

ON THE NUMBER OF TIMES AN INTEGER OCCURS
AS A BINOMIAL COEFFICIENT

H. L. ABBOTT, P. ERDÖS, AND D. HANSON

Let $N(t)$ denote the number of times the integer $t > 1$ occurs as a binomial coefficient; that is, $N(t)$ is the number of solutions of $t = \binom{n}{r}$ in integers n and r . We have $N(2) = 1$, $N(3) = N(4) = N(5) = 2$, $N(6) = 3$, etc. In a recent note in the research problems section of the MONTHLY, D. Singmaster [1] proved that

$$(1) \quad N(t) = O(\log t).$$

He conjectured that $N(t) = O(1)$ but pointed out that this conjecture, if it is in fact true, is perhaps very deep. In [1] and [5], Singmaster points out that $N(t) = 6$ for the following values of $t \leq 2^{48}$; $t = 120, 210, 1540, 7140, 11628$ and 24310 . It has been shown by Singmaster [5] and D. Lind [6] that $N(t) \geq 6$ infinitely often. Singmaster has verified that the only value of $t \leq 2^{48}$ for which $N(t) \geq 8$ is $t = 3003$, for which $N(t) = 8$.

In this note we obtain some additional information about the behavior of $N(t)$. In Theorem 1 we prove that the average and normal order of $N(t)$ is 2; in fact, we prove somewhat more than this, namely, the number of integers t , $1 < t \leq x$, for which $N(t) > 2$ is $O(\sqrt{x})$. (See [4] p. 263 and p. 356, for the definitions of average and normal order.) In Theorem 2 we give an upper bound for $N(t)$ in terms of the number of distinct prime factors of t . Our main result is Theorem 3, in which we show that (1) can be improved to $N(t) = O(\log t / \log \log t)$. Finally, in Theorem 4, we consider the related problem of determining the number of representations of an integer as a product of consecutive integers.

THEOREM 1. *The average and normal order of $N(t) = 2$.*

Proof. For integral x , let n be defined by $\binom{2n-2}{n-1} < x \leq \binom{2n}{n}$ so that $n = O(\log x)$.

We have

$$\sum_{1 < t \leq x} N(t) = 2 \sum_{\substack{1 < \binom{m}{r} \leq x \\ 2r \leq m}} 1 - \sum_{1 < \binom{2k}{k} \leq x} 1$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 (2) \quad &= 2 \left\{ \sum_{1 < \binom{m}{1} \leq x} 1 + \sum_{1 < \binom{m}{2} \leq x} 1 + \sum_{\substack{1 < \binom{m}{r} \leq x \\ 3 \leq r \leq m/2}} 1 \right\} - \sum_{1 < \binom{2k}{k} \leq x} 1 \\
 &= 2x + 2\sqrt{2}x^{1/2} + O(x^{1/3}n) \\
 &= 2x + 2\sqrt{2}x^{1/2} + O(x^{1/3}\log x).
 \end{aligned}$$

It follows that the average order of $N(t)$ is 2.

Let $f(x)$ be the number of integers t , $1 < t \leq x$, such that $N(t) = 2$ and $g(x)$ the number such that $N(t) > 2$, so that $f(x) + g(x) = x - 2$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (3) \quad \sum_{1 < t \leq x} N(t) &\geq 2f(x) + 3g(x) + 1 \\
 &= 2(x - 2 - g(x)) + 3g(x) + 1 \\
 &= 2x + 2g(x) - 3.
 \end{aligned}$$

It follows from (2) and (3) that $g(x) = O(x^{1/2})$ and this implies that the normal order of $N(t)$ is 2.

