Counting tuples restricted by coprimality conditions
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Abstract

Given a set $A = \{(i_1, j_1), \ldots, (i_m, j_m)\}$ we say that $(a_1, \ldots, a_v)$ exhibits pairwise coprimality if $\gcd(a_i, a_j) = 1$ for all $(i, j) \in A$. For a given positive $x$ we give an asymptotic formula for the number of $(a_1, \ldots, a_v)$ with $1 \leq a_1, \ldots, a_v \leq x$ that exhibit pairwise coprimality. Our error term is better than that of Hu.

1 Introduction

We study tuples whose elements are positive integers of maximum value $x$ and impose certain coprimality conditions on pairs of elements. Tóth [10] used an inductive approach to give an asymptotic formula for the number of height constrained tuples that exhibit pairwise coprimality. For a generalisation from pairwise coprimality to $v$-wise coprimality see [6].
Recently Fernández and Fernández, in [1] and in subsequent discussions with the second author, have shown how to calculate the probability that \(v\) positive integers of any size exhibit coprimality across given pairs. Their approach is non-inductive. Hu [7] has estimated the number of \((a_1, \ldots, a_v)\) with \(1 \leq a_1, \ldots, a_v \leq x\) that satisfy given coprimality conditions on pairs of elements of the \(v\)-tuple. His inductive approach gives an asymptotic formula with an upper bound on the error term of \(O(x^{v-1} \log^{v-1} x)\).

Coprimality across given pairs of elements of a \(v\)-tuple is not only interesting in its own right. To date it has been necessary for quantifying \(v\)-tuples that are totally pairwise non-coprime, that is, \(\gcd(i, j) > 1\) for all \(1 \leq i, j \leq v\) (see [7],[5] and [8] and its comments regarding [2]).

Our main result gives a better error term than that of [7]. Unlike [7] our approach is non-inductive.

We use a graph to represent the required primality conditions as follows. Let \(G = (V, E)\) be a graph with \(v\) vertices and \(e\) edges. The set of vertices, \(V\), will be given by \(V = \{1, \ldots, v\}\) whilst the set of edges of \(G\), denoted by \(E\), is a subset of the set of pairs of elements of \(V\). That is, \(E \subset \{\{1, 2\}, \{1, 3\}, \ldots, \{r, s\}, \ldots, \{v - 1, v\}\}\). We admit isolated vertices (that is, vertices that are not adjacent to any other vertex). An edge is always of the form \(\{r, s\}\) with \(r \neq s\) and \(\{r, s\} = \{s, r\}\). For each real \(x > 0\) we define the set of all tuples that satisfy the primality conditions by

\[
G(x) := \{(a_1, \ldots, a_v) \in \mathbb{N}^v : a_r \leq x, \quad \gcd(a_r, a_s) = 1 \text{ if } \{r, s\} \in E \}.
\]

We also let \(g(x) = \text{card}(G(x))\), and denote with \(d\) the maximum degree of the vertices of \(G\). Finally, let \(Q_G(x) = 1 + a_2x^2 + \cdots + a_vx^v\) be the polynomial associated to the graph \(G\) defined in Section 2.

Our main result is as follows.

**Theorem 1.** For real \(x > 0\) we have

\[
g(x) = x^v \rho_G + O(x^{v-1} \log^d x),
\]

where

\[
\rho_G = \prod_{p \text{ prime}} Q_G \left( \frac{1}{p} \right).
\]
2 Preparations

As usual, for any integer $n \geq 1$, let $\omega(n)$ and $\sigma(n)$ be the number of distinct prime factors of $n$ and the sum of divisors of $n$ respectively (we also set $\omega(1) = 0$). We also use $\mu$ to denote the M"{o}bius function, that is, $\mu(n) = (-1)^{\omega(n)}$ if $n$ is square free, and $\mu(n) = 0$ otherwise. $P^+(n)$ denotes the largest prime factor of the integer $n > 1$. By convention $P^+(1) = 1$. We recall that the notation $U = O(V)$ is equivalent to the assertion that the inequality $|U| \leq c|V|$ holds for some constant $c > 0$. We will denote the least common multiple of integers $x_1, \ldots, x_v$ by $[x_1, \ldots, x_v]$.

