Laboratoire d'Informatique Fondamentale, de Recherche Opérationnelle, de Combinatoire et d'Économétrie Availaible on line at http://www.liforce.usthb.dz bulletin-liforce@usthb.dz Bulletin du Laboratoire 03 (2015) 18 - 27



An effective approach for integer partitions using exactly two distinct sizes of parts

Nesrine BENYAHIA TANI¹, Sadek BOUROUBI², Omar KIHEL³

¹ Algiers 3 University,
 ² Ahmed Waked Street, Dely Brahim, Algiers, Algeria.
 ² USTHB, Faculty of Mathematics
 P.B. 32 El-Alia, 16111, Bab Ezzouar, Algiers, Algeria.
 ³ Brock University
 Department of Mathematics and Statistics,
 500 Glenridge Avenue St. Catharines, Ontario, Canada.

Abstract: In this paper we consider the number of partitions of a positive integer n into parts of a specified number of distinct sizes. We give a method for constructing all partitions of n into parts of two sizes, as well as an explicit formula to count them with a new self-contained proof. As a side effect, by using the möbius function we also give a formula for the number of partitions of n into coprime parts.

Keywords: Integer partitions, partitions into parts of different sizes, partitions into parts of two sizes, divisors number, Möbius function.

1 Introduction

A partition of a positive integer n is a sequence of non increasing positive integers n_1 (a_1 times), n_2 (a_2 times), ..., n_s (a_s times), with $n_i > n_{i+1}$, that sum to n. We sometimes write the such partition $\pi = (n_1^{a_1} \ n_2^{a_2} \cdots \ n_s^{a_s})$, each n_i is called part of the partition π and a_i its frequency. The partition function p(n) counts the partitions of n. If we ignore some unpublished work of G.W.V. Leibniz, the theory of integer partitions can find its origin in the work of L. Euler [6]. In fact, he made a sustained study of partitions and partition identities, and exploited them to establish a huge number of results in Analysis in 1748. An excellent introduction to this subject can be found in the book of G. E. Andrews [2].

Definition 1 Let $\pi = (n_1^{a_1} \ n_2^{a_2} \cdots \ n_s^{a_s})$ be a partition of n. We say that π is a partition into k parts with s distinct sizes if

$$\begin{cases} n = a_1 \ n_1 + \dots + a_s \ n_s; \\ n_1 > n_2 > \dots > n_s \ge 1; \\ a_1 + \dots + a_s = k; \\ a_1, \dots, a_s \ge 1. \end{cases}$$
(1)

Let t(n, k, s) be the number of solutions of system (1) and t(n, s) the total number of partitions of n into s distinct sizes. Then we have

$$t(n,s) = \sum_{k=s}^{\frac{2n-s(s-1)}{2}} t(n,k,s).$$
(2)

Example 1 Among 27 partitions of n = 11 into 2 distinct sizes, the partitions $(7^1 \ 1^4)$, $(4^2 \ 1^3)$, $(3^1 \ 2^4)$ and $(3^3 \ 1^2)$ are the only ones which are into 5 parts.

This kind of partitions appeared for the first time in the work of P. A. MacMahon [7]. Next, E. Deutsch presented the number of partitions of n into exactly two odd sizes of parts and the number of partitions of n into exactly two sizes of parts, one odd and one even. One can find these values in the Online Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences (OEIS) [8] as A117955 for the first number, A117956 for the second one and A002133 for the number of partitions of n using only 2 types of parts. In the work of Benyahia-Tani and Bouroubi [3], we can find proof of effective and non-effective finiteness theorems on t(n, k, s). We can cite for example the following results: **Theorem 1** For $k \ge s \ge 2$, $n \ge k + \frac{s(s-1)}{2}$ and $n \ge \max\{k, \frac{s(s+1)}{2}\}$, we have

$$t(n,k,s) = \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor \frac{2n-s(s-1)}{2k} \rfloor_{k-s+1}} \sum_{j=1}^{k-s+1} t(n-ki,k-j,s-1),$$
(3)

$$t(n,k,2) = \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{k} \rfloor} \tau_{k-1\downarrow}(n-ki), \qquad (4)$$

where $\tau_{d\downarrow}(k)$ denotes the number of positive divisors of k less than or equal to d.

2 Main Results

One of the aim of this paper is to give an explicit formula for t(n, k, 2) using an effective new approach.

