

# AN EXTREMAL PROBLEM ON THE SET OF NONCOPRIME DIVISORS OF A NUMBER

BY

P. ERDÖS, M. HERZOG AND J. SCHÖNHEIM

## ABSTRACT

A combinatorial theorem is established, stating that if a family  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_s$  of subsets of a set  $M$  contains every subset of each member, then the complements in  $M$  of the  $A$ 's have a permutation  $C_1, C_2, \dots, C_s$  such that  $C_i \supset A_i$ . This is used to determine the minimal size of a maximal set of divisors of a number  $N$  no two of them being coprime.

## 1. Introduction and results

Many theorems on intersections of sets have been generalized for entities more general than sets. A first such result is that of De Bruijn, Van Tengbergen and Kruijswijk [1]. They established a theorem on *maximal sets of divisors of a number  $N$ , no member of which divides another member*. If  $N$  is square free, this is equivalent to Sperner's theorem on *the maximal set of subsets of a given set, no subset containing another one*. Other results in the same direction have been obtained in [2, 3, 4]. Two of us [6] generalized in the same sense the following result of [5]:

**THEOREM 1.** *If  $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_m\}$  is a family of (different) subsets of a given set  $M$ ,  $|M| = n$ , such that*

$$(1) \quad A_i \cap A_j \neq \phi, \text{ for every } i, j$$

*then*

a)  $m \leq 2^{n-1}$

*and for every  $n$  there are  $m = 2^{n-1}$  such subsets.*

b) *if  $m < 2^{n-1}$  then additional members may be included in  $\mathcal{A}$ , the enlarged family still satisfying (1).*

REMARK 1. If  $m = 2^{n-1}$ , then the set  $\mathcal{M}$  of all subsets of  $M$  is partitioned into  $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{F}$ , where  $\mathcal{F}$  consists of the complements with respect to  $M$  of the members of  $\mathcal{A}$ .

The result in [6] mentioned above is the following:

THEOREM 2. If  $\mathcal{D} = \{D_1, D_2, \dots, D_m\}$  is a set of divisors of an integer  $N$  whose decomposition into primes is  $p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} \dots p_n^{\alpha_n}$  and

$$(2) \quad (D_i, D_j) > 1, \text{ for every } i, j$$

then, denoting  $\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \dots \alpha_n = \alpha$

$$a) \quad m \leq f(N) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_I \max \left\{ \prod_{v=1}^{\mu} \alpha_{i_v}; \alpha / \prod_{v=1}^{\mu} \alpha_{i_v} \right\},$$

where the summation is over all subsets  $I = \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_{\mu}\}$  of  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ , the product corresponding to the empty set being considered as  $I$ ; and for every  $N$  there are  $f(N)$  such divisors.

b) If

$$(3) \quad m < g(N) = \alpha - 1 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_I \min \left( \prod_{v=1}^{\mu} \alpha_{i_v}; \alpha / \prod_{v=1}^{\mu} \alpha_{i_v} \right)$$

then additional members may be included in  $\mathcal{D}$ , the enlarged set still satisfying (2).

REMARK 2. If  $N$  is square free this result is equivalent to Theorem 1. Then  $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \dots = \alpha_n = \alpha = 1$  and  $f(N) = g(N) = 2^{n-1}$ .

REMARK 3. The example of the divisors of 180 which are multiples of 5 shows that for certain  $N$ 's  $g(N)$  is best possible. But  $\mathcal{D} = \{2^2 \cdot 3 \cdot 5 \cdot 7; 2 \cdot 3 \cdot 5 \cdot 7; 2^2 \cdot 3 \cdot 5; 2 \cdot 3 \cdot 5; 2^2 \cdot 3 \cdot 7; 2 \cdot 3 \cdot 7; 3 \cdot 5 \cdot 7; 2^2 \cdot 5 \cdot 7; 2 \cdot 5 \cdot 7; 3 \cdot 5; 3 \cdot 7; 5 \cdot 7\}$  contains 12 members while  $g(420) = 9$ . In both examples the number of members in  $\mathcal{D}$  is  $\alpha_n \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (\alpha_i + 1)$  i.e. equals the number of divisors of  $N$  which are multiples of  $p_n$ —and in the second example not every member is divisible by  $p_n = 7$ . In both examples the  $\alpha_i$ 's are supposed to be ordered as in Lemma 1.

