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Introduction. In 1984 H. Delange ([2]) proved the following result:
Theorem 1. Let $f$ be an arithmetical function and $f^{\prime}=f * \mu$. Let $q$ be any positive integer. Suppose that:
(i) $\sum_{n \leq x}|f(n)|=O(x)$.
(ii) For each positive integer $d$ dividing $q$, the limit

$$
m_{d}=\lim _{x \rightarrow+\infty} \frac{1}{x} \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\(n, q)=d}} f(n)
$$

exists. Then the series

$$
\sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ n \equiv 0(q)}}^{\infty} \frac{f^{\prime}(n)}{n}
$$

converges and its sum is

$$
\frac{1}{\varphi(q)} \lim _{x \rightarrow+\infty} \frac{1}{x} \sum_{n \leq x} f(n) c_{q}(n)
$$

where $c_{q}(n)$ is the Ramanujan sum

$$
\sum_{\substack{h=1 \\(h, q)=1}}^{q} e(h n / q)
$$

In this note we prove (see Theorem 2 below) a simple result about the existence of the mean value for certain convolutions. This result gives
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[^0]immediately (under the hypotheses of Theorem 1) the equality
\[

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ n \equiv 0(q)}}^{\infty} \frac{f^{\prime}(n)}{n}=\sum_{d q^{\prime}=q} \frac{\mu\left(q^{\prime}\right)}{\varphi\left(q^{\prime}\right)} m_{d} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

\]

which is the main step in Delange's proof of Theorem 1 (see [2] p. 34, first formula).

As for the other equality of Theorem 1, namely

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ n \equiv 0(q)}}^{\infty} \frac{f^{\prime}(n)}{n}=\frac{1}{\varphi(q)} \lim _{x \rightarrow+\infty} \frac{1}{x} \sum_{n \leq x} f(n) c_{q}(n) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

it can be checked directly as in the paragraphs 3.6.1 and 3.6.2. of [2], but it should be noted that this is always the case, in the sense that when both sides of (2) exist for every $q$ then they must also be equal. This is implied by theorem 3 below. To be precise the results we prove are the following.

Theorem 2. Let $g:[1,+\infty) \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ be a function of bounded variation on finite intervals and let us suppose that:
(i) There is a number $\alpha>1$ such that $g(x)=O\left(x / \lg ^{\alpha} x\right)$
(ii) There is a number $0<\beta<1$ such that $V_{g}\left(x^{\beta}\right)=o(x)$, where $V_{g}(y)$ is the total variation of $g$ in the interval $[1, y]$.
Let $f(n)$ be a sequence of real numbers such that
(iii) $\sum_{n \leq x}|f(n)|=O(x)$ and $\lim _{x \rightarrow+\infty} 1 / x \sum_{n \leq x} f(n)=m$ exists.

Then we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{x \rightarrow+\infty} \frac{h(x)}{x}=m \int_{1}^{+\infty}(g(x)) x^{-2} d x \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $h(x)=\sum_{n \leq x} f(n) g(x / n)$.
Theorem 3. Suppose that, for all d dividing $q$, the series

$$
\sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ n \equiv 0(d)}}^{\infty} \frac{f^{\prime}(n)}{n}
$$

converges, and that the series

$$
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{f(n) c_{q}(n)}{n^{s}}
$$

converges for Res $=\sigma>1$. Then, for Res $=\sigma>1$, we have
(4)

$$
\begin{aligned}
F_{q}(s) & =\frac{1}{\zeta(s)} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{f(n) c_{q}(n)}{n^{s}} \\
& =\sum_{\delta \mid q} \frac{1}{\sigma^{2}}\left(\sum_{d^{\prime} \mid \delta} d^{\prime} \mu\left(\frac{q}{d^{\prime}}\right)\right)\left(\sum_{d * \mid q / \delta} \frac{\mu\left(d^{*}\right)}{d^{* s}}\right)\left(\sum_{\gamma \mid \delta} \gamma^{s}\left(\sum_{\substack{d=1 \\
(d, q)=\gamma}}^{\infty} \frac{f^{\prime}(d)}{d^{s}}\right)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

from which it follows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{\sigma \rightarrow 1^{+}} F_{q}(\sigma)=\varphi(q) \sum_{\substack{d=1 \\ d \equiv 0(q)}}^{\infty} \frac{f^{\prime}(d)}{d} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

This implies equality (2) if both sides exist for every $q \geq 1$.
Before proving Theorems 2 and 3 we want to show how equality (1) can be obtained from Theorem 2.

