

# ON EVENTUALLY GREEDY BEST UNDERAPPROXIMATIONS BY EGYPTIAN FRACTIONS

VJEKOSLAV KOVAČ

ABSTRACT. Erdős and Graham found it conceivable that the best  $n$ -term Egyptian underapproximation of almost every positive number for sufficiently large  $n$  gets constructed in a greedy manner, i.e., from the best  $(n-1)$ -term Egyptian underapproximation. We show that the opposite is true: the set of real numbers with this property has Lebesgue measure zero.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Ancient Egyptians preferred to write positive rational numbers as sums of distinct unit fractions, i.e., fractions with numerators 1 and mutually different positive denominators. Modern-day interest in such representations might have been revived by Sylvester [17], who also considered expansions of real numbers as infinite series of distinct unit fractions. The “Egyptian fractions” quickly lead to numerous problems that are easy to formulate, but difficult to approach, so they have been one of the favourite occupations of the late Paul Erdős [8, §4]. Excellent survey papers on them were written by Graham [9] and by Bloom and Elsholtz [2]. The topic is still very active and several breakthroughs have been obtained very recently [12, 4].

For a positive integer  $n$ , we say that a rational number  $q \in [0, \infty)$  is an  $n$ -term *Egyptian underapproximation* of a real number  $x \in (0, \infty)$  if

$$q = \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{m_k} < x \quad (1.1)$$

for some positive integers  $m_1 < m_2 < \dots < m_n$ . Conventions vary throughout the literature; for instance Nathanson [13] defines an Egyptian underapproximation to be a tuple of denominators  $(m_1, m_2, \dots, m_n)$ , rather than a number  $q$ . We prefer the above definition, but we need to be aware that some rational numbers  $q$  have many representations (1.1) as sums of distinct unit fractions. It is also convenient to declare that 0 is the unique 0-term underapproximation of every number  $x > 0$ . It is easy to see that the largest  $n$ -term Egyptian underapproximation of any given  $x \in (0, \infty)$  exists (see [13, Theorem 3]); it will also be called *the best  $n$ -term Egyptian underapproximation* of  $x$ .

An effective way of approximating a number  $x > 0$  from below by sums of distinct unit fractions is to use a greedy algorithm. We define the *greedy  $n$ -term Egyptian underapproximation* of  $x > 0$  as the number  $\sum_{k=1}^n 1/m_k$ , where  $(m_k)_{k=1}^{\infty}$  is now the sequence of positive integers defined recursively as

$$m_n := \left\lfloor \left( x - \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{1}{m_k} \right)^{-1} \right\rfloor + 1$$

and the empty sum  $\sum_{k=1}^0$  is interpreted as 0. It is easy to construct numbers  $x$  for which these greedy underapproximations are not optimal; the fraction  $x = 11/24 = 0.45833\dots$  being

---

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 11D68; Secondary 11D75, 11P99.

*Key words and phrases.* unit fraction, underapproximation, greedy algorithm, Lebesgue measure.

just one example. Namely, its greedy two-term Egyptian underapproximation is  $1/3 + 1/9 = 0.44\dots$ , but its best two-term Egyptian underapproximation is larger, being  $1/4 + 1/5 = 0.45$ . For this reason a very nice observation was that the best and the greedy  $n$ -term Egyptian underapproximations of the number  $x = 1$  coincide for every positive integer  $n$ ; it was proved by Curtiss [5] and Takenouchi [18]. Several alternative proofs have appeared since; an elegant one has been given by Soundararajan [15]. Erdős [7] observed that this remains to hold whenever  $x = 1/b$  itself is a unit fraction. Nathanson [13, Theorem 5] showed that the same property is retained by rationals  $x = a/b$  such that  $a$  divides  $b + 1$ , while Chu [3, Theorem 1.12] extended it also to proper reduced fractions  $x = a/b$  such that  $b$  is odd and  $l = 2$  is the smallest positive integer such that  $a$  divides  $b + l$ .

