

Considering a Classical Upper Bound on the Frobenius Number

¹Aled Williams Daiki Haijima

¹Department of Mathematics
London School of Economics and Political Science
London, UK

¹a.e.williams1@lse.ac.uk

Abstract

In this paper we study the (classical) Frobenius problem, namely the problem of finding the largest integer that cannot be represented as a nonnegative integral combination of given relatively prime (strictly) positive integers (known as the Frobenius number). The main contribution of this paper are observations regarding a previously known upper bound on the Frobenius number where, in particular, we observe that a previously presented argument features a subtle error, which alters the value of the upper bound. Despite this, we demonstrate that the subtle error does not impact upon on the validity of the upper bound, although it does impact on the upper bounds tightness. Notably, we formally state the corrected result and additionally compare the relative tightness of the corrected upper bound with the original. In particular, we show that the updated bound is tighter in all but only a relatively “small” number of cases using both formal techniques and via Monte Carlo simulation techniques.

1 Introduction

Let \mathbf{a} be a positive integral n -dimensional primitive vector, i.e. $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)^T \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^n$ with $\gcd(\mathbf{a}) := \gcd(a_1, \dots, a_n) = 1$. In what follows, we exclude the case $n = 1$ and assume that the dimension $n \geq 2$. In particular, without loss of generality, we assume the following conditions:

$$\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)^T \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^n, n \geq 2 \text{ and } \gcd(\mathbf{a}) := \gcd(a_1, \dots, a_n) = 1. \quad (1)$$

The *Frobenius number* of \mathbf{a} , denoted by $F(\mathbf{a})$, is the largest integer that cannot be represented as a nonnegative integral combination of the a_i 's, i.e.

$$F(\mathbf{a}) := \max \{b \in \mathbb{Z} : b \neq \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{z} \text{ for all } \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n\},$$

where \mathbf{a}^T denotes the transpose of \mathbf{a} . It should be noted for completeness that the Frobenius problem, namely the problem of finding the Frobenius number, is also known by other names within the literature including the money-changing problem (or the money-changing problem of Frobenius, or the coin-exchange problem of Frobenius) [17, 15, 3], the coin problem (or the Frobenius coin problem) [4, 13] and the Diophantine problem of Frobenius [12, 10]. From a geometric viewpoint, $F(\mathbf{a})$ is the maximal right-hand side such that the *knapsack polytope*

$$P(\mathbf{a}, b) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n : \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{x} = b\}$$

does not contain integral points. It should be noted that (1) is indeed a necessary and sufficient condition for the existence of the Frobenius number.

Note that instead of the conditions (1), some authors instead assume the stronger condition that all the entries of the vector are pairwise coprime, i.e.

$$\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)^T \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^n, n \geq 2 \text{ and } \gcd(a_i, a_j) = 1 \text{ for any } i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\} \text{ with } i \neq j. \quad (2)$$

It should be noted that not all integral vectors satisfying (1) also satisfy the stronger conditions (2), say the vector $\mathbf{a} = (6, 10, 15)^T$ for example.

There is a very rich history on Frobenius numbers and the book [1] provides a very good survey of the problem. It is worth noting that computing the Frobenius number in general is \mathcal{NP} -hard [9] (which was proved via a reduction to the integer knapsack problem), however, if the number of integers n is fixed, then a polynomial time algorithm to calculate $F(\mathbf{a})$ exists [8]. If $n = 2$, it is well-known (most likely due to Sylvester [14]) that

$$\begin{aligned} F(a_1, a_2) &= a_1 a_2 - a_1 - a_2 \\ &= (a_1 - 1)(a_2 - 1) - 1. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

In contrast to the case when $n = 2$, it was shown by Curtis [5] that no closed formula exists for the Frobenius number if $n > 2$. In light of this, there has been a great deal of research into producing upper bounds on $F(\mathbf{a})$. These bounds share the property that in the worst-case they are of quadratic order with respect to the maximum absolute valued entry of \mathbf{a} , which will be denoted by $\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty$. Further, let $\|\cdot\|_2$ denote the Euclidean norm. In particular, upon assuming that $a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \dots \leq a_n$ holds, such bounds include the classical bound by Erdős and Graham [6, Theorem 1]

$$F(\mathbf{a}) \leq 2a_{n-1} \left\lfloor \frac{a_n}{n} \right\rfloor - a_n,$$

by Selmer [12]

$$F(\mathbf{a}) \leq 2a_n \left\lfloor \frac{a_1}{n} \right\rfloor - a_1,$$

by Vitek [16, Theorem 5]

$$F(\mathbf{a}) \leq \frac{1}{2}(a_2 - 1)(a_n - 2) - 1,$$

by Beck et al. [2, Theorem 9]

$$F(\mathbf{a}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{a_1 a_2 a_3 (a_1 + a_2 + a_3)} - a_1 - a_2 - a_3 \right),$$

and by Fukshansky and Robins [7, Equation 29]

$$F(\mathbf{a}) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{(n-1)^2 \Gamma(\frac{n+1}{2})}{\pi^{(n-1)/2}} \sum_{i=1}^n a_i \sqrt{\|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2 - a_i^2 + 1} \right\rfloor,$$

where $\Gamma(\cdot)$ and $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ denote Euler's gamma and the standard floor functions, respectively.

