Cyclotomic polynomials

Jordan Bell

April 12, 2017

1 Preliminaries

By an arithmetical function we mean a function whose domain contains the positive integers. We say that an arithmetical function f is **multiplicative** when $\gcd(n,m)=1$ implies $f(nm)=f(n)f(m)$, and that it is **completely multiplicative** when $f(nm)=f(n)f(m)$ for all $n,m\geq 1$.

Write

$$U_n=\{e^{2\pi ik/n}:1\leq k\leq n\}=\{e^{2\pi ik/n}:0\leq k\leq n-1\},$$

the nth roots of unity. For $n>1$, there is an element ζ of U_n with $\zeta\neq 1$. Because $\xi\mapsto\zeta\xi$ is a bijection $U_n\to U_n$ we have $\zeta\sum_{\xi\in U_n}\xi=\sum_{\xi\in U_n}\xi$, hence $(1-\zeta)\sum_{\xi\in U_n}\xi=0$. But $\zeta\neq 1$, which means that

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n-1}e^{2\pi ik/n}=\sum_{\xi\in U_n}\xi=0,\qquad n>1.$$

Write

$$\Delta_n=\{e^{2\pi ik/n}:1\leq k\leq n,\gcd(k,n)=1\},$$

the primitive nth roots of unity. Let ϕ be the **Euler phi function**:

$$\phi(n)=|\{k:1\leq k\leq n,\gcd(k,n)=1\}|=|\Delta_n|.$$

ϕ is multiplicative, and for prime p and for $r\geq 1$, $\phi(p^r)=p^{r-1}(p-1)$.

Let μ be the **Möbius function**:

$$\mu(n)=\sum_{1\leq k\leq n,\gcd(k,n)=1}e^{2\pi ik/n}=\sum_{\xi\in\Delta_n}\xi.$$

For p prime, as $\Delta_p=U_p\setminus\{1\}$,

$$\mu(p)=-1+\sum_{\xi\in U_p}\xi=0-1=-1.$$

For $r \geq 2$, as $\Delta_{p^r} = U_{p^r} \setminus U_{p^{r-1}}$,

$$\mu(p^r) = -\sum_{\xi \in U_{p^{r-1}}} \xi + \sum_{\xi \in U_{p^r}} \xi = -0 + 0 = 0.$$

Furthermore, one proves that μ is multiplicative. Thus

$$\mu(n) = \begin{cases} 1 & n \text{ is a square-free integer with an even number of prime factors} \\ -1 & n \text{ is a square-free integer with an odd number of prime factors} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The **Möbius inversion formula** states that if f and g are arithmetic functions satisfying

$$g(n) = \sum_{d|n} f(d), \qquad n \geq 1,$$

then

$$f(n) = \sum_{d|n} \mu(n/d) g(d), \qquad n \geq 1.$$

We can write

$$U_n = \bigcup_{d|n} \Delta_d,$$

and $\Delta_d \cap \Delta_e = \emptyset$ for $d \neq e$. So

$$n = \sum_{d|n} \phi(d).$$

Therefore by the Möbius inversion formula,

$$\phi(n) = \sum_{d|n} d \cdot \mu(n/d).$$

Also, for $n > 1$,

$$\sum_{d|n} \mu(d) = \sum_{d|n} \sum_{\xi \in \Delta_d} \xi = \sum_{\xi \in U_n} \xi = 0. \tag{1}$$

Let

$$d(n) = \sum_{d|n} 1,$$

the number of divisors of n, for example, $d(6) = 4$. Let

$$\omega(n) = \sum_{p|n} 1,$$

the number of prime divisors of n: for $n = p_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots p_r^{\alpha_r}$, $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_r \geq 1$, we have $\omega(n) = r$, for example $\omega(12) = \omega(2^2 \cdot 3) = 2$.

2 Definition and basic properties of cyclotomic polynomials

For $n \geq 1$, let

$$\Phi_n(x) = \prod_{1 \leq k \leq n, \gcd(k,n)=1} (x - e^{2\pi ik/n}) = \prod_{\xi \in \Delta_n} (x - \xi),$$

the n**th cyclotomic polynomial**. The first of the following two identities was found by Euler [45, pp. 199–200, Chap. III, §VI].

Lemma 1. For $n \geq 1$,

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

and for $x \notin U_n$,

$$\Phi_n(x) = \prod_{d|n} (x^d - 1)^{\mu(n/d)}.$$

Proof. For $F_n(x) = x^n - 1$, each of $e^{2\pi ik/n}$, $1 \leq k \leq n$, is a distinct root of $F_n(x)$, so

$$\begin{aligned} x^n - 1 &= \prod_{1 \leq k \leq n} (x - e^{2\pi ik/n}) \\ &= \prod_{d|n} \prod_{1 \leq k \leq n, \gcd(k,n)=d} (x - e^{2\pi ik/n}) \\ &= \prod_{d|n} \prod_{1 \leq j \leq n/d, \gcd(j,n/d)=1} (x - e^{2\pi ijd/n}) \\ &= \prod_{d|n} \Phi_{n/d}(x) \\ &= \prod_{d|n} \Phi_d(x). \end{aligned}$$

That is, $\log F_n = \sum_{d|n} \log \Phi_d$. Therefore applying the Möbius inversion formula yields $\log \Phi_n = \sum_{d|n} \mu(n/d) \log F_d$ and so $\Phi_n = \prod_{d|n} F_d^{\mu(n/d)}$. □

Lemma 2. When p is a prime,

$$\Phi_p(x) = x^{p-1} + \cdots + x + 1.$$

When p is an odd prime,

$$\Phi_{2p}(x) = x^{p-1} - x^{p-2} + x^{p-3} - \cdots + x^2 - x + 1.$$

Proof. When p is a prime, $x^p - 1 = \Phi_1(x) \cdot \Phi_p(x)$, i.e.

$$\Phi_p(x) = \frac{x^p - 1}{\Phi_1(x)} = \frac{x^p - 1}{x - 1} = x^{p-1} + \cdots + x + 1.$$

When p is an odd prime,

$$\Phi_{2p}(x) = \frac{x^{2p} - 1}{\Phi_1(x)\Phi_2(x)\Phi_p(x)} = \frac{x^{2p} - 1}{(x^p - 1)\Phi_2(x)} = \frac{(x^p - 1)(x^p + 1)}{(x^p - 1)(x + 1)} = \frac{x^p + 1}{x + 1},$$

and because $(x+1)(x^{p-1} - x^{p-2} + x^{p-3} - \cdots + x^2 - x + 1) = x^p + 1$,

$$\Phi_{2p}(x) = x^{p-1} - x^{p-2} + x^{p-3} - \cdots + x^2 - x + 1.$$

□

Lemma 3. If p is a prime and $m \geq 1$,

$$\Phi_{pm}(x) = \begin{cases} \Phi_m(x^p) & p|m \\ \Phi_m(x^p)/\Phi_m(x) & p \nmid m. \end{cases}$$

For $k \geq 1$,

$$\Phi_{p^k m}(x) = \begin{cases} \Phi_m(x^{p^k}) & p|m \\ \Phi_m(x^{p^k})/\Phi_m(x^{p^{k-1}}) & p \nmid m, \end{cases}$$

Proof. Using Lemma 1,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_{pm}(x) &= \prod_{d|(pm)} (x^d - 1)^{\mu(pm/d)} \\
&= \prod_{d|(pm), p|d} (x^d - 1)^{\mu(pm/d)} \cdot \prod_{d|(pm), p\nmid d} (x^d - 1)^{\mu(pm/d)} \\
&= \prod_{e|m} (x^{pe} - 1)^{\mu(m/e)} \cdot \prod_{d|(pm), p\nmid d} (x^d - 1)^{\mu(pm/d)} \\
&= \Phi_m(x^p) \cdot \prod_{d|(pm), p\nmid d} (x^d - 1)^{\mu(pm/d)}.
\end{aligned}$$

If $m = ap$ and $d|(pm)$ and $p \nmid d$, then $\mu(pm/d) = \mu(ap^2/d) = 0$ and

$$\Phi_{pm}(x) = \Phi_m(x^p) \cdot \prod_{d|a} (x^d - 1)^{\mu(ap^2/d)} = \Phi_m(x^p).$$

If $p \nmid m$ and $d \mid (pm)$ and $p \nmid d$, then $\mu(pm/d) = \mu(p)\mu(m/d) = -\mu(m/d)$ and

$$\Phi_{pm}(x) = \Phi_m(x^p) \cdot \prod_{d|(pm), p\nmid d} (x^d - 1)^{\mu(pm/d)} = \Phi_m(x^p) \cdot \prod_{d|m} (x^d - 1)^{-\mu(m/d)}.$$

For $k \geq 2$,

$$\Phi_{p^k m}(x) = \Phi_{p \cdot p^{k-1} m}(x) = \Phi_{p^{k-1} m}(x^p) = \cdots = \Phi_{pm}(x^{p^{k-1}}),$$

and using the expression we obtained for $\Phi_{pm}(x)$ we get the expression stated for $\Phi_{p^k m}(x)$. □

Lemma 4. For $n = p_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots p_r^{\alpha_r}$, where p_i are prime and $\alpha_i \geq 1$, and $N = p_1 \cdots p_r$,

$$\Phi_n(x) = \Phi_N(x^{n/N}).$$

Proof. If $d|n$ and $d \nmid N$ then $\mu(d) = 0$, hence

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_n(x) &= \prod_{d|n} (x^{n/d} - 1)^{\mu(d)} \\ &= \prod_{d|N} (x^{n/d} - 1)^{\mu(d)} \\ &= \prod_{d|N} ((x^{n/N})^{N/d} - 1)^{\mu(d)} \\ &= \Phi_N(x^{n/N}).\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 5. If $n > 1$ then

$$\Phi_n(x^{-1}) = x^{-\phi(n)} \Phi_n(x).$$

Proof.

