



Number Theory

# Lower bounds for the least common multiple of finite arithmetic progressions<sup>☆</sup>

Shaofang Hong, Weiduan Feng

Mathematical College, Sichuan University, Chengdu 610064, P.R. China

Received 14 September 2006; accepted 27 October 2006

Available online 1 December 2006

Presented by Christophe Soulé

## Abstract

Let  $u_0, r$  and  $n$  be positive integers such that  $(u_0, r) = 1$ . Let  $u_k = u_0 + kr$  for  $1 \leq k \leq n$ . We prove that  $L_n := \text{lcm}\{u_0, u_1, \dots, u_n\} \geq u_0(r+1)^n$  which confirms Farhi's conjecture (2005). Further we show that if  $r < n$ , then  $L_n \geq u_0r(r+1)^n$ .

**To cite this article:** S. Hong, W. Feng, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I 343 (2006).

© 2006 Académie des sciences. Published by Elsevier Masson SAS. All rights reserved.

## Résumé

**Minoration du plus petit commun multiple d'une progression arithmétique finie.** Soit  $u_0, r$  et  $n$  des entiers positifs tels que  $(u_0, r) = 1$ , posons  $u_k = u_0 + kr$  pour  $1 \leq k \leq n$ . Nous démontrons  $L_n := \text{ppcm}(u_0, u_1, \dots, u_n) \geq u_0(r+1)^n$ , ce qui confirme la conjecture de Farhi (2005). De plus, nous montrons que si  $r < n$  alors  $L_n \geq u_0r(r+1)^n$ . **Pour citer cet article :** S. Hong, W. Feng, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I 343 (2006).

© 2006 Académie des sciences. Published by Elsevier Masson SAS. All rights reserved.

## 1. Introduction

Arithmetic progression is a basic subject in the study of Number Theory. The famous Dirichlet theorem (see, for instance, [1] or [5]) says that the arithmetic progression contains infinitely many primes if the first term and the common difference are coprime. Recently, Hong and Loewy [6] investigated the eigen structure of Smith matrices defined on a finite arithmetic progression and made some progress. Very recently, Green and Tao [3] have shown a significant theorem stating that the set of primes contains arbitrarily long arithmetic progression.

On the other hand, Hanson [4] and Nair [7] got the upper bound and lower bound of  $\text{lcm}\{1, \dots, n\}$  respectively. Farhi [2] obtained some non-trivial lower bounds for the least common multiple of finite arithmetic progressions. Furthermore Farhi proposed the following conjecture:

**Conjecture.** [2, Conjecture 2.5] Assume  $u_0, r, n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ ,  $(u_0, r) = 1$  and  $u_k = u_0 + kr$  for  $1 \leq k \leq n$ . Then  $L_n := \text{lcm}\{u_0, u_1, \dots, u_n\} \geq u_0(r+1)^n$ .

<sup>☆</sup> Research is partially supported by SRF for ROCS, SEM.

E-mail addresses: s-f.hong@tom.com, hongsf02@yahoo.com (S. Hong), d.d.feng@163.com (W. Feng).

In this Note, we are interested in the least common multiple of finite arithmetic progressions. We exploit sharp lower bound for the least common multiple of an arithmetic progression with  $n$  terms. In particular, we show that the above conjecture is true. Under the condition  $r < n$ , we get an improved lower bound  $L_n \geq u_0 r (r + 1)^n$ .

Throughout this Note, as usual,  $[x]$  will denote the integer part of a given real number  $x$ . We say that a real number  $x$  is a multiple of a non-zero real number  $y$  if the quotient  $\frac{x}{y}$  is an integer.

## 2. The main results

To show our main results, we first need a result of Farhi [2]. For the convenience to the readers, we here present an alternative proof using integrals. Throughout this section, we let  $u_0, r, n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  with  $(u_0, r) = 1$ ,  $u_k = u_0 + kr$  for  $1 \leq k \leq n$  and  $L_n = \text{lcm}\{u_0, u_1, \dots, u_n\}$ .