THEOREM 2. Let $w(t)$ denote the number of distinct prime factors of the integer $t > 1$. For all t satisfying $w(t) < \log t / \log \log t$ we have

$$(4) \quad N(t) < \frac{2w(t)\log t}{\log t - w(t)\log \log t}.$$

Proof. The theorem can be verified directly for $t \leq 20$. In what follows we therefore assume $t \geq 21$. Let $k = k(t)$ be the largest integer for which $t = \binom{n}{k}$ for some $n \geq 2k$. Then clearly

$$(5) \quad N(t) \leq 2k.$$

By an easy induction argument we have, for $k \geq 4$, $t = \binom{n}{k} \geq \binom{2k}{k} \geq e^k$. Since we are assuming $t \geq 21 > e^3$, the inequality $t \geq e^k$ holds for all $k \geq 1$. Equivalently,

$$(6) \quad k \leq \log t \text{ and } \log k \leq \log \log t.$$

Let P^α be the highest power of the prime P which divides t . Then, according to the well-known theorem of Legendre,

$$\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^{[\log_P n]} \left\{ \left[\frac{n}{P^i} \right] - \left[\frac{n-k}{P^i} \right] - \left[\frac{k}{P^i} \right] \right\}.$$

Each term in the sum on the right is either 0 or 1. The number of non-zero terms is therefore α and we must have

$$(7) \quad P^\alpha \leq n.$$

From $t = \binom{n}{k}$ and the inequality $\binom{n}{k} \geq \left(\frac{n}{k}\right)^k$, we obtain

$$(8) \quad n \leq kt^{1/k}$$

and from (7) and (8) it follows that

$$t = \Pi P^\alpha \leq n^{w(t)} \leq k^{w(t)} t^{w(t)/k}.$$

If we take logarithms and substitute from the second inequality in (6) we get, after some manipulations,

$$k \leq \frac{w(t) \log t}{\log t - w(t) \log \log t},$$

and this, together with (5), yields (4). This completes the proof of Theorem 2.

We come now to our main result.

THEOREM 3. $N(t) = O(\log t / \log \log t)$.

Proof. We shall need to make use of the following deep result of A. E. Ingham [2] on the distribution of the primes: If $\alpha \geq 5/8$, there is a prime between x and $x + x^\alpha$ for all sufficiently large x .

For a given integer t , let $S = \{n: t = \binom{n}{k} \text{ for some } k \leq n/2\}$. Write $S = S_1 \cup S_2$ where $S_1 = \{n: n \in S, n > (\log t)^{6/5}\}$ and $S_2 = \{n: n \in S, n \leq (\log t)^{6/5}\}$. We first estimate the size of S_1 . Let $n \in S_1$ and let $t = \binom{n}{k}$. We have at our disposal the following inequalities:

$$(9) \quad t = \binom{n}{k} \geq \left(\frac{n}{k}\right)^k$$

$$(10) \quad t \geq e^k \text{ (see the proof of Theorem 2)}$$

$$(11) \quad n > (\log t)^{6/5}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} k &\leq \frac{\log t}{\log n/k} \leq \frac{\log t}{\log(n/\log t)} \leq \frac{\log t}{\log(\log t)^{1/5}} \\ &= O\left(\frac{\log t}{\log \log t}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used, successively, (9), (10) and (11). It follows that

$$|S_1| = O(\log t / \log \log t).$$

Next we must estimate the size of S_2 . Let N be the largest number in S_2 and let $t = \binom{N}{K}$. We have the inequalities

$$N \leq (\log t)^{6/5} \text{ and } t \leq N^K$$

from which we get $N \leq (K \log N)^{6/5}$. This in turn implies, for N sufficiently large,

$$N \leq K^{8/5} < K^{8/5} + K,$$

and it is easy to see that this last inequality implies

$$(N - K) + (N - K)^{5/8} \leq N.$$

We are now in a position to apply the theorem of Ingham. By this theorem, there is a largest prime P satisfying $K \leq N - K < P \leq N$. It follows that P divides t and hence that $n \geq P$ for all $n \in S_2$. Hence all of the numbers in S_2 lie between P and N . The number of numbers in S_2 is thus

$$|S_2| \leq N - P \leq P^{5/8} \leq N^{5/8} \leq (\log t)^{3/4} = O(\log t / \log \log t),$$

where, in obtaining the second inequality, we again appeal to Ingham's result. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.

We remark that if one makes use of the unproved conjecture of Cramér [3] asserting that there is a prime between x and $x + (\log x)^2$ for all sufficiently large x , then our argument gives $N(t) = O((\log t)^{2/3+\epsilon})$. The proof is basically the same as before, except that one puts $S_1 = \{n: n \in S, \log n > (\log t)^{1/3-\epsilon}\}$. We omit the rather laborious details of the argument.

