Journal of Number Theory 256 (2024) 37–54

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Journal of Number Theory

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/jnt

General Section

Recursively divisible numbers

Thomas M.A. Fink

London Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Royal Institution, 21 Albemarle St, London W1S 4BS, UK

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 20 April 2023
Received in revised form 9 August 2023
Accepted 24 August 2023
Available online 29 September 2023
Communicated by S.J. Miller

Keywords:
Recursively divisible numbers
Divisor function
Recursive divisor function
Number of ordered factorizations
Highly composite numbers
Super-abundant numbers

ABSTRACT

We introduce and study the recursive divisor function, a recursive analog of the usual divisor function: $\kappa_x(n) = n^x + \sum_{d\lfloor n} \kappa_x(d)$, where the sum is over the proper divisors of n. We give a geometrical interpretation of $\kappa_x(n)$, which we use to derive a relation between $\kappa_x(n)$ and $\kappa_0(n)$. For $x \geq 2$, we observe that $\kappa_x(n)/n^x < 1/(2-\zeta(x))$. We show that, for $n \geq 2$, $\kappa_0(n)$ is twice the number of ordered factorizations, a problem much studied in its own right. By computing those numbers that are more recursively divisible than all of their predecessors, we recover many of the numbers prevalent in design and technology, and suggest new ones which have yet to be adopted.

1. Introduction

1.1. Recursive divisor function

In this paper we introduce and study the recursive divisor function:

E-mail address: tmafink@gmail.com.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jnt.2023.08.008

Table 1
Values of κ_0, κ_1 and κ_2. A Mathematica algorithm for $\kappa_0(n)$ is: `n = 1; κ = {}; While[n <= 60, κ = Append[κ, n^0 + Sum[κ[[m]], {m, Delete[Divisors[n], -1]}]]; n++];` κ.

n	κ_0	κ_1	κ_2	n	κ_0	κ_1	κ_2	n	κ_0	κ_1	κ_2
1	1	1	1	21	6	34	502	41	2	42	1682
2	2	3	5	22	6	38	612	42	26	132	2636
3	2	4	10	23	2	24	530	43	2	44	1850
4	4	8	22	24	40	116	992	44	16	106	2698
5	2	6	26	25	4	32	652	45	16	96	2416
6	6	14	52	26	6	44	852	46	6	74	2652
7	2	8	50	27	8	46	832	47	2	48	2210
8	8	20	92	28	16	74	1114	48	96	304	4088
9	4	14	92	29	2	30	842	49	4	58	2452
10	6	20	132	30	26	104	1388	50	16	112	3316
11	2	12	122	31	2	32	962	51	6	74	2902
12	16	42	234	32	32	112	1520	52	16	122	3754
13	2	14	170	33	6	50	1222	53	2	54	2810
14	6	26	252	34	6	56	1452	54	40	190	4392
15	6	26	262	35	6	50	1302	55	6	74	3174
16	16	48	376	36	52	176	2196	56	40	196	4672
17	2	18	290	37	2	38	1370	57	6	82	3622
18	16	54	484	38	6	62	1812	58	6	92	4212
19	2	20	362	39	6	58	1702	59	2	60	3482
20	16	58	586	40	40	156	2464	60	88	346	6318

Definition 1.

$$\kappa_x(n) = n^x + \sum_{d\lfloor n} \kappa_0(d),$$

where $d\lfloor n$ means $d|n$ and $d < n$.

It can be thought of as the recursive analogue of the usual divisor function:

$$\sigma_x(n) = \sum_{d|n} d^x. \tag{1}$$

The recursive divisor function considers not only the divisors of n, but also the divisors of the resultant quotients, and the divisors of those resultant quotients, and so on. For example, $\kappa_0(10) = 1+\kappa_0(1)+\kappa_0(2)+\kappa_0(5) = 6$, and $\kappa_1(10) = 10+\kappa_1(1)+\kappa_1(2)+\kappa_1(5) = 20$. Values of κ_0, κ_1 and κ_2 are given in Table 1.

1.2. Example

Consider one of the earliest references to a number that can be divided into equal parts in many ways. Plato writes in his *Laws* that the ideal population of a city is 5040, since this number has more divisors than any number less than it. He observes that

5040 is divisible by 60 numbers, including one to 10. A highly divisible population is useful for dividing the city into equal-sized sectors for administrative, social and military purposes.

This conception of divisibility can be extended. Once the city is divided into equal parts, it is often necessary to divide a part into equal subparts. For example, if 5040 is divided into 15 parts of 336, each part can in turn be divided into subparts in 20 ways, since 336 has 20 divisors. But if 5040 is divided into 16 parts of 315, each part can be divided into subparts in only 12 ways, since 315 has 12 divisors. Thus the division of the whole into 15 parts offers more optionality for further subdivisions than the division into 16 parts. Similar reasoning can be applied to the division of the subparts into sub-subparts, and so on, in a recursive way.

1.3. Outline of paper

The goal of this paper is to quantify the notion of recursive divisibility and to understand the properties of numbers which possess it to a large degree. It is organized as follows.

