

# Moscow ACM ICPC Workshop 2015, Number Theory Lecture Notes

Mikhail Tikhomirov

November 20, 2015

## 1 Notation and preliminaries

An integer  $p > 1$  is *prime* if its only divisors are 1 and  $p$ .

*Fundamental theorem of arithmetic.* Each positive integer  $n$  can be uniquely represented as  $n = p_1^{\alpha_1} \dots p_k^{\alpha_k}$ , where  $p_1, \dots, p_k$  are different primes.

The *Moebius function*  $\mu(n)$  is defined as follows:

- if  $n$  is a product of  $k$  different primes (without squares), then  $\mu(n) = (-1)^k$ .
- else,  $\mu(n) = 0$ .

## 2 Eratosthene's sieve

The most well-known algorithm for finding prime numbers not exceeding  $n$  is the Eratosthene's sieve. Here is a simple implementation:

```
for all k from 2 to n:
  set isPrime[i] = true
for all k from 2 to n:
  if isPrime[k]:
    add k to the list of primes
    for all j = 2k, 3k, ...:
      set isPrime[j] = false
```

After running this pseudo-code, we will obtain a valid list of primes. The running time of the algorithm is roughly  $\sum_{p \text{ is a prime } \leq n} \frac{n}{p} \sim n \log \log n$ .

The sieve can be enhanced as follows:

```
for all k from 2 to n:
  set minimalDiv[i] = i
for all k from 2 to n:
  if minimalDiv[k] == k:
    add k to the list of primes
```

```

for all primes p <= minimalDiv[k]:
    if p * k <= n:
        minimalDiv[p * k] = p

```

How is this an enhancement? First of all, the running time of the algorithm becomes  $O(n)$ , since for each  $k$  we will change `minimalDiv[k]` at most once. To see that, let  $k = p_1^{\alpha_1} \dots p_m^{\alpha_m}$ , and  $p_1 < \dots < p_m$ . Assuming that `minimalDiv` was computed correctly for all numbers less than  $k$ , we conclude that the only way to overwrite `minimalDiv[k]` is from  $k' = k/p_1$  with  $p = p_1$ .

Moreover, the array `minimalDiv` provides us with information to compute many useful functions on all numbers from 1 to  $n$ , such as the number of divisors or Euler's totient  $\varphi$  function, since they can be found easily using factorization of the number.

### 3 Fast sums: first examples

#### 3.1 Points under hyperbola

Count the number of integer pairs  $x, y$  such that  $x, y > 0$  and  $xy \leq n$ .

*Solution* The number can be represented as the sum

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \left\lfloor \frac{n}{k} \right\rfloor$$

**Fact 1.** There are  $O(\sqrt{n})$  different values of  $\left\lfloor \frac{n}{k} \right\rfloor$  for integer  $k$ .

*Proof.* If  $k \geq \sqrt{n}$ , then  $\left\lfloor \frac{n}{k} \right\rfloor \leq \sqrt{n}$ . □

**Fact 2.** If  $k \geq 1$ , the number of  $x$ 's satisfying  $\left\lfloor \frac{n}{x} \right\rfloor = k$  is  $\left\lfloor \frac{n}{k} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{n}{k+1} \right\rfloor$ .

*Proof.* The equation is equivalent to  $k \leq \frac{n}{x} < k+1$ . □

Thus we can break the sum in two, for small and large values of  $k$ :

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\sim\sqrt{n}} \left\lfloor \frac{n}{k} \right\rfloor + \sum_{x=1}^{\sim\sqrt{n}} x \left( \left\lfloor \frac{n}{x} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{n}{x+1} \right\rfloor \right)$$

We should take care to count each summand exactly once, especially for values of  $x$  and  $k$  around  $\sqrt{n}$ .

To sum up, we can compute this sum in  $O(\sqrt{n})$  time.

#### 3.2 Squarefree numbers

A number is *squarefree* if it's not divisible by a square of any number greater than 1. Find  $sq(n)$  — the number of squarefree numbers not exceeding  $n$ .

