arXiv:2203.11457v1 [math.CO] 22 Mar 2022

ON THE FROBENIUS COIN PROBLEM IN THREE VARIABLES

NEGIN BAGHERPOUR
AMIR JAFARI
AMIN NAJAFI AMIN

Abstract. The Frobenius coin problem in three variables, for three positive relatively prime integers $a_1 < a_2 < a_3$ asks to find the largest number not representable as $a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 + a_3x_3$ with non-negative integer coefficients x_1, x_2 and x_3. In this article, we present a new algorithm to solve this problem that is faster and in our belief simpler than all existing algorithms and runs in $O(\log a_1)$ steps.

1. Introduction

According to Brauer [1], in early 1900's Frobenius mentioned the following problem in his lectures. For relatively prime integers $a_1 < a_2 < \cdots < a_n$, the problem asks to find the largest integer $G(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ that can not be represented as $a_1x_1 + \cdots + a_nx_n$ with positive integer coefficients $x_1, \ldots, x_n$. If we define $g(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ to be the largest integer that can not be represented as $a_1x_1 + \cdots + a_nx_n$ with non-negative integer coefficients $x_1 \ldots, x_n$, then one can see that

$$g(a_1, \ldots, a_n) = G(a_1, \ldots, a_n) - a_1 - \cdots - a_n.$$

This problem can be explained to any non-mathematician easily by finding the largest amount of money that can not be formed using coins (of sufficient supply) with denominations $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_n$. That is why this problem is called the Frobenius coin problem.

The numbers $g(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ and $G(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ are known as the Frobenius numbers. The case where $n = 2$ was studied before by Sylvester, where in 1882 [11], he was able to show that $G(a_1, a_2) = a_1a_2$. However, no closed simple formula has been found for the Frobenius numbers for $n > 2$. This has been proved rigorously by Curtis [3] using certain classes of functions. For some comments about the claimed formulae by Tripathi [12] in the case where $n = 3$, please refer to the end of this introduction.

For the sake of completeness, let us show that the Frobenius number is well-defined.

Lemma 1. *For relatively prime positive integers $a_1, \ldots, a_n$, there is an integer m_0 such that any $n \geq m_0$ is a linear combination $a_1x_1 + \cdots + a_nx_n$ for integers $x_1, \ldots, x_n \geq 0$.*

Proof. By Bézout's theorem, choose integers $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ such that $a_1x_1 + \cdots + a_nx_n = 1$. Without loss of generality by reordering the coefficients, we may assume that $x_1, \ldots, x_i \geq 0$ and $x_{i+1}, \ldots, x_n < 0$ for some $i \leq 1 \leq n$. Let $P = a_1x_1 + \cdots + a_ix_i$ and $N = -a_{i+1}x_{i+1} - \cdots - a_nx_n$, then $P - N = 1$. We show that $m_0 = (a_1 - 1)N$ works. Let $m \geq m_0$ and write

$m-(a_1-1)N = a_1q+r$ with $0 \leq r < a_1$. Then $m = (a_1-1)N + a_1q + (P-N)r = (a_1-1-r)N + a_1q + rP$ which is a linear combination of a_i's with non-negative integers. □

We mention the following elementary well-known lemma.

Lemma 2. *If a_1 and a_2 are relatively prime positive integers, then any positive integer n can be uniquely expressed as $a_1x_1 + a_2x_2$ with x_1 and x_2 being integers and $0 < x_1 \leq a_2$.*

Proof. By Bézout's theorem we may find integers y_1 and y_2 such that $a_1y_1 + a_2y_2 = n$. Write $y_1 = qa_2 + x_1$ where $0 < x_1 \leq a_2$. Then, we have $n = a_1x_1 + a_2(qy_1 + y_2)$. This shows the existence of such a representation. Now suppose that $n = a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 = a_1x_1' + a_2x_2'$. Hence if $x_1 > x_1'$, we get $a_1(x_1 - x_1') = a_2(x_2' - x_1)$. So $x_1 - x_1'$ is divisible by a_2, since a_1 and a_2 are relatively prime. But since $0 < x_1 \leq a_2$ then $0 \leq x_1 - x_1' < a_2$. So, we must have $x_1 = x_1'$ and $x_2 = x_2'$ □