In part 2, we introduce divisor trees (Figs. 1 and 2), which give a geometrical interpretation of $\kappa_x(n)$. Using this, we find a relation between $\kappa_x(n)$ and $\kappa_0(n)$.

In part 3, we show that for $x \geq 2$, $\kappa_x(n) < n^x/(2-\zeta(x))$. We plot $\kappa_x(n)$ for $x = 1$ to $x = 6$, confirming our prediction.

In part 4, we investigate the number of recursive divisors $\kappa_0(n)$. We show that $\kappa_0(n)$ is twice the number of ordered factorizations for $n \geq 2$, a problem much studied in its own right [8,7,3,4,9,5]. We give recursion relations for when n is the product of distinct primes, and for when n is the product of primes to a power. The latter can be solved for up to three primes.

In part 5, we investigate the sum of recursive divisors $\kappa_1(n)$. We give recursion relations for when n is the product of primes to a power. These can be solved using the relation between $\kappa_x(n)$ and $\kappa_0(n)$ from part 2.

In part 6, we study numbers which are recursively divisible to a high degree. We call numbers with a record number of recursive divisors recursively highly composite. These have been studied in the context of the number of ordered factorizations [5]. We call numbers with a record sum of recursive divisors, normalized by n, recursively superabundant. We list both kinds up to a million in Appendix A.

In part 7, we survey applications of highly recursive numbers in design and technology and display standards. We conclude with a list of open problems.

2. Divisor trees and the relation between κ_x and κ_0

In this section, we prove the following relation between $\kappa_x(n)$ and $\kappa_0(n)$:



Fig. 1. Divisor trees for 1 to 24. The number of recursive divisors $\kappa_0(n)$ counts the number of squares in each tree. The sum of recursive divisors $\kappa_1(n)$ adds up the side length of the squares in each tree. The sum of the square of recursive divisors $\kappa_2(n)$ adds up the area in each tree, and so on.

Theorem 1.

$$\frac{\kappa_x(n)}{n^x} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{d|n} \frac{\kappa_0(d)}{d^x}.$$

To do so, we introduce the concept of divisor trees. As well as motivating two lemmas necessary for our proof, divisor trees provide some intuition for how the recursive divisor function behaves.

2.1. Divisor trees

A geometric interpretation of the recursive divisor function can be had by drawing the divisor tree for a given value of n. Divisor trees for 1 to 24 are shown in Fig. 1. The number of recursive divisors $\kappa_0(n)$ counts the number of squares in each tree, whereas the number of divisors $d \equiv \sigma_0(n)$ in (1) counts the number of squares in the main diagonal. The sum of recursive divisors $\kappa_1(n)$ adds up the side length of the squares in each tree, whereas the sum of divisors $\sigma \equiv \sigma_1(n)$ in (1) adds up the side length of the squares in the main diagonal. This can be extended to $\kappa_2(n)$, which adds up area, and so on.

A divisor tree is constructed as follows. First, draw a square of side length n. Let $d_1, d_2, \ldots$ be the proper divisors of n in descending order. Then draw squares of side length d_1, $d_2, \ldots$ with each consecutive square situated to the upper right of its predecessor, kitty-corner, as shown in Figs. 1 and 2. This forms the main arm of a divisor tree. Now, for each of the squares of side length $d_1, d_2, \ldots$, repeat the process. Let $e_1, e_2, \ldots$



Fig. 2. Divisor trees for 96 and 100. There are $\kappa_0(96) = 224$ squares in the left tree and $\kappa_0(100) = 52$ squares in the right tree. The sum of the side length of the squares, or one-fourth of the tree perimeter, is $\kappa_1(96) = 768$ and $\kappa_1(100) = 340$. The sum of the area of the squares is $\kappa_2(96) = 16{,}608$ and $\kappa_2(100) = 14{,}740$.

be the proper divisors of d_1 in descending order. Then draw squares of side length e_1, $e_2, \ldots$, but with the sub-arm rotated 90° counter-clockwise. Do the same for each of the remaining squares in the main arm. This forms the branches off of the main arm. Now, continue repeating this process, drawing arms off of arms off of arms, and so on, until the arms are single squares of size 1.

Note that, for large enough n, a divisor tree can overlap itself. The precise conditions as to when is one of the open questions listed at the end.

2.2. Properties of divisor trees

In order to prove Theorem 1, let us consider a more fine-grained description of divisor trees, namely, one that counts the number of divisors of a given size.

Definition 2. The number of recursive divisors of n of size $j < n$ is

$$\kappa_0(n, j) = \begin{cases} \sum_{d \lfloor n} \kappa_0(d, j), & j \lfloor n \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $\kappa_0(n, n) = 1$ and $d \lfloor n$ means $d|n$ and $d < n$.