For each $F \subseteq E$, a subset of the edges of $G$, let $v(F)$ be the number of non-isolated vertices of $F$. We define two polynomials $Q_G(x)$ and $Q_G^+(x)$ by

$$Q_G(x) = \sum_{F \subseteq E} (-1)^{\text{card}(F)} x^{v(F)}, \quad Q_G^+(x) = \sum_{F \subseteq E} x^{v(F)}.$$ 

In this way we associate two polynomials to each graph. It is clear that the only $F \subseteq E$ for which $v(F) = 0$ is the empty set. Thus the constant term of $Q_G(x)$ and $Q_G^+(x)$ is always 1. If $F$ is non-empty then there is some edge $a = \{r, s\} \in F$ so that $v(F) \geq 2$. Therefore the coefficient of $x$ in $Q_G(x)$ and $Q_G^+(x)$ is zero. Since we do not allow repeated edges the only case in which $v(F) = 2$ is when $F$ consists of one edge. Thus the coefficient of $x^2$ in $Q_G^+(x)$ is $e$, that is, the number of edges $e$ in $G$. The corresponding $x^2$ coefficient in $Q_G(x)$ is $-e$.

As a matter of notation we shall sometimes use $r$ and $s$ to indicate vertices. The letter $v$ will always denote the last vertex and the number of vertices in a given graph. Edges will sometimes be denoted by $a$ or $b$. As previously mentioned, we use $d$ to denote the maximum degree of any vertex and $e$ to denote the number of edges. We use terms like $e_j$ to indicate the $j$-th edge.

We associate several multiplicative functions to any graph. To define these functions we consider functions $E \to \mathbb{N}$, that is, to any edge $a$ in the graph we associate a natural number $n_a$. We call any of these functions, $a \mapsto n_a$, an edge numbering of the graph. Given an edge numbering we assign a corresponding vertex numbering function $r \mapsto N_r$ by the rule $N_r = [n_{b_1}, \ldots, n_{b_u}]$, where $E_r = \{b_1, \ldots, b_u\} \subseteq E$ is the set of edges incident to $r$. We note that in the case where $r$ is an isolated vertex we will have $E_r = \emptyset$ and $N_r = 1$. With these notations we define

$$f_G(m) = \sum_{N_1 N_2 \cdots N_v = m} \mu(n_1) \cdots \mu(n_v), \quad f_G^+(m) = \sum_{N_1 N_2 \cdots N_v = m} |\mu(n_1) \cdots \mu(n_v)|.$$ 


where the sums extend to all possible edge numberings of $G$.

The following is interesting in its own right but will also be used to prove Theorem II.

**Proposition 2.** Let $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a multiplicative function. For any graph $G$ the function

$$g_{f,G}(m) = \sum_{N_1N_2\cdots N_v = m} f(n_1) \cdots f(n_e)$$

is multiplicative.

**Proof.** Let $m = m_1m_2$ where gcd$(m_1, m_2) = 1$. Let us assume that for a given edge numbering of $G$ we have $N_1 \cdots N_v = m$. For any edge $a = \{r, s\}$ we have $n_a | N_r$ and $n_a | N_s$. Therefore $n_a^2 | m$. It follows that we may express $n_a$ as $n_a = n_{1,a}n_{2,a}$ with $n_{1,a} | m_1$ and $n_{2,a} | m_2$. In this case gcd$(n_{1,a}, n_{2,a}) = 1$, and we will have

$$N_r = [n_{b_1}, \ldots, n_{b_v}] = [n_{1,b_1}, \ldots, n_{1,b_v}] [n_{2,b_1}, \ldots, n_{2,b_v}],$$

$$f(n_1) \cdots f(n_e) = f(n_{1,1}) \cdots f(n_{1,e}) \cdot f(n_{2,1}) \cdots f(n_{2,e}).$$

Since each edge numbering $n_a$ splits into two edge numberings $n_{1,a}$ and $n_{2,a}$, we have

$$m_1 = N_{1,1} \cdots N_{1,v}, \quad m_2 = N_{2,1} \cdots N_{2,v}.$$

Thus

$$g_{f,G}(m_1m_2) = g_{f,G}(m)$$

$$= \sum_{N_1N_2\cdots N_v = m} f(n_1) \cdots f(n_e)$$

$$= \sum_{N_1,1\cdots N_{1,v}, N_{2,1}\cdots N_{2,v} = m_1m_2} f(n_{1,1}) \cdots f(n_{1,e}) \cdot f(n_{2,1}) \cdots f(n_{2,e})$$

$$= \sum_{N_{1,1}\cdots N_{1,v} = m_1} f(n_{1,1}) \cdots f(n_{1,e}) \sum_{N_{2,1}\cdots N_{2,v} = m_2} f(n_{2,1}) \cdots f(n_{2,e})$$

$$= g_{f,G}(m_1)g_{f,G}(m_2),$$

which completes the proof. \(\Box\)

We now draw the link between $f^+_G(p^k)$ and $Q^+_G(x)$.  

