IMPROVING THE CHEN AND CHEN RESULT FOR ODD PERFECT NUMBERS

Department of Mathematics, University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand
kab@waikato.ac.nz

Department of Mathematics, University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand
delbourgo@waikato.ac.nz

Department of Mathematics, University of Waikato, Hamilton, New Zealand
qz49@waikato.ac.nz

Received: , Revised: , Accepted: , Published:

Abstract

If q^α is the Euler factor of an odd perfect number N, then we prove that its so called index $\sigma(N/q^\alpha)/q^\alpha \geq 3^2 \times 5 \times 7 = 315$. It follows that for any odd perfect number, the ratio of the non-Euler part to the Euler part is greater than $3^2 \times 5 \times 7/2$.

keywords: odd perfect number, index.

MSC2010: 11A25.

1. Introduction

The main motivation for studying the structure of an odd perfect number is ultimately to establish that such a number cannot exist. It is known that any odd perfect number N must have at least 9 distinct prime factors [10], be larger than 10^{1500} [12], have a squarefree core which is less than $2N^{\frac{17}{26}}$ [9], and every prime divisor is less than $(3N)^{\frac{1}{3}}$ [1]. These results represent recent progress on what must be one of the oldest current problems in mathematics.

Following Dris [5], in this paper we define the index m of a prime power dividing N. Using a lower bound for the index one can derive an upper bound, in terms of N, for the Euler factor of N. Dris found the bound $m \geq 3$ then Dris and Luca [6] improved this to $m \geq 6$. In [4] a list of forms in terms of products of prime powers, which includes the results of Dris and Dris-Luca, is derived. We improve the method of [4], obtaining an expanded list of prime power products which cannot occur as the value of an index. This enables us to conclude, in the case of the Euler factor, that $m \geq 315$; for any other prime, if the Euler factor divides N to a power at least 2 then $m \geq 630$, and if the Euler factor divides N to the power 1 then $m \geq 210$.

Notations: $\Omega(n)$ is the total number of prime divisors of n counted with multiplicity, $\omega(n)$ the number of distinct prime divisors of n, $\omega_0(n)$ the number of distinct odd prime divisors of n, $\sigma(n)$ the sum of the divisors of n, $d(n)$ the number of divisors of n, $\log_2 n$ the logarithm to base 2, $(a,\ b)$ the greatest common divisor, $p^e \| n$ means p^e divides n but p^{e+1} does not, $\nu_p(n)$ the highest power of p which divides n, and $\operatorname{ord}_p a$ the smallest power of a which is congruent to 1 modulo p. The symbol $\square$, when not being used to denote the end of a proof, represents the square of an integer.

Let N denote an odd perfect number, and q a prime divisor with $q^\alpha \| N$ say. We write the standard factorization of N as

$$N \ = \ q^\alpha \times \prod_{i=1}^{k} p_i^{\lambda_i} \times \prod_{j=k+1}^{s} p_j^{\lambda_j}$$

where for $1 \leq i \leq k$ we have

$$\sigma\left(p_i^{\lambda_i}\right) = m_i q^{\beta_i}, \ \beta_i \geq 0, \ (m_i, q) = 1, \ m_i > 1. \tag{1}$$

These prime numbers p_i are called primes of **type 1**. For $k+1 \leq j \leq s$

$$\sigma\left(p_j^{\lambda_j}\right) = q^{\beta_j}, \ \ \beta_j > 0 \tag{2}$$

and the p_j are called primes of **type 2**.

One defines the **index** or **perfect number index at prime** q to be the integer

$$m := \frac{\sigma\left(N/q^\alpha\right)}{q^\alpha}\ ; \tag{3}$$

in particular $m = m_1 \cdots m_k$.

In fact $4 \nmid m$, $q \nmid m$, and if an odd prime p satisfies $p^e \mid m$ then $p^e \mid N$. Furthermore if q is the Euler prime, then m is odd and each m corresponding to any other prime is even. Lastly we have the fundamental equation

$$m \times \sigma(q^\alpha) \ = \ 2 \times \prod_{i=1}^{k} p_i^{\lambda_i} \times \prod_{j=k+1}^{s} p_j^{\lambda_j} \ = \ \frac{2N}{q^\alpha}. \tag{4}$$

2. Preliminary Results

First we state the theorem of Chen and Chen [4].

Theorem 1. *If N is an odd perfect number with a prime power $q^\alpha \| N$, then the index $m := \sigma(N/q^\alpha)/q^a$ is not equal to any of the six forms*

$$\{p_1,\ p_1^2,\ p_1^3,\ p_1^4,\ p_1p_2,\ p_1^2p_2\}$$

where p_1 and p_2 are any distinct primes.

