EasyChair Preprint

№ 8121

Note on the Odd Perfect Numbers

Frank Vega

May 30, 2022

Note on the Odd Perfect Numbers

Frank Vega

CopSonic, 1471 Route de Saint-Nauphary 82000 Montauban, France

---

Abstract

The Riemann Hypothesis is a conjecture that the Riemann zeta function has its zeros only at the negative even integers and complex numbers with real part $\frac{1}{2}$. Under the assumption of the Riemann Hypothesis, we claim that there is not any odd perfect number at all.

Keywords: Riemann Hypothesis, Prime numbers, Odd perfect numbers, Superabundant numbers, Sum-of-divisors function
2000 MSC: 11M26, 11A41, 11A25

---

1. Introduction

The Riemann Hypothesis is a conjecture that the Riemann zeta function has its zeros only at the negative even integers and complex numbers with real part $\frac{1}{2}$. As usual $\sigma(n)$ is the sum-of-divisors function of n:

$$\sum_{d \mid n} d$$

where $d \mid n$ means the integer d divides n, $d \nmid n$ means the integer d does not divide n and $d^k \parallel n$ means $d^k \mid n$ and $d^{k+1} \nmid n$. Define $f(n)$ and $G(n)$ to be $\frac{\sigma(n)}{n}$ and $\frac{f(n)}{\log \log n}$ respectively, such that log is the natural logarithm. We know these properties from these functions:

Proposition 1.1. *[1]. Let $\prod_{i=1}^{r} q_i^{a_i}$ be the representation of n as a product of primes $q_1 < \cdots < q_r$ with natural numbers as exponents $a_1, \ldots, a_r$. Then,*

$$f(n) = \left(\prod_{i=1}^{r} \frac{q_i}{q_i - 1}\right) \times \prod_{i=1}^{r} \left(1 - \frac{1}{q_i^{a_i+1}}\right).$$

Proposition 1.2. *For every prime power q^a, we have that $f(q^a) = \frac{q^{a+1}-1}{q^a \times (q-1)}$ [2]. If $m, n \geq 2$ are natural numbers, then $f(m \times n) \leq f(m) \times f(n)$ [2]. Moreover, if p is a prime number, and a, b two positive integers, then [2]:*

$$f(p^{a+b}) - f(p^a) \times f(p^b) = -\frac{(p^a - 1) \times (p^b - 1)}{p^{a+b-1} \times (p-1)^2}.$$

Email address: `vega.frank@gmail.com` (Frank Vega)

Say $\mathsf{Robins}(n)$ holds provided

$$G(n) < e^{\gamma}$$

where the constant $\gamma \approx 0.57721$ is the Euler-Mascheroni constant. The importance of this property is:

Proposition 1.3. $\mathsf{Robins}(n)$ *holds for all natural numbers* $n > 5040$ *if and only if the Riemann Hypothesis is true [3].*

In mathematics, $\Psi = n \times \prod_{q \mid n} \left(1 + \frac{1}{q}\right)$ is called the Dedekind Ψ function. Say $\mathsf{Dedekind}(q_n)$ holds provided

$$\prod_{q \leq q_n} \left(1 + \frac{1}{q}\right) > \frac{e^{\gamma}}{\zeta(2)} \times \log \theta(q_n)$$

where $\zeta(x)$ is the Riemann zeta function and $\zeta(2) = \frac{\pi^2}{6}$. The importance of this inequality is:

Proposition 1.4. $\mathsf{Dedekind}(q_n)$ *holds for all prime numbers* $q_n > 3$ *if and only if the Riemann Hypothesis is true [4].*

Let $q_1 = 2, q_2 = 3, \ldots, q_k$ denote the first k consecutive primes, then an integer of the form $\prod_{i=1}^{k} q_i^{a_i}$ with $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \cdots \geq a_k \geq 0$ is called an Hardy-Ramanujan integer [5]. A natural number n is called superabundant precisely when, for all natural numbers $m < n$

$$f(m) < f(n).$$

Proposition 1.5. *If n is superabundant, then n is an Hardy-Ramanujan integer [6]. Let n be a superabundant number, then $p \parallel n$ where p is the largest prime factor of n [6]. For large enough superabundant number n, we have that $q^{a_q} < 2^{a_2}$ for $q > 11$ where $q^{a_q} \parallel n$ and $2^{a_2} \parallel n$ [6]. For large enough superabundant number n, we obtain that* $\log n < (1 + \frac{0.5}{\log p}) \times p$ *where p is the largest prime factor of n [7].*

In mathematics, the Chebyshev function $\theta(x)$ is given by

$$\theta(x) = \sum_{p \leq x} \log p$$

with the sum extending over all prime numbers p that are less than or equal to x [7].

Proposition 1.6. *[7]. For* $x \geq 89909$*:*

$$\theta(x) > (1 - \frac{0.068}{\log(x)}) \times x.$$

In number theory, a perfect number is a positive integer n such that $f(n) = 2$. Euclid proved that every even perfect number is of the form $2^{s-1} \times (2^s - 1)$ whenever $2^s - 1$ is prime. It is unknown whether any odd perfect numbers exist, though various results have been obtained:

Proposition 1.7. *Any odd perfect number N must satisfy the following conditions:* $N > 10^{1500}$ *and the largest prime factor of N is greater than* 10^8 *[8], [9].*

Using these results, we finally claim that there is not any odd perfect number at all.

