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Abstract

In a recent work, the present author developed an efficient method to find the number of solutions of $ax + by + cz = n$ in non-negative integer triples $(x, y, z)$ where $a, b, c$ and $n$ are given natural numbers. In this note, we use that formula to obtain some simple looking bounds for the number of solutions of $ax + by + cz = n$. Using these bounds, we solve some special cases of a problem related to the generalization of Frobenius coin problem in three variables. Moreover, we use these bounds to disprove a recent conjecture of He, Shiue and Venkat regarding the solution structure of $ax + by + cz = n$.

1 Introduction

Let $a, b, c$ and $n$ be given natural numbers such that $\gcd(a, b) = \gcd(b, c) = \gcd(c, a) = 1$. We recall the formula for the number of solutions $N(a, b, c; n)$ of $ax + by + cz = n$ in non-negative integer triples $(x, y, z)$ described in [3, Theorem 5]. We restate the formula here. For that, we need to introduce some notation.

- Define $b'_1$ such that $b'_1 \equiv -nb^{-1} \pmod{a}$ with $1 \leq b'_1 \leq a$. Moreover, define $c'_1$ such that $c'_1 \equiv bc^{-1} \pmod{a}$ with $1 \leq c'_1 \leq a$.
- Define $c'_2$ such that $c'_2 \equiv -nc^{-1} \pmod{b}$ with $1 \leq c'_2 \leq b$. Moreover, define $a'_2$ such that $a'_2 \equiv ca^{-1} \pmod{b}$ with $1 \leq a'_2 \leq b$.
- Define $a'_3$ such that $a'_3 \equiv -na^{-1} \pmod{c}$ with $1 \leq a'_3 \leq c$. Moreover, define $b'_3$ such that $b'_3 \equiv ab^{-1} \pmod{c}$ with $1 \leq b'_3 \leq c$.
- Define $N_1 = n(n + a + b + c) + cbb'_1(a + 1 - c'_1(b'_1 - 1)) + acc'_2(b + 1 - a'_2(c'_2 - 1)) + baa'_3(c + 1 - b'_3(a'_3 - 1))$. 


Theorem 1. \((B.(2020))\) Let \(a, b, c,\) and \(n\) be given positive integers such that \(\gcd(a, b) = \gcd(b, c) = \gcd(c, a) = 1\). With the notation above, the number of nonnegative integer solutions of the equation \(ax + by + cz = n\) is given by

\[
N(a, b, c; n) = \frac{N_1}{2abc} + \sum_{i=1}^{\nu_1' - 1} \left\lfloor \frac{ic_1'}{a} \right\rfloor + \sum_{i=1}^{\nu_2' - 1} \left\lfloor \frac{ia_2'}{b} \right\rfloor + \sum_{i=1}^{\nu_3' - 1} \left\lfloor \frac{ib_3'}{c} \right\rfloor - 2.
\]

2 Bounds for \(N(a, b, c; n)\)

First, we rewrite the expression for \(N(a, b, c; n)\) in another convenient form, from which it is easy to deduce some nice bounds for \(N(a, b, c; n)\). Recall the definition of the sawtooth function

\[
((x)) = \begin{cases} 
\{x\} - \frac{1}{2}, & \text{if } x \notin \mathbb{Z} \\
0, & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{Z}, 
\end{cases}
\]

where \(\{x\}\) denotes the fractional part of \(x\). Note that \(-\frac{1}{2} < ((x)) < \frac{1}{2}\) for any \(x\). Substituting the value of \(N_1\) in the expression for \(N(a, b, c; n)\) given in Theorem 1 and simplifying further, we can rewrite \(N(a, b, c; n)\) as follows.

\[
N(a, b, c; n) = \frac{n(n + a + b + c)}{2abc} - \frac{1}{2} + \left( \frac{b_1'}{2a} + \frac{c_2'}{2b} + \frac{a_3'}{2c} \right) - \sum_{i=1}^{\nu_1' - 1} \left( ((\frac{ic_1'}{a})) \right) - \sum_{i=1}^{\nu_2' - 1} \left( ((\frac{ia_2'}{b})) \right) - \sum_{i=1}^{\nu_3' - 1} \left( ((\frac{ib_3'}{c})) \right). \tag{1}
\]

To verify that this expression is equivalent to the one in Theorem 1 just substitute the sawtooth function \((x))\) with \(x - \lfloor x \rfloor - \frac{1}{2}\) in all the three sums, since the fractions \(\frac{ic_1'}{a}\), \(\frac{ia_2'}{b}\) and \(\frac{ib_3'}{c}\) are never integers for the given values of \(i\) in each of the three sums. Thus, substituting the sawtooth functions in terms of floor functions in the summations in (1), and then simplifying the sums gives us the expression for \(N(a, b, c; n)\) given in Theorem 1. Next, we use this expression in (1) to obtain some useful bounds for \(N(a, b, c; n)\).

