

On the Existence of Odd Perfect Numbers

Jose Arnaldo Bebita Dris

November 11, 2021

Abstract

In this paper, we prove the conjecture that if there is an odd perfect number, then there are infinitely many of them.

1 Introduction

In what follows, we take $\sigma = \sigma_1$ to be the sum of divisors, and denote the abundancy index of $x \in \mathbb{N}$ as $I(x) = \sigma(x)/x$.

A number j satisfying $\sigma(j) = 2j$ is called a perfect number. If m is odd and $\sigma(m) = 2m$, then m is called an *odd perfect number*. Euler proved that an odd perfect number, if one exists, must necessarily have the form $m = q^k n^2$ where q is the special/Euler prime satisfying $q \equiv k \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ and $\gcd(q, n) = 1$. To date, no example of an odd perfect number has been found (despite extensive computer searches), nor has a proof of their nonexistence been established.

MSE user Peter (<https://math.stackexchange.com/users/82961>) asked on January 27, 2017 in

If we suppose, that a perfect odd number exists, can we determine whether infinite many exist? (<https://math.stackexchange.com/questions/2116257>):

But suppose, a perfect odd number exists. Do we then know whether there are infinite many perfect odd numbers?

This paper answers Peter's question affirmatively.

2 Problem

If $q^k n^2$ is an odd perfect number with special prime q , which of the following relationships between q^2 and n hold?

1. $q^2 < \sigma(q^2) < n < \sigma(n)$
2. $q^2 < n < \sigma(q^2) < \sigma(n)$
3. $n < \sigma(n) < q^2 < \sigma(q^2)$
4. $n < q^2 < \sigma(n) < \sigma(q^2)$

3 Preliminaries

(0) Of course, first of all, note that $q^2 \neq n$ since $\gcd(q, n) = 1$.

(1) Note that

$$\frac{q^2}{n} + \frac{n}{q^2} < \frac{\sigma(q^2)}{n} + \frac{\sigma(n)}{q^2} < 2 \cdot \left(\frac{q^2}{n} + \frac{n}{q^2} \right).$$

Consequently, we know that

$$\frac{q^2}{n} + \frac{n}{q^2} \text{ is bounded from above} \iff \frac{\sigma(q^2)}{n} + \frac{\sigma(n)}{q^2} \text{ is bounded from above.}$$

In general, since the function $f(z) := z + (1/z)$ is not bounded from above, this means that we do not expect

$$\frac{\sigma(q^2)}{n} + \frac{\sigma(n)}{q^2}$$

to be bounded from above.

(2) $n < q^2 \implies k = 1$ [Dris, 2012] ([3],[4])

(3)

$$1 < I(q^2) \leq \frac{q^2 + q + 1}{q^2} = 1 + \frac{1}{q} + \left(\frac{1}{q}\right)^2 \leq 1 + \frac{1}{5} + \left(\frac{1}{5}\right)^2 = \frac{25 + 5 + 1}{5} = \frac{31}{25}$$

since q being the Euler prime implies that q is prime with $q \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$, therefore $q \geq 5$.

Now, $1 < I(n) < 2$ since $n > 1$ is deficient, n being a proper factor of the (odd) perfect number $q^k n^2$.

Consequently,

$$1 < I(q^2 n) = I(q^2) I(n) = \frac{\sigma(q^2)}{n} \cdot \frac{\sigma(n)}{q^2} < 2 \cdot \frac{31}{25} = \frac{62}{25}.$$

(4) It follows from (1) and (3) that the following hold:

(a) $\sigma(n) \neq \sigma(q^2)$

Proof. Assume that $\sigma(n) = \sigma(q^2)$. Then we have (by (3))

$$I(q^2) = \frac{\sigma(q^2)}{q^2} = \frac{\sigma(n)}{q^2} < \frac{31}{25}$$

and

$$I(n) = \frac{\sigma(n)}{n} = \frac{\sigma(q^2)}{n} < 2.$$

It follows that

$$\frac{\sigma(q^2)}{n} + \frac{\sigma(n)}{q^2} < 2 + \frac{31}{25} = \frac{81}{25}.$$