Under the hypothesis of Theorem 1 let

$$
H_{q}(x)=\sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \equiv 0(q)}} \frac{f^{\prime}(n)}{n}
$$

A simple calculation gives

$$
\begin{align*}
H_{q}(x) & =\sum_{d \leq x} \frac{f(d)}{d}\left(\sum_{\substack{n \leq x / d \\
n \equiv 0(q /(q, d))}} \frac{\mu(n)}{n}\right)  \tag{6}\\
& =\sum_{\delta \mid q}\left(\frac{1}{x} \sum_{\substack{d \leq x \\
(d, q)=\delta}} f(d) \frac{x}{d}\left(\sum_{\substack{n \leq x / d \\
n \equiv 0(q / \delta)}} \frac{\mu(n)}{n}\right)\right)=\sum_{\delta \mid q} \sum_{\delta}(x)
\end{align*}
$$

If we remember the estimate

$$
\begin{equation*}
M_{q / \delta}(x)=\sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \equiv 0(q / \delta)}} \frac{\mu(n)}{n}=O\left(\frac{1}{\lg ^{\alpha} x}\right) \text { with } \alpha>1 \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

we see that we can apply Theorem 2 to each term of the sum in (6) and
obtain
(8) $\lim _{x \rightarrow+\infty} H_{q}(x)=\sum_{\delta \mid q} \lim _{x \rightarrow+\infty} \sum_{\delta}(x)=\sum_{\delta \mid q} m_{\delta} \int_{1}^{+\infty}\left(M_{q / \delta}(x)\right) x^{-1} d x$

This proves (1) since

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{1}^{+\infty}\left(M_{q / \delta}(x)\right) x^{-1} d x=\frac{\mu(q / \delta)}{\varphi(q / \delta)} \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

In order to justify (7) and (9) we remember that if $\chi_{0}$ is the principal character $\bmod q$ we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(n) \chi_{0}(n)}{n^{s}}=\frac{1}{L\left(s, \chi_{0}\right)}=\frac{1}{\zeta(s)} \prod_{p \mid q}\left(1-p^{-s}\right)^{-1} \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

From (10) we obtain, by standard techniques, the estimate

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\(n, q)=1}} \frac{\mu(n)}{n}=\sum_{n \leq x} \frac{\mu(n) \chi_{0}(n)}{n}=O\left(\frac{1}{\lg ^{\alpha} x}\right), \quad \alpha>1 \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

which gives (7) with $q / \delta$ replaced by $q$, since

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \equiv 0(q)}} \frac{\mu(n)}{n}=\frac{\mu(q)}{q} \sum_{\substack{n \leq x / q \\(n, q)=1}} \frac{\mu(n)}{n} \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

From (11) we see, by partial summation, that the series

$$
\sum_{\substack{n=1 \\(n, q)=1}}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(n) \lg n}{n}
$$

is convergent, and if we differentiate both sides of (10) and take the limit for $\sigma \rightarrow 1^{+}$we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{\substack{n=1 \\(n, q)=1}}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(n) \lg n}{n}=-\frac{q}{\varphi(q)} \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

This gives (9), with $q / \delta$ replaced by $q$, again by partial summation.
Let us now prove Theorems 2 and 3.

Proof of Theorem 2. We have

$$
\begin{equation*}
h(x)=\sum_{n \leq x}(f(n)-m) g\left(\frac{x}{n}\right)+m \sum_{n \leq x} g\left(\frac{x}{n}\right)=\sum_{1}(x)+\sum_{2}(x) \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Because of hypotheses (i) and (iii) of Theorem 2, a variant of Axer's theorem (see for example, [1], p. 127, problem 52) implies that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{1}(x)=o(x) \quad \text { as } x \rightarrow+\infty \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

so that we can write

$$
\begin{equation*}
h(x)=m \sum_{x^{1-\beta}<n \leq x} g\left(\frac{x}{n}\right)+o(x) \quad \text { as } x \rightarrow+\infty . \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now we use Euler's summation formula with Stieltjes integral. If $F(t)$ is a function of bounded variation on the interval $[n, n+1]$ where $n$ is a positive integer, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{n}^{n+1}\left(t-n-\frac{1}{2}\right) d F(t)=\frac{1}{2}(F(n+1)+F(n))-\int_{n}^{n+1} F(t) d t \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