4
Lemma 3. For any graph $G$ and prime $p$ the value $f_G^+(p^k)$ is equal to the coefficient of $x^k$ in $Q_G^+(x)$. In the same way the value of $f_G(p^k)$ is equal to the coefficient of $x^k$ in $Q_G(x)$.

Proof. First we consider the case of $f_G(p^k)$. Recall that

$$Q_G(x) = \sum_{F \subseteq E} (-1)^{\text{card}(F)} x^{v(F)}, \quad f_G(p^k) = \sum_{N_1 \cdots N_v = p^k} \mu(n_1) \cdots \mu(n_e),$$

where the last sum is on the set of edge numberings of $G$. In the second sum we shall only consider edge numberings of $G$ giving a non null term. This means that we only consider edge numberings with $n_a$ squarefree numbers. Notice also that if $N_1 \cdots N_v = p^k$, then each $n_a | p^k$. So the second sum extends to all edge numbering with $n_a \in \{1, p\}$ for each edge $a \in E$ and satisfying $N_1 \cdots N_v = p^k$.

We need to prove the equality

$$\sum_{F \subseteq E, \ v(F) = k} (-1)^{\text{card}(F)} = \sum_{N_1 \cdots N_v = p^k} \mu(n_1) \cdots \mu(n_e). \quad (1)$$

To this end we shall define for each $F \subseteq E$ with $v(F) = k$ a squarefree edge numbering $\sigma(F) = (n_a)$ with $N_1 \cdots N_v = p^k$, $n_a \in \{1, p\}$ and such that $(-1)^{\text{card}(F)} = \mu(n_1) \cdots \mu(n_e)$. We will show that $\sigma$ is a bijective mapping between the set of $F \subseteq E$ with $v(F) = k$ and the set of edge numberings $(n_a)$ with $N_1 \cdots N_v = p^k$. Thus equality (1) will be established and the proof finished.

Assume that $F \subseteq E$ with $v(F) = k$. We define $\sigma(F)$ as the edge numbering $(n_a)$ defined by

$$n_a = p \text{ for any } a \in F, \quad n_a = 1 \text{ for } a \in E \setminus F.$$ 

In this way it is clear that $\mu(n_1) \cdots \mu(n_e) = (-1)^{\text{card}(F)}$. Also $N_r = p$ or $N_r = 1$. We will have $N_r = p$ if and only if there is some $a = \{r, s\} \in F$. So that $N_1 \cdots N_v = p^{v(F)}$ because by definition $v(F)$ is the cardinality of the union $\bigcup_{\{r, s\} \in F} \{r, s\}$.

The map $\sigma$ is invertible. For let $\sigma(F)$ be an edge numbering of squarefree numbers with $N_1 \cdots N_v = p^k$ and $n_a \in \{1, p\}$. If $\sigma(F) = (n_a)$ necessarily we will have $F = \{a \in E : n_a = p\}$. It is clear that defining $F$ in this way we will have $v(F) = k$ and $\sigma(F) = (n_a)$.

Therefore the coefficient of $x^k$ in $Q_G(x)$ coincide with the value of $f_G(p^k)$.

The proof for $f_G^+$ is the same observing that for $\sigma(F) = (n_a)$ we will have $1 = |(-1)^{\text{card}(F)}| = |\mu(n_1) \cdots \mu(n_e)|$. \qed
3 Proof of Theorem \textsuperscript{1}

We prove the theorem in the following steps:

1. We show that
   \[ g(x) = \sum_{n_1,\ldots,n_e} \mu(n_1) \cdots \mu(n_e) \prod_{r=1}^{v} \left\lfloor \frac{x}{N_r} \right\rfloor. \]

2. We show that
   \[ g(x) = x^v \sum_{n_1=1}^{\infty} \cdots \sum_{n_e=1}^{\infty} \mu(n_1) \cdots \mu(n_e) \prod_{r=1}^{v} \frac{1}{N_r} + R + O \left( x^{v-1} \log^d x \right), \]
   where
   \[ |R| \leq x^{v-1} \sum_{j=1}^{e} \sum_{n_j=1}^{\infty} \cdots \sum_{n_j=x}^{\infty} \sum_{n_{j+1}=1}^{\infty} \cdots \sum_{n_e=1}^{\infty} \mu(n_1) \cdots \mu(n_e) \prod_{r=1}^{v} \frac{1}{N_r}. \]

3. We show that \( |R| = O(x^{v-1} \log^d x) \).

We start with the following sieve result which generalises the sieve of Eratosthenes.

