

## NOTES ON NEAR-PERFECT NUMBERS

**Theorem 1.** *The number of near-perfect  $n \leq x$  is at most  $x^{5/6+o(1)}$ , as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ .*

The proof of Theorem 1 requires some preparation. We begin by recalling Gronwall's determination of the maximal order of the sum-of-divisors function [1, Theorem 323].

**Lemma 1** (Gronwall). *As  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we have  $\limsup \frac{\sigma(n)}{n \log \log n} = e^\gamma$ , where  $\gamma = 0.57721 \dots$  is the Euler–Mascheroni constant.*

The next proposition, which asserts that  $\gcd(n, \sigma(n))$  is small on average, is extracted from [2, Theorem 1.3].

**Proposition 1.** *For each  $x \geq 3$ , we have*

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \gcd(n, \sigma(n)) \leq x^{1+C/\sqrt{\log \log x}},$$

where  $C$  is an absolute positive constant.

The next lemma concerns solutions to the congruence  $\sigma(n) \equiv a \pmod{n}$ . For a given  $a$ , we divide the solutions  $n$  to this congruence into two classes: by a *trivial solution*, we mean a natural number

$$(1) \quad n = pm, \quad \text{where } p \text{ is a prime not dividing } m, \quad m \mid \sigma(m), \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma(m) = a.$$

(It is straightforward to check that all such  $n$  satisfy  $\sigma(n) \equiv a \pmod{n}$ .) All other solutions are called *sporadic*. Pomerance [5, Theorem 3] showed that for each fixed  $a$ , the number of sporadic solutions to  $\sigma(n) \equiv a \pmod{n}$  with  $n \leq x$  is at most

$$(2) \quad x / \exp((1/\sqrt{2} + o(1))\sqrt{\log x \log \log x}),$$

as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ . Theorem 1 requires a stronger bound, with attention paid to uniformity in  $a$ .

**Proposition 2.** *Let  $x \geq 3$ , and let  $a$  be an integer with  $|a| < x^{2/3}$ . Then the number of sporadic solutions  $n \leq x$  to the congruence  $\sigma(n) \equiv a \pmod{n}$  is at most  $x^{2/3+o(1)}$ . Here the  $o(1)$  term decays to 0 as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ , uniformly in  $a$ .*

**Remark.** *In addition to the congruence  $\sigma(n) \equiv a \pmod{n}$ , Pomerance [5] also treats the congruence  $n \equiv a \pmod{\phi(n)}$ , proving the same upper bound (2) for the number of non-trivial solutions  $n \leq x$ . He returned to this latter congruence in the papers [3], [4], which sharpen the upper bound to  $x^{2/3+o(1)}$  and  $x^{1/2+o(1)}$  (again, for each fixed  $a$ ). Our proof of Proposition 2 relies on the method of [3]. It would be interesting to improve the exponent to  $2/3$  to  $1/2$ , as in [4], but this seems somewhat more difficult than might be expected.*

*Proof.* We may assume that the squarefull part of  $n$  is bounded by  $x^{2/3}$ , since the number of  $n \leq x$  for which this condition fails is

$$\ll x \sum_{\substack{m > x^{2/3} \\ \text{squarefull}}} \frac{1}{m} \ll x^{2/3}.$$

(We use here that the counting function of the squarefull numbers is  $\ll x^{1/2}$ .) We also assume, as is clearly permissible, that  $n > x^{2/3}$ .

Consider first the case when the largest prime factor  $p$  of  $n$  satisfies  $p > x^{1/3}$ . Say that  $n = mp$ , so that  $m \leq x^{2/3}$ . By our condition on the squarefull part of  $n$ , we see that  $p \nmid m$ . Write  $\sigma(n) = nq + a$ , where  $q$  is a nonnegative integer; from Lemma 1,  $q \ll \log \log x$ . Observe that

$$\sigma(m)(p+1) = \sigma(mp) = qmp + a,$$

so that

$$(3) \quad p(\sigma(m) - qm) = a - \sigma(m).$$

If  $\sigma(m) - qm = 0$ , then (3) implies that  $a = \sigma(m)$ ; referring back to the definitions we see that  $n$  is a trivial solution to the congruence  $\sigma(n) \equiv a \pmod{n}$ , contrary to hypothesis. Thus,  $\sigma(m) - qm \neq 0$ , and now (3) shows that  $p$  is uniquely determined given  $m$  and  $q$ . Since the number of possibilities for  $m$  is at most  $x^{2/3}$ , while  $q \ll \log \log x$ , the number of  $n$  that arise in this manner is  $\ll x^{2/3} \log \log x$ , which is acceptable for us.