Remark 1. *For relatively prime positive integers a_1 and a_2, the Sylvester's result that $G(a_1, a_2) = a_1a_2$ (or equivalently $g(a_1, a_2) = a_1a_2 - a_1 - a_2$) follows from this lemma very easily. In fact, if $n > a_1a_2$ and one writes $n = a_1x_1 + a_2x_2$ with $0 < x_1 \leq a_1$ then $x_2 > 0$. Also if $a_1a_2 = a_1x_1 + a_2x_2$ with $x_1, x_2 > 0$ then $0 < x_1 \leq a_2$. Hence by the uniqueness of such representation we must have $x_1 = a_2$ and $x_2 = 0$.*

Remark 2. *Given two relatively prime positive integers $a_1 < a_2$, the representation of n as in Lemma 2 can be constructed by successive divisions as in the Euclidean algorithm. It can be shown, that the algorithm requires at least N steps if $a_1 \geq F_{N+1}$ and $a_2 \geq F_{N+2}$, where F_N is the Nth Fibonacci element, see* [6]*. In other words the number of steps required to find this representation is at most $\log_\phi(a_1) + 1$ where $\phi = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$ is the golden ratio.*

The main result of this paper is an algorithm for computing $g(a_1, a_2, a_3)$ for relatively prime positive integers $a_1 < a_2 < a_3$. For this, without loss of generality, we may assume that $gcd(a_1, a_2) = 1$, where gcd is used for the greatest common divisor. To see this, we appeal to the following elementary result of Johnson, see [5].

Lemma 3. *If a_1, a_2 and a_3 are relatively prime positive integers and the greatest common divisor of a_1 and a_2 is d then*

$$G(a_1, a_2, a_3) = dG(\frac{a_1}{d}, \frac{a_2}{d}, a_3).$$

So with the cost of calculating the $gcd(a_1, a_2)$, which takes at most $\log_\phi(a_1)+1$ steps (see Remark 2), we may assume that a_1 and a_2 are relatively prime.

Let us present our algorithm in this case.

Algorithm 1. *Three Variable Frobenius Coin Problem Solver.*

- ***Input:*** *Integers $0 < a_1 < a_2 < a_3$ with $gcd(a_1, a_2) = 1$.*
- ***Output:*** *$G(a_1, a_2, a_3)$.*
  - ***Step 0:*** *Let*

$$b_{-1}' = a_1 \quad \text{and} \quad b_{-1} = a_2.$$

– ***Step 1:*** *Find* $0 < b'_0 \leq a_1$ *and* b_0 *such that*

$$a_3 = a_2 b'_0 - a_1 b_0.$$

If $b_0 \leq 0$ *return* $G(a_1, a_2, a_3) = a_1 a_2 + a_3$ *and stop.*

– ***Step 2:*** *For* $i = 0, 1, \ldots$ *define* b_{i+1} *and* b'_{i+1} *inductively as follows. If* b_i *or* b'_i *is zero stop and go to step 3. Otherwise, by the division algorithm, let*

$$b_{i-1} = b_i q_i + r_i \quad 0 \leq r_i < b_i$$
$$b'_{i-1} = b'_i q'_i + r'_i \quad 0 \leq r'_i < b'_i,$$

Compute $b_{i+1} = b_{i-1} - b_i \min(q_i, q'_i)$ *and* $b'_{i+1} = b'_{i-1} - b'_i \min(q_i, q'_i)$ *and continue if* $q_i = q'_i$ *and if* $q_i \neq q'_i$ *stop.*

– ***Step 3:*** *If the algorithm halts at step* k *(i.e. after calculating* b_k *and* b'_k*), return* $G(a_1, a_2, a_3)$ *as follows.*

$$G(a_1, a_2, a_3) = \begin{cases} b_k a_1 + b'_{k-1} a_2 - \min(b_{k-1} a_1, b'_k a_2) & \text{if } k \text{ is odd} \\ b_{k-1} a_1 + b'_k a_2 - \min(b_k a_1, b'_{k-1} a_2) & \text{if } k \text{ is even} \end{cases}$$

Some remarks about this algorithm are given below.

(1) In Step 1, according to Lemma 2 the numbers b_0 and b'_0 are uniquely determined. If $b_0 \leq 0$ then a_3 is a linear combination of a_1 and a_2 with non-negative coefficient and hence it is redundant, in other words $g(a_1, a_2, a_3) = g(a_1, a_2)$ and hence $G(a_1, a_2, a_3) = g(a_1, a_2) + a_1 + a_2 + a_3 = a_1 a_2 + a_3$. Also note that since $a_3 > 0$ we must have $b_0 \leq a_2$.