2 Preliminary and Auxiliary Results

In this section, we present some preliminary results that are essential for establishing a requirement for upper bounds on $F(\mathbf{a})$ when the more general conditions (1) on \mathbf{a} hold. In particular, this requirement is induced via a simple lower bound which considers the parity of the a_i 's and is formally introduced below.

Proposition 1. *If an integral vector \mathbf{a} satisfies (1), then at least one a_i must be odd for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.*

Proof. Suppose for contradiction there does not exist an odd a_i , i.e. that \mathbf{a} has only even elements. It follows immediately that $\gcd(\mathbf{a}) \geq 2$, which contradicts the assumed conditions (1) as required. \square

Denote by $o_t := o_t(\mathbf{a})$ the t -th smallest odd element in \mathbf{a} . Observe that Proposition 1 implies that o_1 necessarily exists for any integral vector \mathbf{a} satisfying (1).

Proposition 2. *If an integral vector \mathbf{a} satisfies (1), then $o_1 - 2$ is a lower bound for $F(\mathbf{a})$.*

Proof. Firstly, observe that since o_1 is the smallest odd element in \mathbf{a} , it follows that any odd number strictly less than o_1 cannot be expressed as $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i$ for $x_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. In particular, $o_1 - 2$ cannot be expressed as a nonnegative integral linear combination of the a_i 's. Thus, the Frobenius number $F(\mathbf{a})$ is at least $o_1 - 2$ as required. \square

The propositions outlined can be applied to establish a requirement for upper bounds on the Frobenius number, particularly where the weaker conditions (1) concerning the vector \mathbf{a} are met.

Lemma 1. *If an integral vector $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)^T$ satisfies (1) with $a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \dots \leq a_n$, then any general upper bound on the Frobenius number $F(\mathbf{a})$ must inherently depend on the largest element a_n .*

Proof. Let us suppose for simplicity that the vector \mathbf{a} has the form that a_i is even for each $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-1\}$ while the final entry a_n is odd. Notice that here $o_1 = a_n$ and, in light of Proposition 2, it immediately follows that $F(\mathbf{a}) \geq a_n - 2$.

Suppose for contradiction that there exists an upper bound on $F(\mathbf{a})$ that does not depend on a_n , i.e. that there exists some function $f : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $F(\mathbf{a}) \leq f(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{n-1})$. If we set $a_n = f(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{n-1}) + 3$ if $f(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{n-1})$ is even and $a_n = f(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{n-1}) + 4$ if $f(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{n-1})$ is odd, then observe that $a_n - 2 > f(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{n-1})$ holds. In particular, notice that the lower bound on the Frobenius number is strictly larger than the (assumed) upper bound, which is a contradiction as required. \square

It should be emphasised that this result suggests that any (general) upper bound on the Frobenius number which does not depend on the maximal entry of \mathbf{a} does not necessarily hold in general without stronger assumptions than the conditions (1).

The following results provide a rather surprisingly useful property that holds when \mathbf{a} satisfies the stronger conditions (2) that all the entries of the vector are pairwise coprime.

Lemma 2. *If an integral vector $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)^T$ satisfies (2), then for any $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ with $i \neq j$ we have*

$$F(\mathbf{a}) \leq (a_i - 1)(a_j - 1) - 1.$$

Proof. Firstly, notice that given any pair a_i and a_j with $i \neq j$ that in light of the conditions (2) it follows that $\gcd(a_i, a_j) = 1$. Thus, the Frobenius number $F(a_i, a_j)$ corresponding to the pair a_i and a_j exists and takes finite value. Furthermore, it follows in light of (3) that the equality

$$F(a_i, a_j) = (a_i - 1)(a_j - 1) - 1$$

holds. By the definition of Frobenius number, we deduce that all integers strictly greater than $(a_i - 1)(a_j - 1) - 1$ can be expressed as $a_i x_i + a_j x_j$ for some $x_i, x_j \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Thus, it immediately follows that all integers strictly greater than $(a_i - 1)(a_j - 1) - 1$ can be expressed as $\sum_{k=1}^n a_k x_k$ for $x_k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ (upon setting $x_k = 0$ when $k \neq i, j$ whenever necessary). In particular, this shows that the Frobenius number $F(\mathbf{a})$ satisfies the inequality $F(\mathbf{a}) \leq (a_i - 1)(a_j - 1) - 1$ for any $i \neq j$ as required. \square

The following corollary follows immediately from Lemma 2.