A weaker notion of “eventually greedy” underapproximations was suggested by Erdős and Graham [8, p. 31]. We say that  $x \in (0, \infty)$  has *eventually greedy best Egyptian underapproximations* if there exist a strictly increasing sequence of positive integers  $(m_k)_{k=1}^{\infty}$  and an integer  $n_0 \geq 0$  such that for every  $n \geq n_0$  the sum  $\sum_{k=1}^n 1/m_k$  equals the best  $n$ -term Egyptian underapproximation of  $x$ . In words, for sufficiently large  $n$ , an upgrade from the best  $(n-1)$ -term to the best  $n$ -term underapproximation of  $x$  is performed by simply adding another, previously non-existing, unit fraction. Erdős and Graham, in their 1980 monograph [8, p. 31], claimed that every positive rational has eventually greedy best Egyptian underapproximations, but gave no proof or a reference. Then they commented at the bottom of page 31:

*It is not difficult to construct irrationals for which the result fails. Conceivably, however, it holds for almost all reals.*

Whether or not almost every positive real number has eventually greedy best Egyptian underapproximations was formulated as Problem #206 on Bloom’s website *Erdős problems* [1]. Moreover, Nathanson [13, § Open problems, (4)] recently questioned the mere existence of such irrational numbers, since Erdős and Graham provided no proof or a reference for that claim either. The following theorem answers these questions.

**Theorem 1.** *The set of positive real numbers with eventually greedy best Egyptian underapproximations has Lebesgue measure zero.*

Thus, the question stemming from Erdős and Graham’s comment has a negative answer that is even at the other extreme of possibilities. Since the set of rational, and even algebraic, numbers is negligible in the measure-theoretic sense (being only countable), this also gives a positive, but non-constructive, answer to Nathanson’s question.

**Corollary 2.** *There exists a transcendental real number that does not have eventually greedy best Egyptian underapproximations.*

Non-constructive results are often obtained by the probabilistic method, which is how our approach could also be phrased. In particular, the proof below leaves no clue on how to find a particular transcendental number to which Corollary 2 applies.

A recursive construction will reduce Theorem 1 to the study of two-term underapproximations only. We will need to find a positive share, independent of  $i$  (such as  $1\% = 1/1000$ ), of the numbers in the interval  $(1/i, 1/(i-1)]$  that have a more efficient two-term Egyptian underapproximation than the greedy one. Note that the greedy two-term underapproximation of any number from this interval is always of the form  $1/i + 1/j$  for some  $j \geq (i-1)i + 1$ .

**Lemma 3.** *For every integer  $i \geq 1000$ , at least  $1\%$  of the numbers in the interval  $(1/i, 1/(i-1)]$  have non-greedy best two-term Egyptian underapproximations.*

The numbers for which the greedy two-stage process is not optimal have been studied by Nathanson [13] and Chu [3], but here we need to quantify the Lebesgue measure of the set

that they make. Luckily, we do not need to be anyhow precise, as the result will “bootstrap itself” when we start considering underapproximations with more unit fractions.

Erdős and Graham also wrote the following regarding the eventually greedy best Egyptian underapproximation property [8, p. 31]:

*An attractive conjecture is that this also holds for any algebraic number as well.*

Representations of algebraic numbers as greedy series of distinct unit fractions and their algorithmic aspects have been studied by Stratemeyer [16] and Salzer [14]. Finally, some 33 years after [8], Graham [9, 295–296] implicitly retracted the claim that all rationals have eventually greedy Egyptian underapproximations. He first mollified it to:

*Perhaps it is true that for any rational it does hold eventually.*

and then stated it explicitly as yet another open question. This was also asked by Nathanson [13, § Open problems, (4)]. Here we do not make any progress towards these interesting open problems.

The following two sections are respectively dedicated to the proofs of Lemma 3 and Theorem 1. For real sequences  $(x_i)$  and  $(y_i)$  we write  $x_i = \Theta(y_i)$  if both  $|x_i| \leq C|y_i|$  and  $|y_i| \leq C|x_i|$  hold for some unimportant constant  $C \in (0, \infty)$  and every index  $i$ . This notation will only be used in heuristic considerations, as otherwise we will prefer to be explicit.