Theorem 2. Let \(a, b, c,\) and \(n\) be given positive integers such that \(\gcd(a, b) = \gcd(b, c) = \gcd(c, a) = 1\). Further let \(N(a, b, c; n)\) denote the number of nonnegative integer solutions of the equation \(ax + by + cz = n\). Then, \(n(n + a + b + c)/2abc < N(a, b, c; n) < (n(n + a + b + c)/2abc + a + b + c)/2\).

Proof. Using the expression for \(N(a, b, c; n)\) in (1), we have
\[
\left| N(a, b, c; n) - \frac{n(n + a + b + c)}{2abc} \right| \leq \left| -\frac{1}{2} + \left( \frac{b_1'}{2a} + \frac{c_2'}{2b} + \frac{a_3'}{2c} \right) \right| \\
+ \left| \sum_{i=1}^{b_1'-1} \left( \frac{ic_1'}{a} \right) \right| + \left| \sum_{i=1}^{c_2'-1} \left( \frac{ia_2'}{b} \right) \right| + \left| \sum_{i=1}^{a_3'-1} \left( \frac{ib_3'}{c} \right) \right| \\
\leq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{a - 1}{2} + \frac{b - 1}{2} + \frac{c - 1}{2} \\
< \frac{a + b + c}{2}.
\]

This completes the proof of Theorem 2.

\[\square\]

3 An application to \( R_k(a, b, c) \)

For brevity of notation, we set \( \alpha = \frac{a+b+c}{2} \) and \( \beta = 2abc \). Thus, the bounds in Theorem 2 can be rewritten as

\[
\frac{n(n + 2\alpha)}{\beta} - \alpha < N(a, b, c; n) < \frac{n(n + 2\alpha)}{\beta} + \alpha.
\]  

These bounds help us to solve a special case of a problem discussed by Bardomero and Beck in [2] and studied further in [6]. We discuss the problems here in the context of three variables, though they are defined for any number of variables. Let \( a, b \) and \( c \) be given positive integers such that \( \gcd(a, b, c) = 1 \). Let \( R_k(a, b, c) \) consists of all integers \( n \) such that the equation \( ax + by + cz = n \) have exactly \( k \) solutions. Then, Bardomero and Beck [2] suggested the questions of finding the largest number \( g_k(a, b, c) \) in \( R_k(a, b, c) \) and the cardinality of \( |R_k(a, b, c)| \). In general, let \( f(t) \) denotes the number of solutions of \( ax + by + cz = t \). Then, Woods [6] defined the following quantities.

- \( g_{=k}(a, b, c) \) is the maximum \( t \) such that \( f(t) = k \).
- \( h_{=k}(a, b, c) \) is the minimum \( t \) such that \( f(t) = k \).
- \( c_{=k}(a, b, c) \) is the number of \( t \) such that \( f(t) = k \).
- \( s_{=k}(a, b, c) \) is the sum of \( t \) such that \( f(t) = k \).

In terms of \( R_k(a, b, c) \), we can rewrite these as follows.

\[
g_k(a, b, c) = \max\{t : t \in R_k(a, b, c)\}, \quad h_k(a, b, c) = \min\{t : t \in R_k(a, b, c)\},
\]

\[
c_k(a, b, c) = |\{t : t \in R_k(a, b, c)\}|, \quad s_k(a, b, c) = \sum\{t : t \in R_k(a, b, c)\}.
\]

Using our bounds for \( N(a, b, c; n) \), we obtain expressions for these numbers when \( k \) is sufficiently large. We define the following notation.
3.1 An algorithm to find $R_k(a, b, c)$ if $a$, $b$ and $c$ are pairwise coprime

First, we focus on the case $\text{gcd}(a, b) = \text{gcd}(b, c) = \text{gcd}(c, a) = 1$. Once we are done with this case, we will study $R_k(a, b, c)$ for any natural numbers $a$, $b$ and $c$.

