Max-Planck-Institut für Mathematik Bonn

Cyclotomic polynomial coefficients a(n,k) with n and k in prescribed residue classes

by

Jessica Fintzen



Max-Planck-Institut für Mathematik Preprint Series 2010 (85)

Cyclotomic polynomial coefficients a(n,k) with n and k in prescribed residue classes

Jessica Fintzen

Max-Planck-Institut für Mathematik Vivatsgasse 7 53111 Bonn Germany Jacobs University Bremen College Ring 3 Mailbox 341 28759 Bremen Germany

MPIM 10-85

Cyclotomic polynomial coefficients a(n, k) with n and k in prescribed residue classes

Jessica Fintzen

Abstract

Let a(n,k) be the kth coefficient of the nth cyclotomic polynomial. In 2009 Ji, Li and Moree showed that $\{a(n,k) \mid n \equiv 0 \mod d, n \geq 1, k \geq 0\} = \mathbb{Z}$. In this paper we will determine $\{a(n,k) \mid n \equiv a \mod d, k \equiv b \mod f, n \geq 1, k \geq 0\}$.

1 Introduction

Let

$$\Phi_n(x) = \prod_{\substack{1 \le k \le n \\ (k,n)=1}} (x - e^{\frac{2\pi i k}{n}}) = \sum_{k=0}^{\varphi(n)} a(n,k) x^k$$

be the *n*th cyclotomic polynomial, where φ denotes Euler's totient function, and set a(n,k) = 0 for $k > \varphi(n)$.

It can be shown that $a(n, k) \in \mathbb{Z}$. In the 19th century it was conjectured that $|a(n, k)| \leq 1$, which is the case for n < 105. However, a(105, 7) = -2, and in 1931 Schur proved in a letter to Landau (cf. [3]) that |a(n, k)| is unbounded. In 1987 Suzuki [5] showed that $\{a(n, k) | n \geq 1, k \geq 0\} = \mathbb{Z}$, and in 2009 Ji, Li and Moree [2] proved the generalization $\{a(mn, k) | n \geq 1, k \geq 0\} = \mathbb{Z}$ for an arbitrary fixed positive integer m.

In this paper we will show that one can restrict n and k even further and still obtain every integer as coefficient a(n, k).

Theorem 1. Let a < d and b < f be four nonnegative integers. Denote $s(n) = n \cdot \prod_{\substack{p \mid n \\ p \text{ prime}}} p^{-1}$.

Then

$$\{a(n,k) \mid n \equiv a \mod d, k \equiv b \mod f, n \ge 1, k \ge 0\} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{Z} & \text{if } (s((a,d)), f) \mid b; \\ \{0\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

MSC: 11B83, 11C08

Keywords: cyclotomic polynomial, Dirichlet's Theorem, residue classes

We would like to remark that the result also holds true if one replaces the coefficients a(n,k) of the cyclotomic polynomials by the coefficients c(n,k) of the inverse cyclotomic polynomials (see Section 2, equation (3) for a definition), which is a direct corollary to Theorem 1, see Corollary 1 in Section 4.

2 Some properties of cyclotomic polynomials

Using the identity

$$x^n - 1 = \prod_{d|n} \Phi_d(x) \tag{1}$$

and the Möbius inversion formula, one can show that for n > 1

$$\Phi_n(x) = \prod_{d|n} (1 - x^d)^{\mu(\frac{n}{d})},$$
(2)

where μ denotes the Möbius function. From equation (2) one can deduce the following lemma (for a proof see, e.g., Thangadurai [6]).

Lemma 1. Let n > 1 and $k \ge 0$ be integers.

- a) If p and q are primes satisfying k and <math>(n, pq) = 1, we have a(pqn, k) = a(n, k).
- b) If n is odd, we have $a(2n, k) = a(n, k) \cdot (-1)^k$.
- c) If p|n, we have a(pn, pk) = a(n, k).
- d) If $s(n) \nmid k$, we have a(n, k) = 0.

