

SOME LINEAR EQUATIONS INVOLVING A
FUNCTION IN THE NUMBER THEORY

We have constructed a function η which associates to each non-null integer m the smallest positive n such that $n!$ is a multiple of m .

(a) Solve the equation $\eta(x) = n$, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

*(b) Solve the equation $\eta(mx) = x$, where $m \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Discussion.

(c) Let $\eta^{(i)}$ note $\eta \circ \eta \circ \dots \circ \eta$ of i times. Prove that there is a k for which

$$\eta^{(k)}(m) = \eta^{(k+1)}(m) = n_m, \text{ for all } m \in \mathbb{Z}^* \setminus \{1\}.$$

**Find n_m and the smallest k with this property.

Solution

(a) The cases $n = 0, 1$ are trivial.

We note the increasing sequence of primes less or equal than n by p_1, p_2, \dots, p_k , and

$$\beta_t = \sum_{h \geq 1} [n/p_t^h], \quad t = 1, 2, \dots, k;$$

where $[y]$ is the greatest integer less or equal than y .

Let $n = p_{i_1}^{\alpha_{i_1}} \dots p_{i_s}^{\alpha_{i_s}}$, where all p_{i_j} are distinct primes and all α_{i_j} are from \mathbb{N} .

Of course we have $n \leq x \leq n!$

Thus $x = p_1^{\sigma_1} \dots p_k^{\sigma_k}$ where $0 \leq \sigma_t \leq \beta_t$ for all $t = 1, 2, \dots, k$ and there exists at least a $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$ for which

$$\sigma_{i_j} \in \{\beta_{i_j} - \beta_{i_j}^{-1}, \dots, \beta_{i_j} - \alpha_{i_j} + 1\}.$$

Clearly $n!$ is a multiple of x , and is the smallest one.

(b) See [1] too. We consider $m \in \mathbb{N}^*$.

Lemma 1. $\eta(m) \leq m$, and $\eta(m) = m$ if and only if $m = 4$ or m is a prime.

Of course $m!$ is a multiple of m .

If $m \neq 4$ and m is not a prime, the Lemma is equivalent to there are m_1, m_2 such that $m = m_1 \cdot m_2$ with $1 < m_1 \leq m_2$ and $(2m_2 < m \text{ or } 2m_1 < m)$. Whence $\eta(m) \leq 2m_2 < m$, respectively $\eta(m) \leq \max\{m_2, 2m_1\} < m$.

Lemma 2. Let p be a prime ≥ 5 . Then $\eta(px) = x$ if and only if x is a prime $> p$, or $x = 2p$.

Proof: $\eta(p) = p$. Hence $x > p$.

Analogously: x is not a prime and $x = 2p = x_1 x_2$, $1 < x_1 \leq x_2$ and $(2x_2 < x_1, x_2 = p_1, \text{ and } 2x_1 < x) = \eta(px) \leq$

$\leq \max(p, 2x_2) < x$ respectively $\eta(px) \leq \max(p, 2x_1, x_2) < x$.

Observations

$\eta(2x) = x - x = 4$ or x is an odd prime.

$\eta(3x) = x - x = 4, 6, 9$ or x is a prime > 3 .

Lemma 3. If $(m, x) = 1$ then x is a prime $> \eta(m)$.

Of course, $\eta(mx) = \max(\eta(m), \eta(x)) = \eta(x) = x$.

And $x \neq \eta(m)$, because if $x = \eta(m)$ then $m \cdot \eta(m)$ divides $\eta(m)!$ that is m divides $(\eta(m) - 1)!$ whence $\eta(m) \leq \eta(m) - 1$.

Lemma 4. If x is not a prime then $\eta(m) < x \leq 2\eta(m)$ and $x = 2\eta(m)$ if and only if $\eta(m)$ is a prime.

Proof: If $x > 2\eta(m)$ there are x_1, x_2 with $1 < x_1 \leq x_2$, $x = x_1 x_2$. For $x_1 < \eta(m)$ we have $(x - 1)!$ is a multiple of $m x$. Same proof for other cases.

Let $x = 2\eta(m)$; if $\eta(m)$ is not a prime, then $x = 2ab$, $1 < a \leq b$, but the product $(\eta(m) + 1)(\eta(m) + 2) \dots (2\eta(m) - 1)$ is divided by x .

If $\eta(m)$ is a prime, $\eta(m)$ divides m , whence $m \cdot 2\eta(m)$ is divided by $\eta(m)^2$, it results in $\eta(m \cdot 2\eta(m)) \geq 2 \cdot \eta(m)$, but $(\eta(m) + 1)(\eta(m) + 2) \dots (2\eta(m))$ is a multiple of $2\eta(m)$, that is $\eta(m \cdot 2\eta(m)) = 2\eta(m)$.

Conclusion

All x , prime number $> \eta(m)$, are solutions.

If $\eta(m)$ is prime, then $x = 2 \eta(m)$ is a solution.

*If x is not a prime, $\eta(m) < x < 2 \eta(m)$, and x does not divide $(x-1)!/m$ then x is a solution (semi-open question). If $m = 3$ it adds $x = 9$ too. (No other solution exists yet.)

(c)

Lemma 5. $\eta(ab) \leq \eta(a) + \eta(b)$.

Of course, $\eta(a) = a'$ and $\eta(b) = b'$ involves $(a' + b')! = b'!(b' + 1) \dots (b' + a')$. Let $a' \leq b'$. Then $\eta(ab) \leq a' + b'$, because the product of a' consecutive positive integers is a multiple of $a'!$

Clearly, if m is a prime then $k = 1$ and $n_m = m$.

If m is not a prime then $\eta(m) < m$, whence there is a k for which $\eta^{(k)}(m) = \eta^{(k+1)}(m)$.

If $m \neq 1$ then $2 \leq n_m \leq m$.

Lemma 6. $n_m = 4$ or n_m is a prime.

If $n_m = n_1 n_2$, $1 < n_1 \leq n_2$, then $\eta(n_m) < n_m$. Absurd.

$n_m \neq 4$.

(**) This question remains open.

Reference

- [1] F. Smarandache, A Function in the Number Theory, An. Univ. Timisoara, seria st. mat., Vol. XVIII, fasc. 1, pp. 79-88, 1980; Mathematical Reviews: 83c: 10008.

Florentin Smarandache

[Published on "Gamma" Journal, "Steagul Rosu" College,
Brasov, 1987.]