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#### Abstract

For any positive integer $n$, we call an arithmetical function $f(n)$ as the F.Smarandache multiplicative function if $f(1)=1$, and if $n>1, n=p_{1}^{\alpha_{1}} p_{2}^{\alpha_{2}} \cdots p_{k}^{\alpha_{k}}$ be the fractorization of $n$ into prime powers, then $f(n)=\max _{1 \leq i \leq k}\left\{f\left(p_{i}^{\alpha_{i}}\right)\right\}$. The main purpose of this paper is using the elementary methods to study the solutions of an equation involving the F.Smarandache multiplicative function, and give its all positive integer solutions.
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## §1. Introduction and result

For any positive integer $n$, we call an arithmetical function $f(n)$ as the F.Smarandache multiplicative function if $f(1)=1$, and if $n>1, n=p_{1}^{\alpha_{1}} p_{2}^{\alpha_{2}} \cdots p_{k}^{\alpha_{k}}$ be the fractorization of $n$ into prime powers, then $f(n)=\max _{1 \leq i \leq k}\left\{f\left(p_{i}^{\alpha_{i}}\right)\right\}$. For example, the function $S(n)=\min \{m$ : $m \in N, n \mid m!\}$ is a F.Smarandache multiplicative function. From the definition of $S(n)$, it is easy to see that if $n=p_{1}^{\alpha_{1}} p_{2}^{\alpha_{2}} \cdots p_{k}^{\alpha_{k}}$ be the fractorization of $n$ into prime powers, we have

$$
S(n)=\max _{1 \leq i \leq k}\left\{S\left(p_{i}^{\alpha_{i}}\right)\right\}
$$

So we can say that $S(n)$ is a F.Smarandache multiplicative function. In fact, this function be the famous F.Smarandache function, the first few values of it are $S(1)=1, S(2)=2, S(3)=3$, $S(4)=4, S(5)=5, S(6)=3, S(7)=7, S(8)=4, S(9)=6, S(10)=5, \cdots \cdots$. About the arithmetical properties of $S(n)$, some authors had studied it, and obtained some valuable results. For example, Farris Mark and Mitchell Patrick [2] studied the upper and lower bound of $S\left(p^{\alpha}\right)$, and proved that

$$
(p-1) \alpha+1 \leq S\left(p^{\alpha}\right) \leq(p-1)\left[\alpha+1+\log _{p} \alpha\right]+1
$$

Professor Wang Yongxing [3] studied the mean value properties of $S(n)$, and obtained a sharper asymptotic formula, that is

$$
\sum_{n \leq x} S(n)=\frac{\pi^{2}}{12} \frac{x^{2}}{\ln x}+O\left(\frac{x^{2}}{\ln ^{2} x}\right)
$$

[^0]Lu Yaming [4] studied the solutions of an equation involving the F.Smarandache function $S(n)$, and proved that for any positive integer $k \geq 2$, the equation

$$
S\left(m_{1}+m_{2}+\cdots+m_{k}\right)=S\left(m_{1}\right)+S\left(m_{2}\right)+\cdots+S\left(m_{k}\right)
$$

has infinite groups positive integer solutions $\left(m_{1}, m_{2}, \cdots, m_{k}\right)$.
Jozsef Sandor [5] proved for any positive integer $k \geq 2$, there exist infinite groups of positive integer solutions ( $m_{1}, m_{2}, \cdots, m_{k}$ ) satisfied the following inequality:

$$
S\left(m_{1}+m_{2}+\cdots+m_{k}\right)>S\left(m_{1}\right)+S\left(m_{2}\right)+\cdots+S\left(m_{k}\right) .
$$

Also, there exist infinite groups of positive integer solutions $\left(m_{1}, m_{2}, \cdots, m_{k}\right)$ such that

$$
S\left(m_{1}+m_{2}+\cdots+m_{k}\right)<S\left(m_{1}\right)+S\left(m_{2}\right)+\cdots+S\left(m_{k}\right) .
$$

In [6], Fu Jing proved more general conclusion. That is, if the positive integer $k$ and $m$ satisfied the one of the following conditions:
(a) $k>2$ and $m \geq 1$ are all odd numbers.
(b) $k \geq 5$ is odd, $m \geq 2$ is even.
(c) Any even numbers $k \geq 4$ and any positive integer $m$;
then the equation

$$
m \cdot S\left(m_{1}+m_{2}+\cdots+m_{k}\right)=S\left(m_{1}\right)+S\left(m_{2}\right)+\cdots+S\left(m_{k}\right)
$$

has infinite groups of positive integer solutions $\left(m_{1}, m_{2}, \cdots, m_{k}\right)$.
In [7], Xu Zhefeng studied the value distribution of $S(n)$, and obtained a deeply result. That is, he proved the following Theorem:

Let $P(n)$ be the largest prime factor of $n$, then for any real numbers $x>1$, we have the asymptotic formula:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{n \leq x}(S(n)-P(n))^{2}=\frac{2 \zeta\left(\frac{3}{2}\right) x^{\frac{3}{2}}}{3 \ln x}+O\left(\frac{x^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\ln ^{2} x}\right) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\zeta(s)$ is the Riemann zeta-function.
On the other hand, if $n=p_{1}^{\alpha_{1}} p_{2}^{\alpha_{2}} \cdots p_{k}^{\alpha_{k}}$ be the fractorization of $n$ into prime powers, we define

$$
S L(n)=\max \left\{p_{1}^{\alpha_{1}}, p_{2}^{\alpha_{2}}, \cdots, p_{k}^{\alpha_{k}}\right\} .
$$

Obviously, this function is also a Smarandache multiplicativa function, which is called F.Smarandache LCM function. About the properties of this function, there are many scholars have studied it, see references [8] and [9].

Now, we define another arithmetical function $\bar{S}(n)$ as follows: $\bar{S}(1)=1$, when $n>1$ and if $n=p_{1}^{\alpha_{1}} p_{2}^{\alpha_{2}} \cdots p_{k}^{\alpha_{k}}$ be the fractorization of $n$ into prime powers, then we define

$$
\bar{S}(n)=\max \left\{\alpha_{1} p_{1}, \alpha_{2} p_{2}, \alpha_{3} p_{3}, \cdots, \alpha_{k} p_{k}\right\}
$$

It is easy to prove that this function is also a F.Smarandache multiplicative function. About its elementary properties, we know very little, there are only some simple properties mentioned in [7]. That is, if we replace $S(n)$ with $\bar{S}(n)$ in (1), it is also true.

The main purpose of this paper is using the elementary methods to study the solutions of an equation involving $\bar{S}(n)$. That is, we shall study all positive integer solutions of the equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{d \mid n} \bar{S}(d)=n \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\sum_{d \mid n}$ denotes the summation over all positive factors of $n$.
Obviously, there exist infinite positive integer $n$, such that $\sum_{d \mid n} \bar{S}(d)>n$. For example, let $n=p$ be a prime, then $\sum_{d \mid n} \bar{S}(d)=1+p>p$. At the same time, there are also infinite positive integer $n$, such that $\sum_{d \mid n} \bar{S}(d)<n$.

In fact, let $n=p q, p$ and $q$ are two different odd primes with $p<q$, then we have $\sum_{d \mid n} \bar{S}(d)=1+p+2 q<p q$. So a natural problem is whether there exist infinite positive integer $n$ satisfying (2)? We have solved this problem completely in this paper, and proved the following conclusion:

Theorem. For any positive integer $n$, the equation (2) holds if and only if $n=1,28$.

## §2. Proof of the theorem

In this section, we shall complete the proof of the theorem. Firstly, we prove some special cases:
(i) If $n=1, \sum_{d \mid n} \bar{S}(d)=\bar{S}(1)=1$, then $n=1$ is a solution of equation (2).
(ii) If $n=p^{\alpha}$ is the prime powers, then (2) doesn't hold.

In fact, if (2) holds, then from the definition of $\bar{S}(n)$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{d \mid n} \bar{S}(d)=\sum_{d \mid p^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(d)=1+p+2 p+\cdots+\alpha p=p^{\alpha} . \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Obviously, the right side of (3) is a multiple of $p$, but the left side is not divided by $p$, a contradiction. So if $n$ is a prime powers, (2) doesn't hold.
(iii) If $n>1$ and the least prime factor powers of $n$ is 1 , then the equation (2) also doesn't hold. Now, if $n=p_{1} p_{2}^{\alpha_{2}} \cdots p_{k}^{\alpha_{k}}=p_{1} n_{1}$ satisfied (2), then from the conclusion (ii), we know that $k \geq 2$, so from the definition of $\bar{S}(n)$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{d \mid n} \bar{S}(d)=\sum_{d \mid n_{1}} \bar{S}(d)+\sum_{d \mid n_{1}} \bar{S}\left(p_{1} d\right)=2 \sum_{d \mid n_{1}} \bar{S}(d)+p_{1}-1=p_{1} n_{1} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Obviously, two sides of (4) has the different parity, it is impossible.
We get immediately from the conclusion (iii), if $n$ is a square-free number, then $n$ can't satisfy (2).