The following lemma comes from [6]. Here we give an alternative proof.

Lemma 2. *If for some j with $k+1 \le j \le s$ (so p_j is a prime of type 2) and for some γ with $2 \le \gamma \le \lambda_j$ we have $p_j^\gamma \mid (q^{\alpha+1}-1)/(q-1)$, then $p_j^{\gamma-1} \mid \alpha+1$.*

Proof. Because $p_j\big(1+p_j+\cdots+p_j^{\lambda_j-1}\big) = q^{\beta_j}-1$ one deduces $p_j^1 \| q^{\beta_j}-1$, in which case $p_j^1 \| q^{\operatorname{ord}_{p_j}(q)}-1$. However

$$2 \ \le \ \gamma \ \le \ \nu_{p_j}\left(\frac{q^{\alpha+1}-1}{q-1}\right) = \nu_{p_j}\left(\frac{q^{\operatorname{ord}_{p_j}(q)}-1}{q-1}\right) + \nu_{p_j}\left(\frac{\alpha+1}{\operatorname{ord}_{p_j}(q)}\right). \tag{5}$$

If $\operatorname{ord}_{p_j}(q) = 1$ then $\gamma \le \nu_{p_j}(\alpha+1)$ and $p_j^\gamma \mid \alpha+1$, whereas if $\operatorname{ord}_{p_j}(q) > 1$ one has $\gamma \le 1+\nu_{p_j}(\alpha+1)$ and therefore $p_j^{\gamma-1} \mid \alpha+1$. $\square$

Lemma 3. (Ljunggren, see [7]) *The only integer solutions $(x,\ n,\ y)$ with $|x| > 1,\ n > 2,\ y > 0$ to the equation $(x^n-1)/(x-1) = y^2$ are $(7,\ 4,\ 20)$ and $(3,\ 5,\ 11)$, i.e. $(7^4-1)/(7-1) = 20^2$ and $(3^5-1)/(3-1) = 11^2$.*

Lemma 4. *[7] The only solutions in non-zero integers with $n > 1$ to the equation $y^n = x^2+x+1$ are $n = 3$, $y = 7$ and $x = 18$ or $x = -19$.*

The following well known result [2, 3, 13] guarantees the existence of primitive prime divisors for expressions of the form $a^n - 1$ with fixed $a > 1$.

Lemma 5. *Let a and n be integers greater than 1. Then there exists a prime $p \mid a^n - 1$ which does not divide any of $a^m - 1$ for each $m \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$, except possibly in the two cases $n = 2$ and $a = 2^\beta - 1$ for some $\beta \geq 2$, or $n = 6$ and $a = 2$. Such a prime is called a* **primitive prime factor**.

We complete this set of preliminary results by filling in the missing case from the proof of the fundamental lemma [4, Lemma 2.4].

Lemma 6. *Let N be an odd perfect number. Then $d(\alpha + 1) \leq \omega(N)$ whenever a prime power $q^\alpha \| N$.*

Proof. Let $n_1,\ n_2, \dots,\ n_w$ denote all the distinct positive divisors of $\alpha + 1$ which are greater than 1.

If $2 \mid \alpha+1$ then α is odd, and thus $q \equiv \alpha \equiv 1 \bmod 4$. Therefore q cannot be of the form $2^\beta - 1$ and must be odd. By Lemma 5 there exists a primitive prime factor $q_i \mid q^{n_i} - 1$; since $2 \mid q^1 - 1$ the q_i are all odd, and as they are primitive, one finds $q_i \nmid q^1 - 1$ also. Hence

$$q_i \ \mid \ \frac{q^{n_i} - 1}{q - 1} \ \mid \ \frac{q^{\alpha+1} - 1}{q - 1}$$

so that $q_{n_1} \cdots q_{n_w} \bigm| (q^{\alpha+1} - 1)/(q - 1)$. But $m \times \sigma(q^\alpha) = 2N/q^\alpha$ thus, including the divisor 1 and recalling $2 \mid \sigma(q^\alpha)$, one obtains the inequalities

$$d(\alpha + 1) = w + 1 \ \leq\ \omega\big(\sigma(q^\alpha)\big) \ \leq\ \omega\big(m\sigma(q^\alpha)\big) = \omega\left(\frac{2N}{q^\alpha}\right) = \omega(N).$$

Alternatively if $2 \nmid \alpha + 1$ then α is even so, again by Lemma 5, we obtain distinct odd primes q_{n_i} with

$$q_{n_1} \cdots q_{n_w} \mid \frac{q^{\alpha+1} - 1}{q - 1}.$$

Because in this case $2 \mid m$ and $2 \nmid \sigma(q^\alpha)$, we deduce that

$$d(\alpha + 1) = 1 + w \ \leq\ 1 + \omega\big(\sigma(q^\alpha)\big) \ \leq\ \omega\big(m\sigma(q^\alpha)\big) = \omega\left(\frac{2N}{q^a}\right) = \omega(N)$$

which completes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

3. The Proof

We now amend the proof of Theorem 1.1 of [4].

