## ON ODD PERFECT NUMBERS. II

## D. SURYANARAYANA

One of the oldest unsolved mathematical problems is the following one: Are there odd perfect numbers? So many interesting necessary conditions for an odd integer to be perfect have been found out. A bibliography of previous work is given by McCarthy [5].

Throughout this paper $n$ denotes an odd perfect number.
The following results have been proved in [1] and [2] respectively:
(i) $1 / 2<\sum_{p \mid n}(1 / p)<2 \log (\pi / 2)(\sim .903)$,
(ii) $n$ must be of the form $12 t+1$ or $36 t+9$.

The bounds for $\sum_{p \mid n}(1 / p)$ given in [1] have been improved in [3] as
(a)

$$
\frac{\log 2}{5 \log \left(\frac{5}{4}\right)}<\sum_{p \mid n} \frac{1}{p}<\log 2+\frac{1}{338}
$$

if $n$ is of the form $12 t+1$,
(b)

$$
\frac{1}{3}+\frac{\log \frac{4}{3}}{5 \log \frac{5}{4}}<\sum_{p \mid n} \frac{1}{p}<\log \frac{18}{13}+\frac{53}{150}
$$

if $n$ is of the form $36 t+9$.
The object of this paper is to further improve the bounds for $\sum_{p \mid n}(1 / p)$.

The following Tables I and II give numerical values for the bounds obtained in [3] and the bounds obtained in this paper respectively.

Table I

|  | Lower bound | Upper bound | Difference |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (a) | .621 | .696 | .075 |
| (b) | .591 | .679 | .088 |
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It can be easily seen from Table II that (a) if $n$ is of the form $12 t+1$, $.644<\sum_{p \mid n}(1 / p)<.693$, which is of range .049 , a one-third cut in the length of the interval of [3] and (b) if $n$ is of the form $36 t+9$, $.596<\sum_{p \mid n}(1 / p)<.674$, which is of range .078 , an improvement over [3] of about 12 per cent.

Table II

| $(\alpha)$ | .644 | .679 | .035 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $(\beta)$ | .657 | .693 | .036 |
| $(\gamma)$ | .596 | .674 | .078 |
| $(\delta)$ | .600 | .662 | .062 |

The bounds obtained are given by the following:
Theorem. ( $\alpha$ ) If $n$ is of the form $12 t+1$ and $5 \mid n$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{5}+\frac{1}{7}+\frac{\log \frac{48}{35}}{11 \log \frac{11}{10}} & <\sum_{p \mid n} \frac{1}{p} \\
& <\frac{1}{5}+\frac{1}{2738}+\log \frac{50}{31}
\end{aligned}
$$

( $\beta$ ) If $n$ is of the form $12 t+1$ and $5 \nmid n$,

$$
\frac{1}{7}+\frac{\log \frac{12}{7}}{11 \log \frac{11}{10}}<\sum_{p \mid n} \frac{1}{p}<\log 2
$$

( $\gamma$ ) If $n$ is of the form $36 t+9$ and $5 \mid n$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{3}+\frac{1}{5}+\frac{\log \frac{16}{15}}{17 \log \frac{17}{16}} & <\sum_{p \mid n} \frac{1}{p} \\
& <\frac{1}{3}+\frac{1}{5}+\frac{1}{13}+\log \frac{65}{61}
\end{aligned}
$$

( $\delta$ ) If $n$ is of the form $36 t+9$ and $5 \nmid n$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{3}+\frac{\log \frac{4}{3}}{7 \log \frac{7}{6}} & <\sum_{p \mid n} \frac{1}{p} \\
& <\frac{1}{3}+\frac{1}{338}+\log \frac{18}{13}
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof. We prove this theorem in various cases and in each case one can see that either the lower bound or the upper bound for $\sum_{p \mid n}(1 / p)$ as stated in this theorem is further improved.

