MATHEMATICS OF COMPUTATION
Volume 83, Number 289, September 2014, Pages 2435–2439
S 0025-5718(2013)02776-7
Article electronically published on November 20, 2013

ON THE NUMBER OF PRIME FACTORS OF AN ODD PERFECT NUMBER

PASCAL OCHEM AND MICHAËL RAO

Abstract. Let $\Omega(n)$ and $\omega(n)$ denote, respectively, the total number of prime factors and the number of distinct prime factors of the integer n. Euler proved that an odd perfect number N is of the form $N = p^e m^2$ where $p \equiv e \equiv 1 \pmod 4$, p is prime, and $p \nmid m$. This implies that $\Omega(N) \geq 2\omega(N) - 1$. We prove that $\Omega(N) \geq (18\omega(N) - 31)/7$ and $\Omega(N) \geq 2\omega(N) + 51$.

1. Introduction

A natural number N is said to be *perfect* if it is equal to the sum of its positive divisors (excluding N). It is well known that an even natural number N is perfect if and only if $N = 2^{k-1}(2^k - 1)$ for an integer k such that $2^k - 1$ is a Mersenne prime. On the other hand, it is a long-standing open question whether an odd perfect number exists.

In order to investigate this question, several authors gave necessary conditions for the existence of an odd perfect number N. Let $\Omega(n)$ and $\omega(n)$ denote, respectively, the total number of prime factors and the number of distinct prime factors of the integer n. Euler proved that $N = p^e m^2$ for a prime p, with $p \equiv e \equiv 1 \pmod 4$, p is prime, and $p \nmid m$. Moreover, recent results showed that $N > 10^{1500}$ [4], $\omega(N) \geq 9$ [3], and $\Omega(N) \geq 101$ [4].

In this paper, we study the relationship between $\Omega(N)$ and $\omega(N)$. By Euler's result, we have $\Omega(N) \geq 2\omega(N) - 1$. Steuerwald [6] proved that m is not squarefree, that is, the exponents of the non-special primes cannot be all equal to 2. This implies that $\Omega(N) \geq 2\omega(N) + 1$. We improve this inequality in two ways:

Theorem 1. *If N is an odd perfect number, then* $\Omega(N) \geq (18\omega(N) - 31)/7$.

Theorem 2. *If N is an odd perfect number, then* $\Omega(N) \geq 2\omega(N) + 51$.

We prove Theorem 1 in Section 3 using standard arguments. We prove Theorem 2 in Section 4 via computations using the general method in [4].

To summarize the known results for $\Omega(N)$, we have

$$\Omega(N) \geq \max\{101, 2\omega(N) + 51, (18\omega(N) - 31)/7\}.$$

2. Preliminaries

Let n be a natural number. Let $\sigma(n)$ denote the sum of the positive divisors of n, and let $\sigma_{-1}(n) = \frac{\sigma(n)}{n}$ be the *abundancy* of n. Clearly, n is perfect if and only if $\sigma_{-1}(n) = 2$. We first recall some easy results on the functions σ and σ_{-1}. If p is

Received by the editor September 15, 2012 and, in revised form, December 18, 2012.
2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 11A25, 11A51.

prime, $\sigma(p^q) = \frac{p^{q+1}-1}{p-1}$, and $\sigma_{-1}(p^\infty) = \lim_{q\to+\infty} \sigma_{-1}(p^q) = \frac{p}{p-1}$. If $\gcd(a, b) = 1$, then $\sigma(ab) = \sigma(a)\sigma(b)$ and $\sigma_{-1}(ab) = \sigma_{-1}(a)\sigma_{-1}(b)$.

Euler proved that if an odd perfect number N exists, then it is of the form $N = p^e m^2$ where $p \equiv e \equiv 1 \pmod 4$, p is prime, and $p \nmid m$. The prime p is said to be the *special prime*.

3. Proof of $\Omega(N) \geq (18\omega(N) - 31)/7$

We want to obtain a result of the form $\Omega(N) \geq a\omega(N) - c$ for some $a > 2$ using the following idea. If a is close to 2, then N has a large number of prime factors p such that both $p^2 \parallel N$ and $p \parallel \sigma(q^2)$ where $q^2 \parallel N$. It is well known (see [5]) that for primes t, r, and s such that $t \mid \sigma(r^{s-1})$, either $t = s$ or $t \equiv 1 \bmod s$. In particular, this gives $p \equiv 1 \bmod 3$ and thus $3 \mid \sigma(p^2)$. The exponent of the prime 3 is then large, so that $\Omega(N)$ is significantly greater than $2\omega(N)$.

Now we detail the number of certain types of factors of N and obtain the results by contradiction with the involved quantities.

- $p = \omega(N)$: number of distinct prime factors,
- $f = \Omega(N)$: total number of prime factors,
- p_2: number of distinct prime factors with exponent 2, distinct from 3,
- $p_{2,1}$: number of distinct prime factors with exponent 2 congruent to 1 mod 3,
- p_4: number of distinct prime factors with exponent at least 4, distinct from 3 and the special prime,
- f_4: total number of prime factors with exponent at least 4, distinct from 3 and the special prime,
- e: exponent of the special prime,
- f_3: exponent of the prime 3.