Corollary 1. *If an integral vector $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)^T$ satisfies (2) and $a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \dots \leq a_n$, then*

$$F(\mathbf{a}) \leq (a_1 - 1)(a_2 - 1) - 1.$$

It should be emphasised that the above results tell us that the well-known result (3) of Sylvester [14] extends naturally to provide an upper bound for the Frobenius number $F(\mathbf{a})$ under the (stronger) assumption (2) that the entries of the vector \mathbf{a} are pairwise coprime.

3 Observations on a Previously Known Upper Bound

Recall that Beck et al. [2, Theorem 9] introduced the upper bound

$$F(\mathbf{a}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{a_1 a_2 a_3 (a_1 + a_2 + a_3)} - a_1 - a_2 - a_3 \right) \quad (4)$$

on the Frobenius number upon finding bounds for Fourier-Dedekind sums. This bound (4) is widely referenced across books and papers, however, in most of these little attention is given to the underlying assumed conditions on \mathbf{a} . In particular, the upper bound (4) necessitates that the stronger conditions (2) hold, instead of the more general (weaker) conditions (1).

Proposition 3. *The upper bound (4) of Beck et al. [2, Theorem 9] does not necessarily hold unless the stronger conditions (2) hold. This requirement remains even if the weaker conditions (1) are met.*

Proof. Observe that if $n = 2$, then the stronger (2) and weaker conditions (1) are equivalent. Thus, we focus here only on the case that $n \geq 3$, where we show there are counterexamples for each n .

Let us consider two cases, namely $n = 3$ and $n \geq 4$, respectively. If $n = 3$, then consider the integer vector $\mathbf{a} = (3, 6, 19)^T$ with $F(\mathbf{a}) = 35$. In such case, notice that the bound (4) yields

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{3 \cdot 6 \cdot 19 (3 + 6 + 19)} - 3 - 6 - 19 \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left(6\sqrt{266} - 28 \right) \approx 34.928519$$

where, in particular, $35 \not\leq 34.928519$ and hence the upper bound (4) fails when $n = 3$. If instead $n \geq 4$, then in light of Lemma 1 clearly (4) cannot be a general upper bound for the Frobenius number. \square

Note that in the case $n \geq 4$, any vector $\mathbf{a} = (2, 4, 6, a_4, \dots, a_n)^T$ satisfying (1) and $a_n \geq \dots \geq a_4 > 7$ provides a counterexample for any n . Indeed, since $a_4 > 7$ by assumption, the Frobenius number is clearly greater than or equal to 7 (since 7 cannot be expressed by $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i x_i$ for $x_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ for all i). Despite this, the bound (4) yields

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{2 \cdot 4 \cdot 6 (2 + 4 + 6)} - 2 - 4 - 6 \right) = 6,$$

which demonstrates the upper bound (4) does not necessarily hold if only the weaker conditions (1) are met.

The remarks presented in this section are intended to clarify a common misunderstanding about the upper bound (4) as referenced in various books and papers. Furthermore, it is crucial to highlight a subtle error in the argument presented by Beck et al. [2], which alters the value of the upper bound. The following result states the corrected upper bound, where the proof is outlined in a later section.

Theorem 1. *If an integral vector $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)^T$ satisfies (2) with $a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \dots \leq a_n$, then the argument of Beck et al. [2] yields*

$$F(\mathbf{a}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{3} (a_1 + a_2 + a_3) (a_1 + a_2 + a_3 + 2a_1 a_2 a_3) + \frac{8}{3} (a_1 a_2 + a_2 a_3 + a_3 a_1) - a_1 - a_2 - a_3} \right). \quad (5)$$

It is natural to consider if the original bound (4) given by Beck et al. [2, Theorem 9] is indeed correct provided the integral vector \mathbf{a} satisfies the stronger conditions (2). It turns out that the upper bound (4) remains valid. The following result states this formally, where the proof is outlined in a later section.

Theorem 2. *If an integral vector $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)^T$ satisfies (2) with $a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \dots \leq a_n$, then*

$$F(\mathbf{a}) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{a_1 a_2 a_3 (a_1 + a_2 + a_3)} - a_1 - a_2 - a_3 \right).$$

Furthermore, it is natural to consider the relative tightness of (1) with (4). This comparison will be explored in the subsequent section of the paper.

