish, as we see from Hölder's Formula [M] with μ the *Möbius function*, compare [C5] basic facts,

$$c_q(a) = \varphi(q) \frac{\mu(q/(q,a))}{\varphi(q/(q,a))} \implies c_{p^K}(a) = c_{p^K}(p^{v_p(a)}) = \varphi(p^K) \frac{\mu(p^{K-\min(K,v_p(a))})}{\varphi(p^{K-\min(K,v_p(a))})}$$

entailing

$$c_{p^K}(a) = \varphi(p^K), \quad \forall 0 \leq K \leq v_p(a), \quad c_{p^{v_p(a)+1}}(a) = -p^{v_p(a)} \implies \sum_{K=0}^{v_p(a)+1} c_{p^K}(a) = \sum_{K=0}^{v_p(a)} \varphi(p^K) - p^{v_p(a)} = 0$$

and valid for all fixed $a \in \mathbb{N}$ (once again, convergence is pointwise in $a \in \mathbb{N}$) : FINITE EULER PRODUCT above, over $p \leq P$, has ALL p -factors vanishing and we are done.

Of course, this series doesn't converge absolutely: the partial sums

$$\sum_{q \in (P)} |c_q(a)| = \prod_{p \leq P} \sum_{K=0}^{v_p(a)+1} |c_{p^K}(a)| = \prod_{p \leq P} \left(\sum_{K=0}^{v_p(a)} \varphi(p^K) + p^{v_p(a)} \right) = \prod_{p \leq P} (2p^{v_p(a)}) \geq \prod_{p \leq P} 2$$

are bounded from below by $2^{\pi(P)}$, with $\pi(x) \stackrel{def}{=} |\{p \in \mathbb{P} : p \leq x\}|$, so the limit over $P \rightarrow \infty$ is $+\infty$.

While $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\mathbf{1}} = \mathbf{0}$, the classic $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{1}}$ DOESN'T EXIST, as the general term $c_q(a)$ is NOT INFINITESIMAL as $q \rightarrow \infty$ (because, $\forall a \in \mathbb{N}$ fixed, $c_q(a) \in \mathbb{Z}$, as we know from Hölder's formula above, so that $c_q(a) \rightarrow 0$, as $q \rightarrow \infty$, means: $\exists Q \in \mathbb{N}$, $c_q(a) = 0$, $\forall q > Q$ and THIS goes against Ramanujan sums vanishing, see §3.1).

Most weird things are also most interesting things, so to speak: they might happen ONLY in absence of absolute convergence!

We leave aside, for the moment, convergence issues and we focus for a while on properties and definitions regarding arithmetic aspects.

First of all, the most fundamental property we apply, regarding Ramanujan sums, when coming to any kind of expansion in this paper, is RAMANUJAN ORTHOGONALITY :

$$(1.1) \quad \mathbf{1}_{q|a} = \mathbf{1}_{a \equiv 0 \pmod{q}} = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{\ell|q} c_\ell(a),$$

valid for all “moduli”, say, $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and integer arguments a ; hereafter we abbreviate with $\mathbf{1}_\varphi$ the indicator function of property φ : it’s $\stackrel{def}{=} 1$ IFF (If and only If) φ is true and $\stackrel{def}{=} 0$ IFF φ is false; actually, we also use $\mathbf{1}_S$, for any subset of natural numbers $S \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, as the indicator function of S : we saw above $\mathbf{1}$, namely $\mathbf{1} = \mathbf{1}_{\mathbb{N}}$. The name we use here for above property is, of course, in honor of Ramanujan; however, there will be other kinds of Orthogonality, for Ramanujan sums, along this paper : compare well-known Facts in [C5].

By the way, we take for granted ALL the **basic facts** (like the Orthogonality of Additive Characters) quoted in [C5] and quotations therein of Bibliographic sources (i.e., Davenport’s [D] & Tenenbaum’s [T] Books, with Iwaniec-Kowalski [IKo] Book, too, see [C5]).

Here, compare [IKo] notation, we write $\sum^b \dots$ for the sum $\sum \dots$ with restriction to *square-free* summands (with other constraints denoted \dots here). As a kind of extension for this notation, we add the *superscript* b to any subset of natural numbers, say S , writing S^b for the square-free elements of S ; in particular, \mathbb{N}^b is the subset of square-free natural numbers (recall: $\mathbb{N} \stackrel{def}{=} \{1, 2, 3, 4, \dots\}$), like $(P)^b \stackrel{def}{=} \{n \in (P) : n \text{ square-free}\}$ is the subset of P -smooth numbers that are square-free, too. Notice that, once fixed $P \in \mathbb{P}$, $(P)^b$ is a finite set, of cardinality $|(P)^b| = 2^{\pi(P)}$, with $\max(P)^b = \prod_{p \leq P} p$ the P -**primorial**.

We add, to our notation, the set of P -*sifted naturals*:

$$)P(\stackrel{def}{=} \{n \in \mathbb{N} : p|n \Rightarrow p > P\} \stackrel{\bullet}{=} \{n \in \mathbb{N} : (n, p) = 1, \forall p \leq P\} \stackrel{\bullet}{=} \{n \in \mathbb{N} : (n, \prod_{p \leq P} p) = 1\},$$

hereafter indicating with $\stackrel{\bullet}{=}$ that there is equality by definition. Notice: last way we write it highlights the sieving procedure, to identify its elements (compare the elementary Eratosthenes-Legendre Sieve [HaRi]).

Once fixed $P \in \mathbb{P}$, not only $(P) \cap P(= \{1\}$), but an important feature is that, even if $(P) \cup P($ is NOT all \mathbb{N} , we have:

$$\forall a \in \mathbb{N}, a = rs, \quad s \in (P), \quad r \in P(,$$

for **unique factors** $a_{(P)} \stackrel{def}{=} s \stackrel{\bullet}{=} \prod_{p \leq P} p^{v_p(a)}$ (for: smooth) and $a_{P(} \stackrel{def}{=} r \stackrel{\bullet}{=} \prod_{p > P} p^{v_p(a)}$ (for: rough); this kind of decomposition was used at the state-of-art by Paul Erdős in His Proofs. Here, much more modestly, we’ll see this kind of **orthogonality** (since r & s are coprime, a kind of ortogonality) at work, so to speak, in our next Theorem 2.1, named in honor of Wintner: Wintner’s Orthogonal Decomposition, say, (WOD). (Compare §3.1.4.)

We give now an elementary result: a P -*local expansion*, for **all** arithmetic functions. Recall F' is the ERATOSTHENES TRANSFORM of our arithmetic function F (see [T], compare [C5]).

Theorem 1.1. *Let $F : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. Fix a prime P . Then, defining $\text{Win}_q^{(P)^b} F \stackrel{def}{=} \sum_{\substack{d \in (P)^b \\ d \equiv 0 \pmod{q}}} \frac{F'(d)}{d}$, $\forall q \in \mathbb{N}$, we*

have the P -local expansion

$$F(a) = \sum_{q \in (P)^b} \left(\text{Win}_q^{(P)^b} F \right) c_q(a), \quad \forall a \in (P)^b.$$

This is a kind of coming soon, for Lemma 3.2, in which we give many more details and the one-line-proof: it uses ONLY (1.1) above. By the way, in THIS paper we apply & quote Lemma 3.2, while OUTSIDE present paper we’ll quote Theorem 1.1!

It’s a kind of UNIVERSAL expansion, namely it holds FOR ALL ARITHMETIC FUNCTIONS. Of course, (1): it’s local, namely both the coefficients and their indices (outside which they vanish, see §3) depend on P ; (2): it’s only for square-free and P -smooth arguments; (3):last, but not least, we have no idea of what are these coefficients in this P -local expansion. By the way, the definition above for the d -series is well-posed as: $d \in (P)^b$ is in a finite set, so the d -series converges trivially, being a finite sum!

2. Main Results: Statements and Proofs

We collect here all the Statements & Proofs of our main results, but the ones needing the Lemmata in §3 & §4 will be proved in next subsection §2.1.

By the way, we call “main”, the present results, since also the Facts, Lemmata and Propositions given in §3 and §4, §5 have their own interest.

We state and prove our next result. Compare [HaRi] for the Eratosthenes-Legendre Sieve.

Theorem 2.1. (WINTNER ORTHOGONAL DECOMPOSITION FOR F')

Let $F : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ have the WINTNER TRANSFORM, say

$$\text{Win } F : q \in \mathbb{N} \mapsto \text{Win}_q F \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{d \equiv 0 \pmod{q}} \frac{F'(d)}{d} \in \mathbb{C},$$

i.e., has all such WINTNER'S q -TH COEFFICIENTS: these series converge pointwise $\forall q \in \mathbb{N}$. Fix a prime P . Then

$$\forall d \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \text{Irr}_d^{(P)} F \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\substack{r \in)P(\\ r > 1}} \frac{F'(dr)}{r} \stackrel{\bullet}{=} \lim_x \sum_{\substack{r \in)P(\\ 1 < r \leq x}} \frac{F'(dr)}{r}$$

is a series, converging pointwise in d , $\forall d \in \mathbb{N}$, called the IRREGULAR SERIES of our F , WITH ARGUMENT d , OVER THE PRIME P . Varying $d \in \mathbb{N}$, we get as arithmetic function the P -IRREGULAR SERIES of F ,

$$\text{Irr}^{(P)} F : d \in \mathbb{N} \mapsto \sum_{\substack{r \in)P(\\ r > 1}} \frac{F'(dr)}{r} \in \mathbb{C}.$$

In all, $\exists \text{Win } F$ entails $\exists \text{Irr}^{(P)} F$, $\forall P \in \mathbb{P}$; and the DECOMPOSITION OF ERATOSTHENES TRANSFORM $F' : \forall P \in \mathbb{P}$,

$$(\text{WOD})_{F',P} \quad F'(d) = d \sum_{K \in (P)} \mu(K) \text{Win}_{dK} F - \text{Irr}_d^{(P)} F, \quad \forall d \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Thus in particular

$$(\text{WOD})_{F'} \quad \forall d \in \mathbb{N}, \quad F'(d) = \lim_P \left(d \sum_{K \in (P)} \mu(K) \text{Win}_{dK} F - \text{Irr}_d^{(P)} F \right).$$

Proof. We prove both the CONVERGENCE of $\text{Irr}_d^{(P)} F$ and $(\text{WOD})_{F',P} : \text{FIX } P \in \mathbb{P}$ and $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, $r \in)P($ is equivalent to: $(r, \prod_{p \leq P} p) = 1$ (see the P -sifted set's definition on page 3), which can be expressed as:

$$\mathbf{1}_{r \in)P(} = \sum_{K|r, K| \prod_{p \leq P} p} \mu(K) = \sum_{\substack{K|r \\ K \in (P)}} \mu(K), \text{ compare [C5], entailing, for a large } x > 0,$$

$$\sum_{\substack{r \in)P(\\ r \leq x}} \frac{F'(dr)}{r} = \sum_{r \leq x} \sum_{\substack{K|r \\ K \in (P)}} \mu(K) \frac{F'(dr)}{r} = \sum_{K \in (P)} \mu(K) \sum_{m \leq x/K} \frac{F'(dKm)}{Km} = d \sum_{K \in (P)} \mu(K) \sum_{m \leq x/K} \frac{F'(dKm)}{dKm},$$

whence, EXCHANGING the FINITE SUM OVER $K \in (P)^b$ WITH \lim_x ,

$$F'(d) + \lim_x \sum_{\substack{r \in)P(\\ 1 < r \leq x}} \frac{F'(dr)}{r} = d \sum_{K \in (P)} \mu(K) \lim_x \sum_{\substack{t \leq dx \\ t \equiv 0 \pmod{dK}}} \frac{F'(t)}{t} = d \sum_{K \in (P)} \mu(K) \text{Win}_{dK} F,$$

from the definition of $\text{Win}_{dK} F$, guaranteed by hypothesis: $\exists \text{Win } F$. □

We state and prove our next result, an immediate consequence of Theorem 2.1.