Lemma 1. *The number of recursive divisors of size j satisfies $\kappa_0(j\, n, j) = \kappa_0(n, 1)$.*

Proof. By Definition 2, with $j \to 1$,

$$\kappa_0(n,1) = \sum_{d \lfloor n} \kappa_0(d,1). \tag{2}$$

Similarly, with $n \to j\,n$,

$$\kappa_0(j\,n,j) = \sum_{d \lfloor j\,n} \kappa_0(d,j).$$

Since $\kappa_0(d,j) = 0$ if j does not divide d, this can be rewritten as

$$\kappa_0(j\,n,j) = \sum_{d \lfloor n} \kappa_0(j\,d,j). \tag{3}$$

We will use this result in a moment.

Let $n = p_1^{\alpha_1}\,p_2^{\alpha_2}\ldots p_\omega^{\alpha_j}$ and $\Omega(n) = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \ldots + \alpha_\omega$. We prove the lemma by induction on $\Omega(n)$. The base case $\Omega(n) = 0$, or $n = 1$, holds by Definition 2: $\kappa_0(j\,1,j) = \kappa_0(1,1)$. We now show that if $\kappa_0(j\,n,j) = \kappa_0(n,1)$ for all n such that $\Omega(n) < i$, then $\kappa_0(j\,n,j) = \kappa_0(n,1)$ for all n such that $\Omega(n) < i+1$. To see why, observe that in (3) all of the proper divisors d of n must have $\Omega(d)$ at most $\Omega(n) - 1$. So by assumption all of the $\kappa_0(j\,d,j)$ in (3) reduce to $\kappa_0(d,1)$, and the right side of (3) takes the form of the right side of (2) and thus equals $\kappa_0(n,1)$. □

Lemma 2. *For $n \geq 2$, the number of recursive divisors of size 1 is equal to half the total number of recursive divisors, that is, $\kappa_0(n,1) = \kappa_0(n)/2$.*

Proof. Clearly

$$\kappa_0(n) = \sum_{d|n} \kappa_0(n,d).$$

By Lemma 1, $\kappa_0(n,k) = \kappa_0(n/k,1)$ for $k|n$, so the above becomes

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_0(n) &= \sum_{d|n} \kappa_0(n/d,1)\\ &= \sum_{d|n} \kappa_0(d,1)\\ &= \kappa_0(n,1) + \sum_{d \lfloor n} \kappa_0(d,1).\end{aligned}$$

Inserting Definition 2 with $j = 1$ into the above gives the desired result. □

2.3. Relation between κ_x and κ_0

Proof of Theorem 1. We can write $\kappa_x(n)$ as

$$\kappa_x(n) = \sum_{d|n} d^x \, \kappa_0(n, d).$$

By Lemma 1,

$$\kappa_x(n) = \sum_{d|n} d^x \, \kappa_0(n/d, 1).$$

Recall that Lemma 2 only applies for $n \geq 2$, so we pull out the $d = n$ term:

$$\kappa_x(n) = n^x + \sum_{d \lfloor n} d^x \, \kappa_0(n/d, 1).$$

By Lemma 2,

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa_x(n) &= n^x + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{d \lfloor n} d^x \, \kappa_0(n/d) \\
&= \frac{n^x}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{d|n} d^x \kappa_0(n/d) \\
&= \frac{n^x}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{d|n} \left(\frac{n}{d}\right)^x \kappa_0(d).
\end{aligned}$$

Dividing by n^x, the theorem follows. □

3. Properties of κ_2, κ_3, and so on

Theorem 2. *For $x > 1$,*

$$\frac{\kappa_x(n)}{n^x} < \frac{1}{2 - \zeta(x)}.$$

This theorem was inspired by an anonymous referee from a previous version of this paper. The referee answered one of our then open questions at the end of our paper. We generalized the answer, which led to this theorem. We confirm it in Fig. 3, in which we plot $\kappa_x(n)/n^x$ for $x = 1$ to $x = 6$.

Proof. We prove the theorem by induction. We know that it is true for $n = 1$. Assume it is true for all numbers less than n. We show it is then true for n. By Definition 1,



Fig. 3. Plots of $\kappa_x(n)/n^x$. We plot $\kappa_x(n)/n^x$ up to $n = 3{,}000$, for $x = 0$ to $x = 5$. The large points (which are orange in the online version) are the sequence records, which satisfy $\kappa_x(n)/n^x > \kappa_x(m)/m^x$ for all $m < n$. For $x = 0$ and $x = 1$, the upper bound for the sequence diverges. But for $x = 2$ and above, it converges to $1/(2 - \gamma(x))$, where γ is the Riemann zeta function. For $x = 0$, the large points are the recursively highly composite numbers. For $x = 1$, they are the recursively super-abundant numbers (see Appendix A).