Lemma 4. Let \( X \) be a finite set, and let \( A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_k \subset X \). Then
   \[ \text{card} \left( X \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^{k} A_j \right) = \sum_{J \subset \{1,2,\ldots,k\}} (-1)^{\text{card}(J)} \text{card}(A_J), \]
   where \( A_\emptyset = X \), and for \( J \subset \{1,2,\ldots,k\} \) nonempty
   \[ A_J = \bigcap_{j \in J} A_j. \]

To prove Theorem \textsuperscript{1} let \( X \) be the set
   \[ X = \{(a_1,\ldots,a_v) \in \mathbb{N}^v : a_r \leq x, 1 \leq r \leq v\}. \]

Our set \( G(x) \), associated to the graph \( G \), is a subset of \( X \). Now for each prime \( p \leq x \) and each edge \( a = \{r,s\} \in G \) define the following subset of \( X \).
   \[ A_{p,a} = \{(a_1,\ldots,a_v) \in X : p|a_r, p|a_s\}. \]
Therefore the tuples in $A_{p,a}$ are not in $G(x)$. In fact it is clear that

$$G(x) = X \setminus \bigcup_{a \in E \atop p \leq x} A_{p,a},$$

where $E$ denotes the set of edges in our graph $G$. We note that we have an $A_{p,a}$ for each prime number less than or equal to $x$ and each edge $a \in E$. Denoting $P_x$ as the set of prime numbers less than or equal to $x$ and each edge $a \in E$, we can represent each $A_{p,a}$ as $A_{j}$ with $j \in P_x \times E$. We now apply Lemma 4 and obtain

$$g(x) = \sum_{J \subset P_x \times E} (-1)^{\text{card}(J)} \text{card}(A_J).$$

(2)

We compute $\text{card}(A_J)$ and then $\text{card}(J)$. For $\text{card}(A_J)$ we have

$$J = \{(p_1, e_1), \ldots, (p_m, e_m)\}, \quad A_J = \bigcap_{j=1}^m A_{p_j, e_j}.$$ 

Therefore $(a_1, \ldots, a_v) \in A_J$ is equivalent to saying that $p_j | a_{r_j}, p_j | a_{s_j}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq m$, where $e_j = \{r_j, s_j\}$. We note that if $p_{i_1}, \ldots, p_{i_\ell}$ are the primes associated in $J$ with a given edge $a = \{r, s\}$, then the product of $p_{i_1} \cdots p_{i_\ell}$ must also divide the values $a_r$ and $a_s$ associated to the vertices of $a$. Let $T_a \subset P_x$ consist of the primes $p$ such that $(p, a) \in J$. In addition we define

$$n_a = \prod_{p \in T_a} p,$$

observing that when $T_a = \emptyset$ we have $n_a = 1$. Then $(a_1, \ldots, a_v) \in A_J$ is equivalent to saying that for each $a = \{r, s\}$ appearing in $J$ we have $n_a | a_r$ and $n_a | a_s$. In this way we can define $J$ by giving a number $n_a$ for each edge $a$. We note that $n_a$ will always be squarefree, and all its prime factors will be less than or equal to $x$. We also note that $(a_1, \ldots, a_v) \in A_J$ is equivalent to saying that $n_a | a_r$ for each edge $a$ that joins vertex $r$ with another vertex.

Then for each vertex $r$, consider all the edges $a$ joining $r$ to other vertices, and denote the least common multiple of the corresponding $n_a$'s by $N_r$. So $(a_1, \ldots, a_v) \in A_J$ is equivalent to saying that $N_r | a_r$. The number of multiples of $N_r$ that are less than or equal to $x$ is $\lfloor x/N_r \rfloor$, so we can express the number...
of elements of $A_J$ as

$$\text{card}(A_J) = \prod_{r=1}^{v} \left\lfloor \frac{x}{N_r} \right\rfloor.$$  \hfill (3)

We now compute $\text{card}(J)$. This is the total number of prime factors across all the $n_j$. As mentioned before $n_j$ is squarefree, so

$$(-1)^{\text{card}(J)} = (-1)^{\sum_{j=1}^{b} \omega(n_j)} = \mu(n_1) \cdots \mu(n_e),$$  \hfill (4)

where the summations are over all squarefree $n_j$ with $P^+(n_j) \leq x$. Substituting (3) and (4) into (2) yields

$$g(x) = \sum_{n_1=1}^{\infty} \cdots \sum_{n_e=1}^{\infty} \mu(n_1) \cdots \mu(n_e) \prod_{r=1}^{v} \left\lfloor \frac{x}{N_r} \right\rfloor.$$