## 2. PROOF OF LEMMA 3

Fix an integer  $i \geq 1000$ . Consider numbers of the form

$$\frac{1}{i+1} + \frac{1}{i(i+1)/2+k} \tag{2.1}$$

for integers  $0 \leq k \leq \lfloor i(i+1)/10 \rfloor$ . If we define

$$x_k := \left( \frac{1}{i+1} + \frac{1}{i(i+1)/2+k} - \frac{1}{i} \right)^{-1} = i(i+1) \frac{i(i+1) + 2k}{i(i+1) - 2k}, \tag{2.2}$$

then the number (2.1) can be rewritten as

$$\frac{1}{i} + \frac{1}{x_k}$$

and it falls into

$$\left[ \frac{1}{i} + \frac{1}{j_k}, \frac{1}{i} + \frac{1}{j_k - 1} \right], \quad j_k = \lfloor x_k \rfloor + 1. \tag{2.3}$$

Clearly,

$$j_k > x_k \geq i(i+1) > (i-1)i + 1,$$

and from this we see that each interval (2.3) lies fully inside  $(1/i, 1/(i-1)]$ . We also have

$$x_{k+1} - x_k = \frac{4i^2(i+1)^2}{(i(i+1) - 2k)(i(i+1) - 2k - 2)} > 1.$$

Thus, different values of  $k$  lead to different integers  $j_k$ , so the obtained subintervals (2.3) are mutually different. The point (2.1) splits (2.3) into its left and right parts, the right one being

$$\left[ \frac{1}{i} + \frac{1}{x_k}, \frac{1}{i} + \frac{1}{\lfloor x_k \rfloor} \right]. \tag{2.4}$$

Every point from (2.4) has its best two-term Egyptian underapproximation at least equal to (2.1), which is strictly larger than a greedy one,  $1/i + 1/j_k$ .

Since there are  $\Theta(i^2)$  considered intervals (2.3) and their lengths are easily seen to be  $\Theta(j_k^{-2}) = \Theta(x_k^{-2}) = \Theta(i^{-4})$ , the main idea is now to show that there are  $\Theta(i^2)$  points (2.1) that fall reasonably far from the right endpoint of the corresponding interval (2.3). That way

there will be  $\Theta(i^2)$  intervals (2.4) with length  $\Theta(i^{-4})$ , so their total length will be  $\Theta(i^{-2})$ . This is a positive fraction of  $1/((i-1)i)$ , as desired. We remark that Chu [3, §3] has already used the idea of comparing the non-greedy two-term underapproximation  $1/(i+1) + \dots$  to the greedy one, namely  $1/i + \dots$ , but gave no estimates on the length of the set for which the former underapproximation is superior.

The task is now reduced to finding  $\Theta(i^2)$  terms of the above finite sequence  $(x_k)$ , such that  $x_k$  is reasonably far from  $\lfloor x_k \rfloor$ . In order to achieve this, one is tempted to study equidistribution properties of

$$x_k = i(i+1) + 4k + \frac{8k^2}{i(i+1) - 2k}$$

modulo 1, but this leads to unnecessary complications, since  $(x_k)$  is not quite a polynomial sequence; it only emulates the quadratic behaviour of  $8k^2/(i(i+1))$  modulo 1. Luckily, the difference sequence  $(x_{k+1} - x_k)$  has a more stable dynamics and we will be content if, for many indices  $k$ , at least one of the terms  $x_k$  and  $x_{k+1}$  is far from 0 modulo 1. One might view at this trick as a cheap substitute for van der Corput's lemma. More information about the relevant concepts from the theory of equidistribution can be found in [11], but we will not need them for the rest of the proof. These tools and the related Diophantine approximations [6, Chapter 8] could become useful if one desires to obtain a quantitatively sharper version of Lemma 3.

Let us now make the arguments rigorous and finish the proof. Define

$$\mathcal{L} := \left[ \frac{i(i+1)}{100}, \frac{3i(i+1)}{200} \right] \cap \mathbb{Z} \quad (2.5)$$

and observe that its cardinality is at least  $i^2/200$ . For every  $l \in \mathcal{L}$  the formula

$$x_{2l+1} - x_{2l} = \frac{4i^2(i+1)^2}{(i(i+1) - 4l)(i(i+1) - 4l - 2)}$$

guarantees

$$4 + \frac{1}{3} \leq x_{2l+1} - x_{2l} \leq 4 + \frac{2}{3}. \quad (2.6)$$

Consequently,

$$x_{2l} - \lfloor x_{2l} \rfloor \geq \frac{1}{3} \quad \text{or} \quad x_{2l+1} - \lfloor x_{2l+1} \rfloor \geq \frac{1}{3},$$

