ON A NONINTEGRALITY CONJECTURE

FLORIAN LUCA AND CARL POMERANCE

Abstract. It is conjectured that the sum
\[ S_r(n) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{k}{k+r} \binom{n}{k} \]
for positive integers \( r, n \) is never integral. This has been shown for \( r \leq 22 \). In this note we study the problem in the “\( n \) aspect” showing that the set of \( n \) such that \( S_r(n) \in \mathbb{Z} \) for some \( r \geq 1 \) has asymptotic density 0. Our principal tools are some deep results on the distribution of primes in short intervals.

1. Introduction

For positive integers \( r, n \) let
\[ S_r(n) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{k}{k+r} \binom{n}{k}. \]

Motivated by some cases with small \( r \), López-Aguayo [4] asked if \( S_r(n) \) is ever an integer, showing for \( r \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\} \) that \( S_r(n) \) is not integral for all \( n \). In [5] it was conjectured that \( S_r(n) \) is never integral, and they proved the conjecture for \( r \leq 6 \). In [3] it was proved for \( r \leq 22 \). Also in [3], using a deep theorem of Montgomery and Vaughan [6], it was shown for a fixed \( r \) that the set of \( n \) such that \( S_r(n) \in \mathbb{Z} \) has upper density bounded by \( O_k(1/r^k) \) for any \( k \geq 1 \). In fact, this density is 0, as we shall show. Actually we prove a stronger result. Let
\[ S := \{ n : S_r(n) \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ for some } r \geq 1 \}. \]

Theorem 1. The set \( S \) has zero density as a subset of the integers.

It follows from our argument that if we put \( S(x) = S \cap [1, x] \) then \( \#S(x) = O_A(x/\log x)^A \) for every fixed \( A \). In particular, taking \( A = 2 \), we see that the reciprocal sum of \( S \) is finite.

2. The proof

We let \( x \) be large and \( n \in S \cap [x/2, x] \). Thus, \( S_r(n) \in \mathbb{Z} \) for some \( r \geq 1 \). Let
\[ S(r, n) := \sum_{k=0}^{n} \frac{r}{r+k} \binom{n}{k}. \]
so that \( S(r, n) + S_r(n) = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} = 2^n \) \( \in \mathbb{Z} \), so that \( S(r, n) \in \mathbb{Z} \). It is shown in [3] that

\[
S(r, n) = \sum_{j=1}^{r} (-1)^{r-j} r \binom{r-1}{j-1} \frac{2^{n+j} - 1}{n+j}.
\]

**Lemma 1.** If there is a prime \( p > n \) that divides one of \( 1 + r, 2 + r, \ldots, n + r \), then \( S_r(n) \) is not integral.

**Proof.** Write \( p = k_0 + r \), where \( 1 \leq k_0 \leq n \). Since \( p > n \), we have that \( p \) does not divide any other \( k + r \) for \( 1 \leq k \leq n \). So the term \( (k_0/(k_0 + r)) \binom{n}{k_0} \) in the definition of \( S_r(n) \), in reduced form, has a factor \( p \) in the denominator, and no other terms \( (k/(k+r)) \binom{n}{k} \) have this property. We deduce that \( S_r(n) \) is nonintegral, completing the proof.

We distinguish various cases.

**Case 1.** \( r \geq n \).

By Sylvester’s theorem, one of the integers \( 1+r, 2+r, \ldots, n+r \) is divisible by a prime \( p > n \). It follows from Lemma 1 that \( S_r(n) \) is nonintegral. From now on, we assume that \( n > r \).

**Case 2.** \( n > r > (x/2)^{1/10} \).

By a result of Jia (see [2]) for every fixed \( \varepsilon > 0 \), the interval \([n + 1, n + n^{1/20+\varepsilon}]\) contains a prime number \( p \) for almost all \( n \), with the number of exceptional values of \( n \leq x \) being \( \ll_{\varepsilon, A} n^{-A} (\log x)^{4} \) for every fixed \( A > 0 \). If \( r > (x/2)^{1/10} \geq (n/2)^{1/10} \), then \( r > n^{1/11} \) holds for all \( x > x_0 \). If \( n \) is not exceptional in the sense of Jia’s theorem, then the interval \([n, n + r]\) contains the interval \([n + 1, n + n^{1/11}]\) and hence a prime \( p > n > r \), so \( S_r(n) \) cannot be an integer by Lemma 1. Hence, \( n \) must be exceptional in the sense of Jia’s theorem and the set of such \( n \) has counting function \( O_A(\log x)^{4} \) for any fixed \( A > 0 \).