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

hence

$$\Phi_n(x^{-1}) = \prod_{d|n} (-x^{-d})^{\mu(n/d)} \cdot \prod_{d|n} (x^d - 1)^{\mu(n/d)}.$$

Because $n > 1$ it holds that $\sum_{d|n} \mu(n/d) = 0$, and using this and $\sum_{d|n} d \cdot \mu(n/d) = \phi(n)$ yields

$$\Phi_n(x^{-1}) = x^{-\phi(n)} \Phi_n(x).$$

□

Lemma 6. If $r > 1$ is odd then

$$\Phi_{2r}(x) = \Phi_r(-x).$$

Proof. Because r is odd, if $d_1, \dots, d_l$ are the divisors of r then

$$d_1, \dots, d_l, 2d_1, \dots, 2d_l$$

are the divisors of $2r$, so

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_{2r}(x) &= \prod_{d|(2r)} (x^d - 1)^{\mu(2r/d)} \\ &= \prod_{d|r} (x^d - 1)^{\mu(2r/d)} \cdot \prod_{d|r} (x^{2d} - 1)^{\mu(2r/(2d))} \\ &= \prod_{d|r} (x^d - 1)^{\mu(2r/d)} (x^{2d} - 1)^{\mu(r/d)} \\ &= \prod_{d|r} (x^d - 1)^{\mu(2)\mu(r/d)+\mu(r/d)} (x^d + 1)^{\mu(r/d)} \\ &= \prod_{d|r} (x^d + 1)^{\mu(r/d)}.\end{aligned}$$

Because r is odd, any divisor d of r is odd and then $x^d + 1 = -((-x)^d - 1)$, so

$$\Phi_{2r}(x) = \prod_{d|r} (-1)^{\mu(r/d)} ((-x)^d - 1)^{\mu(r/d)} = (-1)^{\phi(r)} \cdot \prod_{d|r} ((-x)^d - 1)^{\mu(r/d)}.$$

Because r is odd and > 1, $\phi(r)$ is even, so we have obtained the claim. □

Theorem 7. $\Phi_n \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$.

Proof. It is a fact that if R is a unital commutative ring, $f \in R[x]$ is a monic polynomial and $g \in R[x]$ is a polynomial, then there are $q, r \in R[x]$ with

$$g = qf + r,$$

$r = 0$ or $\deg r < \deg f$.

First, $\Phi_1(x) = x - 1 \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$. For $n > 1$, assume that $\Phi_d(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ for $1 \leq d < n$. Then let

$$f = \prod_{d|n, d<n} \Phi_d,$$

which by hypothesis belongs to $\mathbb{Z}[x]$. Since each Φ_d is monic, so is f. On the one hand, since $g(x) = x^n - 1 \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$, there are $q, r \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ with $g = qf + r$ and $r = 0$ or $\deg r < \deg f$. On the other hand, by Lemma 1 we have $g = \Phi_n f \in \mathbb{C}[x]$. Thus $\Phi_n f = qf + r \in \mathbb{C}[x]$, so $r = f \cdot (\Phi_n - q) \in \mathbb{C}[x]$. If $\Phi_n \neq q$ then $\deg r = \deg f + \deg(\Phi_n - q) \geq \deg f$, contradicting that $r = 0$ or $\deg r < \deg f$. Therefore $\Phi_n = q \in \mathbb{C}[x]$, and because $q \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ this means that $\Phi_n \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$. □

In fact, it can be proved that Φ_n is irreducible in $\mathbb{Q}[x]$. Gauss states in entry 40 of his mathematical diary, dated October 9, 1796, that Φ_p is irreducible in $\mathbb{Q}[x]$ when p is prime, and he proves this in *Disqisitiones Arithmeticae*, Art.

341. Gauss further states in entry 136 of his mathematical diary, dated June 12, 1808, that for any n, Φ_n is irreducible in $\mathbb{Q}[x]$, and Kronecker proves this in his 1854 *Mémoire sur les facteurs irréductibles de l'expression* $x^n - 1$. Gauss's work on cyclotomic polynomials is surveyed by Neumann [40]. For any $\xi \in \Delta_n$, $\Phi_n(\xi) = 0$, and since Φ_n is irreducible in $\mathbb{Q}[x]$ and is monic, Φ is the minimal polynomial of ξ over $\mathbb{Q}$, which implies that $[\mathbb{Q}(\xi) : \mathbb{Q}] = \deg \Phi_n = \phi(n)$.

There is a group isomorphism $\mathrm{Gal}(\mathbb{Q}(\xi)/\mathbb{Q}) \to (\mathbb{Z}/n)^*$ [16, p. 596, Theorem 26].

The **discriminant** [44, p. 12, Proposition 2.7]:

$$d(\mathbb{Q}(e^{2\pi i/n})) = \frac{(-1)^{\phi(n)/2} n^{\phi(n)}}{\prod_{p|n} p^{\phi(n)/(p-1)}}.$$

It can be proved that $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}(e^{2\pi i/n})} = \mathbb{Z}[e^{2\pi i/n}]$ [39, p. 60, Proposition 10.2].

Let p be prime, let $q = p^r$ for $r \geq 1$, let $\mathbb{F}_q$ be a finite field with q elements, and for $n \geq 1$ with $\gcd(n, q) = 1$, let ν be the multiplicative order of q modulo n: ν is the minimum positive integer satisfying $q^\nu \equiv 1 \pmod{n}$. It can be proved that there are monic, degree ν, irreducible polynomials $P_1, \ldots, P_{\phi(n)/\nu} \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$ such that $\Phi_n = P_1 \cdots P_{\phi(n)/\nu} \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$ [28, p. 65, Theorem 2.47]; cf. Bourbaki [7, p. 581] on Kummer. In particular, q is a generator of the multiplicative group $(\mathbb{Z}/n)^*$ if and only if $\nu = \phi(n)$ if and only if Φ_n is irreducible in $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$. We remark that $(\mathbb{Z}/n)^*$ is cyclic if and only if n is 2, 4, some power of an odd prime, or twice some power of an odd prime (Gauss, *Disquisitiones Arithmeticae*, Art. 89–92). This follows from (i) the multiplicative group $(\mathbb{Z}/n)^*$ is isomorphic with the direct product $(\mathbb{Z}/p_1^{\alpha_1})^* \times \cdots \times (\mathbb{Z}/p_r^{\alpha_r})^*$ for $n = p_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots p_r^{\alpha_r}$, (ii) $(\mathbb{Z}/2^\alpha)^*$ is isomorphic with $\mathbb{Z}/2 \times \mathbb{Z}/2^{\alpha-2}$, $\alpha \geq 2$, and (iii) $(\mathbb{Z}/p^\alpha)^*$ is a cyclic group with $p^{\alpha-1}(p-1)$ elements when p is an odd prime, $\alpha \geq 1$ [16, p. 314, Corollary 20].

3 Special values

Lemma 8. $\Phi_1(0) = -1$, and for $n \geq 2$, $\Phi_n(0) = 1$.

Proof. $\Phi_1(x) = x - 1$, so $\Phi_1(0) = -1$. For $n \geq 2$, using (1),

$$\Phi_n(0) = \prod_{d|n} (-1)^{\mu(n/d)} = (-1)^{\sum_{d|n} \mu(n/d)} = (-1)^{\sum_{d|n} \mu(d)} = (-1)^0 = 1.$$

□

Let Λ be the **von Mangoldt function**: $\Lambda(n) = \log p$ if $n = p^\alpha$ for some prime p and some integer $\alpha \geq 1$, and is $\Lambda(n) = 0$ otherwise. Thus $\Lambda(2) = \log 2$, $\Lambda(8) = \log 2$, $\Lambda(3) = \log 3$, and $\Lambda(6) = 0$. One sees that

$$\log n = \sum_{d|n} \Lambda(d).$$

Therefore by the Möbius inversion formula,

$$\Lambda(n) = \sum_{d|n} \mu(n/d) \log d.$$

Theorem 9. For $n > 1$,

$$\Phi_n(1) = e^{\Lambda(n)}$$

and

$$\Phi_n'(1) = \frac{1}{2} e^{\Lambda(n)} \phi(n).$$

Proof. For $n > 1$,

$$x^{n-1} + \cdots + x + 1 = \prod_{d|n, d>1} \Phi_d(x),$$

hence

$$\log n = \sum_{d|n, d>1} \log \Phi_d(1).$$

Therefore by the Möbius inversion formula,

$$\log \Phi_n(1) = \sum_{d|n, d>1} \mu(n/d) \log d = \sum_{d|n} \mu(n/d) \log d = \Lambda(n).$$

Because $x^n - 1 = \prod_{d|n} \Phi_d(x)$, taking the logarithm and then taking the derivative yields

$$\frac{nx^{n-1}}{x^n - 1} = \sum_{d|n} \frac{\Phi_d'(x)}{\Phi_d(x)}.$$

$\Phi_1(x) = x - 1$ and so $\frac{\Phi_1'(x)}{\Phi_1(x)} = \frac{1}{x-1}$, hence

$$\frac{nx^{n-1}}{x^n - 1} - \frac{1}{x - 1} = \sum_{d|n, d>1} \frac{\Phi_d'(x)}{\Phi_d(x)},$$

i.e.

$$\frac{nx^{n-1} - (x^{n-1} + x^{n-2} + \cdots + x + 1)}{x^n - 1} = \sum_{d|n, d>1} \frac{\Phi_d'(x)}{\Phi_d(x)}.$$

Doing polynomial long division we find

$$\frac{(n-1)x^{n-1} - x^{n-2} - \cdots - x - 1}{x - 1} = (n-1)x^{n-2} + (n-2)x^{n-3} + \cdots + 2x + 1.$$

Hence

$$\frac{(n-1)x^{n-2} + (n-2)x^{n-3} + \cdots + 2x + 1}{x^{n-1} + x^{n-2} + \cdots + x + 1} = \sum_{d|n, d>1} \frac{\Phi_d'(x)}{\Phi_d(x)},$$

and for $x = 1$ this is

$$\frac{n-1}{2} = \sum_{d|n, d>1} \frac{\Phi'_d(1)}{\Phi_d(1)}.$$

By the Möbius inversion formula,

$$\frac{\Phi'_n(1)}{\Phi_n(1)} = \sum_{d|n, d>1} \mu(n/d) \cdot \frac{d-1}{2},$$

and using (i) $\Phi_n(1) = e^{\Lambda(n)}$ for $n > 1$, (ii) $\sum_{d|n} \mu(n/d) = 0$ for $n > 1$, and (iii) $\sum_{d|n} d \cdot \mu(n/d) = \phi(n)$, we have

$$\Phi'_n(1) = e^{\Lambda(n)} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{d|n} \mu(n/d) \cdot d - e^{\Lambda(n)} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{d|n} \mu(n/d) = \frac{1}{2} e^{\Lambda(n)} \phi(n).$$

□

Because $\Phi_n \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$, it is the case that $\Phi_n(-i) = \overline{\Phi_n(i)}$.

