

## INFINITE BRANCHES OF THE PHI-TREE

ELIOT T. JACOBSON AND ALAN E. PARKS

*Department of Mathematics, Ohio University, Athens, OH 45701*

Let  $\phi$  denote Euler's totient function. We make the set  $\mathcal{J}$  of integers greater than 1 into the vertices of a directed graph, connecting  $x \in \mathcal{J}$  with an arrow "pointing down to"  $\phi(x)$ . For  $x \in \mathcal{J}$  with  $x \geq 3$ , the sequence  $x, \phi(x), \phi^2(x), \dots$  eventually reaches 2, hence 2 is the unique minimal element of  $\mathcal{J}$ . Thus,  $\mathcal{J}$  is a tree under this structure, the *Phi-tree*. This idea is due to H. Shapiro [1].

For  $x, y \in \mathcal{J}$ , we say that  $y$  is *above*  $x$  if there is a directed path from  $y$  to  $x$  (of course,  $y$  is above  $x$  if  $\phi^k(y) = x$  for some positive integer  $k$ ). Although the *Phi-tree* is easily constructed,

one may appreciate the difficulty of predicting for given  $x$  which  $y$  lie above it by trying to find the 77 elements above  $x = 40$ , for example. Surprisingly, it is easy to determine which  $x$  have infinitely many elements of  $\mathcal{J}$  above them, given our main theorem.

An even integer of the form  $2^e 3^f$  will be called a 2,3-number.

**THEOREM.** *The integer  $x \geq 2$  has infinitely many elements of the Phi-tree above it if and only if  $x$  is a 2,3-number.*

We will give the proof in a sequence of lemmas, beginning with the observations for positive integers  $e, f$  that  $\phi(2^e 3^f) = 2^e \cdot 3^{f-1}$  and that  $\phi(2^e) = 2^{e-1}$ . From this the following is clear.

**LEMMA 1.** *If  $x$  is a 2,3-number, then there are infinitely many elements of the Phi-tree above  $x$ . Furthermore, every element below  $x$  is a 2,3-number.*

Of course we have just established one direction of the theorem.

For an integer  $y$  define  $\nu(y)$  to be the exponent of 2 in the prime factorization of  $y$ . The idea of the rest of the proof is to keep track of the sequence  $\nu(y), \nu(\phi(y)), \nu(\phi^2(y)), \dots$ .

**LEMMA 2.** *Let  $y \in \mathcal{J}$  not be a power of 2. Then  $\nu(y) \leq \nu(\phi(y))$  with equality implying that  $y = 2^e p^f$ , where  $e, f$  are positive integers and  $p$  is a prime with  $p \equiv 3(4)$ . If, in addition,  $\nu(y) = \nu(\phi^2(y))$ , and  $y$  is not a 2,3-number, then  $f = 1$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $p$  be an odd prime divisor of  $y$  and write  $y = 2^e p^f m$ , where  $p \nmid m$  and  $e = \nu(y)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(\phi(y)) &= \nu(\phi(2^e) p^{f-1} (p-1)\phi(m)) = \nu\left(\phi(2^e) p^{f-1} \cdot 2 \frac{p-1}{2} \cdot \phi(m)\right) \\ &= \nu(\phi(2^e)) + 1 + \nu\left(\frac{p-1}{2}\right) + \nu(\phi(m)). \end{aligned}$$

But  $\nu(\phi(2^e)) \geq e - 1$  with equality provided  $e \geq 1$ . Thus

$$\nu(\phi(y)) \geq e - 1 + 1 = \nu(y)$$

as claimed. If  $\nu(\phi(y)) = \nu(y)$  then  $\nu(\phi(2^e)) = e - 1$ , so that  $e \geq 1$ . Also  $\nu\left(\frac{p-1}{2}\right) = 0$ , so that  $p \equiv 3(4)$ , and finally  $\nu(\phi(m)) = 0$  so that  $m = 1$ , since  $m$  is odd. This completes the proof of the first assertion.