- Recall that $\alpha = \frac{a+b+c}{2}$ and $\beta = 2abc$. Then,
  
  $$M = \left\lfloor \frac{(2\alpha\beta - 1)^2 - 4\alpha^2}{4\beta} + \alpha \right\rfloor + 1,$$

- For any natural number $k$, define
  
  $$\gamma_k = \left\lfloor \sqrt{\beta(k + \alpha) + \alpha^2} - \alpha \right\rfloor$$

  and

  $$\delta_k = \left\lfloor \sqrt{\beta(k - \alpha) + \alpha^2} - \alpha \right\rfloor.$$

**Theorem 3.** Let $a$, $b$ and $c$ be given positive integers such that $\text{gcd}(a, b) = \text{gcd}(b, c) = \text{gcd}(c, a) = 1$. Suppose $k \geq M$. If $\gamma_k = \delta_k$, then $R_k(a, b, c) = \emptyset$. Otherwise, suppose $\gamma_k \neq \delta_k$. Then, $R_k(a, b, c) = \{\gamma_k\}$ or $R_k(a, b, c) = \emptyset$, depending on whether

  $$ax + by + cz = \gamma_k$$

has exactly $k$ solutions or not.

**Proof.** Suppose $f(t) = k$. Then, by the above bounds in (2), we get that

$$k - \alpha < \frac{t(t + 2\alpha)}{\beta} < k + \alpha.$$

Equivalently,

$$\beta(k - \alpha) + \alpha^2 < (t + \alpha)^2 < \beta(k + \alpha) + \alpha^2.$$

That is,

$$\sqrt{\beta(k - \alpha) + \alpha^2} - \alpha < t < \sqrt{\beta(k + \alpha) + \alpha^2} - \alpha. \quad (3)$$

Thus, if $\gamma_k = \delta_k$, then there is no possible value of $t$ and $R_k(a, b, c) = \emptyset$.

Next suppose $\gamma_k \neq \delta_k$. We show that if $k \geq M$, then the left hand side and the right hand side of (3) differ by less than 1, and thus $t$ can be determined from this inequality. Since $k \geq M$, we have

$$k > \frac{(2\alpha\beta - 1)^2 - 4\alpha^2}{4\beta} + \alpha.$$

Therefore,

$$2\alpha\beta - 1 < 2\sqrt{\beta(k - \alpha) + \alpha^2}.$$

Thus,

$$(\beta(k + \alpha) + \alpha^2) < (\beta(k - \alpha) + \alpha^2) + 1 + 2\sqrt{\beta(k - \alpha) + \alpha^2}.$$

That is,
\[ \sqrt{\beta(k + \alpha) + \alpha^2} < \sqrt{\beta(k - \alpha) + \alpha^2} + 1. \]  

(4)

From (3) and (4), it follows that there can be at most one possible value of \( t \) and that is \( \gamma_k \). This completes the proof of the theorem.

Let \( a, b \) and \( c \) be given positive integers such that \( \gcd(a, b) = \gcd(b, c) = \gcd(c, a) = 1 \). We say that a number \( k \) is of category I with respect to \( a, b \) and \( c \) if \( \gamma_k \neq \delta_k \) and the equation

\[ ax + by + cz = \gamma_k \]

has exactly \( k \) solutions. Otherwise, we say that \( k \) is of category II with respect to \( a, b \) and \( c \). When there is no confusion about \( a, b \) and \( c \), we just say that \( k \) is of category I or \( k \) is of category II.

Thus, if \( k \geq M \) is of category I, then by Theorem 3, \( R_k(a, b, c) = \{ \gamma_k \} \). Thus, \( c_{=k}(a, b, c) = 1 \) and

\[ g_{=k}(a, b, c) = h_{=k}(a, b, c) = s_{=k}(a, b, c) = \gamma_k. \]

Otherwise, if \( k \geq M \) is of category II, then by Theorem 3, \( R_k(a, b, c) = \emptyset \). Thus, \( c_{=k}(a, b, c) = 0 \). Also, by the convention that empty sum is 0, we get \( s_{=k}(a, b, c) = 0 \). However, in this case, \( g_{=k}(a, b, c) \) and \( h_{=k}(a, b, c) \) are not defined.