Another helpful tool will be the consideration of the coefficients of the power series expansion of the inverse cyclotomic polynomial $\Phi_n(x)^{-1}$ at x = 0. We denote

$$\frac{1}{\Phi_n(x)} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c(n,k) x^k.$$
(3)

The coefficients c(n, k) are integers, see for example Moree [4], and we have the following relation with the coefficients of the cyclotomic polynomials, cf. Gallot, Moree and Hommersom [1].

Lemma 2. Let k be a nonnegative integer and p a prime exceeding k and coprime with n > 1. Then a(pn, k) = c(n, k) and c(pn, k) = a(n, k).

This lemma follows from equation (2) and

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c(n,k)x^k = \frac{1}{\Phi_n(x)} = \prod_{d|n} (1-x^d)^{-\mu(\frac{n}{d})}$$
(4)

(for |x| < 1 and n > 1).

Definition 1. Let *n* and *k* be integers with n > 0. Denote by $(k \mod n)$ the unique integer satisfying $(k \mod n) \equiv k \mod n$ and $0 \leq (k \mod n) < n$.

Lemma 3. Let n > 0 and $k \ge 0$ be integers.

- a) We have $c(n, k) = c(n, (k \mod n))$.
- b) If $(k \mod n) > n \varphi(n)$, then c(n, k) = 0.

Proof. From equation (1) it follows that

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c(n,k) x^k = \frac{1}{\Phi_n(x)} = -\left(\prod_{d|n, d < n} \Phi_d(x)\right) \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} x^{jn}$$

As $\prod_{d|n,d < n} \Phi_d(x)$ has degree $n - \varphi(n) < n$, we obtain $c(n,k) = c(n, (k \mod n))$ and c(n,k) = 0 for $(k \mod n) > n - \varphi(n)$.

Lemma 4. Let n > 1 be a positive integer, then $c(n, 1) = \mu(n)$.

Proof. Using equation (4) we obtain

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c(n,k) x^k = \prod_{d|n} (1-x^d)^{-\mu(\frac{n}{d})} \equiv (1-x)^{-\mu(n)} \equiv 1+\mu(n)x \mod x^2,$$

and therefore $c(n, 1) = \mu(n)$.

3 Warm-up: special cases of Theorem 1

Before we tackle Theorem 1 in its full generality, we want to demonstrate that it becomes an easy generalization of Theorem 2 if we restrict only n or k to a prescribed residue class while the other variable is not required to satisfy any congruence condition.

Theorem 2. Let m and N be positive integers. Then

$$\{a(mn,k) \mid n > 1, k \ge 0, (n,N) = 1\} = \mathbb{Z}$$

and

$$\{c(mn,k) \mid n > 1, k \ge 0, (n,N) = 1\} = \mathbb{Z}.$$

This theorem follows easily from the proof of $\{a(n,k) \mid n \equiv 0 \mod d, n \geq 1, k \geq 0\} = \mathbb{Z}$ by Ji, Li and Moree [2]. Using it, we prove the following two special cases of Theorem 1.

Theorem 3. Let b < f be two nonnegative integers. Then

$$\{a(n,k) \mid k \equiv b \mod f, n \ge 1, k \ge 0\} = \mathbb{Z}.$$

Proof. Let z be an arbitrary integer. By Theorem 2 there exist an integer n > 1, (n, f) = 1 and an integer $k \ge 0$ such that c(n, k) = z. As (n, f) = 1, we can find an integer $r \ge 1$ with $nr \equiv b - k \mod f$. Let p > nr + k be a prime. Then by Lemma 2 and Lemma 3 we obtain

$$a(np, nr + k) = c(n, nr + k) = c(n, k) = z$$

with $nr + k \equiv b \mod f$.