At first the sum extends to the $(n_1, \ldots, n_e)$ that are squarefree and have all prime factors less than or equal to $x$. But we may extend the sum to all $(n_1, \ldots, n_e)$, because if these conditions are not satisfied then the corresponding term is automatically 0. In fact we may restrict the summation to the $n_a \leq x$, because otherwise for $a = \{r, s\}$ we have $n_a \mid N_r$ and $[x/N_r] = 0$. Therefore

$$g(x) = \sum_{1 \leq n_1 \leq x} \cdots \sum_{1 \leq n_e \leq x} \mu(n_1) \cdots \mu(n_e) \prod_{r=1}^{v} \left\lfloor \frac{x}{N_r} \right\rfloor.$$

We now seek to express $g(x)$ as a multiple of $x^v$ plus a suitable error term. Observe that for all real $z_1, z_2, z_3 > 0$,

$$[z_1][z_2][z_3] = z_1z_2z_3 - z_1z_2\{z_3\} - z_1\{z_2\}[z_3] - \{z_1\}[z_2][z_3],$$

where $\{y\}$ denotes the fractional part of a number $y$. 

8
Applying a similar procedure, with 3 factors instead of 3, we get

\[
g(x) = \sum_{1 \leq n_1 \leq x} \cdots \sum_{1 \leq n_e \leq x} \mu(n_1) \cdots \mu(n_e) \prod_{r=1}^{v} \frac{x}{N_r} \\
- \sum_{1 \leq n_1 \leq x} \cdots \sum_{1 \leq n_e \leq x} \mu(n_1) \cdots \mu(n_e) \left\{ \frac{x}{N_1} \prod_{r=2}^{v} \frac{x}{N_r} \right\} \\
- \sum_{1 \leq n_1 \leq x} \cdots \sum_{1 \leq n_e \leq x} \mu(n_1) \cdots \mu(n_e) \frac{x}{N_1} \left\{ \frac{x}{N_2} \prod_{r=3}^{v} \frac{x}{N_r} \right\} \\
\vdots \\
- \sum_{1 \leq n_1 \leq x} \cdots \sum_{1 \leq n_e \leq x} \mu(n_1) \cdots \mu(n_e) \frac{x}{N_1} \cdots \frac{x}{N_{v-1}} \left\{ \frac{x}{N_v} \right\}
\]

\[
= x^v \sum_{1 \leq n_1 \leq x} \cdots \sum_{1 \leq n_e \leq x} \mu(n_1) \cdots \mu(n_e) \prod_{r=1}^{v} \frac{1}{N_r} + \sum_{k=1}^{v} R_k, \tag{5}
\]

where for 1 \( \leq k \leq v, \)

\[
R_k = - \sum_{1 \leq n_1 \leq x} \cdots \sum_{1 \leq n_e \leq x} \mu(n_1) \cdots \mu(n_e) \frac{x}{N_1} \cdots \frac{x}{N_{k-1}} \left\{ \frac{x}{N_k} \right\} \cdots \left\{ \frac{x}{N_{k+1}} \right\} \cdots \left\{ \frac{x}{N_v} \right\},
\]

with the obvious modifications for \( j = 1 \) and \( j = v. \) We then have

\[
|R_k| \leq \sum_{1 \leq n_1 \leq x} \cdots \sum_{1 \leq n_e \leq x} |\mu(n_1) \cdots \mu(n_e)| \frac{x}{N_1} \cdots \frac{x}{N_{k-1}} \frac{x}{N_k} \cdots \frac{x}{N_{k+1}} \cdots \frac{x}{N_v}
\]

\[
\leq x^{v-1} \sum_{P^+(m) \leq x} \frac{C_{G,k}(m)}{m},
\]

where

\[
C_{G,k}(m) = \sum_{m=\prod_{1 \leq r \leq v, r \neq k} N_r} |\mu(n_1) \cdots \mu(n_e)|.
\]

By similar reasoning to that of Proposition 2, the function \( C_{G,k}(m) \) can be shown to be multiplicative. The numbers \( C_{G,k}(p^\alpha) \) do not depend on \( p, \) and \( C_{G,k}(p^\alpha) = 0 \) for \( \alpha > v. \) So we have

\[
\sum_{P^+(m) \leq x} \frac{C_{G,k}(m)}{m} \leq \prod_{p \leq x} \left( 1 + \frac{C_{G,k}(p)}{p} + \frac{C_{G,k}(p^2)}{p^2} + \cdots \frac{C_{G,k}(p^v)}{p^v} \right)
\]