Corollary 2.1. (WINTNER ORTHOGONAL DECOMPOSITION FOR F)

Let $F : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ have the WINTNER TRANSFORM. Fix a prime P . Then

$$(WOD)_{F,P} \quad F(a) = \sum_{q \in (P)} (\text{Win}_q F) c_q(a) - \sum_{d|a} \text{Irr}_d^{(P)} F, \quad \forall a \in (P).$$

Thus in particular

$$(WOD)_F \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{N}, \quad F(a) = \lim_P \left(\sum_{q \in (P)} (\text{Win}_q F) c_q(a) - \sum_{d|a} \text{Irr}_d^{(P)} F \right).$$

Proof. The rough idea is to sum $(WOD)_{F',P}$ over divisors $d|a$. Right approach follows. We apply Kluyver's formula [K] (see [C5] basic facts), recall:

$$c_q(a) = \sum_{\substack{d|a \\ d|q}} d\mu\left(\frac{q}{d}\right),$$

to above decomposition for F' , i.e. $(WOD)_{F',P}$, for a fixed $P \in \mathbb{P}$, getting $(WOD)_{F,P}$, because we set $K = q/d$ and we use the elementary fact: $a \in (P)$ and $d|a$ entail $d \in (P)$; namely, P -smooth numbers are a **divisor-closed** set. \square

Wintner Orthogonal Decomposition is very simple and beautiful; it starts from the most elementary sieve method, namely the inclusion-exclusion principle with products of primes, codified by the Möbius function, [HaRi] : it is, in fact, called the Sieve of Eratosthenes-Legendre and, not by chance, we are working with the Eratosthenes Transform, here (name due to Wintner in his beautiful Book [W], by the way see Appendix §5 here).

It may seem incredible, but it turns very useful for our purposes: we are seeking Ramanujan Smooth Expansions. And $(WOD)_F$ in previous Corollary not only gives a beautiful, rather unbelievable characterization of such Expansions in terms of, say, a series summed over sifted numbers, that's our Irregular Series for F ; also, as a gift, these Smooth Expansions have a completely explicit coefficient: Wintner's Transform of our F . All of this sparkles, from Corollary 2.1, in our next Corollary 2.2!

We state and prove our next result, an immediate consequence of Corollary 2.1.

Corollary 2.2. (CHARACTERIZING RAMANUJAN SMOOTH EXPANSION WITH WINTNER COEFFICIENTS)

Let $F : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ have Win F . Then

$$\forall a \in \mathbb{N}, \quad F(a) = \lim_P \sum_{q \in (P)} (\text{Win}_q F) c_q(a) \iff \forall d \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \lim_P \text{Irr}_d^{(P)} F = 0 \iff \lim_P \text{Irr}^{(P)} F = \mathbf{0}.$$

Proof. Of course, second equivalence holds as a definition, so we apply $(WOD)_F$ to prove first equivalence:

$$\forall a \in \mathbb{N}, \quad F(a) = \lim_P \sum_{q \in (P)} (\text{Win}_q F) c_q(a) \iff \forall a \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \sum_{d|a} \lim_P \text{Irr}_d^{(P)} F = 0 \iff \forall d \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \lim_P \text{Irr}_d^{(P)} F = 0.$$

After the above exchange of \lim_P with the finite sum $\sum_{d|a}$ (independent of P , too), we simply have applied Möbius Inversion, [T], compare [C5]. \square

Since $\mathbb{C}^{\mathbb{N}}$ indicates ALL arithmetic functions, arithmetic functions F having the Wintner Transform will be indicated as: $\mathbb{C}_{\text{Win}}^{\mathbb{N}}$; furthermore $\mathbb{C}_{\text{smWin}}^{\mathbb{N}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{F \in \mathbb{C}_{\text{Win}}^{\mathbb{N}} : \exists P \in \mathbb{P}, \text{supp}(\text{Win } F) \subseteq (P)\}$ are the F with Win F , say, "smooth-supported"; and $\mathbb{C}_{\text{finWin}}^{\mathbb{N}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{F \in \mathbb{C}_{\text{Win}}^{\mathbb{N}} : |\text{supp}(\text{Win } F)| < \infty\}$ are the F with Win F , say, "finitely-supported": namely, these F have only a finite number of non-zero Wintner coefficients, eventually none whenever Win $F = \mathbf{0}$.

We'll be back on this, after next Corollary.

In order to expose next result, we need to recall THE q -TH CARMICHAEL COEFFICIENT of our $F : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$,

$$\text{Car}_q F \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{\varphi(q)} \lim_x \frac{1}{x} \sum_{a \leq x} F(a) c_q(a), \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{N},$$

of course whenever, fixed $q \in \mathbb{N}$, this limit exists in the complex numbers. Notice that we defined the Wintner q -th coefficient inside Theorem 2.1 above and we also gave there the definition of Wintner Transform of our F , whenever ALL $\text{Win}_q F$ exist. In the same way, assuming ALL $\text{Car}_q F$ exist, we define:

$$\text{Car } F : q \in \mathbb{N} \mapsto \text{Car}_q F \in \mathbb{C},$$

to be THE CARMICHAEL TRANSFORM of our F . For both these transforms, see §3, in particular §3.3 and compare [C5]. Here we only recall that, under (WA), see next Corollary 2.3, these two transforms, not only exist both, but they are also known to be equal: $\text{Car } F = \text{Win } F$. Compare Wintner's Criterion in [ScSp].

We state and prove our next result.

Corollary 2.3. (WINTNER'S "DREAM" THEOREM)

Let $F : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ satisfy WINTNER ASSUMPTION, say

$$(WA) \quad \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \frac{|F'(d)|}{d} < \infty.$$

Then F has the RAMANUJAN SMOOTH EXPANSION, with, say, CARMICHAEL-WINTNER COEFFICIENTS

$$(2.1) \quad F(a) = \lim_P \sum_{q \in (P)} (\text{Car}_q F) c_q(a) = \lim_P \sum_{q \in (P)} (\text{Win}_q F) c_q(a), \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Proof. Thanks to Corollary 2.2, we only need to prove:

$$(WA) \quad \implies \quad \forall d \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \lim_P \text{Irr}_d^{(P)} F = 0.$$

We fix $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $P \in \mathbb{P}$ with P large enough, namely $P > d$. Then, $r \in P \setminus \{1\}$ entails $dr > P$, whence

$$\text{Irr}_d^{(P)} F \stackrel{\bullet}{=} d \lim_x \sum_{\substack{r \in P \\ 1 < r \leq x}} \frac{F'(dr)}{dr} \implies \left| \text{Irr}_d^{(P)} F \right| \leq d \sum_{m > P} \frac{|F'(m)|}{m} \xrightarrow{P} 0,$$

since this m -series represents the P -tails of the series converging in (WA). □

We have now very clear both the importance and the difficulty when handling the Irregular series: the two variables $P \in \mathbb{P}$ (say, compare [HaRi], the sifting limit) and $d \in \mathbb{N}$ (our divisors for F , the arguments of our F') interact in a non-trivial way! I don't think it would be a good idea, trying to study the uniform convergence of our Irregular Series, w.r.t. the divisors $d \in \mathbb{N}$! And likewise it's not a good approach (even if we followed it, in previous Proof!), that of studying the absolute convergence of $\text{Irr}^{(P)} F$. We are "lucky", so to speak, because the strength of Wintner's hypothesis (WA) allows not only to get an absolutely convergent $\text{Irr}_d^{(P)} F$, once fixed d and P as above, but also, once fixed d , infinitesimal with P (when I found above Proof, I could not realize its strength & beauty at once: I still didn't know enough $\text{Irr}^{(P)} F$ subtleties!).

By the way, previous Proof doesn't allow to prove the absolute convergence of our Smooth Ramanujan Expansion and the reason is clear: already Wintner, in His Book [W], realized that His (WA), above, is not sufficient to get a CLASSIC RAMANUJAN EXPANSION; this, instead, follows, **with absolute convergence** (so, for any summation method), **from Delange Hypothesis**, recall: $\omega(d) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |\{p \in \mathbb{P} : p|d\}|$, hereafter,

$$(DH) \quad \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \frac{2^{\omega(d)} |F'(d)|}{d} < \infty.$$

The Proof of this is the content of, say, *Delange's Theorem* [De] (compare [C1] exposition).

Thus

Warning. Wintner's Dream Theorem ensures ONLY pointwise, not absolute, convergence with the smooth summation method. ◦

We need, for previously defined two subsets of $\mathbb{C}_{\text{Win}}^{\mathbb{N}}$, two useful definitions; since, of course, $\mathbb{C}_{\text{finWin}}^{\mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{C}_{\text{smWin}}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and this inclusion is strict, we start with $\mathbb{C}_{\text{smWin}}^{\mathbb{N}}$, then pass to $\mathbb{C}_{\text{finWin}}^{\mathbb{N}}$.

We define $\forall F \in \mathbb{C}_{\text{smWin}}^{\mathbb{N}}$ the WINTNER'S PRIME for F :

$$P_F \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min\{P \in \mathbb{P} : \text{supp}(\text{Win } F) \subseteq (P)\}, \quad \forall F \in \mathbb{C}_{\text{smWin}}^{\mathbb{N}}.$$

Notice: in particular, for any F with $\text{Win } F = \mathbf{0}$ (so, support's empty) and any F with $\text{supp}(\text{Win } F) = \{1\}$, we have $P_F = 2$.

While, $\forall F \in \mathbb{C}_{\text{finWin}}^{\mathbb{N}}$ with $\text{Win } F = \mathbf{0}$ we set the EXACT WINTNER'S RANGE for F to: $Q_F \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 0$; and it's the following natural number otherwise:

$$F \in \mathbb{C}_{\text{finWin}}^{\mathbb{N}}, \text{Win } F \neq \mathbf{0} \implies Q_F \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max \text{supp}(\text{Win } F).$$

We wish to give, in the two environments (one nested in the other), $\mathbb{C}_{\text{smWin}}^{\mathbb{N}}$ and $\mathbb{C}_{\text{finWin}}^{\mathbb{N}}$, the Wintner Orthogonal Decompositions; these, in fact, for our F in $\mathbb{C}_{\text{smWin}}^{\mathbb{N}}$ simplify (and in $\mathbb{C}_{\text{finWin}}^{\mathbb{N}}$, even more).

Roughly speaking, P_F is important for $\text{Irr}^{(P)} F$ and Q_F a must for the sum with Wintner coefficients.

We state and prove next Wintner Decompositions for F' & F into ‘‘Regular and Irregular Parts’’, say.