Theorem 4. Let a < d be two nonnegative integers. Then

$$\{a(n,k) \mid n \equiv a \mod d, n \ge 1, k \ge 0\} = \mathbb{Z}$$

Proof. Let g = (a, d), and denote by z an arbitrary integer. Using Theorem 2, there exist an integer n > 1, $(n, \frac{d}{g}) = 1$ and an integer $k \ge 0$ such that c(ng, k) = z. By Dirichlet's Prime Number Theorem we can pick a prime $p > \max\{k, ng\}$ that satisfies $p \equiv n^{-1}\frac{a}{g} \mod \frac{d}{g}$. Then by Lemma 2 we have a(npg, k) = c(ng, k) = z with $npg \equiv a \mod d$. \Box

Although these special cases have relatively easy proofs, the combination of the congruence restrictions on both n and k in Theorem 1 requires a more complicated proof.

4 The main theorem

Before proving Theorem 1, we will first prove the following key result.

Lemma 5. Let a < d, b < d be three nonnegative integers such that (a, d) is squarefree. Then

$$\{a(n,k) \mid n \equiv a \mod d, k \equiv b \mod d, n \ge 1, k \ge 0\} = \mathbb{Z}$$

Let c = (a, d). We will prove Lemma 5 in two parts. First we will consider when c is odd, and then the case where c is even will follow easily.

Suppose c is odd. We will start this case by proving that all negative integers are contained in $\{a(n,k) \mid n \equiv a \mod d, k \equiv b \mod d, n \geq 1, k \geq 0\}$. In order to do this we will show that for every positive integer t there exist positive integers m and q satisfying certain conditions such that a(cqm, k) = -t. For this we will need three lemmas. The first will ensure that the integer m can be chosen as a product of primes that are in a prescribed primitive residue class and satisfy certain size conditions. The other two will show that there exist residue classes satisfying the properties that we will need later.

Lemma 6. Let a, m and t be positive integers with (a, m) = 1. Then for each N there exists n > N such that the interval $[n, \frac{3}{2}n)$ contains at least t primes satisfying $p \equiv a \mod m$.

Proof. Assume that there exists N_0 such that for every $n \ge N_0$ the interval $[n, \frac{3}{2}n)$ contains less than t primes satisfying $p \equiv a \mod m$. Then for all $x \ge N_0$ we have

$$\sum_{\substack{p \le x, p \text{ prime} \\ p \equiv a \mod m}} 1 < N_0 + \log \frac{x}{N_0} \left(\log \frac{3}{2} \right)^{-1} \cdot (t-1) = O\left(\log x \right),$$

which contradicts the quantitative version of Dirichlet's Prime Number Theorem

$$\sum_{\substack{p \le x, \ p \text{ prime} \\ p \equiv a \mod m}} 1 = (1 + o(1)) \frac{x}{\varphi(m) \log x} \,.$$

Lemma 7. Let s be an integer, and let d be an odd squarefree natural number. Then there exists an integer x such that (x, d) = (x + s, d) = 1.

Proof. Let $d = \prod_{i=1}^{n} p_i$ be the prime factorization of d with $n \ge 1$ (for d = 1 the lemma holds obviously true). For each odd prime there exists an x_i such that $(x_i, p_i) = (x_i + s, p_i) = 1$. Hence by the Chinese Remainder Theorem there exists an integer x satisfying $x \equiv x_i \mod p_i$ for $1 \le i \le n$, and we have (x, d) = (x + s, d) = 1. \Box

Lemma 8. Let s and y < c be nonnegative integers and let q_1, \ldots, q_N be N > 1 distinct primes larger than $\max\{c, 2N + 1\}$. Define $q = \prod_{i=1}^{N} q_i$. Then there exists an integer u with (u, q) = (u + s, q) = 1 such that the system of congruences

$$k \equiv u + s \mod q$$
$$k \equiv y \mod c$$

implies

$$cq - \varphi(cq) < (k \mod cq).$$

Proof. Consider the set $S = \{cq + y - c \cdot j - s \mid 1 \leq j \leq 2N + 1\}$. As $q_i > 2N + 1$ and $(q_i, c) = 1$, for each $1 \leq i \leq N$ there is at most one element in S that is not coprime with q_i and at most one element $r \in S$ with $(r + s, q_i) \neq 1$. Thus there exists $u \in S$ with (u, q) = (u + s, q) = 1. Note that $u + s \equiv y \mod c$ and 0 < u + s < cq. Hence

$$(k \mod cq) = u + s \ge cq + y - c(2N + 1) > cq - \prod_{i=1}^{2} (q_i - 1) \ge cq - \prod_{i=1}^{N} (q_i - 1) \ge cq - \varphi(cq).$$

Now we have the necessary preliminaries to prove Lemma 5.