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\kappa_x(n)}{n^x} &= 1 + \frac{1}{n^x}\sum_{d\lfloor n}\kappa_x(d)\\ &= 1 + \sum_{d\lfloor n}\frac{\kappa_x(d)}{d^x}\frac{d^x}{n^x}\\ &< 1 + \frac{1}{2-\zeta(x)}\sum_{d\lfloor n}\frac{d^x}{n^x}\\ &< 1 + \frac{1}{2-\zeta(x)}\left(-1 + \sum_{d|n}\frac{d^x}{n^x}\right),\end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma(x)$ is the Riemann zeta function. Since, for $x > 1$,

$$\sum_{d|n}\frac{d^x}{n^x} = \sum_{d|n}\frac{1}{d^x} < \zeta(x), \tag{4}$$

we have

$$\frac{\kappa_x(n)}{n^x} < 1 + \frac{1}{2-\zeta(x)}\left(\zeta(x) - 1\right)$$

$$< \frac{1}{2-\zeta(x)}. \quad \square$$

4. Number of recursive divisors

4.1. Relation to ordered factorizations

Some of the properties of $\kappa_0(n)$ can be deduced from properties of a related function, the number $K(n)$ of ordered factorizations into integers greater than one. It satisfies $K(1) = 1$ and

$$K(n) = \sum_{d \lfloor n} K(d).$$

For example, 12 is the product of integers greater than one in eight ways: $12 = 6 \cdot 2 = 2 \cdot 6 = 4 \cdot 3 = 3 \cdot 4 = 3 \cdot 2 \cdot 2 = 2 \cdot 3 \cdot 2 = 2 \cdot 2 \cdot 3$. So $K(12) = 8$. Kalmar [8] was the first to consider $K(n)$—hence the name K—and it was later studied more systematically by Hille [7]. Over the last 20 years several authors have extended Hille's results [4,9,5], some of which we will mention later.

Notice that the definition of $K(n)$ is identical to Definition 2 for $j = 1$, that is, to $\kappa_0(n, 1)$. Since $K(1) = \kappa_0(1, 1) = 1$, then by Lemma 2 we arrive at

Proposition 1. *For $n \geq 2$, $\kappa_0(n) = 2K(n)$, where $K(n)$ is the number of ordered factorizations into integers greater than one.*

4.2. Distinct primes

Let $n = p_1 p_2 \dots p_\omega$ be the product of ω distinct primes.

Proposition 2. *The exponential generating function of $\kappa_0(p_1 \dots p_\omega)$ is*

$$\mathrm{EG}(\kappa_0(p_1 \dots p_\omega), x) = \frac{e^x}{2 - e^x}.$$

Proof. Since κ_0 depends only on the prime signature of n, which in this case is all 1s, we can immediately write down

$$2\kappa_0(p_1 \dots p_\omega) = 1 + \sum_{i=0}^{\omega} \binom{\omega}{i} \kappa_0(p_1 \dots p_i).$$

Then

$$2 \sum_{\omega=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^w}{w!} \kappa_0(p_1, \dots, p_\omega) = \sum_{\omega=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^\omega}{\omega!} \left(1 + \sum_{i=0}^{\omega} \binom{\omega}{i} \kappa_0(p_1 \dots p_i) \right)$$

$$= e^x + \sum_{\omega=0}^{\infty} \sum_{i=0}^{\omega} \frac{x^i}{i!} \frac{x^{\omega-i}}{(\omega-i)!} \kappa_0(p_1 \dots p_i).$$

Summing this along the diagonals $\omega = i$, $\omega = i+1$, and so on,

$$2 \sum_{\omega=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^w}{w!} \kappa_0(p_1, \dots, p_\omega) = e^x + \frac{x^0}{0!} \sum_{\omega=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^w}{w!} \kappa_0(p_1, \dots, p_\omega) + \frac{x^1}{1!} \sum_{\omega=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^w}{w!} \kappa_0(p_1, \dots, p_\omega) + \dots$$
$$= e^x + e^x \sum_{\omega=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^w}{w!} \kappa_0(p_1, \dots, p_\omega).$$

From this it follows that

$$\mathrm{EG}(\kappa_0(p_1 \dots p_\omega), x) = \frac{e^x}{2 - e^x}. \quad \square$$

4.3. Primes to a power

When n is the product of primes to powers, $\kappa_0(n)$ satisfies recursion relations relating it to values of $\kappa_0(n)$ for primes to lower powers. The first few of these can be solved explicitly.

Theorem 3. *Let p, q and r be prime. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa_0(p^c) &= 2\kappa_0\left(\tfrac{p^c}{p}\right) \\
&= 2^c \\
\kappa_0(p^c q^d) &= 2\left(\kappa_0\left(\tfrac{p^c q^d}{p}\right) + \kappa_0\left(\tfrac{p^c q^d}{q}\right) - \kappa_0\left(\tfrac{p^c q^d}{pq}\right)\right) \\
&= 2^c \sum_{i=0}^{d} \binom{d}{i}\binom{c+i}{i}, \\
\kappa_0(p^c q^d r^e) &= 2\Big(\kappa_0\left(\tfrac{p^c q^d r^e}{p}\right) + \kappa_0\left(\tfrac{p^c q^d r^e}{q}\right) + \kappa_0\left(\tfrac{p^c q^d r^e}{r}\right) \\
&\quad - \kappa_0\left(\tfrac{p^c q^d r^e}{pq}\right) - \kappa_0\left(\tfrac{p^c q^d r^e}{pr}\right) - \kappa_0\left(\tfrac{p^c q^d r^e}{qr}\right) + \kappa_0\left(\tfrac{p^c q^d r^e}{pqr}\right)\Big) \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^{d} (-1)^j \binom{d}{j}\binom{c+d-j}{d} \kappa_0(p^{c+d-j} r^e).
\end{aligned}$$

Analogous recursion relations apply for the product of more primes to powers.

