

UNDERAPPROXIMATION BY EGYPTIAN FRACTIONS

MELVYN B. NATHANSON

ABSTRACT. An increasing sequence $(x_i)_{i=1}^n$ of positive integers is an n -term Egyptian underapproximation of $\theta \in (0, 1]$ if $\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} < \theta$. A greedy algorithm constructs an n -term underapproximation of θ . For some but not all numbers θ , the greedy algorithm gives a unique best n -term underapproximation for all n . An infinite set of rational numbers is constructed for which the greedy underapproximations are best, and numbers for which the greedy algorithm is not best are also studied.

1. THE GREEDY UNDERAPPROXIMATION ALGORITHM

An *Egyptian fraction* is a fraction of the form $1/x$, where x is a positive integer. Let $\theta \in (0, 1]$. A finite sequence $(x_i)_{i=1}^n$ of integers is an n -term *Egyptian underapproximation* of θ if

$$2 \leq x_1 \leq x_2 \leq \cdots \leq x_n$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} < \theta.$$

For example, $(2, 3, 7, 43)$ is a 4-term underapproximation of 1. If x is an integer such that $x > n/\theta$, then

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x+i} < \theta$$

and $(x+i)_{i=1}^n$ is an n -term Egyptian underapproximation of θ .

An infinite sequence $(x_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ of integers is an *infinite Egyptian underapproximation* of θ if the finite sequence $(x_i)_{i=1}^n$ is an n -term Egyptian underapproximation of θ for all $n \geq 1$.

For all $\theta \in (0, 1]$, there is a unique positive integer $G(\theta) = a$ such that

$$a \geq 2 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{a} < \theta \leq \frac{1}{a-1}.$$

Thus, $G(\theta)$ is the smallest positive integer such that Egyptian fraction $1/G(\theta)$ underapproximates θ . Equivalently,

$$a \leq \frac{1}{\theta} + 1 < a + 1$$

Date: February 2, 2022.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 11D68, 11A67, 11D72, 11D75, 11D85, 11P99.

Key words and phrases. Egyptian fractions, underapproximation, Sylvester's sequence, Muirhead inequality, greedy algorithm.

Supported in part by a grant from the PSC-CUNY Research Award Program.

and so¹

$$G(\theta) = \left\lfloor \frac{1}{\theta} \right\rfloor + 1.$$

For all $\theta \in (0, 1]$, the *greedy underapproximation algorithm* applied to θ constructs an infinite sequence of integers $(a_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ as follows:

$$(1) \quad a_1 = G(\theta) \geq 2$$

and, for all $i \geq 1$ and integers a_1, a_2, \dots, a_i ,

$$a_{i+1} = G\left(\theta - \sum_{j=1}^i \frac{1}{a_j}\right).$$

Thus,

$$(2) \quad \frac{1}{a_{i+1}} < \theta - \sum_{j=1}^i \frac{1}{a_j} \leq \frac{1}{a_{i+1} - 1}.$$

Equivalently,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{i+1} \frac{1}{a_j} < \theta \leq \sum_{j=1}^i \frac{1}{a_j} + \frac{1}{a_{i+1} - 1}.$$

We call $(a_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ the *infinite greedy underapproximation sequence* of θ and $(a_i)_{i=1}^n$ the *n-term greedy underapproximation sequence* of θ .

Let $i \geq 1$. Inequality (2) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{a_{i+1}} &< \theta - \sum_{j=1}^i \frac{1}{a_j} = \left(\theta - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} \frac{1}{a_j}\right) - \frac{1}{a_i} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{a_i - 1} - \frac{1}{a_i} = \frac{1}{a_i(a_i - 1)} \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$(3) \quad a_{i+1} \geq a_i^2 - a_i + 1.$$

It follows from (2) and (3) that $(a_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$, the infinite greedy underapproximation sequence of θ , is a strictly increasing sequence of positive integers and that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{a_i} = \theta.$$

Here is a classical example of Egyptian underapproximation. *Sylvester's sequence* [8] is the sequence of positive integers $(s_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ constructed recursively by the following rule:

$$(4) \quad s_1 = 2 \quad \text{and} \quad s_{i+1} = \prod_{j=1}^i s_j + 1$$

¹The *greatest integer function* of the real number w , also called the *floor* of w , is the unique integer ℓ such that $\ell \leq w < \ell + 1$. We write $\lfloor w \rfloor = \ell$. The *ceiling* of w , denoted $\lceil w \rceil$, is the unique integer m such that $m \geq w > m - 1$. Define the interval $(t_1, t_2] = \{t \in \mathbf{R} : t_1 < t \leq t_2\}$.

for all $i \geq 1$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} s_1 &= 2 \\ s_2 &= 3 \\ s_3 &= 7 \\ s_4 &= 43 \\ s_5 &= 1807 \\ s_6 &= 3263443 \\ s_7 &= 10650056950807 \\ s_8 &= 113423713055421844361000443 \\ s_9 &= 12864938683278671740537145998360961546653259485195807. \end{aligned}$$

Sylvester's sequence is sequence A000058 in the OEIS. It follows from Theorem 1 that Sylvester's sequence $(s_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is the infinite greedy underapproximation sequence of $\theta = 1$.

The following theorem describes a set of rational numbers whose infinite greedy approximation sequences generalize Sylvester's sequence.

Theorem 1. *Let $\theta = p/q \in (0, 1]$, where p and q are positive integers such that p divides $q + 1$, and let $(a_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ be the infinite greedy underapproximation sequence of θ . Then*

$$a_1 = \frac{q + 1}{p}$$

and, for all $k \geq 1$,

$$a_{k+1} = q \prod_{i=1}^k a_i + 1$$

and

$$\frac{p}{q} = \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{a_i} + \frac{1}{q \prod_{i=1}^k a_i}.$$

Proof. The proof is by induction on k . Let $q + 1 = pt$. We have

$$\frac{1}{t} = \frac{p}{q + 1} < \frac{p}{q} = \frac{p}{pt - 1} \leq \frac{1}{t - 1}$$

and so

$$a_1 = G\left(\frac{p}{q}\right) = t = \frac{q + 1}{p}.$$

It follows that

$$\frac{p}{q} - \frac{1}{a_1} = \frac{p}{q} - \frac{1}{t} = \frac{1}{qt} = \frac{1}{qa_1}$$

and so

$$a_2 = G\left(\frac{p}{q} - \frac{1}{a_1}\right) = qa_1 + 1.$$

We obtain

$$\frac{p}{q} - \frac{1}{a_1} - \frac{1}{a_2} = \frac{1}{qa_1} - \frac{1}{qa_1 + 1} = \frac{1}{qa_1(qa_1 + 1)} = \frac{1}{qa_1 a_2}$$

and so

$$a_3 = G\left(\frac{p}{q} - \frac{1}{a_1} - \frac{1}{a_2}\right) = qa_1 a_2 + 1.$$