Theorem 10. $\Phi_1(i) = i - 1$, $\Phi_2(i) = i + 1$, $\Phi_4(i) = 0$, and otherwise we have the following.

- If n is odd and has a prime factor $p \equiv 1 \pmod 4$, then $\Phi_n(i) = 1$.
- If $p \equiv 3 \pmod 4$ is prime and $k \geq 1$ is odd, then $\Phi_{p^k}(i) = i$.
- If $p \equiv 3 \pmod 4$ is prime and $k \geq 1$ is even, then $\Phi_{p^k}(i) = -i$.
- If $p \equiv 3 \pmod 4$ is prime and $k \geq 1$ is odd, then $\Phi_{2p^k}(i) = -i$.
- If $p \equiv 3 \pmod 4$ is prime and $k \geq 1$ is even, then $\Phi_{2p^k}(i) = i$.
- If $p, q \equiv 3 \pmod 4$ are distinct primes and $k, l \geq 1$, then $\Phi_{p^k q^l}(i) = -1$.
- If $p, q \equiv 3 \pmod 4$ are distinct primes and $k, l \geq 1$, then $\Phi_{2p^k q^l}(i) = -1$.
- If p is an odd prime and $k \geq 1$, then $\Phi_{4p^k}(i) = p$.
- If $\omega(n) \geq 3$ then $\Phi_n(i) = 1$.

Proof. $\Phi_1(x) = x - 1$, $\Phi_2(x) = x + 1$, so $\Phi_1(i) = i - 1$ and $\Phi_2(i) = i + 1$. As $i \in \Delta_4$, $\Phi_4(i) = 0$.

Suppose that n is odd, that $p \equiv 1 \pmod 4$ is a prime factor of n, and write $n = p^k m$ with $\gcd(m, p) = 1$. Lemma 3 tells us

$$\Phi_n(x) = \Phi_{p^k m}(x) = \frac{\Phi_m(x^{p^k})}{\Phi_m(x^{p^{k-1}})},$$

and as $p^{k-1} \equiv 1 \pmod 4$ and $i^4 = 1$, this yields

$$\Phi_n(i) = \frac{\Phi_m(i)}{\Phi_m(i)} = 1.$$

Suppose that n is odd, that $p \equiv 3 \pmod 4$ is a prime factor of n, and write $n = p^k m$ with $\gcd(m, p) = 1$. If k is odd then $p^k \equiv 3 \pmod 4$, so

$$\Phi_n(i) = \frac{\Phi_m(i^{p^k})}{\Phi_m(i^{p^{k-1}})} = \frac{\Phi_m(i^3)}{\Phi_m(i)} = \frac{\Phi_m(-i)}{\Phi_m(i)},$$

and if $m = 1$ then

$$\Phi_n(i) = \frac{\Phi_1(-i)}{\Phi_1(i)} = \frac{-i-1}{i-1} = i.$$

If k is even then $p^k \equiv 1 \pmod 4$, so

$$\Phi_n(i) = \frac{\Phi_m(i)}{\Phi_m(-i)},$$

and if $m = 1$ then $\Phi_n(i) = -i$.

Suppose that $n = 2^k$, $k \geq 3$. Lemma 4 tells us that

$$\Phi_n(x) = \Phi_2(x^{n/2}) = \Phi_2(x^{2^{k-1}}) = x^{2^{k-1}} + 1,$$

thus

$$\Phi_n(i) = i^{2^{k-1}} + 1 = 1 + 1 = 2.$$

Suppose that $n = 2m$ with $m > 1$ odd. Lemma 6 tells us $\Phi_n(x) = \Phi_{2m}(x) = \Phi_m(-x)$, so $\Phi_n(i) = \Phi_m(-i)$.

Suppose that $n = 2^k m$ with $k \geq 2$ and $m > 1$ odd. Lemma 3 tells us

$$\Phi_{2^k m}(x) = \Phi_{2^{k-1} \cdot 2m}(x) = \Phi_{2m}(x^{2^{k-1}}),$$

and then Lemma 6 tells us $\Phi_{2m}(x^{2^{k-1}}) = \Phi_m(-x^{2^{k-1}})$. For $k = 2$ this yields

$$\Phi_{4m}(i) = \Phi_m(1),$$

and for $k > 2$,

$$\Phi_n(i) = \Phi_m(-i^{2^{k-1}}) = \Phi_m(-1).$$

□

Kurshan and Odlyzko [25]

Montgomery and Vaughan [36, pp. 131–132, Exercise 9].

Theorem 11. If $n = \prod_{p \leq y, p \equiv 2,3 \pmod 5} p$ with $\omega(n)$ odd, then

$$|\Phi_n(e^{2\pi i/5})| = \left(\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}\right)^{d(n)/2}.$$

Proof. Write $e(x) = e^{2\pi i x}$, let $d \mid n$, $d > 1$, and write $d = p_1 \cdots p_k \cdot q_1 \cdots q_l$ where $p_1, \dots, p_k \equiv 2 \pmod 5$ and $q_1, \dots, q_l \equiv 3 \pmod 5$ are prime. Then $\omega(d) = k+l$ and, as $2^3 \equiv 3 \pmod 5$,

$$d \equiv 2^k 3^l \equiv 2^k 2^{3l} \equiv 2^{k+l}(-1)^l \pmod 5.$$

If $\omega(d) \equiv 0 \pmod 4$ then $2^{k+l} \equiv 1 \pmod 5$ and if $\omega(d) \equiv 2 \pmod 4$ then $2^{k+l} \equiv -1 \pmod 5$, and therefore if $\omega(d)$ is even then $d \equiv 1 \pmod 5$ or $d \equiv -1 \pmod 5$. Since $|e(-1/5) - 1| = |e(1/5) - 1|$, we have $|e(d/5) - 1| = |e(1/5) - 1|$.

If $\omega(d) \equiv 1 \pmod 4$ then $2^{k+l} \equiv 2 \pmod 5$ and if $\omega(d) \equiv 3 \pmod 4$ then $2^{k+l} \equiv -2 \pmod 5$, and therefore if $\omega(d)$ is odd then $d \equiv 2 \pmod 5$ or $d \equiv -2 \pmod 5$. Since $|e(-2/5) - 1| = |e(2/5) - 1|$, we have $|e(d/5) - 1| = |e(2/5) - 1|$.

Now using Lemma 1 and $|e(1/5) - 1|^{-1} = |e(2/5) - 1|$,

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi_n(e(1/5))| &= \prod_{d \mid n} |e(d/5) - 1|^{\mu(n/d)} \\ &= \prod_{d \mid n, \omega(d) \text{ even}} |e(1/5) - 1|^{-1} \cdot \prod_{d \mid n, \omega(d) \text{ odd}} |e(2/5) - 1|. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for $\omega(n) = 2\nu + 1$ and for $A = |e(1/5) - 1|^{-1}$ and $B = |e(2/5) - 1|$,

$$\begin{aligned} \log |\Phi_n(e(1/5))| &= \sum_{r=0}^{\nu} \binom{2\nu+1}{2r} \log A + \sum_{r=0}^{\nu} \binom{2\nu+1}{2r+1} \log B \\ &= 2^{2\nu} \log A + 2^{2\nu} \log B \\ &= \log((AB)^{2^{\omega(n)}/2}), \end{aligned}$$

and using $d(n) = \sum_{r=0}^{\omega(n)} \binom{\omega(n)}{r} = 2^{\omega(n)}$ this is $|\Phi_n(e(1/5))| = (AB)^{d(n)/2}$. Finally,

$$AB = \frac{|e(2/5) - 1|}{|e(1/5) - 1|} = |e(1/5) + 1| = \frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{2}.$$

□

4 Primes in arithmetic progressions

For prime p, $p \nmid n$, the following theorem relates the order of an element of the multiplicative group $(\mathbb{Z}/p)^*$ with Φ_n [44, p. 13, Lemma 2.9]. We remind ourselves that $\Phi_n \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ (Theorem 7), and so $\Phi_n(a) \in \mathbb{Z}$ for $a \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Lemma 12. Let p be prime, $p \nmid n$, and $a \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then $p \mid \Phi_n(a)$ if and only if n is the multiplicative order of a modulo p.