2. Results

Theorem 2.1. *Under the assumption of the Riemann Hypothesis, we claim that there is not any odd perfect number at all.*

Proof. Let N be a large enough odd perfect number, then we will show its existence implies that the Riemann Hypothesis is false. If N is a large enough odd perfect number, then a superabundant number n that is a multiple of N would be large enough as well. We would have

$$f(n) \leq f(N) \times f(\frac{n}{N})$$

according to the Proposition 1.2. That is the same as

$$f(n) \leq 2 \times f(\frac{n}{N})$$

since $f(N) = 2$, because N is a perfect number. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{f(n)}{2} &= \frac{(2 - \frac{1}{2^{a_2}}) \times f(\frac{n}{2^{a_2}})}{2} \\ &= f(\frac{n}{2^{a_2}}) \times \frac{(2 - \frac{1}{2^{a_2}})}{2} \\ &= f(\frac{n}{2^{a_2}}) \times \frac{2^{a_2+1} - 1}{2^{a_2+1}} \end{aligned}$$

when $2^{a_2} \parallel n$ due to the Proposition 1.2. In this way, we have

$$\frac{f(\frac{n}{2^{a_2}})}{f(\frac{n}{N})} \leq \frac{2^{a_2+1}}{2^{a_2+1} - 1}.$$

However, we know that $p < 2^{a_2}$ because of $p > 10^8 > 11$ and the Propositions 1.5 and 1.7, where p is the largest prime factor of n. Consequently,

$$\frac{2^{a_2+1}}{2^{a_2+1} - 1} \leq \frac{2 \times p}{2 \times p - 1}$$

since $\frac{x}{x-1}$ decreases when $x \geq 2$ increases. In addition, we know that

$$\frac{2 \times p}{2 \times p - 1} \leq f(p)$$

where we know that $f(p) = \frac{p+1}{p}$ from the Proposition 1.2. Certainly,

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \times p^2 &\leq (p + 1) \times (2 \times p - 1) \\ &= 2 \times p^2 + 2 \times p - p - 1 \\ &= 2 \times p^2 + p - 1 \end{aligned}$$

where this inequality is satisfied for every prime number p. So,

$$\frac{f(\frac{n}{2^{a_2}})}{f(\frac{n}{N})} \leq f(p)$$

where we know that $p \parallel n$ from the Proposition 1.5. Under the assumption of the Riemann Hypothesis, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\gamma} &> G(n) \\ &= \frac{f(\frac{n}{p}) \times f(p)}{\log \log n} \\ &\geq \frac{f(\frac{n}{p}) \times f(\frac{n}{2^{a_2}})}{f(\frac{n}{N}) \times \log \log n} \end{aligned}$$

since $f(\ldots)$ is multiplicative and as a consequence of Proposition 1.3. This is equivalent to

$$\frac{f(\frac{n}{p})}{f(\frac{n}{N})} < \frac{e^{\gamma}}{f(\frac{n}{2^{a_2}})} \times \log \log n.$$

From the Propositions 1.1 and 1.5, we know that

$$f(\frac{n}{2^{a_2}}) = \left(\prod_{i=2}^{k} \frac{q_i}{q_i - 1} \right) \times \prod_{i=2}^{k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{q_i^{a_i+1}} \right)$$

where $q_k = p$ and $q_1 = 2$. We know that

$$\frac{q_i}{q_i - 1} = \frac{q_i + 1}{q_i} \times \frac{q_i^2}{q_i^2 - 1}$$

and

$$\frac{q_i^2}{q_i^2 - 1} \times (1 - \frac{1}{q_i^{a_i+1}}) \geq 1.$$

Using the previous inequalities, we obtain that

$$f(\frac{n}{2^{a_2}}) \geq \prod_{i=2}^{k} \frac{q_i + 1}{q_i}.$$

Under the assumption of the Riemann Hypothesis:

$$\prod_{q \leq p} \left(1 + \frac{1}{q} \right) > \frac{e^{\gamma}}{\zeta(2)} \times \log \theta(p)$$

which is the same as

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta(2) \times \prod_{q \leq p} \left(1 + \frac{1}{q} \right) &= \frac{\pi^2}{6} \times \prod_{q \leq p} \left(1 + \frac{1}{q} \right) \\ &= \frac{\pi^2}{6} \times \frac{3}{2} \times \prod_{2 < q \leq p} \left(1 + \frac{1}{q} \right) \\ &= \frac{\pi^2}{8} \times \prod_{2 < q \leq p} \left(1 + \frac{1}{q} \right) \\ &> e^{\gamma} \times \log \theta(p). \end{aligned}$$

due to the Proposition 1.4. Taking into account that $p > 10^8 > 3$ and n is superabundant:

$$\frac{\pi^2}{8} \times f(\frac{n}{2^{a_2}}) > e^{\gamma} \times \log \theta(p).$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{\frac{\pi^2}{8}}{\log \theta(p)} > \frac{e^{\gamma}}{f(\frac{n}{2^{a_2}})}.$$