Now we obtain useful inequalities among these quantities. The special exponent is at least 1:

$$1 \leq e. \tag{1}$$

By detailing the total number of prime factors, we have

$$e + f_3 + 2p_2 + f_4 = f. \tag{2}$$

By considering the prime factors (distinct from 3 and the special prime) with exponent at least 4, we have

$$4p_4 \leq f_4. \tag{3}$$

As already mentioned, if $p \equiv 1 \bmod 3$ and $p^2 \parallel N$, then $3 \mid \sigma(p^2)$, so that

$$p_{2,1} \leq f_3. \tag{4}$$

Let us consider the number of distinct prime factors. We have the special prime, the primes from p_2 and p_4, and maybe the prime 3. So it is $1 + p_2 + p_4$ if $f_3 = 0$ and $2 + p_2 + p_4$ if $f_3 \geq 2$. Thus, we have

$$p \leq f_3/2 + 1 + p_2 + p_4 \tag{5}$$

and

$$p \leq 2 + p_2 + p_4. \tag{6}$$

For the sake of contradiction, we suppose that

$$7f \leq 18p - 32. \tag{7}$$

The following lemma is useful to obtain one last inequality:

Lemma 3. *Let p, q, and r be positive integers. If $p^2+p+1=r$ and $q^2+q+1=3r$, then p is not an odd prime.*

Proof. Since $q^2+q+1 \equiv 0 \bmod 3$, then $q \equiv 1 \bmod 3$ and we set $q = 3s+1$. The equality $q^2+q+1 = 3(p^2+p+1)$ reduces to $3s(s+1) = p(p+1)$. Notice that p divides $3s(s+1)$, so that if p is an odd prime, then either $p \mid 3$, $p \mid s$, or $p \mid (s+1)$. We have $p = 3$ in the first case, which gives no solution. We have $s \geq p-1$ in the other two cases, so that $p(p+1) = 3s(s+1) \geq 3(p-1)p$. This gives $p+1 \geq 3(p-1)$, so that $p \leq 2$, which is a contradiction. ☐

Let K be the multiset of all the primes distinct from 3 produced by all the components $\sigma(p^2)$ of N. The primes in K are 1 mod 3, so $|K| \leq e+2p_{2,1}+f_4$. For a prime $u > 3$, let $\alpha(u)$ be such that $\alpha(u) = \sigma(u^2)$ if $u \equiv 2 \bmod 3$ and $\alpha(u) = \sigma(u^2)/3$ if $u \equiv 1 \bmod 3$. By Lemma 3, $\alpha(u) = \alpha(v)$ implies $u = v$. So all primes from p_2 produce at least two prime factors, except for at most one per distinct prime from K. That is, $2p_2 - 1 - p_{2,1} - p_4 \leq |K|$. Thus, we have $2p_2 - 1 - p_{2,1} - p_4 \leq e + 2p_{2,1} + f_4$, which gives

$$2p_2 \leq 1 + e + 3p_{2,1} + p_4 + f_4. \tag{8}$$

The combination $5\times$**(1)**$+7\times$**(2)**$+5\times$**(3)**$+6\times$**(4)**$+2\times$**(5)**$+16\times$**(6)**$+$**(7)**$+2\times$**(8)** gives $1 \leq 0$, a contradiction. This means that for assumption (7) that $7f \leq 18p-32$ is false, and thus $\Omega(N) \geq (18\omega(N) - 31)/7$.

4. Proof of $\Omega(N) \geq 2\omega(N) + 51$

We use the general method and the computer program discussed in [4].

We use the following contradictions:

- The abundancy of the current number is strictly greater than 2.
- The current number n satisfies $\Omega(n) \geq 2\omega(n) + 51$.

We forbid the factors in $S = \{3, 5, 7, 11, 13, 17, 19\}$, in this order. We branch on the smallest available prime congruent to 1 mod 3. If there is no such prime, we branch on the smallest available prime congruent to 2 mod 3. We still use a combination of exact branchings and standard branchings, as in [4]. We use exact branchings only for the special components p^1 and for all the even powers 3^{2e} of 3.

By-passing roadblocks. A *roadblock* is a situation such that there is no contradiction and no possibility to branch on a prime. This happens when we have already made suppositions for the multiplicity of all the known primes and the other numbers are composites.

Given a roadblock M, we check that the composites involved are not divisible by an already considered prime, are not perfect powers, have no factor less than 10^{10}, and are pairwise coprime. Then we compute the following quantities:

- F: It is a lower bound on the number of distinct prime factors of M. We count the number of known prime factors of M plus two primes per composite number.

- A: It is an upper bound on the abundancy of M. For the abundancy of a component p^e, we use $\sigma_{-1}(p^e)$ for an exact branching and $\sigma_{-1}(p^\infty) = p/(p-1)$ for a standard branching.

