## ON A THEOREM OF RAV CONCERNING EGYPTIAN FRACTIONS

## BY

## WILLIAM A. WEBB

Problems involving Egyptian fractions (rationals whose numerator is 1 and whose denominator is a positive integer) have been extensively studied. (See [1] for a more complete bibliography). Some of the most interesting questions, many still unsolved, concern the solvability of

$$\frac{m}{n} = \frac{1}{x_1} + \frac{1}{x_2} + \dots + \frac{1}{x_k}$$

where k is fixed.

In [2] Rav proved necessary and sufficient conditions for the solvability of the above equation, as a consequence of some other theorems which are rather complicated in their proofs. In this note we give a short, elementary proof of this theorem, and at the same time generalize it slightly.

THEOREM 1.

(1) 
$$\frac{m}{n} = \frac{1}{x_1} + \frac{1}{x_2} + \dots + \frac{1}{x_k}$$

if and only if there exist positive integers M and N and divisors  $D_1, \ldots, D_k$  of N such that M/N=m/n and  $D_1+D_2+\cdots+D_k\equiv 0 \pmod{M}$ . Also, the last condition can be replaced by  $D_1+D_2+\cdots+D_k=M$ ; and the condition  $(D_1, D_2, \ldots, D_k)=1$  may be added without affecting the validity of the theorem.

**Proof.** Suppose there exist M and N and divisors  $D_1, \ldots, D_k$  of N such that M/N = m/n and  $D_1 + D_2 + \cdots + D_k = rM$ . Then

(2) 
$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{1}{rN/D_{i}} = \frac{rM}{rN} = \frac{m}{n}$$

and so (1) is solvable. This holds regardless of whether r=1 or whether  $(D_1, D_2, \ldots, D_k)=1$ .

Now suppose that (1) is solvable, then

(3) 
$$\frac{m}{n} = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{1}{x_i} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{k} x_1 \cdots x_{i-1} x_{i+1} \cdots x_k}{x_1 x_2 \cdots x_k}.$$

Letting M and N be the numerator and denominator of the right hand fraction in (3) and letting  $D_i = x_1 \cdots x_{i-1} x_{i+1} \cdots x_k$  our theorem is satisfied. Furthermore 155  $D_1+D_2+\cdots D_k=M$ . Also, letting  $d=(D_1, D_2, \dots, D_k)$ , M'=M/d, N'=N/d,  $D'_i=D_i/d$  then M', N' and the  $D'_i$  also satisfy the theorem, and  $(D'_1, D'_2, \dots, D'_k)=1$ .

This theorem would give an effective means of deciding the solvability of (1) if we could obtain an upper bound for the least M and N satisfying the theorem. Letting M=Cm and N=Cn we want a bound B such that if (1) is solvable, then our theorem is satisfied for some  $C \leq B$ . This is possible to do inductively, although the bounds obtained are rather cumbersome. We illustrate with the cases k=2 and 3—these cases are the most important and have been most extensively studied in other contexts.

THEOREM 2. Letting M = Cm and N = Cn, theorem 1 is satisfied with

(i) 
$$C \le (n+1)/m$$
 if  $k = 2$ 

(ii) 
$$C \leq \max_{x \in (n/m, 3n/m]} \frac{nx^2 + x}{mx - n}$$
 if  $k = 3$ .

**Proof.** Suppose without loss of generality that (m, n)=1 and  $m/n=(1/x_1)+(1/x_2)$ . In this case we know that there exist  $d_1, d_2 \mid n$  such that  $d_1+d_2=tm$ . Then theorem 1 is satisfied with C=t and  $t \le (n+1)/m$  since  $(d_1, d_2)=1$  which implies  $d_1+d_2 \le n+1$ . Examples such as 3/11 show that this is the best possible bound for C in the case k=2.

Now suppose  $m/n=1/x_1+1/x_2+1/x_3$ , where  $x_1 \le x_2 \le x_3$ . By applying part (i) to  $m/n-1/x_1$  we get the bound given in (ii) since obviously  $x_1 \in (n/m, 3n/m]$ . The maximum occurs at either x=[n/m]+1 or [3n/m] depending on the values of m and n in the specific case considered. A simpler bound for C such as  $(n+m)(n^2+nm+m)/m^2$  could be used in (ii) although some precision would be lost.

The case where the  $x_i$  are allowed to be negative is also of considerable interest. A result completely analogous to Theorem 1 can be proved in this case with only the most minor changes. This extends Lemmas 2 and 3 of [3].

## References

1. M. N. Bleicher, A new algorithm for the expansion of Egyptian fractions, J. of Number Theory, Vol. 4 (1972), 342–382.

2. Y. Rav, On the representation of a rational number as a sum of a fixed number of unit fractions, J. Reine Angew. Math. 222 (1966), 207–213.

3. B. M. Stewart and W. A. Webb, Sums of fractions with bounded numerators, Can. J. Math., 18 (1966), 999-1003.

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

156