Proof. Suppose that $p \mid \Phi_n(a)$. Now, let $b \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $p \mid \Phi_n(b)$. By Lemma 1, $b^n - 1 = \prod_{d \mid n} \Phi_d(b)$, and because $\Phi_n(b) \equiv 0 \pmod p$ this yields $b^n - 1 \equiv 0 \pmod p$, i.e. $b^n \equiv 1 \pmod p$; in particular, $p \nmid b$. Let $\nu = \min\{k > 0 : a^k \equiv 1 \pmod p\}$, the multiplicative order of a modulo p, so $\nu \mid n$, and suppose by contradiction that $\nu < n$. Using $x^\nu - 1 = \prod_{d|\nu} \Phi_d(x)$ we have $b^\nu - 1 = \prod_{d|\nu} \Phi_d(b)$. Using this with $b = a$, as $a^\nu \equiv 1 \pmod p$ and because p is prime it follows that for some $d_0 \leq \nu < n$, $\Phi_{d_0}(a) \equiv 0 \pmod p$. As $\nu \mid n$,

$$b^n - 1 = \Phi_n(b)\Phi_{d_0}(b) \cdot \prod_{d|n, d \neq d_0, n} \Phi_d(b).$$

Applying the above with $b = a$ yields $a^n - 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{p^2}$. Moreover, by the binomial theorem, $\Phi_n(a+p) \equiv \Phi_n(a) \equiv 0 \pmod p$ and $\Phi_{d_0}(a+p) \equiv \Phi_{d_0}(a) \equiv 0 \pmod p$, so applying the above with $b = a + p$ yields $(a+p)^n - 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{p^2}$. But by the binomial theorem, $(a+p)^n - 1 = \sum_{j=0}^n \binom{n}{j} a^{n-j} p^j - 1$, whence $(a+p)^n - 1 \equiv a^n + na^{n-1}p - 1 \pmod{p^2}$, hence $a^n + na^{n-1}p - 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{p^2}$. Together with $a^n - 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{p^2}$ this yields $na^{n-1}p \equiv 0 \pmod{p^2}$, i.e. $na^{n-1} \equiv 0 \pmod p$, contradicting that $p \nmid n, a$. Therefore $\nu = n$.

Suppose that $a^n \equiv 1 \pmod p$ and that $a^\nu \not\equiv 1 \pmod p$ for $0 < \nu < n$. As $\prod_{d|n} \Phi_d(a) = a^n - 1 \equiv 0 \pmod p$, there is some $d_0 \mid n$ for which $\Phi_{d_0}(a) \equiv 0 \pmod p$. Suppose by contradiction that $d_0 < n$. As $d_0 \mid n$,

$$a^{d_0} - 1 = \prod_{d|d_0} \Phi_d(a) = \Phi_{d_0}(a) \cdot \prod_{d|d_0, d<d_0} \Phi_d(a) \equiv 0 \pmod p,$$

contradicting that $a^\nu \not\equiv 1 \pmod p$ for $0 < \nu < n$. Therefore $\Phi_n(a) \equiv 0 \pmod p$, i.e. $p \mid \Phi_n(a)$. □

Lemma 13. Let p be prime, $p \nmid n$. There is some $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $p \mid \Phi_n(a)$ if and only if $p \equiv 1 \pmod n$.

Proof. Suppose that $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $p \mid \Phi_n(a)$. Then by Lemma 12, n is the multiplicative order of a modulo p. As the multiplicative group $(\mathbb{Z}/p)^*$ has $p - 1$ elements, this implies that $n \mid (p-1)$, i.e. $p - 1 \equiv 0 \pmod n$.

Suppose that $p \equiv 1 \pmod n$, i.e. $n \mid (p-1)$. Because $(\mathbb{Z}/p)^*$ is a cyclic group with $p-1$ elements, it is a fact that there is some $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $a + p\mathbb{Z} \in (\mathbb{Z}/p)^*$, whose multiplicative order modulo p is n. (Generally, if G is a cyclic group with m elements and n divides m then there is some $g \in G$ with order n.) Then by Lemma 12, $p \mid \Phi_n(a)$. □

We now use Lemma 13 to prove an instance of Dirichlet's theorem on primes in arithmetic progressions [44, p. 13, Lemma 2.9].

Theorem 14. For any $n \geq 1$, there are infinitely many primes p with $p \equiv 1 \pmod n$.

Proof. The claim for $n = 1$ follows from the claim for $n = 2$. For $n \geq 2$, by Lemma 8, $\Phi_n(0) = 1$, namely the constant coefficient of $\Phi_n(x)$ is 1. Suppose by contradiction that there are at most finitely many such primes $p_1, \ldots, p_t$ and let $M = np_1 \cdots p_t$. For $N \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\Phi_n(NM) \equiv 1 \pmod M$ and from $M \mid (\Phi_n(NM) - 1)$ it follows that $p_i \mid (\Phi_n(NM) - 1)$, $1 \leq i \leq t$, and $n \mid (\Phi_n(NM) - 1)$. Hence if p is a prime factor of $\Phi_n(NM)$ then $p \neq p_i$, $1 \leq i \leq t$, and $p \nmid n$. As Φ_n is a monic polynomial that is not a constant, for all sufficiently large N, $\Phi_n(NM)$ is an integer ≥ 2 and thus has a prime factor p, amd we have established that $p \nmid n$. Therefore Lemma 13 tells us that $p \equiv 1 \pmod{n}$. But we have also established that $p \neq p_i$, $1 \leq i \leq r$, a contradiction. Therefore there are infinitely many primes p with $p \equiv 1 \pmod{n}$. □

One can prove that for any integers $n, b \geq 2$ it holds that

$$\frac{1}{2} \cdot b^{\phi(n)} \leq \Phi_n(b) \leq 2 \cdot b^{\phi(n)}.$$

Using this, Thangadurai and Vatwani [42] prove that for $n \geq 2$, the least prime $p \equiv 1 \pmod{n}$ satisfies

$$p \leq 2^{\phi(n)+1} - 1.$$

5 Zsigmondy's theorem

[20, pp. 167–169, §8.3.1]

6 Newton's identities and Ramanujan sums

For positive integers n and n, let

$$c_n(k) = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq n, \gcd(n,j)=1} e^{2\pi ijk/n} = \sum_{\xi \in \Delta_n} \xi^k,$$

called a **Ramanujan sum**.

Lemma 15.

$$c_n(k) = \sum_{d \mid \gcd(n,k)} d \cdot \mu(n/d).$$

Proof. Let

$$\eta_n(k) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} e^{2\pi ijk/n} = \begin{cases} 0 & n \nmid k \\ m & n \mid k. \end{cases}$$

We can write $\eta_n(k)$ as

$$\eta_n(k) = \sum_{d \mid n} c_d(k),$$

so by the Möbius inversion formula,

$$c_n(k) = \sum_{d \mid n} \mu(n/d) \eta_d(k).$$

□

Theorem 16. For $n > 1$ and for $|x| < 1$,

$$\Phi_n(x) = \exp\left(-\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{c_n(m)}{m} x^m \right).$$

Proof. Using that $\xi \mapsto \xi^{-1}$ is a bijection $\Delta_n \to \Delta_n$,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dx} \log \Phi_n(x) &= \frac{d}{dx} \sum_{\xi \in \Delta_n} \log(x - \xi) \\ &= \sum_{\xi \in \Delta_n} \frac{1}{x - \xi} \\ &= \sum_{\xi \in \Delta_n} -\frac{1}{\xi} \cdot \frac{1}{1 - \frac{x}{\xi}} \\ &= -\sum_{\xi \in \Delta_n} \frac{1}{\xi} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{x}{\xi}\right)^m \\ &= -\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} x^m \sum_{\xi \in \Delta_n} \xi^{m+1}.\end{aligned}$$

Because $n > 1$, $\Phi_n(0) = 1$, and integrating,

$$\Phi_n(x) = \exp\left(-\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^{m+1}}{m+1} \sum_{\xi \in \Delta_n} \xi^{m+1} \right) = \exp\left(-\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{x^m}{m} c_n(m) \right).$$

□

A formula due to Hölder [36, p. 110, Theorem 4.1] is that

$$c_n(k) = \frac{\mu(n/\gcd(n,k)) \cdot \phi(n)}{\phi(n/\gcd(n,k))}. \tag{2}$$

This identity is used to prove the following lemma that we use later.

Lemma 17. If n is square-free then $k \mapsto \mu(n)c_n(k)$ is multiplicative.

Lemma 18. For $n \geq 1$ and $\operatorname{Re} s > 1$,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c_n(k) k^{-s} = \zeta(s) \cdot \sum_{d|n} \mu(n/d) d^{1-s}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 15,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c_n(k)k^{-s} &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} k^{-s} \sum_{d|n,d|k} \mu(n/d)d \\ &= \sum_{d|n} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (md)^{-s}\mu(n/d)d \\ &= \sum_{d|n} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} m^{-s}d^{-s}\mu(n/d)d \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} m^{-s} \sum_{d|n} d^{-s}\mu(n/d)d \\ &= \zeta(s) \cdot \sum_{d|n} \mu(n/d)d^{1-s}.\end{aligned}$$

□

Write

$$\prod_{j=1}^{n}(x-\alpha_j) = \sum_{k=0}^{n}(-1)^k s_k x^{n-k},$$

and put, for $k \geq 1$,

$$p_k = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \alpha_j^k.$$

Newton's identities [19, p. 32, Proposition 3.4] state that for $k \geq 1$,

$$p_k = \sum_{j=1}^{k-1}(-1)^{j-1}s_j p_{k-j} + (-1)^{k-1}k s_k. \tag{3}$$

Write

$$\Phi_n(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\phi(n)} a_n(k)x^k.$$

Let $n > 1$, and for integer j define

$$\chi_1(j) = \begin{cases} 1 & \gcd(n,j) = 1 \\ 0 & \gcd(n,j) > 1, \end{cases}$$

namely the **principal Dirichlet character modulo** n. We can then write

$$\Phi_n(x) = \prod_{1 \leq k \leq n, \gcd(n,k)=1} (x - e^{2\pi i k/n}) = x^{-n+\phi(n)} \prod_{j=1}^{n}(x-\alpha_j)$$

for $\alpha_j = \chi_1(j)e^{2\pi i j/n}$, and thus

$$x^{n-\phi(n)}\Phi_n(x) = \prod_{j=1}^{n}(x-\alpha_j).$$

Because $\chi_1(j)^k = \chi_1(j)$ for $k \geq 1$,

$$p_k = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \alpha_j^k = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \chi_1(j)e^{2\pi ijk/n} = \sum_{1\leq j\leq n, \gcd(n,j)=1} e^{2\pi ijk/n} = c_n(k).$$

Now, from

$$x^{n-\phi(n)}\sum_{k=1}^{\phi(n)} a_n(k)x^k = \sum_{k=0}^{n}(-1)^k s_k x^{n-k}$$

we have, for $0 \leq k \leq n$,

$$(-1)^k s_k = a_n(\phi(n)-k).$$

In fact by Lemma 20, $a_n(\phi(n)-k) = a_n(k)$, so $a_n(k) = (-1)^k s_k$. Thus (3) yields the following, and in particular

$$a_n(1) = -c_n(1) = -\mu(n).$$

Theorem 19. For $n \geq 1$ and $k \geq 1$,

$$ka_n(k) = -c_n(k) - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} a_n(j)c_n(k-j).$$