Corollary 2.4. (WINTNER ORTHOGONAL DECOMPOSITIONS WHEN $\text{Win } F$ IS SMOOTH-SUPPORTED)

Let $F \in \mathbb{C}_{\text{smWin}}^{\mathbb{N}}$, namely Wintner Transform is smooth-supported, with P_F WINTNER'S PRIME FOR F . Then

$$(P\text{-INERTIA}) \quad \text{Irr}^{(P)} F = \text{Irr}^{(P_F)} F, \quad \forall P \in \mathbb{P}, P \geq P_F.$$

Thus, previous general formulæ $(\text{WOD})_{F'}$ and $(\text{WOD})_F$ become

$$\forall F \in \mathbb{C}_{\text{smWin}}^{\mathbb{N}}, \quad F'(d) = d \sum_{K \in (P_F)} \mu(K) \text{Win}_{dK} F - \text{Irr}_d^{(P_F)} F, \quad \forall d \in \mathbb{N}$$

and

$$\forall F \in \mathbb{C}_{\text{smWin}}^{\mathbb{N}}, \quad F(a) = \sum_{q \in (P_F)} (\text{Win}_q F) c_q(a) - \sum_{d|a} \text{Irr}_d^{(P_F)} F, \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Furthermore, these two formulæ specialize, for $\text{Win } F$ FINITELY SUPPORTED, to:

$$\forall F \in \mathbb{C}_{\text{finWin}}^{\mathbb{N}}, \quad F'(d) = d \sum_{K \leq Q_F/d} \mu(K) \text{Win}_{dK} F - \text{Irr}_d^{(P_F)} F, \quad \forall d \in \mathbb{N}$$

and

$$\forall F \in \mathbb{C}_{\text{finWin}}^{\mathbb{N}}, \quad F(a) = \sum_{q \leq Q_F} (\text{Win}_q F) c_q(a) - \sum_{d|a} \text{Irr}_d^{(P_F)} F, \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{N}.$$

We leave the Proof to the interested reader.

Last but not least, $(P\text{-INERTIA})$ above ALLOWS TO DEFINE, $\forall F \in \mathbb{C}_{\text{smWin}}^{\mathbb{N}}$, the IRREGULAR PART of our F AS : $I_F(a) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{d|a} \text{Irr}_d^{(P_F)} F$, $\forall a \in \mathbb{N}$, and the

SMOOTH PART of our F AS : $S_F(a) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{q \in (P_F)} (\text{Win}_q F) c_q(a)$, $\forall a \in \mathbb{N}$.

Whenever $F \in \mathbb{C}_{\text{finWin}}^{\mathbb{N}}$, we also define the ANALYTIC PART of our F AS : $A_F(a) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{q \leq Q_F} (\text{Win}_q F) c_q(a)$, $\forall a \in \mathbb{N}$. Recall **empty sums are** $\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 0$.

Of course, we CAN'T DEFINE A_F for the arithmetic functions $F \in \mathbb{C}_{\text{smWin}}^{\mathbb{N}} \setminus \mathbb{C}_{\text{finWin}}^{\mathbb{N}}$. For these functions, the Smooth Part has the number of non-zero terms depending on $a \in \mathbb{N}$, by Ramanujan Vertical Limit !

We give still two definitions, very important for applications (compare [CM], [C5]): for $F \in \mathbb{C}_{\text{finWin}}^{\mathbb{N}}$ we say that F HAS THE REEF, abbreviating *Ramanujan Exact Explicit Formula*, exactly when $F = A_F$, I.E.

$$\text{(REEF)} \quad F(a) = A_F(a) \stackrel{\bullet}{=} \sum_{q \leq Q_F} (\text{Win}_q F) c_q(a), \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{N}.$$

When $F \notin \mathbb{C}_{\text{finWin}}^{\mathbb{N}}$, but $F \in \mathbb{C}_{\text{smWin}}^{\mathbb{N}}$, we say that F HAS THE WEAK REEF exactly when $F = S_F$, I.E.

$$\text{(WEAK REEF)} \quad F(a) = S_F(a) \stackrel{\bullet}{=} \sum_{q \in (P_F)} (\text{Win}_q F) c_q(a), \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{N}.$$

In both cases, for $F \in \mathbb{C}_{\text{finWin}}^{\mathbb{N}}$ to have the REEF, or for $F \in \mathbb{C}_{\text{smWin}}^{\mathbb{N}}$ to have the WEAK REEF, we need, and it suffices, to have a vanishing Irregular Part for F , i.e., $I_F = \mathbf{0}$.

In passing, see that for $F \in \mathbb{C}_{\text{finWin}}^{\mathbb{N}}$ we have the regular/irregular decomposition: $F = A_F - I_F$ i.e.,

$$\forall F \in \mathbb{C}_{\text{finWin}}^{\mathbb{N}}, \quad F(a) = A_F(a) - I_F(a) \stackrel{\bullet}{=} \sum_{q \leq Q_F} (\text{Win}_q F) c_q(a) - \sum_{d|a} \text{Irr}_d^{(P_F)} F, \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{N}$$

where we call A_F the Analytic Part not by chance: it's, as a function of $a \in \mathbb{C}$, a holomorphic function, since it's a finite linear combination (not depending on a & this is important), of exponentials $e^{2\pi i j a / q}$ (inside Ramanujan sums). Instead, for $F \in \mathbb{C}_{\text{smWin}}^{\mathbb{N}} \setminus \mathbb{C}_{\text{finWin}}^{\mathbb{N}}$, the regular/irregular decomposition is: $F = S_F - I_F$,

$$\forall F \in \mathbb{C}_{\text{smWin}}^{\mathbb{N}} \setminus \mathbb{C}_{\text{finWin}}^{\mathbb{N}}, \quad F(a) = S_F(a) - I_F(a) \stackrel{\bullet}{=} \sum_{q \in (P_F)} (\text{Win}_q F) c_q(a) - \sum_{d|a} \text{Irr}_d^{(P_F)} F, \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{N}$$

where now $S_F \neq A_F$ is still a linear combination of exponentials above, BUT the LENGTH of q -sum, now, IS NOT FIXED (by Wintner's exact range, as before) : it DEPENDS ON a , thanks to Ramanujan Vertical Limit (in particular, depending on p -adic valuations of our a). This is new, w.r.t. [C4].

All of our Corollaries, 2.1 to 2.4, are, directly or indirectly, consequences of Theorem 2.1, namely, Wintner's Orthogonal Decomposition for the Eratosthenes Transform. All are about the, say, "global coefficients", both $\text{Win}_q F$ and $\text{Car}_q F$.

We come, now, to P -local expansions, not for all arithmetic functions, like we did in Theorem 1.1 above, but in particular subsets; because, introducing mild assumptions for F to expand, we want to derive a good piece of informations, for example about P -local coefficients. In particular, the P -expansion's uniqueness. Here, we give only the necessary definitions we need for next statements, leaving to §3 other details.

We recall the **square-free kernel**: $\kappa(1) \stackrel{def}{=} 1$, $\kappa(n) \stackrel{def}{=} \prod_{p|n} p$, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$; in $n = 1$ these are consistent, by the convention: **empty products are** $\stackrel{def}{=} 1$. We need this kernel in order to define any arithmetic function F that "IGNORES PRIME POWERS", abbreviated (IPP),

$$F \text{ (IPP)} \quad \stackrel{def}{\iff} \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{N}, \quad F(a) \stackrel{def}{=} F(\kappa(a)).$$

The standard example is: ω (IPP) (the prime-divisors function we recalled above). A moment's reflection brings : $F \text{ (IPP)} \iff F' = \mu^2 F'$ (i.e., the Eratosthenes Transform is square-free supported), compare [C5].

Recall the **identity function**: $\text{Id}(n) \stackrel{def}{=} n$, $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$; and the RAMANUJAN CONJECTURE: $F(n) \ll_{\varepsilon} n^{\varepsilon}$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, compare [C5], also for standard \ll -notation; while, F is "NEATLY SUB-LINEAR", abbreviated

$$F \text{ is (NSL)} \quad \stackrel{def}{\iff} \quad \exists \delta < 1, F(a) \ll_{\delta} a^{\delta}, \quad a \rightarrow \infty.$$

While the (IPP) subset has a more arithmetic flavor, so-to-speak, the (NSL) is more towards analytic worlds. Next results will study both environments and their intersection, too.

In order to give next results, we define, once fixed $P \in \mathbb{P}$, THE q -TH P -CARMICHAEL COEFFICIENT of F ,

$$\text{Car}_q^{(P)} F \stackrel{def}{=} \frac{1}{\varphi(q)} \lim_x \frac{1}{x} \sum_{a \leq x} \left(\sum_{\substack{d \in (P) \\ d|a}} F'(d) \right) c_q(a), \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{N},$$

of course whenever, fixed $q \in \mathbb{N}$, this limit exists in \mathbb{C} . Defining THE (P) -RESTRICTION of our F as [C2]

$$F_{(P)}(a) \stackrel{def}{=} \sum_{\substack{d \in (P) \\ d|a}} F'(d), \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{N},$$

we get at once: $\text{Car}_q^{(P)} F \stackrel{\bullet}{=} \text{Car}_q F_{(P)}$, $\forall P \in \mathbb{P}, \forall q \in \mathbb{N}$. Next, THE P -CARMICHAEL TRANSFORM of F ,

$$\text{Car}^{(P)} F : q \in \mathbb{N} \mapsto \text{Car}_q^{(P)} F \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Likewise, we define THE q -TH P -WINTNER COEFFICIENT of $F : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, if following series converges in \mathbb{C}

$$\text{Win}_q^{(P)} F \stackrel{def}{=} \sum_{\substack{d \in (P) \\ d \equiv 0 \pmod{q}}} \frac{F'(d)}{d}, \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{N}.$$

As above, $\text{Win}_q^{(P)} F \stackrel{\bullet}{=} \text{Win}_q F_{(P)}$, $\forall P \in \mathbb{P}, \forall q \in \mathbb{N}$. We define, when all these coefficients exist, THE P -WINTNER TRANSFORM of F , $\text{Win}^{(P)} F : q \in \mathbb{N} \mapsto \text{Win}_q^{(P)} F \in \mathbb{C}$. More details in §3.

We state here, and prove in next subsection, following result.

Theorem 2.2. (FORMULA FOR (NSL)-FUNCTIONS' P-CARMICHAEL/P-WINTNER COEFFICIENTS)

Let F be (NSL). Then, $\forall P \in \mathbb{P}$,

- (1) $\exists \text{Win}_q^{(P)} F \in \mathbb{C}, \forall q \in \mathbb{N}$ AND $\text{Win}_q^{(P)} F = 0, \forall q \notin (P)$;
- (2) $\exists \text{Car}_q^{(P)} F \in \mathbb{C}, \forall q \in \mathbb{N}$ AND $\text{Car}_q^{(P)} F = \text{Win}_q^{(P)} F, \forall q \in \mathbb{N}$;
- (3) $\text{Car}_q^{(P)} F = \frac{1}{\varphi(q) \prod_{p \leq P} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)^{-1}} \sum_{t \in (P)} \frac{F(t)}{t} c_q(t), \forall q \in (P)$;

$$(4) F_{(P)}(a) = F(a_{(P)}) = \sum_{q \in (P)} (\text{Win}_q^{(P)} F) c_q(a), \forall a \in \mathbb{N};$$

- (5) IF $G_P : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ WITH $\text{supp}(G_P) \subseteq (P)$ HAS, FOR SOME $\varepsilon > 0$, $G_P(q) \ll_{\varepsilon, P} q^{-\varepsilon}, \forall q \in (P)$, THEN

$$F_{(P)}(a) = \sum_{\ell \in (P)} G_P(\ell) c_\ell(a), \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{N} \implies G_P = \text{Win}^{(P)} F.$$

In other words, (NSL) arithmetic functions F have ALL the, say, (P) -SMOOTH CARMICHAEL-WINTNER COEFFICIENTS which expand P -locally our F , being, also, the unique such coefficients with a good decay.