(2) In Step 2, before termination b_{i+1} and b'_{i+1} are the actual remainders and therefore $b_{i+1} < b_i$ and $b'_{i+1} < b'_i$. Therefore this loop must stop and in fact since the process is similar to the Euclidean algorithm it must stop at most after $\log_\phi(a_1) + 1$ steps. Since, we need to do two divisions in each step, Step 2 requires at most $2\log_\phi(a_1) + 2$ divisions. In fact with a little more care, we can show that the number of steps needed for this, is at most $\frac{1}{2}\log_\phi(a_1) + 2$ and hence we can replace $2\log_\phi(a_1) + 2$ with $\log_\phi(a_1) + 4$.

(3) Finally, in order to make $gcd(a_1, a_2) = 1$, we need to find the gcd and divide. So by one round of the Euclidean algorithm we can do this and also find b_0 and b'_0 of Step1. We need at most $\log_\phi(a_1) + 3$ divisions or multiplications. So in total the algorithm returns the answer for any three relatively prime integers $0 < a_1 < a_2 < a_3$ in at most $2\log_\phi(a_1) + 7$ steps.

We conclude our introduction with a review of the vast literature around the Frobenius coin problem and especially the case when the number of variables is three. The first algorithm for calculating $g(a_1, a_2, a_3)$ was perhaps given by Selmer and Bayer in [10], which relied on delicate properties of the continued fraction. Soon after their algorithm was simplified and improved by Rødset in [8]. The number of steps required for his algorithm was $O(a_1 + \log a_2)$. Davison in [4] improved Rødset's algorithm and presented an algorithm with certain similarities with ours, that needed $O(\log a_2)$ steps. The most costly step in Davison's algorithm is calculating the greatest common divisor of a_2 and a_3. This was needed since the algorithm requires making the three integers pairwise relatively prime. The new algorithm presented in this paper, although being simpler and more intuitive than Davison's algorithm has a better running time and requires only $O(\log a_1)$ steps to find

$G(a_1, a_2, a_3)$. This is because, we do not need a_3 to be relatively prime to a_1 or a_2. For a more detailed discussion about the Frobenius coin problem and its related algorithms, we refer the reader to the excellent book of Ramírez Alfonsín [7].

We should also justify the reason for trying to improve upon the previously existing algorithms despite Tripathi's claimed formulae for $g(a_1, a_2, a_3)$ in [12]. In fact, we believe that the formulae given in [12] are not capable to calculate $g(a_1, a_2, a_3)$ efficiently. In several places in [12] (e.g. Lemma 11 and Theorem 5) for certain two rational numbers $0 < \alpha < \beta$, the maximum integer m such that $\lfloor m\alpha \rfloor = \lfloor m\beta \rfloor$ is used without any indication of how such a number may be found. The structure of numbers m with this property is complicated and they might not be consecutive integers. For example if

$$a_1 = 468342493, \;\; a_2 = 472518070 \;\; \text{and} \;\; a_3 = 472714471$$

then our algorithm terminates in four rounds as follows.

$$\begin{array}{lllll} b_{-1} = a_2 & b_0 = 235128713 & b_1 = 2260644 & b_2 = 21737 & b_3 = 21733, \quad b_4 = 4 \\ b'_{-1} = a_1 & b'_0 = 233050914 & b'_1 = 2240665 & b'_2 = 21754 & b'_3 = 3 \qquad\; b'_4 = 21751 \end{array}$$

and returns the value

$$G(a_1, a_2, a_3) = b_3 a_1 + b'_4 a_2 - \min\left(b_4 a_1, b'_3 a_2\right) = 20454810386729.$$

If one uses the formulae in [12], then for example at one of the steps, i.e. in Theorem 5 of that article one needs to find the largest integer m where $\lfloor m\alpha \rfloor = \lfloor m\beta \rfloor$ with

$$\alpha = \frac{10906201339369943}{105875470131655} \quad \beta = \frac{232868069}{2260644}$$

the values for m that $\lfloor m\alpha \rfloor = \lfloor m\beta \rfloor$ are the following (that are written only for $m \geq 10400$)

$$\ldots, 10400, 10401, 10402, 10403, 10504, 10505, 10506, 10608, 10609, 10712.$$

So, the required value is 10712. Therefore, unless there is an effective way to find m, the formulae in [12] are of little use.

In the last section of this paper, we will indicate how one may use this algorithm to derive some existing calculations of $G(a_1, a_2, a_3)$ for special values of variables.