Thus, let consider the system:

$$\begin{cases}
n = a_1 \ n_1 + a_2 \ n_2; \\
a_1 + a_2 = k; \\
n_1 > n_2 \ge 1; \\
a_1, a_2 \ge 1.
\end{cases}$$
(5)

and let $m = n_1 - n_2$ throughout the remainder of the paper.

First of all, we introduce the following lemma to prepare the main theorem.

Lemma 2 System (5) has integral solutions if and only if the following conditions are satisfied:

(i)
$$n \equiv n_2 k \pmod{m}$$
,
(ii) $\max\left(1, \left\lceil \frac{n}{k} \right\rceil - m + \chi(k|n)\right) \le n_2 \le \left\lfloor \frac{n}{k} \right\rfloor - \chi(k|n)$,
where $\chi(k|n) = 1$ if k divides n, and 0 otherwise.

Proof. From system (5), we have

$$\left(\begin{array}{cc}n_1 & n_2\\1 & 1\end{array}\right)\left(\begin{array}{c}a_1\\a_2\end{array}\right) = \left(\begin{array}{c}n\\k\end{array}\right)\cdot$$

Since m > 0, we can write

$$\left(\begin{array}{c}a_1\\a_2\end{array}\right) = \frac{1}{m}\left(\begin{array}{c}n-n_2k\\-n+n_1k\end{array}\right).$$

Then, system (5) has integral solutions if and only if m divides $n - n_2 k$, $n - n_2 k > 0$ and $-n + n_1 k > 0$. That is,

$$n \equiv n_2 k \pmod{m}$$
 and $\frac{n}{k} - m < n_2 < \frac{n}{k}$.

Since k can divide n, and $n_2 \ge 1$, the result holds.

From this lemma, we can now derive the following theorem.

Theorem 3 For $k \ge 2$, $n \ge max\{k,3\}$, d = gcd(n,k) and e|d, let $\mathfrak{I}_{\mathfrak{e}}$ be the set of pairs $(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{N}^2$, such that:

- $1 \le \alpha \le \left\lfloor \frac{n-k}{e} \right\rfloor$ and $\operatorname{gcd}\left(\alpha, \frac{k}{e}\right) = 1$,
- $\beta \equiv \left(\frac{n}{e}\right) \left(\frac{k}{e}\right)^{-1} (mod \ \alpha) \text{ and } 0 \leq \beta \leq \min\left(\alpha 1, \left\lfloor \frac{n}{k} \right\rfloor \chi(k|n)\right).$

Then

$$t(n,k,2) = \sum_{e|d} \sum_{(\alpha,\beta)\in\mathfrak{I}_{e}} \left(\left\lfloor \frac{\lfloor \frac{n}{k} \rfloor - \chi(k|n) - \beta}{\alpha} \right\rfloor - \left\lceil \frac{max\left(1, \lceil \frac{n}{k} \rceil + \chi(k|n) - \alpha e\right) - \beta}{\alpha} \right\rceil + 1 \right).$$

Proof. Put e = gcd(m, k) and let $\alpha = \frac{m}{e}$, that is $1 \le \alpha \le \lfloor \frac{n-k}{e} \rfloor$ and $gcd(\alpha, \frac{k}{e}) = 1$. By Lemma 2, case (i), we can see that e divides d, and $n_2 \equiv \left(\frac{n}{e}\right) \left(\frac{k}{e}\right)^{-1} (mod \alpha)$. Let $0 \le \beta < \alpha$, such that $\beta \equiv \left(\frac{n}{e}\right) \left(\frac{k}{e}\right)^{-1} (mod \alpha)$. Then

$$n_2 = \beta + t\alpha, \ t \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Since $0 \le \beta < \alpha$ and $\beta \le n_2 > 0$, then $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 \le \beta \le \min\left(\alpha - 1, \left\lfloor \frac{n}{k} \right\rfloor - \chi(k|n)\right)$. It follows from Lemma 2, case (*ii*), that

$$max\left(1, \left\lceil \frac{n}{k} \right\rceil + \chi(k|n) - m\right) \le \beta + t\alpha \le \left\lfloor \frac{n}{k} \right\rfloor - \chi(k|n) \cdot$$

Finally, t(n, k, 2) equals the number of positive integers t, such that

$$\left\lceil \frac{\max\left(1, \left\lceil \frac{n}{k} \right\rceil + \chi(k|n) - m\right) - \beta}{\alpha} \right\rceil \le t \le \left\lfloor \frac{\left\lfloor \frac{n}{k} \right\rfloor - \chi(k|n) - \beta}{\alpha} \right\rfloor$$

This completes the proof.