**Case 3.** \( y \leq r \leq (x/2)^{1/10} \), where \( y := x^{1/\log \log x} \).

This is the most interesting part. We prove the following lemma. For an odd prime \( p \) we write \( \ell_2(p) \) for the order of 2 modulo \( p \).

**Lemma 2.** There exists \( r_0 \) such that if \( r > r_0 \), then the interval \( I = [r, r + r^{0.61}] \) contains 6 primes \( p_1, \ldots, p_6 \) such that each \( \ell_2(p_i) > r^{0.3} \) for \( 1 \leq i \leq 6 \) and each \( \gcd(p_i - 1, p_j - 1) < r^{0.001} \) for \( 1 \leq i < j \leq 6 \).

**Proof.** Let \( \pi(I) \) be the number of primes in \( I \). From Baker, Harman, and Pintz [1] we have for large \( r \) that

\[
\pi(I) \gg r^{0.61} / \log r.
\]

(Actually, this follows from earlier results, but [1] holds the record currently for primes in short intervals.) Let \( Q \) be the subset of primes \( p \in I \) such that \( \ell_2(p) \leq r^{0.3} \). By a classical argument, \( \#Q \ll r^{0.6} / \log r \). Indeed,

\[
r^{0.6} \#Q \leq \prod_{p \in Q} p \leq \prod_{t \leq r^{0.6}} (2^t - 1) < 2^{\sum_{t \leq r^{0.3}} t} < 2^{0.6},
\]

from which we deduce the desired upper bound on \( \#Q \). Since

\[
r^{0.6} / \log r = o(r^{0.61} / \log r) = o(\pi(I)), \quad \text{as} \quad r \to \infty,
\]

however, it is an open question whether \( \#Q \) is really less than \( r^{0.6} / \log r \).
we deduce that most primes \( p \) in \( I \) have \( \ell_2(p) \geq r^{0.3} \). Let \( \mathcal{P} \) denote this set of primes in \( I \), so that \( \#\mathcal{P} \gg r^{0.61}/\log r \). For any positive integer \( d \) the number of pairs of primes \( p, q \) in \( \mathcal{P} \) with \( d \mid p - 1 \) and \( d \mid q - 1 \) is \( \ll r^{2 \times 0.61}/d^2 \) even ignoring the primality condition. Summing over \( d \geq r^{0.001} \) we see that the number of pairs \( p, q \in \mathcal{P} \) with \( \gcd(p - 1, q - 1) \geq r^{0.001} \) is \( \ll r^{2 \times 0.61 - 0.001} \), so that most pairs of primes \( p, q \in \mathcal{P} \) have \( \gcd(p - 1, q - 1) < r^{0.001} \). In fact, the number of 6-tuples of primes \( p_1, \ldots, p_6 \in \mathcal{P} \) with some \( \gcd(p_i - 1, p_j - 1) \geq r^{0.001} \) is \( \ll r^{6 \times 0.61 - 0.001} \), so we may deduce that most 6-tuples of primes in \( \mathcal{P} \) satisfy the \( \gcd \) condition of the lemma. Of course “6” may be replaced with any fixed positive integer, only affecting the choice of \( r_0 \).

Let \( \{p_1, \ldots, p_6\} \) be the 6 primes in \( I \) which exist for \( x > x_0 \) (such that \( y > r_0 \)). Either there are 4 of these primes such that the interval \([n + 1, n + r]\) contains a multiple of each, or there are 3 of these primes which do not have multiples in \([n + 1, n + r]\). Take the case of 4 of the primes having a multiple in \([n + 1, n + r]\) and without essential loss of generality, say they are \( p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4 \). They determine integers \( j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4 \) with \( 1 \leq j_i \leq r \) and \( p_i \mid n + j_i \). However, there is another restriction on \( n \) caused by \( S(r, n) \) being integral. We have each \( \ell_2(p_i) \mid n + j_i \), since otherwise the \( j_i \) term in \( \square \) in reduced form contains a factor of \( p_i \) in the denominator, a property not shared with any other term. This would imply that \( S(r, n) \) is nonintegral, a contradiction. Thus, we have \( \ell_2(p_i) \mid n + j_i \) as claimed for \( i = 1, 2, 3, 4 \). We conclude that \( n \) is in a residue class modulo

\[
M := \operatorname{lcm}\{p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4, \ell_2(p_1), \ell_2(p_2), \ell_2(p_3), \ell_2(p_4)\}.
\]

