

SUFFICIENT CONDITIONS FOR SOLVABILITY OF LINEAR DIOPHANTINE EQUATIONS AND FROBENIUS NUMBERS

ETERI SAMSONADZE

ABSTRACT. A linear Diophantine equation $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i = b$ is considered, where a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n are coprime natural numbers, b is a non-negative integer, x_i ($i = 1, 2, \dots, n$) are non-negative integers. It is proved that if $\left\lfloor \frac{b}{M} \right\rfloor \geq \left\lfloor n - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n a_i + r}{M} \right\rfloor$, then this equation is solvable (here M is the least common multiple of the numbers a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n ; r is the remainder of b modulo M). With the aid of this result, it is shown that the considered equation is solvable if either $b \geq nM - \sum_{i=1}^n a_i$ or $b \geq (n-1)M$. The case where $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \geq (n-2)M + 2$ is considered closer. It is proved that, in that case, the equation is solvable if $b > (n-1)M - \sum_{i=1}^n a_i$. If, in addition, $r > (n-1)M - \sum_{i=1}^n a_i$, then it has $\frac{M^{n-1}}{a_1 a_2 \dots a_n} C_{b'+n-1}^{n-1}$ integer non-negative solutions; it is also shown that if $b \geq M$ and $r \leq (n-1)M - \sum_{i=1}^n a_i$, then the number of solutions of the equation is greater than or equal to $\frac{M^{n-1}}{a_1 a_2 \dots a_n} C_{b'+n-2}^{n-1}$; here $b' = \left\lfloor \frac{b}{M} \right\rfloor$ (and C_m^k denotes the binomial coefficient $\binom{m}{k}$). Moreover, it is proved that if the numbers a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n are coprime, then $Frob(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) \leq c$, where c is the smallest among the numbers $a_i a_j - a_i - a_j$ with $(a_i, a_j) = 1$ ($1 \leq i < j \leq n$).

Key words and phrases: linear Diophantine equation; Frobenius number.
2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: 11D04, 11D07.

Consider a linear Diophantine equation

$$(1) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i = b,$$

where a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n are coprime natural numbers, b is an integer non-negative number, x_i ($i = 1, 2, \dots, n$) are integer non-negative numbers.

Proposition 1. Let a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n be coprime natural numbers. Then we have the inequality

$$(2) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \leq (n-1)M + 1,$$

where M is the least common multiple of the numbers a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n .

Proof. We have $a_i = \frac{M}{k_i}$, where $k_i \in \mathbf{N}$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, n$) ($a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \dots \leq a_n$). Therefore, if $a_1 \neq M$ and $a_i = M$ for $i > 1$, then $a_i = 1$ (as it follows from the fact the numbers a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n are coprime). Hence, in that case, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n a_i = (n-1)M + 1.$$

If numbers a_1, a_2, \dots, a_l are different from M ($2 \leq l \leq n$), then $a_i \leq \frac{M}{2}$ for $1 \leq i \leq l$ (at that, at least one of the numbers a_1, a_2, \dots, a_l is less than $\frac{M}{2}$ since, again, a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n are coprime). Therefore, in that case, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n a_i < \frac{M}{2}l + (n-l)M = M(n - \frac{l}{2}) \leq M(n-1).$$

□

Formula (2) implies that

$$n - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n a_i + r}{M} \geq \frac{M-1-r}{M},$$

where r is the remainder of b modulo M . Since $r \leq M-1$, this implies that

$$(3) \quad n - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n a_i + r}{M} \geq 0.$$

Introduce the following notation:

$$(4) \quad s = \left[n - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n a_i + r}{M} \right]$$

where $[x]$ denotes the integer part of a number x , i.e., the greatest integer that is not greater than x .

In [2], we have shown that, for the number $P(b)$ of integer non-negative solutions of equation (1), the following equality is valid:

$$(5) \quad P(b) = \sum_{k=0}^s l_k \overline{C}_{b'+n-1-k}^{n-1} = l_0 \overline{C}_{b'+n-1}^{n-1} + l_1 \overline{C}_{b'+n-1-2}^{n-1} + \dots + l_s \overline{C}_{b'+n-1-s}^{n-1},$$

where $b' = \left[\frac{b}{M} \right]$, l_k ($k = 0, 1, \dots, s$) is the number of integer non-negative solutions of the system

$$\sum_{i=1}^n a_i t_i = r + Mk; \quad 0 \leq t_i \leq \frac{M}{a_i} - 1 \quad (i = 1, 2, \dots, n),$$

while \overline{C}_m^t denotes C_m^t if $m \geq t$, and denotes 0 otherwise (here C_m^t is the binomial coefficient $\binom{t}{k}$).

Since $l_i \geq 0$ ($i = 0, 1, \dots, s$), formula (5) implies that equation (1) is solvable if and only if there is $l_k \neq 0$ ($k \leq s$) such that $k \leq b'$.

