Pacific Journal of Mathematics

ON PRIME DIVISORS OF THE BINOMIAL COEFFICIENT

EARL F. ECKLUND JR.

Vol. 29, No. 2 June 1969

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS
Vol. 29, No. 2, 1969

ON PRIME DIVISORS OF THE BINOMIAL COEFFICIENT

E. F. ECKLUND, JR.

A classical theorem discovered independently by J. Sylvester and I. Schur states that in a set of k consecutive integers, each of which is greater than k, there is a number having a prime divisor greater than k. In giving an elementary proof, P. Erdös expressed the theorem in the following form:

If $n \geqq 2k$, then $\binom{n}{k}$ has a prime divisor $p > k$.

Recently, P. Erdös suggested a problem of a complementary nature:

If $n \geqq 2k$, then $\binom{n}{k}$ has a prime divisor $p \leqq \frac{n}{2}$

The problem is solved by the following

THEOREM. **If $n \geqq 2k$, then $\binom{n}{k}$ has a prime divisor $p \leqq \max\left\{\frac{n}{k}, \frac{n}{2}\right\}$, with the exception $\binom{7}{3}$.**

Throughout the paper, p denotes a prime. J. Rosser and L. Schoenfeld [2] have obtained fairly precise estimates for $\theta(x) = \sum_{p \leqq x} \log(p)$, and $\pi(x) = \sum_{p \leqq x} 1$.

$$\frac{x}{\log x}\left(1 + \frac{1}{2\log x}\right) < \pi(x) \qquad \text{for } x \geqq 59 . \tag{1}$$

$$\pi(x) < \frac{x}{\log x}\left(1 + \frac{3}{2\log x}\right) \qquad \text{for } x > 1 . \tag{2}$$

$$\pi(x) < \frac{1.25506x}{\log x} \qquad \text{for } x > 1 . \tag{3}$$

$$\theta(x) < 1.01624x \qquad \text{for } x > 0 . \tag{4}$$

$$x - 2.05282\sqrt{x} < \theta(x) < x \qquad \text{for } 0 < x \leqq 10^8 . \tag{5}$$

Using these results, we are able to prove the theorem.

First we establish the following lemmas.

LEMMA 1. *If $\binom{n}{k}$ has no prime divisors $p \leqq n/2$, then*

$$\binom{n}{k} \leqq e^{\theta(n)-\theta(n-k)} \leqq n^{\pi(n)-\pi(n-k)} . \tag{6}$$

LEMMA 2. *For $k \geqq 59$,*

$$(7) \qquad n^{\pi(n)-\pi(n-k)} < e^{(n/\log n + k + k/2\log n)} .$$

LEMMA 3.

$$(8) \qquad \frac{2^{(n+1)k-1}}{\sqrt{k}} \leqq \binom{2^n k}{k} .$$

Proof of Lemma 1. $\binom{n}{k} \leqq \prod_{n-k<p\leqq n} p \leqq \prod_{n-k<p\leqq n} n$. Hence

$$\binom{n}{k} \leqq e^{\theta(n)-\theta(n-k)} \leqq n^{\pi(n)-\pi(n-k)} .$$

Proof of Lemma 2. From (1) and (2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} n^{\pi(n)-\pi(n-k)} &< n^{\{n/\log n[1+3/(2\log n)]-(n-k)/\log(n-k)[1+1/(2\log(n-k))]\}} \\ &< n^{\{n/\log n[1+3/2\log n]-(n-k)/\log n[1+1/2\log n]\}} \\ &< e^{\{n[1+3/2\log n]-(n-k)[1+1/2\log n]\}} \\ &< e^{(n//\log n+k+k/2\log n)} . \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3 is proved by induction on n for all values of k.

The proof of the theorem is by contradiction. Three cases are considered. The general case is a Sylvester-Schur type argument. The other cases involve deducing contradictions from appropriate upper and lower bounds on the inequalities, (6), of Lemma 1.

Proof of the theorem. Assume $\binom{n}{k}$ has no prime divisors

$$p \leqq \max\left\{\frac{n}{k}, \frac{n}{2}\right\} .$$

1. $k < n^{2/3}$. $\binom{n}{k} = \dfrac{n\cdot(n-1)\cdots(n-k+1)}{k\cdot(k-1)\cdots 1} \geqq \left(\dfrac{n}{k}\right)^k .$

By sieving all multiples of 2, and 3, we have

$$\pi(n) - \pi(n-k) \leqq \frac{k}{2} \qquad \text{for } k \geqq 4 .$$

Therefore from (6), we have $(n/k)^k \leqq n^{k/2}$. Thus the assumption is false if $4 \leqq k < n^{1/2}$. By sieving all multiples of 2, 3, and 5, we have

$$\pi(n) - \pi(n-k) \leqq \frac{k}{3} \qquad \text{for } k \geqq 60 .$$

Thus from (6), we have $(n/k)^k \leqq n^{k/3}$. Hence the assumption is false if $60 \leqq k < n^{2/3}$.