Remark 4 One nice application of Theorem 3 concerns the following algorithm which allows us to generate all partitions of n using exactly two distinct sizes of parts.

```
Algorithm 1 Partitions into k parts with exactly two distinct sizes of parts
```

```
Require: k \ge 2, n \ge max\{k, 3\}
Ensure: Set of quadruple (n_1, a_1, n_2, a_2),
     d \leftarrow gcd(n,k)
     for each divisor e of d do
          for \alpha from 1 to \lfloor \frac{n-k}{e} \rfloor do
               if gcd\left(\alpha, \frac{k}{e}\right) = 1 then
                    \beta \leftarrow \left(\frac{n}{e}\right) \left(\frac{k}{e}\right)^{-1} (mod \ \alpha)
                    if \beta \leq \min\left(\alpha - 1, \left\lfloor \frac{n}{k} \right\rfloor - \chi(k|n)\right) then
                         t_1 \leftarrow \left\lceil \frac{\max\left(1, \left\lceil \frac{n}{k} \right\rceil + \chi(k|n) - \alpha e\right) - \beta}{\alpha} \right\rceil
                         t_2 \leftarrow \left\lfloor \frac{\left\lfloor \frac{n}{k} \right\rfloor - \chi(k|n) - \beta}{\alpha} \right\rfloor
                          for t from t_1 to t_2 do
                               n_2 \leftarrow \beta + t\alpha
                               n_1 \leftarrow \alpha e + n_2 \\ a_2 \leftarrow \left\lfloor \frac{n - n_1 k}{n_2 - n_1} \right\rfloor
                               a_1 \leftarrow k - a_2
                          end for
                     end if
                end if
          end for
     end for
```

This algorithm runs in O(n).

Example 2 Let n = 11 and k = 8, then d = gcd(11, 8) = 1. So, e = 1 is the only one divisor of d. The values of α that satisfies $1 \le \alpha \le 3$ and $gcd(\alpha, 8) = 1$ are 1 or 3.

1. For $\alpha = 1$, we get $\beta \equiv 11.8^{-1} \pmod{1} = 0$, which is $\leq \min(0, 1)$. The pair $(\alpha, \beta) = (1, 0)$ is then accepted and gives only one value of t:

$$t = \left\lfloor \frac{1-0}{1} \right\rfloor - \left\lceil \frac{\max(1,2-1) - 0}{1} \right\rceil + 1 = 1.$$

Therefore, we have only one partition corresponding to the pair $(\alpha, \beta) = (1, 0)$. By applying Algorithm 4, we get:

$$n_2 = 1, n_1 = 2, a_2 = 5 and a_1 = 3,$$

and thus the partition $(2^3 \ 1^5)$.

2. For $\alpha = 3$, we get $\beta = 1 \leq \min(2, 1)$, then the pair $(\alpha, \beta) = (3, 1)$ is accepted and gives the values:

 $t = 1, n_2 = 1, n_1 = 4, a_2 = 7 and a_1 = 1.$

Thus the associated partition is $(4^1 \ 1^7)$.

We get, finally

$$t(11, 8, 2) = 2.$$

Example 3 Let n = 22 and k = 8, then d = gcd(22, 8) = 2. So, we have two divisors of d, e = 1 and e = 2.

- Case1: e = 1. The values of α that satisfies $1 \le \alpha \le 14$ and $gcd(\alpha, 8) = 1$ are 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11 or 13.
 - 1. For $\alpha = 1$, we get $\beta = 0$. The pair (1,0) is accepted and gives the values:

$$t = 1, n_2 = 2, n_1 = 3, a_2 = 2 and a_1 = 6,$$

and then the partition $(3^6 \ 2^2)$.

2. For $\alpha = 3$, we get $\beta = 2$. The pair (3,2) is accepted and gives the values:

$$t = 1, n_2 = 2, n_1 = 5, a_2 = 6 and a_1 = 2$$

and then the partition $(5^2 \ 2^6)$.

- 3. For $\alpha = 5$, we get $\beta = 4 > min(4, 2)$, then the pair (5, 4) is rejected.
- 4. For $\alpha = 7$, we get $\beta = 1$. The pair (7,1) is accepted and gives the values:

$$t = 1, n_2 = 1, n_1 = 8, a_2 = 6 and a_1 = 2,$$

and then the partition $(8^2 \ 1^6)$.