*Solution.* We will use the inclusion-exclusion principle. We will start with  $n$  numbers, then subtract numbers divisible by  $2^2 = 4$  and  $3^2 = 9$ , then add back numbers divisible by  $6^2 = 36$  and so on. Since  $\mu(n)$  are exactly the coefficients for inclusion-exclusion principle, we obtain the formula:

$$sq(n) = \sum_{k=1}^{\lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor} \mu(k) \left\lfloor \frac{n}{k^2} \right\rfloor$$

All  $\mu(k)$  up to  $\sqrt{n}$  can be directly obtained from the linear Eratosthene's sieve. Thus, this sum can be computed in  $O(\sqrt{n})$ .

## 4 Harder summation examples

### 4.1 Sum of $\varphi(k)$

Let us find  $\Phi(n) = \sum_{k=1}^n \varphi(k)$ . We can find it easily in linear time using the Eratosthene's sieve, but we would like to do better.

**Fact.**  $\sum_{d|k} \varphi(d) = k$

*Proof.* Let us break all the numbers from 1 to  $k$  into groups with respect to  $GCD(k, x)$ . There are exactly  $\varphi(k/d)$  numbers with  $GCD(k, x) = d$ , hence the formula. □

**Fact.**  $\sum_{d=1}^n \Phi(\lfloor n/d \rfloor) = \frac{n(n+1)}{2}$

*Proof.* This is the previous statement after summation over  $k$  from 1 to  $n$ . □

It follows that  $\Phi(n) = \frac{n(n+1)}{2} - \sum_{d=2}^n \Phi(\lfloor n/d \rfloor)$ . Thus, if we know values of  $\Phi(\lfloor n/d \rfloor)$  for all  $d$ , then we can find  $\Phi(n)$ . Note that the summation here can be performed in  $O(\sqrt{n})$  similar to the above examples.

To improve the summation even more, let's find first  $K$  values of  $\Phi$  explicitly using the sieve, and values of  $\Phi(n/d)$  for  $d$  up to  $\sim n/K$  using the above method. The complexity becomes

$$O(K + \sum_{j=1}^{n/K} \sqrt{n/j}) \sim O(k + \int_1^{n/K} \sqrt{n/x} dx) \sim O(K + n/\sqrt{K})$$

Choosing  $K \sim n^{2/3}$ , we obtain a method with complexity  $O(n^{2/3})$ .

### 4.2 Sum of $\mu(k)$

Let's find  $M(n) = \sum_{k=1}^n \mu(k)$ , so called Mertens' function. Let  $g(x) \equiv 1$  for all  $x$ . Then

$$M(n) = \sum_{k=1}^n \mu(k)g(\lfloor n/x \rfloor)$$

By the second Moebius' inversion formula,

$$1 = g(n) = \sum_{k=1}^n M(\lfloor n/k \rfloor)$$

Thus, we have the expression  $M(n) = 1 - \sum_{k=2}^n M(\lfloor n/k \rfloor)$ . We can use the method for finding  $\Phi(n)$  here without much modification to find  $M(n)$  in  $O(n^{2/3})$ .

### 4.3 Revisiting $\Phi(n)$

The Mertens' function proves useful in finding quite general sums involving  $\mu(n)$ , which arise naturally if we use inclusion-exclusion principle. As an illustration, consider  $cp(n)$  — the number of pairs  $1 \leq a \leq b \leq n$  such that  $GCD(a, b) = 1$  (we already know that  $cp(n) = \Phi(n)$ , but here we will show another way of computing this value).