since otherwise  $x_{2l+1} - x_{2l}$  would differ from an integer by less than  $1/3$ , which would contradict (2.6). Also note that, by the definitions (2.2) and (2.5),

$$x_{2l} < x_{2l+1} < \frac{6}{5}i^2.$$

In any case, there exist at least  $i^2/200$  terms of the original sequence  $(x_k)$  such that

$$x_k - \lfloor x_k \rfloor \geq 1/3 \quad \text{and} \quad x_k < \frac{6}{5}i^2.$$

For every such index  $k$ , the length of the interval (2.4) is

$$\frac{1}{\lfloor x_k \rfloor} - \frac{1}{x_k} \geq \frac{x_k - \lfloor x_k \rfloor}{x_k^2} > \frac{25}{108i^4},$$

and the total length of those intervals is greater than

$$\frac{i^2}{200} \cdot \frac{25}{108i^4} > \frac{1}{1000(i-1)i}.$$

The last number is 1‰ of the length of the considered interval  $(1/i, 1/(i-1))$  and we are done.

## 3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Let

$$H_n := \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{k}$$

denote the  $n$ -th harmonic number. We begin by listing some obvious properties of the Egyptian underapproximations.

- (P1) If  $q \in \mathbb{Q} \cap [0, \infty)$  is the best  $n$ -term underapproximation of a number  $x \in (0, \infty)$ , then it is also the best  $n$ -term underapproximation of every real from the interval  $(q, x]$ .
- (P2) If two positive numbers have equal best  $n$ -term underapproximations, then they also have equal best  $(n - 1)$ -term underapproximations.

For a positive integer  $n$  define an equivalence relation  $\sim_n$  on the set  $(0, \infty)$  by proclaiming that  $x \sim_n y$  if  $x$  and  $y$  have the same best  $n$ -term underapproximation. Then (P1) implies the following.

- (P3) Every equivalence class of  $\sim_n$  is either an interval of the form  $(q, r]$  for some rational numbers  $q < r$ , or the unbounded interval  $(H_n, \infty)$ .

Let  $\mathcal{I}_n$  denote the collection of all intervals mentioned in (P3). By definition they make a countable partition of  $(0, \infty)$ . Next, (P2) implies the following further property.

- (P4) Partition  $\mathcal{I}_n$  is a refinement of  $\mathcal{I}_{n-1}$ , i.e., every interval from  $\mathcal{I}_{n-1}$  is a countable disjoint union of some intervals from  $\mathcal{I}_n$ .

Finally, we will prove the following.

- (P5) Every bounded interval from  $\mathcal{I}_n$  has length at most  $1/(n(n + 1))$ .

Namely, consider only numbers of the form

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{m_k} = \sum_{k=1}^l \frac{1}{k} + \sum_{k=l+1}^n \frac{1}{m_k}, \quad (3.1)$$

where  $m_1 < m_2 < \dots < m_n$  are positive integers and there exists  $0 \leq l < n$  such that  $m_k = k$  for  $k = 1, \dots, l$  and  $m_{k+1} \geq (m_k - 1)m_k + 1$  for  $k = l + 1, \dots, n - 1$ . By an easy induction on  $n$  we see that each of the numbers (3.1), other than  $H_n$ , is precisely  $1/((m_k - 1)m_k)$  apart from the numbers (3.1) to its right. Since we have  $m_n \geq n + 1$  for every number (3.1) different from  $H_n$ , we conclude that the above numbers are  $1/(n(n + 1))$ -dense in  $(0, H_n]$ . No interval  $I \in \mathcal{I}_n$  can have a number of the form (3.1) in its interior, so each bounded interval from  $\mathcal{I}_n$  has length at most  $1/(n(n + 1))$ . This verifies (P5).