We conclude with a brief discussion of a somewhat related problem. Let $G(t)$ denote the number of representations of the positive integer t as a product of consecutive integers; that is, $G(t)$ is the number of solutions of $t = (n+1)(n+2)\cdots(n+l)$ in integers n and l . For any such solution we have $t \geq l!$ and consequently we get $G(t) = O(\log t / \log \log t)$. For this problem, however, we can get a substantially stronger result.

THEOREM 4. $G(t) = O(\sqrt{\log t})$.

Proof. Let $S = \{l: t = (n+1)(n+2)\cdots(n+l) \text{ for some } n\}$. Let L_0 be the largest number in S and let

$$S_1 = \{l: l \in S, L_0 - C(\log t)^{1/2} < l \leq L_0\} \text{ and } S_2 = \{l: l \in S, l \leq L_0 - C(\log t)^{1/2}\},$$

C is a constant. It is clear that $|S_1| \leq C(\log t)^{1/2}$. It remains to estimate the size of $|S_2|$. Let 2^α be the highest power of 2 which divides t . Then, for some constant C_1 ,

$$(12) \quad \alpha \geq \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left\lfloor \frac{L_0}{2^j} \right\rfloor \geq L_0 - C_1 \log L_0.$$

Let L be the largest number in S_2 and let $t = (N+1)(N+2)\cdots(N+L)$. Let 2^β be the highest power of 2 which divides one of $(N+1), (N+2), \dots, (N+L)$, say $N+k$. Then

$$(13) \quad \alpha = \beta + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left[\frac{L-k}{2^j} \right] + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left[\frac{k-1}{2^j} \right].$$

In fact (13) follows from the observation that the first sum on the right is the exponent to which 2 divides the product $(N+k+1)(N+k+2)\cdots(N+L)$, while the second sum is the exponent to which 2 divides the product $(N+1)(N+2)\cdots(N+k-1)$. It follows from (13) that

$$(14) \quad \alpha \leq \beta + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \left[\frac{L}{2^j} \right] \leq \beta + L.$$

Thus,

$$(15) \quad \begin{aligned} \beta &\geq \alpha - L \\ &\geq (L_0 - C_1 \log L_0) - (L_0 - C(\log t)^{1/2}) \\ &\geq C(\log t)^{1/2} - C_1 \log L_0 \\ &\geq C_2(\log t)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (14), (12), the definition of S_2 and the estimate $L_0 = O(\log t)$. We need two further inequalities; the first of which is obvious. These are

$$(16) \quad (N+1)^L \leq t$$

and, for t sufficiently large,

$$(17) \quad N+1 \geq 2^{\beta-1}.$$

To obtain (17) we simply have to notice that $N+L \geq N+k \geq 2^\beta$, so that $N+1 \geq 2^\beta - (L-1)$ and (17) now follows from (15) and the fact that $L = O(\log t)$.

It now follows from (15), (16) and (17) that $L \leq C_3(\log t)^{1/2}$, where C_3 is a positive constant depending on C_2 , and hence on C . This completes the proof of Theorem 4.

We remark that by choosing $C = (1+\varepsilon)(\log 2)^{-1/2}$, our argument yields $G(t) < (2+\varepsilon)(\log t / \log 2)^{1/2}$ for every $\varepsilon > 0$, provided $t \geq t_0(\varepsilon)$.

References

1. D. Singmaster, How often does an integer occur as a binomial coefficient, this MONTHLY, 78 (1971) 385-386.
2. A. E. Ingham, On the difference between consecutive primes; Quart. J. Math. Oxford, 8 (1937) 255-266.
3. H. Cramér, On the order of magnitude of the difference between consecutive prime numbers, Acta. Arith., 2 (1936) 23-46.

4. G. H. Hardy and E. M. Wright, *Introduction to the Theory of Numbers*, Oxford University Press, New York, 1960.
5. D. Singmaster, Repeated binomial coefficients and Fibonacci Numbers, (to appear in *Fibonacci Quarterly*).
6. Douglas Lind, The quadratic field $Q(\sqrt{5})$ and a certain diophantine equation, *Fibonacci Quarterly*, 6 (1968) 86-94.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA, EDMONTON, ALBERTA, CANADA.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY, CALGARY, ALBERTA, CANADA.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN, REGINA, SASKATCHEWAN, CANADA.