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## 1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULT

A well-known but classicial result concerning the harmonic series is that the sequence of partial sums $\sum_{r=1}^{n} \frac{1}{r}$ can never be an integer for $n>1$. More generally, Nagell [3] showed that $\sum_{r=1}^{n} \frac{1}{m+r d}$ cannot be an integer for any positive integers $m, n$ and $d$. As an extension of these results the author, in a recent paper [4], constructed further examples of positive rational termed series having non-integer partial sums. These partial sums were of the form $\sum_{r=1}^{n} \frac{1}{U_{r}}$, where $\left\{U_{n}\right\}$ are the sequence of generalised Fibonacci numbers generated, for $n \geq 2$, via the recurrence relation

$$
\begin{equation*}
U_{n}=P U_{n-1}-Q U_{n-2} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $U_{0}=0, U_{1}=1$ and $(P, Q)$ a relatively prime pair of integers satisfying $|P|>Q>0$ or $P \neq 0, Q<0$. (Note when $(P, Q)=(2,1)$ one has $U_{n}=n$ ). By viewing these partial sums as the symmetric function formed from summing the products of the terms $\frac{1}{U_{1}}, \frac{1}{U_{2}}, \ldots \frac{1}{U_{n}}$ taken one at a time, one may naturally ask whether all other symmetric fucntions in the reciprocals of such generalised Fibonacci numbers can be non-integer. In this paper we will show that for sequences $\left\{U_{n}\right\}$ generated via (1), with $P \geq 2$ and $Q<0$, there can in fact be at most finitely many $n$ such that one or more of the elementary symmetric functions in $\frac{1}{U_{1}}, \frac{1}{U_{2}}, \ldots \frac{1}{U_{n}}$ is an integer. To establish this result we will require two preliminary Lemmas, the first of which is a refinement of Bertrand's postulate due to Ingham [2].

Lemma 1.1: For any real number $x>1$ there always exists a prime in the interval $\left(x, x+x^{\frac{5}{8}}\right)$.
The second lemma is a standard result of generalised Fibonacci sequences, a proof of which can be found in [1].
Lemma 1.2: For any sequence $\left\{U_{n}\right\}$ generated with respect to a relatively prime pair of integers $(P, Q)$ via (1) then $\left(U_{m}, U_{n}\right)=U_{(m, n)}$.

We now can prove the following theorem:
Theorem 1.1: Suppose the sequence $\left\{U_{n}\right\}$ is generated via (1) with respect to the relatively prime pair $(P, Q)$ such that $P \geq 2$ and $Q<0$. Denote the $k^{\text {th }}$ elementary symmetric function in $\frac{1}{U_{1}}, \frac{1}{U_{2}}, \ldots, \frac{1}{U_{n}}$ by $\phi(n, k)$, then for this family of functions there exists a uniform lower bound $N$ on $n$, such that $\phi(n, k)$ is non-integer for $n \geq N$ and $1 \leq k \leq n$.

Proof: To establish the non-integer status of $\phi(n, k)$ it will suffice to consider the two separate cases of $k>3 \log n$ and $k<3 \log n$, noting here that it is sufficient to take only strict inequalities as $\log n$ can never be an integer for integer $n>1$. In both cases we will demonstrate the existence of the lower bounds given by $N_{1}=\min \left\{s \in \mathbb{N}: \log n \geq \frac{e}{3-e}\right.$ for
$n \geq s\}=\left\lceil e^{\frac{e}{3-e}}\right\rceil$ and $N_{2}=\min \left\{s \in \mathbb{N}: \frac{9(\log n)^{2}}{n}+\frac{3 \log n}{n}<\frac{1}{2}, \frac{n^{3}}{(3 \log n+1)^{11}}>2^{8}(1+\log 3)^{5}\right.$ for
all $n \geq s\}$ respectively on $n$, for which $\phi(n, k)$ is non-integer. As $N_{1}$ and $N_{2}$ are constructed independently of $k$, one can then set $N=\max \left\{N_{1}, N_{2}\right\}$ from which it is immeidate that $\phi(n, k)$ must be non-integer for all $n \geq N$ and $1 \leq k \leq n$. Furthermore, as $N_{1}$ and $N_{2}$ are not dependent on the specific choice of the sequence $\left\{U_{n}\right\}$, one sees that the lower bound $N$ must hold uniformly over the family of generalised Fibonacci sequences as specified in the theorem statement. We now proceed with the following two cases.
Case 1: $k>3 \log n$
First note for the prescribed values of $(P, Q)$ it can be shown, via an easy induction on $n$, that $U_{n} \geq n$. Now, as $\phi(n, k)$ is formed from summing the terms $\frac{1}{U_{1}}, \frac{1}{U_{2}}, \ldots, \frac{1}{U_{n}}$ taken $k$ at a time, we observe that $\phi(n, k)$ must occur $k!$ times in the multinomial expan$\operatorname{sion}\left(\frac{1}{U_{1}}+\frac{1}{U_{2}}+\cdots+\frac{1}{U_{n}}\right)^{k}$. Hence, using the usual comparison of $\log n$ with the terms of the harmonic series, we obtain that

$$
\begin{align*}
\phi(n, k)<\frac{1}{k!}\left(\frac{1}{U_{1}}+\frac{1}{U_{2}}+\cdots+\frac{1}{U_{n}}\right)^{k} & <\frac{1}{k!}\left(1+\frac{1}{2}+\cdots+\frac{1}{n}\right)^{k} \\
& <\frac{1}{k!}(1+\log n)^{k} \tag{2}
\end{align*}
$$