Now we prove the general case. Provided integer $n>1$ satisfied equation (2), from (ii) and (iii), we know that $n$ has two different prime powers at least, and the least prime factor power
of $n$ is larger than 1 . So we let $n=p_{1}^{\alpha_{1}} p_{2}^{\alpha_{2}} \cdots p_{k}^{\alpha_{k}}, \alpha_{1}>1, k \geq 2$. Let $\bar{S}(n)=\alpha p$, we discuss it in the following cases:
(A) $\alpha=1$. Then $p$ must be the largest prime factors of $n$, let $n=n_{1} p$, note that, if $d \mid n_{1}$, we have $\bar{S}(d) \leq p-1$, so from $\sum_{d \mid n} \bar{S}(d)=n$ we get

$$
\begin{align*}
n_{1} p & =n=\sum_{d \mid n_{1} p} \bar{S}(d)=\sum_{d \mid n_{1}} \bar{S}(d)+\sum_{d \mid n_{1}} \bar{S}(d p) \\
& =\sum_{d \mid n_{1}} \bar{S}(d)+\sum_{d \mid n_{1}} p \leq 1+\sum_{\substack{d \mid n_{1} \\
d>1}}(p-1)+p d\left(n_{1}\right) \\
& =2+(2 p-1) d\left(n_{1}\right)-p \tag{5}
\end{align*}
$$

or

$$
\begin{equation*}
n_{1}+1<2 d\left(n_{1}\right) \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $d\left(n_{1}\right)$ is the Direchlet divisor function. Obviously, if $n_{1} \geq 7$, then $2 \leq n_{1} \leq 6$. It is also because the least prime factors power of $n_{1}$ is bigger than 1 , we have $n_{1}=4$, and $n=n_{1} p=4 p$, $p>3$. Now, from

$$
4 p=\sum_{d \mid 4 p} \bar{S}(d)=\bar{S}(1)+\bar{S}(2)+\bar{S}(4)+\bar{S}(p)+\bar{S}(2 p)+\bar{S}(4 p)=1+2+4+3 p
$$

we immediately obtain $p=7$ and $n=28$.
(B) $\bar{S}(n)=\alpha p$ and $\alpha>1$, now let $n=n_{1} p^{\alpha},\left(n_{1}, p\right)=1$, if $n$ satisfied (2), we have

$$
n=p^{\alpha} n_{1}=\sum_{i=0}^{\alpha} \sum_{d \mid n_{1}} \bar{S}\left(p^{i} d\right) .
$$

If $1<n_{1}<8$, we consider equation (2) as follows:
(a) If $n_{1}=2$. That is, $n=2 p^{\alpha}(p>2)$, from the discussion of (iii), we know that $n=2 p^{\alpha}$ isn't the solution of (2).
(b) If $n_{1}=3$. That is, $n=3 p^{\alpha}$, since $\left(n_{1}, p\right)=1$, we have $p \neq 3$.

If $p=2, n=3 \cdot 2^{\alpha}$ satisfied (2). That is

$$
\sum_{d \mid 3 \cdot 2^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(d)=\sum_{d \mid 2^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(d)+\sum_{d \mid 2^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(3 d)=2 \sum_{d \mid 2^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(d)+3=3 \cdot 2^{\alpha} .
$$

In the above equation, $2 \sum_{d \mid 2^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(d)+3$ is an odd number, but $3 \cdot 2^{\alpha}$ is an even number, so $n=3 \cdot 2^{\alpha}$ is not the solution of (2).

If $p>3$. That is, $n=3 \cdot p^{\alpha}$ satisfied (2), then the least prime factor powers of $n$ is 1 , from (iii), we know that $n=3 \cdot p^{\alpha}$ is not the solution of (2).
(c) If $n_{1}=4, n=4 \cdot p^{\alpha}(p \geq 3)$, we have

$$
\sum_{d \mid 4 \cdot p^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(d)=\sum_{d \mid p^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(d)+\sum_{d \mid p^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(2 d)+\sum_{d \mid p^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(4 d)
$$

If $p=3$. That is, $n=4 \cdot 3^{\alpha}$ satisfied equation (2), then

$$
\sum_{d \mid 4 \cdot 3^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(d)=\sum_{d \mid 3^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(d)+\sum_{d \mid 3^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(2 d)+\sum_{d \mid 3^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(4 d)=3 \sum_{\substack{d \mid 3^{\alpha} \\ d>1}} \bar{S}(d)+12=4 \cdot 3^{\alpha}
$$

Since $3^{2} \mid 3 \sum_{\substack{d \mid 3^{\alpha} \\ d>1}} \bar{S}(d)$, and $3^{2} \mid 4 \cdot 3^{\alpha}$, then $3^{2} \mid 12$, this is impossible.
If $p>3$. That is, $n=4 \cdot p^{\alpha}$, then

$$
\sum_{d \mid 4 \cdot p^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(d)=\sum_{d \mid p^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(d)+\sum_{d \mid p^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(2 d)+\sum_{d \mid p^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(4 d)=3 \sum_{d \mid p^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(d)+8=\frac{3}{2} \alpha(\alpha+1) p+11=4 \cdot p^{\alpha}
$$

or $4 \cdot 3^{\alpha}-\frac{3}{2} \alpha(\alpha+1) p+11=0$. Now we fix $\alpha$, and let $f(x)=4 \cdot x^{\alpha}-\frac{1}{2} \alpha(\alpha+1) x+11$, if $x \geq 3$, $f(x)$ is a increased function. That is,

$$
f(x) \geq f(3)=4 \cdot 3^{\alpha}-\frac{3}{2} \alpha(\alpha+1)+11=g(\alpha)
$$