Euler proved that $n$ must be of the form $p_{0}^{\alpha_{0}} \cdot x^{2}$, where $p_{0}$ is a prime of the form $4 \lambda+1, \alpha_{0}$ is of the form $4 \mu+1, x>1$ and $\left(p_{0}, x\right)=1$. Hence we can write $n=p_{0}^{\alpha_{0}} \cdot p_{1}^{\alpha_{1}} \cdot p_{2}^{\alpha_{2}} \cdots p_{k}^{\alpha_{k}}$, where $\alpha_{r}$ is even for $1 \leqq r \leqq k$. We shall suppose as we may do without loss of generality that $p_{1}<p_{2}<\cdots<p_{k}$. Let $\sigma(n)$ denote the sum of the positive divisors of $n$. Since $n$ is a perfect number, we have $\sigma(n)=2 n$, from which it can easily be seen that

$$
\begin{align*}
2 \prod_{r=0}^{k}\left(1-\frac{1}{p_{r}}\right) & =\prod_{r=0}^{k}\left(1-\frac{1}{p_{r}^{\alpha+1}}\right)  \tag{A}\\
& <1
\end{align*}
$$

Therefore

$$
\begin{align*}
\log 2 & <-\sum_{r=0}^{k} \log \left(1-\frac{1}{p_{r}}\right)  \tag{B}\\
& =\sum_{r=0}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}}+\frac{1}{2} \sum_{r=0}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}^{2}}+\frac{1}{3} \sum_{r=0}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}^{3}}+\cdots
\end{align*}
$$

Taking logarithms of both sides of (A) and expressing them in series, we have
(C)

$$
\begin{aligned}
\log 2 & =\sum_{r=0}^{k} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\left[\frac{1}{i p_{r}^{i}}-\frac{1}{i p_{r}^{\left(\alpha_{r}+1\right) i}}\right] \\
& =\sum_{r=0}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}}+\sum_{r=0}^{k} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\left[\frac{1}{(i+1) p_{r}^{i+1}}-\frac{1}{i p_{r}^{\left(\alpha_{r}+1\right) i}}\right] .
\end{aligned}
$$

(a) Suppose $n$ is of the form $12 t+1$. In this case it has been proved in [3, p. 134] that $p_{0}$ is of the form $12 N+1$ and hence $p_{0} \geqq 13$.
( $\mathrm{a}_{1}$ ) If $5 \mid n$ and $7 \mid n$, then $p_{1}=5, p_{2}=7$ and $p_{r} \geqq 11$ for $3 \leqq r \leqq k$. Now $\alpha_{2} \geqq 4$ for, if $\alpha_{2}=2$, then $\sigma\left(p_{2}^{\alpha_{2}}\right)=3.19$ and since $\sigma(n)=2 n$ it would follow that $3 \mid n$, which cannot hold.

From (B), we get that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\log 2< & -\log \left(1-\frac{1}{5}\right)-\log \left(1-\frac{1}{7}\right)+\frac{1}{p_{0}}+\frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{11} \cdot \frac{1}{p_{0}} \\
& +\frac{1}{3} \cdot \frac{1}{11^{2}} \cdot \frac{1}{p_{0}}+\cdots \\
& +\sum_{r=3}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}}+\frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{11} \cdot \sum_{r=3}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}} \\
& +\frac{1}{3} \cdot \frac{1}{11^{2}} \cdot \sum_{r=3}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}}+\cdots \\
= & \log \frac{5}{4}+\log \frac{7}{6}+\left(\frac{1}{p_{0}}+\sum_{r=3}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}}\right) \\
& \cdot\left(1+\frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{11}+\frac{1}{3} \cdot \frac{1}{11^{2}}+\cdots\right) \\
= & \log \frac{5}{4}+\log \frac{7}{6} \\
+ & 11 \log \frac{11}{10}\left[\sum_{r=0}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}}-\frac{1}{5}-\frac{1}{7}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

therefore
( $a_{1 L}$ )

$$
\sum_{r=0}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}}>\frac{1}{5}+\frac{1}{7}+\frac{\log \frac{48}{35}}{11 \log \frac{11}{10}}
$$

Also from (C), we get that

$$
\begin{align*}
\log 2= & \sum_{r=0}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}}+\sum_{r=1}^{k} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\left[\frac{1}{(i+1) p_{r}^{i+1}}-\frac{1}{i p_{r}^{\left(\alpha_{r}+1\right) i}}\right]  \tag{D}\\
& +\left(\frac{1}{2 p_{0}^{2}}-\frac{1}{p_{0}^{\alpha_{0}+1}}\right)+\sum_{i=2}^{\infty}\left[\frac{1}{(i+1) p_{0}^{i+1}}-\frac{1}{i p_{0}^{\left(\alpha_{0}+1\right) i}}\right] .
\end{align*}
$$