**Lemma 2.1.** *For any positive integer  $n$ ,  $L_n$  is a multiple of  $\frac{u_0 u_1 \cdots u_n}{n!}$ .*

**Proof.** We compute the integral  $\int_0^1 x^{u_0/r-1} (1-x)^n dx$  in two ways. First we use the binomial theorem to get that

$$\int_0^1 x^{u_0/r-1} (1-x)^n dx = \int_0^1 x^{u_0/r-1} \sum_{k=0}^n (-1)^k \binom{n}{k} x^k dx = \sum_{k=0}^n (-1)^k \binom{n}{k} \frac{r}{u_k}. \quad (1)$$

Second by using partial integral we have

$$\int_0^1 x^{u_0/r-1} (1-x)^n dx = \frac{r}{u_0} \int_0^1 (1-x)^n dx^{u_0/r} = \frac{n}{u_0/r} \int_0^1 x^{u_0/r} (1-x)^{n-1} dx.$$

Continue to use partial integral for  $n - 1$  times, we get

$$\int_0^1 x^{u_0/r-1} (1-x)^n dx = \frac{n!}{\frac{u_0}{r} (\frac{u_0}{r} + 1) \cdots (\frac{u_0}{r} + n - 1)} \int_0^1 x^{u_0/r+n-1} dx = \frac{n! r^{n+1}}{u_0 u_1 \cdots u_n}. \quad (2)$$

So by (1) and (2) we have

$$\sum_{k=0}^n (-1)^k \binom{n}{k} \frac{1}{u_k} = \frac{n! r^n}{u_0 u_1 \cdots u_n}. \quad (3)$$

By  $A$  denote the product of  $L_n$  and the left-hand side of (3). Clearly  $A$  is an integer. Multiplying both sides of (3) by  $L_n$ , we have  $(n! r^n L_n) / (u_0 u_1 \cdots u_n) = A \in \mathbb{Z}$ . So  $L_n = (A/r^n)(u_0 u_1 \cdots u_n/n!)$ . But  $(r, u_0) = 1$  implies that  $(r^n, u_0 u_1 \cdots u_n) = 1$ . Thus  $A_n := A/r^n$  is an integer. Then  $L_n = A_n u_0 u_1 \cdots u_n/n!$  as required. This completes the proof of Lemma 2.1.  $\square$

Define  $C_{n,k} := \frac{u_k \cdots u_n}{(n-k)!}$  for  $0 \leq k \leq n$ . Then we have the following lemma.

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let*

$$k_n := \max \left\{ 0, \left[ \frac{n - u_0}{r + 1} \right] + 1 \right\}.$$

*Then for any  $0 \leq k \leq n$ , we have  $C_{n,k} \leq C_{n,k_n}$ .*

**Proof.** By the definition, we find the following relation

$$C_{n,k} = C_{n,k+1} \cdot \frac{u_k}{n-k} \quad (4)$$

for all  $0 \leq k \leq n - 1$ . Let first  $u_0 > n$ . Then  $k_n = 0$ . Since  $u_k > u_0$  and  $n > n - k$ , we have  $\frac{u_k}{n-k} > 1$  for all  $0 \leq k \leq n - 1$ . This implies immediately that  $C_{n,0} > C_{n,1} > \cdots > C_{n,n}$ . Thus Lemma 2.2 is true if  $n < u_0$ .

Now let  $u_0 \leq n$ . It is easy to see that  $\frac{u_k}{n-k}$  is increasing as  $k$  increases. Note that  $u_0/n \leq 1$ ,  $u_{n-1}/(n - (n - 1)) = u_{n-1} > 1$ . Then there must be an integer  $l$  with  $0 \leq l \leq n - 2$  such that

$$\frac{u_l}{n-l} \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{u_{l+1}}{n-(l+1)} > 1. \tag{5}$$

So by (4) and (5) we obtain

$$C_{n,0} < \dots < C_{n,l} \leq C_{n,l+1} > \dots > C_{n,n}. \tag{6}$$

On the other hand, from (5) we derive that

$$\frac{n-u_0}{r+1} - 1 < l \leq \frac{n-u_0}{r+1} \Rightarrow l = \left\lfloor \frac{n-u_0}{r+1} \right\rfloor.$$

Since  $n \geq u_0, l \geq 0$ . Thus  $k_n = l + 1$ . Then by (6) we know that Lemma 2.2 holds if  $n \geq u_0$ . So Lemma 2.2 is proved.  $\square$

For any integer  $0 \leq k \leq n$ , define  $L_{n,k} := \text{lcm}\{u_k, \dots, u_n\}$ . Then  $L_n = L_{n,0}$ . By Lemma 2.1 we have

$$L_{n,k} = A_{n,k} \frac{u_k u_{k+1} \dots u_n}{(n-k)!} = A_{n,k} C_{n,k} \tag{7}$$

with  $A_{n,k} \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ . It is obvious that  $L_n$  is a multiple of  $L_{n,k}$  for all  $0 \leq k \leq n$ . Hence for all  $0 \leq k \leq n$ , by (7) we have  $L_n \geq L_{n,k} \geq C_{n,k}$ . Particularly  $L_n \geq C_{n,k_n}$ .