Let $k \geq 2$. If

$$\frac{p}{q} - \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{a_i} = \frac{1}{q \prod_{i=1}^k a_i}$$

then

$$a_{k+1} = G\left(\frac{p}{q} - \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{a_i}\right) = q \prod_{i=1}^k a_i + 1$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{p}{q} - \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \frac{1}{a_i} &= \frac{p}{q} - \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{a_i} - \frac{1}{a_{k+1}} = \frac{1}{q \prod_{i=1}^k a_i} - \frac{1}{q \prod_{i=1}^k a_i + 1} \\ &= \frac{1}{q \prod_{i=1}^k a_i (q \prod_{i=1}^k a_i + 1)} \\ &= \frac{1}{q \prod_{i=1}^{k+1} a_i}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Corollary 1. *Sylvester's sequence is the infinite greedy underapproximation sequence for $\theta = 1$.*

2. A CRITERION FOR GREEDY UNDERAPPROXIMATION

Theorem 2. *Let $(a_i)_{i=1}^n$ be a sequence of integers such that*

$$a_1 \geq 2 \quad \text{and} \quad a_{i+1} \geq a_i^2 - a_i + 1$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, n-1$. The sequence $(a_i)_{i=1}^n$ is the n -term greedy underapproximation sequence of the real number θ if and only if

$$(5) \quad \theta \in \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{a_i}, \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{a_i} + \frac{1}{a_n - 1} \right].$$

Proof. If $(a_i)_{i=1}^n$ is the n -term greedy underapproximation sequence of θ , then

$$\frac{1}{a_n} < \theta - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{a_i} \leq \frac{1}{a_n - 1}$$

and so θ is in the interval (5).

To prove the converse, we observe that for all $i = 1, \dots, n-1$, the inequality $a_{i+1} \geq a_i^2 - a_i + 1$ implies that

$$\frac{1}{a_i} + \frac{1}{a_{i+1} - 1} \leq \frac{1}{a_i - 1}.$$

It follows that for all $k = 1, \dots, n$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{a_i} + \frac{1}{a_n - 1} &= \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \frac{1}{a_i} + \frac{1}{a_{n-1}} + \frac{1}{a_n - 1} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \frac{1}{a_i} + \frac{1}{a_{n-1} - 1} \\ &\leq \dots \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{1}{a_i} + \frac{1}{a_k - 1} \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{a_i} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{a_i} < \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{a_i} + \frac{1}{a_n - 1} \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{1}{a_i} + \frac{1}{a_k - 1}$$

If θ is in the interval (5), then for all $k = 1, \dots, n$ we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{a_i} < \theta \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{1}{a_i} + \frac{1}{a_k - 1}.$$

Equivalently,

$$\frac{1}{a_k} < \theta - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{1}{a_i} \leq \frac{1}{a_k - 1}$$

and

$$a_k = G \left(\theta - \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} \frac{1}{a_i} \right).$$

Thus, $(a_i)_{i=1}^n$ is the n -term greedy underapproximation sequence of θ . This completes the proof. \square

Corollary 2. *Let $\theta \in (0, 1]$. The pair of integers (a_1, a_2) with $2 \leq a_1 \leq a_2$ is the 2-term greedy underapproximation of θ if and only if $a_2 \geq a_1^2 - a_1 + 1$ and*

$$\frac{1}{a_1} + \frac{1}{a_2} < \theta \leq \frac{1}{a_1} + \frac{1}{a_2 - 1}.$$

Corollary 3. *Let $(a_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of integers such that*

$$a_1 \geq 2 \quad \text{and} \quad a_{i+1} \geq a_i^2 - a_i + 1$$

for all $i \geq 1$. The infinite series

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{a_i}$$

converges to a number $\theta \in (0, 1]$, and $(a_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ is the infinite greedy underapproximation sequence of θ .

3. BEST EGYPTIAN APPROXIMATION

Let E_n be the set of all sequences $(x_i)_{i=1}^n$ of integers such that

$$2 \leq x_1 \leq x_2 \leq \dots \leq x_n.$$

For $\theta \in (0, 1]$, let $U_n(\theta)$ be the set of all n -term Egyptian underapproximations of θ . Thus,

$$U_n(\theta) = \left\{ (x_i)_{i=1}^n \in E_n : \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} < \theta \right\}.$$

Let

$$u_n(\theta) = \sup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} : (x_i)_{i=1}^n \in U_n(\theta) \right\}.$$

We call $u_n(\theta)$ the *best n -term Egyptian underapproximation of θ* .

If $(x_i)_{i=1}^n \in U_n(\theta)$, then $\sum_{i=1}^n 1/x_i < \theta$ and so $u_n(\theta) \leq \theta$. We shall prove (Theorem 3) that there is a sequence $(b_i)_{i=1}^n \in U_n(\theta)$ such that $u_n(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n 1/b_i$ and so $u_n(\theta)$ is a rational number that is strictly less than θ . We shall also construct examples to prove that the n -term greedy underapproximation of θ is not necessarily

the best n -term Egyptian underapproximation and that there is not necessarily a unique sequence that is the best n -term Egyptian underapproximation of θ .

Theorem 3. *Let $\theta \in (0, 1]$. For all $n \geq 1$, there is a sequence $(b_i)_{i=1}^n \in U_n(\theta)$ such that*

$$u_n(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{b_i} < \theta.$$

Thus, the best n -term underapproximation $u_n(\theta)$ is rational.

Proof. For $n = 1$, we have

$$U_1(\theta) = \{(x_1) : x_1 \geq a_1 = G(\theta)\}.$$

Setting $b_1 = a_1$ gives $u_1(\theta) = 1/a_1 = 1/b_1 < \theta$.

Let $n \geq 2$. Choose an n -tuple $(c_i^{(1)})_{i=1}^n \in U_n(\theta)$. We have

$$2 \leq c_1^{(1)} \leq c_2^{(1)} \leq \dots \leq c_n^{(1)} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{c_i^{(1)}} < \theta.$$

If $(x_i)_{i=1}^n \in U_n(\theta)$ and

$$x_1 \geq nc_1^{(1)} = x_1^*$$

then the inequality $x_1 \leq x_2 \leq \dots \leq x_n$ implies that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} \leq \frac{n}{x_1} \leq \frac{1}{c_1^{(1)}} < \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{c_i^{(1)}} < \theta.$$

Thus, $(c_i^{(1)})_{i=1}^n$ is a larger n -term Egyptian underapproximation of θ than $(x_i)_{i=1}^n$.