2. Proof of the correctness of algorithm

In this section, we will show that the algorithm presented in the introduction does indeed return the correct value for $G(a_1, a_2, a_3)$, where a_1, a_2 and a_3 are relatively prime positive integers and $\gcd(a_1, a_2) = 1$. Assume that after calculating b_k and b'_k the algorithm halts, in this case we say that the algorithm stops after k rounds. We first observe that the algorithm alternatively writes a positive multiple of a_1 or a_2 as a positive linear combination of the other two numbers.

Lemma 4. *For $0 \leq j \leq k$, one can find positive integers p_j such that*

$$b'_j a_2 = b_j a_1 + (-1)^j p_j a_3.$$

Proof. By the definition of b_0 and b'_0 the identity holds for $j = 0$ with $p_0 = 1$. This identity is true also for $j = -1$ if $p_{-1} = 0$. Assume that we have found $p_0, \ldots, p_j$ that the identity

holds. According to the notation of the Step 2 of the algorithm, we may write If we subtract $\min(q_j, q'_j)$ multiple of the identity above for j from the similar identity for $j-1$ we obtain

$$b'_{j+1}a_2 = b_{j+1}a_1 + (-1)^{j+1}(p_{j-1} + \min(q_i, q'_i)p_j)a_3$$

so we may define $p_{j+1} = p_{j-1} + \min(q_i, q'_i)p_j$. □

Lemma 5. *For any $0 \leq j \leq k$ one has*

$$(-1)^j a_3 = b_{j-1}b'_j - b_j b'_{j-1}.$$

Proof. For $j = 0$, this follows from the definition of b_0 and b'_0. The general case follows by a simple inductive argument similar to the previous lemma. □

Lemma 6. *If the algorithm stops after k rounds, $b_k b'_k \neq 0$ and k is odd then $q'_k < q_k$, $b'_k < b'_{k-1}$ and $b_k > b_{k-1}$. Similarly if k is even then $q'_k > q_k$, $b'_k > b'_{k-1}$ and $b_k < b_{k-1}$.*

Proof. Let k be odd then by Lemma 5, $b'_{k-1}b_{k-2} - b'_{k-2}b_{k-1} = a_3 > 0$ and hence $\frac{b_{k-2}}{b_{k-1}} > \frac{b'_{k-2}}{b'_{k-1}}$. Since $q_{k-1} \neq q'_{k-1}$ hence $q_{k-1} > q'_{k-1}$. Now

$$b'_k = b'_{k-2} - q'_{k-1}b_{k-1} = r'_{k-1} < b'_{k-1}$$

$$b_k = b_{k-2} - q'_{k-1}b_{k-1} \geq b_{k-2} - (q_{k-1} - 1)b_{k-1} = r_{k-1} + b_{k-1} > b_{k-1}$$

The case where k is even is similar. □

The following definition will be useful in the sequel.

Definition 1. *Let a_1, a_2 and a_3 be relatively prime positive integers. Let $L(a_1|a_2, a_3)$ be the smallest positive integer m such that $ma_1 = a_2x + a_3y$ for non-negative integers x and y.*

Lemma 7. *If k is odd then $b_k = L(a_1|a_2, a_3)$ and $b'_{k-1} = L(a_2|a_1, a_3)$. If k is even then $b_{k-1} = L(a_1|a_2, a_3)$ and $b'_k = L(a_2|a_1, a_3)$.*

Proof. Assume k is odd, then by Lemma 4, we know

$$b_k a_1 = b'_k a_2 + p_k a_3 \tag{1}$$

$$b'_{k-1}a_2 = b_{k-1}a_1 + p_{k-1}a_3 \tag{2}$$

Hence $L_1 = L(a_1|a_2, a_3) \leq b_k$ and $L_2 = L(a_2|a_1, a_3) \leq b'_{k-1}$. Suppose $L_2 < b'_{k-1}$ and

$$L_2 a_2 = xa_1 + ya_3$$

with $x, y \geq 0$. Observe that any linear relation between a_1, a_2 and a_3 can be obtained by a linear combination of Equations (1) and (2). In other words there exists integers α and β such that

$$-\alpha b_k + \beta b_{k-1} = x \geq 0 \tag{3}$$

$$0 < -\alpha b'_k + \beta b'_{k-1} = L_2 < b'_{k-1} \tag{4}$$

$$\alpha p_k + \beta p_{k-1} = y \geq 0 \tag{5}$$

In fact any two consecutive identities in Lemma 4 generate all linear relations among a_1, a_2 and a_3. Since any of these identities is obtained from the previous two, we only need to prove it from the first two. That is for $j = -1$ and $j = 0$.

$$b_{-1}a_1 = b'_{-1}a_2 + 0 \cdot a_3$$

$$b_0 a_1 = b'_0 a_2 + a_3$$

This is indeed true. Assume that $a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 + a_3x_3 = 0$ is a linear relation. If we multiply the first equation with x_3 and subtract from this, we eliminate a_3. Now since a_1 and a_2 are relatively prime the coefficients of a_1 and a_2 are multiples of a_2 and a_1 respectively. So from the second equation we can eliminate them as well.