4 Tightness Comparison of Upper Bounds

In this section, we consider the relative tightness of the upper bounds (1) and (4). In particular, to slightly simplify notation, let us denote by

$$\begin{aligned} UB_1(\mathbf{a}) &= UB_1(a_1, a_2, a_3) \\ &:= \frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{3} (a_1 + a_2 + a_3) (a_1 + a_2 + a_3 + 2a_1 a_2 a_3)} + \frac{8}{3} (a_1 a_2 + a_2 a_3 + a_3 a_1) - a_1 - a_2 - a_3 \right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$UB_2(\mathbf{a}) = UB_2(a_1, a_2, a_3) := \frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{a_1 a_2 a_3 (a_1 + a_2 + a_3)} - a_1 - a_2 - a_3 \right).$$

Recall that Theorem 1 and 2 imply that $UB_1(\mathbf{a})$ and $UB_2(\mathbf{a})$ are valid upper bounds provided \mathbf{a} satisfies (2) and $a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \dots \leq a_n$, however, we instead are interested in which bound is tighter. The first result of this section shows that $UB_2(\mathbf{a})$ is tighter than $UB_1(\mathbf{a})$ is only a relatively “small” (finite) number of cases, where the proof is excluded given this was completed via simple enumeration.


Theorem 3. *If an integral vector $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)^T$ satisfies (2) with $a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \dots \leq a_n$, then $F(\mathbf{a})$ satisfies $F(\mathbf{a}) \leq UB_1(\mathbf{a})$ and $F(\mathbf{a}) \leq UB_2(\mathbf{a})$, where $UB_2(\mathbf{a})$ is sharper only when*

$$\begin{aligned} (a_1, a_2, a_3) \in \{ &(1, 2, 3), (1, 2, 5), (1, 2, 7), (1, 2, 9), (1, 2, 11), (1, 2, 13), (1, 2, 15), \\ &(1, 2, 17), (1, 2, 19), (1, 2, 21), (1, 2, 23), (1, 2, 25), (1, 3, 4), (1, 3, 5), \\ &(1, 3, 7), (1, 3, 8), (1, 3, 10), (1, 3, 11), (1, 3, 13), (1, 3, 14), (1, 4, 5), \\ &(1, 4, 7), (1, 4, 9), (1, 4, 11), (1, 5, 6), (1, 5, 7), (1, 5, 8), (1, 5, 9), (1, 6, 7), (2, 3, 5) \}. \end{aligned}$$


It should be emphasised that this result suggests that in “almost all” cases, $UB_1(\mathbf{a})$ provides a tighter bound than $UB_2(\mathbf{a})$. In order to compare the relative tightness of the bounds, for completeness, we apply Monte Carlo simulation techniques (see e.g. [11, Chapter 2]) and present the results below.

During this simulation, we firstly randomly generate integral vectors \mathbf{a} satisfying the conditions (2) with ordering $a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \dots \leq a_n$, before computing the values of $UB_1(\mathbf{a})$ and $UB_2(\mathbf{a})$. This process is iteratively


repeated 100,000 times. During the sampling, we set $\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty = \max_i |a_i| \leq 1000$ for convenience. Note that in each graph in Figure 1, the vertical axis corresponds to the difference $UB_1(\mathbf{a}) - UB_2(\mathbf{a})$, where a large vertical value illustrates that the corrected upper bound (5) is much tighter than the originally stated bound (4).




(a) $UB_1(\mathbf{a}) - UB_2(\mathbf{a})$ upon increasing a_3 .



(b) $UB_1(\mathbf{a}) - UB_2(\mathbf{a})$ upon increasing $a_1 a_2$.



(c) $UB_1(\mathbf{a}) - UB_2(\mathbf{a})$ upon increasing $a_1 a_2 a_3$.



(d) $UB_1(\mathbf{a}) - UB_2(\mathbf{a})$ upon increasing $a_1 + a_2 + a_3$.

Figure 1: This figure illustrates how the difference $UB_1(\mathbf{a}) - UB_2(\mathbf{a})$ varies dependent upon the a_i 's.

Figure 1a demonstrates the difference $UB_1(\mathbf{a}) - UB_2(\mathbf{a})$ grows rapidly with increases in a_3 , while the difference remains small if a_3 is small. It should be emphasised that one would not expect the difference to be significant when a_3 is small given that the entries of \mathbf{a} are ordered by assumption. Figure 1b shows how this differences varies upon increases in $a_1 a_2$. Notably, the figure suggests that the minimum difference increases linearly with $a_1 a_2$, whereas the maximum difference seems to grow sublinearly with $a_1 a_2$. Furthermore, if $a_1 a_2$ is large (around 1,000,000), then the variance of the difference $UB_1(\mathbf{a}) - UB_2(\mathbf{a})$ appears small. This can be

explained by considering the difference

$$UB_1(\mathbf{a}) - UB_2(\mathbf{a}) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{a_1 a_2 a_3 (a_1 + a_2 + a_3)} - \sqrt{\frac{1}{3} a_1 a_2 a_3 (a_1 + a_2 + a_3) + (a_1 + a_2 + a_3)^2 + \frac{8}{3} (a_1 a_2 + a_2 a_3 + a_3 a_1)} \right),$$

which is maximised for fixed $a_1 a_2$ when a_3 is large and is minimised when a_3 is small. In particular, note that if a_3 is small, then the assumed ordering implies that $a_3 \approx a_2$. In such case, the value of the difference can be well approximated by