Let

$$U_n^{(1)}(\theta) = \{(x_i)_{i=1}^n \in U_n(\theta) \text{ and } x_1 < x_1^*\}.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} u_n(\theta) &= \sup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} : (x_i)_{i=1}^n \in U_n(\theta) \right\} \\ &= \sup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} : (x_i)_{i=1}^n \in U_n(\theta) \text{ and } x_1 < x_1^* \right\} \\ &= \sup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} : (x_i)_{i=1}^n \in U_n^{(1)}(\theta) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $k \in \{1, \dots, n-1\}$ and let x_1^*, \dots, x_k^* be positive integers such that

$$u_n(\theta) = \sup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} : (x_i)_{i=1}^n \in U_n(\theta) \text{ and } x_i < x_i^* \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, k \right\}.$$

Let

$$U_n^{(k)}(\theta) = \{(x_i)_{i=1}^n \in U_n(\theta) : x_i < x_i^* \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, k\}.$$

Thus,

$$u_n(\theta) = \sup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} : (x_i)_{i=1}^n \in U_n^{(k)}(\theta) \right\}.$$

Let $\mathcal{Y}(k, n)$ be the finite set of all k -tuples of positive integers $\mathbf{y} = (y_i)_{i=1}^k$ such that

- (i) $y_i < x_i^*$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$, and
- (ii) there exists an n -tuple $(x_i)_{i=1}^n \in U_n^{(k)}(\theta)$ such that $x_i = y_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$.

For each k -tuple $\mathbf{y} = (y_i)_{i=1}^k \in \mathcal{Y}(k, n)$, let $U_n^{(\mathbf{y})}(\theta)$ be the set of all n -tuples $(x_i)_{i=1}^n \in U_n^{(k)}(\theta)$ such that $x_i = y_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$. We have

$$U_n^{(k)}(\theta) = \bigcup_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}(k, n)} U_n^{(\mathbf{y})}(\theta).$$

For all $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}(k, n)$, choose an n -tuple $(c_i^{(\mathbf{y})})_{i=1}^n \in U_n^{(\mathbf{y})}(\theta)$. If $(x_i)_{i=1}^n \in U_n^{(\mathbf{y})}(\theta)$ and

$$x_{k+1} \geq (n - k)c_{k+1}^{(\mathbf{y})}$$

then $x_i = y_i = c_i^{(\mathbf{y})}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, k$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} &= \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{c_i^{(\mathbf{y})}} + \sum_{i=k+1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{c_i^{(\mathbf{y})}} + \frac{n - k}{x_{k+1}} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \frac{1}{c_i^{(\mathbf{y})}} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{c_i^{(\mathbf{y})}} \\ &< \theta \end{aligned}$$

and so the n -term Egyptian underapproximation of θ by $(x_i)_{i=1}^n$ is no larger than the n -term Egyptian underapproximation of θ by $(c_i^{(\mathbf{y})})_{i=1}^n$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} : (x_i)_{i=1}^n \in U_n^{(\mathbf{y})}(\theta) \right\} \\ &= \sup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} : (x_i)_{i=1}^n \in U_n^{(\mathbf{y})}(\theta) \text{ and } x_{k+1} < (n - k)c_{k+1}^{(\mathbf{y})} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$x_{k+1}^* = \max \left\{ (n - k)c_{k+1}^{(\mathbf{y})} : \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}(k, n) \right\}.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} : (x_i)_{i=1}^n \in U_n^{(k)}(\theta) \right\} \\ &= \sup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} : (x_i)_{i=1}^n \in U_n^{(k)}(\theta) \text{ and } x_i < x_i^* \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, k + 1 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Continuing inductively, we obtain positive integers x_1^*, \dots, x_n^* such that

$$\begin{aligned} u_n(\theta) &= \sup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} : (x_i)_{i=1}^n \in U_n(\theta) \right\} \\ &= \sup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} : (x_i)_{i=1}^n \in U_n(\theta) \text{ and } x_i < x_i^* \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, n \right\} \\ &= \sup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} : (x_i)_{i=1}^n \in U_n^{(n)}(\theta) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$U_n^{(n)}(\theta) = \{(x_i)_{i=1}^n \in U_n(\theta) : x_i < x_i^* \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, n\}.$$

The set $U_n^{(n)}(\theta)$ is finite and so there exists $(b_i)_{i=1}^n \in U_n^{(n)}(\theta) \subseteq U_n(\theta)$ such that

$$u_n(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{b_i} < \theta.$$

This completes the proof. \square

4. WHEN GREEDY IS BEST

It had been conjectured by G. A. Miller [5] and Kellogg [4] and then proved by Curtiss [2] and Takenouchi [9] that, for every positive integer n , the n -tuple of Sylvester numbers $(s_i)_{i=1}^n$ is the unique best n -term Egyptian fraction underapproximation of 1. Equivalently, if $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in U_n(1)$ and

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{s_i} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} < 1$$

then $x_i = s_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. There is also a recent proof by Soundararajan [7].

In this section we generalize this result. We construct an infinite set of rational numbers whose infinite greedy underapproximation sequences can be explicitly computed, and for which, for every n , the n -term greedy underapproximation sequence is the unique best n -term underapproximation by Egyptian fractions. We use the method of Soundararajan [7], which is based on the following inequality.

Theorem 4. *If $(x_i)_{i=m+1}^n$ and $(a_i)_{i=m+1}^n$ are increasing sequences of positive numbers such that $(x_i)_{i=m+1}^n \neq (a_i)_{i=m+1}^n$ and*

$$\prod_{i=m+1}^{m+k} a_i \leq \prod_{i=m+1}^{m+k} x_i$$

for all $k = 1, \dots, n - m$, then

$$\sum_{i=m+1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} < \sum_{i=m+1}^n \frac{1}{a_i}.$$

Proof. This inequality is a corollary of Muirhead's inequality (see Nathanson [6]). A nice direct proof due to Ambro and Barc au [1] is given in the Appendix. \square

Theorem 5. *Let $\theta = p/q \in (0, 1]$, where p and q are positive integers such that p divides $q + 1$, and let $(a_i)_{i=1}^\infty$ be the infinite greedy underapproximation sequence of θ . For every positive integer n , if $(x_i)_{i=1}^n$ is an increasing sequence of positive integers such that*

$$(6) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{a_i} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} < \frac{p}{q}$$

then $x_i = a_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$.

Proof. The proof is by induction on n . For $n = 1$, the greedy algorithm gives

$$\frac{1}{a_1} \leq \frac{1}{x_1} < \theta \leq \frac{1}{a_1 - 1}$$

and so $x_1 = a_1$. Thus, the Theorem is true for $n = 1$.