If the algorithm stops since b_k or b'_k is zero, then in the case when k is odd from Equation (1) it follows that $b'_k = 0$. Now Equation (4) is impossible to hold, so we consider the case where b'_k is not zero. By Lemma 6, $b_k > b_{k-1}$ and $b'_k < b'_{k-1}$. If $\alpha < 0$ then by Equation (5), $\beta \geq 0$ and this will contradict Equation (4). So $\alpha > 0$ and $\beta > 0$. Now Equation (3) and $b_k > b_{k-1}$ implies that $\alpha < \beta$ but Equation (4) and $b'_k < b'_{k-1}$ implies that $\alpha \geq \beta$, which proves this case.

Now assume that $L_1 < b_k$ and write

$$L_1 a_1 = x' a_2 + y' a_3$$

with $x', y' \geq 0$. Like the previous case we may find integers α and β such that

$$0 < \alpha b_k - \beta b_{k-1} = L_1 < b_k \tag{6}$$

$$0 < \alpha b'_k - \beta b'_{k-1} = x' \geq 0 \tag{7}$$

$$\alpha p_k + \beta p_{k-1} = y' \geq 0 \tag{8}$$

If $b'_k = 0$ then by Equation (7), $\beta < 0$. By Equation (8) $\alpha > 0$. Now these contradicts Equation (6). If $b'_k \neq 0$, by Lemma 6, $b_k > b_{k-1}$, from Equation (6), we must have $\alpha \leq \beta$ and since $b'_k < b'_{k-1}$ from Equation (7) we must have $\alpha > \beta$.

□

We also need the following lemma.

Lemma 8. *If the algorithm stops after k rounds and k is odd the following representation of $b_k a_1$ has maximum coefficients of a_3 among all such representations and if $b'_k \neq 0$ the same is true for $b'_{k-1}a_2$.*

$$b_k a_1 = b'_k a_2 + p_k a_3 \tag{9}$$

$$b'_{k-1}a_2 = b_{k-1}a_1 + p_{k-1}a_3 \tag{10}$$

Similarly if k even the following representation of $b'_k a_2$ has maximum coefficients of a_3 among all such representations and if $b_k \neq 0$ the same is true for $b_{k-1}a_1$.

$$b'_k a_2 = b_k a_1 + p_k a_3 \tag{11}$$

$$b_{k-1}a_1 = b'_{k-1}a_2 + p_{k-1}a_3 \tag{12}$$

Proof. Let us prove it for the case where k is odd. We know any relation among a_1, a_2 and a_3 is obtained by a linear combination of Equations (9) and (10), see the beginning of the proof of Lemma 7. So we need to see if there are integers α and β such that

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha b_k - \beta b_{k-1} &= b_k\\ \alpha b'_k - \beta b'_{k-1} &\geq 0\\ \alpha p_k + \beta p_{k-1} &> p_k\end{aligned}$$

If the algorithm stoped since $b'_k = 0$ then $\beta < 0$ and hence $\alpha > 0$ and the first equation is not true. Otherwise, by Lemma 6, $b_k > b_{k-1}$ so $\alpha \leq \beta$. But since $b'_k < b'_{k-1}$ the second equation implies that $\alpha > \beta$. So this case is not possible.

To reduce the coefficient of a_3 in Equation (10), we need to find integers α and β such that

$$\begin{aligned}-\alpha b'_k + \beta b'_{k-1} &= b'_{k-1}\\ -\alpha b_k + \beta b_{k-1} &\geq 0\\ \alpha p_k + \beta p_{k-1} &> p_{k-1}\end{aligned}$$

If $b'_k \neq 0$ then by Lemma 6, $b_k > b_{k-1}$ and $b'_k < b'_{k-1}$. If $\alpha < 0$ then $\beta > 0$ and this contradicts the first equation above. So $\alpha, \beta \geq 0$. The second equation implies $\alpha < \beta$. but the first equation implies $\alpha \geq \beta$. In the case when $b'_k = 0$ we might indeed get representations with bigger value for a_3. □

The following lemma and its proof have been taken from Johnson [5] with few modification to allow only the assumption of $gcd(a_1, a_2) = 1$ instead of Johnson's assumption that $gcd(a_1, a_2) = gcd(a_1, a_3) = gcd(a_2, a_3) = 1$.