Now each term in the brackets of the second summation is positive, since $\alpha_{r} \geqq 2$ for $r>0$, and hence the second sum is positive. Similarly
the fourth sum is also positive, and $1 / 2 p_{0}^{2}-1 / p_{0}^{\alpha_{0}+1} \geqq-1 / 2 p_{0}^{2}$ $\geqq-1 / 338$, since $\alpha_{0} \geqq 1$ and $p_{0} \geqq 13$. Therefore

$$
\begin{aligned}
\log 2> & \sum_{r=0}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}}+\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\left[\frac{1}{(i+1) 5^{i+1}}-\frac{1}{i\left(5^{3}\right)^{i}}\right] \\
& +\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\left[\frac{1}{(i+1) 7^{i+1}}-\frac{1}{i\left(7^{5}\right)^{i}}\right]-\frac{1}{338}, \text { since } \alpha_{1} \geqq 2 \text { and } \alpha_{2} \geqq 4 \\
= & \sum_{r=0}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}}-\log \left(1-\frac{1}{5}\right)-\frac{1}{5}+\log \left(1-\frac{1}{5^{3}}\right) \\
& -\log \left(1-\frac{1}{7}\right)-\frac{1}{7}+\log \left(1-\frac{1}{7^{5}}\right)-\frac{1}{338} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore
( $\mathrm{a}_{1 \mathrm{R}}$ )

$$
\sum_{r=0}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}}<\frac{1}{5}+\frac{1}{7}+\frac{1}{338}+\log \frac{50}{31} \cdot \frac{2401}{2801}
$$

$$
<\frac{1}{5}+\frac{1}{2738}+\log \frac{50}{31}
$$

Hence by ( $\mathrm{a}_{1 \mathrm{~L}}$ ) and ( $\mathrm{a}_{1 \mathrm{R}}$ ), ( $\alpha$ ) follows in this case.
( $a_{2}$ ) If $5 \mid n$ and $7 \nmid n$, then $p_{1}=5$ and $p_{r} \geqq 11$ for $2 \leqq r \leqq k$. Since $\alpha_{0}$ is odd $\left(1+p_{0}\right) \mid \sigma\left(p_{0}^{\alpha_{0}}\right)$ and hence $\left(1+p_{0}\right) / 2 \mid n$ since $\sigma(n)=2 n$. Now $p_{0}$ is not 13 , since otherwise it would follow that $7 \mid n$, which is not the case. Since $p_{0}$ is of the form $12 N+1, p_{0} \geqq 37$.

From (B) as in ( $a_{1}$ ) we can get that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\log 2 & <\log \frac{5}{4}+11 \log \frac{11}{10}\left[\frac{1}{p_{0}}+\sum_{r=2}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}}\right] \\
& =\log \frac{5}{4}+11 \log \frac{11}{10}\left[\sum_{r=0}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}}-\frac{1}{5}\right]
\end{aligned}
$$

therefore

$$
\sum_{r=0}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}}>\frac{1}{5}+\frac{\log \frac{8}{5}}{11 \log \frac{11}{10}}
$$

( $\mathrm{a}_{2 \mathrm{~L}}$ )

$$
>\frac{1}{5}+\frac{1}{7}+\frac{\log \frac{48}{35}}{11 \log \frac{11}{10}}
$$

From (D), arguing in a similar way as in ( $\mathrm{a}_{1}$ ), we can get that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\log 2 & >\sum_{r=0}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}}+\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\left[\frac{1}{(i+1) 5^{i+1}}-\frac{1}{i\left(5^{3}\right)^{i}}\right]-\frac{1}{2(37)^{2}} \\
& =\sum_{r=0}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}}-\log \left(1-\frac{1}{5}\right)-\frac{1}{5}+\log \left(1-\frac{1}{5^{3}}\right)-\frac{1}{2738} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore
( $\mathrm{a}_{2 \mathrm{R}}$ ) $\quad \sum_{r=0}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}}<\frac{1}{5}+\frac{1}{2738}+\log \frac{50}{31}$.
Hence by ( $\mathrm{a}_{2 \mathrm{~L}}$ ) and ( $\mathrm{a}_{2 \mathrm{R}}$ ), ( $\alpha$ ) follows in this case.
Thus ( $\alpha$ ) is proved.
( $\mathrm{a}_{3}$ ) If $5 \nmid n$ and $7 \mid n$, then $p_{1}=7$ and $p_{r} \geqq 11$ for $2 \leqq r \leqq k$. Now $\alpha_{1} \geqq 4$ as we have seen in ( $\mathrm{a}_{1}$ ) that $\alpha_{1} \neq 2$. From (B) as in the case ( $\mathrm{a}_{1}$ ), we get that

$$
\log 2<\log \frac{7}{6}+11 \log \frac{11}{10}\left[\sum_{r=0}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}}-\frac{1}{7}\right] .
$$