Let $n \geq 2$ and assume that the Theorem is true for all increasing sequences $(x_i)_{i=1}^m$ with $m < n$. Let $(x_i)_{i=1}^n$ be an increasing sequence that satisfies (6). Inequality (6) and Theorem 1 give

$$0 < \frac{p}{q} - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} \leq \frac{p}{q} - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{a_i} = \frac{1}{q \prod_{i=1}^n a_i}.$$

A common denominator of the $n + 1$ fractions $p/q, 1/x_1, \dots, 1/x_n$ is $q \prod_{i=1}^n x_i$, and so there is a positive integer r such that

$$0 < \frac{1}{q \prod_{i=1}^n x_i} \leq \frac{r}{q \prod_{i=1}^n x_i} = \frac{p}{q} - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} \leq \frac{1}{q \prod_{i=1}^n a_i}.$$

This implies

$$\prod_{i=1}^n a_i \leq \prod_{i=1}^n x_i.$$

Let m be the largest integer $\leq n - 1$ such that

$$(7) \quad \prod_{i=m+1}^n a_i \leq \prod_{i=m+1}^n x_i.$$

We shall prove that

$$(8) \quad \prod_{i=m+1}^{m+j} a_i \leq \prod_{i=m+1}^{m+j} x_i$$

for all $j \in \{1, \dots, n - m - 1\}$. If not, then there exists $k \in \{1, \dots, n - m - 1\}$ such that

$$\prod_{i=m+1}^{m+k} x_i < \prod_{i=m+1}^{m+k} a_i.$$

It follows from (7) that

$$\prod_{i=m+k+1}^n a_i \leq \frac{\prod_{i=m+1}^n x_i}{\prod_{i=m+1}^{m+k} x_i} = \left(\frac{\prod_{i=m+1}^{m+k} x_i}{\prod_{i=m+1}^{m+k} a_i} \right) \prod_{i=m+k+1}^n x_i < \prod_{i=m+k+1}^n x_i$$

which contradicts the maximality of m . This proves (8).

Suppose that $a_i \neq x_i$ for some $i \in \{m+1, \dots, n\}$. Applying Theorem 4 to the distinct increasing sequences $(a_i)_{i=m+1}^n$ and $(x_i)_{i=m+1}^n$, we obtain

$$(9) \quad \sum_{i=m+1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} < \sum_{i=m+1}^n \frac{1}{a_i}.$$

From inequality (6) we have $1 \leq m \leq n-1$, and so

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{a_i} &\leq \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{x_i} - \left(\sum_{i=m+1}^n \frac{1}{a_i} - \sum_{i=m+1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} \right) \\ &< \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{x_i} \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} < \frac{p}{q}. \end{aligned}$$

The induction hypothesis implies $x_i = a_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, m$, which is absurd. Thus, $x_i = a_i$ for all $i = m+1, \dots, n$, and

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{a_i} \leq \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{x_i} < \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} < \frac{p}{q}.$$

The induction hypothesis again implies $x_i = a_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, m$. This completes the proof. \square

5. WHEN IS GREEDY BEST?

It is a critical observation that the n -term greedy underapproximation of a real number $\theta \in (0, 1]$ is not always the unique best n -term Egyptian underapproximation, nor even the best n -term Egyptian underapproximation.

Here are two examples for the case $n = 2$. The inequality

$$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{30} = \frac{8}{15} < \frac{31}{58} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{29}$$

proves that $(2, 30)$ is the 2-term greedy underapproximation for all θ in the interval

$$\frac{8}{15} < \theta \leq \frac{31}{58}.$$

We prove (Theorem 6) that $(2, 30)$ is a best 2-term greedy underapproximation for all θ in this interval. The equation

$$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{30} = \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{5} = \frac{8}{15}$$

shows that the best 2-term Egyptian underapproximation is not unique.

Similarly, the inequality

$$\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{17} = \frac{20}{51} < \frac{19}{48} = \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{16}$$

proves that $(3, 17)$ is the 2-term greedy underapproximation for all θ in the interval

$$\frac{20}{51} < \theta \leq \frac{19}{48}.$$

The inequality

$$\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{17} < \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{7} = \frac{11}{28} < \theta \leq \frac{19}{48}$$

proves that (3, 17) is not a best 2-term Egyptian underapproximation of θ for all θ in the interval

$$\frac{11}{28} < \theta \leq \frac{19}{48}.$$

Theorem 7 shows that (4, 7) is the best 2-term Egyptian underapproximation of θ for all θ in this interval.

6. BEST 2-TERM EGYPTIAN UNDERAPPROXIMATIONS

In this section we describe best 2-term Egyptian underapproximations for $\theta \in (0, 1]$.

For all integers $a_1 \geq 2$ we have the *harmonic interval*

$$I(a_1) = \left(\frac{1}{a_1}, \frac{1}{a_1 - 1} \right] = \left(\frac{1}{a_1}, \frac{1}{a_1} + \frac{1}{a_1^2 - a_1} \right].$$

The intervals $I(a_1)$ are pairwise disjoint and

$$(0, 1] = \bigcup_{a_1=2}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{a_1}, \frac{1}{a_1 - 1} \right].$$

For all integers $a_1 \geq 2$ and $a_2 \geq a_1^2 - a_1 + 1$, we have the *harmonic subinterval*

$$J(a_1, a_2) = \left(\frac{1}{a_1} + \frac{1}{a_2}, \frac{1}{a_1} + \frac{1}{a_2 - 1} \right].$$

Corollary 2 implies that (a_1, a_2) is the 2-term greedy underapproximation of θ for all $\theta \in J(a_1, a_2)$.

We have

$$J(a_1, a_2) \subseteq \left(\frac{1}{a_1}, \frac{1}{a_1 - 1} \right] = I(a_1).$$

The intervals $J(a_1, a_2)$ are pairwise disjoint. It follows from the identity

$$\left(\frac{1}{a_1} + \frac{1}{a_1^2 - a_1 + 1}, \frac{1}{a_1} + \frac{1}{a_1^2 - a_1} \right] = \left(\frac{1}{a_1} + \frac{1}{a_1^2 - a_1 + 1}, \frac{1}{a_1} + \frac{1}{a_1 - 1} \right]$$

that

$$I(a_1) = \bigcup_{a_2=a_1^2-a_1+1}^{\infty} J(a_1, a_2) = \bigcup_{a_2=a_1^2-a_1+1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{a_1} + \frac{1}{a_2}, \frac{1}{a_1} + \frac{1}{a_2 - 1} \right].$$

Thus,

$$(0, 1] = \bigcup_{a_1=2}^{\infty} \bigcup_{a_2=a_1^2-a_1+1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{a_1} + \frac{1}{a_2}, \frac{1}{a_1} + \frac{1}{a_2 - 1} \right].$$

The pair of integers (x_1, x_2) with $2 \leq x_1 \leq x_2$ is not the 2-term greedy underapproximation of some $\theta \in (0, 1]$ if and only if $x_2 \leq x_1^2 - x_1$.