Thus, for any \( k \geq M \), the problem of finding \( R_k(a, b, c), g_{=k}(a, b, c), h_{=k}(a, b, c), c_{=k}(a, b, c) \) and \( s_{=k}(a, b, c) \) reduces to determining the category of \( k \). For that, we need to find the number of solutions of the equation

\[ ax + by + cz = \gamma_k. \]

However, we can easily do that using the algorithm described in [3, Section 2.3].

We summarize our algorithm for finding the quantities \( R_k(a, b, c), g_{=k}(a, b, c), h_{=k}(a, b, c), c_{=k}(a, b, c) \) and \( s_{=k}(a, b, c) \) for given positive numbers \( a, b \) and \( c \) with \( \gcd(a, b) = \gcd(b, c) = \gcd(c, a) = 1 \), and given \( k \geq M \), where

\[ M = \left\lfloor \frac{(2\alpha \beta - 1)^2 - \alpha^2}{\beta} + \alpha \right\rfloor + 1, \]

where \( \alpha = \frac{a + b + c}{2} \) and \( \beta = 2abc \).

1. Evaluate the quantities \( \gamma_k = \left\lfloor \sqrt{\beta(k + \alpha) + \alpha^2} - \alpha \right\rfloor \) and \( \delta_k = \left\lfloor \sqrt{\beta(k - \alpha) + \alpha^2} - \alpha \right\rfloor \).

2. Determine the category of \( k \). We do that in two steps. If \( \gamma_k = \delta_k \), then \( k \) is of category II. Otherwise, find the number of solutions of

\[ ax + by + cz = \gamma_k \]

using the algorithm described in [3, Section 2.3]. If the number of solutions equals \( k \), then \( k \) is of category I. Otherwise \( k \) is of category II.

3. If \( k \) is of category I, then \( R_k(a, b, c) = \{ \gamma_k \}, c_{=k}(a, b, c) = 1 \) and

\[ g_{=k}(a, b, c) = h_{=k}(a, b, c) = s_{=k}(a, b, c) = \gamma_k. \]
4. If $k$ is of category II, then $R_k(a, b, c) = \emptyset$, and
\[ c_{=k}(a, b, c) = s_{=k}(a, b, c) = 0. \]

However, in this case, $g_{=k}(a, b, c)$ and $h_{=k}(a, b, c)$ are not defined.

### 3.2 An example

We demonstrate our algorithm for an example. Let $a = 37$, $b = 23$ and $c = 16$. Then $\alpha = 38$, $\beta = 27232$ and $M = 157291918$. We illustrate our example for three values of $k$.

First suppose $k = 157295111$. Then,
\[ \gamma_k = \delta_k = 2069614. \]

Thus, by the second step of the algorithm, $k$ is of category II, and then by the fourth step, $R_k(37, 23, 16) = \emptyset$ for $k = 157295111$. Thus, in this case
\[ c_{=k}(37, 23, 16) = s_{=k}(37, 23, 16) = 0. \]

However, in this case, $g_{=k}(37, 23, 16)$ and $h_{=k}(37, 23, 16)$ are not defined.

Next, suppose $k = 157295072$. In this case, $\gamma_k = 2069614$ and $\delta_k = 2069613$. Thus, $\gamma_k \neq \delta_k$. Therefore, we need to find the number of solutions
\[ 37x + 23y + 16z = 2069614. \]

Using the formula in Theorem 1, we find that the number of solutions of $37x + 23y + 16z = 2069614$ is given by
\[ 157295066 + 3 \sum_{i=1}^{3} \left\lfloor \frac{13i}{37} \right\rfloor + 3 \sum_{i=1}^{3} \left\lfloor \frac{11i}{23} \right\rfloor + 9 \sum_{i=1}^{9} \left\lfloor \frac{3i}{16} \right\rfloor. \]

Using the algorithm in [3, Section 2.3] (Basically reciprocity relation of [3, Lemma 7]), we easily get that
\[ \sum_{i=1}^{3} \left\lfloor \frac{13i}{37} \right\rfloor = 1, \]
\[ \sum_{i=1}^{3} \left\lfloor \frac{11i}{23} \right\rfloor = 1, \]
\[ \sum_{i=1}^{9} \left\lfloor \frac{3i}{16} \right\rfloor = 4. \] (5)