- 5. For $\alpha = 9$, we get $\beta = 5 > min(8, 2)$, then the pair (9, 5) is rejected.
- 6. For $\alpha = 11$, we get $\beta = 3 > min(10, 2)$, then the pair (11, 3) is rejected.
- 7. For $\alpha = 13$, we have $\beta = 6 > min(13, 2)$, then the pair (13, 6) is rejected.
- *Case2*: e = 2.

The values of α that satisfies $1 \leq \alpha \leq 7$ and $gcd(\alpha, 8) = 1$ are 1, 3, 5 or 7.

1. For $\alpha = 1$, we have $\beta = 0$. The pair (1,0) is accepted and gives $1 \le t \le 2$. Applying Algorithm 4, we obtain two partitions corresponding to the pair (1,0); the first one is $(3^7 \ 1^1)$ for t = 1 and the second one is $(4^3 \ 2^5)$ for t = 2. 2. For $\alpha = 3$, we get $\beta = 2$. The pair (3,2) is accepted and gives the values:

$$t = 1, n_2 = 2, n_1 = 8, a_2 = 7 and a_1 = 1,$$

and then the partition $(8^1 \ 2^7)$.

- 3. For $\alpha = 5$, we get $\beta = 4 > min(4, 2)$, the pair (5, 4) is rejected.
- 4. For $\alpha = 7$, we get $\beta = 1$. The pair (7,1) is accepted and gives the values:

 $t = 1, n_2 = 1, n_1 = 15, a_2 = 7 and a_1 = 1,$

and then the partition $(15^1 \ 1^7)$.

We get, finally

$$t(22, 8, 2) = 7.$$

After having counting the number t(n, k, s), it would be of considerable interest to explore the number of partitions of n into k parts with exactly s distinct coprime sizes, which we denote by g(n, k, s). Thus, let set

$$g(n,s) = \sum_{k=s}^{\frac{2n-s(s-1)}{2}} g(n,k,s).$$
(6)

Theorem 5 For $k \ge s \ge 2$ and $n \ge \max\{k, \frac{s(s+1)}{2}\}$, we have

$$g(n,k,s) = \sum_{d|n} \mu\left(\frac{n}{d}\right) t(d,k,s), \tag{7}$$

where $\mu(.)$ denotes Möbius function.

Proof. Let T(n, k, s) be the set of partitions of n into k parts with s distinct sizes and G(n, k, s) the subset of the such partitions but with s distinct coprimes sizes. We notice that, the mapping from the set T(n, k, s) to $\bigcup_{d|n} G(d, k, s)$ defined by:

$$(n_1^{a_1} \ n_2^{a_2} \cdots \ n_s^{a_s}) \to \left(\left(\frac{n_1}{\delta} \right)^{a_1} \ \left(\frac{n_2}{\delta} \right)^{a_2} \cdots \ \left(\frac{n_s}{\delta} \right)^{a_s} \right),$$

is a bijection, where $\delta = gcd(n_1, n_2, \dots, n_s)$. Consequently, we have

$$t(n,k,s) = \sum_{d|n} g(d,k,s).$$
(8)

Hence, the result follows by using the Möbius inversion formula. ■

Remark 6 Since t(d, k, s) = 0 if $d < \max\left\{k, \frac{s(s+1)}{2}\right\}$, the summation in (7) can be extended only over all divisors d of n such that $\frac{n}{d} \ge \max\left\{k, \frac{s(s+1)}{2}\right\}$. For example, if we take n = 22 and k = 8, then

$$g(22, 8, 2) = \mu(2) t(11, 8, 2) + \mu(1) t(22, 8, 2),$$

and, according to Examples 2 and 3, we get g(22, 8, 2) = 7 - 2 = 5. These partitions are: $(3^7 \ 1^1), (3^6 \ 2^2), (5^2 \ 2^6), (8^2 \ 1^6)$ and $(15^1 \ 1^7)$.