The pair (a_1, a_2) is not a best 2-term underapproximation of $\theta \in I(a_1, a_2)$ if and only if there exists a pair of positive integers (x_1, x_2) with $x_1 \leq x_2$ such that

$$\frac{1}{a_1} + \frac{1}{a_2} < \frac{1}{x_1} + \frac{1}{x_2} < \theta \leq \frac{1}{a_1} + \frac{1}{a_2 - 1}.$$

Lemma 1. *Let a_1 and a_2 be integers such that*

$$a_1 \geq 2 \quad \text{and} \quad a_2 \geq a_1(a_1 - 1) + 1.$$

If x_1 and x_2 are integers such that

$$2 \leq x_1 \leq x_2 \quad \text{and} \quad (x_1, x_2) \neq (a_1, a_2)$$

and

$$(10) \quad \frac{1}{a_1} + \frac{1}{a_2} \leq \frac{1}{x_1} + \frac{1}{x_2} < \frac{1}{a_1} + \frac{1}{a_2 - 1}$$

then

$$(11) \quad a_1 + 1 \leq x_1 \leq 2a_1 - 1 \leq x_2 < \frac{a_1 x_1}{x_1 - a_1}$$

and

$$(12) \quad x_2 \leq a_2 - 1.$$

Proof. Inequalities (??) and (10) imply

$$\frac{2}{x_2} \leq \frac{1}{x_1} + \frac{1}{x_2} < \frac{1}{a_1} + \frac{1}{a_2 - 1} \leq \frac{1}{a_1 - 1}$$

and so $2a_1 - 1 \leq x_2$. Similarly,

$$\frac{1}{x_1} < \frac{1}{x_1} + \frac{1}{x_2} < \frac{1}{a_1 - 1}$$

implies $a_1 \leq x_1$. If $a_1 = x_1$, then from (10) we obtain

$$\frac{1}{a_2} \leq \frac{1}{x_2} < \frac{1}{a_2 - 1}$$

and so $a_2 = x_2$, which contradicts $(x_1, x_2) \neq (a_1, a_2)$. It follows that $a_1 + 1 \leq x_1$.

If $x_1 \geq 2a_1$, then

$$\frac{1}{a_1} + \frac{1}{a_2} \leq \frac{1}{x_1} + \frac{1}{x_2} \leq \frac{2}{x_1} \leq \frac{1}{a_1} < \frac{1}{a_1} + \frac{1}{a_2}$$

which is absurd. Therefore,

$$a_1 + 1 \leq x_1 \leq 2a_1 - 1 \leq x_2.$$

The inequality

$$\frac{1}{a_1} < \frac{1}{a_1} + \frac{1}{a_2} \leq \frac{1}{x_1} + \frac{1}{x_2}$$

implies

$$\frac{x_1 - a_1}{a_1 x_1} = \frac{1}{a_1} - \frac{1}{x_1} < \frac{1}{x_2}$$

and so

$$2a_1 - 1 \leq x_2 < \frac{a_1 x_1}{x_1 - a_1}.$$

This finishes the proof of (11).

Finally, $a_1 < x_1$ implies

$$\frac{1}{a_1} + \frac{1}{a_2} \leq \frac{1}{x_1} + \frac{1}{x_2} < \frac{1}{a_1} + \frac{1}{x_2}$$

and so $x_2 \leq a_2 - 1$, which is (12). This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 2. For all integers $a_1 \geq 2$, there are $a_1 - 1$ integers x_1 that satisfy

$$a_1 + 1 \leq x_1 \leq 2a_1 - 1.$$

For each such x_1 there are

$$\left[\frac{a_1 x_1}{x_1 - a_1} \right] - 2a_1 + 2 \geq 1$$

integers x_2 that satisfy

$$2a_1 - 1 \leq x_2 < \frac{a_1 x_1}{x_1 - a_1}$$

For all integers $a_1 \geq 2$, the set

$$(13) \quad X(a_1) = \left\{ (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbf{N}^2 : a_1 + 1 \leq x_1 \leq 2a_1 - 1 \leq x_2 < \frac{a_1 x_1}{x_1 - a_1} \right\}$$

is nonempty.

Proof. If $a_1 \geq 2$, then $a_1 + 1 \leq 2a_1 - 1$. There are $a_1 - 1 \geq 1$ integers x_1 such that $a_1 + 1 \leq x_1 \leq 2a_1 - 1$.

If $x_1 \leq 2a_1 - 1$, then

$$(a_1 - 1)x_1 \leq (a_1 - 1)(2a_1 - 1) < a_1(2a_1 - 1).$$

Equivalently,

$$(2a_1 - 1)(x_1 - a_1) < a_1 x_1$$

and so

$$2a_1 - 1 < \frac{a_1 x_1}{x_1 - a_1}.$$

It follows that there are

$$\left[\frac{a_1 x_1}{x_1 - a_1} \right] - 2a_1 + 2 \geq 1$$

integers x_2 such that

$$2a_1 - 1 \leq x_2 < \frac{a_1 x_1}{x_1 - a_1}$$

and so the set $X(a_1)$ is nonempty. This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 3. Let $a_1 \geq 2$. If $(x_1, x_2) \in X(a_1)$ and

$$(14) \quad a_2 = \left[\left(\frac{1}{x_1} + \frac{1}{x_2} - \frac{1}{a_1} \right)^{-1} \right]$$

then

$$(15) \quad \frac{1}{a_1} + \frac{1}{a_2} \leq \frac{1}{x_1} + \frac{1}{x_2} < \frac{1}{a_1} + \frac{1}{a_2 - 1}$$

and the pairs (a_1, a_2) and (x_1, x_2) are 2-term underapproximations of θ for all

$$\theta \in \left(\frac{1}{x_1} + \frac{1}{x_2}, \frac{1}{a_1} + \frac{1}{a_2 - 1} \right].$$

Moreover,

$$\frac{1}{a_1} + \frac{1}{a_2} = \frac{1}{x_1} + \frac{1}{x_2}$$

if and only if

$$a_2 = \left(\frac{1}{x_1} + \frac{1}{x_2} - \frac{1}{a_1} \right)^{-1}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{a_1} + \frac{1}{a_2} < \frac{1}{x_1} + \frac{1}{x_2}$$

if and only if

$$a_2 - 1 < \left(\frac{1}{x_1} + \frac{1}{x_2} - \frac{1}{a_1} \right)^{-1} < a_2.$$

Proof. If $(x_1, x_2) \in X(a_1)$, then

$$a_2 - 1 < \left(\frac{1}{x_1} + \frac{1}{x_2} - \frac{1}{a_1} \right)^{-1} \leq a_2$$

and

$$\frac{1}{a_1} + \frac{1}{a_2} \leq \frac{1}{x_1} + \frac{1}{x_2} < \frac{1}{a_1} + \frac{1}{a_2 - 1}.$$

This proves (15). The remaining statements are immediate consequences. \square

It is important to note that the integer a_2 computed from (14) does not necessarily satisfy the inequality $a_2 \geq a_1^2 - a_1 + 1$. Thus, (x_1, x_2) is an equal or better 2-term underapproximation than (a_1, a_2) for all $\theta > 1/x_1 + 1/x_2$, but (a_1, a_2) is not necessarily a 2-term greedy underapproximation.