Proof of Lemma 5.

Denote, as above, the squarefree natural number (a, d) by c, and let d_2 be the largest positive integer satisfying

$$d = d_1 d_2$$
 and $(b, d_2) = 1$ and $d_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$. (5)

Note that this implies $(d_1, d_2) = 1$. Furthermore, write $c = c_1 c_2$ with nonnegative integers c_1 and c_2 satisfying $c_1|d_1$ and $c_2|d_2$.

We distinguish two cases.

Case 1. c is odd. Let s be a positive integer coprime with c_1 . Note that this implies $(b - s, c_1) = 1$ as every prime divisor of c_1 divides by definition d_1 and therefore b and thus does not divide b - s. In addition, by Lemma 7 there exists an integer x such that $(x, c_2) = (x + s, c_2) = 1$ because c_2 is odd in this case. Denote by γ the smallest positive integer satisfying $(c_2\gamma, \frac{d_2}{c_2\gamma}) = 1$. Note that this implies $(x + s, \gamma) = 1$. Since the moduli are coprime and their product is divisible by c, there exists a unique integer $0 \le y < c$ such that the system of congruences

$$k \equiv b \mod d_1$$

$$k \equiv x + s \mod c_2 \gamma$$

$$k \equiv 1 \mod \frac{d_2}{c_2 \gamma}$$
(6)

implies

$$k \equiv y \mod c$$
.

Let q_1, \ldots, q_N be N > 1 distinct primes all larger than $\max\{d, 2N + 7\}$ and define $q = \prod_{i=1}^{N} q_i$. According to Lemma 8 there exists an integer u such that (u, q) = (u + s, q) = 1 and such that $k \equiv u + s \mod q$ together with the system of congruences (6) implies

$$cq - \varphi(cq) < (k \mod cq). \tag{7}$$

Furthermore, by the Chinese Remainder Theorem we can find an integer v such that

$$p_i \equiv v \mod dq$$

implies

$$p_i \equiv u \mod q$$

$$p_i \equiv b - s \mod c_1 \tag{8}$$

$$p_i \equiv x \mod c_2.$$

As $(u,q) = (b-s,c_1) = (x,c_2) = 1$, the integer v can (and will) be chosen coprime with dq. In addition, since d and q are coprime, there exists an integer w such that the system

$$k \equiv u + s \mod q$$

$$k \equiv b \mod d_1$$

$$k \equiv x + s \mod c_2 \gamma$$

$$k \equiv 1 \mod \frac{d_2}{c_2 \gamma}$$
(9)

is equivalent to

$$k \equiv w \mod dq$$

Note that therefore $k \equiv w \mod dq$ implies $k \equiv b \mod c_1$ and $k \equiv x + s \mod c_2$.

Given an arbitrary positive integer t by Lemma 6 there exist primes p_1, \ldots, p_t such that $\max\{2dq, 2N+7\} < p_1 < p_2 < \ldots < p_t < \frac{3}{2}p_1$ and $p_i \equiv v \mod dq$ for $1 \leq i \leq t$. As $2p_1 - \frac{3}{2}p_1 - \frac{1}{2} \geq dq$, we can choose an integer $k \equiv w \mod dq$ with $\frac{3p_1}{2} < k < 2p_1$. Set

$$m = \begin{cases} p_1 p_2 \cdots p_t p_{t+1} & \text{if } t \text{ is even;} \\ p_1 p_2 \cdots p_t & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $p_{t+1} > 2p_1$ is a prime. Then we obtain (cf. also [2])