We state here, and prove in next subsection, following result, too.

Theorem 2.3. (FORMULA FOR (IPP)-FUNCTIONS' P-CARMICHAEL/P-WINTNER COEFFICIENTS)

Let F (IPP). Then, $\forall P \in \mathbb{P}$,

- (1) $\exists \text{Win}_q^{(P)} F \in \mathbb{C}, \forall q \in \mathbb{N}$ AND $\text{Win}_q^{(P)} F = 0, \forall q \notin (P)^b$;
- (2) $\exists \text{Car}_q^{(P)} F \in \mathbb{C}, \forall q \in \mathbb{N}$ AND $\text{Car}_q^{(P)} F = \text{Win}_q^{(P)} F, \forall q \in \mathbb{N}$;
- (3) $\text{Car}_q^{(P)} F = \frac{1}{\varphi(q) \prod_{p \leq P} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)^{-1}} \sum_{t \in (P)} \frac{F(t)}{t} \cdot \left(\frac{\mu^2(t)t}{\varphi(t)} \right) \cdot c_q(t), \forall q \in (P)^b$;

$$(4) F_{(P)}(a) = F(a_{(P)}) = \sum_{q \in (P)} (\text{Win}_q^{(P)} F) c_q(a), \forall a \in \mathbb{N};$$

- (5) IF $G_P : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ HAS $\text{supp}(G_P) \subseteq (P)^b$, THEN

$$F_{(P)}(a) = \sum_{\ell \in (P)} G_P(\ell) c_\ell(a), \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{N} \implies G_P = \text{Win}^{(P)} F.$$

In other words, F (IPP) have ALL the, say, (P) -SMOOTH CARMICHAEL-WINTNER COEFFICIENTS which expand P -locally our F , and, also, the unique such coefficients being square-free supported.

THEOREM 2.2 & THEOREM 2.3 ENTAIL THE

Corollary 2.5. (P-LOCAL EXPANSIONS & THEIR COEFFICIENTS FOR FUNCTIONS (IPP) AND (NSL) TOO)
Let F (IPP) and let it be (NSL), too. Then, $\forall P \in \mathbb{P}$,

- (i) $\exists \text{Win}^{(P)}F$, $\text{supp}(\text{Win}^{(P)}F) \subseteq (P)^b$, $\exists \text{Car}^{(P)}F$ AND $\text{Car}^{(P)}F = \text{Win}^{(P)}F$;
- (ii) $\exists \text{Win}^{(P)}\left(F \cdot \frac{\text{Id}}{\varphi} \cdot \mu^2\right)$, $\exists \text{Car}^{(P)}\left(F \cdot \frac{\text{Id}}{\varphi} \cdot \mu^2\right)$ AND $\text{Car}^{(P)}\left(F \cdot \frac{\text{Id}}{\varphi} \cdot \mu^2\right) = \text{Win}^{(P)}\left(F \cdot \frac{\text{Id}}{\varphi} \cdot \mu^2\right)$;
- (iii) $\text{Car}_q^{(P)}F = \text{Car}_q^{(P)}\left(F \cdot \frac{\text{Id}}{\varphi} \cdot \mu^2\right)$, $\forall q \in (P)^b$;
- (iv) $F_{(P)}(a) = F(a_{(P)}) = \sum_{q \in (P)} (\text{Win}_q^{(P)}F) c_q(a)$, $\forall a \in \mathbb{N}$;

- (v) IF $G_P : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ WITH $\text{supp}(G_P) \subseteq (P)$ HAS AT LEAST ONE, OR BOTH, OF THE FOLLOWING TWO PROPERTIES:

$$G_P = \mu^2 \cdot G_P \quad \text{OR} \quad \exists \varepsilon > 0, G_P(q) \ll_{\varepsilon, P} q^{-\varepsilon}, \quad \forall q \in (P),$$

THEN

$$F_{(P)}(a) = \sum_{\ell \in (P)} G_P(\ell) c_\ell(a), \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{N} \quad \implies \quad G_P = \text{Win}^{(P)}F.$$

Proof. Since (iii) is the ‘‘MARRIAGE’’, so to speak, OF TH.M 2.2’S (3) AND TH.M 2.3’S (3), we only prove (ii).

For this, we only need to show:

$$(*) \quad F \text{ (NSL)} \quad \Rightarrow \quad F \cdot \frac{\text{Id}}{\varphi} \cdot \mu^2 \text{ (NSL)}$$

because, from this, we may apply TH.M 2.2’S FIRST PART OF (1) AND (2) FOR $F \cdot \frac{\text{Id}}{\varphi} \cdot \mu^2$ GETTING (ii), in this way. In turn, our (*) above follows from, when $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$(**) \quad \mu^2(n) = 1 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \frac{\text{Id}(n)}{\varphi(n)} = \frac{n}{\varphi(n)} = \prod_{p|n} \frac{p}{p-1} = \prod_{p|n} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p-1}\right) = \exp\left(\sum_{p|n} \log\left(1 + \frac{1}{p-1}\right)\right) \ll \log n.$$

This bound, in fact, comes from

$$\exp\left(\sum_{p|n} \log\left(1 + \frac{1}{p-1}\right)\right) \ll \exp\left(\sum_{p|n} \frac{1}{p-1}\right) = \exp\left(\sum_{p|n} \frac{1}{p} + \sum_{p|n} \frac{1}{p(p-1)}\right) \ll \exp\left(\sum_{p|n} \frac{1}{p}\right);$$

the trivial bound $\sum_{p|n} \frac{1}{p} \ll \sum_{p \leq n} \frac{1}{p}$ with (see [T])

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{p} \ll \log \log x \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty,$$

thus give (**). □

In the following, we’ll write QED for the end of a Proof’s part. The Proof, except for Facts, ends with □
 Hereafter we define \tilde{F} , THE ‘‘IPPIFICATION’’, say, of an arithmetic function F as

$$\forall a \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \tilde{F}(a) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} F(\kappa(a)).$$

Whatever is $F : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, its IPPification \tilde{F} is (IPP) by definition; also, F (IPP) entails $\tilde{F} = F$.

THEOREM 2.2 & THEOREM 2.3 ALSO ENTAIL THE OTHER

Corollary 2.6. (P-LOCAL EXPANSIONS FOR (NSL) FUNCTIONS F AND $\mu^2 F \text{Id} / \varphi$)

Let F be (NSL). Fix $P \in \mathbb{P}$. Then

- (i) Carmichael P -Transforms and Wintner P -Transforms EXIST AND ARE EQUAL, FOR THE 3 FUNCTIONS F , \tilde{F} AND $\mu^2 \cdot F \cdot \frac{\text{Id}}{\varphi}$;
- (ii) $q \in (P)^\flat \Rightarrow \text{Car}_q^{(P)} \tilde{F} = \text{Car}_q^{(P)} \left(F \cdot \frac{\text{Id}}{\varphi} \cdot \mu^2 \right)$;
- (iii) $\left(\frac{a}{\varphi(a)} - 1 \right) F(a) = \sum_{\substack{\ell \in (P) \\ \ell \text{ CUBE-FREE, NOT S-F} \\ \frac{\ell}{\kappa(\ell)} | a}} \text{Win}_\ell^{(P)} \left(\mu^2 F \cdot \frac{\text{Id}}{\varphi} \right) c_\ell(a), \quad \forall a \in (P)^\flat.$

Remark 1. We use now: when F is (NSL), then G has RAMANUJAN CONJECTURE $\Rightarrow FG$ is (NSL). \diamond

Proof. Using (1) and (2) of THEOREM 2.2, since: F (NSL) $\Rightarrow \tilde{F}$ (NSL) is trivial, to prove (i) we only need the property (*) in previous Corollary 2.5 Proof. QED

Since \tilde{F} (IPP) by definition, present (ii) comes from (iii) of Corollary 2.5. QED

The INTERESTING PART IS FORMULA (iii), FOR WHICH WE START FROM TWO FORMULÆ:

USING (1), (2), (4) OF THEOREM 2.2 for $\mu^2 F \text{Id} / \varphi$ and (*) above, we get

$$(I) \quad F \text{ (NSL) AND } a \in (P)^\flat \implies F(a) \frac{a}{\varphi(a)} = \sum_{\ell \in (P)} \text{Car}_\ell^{(P)} \left(\mu^2 F \cdot \frac{\text{Id}}{\varphi} \right) c_\ell(a)$$

AND BY THEOREM 2.3'S (1), (2), (3), (4) & THEOREM 2.2'S (3), we obtain, recalling $\sum_{\ell \dots}^\bullet \doteq \sum_{\ell \dots, \ell \text{ S-F}}$,

$$(II) \quad \tilde{F} \text{ (IPP) AND (NSL), } a \in (P)^\flat \implies \tilde{F}(a) = \sum_{\ell \in (P)} \text{Car}_\ell^{(P)} \left(\mu^2 F \cdot \frac{\text{Id}}{\varphi} \right) c_\ell(a)$$

whence, using $\tilde{F} \cdot \mu^2 = F \cdot \mu^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} a \in (P)^\flat \implies F(a) &\stackrel{(II)}{=} \sum_{\ell \in (P)} \text{Car}_\ell^{(P)} \left(\mu^2 F \cdot \frac{\text{Id}}{\varphi} \right) c_\ell(a) - \sum_{\substack{\ell \in (P) \\ \ell \text{ NOT S-F}}} \text{Car}_\ell^{(P)} \left(\mu^2 F \cdot \frac{\text{Id}}{\varphi} \right) c_\ell(a) \stackrel{(I)}{=} \\ &\stackrel{(I)}{=} F(a) \frac{a}{\varphi(a)} - \sum_{\substack{\ell \in (P) \\ \ell \text{ NOT S-F}}} \text{Win}_\ell^{(P)} \left(\mu^2 F \cdot \frac{\text{Id}}{\varphi} \right) c_\ell(a), \end{aligned}$$

recalling TH.M 2.2's (2) for $\mu^2 F \cdot \frac{\text{Id}}{\varphi}$.