\[
= O(\log^{C_{G,k}(p)} x),
\]
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where \( C_{G,k}(m) \) is the number of solutions \((n_1, \ldots, n_e)\), with \( n_j \) squarefree, to
\[
\prod_{1 \leq r \leq v, r \neq k} N_r = m. \tag{6}
\]
Let \( h_k \) denote the degree of vertex \( k \). It is easy to see that for a prime \( p \) we have \( C_{G,k}(p) = h_k \). The solutions are precisely those with all \( n_j = 1 \), except one \( n_\ell = p \), where \( \ell \) should be one of the edges meeting at vertex \( k \). Therefore the maximum number of solutions occurs when \( k \) is one of the vertices of maximum degree. So if we let \( d \) be this maximum degree, then the maximum value of \( C_{G,k}(p) \) is \( d \). Therefore
\[
|R_k| = O(x^{v-1} \log^d x). \tag{7}
\]
Substituting (7) into (5) we obtain
\[
g(x) = x^v \sum_{1 \leq n_1 \leq x} \cdots \sum_{1 \leq n_e \leq x} \mu(n_1) \cdots \mu(n_e) \prod_{r=1}^{v} \frac{1}{N_r} + O(x^{v-1} \log^d x). \tag{8}
\]
We require the following lemma.

**Lemma 5.**

\[
\lim_{x \to \infty} \sum_{1 \leq n_1 \leq x} \cdots \sum_{1 \leq n_e \leq x} |\mu(n_1) \cdots \mu(n_e)| \prod_{r=1}^{v} \frac{1}{N_r} < +\infty.
\]

**Proof.** We have
\[
\lim_{x \to \infty} \sum_{1 \leq n_1 \leq x} \cdots \sum_{1 \leq n_e \leq x} |\mu(n_1) \cdots \mu(n_e)| \prod_{r=1}^{v} \frac{1}{N_r} = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{f_G^+(m)}{m}, \tag{9}
\]
where
\[
f_G^+(m) = \sum_{m=\prod_{r=1}^{v} N_r} |\mu(n_1) \cdots \mu(n_e)|.
\]
We note that \( f_G^+(m) \) is multiplicative by Proposition 2. It is clear that \( f_G^+(1) = 1 \). Also, each edge joins two vertices \( r \) and \( s \) and thus \( n_j | E_r \) and \( n_j | E_s \). This means that
\[
n_j^2 \prod_{r=1}^{v} N_r.
\]
It follows that
\[ \prod_{r=1}^{v} N_r \neq p, \]
for any prime \( p \) and so \( f_G^+(p) = 0 \). We also note that a multiple \((n_1, \ldots, n_e)\) only counts in \( f_G^+(m) \) if \(|\mu(n_1) \cdots \mu(n_e)| = 1\). Therefore each \( n_j \) is squarefree. So each factor in
\[ \prod_{r=1}^{v} N_r \tag{10} \]
brings at most a \( p \). So the greatest power of \( p \) that can divide \( (10) \) is \( p^v \). So \( f_G^+(p^\alpha) = 0 \) for \( \alpha > v \). Recall that \( f_G^+(p^\alpha) \) is equal to the coefficient of \( x^\alpha \) in \( Q_G(x) \). So, by Lemma 3 we note that \( f_G^+(p^\alpha) \) depends on \( \alpha \) but not on \( p \). Putting all this together we have
\[ \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{f_G(m)}{m} = \prod_{p \text{ prime}} \left( 1 + \frac{f_G(p^2)}{p^2} + \ldots + \frac{f_G(p^v)}{p^v} \right) < +\infty. \tag{11} \]
Substituting (11) into (9) completes the proof. \( \square \)

Returning to (8) it is now clear from Lemma 5 that
\[ \rho_G = \lim_{x \to \infty} \sum_{1 \leq n_1 \leq x} \cdots \sum_{1 \leq n_e \leq x} \mu(n_1) \cdots \mu(n_e) \prod_{r=1}^{v} \frac{1}{N_r} \]
is absolutely convergent. In fact,
\[ g(x) = x^v \rho_G + R + O(x^{v-1} \log^d x), \tag{12} \]
where
\[ \rho_G = \sum_{n_1=1}^{\infty} \cdots \sum_{n_e=1}^{\infty} \mu(n_1) \cdots \mu(n_e) \prod_{r=1}^{v} \frac{1}{N_r}, \]
and
\[ |R| \leq x^{v-1} \sum_{j=1}^{e} \sum_{n_1=1}^{\infty} \cdots \sum_{n_{j-1}=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n_{j+1}=1}^{\infty} \cdots \sum_{n_e=1}^{\infty} |\mu(n_1) \cdots \mu(n_e)| \prod_{r=1}^{v} \frac{1}{N_r}. \]
Now
\[ \rho_G = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{N_1 \ldots N_v = m} \mu(n_1) \cdots \mu(n_v) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{f_G(m)}{m}. \]