| $n \backslash k$ | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | g(n,2) |
|------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----|------|-------|---------|-------|----------|-----|-----------|----|----|----|----|--------|
| 3 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 |
| 4 | 1 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2 |
| 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 5 |
| 6 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 5 |
| 7 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 11 |
| 8 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 11 |
| 9 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 16 |
| 10 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | 17 |
| 11 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 27 |
| 12 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | | 21 |
| 13 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | 37 |
| 14 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | 33 |
| 15 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | 38 |
| 16 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | | | | 42 |
| 17 | 8 | 8 | 5 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | | | 59 |
| 18 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | | 46 |
| 19 | 9 | 9 | 6 | 7 | 3 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | 71 |
| 20 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 57 |
| | - | | | | | , | Tab | le 1 | : g(r | n, k, 2 | 2), 2 | $\leq k$ | < n | ≤ 20 | | | | | • |

Using Theorems 5 and 3, we can construct the following table:

From identity (7) we can see that if $k \ge \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$, then t(n, k, 2) = g(n, k, 2). In the present theorem we present this observation in a more explicit form.

Theorem 7 For $n \ge \max\{3, k\}$ and $k \ge \max\{2, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor\}$, we have

$$t(n,k,2) = g(n,k,2) = \tau(n-k) - \chi(n=2k),$$

where $\tau(n)$ denotes the number of positive divisors of n and $\chi(n = 2k) = 1$ if n = 2k, 0 otherwise.

Proof. Let us first notice that if $k \ge 1 + \max\{2, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor\}$, then $k \ge \lceil \frac{n+1}{2} \rceil$, and by Identity (4) the result yields (see [3], Corollary 3). Let now $k = \max\{2, \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor\}$. Since the result is true for n = 3, we can assume $k = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$. Let $\pi = (n_1^{a_1} n_2^{a_2})$ be a partition of n into k parts with two distinct sizes. If n is even, then $n_2 = 1$, else $n > (a_1 + a_2) n_2 = k n_2 \ge 2 \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor = n$, a contradiction. Hence, $n - k = (n_1 - 1) a_1$, in which case $n_1 - 1$ divides n - k. So, for each divisor d of n - k, we get $n_1 = d + 1$, $a_1 = \frac{n-k}{d} > 0$ and $a_2 = k - \frac{n-k}{d} > 0$, except for d = 1, where $a_2 = k - \frac{n-k}{d} = 0$. Thus, the result yields.

Now, if n is odd, then $n_2 = 1$ or $(n_1, n_2) = (3, 2)$. Indeed, if $(n_2 = 2 \text{ and } n_1 \ge 4)$ or $(n_2 \ge 3)$, then $n > 3a_1 + 2a_2 = 2k + a_1 \ge 2 \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor + 1 = n$, a contradiction. In case of $n_2 = 1$, by the same argument above, we get for each divisor d of n - k, $n_1 = d + 1$, $a_1 = \frac{n-k}{d} > 0$ and $a_2 = k - \frac{n-k}{d} > 0$, except for d = 1, where $a_2 = k - \frac{n-k}{d} < 0$, which is completed by the partition $(3^{n-2k} 2^{3k-n})$. This completes the proof.

Remark 8 As shown in the proof above, the t(n, k, 2)'s partitions have been generated explicitly.

Acknowledgements

This research was partly supported by L'IFORCE Laboratory.

References

- T. M. Apostol, Introduction to Analytic Number Theory. Springer-Verlag, New York (1976).
- [2] G. E. Andrews and K. Eriksson, *Integer Partitions*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2004).
- [3] N.B. Tani and S. Bouroubi, Enumeration of the partitions of an integer into parts of a specified number of different sizes and especially two sizes, Journal of Integer Sequences, 14, Article 11.3.6 (2011).
- [4] A. Charalambos Charalambides, *Enumerative Combinatorics*, Chapman & Hall/CRC (2002).
- [5] L. Comtet, Advanced Combinatorics, pp. 133–175. D. Reidel Publishing Company, Dordrecht-Holland, Boston, (1974).
- [6] E. Knobloch, Leibniz on combinatorics, pp. 409–430. Historia Math, 1 (1974).

- [7] P. A. MacMahon, Divisors of numbers and their continuations in the theory of partitions, Proc. London Math. Soc., 2, pp. 75–113 (1919).
- [8] OEIS : The online Encyclopedia of Integer sequences. Published electronically at http://oeis.org, (2008).
- [9] I. Pak, Partition bijections, a survey, Ramanujan Journal, 12, 5–75 (2006).
- [10] H. Rademacher, On the partition function p(n), Proc. London, Math. Soc., 43, 241–254 (1937).
- [11] H. S. Wilf, Lectures on integer partitions, unpublished, http://cis.upenn. edu / wilf.