For integers  $0 \leq s < t$ , let  $X_{s,t}$  denote the set of all numbers  $x \in (0, H_s]$  for which there exist positive integers  $m_1 < m_2 < \dots < m_t$  such that  $\sum_{k=1}^n 1/m_k$  is the best  $n$ -term Egyptian underapproximation of  $x$  for  $n = s, s + 1, \dots, t - 1, t$ . Clearly, the set of all positive reals with eventually greedy best Egyptian underapproximations is contained in

$$\bigcup_{s=0}^{\infty} \underbrace{\bigcap_{t=s+1}^{\infty} X_{s,t}}_{\text{increases in } s}. \quad (3.2)$$

We will simply write  $|A|$  for the Lebesgue measure of a measurable set  $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ .

**Lemma 4.** *The estimate*

$$|X_{s,t+2}| \leq \frac{1999}{2000} |X_{s,t}| \quad (3.3)$$

holds for all integers  $100 \leq s < t$ .

*Proof.* Each set  $X_{s,t}$  is defined in terms of the best  $n$ -term underapproximations for  $n \leq t$ . (In particular,  $(0, H_s]$  is the set of positive reals for which the best  $s$ -term underapproximation is less than  $H_s$ .) By (P2) and (P4), the set  $X_{s,t}$  is a union of intervals from a subcollection of  $\mathcal{I}_t$ , which was introduced after property (P3). We denote this subcollection by  $\mathcal{X}_{s,t}$ :

$$X_{s,t} = \bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{X}_{s,t}} I. \quad (3.4)$$

Since  $X_{s,t}$  is bounded, each interval in  $\mathcal{X}_{s,t}$  is bounded too.

Take an arbitrary non-empty interval  $I \in \mathcal{X}_{s,t}$  and write it as  $I = (q, r]$ . Let  $i_0$  be the smallest positive integer such that  $1/i_0 < r - q$ . From (P5) and  $t > 100$  we know that  $|I| < 10^{-4}$ , so

$$i_0 > |I|^{-1} > 10^4.$$

The interval  $I$  is a disjoint union of

$$I' := \left( q + \frac{1}{i_0}, r \right]$$

and

$$I_i := q + \left( \frac{1}{i}, \frac{1}{i-1} \right] \quad \text{for } i = i_0 + 1, i_0 + 2, \dots$$

We treat  $I'$  as an exceptional interval and we only need a rough bound on its relative length. Namely,  $q + 1/(i_0 - 1) \geq r$  by the definition of  $i_0$ , and it means that

$$|I'| \leq \frac{1}{i_0 - 1} - \frac{1}{i_0} = \frac{1}{(i_0 - 1)i_0} \leq \frac{10^{-4}}{i_0} < 10^{-4}|I|. \quad (3.5)$$

Next, for an integer  $i > i_0$  and every  $x \in X_{s,t+2} \cap I_i$  we can say that:

- $q$  is the best  $t$ -term underapproximation of  $x$ ;
- $q + 1/i$  is the best  $(t + 1)$ -term underapproximation of  $x$ ;
- $q + 1/i + 1/j$  is the best  $(t + 2)$ -term underapproximation of  $x$  for some integer  $j \geq (i - 1)i + 1$  depending on  $x$ .

From this, we see that the number  $x - q \in (1/i, 1/(i - 1)]$  has greedy best two-term Egyptian underapproximation and it is  $1/i + 1/j$ . (Namely, if  $i' < j'$  were positive integers such that  $1/i + 1/j < 1/i' + 1/j' < x - q$ , then we would have  $i' > i$  and  $q + 1/i' + 1/j'$  would be a better  $(t + 2)$ -term underapproximation of  $x$  than  $q + 1/i + 1/j$ .) Lemma 3 implies that the set of such numbers has measure at most 999/1000 of the length of  $(1/i, 1/(i - 1)]$ , so

$$|X_{s,t+2} \cap I_i| \leq \frac{999}{1000} |I_i|.$$

Summing in  $i = i_0 + 1, i_0 + 2, \dots$  and using (3.5) we get

$$|X_{s,t+2} \cap I| \leq \frac{1999}{2000} |I|.$$

Finally, summing in  $I \in \mathcal{X}_{s,t}$ , recalling (3.4), and observing  $X_{s,t+2} \subseteq X_{s,t}$ , we obtain (3.3).  $\square$