Lemma 7. *Let N be an odd perfect number, and m the index at some prime divisor of N. Then*

$$\Omega(m) + \omega_0(m) \ \geq \ \omega(N) - \log_2 \sqrt{\omega(N)} - \eta$$

where $\eta = 1$ if m is odd, $\eta = \frac{1}{2}$ if m is even and the Euler prime divides N to a power greater than 1, and $\eta = \frac{3}{2}$ if m is even and the Euler prime divides N exactly to the power 1.

Proof. Whenever $(m,\ p_{k+1}\cdots p_s) = \ p_{k+1}\cdots p_s$, one has an inequality

$$s - k \ \leq \ \omega_0(m) = t$$

and it follows that

$$k + t \ \geq \ s = \omega(N) - 1.$$

Because $k \leq \Omega(m)$, $t = \omega_0(m)$ and $\omega(N) \geq 9$, we quickly deduce

$$\Omega(m) + \omega_0(m) \ \geq \ k + t \ \geq \ \omega(N) - 2 \ \geq \ \omega(N) - \log_2 \sqrt{\omega(N)} - 0.42.$$

The non-trivial case occurs when $(m,\ p_{k+1}\cdots p_s) \neq \ p_{k+1}\cdots p_s$. By suitably reordering the p_i, we can always write for some l with $k \leq l < s$:

$$\frac{p_{k+1}\cdots p_s}{(m, p_{k+1}\cdots p_s)} \ = \ p_{l+1}\cdots p_s. \tag{6}$$

Applying [4] Equation (2.2) and (6), we see that

$$p_{l+1}^{\lambda_{l+1}}\cdots p_s^{\lambda_s} \mid \sigma(q^{\alpha}).$$

Moreover using [4] Equation (2.1) and [4] Lemma 2.3,

$$p_i^{\lambda_i - 1} \mid \alpha + 1, \quad l + 1 \leq i \leq s$$

hence

$$p_{l+1}^{\lambda_{l+1}-1}\cdots p_s^{\lambda_s - 1} \mid \alpha + 1.$$

Now for $k+1 \leq i \leq s$ one knows $\sigma(p_i^{\lambda_i}) = q^{\beta_i}$, and q is odd so we must have λ_i even. It follows for $l+1 \leq i \leq s$ each $\lambda_i \geq 2$, thus $p_{l+1}\cdots p_s \mid \alpha + 1$. Note also that $l < s$ in which case $s - l \geq 1$.

If $s-l=1$ then because $\omega(N)\geq 9$,

$$\Omega(m)+\omega_0(m)\geq k+t\geq l=s-1\geq \omega(N)-2\geq \omega(N)-\log_2\sqrt{\omega(N)}-0.42$$

as in the previous case.

If $s-l\geq 2$ then we **claim** at most one of the $\lambda_i=2$ and the remainder have $\lambda_i\geq 4$. To see this, consider the equations

$$p_i^2+p_i+1=q^{\beta_i}.$$

If $\beta_i>1$ then, by Lemma 4, the only solution is $\beta_i=3$, $q=7$ and $p_i=18$ which is not prime, so the solution cannot occur in this context. Hence $\beta_i=1$ and the form of the equation is $q=x^2+x+1$. But this, for given q, has at most one positive integer solution, therefore at most one prime solution p_i.