  For a composite C, we know that C has at most $\left\lfloor \frac{\ln C}{10 \ln 10} \right\rfloor$ prime factors since C has no factor less than 10^{10}. So, the abundancy due to C is at most $\left(1+10^{-10}\right)^{\left\lfloor \frac{\ln C}{10 \ln 10} \right\rfloor}$.
- T: It is the target lower bound on $\Omega(N) - 2\omega(N)$, thus an odd integer. We use $T = 51$ in the proof of Theorem 2.

For the sake of contradiction, we suppose that $\Omega(N) - 2\omega(N) \leq T - 2$. By Theorem 1, we have $\Omega(N) \geq (18\omega(N) - 31)/7$. So $(18\omega(N) - 31)/7 - 2\omega(N) \leq \Omega(N) - 2\omega(N) \leq T - 2$, which gives $\omega(N) \leq (7T + 17)/4$. Thus, N has at most $\omega(N) \leq (7T+17)/4 - F$ prime factors that do not divide M. Let p be the smallest of these extra factors. We see that if

$$A(p/(p-1))^{(7T+17)/4-F} < 2, \tag{9}$$

then N cannot reach abundancy 2. This gives an upper bound on p. To get around the roadblock, we branch on every prime number p (except those that divide M or are already forbidden) in increasing order until (9) is satisfied.

Example.
$3^4 \Longrightarrow 11^2$
  $11^{18} \Longrightarrow 6115909044841454629$
    $6115909044841454629^{16} \Longrightarrow \sigma\left(6115909044841454629^{16}\right)$ Roadblock 1
      $5^1 \Longrightarrow 2 \times 3$ Roadblock 2

We first branch on the components 3^4, 11^{18}, and $\sigma\left(11^{18}\right)^{16}$ and hit a first roadblock, as no factors of $C_1 = \sigma\left(\sigma\left(11^{18}\right)^{16}\right)$ are known. When trying to get around this roadblock, we first branch on 5^1 and hit a second roadblock. Consider this second roadblock:

- $F = 6$: We have the four primes 3, 5, 11, $\sigma\left(11^{18}\right)$, and at least two primes from C_1.
- $A = \sigma_{-1}\left(3^4 \times 5 \times 11^\infty \times \sigma\left(11^{18}\right)^\infty\right) \times \left(1+10^{-10}\right)^{\left\lfloor \frac{\ln C_1}{10 \ln 10} \right\rfloor} = 1.9718518\cdots$.
- $T = 51$.

Equation (9) is satisfied for $p \geq 6174$, so to circumvent M, we branch on every prime p between 7 and 6173, except 11.

When N has no factors in S. If N has no factor in S, then it must have at least 115 distinct prime factors. We obtain this by considering the product $\Pi_{23 \leq p \leq 673} \frac{p}{p-1} = 1.99807632\ldots$ over the first 114 primes p greater than 19, which is an upper bound on the abundancy and is smaller than 2.

Using Theorem 1, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega(N) - 2\omega(N) &\geq (18\omega(N) - 31)/7 - 2\omega(N) \\ &= (4\omega(N) - 31)/7 \\ &\geq (4 \times 115 - 31)/7 \\ &= 61 + 2/7. \end{aligned}$$

So, we have $\Omega(N) \geq 2\omega(N) + 62$, which concludes the proof of Theorem 2.

Acknowledgment

We thank Robert Gerbicz for a much simpler proof of Lemma 3.

References

[1] Graeme L. Cohen, *On the largest component of an odd perfect number*, J. Austral. Math. Soc. Ser. A **42** (1987), no. 2, 280–286. MR869751 (87m:11005)

[2] Takeshi Goto and Yasuo Ohno, *Odd perfect numbers have a prime factor exceeding* 10^8, Math. Comp. **77** (2008), no. 263, 1859–1868, DOI 10.1090/S0025-5718-08-02050-9. MR2398799 (2009b:11008)

[3] Pace P. Nielsen, *Odd perfect numbers have at least nine distinct prime factors*, Math. Comp. **76** (2007), no. 260, 2109–2126, DOI 10.1090/S0025-5718-07-01990-4. MR2336286 (2008g:11153)

[4] Pascal Ochem and Michaël Rao, *Odd perfect numbers are greater than* 10^{1500}, Math. Comp. **81** (2012), no. 279, 1869–1877, DOI 10.1090/S0025-5718-2012-02563-4. MR2904606

[5] Trygve Nagell, *Introduction to Number Theory*, John Wiley & Sons Inc., New York, 1951. MR0043111 (13,207b)

[6] R. Steuerwald, Verschärfung einer notwendigen Bedingung für die Existenz einen ungeraden vollkommenen Zahl, *S.-B. Bayer. Akad. Wiss.* (1937), pp. 69–72.

CNRS, LIRMM, Université Montpellier 2, 161 rue Ada, 34095 Montpellier Cedex 5, France

E-mail address: ochem@lirmm.fr

CNRS, LIP, ENS Lyon, 15 parvis R. Descartes BP 7000, 69342 Lyon Cedex 07, France

E-mail address: michael.rao@ens-lyon.fr