Summing over $n$ we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{n=m}^{N} F(n)=\int_{m}^{N} F(t) d t+\frac{1}{2}(F(m)+F(N))+O\left(V_{F_{[m, N]}}\right) \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $V_{F_{[m, N]}}$ is the total variation of $F$ in the interval [ $m, N$ ]. If we choose $F(t)=g(x / t), m=\left[x^{1-\beta}\right]+1, N=[x]$ and put $x / t=u$ in the integral in (18) we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{x^{1-\beta}<n \leq x} g\left(\frac{x}{n}\right)=x \int_{1}^{x^{\beta}}(g(u)) u^{-2} d u+o(x) \quad \text { as } x \rightarrow+\infty \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

because of hypotheses (i) and (ii). Equation (3) follows from (16) and (19), and this proves Theorem 2.

Proof of Theorem 3. For the proof of (4) we may suppose Res $>2$, for the hypotheses imply that both sides exist for Res $>1$ and are analytic functions of $s$ in this half-plane.

Since the Dirichlet series

$$
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{f(n) c_{q}(n)}{n^{s}}
$$

is convergent for Res $>1$ it is absolutely convergent for Res $>2$. This permits to write for Res $>2$

$$
\begin{align*}
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{f(n) c_{q}(n)}{n^{s}} & =\sum_{\delta \mid q}\left(\sum_{\substack{n=1 \\
(n, q)=\delta}}^{\infty} \frac{f(n) c_{q}(n)}{n^{s}}\right)  \tag{20}\\
& =\sum_{\delta \mid q}\left(\sum_{d^{\prime} \mid \delta} d^{\prime} \mu\left(\frac{q}{d^{\prime}}\right)\right) \sum_{\substack{n=1 \\
(n, q)=\delta}}^{\infty} \frac{f(n)}{n^{s}}
\end{align*}
$$

Now

$$
\begin{align*}
\sum_{\substack{n=1 \\
(n, q)=\delta}}^{\infty} \frac{f(n)}{n^{s}} & =\sum_{\substack{n=1 \\
(n, q)=\delta}}^{\infty}\left(\frac{1}{n^{s}} \sum_{d \mid n} f^{\prime}(d)\right)  \tag{21}\\
& =\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} f^{\prime}(d)\left(\sum_{\substack{n=1 \\
(n, q)=\delta \\
n \equiv 0(d)}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^{s}}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

Here the change of the order of summations is justified by the fact that the series $\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} f^{\prime}(d) d^{-s}$ is absolutely convergent for Res $>2$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{\substack{d \geq 1 \\ n \geq 1 \\ n, q=\delta \\ n \equiv 0(d)}}\left|\frac{f^{\prime}(d)}{n^{s}}\right|=\sum_{\substack{d \geq 1 \\ m \geq 1 \\(m d, q)=\delta}}\left|\frac{f^{\prime}(d)}{m^{s} d^{s}}\right| \leq \zeta(\sigma) \sum_{d=1}^{\infty}\left|\frac{f^{\prime}(d)}{d^{s}}\right| \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is not difficult to see that

$$
\sum_{\substack{n=1  \tag{23}\\(n, q)=\delta \\ n \equiv 0(d)}} \frac{1}{n^{s}}= \begin{cases}0 & \text { if }(d, q)+\delta, \\ \zeta(s) \sum_{\substack{d^{*} \mid q / \delta}} \mu\left(d^{*}\right)\left(\frac{(d, q)}{d d^{*} \delta}\right)^{s} & \text { if }(d, q) \mid \delta\end{cases}
$$

This gives
(24)