Let n be a product of distinct odd primes and for $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ let $\chi(a) = \left(\frac{a}{n}\right)$ be the **Jacobi symbol**. Dedekind, in Supplement I to Dirichlet's *Vorlesungen über Zahlentheorie* [15, pp. 208–210], §116, proves that

$$\sum_{1\leq j\leq n} \chi(j)e^{2\pi ijh/n} = \chi(h)i^{(n-1)^2/4}\sqrt{n}; \tag{4}$$

this is proved earlier by Gauss in his *Summatio quarumdam serierum singularium* [22, pp. 9–45], dated 1808. The expression $G(h,\chi) = \sum_{1\leq j\leq n}\chi(j)e^{2\pi ijh/n}$ is called a **Gauss sum**. Dedekind, in Supplement VII to Dirichlet's *Vorlesungen*, says what amounts to the following. Define

$$A_n(x) = \prod_{1\leq a\leq n, \chi(a)=1}(x-e^{2\pi ia/n}) = \sum_j \alpha_n(j)x^j$$

and

$$B_n(x) = \prod_{1\leq b\leq n, \chi(b)=-1}(x-e^{2\pi ib/n}) = \sum_j \beta_n(j)x^j,$$

and write

$$S_n(k) = \sum_{1 \le a \le n, \chi(a)=1} e^{2\pi i k a/n}, \qquad T_n(k) = \sum_{1 \le b \le n, \chi(b)=-1} e^{2\pi i k b/n}.$$

Then

$$\Phi_n(x) = A_n(x)B_n(x), \qquad c_n(k) = S_n(k) + T_n(k),$$

and by (4), writing

$$n^* = (-1)^{(n-1)/2} n,$$

we have

$$S_n(k) - T_n(k) = \sum_{1 \le j \le n} \chi(j) e^{2\pi i k j/n} = \chi(k)\sqrt{n^*},$$

hence

$$2S_n(k) = c_n(k) + \chi(k)\sqrt{n^*}, \quad 2T_n(k) = c_n(k) - \chi(k)\sqrt{n^*}.$$

We have established in Lemma 15 that $c_n(k) \in \mathbb{Z}$, so this shows that $S_n(k), T_n(k) \in \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{n^*})$. Newton's identities yield for $k \ge 1$,

$$S_n(k) = -\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \alpha_n(n-j) S_n(k-j) - k\alpha_n(n-k)$$

and

$$T_n(k) = -\sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \beta_n(n-j) T_n(k-j) - k\beta_n(n-k),$$

and it follows that $\alpha_n(k), \beta_n(k) \in \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{n^*})$. Furthermore, $\alpha_n(k), \beta_n(k)$ are algebraic integers, so $\alpha_n(k), \beta_n(k) \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{n^*})}$. If D is a square-free, it is a fact [16, p. 698, §15.3] that $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D})} = \mathbb{Z}[\omega]$ for

$$\omega = \begin{cases} \sqrt{D} & D \equiv 2, 3 \pmod 4 \\ \frac{1+\sqrt{D}}{2} & D \equiv 1 \pmod 4, \end{cases}$$

and $n^* = (-1)^{(n-1)/2} n \equiv 1 \pmod 4$, we have $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{n^*})} = \mathbb{Z}[(1+\sqrt{n^*})/2]$. Thus $\alpha_n(k), \beta_n(k) \in \mathbb{Z}[(1+\sqrt{n^*})/2]$.

It is a fact that $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{n^*}) \subset \mathbb{Q}(e^{2\pi i/n})$ [23, p. 19, Proposition 5.13]

Gauss, *Disquisitiones Arithmeticae*, Art. 357

7 Algebraic theorems about coefficients of cyclotomic polynomials

For $n \ge 1$, we write

$$\Phi_n(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\phi(n)} a_n(k) x^k.$$

Let

$$A(n) = \max_{0 \le k \le \phi(n)} |a_n(k)|$$

and

$$S(n) = \sum_{k=0}^{\phi(n)} |a_n(k)|.$$

It is immediate that $A(n) \le S(n)$.

Lemma 20. For $n > 1$ and for $0 \le k \le \phi(n)$,

$$a_n(\phi(n) - k) = a_n(k).$$

Proof. For $P(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} a(j)x^j$, check that $a(j) = a(n - j)$ for each $0 \le j \le n$ is equivalent to $x^n P(x^{-1}) = P(x)$. But because $n > 1$, by Lemma 5 we have $\Phi_n(x^{-1}) = x^{-\phi(n)}\Phi_n(x)$, so we obtain the claim. □

Migotti [35] proves the following, and also calculates $a_{105}(7) = -2$. The following is also proved by Bang [2]; cf. Beiter [4].

Theorem 21 (Bang)**.** For odd primes $p < q$,

$$a_{pq}(k) \in \{0, -1, 1\}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 1,

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_{pq}(x) &= \frac{(x^{pq} - 1)(x - 1)}{(x^p - 1)(x^q - 1)} \\
&= \frac{(1 - x)\sum_{\alpha=0}^{p-1} x^{\alpha q}}{1 - x^p} \\
&= (1 - x) \sum_{0 \le \alpha \le p-1} x^{\alpha q} \cdot \sum_{\beta \ge 0} x^{\beta p} \\
&= \sum_{0 \le \alpha \le p-1, \beta \ge 0} x^{\alpha q + \beta p} - \sum_{0 \le \alpha \le p-1, \beta \ge 0} x^{\alpha q + \beta p + 1} \\
&= \sum_{0 \le \alpha \le p-1, \beta \ge 0, 0 \le \delta \le 1} (-1)^\delta x^{\alpha q + \beta p + \delta}.
\end{aligned}$$

Suppose by contradiction that $\alpha_1 q + \beta_1 p + \delta_1 = \alpha_2 q + \beta_2 p + \delta_2$ with $\delta_1 = \delta_2$. Then $q(\alpha_1 - \alpha_2) = p(\beta_2 - \beta_1)$, which implies that p divides $\alpha_1 - \alpha_2$. But $0 \le \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \le p-1$ means $0 \le |\alpha_1 - \alpha_2| \le p-1$, so $\alpha_1 - \alpha_2 = 0$ and thence $\beta_2 - \beta_1 = 0$, which means that $(\alpha_1, \beta_1, \delta_1) = (\alpha_2, \beta_2, \delta_2)$. Therefore, for $0 \le k \le \phi(pq)$ there are zero, one, or two triples (α, β, δ) such that $k = \alpha q + \beta p + \delta$; if there are two such triples, then one has $\delta = 0$ and one has $\delta = 1$. If there are no such triples, then $a_n(k) = 0$. If there is one such triple (α, β, δ), then $a_n(k) = (-1)^\delta$. If there are two such triples, then $a_n(k) = (-1)^0 + (-1)^1 = 0$. □

Lam and Leung [26] determine the following explicit formula.

Theorem 22 (Lam and Leung)**.** Suppose that $p < q$ are primes. Then there are nonnegative integers r, s such $(p-1)(q-1) = rp + sq$, and for $0 \leq k \leq \phi(pq) = (p-1)(q-1)$,

$$a_{pq}(k) = \begin{cases} 1 & 0 \leq i \leq r,\ 0 \leq j \leq s \text{ with } k = ip + jq \\ -1 & r+1 \leq i \leq q-1,\ s+1 \leq j \leq p-1 \text{ with } k + pq = ip + jq \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Furthermore,

$$|\{k : 0 \leq k \leq \phi(pq), a_{pq}(k) = 1\}| = (r+1)(s+1)$$

and

$$|\{k : 0 \leq k \leq \phi(pq), a_{pq}(k) = -1\}| = (p-s-1)(q-r-1).$$

Proof. Because $\gcd(p, q) = 1$, there is some $0 \leq r \leq q-1$ such that

$$rp \equiv -p + 1 \pmod{q}.$$

If $r = q - 1$ then we get from the above that $1 \equiv 0 \pmod{q}$, which is false because $q \neq 1$, so in fact $0 \leq r \leq q-2$. Now,

$$s = \frac{(p-1)(q-1) - rp}{q} = \frac{pq - p - q + 1 - rp}{q}$$

is an integer and

$$s = \frac{p(q-r-1) - q + 1}{q} \geq \frac{-q+1}{q} > -1,$$

hence $s \geq 0$. Also, $s \leq \frac{(p-1)(q-1)}{q} < p-1$, so $s \leq p-2$. We then have

$$rp + sq = rp + (p-1)(q-1) - rp = (p-1)(q-1).$$

For $\xi \in \Delta_{pq}$, because $\Phi_q(\xi^p) = 0$ and $\Phi_p(\xi^q) = 0$,

$$\sum_{i=0}^{r} (\xi^p)^i = -\sum_{i=r+1}^{q-1} (\xi^p)^i, \qquad \sum_{j=0}^{s} (\xi^q)^j = -\sum_{j=s+1}^{p-1} (\xi^q)^j.$$

(Because $0 \leq r \leq q-2$ and $0 \leq s \leq p-2$, each of the above four sums has a nonempty index set.) From this we have

$$\left(\sum_{i=0}^{r} (\xi^p)^i\right)\left(\sum_{j=0}^{s} (\xi^q)^j\right) - \left(\sum_{i=r+1}^{q-1} (\xi^p)^i\right)\left(\sum_{j=s+1}^{p-1} (\xi^q)^j\right) = 0.$$

Because $\xi^{-pq} = 1$, this implies that each $\xi \in \Delta_{pq}$ is a zero of the polynomial

$$f(x) = \left(\sum_{i=0}^{r} x^{ip}\right)\left(\sum_{j=0}^{s} x^{jq}\right) - \left(\sum_{i=r+1}^{q-1} x^{ip}\right)\left(\sum_{j=s+1}^{p-1} x^{jq}\right) x^{-pq};$$

that this is indeed a polynomial follows from

$$(r+1)p + (s+1)q - pq = rp + sq + p + q - pq = 1.$$

The first product is a monic polynomial of degree $rp + sq = \phi(pq)$. The second product is a polynomial of degree

$$(q-1)p + (p-1)q - pq = -p - q + pq = \phi(pq) - 1.$$

Therefore $f(x)$ is a monic polynomial of degree $\phi(pq)$. Because each $\xi \in \Delta_{pq}$ is a zero of $f(x)$ and $f(x)$ is monic, $f(x) = \Phi_{pq}(x)$. □

Carlitz [10] proves the following.

