

A NOTE ON THE NUMBER OF EGYPTIAN FRACTIONS

NOAH LEBOWITZ-LOCKARD AND VICTOR SOUZA

ABSTRACT. Refining an estimate of Croot, Dobbs, Friedlander, Hetzel and Pappalardi, we show that for all $k \geq 2$, the number of integers $1 \leq a \leq n$ such that the equation $a/n = 1/m_1 + \dots + 1/m_k$ has a solution in positive integers m_1, \dots, m_k is bounded above by $n^{1-1/2^{k-2}+o(1)}$ as n goes to infinity. The proof is elementary.

For a positive integer k , let $A_k(n)$ be the number of integers $1 \leq a \leq n$ for which a/n has a k -term Egyptian fraction representation. Namely, $A_k(n)$ is the number of $1 \leq a \leq n$ for which there are integers $m_1 \leq \dots \leq m_k$ such that

$$\frac{a}{n} = \frac{1}{m_1} + \dots + \frac{1}{m_k}. \quad (1)$$

Croot, Dobbs, Friedlander, Hetzel and Pappalardi [1] proved that for any $k \geq 2$,

$$A_k(n) \leq n^{\alpha_k + o(1)} \quad (2)$$

as n goes to infinity, where $\alpha_k = 1 - 2/(3^{k-2} + 1)$. In particular, this shows that $A_2(n) = n^{o(1)}$. Refining their ideas, we get the following improved estimate.

Theorem. *For every $k \geq 2$, we have $A_k(n) \leq n^{\beta_k + o(1)}$, where $\beta_k = 1 - 1/2^{k-2}$.*

Proof. We perform induction on k . The case $k = 2$ follows from (2), so assume $k \geq 3$.

Set $\gamma_i = 2^{i-1}/2^k$. For $1 \leq j \leq k-2$, we say that such a tuple (m_1, \dots, m_k) with $m_1 \leq \dots \leq m_k$ is of *type j* if $m_j \geq n^{\gamma_j}$ and $m_i < n^{\gamma_i}$ for $1 \leq i < j$. In addition, we say that such a tuple is of *type $k-1$* if $m_i < n^{\gamma_i}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k-2$, no restrictions being placed on m_{k-1} or m_k . It follows from this definitions that any tuple (m_1, \dots, m_k) has a type $1 \leq j \leq k-1$.

We now show that the number of solutions to (1) of any given type is $\leq n^{\beta_k + o(1)}$, and the Theorem follows. For instance, type 1 solutions satisfy

$$\frac{a}{n} = \frac{1}{m_1} + \dots + \frac{1}{m_k} \leq \frac{k}{m_1} \leq kn^{-\gamma_1}.$$

Thus, $a \leq kn^{1-\gamma_1} = kn^{\beta_k}$. That is, there are $\leq kn^{\beta_k}$ solutions of type 1.

Indeed, for type j solutions, $1 \leq j \leq k-2$, we have

$$0 \leq \frac{a}{n} - \frac{1}{m_1} - \dots - \frac{1}{m_{j-1}} = \frac{1}{m_j} + \dots + \frac{1}{m_k} \leq \frac{k-j+1}{m_j} \leq kn^{-\gamma_j}.$$

Therefore,

$$0 \leq a - \frac{n}{m_1} - \dots - \frac{n}{m_{j-1}} \leq kn^{1-\gamma_j},$$

or in other words, given (m_1, \dots, m_{j-1}) , there are at most $kn^{1-\gamma_j}$ choices for a . Thus, the number of solutions of (1) of type j is at most

$$kn^{1-\gamma_j} m_1 \dots m_{j-1} \leq kn^{1+\gamma_1+\dots+\gamma_{j-1}-\gamma_j} = kn^{\beta_k}.$$

Solutions of type $k - 1$ are handled more efficiently via binary Egyptian fractions. Note that

$$0 \leq \frac{a}{n} - \frac{1}{m_1} - \dots - \frac{1}{m_{k-2}} = \frac{1}{m_{k-1}} + \frac{1}{m_k}.$$

So writing $a' = am_1 \cdots m_{k-2} - nm_1 \cdots m_{k-2}(1/m_1 + \cdots + 1/m_{k-2})$, we have that a' is an integer satisfying $0 \leq a' \leq nm_1 \cdots m_{k-2}$ and

$$\frac{a'}{nm_1 \cdots m_{k-2}} = \frac{1}{m_{k-1}} + \frac{1}{m_k}.$$

Therefore, given (m_1, \dots, m_{k-2}) , there are at most $A_2(nm_1 \cdots m_{k-2})$ choices of a . Thus, the number of choices of a is bounded by

$$\sum_{\substack{m_i \leq n^{\gamma_i} \\ 1 \leq i \leq k-2}} A_2(nm_1 \cdots m_{k-2}) \leq n^{\gamma_1 + \cdots + \gamma_{k-2} + o(1)} = n^{\beta_k + o(1)},$$

as $A_2(n) = n^{o(1)}$ from (2) and $nm_1 \cdots m_{k-2} = n^{O(1)}$. \square

We get an improved exponent for all $k \geq 4$. To illustrate the change, the first exponents in (2) are $\alpha_2 = 0$, $\alpha_3 = 1/2$, $\alpha_4 = 4/5$, $\alpha_5 = 13/14$ and $\alpha_6 = 79/81$, whereas the new exponents are $\beta_2 = 0$, $\beta_3 = 1/2$, $\beta_4 = 3/4$, $\beta_5 = 7/8$ and $\beta_6 = 15/16$.

It is still expected, however, that $A_k(n) = n^{o(1)}$ for all $k \geq 2$. Nonetheless, even the weaker statement that $\sum_{n \leq x} A_k(n) = x^{1+o(1)}$ remains unproven for $k \geq 3$.

Using our argument, if one shows that $A_k(n) = n^{o(1)}$ holds for some fixed k , we get that $A_{k+\ell}(n) \leq n^{1-1/2^\ell + o(1)}$ for all $\ell \geq 1$. In fact, any improvement on the exponent in $A_k(n) \leq n^{\beta_k + o(1)}$ can be propagated to an improvement on $A_{k+\ell}(n)$.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are grateful for stimulating discussions with Carlo Adajar, Adva Mond and Julien Portier. The second named author would like to thank his supervisor Professor Béla Bollobás for his continuous support.

REFERENCES

- [1] Ernest S Croot, David E Dobbs, John B Friedlander, Andrew J Hetzel, and Francesco Pappalardi, *Binary Egyptian Fractions*, Journal of Number Theory **84** (2000), no. 1, 63–79.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS, TYLER, TX 75799
Email address: nlebowitzlockard@uttyler.edu

DEPARTMENT OF PURE MATHEMATICS AND MATHEMATICAL STATISTICS, UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE, CAMBRIDGE, UNITED KINGDOM
Email address: vss28@cam.ac.uk