

ON A PROBLEM INVOLVING UNIT FRACTIONS

STEFAN STEINERBERGER

ABSTRACT. Erdős and Graham proposed to determine the number of subsets $S \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ with $\sum_{s \in S} 1/s = 1$ and asked, among other things, whether that number could be as large as $2^{n-o(n)}$. We show that the number of subsets $S \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ with $\sum_{s \in S} 1/s \leq 1$ is smaller than $2^{0.93n}$.

1. THE RESULT

A question of Erdős and Graham [2] is as follows: how many subsets of the first n integers $S \subseteq \{1, 2, 3, \dots, n\}$ describe unit fractions that sum to one, meaning subsets for which

$$\sum_{s \in S} \frac{1}{s} = 1 ?$$

They ask whether the correct number might grow like 2^{cn} for some $0 < c < 1$ or whether it might be even as large as $2^{n-o(n)}$. The problem is also listed as Problem #297 in the list of Erdős problems curated by Bloom [1].

Theorem. *We have, for n sufficiently large,*

$$\# \left\{ S \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\} : \sum_{s \in S} \frac{1}{s} \leq 1 \right\} \leq 2^{0.93n}.$$

This set of subsets trivially contains all subsets of $\{n/2, n/2 + 1, \dots, n\}$ and thus the size is at least $2^{n/2}$. The question about the size of the smaller set of subsets for which $\sum_{s \in S} \frac{1}{s} = 1$ remains of interest, presumably that number is much smaller.

2. PROOF OF THE THEOREM

2.1. Rephrasing the problem. Instead of counting the number of subsets, we introduce indicator variables $\delta_i \in \{0, 1\}$ and are interested in whether

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\delta_i}{i} \leq 1.$$

The question is now for how many of the 2^n choices of $(\delta_1, \dots, \delta_n) \in \{0, 1\}^n$ this inequality is satisfied. We will rephrase the question in a more symmetric way. Writing $\delta_i = (1 + \varepsilon_i)/2$, where $\varepsilon_i \in \{-1, 1\}$, we get

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1 + \varepsilon_i}{2i} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{i} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\varepsilon_i}{i} = \frac{H_n}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\varepsilon_i}{i},$$

The author was partially supported by the NSF (DMS-212322).

with $H_n = 1 + 1/2 + \dots + 1/n$ being the n -th harmonic number. The question can thus be equivalently written as follows: for how many $\varepsilon \in \{-1, 1\}^n$ do we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\varepsilon_i}{i} \leq 2 - H_n \quad \text{or, by symmetry,} \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\varepsilon_i}{i} \geq H_n - 2 ?$$

2.2. Hoeffding. We can interpret this new sum as a random walk with decreasing step size. The usual out-of-the-box deviation estimates appear to be not quite delicate enough: for example, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\varepsilon_i}{i} \right) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{V} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\varepsilon_i}{i} \right) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{i^2} \leq \frac{\pi^2}{6}.$$

Comparing with a Gaussian with the same parameters would, in the best case, only give something along the lines of $e^{-c(\log n)^2}$. We will instead go through the main idea behind the proof of Hoeffding's inequality and then estimate things in a manner more adapted to the problem at hand. For each $x > 0$ and $t > 0$

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\varepsilon_i}{i} \geq t \right) = \mathbb{P} \left(x \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\varepsilon_i}{i} \geq xt \right) = \mathbb{P} \left(\exp \left(-xt + x \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\varepsilon_i}{i} \right) \geq 1 \right).$$

For any nonnegative random variable X one has $\mathbb{P}(X \geq 1) \leq \mathbb{E}X$ and thus

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\varepsilon_i}{i} \geq t \right) \leq \mathbb{E} \exp \left(-xt + x \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\varepsilon_i}{i} \right) = e^{-xt} \cdot \mathbb{E} \exp \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\varepsilon_i x}{i} \right)$$

The exponential function sends sum to products, the ε_i are independent random variables and $\mathbb{E}(XY) = (\mathbb{E}X)(\mathbb{E}Y)$ whenever X and Y are independent. Thus

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\varepsilon_i}{i} \geq t \right) \leq e^{-xt} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n \left(\mathbb{E} e^{x\varepsilon_i/i} \right) = e^{-xt} \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{e^{x/i} + e^{-x/i}}{2} \right)$$