Proof. For the recursion relations, the approach is similar to, but somewhat simpler than, that used to prove the recursion relations in Theorem 4. But we can deduce these relations from previous work using Proposition 1. Hille [7] and Chor et al. [4] proved that identical recursion relations govern $K(n)$, the number of ordered factorizations.

Since $\kappa_0(n) = 2K(n)$ for $n \geq 2$, the same recursion relations apply to $\kappa_0(n)$. For the explicit forms of κ_0, Chor et al. [4] give analogous results for $K(n)$, which when multiplied by 2 apply to $\kappa_0(n)$. □

Corollary 1. *Let α^* be the maximum exponent in the prime factorization of n. Then 2^{α^*} divides $\kappa_0(n)$.*

Proof. All of the recursion relations in Theorem 3 have a factor of 2 on the right side. The corollary is implied by iterating the recursion relation α^* times. Each time, the exponents on the right are reduced by at most 1. Iterating until the smallest exponent is reduced to 0, the exponent disappears since, for example, $\kappa_0(p^c q^0) = \kappa_0(p^c)$. Continuing this process ultimately gives a total of α^* factors of 2. The $\kappa_0(n)$ are expressed as a product of an integer and 2^{α^*} in Appendix A. □

5. Sum of recursive divisors

We now turn to the sum of recursive divisors $\kappa_1(n)$. This quantity is more intricate than $\kappa_0(n)$, because it depends on the primes as well as their exponents in the prime factorization of n.

5.1. Primes to a power

When n is equal to the product of primes to powers, $\kappa_1(n)$ satisfies recursion relations similar to those for $\kappa_0(n)$, but more complex.

Theorem 4. *Let p, q and r be prime. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa_1(p^c) &= 2\kappa_1\left(\tfrac{p^c}{p}\right) + \tfrac{p-1}{p}p^c \\
&= \begin{cases} 2^c\,\frac{c+2}{2} & p = 2 \\ p^c\,\frac{p-1-(2/p)^c}{p-2} & p \text{ odd} \end{cases} \\
\kappa_1(p^c q^d) &= 2\left(\kappa_1\left(\tfrac{p^c q^d}{p}\right) + \kappa_1\left(\tfrac{p^c q^d}{q}\right) - \kappa_1\left(\tfrac{p^c q^d}{pq}\right)\right) + \tfrac{p-1}{p}\tfrac{q-1}{q}p^c q^d \\
&= p^c q^d\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=0}^{c}\frac{2^i}{p^i}\sum_{j=0}^{d}\frac{1}{q^j}\sum_{k=0}^{j}\binom{i+k}{k}\binom{j}{k}\right) \\
\kappa_1(p^c q^d r^e) &= 2\Big(\kappa_1\left(\tfrac{p^c q^d r^e}{p}\right) + \kappa_1\left(\tfrac{p^c q^d r^e}{q}\right) + \kappa_1\left(\tfrac{p^c q^d r^e}{r}\right) \\
&\quad - \kappa_1\left(\tfrac{p^c q^d r^e}{pq}\right) - \kappa_1\left(\tfrac{p^c q^d r^e}{pr}\right) - \kappa_1\left(\tfrac{p^c q^d r^e}{qr}\right) + \kappa_1\left(\tfrac{p^c q^d r^e}{pqr}\right)\Big) \\
&\quad + \tfrac{p-1}{p}\tfrac{q-1}{q}\tfrac{r-1}{r}p^c q^d r^e.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We start with the recursion relations. For $n = p^c$, from Definition 1,

$$\kappa_1(p^c) = p^c + \sum_{i=0}^{c-1} \kappa_1(p^i). \tag{5}$$

Adding $\kappa_1(p^c)$ to both sides and with $c \to c-1$,

$$\sum_{i=0}^{c-1} \kappa_1(p^i) = 2\kappa_1(p^{c-1}) - p^{c-1},$$

which, when inserted into (5), gives the desired recurrence relation.

For $n = p^c q^d$, from Definition 1,

$$\kappa_1(p^c q^d) = p^c q^d + \sum_{i=0}^{c-1} \sum_{j=0}^{d} \kappa_1(p^i q^j) + \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \kappa_1(p^c q^j). \tag{6}$$

Adding $\kappa_1(p^c q^d)$ to both sides,

$$2\kappa_1(p^c q^d) = p^c q^d + \sum_{i=0}^{c-1} \sum_{j=0}^{d} \kappa_1(p^i q^j) + \sum_{j=0}^{d} \kappa_1(p^c q^j), \tag{7}$$

which we can equally write

$$2\kappa_1(p^c q^d) = p^c q^d + \sum_{i=0}^{c} \sum_{j=0}^{d} \kappa_1(p^i q^j). \tag{8}$$

With $d \to d-1$ in (7), we find

$$\sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \kappa_1(p^c q^j) = 2\kappa_1(p^c q^{d-1}) - p^c q^{d-1} - \sum_{j=0}^{c-1} \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \kappa_1(p^i q^j). \tag{9}$$