By renumbering the p_i if necessary, when $s-l\geq 2$ we can write

$$p_{l+1}^3p_{l+2}^3\cdots p_{s-1}^3p_s\mid \alpha+1.$$

Case 1: Suppose that the index m is odd. Then q is the Euler prime, and consequently $2\mid \alpha+1$. Hence

$$2p_{l+1}^3p_{l+2}^3\cdots p_{s-1}^3p_s\mid \alpha+1$$

thus by Lemma 6 we have

$$2^{2s-2l}\ \leq\ d(\alpha+1)\ \leq\ \omega(N),$$

or in other words $s-l\leq \log_2\sqrt{\omega(N)}$, which implies

$$l\ \geq\ \omega(N)-\log_2\sqrt{\omega(N)}-1.$$

As $\omega_0(m)=t$ then by Equation (6) we have $l-k\leq t$, so $l\leq \Omega(m)+\omega_0(m)$. Lastly because $\omega(N)\geq 9$,

$$6.41\ \leq\ \omega(N)-\log_2\sqrt{\omega(N)}-1\ \leq\ l\ \leq\ \Omega(m)+\omega_0(m).$$

Case 2: Here we assume the Euler prime divides N to a power at least 2. Let m be even. Now $m=m_1\cdots m_k$ and $2\|m$ so, for a unique i, one knows that $2\mid m_i$. We **claim** that $2\neq m_i$. If not, then

$$\sigma(p_i^{\lambda_i})=2q^{\beta_i}$$

whence p_i is the Euler prime and λ_i+1 is even; we can write

$$\frac{p_i^{\lambda_i+1}-1}{2(p_i-1)} \;=\; \left(\frac{p_i^{\frac{\lambda_i+1}{2}}-1}{p_i-1}\right)\times\left(\frac{p_i^{\frac{\lambda_i+1}{2}}+1}{2}\right) \;=\; q^{\beta_i}$$

but this cannot hold since the two factors in the middle term are coprime and greater than 1, thus $2\neq m_i$.

It follows that $k\leq\Omega(m)-1$. In this scenario with $s-l\geq 2$, we also know

$$p_{l+1}^3p_{l+2}^3\cdots p_{s-1}^3p_s \mid \alpha+1$$

thus

$$2^{2s-2l-1} \;\leq\; d(\alpha+1)\leq\omega(N),$$

which in turn implies

$$l \;\geq\; s-\frac{1}{2}-\log_2\sqrt{\omega(N)} \;=\; \omega(N)-\log_2\sqrt{\omega(N)}-\frac{3}{2}.$$

It follows from the discussion that

$$\omega(N)-\log_2\sqrt{\omega(N)}-\frac{3}{2} \;\leq\; l \;\leq\; k+t \;\leq\; \Omega(m)-1+\omega_0(m)$$

and therefore

$$6.91 \;\leq\; \omega(N)-\log_2\sqrt{\omega(N)}-\frac{1}{2} \;\leq\; \Omega(m)+\omega_0(m).$$

Case 3: We shall now assume the Euler prime divides N exactly to the power 1 and that m is even. Here we have only the weaker inequality $k\leq\Omega(m)$, and using an identical argument to **Case 2**:

$$5.91 \;\leq\; \omega(N)-\log_2\sqrt{\omega(N)}-\frac{3}{2} \;\leq\; \Omega(m)+\omega_0(m).$$

$\square$

Lemma 8. *If the index m is a square, then $\alpha=1$.*

Proof. If $m=\square$ then necessarily q is the Euler prime. We must have $\sigma(q^\alpha)=2\square$ and α is odd. Assuming $\alpha>1$ then

$$\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{q^{\alpha+1}-1}{q-1}\right) \;=\; \left(\frac{q^{(\alpha+1)/2}-1}{q-1}\right)\times\left(\frac{q^{(\alpha+1)/2}+1}{2}\right) \;=\; \square$$

and the two factors in the penultimate term are coprime, in which case

$$\frac{q^{(\alpha+1)/2}-1}{q-1} \;=\; \square.$$

By Lemma 3 one has $(\alpha+1)/2 \leq 2$, and as $\alpha \equiv 1 \bmod 4$ we deduce $\alpha = 1$, thereby yielding a contradiction. $\square$

Lemma 9. *If the index m is odd, then it cannot be the sixth power of a prime.*

Proof. Firstly the index being odd means it corresponds to the Euler prime. Assume $m = p^6 = \square$. By Lemma 8, we have $\alpha = 1$. If $p = p_I$ is of type 1 then $\sigma(p_I^{\lambda_I}) = p_I^{\theta} q^{\beta_I}$ for some $\theta > 0$, which is false. Hence p_I will be of type 2. If any other prime p_j were also of type 2, then due to the equality

$$\sigma(q^\alpha) \;=\; \frac{2N}{q^\alpha p_I^6}$$

we would have $p_j^2 \mid \sigma(q^\alpha)$ and also $q^{\beta_j} = \frac{p_j^{\lambda_j+1}-1}{p_j-1}$; however from Lemma 2 there is a divisibility $p_j \,\big|\, \alpha+1 = 2$, which is clearly false as $p_j \geq 3$.