2.3. Product term. The next step is an estimate for the product term.

Lemma. *For $x > 0$ and all $2 \leq m \leq n$, we have*

$$\prod_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{e^{x/i} + e^{-x/i}}{2} \right) \leq \left(\frac{1 + e^{-2x/m}}{2} \right)^m \exp \left(x \cdot H_m + \frac{x^2}{2m} \right).$$

Proof. We split the product into small and large values of i

$$\prod_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{e^{x/i} + e^{-x/i}}{2} \right) = \prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} \left(\frac{e^{x/i} + e^{-x/i}}{2} \right) \cdot \prod_{m < i \leq n} \left(\frac{e^{x/i} + e^{-x/i}}{2} \right).$$

For small values of i , we argue

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} \left(\frac{e^{x/i} + e^{-x/i}}{2} \right) &= \frac{1}{2^m} \prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} e^{x/i} (1 + e^{-2x/i}) \leq \frac{1}{2^m} \prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} e^{x/i} (1 + e^{-2x/m}) \\ &= \left(\frac{1 + e^{-2x/m}}{2} \right)^m \prod_{1 \leq i \leq m} e^{x/i} = \left(\frac{1 + e^{-2x/m}}{2} \right)^m e^{x \cdot H_m}. \end{aligned}$$

For large i , we use $(e^x + e^{-x})/2 \leq e^{x^2/2}$ to bound

$$\prod_{m < i \leq n} \left(\frac{e^{x/i} + e^{-x/i}}{2} \right) \leq \prod_{m < i \leq n} \exp \left(\frac{x^2}{2i^2} \right) = \exp \left(\frac{x^2}{2} \sum_{m < i \leq n} \frac{1}{i^2} \right).$$

The result then follows from

$$\sum_{m < i \leq n} \frac{1}{i^2} \leq \sum_{i=m+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i^2} \leq \int_m^{\infty} \frac{dx}{x^2} = \frac{1}{m}.$$

□

2.4. Conclusion. We have, for all $t, x > 0$ and all integers $2 \leq m \leq n$

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\varepsilon_i}{i} \geq t \right) \leq e^{-xt} \left(\frac{1 + e^{-2x/m}}{2} \right)^m \exp \left(x \cdot H_m + \frac{x^2}{2m} \right).$$

The relevant value is $t = H_n - 2$. If $m \leq n/8$, then

$$H_n - H_m \geq H_n - H_{n/8} \geq \int_{n/8}^n \frac{dx}{x} + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{n} \right) = \log(8) + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{n} \right) \sim 2.07 > 2$$

and thus $(H_n - H_m - 2)m > 0$. We set $x = (H_n - H_m - 2)m$. Some computation shows that then

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\varepsilon_i}{i} \geq H_n - 2 \right) \leq \exp \left(-\frac{m}{2} (H_n - H_m - 2)^2 \right) \cdot \left(\frac{1 + e^{-2(H_n - H_m - 2)}}{2} \right)^m.$$

With $H_n = \log n + \gamma + \mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$ and the ansatz $m = cn$ for some $0 < c < 1/8$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\varepsilon_i}{i} \geq H_n - 2 \right) &\leq \exp \left[-\frac{cn}{2} \left(\log \left(\frac{1}{c} \right) - 2 + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{1}{n} \right) \right)^2 \right] \\ &\quad \cdot \exp \left[cn \log \left(\frac{1 + e^{-2(\log(\frac{1}{c}) - 2 + \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{n}))}}{2} \right) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The function

$$f(c) = -\frac{c}{2} \left(\log \left(\frac{1}{c} \right) - 2 \right)^2 + c \log \left(\frac{1 + e^{-2(\log(\frac{1}{c}) - 2)}}{2} \right)$$

satisfies $f(0.0384235) \leq -0.0541$. Since $e^{-0.054} \leq 2^{-0.07}$, the result follows.

REFERENCES

- [1] T. Bloom, www.erdosproblems.com, March 2024.
- [2] P. Erdős and R. Graham, Old and new problems and results in combinatorial number theory. Monographies de L'Enseignement Mathematique, Université de Genève, 1980.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, SEATTLE, WA 98195, USA
Email address: steinerb@uw.edu