With $c \to c-1$ and $d \to d-1$ in (8), and inserting the result into (9), yields

$$\sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \kappa_1(p^c q^j) = 2\kappa_1(p^c q^{d-1}) - 2\kappa_1(p^{c-1} q^{d-1}) + (1-p)p^{c-1} q^{d-1}. \tag{10}$$

With $c \to c-1$ in (8), we find

$$\sum_{i=0}^{c-1} \sum_{j=0}^{d} \kappa_1(p^i q^j) = 2\kappa_1(p^{c-1} q^d) - p^{c-1} q^d. \tag{11}$$

Inserting (10) and (11) into (6) gives the desired recursion relation.

For $n = p^c q^d r^e$, the proof is similar to the one above and is omitted here.

For the explicit forms of $\kappa_1(n)$, we appeal to Theorem 1, which tells us

$$\frac{2\kappa_1(n)}{n} = 1 + \sum_{d|n} \frac{\kappa_0(d)}{d}. \tag{12}$$

For $n = p^c$, from (12) we have

$$\frac{2\kappa_1(p^c)}{p^c} = 1 + \sum_{i=0}^{c} \frac{\kappa_0(p^i)}{p^i}.$$

Inserting Theorem 3 into the above gives the desired result. For $n = p^c q^d$, from (12) we have

$$\frac{2\kappa_1(p^c q^d)}{p^c q^d} = 1 + \sum_{i=0}^{c} \sum_{j=0}^{d} \frac{\kappa_0(p^i q^j)}{p^i q^j}.$$

Inserting Theorem 3 into the above gives the desired result. For $p = 2$, the result simplifies to contain just two sums. □

6. Numbers that are recursively divisible to a high degree

6.1. Recursively highly composite numbers

A number n is highly composite [11] if it has more divisors than any of its predecessors, that is, $\sigma_0(n) > \sigma_0(m)$ for all $m < n$. These are shown in the right side of Table 3 in Appendix A.

By analogy with highly composite numbers, a number n is recursively highly composite if it has more recursive divisors than any of its predecessors.

Definition 3. n is recursively highly composite if $\kappa_0(n) > \kappa_0(m)$ for all $m < n$.

These numbers are shown in the left side of Table 3 in Appendix A. From the third term, they correspond to the indices of sequence records of $K(n)$, the K-champion numbers [5]. Because $\kappa_0(n)$ depends only on the exponents in the prime factorization of n, the exponents in recursively highly composite numbers must be non-increasing.

6.2. Recursively super-abundant numbers

A number n is super-abundant [2] if the sum of its divisors, normalized by n, is greater than that of any of its predecessors, that is, $\sigma(n)/n > \sigma(m)/m$ for all $m < n$. These are the starred numbers in the right side of Table 3 in Appendix A. For small n, super-abundant numbers are also highly composite, but later this ceases to be the case. The

first super-abundant number that is not highly composite is 1,163,962,800 (A166735 [1]), and in fact only 449 numbers have both properties (A166981 [1]).

By analogy with super-abundant numbers, a number n is recursively super-abundant if the sum of its recursive divisors, normalized by n, is greater than that of any of its predecessors.

Definition 4. n is recursively super-abundant if $\kappa_1(n)/n > \kappa_1(m)/m$ for all $m < n$.

These numbers are starred in the left side of Table 3 in Appendix A. Early on, recursively super-abundant numbers are recursively highly composite. The first exception is 181,440.

6.3. Applications

In graphic and digital design, the layout of graphics and text is often constrained to lie on an underlying rectangular grid [10]. The grid elements are the primitive building blocks from which bigger columns or rows can be formed. For example, grids of 24 and 96 columns are often used for books and websites, respectively [10]. Using a grid reduces the space of possible designs, making it easier to navigate. And the design elements become more interoperable, like how Lego bricks snap into place with one another, making it faster to build new designs.

What are the best grid sizes? The challenge is committing to a grid size now that provides the greatest optionality for an unknown future. Imagine, for example, that we have to cut a pie into slices, to be divided up later for an unknown number of colleagues. How many slices should we choose? The answer in this case is straightforward: the best grids are the ones with the most divisors, such as the highly composite or super-abundant numbers [11,2].

But the story gets more complicated when we need to consider steps into the future. For instance, imagine now that each colleague takes his share of pie home to further divide it amongst his family—but they cannot make any additional cuts. In this case, not only does the whole need to be highly divisible, but the parts need to be highly divisible, too. This process can be extended in a recursive way.

Recursive modularity, in which there are multiple levels of organization, has long been a feature of graphic and digital design. For example, newspapers are divided into columns for different stories, and columns into sub-columns of text. But with the rise of digital technologies, recursive modularity is becoming the rule. Different pages of a website are divided into different numbers of columns, each of which can be broken down into smaller design elements. Often one column from the website fills the full screen of a phone.