Thus, the number of solutions of $37x + 23y + 16z = 2069614$ is equal to 157295072. Therefore, $k = 157295072$ is of category I, and we get that in this case $R_k(37, 23, 16) = \{2069614\}$. Thus, $c_{=k}(37, 23, 16) = 1$ and
\[ g_{=k}(37, 23, 16) = h_{=k}(37, 23, 16) = s_{=k}(37, 23, 16) = 2069614. \]
Finally, we consider \( k = 157294925 \). In this case, \( \gamma_k = 2069613 \) and \( \delta_k = 2069612 \). Thus, \( \gamma_k \neq \delta_k \). Therefore, we need to find the number of solutions

\[
37x + 23y + 16z = 2069613.
\]

Using the formula in Theorem [1] we find that the number of solutions of \( 37x + 23y + 16z = 2069613 \) is given by

\[
157294695 + \sum_{i=1}^{32} \left\lfloor \frac{13i}{37} \right\rfloor + \sum_{i=1}^{16} \left\lfloor \frac{11i}{23} \right\rfloor + \sum_{i=1}^{6} \left\lfloor \frac{3i}{16} \right\rfloor.
\]

Using the algorithm in [3, Section 2.3] (Basically reciprocity relation of [3, Lemma 7]), we easily get that

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{32} \left\lfloor \frac{13i}{37} \right\rfloor = 170,
\]

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{16} \left\lfloor \frac{11i}{23} \right\rfloor = 56,
\]

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{6} \left\lfloor \frac{3i}{16} \right\rfloor = 1.
\]  

(6)

Thus, the number of solutions of \( 37x + 23y + 16z = 2069613 \) is equal to 157294920. Therefore, \( k = 157294925 \) is of category II, and we get that in this case \( R_k(37, 23, 16) = \emptyset \). Thus, \( c_k(37, 23, 16) = s_k(37, 23, 16) = 0 \). However, in this case, \( g_k(37, 23, 16) \) and \( h_k(37, 23, 16) \) are not defined.

### 3.3 \( R_k(a, b, c) \) for any natural numbers \( a, b \) and \( c \)

Next suppose \( a, b \) and \( c \) are any natural numbers with \( \gcd(a, b, c) = 1 \) (need not be pairwise coprime). We handle this case using the technique of reduction to an equation with pairwise coprime coefficients, described in [3, Lemma 3]. We restate that result here. For that, we recall the following notation.

- Let \( g_1, g_2, \) and \( g_3 \) denote \( \gcd(b, c), \gcd(c, a), \) and \( \gcd(a, b) \), respectively. Note that \( \gcd(g_1, g_2) = \gcd(g_2, g_3) = \gcd(g_3, g_1) = 1 \).
- Let \( a_1, b_2, \) and \( c_3 \) denote the modular inverses of \( a \) with respect to the modulus \( g_1 \), \( b \) with respect to the modulus \( g_2 \), and \( c \) with respect to the modulus \( g_3 \), respectively.
- Let \( n_1, n_2, \) and \( n_3 \) denote the remainders upon dividing \( na_1 \) by \( g_1, nb_2 \) by \( g_2 \), and \( nc_3 \) by \( g_3 \), respectively.
- Let \( A = \frac{a}{g_2g_3}, B = \frac{b}{g_1g_3}, \) and \( C = \frac{c}{g_1g_2} \). Note that \( \gcd(A, B) = \gcd(B, C) = \gcd(A, C) = 1 \).
- Let \( N = \frac{n-an_1-bn_2-cn_3}{g_1g_2g_3} \).
Lemma 4. (B.(2020)) With the notation above, the number of solutions of the equation
\[ ax + by + cz = n \]
in nonnegative integer triples \((x, y, z)\) is equal to the number of solutions of the equation
\[ Ax + By + Cz = N \]
in nonnegative integer triples \((x, y, z)\).

In particular, note that \(ax + by + cz = n\) has \(k\) solutions if and only if \(Ax + By + Cz = N\) has \(k\) solutions.

- Let \(\alpha' = \frac{A+B+C}{2}\) and \(\beta' = 2ABC\), and
  
  \[ M' = \left\lfloor \frac{(2\alpha'\beta' - 1)^2 - 4\alpha'^2}{4\beta'} + \alpha' \right\rfloor + 1. \]

- For any natural number \(k\), define
  
  \[ \gamma'_k = \left\lfloor \sqrt{\beta'(k + \alpha') + \alpha'^2 - \alpha'} \right\rfloor \]
  
  and
  
  \[ \delta'_k = \left\lfloor \sqrt{\beta'(k - \alpha') + \alpha'^2 - \alpha'} \right\rfloor. \]

Suppose \(k \geq M'\) be of category II with respect to \(A, B\) and \(C\), then there is no value of \(N\) such that \(Ax + By + Cz = N\) has \(k\) solutions. Thus, there is no value of \(n\) such that \(ax + by + cz = n\) has \(k\) solutions. Thus, \(R_k(a, b, c) = \emptyset\), and

\[ c_{=k}(a, b, c) = s_{=k}(a, b, c) = 0. \]

In this case, \(g_{=k}(a, b, c)\) and \(h_{=k}(a, b, c)\) are not defined.