We use the previous inequality to show that

$$\frac{f(\frac{n}{p})}{f(\frac{n}{N})} < \frac{\frac{\pi^2}{8}}{\log \theta(p)} \times \log \log n.$$

For large enough superabundant number n and $p > 10^8$, then

$$\frac{\frac{\pi^2}{8}}{\log \theta(p)} \times \log \log n \leq \frac{\frac{\pi^2}{8}}{\log \left((1 - \frac{0.068}{\log 10^8}) \times 10^8 \right)} \times \log \left((1 + \frac{0.5}{\log 10^8}) \times 10^8 \right)$$

because of the Propositions 1.6 and 1.5. We obtain that

$$\frac{\frac{\pi^2}{8}}{\log \left((1 - \frac{0.068}{\log 10^8}) \times 10^8 \right)} \times \log \left((1 + \frac{0.5}{\log 10^8}) \times 10^8 \right) < 1.2357481.$$

Thus,

$$\frac{f(\frac{n}{p})}{f(\frac{n}{N})} < 1.2357481.$$

For every prime p_i that divides N such that $p_i^{a_i} \parallel N$ and $p_i^{a_i+b_i} \parallel n$ for a_i, b_i two natural numbers, we have that

$$f(p_i^{a_i+b_i}) - f(p_i^{a_i}) \times f(p_i^{b_i}) = -\frac{(p_i^{a_i} - 1) \times (p_i^{b_i} - 1)}{p_i^{a_i+b_i-1} \times (p_i - 1)^2}$$

in the Proposition 1.2. This is equal to

$$\frac{f(p_i^{a_i+b_i})}{f(p_i^{b_i})} = f(p_i^{a_i}) - \frac{(p_i^{a_i} - 1) \times (p_i^{b_i} - 1)}{f(p_i^{b_i}) \times p_i^{a_i+b_i-1} \times (p_i - 1)^2}.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{f(\frac{n}{p})}{f(\frac{n}{N})} &= \prod_i \left(\frac{f(p_i^{a_i+b_i})}{f(p_i^{b_i})} \right) \\
&= \prod_i \left(f(p_i^{a_i}) - \frac{(p_i^{a_i} - 1) \times (p_i^{b_i} - 1)}{f(p_i^{b_i}) \times p_i^{a_i+b_i-1} \times (p_i - 1)^2} \right) \\
&\approx \prod_i \left(f(p_i^{a_i}) \right) \\
&= f(N) \\
&= 2 \\
&> 1.2357481
\end{aligned}$$

since we know that the expression

$$\frac{(p_i^{a_i} - 1) \times (p_i^{b_i} - 1)}{f(p_i^{b_i}) \times p_i^{a_i + b_i - 1} \times (p_i - 1)^2}$$

tends to 0 as b tends to infinity for every odd prime p. Certainly, the fraction $\frac{f(\frac{n}{p})}{f(\frac{n}{N})}$ gets closer to 2 as long as we take n bigger and bigger. However,

$$1.2357481 < \frac{f(\frac{n}{p})}{f(\frac{n}{N})} < 1.2357481$$

is a contradiction. By contraposition, the number N does not exist when N would be a large enough odd perfect number under the assumption of the Riemann Hypothesis. In addition, we claim there is not any odd perfect number at all since the smallest counterexample N must comply that $N > 10^{1500}$ according to the Proposition 1.7. $\square$

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank his mother, maternal brother and his friend Sonia for their support.

References

[1] A. Hertlein, Robin's Inequality for New Families of Integers, Integers 18, (2018).

[2] R. Vojak, On numbers satisfying Robin's inequality, properties of the next counterexample and improved specific bounds, arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.09307(2020).

[3] G. Robin, Grandes valeurs de la fonction somme des diviseurs et hypothèse de Riemann, J. Math. pures appl 63 (2) (1984) 187–213.

[4] P. Solé, M. Planat, Extreme values of the Dedekind ψ function, Journal of Combinatorics and Number Theory 3 (1) (2011) 33–38.

[5] Y. Choie, N. Lichiardopol, P. Moree, P. Solé, On Robin's criterion for the Riemann hypothesis, Journal de Théorie des Nombres de Bordeaux 19 (2) (2007) 357–372. doi:doi:10.5802/jtnb.591.

[6] L. Alaoglu, P. Erdős, On highly composite and similar numbers, Transactions of the American Mathematical Society 56 (3) (1944) 448–469. doi:doi:10.2307/1990319.

[7] S. Nazardonyavi, S. Yakubovich, Superabundant numbers, their subsequences and the Riemann hypothesis, arXiv preprint arXiv:1211.2147(2012).

[8] P. Ochem, M. Rao, Odd perfect numbers are greater than 10^{1500}, Mathematics of Computation 81 (279) (2012) 1869–1877. doi:doi:10.1090/S0025-5718-2012-02563-4.

[9] T. Goto, Y. Ohno, Odd perfect numbers have a prime factor exceeding 10^8, Mathematics of Computation 77 (263) (2008) 1859–1868.