2. $n^{2/3} \leqq k \leqq n/16$. Let $\tilde{n} = [n/2]$, and $\tilde{k} = [k/2]$; where $[x]$ denotes the integral part of x. If $p > k$ and p divides $\binom{\tilde{n}}{\tilde{k}}$, then p divides $\binom{n}{k}$ and $p \leqq n/2$. By assumption, there are no such primes. Therefore, $\binom{\tilde{n}}{\tilde{k}}$ has no prime divisors $p > 2\tilde{k} + 1$. Thus $\binom{\tilde{n}}{\tilde{k}} < \tilde{n}^{\pi(\sqrt{\tilde{n}})} \cdot e^{\theta(2\tilde{k}+1)}$ (see paper of M. Faulkner [1]). From (3), (4), and (8), we have

$$\frac{2^{5\tilde{k}-1}}{\sqrt{\tilde{k}}} < \tilde{n}^{(1.26\sqrt{\tilde{n}}/\log\sqrt{\tilde{n}})} \cdot e^{1.02(2\tilde{k}+1)} .$$

Taking logarithms, we obtain

$$3.45\tilde{k} - 0.70 - \frac{1}{2}\log(\tilde{k}) < 2.52\sqrt{\tilde{n}} + 1.02(2\tilde{k} + 1) ,$$

which is a contradiction for $\tilde{k} > 32$. Therefore the assumption is false if $n^{2/3} \leqq k \leqq n/16$ when $k \geqq 65$.

3. $n/16 < k \leqq n/2$. Consider $n/16 < k \leqq n/8$. By (6), (7) and (8), we have

$$\frac{2^{4k-1}}{\sqrt{k}} < e^{(n/\log n + k + k/2\log n)} .$$

Taking logarithms, we obtain

$$2.76k - 0.70 - \frac{1}{2}\log(k) < \frac{n}{\log n} + k + \frac{k}{2\log n} ;$$

which is false for $k \geqq 1901$. By (5), (6), and (8), we have

$$\frac{2^{4k-1}}{\sqrt{k}} < e^{(k+2.06\sqrt{15k})} .$$

Taking logarithms, we obtain

$$2.76k - 0.70 - \frac{1}{2}\log(k) < k + 2.6\sqrt{15k} ;$$

which is false for $k \geqq 25$. Thus the assumption is false if $n/16 < k \leqq n/8$ when $k \geqq 25$. By similar arguments, we show the assumption is false is $n/8 < k \leqq n/4$ when $k \geqq 32$; and if $n/4 < k \leqq n/2$ when $k > 105$.

We have proved the theorem for $k \geqq 4$ with the exception of a finite number of cases. The cases $k = 1, 2$, and 3, are easily resolved; and the remaining cases have been checked with the aid of an IBM 1620 computer in the following manner:

The values which were checked are $4 \leqq k \leqq 60$ with $2k \leqq n \leqq k^2$, and $61 \leqq k \leqq 105$ with $2k \leqq n \leqq 4k$.

For the i-th prime, p_i, the exponent to which p_i occurred in the "numerator", $n(n-1)\cdots(n-k+1)$, and in the "denominator", $k!$, of $\binom{n}{k}$, α_i and β_i respectively, were determined; and the values of p_i, n, and k, were reported if the difference, $\alpha_i - \beta_i$, was positive. Cross-checking was done manually. The first ten primes proved sufficient to verify the theorem in these cases.

This concludes the proof of the theorem.

In closing, I would like to thank Professor M. Faulkner for her gracious assistance.

REFERENCES

1. M. Faulkner, *On a theorem of Sylvester and Schur*, J. London Math. Soc., **41** (1966), 107-110.

2. J. Rosser and L. Schoenfeld, *Approximate formulas for some functions of prime numbers*, Illinois J. Math. **6** (1962), 64-94.

Received July 8, 1968.

WESTERN WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS

Mathematical papers intended for publication in the *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* should be in typed form or offset-reproduced, double spaced with large margins. Underline Greek letters in red, German in green, and script in blue. The first paragraph or two must be capable of being used separately as a synopsis of the entire paper. It should not contain references to the bibliography. Manuscripts, in duplicate if possible, may be sent to any one of the four editors. Please classify according to the scheme of Math. Rev. **36**, 1539-1546. All other communications to the editors should be addressed to the managing editor, Richard Arens, University of California, Los Angeles, California, 90024.

50 reprints are provided free for each article; additional copies may be obtained at cost in multiples of 50.

The *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* is published monthly. Effective with Volume 16 the price per volume (3 numbers) is $8.00; single issues, $3.00. Special price for current issues to individual faculty members of supporting institutions and to individual members of the American Mathematical Society: $4.00 per volume; single issues $1.50. Back numbers are available.

Subscriptions, orders for back numbers, and changes of address should be sent to Pacific Journal of Mathematics, 103 Highland Boulevard, Berkeley, California, 94708.

PUBLISHED BY PACIFIC JOURNAL OF MATHEMATICS, A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION

Printed at Kokusai Bunken Insatsusha (International Academic Printing Co., Ltd.), 7-17, Fujimi 2-chome, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

Pacific Journal of Mathematics
Vol. 29, No. 2 June, 1969