Suppose \(k \geq M'\) be of category I with respect to \(A, B\) and \(C\), then \(R_k(A, B, C) = \gamma'_k\). That is, \(Ax + By + Cz = N\) has \(k\) solutions if and only if \(N = \gamma'_k\). That is
\[ \frac{n - an_1 - bn_2 - cn_3}{g_1g_2g_3} = \gamma'_k. \]

Thus, \(n\) lies in the set
\[ \{g_1g_2g_3\gamma'_k + ai_1 + bi_2 + ci_3 : 0 \leq i_1 \leq g_1 - 1, 0 \leq i_2 \leq g_2 - 1, 0 \leq i_3 \leq g_3 - 1\}. \]
Conversely, it is easy to see that if \(n\) is a member of this set, then \(N = \gamma'_k\), and thus \(Ax + By + Cz = N\) has \(k\) solutions, and therefore \(ax + by + cz = n\) also has \(k\) solutions. Thus, we get that
\[ R_k(a, b, c) = \{g_1g_2g_3\gamma'_k + ai_1 + bi_2 + ci_3 : 0 \leq i_1 \leq g_1 - 1, 0 \leq i_2 \leq g_2 - 1, 0 \leq i_3 \leq g_3 - 1\}. \]

Therefore,

\[ g_{=k}(a, b, c) = \max\{t : t \in R_k(a, b, c)\} = g_1g_2g_3\gamma'_k + a(g_1 - 1) + b(g_2 - 1) + c(g_3 - 1), \]

\[ h_{=k}(a, b, c) = \min\{t : t \in R_k(a, b, c)\} = g_1g_2g_3\gamma'_k, \]
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\[ c_{=k}(a, b, c) = |\{t : t \in R_k(a, b, c)\}| = g_1g_2g_3. \]

Finally,

\[
s_{=k}(a, b, c) = \sum_{g_1^{-1}g_2^{-1}g_3^{-1}} \{t : t \in R_k(a, b, c)\}.\]

\[
= \sum_{i_1=0}^{g_1-1} \sum_{i_2=0}^{g_2-1} \sum_{i_3=0}^{g_3-1} (g_1g_2g_3\gamma_k + ai_1 + bi_2 + ci_3) \]

\[
= (g_1g_2g_3)^2\gamma_k + g_1g_2g_3(a(g_1' - 1) + b(g_2' - 1) + c(g_3' - 1)).
\]

Let \(a, b\), and \(c\) be given positive integers such that \(\gcd(a, b, c) = 1\). Let \(g_1, g_2,\) and \(g_3\) denote \(\gcd(b, c), \gcd(c, a),\) and \(\gcd(a, b),\) respectively. Moreover, let \(A = \frac{a}{g_2g_3}, B = \frac{b}{g_3g_1},\) and \(C = \frac{c}{g_1g_2}\). Then, we say that a number \(k\) is of category I with respect to \(a, b\), and \(c\) if \(k\) is of category I with respect to \(A, B\), and \(C\). Otherwise, we say that \(k\) is of category II with respect to \(a, b\), and \(c\).

Finally suppose \(a, b\), and \(c\) be any natural numbers \((\gcd(a, b, c) \text{ need not be } 1)\). Let \(\gcd(a, b, c) = g\). For \(ax + by + cz = n\) to have \(k \geq 1\) solutions, it is necessary that \(g\) divides \(n\). Let \(a'' = \frac{a}{g}, b'' = \frac{b}{g}, c'' = \frac{c}{g},\) and \(n'' = \frac{n}{g}\). Note that \(\gcd(a'', b'', c'') = 1\).