Lemma 9. *If $0 < a_1 < a_2 < a_3$ are integers with $gcd(a_1, a_2) = 1$ and a_3 is not a non-negative linear combination of a_1 and a_2. Let $L_1 = L(a_1|a_2, a_3)$, $L_2 = L(a_2|a_1, a_3)$, $L_1a_1 = xa_2 + ya_3$ and $L_2a_2 = x'a_1 + y'a_3$ with non-negative coefficients. If these representations are not unique choose the one with maximum value of y or y'. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}G(a_1, a_2, a_3) &= \max\left(L_1a_1 + y'a_3, L_2a_2 + ya_3\right)\\ &= L_1a_1 + L_2a_2 - \min\left(x'a_1, xa_2\right)\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since a_1 and a_2 are relatively prime, by Lemma 2, we may write

$$a_3 = a_1s_1 + a_2s_2 \qquad 0 < s_1 \leq a_2$$

Since a_3 is not a linear combination of a_1 and a_2 with non-negative coefficients, we assume $0 < s_1 < a_2$ and $s_2 < 0$. Hence s_1a_1 is a linear combination of a_2 and a_3 with positive coefficients, which gives $L_1 \leq s_1 < a_2$. Similarly $L_2 < a_1$. Since $gcd(a_1, a_2) = 1$, this will imply simply that y and y' are positive integers.

Next, observe that $G(a_1, a_2, a_3)$ is a positive number that is not a linear combination of a_1, a_2 and a_3 with positive coefficients but for each $i = 1, 2, 3$, $G(a_1, a_2, a_3)+a_i$ is such a linear combination, which under the first assumption is equivalent to the fact that $G(a_1, a_2, a_3)$ is a linear combination with positive coefficients of any two of a_1, a_2 or a_3. We will show that only two numbers satisfy these two properties that are $L_1a_1 + y'a_3$ and $L_2a_2 + ya_3$. This is enough to finish the proof of the lemma.

Assume $N = za_2 + z'a_3 = ta_1 + t'a_3 = wa_1 + w'a_2$ with positive coefficients z, z', t, t', w and w'. If these representations are not unique choose the ones with maximum value for z' and t'. Also assume N is not a linear combination of a_1, a_2 and a_3 with positive coefficients. We remark that $w \leq L_1$ and $w' \leq L_2$. Assume for instance that $w > L_1$ then

$$N = (w - L_1)a_1 + L_1a_1 + w'a_2 = (w - L_1)a_1 + (x + w')a_2 + ya_3$$

is a linear combination with positive coefficients of a_1, a_2 and a_3 which is a contradiction. The proof for $w' \leq L_2$ is similar.

Also we must have $z \leq L_2$ and $t \leq L_1$. If $z > L_2$ and $L_2a_2 = x'a_1 + y'a_3$ with $x' > 0$ then the above argument suffices for the proof. If $x' = 0$, then we can increase the value of z' by decreasing z to $z - L$, which contradicts the maximality of z'. The argument for $t \leq L_1$ is similar.

Now, we compare z' and t'. If $z' = t'$ then $a_1|z$ so $z \geq a_1$ which contradicts $z \leq L_2 < a_1$. If $z' > t'$, then $ta_1 = za_2 + (z' - t')a_3$ so $t \geq L_1$ and since $t \leq L_1$, we must have $t = L_1$. It follows that $w'a_2 = (L_1 - w)a_1 + t'a_3$. So $w' \geq L_2$ and hence $w' = L_2$. By maximality of t' and y' it follows that $t' = y'$ and hence $N = L_1a_1 + y'a_3$.

If $z' < t'$ then $za_2 = ta_1 + (t' - z')a_3$. Hence $z \geq L_2$ which together with $z \leq L_2$ results in $z = L_2$. Now, we have $wa_1 = (L_2 - w')a_2 + z'a_3$. Hence $w \geq L_1$ and therefore $w = L_1$. By maximality of z' and y therefore we have $z' = y$ and so $N = L_2a_2 + ya_3$.

□

Now Lemmas 7, 8, and 9 imply the following theorem.