THUS

$$\left(\frac{a}{\varphi(a)} - 1 \right) F(a) = \sum_{\substack{\ell \in (P) \\ \ell \text{ NOT S-F}}} \text{Win}_\ell^{(P)} \left(\mu^2 F \cdot \frac{\text{Id}}{\varphi} \right) c_\ell(a), \quad \forall a \in (P)^\flat.$$

The SUPPLEMENTARY CONDITIONS: ℓ CUBE-FREE AND $\frac{\ell}{\kappa(\ell)} | a$ are needed, just TO AVOID $c_\ell(a) = 0$:

$$c_\ell(a) \stackrel{[K]}{=} \sum_{\substack{d|a \\ d|\ell}} d\mu \left(\frac{\ell}{d} \right) \stackrel{\mu^2(a)=1}{=} \sum_{\substack{d|a \\ d|\kappa(\ell)}} d\mu \left(\frac{\ell}{\kappa(\ell)} \cdot \frac{\kappa(\ell)}{d} \right) = \mu \left(\frac{\ell}{\kappa(\ell)} \right) \sum_{\substack{d|a, d|\kappa(\ell) \\ \left(\frac{\ell}{\kappa(\ell)}, \frac{\kappa(\ell)}{d} \right) = 1}} d\mu \left(\frac{\kappa(\ell)}{d} \right) \neq 0$$

ENTAILS, in particular, $\mu(\ell/\kappa(\ell)) \neq 0 \Rightarrow \ell/\kappa(\ell)$ SQUARE-FREE $\Rightarrow \ell$ is CUBE-FREE (compare the following) AND THE INNER d -SUM HAS:

$$\left(\frac{\ell}{\kappa(\ell)}, \frac{\kappa(\ell)}{d} \right) = 1 \iff \left(p | \frac{\ell}{\kappa(\ell)} \Rightarrow p | d \right) \iff \frac{\ell}{\kappa(\ell)} | d,$$

using in this last equivalence (compare implications above): ℓ cube-free $\Leftrightarrow \ell/\kappa(\ell)$ square-free; finally, last condition above, from $d|a$, entails $\frac{\ell}{\kappa(\ell)} | a$. □

See that also Lemma 4.2 and Remark 5 entail, in particular, the cube-free restriction in the ℓ -sum of (iii), above.

2.1 Theorems' Proofs requiring sections 3,4 Lemmata

Hereafter we use the O -notation, a perfect synonym of \ll , including subscripts: see [D],[T] & compare [C5].

Our Lemmata 3.1, 3.4, 3.6, 3.7 and 4.1 prove **Theorem 2.2**.

Proof. Second part of (1) is trivial from $\text{Win}_q^{(P)} F$ definition, while first part follows from F (NSL) and formula (1P) of Lemma 3.6 giving even more than convergence, absolute convergence:

$$\text{Win}_q^{(P)} F \stackrel{\bullet}{=} \sum_{\substack{d \in (P) \\ d \equiv 0 \pmod{q}}} \frac{F'(d)}{d} \ll_{\delta} q^{\delta-1} \sum_{m \in (P)} m^{\delta-1} \ll_{\delta, P} q^{\delta-1}.$$

QED

Then, Lemma 3.7 proves immediately (2), from F (NSL) $\Rightarrow F'$ (NSL) and (2P) of Lemma 3.6.

QED

For (3), $\text{Car}_q^{(P)} F$ definition and Lemma 3.4 ENTAIL, $\forall P \in \mathbb{P}$ & $\forall q \in (P)$,

$$\text{Car}_q^{(P)} F = \frac{1}{\varphi(q)} \lim_x \frac{1}{x} \sum_{a \leq x} c_q(a) \sum_{\substack{t \in (P) \\ t|a \\ \frac{t}{q} \in (P)}} F(t) = \frac{1}{\varphi(q)} \lim_x \frac{1}{x} \sum_{\substack{t \in (P) \\ t \leq x}} F(t) c_q(t) \sum_{\substack{m \leq \frac{x}{t} \\ m \in (P)}} 1,$$

FROM: $c_q(tm) = c_q(t)$, $\forall q \in (P)$, $\forall m \in (P)$; now, (3P) of Lemma 3.6, with x/t instead of x , gives:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Car}_q^{(P)} F &= \frac{1}{\varphi(q)} \lim_x \frac{1}{x} \sum_{\substack{t \in (P) \\ t \leq x}} F(t) c_q(t) \left(\prod_{p \leq P} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \frac{x}{t} + O_P(1) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\varphi(q) \prod_{p \leq P} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)^{-1}} \lim_x \sum_{\substack{t \in (P) \\ t \leq x}} \frac{F(t)}{t} c_q(t), \end{aligned}$$

because:

$$\frac{1}{\varphi(q)} \lim_x \frac{1}{x} \sum_{\substack{t \in (P) \\ t \leq x}} F(t) c_q(t) O_P(1) = O_{P, \delta} \left(\lim_x \frac{1}{x} \sum_{\substack{t \in (P) \\ t \leq x}} t^{\delta} \right) = O_{P, \delta, \varepsilon} \left(\lim_x \frac{1}{x} x^{\delta} \cdot x^{\varepsilon} \right),$$

FROM: the trivial $|c_q(t)| \leq \varphi(q)$, $\forall t \in \mathbb{N}$ and (2P) of Lemma 3.6, so this VANISHES CHOOSING $0 < \varepsilon < 1 - \delta$;
MAIN TERM'S SERIES OVER $t \in (P)$ CONVERGES, even better, absolutely:

$$\sum_{\substack{t \in (P) \\ t \leq x}} \frac{|F(t)|}{t} |c_q(t)| \ll_{q, \delta} \sum_{t \in (P)} t^{\delta-1} \ll_{q, \delta, P} 1,$$

again from (1P) quoted above.

QED

The LOCAL EXPANSION in (4) comes straight from (1) and Lemma 3.1.

QED

To show (5):

$$\ell \in (P) \stackrel{(3)}{\Rightarrow} \text{Car}_{\ell}^{(P)} F = \frac{1}{\varphi(\ell) \prod_{p \leq P} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)^{-1}} \sum_{t \in (P)} \frac{c_{\ell}(t)}{t} \sum_{q \in (P)} G_P(q) c_q(t) \stackrel{\text{LEMMA 4.1}}{=} G_P(\ell),$$

PROVIDED \sum_t AND \sum_q MAY BE EXCHANGED; THIS follows FROM THE t, q DOUBLE SERIES ABSOLUTE CONVERGENCE, as:

$$\sum_{t \in (P)} \frac{|c_{\ell}(t)|}{t} \sum_{q \in (P)} |G_P(q)| \cdot |c_q(t)| \ll_{\ell, \varepsilon, P, q} \sum_{t \in (P)} t^{-1} \sum_{q \in (P)} q^{-\varepsilon} \ll_{\ell, \varepsilon, P, q} 1,$$

THANKS TO (1P) one last time. □

Recall $(P)^\flat \stackrel{\bullet}{=} (P) \cap \{n \in \mathbb{N} : n \text{ square-free}\}$.

Our Lemmata 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, 3.6, 3.7 and 4.1 altogether prove **Theorem 2.3**.

Proof. We CLOSELY FOLLOW TH.M 2.2 PROOF, FOR PROPERTIES (1), (2) & (4).

Second part of (1) is trivial from $\text{Win}_q^{(P)} F$ definition; this, with $F' = \mu^2 \cdot F'$, gives first part, too. QED

Lemma 3.7 & F (IPP), again from $F' = \mu^2 \cdot F'$, immediately give (2). QED

For (3), Th.m 2.2 Proof applies here, once FIXED $P \in \mathbb{P}$ and $q \in (P)$, UP TO EQUATION

$$\text{Car}_q^{(P)} F = \frac{1}{\varphi(q)} \lim_x \frac{1}{x} \sum_{\substack{t \in (P) \\ t \leq x}} F(t) c_q(t) \left(\prod_{p \leq P} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \frac{x}{t} + O_P(1) \right);$$

here, hypothesis F (IPP) gives, trivially, $F = \tilde{F}$: we apply Lemma 3.3 to $F(t) = \tilde{F}(t)$, $\forall t \in \mathbb{N}$, TO GET

$$\frac{1}{\varphi(q)} \lim_x \frac{1}{x} \sum_{\substack{t \in (P) \\ t \leq x}} F(t) c_q(t) \prod_{p \leq P} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \frac{x}{t} = \frac{1}{\varphi(q) \prod_{p \leq P} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)^{-1}} \lim_x \sum_{\substack{t \in (P) \\ t \leq x}} \frac{c_q(t)}{t} \sum_{\substack{d|t \\ \kappa(\frac{t}{d})|d}} \mu^2(d) F(d)$$

and SETTING $t = dm$ this double sum becomes, since $d \in (P)$ and $\kappa(m)|d$ entail $m \in (P)$, the following:

$$\sum_{\substack{d \in (P) \\ d \leq x}} \frac{\mu^2(d) F(d)}{d} \sum_{\substack{m \in (P) \\ m \leq x/d \\ \kappa(m)|d}} \frac{c_q(dm)}{m} = \sum_{\substack{d \in (P) \\ d \leq x}} \frac{\mu^2(d) F(d)}{d} \cdot c_q(d) \sum_{\substack{m \leq x/d \\ \kappa(m)|d}} \frac{1}{m}, \quad \forall q \in (P)^\flat,$$

because $\mu^2(q) = 1 \Rightarrow$ (see §3.1.2) $\Rightarrow c_q(a)$ (IPP) as a function of $a \in \mathbb{N} \Rightarrow c_q(dm) = c_q(d)$, FOR ANY $m \in \mathbb{N}$ WITH $\kappa(m)|d$, because in this case $p|m \Rightarrow p|d$; as soon as $x \geq \prod_{p \leq P} p$, we have $d \in (P)^\flat \Rightarrow x \geq d$; THUS

$$\lim_x \sum_{\substack{t \in (P) \\ t \leq x}} \frac{c_q(t)}{t} \sum_{\substack{d|t \\ \kappa(\frac{t}{d})|d}} \mu^2(d) F(d) = \sum_{d \in (P)} \frac{\mu^2(d) F(d)}{d} \cdot c_q(d) \cdot \lim_x \sum_{\substack{m \leq x/d \\ \kappa(m)|d}} \frac{1}{m},$$

where

$$\lim_x \sum_{\substack{m \leq x/d \\ \kappa(m)|d}} \frac{1}{m} = \sum_{\kappa(m)|d} \frac{1}{m} = \prod_{p|d} \sum_{K=0}^{\infty} p^{-K} = \prod_{p|d} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{p}} = \left(\prod_{p|d} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \right)^{-1} = \left(\frac{\varphi(d)}{d} \right)^{-1}$$

GIVES (3)'s RHS(Right Hand Side), once we prove that THE REMAINDER $O_P(1)$ IN EQUATION ABOVE HAS \lim_x VANISHING : this is from

$$\frac{1}{\varphi(q)} \frac{1}{x} \sum_{\substack{t \in (P) \\ t \leq x}} F(t) c_q(t) O_P(1) \ll_{q,P} \frac{1}{x} \sum_{\substack{t \in (P) \\ t \leq x}} \sum_{\substack{d|t \\ \kappa(\frac{t}{d})|d}} \mu^2(d) |F(d)| \ll_{q,P} \frac{1}{x} \sum_{d \in (P)^\flat} |F(d)| \sum_{\substack{m \in (P) \\ m \leq x/d}} 1 \ll_{q,P,\varepsilon,F} x^{\varepsilon-1} \xrightarrow{x} 0,$$

USING (2P) of Lemma 3.6. QED

For (4), use (1) with Lemma 3.1. QED

For (5), on the same line of TH.M 2.2 PROOF, THIS TIME WE USE $G_P = \mu^2 \cdot G_P$ TO GET THE ABSOLUTE CONVERGENCE. □

3. Technical Lemmas

3.1 Ramanujan vertical limit: non-vanishing Ramanujan sums

We start with a small Lemma, a FACT, regarding Ramanujan Sums. We use it at once, in next Lemma 3.1.