Specific applications of recursively highly composite numbers are shown in Table 2. In design and technology, these numbers are used for the screen resolutions of watches, phones, cameras and computers. They appear in typesetting, websites, and experimental equipment, such as test tube microplates. In display standards, many resolutions use

Table 2
Applications. Numbers that are recursively divisible to a large degree predict the numbers that frequently show up in design and technology and display standards. All of the numbers n are recursively highly composite; those that are starred are also recursively super-abundant.

n	*Design and technology*		*Display standards*	
*24	24 × 16	Biotech 384-well assay		
*48	128 × 48	TRS 80		
72	72 points/in	Adobe typography point		
96	96 × 65	Nokia 1100 phone		
*120	120 × 160	Nokia 100 phone	160 × 120	QQVGA
144	144 × 168	Pebble Time watch		
*240	240 × 64	Atari Portfolio	320 × 240	Quarter VGA
288	352 × 288	Video CD	352 × 288	CIF
*360	360 × 360	LG Watch Style	640 × 360	nHD
480	320 × 480	iPhone 1–3	640 × 480	VGA
576	576 lines	PAL analog television	1024 × 576	WSVGA
*720	720 × 364	Macintosh XL, Hercules	1280 × 720	HD
864			1152 × 864	XGA+
960		Facebook website		
*1152			1152 × 2048	QWXGA
*1440		3.5" disk block size	2560 × 1440	Quad HD
1920			1920 × 1080	Full HD
*2160	2160 × 1440	Microsoft Surface Pro 3	4096 × 2160	4K Ultra HD
2304	2304 × 1440	MacBook Retina		
*2880	2880 × 1800	15" MacBook Pro Retina	5120 × 2880	5K
3456		Canon EOS 1100D		
*4320			7680 × 4320	8K Ultra HD
*8640			15360 × 8640	16K Ultra HD

these numbers in the height or width, measured in pixels. Because these standards tend to preserve certain aspect ratios, such as 16:9, usually just one of the two dimensions is highly recursively divisible.

6.4. Open questions

There are many open questions about the recursive divisor function and numbers that are recursively divisible to a high degree. Here are six.

1. Let n be a number such that $\sigma_1(n) > 3n$. The first such numbers are 180, 240, 360, ... (A068403 [1]). Then the divisor tree for $4n$ overlaps itself (see lims.ac.uk/recursively-divisible-numbers). But there are other numbers that cause overlaps. What are they?
2. For what values of n do divisor trees have an (approximate) fractal dimension?
3. What is the value of $\kappa_1(n)$ when n is the product of the first k distinct primes?
4. How frequently do recursively highly composite numbers appear? How about recursively super-abundant numbers?
5. Recursively perfect numbers satisfy $\kappa_0(n) = n$ [6]. How frequently do they appear?
6. Recursively abundant numbers satisfy $\kappa_0(n) > n$ [6]. Are any odd and, if so, what is the smallest?

I acknowledge Andriy Fedosyeyev for creating the divisor tree generator, lims.ac.uk/recursively-divisible-numbers.

Data availability

No data was used for the research described in the article.

Appendix A

Table 3
Numbers that are recursively divisible to a high degree. The left side shows the recursively highly composite numbers and the recursively super-abundant numbers (starred) up to a million. All of the recursively super-abundant numbers shown are also recursively highly composite, apart from one, 181,440. The right side shows the highly composite numbers and the super-abundant numbers (starred) up to a million. All of the super-abundant numbers shown are also highly composite.