Lemmata 1, 2, and 3 enable us to compute, for all integers $a_1 \geq 2$, the set of real numbers θ in the harmonic interval $I(a_1) = (1/a_1, 1/(a_1 - 1)]$ for which the 2-term greedy underapproximation is not the unique best 2-term Egyptian underapproximation.

Here are three examples in the case $a_1 = 5$. We have $a_1^2 - a_1 + 1 = 21$ and

$$\left(\frac{1}{5}, \frac{1}{4} \right] = I(5) = \bigcup_{a_2=21}^{\infty} J(5, a_2) = \bigcup_{a_2=21}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{5} + \frac{1}{a_2}, \frac{1}{5} + \frac{1}{a_2 - 1} \right).$$

For all $a_2 \geq 21$, the pair $(a_1, a_2) = (5, a_2)$ is the 2-term greedy underapproximation of θ of all θ is in the harmonic subinterval $J(5, a_2)$. From (13) we obtain the inequality that determines the set $X(5)$:

$$6 \leq x_1 \leq 9 \leq x_2 < \frac{5x_1}{x_1 - 5}.$$

The set $X(5)$ contains the pairs $(x_1, x_2) = (7, 10)$, $(9, 11)$, and $(6, 9)$.

The pair $(7, 10) \in X(5)$ generates the integer

$$a_2 = 24 > \left(\frac{1}{7} + \frac{1}{10} - \frac{1}{5} \right)^{-1} = \frac{70}{3}$$

and $24 = a_2 \geq a_1^2 - a_1 + 1 = 21$. The pair $(5, 24)$ is the 2-term greedy underapproximation of all $\theta \in J(5, 24)$. We have

$$\frac{29}{120} = \frac{1}{5} + \frac{1}{24} < \frac{1}{7} + \frac{1}{10} = \frac{17}{70} < \frac{1}{5} + \frac{1}{23} = \frac{28}{115}.$$

Thus, the pair $(7, 10)$ is a better 2-term underapproximation of θ than the 2-term greedy underapproximation $(5, 24)$ for all

$$\theta \in \left(\frac{17}{70}, \frac{28}{115} \right] \subseteq \left(\frac{29}{120}, \frac{28}{115} \right] = J(5, 24).$$

The pair $(9, 11) \in X(5)$ generates the integer

$$a_2 = 495 = \left(\frac{1}{9} + \frac{1}{11} - \frac{1}{5} \right)^{-1}$$

and $495 = a_2 \geq a_1^2 - a_1 + 1 = 21$. The pair $(5, 495)$ is the 2-term greedy underapproximation for all $\theta \in J(5, 495)$. For all

$$\theta \in \left(\frac{20}{99}, \frac{499}{2470} \right]$$

we have

$$\frac{1}{5} + \frac{1}{495} = \frac{1}{9} + \frac{1}{11} = \frac{20}{99} < \theta \leq \frac{499}{2470} = \frac{1}{5} + \frac{1}{494}.$$

and the pairs $(5, 495)$ and $(9, 11)$ are equal 2-term underapproximations.

The pair $(6, 9) \in X(5)$ generates the integer

$$a_2 = 13 = \left\lceil \frac{90}{7} \right\rceil = \left\lceil \left(\frac{1}{6} + \frac{1}{9} - \frac{1}{5} \right)^{-1} \right\rceil > \frac{90}{7}.$$

However, $a_2 = 13 < 21$ and $(5, 13)$ is not a 2-term greedy underapproximation.

7. BEST 2-TERM UNDERAPPROXIMATIONS FOR $a_1 = 2$ AND $a_1 = 3$

In this section we compute all real numbers θ in the harmonic intervals $I(2)$ and $I(3)$ whose 2-term greedy approximations are not best approximations or not unique best approximations.

Theorem 6. *Let $a_1 = 2$ and $a_2 \geq 3$. The 2-term greedy underapproximation $(2, a_2)$ is a best 2-term Egyptian underapproximation of θ for all θ in the harmonic subinterval*

$$J(2, a_2) = \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{a_2}, \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{a_2 - 1} \right].$$

Consider the harmonic subintervals

$$J(2, 6) = \left(\frac{2}{3}, \frac{7}{10} \right], \quad J(2, 12) = \left(\frac{7}{12}, \frac{13}{22} \right], \quad J(2, 30) = \left(\frac{8}{15}, \frac{31}{58} \right].$$

- (i) For all $\theta \in J(2, 6)$, the pairs $(2, 6)$ and $(3, 3)$ are best 2-term underapproximations of θ , and are the only best 2-term underapproximations of θ .
- (ii) For all $\theta \in J(2, 12)$, the pairs $(2, 12)$ and $(3, 4)$ are best 2-term underapproximations of θ , and are the only best 2-term underapproximations of θ .
- (iii) For all $\theta \in J(2, 30)$, the pairs $(2, 30)$ and $(3, 5)$ are best 2-term underapproximations of θ , and are the only best 2-term underapproximations of θ .
- (iv) For all $\theta \in I(2) = (1/2, 1]$ such that $\theta \notin J(2, 6) \cup J(2, 12) \cup J(2, 30)$, the pair (a_1, a_2) is the unique best 2-term underapproximation of θ .

Proof. If $a_1 = 2$, then inequality (11) is simply

$$3 = x_1 \leq x_2 < 6$$

and so $x_2 = 3, 4$, or 5 . If $x_2 = 3$, then

$$a_2 = \left(\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{2} \right)^{-1} = 6$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{6} = \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{3} = \frac{2}{3}.$$

If $x_2 = 4$, then

$$a_2 = \left(\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{2} \right)^{-1} = 12$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{12} = \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{4} = \frac{7}{12}.$$

If $x_2 = 5$, then

$$a_2 = \left(\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{5} - \frac{1}{2} \right)^{-1} = 30$$

and

$$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{30} = \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{5} = \frac{8}{15}.$$

The only solutions $(x_1, x_2) \neq (2, a_2)$ of the diophantine inequality

$$(16) \quad \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{a_2} \leq \frac{1}{x_1} + \frac{1}{x_2} < \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{a_2 - 1}$$

are $(x_1, x_2) = (3, 3)$, $(3, 4)$, and $(3, 5)$. This completes the proof. \square