Fact 3.1. (RAMANUJAN VERTICAL LIMIT)

$$(RVL) \quad c_q(a) \neq 0 \implies v_p(q) \leq v_p(a) + 1, \quad \forall p|q.$$

Remark 2. Actually, RHS inequality above holds $\forall p \in \mathbb{P}$ (trivially: $\forall p \in \mathbb{P}$ fixed, $v_p(q) \geq 0, \forall q \in \mathbb{N}$). \diamond

In fact, we prove even more than *Ramanujan vertical limit* above, since we have the following equivalence.

Proposition 3.1. (NON-VANISHING RAMANUJAN SUMS)

$$c_q(a) \neq 0 \iff v_p(q) \leq v_p(a) + 1, \quad \forall p \in \mathbb{P}.$$

Proof. We apply Hölder's formula: (compare (1.6), Fact 1.5 in [C5])

$$c_q(a) = \varphi(q)\mu(q/(q,a))/\varphi(q/(q,a)), \quad \forall q \in \mathbb{N}, \forall a \in \mathbb{Z},$$

to conclude that the Ramanujan sum $c_q(a)$ doesn't vanish IFF $\mu(q/(q,a)) \neq 0$; this, in turn, is equivalent to: $q/(q,a)$ is square-free, so,

$$c_q(a) \neq 0 \Leftrightarrow v_p(q/(q,a)) \leq 1, \forall p \in \mathbb{P} \Leftrightarrow v_p(q) - v_p((q,a)) \leq 1, \forall p \in \mathbb{P},$$

from the complete additivity of $v_p, \forall p \in \mathbb{P}$; then, by definition $v_p((q,a)) = \min(v_p(q), v_p(a))$, whence

$$c_q(a) \neq 0 \Leftrightarrow v_p(q) - \min(v_p(q), v_p(a)) \leq 1, \forall p \in \mathbb{P}, \Leftrightarrow \max(0, v_p(q) - v_p(a)) \leq 1, \forall p \in \mathbb{P};$$

we've two possible cases for the maximum, for each fixed $p \in \mathbb{P}$: first case $v_p(q) \leq v_p(a)$, with vanishing max, renders the RHS (right hand side) the trivial $0 \leq 1$; and second case $v_p(q) > v_p(a)$, having $\max = v_p(q)$, entails that RHS is equivalent to $v_p(q) - v_p(a) \leq 1$, i.e. $v_p(q) \leq v_p(a) + 1$. \square

3.1.1 Local expansions: horizontal limits on moduli

Once fixed $P \in \mathbb{P}$, the existence of WINTNER P -SMOOTH TRANSFORM entails following formula.

Lemma 3.1. (WINTNER P -SMOOTH TRANSFORM EXISTENCE GIVES P -LOCAL EXPANSION)

Let $F : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ have, FOR A FIXED $P \in \mathbb{P}$, the Wintner P -smooth Transform. Then

$$F(a) = \sum_{q \in (P)} \left(\text{Win}_q^{(P)} F \right) c_q(a), \quad \forall a \in (P).$$

Proof. Fix $P \in \mathbb{P}$ and choose $a \in (P)$: (RVL) \Rightarrow next $\sum_{q \in (P)}$ is finite, whence x -independent, as $x \rightarrow \infty$,

$$F(a) = \sum_{\substack{d \in (P) \\ d|a}} F'(d) \stackrel{(1.1)}{\lim_x} \sum_{\substack{d \in (P) \\ d \leq x}} \frac{F'(d)}{d} \sum_{q|d} c_q(a) \stackrel{(RVL)}{\sum_{q \in (P)}} \left(\text{Win}_q^{(P)} F \right) c_q(a),$$

from $\text{Win}_q^{(P)} F$ definition, $\forall q \in \mathbb{N}$, thanks to our existence hypothesis and the property that the set (P) is divisor-closed, here: $d \in (P), q|d \Rightarrow q \in (P)$. This q -sum is bounded ONLY in terms of P and a . \square

Remark 3. The power of (RVL) is in the exchange of limits: in above Proof, these are over $q \in (P)$ and over $x \rightarrow \infty$; actually, first one is a fake limit process, as q is bounded UNIFORMLY $\forall x \in \mathbb{N}$, by (RVL)! And we need ONLY the existence (guaranteed by existence hypothesis) of limit over $x \rightarrow \infty$. \diamond

3.1.2 Ramanujan sums ignoring prime powers: square-free moduli

We invoke Kluyver's Formula [K] quoted above, in order to prove that: once fixed $q \in \mathbb{N}$ square-free, the arithmetic function

$$c_q(\cdot) : a \in \mathbb{N} \mapsto c_q(a) \in \mathbb{C}$$

is an (IPP) function. In fact, q square-free entails all $d|q$, its divisors, are square-free, too:

$$c_q(a) = \sum_{\substack{d|a \\ d|q}} d\mu\left(\frac{q}{d}\right) = \sum_{\substack{d|a \\ d|q}} d\mu\left(\frac{q}{d}\right) = \sum_{\substack{d|\kappa(a) \\ d|q}} d\mu\left(\frac{q}{d}\right) = c_q(\kappa(a)),$$

giving : **Fact 3.2.** $\mu^2(q) = 1 \Rightarrow c_q(\cdot)$ (IPP).

QED

(Yes, we use QED also when proving Facts: recall, they're small Lemmas.)

3.1.3 Horizontal and vertical constraints combined: Finite-Length expansions

As a corollary to above Lemma 3.1 we get next Lemma 3.2, using $|(P)^\flat| = 2^{\pi(P)} < \infty$, $\forall P \in \mathbb{P}$ FIXED; however, we give a shorter independent Proof, following.

Lemma 3.2. (P -SMOOTH SQUARE-FREE ARGUMENTS ALWAYS HAVE P -LOCAL EXPANSION)

Let $F : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ AND CHOOSE ANY $P \in \mathbb{P}$. Then, RECALLING $\text{Win}_q^{(P)^\flat} F \stackrel{\bullet}{=} \sum_{\substack{d \in (P)^\flat \\ d \equiv 0 \pmod{q}}} \frac{F'(d)}{d}$, WE HAVE

$$F(a) = \sum_{q \in (P)^\flat} \left(\text{Win}_q^{(P)^\flat} F \right) c_q(a), \quad \forall a \in (P)^\flat,$$

$$F_{(P)^\flat}(a) \stackrel{def}{=} \sum_{\substack{d \in (P)^\flat \\ d|a}} F'(d) = \sum_{q \in (P)^\flat} \left(\text{Win}_q^{(P)^\flat} F \right) c_q(a), \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{N}$$

AND, JOINING THE HYPOTHESIS F (IPP),

$$F_{(P)}(a) = \sum_{q \in (P)} \left(\text{Win}_q^{(P)} F \right) c_q(a), \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{N}, \text{ TOO.}$$

Proof. Just one line:

$$a \in (P)^\flat \implies F(a) = \sum_{\substack{d \in (P)^\flat \\ d|a}} F'(d) \stackrel{(1.1)}{=} \sum_{d \in (P)^\flat} \frac{F'(d)}{d} \sum_{q|d} c_q(a) \stackrel{|(P)^\flat| < \infty}{=} \sum_{q \in (P)^\flat} \left(\text{Win}_q^{(P)^\flat} F \right) c_q(a). \text{ QED}$$

First formula is proved, we leave other two formulæ proofs to the interested readers. \square

3.1.4 Odds & ends for horizontal and vertical limits

We saw above already the horizontal limits: we are limiting the prime-factors of a natural, up to a certain "limit": the classic example are the P -smooth naturals, whose set (P) we are using a lot, in this paper. More in general we may, so-to-speak, agree that we may have any kind of horizontal limit, simply FIXING a subset of primes, for our natural's prime-factors.

We saw vertical limits, too: for example, the limitations on p -adic valuations in Fact 3.1 above. More in general we may, so-to-speak, complicate our life with arbitrary vertical limits, not FIXING a single number, say, V , for our p -adic valuations to be $v_p(n) \leq V$, for our natural n . For example, asking n square-free is a FIXED vertical limit: ALL $v_p(n) \leq 1$, for our n .

Our Theorem 1.1 and, more in detail, its Lemma 3.2 counterpart, use the fact that a combination of a vertical (fixed) limit with a horizontal one, of course, entails a finite number of naturals with both constraints: " $p|n$ implies $p \leq P$ " and " $v_p(n) \leq 1$ for all p ", actually, give exactly $2^{\pi(P)}$ numbers n .

Generalizing even more, we may start from the, say, Erdős FACTORIZATION: $\mathbb{N} = P(\otimes(P))$, meaning $a = rs$ we saw at page 3, going to more & more general ways, with (like for previous) two factors or even with a finite (> 2) number of “factors”, choosing both the primes subsets (for the “horizontal choice”) and the p -adic valuations subsets (for the “vertical choice”).

One common feature, however, should be the ORTHOGONALITY of these sets that are the \mathbb{N} -factors. In our, say, (WOD)-application, orthogonality is simply the COPRIMALITY, in between factors’ elements.

In the following Lemmata, we are actually still surfing horizontal/vertical limits sea: esp., next Lemma 3.3 is about the “IPPification”, that’s a kind of giving to F ’s divisors (i.e., to F ’ support) the FIXED vertical limit 1, because (see page 8) F (IPP) is equivalent to F ’ square-free supported.

In the subsequent Lemma 3.4 we consider instead the (P) -restriction of our F : a kind of restricting F ’s divisors (i.e., F ’ support) to the FIXED horizontal limit P .

Next result is a kind of explicit formula, for the IPPification of an arbitrary F ; even if it may appear as trivial, it will be very useful, when applied inside other formulæ; its name, then, is underlining the universality, as it holds for all arithmetic functions. Recall abbreviations: o.w. = otherwise, \dashv = absurd.

Lemma 3.3. (IPPIFICATION UNIVERSAL FORMULA)

Let $F : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ AND RECALL $\tilde{F}(a) \stackrel{\bullet}{=} F(\kappa(a))$, $\forall a \in \mathbb{N}$. Then,

$$\forall a \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \tilde{F}(a) = \sum_{t|a, \kappa(\frac{a}{t})|t} \mu^2(t)F(t).$$

Proof. Just one line:

$$t|\kappa(a), \kappa(\frac{a}{t})|t \Rightarrow \kappa(a) = tm, \mu^2(tm) = 1, (t, m) = 1 \Rightarrow m = 1 : o.w. \exists p|m \Rightarrow p|a \& p \nmid t \Rightarrow p|\kappa(\frac{a}{t}) \Rightarrow p|t \dashv$$

□

Next result is Lemma 3.1 in [C2]: once fixed $P \in \mathbb{P}$, for any $a \in \mathbb{N}$ we have the representation with a UNIQUE $(r, t) \in P(\times(P))$ as $a = rt$. Notice that next Lemma, too, is Universal (compare the above).