$$\begin{split} \Phi_{cqm}(x) &\equiv \prod_{r|cqm, r < k+1} (1-x^r)^{\mu(\frac{cqm}{r})} \mod x^{k+1} \\ &\equiv \prod_{r|cq} (1-x^r)^{\mu(\frac{cq}{r})\mu(m)} \prod_{i=1}^t (1-x^{p_i})^{\mu(\frac{cqm}{p_i})} \mod x^{k+1} \\ &\equiv \Phi_{cq}(x)^{\mu(m)} \prod_{i=1}^t (1-x^{p_i})^{-\mu(cqm)} \mod x^{k+1} \\ &\equiv \frac{1}{\Phi_{cq}(x)} \prod_{i=1}^t (1-x^{p_i})^{\mu(cq)} \mod x^{k+1} \\ &\equiv \frac{1}{\Phi_{cq}(x)} \left(1-\mu(cq) \sum_{i=1}^t x^{p_i} \right) \mod x^{k+1}. \end{split}$$

Thus by Lemma 3 together with equation (7) and the systems of congruences (8) and (9) we obtain

$$a(cqm,k) = c(cq,k) - \mu(cq) \sum_{i=1}^{t} c(cq,k-p_i) = 0 - \mu(cq) \sum_{i=1}^{t} c(cq,s)$$

= $-\mu(cq)tc(cq,s)$. (10)

Let us first consider the case s = 1. As $c(cq, 1) = \mu(cq)$ by Lemma 4, equation (10) yields

$$a(cqm,k) = -\mu(cq)^2 t = -t.$$
 (11)

Since $(b, d_2) = 1$ and $(x + s, c_2 \gamma) = 1$, we infer from Dirichlet's Prime Number Theorem the existence of a prime $q_{N+1} > k$ coprime with dqm such that

$$q_{N+1} \equiv 1 \mod d_1,$$

$$q_{N+1} \equiv b(x+s)^{-1} \mod c_2 \gamma$$

and
$$q_{N+1} \equiv b \mod \frac{d_2}{c_2 \gamma}.$$

Let $q_{N+2} > k$ be a prime coprime with $cqmq_{N+1}$ and satisfying

$$q_{N+2} \equiv \frac{a}{c} (qmq_{N+1}^2)^{-1} \mod \frac{d}{c}.$$

Using Lemma 1, the system of congruences (9) and equation (11), we obtain

$$a(cqmq_{N+1}^2q_{N+2}, kq_{N+1}) = a(cqmq_{N+1}q_{N+2}, k) = a(cqm, k) = -t$$

with

$$cqmq_{N+1}^2q_{N+2} \equiv qmq_{N+1}^2 a(qmq_{N+1}^2)^{-1} \equiv a \mod d$$
 and

 $kq_{N+1} \equiv b \mod d_1$, $kq_{N+1} \equiv b \mod c_2\gamma$ and $kq_{N+1} \equiv b \mod \frac{d_2}{c_2\gamma}$, i.e. $kq_{N+1} \equiv b \mod d$.

Hence, if c = (a, d) is odd, we have

$$\mathbb{Z}_{<0} \subseteq \{a(n,k) \mid n \equiv a \mod d, k \equiv b \mod d, n \ge 1, k \ge 0\}.$$
 (12)

As a(n,k) = 0 for every $k > \varphi(n)$, it only remains to show that

$$\mathbb{Z}_{>0} \subseteq \{a(n,k) \mid n \equiv a \mod d, k \equiv b \mod d, n \ge 1, k \ge 0\}$$

In order to do this we will proceed as above, this time exploiting the fact that we proved that $-1 \in \{a(n,k) \mid n \equiv a \mod d, k \equiv 1 \mod d, n \geq 1, k \geq 0\}.$

Define

$$q_0 = \begin{cases} q & \text{if } \mu(cq) = 1; \\ qq_{N+3} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $q_{N+3} > \max\{d, 2N+7\}$ is a prime coprime to q. Then for the special case b = s = t = 1 the construction of equation (11) establishes the existence of a prime $m_0 > \max\{2dq, 2N+7\}$ and an integer $k_0 \ge 0$ such that $a(cq_0m_0, k_0) = -1$ with $(k_0, c) = 1$ (consider the system of congruences (9)).