Consequently there exists exactly one type 2 prime, p_I. Note that $\lambda_I \geq 6$. If $\lambda_I \neq 6$ we would have λ_I even and greater than 6, implying $p_I^2 \mid \sigma(q^\alpha)$ and by Lemma 2, $p_I \mid \alpha+1$ which is false. Hence $\lambda_I = 6$ and we can write

$$\sigma(q^\alpha) = 2p_1^{\lambda_1}\cdots p_k^{\lambda_k}.$$

But $m = p^6 = m_1 \cdots m_k$ has at most 6 factors, in which case $k \leq 6$; therefore

$$9 \;\leq\; \omega(N) = k+2 \;\leq\; 8$$

a clear contradiction, completing the proof that $m \neq p^6$. $\square$

Applying Lemmas 7 and 9, we have shown

Theorem 10. *If N is an odd perfect number and the odd prime $q^\alpha \| N$ then the index $\sigma(N/q^\alpha)/q^\alpha$ is either odd when q is the Euler prime, or even but not divisible by 4 when q is not the Euler prime.*

(i) If q is the Euler prime, it cannot take any of the 11 forms

$$\left\{p,\; p^2,\; p^3,\; p^4,\; p^5,\; p^6,\; p_1p_2,\; p_1^2p_2,\; p_1^3p_2,\; p_1^2p_2^2,\; p_1p_2p_3\right\}$$

where p *is any odd prime and* p_1, p_2, p_3 *are any distinct odd primes.*

(ii) If q *is not the Euler prime and the Euler prime divides* N *to a power greater than 1, it cannot take any of the 7 forms*

$$\left\{2,\ 2p,\ 2p^2,\ 2p^3,\ 2p^4,\ 2p_1p_2,\ 2p_1^2p_2\right\}.$$

(iii) If q *is not the Euler prime and the Euler prime divides* N *to the power 1, it cannot take any of the 5 forms*

$$\left\{2,\ 2p,\ 2p^2,\ 2p^3,\ 2p_1p_2\right\}.$$

Therefore the smallest possible value of the index m *is, respectively:*

$$3^2 \times 5 \times 7 = 315 \quad \textit{in case (i)},$$

$$2 \times 3^3 \times 5 = 270 \quad \textit{in case (ii)},$$

$$\textit{and} \quad 2 \times 3^2 \times 5 = 90 \quad \textit{in case (iii)}.$$

Corollary 11. *It follows directly that for any odd perfect number, the ratio of the non-Euler part to the Euler part is greater than* $315/2$.

Acknowledgements: The first version of this paper was based on [6]. We are most grateful to a referee who alerted us to the recent work of Chen and Chen [4], and pointed out some errors in an earlier version.

References

[1] P. Acquaah and S. Konyagin, *On prime factors of odd perfect numbers*, Int. J. Number Theory, **8** (2012), 1537–1540.

[2] A. S. Bang, *Taltheoretiske undersogelser* Tidsskrift for Mat. **5** (1886), 70–80, 130–137.

[3] G. D. Birkhoff and H. S. Vandiver, *On the integral divisors of* $a^n - b^n$, Ann. of Math. (2)**5** (1904), 173–180.

[4] F. J. Chen and Y. G. Chen, *On odd perfect numbers*, Bull. Aust. Math. Soc. **86** (2012), 510–514.

[5] J. A. B. Dris, *Solving the odd perfect number problem: some old and new approaches*, M. Sc. Thesis, De La Salle University, Philippines, 2008.

[6] J. A. B. Dris and F. Luca, *A note on odd perfect numbers*, (preprint).

[7] D. Estes, R. Guralnick, M. Schacher and E. Straus, *Equations in prime powers*, Pacific J. Math. **118** (1985), 359–367.

[8] R. Heath-Brown, *Odd perfect numbers*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc. **115** (1994), 191–196.

[9] F. Luca and C. Pomerance, *On the radical of a perfect number*, New York J. Math. **16** (2010), 23–30.

[10] P. P. Nielsen, *An upper bound for odd perfect numbers*, Integers, **3** (2003) A14, 1–9.

[11] P. P. Nielsen, *Odd perfect numbers have at least nine prime factors*, Math. Comp. **76** (2007), 2109–2126.

[12] P. Ochem and M. Rao, *Odd perfect numbers are greater than* 10^{1500}, Math. Comp. **81** (2012), 1869–1877.

[13] M. Roitman, *On Zsigmondy primes*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **125** (1997), 1913–1919.