Lemma 3.4. (MÖBIUS SWITCH)

Let $F : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ AND CHOOSE $P \in \mathbb{P}$. Then, recalling $F_{(P)}(a) \stackrel{\bullet}{=} F(a_{(P)})$, $\forall a \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\forall a \in \mathbb{N}, \quad F_{(P)}(a) = \sum_{\substack{t \in (P) \\ t|a \\ \frac{a}{t} \in P}} F(t).$$

Proof. Another one line (recall notations $a_{(P)}$ and $a_{)P(}$ at page 3):

$$t \in (P), t|a, \frac{a}{t} := r \in P(\Rightarrow t|a_{(P)}, a = a_{(P)} a_{)P(} \Rightarrow \frac{a_{(P)}}{t} a_{)P(} = r \in P(\Rightarrow \frac{a_{(P)}}{t} \in (P) \cap P(\Rightarrow t = a_{(P)}. \quad \square$$

We marry these 2 Lemmas in next. With $a_{(P)^{\flat}} \stackrel{def}{=} \prod_{\substack{p \leq P \\ p|a}} p$, $F_{(P)^{\flat}}(a) \stackrel{\bullet}{=} F(a_{(P)^{\flat}})$, $\forall a \in \mathbb{N}$, see Lemma 3.2.

Lemma 3.5. (LOCAL P -EXPANSIONS AND P -SMOOTH SQUARE-FREE RESTRICTIONS)

Let $F : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ AND CHOOSE $P \in \mathbb{P}$. Then, recalling $\tilde{F}_{(P)}(a) = \widetilde{F_{(P)}}(a) = F(a_{(P)^{\flat}})$, $\forall a \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\forall a \in \mathbb{N}, \quad F(a_{(P)^{\flat}}) = \sum_{\substack{t|a_{(P)} \\ \kappa(\frac{a_{(P)}}{t})|t}} \mu^2(t)F(t) = \sum_{\substack{t \in (P) \\ t|a_{(P)} \\ \frac{a_{(P)}}{t} \in P}} F(t) = \sum_{\substack{t \in (P)^{\flat} \\ t|a \\ \frac{a}{t} \in P}} F(t).$$

Proof. We prove: Rightmost RHS = Leftmost LHS(Left Hand Side), in two lines, as $)P($ is divisor-closed,

$$\begin{aligned} & t \in (P)^{\flat}, t|a, \frac{\kappa(a)}{t} \in P(\Rightarrow t|a_{(P)^{\flat}} \Rightarrow t|\kappa(a_{(P)}) \Rightarrow \\ & \Rightarrow \frac{\kappa(a_{(P)})}{t} \kappa(a_{)P(}) = \frac{\kappa(a)}{t} \in P(\Rightarrow \frac{\kappa(a_{(P)})}{t} \in (P) \cap P(\Rightarrow t = \kappa(a_{(P)}) = a_{(P)^{\flat}}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 3.5 speaks about arguments $a \in (P)^{\flat}$, but not like Lemma 3.2 that gives P -local expansions: it combines Lemmas 3.3 and 3.4 formulæ. Last but not least, this entails that Lemma 3.5 is Universal, too.

3.2. Wintner Orthogonal Decompositions: (P) and $)P($ properties

We need to bound series over (P) and, also, to analyze counting functions both in (P) and in $)P($.

Next Lemma provides these informations, coming from Lemma 2 and Lemma 3 in [C2].

Lemma 3.6. (CONVERGING SERIES IN (P) & COUNTING P -SMOOTH AND P -SIFTED NUMBERS)
Let $x \geq 1$ be a REAL NUMBER, $P \in \mathbb{P}$ and $\delta \in \mathbb{R}, \delta > 0$ be FIXED. Then

$$(1P) \quad \sum_{n \in (P)} n^{-\delta} \ll_{\delta, P} 1,$$

$$(2P) \quad \sum_{\substack{n \in (P) \\ n \leq x}} 1 \ll_{\varepsilon, P} x^\varepsilon, \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0,$$

$$(3P) \quad \sum_{\substack{n \in)P(\\ n \leq x}} 1 = \prod_{p \leq P} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) x + O_P(1).$$

Proof. Any $n \in (P)$ can be REPRESENTED AS $n = p_1^{K_1} \cdots p_r^{K_r}$, where $2 = p_1 < p_2 < \cdots < p_r = P$ are CONSECUTIVE PRIME NUMBERS and $K_j \in \mathbb{N}_0, \forall j \leq r$; hence, (1P) follows from:

$$\sum_{n \in (P)} n^{-\delta} = \sum_{K_1 \geq 0} (p_1^{-\delta})^{K_1} \cdots \sum_{K_r \geq 0} (p_r^{-\delta})^{K_r} = \frac{1}{1 - p_1^{-\delta}} \cdots \frac{1}{1 - p_r^{-\delta}} = \prod_{p \leq P} \frac{1}{1 - p^{-\delta}} \ll_{\delta, P} 1.$$

QED

The same representation gives (2P) : $\forall \varepsilon > 0$, from above (1P),

$$\sum_{\substack{n \in (P) \\ n \leq x}} 1 \leq \sum_{\substack{n \in (P) \\ n \leq x}} \frac{x^\varepsilon}{n^\varepsilon} \leq x^\varepsilon \sum_{n \in (P)} n^{-\varepsilon} \ll_{\varepsilon, P} x^\varepsilon.$$

QED

Saying $n \in)P($ is equivalent to : $(n, Q(P)) = 1$, where we abbreviate here $Q(P) = \prod_{p \leq P} p$; this coprimality

condition is detected by the sum (see Eratosthenes-Legendre Sieve [HaRi]) $\sum_{\substack{d|n \\ d|Q(P)}} \mu(d)$: exchanging sums,

$$\sum_{\substack{n \in)P(\\ n \leq x}} 1 = \sum_{d|Q(P)} \mu(d) \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \equiv 0 \pmod{d}}} 1 = \sum_{d|Q(P)} \mu(d) \left(\frac{x}{d} + O(1)\right) = x \sum_{d|Q(P)} \frac{\mu(d)}{d} + O\left(\sum_{d|Q(P)} \mu^2(d)\right)$$

and recalling EULER PRODUCT

$$\sum_{d|n} \frac{\mu(d)}{d} = \prod_{p|n} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \implies \sum_{d|Q(P)} \frac{\mu(d)}{d} = \prod_{p \leq P} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)$$

together with

$$\sum_{d|Q(P)} \mu^2(d) = \prod_{p \leq P} 2 = 2^{\pi(P)} = O_P(1),$$

we get (3P). □

Remark 4. For more details, in previous Lemma Proof ingredients, see §1 in [C5] : Facts. ◇

3.3. When are Carmichael’s coefficients also Wintner’s coefficients?

The answer to this question comes from a property that we expose here, in next result, and can be proved exactly like next Lemma 3.7, regarding the P –smooth version for Carmichael’s & Wintner’s “partial sums”:

Proposition 3.2. (DIFFERENCE OF CARMICHAEL’S AND WINTNER’S PARTIAL SUMS)

Let $F : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. Then, $\forall q \in \mathbb{N}, \forall x \in \mathbb{R}, x \geq 1$,

$$\frac{1}{\varphi(q)x} \sum_{a \leq x} c_q(a)F(a) = \sum_{\substack{d \leq x \\ d \equiv 0 \pmod{q}}} \frac{F'(d)}{d} + O_q \left(\frac{1}{x} \sum_{d \leq x} |F'(d)| \right).$$

The Proof mimics Lemma 3.7’s one.

We saw above, before stating Wintner’s Dream Theorem, Corollary 2.3, that $\text{Car } F = \text{Win } F$ follows when F satisfies (WA) and this is contained in the quoted Wintner’s Criterion. However, in [C3], we prove this, by equation (5) there : actually, above formula for partial sums; then, soon after quoted (5), we prove in [C3] that (WA) implies the condition:

$$\text{(ETD)} \quad \lim_x \frac{1}{x} \sum_{d \leq x} |F'(d)| = 0,$$

name abbreviating “ERATOSTHENES TRANSFORM DECAY”; namely, the **Classic Mean Value** (compare [C3] again), of Eratosthenes Transform’s modulus: $|F'|$, vanishes. See that, even if (WA) implies (ETD), this doesn’t imply (WA) (a simple counterexample’s F with: $F'(1) = 1$ and $F'(d) = 1/\log(d), \forall d > 1$).

Summarizing, (WA) implies $\text{Car } F = \text{Win } F$; but this should hold under the condition (ETD) above, that is strictly weaker than (WA). However, while (WA), of course, gives $\exists \text{Win } F$, with (ETD) we need to know, furthermore, that $\exists \text{Win } F$ OR that $\exists \text{Car } F$, to conclude $\text{Car } F = \text{Win } F$.

We come, now, to the version for P –smooth counterparts of Carmichael’s & Wintner’s coefficients.

Next result tightly links Carmichael and Wintner P –smooth coefficients together, for a general arithmetic function F , once fixed $P \in \mathbb{P}$, estimating the remainder of any q –th P –smooth difference of such coefficients, for a kind of their x –partial sums.

Next Lemma Proof comes from exponential sums elementary bounds.

Lemma 3.7. (DIFFERENCE OF P –SMOOTH CARMICHAEL’S AND P –SMOOTH WINTNER’S PARTIAL SUMS)

Let $F : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ AND CHOOSE $P \in \mathbb{P}$. Then, $\forall q \in \mathbb{N}, \forall x \in \mathbb{R}, x \geq 1$,

$$\frac{1}{\varphi(q)x} \sum_{a \leq x} c_q(a) \sum_{\substack{d|a \\ d \in (P)}} F'(d) = \sum_{\substack{d \leq x \\ d \in (P) \\ d \equiv 0 \pmod{q}}} \frac{F'(d)}{d} + O_q \left(\frac{1}{x} \sum_{\substack{d \leq x \\ d \in (P)}} |F'(d)| \right).$$

Proof. The LHS above is, exchanging sums,

$$\frac{1}{\varphi(q)x} \sum_{\substack{d \leq x \\ d \in (P)}} F'(d) \sum_{m \leq \frac{x}{d}} c_q(dm) = \frac{1}{x} \sum_{\substack{d \leq x \\ d \in (P) \\ d \equiv 0 \pmod{q}}} F'(d) \left(\frac{x}{d} + O(1) \right) + O \left(\sum_{\substack{d \leq x \\ d \in (P) \\ d \not\equiv 0 \pmod{q}}} \frac{|F'(d)|}{\varphi(q)x} \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}_q^*} \left| \sum_{m \leq \frac{x}{d}} e_q(jdm) \right| \right)$$

which, thanks to [D,ch.26] that implies:

$$d \not\equiv 0 \pmod{q} \implies \sum_{m \leq \frac{x}{d}} e_q(jdm) \ll \left\| \frac{jd}{q} \right\|^{-1} = \frac{1}{\left\| \frac{j \cdot d/(d,q)}{q/(d,q)} \right\|},$$

RECALLING $\|\alpha\| \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} |\alpha - n|, \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, gives : LHS equals, abbreviating $q' := q/(d,q) \leq q/2$, AND CHANGING VARIABLE from $j \in \mathbb{Z}_q^*$ to $j' \in \mathbb{Z}_{q'}^*$,

$$\frac{1}{\varphi(q)x} \sum_{\substack{d \leq x \\ d \in (P)}} F'(d) \sum_{m \leq \frac{x}{d}} c_q(dm) = \sum_{\substack{d \leq x \\ d \in (P) \\ d \equiv 0 \pmod{q}}} \frac{F'(d)}{d} + O \left(\frac{1}{x} \sum_{\substack{d \leq x \\ d \in (P)}} |F'(d)| \right) + O \left(\frac{1}{x} \sum_{\substack{d \leq x \\ d \in (P)}} \frac{|F'(d)|}{\varphi(q)} \cdot \frac{q}{q'} \cdot \sum_{j' \leq \frac{q'}{2}} \frac{q'}{j'} \right)$$

IN ALL, with above remainder. \square

4. Odds & Ends

4.1 Smooth-twisted ORTHOGONALITY of RAMANUJAN SUMS

Next result is a kind of NEW orthogonality property of Ramanujan sums, that we found in [C2] (3rd version!), compare Proposition 2 there. We adapt it here, to present applications.