This implies that

$$\frac{\sigma(q^2)}{n} + \frac{\sigma(n)}{q^2}$$

is bounded from above, contradicting (1). □

(b) $\sigma(q^2) \neq n$

Proof. Suppose to the contrary that $\sigma(q^2) = n$. Then we have (from (3))

$$1 \cdot \frac{\sigma(n)}{q^2} = \frac{\sigma(q^2)}{n} \cdot \frac{\sigma(n)}{q^2} < \frac{62}{25}.$$

It follows that

$$\frac{\sigma(q^2)}{n} + \frac{\sigma(n)}{q^2} = 1 + \frac{\sigma(n)}{q^2} < 1 + \frac{62}{25} = \frac{87}{25}.$$

This implies that

$$\frac{\sigma(q^2)}{n} + \frac{\sigma(n)}{q^2}$$

is bounded from above, contradicting (1). □

The proof for the following is similar to that of (b):

(c) $\sigma(n) \neq q^2$

4 Main Results

The proofs of the succeeding three lemmas are trivial.

Lemma 4.1. *The inequality*

$$I(q^2) + I(n) < \frac{\sigma(q^2)}{n} + \frac{\sigma(n)}{q^2}$$

is true if and only if the biconditional

$$q^2 < n \iff \sigma(q^2) < \sigma(n)$$

is true.

Lemma 4.2. *The inequality*

$$\frac{\sigma(q^2)}{n} + \frac{\sigma(n)}{q^2} < I(q^2) + I(n)$$

is true if and only if the biconditional

$$q^2 < n \iff \sigma(n) < \sigma(q^2)$$

is true.

Lemma 4.3. *The equation*

$$I(q^2) + I(n) = \frac{\sigma(q^2)}{n} + \frac{\sigma(n)}{q^2}$$

is true if and only if either $q^2 = n$ or $\sigma(q^2) = \sigma(n)$ hold.

We now prove our first main result:

Theorem 4.4. *If $q^k n^2$ is an odd perfect number with special prime q , then the inequality*

$$I(q^2) + I(n) < \frac{\sigma(q^2)}{n} + \frac{\sigma(n)}{q^2}$$

holds.

Proof. Suppose to the contrary that

$$\frac{\sigma(q^2)}{n} + \frac{\sigma(n)}{q^2} \leq I(q^2) + I(n).$$

Since $I(q^2) \leq 31/25$ and $I(n) < 2$, this implies that

$$\frac{\sigma(q^2)}{n} + \frac{\sigma(n)}{q^2} < 2 + \frac{31}{25} = \frac{81}{25}$$

so that

$$\frac{\sigma(q^2)}{n} + \frac{\sigma(n)}{q^2}$$

is bounded from above, contradicting (1). □

By using Lemma 4.1, we are able to obtain the following Corollary to Theorem 4.4:

Corollary 4.4.1. *If $q^k n^2$ is an odd perfect number with special prime q , then the biconditionals*

$$q^2 < n \iff \sigma(q^2) < \sigma(n) \iff \frac{\sigma(q^2)}{n} < \frac{\sigma(n)}{q^2}$$

hold.

Proof. Trivial. □

Note that Corollary 4.4.1 proves that the list of inequalities given in Section 2 exhausts all possible cases.

We now claim that:

Theorem 4.5. *If $q^k n^2$ is an odd perfect number, then $q^2 < \sigma(n)$ and $n < \sigma(q^2)$ cannot be both true.*

Proof. Suppose that both

$$1 < \frac{\sigma(q^2)}{n}$$

and

$$1 < \frac{\sigma(n)}{q^2}$$

hold. Then it follows that both

$$\frac{\sigma(n)}{q^2} < \frac{\sigma(q^2)}{n} \cdot \frac{\sigma(n)}{q^2} = I(q^2n) < \frac{62}{25}$$

and

$$\frac{\sigma(q^2)}{n} < \frac{\sigma(q^2)}{n} \cdot \frac{\sigma(n)}{q^2} = I(q^2n) < \frac{62}{25}$$

hold. This means that

$$\frac{\sigma(q^2)}{n} + \frac{\sigma(n)}{q^2} < 2 \cdot \frac{62}{25} = \frac{124}{25}$$

which implies that

$$\frac{\sigma(q^2)}{n} + \frac{\sigma(n)}{q^2}$$

is bounded from above, contradicting (1). \square

Note that Theorem 4.5 immediately rules out cases 2 and 4 from Section 2.