Let us use the inclusion-exclusion principle: take all pairs, subtract all pairs with common divisors 2 and 3, add back pairs with common divisor 6, and so on. We obtain the formula:

$$cp(n) = \sum_{d=1}^n \mu(d) \frac{\lfloor n/d \rfloor (\lfloor n/d \rfloor + 1)}{2}$$

Perform the  $\sqrt{n}$ -breaking of the sum:

$$cp(n) = \sum_{d=1}^{\sim\sqrt{n}} \mu(d) \frac{\lfloor n/d \rfloor (\lfloor n/d \rfloor + 1)}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\sqrt{n}} \frac{k(k+1)}{2} \left( M\left(\left\lfloor \frac{n}{k} \right\rfloor\right) - M\left(\left\lfloor \frac{n}{k+1} \right\rfloor\right) \right)$$

Note that the method of computing  $M(n)$  also produces all values of  $M(\lfloor n/d \rfloor)$ , thus our problem can be solved directly using results of computing  $M(n)$  as shown above. The complexity is still  $O(n^{2/3})$ .

## 5 Counting the primes

We would like to find  $\pi(n)$  — the number of primes not exceeding  $n$ . Once again, we want to do better than the linear sieve approach.

Denote  $p_j$  the  $j$ -th prime number. Denote  $dp_{n,j}$  the number of  $k$  such that  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , and all prime divisors of  $k$  are at least  $p_j$  (note that 1 is counted in all  $dp_{n,j}$ , since the set of its prime divisors is empty).  $dp_{n,j}$  satisfy a simple recurrence:

- $dp_{n,1} = n$  (since  $p_1 = 2$ )
- $dp_{n,j} = dp_{n,j+1} + dp_{\lfloor n/p_j \rfloor, j}$ , hence  $dp_{n,j+1} = dp_{n,j} - dp_{\lfloor n/p_j \rfloor, j}$

Let  $p_k$  be the smallest prime greater than  $\sqrt{n}$ . Then  $\pi(n) = dp_{n,k} + k - 1$  (by definition, the first summand accounts for all the primes not less than  $k$ ).

If we evaluate the recurrence  $dp_{n,k}$  straightforwardly, all the reachable states will be of the form  $dp_{\lfloor n/i \rfloor, j}$ . We can also note that if  $p_j$  and  $p_k$  are both greater than  $\sqrt{n}$ , then  $dp_{n,j} + j = dp_{n,k} + k$ . Thus, for each  $\lfloor n/i \rfloor$  it makes sense to keep only  $\sim \pi\sqrt{n/i}$  values of  $dp_{\lfloor n/i \rfloor, j}$ .

Instead of evaluating all DP states straightforwardly, we perform a two-step process:

- Choose  $K$ .
- Run recursive evaluation of  $dp_{n,k}$ . If we want to compute a state with  $n < K$ , memorize the query “count the numbers not exceeding  $n$  with all prime divisors at least  $k$ ”.
- Answer all the queries off-line: compute the sieve for numbers up to  $K$ , then sort all numbers by the smallest prime divisor. Now all queries can be answered using RSQ structure. Store all the answers globally.
- Run recursive evaluation of  $dp_{n,k}$  yet again. If we want to compute a state with  $n < K$ , then we must have preprocessed a query for this state, so take it from the global set of answers.

The performance of this approach relies heavily on  $Q$  — the number of queries we have to preprocess.

**Statement.**  $Q = O\left(\frac{n}{\sqrt{K} \log n}\right)$ .

*Proof.* Each state we have to preprocess is obtained by following a  $dp_{\lfloor n/p_j \rfloor, j}$  transition from some greater state. It follows that  $Q$  doesn't exceed the total number of states for  $n > K$ .

$$Q \leq \sum_{j=1}^{n/K} \pi(\sqrt{n/j}) \sim \sum_{j=1}^{n/K} \sqrt{n/j} / \log n \sim \frac{1}{\log n} \int_1^{n/K} \sqrt{n/x} dx \sim \frac{n}{\sqrt{K} \log n}$$

□

The preprocessing of  $Q$  queries can be done in  $O((K + Q) \log(K + Q))$ , and it is the heaviest part of the computation. Choosing optimal  $K \sim \left(\frac{n}{\log n}\right)^{2/3}$ , we obtain the complexity  $O(n^{2/3}(\log n)^{1/3})$ .