$$\frac{1}{2} a_1 a_2 \left(\sqrt{3} - \sqrt{2 + \frac{11}{a_1 a_2}} \right),$$

which grows roughly linearly. If instead $a_1 a_2$ is large (say around 1,000,000), then the assumed ordering and upper bound on the a_i 's restricts variance in both $UB_1(\mathbf{a})$ and $UB_2(\mathbf{a})$, respectively. Figure 1c demonstrates the difference $UB_1(\mathbf{a}) - UB_2(\mathbf{a})$ grows sublinearly with the product $a_1 a_2 a_3$, while the variance once more appears small, which can be similarly explained via careful algebraic analysis. Figure 1d shows how this difference varies upon increases in $a_1 + a_2 + a_3$, where the variance decreases significantly as the value of $a_1 + a_2 + a_3$ grows beyond 2000. Notably, the final figure suggests that one should expect the difference $UB_1(\mathbf{a}) - UB_2(\mathbf{a})$ to be small only in the scenario that a_1 is “reasonably small”, which follows in light of the assumed ordering.

5 Proof of Theorem 1

In this section, we follow closely the argument presented by Beck et al. [2, Theorem 9] to demonstrate that it actually yields the upper bound (5) instead of (4). It should be noted that the proof presented by Beck et al. [2] instead provides an upper bound for

$$\begin{aligned} F^*(\mathbf{a}) &:= \max \{ b \in \mathbb{Z} : b \neq \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{z} \text{ for all } \mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^n \} \\ &= F(\mathbf{a}) + a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_n, \end{aligned}$$

which is the largest integer that cannot be represented as a (strictly) positive integral combination of the a_i 's.

Let $A = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n\}$ be a set of pairwise coprime positive integers and

$$p'_A(b) = \# \left\{ (m_1, \dots, m_n) \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^n : \sum_{k=1}^n m_k a_k = b \right\},$$

where notice that $F^*(\mathbf{a})$ is simply the largest value for b for which $p'_A(b) = 0$.

Let $c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n \in \mathbb{Z}$ be relatively prime to $c \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $t \in \mathbb{Z}$. We define the Fourier–Dedekind sum as

$$\sigma_t(c_1, \dots, c_n; c) = \frac{1}{c} \sum_{\lambda^c = 1 \neq \lambda} \frac{\lambda^t}{(\lambda^{c_1} - 1) \dots (\lambda^{c_n} - 1)}.$$

Note that one particularly noteworthy expression (which follows by periodicity) [2] is

$$\sigma_t(a, b; c) = \sum_{m=0}^{c-1} \left(\left(\frac{-a^{-1}(bm+t)}{c} \right) \right) \left(\left(\frac{m}{c} \right) \right) - \frac{1}{4c} \quad (6)$$

with $aa^{-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{c}$ and where $((x)) = x - [x] - \frac{1}{2}$ is a sawtooth function.

Proof. Firstly, note that it is easy to verify that

$$F^*(\mathbf{a}) = F^*(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) \leq F^*(a_1, a_2, a_3) + a_3 + a_4 + \dots + a_n.$$

We closely follow [2] by focusing on the case where $n = 3$ and the a_i 's are pairwise coprime. In order to slightly simplify notation, let a, b, c denote pairwise relatively prime positive integers. Upon using the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality we find

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_t(a, b; c) &\geq - \sum_{m=0}^{c-1} \left(\left(\frac{m}{c} \right) \right)^2 - \frac{1}{4c} = \sum_{m=0}^{c-1} \left(\frac{m}{c} - \frac{1}{2} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{4c} \\ &= - \frac{1(2c-1)(c-1)c}{c^2} + \frac{1}{c} \frac{c(c-1)}{2} - \frac{c}{4} - \frac{1}{4c} \\ &= - \frac{c}{12} - \frac{5}{12c}. \end{aligned}$$

It should be noted that in [2], the right-hand side of the expression previously discussed differs from the one presented here. We can now utilise the above inequality to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} p'_{\{a,b,c\}}(t) &\geq \frac{t^2}{2abc} - \frac{t}{2} \left(\frac{1}{ab} + \frac{1}{ac} + \frac{1}{bc} \right) + \frac{1}{12} \left(\frac{3}{a} + \frac{3}{b} + \frac{3}{c} + \frac{a}{bc} + \frac{b}{ac} + \frac{c}{ab} \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{12}(a+b+c) - \frac{5}{12} \left(\frac{1}{a} + \frac{1}{b} + \frac{1}{c} \right) \\ &= \frac{t^2}{2abc} - \frac{t}{2} \left(\frac{1}{ab} + \frac{1}{ac} + \frac{1}{bc} \right) + \frac{1}{12} \left(\frac{a}{bc} + \frac{b}{ac} + \frac{c}{ab} \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{12}(a+b+c) - \frac{1}{6} \left(\frac{1}{a} + \frac{1}{b} + \frac{1}{c} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which upon algebraic manipulation yields the upper bound

$$F^*(a, b, c) \leq \frac{1}{2}(a+b+c) + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}(a+b+c)(a+b+c+2abc) + \frac{3}{8}(ab+bc+ca)}$$