Theorem 23. Let $p < q$ be primes, let

$$qu \equiv -1 \pmod{p}, \qquad 0 < u < p,$$

let $\theta(pq)$ be the number of terms of Φ_{pq} with nonzero coefficients, and let $\theta_0(pq)$ be the number of terms of Φ_{pq} with positive coefficients. Then

$$\theta(pq) = 2\theta_0(pq) - 1$$

and

$$\theta_0(pq) = (p-u)(uq+1)/p.$$

Cobeli, Gallot, Moree and Zaharescu [13] give an exposition of $a_{pqr}(k)$ where $p < q < r$ are primes, p is fixed, and q, r are free.

Bang [2] proves the following.

Theorem 24 (Bang)**.** For odd primes $p < q < r$,

$$A(pqr) \leq p - 1.$$

Beiter [5] proves the following improvement for a case of the above theorem. If p, q, r, $3 < p < q < r$, are odd primes for which either $q \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{p}$ or $r \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{p}$, then

$$A(pqr) \leq \frac{1}{2}(p+1).$$

Bloom [6] proves the following.

Theorem 25 (Bloom)**.** For odd primes $p < q < r < s$,

$$A(pqrs) \leq p(p-1)(pq-1).$$

Gallot and Moree [21]

The following is from Lehmer [27], who says that it appears in an unpublished letter of Schur to Landau; cf. Bourbaki [8, V. 165, §11, Exercise 19].

Theorem 26 (Schur)**.** For any odd $m \geq 3$ there are primes $p_1 < p_2 < \cdots < p_m$, with $p_1 + p_2 > p_m$. For such primes,

$$a_{p_1 p_2 \cdots p_m}(p_m) = -m + 1.$$

Proof. Write

$$\pi(x) = |\{p : p \text{ is prime and } p \leq x\}|.$$

For $m \geq 3$, suppose by contradiction that if $p_1 < p_2 < \cdots < p_m$ are primes then $p_1 + p_2 \leq p_m$, and thus $2p_1 < p_m$. For $k \geq 1$, as there are infinitely many primes, let p_1 be the least prime $> k$, and let $k \leq p_1 < p_2 < \cdots < p_m$. Then

$$\pi(2k) - \pi(k) = \pi(2k) - \pi(p_1) + 1 \leq \pi(2p_1) - \pi(p_1) + 1 \leq (m-1) + 1 = m.$$

This yields, for $j \geq 1$,

$$\pi(2^j) \leq m + \pi(2^{j-1}) \leq m + m + \pi(2^{j-2}) \leq \cdots \leq jm.$$

But the prime number theorem tells us

$$\pi(2^j) \sim \frac{2^j}{j \log 2}, \qquad j \to \infty,$$

with which we get a contradiction.

Let $m \geq 3$ be odd and let $p_1 < p_2 < \cdots < p_m$ be primes satisfying $p_1 + p_2 > p_m$, and let $n = p_1 p_2 \cdots p_m$. Since $p_1 + p_2 > p_m$, for $1 \leq j, k \leq m$ we have $p_j + p_k \geq p_m + 1$. It follows that if d is a divisor of n aside from 1 and $p_1, \ldots, p_m$, and $\mu(n/d) \neq 0$, then

$$(x^d - 1)^{\mu(n/d)} \in x^{p_m+1}\mathbb{Z}[x].$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi_n(x) + x^{p_m+1}\mathbb{Z}[x] &= \prod_{d|n} (x^d - 1)^{\mu(n/d)} + x^{p_m+1}\mathbb{Z}[x] \\
&= \prod_{d|n, \mu(d/n) \neq 0} (x^d - 1)^{\mu(n/d)} + x^{p_m+1}\mathbb{Z}[x] \\
&= (x-1)^{-1} \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{m} (x^{p_j} - 1)^{\mu(n/p_j)} + x^{p_m+1}\mathbb{Z}[x] \\
&= (x-1)^{-1} \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{m} (x^{p_j} - 1) + x^{p_m+1}\mathbb{Z}[x] \\
&= (x-1)^{-1} \cdot (-1 + x^{p_1} + \cdots + x^{p_m}) + x^{p_m+1}\mathbb{Z}[x].
\end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned}&(x-1)^{-1}\cdot(-1+x^{p_1}+\cdots-x^{p_m})+x^{p_m+1}\mathbb{Z}[x]\\=&(1+x+x^2+\cdots+x^{p_m})\cdot(1-x^{p_1}-\cdots-x^{p_m})+x^{p_m+1}\mathbb{Z}[x].\end{aligned}$$

For $1\le i\le m$, there is one and only one $0\le j\le p_m$ such that $p_i+j=p_m$. This implies that the coefficient of x^{p_m} in the above expression is $-m+1$. □

Lehmer also states that in Rolf Bungers' 1934 dissertation, *Über die Koeffizienten von Kreisteilungspolynomen* (University of Göttingen), it is proved that if there exist infinitely many twin primes then for any M there are primes $p<q<r$ such that $A(pqr)\ge M$. Lehmer proves this without the hypothesis that there are infinitely many twin primes.

For power series $A(x)=\sum_{k=0}^\infty a_kx^k$ and $B(x)=\sum_{k=0}^\infty b_kx^k$, write

$$A\preceq B$$

if $|a_k|\le b_k$ for all k. For power series A,B,P,Q with $A\preceq P$ and $B\preceq Q$,

$$|a_k+b_k|\le|a_k|+|b_k|\le p_k+q_k,$$

so $A+B\preceq P+Q$, and

$$\left|\sum_{i+j=k}a_ib_j\right|\le\sum_{i+j=k}|a_ib_j|\le\sum_{i+j=k}p_iq_j,$$

so $AB\preceq PQ$.

Now,

$$x^d-1\preceq\sum_{k=0}^\infty x^{kd},\quad 1\preceq\sum_{k=0}^\infty x^{kd},\quad (x^d-1)^{-1}\preceq\sum_{k=0}^\infty x^{kd},$$

and since $\mu(n/d)\in\{0,1,-1\}$,

$$\Phi_n(x)=\prod_{d|n}(x^d-1)^{\mu(n/d)}\preceq\prod_{d|n}\left(\sum_{k=0}^\infty x^{kd}\right)=\prod_{d|n}\frac{1}{1-x^d}.\tag{5}$$

Hence, because $1\preceq\frac{1}{1-x^j}$,

$$\Phi_n(x)\preceq\prod_{j=1}^\infty\frac{1}{1-x^j}.$$

Let $n\mapsto p(n)$ be the partition function, the number of ways of writing n as a sum of positive integers, where the order does not matter. $p(0)=1$ and $p(n)=0$ for $n<0$, and for example, $p(4)=5$ because $4=4,3+1,2+2,2+1+1,1+1+1+1$. It is a fact that for $|x|<1$,

$$\prod_{j=1}^\infty\frac{1}{1-x^j}=\sum_{k=0}^\infty p(k)x^k,$$

found by Euler.

Theorem 27.
$$|a_n(k)| \leq p(k),$$
and so
$$A(n) = \max_{0\leq k\leq \phi(n)} |a_n(k)| \leq \max_{0\leq k\leq \phi(n)} p(k) \leq p(\phi(n)) \leq p(n).$$

It is proved by Hardy and Ramanujan [12, p. 166, Chapter VII] that for $K = \pi\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}$ and $\lambda_n = \sqrt{n - \frac{1}{24}}$,
$$p(n) = \frac{e^{K\lambda_n}}{4\sqrt{3}\cdot \lambda_n^2} + O\left(\frac{e^{K\lambda_n}}{\lambda_n^3}\right), \qquad n \to \infty.$$
This implies
$$p(n) \sim \frac{e^{K\sqrt{n}}}{4\sqrt{3}\cdot n}, \qquad n \to \infty.$$
Therefore,
$$A(n) = O\left(\frac{e^{K\sqrt{n}}}{n}\right), \qquad S(n) = O(e^{K\sqrt{n}}), \qquad n \to \infty$$

Now let
$$Q_n(x) = \prod_{d|n}(1 + x^d + x^{2d} + \cdots + x^{n-d}).$$
It is straightforward that for $0 \leq k < n$, the coefficient of x^k in $Q_n(x)$ is equal to the coefficient of x^k in $\prod_{d|n} \frac{1}{1-x^d}$. For $n > 1$, because the degree of $\Phi_n(x)$ is $\phi(n) < n$, using (5) we get
$$\Phi_n(x) \preceq Q_n(x).$$
Let
$$d(n) = \sum_{d|n} 1,$$
the number of positive integer divisors of n. It is straightforward that
$$\prod_{d|n} d = n^{d(n)/2},$$
so
$$Q_n(1) = \prod_{d|n} \frac{n}{d} = \prod_{d|n} d = n^{d(n)/2}.$$
But from $\Phi_n(x) \preceq Q_n(x)$ we have that $S(n)$ is $\leq$ the sum of the coefficients of the polynomial $Q_n(x)$, i.e.
$$S(n) \leq Q_n(1) = n^{d(n)/2}.$$
This is found by Bateman [3]; cf. [36, p. 64, Exercise 7].