We note that \( f_G(m) \) is multiplicative by Proposition 2. In a similar way to Lemma 5 we have \( f_G(1) = 1, f_G(p) = 0 \) and \( f_G(p^\alpha) = 0 \), for all \( \alpha > v \). Thus, by the multiplicativity,
\[
\rho_G = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{f_G(m)}{m} = \prod_{p \text{ prime}} \left( 1 + \frac{f_G(p^2)}{p^2} + \ldots + \frac{f_G(p^v)}{p^v} \right).
\]

Therefore, by Lemma 3 we have
\[
\rho_G = \prod_{p \text{ prime}} Q_G \left( \frac{1}{p} \right). \tag{13}
\]

Substituting (13) into (12), it only remains to show that \(|R| = O(x^{v-1} \log^d x)\).

We have
\[
|R| \leq x^{v-1} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \sum_{n_1 = 1}^{\infty} \cdots \sum_{n_i = 1}^{\infty} \sum_{n_i > x} \sum_{n_{i+1} = 1}^{\infty} \cdots \sum_{n_v = 1}^{\infty} |\mu(n_1) \cdots \mu(n_v)| \prod_{r=1}^{v} \frac{1}{N_r}.
\]

All terms in the sum on \( j \) are analogous; so assuming that the first is the largest, we have
\[
|R| \leq C_1 x^{v-1} \sum_{n_1 > x} \sum_{n_2 = 1}^{\infty} \sum_{n_3 = 1}^{\infty} \cdots \sum_{n_v = 1}^{\infty} |\mu(n_1) \cdots \mu(n_v)| \prod_{r=1}^{v} \frac{1}{N_r},
\]
where \( C_1 \) is a function of \( e \) and not \( x \). So it will suffice to show that
\[
R_1 := \sum_{n_1 > x} \sum_{n_2 = 1}^{\infty} \cdots \sum_{n_v = 1}^{\infty} |\mu(n_1) \cdots \mu(n_v)| \prod_{r=1}^{v} \frac{1}{N_r} = O(\log^d x). \tag{14}
\]

We will treat an edge \( e_1 = \{r,s\} \) differently to the other edges. For a given \((n_1, \ldots, n_v)\) of squarefree numbers we have two special \( N_r \),
\[
N_r = [n_1, n_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, n_{\alpha_k}], \quad N_s = [n_1, n_{\beta_1}, \ldots, n_{\beta_k}].
\]

We also remark that we may have \( N_r = [n_1] \) or \( N_s = [n_1] \).
For any edge $e_j$ with $2 \leq j \leq e$ we define $d_j = \gcd(n_1, n_j)$. Since the $n_j$ are squarefree, we have

$$n_j = d_j n_j', \quad d_j | n_1, \quad \gcd(n_1, n_j') = 1.$$  

Then it is clear that

$$N_r = [n_1, d_{\alpha_1} n'_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, d_{\alpha_k} n'_{\alpha_k}] = n_1 [n'_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, n'_{\alpha_k}], \quad N_s = n_1 [n'_{\beta_1}, \ldots, n'_{\beta_l}].$$

For any other vertex with $t \neq r$ and $t \neq s$, we have

$$N_t = [n_{t_1}, \ldots, n_{t_m}] = [d_{t_1}, n_{t_1}', \ldots, d_{t_m} n_{t_m}'] = [d_{t_1}, \ldots, d_{t_m}] [n'_{t_1}, \ldots, n'_{t_m}],$$

where $m$ will vary with $t$. Substituting the equations for $N_r$, $N_s$ and $N_t$ into the definition of $R_1$ in (14) we obtain

$$R_1 = \sum_{n_1 > x} \sum_{n_2 = 1}^{\infty} \cdots \sum_{n_e = 1}^{\infty} |\mu(n_1) \cdots \mu(n_e)| \frac{1}{N_r N_s} \prod_{1 \leq t \leq v \atop t \neq r, t \neq s} \frac{1}{N_t}$$

$$= \sum_{n_1 > x} \frac{|\mu(n_1)|}{n_1^2} \sum_{d_2 | n_1} \cdots \sum_{d_e | n_1} \prod_{1 \leq t \leq v \atop t \neq r, t \neq s} \frac{1}{[d_{t_1}, \ldots, d_{t_m}]}$$

$$\times \prod_{n_2 = 1}^{\infty} \cdots \sum_{n_e = 1}^{\infty} \frac{|\mu(d_2 n_2') \cdots \mu(d_e n_e')|}{[n'_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, n'_{\alpha_k}] [n'_{\beta_1}, \ldots, n'_{\beta_l}]} \prod_{1 \leq t \leq v \atop t \neq r, t \neq s} \frac{1}{[n'_{t_1}, \ldots, n'_{t_m}]}$$