We can now finalize the proof of Theorem 1. Starting from  $|X_{s,s+1}| \leq H_s$ ,  $|X_{s,s+2}| \leq H_s$  and repeatedly applying Lemma 4, we conclude

$$|X_{s,t}| \leq \left( \frac{1999}{2000} \right)^{(t-s-2)/2} H_s$$

whenever  $100 \leq s < t$ . Letting  $t \rightarrow \infty$  we obtain

$$\left| \bigcap_{t=s+1}^{\infty} X_{s,t} \right| = 0.$$

Taking the union over  $s \geq 100$  and using countable subadditivity of the Lebesgue measure, we conclude that the set (3.2) also has measure zero.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported in part by the Croatian Science Foundation under the project HRZZ-IP-2022-10-5116 (FANAP). The author would like to thank Rudi Mrazović for a useful discussion and Thomas Bloom for founding the website [1], where he discovered numerous interesting problems. The author is also grateful to Richard Green for discussing the present paper and its background in the popular newsletter *A Piece of the Pi: mathematics explained* [10].

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Thomas F. Bloom. Erdős problems. <https://www.erdosproblems.com/>. Accessed: June 7, 2024.
- [2] Thomas F. Bloom and Christian Elsholtz. Egyptian fractions. *Nieuw Arch. Wiskd.* (5), 23(4):237–245, 2022.
- [3] Hùng Viet Chu. A threshold for the best two-term underapproximation by Egyptian fractions. *Indag. Math. (N.S.)*, 35(2):350–375, 2024. doi:10.1016/j.indag.2024.01.006.
- [4] David Conlon, Jacob Fox, Xiaoyu He, Dhruv Mubayi, Huy Tuan Pham, Andrew Suk, and Jacques Verstraëte. A question of Erdős and Graham on Egyptian fractions. Available at: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.16016>, 2024.
- [5] David R. Curtiss. On Kellogg’s Diophantine Problem. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 29(10):380–387, 1922. doi:10.2307/2299023.
- [6] Andrej Dujella. *Number theory*. Školska Knjiga, Zagreb, 2021.
- [7] Paul Erdős. On a Diophantine equation. *Mat. Lapok*, 1:192–210, 1950.
- [8] Paul Erdős and Ronald L. Graham. *Old and new problems and results in combinatorial number theory*, volume 28 of *Monographies de L’Enseignement Mathématique*. Université de Genève, L’Enseignement Mathématique, Geneva, 1980.
- [9] Ronald L. Graham. Paul Erdős and Egyptian fractions. In *Erdős centennial*, volume 25 of *Bolyai Soc. Math. Stud.*, pages 289–309. János Bolyai Math. Soc., Budapest, 2013. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-39286-3\_9.
- [10] Richard Green. A Piece of the Pi: mathematics explained. Egyptian fractions. <https://apieceofthepi.substack.com/p/egyptian-fractions>. Accessed: September 24, 2024.
- [11] Lauwerens Kuipers and Harald Niederreiter. *Uniform distribution of sequences*. Pure and Applied Mathematics. Wiley-Interscience [John Wiley & Sons], New York-London-Sydney, 1974.
- [12] Yang P. Liu and Mehtaab Sawhney. On further questions regarding unit fractions. Available at: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.07113>, 2024.
- [13] Melvyn B. Nathanson. Underapproximation by Egyptian fractions. *J. Number Theory*, 242:208–234, 2023. doi:10.1016/j.jnt.2022.07.005.
- [14] Herbert E. Salzer. The approximation of numbers as sums of reciprocals. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 54:135–142, 1947. doi:10.2307/2305906.
- [15] Kannan Soundararajan. Approximating 1 from below using  $n$  Egyptian fractions. Available at: <https://arxiv.org/abs/math/0502247>, 2005.
- [16] Gottfried Stratemeyer. Stambruchentwickelungen für die Quadratwurzel aus einer rationalen Zahl. *Math. Z.*, 31(1):767–768, 1930. doi:10.1007/BF01246446.
- [17] James J. Sylvester. On a point in the theory of vulgar fractions. *Amer. J. Math.*, 3(4):332–335, 1880. doi:10.2307/2369261.
- [18] Tanzo Takenouchi. On an indeterminate equation. *Proceedings of the Physico-Mathematical Society of Japan*, 3:78–92, 1921.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF SCIENCE, UNIVERSITY OF ZAGREB, BIJENIČKA CESTA 30, 10000 ZAGREB, CROATIA

Email address: vjekovac@math.hr