We can now prove the first main result:

**Theorem 2.3.** *Let  $C_{n,k}$  and  $k_n$  be defined as above. Then  $C_{n,k_n} \geq u_0(r+1)^n$ . Consequently we have  $L_n \geq u_0(r+1)^n$ .*

**Proof.** We use induction on  $n$  to prove that  $C_{n,k_n} \geq u_0(r+1)^n$ . First if  $n \leq u_0$ , then by Lemma 2.2 we have

$$C_{n,k_n} \geq C_{n,0} = \frac{u_0 u_1 \dots u_n}{n!} = u_0 \frac{u_1}{1} \frac{u_2}{2} \dots \frac{u_n}{n} = u_0(u_0+r) \left(\frac{u_0}{2} + r\right) \dots \left(\frac{u_0}{n} + r\right) \geq u_0(r+1)^n.$$

Thus the conclusion is true for  $n = 1$  since  $u_0 \geq 1$ .

Assume that the claim holds for the case  $n$ . In what follows we prove that the claim is true for the case  $n + 1$ . By the proof above, we may let  $n > u_0$ . Evidently we have  $k_n \leq k_{n+1} \leq k_n + 1$ . So we can divide the proof into the following two cases:

Case 1:  $k_{n+1} = k_n$ . Then we have

$$k_n = \left\lfloor \frac{n-u_0}{r+1} \right\rfloor + 1 = \left\lfloor \frac{n+1-u_0}{r+1} \right\rfloor + 1.$$

Hence we have

$$\frac{n+1-u_0}{r+1} < k_n. \tag{8}$$

Then

$$C_{n+1,k_{n+1}} = C_{n+1,k_n} = \frac{u_{k_n} \dots u_n u_{n+1}}{(n+1-k_n)!} = C_{n,k_n} \cdot \frac{u_{n+1}}{n+1-k_n}, \tag{9}$$

By (8), we have

$$u_{n+1} - (r+1)(n+1-k_n) = u_0 + (n+1)r - (n+1)(r+1) + k_n(r+1) = u_0 - (n+1) + k_n(r+1) > 0.$$

So  $\frac{u_{n+1}}{n+1-k_n} \geq r+1$ . But the induction hypothesis tells us  $C_{n,k_n} \geq u_0(r+1)^n$ . Then by (9) we get  $C_{n+1,k_{n+1}} \geq u_0(r+1)^{n+1}$  as required.

Case 2:  $k_{n+1} = k_n + 1$ . Then we have  $k_n = k_{n+1} - 1 = \left\lfloor \frac{n+1-u_0}{r+1} \right\rfloor$ . Thus

$$k_n \leq \frac{n+1-u_0}{r+1}. \tag{10}$$

So we have

$$C_{n+1, k_{n+1}} = C_{n+1, k_n+1} = \frac{u_{k_n+1} \cdots u_n u_{n+1}}{((n+1) - (k_n+1))!} = C_{n, k_n} \cdot \frac{u_{n+1}}{u_{k_n}}. \quad (11)$$

By (10) we have

$$\begin{aligned} u_{n+1} - (r+1)u_{k_n} &= u_0 + (n+1)r - (r+1)(u_0 + k_n r) = u_0 + (n+1)r - (r+1)u_0 - k_n r(r+1) \\ &\geq nr + r - u_0 r - r(n+1 - u_0) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that  $\frac{u_{n+1}}{u_{k_n}} \geq r+1$ . Then the desired result  $C_{n+1, k_{n+1}} \geq u_0(r+1)^{n+1}$  follows immediately from (11) and the induction hypothesis. This completes the proof of the claim for case  $n+1$ . So Theorem 2.3 is proved.  $\square$

By Theorem 2.3, we know that Farhi's conjecture is true.