Now \( p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4 \) are distinct primes in \([r + 1, r + r^{0.61}]\), and each \( \ell_2(p_i) \), since it divides \( p_i - 1 \), has all prime factors \( \leq r \), so is coprime to the other \( p_j \)'s. Moreover, each \( \ell_2(p_i) \gg r^{0.3} \) and being a divisor of \( p_i - 1 \), each \( \gcd(\ell_2(p_i), \ell_2(p_j)) \leq r^{0.001} \). Thus,

\[
M > r^4r^{1.2}r^{-0.006} = r^{5.194}.
\]

Further, \( M \ll r^8 < x \). Thus, the number of \( n \) in this residue class is \( \ll x/M < x/r^{1.194} \). Summing over the different possibilities for \( j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4 \), our count is \( \ll x/r^{1.194} \). Now summing over \( r > y \), we have that the number of \( n \) in this case is \( \ll x/y^{0.194} \).

We also must consider the possibility that 3 of our 6 primes do not divide any \( n + j \) with \( 1 \leq j \leq r \). Again without essential loss of generality, assume they are \( p_1, p_2, p_3 \). Since each is in \([r + 1, r + r^{0.61}]\), it follows that each \( p_i \) corners \( n \) in a set of \( O(r^{0.61}) \) residue classes mod \( p_i \). With the Chinese Remainder Theorem, such \( n \)'s are in a set of \( O(r^{1.83}) \) residues classes modulo \( p_1p_2p_3 \). Note that the modulus is small, at most \( O(r^3) = o(x) \). Thus, the number of such \( n \) is at most

\[
O \left( \frac{r^{1.83}x}{p_1p_2p_3} \right) = O \left( \frac{x}{r^{1.17}} \right).
\]

Varying the 3 primes in \( \binom{6}{3} = 20 \) ways multiplies the above count by a constant factor. Summing on \( r > y \) we deduce that the number of \( n \) in \([x/2, x]\) is \( \ll x/y^{0.17} \).

With our above estimate, this puts the count in Case 3 at \( O(x/y^{0.17}) = o(x) \) as \( x \to \infty \).

**Case 4.** We assume that \( r \in (22, y] \).
Here, we do the “regular” thing, where we distinguish between smooth numbers and numbers with a large prime factor. Let $P(m)$ denote the largest prime factor of $m$. If $P(n+1) \leq y$, this puts $n$ in a set of size $x/(\log x)^{(1+o(1))\log \log \log x}$ as $x \to \infty$, by standard estimates for smooth numbers. So, assume that $p = P(n+1) > y$. Since $r \leq y$, it follows that $p$ does not divide any other $n+j$ with $j \leq r$, so that (1) and $S(r, n)$ integral imply that $\ell_2(p) | n + 1$.

The number of primes $2 < q \leq t$ with $\ell_2(q) \leq q^{0.3}$ is by the argument in the previous case at most $t^{0.6}$. By a partial summation argument, the number of $n \in (x/2, x]$ with $n + 1$ divisible by such a prime $q > y$ is $O(x/y^{0.4})$. So, assume that $\ell_2(p) > p^{0.3}$. The number of integers $n \in (x/2, x]$ with $n + 1$ divisible by $p\ell_2(p)$ is $\leq x/(p\ell_2(p)) \leq x/p^{1.3}$. Summing on $p > y$ our count is $\ll x/y^{0.3}$.

Putting together everything, we get that $\#S(x)$ is $O_A(x/(\log x)^A)$ for every fixed $A > 0$. This completes the proof of the theorem.

Remarks. Note that assuming Cramér’s conjecture that for some constant $c$ and for large $x$ there is a prime in $[x, x+c(\log x)^2]$, the estimate in Case 2 is eliminated. By then optimizing the choice of $y$, our final count for $S(x)$ would be of the shape $O(x/\exp(c\sqrt{\log x}\log \log x))$ for some $c > 0$. The hardest cases to try and do better seem to be $r = O(1)$.

Let $s_r(m)$ be the largest $r$-smooth divisor of $m$ and let $M_r(n) = \min\{s_r(n+j) : 1 \leq j \leq r\}$. It follows from [3] Proposition 3.1 that if $M_r(n) \leq \log_2 r$, then $S_r(n)$ is nonintegral. Unfortunately, as discussed in [3] Remark 2, it is not always the case that $M_r(n) \leq \log_2 r$. Nevertheless, it seems interesting to get estimates for $M_r := \max\{M_r(n) : n > 0\}$.
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