Let $\tilde{q} = q_0 m_0 q_{N+4}$, where q_{N+4} is a prime larger than k_0 and coprime with $cq_0 m_0$. Then \tilde{q} is a product of at most N+3 and at least 2 primes that are all larger than $\max\{d, 2(N+3)+1\}$. Note that we can therefore apply Lemma 8. Hence by the construction of equation (10)

above and by setting $s = k_0$, there exists a product \tilde{m} of primes all larger than $2d\tilde{q}$ and a nonnegative integer \tilde{k} such that

$$a(c\tilde{q}\tilde{m},\tilde{k}) = -\mu(c\tilde{q})\sum_{i=1}^{t} c(c\tilde{q},k_0) = -\mu(cq_0m_0q_{N+4})tc(cq_0m_0q_{N+4},k_0)$$

= $-ta(cq_0m_0,k_0) = t$ (13)

(we used Lemma 2 for the third equality) and

$$\tilde{k} \equiv u + k_0 \mod q \ \tilde{k} \equiv b \mod d_1, \ \tilde{k} \equiv \tilde{x} + k_0 \mod c_2 \gamma \text{ and } \tilde{k} \equiv 1 \mod \frac{d_2}{c_2 \gamma},$$

where \tilde{x} is an integer satisfying $(\tilde{x}, c_2) = (\tilde{x} + k_0, c_2) = 1$. By choosing a prime $\tilde{q}_{N+1} > \tilde{k}$ coprime with $d\tilde{q}\tilde{m}$ that satisfies the following system of congruences

$$\widetilde{q}_{N+1} \equiv 1 \mod d_1$$

$$\widetilde{q}_{N+1} \equiv b(\widetilde{x} + k_0)^{-1} \mod c_2 \gamma$$

$$\widetilde{q}_{N+1} \equiv b \mod \frac{d_2}{c_2 \gamma}$$

and a prime $\tilde{q}_{N+2} > \tilde{k}$ coprime with $c\tilde{q}\tilde{m}\tilde{q}_{N+1}$ satisfying

$$\widetilde{q}_{N+2} \equiv \frac{a}{c} (\widetilde{q} \widetilde{m} \widetilde{q}_{N+1}^2)^{-1} \bmod \frac{d}{c},$$

we obtain

$$a(c\tilde{q}\tilde{m}\tilde{q}_{N+1}^2\tilde{q}_{N+2},\tilde{k}\tilde{q}_{N+1}) = a(c\tilde{q}\tilde{m}\tilde{q}_{N+1}\tilde{q}_{N+2},\tilde{k}) = a(c\tilde{q}\tilde{m},\tilde{k}) = t,$$

with

$$c\tilde{q}\widetilde{m}\widetilde{q}_{N+1}^2\widetilde{q}_{N+2} \equiv \tilde{q}\widetilde{m}\widetilde{q}_{N+1}^2 a(\tilde{q}\widetilde{m}\widetilde{q}_{N+1}^2)^{-1} \equiv a \mod d \text{ and } \tilde{k}\widetilde{q}_{N+1} \equiv b \mod d.$$

Hence we have $\mathbb{Z}_{>0} \subseteq \{a(n,k) \mid n \equiv a \mod d, k \equiv b \mod d, n \geq 1, k \geq 0\}$, and therefore

$$\mathbb{Z} = \{a(n,k) \mid n \equiv a \mod d, k \equiv b \mod d, n \ge 1, k \ge 0\}.$$

Case 2. c is even. We distinguish two subcases.

Case 2.1. 4|d. The condition that c = (a, d) is squarefree implies that $4 \nmid (a, d)$, but 2|(a, d) and therefore $\frac{a}{2}$ is an odd integer. Hence by Case 1 for every integer z there exist integers $n \equiv \frac{a}{2} \mod d$ and $k \equiv b \mod d$ such that $a(n, k) = z \cdot (-1)^b$. By Lemma 1 we obtain

$$a(2n,k) = a(n,k) \cdot (-1)^k = z \cdot (-1)^b \cdot (-1)^b = z$$

with $2n \equiv 2\frac{a}{2} \equiv a \mod d$.

$$a(2n,k) = a(n,k) \cdot (-1)^k = z \cdot (-1)^b \cdot (-1)^b = z$$

with $2n \equiv 2\left(\frac{d}{2} + a\beta\right) \equiv a \mod d$.