Theorem 28 (Bateman)**.**

$$S(n) \le \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}d(n)\log n\right).$$

A result due to Wigert [12, p. 19, Theorem 6], proved using the prime number theorem, is that

$$\limsup_{n\to\infty} \log d(n) \cdot \frac{\log\log n}{\log n} = \log 2.$$

Thus, for each $\epsilon > 0$, there is some n_ϵ such that when $n \ge n_\epsilon$,

$$\log d(n) \cdot \frac{\log\log n}{\log n} \le \log 2 + \epsilon,$$

so

$$\log d(n) \le \frac{\log n}{\log\log n}(\epsilon + \log 2).$$

Then

$$\log S(n) \le \frac{d(n)}{2} \cdot \log n \le \frac{\log n}{2} \exp\left(\frac{\log n}{\log\log n}(\epsilon + \log 2)\right).$$

Wirsing [46]

Konyagin, Maier and Wirsing [24]

Maier [29], [30], [31], [32]

Bachman [1]

Bzdęga [9]

Nicolas and Terjanian [41]

Let $\Psi_n(x) = \frac{x^n-1}{\Phi_n(x)}$, i.e. $\Psi_n(x) = \prod_{d|n,d<n} \Phi_d(x)$, which belongs to $\mathbb{Z}[x]$ and is monic. Moree [37] proves the following.

8 Analytic theorems about coefficients of cyclotomic polynomials

Erdős [17]

Erdős and Vaughan [18] prove the following.

Vaughan [43] proves the next theorem. Vaughan's original proof is complicated and delightful, and we first outline it and then give a radically simplified proof using Theorem 11, attributed to Saffari by Montgomery and Vaughan [36, pp. 131–132, Exercise 9].

For $n = \prod_{p\le y, p\equiv 2,3 \pmod 5} p$ with $\omega(n)$ odd, let $c_m = -\frac{c_n(m)}{m}$. Because n is square-free and $\mu(n) = -1$, it follows from Lemma 17 that $m \mapsto c_m$ is multiplicative. Because $c_m = O(m^{-1})$, the following Euler product expansions hold [36, p. 20, Theorem 1.9]:

$$\sum_{m=1}^\infty c_m m^{-s} = \prod_p \sum_{k=0}^\infty c_{p^k} p^{-ks}, \qquad \operatorname{Re} s > 0$$

and
$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \chi(m) c_m m^{-s} = \prod_p \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \chi(p^k) c_{p^k} p^{-ks}, \qquad \operatorname{Re} s > 0,$$
where χ is the quadratic Dirichlet character modulo 5. Using Hölder's formula (2) one works out that for $p \mid n$,
$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_{p^k} p^{-ks} = \frac{1-p^{-s}}{1-p^{-(s+1)}}$$
and for $p \nmid n$,
$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_{p^k} p^{-ks} = \frac{1}{1-p^{-(s+1)}},$$
thus
$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} c_m m^{-s} = \zeta(1+s) \prod_{p|n} (1-p^{-s}), \qquad \operatorname{Re} s > 0.$$
Using Hölder's formula and that χ is completely multiplicative, one works out that for $p \mid n$,
$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \chi(p^k) c_{p^k} p^{-ks} = \frac{1+p^{-s}}{1-\chi(p)p^{-(s+1)}}$$
and for $p \nmid n$,
$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \chi(p^k) c_{p^k} p^{-ks} = \frac{1}{1-\chi(p)p^{-(s+1)}},$$
thus
$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \chi(m) c_m m^{-s} = L(1+s,\chi) \prod_{p|n} (1+p^{-s}), \qquad \operatorname{Re} s > 0.$$
Using (i) the fact that the Gauss sum $\sum_{r=1}^{4} \chi(r) e^{2\pi i r a/5}$ is equal to $\chi(a)\sqrt{5}$, (ii) the fact that $c_{5m} = \frac{c_m}{5}$, and (iii) $e^{2\pi i m/5} + e^{2\pi i \cdot 4m/5} = 2 \cdot \operatorname{Re} e^{2\pi i m/5}$, one works out that for $x > 0$,
$$4 \cdot \operatorname{Re} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} c_m e^{2\pi i m/5} e^{-m/x} = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} c_m \left(\sqrt{5} \cdot \chi(m) e^{-m/x} + e^{-5m/x} - e^{-m/x} \right).$$
Using this and the above Euler product expansions we get for $s > 0$,
$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^{\infty} \left(\operatorname{Re} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} c_m e(m/5) e^{-m/x} \right) x^{-s-1} dx \\ =&\frac{\Gamma(s)}{4} \left(\sqrt{5} \cdot L(1+s,\chi) \prod_{p|n} (1+p^{-s}) - (1-5^{-s}) \zeta(1+s) \prod_{p|n} (1-p^{-s}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

For $x > 0$, writing $f(x) = \mathrm{Re} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} c_m e^{2\pi i m/5} e^{-m/x}$, one has for $0 < \sigma < 1$,

$$\int_0^\infty f(x) x^{-\sigma-1} dx \le \frac{1}{1-\sigma} + \frac{1}{\sigma} \sup_{x \ge 1} f(x),$$

so

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{x\ge 1} f(x) \\
\ge&\sigma \int_0^\infty f(x) x^{-\sigma-1} dx - \frac{\sigma}{1-\sigma} \\
=&\frac{\sigma\Gamma(\sigma)}{4} \left(\sqrt{5} \cdot L(1+\sigma, \chi) \prod_{p|n} (1 + p^{-\sigma}) - (1 - 5^{-\sigma}) \zeta(1+\sigma) \prod_{p|n} (1 - p^{-\sigma}) \right) \\
&- \frac{\sigma}{1-\sigma}.
\end{aligned}$$

As $\sigma \to 0$ we have $\sigma\Gamma(\sigma) = 1 + O(\sigma)$, $(1 - 5^{-\sigma})\zeta(1 + \sigma) = \log 5 + O(\sigma)$, and $1 - p^{-\sigma} = \sigma \log p + O(\sigma^2)$, thus

$$\sup_{x \ge 1} f(x) \ge \frac{1}{4} \cdot \sqrt{5} \cdot L(1, \chi) \cdot 2^{\omega(n)} = \frac{1}{4} \cdot \sqrt{5} \cdot L(1, \chi) \cdot d(n).$$

But Theorem 16 tells us that for $|z| < 1$,

$$|\Phi_n(z)| = \exp\left(\mathrm{Re} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} c_m z^m \right),$$

so $|\Phi_n(e^{2\pi i/5} e^{-1/x})| = e^{f(x)}$ and thus

$$\sup_{|z|<1} |\Phi_n(z)| \ge \exp\left(\frac{1}{4} \cdot \sqrt{5} \cdot L(1,\chi) \cdot d(n) \right).$$

As χ is the quadratic Dirichlet character modulo 5, it is a fact that $L(1, \chi)$ can be explicitly evaluated (this is an instance of Dirichlet's class number formula), and using this one checks that $\exp\left(\frac{1}{2} \cdot \sqrt{5} \cdot L(1, \chi)\right) = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$. Therefore

$$\sup_{|z|<1} |\Phi_n(z)| \ge \left(\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2} \right)^{d(n)/2}.$$

Theorem 29 (Vaughan)**.** If $n = \prod_{p \le y, p \equiv 2,3 \pmod 5} p$ with $\omega(n)$ odd, then

$$|\Phi_n(e^{2\pi i/5})| = \left(\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2} \right)^{d(n)/2}.$$

There are infinitely many n such that

$$\log A(n) > \exp\left(\frac{(\log 2)(\log n)}{\log\log n} \right).$$

Proof. □

Vaughan further proves the following.

Theorem 30 (Vaughan)**.** There is some C such that for infinitely many k,

$$\log \max_{n\geq 1} |a_n(k)| \geq Ck^{1/2}(\log k)^{-1/4}.$$

9 Fourier analysis

Let $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$. For $p \geq 1$, define

$$\|f\|_{L^p} = \left(\int_0^1 |f(x)|^p dx\right)^{1/p}$$

and $\|f\|_{L^\infty} = \sup_{x\in[0,1]} |f(x)|$. By Jensen's inequality, if $1 \leq p \leq q \leq \infty$ then

$$\|f\|_{L^p} \leq \|f\|_{L^q}.$$

For $f \in L^1(\mathbb{T})$, define $\widehat{f} : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{C}$ by

$$\widehat{f}(k) = \int_0^1 e^{-2\pi ikx} f(x)dx.$$

Define

$$\left\|\widehat{f}\right\|_{\ell^p} = \left(\sum_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} |\widehat{f}(k)|^p\right)^{1/p}$$

and $\left\|\widehat{f}\right\|_{\ell^\infty} = \sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}} |\widehat{f}(k)|$. For $1 \leq p \leq q \leq \infty$,

$$\left\|\widehat{f}\right\|_{\ell^q} \leq \left\|\widehat{f}\right\|_{\ell^p}.$$

Plancherel's theorem tells us that

$$\|f\|_{L^2} = \left\|\widehat{f}\right\|_{\ell^2}.$$

The Hausorff-Young inequality states that for $1 \leq p \leq 2$ and $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$,

$$\left\|\widehat{f}\right\|_{\ell^q} \leq \|f\|_{L^p}.$$

Nikolsky's inequality [14, p. 102, Theorem 2.6] says that if $\widehat{f}(k) = 0$ for $|k| > n$, namely f is a trigonometric polynomial of degree n, then for $0 < p \leq q \leq \infty$ and for $r \geq \frac{p}{2}$ an integer,

$$\|f\|_{L^q} \leq (2nr + 1)^{\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}} \|f\|_{L^p}.$$

On the other hand, using Jensen's inequality for sums one proves that if f is a trigonometric polynomial of degree n, then for $1 \leq p \leq q \leq \infty$,

$$\left\|\widehat{f}\right\|_{\ell^p} \leq (2n+1)^{\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{q}} \left\|\widehat{f}\right\|_{\ell^q}.$$

For $f : \mathbb{T} \to \mathbb{C}$, define

$$\left\|\hat{f}\right\|_{\ell^0} = |\mathrm{supp}\, \hat{f}| = \left|\{n \in \mathbb{Z} : \hat{f}(n) \neq 0\}\right|.$$