Now by definition of $N_{1}$ if $n \geq N_{1}$ then $\log n>\frac{e}{3-e}$ and so $k>\frac{3 e}{3-e}$. Consequently

$$
\frac{1}{k!}(1+\log n)^{k}<\frac{1}{k!}\left(1+\frac{k}{3}\right)^{k}=\frac{k^{k}}{k!}\left(\frac{1}{k}+\frac{1}{3}\right)^{k}<\left(\frac{e}{k}+\frac{e}{3}\right)^{k}<1
$$

noting here that the second last inequality follows from the fact that $\frac{k^{k}}{k!}<e^{k}$. Hence, we deduce from the previous inequality and (2) that $0<\phi(n, k)<1$ for any $n \geq N_{1}$ as required. Case 2: $k<3 \log n$

In this case it first will be necessary to show that for $n \geq N_{2}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\frac{n}{k(k+1)}-1\right)^{8}>\left(\frac{n}{k}+1\right)^{5} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Upon factoring out $\frac{n}{k}$ and $\frac{n}{k(k+1)}$ from the right and left hand side respectively of the conjectured inequality in (3) one finds that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{n^{3}}{k^{3}(k+1)^{8}}\left(1-\frac{k(k+1)}{n}\right)^{8}>\left(1+\frac{k}{n}\right)^{5} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now, as $k<3 \log n$ and so $\frac{k}{n}<\frac{3 \log n}{n} \rightarrow 0$ monotonically for $n>e$, it is clear the term $\left(1+\frac{k}{n}\right)^{5}$ can be bounded above by $(1+\log 3)^{5}$ for $n \geq 3$ say. Similarly, as $\frac{k(k+1)}{n}<$ $\frac{9(\log n)^{2}}{n}+\frac{3 \log n}{n} \rightarrow 0$ and $\frac{n^{3}}{k^{3}(k+1)^{8}}>\frac{n^{3}}{(3 \log n+1)^{11}} \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, one can choose $n$ sufficiently large but finite and independent of $k$, such that $\frac{k(k+1)}{n}<\frac{1}{2}$ and $\frac{n^{3}}{k^{3}(k+1)^{8}}>2^{8}(1+\log 3)^{5}$. Consequently by definition of $N_{2}$ one has for $n \geq N_{2}$

$$
\frac{n^{3}}{k^{3}(k+1)^{8}}\left(1-\frac{k(k+1)}{n}\right)^{8}>(1+\log 3)^{5}
$$

and so one concludes that (3) must hold for all $n \geq N_{2}$. Now raising both sides of (3) to the power $\frac{1}{8}$ one finds upon rearrangement that

$$
\frac{n}{k}>\left(1+\frac{n}{k+1}\right)+\left(1+\frac{n}{k+1}\right)^{\frac{5}{8}}
$$

Hence for $n \geq N_{2}$ there must exist, by Lemma 1.1, a prime $p$ in the open interval $\left(1+\frac{n}{k+1}, \frac{n}{k}\right)$. By construction $p$ must be such that $1<m p<n$ for $m=1,2, \ldots, k$ but $(k+1) p>n$. Considering again $\phi(n, k)$ as a sum of the product of the terms $\frac{1}{U_{1}}, \frac{1}{U_{2}}, \ldots, \frac{1}{U_{n}}$ taken $k$ at a time we can write

$$
\phi(n, k)=\sum_{i=1}^{\binom{n}{k}} \frac{1}{c_{i}}=\frac{b_{1}+b_{2}+\cdots+b_{\binom{n}{k}}}{U_{1} U_{2} \ldots U_{n}}=\frac{B}{C}
$$

where $c_{i}$ is one of the possible $\binom{n}{k}$ products of the terms $U_{1}, U_{2}, \ldots, U_{n}$ taken $k$ at a time and

$$
b_{i}=\frac{U_{1} U_{2} \ldots U_{n}}{c_{i}}
$$

By the above $U_{p} U_{2 p} \ldots U_{k p}=c_{s}$, for some $s \in\left\{1,2, \ldots,\binom{n}{k}\right\}$, and as $(k+1) p>n$, no other of the remaining $\binom{n}{k}-1$ products $c_{i}$ can contain generalised Fibonacci numbers in which all of the corresponding $k$ subscripts are a multiple of $p$. Consequently, by construction each $b_{i}$, with
$i \neq s$, must contain at least one of the terms in the set $A=\left\{U_{p}, U_{2 p}, \ldots, U_{k p}\right\}$ while $b_{s}$ will contain none of the terms in $A$. Now by Lemma 1.2 as $p$ is prime $\left(U_{p}, U_{m p}\right)=U_{(p, m p)}=U_{p}$, for each $m=1,2, \ldots, k$, and so $U_{p} \mid b_{i}$ for every $i \neq s$. Also for $(r, p)=1$ one has $\left(U_{p}, U_{r}\right)=U_{1}=1$ but as $b_{s}$ contains only those terms $U_{r}$ for which $(r, p)=1$, we conclude that $U_{p}$ must be relatively prime to $b_{s}$, and so $U_{p} / b_{s}$, which in turn implies that $U_{p} / B$. Thus $\phi(n, k)=\frac{B}{C}$ where $U_{p} \mid C$ but $U_{p} \gamma B$, that is $\phi(n, k)$ cannot be an integer for any $n \geq N_{2}$ as required.
Remark 1.1: It is clear that the above argument could easily be applied to higher order recurrences $\left\{U_{n}\right\}$ with $U_{n} \geq n$ if an analogous result in Lemma 1.2 could be found.
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