Theorem 7. *Let $a_1 = 3$ and let $\theta \in I(3) = (1/3, 1/2]$. The 2-term greedy underapproximation of θ is a best 2-term Egyptian underapproximation if and only if*

$$\theta \notin \left(\frac{9}{20}, \frac{11}{24} \right] \cup \left(\frac{11}{28}, \frac{19}{48} \right].$$

The 2-term greedy underapproximation of θ is a best 2-term Egyptian underapproximation but not the unique best 2-term Egyptian underapproximation if and only if $\theta \in J(3, a_2)$ for

$$a_2 \in \{12, 15, 24, 30, 36, 60, 105, 132\}.$$

Proof. For $a_1 = 3$, inequality (11) gives

$$4 \leq x_1 \leq 5 \leq x_2 < \frac{3x_1}{x_1 - a_1}.$$

Thus, a complete list of the 10 solutions $(3, a_2) \neq (x_1, x_2)$ of the diophantine inequality

$$(17) \quad \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{a_2} \leq \frac{1}{x_1} + \frac{1}{x_2} < \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{a_2 - 1}$$

is the following:

x_1	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	5	5	5
x_2	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	5	6	7
a_2	9	12	17	24	36	60	132	15	30	105

We have strict inequality

$$\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{a_2} < \frac{1}{x_1} + \frac{1}{x_2} < \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{a_2 - 1}$$

only if either $a_2 = 9$ and $(x_1, x_2) = (4, 5)$ or $a_2 = 17$ and $(x_1, x_2) = (4, 7)$. Note that

$$\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{5} = \frac{9}{20} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{7} = \frac{11}{28}.$$

The pair (4, 5) is the unique best 2-term underapproximation of all θ such that

$$\theta \in \left(\frac{9}{20}, \frac{11}{24} \right] \subseteq \left(\frac{4}{9}, \frac{11}{24} \right] = J(3, 9).$$

The pair (4, 7) is the unique best 2-term underapproximation of all θ such that

$$\theta \in \left(\frac{11}{28}, \frac{19}{48} \right] \subseteq \left(\frac{20}{51}, \frac{19}{48} \right] = J(3, 17).$$

The 8 solutions $(3, a_2) \neq (x_1, x_2)$ with $a_2 \geq 7$ and $4 \leq x_1 \leq x_2$ of the diophantine equation

$$\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{a_2} = \frac{1}{x_1} + \frac{1}{x_2}$$

are

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{12} &= \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{6} = \frac{5}{12} \\ \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{15} &= \frac{1}{5} + \frac{1}{5} = \frac{2}{5} \\ \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{24} &= \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{8} = \frac{3}{8} \\ \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{30} &= \frac{1}{5} + \frac{1}{6} = \frac{11}{30} \\ \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{36} &= \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{9} = \frac{13}{36} \\ \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{60} &= \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{10} = \frac{7}{20} \\ \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{105} &= \frac{1}{5} + \frac{1}{7} = \frac{12}{35} \\ \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{132} &= \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{11} = \frac{15}{44}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

8. OPEN PROBLEMS

- (1) Let $\theta \in (0, 1]$, let $n \geq 3$, and let $(a_i)_{i=1}^n \in U_n(\theta)$ be the n -term greedy underapproximation of θ . Do there exist sequences $(x_i)_{i=1}^n \in U_n(\theta)$ such that $(a_i)_{i=1}^n \neq (x_i)_{i=1}^n$ and

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{a_i} < \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} < \theta?$$

How many such sequences are there? Do there exist sequences $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in U_n(\theta)$ such that $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \neq (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{a_i} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} < \theta?$$

How many such sequences are there? Can we identify and understand counterexamples to unique best n -term underapproximation by the greedy algorithm?

- (2) Consider real numbers $\theta \in (0, 1]$ whose infinite greedy underapproximation sequence $(a_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ has the property that $(a_i)_{i=1}^n$ is the unique best underapproximation of θ for all positive integers n . By Theorem 5, every rational number of the form p/q where p divides $q + 1$ has this property. Do other rational numbers have this property? Do there exist irrational numbers with this property?
- (3) Let $n \geq 3$. Is there an efficient algorithm to compute the best n -term underapproximation of a real number $\theta \in (0, 1]$?
- (4) Let $\theta \in (0, 1]$. Erdős and Graham [3, p.31] asserted (without proof or reference to any publication) that for every rational number θ there exists an integer $n_0 = n_0(\theta)$ such that, for all $n \geq n_0 + 1$,

$$u_n(\theta) = u_{n_0}(\theta) + u_{n-n_0}(\theta - u_{n_0}(\theta))$$

and the best $(n-n_0)$ -term underapproximation $u_{n-n_0}(\theta - u_{n_0}(\theta))$ is always constructed by the greedy algorithm. They also wrote, "It is not difficult to construct irrationals for which the result fails." Prove or disprove these statements.

- (5) Let A be a nonempty set of positive integers and let

$$\frac{1}{A} = \left\{ \frac{1}{x} : x \in A \right\}$$

be the set of Egyptian fractions with denominators in A . An n -term A -underapproximation of θ is a sum of n not necessarily distinct Egyptian fractions in $1/A$ that is strictly less than θ . Let

$$u_{n,A}(\theta) = \sup \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} : (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in A^n, x_1 \geq \dots \geq x_n, \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} < \theta \right\}.$$

An n -term A -underapproximation $\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i} < \theta$ is *best* if

$$u_n(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{x_i}.$$

For what real numbers $\theta \in (0, 1)$ does the greedy algorithm restricted to A give a best n -term underapproximation?

APPENDIX A. PROOF OF AN INEQUALITY

The following proof is due to Ambro and Barcău [1].

Theorem 8. *Let $(u_i)_{i=1}^n$ and $(v_i)_{i=1}^n$ be distinct sequences of positive numbers such that*

$$(19) \quad \prod_{i=1}^k v_i \leq \prod_{i=1}^k u_i$$

for all $k = 1, \dots, n$. If $(u_i)_{i=1}^n$ and $(v_i)_{i=1}^n$ are decreasing, then

$$(20) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n v_i < \sum_{i=1}^n u_i.$$

If $(u_i)_{i=1}^n$ and $(v_i)_{i=1}^n$ are increasing, then

$$(21) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{u_i} < \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{v_i}.$$

Proof. Let $(u_i)_{i=1}^n$ and $(v_i)_{i=1}^n$ be decreasing sequences that satisfy the product inequality (19). The proof of inequality (20) is by induction on n . The case $n = 1$ is simply the assertion that if $v_1 \leq u_1$ and $v_1 \neq u_1$, then $v_1 < u_1$.

Let $n \geq 2$ and assume inequality (20) is true for sequences of length less than n . If $u_i = v_i$ for some i , the inequality follows from the case $n - 1$. If $v_i < u_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, then $\sum_{i=1}^n v_i < \sum_{i=1}^n u_i$. Thus, we can assume that $u_i \neq v_i$ for all i and that $u_j < v_j$ for some j .