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} f^{\prime}(d)\left(\sum_{\substack{n=1 \\
(n, q)=\delta \\
n \equiv 0(d)}}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^{s}}\right) & =\zeta(s) \sum_{\substack{d=1 \\
(d, q) \mid \delta}}^{\infty} f^{\prime}(d)\left(\sum_{d^{*} \mid q / \delta} \mu\left(d^{*}\right)\left(\frac{(d, q)}{d d^{*} \delta}\right)^{s}\right) \\
& =\frac{\zeta(s)}{\delta^{s}} \sum_{d * \mid q / \delta} \frac{\mu\left(d^{*}\right)}{d^{* s}}\left(\sum_{\substack{d=1 \\
(d, q) \mid \delta}}^{\infty} \frac{f^{\prime}(d)(d, q)^{s}}{d^{s}}\right) \\
& =\frac{\zeta(s)}{\delta^{s}}\left(\sum_{d * \mid q / \delta} \frac{\mu\left(d^{*}\right) s 26}{d^{* s}}\right)\left(\sum_{\gamma \mid \delta} \gamma^{s}\left(\sum_{\substack{d=1 \\
(d, q)=\gamma}}^{\infty} \frac{f^{\prime}(d)}{d^{s}}\right)\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

and the announced result follows from (20), (21) and (24). To prove (5) we first note that
(25)

$$
\lim _{\sigma \rightarrow 1^{+}} F_{q}(\sigma)=\sum_{\delta \mid q}\left(\sum_{d^{\prime} \mid \delta} \mu\left(\frac{q}{d^{\prime}}\right) \frac{d^{\prime}}{\delta}\right)\left(\sum_{d^{*} \mid q / \delta} \frac{\mu\left(d^{*}\right)}{d^{*}}\right)\left(\sum_{\gamma \mid \delta} \gamma\left(\sum_{\substack{d=1 \\(d, q)=\gamma}}^{\infty} \frac{f^{\prime}(d)}{d}\right)\right)
$$

since the hypothesis

$$
\sum_{\substack{n=1 \\ n \equiv 0(d)}}^{\infty} \frac{f^{\prime}(n)}{n}
$$

convergent for every $d$ dividing $q$ implies

$$
\sum_{\substack{d=1 \\(d, q)=\gamma}}^{\infty} \frac{f^{\prime}(d)}{d}
$$

convergent for every $\gamma$ dividing $q$. Now we observe that
(26) $\left(\sum_{d^{\prime} \mid \delta} \mu\left(q / d^{\prime}\right) \frac{d^{\prime}}{\delta}\right)\left(\sum_{d^{*} \mid q / \delta} \frac{\mu\left(d^{*}\right)}{d^{*}}\right)=\mu\left(\frac{q}{\delta}\right)\left(\sum_{\substack{d^{\prime} \mid \delta \\\left(d^{\prime}, q / \delta\right)=1}} \frac{\mu\left(d^{\prime}\right)}{d^{\prime}}\right)$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \times\left(\sum_{d^{*}(q / \delta)} \frac{\mu\left(d^{*}\right)}{d^{*}}\right) \\
= & \mu\left(\frac{q}{\delta}\right) \varphi(q) \frac{1}{q}
\end{aligned}
$$

where the last equality in (26) is justified since every square-free divisor $d$ of $q$ admits a unique representation as $d=d^{\prime} d^{*}$ with $d^{*}\left|q / \delta, d^{\prime}\right| \delta$ and $\left(d^{\prime}, q / \delta\right)=1$.

Equation (5) follows immediately from (25) and (26) by the Möbius inversion formula.

If the limit

$$
\lim _{x \rightarrow+\infty} \frac{1}{x} \sum_{n \leq x} f(n) c_{q}(n)=l(q)
$$

exists we must also have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{\sigma \rightarrow 1^{+}} F_{q}(\sigma)=l(q) \tag{27}
\end{equation*}
$$

This proves that when both sides of equation (2) exist for every $q$ they must be equal. This concludes the proof of Theorem 3. It should be noted that the existence of one side of equation (2) does not, in general, imply the existence of the other one. In fact, for the case $q=1$ for example, since

$$
\frac{1}{x} \sum_{n \leq x} f(n)=\sum_{d \leq x} \frac{f^{\prime}(d)}{d}\left[\frac{x}{d}\right] \frac{d}{x}
$$

this is equivalent to saying that there exist Ingham-summable series which are not convergent and vice versa, and this is well known (see for example, [4], p. 376; [6], p. 10-13; [3], p. 98; [5], p. 180).

The author wishes to thank the referee for his very valuable suggestions.
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