

NOTE ON EULER'S  $\varphi$ -FUNCTION

BY R. D. CARMICHAEL

Two correspondents have recently called my attention to the fact that the supposed proof of the following theorem, which I gave some years ago,\* is not adequate:

**THEOREM I.** *For a given number  $n$ , the equation  $\varphi(x) = n$  either has no solution or it has at least two solutions.*

So far I have been unable to supply a proof of the theorem, though it seems probable that it is correct. I am therefore compelled to allow it to stand in the status of a conjectured or empirical theorem.

Let us examine the hypothesis that there exists a value  $\nu$  of  $n$  such that  $\varphi(x) = \nu$  has one and just one solution. It is easy to derive certain necessary properties of  $x$ . In the first place,  $x$  is even, since otherwise  $2x$  would also be such that  $\varphi(2x) = \nu$ . Again,  $x$  is divisible by 4, since otherwise  $\varphi(x/2)$  would be equal to  $\nu$ . Let us then denote the value of  $x$  by  $4s$ . We shall prove the following theorem.

**THEOREM II.** *If  $4s$  has the factor  $p_0^{\alpha_0} p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \dots p_k^{\alpha_k}$ , where  $p_0 (= 2)$ ,  $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_k$  are distinct prime numbers, and if the quotient of  $4s$  by this factor is prime to the factor, and if  $p_0^{\gamma_0} p_1^{\gamma_1} \dots p_k^{\gamma_k} + 1$  is a prime number  $q$ , where for a given  $i$ ,  $0 < \gamma_i < \alpha_i$ , then  $4s$  has the factor  $q^2$ .*

The proof is almost immediate. For we have

$$\varphi(2^{\alpha_0} p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \dots p_k^{\alpha_k}) = \varphi(2^{\alpha_0 - \gamma_0} p_1^{\alpha_1 - \gamma_1} p_2^{\alpha_2 - \gamma_2} \dots p_k^{\alpha_k - \gamma_k} q),$$

so that we should have two solutions of the equation  $\varphi(4s) = \nu$  unless  $s$  contains the factor  $q$ . Similarly, it may be shown that  $s$  contains the factor  $q^2$ , since otherwise the first power of  $q$  could be omitted by appropriately raising certain (or all)

---

\* This BULLETIN, vol. 13 (1907), p. 241. The theorem is also stated as an exercise in my *Theory of Numbers*, p. 36; it was its presence here that led each correspondent to the discovery of the error.