McGehee, Pigno and Smith [33] prove that there is some K such that for all N, if $n_1, \ldots, n_N$ are distinct integers and $c_1, \ldots, c_N \in \mathbb{C}$ satisfy $|c_k| \geq 1$, then

$$\left\|\sum_{k=1}^N c_k e^{2\pi i n_k t}\right\|_{L^1} \geq K \log N.$$

That is, if $f : \mathbb{T} \to \mathbb{C}$ is a trigonometric polynomial with $|\hat{f}(n)| \geq 1$ when $\hat{f}(n) \neq 0$, then

$$\|f\|_{L^1} \geq K \log \left\|\hat{f}\right\|_{\ell^0}.$$

For $F : \mathbb{Z}/N \to \mathbb{C}$, define $\widehat{F} : \mathbb{Z}/N \to \mathbb{C}$ by

$$\widehat{F}(k) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} F(j) e^{-2\pi i jk/N}, \qquad 0 \leq k \leq N-1.$$

One checks that [36, pp. 109–110, §4.1]

$$F(j) = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \widehat{F}(k) e^{2\pi i jk/N}, \qquad 0 \leq j \leq N-1$$

and

$$\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} |\widehat{F}(k)|^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} |F(j)|^2.$$

For $a_0, \ldots, a_{N-1} \in \mathbb{C}$, define $f : \mathbb{T} \to \mathbb{C}$ by

$$f(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} a_k e^{2\pi i kx}$$

and define $F : \mathbb{Z}/N \to \mathbb{C}$ by

$$F(j) = f(j/N) = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} a_k e^{2\pi i kj/N}, \qquad 0 \leq j \leq N-1,$$

for which we calculate $\widehat{F}(k) = a_k$, for $0 \leq k \leq N-1$. Then

$$\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} |a_k|^2 = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} |\widehat{F}(k)|^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} |F(j)|^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} |f(j/N)|^2.$$

Carlitz [11]

10 Algebraic topology

Musiker and Reiner [38]
Meshulam [34]

References

[1] Gennady Bachman. On the coefficients of cyclotomic polynomials. *Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society*, 106(510):1–80, 1993.

[2] Alfred Sophus Bang. Om Ligningen $\Phi_m(X) = 0$. *Nyt Tidsskrift for Mathematik, Afdeling B*, 6:6–12, 1895.

[3] P. T. Bateman. Note on the coefficient of the cyclotomic polynomial. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 55(12):1180–1181, 1949.

[4] Marion Beiter. The midterm coefficient of the cyclotomic polynomial $F_{pq}(x)$. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 71(7):769–770, 1964.

[5] Marion Beiter. Magnitude of the coefficients of the cyclotomic polynomial $F_{pqr}(x)$. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 75(4):370–372, 1968.

[6] D. M. Bloom. On the coefficients of the cyclotomic polynomials. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 75:372–377, 1968.

[7] Nicolas Bourbaki. *Elements of Mathematics. Commutative Algebra.* Addison-Wesley, 1972.

[8] Nicolas Bourbaki. *Elements of Mathematics. Algebra II, Chapters 4–7.* Springer, 1990. Translated by P. M. Cohn and J. Howie.

[9] Bartłomiej Bzdęga. On the height of cyclotomic polynomials. *Acta Arith.*, 152(4):349–359, 2012.

[10] L. Carlitz. The number of terms in the cyclotomic polynomial $F_{pq}(x)$. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 73(9):979–981, 1966.

[11] L. Carlitz. The sum of the squares of the coefficients of the cyclotomic polynomial. *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar.*, 18:295–302, 1967.

[12] K. Chandrasekharan. *Arithmetical Functions*, volume 167 of *Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften.* Springer, 1970.

[13] Cristian Cobeli, Yves Gallot, Pieter Moree, and Alexandru Zaharescu. Sister Beiter and Kloosterman: A tale of cyclotomic coefficients and modular inverses. *Indagationes Mathematicae*, 24:915–929, 2013.

[14] Ronald A. DeVore and George G. Lorentz. *Constructive Approximation*, volume 303 of *Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften.* Springer, 1993.

[15] P. G. L. Dirichlet. *Lectures on Number Theory*, volume 16 of *History of Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1999. Supplements by R. Dedekind, translated from the German by John Stillwell.

[16] David S. Dummit and Richard M. Foote. *Abstract Algebra*. John Wiley & Sons, third edition, 2004.

[17] P. Erdős. On the growth of the cyclotomic polynomial in the interval $(0, 1)$. *Proceedings of the Glasgow Mathematical Association*, 3(2):102–104, 1957.

[18] P. Erdős and R. C. Vaughan. Bounds for the r-th coefficients of cyclotomic polynomials. *J. London Math. Soc. (2)*, 8(3):393–400, 1974.

[19] Jean-Pierre Escofier. *Galois Theory*, volume 204 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, 2001. Translated by Leila Schneps.

[20] Graham Everest and Thomas Ward. *An Introduction to Number Theory*, volume 232 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, 2005.

[21] Yves Gallot and Pieter Moree. Ternary cyclotomic polynomials having a large coefficient. *J. reine angew. Math.*, 632:105–125, 2009.

[22] Carl Friedrich Gauss. *Carl Friedrich Gauss. Werke. Zweiter Band.* Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, 1876.

[23] Kazuya Kato, Nobushige Kurokawa, and Takeshi Saito. *Number Theory 2: Introduction to Class Field Theory*, volume 240 of *Translations of Mathematical Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2011. Translated by Masato Kuwata and Katsumi Nomizu.

[24] Sergei Konyagin, Helmut Maier, and Eduard Wirsing. Cyclotomic polynomials with many primes dividing their orders. *Period. Math. Hungar.*, 49(2):99–106, 2004.

[25] R. P. Kurshan and A. M. Odlyzko. Values of cyclotomic polynomials at roots of unity. *Math. Scand.*, 49:15–35, 1981.

[26] T. Y. Lam and K. H. Leung. On the cyclotomic polynomial $\Phi_{pq}(X)$. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 103(7):562–564, 1996.

[27] Emma Lehmer. On the magnitude of the coefficients of the cyclotomic polynomial. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 42(6):389–392, 1936.

[28] Rudolf Lidl and Harald Niederreiter. *Finite Fields*, volume 20 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and Its Applications*. Cambridge University Press, 1997.

[29] Helmut Maier. The coefficients of cyclotomic polynomials. In Bruce C. Berndt, Harold G. Diamond, Heini Halberstam, and Adolf Hildebrand, editors, *Analytic Number Theory. Proceedings of a Conference in Honor of Paul T. Bateman*, volume 85 of *Progress in Mathematics*, pages 349–366. Birkhäuser, 1990.

[30] Helmut Maier. The size of the coefficients of cyclotomic polynomials. In Bruce C. Berndt, Harold G. Diamond, and Adolf J. Hildebrand, editors, *Analytic Number Theory. Proceedings of a Conference in Honor of Heini Halberstam, Volume 2*, volume 139 of *Progress in Mathematics*, pages 633–639. Birkhäuser, 1996.

[31] Helmut Maier. The distribution of the L^2-norm of cyclotomic polynomials on the unit circle. In Wolfgang Schwarz and Jörn Steuding, editors, *Elementare und analytische Zahlentheorie*, volume 20 of *Schriften der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main*, pages 164–179. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart, 2006.

[32] Helmut Maier. Anatomy of integers and cyclotomic polynomials. In Jean-Marie De Koninck, Andrew Granville, and Florian Luca, editors, *Anatomy of Integers*, volume 46 of *CRM Proceedings & Lecture Notes*, pages 89–95. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2008.

[33] O. Carruth McGehee, Louis Pigno, and Brent Smith. Hardy's inequality and the L^1 norm of exponential sums. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 113(3):613–618, 1981.

[34] Roy Meshulam. Homology of balanaced complexes via the Fourier transform. *J. Algebraic Combin.*, 35:565–571, 2012.

[35] Adolf Migotti. Zur Theorie der Kreistheilungsgleichung. *Sitzungsberichte der Mathematisch-Naturwissenschaftlichen Classe der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 87:7–14, 1883. Heft I, Abt. II.

[36] Hugh L. Montgomery and Robert C. Vaughan. *Multiplicative Number Theory I: Classical Theory*, volume 97 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, 2006.

[37] Pieter Moree. Inverse cyclotomic polynomials. *J. Number Theory*, 129:667–680, 2009.

[38] Gregg Musiker and Victor Reiner. The cyclotomic polynomial topologically. *J. reine angew. Math.*, 687:113–132, 2014.

[39] Jürgen Neukirch. *Algebraic Number Theory*, volume 322 of *Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften*. Springer, 1999. Translated from the German by Norbert Schappacher.

[40] Olaf Neumann. The *Disquisitiones Arithmeticae* and the theory of equations. In Catherine Goldstein, Norbert Schappacher, and Joachim Schwermer, editors, *The Shaping of Arithmetic after C. F. Gauss's Disquisitiones Arithmeticae*, pages 107–127. Springer, 2007.

[41] Jean-Louis Nicolas and Guy Terjanian. Une majoration de la longueur des polynômes cyclotomiques. *Enseign. Math. (2)*, 45(3-4):301–309, 1999.

[42] R. Thangadurai and A. Vatwani. The least prime congruent to one modulo n. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 118(8):737–742, 2011.

[43] R. C. Vaughan. Bounds for the coefficients of cyclotomic polynomials. *Michigan Math. J.*, 21:289–295 (1975), 1974.

[44] Lawrence C. Washington. *Introduction to cyclotomic fields*, volume 83 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, second edition, 1997.

[45] André Weil. *Number Theory: An approach through history from Hammurapi to Legendre*. Birkhäuser, 1984.

[46] Eduard Wirsing. The third logarithmic momentum of the cyclotomic polynomial on the unit circle and factorizations with a linear side condition. In Wolfgang Schwarz and Jörn Steuding, editors, *Elementare und analytische Zahlentheorie*, volume 20 of *Schriften der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft an der Johann Wolfgang Goethe-Universität Frankfurt am Main*, pages 297–312. Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart, 2006.