- Let \(g_1'', g_2'',\) and \(g_3''\) denote \(\gcd(b'', c''), \gcd(c'', a''),\) and \(\gcd(a'', b''),\) respectively.
- Let \(A'' = \frac{a''}{g_2''g_3''}, B'' = \frac{b''}{g_3''g_1''}\) and \(C'' = \frac{c''}{g_1''g_2''}\).
- Let \(a'' = A''B'' + C''\) and \(b'' = 2A''B''C''\), and

\[
M'' = \left[\frac{(2a''b'' - 1)^2 - 4a''^2}{4b''} + a'' \right] + 1.
\]

Suppose \(k \geq M''\). It is clear that \(ax + by + cz = n\) has \(k\) solutions if and only if \(a''x + b''y + c''z = n''\) has \(k\) solutions. That is, \(n \in R_k(a, b, c)\) if and only if \(n'' = \frac{n}{g} \in R_k(a'', b'', c'')\). Therefore,

\[
R_k(a, b, c) = \{gt : t \in R_k(a'', b'', c'')\},
\]

(7)

where \(R_k(a'', b'', c'')\) can be calculated from the formulas described above (since \(\gcd(a'', b'', c'') = 1\)). Note that if \(k\) is of Category II with respect to \(a'', b'',\) and \(c''\), then \(R_k(a'', b'', c'') = \emptyset\), and therefore \(R_k(a, b, c) = \emptyset\). Thus,

\[
c_{=k}(a, b, c) = s_{=k}(a, b, c) = 0,
\]

and the quantities \(g_{=k}(a, b, c)\) and \(h_{=k}(a, b, c)\) are not defined. If \(k\) is of Category I with respect to \(a'', b'',\) and \(c''\), then from (7), we have

\[
g_{=k}(a, b, c) = gg_{=k}(a'', b'', c''),
\]

\[
h_{=k}(a, b, c) = gh_{=k}(a'', b'', c''),
\]

\[
c_{=k}(a, b, c) = c_{=k}(a'', b'', c''),
\]

\[
s_{=k}(a, b, c) = gs_{=k}(a'', b'', c''),
\]

where \(g_{=k}(a'', b'', c''), h_{=k}(a'', b'', c''), c_{=k}(a'', b'', c''),\) and \(s_{=k}(a'', b'', c'')\) can be calculated from the formulas described above (since \(\gcd(a'', b'', c'') = 1\)).
4 An application to a recent conjecture

Next, we use the bounds in Theorem 2 to disprove a recent conjecture of He, Shiue and Venkat in [4]. First, we describe some notation required to state their conjecture. Let $a, b, c$ and $n$ be given positive integers with $\gcd(a, b, c) = 1$.

- $\hat{S}_1$ denotes the set of non-negative integer solutions $(x, y, z)$ of $ax + by + cz = n$ such that $x = 0$.
- $\hat{S}_2$ denotes the set of non-negative integer solutions $(x, y, z)$ of $ax + by + cz = n$ such that $y = 0$.
- $\hat{S}_3$ denotes the set of non-negative integer solutions $(x, y, z)$ of $ax + by + cz = n$ such that $z = 0$.

Conjecture 5. (He, Shiue and Venkat (2021)) For any solution $(\hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{z})$ of $ax + by + cz = n$, there exist $s_i \in \hat{S}_i$ such that

$$(\hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{z}) = s_1 - s_2 + s_3.$$  

They verified this conjecture for some basic examples. Moreover, they also gave the following interesting consequence of this conjecture, if it is true.

Consequence of the conjecture: Let $N_i$ denote $|\hat{S}_i|$, and $\hat{N} = N_1 + N_2 + N_3$. Then

$$0 \leq N(a, b, c; n) \leq 3 \left(\binom{N}{3}\right).$$

We give a counterexample to this consequence of the conjecture, which in turn will disprove the conjecture. Choose $a = 191$, $b = 131$, $c = 117$, and $n = 67529$. Then, using the formula given in [3, Corollary 17], $N_1 = 4$, $N_2 = 3$ and $N_3 = 3$. This method was also described independently in [1]. Equivalently, we might calculate $N_1, N_2$ and $N_3$ using the formula given in [5]. Thus, $\hat{N} = 10$. Therefore, assuming the conjecture is true, the number of solutions of

$$191x + 131y + 117z = 67529$$

should be less than or equal to $3 \binom{10}{3} = 360$. However, by our bounds in Theorem 2 we have

$$565 \leq N(191, 131, 117; 67529) \leq 1003,$$

giving the required contradiction. For further studies, it may be interesting to see if this conjecture or its consequence hold true for some special families of values of $a$, $b$ and $c$.
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