



## A NOTE ON MULTIPLICATIVELY $e$ -PERFECT NUMBERS

LE ANH VINH AND DANG PHUONG DUNG

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS  
UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES  
SYDNEY 2052 NSW  
[vinh@maths.unsw.edu.au](mailto:vinh@maths.unsw.edu.au)

SCHOOL OF FINANCE AND BANKING  
UNIVERSITY OF NEW SOUTH WALES  
SYDNEY 2052 NSW  
[phuogdug@yahoo.com](mailto:phuogdug@yahoo.com)

*Received 17 October, 2005; accepted 26 October, 2005*

*Communicated by J. Sándor*

---

**ABSTRACT.** Let  $T_e(n)$  denote the product of all exponential divisors of  $n$ . An integer  $n$  is called multiplicatively  $e$ -perfect if  $T_e(n) = n^2$  and multiplicatively  $e$ -superperfect if  $T_e(T_e(n)) = n^2$ . In this note, we give an alternative proof for characterization of multiplicatively  $e$ -perfect and multiplicatively  $e$ -superperfect numbers.

---

*Key words and phrases:* Perfect number, Exponential divisor, Multiplicatively perfect, Sum of divisors, Number of divisors.

*2000 Mathematics Subject Classification.* 11A25, 11A99.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $\sigma(n)$  be the sum of all divisors of  $n$ . An integer  $n$  is called perfect if  $\sigma(n) = 2n$  and superperfect if  $\sigma(\sigma(n)) = 2n$ . If  $n = p_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots p_k^{\alpha_k}$  is the prime factorization of  $n > 1$ , a divisor  $d \mid n$ , called an exponential divisor ( $e$ -divisor) of  $n$  is  $d = p_1^{\beta_1} \cdots p_k^{\beta_k}$  with  $\beta_i \mid \alpha_i$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq k$ . Let  $T_e(n)$  denote the product of all exponential divisors of  $n$ . The concepts of multiplicatively  $e$ -perfect and multiplicatively  $e$ -superperfect numbers were first introduced by Sándor in [1].

**Definition 1.1.** An integer  $n$  is called multiplicatively  $e$ -perfect if  $T_e(n) = n^2$  and multiplicatively  $e$ -superperfect if  $T_e(T_e(n)) = n^2$ .

In [1], Sándor completely characterizes multiplicatively  $e$ -perfect and multiplicatively  $e$ -superperfect numbers.

**Theorem 1.1** ([1]).

- a) An integer  $n$  is multiplicatively  $e$ -perfect if and only if  $n = p^\alpha$ , where  $p$  is prime and  $\alpha$  is a perfect number.
- b) An integer  $n$  is multiplicatively  $e$ -superperfect if and only if  $n = p^\alpha$ , where  $p$  is a prime, and  $\alpha$  is a superperfect number.

Sándor's proof is based on an explicit expression of  $T_e(n)$ . In this note, we offer an alternative proof of Theorem 1.1.

**2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1**

a) Suppose that  $n$  is multiplicatively  $e$ -perfect; that is  $T_e(n) = n^2$ . If  $n$  has more than one prime factor then  $n = p_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots p_k^{\alpha_k}$  for some  $k \geq 2$ ,  $\alpha_i \geq 1$  and  $p_1, \dots, p_k$  are  $k$  distinct primes. We have three separate cases.

- (1) Suppose that  $\alpha_1 = \cdots = \alpha_k = 1$ . Then  $d$  is an exponential divisor of  $n$  if and only if  $d = p_1 \cdots p_k = n$ . Hence  $T_e(n) = n$ , which is a contradiction.
- (2) Suppose that two of  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$  are greater 1. Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 > 1$ . Then  $d_1 = p_1 p_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots p_k^{\alpha_k}$ ,  $d_2 = p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2 p_3^{\alpha_3} \cdots p_k^{\alpha_k}$ ,  $d_3 = n$  are three distinct exponential divisors of  $n$ . Hence  $d_1 d_2 d_3 \mid T_e(n)$ . However,  $p_1^{2\alpha_1+1} \mid d_1 d_2 d_3$  so  $T_e(n) \neq n^2$ , which is a contradiction.
- (3) Suppose that there is exactly one of  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$  which is greater than 1. Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $\alpha_1 > 1$  and  $\alpha_2 = \cdots = \alpha_k = 1$ . We have that if  $d$  is an exponential divisor of  $n$  then  $d = p_1^{\beta_1} p_2 \cdots p_k$  for some  $\beta_1 \mid \alpha_1$ . Hence if  $n$  has more than two distinct exponential divisors then  $p_2^3 \mid T_e(n) = p_1^{2\alpha_1} p_2^2 \cdots p_k^2$ , which is a contradiction. However,  $d_1 = p_1 p_2 \cdots p_k$ ,  $d_2 = p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2 p_3 \cdots p_k$  are two distinct exponential divisors of  $n$  so  $d_1, d_2$  are all exponential divisors of  $n$ . Hence  $T_e(n) = p_1^{\alpha_1+1} p_2^2 \cdots p_k^2 = p_1^{2\alpha_1} p_2^2 \cdots p_k^2$ . This implies that  $\alpha_1 = 1$ , which is a contradiction.