So when $x \geq 3, f(x)=0$ has no solutions, from which we get if $p>3$, then equation (2) has no solutions.
(d) If $n_{1}=5$, we have $n=5 \cdot p^{\alpha}(p \neq 5)$.

If $p>5$, then from (iii), we know that $n=5 \cdot p^{\alpha}$ is not a solution of equation (2).
If $p=2$, since

$$
\sum_{d \mid 5 \cdot 2^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(d)=\sum_{d \mid 2^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(d)+\sum_{d \mid 2^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(5 d)=2 \sum_{\substack{d \mid 2^{\alpha} \\ d>1}} \bar{S}(d)+10=5 \cdot 2^{\alpha}
$$

where $2^{2} \mid 2 \sum_{\substack{d \mid 2^{\alpha} \\ d>1}} \bar{S}(d)$, and $2^{2} \mid 5 \cdot 2^{\alpha}$, so we have $2^{2} \mid 10$, this is impossible. Hence $n=5 \cdot 2^{\alpha}$ unsatisfied the equation (2).

If $p=3$, since

$$
\sum_{d \mid 5 \cdot 3^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(d)=\sum_{d \mid 3^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(d)+\sum_{d \mid 3^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(5 d)=2 \sum_{d \mid 3^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(d)+6,
$$

where $2 \sum_{d \mid 3^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(d)+6$ is even, and $5 \cdot 3^{\alpha}$ is odd, so $n=5 \cdot 3^{\alpha}$ unsatisfied the equation (2).
(e) When $n_{1}=6, n=2 \cdot 3 \cdot p^{\alpha}$, from the discussion of (3), $n$ unsatisfied (2).
(f) When $n_{1}=7$, we have $n=7 \cdot p^{\alpha}(p \neq 7)$.

If $p>7$, then from (iii), $n=7 \cdot p^{\alpha}$ isn't the solution of (2).
If $p=2$, we must have $\alpha \geq 4$. Since

$$
\sum_{d \mid 7 \cdot 2^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(d)=\sum_{d \mid 2^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(d)+\sum_{d \mid 2^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(7 d)=2 \sum_{d \mid 2^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(d)+15
$$

where $2 \sum_{d \mid 2^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(d)+15$ is odd, but $n=7 \cdot 2^{\alpha}$ is even. So $n=7 \cdot 2^{\alpha}$ unsatisfied (2).
If $p=3$, since

$$
\sum_{d \mid 7 \cdot 3^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(d)=\sum_{d \mid 3^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(d)+\sum_{d \mid 3^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(7 d)=2 \sum_{\substack{d \mid 3^{\alpha} \\ d>1}} \bar{S}(d)+13,
$$

in above equation, $3 \mid 2 \sum_{d \mid 3^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(d)$, and $3 \mid 7 \cdot 3^{\alpha}$. If it satisfied (2), we must obtain $3 \dagger 13$, a contradiction! So $n=7 \cdot 3^{\alpha}$ is not a solution of (2) either.

If $p=5$, since

$$
\sum_{d \mid 7 \cdot 5^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(d)=\sum_{d \mid 5^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(d)+\sum_{d \mid 5^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(7 d)=2 \sum_{d \mid 5^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(d)+8
$$

in the above equation, $2 \sum_{d \mid 5^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(d)+8$ is even, $7 \cdot 5^{\alpha}$ is odd. So $n=7 \cdot 5^{\alpha}$ is not a solution of (2) either.
(g) When $n_{1} \geq 8$, we have $n=n_{1} \cdot p^{\alpha}$ and $p^{\alpha}>\frac{\alpha(\alpha+1)}{2} p$, then

$$
\sum_{d \mid n_{1} \cdot p^{\alpha}} \bar{S}(d)<\bar{S}\left(p^{\alpha}\right) d\left(n_{1} p^{\alpha}\right)=\alpha(\alpha+1) p d\left(n_{1}\right) \leq \frac{\alpha(\alpha+1)}{2} p n_{1}<p^{\alpha} n_{1}=n
$$

then if $n_{1} \geq 8, n=n_{1} p^{\alpha}$ is not a solution of (2) either.
In a word, equation (2) only has two solutions $n=1$ and $n=28$.
This completes the proof of the theorem.
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