

## **n-Tuples Whose Elements Divide Their Sum: 10597**

David Cox; GCHQ Problem Solving Group

*The American Mathematical Monthly*, Vol. 106, No. 5. (May, 1999), pp. 474-475.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0002-9890%28199905%29106%3A5%3C474%3ANWEDTS%3E2.0.CO%3B2-F>

*The American Mathematical Monthly* is currently published by Mathematical Association of America.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at [http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html.](http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html) JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/maa.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

The JSTOR Archive is a trusted digital repository providing for long-term preservation and access to leading academic journals and scholarly literature from around the world. The Archive is supported by libraries, scholarly societies, publishers, and foundations. It is an initiative of JSTOR, a not-for-profit organization with a mission to help the scholarly community take advantage of advances in technology. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Since  $r_i = (1 + k + k^2 + b_i)/2$  and  $r_i$  is an integer,  $b_i$  must be odd, and so  $1 - b_i^2 \le 0$  for all *i*. Therefore  $\sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i \leq 0$ . The total number of positive entries in the matrix thus satisfies

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{m} r_i = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{1}{2}(n+k+b_i) = \frac{m}{2}(n+k) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i \le \frac{m}{2}(n+k).
$$

Achieving the bound requires  $\sum_{i=1}^{m} b_i = 0$ , which occurs only when half the rows have  $b_i = +1$  and the other half have  $b_i = -1$ . Thus it is necessary that *m* be even. One matrix that achieves the bound when  $m = 2(n!)$  is formed by taking all  $n!$  permutations of a row with  $\frac{1}{2}(n+k+1)$  positive entries and all *n*! permutations of a row with  $\frac{1}{2}(n+k-1)$  positive entries. By symmetry, all of the dot products are equal, and their sum is zero; hence each dot product must be zero.

*Editorial comment.* John H. Lindsey observed that equality in the bound requires *m* to be divisible by 4. The proposer asked for the smallest number of rows allowing equality to be achieved for a given *n.* He and Richard Stong independently provided a construction with  $m = 2\binom{n-1}{(k+1)k/2}.$ 

Solved also by R. J. Chapman (U. K.), J. H. Lindsey II, K. McInturff, R. Stong, and the proposer.

## **n-Tbples Whose Elements Divide Their Sum**

**10597** *[1997,457]. Proposed by David Cox, Amherst College; Amherst, MA.* Fix an integer  $n \geq 2$ , and let  $d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_n$  be positive integers with no common divisor greater than 1. Suppose that  $d_i$  divides  $d_1 + \cdots + d_n$  for  $1 \le i \le n$ .

(a) Prove that  $d_1 d_2 \cdots d_n$  divides  $(d_1 + \cdots + d_n)^{n-2}$ .

**(b)** For each  $n \geq 3$ , give an example to show that the exponent in part (a) cannot be made smaller.

*Solution by GCHQ Problems Group, Cheltenham, U. K.* 

(a) Let *p* be a prime factor of the product  $d_1d_2 \cdots d_n$ , and let  $p^k$  be the highest power of *p* dividing any one of the  $d_i$ . We have  $p^k \mid \sum d_i$ , and thus  $p^{k(n-2)} \mid (\sum d_i)^{n-2}$ . Since  $d_1, \ldots, d_n$  have no common factor greater than 1, some element  $d_i$  is not divisible by p. Furthermore, since  $p \mid \sum d_i$ , at least two summands are not divisible by p. Hence the highest power of *p* dividing  $\prod d_i$  does not exceed  $p^{k(n-2)}$ . Repeating this for each prime factor shows that  $\prod d_i$  divides  $(\sum d_i)^{n-2}$ .

(**b**) Let  $d_1 = 1$ ,  $d_2 = n - 1$ , and  $d_i = n$  for  $3 \le i \le n$ . Here  $\sum d_i = n(n - 1)$ , which is divisible by each  $d_i$ . Since  $d_1 = 1$ , the greatest common divisor is 1. We have  $\prod d_i = n^{n-2}(n-1)$ . Since *n* and  $n-1$  are coprime, the smallest power of  $n(n-1)$  divisible by  $n^{n-2}(n-1)$  is  $(n(n-1))^{n-2}$ , and thus the exponent cannot be reduced.

*Editorial comment.* Other examples submitted for part **(b)** by various solvers included

$$
d_1 = 1, d_2 = 2,
$$
 and  $d_i = 3 \cdot 2^{i-3}$  for  $3 \le i \le n$ 

and

$$
d_1 = 1, d_i = 2
$$
 for  $2 \le i \le n - 1$ , and  $d_n = 2n - 3$ .

Using Euclid's sequence *2,3,7,43, 1807,* . . .,the San Jose State Problem Solving Ring gave an example in which  $d_1 d_2 \cdots d_n = (d_1 + \cdots + d_n)^{n-2}$ . Another use of Euclid's sequence appears in this MONTHLY inthe solution of Problem *10532 [1996, 510; 1998, 7751,* where references are given.