Theorem 10. *If Algorithm 1 stops after k rounds then*

$$G(a_1, a_2, a_3) = \begin{cases} b_k a_1 + b'_{k-1}a_2 - \min(b_{k-1}a_1, b'_k a_2) & \text{if } k \text{ is odd} \\ b_{k-1}a_1 + b'_k a_2 - \min(b_k a_1, b'_{k-1}a_2) & \text{if } k \text{ is even} \end{cases}.$$

Proof. The only case that needs explanation is when the algorithm stops because b_k or b'_k vanish. Suppose k is odd and $b'_k = 0$ then $L_1 = b_k$ and the representation $b_k a_1 = p_k a_3$ is definitely a representation with maximum coefficient for a_3. So the factor a_2x in Lemma 9 is zero. Therefore it is of no importance what representation we use for L_2a_2 and the answer is $G(a_1, a_2, a_3) = L_1a_1 + L_2a_2 = b_k a_1 + b'_{k-1}a_2$. The case when k is even is similar. Note that if $b_k \neq 0$ and $b'_k \neq 0$ then according to Lemma 8, the representations for L_1a_1 and L_2a_2 derived from our algorithm have maximum coefficients for a_3. □

3. CONCLUSION

In this article, an algorithm for calculating the Frobenius number in the case where the number of variables is three is presented. This algorithm is very simple and intuitive. However, it is faster than existing algorithms and runs in $O(\log a_1)$ and more precisely in at most $2\log_\phi(a_1) + 7$ steps. Here a_1 is the smallest number. In fact, in practice, the number of steps is usually far smaller than this bound. For example, for calculating $G(a_1, a_2, a_3)$ for

$$a_1 = 468342493, \;\; a_2 = 472518070 \;\; \text{and} \;\; a_3 = 472714471$$

which was given in the introduction, the Euclidean algorithm for $gcd(a_1, a_2)$ requires 12 divisions, we need 2 more for finding b_0 and b'_0 and and 8 divisions for the loop of Step 2. In total, we need to perform 22 divisions or multiplication. Now $2\log_\phi(a_1) + 7 \simeq 90$.

This algorithm, due to its simplicity, is capable to obtain formulae for $g(a_1, a_2, a_3)$ that exist in the literature for special cases. For instance, if $d > 0$, $gcd(a, d) = 1$ and $a \geq 3$ then the following formula

$$g(a, a+d, a+2d) = \left\lfloor \frac{a-2}{2} \right\rfloor a + (a-1)d$$

was obtained by Roberts [9]. Our algorithm derives this formula quite easily. Assume $a = 2k$, then we get the following numbers from the algorithm.

$$\begin{array}{lll} b_{-1} = 2k+d & b_0 = 1 & b_1 = k+d \\ b'_{-1} = 2k & b'_0 = 2 & b'_1 = 0 \end{array}$$

So the algorithm stops after 1 round and we have

$$G(a, a+d, a+2d) = (k+d)(2k) + 2(2k+d) - \min(2k+d, 0) = 2k^2 + 4k + (2k+2)d.$$

If we calculate $g(a, a+d, a+2d) + (a + a + d + a + 2d)$ from Robert's formula we get the same answer

$$(k-1)(2k) + (2k-1)d + 6k + 3d = 2k^2 + 4k + (2k+2)d.$$

When a is odd, the proof is similar.

Assume $a_1 < a_2 < a_3$ are relatively prime positive integers. The following formula for $G(a_1, a_2, a_3)$ in the case where $a_2 \equiv 1 \pmod{a_1}$ and a_3 not being too small relative to a_1 and a_2, was the main result of Byrnes [2].[1]

$$G(a_1, a_2, a_3) = \begin{cases} a_1a_2 + a_3 & \text{if} \quad a_3 \geq ja_2 \\ (\frac{a_1-m}{j} + 1)a_3 + ma_2 & \text{if} \quad (j-m)a_2 < a_3 < ja_2 \\ \frac{a_1-m}{j}a_3 + ja_2 & \text{if} \quad \frac{j}{a_1-m+j}(j-m)a_2 \leq a_3 < (j-m)a_2 \end{cases}$$