Thus  $n$  has only one prime factor; that is,  $n = p^\alpha$  for some prime  $p$ . In this case then  $T_e(n) = p^{\sigma(\alpha)}$ . Hence  $T_e(n) = n^2 = p^{2\alpha}$  if and only if  $\sigma(\alpha) = 2\alpha$ . This concludes the proof.

b) Suppose that  $n$  is multiplicatively  $e$ -superperfect; that is  $T_e(T_e(n)) = n^2$ . If  $n$  has more than one prime factor then  $n = p_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots p_k^{\alpha_k}$  for some  $k \geq 2$ ,  $\alpha_i \geq 1$  and  $p_1, \dots, p_k$  are  $k$  distinct primes. We have two separate cases.

- (1) Suppose that  $\alpha_1 = \cdots = \alpha_k = 1$ . Then  $d$  is an exponential divisor of  $n$  if and only if  $d = p_1 \cdots p_k = n$ . Hence  $T_e(n) = n$  and  $T_e(T_e(n)) = T_e(n) = n$  which is a contradiction.
- (2) Suppose that there is at least one of  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$  which is greater 1. Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $\alpha_1 > 1$ . Then  $d_1 = p_1 p_2^{\alpha_2} \cdots p_k^{\alpha_k}$ ,  $d_2 = n = p_1^{\alpha_1} p_2^{\alpha_2} p_3^{\alpha_3} \cdots p_k^{\alpha_k}$ , are two distinct exponential divisors of  $n$ . Hence  $d_1 d_2 \mid T_e(n)$ . However,  $d_1 d_2 = p_1^{\alpha_1+1} p_2^{2\alpha_2} \cdots p_k^{2\alpha_k}$  so  $T_e(n) = p_1^{\gamma_1} \cdots p_k^{\gamma_k}$  where  $\gamma_1 \geq \alpha_1 + 1$ ,  $\gamma_i \geq 2\alpha_i \geq 2$  for  $i = 2, \dots, k$ . Thus,  $t_1 = p_1^{\gamma_1} p_2 p_3^{\gamma_3} \cdots p_k^{\gamma_k}$  and  $t_2 = T_e(n) = p_1^{\gamma_1} p_2^{\gamma_2} p_3^{\gamma_3} \cdots p_k^{\gamma_k}$  are two distinct exponential divisors of  $T_e(n)$ . Hence  $t_1 t_2 \mid T_e(T_e(n))$ . However,  $p_1^{2\gamma_1} \mid t_1 t_2$  and  $\gamma_1 > \alpha_1$ , which is a contradiction.

Thus  $n$  has only one prime factor; that is  $n = p^\alpha$  for some prime  $p$ . In this case then  $T_e(n) = p^{\sigma(\alpha)}$  and  $T_e(T_e(n)) = p^{\sigma(\sigma(\alpha))}$ . Hence  $T_e(T_e(n)) = n^2 = p^{2\alpha}$  if and only if  $\sigma(\sigma(\alpha)) = 2\alpha$ . This concludes the proof.

**Remark 2.1.** In an e-mail message, Professor Sándor has provided the authors some more recent references related to the arithmetic function  $T_e(n)$ , as well as connected notions on  $e$ -perfect numbers and generalizations. These are [2], [3], and [4].

**REFERENCES**

- [1] J. SÁNDOR, On multiplicatively  $e$ -perfect numbers, *J. Inequal. Pure Appl. Math.*, **5**(4) (2004), Art. 114. [ONLINE: <http://jipam.vu.edu.au/article.php?sid=469>]
- [2] J. SÁNDOR, A note on exponential divisors and related arithmetic functions, *Scientia Magna*, **1** (2005), 97–101. [ONLINE <http://www.gallup.unm.edu/~smarandache/ScientiaMagna1.pdf>]
- [3] J. SÁNDOR, On exponentially harmonic numbers, to appear in *Indian J. Math.*
- [4] J. SÁNDOR AND M. BENCZE, On modified hyperperfect numbers, *RGMA Research Report Collection*, **8**(2) (2005), Art. 5. [ONLINE: <http://eureka.vu.edu.au/~rgmia/v8n2/mhpn.pdf>]