It was shown in [2] that

$$(6) \quad \begin{aligned} l_0 &= P(r), \\ l_k &= P(r + kM) - C_n^1 P(r + (k-1)M) + C_n^2 P(r + (k-2)M) + \\ &\dots + (-1)^k C_n^k P(r), \quad (k = 1, 2, \dots, s), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(7) \quad \sum_{i=0}^s l_i = \frac{M^{n-1}}{a_1 a_2 \dots a_n}.$$

Observe that formula (5) implies the obvious fact that if $P(r) \neq 0$, then equation (1) is solvable.

Since $l_i \geq 0$ ($i = 0, 1, \dots, s$), formula (7) implies that at least one of l_0, l_1, \dots, l_s is different from zero. It follows that at least one of the numbers

$$P(r), P(r + M), \dots, P(r + sM)$$

is different from zero (otherwise equality (6) would imply that $l_0 = l_1 = \dots = l_s = 0$.)

Theorem 2. If $\left[\frac{b}{M}\right] \geq \left[n - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n a_i + r}{M}\right]$, then equation (1) is solvable.

Proof. If $b' \geq s$, then $\overline{C}_{b'+n-1-k}^{n-1} \neq 0$, for $k = 0, 1, \dots, s$. Since at least one of the numbers l_0, l_1, \dots, l_s is different from zero, formula (5) implies that $P(b) \neq 0$. \square

Theorem 3. If $b \geq nM - \sum_{i=1}^n a_i$, then equation (1) is solvable.

Proof. If $b \geq nM - \sum_{i=1}^n a_i$, then $\frac{b}{M} \geq n - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n a_i}{M}$. This implies that $\left[\frac{b}{M}\right] \geq \left[n - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n a_i + r}{M}\right]$. Therefore, from Theorem 1 we obtain that equation (1) is solvable. \square

Theorem 4. If $b \geq (n-1)M$, then equation (1) is solvable.

Proof. If $b \geq (n-1)M$, then $\frac{b}{M} \geq n-1$. The inequality $n-1 \geq s$ implies that $\frac{b}{M} \geq s$ and hence $\left[\frac{b}{M}\right] \geq s$. Therefore, by Theorem 1, equation (1) is solvable. \square

As is well known (see, e.g., [1]), if $b > a_1 a_2 - (a_1 + a_2)$, then the equation

$$a_1 x_1 + a_2 x_2 = b$$

is solvable if a_1 and a_2 are coprime. If, for some integers y_1 and y_2 , one has

$$a_1 y_1 + a_2 y_2 = b,$$

then obviously the n -tuple $(y_1, y_2, 0, 0, \dots, 0)$ is a solution of the equation

$$\sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i = b$$

provided that $n \geq 2$. These arguments imply

Theorem 5. Equation (1) is solvable if, among coprime numbers a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n , one can choose coprime numbers a_i and a_j such that

$$b > a_i a_j - (a_i + a_j).$$

For instance, the equation

$$3x_1 + 4x_2 + \sum_{i=3}^n a_i x_i = b$$

is solvable provided that $b \geq 6$.

Consider the case where

$$(8) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \geq (n-2)M + 2,$$

or, equivalently,

$$(9) \quad (n-1)M - \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \leq M - 2.$$

Formula (8) implies that

$$n - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n a_i + r}{M} \leq n - \frac{(n-2)M + 2 + r}{M} = 2 - \frac{2+r}{M} \leq 1.$$

Thus, if condition (8) is satisfied, then $s = 0$ or $s = 1$. As it is not hard to verify, $s = 0$ if $r > r_0$; and $s = 1$ if $r \leq r_0$. Here

$$(10) \quad r_0 = (n-1)M - \sum_{i=1}^n a_i.$$

Formulas (5) and (7) imply that, for any non-negative integer b ,

$$(11) \quad P(b) = \frac{M^{n-1}}{a_1 a_2 \dots a_n} C_{b'+n-1}^{m-1}$$

if $r > r_0$; and

$$(12) \quad P(b) = P(r) C_{b'+n-1}^{m-1} + \left(\frac{M^{n-1}}{a_1 a_2 \dots a_n} - P(r) \right) \overline{C}_{b'+n-2}^{n-1}$$

if $r \leq r_0$.

Since

$$\overline{C}_{b'+n-2}^{n-1} = \frac{(b' + n - 2)(b' + n - 1) \dots b'}{(n - 1)!},$$

for any integer non-negative b , and

$$C_{b'+n-2}^{n-1} - \frac{(b' + n - 2)(b' + n - 1) \dots b'}{(n - 1)!} = C_{b'+n-2}^{n-2},$$

equality (12) implies that

$$(13) \quad P(b) = P(r)C_{b'+n-2}^{n-2} + \frac{M^{n-1}}{a_1 a_2 \dots a_n} \overline{C}_{b'+n-2}^{n-2},$$

for $r \leq r_0$.