Thus, upon replacing a, b and c with a_1, a_2 and a_3 , respectively, we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} F^*(\mathbf{a}) &\leq F^*(a_1, a_2, a_3) + a_3 + a_4 + \dots + a_n \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}(a_1 + a_2 + a_3)(a_1 + a_2 + a_3 + 2a_1a_2a_3) + \frac{8}{3}(a_1a_2 + a_2a_3 + a_3a_1) + a_1 + a_2 + a_3} \right) \\ &\quad + a_3 + a_4 + \dots + a_n \end{aligned}$$

which yields that

$$\begin{aligned} F(\mathbf{a}) &= F^*(\mathbf{a}) - a_1 - a_2 - \dots - a_n \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}(a_1 + a_2 + a_3)(a_1 + a_2 + a_3 + 2a_1a_2a_3) + \frac{8}{3}(a_1a_2 + a_2a_3 + a_3a_1) - a_1 - a_2 - a_3} \right) \end{aligned}$$

as required, which concludes the proof. \square

6 Proof of Theorem 2

Recall the notation

$$UB_1(\mathbf{a}) := \frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{3} (a_1 + a_2 + a_3) (a_1 + a_2 + a_3 + 2a_1a_2a_3)} + \frac{8}{3} (a_1a_2 + a_2a_3 + a_3a_1) - a_1 - a_2 - a_3 \right)$$

and

$$UB_2(\mathbf{a}) := \frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{a_1a_2a_3 (a_1 + a_2 + a_3)} - a_1 - a_2 - a_3 \right).$$

In this section, we show that $UB_2(\mathbf{a})$ is a valid upper bound on the Frobenius number $F(\mathbf{a})$ provided \mathbf{a} satisfies (2) and $a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \dots \leq a_n$. It should be noted that the stronger condition (2) with the (assumed) ordering of the a_i 's implies that $a_1 < a_2 < \dots < a_n$ provided that $a_1 > 1$. Before discussing the correctness of the upper bound $UB_2(\mathbf{a})$, we firstly consider how this bound varies with changes in a_3 .

Proposition 4. *If $a_1 < a_2 < a_3$, then $UB_2(\mathbf{a})$ is a strictly increasing function in a_3 . If instead $a_1 \leq a_2 \leq a_3$ holds, then $UB_2(\mathbf{a})$ is a nondecreasing function in a_3 .*

Proof. Upon partial differentiation with respect to a_3 , observe that $UB_2(\mathbf{a})$ becomes

$$\frac{\partial UB_2(\mathbf{a})}{\partial a_3} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{a_1a_2 (a_1 + a_2 + 2a_3)}{2\sqrt{a_1a_2a_3 (a_1 + a_2 + a_3)}} - 1 \right).$$

If $a_1 < a_2 < a_3$, then note that $a_1a_2 (a_1 + a_2 + 2a_3) > 4a_3$ holds. Upon simple algebraic manipulation, we deduce that $a_1^2a_2^2 (a_1 + a_2 + 2a_3)^2 > 4a_1a_2a_3 (a_1 + a_2 + a_3)$, which implies that

$$\frac{a_1a_2 (a_1 + a_2 + 2a_3)}{2\sqrt{a_1a_2a_3 (a_1 + a_2 + a_3)}} > 1.$$

It follows that $\frac{\partial UB_2(\mathbf{a})}{\partial a_3} > 0$ and hence $UB_2(\mathbf{a})$ is a strictly increasing function in a_3 when $a_1 < a_2 < a_3$. If instead $a_1 \leq a_2 \leq a_3$, then a similar argument yields that $\frac{\partial UB_2(\mathbf{a})}{\partial a_3} \geq 0$ and hence $UB_2(\mathbf{a})$ is a nondecreasing function in a_3 as required. \square

We now proceed to present a detailed proof to establish the validity of Theorem 2.

Proof. Observe that if $UB_2(\mathbf{a}) \geq UB_1(\mathbf{a})$, then clearly the upper bound $UB_2(\mathbf{a})$ is valid in consequence to the validity of Theorem 1. Thus, we consider only the setting where $UB_2(\mathbf{a}) < UB_1(\mathbf{a})$. Notice that upon simple algebraic manipulation the inequality $UB_2(\mathbf{a}) \leq UB_1(\mathbf{a})$ is equivalent to

$$a_1a_2a_3 (a_1 + a_2 + a_3) \leq a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_3^2 + 10(a_1a_2 + a_2a_3 + a_1a_3). \quad (7)$$

It is sufficient to here consider only the case that $a_1 < a_2 < a_3$. In particular, this follows because otherwise we require $a_1 = 1$ in light of the assumed conditions (2) and hence, in such case, we yield that $F(\mathbf{a}) = -1 \leq UB_2(\mathbf{a})$ holds as required.