where $a_3 \equiv j \pmod{a_1}$ for $0 \leq j < a_1$ and if $j \neq 0$, $a_1 \equiv m \pmod{j}$ for $1 \leq m \leq j$. If $j = 0$, then m is irrelevant since we are in the first case and $G(a_1, a_2, a_3) = a_1a_2 + a_3$. This formula follows easily from our algorithm as well. By the hypothesis $a_3 \equiv ja_2 \pmod{a_1}$ and so there is an integer b such that $a_3 = ja_2 - ba_1$. If $a_3 \geq ja_1$ then $b \leq 0$ and hence a_3 is a non-negative linear combination of a_1 and a_2 and so $g(a_1, a_2, a_3) = g(a_1, a_2)$ or equivalently $G(a_1, a_2, a_3) = g(a_1, a_2) + a_1 + a_2 + a_3 = a_1a_2 + a_3$. Since $0 < j < a_1$, in Step 1 of the algorithm $b'_0 = j$ and $b_0 = b$. Note that since $ja_2 - ba_1 = a_3 > 0$, hence $a_2/b_0 > a_1/j$. So, in Step 2 of our algorithm $q_1 \geq q'_1 = \frac{a_1-m}{j}$. If $m < j$, we have the following numbers in the algorithm.

$$\begin{array}{llll} b_{-1} = a_2 & b_0 = b & b_1 = a_2 - \frac{a_1-m}{j}b \\ b'_{-1} = a_1 & b'_0 = j & b'_1 = m \end{array}$$

It can be seen from Lemma 5 or directly that $a_3 = jb_1 - mb$. The algorithm stops after one round if and only if $b_1 \geq b_0$ or equivalently $a_3 \geq b(j-m)$. But $b = \frac{ja_2-a_3}{a_1}$. so this inequality is equivalent to

$$\frac{j}{a_1 - m + j}(j-m)a_2 \leq a_3$$

[1] In the article the formula is written for $g(a_1, a_2, a_3)$ and the notation M is used for this function.

Hence, Brynes in [2] has considered only the situation where the algorithm stops after one round. Therefore by Theorem 10

$$G(a_1, a_2, a_3) = b_1a_1 + ja_2 - \min(ba_1, ma_2).$$

Since $(j-m)a_2 < a_3 = ja_2 - ba_1$ is equivalent to $ma_2 > ba_1$, in the second case we have

$$G(a_1, a_2, a_3) = b_1a_1 + ja_2 - ba_1 = b_1a_1 + a_3$$

and in the third case

$$G(a_1, a_2, a_3) = b_1a_1 + ja_2 - ma_2.$$

Now, all one needs to do is to use Lemma 4 and replace b_1a_1 by $ma_2 + q_1'a_3 = ma_2 + \frac{a_1-m}{j}a_3$. It remains to deal with the case when $m = j$. In this case $b_1' = 0$ and $q_1' = \frac{a_1}{j}$ and hence

$$b_1a_1 = \frac{a_1}{j}a_3$$

$$G(a_1, a_2, a_3) = b_1a_1 + ja_2 = \frac{a_1}{j}a_3 + ma_2,$$

as prescribed in the second case of the formula. The third case is empty if $m = j$.

References

[1] A. Brauer, On a problem of partitions, Am. J. Math. 64 (1942), 299–312.
[2] J. S. Byrnes, On a partition problem of Frobenius. J. Comb. Theor. Ser. A, 17 (1974), 162-166.
[3] F. Curtis, On formulas for the Frobenius number of a numerical semigroup, Math. Scand. 67 (1990), 190–192.
[4] J.L. Davison, On the linear diophantine of Frobenius, J. Number Theory 48 (1994), 353–363.
[5] S.M. Johnson, A linear diophantine problem, Can. J. Math. 12 (1960), 390–398.
[6] D. Knuth, The Art of Computer Programming, Volume 2: Seminumerical Algorithms (3rd ed.). Addison–Wesley. ISBN 0-201-89684-2.
[7] J.L Ramírez Alfonsín, The Diophantine Frobenius problem.Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications 30, (2005).
[8] Ø.J. Rødseth, On a linear diophantine problem of Frobenius II, J. Reine Angewandte Math. 307/308 (1979), 431–440.
[9] J. B. Roberts, Note on linear forms, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 7 (1956), 465-469.
[10] E.S. Selmer and O. Beyer, On the linear diophantine problem of Frobenius in three variables, J. Reine Angewandte Math. 301 (1978), 161–170 .
[11] J.J. Sylvester, On sub-invariants, i.e. semi-invariants to binary quanties of an unlimited order, Am. J. Math. 5 (1882), 119–136.
[12] A. Tripathi, Formulae for the Frobenius number in three variables. J, Number Theory 170 (2017) 368-389.

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Sharif University of Technology, Tehran, IRAN

Email address: ajafari@sharif.edu