For the second assertion, assume that  $y = 2^e p^f$ , where  $p$  is a prime with  $p \equiv 3(4)$ . If  $y$  is not a 2,3-number, then  $p \equiv 3(4)$  implies  $p \geq 7$  and so  $(p-1)/2 \geq 3$ , whence  $2 \mid \phi\left(\frac{p-1}{2}\right)$ . But also  $(p-1)/2$  is odd, and so in the calculation

$$\phi(y) = 2^e \cdot p^{f-1} \cdot \left(\frac{p-1}{2}\right),$$

the factors  $2^e$ ,  $p^{f-1}$ , and  $(p-1)/2$  are pairwise coprime. Thus

$$\phi^2(y) = \phi(2^e) \phi(p^{f-1}) \phi\left(\frac{p-1}{2}\right)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(\phi^2(y)) &= e - 1 + \nu(\phi(p^{f-1})) + \nu\left(\phi\left(\frac{p-1}{2}\right)\right) \\ &\geq e - 1 + \nu(\phi(p^{f-1})) + 1 \geq \nu(y) + \nu(\phi(p^{f-1})). \end{aligned}$$

If now  $\nu(\phi^2(y)) = \nu(y)$ , then we must have  $\nu(\phi(p^{f-1})) = 0$ , whence  $f = 1$ .

The next result, which is fairly well known, we include for the sake of completeness.

LEMMA 3. For  $x \in \mathcal{J}$  the set  $\{y | \phi(y) = x\}$  is finite.

*Proof.* If  $\phi(y) = x$  and if  $p^e$  is a prime power divisor of  $y$ , then  $p^{e-1}(p-1)$  divides  $x$ . It follows that  $p \leq x+1$  and that

$$e \leq \log_p(x) + 1 \leq \log_2(x) + 1.$$

A rather crude bound

$$y \leq [(x+1)!]^{\log_2(x)+1}$$

follows, and the lemma is thereby proved.

LEMMA 4. Let  $x \in \mathcal{J}$  have infinitely many elements of the Phi-tree above it. Then there is an infinite sequence  $a_n$  of integers with  $a_1 = x$  and  $\phi(a_i) = a_{i-1}$  for all  $i \geq 2$ .

*Proof.* Elementary graph theory: Assume for  $n \geq 1$  that  $a_1 = x, a_2, \dots, a_n$  have been constructed with  $\phi(a_i) = a_{i-1}$  for  $i \geq 2$  and with  $a_n$  having infinitely many elements of the Phi-tree above it. By Lemma 3 the set  $\{y | \phi(y) = a_n\}$  is finite, and so some such  $y$  has infinitely many elements above it. Put  $a_{n+1} = y$ . Continuing in this way we obtain our sequence.

LEMMA 5. Let  $x \in \mathcal{J}$  have infinitely many elements above it. Then  $x$  is a 2,3-number.

*Proof.* Given such  $x$ , construct a sequence  $a_n$  as in Lemma 4. If  $x$  is not a 2,3-number, then by Lemma 1, none of the  $a_n$  is a 2,3-number. By Lemma 2

$$\nu(a_1) \geq \nu(a_2) \geq \dots$$

Thus there is some  $n \geq 1$  for which

$$\nu(a_n) = \nu(a_{n+k}) \quad \text{for all } k \geq 0.$$

For  $k \geq 2$ , we have

$$\nu(a_{n+k}) = \nu(a_{n+k-2}) = \nu(\phi^2(a_{n+k})),$$

and so by Lemma 2,

$$a_{n+k} = 2^{e_k} p_k \quad \text{for } k \geq 2,$$

where  $e_k \geq 1$  and  $p_k$  is a prime with  $p_k \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ . Now

$$2^{e_k-1} p_{k-1} = a_{n+k-1} = \phi(a_{n+k}) = 2^{e_k} \frac{p_k - 1}{2},$$

from which we conclude that

$$\frac{p_k - 1}{2} = p_{k-1}.$$

Thus,  $p_k = 2p_{k-1} + 1$ , and it follows from induction that

$$(1) \quad p_k = 2^{k-2}(p_2 + 1) - 1 \quad \text{for } k \geq 2.$$

Since the  $p_k$  are odd primes, put  $k = p_2 + 1$  in (1) so that

$$p_k = 2^{p_2-1}(p_2 + 1) - 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{p_2},$$

so then  $p_k = p_2$ , a clear contradiction to (1). This completes the proof of the lemma and the theorem.

#### Reference

1. H. Shapiro, An arithmetic function arising from the  $\phi$  function, this MONTHLY, 50 (1943) 18-30.