Therefore
( $a_{3 \mathrm{~L}}$ ) $\quad \sum_{r=0}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}}>\frac{1}{7}+\frac{\log \frac{12}{7}}{11 \log \frac{11}{10}}$.
From (D), arguing in a similar way as in ( $\mathrm{a}_{1}$ ), we get that

$$
\log 2>\sum_{r=0}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}}-\log \left(1-\frac{1}{7}\right)-\frac{1}{7}+\log \left(1-\frac{1}{7^{5}}\right)-\frac{1}{338} .
$$

Therefore

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(\mathrm{a}_{3 \mathrm{R}}\right) \quad \sum_{r=0}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}} & <\frac{1}{7}+\frac{1}{338}+\log \frac{4802}{2801} \\
& <\log 2 .
\end{aligned}
$$

Hence by ( $\mathrm{a}_{3 \mathrm{~L}}$ ) and ( $\mathrm{a}_{3 \mathrm{R}}$ ), ( $\beta$ ) follows in this case.
$\left(\mathrm{a}_{4}\right)$ If $5 \nmid n$ and $7 \nmid n$, then $p_{r} \geqq 11$ for $1 \leqq r \leqq k$.
From (B) as in $\left(a_{1}\right)$, we get that $\log 2<11 \log 11 / 10 \cdot \sum_{r=0}^{k} 1 / p_{r}$.

## Therefore

$\left(a_{4 L}\right)$

$$
\sum_{r=0}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}}>\frac{\log 2}{11 \log \frac{11}{10}}>\frac{1}{7}+\frac{\log \frac{12}{7}}{11 \log \frac{11}{10}}
$$

Now as in $\left(a_{2}\right)$, we see that $\left(1+p_{0}\right) / 2 \mid n$. Let $\pi$ be any prime dividing $\left(1+p_{0}\right) / 2$, then $\pi \mid n$ and hence $\pi=p_{j}$ for some $j$ satisfying $1 \leqq j \leqq k$.

From (D), arguing in a similar way as in ( $\mathrm{a}_{1}$ ), we see that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\log 2> & \sum_{r=0}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}}+\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\left[\frac{1}{(i+1) p_{j}^{i+1}}-\frac{1}{i\left(p_{j}^{3}\right)^{i}}\right] \\
& +\left(\frac{1}{2 p_{0}^{2}}-\frac{1}{p_{0}^{2}}\right), \quad \text { since } \alpha_{0} \geqq 1 \text { and } \alpha_{j} \geqq 2 \\
> & \sum_{r=0}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}}+\left(\frac{1}{2 p_{j}^{2}}-\frac{1}{p_{j}^{3}}\right)-\frac{1}{2 p_{0}^{2}} \\
> & \sum_{r=0}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}}, \quad \text { since } 11 \leqq p_{j} \leqq \frac{1+p_{0}}{2} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore
( $\mathrm{a}_{4 \mathrm{R}}$ ) $\quad \sum_{r=0}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}}<\log 2$.
Hence by ( $\mathrm{a}_{4 \mathrm{~L}}$ ) and ( $\mathrm{a}_{4 \mathrm{R}}$ ), ( $\beta$ ) follows in this case.
Thus $(\beta)$ is proved.
(b) Suppose $n$ is of the form $36 t+9$. Since $3 \mid n, p_{1}=3$.
( $\mathrm{b}_{1}$ ) If $5 \mid n$, then $7 \nmid n$ in virtue of the result that 3.5.7 does not divide $n$ (proved in Kühnel [4]).
$\left(b_{1 \cdot 1}\right)$ If at least one of 11 and 13 divides $n$, then obviously

$$
\sum_{r=0}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}}>\frac{1}{3}+\frac{1}{5}+\frac{1}{13}>\frac{1}{3}+\frac{1}{5}+\frac{\log \frac{16}{15}}{17 \log \frac{17}{16}}
$$

Otherwise,

$$
\left(\mathrm{b}_{1 \cdot 2}\right) p_{r} \geqq 17 \text { for } 2 \leqq r \leqq k \text {, if } p_{0}=5 \text {; or }
$$

( $\mathrm{b}_{1.3}$ ) $p_{r} \geqq 17$ for $3 \leqq r \leqq k$, if $p_{2}=5$. In this particular case $p_{0}$ is also $\geqq 17$, since $p_{0} \neq 5$ and $p_{0}$ is not 13 , since we are in the case where neither 11 nor 13 divides $n$.

