

This is a slightly revised version of an article first published in the Australian Mathematical Gazette in 2008.

On the form of an odd perfect number

Tim S. Roberts

email: timro21@gmail.com

It has been known since the time of Euler that an odd perfect number N (if it exists) must have the form $N = p^a Q^2$ where p is prime and $p = a = 1 \pmod{4}$ (e.g., [1, pp. 3–33]).

Further, it has been shown that N must equal $1 \pmod{12}$, or $9 \pmod{36}$ ([3], [2]). However, we can do a little better than this.

From either result it is immediately evident that if 3 divides N , then 3^k divides N , where $k = 0 \pmod{2}$.

If $k = 0$, then N must be of the form $1 \pmod{12}$.

For any positive integer $N = p_1^{k_1} p_2^{k_2} \dots p_n^{k_n}$ the sum S of all of its divisors (including 1 and N itself), is given by

$$S = (1 + p_1 + p_1^2 + \dots + p_1^{k_1})(1 + p_2 + p_2^2 + \dots + p_2^{k_2}) \dots (1 + p_n + p_n^2 + \dots + p_n^{k_n})$$

If N is perfect, it is equal to the sum of its divisors (excepting itself), so $N = S - N$, so $2N = S$. Thus, if N is perfect, and 3^k is a factor of N , then N is itself divisible by $(1 + 3^1 + 3^2 + \dots + 3^k)$.

If $k = 2$, then N must be of the form $9 \pmod{36}$. Further, since N is perfect, from the above we know that $3^0 + 3^1 + 3^2 = 1 + 3 + 9 = 13$ must divide $2N$, and hence $N = 0 \pmod{13}$. Thus, N must satisfy both $N = 9 \pmod{36}$ and $N = 0 \pmod{13}$.

We can therefore deduce that N must equal $117 \pmod{468}$.

If $k > 2$, then N is divisible by $3^4 = 81$. Thus, N must satisfy both $N = 9 \pmod{36}$ and $N = 0 \pmod{81}$.

We can therefore deduce that N must equal $81 \pmod{324}$.

Thus, if N is an odd perfect number, it must be of the form $N = 1 \pmod{12}$ or $N = 117 \pmod{468}$ or $N = 81 \pmod{324}$.

Of course, it is possible to further refine the last of these results in a similar way, by considering separately values of k greater than or equal to 4.

References

[1] Dickson, L.E. (2005). *History of the Theory of Numbers*, Vol. 1, Divisibility and Primality. Dover, New York.

[2] Holdener, J.A. (2002). A theorem of Touchard and the form of odd perfect numbers. *American Mathematical Monthly* **109**, 661–663.

[3] Touchard, J. (1953). On prime numbers and perfect numbers. *Scripta Mathematica* **19**, 35–39.