$$\leq \sum_{n_1 > x} \frac{|\mu(n_1)|}{n_1^2} \sum_{d_2 | n_1} \cdots \sum_{d_e | n_1} |\mu(d_2) \cdots \mu(d_e)| \prod_{1 \leq t \leq v \atop t \neq r, t \neq s} \frac{1}{[d_{t_1}, \ldots, d_{t_m}]}$$

$$\times \prod_{n_2 = 1}^{\infty} \cdots \sum_{n_e = 1}^{\infty} \frac{|\mu(n_2') \cdots \mu(n_e')|}{[n'_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, n'_{\alpha_k}] [n'_{\beta_1}, \ldots, n'_{\beta_l}]} \prod_{1 \leq t \leq v \atop t \neq r, t \neq s} \frac{1}{[n'_{t_1}, \ldots, n'_{t_m}]}.$$
The product
\[
\sum_{n_2' = 1}^{\infty} \cdots \sum_{n_v' = 1}^{\infty} \frac{|\mu(n_2') \cdots \mu(n_v')|}{[n'_{\alpha_1}, \ldots, n'_{\alpha_k}][n'_{\beta_1}, \ldots, n'_{\beta_l}]} \prod_{1 \leq t \leq v \atop t \neq r, t \neq s} \frac{1}{n'_{t_1}, \ldots, n'_{t_m}}
\]
is finite by Lemma 5 (but this time considering the graph \(G\) without the edge \(\{r, s\}\)). Thus, for some constant \(C_1\), we have
\[
R_1 \leq C_2 \sum_{n_1 > x} \frac{|\mu(n_1)|}{n_1^2} \sum_{d_2 | n_1} \cdots \sum_{d_v | n_1} |\mu(d_2) \cdots \mu(d_v)| \prod_{1 \leq t \leq v \atop t \neq r, t \neq s} \frac{1}{[d_{t_1}, \ldots, d_{t_m}]}
= C_2 \sum_{n_1 > x} \frac{|\mu(n_1)|}{n_1^2} f_{G,e}(n_1),
\]
(15)
where the arithmetic function \(f_{G,e}\) is defined as follows.

\[
f_{G,e}(n) = \sum_{d_2 | n} \cdots \sum_{d_v | n} |\mu(d_2) \cdots \mu(d_v)| \prod_{1 \leq t \leq v \atop t \neq r, t \neq s} \frac{1}{[d_{t_1}, \ldots, d_{t_m}]}.
\]

We note that there is a factor \([d_{t_1}, \ldots, d_{t_m}]\) for each vertex other than \(r\) or \(s\). The function \(f_{G,e}\) is a multiplicative function. We have \(f_{G,e}(p^k) = f_{G,e}(p)\) for any power of a prime \(p\) with \(k \geq 2\), because in the definition of \(f_{G,e}(p^k)\) only the divisors 1 and \(p\) of \(p^k\) give non null terms. When \(n = p\) we have
\[
f_{G,e}(p) = 1 + \frac{A_1}{p} + \cdots + \frac{A_{v-2}}{p^{v-2}},
\]
where \(A_i\) is the number of ways that
\[
\prod_{1 \leq t \leq v \atop t \neq r, t \neq s} |\mu(d_2) \cdots \mu(d_v)|[d_{t_1}, \ldots, d_{t_m}] = p^i,
\]
where every divisor in the product \(d_h \mid n = p\) can only be 1 or \(p\). Clearly \(A_i \leq 2^{e-1}\) do not depend on \(p\), and so there must be a number \(w\), independent of \(p\), such that
\[
f_{G,e}(p^k) = f_{G,e}(p) \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right)^w.
\]
Since $f_{G,e}$ is multiplicative we have, for any squarefree $n$,

$$f_{G,e}(n) \leq \prod_{p|n} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right)^w = \left(\frac{\sigma(n)}{n}\right)^w, \quad |\mu(n)| = 1. \quad (16)$$

Substituting (16) into (15) yields

$$R_1 \leq C_2 \sum_{n>x}^{\infty} \frac{|\mu(n)|}{n^2} \left(\frac{\sigma(n)}{n}\right)^w \leq C_2 \sum_{n>x}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} \left(\frac{\sigma(n)}{n}\right)^w.$$

It is well known that $\sigma(n) = O(n \log \log n)$ (see, for example, [3]), and thus

$$R_1 = O\left(\frac{(\log \log x)^w}{x}\right). \quad (17)$$

Comparing (17) with (14) completes the proof of Theorem 1.
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