Remark 3 makes part 6 of Theorem 2 appear not too illuminating. This is remedied in the present paper by establishing the minimal size of a set  $\mathcal{D}$  which satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 2 and cannot be enlarged. This is formulated in the following theorem:

THEOREM 4. If  $\mathcal{D}, |\mathcal{D}| = m$ , is a set of divisors of  $N = p_1^{\alpha_1} \dots p_n^{\alpha_n}$ ,

$$(4) \quad \alpha_1 \geq \alpha_2 \geq \dots \geq \alpha_n,$$

no two members of the set being coprime and if no additional member may be included in  $\mathcal{D}$  without contradicting this requirement then

$$(5) \quad m \geq \alpha_n \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (\alpha_i + 1).$$

REMARK 4. (5) is best possible, the right side representing the number of divisors of  $N$  being multiples of  $p_n$ . Two such divisors are clearly not coprime. The final observation in Remark 3 shows that there are other sets of divisors satisfying (5) with equality.

The proof of Theorem 4 depends on the following combinatorial theorem and on Lemma 1.

THEOREM 3. Let  $A$  and  $M$  be sets,  $A \subset M$ . Denote  $\bar{A} = M - A$ . If  $\mathcal{F} = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_s\}$  is a family of sets satisfying

- (i)  $A_i \subset M, i = 1, 2, \dots, s$
- (ii)  $X \subset A_i \Rightarrow X \in \mathcal{F}$

then there exists a permutation  $C_1, C_2, \dots, C_s$  of  $\bar{A}_1, \bar{A}_2, \dots, \bar{A}_s$  such that

$$C_i \supset A_i.$$

DEFINITION. A family of sets  $\mathcal{F} = \{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_s\}$  has the property  $\mathcal{P}(M)$  if (i) and (ii) hold.

LEMMA 1. Let  $M$  be the set  $M = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  and let  $\alpha_1 \geq \alpha_2 \geq \dots \geq \alpha_n$  be positive integers. Denote  $\alpha = \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \dots \alpha_n, \bar{A} = M - A$ .

If  $\mathcal{F}$  is a family of sets having property  $\mathcal{P}(M)$  and if

$$(6) \quad A \in \mathcal{F} \Rightarrow \bar{A} \notin \mathcal{F},$$

then

$$(7) \quad \alpha_n \sum \alpha_{i_1} \alpha_{i_2} \dots \alpha_{i_t} \leq \sum \alpha / \alpha_{i_1} \alpha_{i_2} \dots \alpha_{i_t}$$

where the summation is over  $\{i_1, \dots, i_t\} \in \mathcal{F}$ .

### 2. Proofs

PROOF OF THEOREM 3. For  $s = 1, 2$  the theorem is true. Let  $s = s_0 > 2$  and suppose by induction that it is true for  $s \leq s_0 - 1$ . Let  $a$  be a fixed element contained in at least one member of  $\mathcal{F}$ . Denote by  $B'_1, B'_2, \dots, B'_r$  the members of  $\mathcal{F}$  containing the element  $a$ , then  $B_i = B'_i - a, i = 1, 2, \dots, r$  are also members of  $\mathcal{F}$ . Denote by  $B_{r+1}, B_{r+2}, \dots, B_{r+q}$  the other members of  $\mathcal{F}$ , if any. Since

$s_0 = 2r + q$  the families  $B_1, B_2, \dots, B_r$  and  $B_1, B_2, \dots, B_{r+q}$  have fewer members than  $s_0$ , and since both have the property  $\mathcal{P}(M)$ , by the induction hypothesis, there is a permutation of  $\bar{B}_1, \bar{B}_2, \dots, \bar{B}_r$  say  $C_1, C_2, \dots, C_r$  and a permutation of  $\bar{B}_1, \bar{B}_2, \dots, \bar{B}_{r+q}$  say  $D_1, D_2, \dots, D_{r+q}$  such that  $C_i \supset B_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, r$ ) and  $D_i \supset B_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, r + q$ ). It follows that  $D_i \supset B'_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, \dots, r$ ),  $C_i - a \supset B_i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, r$ ) and since  $C_i = \bar{B}_j$  implies  $C_i - a = \bar{B}'_j$

$$D_1, D_2, \dots, D_r, C_1 - a, \dots, C_r - a, D_{r+1}, \dots, D_{r+q}$$

is the required permutation of the complements of the members of  $\mathcal{F}$ .

PROOF OF LEMMA 1. By Theorem 3 each term of the first sum in (7) divides a corresponding term of the second sum. Moreover, by (6) each such factor is proper and therefore by (4) each term may be multiplied by  $\alpha_n$ .

