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Over the paper of Lagarias [1], for a positive integer $n$, let $\sigma(n)$ denote the sum of the positive integers that divide $n$. Let $H_{n}$ denote the $n$th harmonic number by

$$
H_{n}=\sum_{n=1}^{n} \frac{1}{n}
$$

Does the following inequality hold for all $n \geq 1$ where $\sigma(n)$ is the sum of divisors function?

$$
H_{n}+\ln \left(H_{n}\right) e^{H_{n}} \geq \sigma(n)
$$

## 1 Definition for the solutions

Theorem: First of all, let's define an imaginary function as $\rho(n)$, and know that this function is the sum of the elements which are not dividable being the result is an integer in a function as $n H_{n}$; so according to this definition, it becomes as the following.

$$
H_{n}=\frac{\sigma(n)+\rho(n)}{n}
$$

By using the equation, $H_{n}+\ln \left(H_{n}\right) e^{H_{n}} \geq \sigma(n)$ inequality turns into (1).

$$
\begin{equation*}
H_{n}+\ln \left(H_{n}\right) e^{H_{n}} \geq n H_{n}-\rho(n) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

If it is edited, it becomes (2) over (2a).

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\ln \left(H_{n}\right) e^{H_{n}}+\rho(n)}{n-1} \geq H_{n} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\ln \left(H_{n}\right) e^{H_{n}} \geq n H_{n}-H_{n}-\rho(n) \tag{2a}
\end{equation*}
$$

Condition: Right this point assume, that the actual inequality is not (2) but is (3).

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{e^{H_{n}}}{n} \geq H_{n} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

On (2), actually the numerator is always bigger than $e^{H_{n}}$, and also if the divisor was $n-1$, this would increase the possibility of to be greater than $H_{n}$ of the division; so for the worst possibility, let's use this as (3).

Now, let (3) be (4).

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sqrt[n]{e} \geq \sqrt[n H n]{n H_{n}} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

For $e=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left(1+\frac{1}{n}\right)^{n},(4)$ becomes (5).

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}\left(1+\frac{1}{n} \geq \sqrt[n H_{n}]{n H_{n}}\right) \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

For this, it can be written as (6)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty}(n+1 \geq n k) \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $k=\sqrt[n H]{n H_{n}}$. For $\mathrm{n}=1, \mathrm{k}$ must be smaller than 2 that is smaller as $\mathrm{k}=1$. Additionally, for $n \geq n k-n$ it becomes $\frac{1}{n} \geq k-1$; so what ever the direction of the inequality, even if both sides would be equal to each other, k cannot become a number smaller than 1 since n is always positive. It is always $k>1$. Here assume, that is (7)

$$
\begin{equation*}
n=n k-1+b \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

since it is $n \geq n k-1$ over (6), where $b$ is a number being $b \in \mathbb{R}^{+}$ and thus being $b>0$; thus it becomes (8) over (7).

$$
\begin{equation*}
n=\frac{b-1}{1-k} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since is $k>1$, then b must always be smaller number than 1 to be positive of the division; thus it becomes $1>b>0$; so $k$ cannot take random values since n is positive integer. If is $k>1$, for the greatest value of k , it becomes $\lim _{b \rightarrow 0} k=2$. For this value, equality of (7) becomes $n=2 n-1$ and thus
becomes $n=1$. It means, actually k decreases as long as n increased; thus it means it is always (9),

$$
\begin{equation*}
1=\lim _{m \longrightarrow \infty} \sqrt[m]{m} \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $m \in \mathbb{Z}^{+}$; thus also means it is (10),

$$
\begin{equation*}
1=\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt[n H_{n}]{n H_{n}} \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

since is $H_{n} \geq 1$ and thus is $n H_{n} \geq 1$.

## 2 Conclusion

By the defined elements, over (6), it becomes (11).

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} n+1 \geq n \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

This is also equivalent of (3) and thus of (12).

$$
\begin{equation*}
H_{n}+\ln \left(H_{n}\right) e^{H_{n}} \geq \sigma(n) \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$
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Good bye!
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