Let ℓ be the smallest j such that $u_j < v_j$. Inequality (19) with $k = 1$ gives $v_1 \leq u_1$ and so $v_1 < u_1$. Therefore, $\ell \geq 2$ and

$$u_\ell < v_\ell \leq v_{\ell-1} < u_{\ell-1}.$$

Let

$$(22) \quad t = \min\left(\frac{u_{\ell-1}}{v_{\ell-1}}, \frac{v_\ell}{u_\ell}\right).$$

We have $v_\ell \leq v_{\ell-1}$ and

$$(23) \quad 1 < t < t^2 \leq \left(\frac{u_{\ell-1}}{v_{\ell-1}}\right) \left(\frac{v_\ell}{u_\ell}\right) = \left(\frac{u_{\ell-1}}{u_\ell}\right) \left(\frac{v_\ell}{v_{\ell-1}}\right) \leq \frac{u_{\ell-1}}{u_\ell}.$$

Define the sequence $(u'_i)_{i=1}^n$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} u'_i &= u_i & \text{if } i \neq \ell - 1, \ell \\ u'_{\ell-1} &= \frac{u_{\ell-1}}{t} \\ u'_\ell &= tu_\ell. \end{aligned}$$

Inequalities (22) and (23) imply that

$$u_{\ell-1} > \frac{u_{\ell-1}}{t} = u'_{\ell-1} \geq u'_\ell = tu_\ell > u_\ell$$

and so

$$u'_1 \geq \dots \geq u'_{\ell-2} \geq u_{\ell-1} > u'_{\ell-1} \geq u'_\ell > u_\ell > u'_{\ell+1} \geq \dots \geq u'_n.$$

Thus, the sequence $(u'_i)_{i=1}^n$ is decreasing.

We shall prove product inequality (19) for the decreasing sequences $(u'_i)_{i=1}^n$ and $(v_i)_{i=1}^n$. For $k = 1, \dots, \ell - 2$ we have

$$\prod_{i=1}^k v_i \leq \prod_{i=1}^k u_i = \prod_{i=1}^k u'_i.$$

For $k = \ell, \dots, n$, the identity

$$u'_{\ell-1} u'_\ell = \left(\frac{u_{\ell-1}}{t}\right) (tu_\ell) = u_{\ell-1} u_\ell$$

implies

$$\prod_{i=1}^k v_i \leq \prod_{i=1}^k u_i = \left(\prod_{i=1}^{\ell-2} u_i\right) (u'_{\ell-1} u'_\ell) \left(\prod_{i=\ell+1}^k u_i\right) = \prod_{i=1}^k u'_i.$$

Let $k = \ell - 1$. We have $t \leq u_{\ell-1}/v_{\ell-1}$ and so $v_{\ell-1} \leq u_{\ell-1}/t = u'_{\ell-1}$. It follows that

$$\prod_{i=1}^{\ell-1} v_i = v_{\ell-1} \prod_{i=1}^{\ell-2} v_i \leq u'_{\ell-1} \prod_{i=1}^{\ell-2} u'_i = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell-1} u'_i.$$

This proves (19) for the sequences $(u'_i)_{i=1}^n$ and $(v_i)_{i=1}^n$. If $t = u_{\ell-1}/v_{\ell-1}$, then $v_{\ell-1} = u'_{\ell-1}$. If $t = v_{\ell}/u_{\ell}$, then $v_{\ell} = u'_{\ell}$. The induction hypothesis implies

$$\sum_{i=1}^n v_i < \sum_{i=1}^n u'_i.$$

We have $t < u_{\ell-1}/u_{\ell}$ from inequality (23) and so

$$(t-1)u_{\ell} < \left(1 - \frac{1}{t}\right)u_{\ell-1}.$$

Equivalently,

$$u'_{\ell-1} + u'_{\ell} = \frac{u_{\ell-1}}{t} + tu_{\ell} < u_{\ell-1} + u_{\ell}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n u'_i &= \left(\sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq \ell-1, \ell}}^n u'_i \right) + u'_{\ell-1} + u'_{\ell} \\ &< \left(\sum_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq \ell-1, \ell}}^n u'_i \right) + u_{\ell-1} + u_{\ell} = \sum_{i=1}^n u_i. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the Theorem for decreasing sequences.

If $(u_i)_{i=1}^n$ and $(v_i)_{i=1}^n$ are increasing sequences that satisfy (19), then $(1/u_i)_{i=1}^n$ and $(1/v_i)_{i=1}^n$ are decreasing sequences such that

$$\prod_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{u_i} \leq \prod_{i=1}^k \frac{1}{v_i}$$

for all $k = 1, \dots, n$, and we obtain inequality (21). This completes the proof. \square

Note that inequality (19) does not imply inequality (20) if the sequences $(u_i)_{i=1}^n$ and $(v_i)_{i=1}^n$ are increasing. For example, the increasing sequences $(v_1, v_2) = (1, 7)$ and $(u_1, u_2) = (2, 4)$ satisfy

$$1 = v_1 < u_1 = 2 \quad \text{and} \quad 7 = v_1 v_2 < u_1 u_2 = 8$$

but

$$8 = v_1 + v_2 > u_1 + u_2 = 6.$$

REFERENCES

- [1] F. Ambro and M. Barcău, *On representations by Egyptian fractions*, Rev. Roumaine Math. Pures Appl. 60 (2015), 331–336.
- [2] D. R. Curtis, *On Kellogg's diophantine problem*, Amer. Math. Monthly 29 (1922), 380–387.
- [3] P. Erdős and R. L. Graham, *Old and New Problems and Results in Combinatorial Number Theory*, L'Enseignement Mathématique, Geneva, 1980.
- [4] O. D. Kellogg, *On a diophantine problem*, Amer. Math. Monthly 28 (1921), 300–303.
- [5] G. A. Miller, *Groups possessing a small number of sets of conjugate operators*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 20 (1919), 260–270.

- [6] M. B. Nathanson, *The Muirhead-Rado inequality, 2: Symmetric means and inequalities*, arXiv:2201.01270 (math.CO), 2022.
- [7] K. Soundararajan, *Approximating 1 from below using Egyptian fractions*, arXiv:0502247 (math.CA), 2005.
- [8] J. J. Sylvester, *On a point in the theory of vulgar fractions*, Amer. J. Math. 3 (1880), 332–335.
- [9] T. Takenouchi, *On an indeterminate equation*, Proceedings of the Physico-Mathematical Society of Japan 3 (1921), 78–92.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, LEHMAN COLLEGE (CUNY), BRONX, NY 10468
Email address: `melvyn.nathanson@lehman.cuny.edu`