4.1 If An OPN Exists, Then There Are Infinitely Many Of Them

Without further ado:

Theorem 4.6. *If there is an odd perfect number, then there are infinitely many of them.*

Proof. Suppose that there are only a finite number of odd perfect numbers.

This means that there exists an effectively computable constant \mathcal{C} such that

$$q^k n^2 < \mathcal{C}.$$

Since $q^k < n^2$ [Dris, 2012] ([3],[4]), then it follows that

$$q^{2k} < q^k n^2 < \mathcal{C}.$$

This implies that

$$q^2 \leq q^{2k} < \mathcal{C},$$

so that

$$q < \mathcal{C}^{1/2}$$

which means that the Euler prime is bounded from above (by $\mathcal{C}^{1/2}$).

Note that we also have

$$n^2 < q^k n^2 < \mathcal{C}$$

so that $n < \mathcal{C}^{1/2}$, that is to say, the square root of the non-Euler part (which is n) is bounded from above (by $\mathcal{C}^{1/2}$).

Going back to the considerations in Section 4, we either have $q^2 < n$ or $n < q^2$. (In both cases, note that we have $q < n$ by [Brown, 2016] ([1]), [Starni, 2017] ([5]), and [Dris, 2017] ([2]) - note that the years indicated refer to the respective arXiv submissions of these authors. As of February 6, 2020, Brown's work remains unpublished.)

In the first case, we have

$$q^2 < n < \mathcal{C}^{1/2}$$

so that

$$\frac{q^2}{n} + \frac{n}{q^2} < 1 + \frac{\mathcal{C}^{1/2}}{25}.$$

This contradicts (1) in Section 3.

In the second case, we have

$$q < n < q^2$$

so that $n > 10^{500}$, and

$$\frac{q^2}{n} + \frac{n}{q^2} < \frac{\mathcal{C}}{10^{500}} + 1.$$

Again, this contradicts (1) in Section 3, and the theorem is proved. □

5 Further Research

We leave the following open problems for other researchers to investigate:

Question1 By this answer (<https://math.stackexchange.com/a/1843814/28816>), we know (?) that the implication $n < q^{k+1} \implies k \neq 1$ is true if and only if $q^2 < n$. Can this result be improved?

Question2 Following this answer (<https://math.stackexchange.com/a/1918871/28816>), it is conjectured that $k \neq 1$. This would follow if we could rule out $q = q^k < \sigma(q) = \sigma(q^k) < n < \sigma(n)$. (That is, if we could prove that $\sigma(q^k) < n$ is false.) To what extent can a proof along this thread of thought be pursued, given Brown's arguments for a partial proof of $q^k < n$ in "A Partial Proof of a Conjecture of Dris" ([1]) and the considerations in this article?

References

- [1] Brown, P. A. (2016). A partial proof of a conjecture of Dris, preprint, <https://arxiv.org/abs/1602.01591>.

- [2] Dris, J. A. B. (2017). On a curious biconditional involving the divisors of odd perfect numbers, *Notes Number Theory Discrete Math*, **23**(4), pp. 1–13.
- [3] Dris, J. A. B. (2012) The abundancy index of divisors of odd perfect numbers, *J. Integ. Seq.* **15**(4), Article 12.4.4.
- [4] Dris, J. A. B. (2008) Solving the odd perfect number problem: some old and new approaches, M. Sc. thesis, De La Salle University, Manila, Philippines.
- [5] Starni, P. (2018). On Dris conjecture about odd perfect numbers, *Notes Number Theory Discrete Math* **24**(1), pp. 5–9, doi:<https://doi.org/10.7546/nntdm.2018.24.1.5-9>.