Assume now that $b' \geq 1$, or, equivalently, $b \geq M$. Formula (13) implies that equation (1) is solvable if $r \leq r_0$, for any integer non-negative b . Moreover, formula (11) implies that this equation is solvable also in the case where $r > r_0$. Thus, equation (1) is solvable for any $b \geq M$. Formula (10) implies that it is solvable also for $b \in (r_0, M)$. Therefore, equation (1) is solvable for any $b > r_0$.

Thus, formulas (11) and (13) imply

Theorem 6. If $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \geq (n - 2)M + 2$, and $b > (n - 1)M - \sum_{i=1}^n a_i$, then equation (1) is solvable. At that, if $r > (n - 1)M - \sum_{i=1}^n a_i$, there are precisely $\frac{M^{n-1}}{a_1 a_2 \dots a_n} C_{b'+n-1}^{n-1}$ integer non-negative solutions. If $b \geq M$, but $r \leq (n - 1)M - \sum_{i=1}^n a_i$, then the number of solutions is greater or equal to $\frac{M^{n-1}}{a_1 a_2 \dots a_n} C_{b'+n-2}^{n-2}$.

Thus, under condition (8), if equation (1) has no solution for $b = (n - 1)M - \sum_{i=1}^n a_i$, then the number $b_0 = (n - 1)M - \sum_{i=1}^n a_i$ is the greatest integer such that equation (1) has no solution.

In literature, an integer b_0 is called the Frobenius number $Frob(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$ if $b = b_0$ is the greatest integer such that the equation

$$(14) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i = b$$

has no solution. The problem of finding Frobenius numbers is closely related to problems from various fields of mathematics. A lot of papers are devoted to this problem. The explicit formula for Frobenius numbers are found only for the particular cases $n = 2$ (see, e.g., [1]) and $n = 3$ [3]. Namely, it is proved that

$$(15) \quad Frob(a_1, a_2) = a_1 a_2 - (a_1 + a_2)$$

if $(a_1, a_2) = 1$.

Formula (15) and Theorem 6 imply

Theorem 7. Let $(a_1, a_2) = 1$. Then

$$(16) \quad \text{Frob}(a_1, a_2, a_1a_2, a_1a_2, \dots, a_1a_2) = a_1a_2 - (a_1 + a_2).$$

Proof. Condition (8) is satisfied for equation

$$(17) \quad a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 + a_1a_2x_3 + a_1a_2x_4 + \dots + a_1a_2x_n = b,$$

(here $M = a_1a_2$, and $a_1 + a_2 + (n-2)a_1a_2 \geq (n-2)M + 2$). Therefore, Theorem 6 implies that this equation is solvable if $b > (n-1)a_1a_2 - (a_1 + a_2 + (n-2)a_1a_2)$, or, equivalently, $b > a_1a_2 - (a_1 + a_2)$.

If $b = a_1a_2 - (a_1 + a_2)$, then equation (17) has no solution since the equality

$$a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 + a_1a_2x_3 + a_1a_2x_4 + \dots + a_1a_2x_n = a_1a_2 - (a_1 + a_2)$$

implies that $x_3 = x_4 = \dots = x_n = 0$. Moreover, the equation

$$a_1x_1 + a_2x_2 = a_1a_2 - (a_1 + a_2)$$

has no solution if $(a_1, a_2) = 1$, as it follows from formula (15).

Thus $b = a_1a_2 - (a_1 + a_2)$ is the greatest integer such that equation (17) has no solution. \square

Theorem 5 implies

Theorem 8. If numbers a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n are coprime, then

$$\text{Frob}(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) \leq c,$$

where c is the smallest among the numbers $a_i a_j - a_i - a_j$ with $(a_i, a_j) = 1$ ($1 \leq i < j \leq n$).

Example 9. $\text{Frob}(2, 4, 5, 5, 6) \leq 3$ since $\min(2 \cdot 5 - 2 - 5, 4 \cdot 5 - 4 - 5, 5 \cdot 6 - 5 - 6) = 3$. Moreover, the equation

$$2x_1 + 4x_2 + 5x_3 + 5x_4 + \dots + 6x_5 = b$$

is solvable for $b = 2$. Therefore, $\text{Frob}(2, 4, 5, 5, 6) = 3$.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Brauer, On a problem of partitions, American J. Mathematics, 64(1)(1942) 299-312.
- [2] E. Samsonadze, On the number of integer non-negative solutions of a linear Diophantine equation. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.04756>.
- [3] A. Tripathi, Formulae for the Frobenius number in three variables, J. Number Theory 170 (2017), 368-389.

Author's addresses: Eteri Samsonadze, Retd., I. Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, 1 Tchavchavadze Av., Tbilisi, 0179, Georgia,

e-mail: eteri.samsonadze@outlook.com