We conclude that also in this case $\{a(n,k) \mid n \equiv a \mod d, k \equiv b \mod d, n \ge 1, k \ge 0\} = \mathbb{Z}$.

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1.

We denote (a, d) by c and distinguish two cases.

Case 1. (s(c), f) | b. We want to show that in this case

$$\{a(n,k) \mid n \equiv a \mod d, k \equiv b \mod f, n \ge 1, k \ge 0\} = \mathbb{Z}.$$

Note that every prime divisor of s(c) divides $\frac{c}{s(c)}$, which divides every integer congruent $\frac{a}{(s(c),f)} \mod \frac{d}{(s(c),f)}$. Hence it is enough to find for every integer z integers

$$n \equiv \frac{a}{(s(c), f)} \mod \frac{d}{(s(c), f)}$$
 and $k \equiv \frac{b}{(s(c), f)} \mod \frac{f}{(s(c), f)}$

with a(n,k) = z because by Lemma 1 we have

$$a(n(s(c), f), k(s(c), f)) = a(n, k) = z$$

with $n(s(c), f) \equiv a \mod d$ and $k(s(c), f) \equiv b \mod f$. As

$$\begin{pmatrix} s\left(\left(\frac{a}{(s(c),f)}, \frac{d}{(s(c),f)}\right)\right), \frac{f}{(s(c),f)}\right) &= \left(s\left(\frac{(a,d)}{(s(c),f)}\right), \frac{f}{(s(c),f)}\right) \\ &= \left(\frac{s\left((a,d)\right)}{(s(c),f)}, \frac{f}{(s(c),f)}\right) \\ &= \left(\frac{s\left(c\right)}{(s(c),f)}, \frac{f}{(s(c),f)}\right) \\ &= 1, \end{aligned}$$

we can assume without loss of generality that (s(c), f) = 1.

We will now modify the restrictions $n \equiv a \mod d$ and $k \equiv b \mod f$ on the coefficients a(n,k) to be able to apply Lemma 5.

Define

$$\lambda(x) = \prod_{\substack{p|x, \ p^2 \nmid x, \\ p \ prime}} p,$$

and let g_2 be the largest positive integer such that

$$g = lcm\left(\frac{d}{s(c)}, f\right) = g_1g_2$$
 and $\left(\frac{d}{s(c)}, g_2\right) = 1$,

where g_1 is a positive integer. Let

$$n_0 = \frac{a}{s(c)} + \frac{d}{s(c)}\lambda\left(\frac{a}{s(c)}\right)$$

As $(g_1, g_2) = 1$, by the Chinese Remainder Theorem there exists a unique y satisfying $0 \le y < g$ such that

$$n \equiv n_0 \mod g_1$$
 and $n \equiv 1 \mod g_2$

is equivalent to

$$n \equiv y \mod g$$
 .

Note that (n_0, g_1) is squarefree because if p is a prime with $p^2 | (n_0, g_1)$, then $p^2 | g_1$ implies $p | \frac{d}{s(c)}$ by definition of g_1 . Hence $p | \frac{a}{s(c)}$ (see definition of n_0). If, however, $p^2 | \frac{a}{s(c)}$, then $p^2 \nmid \frac{d}{s(c)}$ and $p \nmid \lambda \left(\frac{a}{s(c)}\right)$, which contradicts $p^2 | (n_0, g_1)$. Thus $p^2 \nmid \frac{a}{s(c)}$, which implies $p | \lambda \left(\frac{a}{s(c)}\right)$ and therefore $p^2 | \frac{d}{s(c)} \lambda \left(\frac{a}{s(c)}\right)$, which again contradicts $p^2 | (n_0, g_1)$. We conclude that (y, g) is squarefree, and for a given integer z by Lemma 5 there exist integers $n \equiv y \mod g$ and $k \equiv b \mod g$ such that a(n, k) = z.