M. J. Knight and the San Jose State Problem Solving Ring each showed that for given *n* the set  $D_n$  of *n*-tuples  $(d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_n)$  satisfying the conditions of the problem is finite. For example,  $D_2$  contains only the pair  $(1, 1)$ , and  $D_3$  contains only the triples  $(1, 1, 1)$ ,  $(1, 1, 2), (1, 2, 3)$ , and their permutations. The finiteness of  $D_n$  is equivalent to the finiteness of the set  $X_n$  of solutions of  $1/x_1 + 1/x_2 + \cdots + 1/x_n = 1$  in positive integers, which was apparently first established by D. R. Curtiss, this MONTHLY *29 (1922) 380-387. A* direct bijection between  $D_n$  and  $X_n$  is obtained by setting  $x_i = (\sum d_i)/d_i$ .

Solved also by R. Barbara (Lebanon), D. Beckwith, M. Boase (U.K.), J. Brawner, D. Callan, R. J. Chapman (U. K.), T. Hermann, R. Holzsager, T. Jager, S. A. Jassim (U. K.), M. J. Knight, C. Lanski, J. H. Lindsey 11, D. Lorenzini, K. McInturff, R. Padma (India), K. Schilling, R. Stong, A. Tissier (France), SJSU Problem Solving Ring, and the proposer.

## **Binomial Ratios**

**10625** [1997, 871]. Proposed by Olaf Krafft and Martin Schaefer, Technical University *Aachen, Aachen, Germany.* For  $x > 0$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , define

$$
a_n = \sum_{i=0}^{2^{n-1}} {2^n \choose 2i} x^i / \sum_{i=0}^{2^{n-1}-1} {2^n \choose 2i+1} x^i.
$$

Evaluate  $\lim_{n\to\infty} a_n$ .

Solution I by Nora Thornber, Raritan Valley Community College, Somerville, NJ. Applying the binomial theorem four times, we have

$$
a_n = \sqrt{x} \cdot \frac{\left(1 + \sqrt{x}\right)^{2^n} + \left(1 - \sqrt{x}\right)^{2^n}}{\left(1 + \sqrt{x}\right)^{2^n} - \left(1 - \sqrt{x}\right)^{2^n}} = \sqrt{x} \cdot \frac{1 + \left(\frac{1 - \sqrt{x}}{1 + \sqrt{x}}\right)^{2^n}}{1 - \left(\frac{1 - \sqrt{x}}{1 + \sqrt{x}}\right)^{2^n}}.
$$

But  $|(1 - \sqrt{x})/(1 + \sqrt{x})| < 1$ , so we conclude that  $\lim_{n \to \infty} a_n = \sqrt{x}$ .

*Solution II by The National Security Agency Problems Group, Fort Meade, MD.* Let  $p=$  $\sqrt{x}/(\sqrt{x} + 1)$  and  $q = 1/(\sqrt{x} + 1)$ , so that  $0 < p, q < 1, p + q = 1$ , and  $\sqrt{x} = p/q$ . Now consider an experiment consisting of  $2<sup>n</sup>$  independent tosses of a coin that is biased to come up heads with probability p. Let  $E_n$  (respectively,  $O_n$ ) be the probability that an even (respectively, odd) number of heads comes up. Set  $u_n = u_n(p) = E_n/O_n$ . Then

$$
u_n = \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{2^{n-1}} {2 \choose 2i} p^{2i} q^{2^n - 2i}}{\sum_{i=0}^{2^{n-1}-1} {2^n \choose 2i+1} p^{2i+1} q^{2^n - (2i+1)}}
$$
  
= 
$$
\frac{q^{2^n} \sum_{i=0}^{2^{n-1}} {2^n \choose 2i} (p/q)^{2i}}{q^{2^n} \sum_{i=0}^{2^{n-1}-1} {2^n \choose 2i+1} (p/q)^{2i+1}} = \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{2^{n-1}} {2^n \choose 2i} x^i}{\sqrt{x} \sum_{i=0}^{2^{n-1}-1} {2^n \choose 2i+1} x^{2i+1}}
$$

Hence  $a_n = \sqrt{x}u_n$ .

The independence of the various tosses implies  $E_{n+1} = E_n E_n + O_n O_n$  and  $O_{n+1}$ *2 En On.* Therefore

$$
u_{n+1} = \frac{E_n^2 + O_n^2}{2E_n O_n} = \frac{1}{2} \left( u_n + \frac{1}{u_n} \right).
$$

By the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality,  $u_n \geq 1$ ; hence  $u_n \geq (1/2)(u_n + 1/u_n)$  $u_{n+1}$ . Therefore the sequence  $u_n$  is decreasing and bounded below; it follows that  $L=$  $\lim_{n\to\infty} u_n$  exists, and satisfies  $L = (1/2)(L + 1/L)$ . Therefore  $L = 1$ , so we conclude that  $\lim_{n\to\infty} a_n = \sqrt{x}$ .

*Solution 111by Ulrich Abel, Fachhochschule Giessen-Friedberg, Friedberg, Germany.* We prove the following generalization: For integers  $k \ge 1$ ,  $r, s \ge 0$ , and real  $x > 0$ , we have

$$
b_n = \sum_{i \ge 0} {kn \choose ki+r} x^i / \sum_{i \ge 0} {kn \choose ki+s} x^i \longrightarrow x^{(s-r)/k}.
$$

In the special case  $k = 2$ ,  $r = 0$ ,  $s = 1$ , we have  $b_{2^{n-1}} = a_n$ , and conclude that  $a_n \to \sqrt{x}$ .