In order to satisfy (7), the (strict) inequality $a_1 a_2 < 33$ is necessary. Indeed, if instead $a_1 a_2 \geq 33$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
a_1 a_2 a_3 (a_1 + a_2 + a_3) &= a_1 a_2 a_3^2 + a_1 a_2 a_3 (a_1 + a_2) \\
&> a_1 a_2 a_3^2 \\
&\geq 33 a_3^2 \\
&= 3 a_3^2 + 10(a_3^2 + a_3^2 + a_3^2) \\
&> a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_3^2 + 10(a_1 a_2 + a_2 a_3 + a_1 a_3)
\end{aligned}$$

holds, where the final inequality follows since $a_1, a_2 < a_3$. Thus, we need only to consider the cases that $a_1 a_2 \leq 32$ and $a_1 < a_2$ with $\gcd(a_1, a_2) = 1$. The pairs (a_1, a_2) satisfying these conditions are:

- (i) if $a_1 = 1$, then $(a_1, a_2) = (1, 2), (1, 3), \dots, (1, 31), (1, 32)$,
- (ii) if $a_1 = 2$, then $(a_1, a_2) = (2, 3), (2, 5), (2, 7), (2, 9), (2, 11), (2, 13), (2, 15)$,
- (iii) if $a_1 = 3$, then $(a_1, a_2) = (3, 4), (3, 5), (3, 7), (3, 8), (3, 10)$,
- (iv) if $a_1 = 4$, then $(a_1, a_2) = (4, 5), (4, 7)$, and
- (v) if $a_1 = 5$, then $(a_1, a_2) = (5, 6)$.

It should be emphasised that if $UB_2(\mathbf{a})$ is a valid upper bound in each of the above cases, then it follows that $UB_2(\mathbf{a})$ is a valid upper bound as required. In order to complete the proof we now consider each of these cases in turn. It should be noted that cases (ii) - (v) use the properties $F(\mathbf{a}) \leq (a_1 - 1)(a_2 - 1) - 1$ (which follows by Corollary 1) and $UB(a_1, a_2, a'_3) > UB(a_1, a_2, a_3)$ when $a'_3 > a_3$ (which follows by Proposition 4).

- (i) $a_1 = 1$: In this case, notice that since the entries of the vector \mathbf{a} are coprime by assumption, it follows that we have $a_2 \geq 2$ and $a_3 \geq 3$. Note that we have $(a_2 - 1)(a_3 - 1) \geq 2$ and $a_2 a_3 \geq 1 + a_2 + a_3$. These inequalities imply that

$$a_2 a_3 (1 + a_2 + a_3) \geq (1 + a_2 + a_3)^2$$

which, upon rearranging algebraically, yields that

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{a_2 a_3 (1 + a_2 + a_3)} - (1 + a_2 + a_3) \right) = UB_2(1, a_2, a_3, \dots, a_n) \geq 0.$$

Finally, observe that the equality $F(1, a_2, a_3, \dots, a_n) = -1$ holds for all a_2, a_3, \dots, a_n and, thus, $UB_2(\mathbf{a})$ is a valid upper bound in this scenario.

- (ii) $a_1 = 2$: In this case, notice that

$$F(2, 3, a_3, a_4, \dots, a_n) \leq (2 - 1)(3 - 1) - 1 = 1 < 3.660254 = UB_2(2, 3, 5) \leq UB_2(2, 3, 5),$$

where the strict inequality follows since if $(a_1, a_2) = (2, 3)$, then $a_3 \geq 5$ by the conditions (2). In a similar fashion, notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
F(2, 5, a_3, a_4, \dots, a_n) &\leq (2-1)(5-1) - 1 = 3 < 8.652476 = UB_2(2, 5, 7) \leq UB_2(2, 5, a_3), \\
F(2, 7, a_3, a_4, \dots, a_n) &\leq (2-1)(7-1) - 1 = 5 < 14.811762 = UB_2(2, 7, 9) \leq UB_2(2, 7, a_3), \\
F(2, 9, a_3, a_4, \dots, a_n) &\leq (2-1)(9-1) - 1 = 7 < 22 = UB_2(2, 9, 11) \leq UB_2(2, 9, a_3), \\
F(2, 11, a_3, a_4, \dots, a_n) &\leq (2-1)(11-1) - 1 = 9 < 30.116122 = UB_2(2, 11, 13) \leq UB_2(2, 11, a_3), \\
F(2, 13, a_3, a_4, \dots, a_n) &\leq (2-1)(13-1) - 1 = 11 < 39.083269 = UB_2(2, 13, 15) \leq UB_2(2, 13, a_3), \\
F(2, 15, a_3, a_4, \dots, a_n) &\leq (2-1)(15-1) - 1 = 13 < 48.8407169 = UB_2(2, 15, 17) \leq UB_2(2, 15, a_3).
\end{aligned}$$