Next Lemma gives a more suitable expression of this quoted result.

Lemma 4.1. (SMOOTH–TWISTED ORTHOGONALITY OF RAMANUJAN SUMS)

Let $q, \ell \in (P)$, FOR A FIXED $P \in \mathbb{P}$. Then

$$\frac{1}{\varphi(\ell) \prod_{p \leq P} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)^{-1}} \sum_{t \in (P)} \frac{c_\ell(t) c_q(t)}{t} = \mathbf{1}_{q=\ell}.$$

Proof. We only need [C2, Proposition 2], after showing:

$$\sum_{t \in (P)} \frac{1}{t} = \prod_{p \leq P} \sum_{K=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{p^K} = \prod_{p \leq P} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{p}} = \prod_{p \leq P} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)^{-1}.$$

□

4.2 Square-free supported F and their F'

We need to know why our expectation that s-f-supported a.f.s should have a cube-free supported Eratosthenes Transform is confirmed, so we do it in next result. In which we will use: d cube-free $\Leftrightarrow d/\kappa(d)$ square-free.

All of this is in next, very general and useful LEMMA.

Lemma 4.2. (ERATOSTHENES TRANSFORM OF SQUARE-FREE SUPPORTED ARITHMETIC FUNCTIONS)

Let $F : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be ANY ARITHMETIC FUNCTION. Then

$$(\mu^2 F)'(d) = \mu(d) \sum_{t|d} \mu(t) F(t) + (1 - \mu^2(d)) \mu\left(\frac{d}{\kappa(d)}\right) \sum_{\substack{t|\kappa(d) \\ \left(\frac{\kappa(d)}{t}, \frac{d}{\kappa(d)}\right)=1}} \mu\left(\frac{\kappa(d)}{t}\right) F(t), \quad \forall d \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Remark 5. In the RHS, first term is on SQUARE-FREE d , while second term's on d NOT S-F, BUT CUBE-FREE. In all, this proves, in particular, that ANY S-F-SUPPORTED F HAS CUBE-FREE-SUPP.^{ED} F' . ◊

Proof. Use ERATOSTHENES TRANSFORM DEFINITION & THE PROPERTY: d S-F DIVISORS ARE $\kappa(d)$ DIVISORS

$$(\mu^2 F)'(d) = \sum_{t|d} \mu^2(t) F(t) \mu\left(\frac{d}{t}\right) = \sum_{t|\kappa(d)} F(t) \mu\left(\frac{d}{\kappa(d)} \cdot \frac{\kappa(d)}{t}\right) = \mu\left(\frac{d}{\kappa(d)}\right) \sum_{\substack{t|\kappa(d) \\ (\kappa(d)/t, d/\kappa(d))=1}} \mu\left(\frac{\kappa(d)}{t}\right) F(t);$$

distinguishing TWO INCOMPATIBLE CASES $\mu^2(d) = 1$ AND $1 - \mu^2(d) = 1$, we get

$$(\mu^2 F)'(d) = \mu^2(d) \cdot \mu(d) \sum_{t|d} \mu(t) F(t) + (1 - \mu^2(d)) \mu\left(\frac{d}{\kappa(d)}\right) \sum_{\substack{t|\kappa(d) \\ \left(\frac{\kappa(d)}{t}, \frac{d}{\kappa(d)}\right)=1}} \mu\left(\frac{\kappa(d)}{t}\right) F(t),$$

because $\mu^2(d) = 1$ means d square-free, whence $\mu(\kappa(d)/t) = \mu(d/t) = \mu(d)/\mu(t) = \mu(d)\mu(t)$, $\forall t|d$. □

Before next section, we profit here to say that in our paper [CG2] we give a glance to the interactions of analytic and arithmetic aspects, for classic Ramanujan expansions. Needless to say, we would like to do the same (for example a classification of multiplicative coefficients), for the Smooth Ramanujan expansions. Like our first example $G = \mathbf{1}$, in §1, shows, the coefficients for the two summation methods might be dramatically different, in fact. Last but not least : are there other interesting summation methods beyond the classic and our smooth one?

5. Appendix

We are concluding our short tour about elementary results for general arithmetic functions, regarding Smooth Ramanujan Expansions, both local and global: with a generalization for the Wintner Orthogonal Decomposition; Theorem 2.1 above works for the Wintner coefficients : these are, in turn, what Wintner Himself called “Eratosthenian Averages”: His Book’s [W] name ! Then, we may generalize the Proof of Theorem 2.1 to a kind of more general “Wintner Average”, not only for F' , the Eratosthenes Transform. This we do in next subsection.

5.1 Wintner Averages

Given an arithmetic function, written like a sequence of complex numbers,

$$\{a_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}},$$

whenever, of course, following series converge pointwise in all $q \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$A_q \stackrel{def}{=} \sum_{n \equiv 0 \pmod{q}} \frac{a_n}{n},$$

we call: $\{A_q\}_{q \in \mathbb{N}}$ THE WINTNER AVERAGE OF our arithmetic function $\{a_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$.

Remark 6. It may seem strange, at first sight, not to see F' , in these averages: it may seem a kind of considering, say, $A_q = \text{Win}_q(F * 1)$, with $*$ Dirichlet product [T]. However, compare next Remark. \diamond

Following holds.

Proposition 3.3. (WINTNER ORTHOGONAL DECOMPOSITION WITH WINTNER AVERAGES)

Let $\{a_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ have the WINTNER AVERAGE, say

$$A : q \in \mathbb{N} \mapsto A_q \stackrel{\bullet}{=} \sum_{n \equiv 0 \pmod{q}} \frac{a_n}{n} \in \mathbb{C},$$

we defined above. Fix a prime P . Then

$$\forall d \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \sum_{\substack{r \in)P(\\ r > 1}} \frac{a_{dr}}{r} \stackrel{def}{=} \lim_x \sum_{\substack{r \in)P(\\ 1 < r \leq x}} \frac{a_{dr}}{r} \in \mathbb{C}$$

is a series, converging pointwise in d , $\forall d \in \mathbb{N}$, called the IRREGULARITY of our $\{a_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, WITH ARGUMENT d , OVER THE PRIME P . Varying $d \in \mathbb{N}$, we get the arithmetic function

$$\text{Irreg}^{(P)} a : d \in \mathbb{N} \mapsto \sum_{\substack{r \in)P(\\ r > 1}} \frac{a_{dr}}{r} \in \mathbb{C}.$$

In all, $\exists \{A_q\}_{q \in \mathbb{N}}$ entails $\exists \text{Irreg}^{(P)} a$, $\forall P \in \mathbb{P}$; and WINTNER AVERAGE DECOMPOSITION OF $\{a_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$: $\forall P \in \mathbb{P}$,

$$(\text{WAD})_{a,P} \quad a_d = d \sum_{K \in (P)} \mu(K) A_{dK} - \sum_{\substack{r \in)P(\\ r > 1}} \frac{a_{dr}}{r}, \quad \forall d \in \mathbb{N}.$$

PROOF works with a_d instead of $F'(d)$, $\forall d \in \mathbb{N}$, because we mimic Theorem 2.1 Proof. \square

Remark 7. The IRREGULAR SERIES FOR F IS NOT THE IRREGULARITY OF our F , BUT THAT OF our F' . \diamond

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [C1] G. Coppola, *An elementary property of correlations*, Hardy-Ramanujan J. **41** (2018), 65–76.
- [C2] G. Coppola, *A smooth shift approach for a Ramanujan expansion*, arXiv:1901.01584v3 (3rd version)
- [C3] G. Coppola, *Recent results on Ramanujan expansions with applications to correlations*, Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Pol. Torino **78.1** (2020), 57–82.
- [C4] G. Coppola, *A smooth summation of Ramanujan expansions*, arXiv:2012.11231v8 (8th version)
- [C5] G. Coppola, *General elementary methods meeting elementary properties of correlations*, available online at arXiv:2309.17101 (2nd version)
- [CG1] G. Coppola and L. Ghidelli, *Multiplicative Ramanujan coefficients of null-function*, arXiv:2005.14666v2 (2nd Version)
- [CG2] G. Coppola and L. Ghidelli, *Convergence of Ramanujan expansions, I [Multiplicativity on Ramanujan clouds]*, arXiv:2009.14121v1
- [CM] G. Coppola and M. Ram Murty, *Finite Ramanujan expansions and shifted convolution sums of arithmetical functions, II*, J. Number Theory **185** (2018), 16–47.
- [D] H. Davenport, *Multiplicative Number Theory*, 3rd ed., GTM 74, Springer, New York, 2000.
- [De] H. Delange, *On Ramanujan expansions of certain arithmetical functions*, Acta Arith., **31** (1976), 259–270.
- [HaRi] H. Halberstam and H.E. Richert, *Sieve Methods*, London Mathematical Society Monographs, No. 4. Academic Press, London-New York, 1974. xiv + 364 pp.
- [H] G.H. Hardy, *Note on Ramanujan’s trigonometrical function $c_q(n)$ and certain series of arithmetical functions*, Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc. **20** (1921), 263–271.
- [IKo] H. Iwaniec and E. Kowalski, *Analytic Number Theory*, American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, 53. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2004. xii+615pp. ISBN:0-8218-3633-1
- [K] J.C. Kluyver, *Some formulae concerning the integers less than n and prime to n* , Proceedings of the Royal Netherlands Academy of Arts and Sciences (KNAW), **9(1)** (1906), 408–414.
- [M] M. Ram Murty, *Ramanujan series for arithmetical functions*, Hardy-Ramanujan J. **36** (2013), 21–33. Available online
- [R] S. Ramanujan, *On certain trigonometrical sums and their application to the theory of numbers*, Transactions Cambr. Phil. Soc. **22** (1918), 259–276.
- [ScSp] W. Schwarz and J. Spilker, *Arithmetical Functions*, Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- [T] G. Tenenbaum, *Introduction to Analytic and Probabilistic Number Theory*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 46, Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- [W] A. Wintner, *Eratosthenian averages*, Waverly Press, Baltimore, MD, 1943.

Giovanni Coppola - Università degli Studi di Salerno (affiliation)
 Home address : Via Partenio 12 - 83100, Avellino (AV) - ITALY
 e-mail : giocop70@gmail.com
 e-page : www.giovincoppola.name
 e-site : www.researchgate.net