If we exploit the term  $A_{n, k}$  in the identity (7), then we can improve the lower bound under certain condition as the following theorem shows.

**Theorem 2.4.** *Let  $r < n$ . Then we have  $L_n \geq u_0 r(r+1)^n$ .*

**Proof.** Letting  $k = k_n$  in (7) gives us that

$$(n - k_n)! \cdot L_{n, k_n} = A_{n, k_n} \cdot u_{k_n} u_{k_n+1} \cdots u_n. \quad (12)$$

Suppose that  $r \leq n - k_n$ . Then  $r \mid (n - k_n)!$ . Since  $(r, u_0) = 1$ , we have  $(r, u_{k_n} u_{k_n+1} \cdots u_n) = 1$ . So from (12) we deduce that  $r \mid A_{n, k_n}$ . Hence  $A_{n, k_n} \geq r$  and so  $L_{n, k_n} = A_{n, k_n} C_{n, k_n} \geq u_0 r(r+1)^n$ . Then the conclusion of Theorem 2.4 follows. Thus to prove Theorem 2.4, we need only to prove that  $r \leq n - k_n$  which will be done in the following.

If  $u_0 > n$ , then  $k_n = 0$  and  $n - k_n = n > r$ . If  $u_0 = n$ , then  $k_n = 1$  and  $n - k_n = n - 1 \geq r$ . If  $u_0 < n$ , then we consider the following three cases:

*Case 1:*  $r < u_0 < n$ . Then  $k_n = \left\lfloor \frac{n-u_0}{r+1} \right\rfloor + 1$ . So we have  $r + k_n \leq r + \frac{n-u_0}{r+1} + 1 \leq \frac{(r+1)u_0 + n - u_0}{r+1} < n$ . Thus we have  $r < n - k_n$  as required.

*Case 2:*  $u_0 < r < 2r \leq n$ . Then  $r \geq 2$  and  $n \geq 4$ . Hence  $k_n \leq \frac{n-u_0}{r+1} + 1 \leq \frac{n-1}{3} + 1 \leq \frac{n}{2}$ . It follows that  $r \leq n/2 \leq n - k_n$  as required.

*Case 3:*  $u_0 < r < n < 2r$ . Then  $k_n \leq \frac{n-u_0}{r+1} + 1 < \frac{2r-1}{r+1} + 1 = 3 - \frac{3}{r+1} < 3$ . Since  $k_n \geq 1$ ,  $k_n$  must be 1 or 2. If  $k_n = 1$ , then  $r \leq n - 1 = n - k_n$  as desired. If  $k_n = 2$ , then  $r \neq n - 1$ . Otherwise we have  $r = n - 1$  which means

$$k_n = \left\lfloor \frac{n - u_0}{n - 1 + 1} \right\rfloor + 1 = 1.$$

This is impossible. So we have  $r \leq n - 2 = n - k_n$  as required.

The proof of Theorem 2.4 is complete.  $\square$

**Remark.** We point out that the conclusion of Theorem 2.4 may be false if the restricted condition  $r < n$  does not hold. For example, let  $u_0 = 1, r = n = 2$ . Then  $L_n = \text{lcm}\{1, 3, 5\} = 15$ . But  $u_0 r(r+1)^n = 18$ . So we have  $L_n < u_0 r(r+1)^n$ .

## References

- [1] T.M. Apostol, Introduction to Analytic Number Theory, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1976.
- [2] B. Farhi, Minoration non triviale du plus petit commun multiple de certaines suites finies d'entiers, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I 341 (2005) 469–474.
- [3] B. Green, T. Tao, The primes contain arbitrarily long arithmetic progression, Ann. Math., in press.
- [4] D. Hanson, On the product of the primes, Canad. Math. Bull. 15 (1972) 33–37.
- [5] G.H. Hardy, E.M. Wright, An Introduction to the Theory of Numbers, fourth ed., Oxford University Press, London, 1960.
- [6] S. Hong, R. Loewy, Asymptotic behavior of eigenvalues of greatest common divisor matrices, Glasgow Math. J. 46 (2004) 551–569.
- [7] M. Nair, On Chebyshev-type inequalities for primes, Amer. Math. Monthly 89 (1982) 126–129.