(iii) $a_1 = 3$: In this case, notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
F(3, 4, a_3, a_4, \dots, a_n) &\leq (3-1)(4-1) - 1 = 5 < 7.416408 = UB_2(3, 4, 5) \leq UB_2(3, 4, a_3), \\
F(3, 5, a_3, a_4, \dots, a_n) &\leq (3-1)(5-1) - 1 = 9 < 12.343135 = UB_2(3, 5, 7) \leq UB_2(3, 5, a_3), \\
F(3, 7, a_3, a_4, \dots, a_n) &\leq (3-1)(7-1) - 1 = 11 < 18.495454 = UB_2(3, 7, 8) \leq UB_2(3, 7, a_3), \\
F(3, 8, a_3, a_4, \dots, a_n) &\leq (3-1)(8-1) - 1 = 13 < 27.105118 = UB_2(3, 8, 11) \leq UB_2(3, 8, a_3), \\
F(3, 10, a_3, a_4, \dots, a_n) &\leq (3-1)(10-1) - 1 = 17 < 32.497191 = UB_2(3, 10, 11) \leq UB_2(3, 10, a_3).
\end{aligned}$$

(iv) $a_1 = 4$: In this case, notice that

$$\begin{aligned}
F(4, 5, a_3, a_4, \dots, a_n) &\leq (4-1)(5-1) - 1 = 11 < 15.6643191 = UB_2(4, 5, 7) \leq UB_2(4, 5, a_3), \\
F(4, 7, a_3, a_4, \dots, a_n) &\leq (4-1)(7-1) - 1 = 17 < 25.496479 = UB_2(4, 7, 9) \leq UB_2(4, 7, a_3).
\end{aligned}$$

(v) $a_1 = 5$: In this case, notice that

$$F(5, 6, a_3, a_4, \dots, a_n) \leq (5-1)(6-1) - 1 = 19 < 21.740852 = UB_2(5, 6, 7) \leq UB_2(5, 6, a_3).$$

Thus, provided that $a_1 a_2 \leq 32$, then $F(\mathbf{a}) < UB_2(a_1, a_2, a_3) = UB_2(\mathbf{a})$. Thus, it follows that $UB_2(\mathbf{a})$ is indeed a valid upper bound in all cases, which concludes the proof. \square

References

- [1] Jorge L Ramírez Alfonsín. *The diophantine Frobenius problem*. OUP Oxford, 2005.
- [2] Matthias Beck, Ricardo Diaz, and Sinai Robins. The frobenius problem, rational polytopes, and fourier–dedekind sums. *Journal of number theory*, 96(1):1–21, 2002.
- [3] Sebastian Böcker and Zsuzsanna Lipták. The money changing problem revisited: computing the frobenius number in time $o(ka)$. In *International Computing and Combinatorics Conference*, pages 965–974. Springer, 2005.
- [4] Valentin Boju and Louis Funar. *The math problems notebook*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2007.
- [5] Frank Curtis. On formulas for the frobenius number of a numerical semigroup. *Mathematica Scandinavica*, 67(2):190–192, 1990.
- [6] Paul Erdős and Ronald Graham. On a linear diophantine problem of frobenius. *Acta Arithmetica*, 21(1):399–408, 1972.
- [7] Lenny Fukshansky and Sinai Robins. Frobenius problem and the covering radius of a lattice. *Discrete & Computational Geometry*, 37(3):471–483, 2007.
- [8] Ravi Kannan. Lattice translates of a polytope and the frobenius problem. *Combinatorica*, 12(2):161–177, 1992.
- [9] Jorge L Ramirez-Alfonsin. Complexity of the frobenius problem. *Combinatorica*, 16(1):143–147, 1996.
- [10] Öystein J Rødseth. On a linear diophantine problem of frobenius. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, 1978.
- [11] Sheldon M Ross. *Simulation*. Academic Press, 5 edition, 2013.
- [12] Ernst S Selmer. On the linear diophantine problem of frobenius. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, 1977(293-294):1–17, 1977.
- [13] Michael Z Spivey. Quadratic residues and the frobenius coin problem. *Mathematics Magazine*, 80(1):64–67, 2007.
- [14] James J Sylvester. Problem 7382. *Educational Times*, 37:26, 1884.
- [15] Amitabha Tripathi. On a variation of the coin exchange problem for arithmetic progressions. *Integers: Electronic Journal of Combinatorial Number Theory*, 3(5), 2003.

- [16] Yehoshua Vitek. Bounds for a linear diophantine problem of frobenius. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 2(1):79–85, 1975.
- [17] Herbert S Wilf. A circle-of-lights algorithm for the money-changing problem. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 85(7):562–565, 1978.