Now suppose that the largest prime factor of  $n$  does not exceed  $x^{1/3}$ . We claim that  $n$  has a unitary divisor  $m$  from the interval  $(x^{1/3}, x^{2/3}]$ . The claim obviously holds if every prime power divisor of  $n$  is bounded by  $x^{1/3}$ . Otherwise,  $p^e \parallel n$  for some prime power  $p^e > x^{1/3}$  (with  $e > 1$ ). In this case,  $p^e \leq x^{2/3}$  by our restriction on the squarefull part of  $n$ , and so we can take  $m = p^e$ .

Since  $m$  is a unitary divisor of  $n$ , it follows that

$$\sigma(n) \equiv 0 \pmod{\sigma(m)} \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma(n) \equiv a \pmod{m}.$$

This places  $\sigma(n)$  in a uniquely-defined residue class modulo  $[m, \sigma(m)]$ . Thus, summing over  $m \in (x^{1/3}, x^{2/3}]$ , we have that the number of values  $\sigma(n)$  that can arise this way is at most

$$(4) \quad \sum_{x^{1/3} < m \leq x^{2/3}} \left( \frac{x}{\text{lcm}[m, \sigma(m)]} + 1 \right) \leq x^{2/3} + x \sum_{x^{1/3} < m \leq x^{2/3}} \frac{\gcd(m, \sigma(m))}{m\sigma(m)} \\ \leq x^{2/3} + x \sum_{x^{1/3} < m \leq x^{2/3}} \frac{\gcd(m, \sigma(m))}{m^2}.$$

Letting  $A(t) = \sum_{m \leq t} \gcd(m, \sigma(m))$ , the final sum in (4) is given by

$$\int_{x^{1/3}}^{x^{2/3}} \frac{1}{t^2} dA(t) \leq A(x^{2/3})x^{-4/3} + 2 \int_{x^{1/3}}^{x^{2/3}} A(t)t^{-3} dt \\ \leq x^{-2/3+o(1)} + x^{-1/3+o(1)} = x^{-1/3+o(1)},$$

where we use the estimate of Proposition 1 for  $A(t)$ . Referring back to (4), we see that the number of values  $\sigma(n)$  that can arise is at most  $x^{2/3+o(1)}$ . Since  $\sigma(n) = qn + a$ , the values  $\sigma(n)$  and  $q$  uniquely determine  $n$ . Since the number of possible values of  $q$  is  $\ll \log \log x = x^{o(1)}$  (as above), and there are only  $x^{2/3+o(1)}$  possible values of  $\sigma(n)$ , there are also only  $x^{2/3+o(1)}$  possible values of  $n$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.* We can assume that  $n > x^{5/6}$ . Write  $\sigma(n) = 2n + d$ , where  $d$  is a proper divisor of  $n$ . If  $d > x^{1/6}$ , then  $\gcd(n, \sigma(n)) = d > x^{1/6}$ . By Proposition 1, the number of such  $n \leq x$  is at most  $x^{5/6+o(1)}$ .

So suppose that  $d \leq x^{1/6}$ . In this case, we observe that  $\sigma(n) \equiv d \pmod{n}$  and apply Proposition 2. Let us check that our near-perfect number  $n$  is not a trivial solution to this congruence. If it were, then we could write  $n$  in the form (1), with ‘ $d$ ’ in place of ‘ $a$ ’. Then

$$(p+1)d = (p+1)\sigma(m) = \sigma(mp) = 2mp + d,$$

so that  $d = 2m$ . But then  $d$  and  $pm$  have the same number of prime factors (counted with multiplicity), contradicting that  $d$  is a proper divisor of  $n$ . So  $n$  is a sporadic solution, and thus the number of possibilities for  $n$ , given  $d$ , is at most  $x^{2/3+o(1)}$ . Summing over values of  $d \leq x^{1/6}$ , we see the number of  $n$  that arise in this way is at most  $x^{5/6+o(1)}$ .  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [1] G. H. Hardy and E. M. Wright, *An introduction to the theory of numbers*, sixth ed., Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2008.
- [2] P. Pollack, *On the greatest common divisor of a number and its sum of divisors*, Michigan Math. J. **60** (2011), no. 1, 199–214.
- [3] C. Pomerance, *On composite  $n$  for which  $\varphi(n)n - 1$* , Acta Arith. **28** (1975/76), no. 4, 387–389.
- [4] ———, *On composite  $n$  for which  $\varphi(n) \mid n - 1$ . II*, Pacific J. Math. **69** (1977), no. 1, 177–186.
- [5] Carl Pomerance, *On the congruences  $\sigma(n) \equiv a \pmod{n}$  and  $n \equiv a \pmod{\varphi(n)}$* , Acta Arith. **26** (1974/75), no. 3, 265–272.