Let $p > \max\{d, k, n\}$ be a prime satisfying

$$p \equiv (s(c))^{-1} \bmod f,$$

and let q > p be a prime such that

$$q \equiv p^{-2} \bmod d.$$

Since $n \equiv n_0 \mod g_0$ implies $n \equiv \frac{a}{s(c)} \mod \frac{d}{s(c)}$, every prime divisor of s(c) divides n, and we have by Lemma 1

$$a(ns(c)p^2q, ks(c)p) = a(np^2q, kp) = a(npq, k) = a(n, k) = z.$$

Furthermore, using $n \equiv n_0 \mod \frac{d}{s(c)}$, we have

$$ns(c)p^2q \equiv n_0s(c)p^2p^{-2} \equiv \left(\frac{a}{s(c)} + \frac{d}{s(c)}\lambda\left(\frac{a}{s(c)}\right)\right)s(c) \equiv a \mod d$$

and $ks(c)p \equiv bs(c)(s(c))^{-1} \equiv b \mod f$.

Hence $\{a(n,k) \mid n \equiv a \mod d, k \equiv b \mod f, n \ge 1, k \ge 0\} = \mathbb{Z}$, as desired.

Case 2. $(s(c), f) \nmid b$. Suppose that $n \equiv a \mod d$ and $k \equiv b \mod f$. Then s(c)|s(n), but $s(c) \nmid k$, i.e. $s(n) \nmid k$. Thus a(n, k) = 0 by Lemma 1.

Therefore we obtain in this case $\{a(n,k) \mid n \equiv a \mod d, k \equiv b \mod f, n \ge 1, k \ge 0\} = \{0\}$, as desired.

Corollary 1. We have

$$\{c(n,k) \mid n \equiv a \mod d, k \equiv b \mod f, n \ge 1, k \ge 0\} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{Z} & \text{if } (s((a,d)), f) \mid b ;\\ \{0\} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The corollary follows easily from Theorem 1 by using Lemma 2 with a prime $p \equiv 1 \mod d$. Lemma 1 implies in addition that each value in the set $\{a(n,k) \mid n \equiv a \mod d, k \equiv b \mod f, n \geq 1, k \geq 0\}$ is assumed by infinitely many different pairs (n, k).

Acknowledgements

This paper was written during a two month internship at the Max-Planck-Institute for Mathematics in Bonn. I would like to thank the MPIM for its hospitality and nice research atmosphere. In particular, I am grateful to my internship supervisor Pieter Moree for his many helpful comments and suggestions on this paper. Finally, I would like to thank Kestutis Cesnavicius, Nathan Kaplan and Anton Mellit for comments on earlier versions.

References

- [1] Yves Gallot, Pieter Moree and Huib Hommersom, Value distribution of coefficients of cyclotomic polynomials, *Unif. Distrib. Theory*, to appear.
- [2] Chun-Gang Ji, Wei-Ping Li, Pieter Moree, Values of coefficients of cyclotomic polynomials II, Discrete Math. 309 (2009), 1720–1723.
- [3] Emma Lehmer, On the magnitude of the coefficients of the cyclotomic polynomial, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc, 42, 389-392 (1936)
- [4] Pieter Moree, Inverse cyclotomic polynomials, J. Number Theory **129** (2009), 667–680.
- [5] Jiro Suzuki, On coefficients of cyclotomic polynomials, Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci. 63 (1987) 279-280.

[6] Ravindranathan Thangadurai, On the coefficients of cyclotomic polynomials, Cyclotomic fields and related topics (Pune, 1999), 311–322, Bhaskaracharya Pratishthana, Pune, 2000.

Jacobs University Bremen, College Ring 3, Mailbox 341, 28759 Bremen, Germany E-mail address: J.Fintzen@Jacobs-University.de