In both the cases $\left(b_{1.2}\right)$ and ( $b_{1.3}$ ), from (B) as in ( $a_{1}$ ) we can get that

$$
\log 2<\log \frac{3}{2}+\log \frac{5}{4}+17 \log \frac{17}{16}\left[\sum_{r=0}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}}-\frac{1}{3}-\frac{1}{5}\right] .
$$

Hence in any case under $\left(b_{1}\right)$, we have that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{r=0}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}}>\frac{1}{3}+\frac{1}{5}+\frac{\log \frac{16}{15}}{17 \log \frac{17}{16}} \tag{1L}
\end{equation*}
$$

For the upper bound, the proof for the cases (1) $p_{0} \neq 5$ and (2) $p_{0}=5$ and $\alpha_{1} \geqq 4$ are omitted as they are similar to the previous proofs. In both these cases we easily verify that the bound obtained is less than the bound obtained for the case $p_{0}=5$ and $\alpha_{1}=2$.

For this case, since $\alpha_{1}=2, \sigma\left(p_{1}^{\alpha_{1}}\right)=13$, so $13 \mid n$.
We then obtain from (D), arguing in a similar way as in ( $a_{1}$ ),

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \log 2> \sum_{r=0}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}}+\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\left[\frac{1}{(i+1) 3^{i+1}}-\frac{1}{i\left(3^{3}\right)^{i}}\right] \\
&+\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\left[\frac{1}{(i+1) 5^{i+1}}-\frac{1}{i\left(5^{2}\right)^{i}}\right]+\sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\left[\frac{1}{(i+1) 13^{i+1}}-\frac{1}{i\left(13^{3}\right)^{i}}\right] \\
&=\sum_{r=0}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}}-\log \left(1-\frac{1}{3}\right)-\frac{1}{3}+\log \left(1-\frac{1}{3^{3}}\right)-\log \left(1-\frac{1}{5}\right)-\frac{1}{5} \\
&+\log \left(1-\frac{1}{5^{2}}\right)-\log \left(1-\frac{1}{13}\right)-\frac{1}{13}+\log \left(1-\frac{1}{13^{3}}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore
( $b_{1 R}$ )

$$
\sum_{r=0}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}}<\frac{1}{3}+\frac{1}{5}+\frac{1}{13}+\log \frac{65}{61}
$$

Hence by ( $\mathrm{b}_{1 \mathrm{~L}}$ ) and ( $\mathrm{b}_{1 \mathrm{R}}$ ), ( $\gamma$ ) follows.
( $\mathrm{b}_{2}$ ) If $5 \nmid n$, then $p_{r} \geqq 7$ for $2 \leqq r \leqq k$ and $p_{0} \geqq 13$.
From (B) as in ( $\mathrm{a}_{1}$ ) we get that

$$
\log 2<\log \frac{3}{2}+7 \log \frac{7}{6}\left[\sum_{r=0}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}}-\frac{1}{3}\right]
$$

therefore
( $\mathrm{b}_{2 \mathrm{~L}}$ )

$$
\sum_{r=0}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}}>\frac{1}{3}+\log \frac{4}{3} / 7 \log \frac{7}{6}
$$

From (D), arguing in a similar way as in ( $\mathrm{a}_{1}$ ), we get that

$$
\log 2>\sum_{r=0}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}}-\log \left(1-\frac{1}{3}\right)-\frac{1}{3}+\log \left(1-\frac{1}{3^{3}}\right)-\frac{1}{338} .
$$

## Therefore

( $\mathrm{b}_{2 \mathrm{R}}$ ) $\quad \sum_{r=0}^{k} \frac{1}{p_{r}}<\frac{1}{3}+\frac{1}{338}+\log \frac{18}{13}$.
Hence by ( $\mathrm{b}_{2 \mathrm{~L}}$ ) and ( $\mathrm{b}_{2 \mathrm{R}}$ ), ( $\delta$ ) follows.
Thus the proof of the theorem is complete.
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