PROOF OF THEOREM 4. Define  $\mathcal{A} = \{(j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k) \mid p_{j_1}^{\beta_1} \dots p_{j_k}^{\beta_k} \in \mathcal{D} \text{ for some } \beta_i > 0, i = 1, \dots, k\}$  and let  $\mathcal{M}$  be the set of all subsets of  $M = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . Then by the maximum property of  $\mathcal{D}$ ,

$$m = \sum_{\mathcal{A}} \alpha_{j_1} \alpha_{j_2} \dots \alpha_{j_k},$$

where the summation is over  $\{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_k\} \in \mathcal{A}$ , and

$$|\mathcal{A}| = 2^{n-1} \text{ by Theorem 1.}$$

Furthermore, since  $\mathcal{A}$  cannot contain a set and its complement, the set  $\mathcal{F}$  of all complements of members of  $\mathcal{A}$  has no member in common with  $\mathcal{A}$  and

$$(8) \quad \mathcal{M} = \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{F}$$

is a partition of  $\mathcal{M}$ . It follows also that

$$m = \sum_{\mathcal{A}} \alpha_{j_1} \alpha_{j_2} \dots \alpha_{j_k} = \sum_{\mathcal{F}} \alpha / \alpha_{i_1} \alpha_{i_2} \dots \alpha_{i_t}$$

where the second summation is over  $\{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_t\} \in \mathcal{F}$ . We have to prove

$$(9) \quad \sum_{\mathcal{F}} \alpha / \alpha_{i_1} \dots \alpha_{i_t} \geq \alpha_n \prod_{n-1}^{i=1} (\alpha_i + 1).$$

If  $p_n \in \mathcal{D}$ , (9) holds obviously with equality, while  $p_n \notin \mathcal{D}$  means  $n \in \mathcal{F}$ . Denote by  $\mathcal{A}_n$  and by  $\mathcal{F}_n$  the families of sets in  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  respectively containing  $n$ , and by  $\mathcal{F}^*$  the family obtained by deleting  $n$  from each member of  $\mathcal{F}_n$ . Denote also by  $\mathcal{A}'$  and  $\mathcal{F}'$  the families of sets in  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  respectively not containing  $n$ .

$$m = \sum_{\mathcal{F}'} \alpha / \alpha_{i_1} \alpha_{i_2} \dots \alpha_{i_t} + \sum_{\mathcal{F}_n} \alpha / \alpha_{i_1} \alpha_{i_2} \dots \alpha_{i_t},$$

and since

$$\sum_{\mathcal{F}'} \alpha/\alpha_{i_1} \cdots \alpha_{i_t} + \sum_{\mathcal{F}_n} \alpha_{i_1} \cdots \alpha_{i_t} = \alpha_n \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (\alpha_i + 1),$$

in order to show (9) it is sufficient to prove

$$\sum_{\mathcal{F}'} \alpha/\alpha_{i_1} \cdots \alpha_{i_t} \geq \sum_{\mathcal{F}_n} \alpha_{i_1} \cdots \alpha_{i_t}$$

i.e.

$$\sum_{\mathcal{F}^*} \alpha/\alpha_{i_1} \cdots \alpha_{i_t} \alpha_n \geq \alpha_n \sum_{\mathcal{F}^*} \alpha_{i_1} \cdots \alpha_{i_t}.$$

Observe that (10)  $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{P}(M)$  and hence  $\mathcal{F}^* \in \mathcal{P}(M-n)$ . For (10), let  $B \in \mathcal{F}$  then by (8)  $\bar{B} \in \mathcal{A}$ , so  $\mathcal{D} \subset B$  implies  $X \in \mathcal{F}$ . The assumptions of Lemma 1 are satisfied by  $\mathcal{F}^*$ . It follows that

$$\sum_{\mathcal{F}^*} (\alpha/\alpha_n)/\alpha_{i_1} \cdots \alpha_{i_t} \geq \alpha_{n-1} \sum_{\mathcal{F}^*} \alpha_{i_1} \cdots \alpha_{i_t} \geq \alpha_n \sum_{\mathcal{F}^*} \alpha_{i_1} \cdots \alpha_{i_t}$$

and the proof is complete.

**Final remark**

It would be of interest to determine all sets  $\mathcal{D}$  satisfying the assumptions of Theorem 4 with  $m = \alpha_n \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (\alpha_i + 1)$ .

REFERENCES

1. De Bruijn, Van Tengbergen, D. Kruijswijk; *On the set of divisors of a number*, Nieuw Arch. Wisk. **23** (1949-51) 191-193.
2. J. Schönheim, *A generalization of results of P. Erdős, G. Katona, and D. Kleitman concerning Sperner's theorem*, J. Combination Theory (to appear).
3. G. Katona, *A generalization of some generalizations of Sperner's theorem*, J. Combination Theory (to appear).
4. J. Marica and J. Schönheim, *Differences of sets and a problem of Graham*, Canad. Math. Bull. **12** (1969), 635-638.
5. P. Erdős, Chao-Ko, R. Rado, *Intersection theorems for systems of finite sets*, Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. **12** (1961), 313-320.
6. P. Erdős and J. Schönheim; *On the set of non pairwise coprime divisors of a number*, Proceedings of the Colloquium on Comb. Math. Balaton Füred, 1969 (To appear).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS  
 TEL AVIV UNIVERSITY  
 TEL AVIV