n	.	$\kappa_0(n)$	n	$\sigma_0(n)$
$*1 = 1$		1	$*1 = 1$	1
$*2 = 2$		$1 \cdot 2$	$*2 = 2$	2
$*4 = 2^2$		$1 \cdot 2^2$	$*4 = 2^2$	3
$*6 = 2 \cdot 3$		$3 \cdot 2$	$*6 = 2 \cdot 3$	4
$8 = 2^3$		$1 \cdot 2^3$		
$*12 = 2^2 \cdot 3$		$4 \cdot 2^2$	$*12 = 2^2 \cdot 3$	6
$*24 = 2^3 \cdot 3$		$5 \cdot 2^3$	$*24 = 2^3 \cdot 3$	8
$*36 = 2^2 \cdot 3^2$		$13 \cdot 2^2$	$*36 = 2^2 \cdot 3^2$	9
$*48 = 2^4 \cdot 3$		$6 \cdot 2^4$	$*48 = 2^4 \cdot 3$	10
			$*60 = 2^2 \cdot 3 \cdot 5$	12
$72 = 2^3 \cdot 3^2$		$19 \cdot 2^3$		
$96 = 2^5 \cdot 3$		$7 \cdot 2^5$		
$*120 = 2^3 \cdot 3 \cdot 5$		$33 \cdot 2^3$	$*120 = 2^3 \cdot 3 \cdot 5$	16
$144 = 2^4 \cdot 3^2$		$26 \cdot 2^4$		
			$*180 = 2^2 \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5$	18
$192 = 2^6 \cdot 3$		$8 \cdot 2^6$		
$*240 = 2^4 \cdot 3 \cdot 5$		$46 \cdot 2^4$	$*240 = 2^4 \cdot 3 \cdot 5$	20
$288 = 2^5 \cdot 3^2$		$34 \cdot 2^5$		
$*360 = 2^3 \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5$		$151 \cdot 2^3$	$*360 = 2^3 \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5$	24
$432 = 2^4 \cdot 3^3$		$96 \cdot 2^4$		
$480 = 2^5 \cdot 3 \cdot 5$		$61 \cdot 2^5$		
$576 = 2^6 \cdot 3^2$		$43 \cdot 2^6$		
$*720 = 2^4 \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5$		$236 \cdot 2^4$	$*720 = 2^4 \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5$	30
			$*840 = 2^3 \cdot 3 \cdot 5 \cdot 7$	32
$864 = 2^5 \cdot 3^3$		$138 \cdot 2^5$		
$960 = 2^6 \cdot 3 \cdot 5$		$78 \cdot 2^6$		
$*1152 = 2^7 \cdot 3^2$		$53 \cdot 2^7$		
			$*1260 = 2^2 \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5 \cdot 7$	36
$*1440 = 2^5 \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5$		$346 \cdot 2^5$		
			$*1680 = 2^4 \cdot 3 \cdot 5 \cdot 7$	40
$1728 = 2^6 \cdot 3^3$		$190 \cdot 2^6$		
$1920 = 2^7 \cdot 3 \cdot 5$		$97 \cdot 2^7$		
$*2160 = 2^4 \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5$		$996 \cdot 2^4$		
$2304 = 2^8 \cdot 3^2$		$64 \cdot 2^8$		
			$*2520 = 2^3 \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5 \cdot 7$	48
$*2880 = 2^6 \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5$		$484 \cdot 2^6$		
$3456 = 2^7 \cdot 3^3$		$253 \cdot 2^7$		
$*4320 = 2^5 \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5$		$1590 \cdot 2^5$		
			$*5040 = 2^4 \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5 \cdot 7$	60
$*5760 = 2^7 \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5$		$653 \cdot 2^7$		
$6912 = 2^8 \cdot 3^3$		$328 \cdot 2^8$		
			$7560 = 2^3 \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5 \cdot 7$	64
$*8640 = 2^6 \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5$		$2402 \cdot 2^6$		
			$*10080 = 2^5 \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5 \cdot 7$	72

Table 3 (*continued*)

n	$\kappa_0(n)$	n	$\sigma_0(n)$
$*11520 = 2^8 \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5$	$856 \cdot 2^8$		
		$*15120 = 2^4 \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5 \cdot 7$	80
$*17280 = 2^7 \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5$	$3477 \cdot 2^7$		
		$20160 = 2^6 \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5 \cdot 7$	84
$23040 = 2^9 \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5$	$1096 \cdot 2^9$		
		$*25200 = 2^4 \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5^2 \cdot 7$	90
$*25920 = 2^6 \cdot 3^4 \cdot 5$	$10368 \cdot 2^6$		
		$*27720 = 2^3 \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5 \cdot 7 \cdot 11$	96
$*30240 = 2^5 \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5 \cdot 7$	$20874 \cdot 2^5$		
$*34560 = 2^8 \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5$	$4864 \cdot 2^8$		
		$45360 = 2^4 \cdot 3^4 \cdot 5 \cdot 7$	100
$46080 = 2^{10} \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5$	$1376 \cdot 2^{10}$		
		$50400 = 2^5 \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5^2 \cdot 7$	108
$*51840 = 2^7 \cdot 3^4 \cdot 5$	$15979 \cdot 2^7$		
		$*55440 = 2^4 \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5 \cdot 7 \cdot 11$	120
$*60480 = 2^6 \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5 \cdot 7$	$34266 \cdot 2^6$		
$*69120 = 2^9 \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5$	$6616 \cdot 2^9$		
		$83160 = 2^3 \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5 \cdot 7 \cdot 11$	128
$86400 = 2^7 \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5^2$	$28481 \cdot 2^7$		
$*103680 = 2^8 \cdot 3^4 \cdot 5$	$23692 \cdot 2^8$		
		$*110880 = 2^5 \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5 \cdot 7 \cdot 11$	144
$*120960 = 2^7 \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5 \cdot 7$	$53485 \cdot 2^7$		
$138240 = 2^{10} \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5$	$8790 \cdot 2^{10}$		
$161280 = 2^9 \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5 \cdot 7$	$17656 \cdot 2^9$		
		$*166320 = 2^4 \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5 \cdot 7 \cdot 11$	160
$*172800 = 2^8 \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5^2$	$42520 \cdot 2^8$		
$*207360 = 2^9 \cdot 3^4 \cdot 5$	$34026 \cdot 2^9$		
		$221760 = 2^6 \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5 \cdot 7 \cdot 11$	168
$*241920 = 2^8 \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5 \cdot 7$	$80176 \cdot 2^8$		
$276480 = 2^{11} \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5$	$11447 \cdot 2^{11}$		
		$*277200 = 2^4 \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5^2 \cdot 7 \cdot 11$	180
$311040 = 2^8 \cdot 3^5 \cdot 5$	$103540 \cdot 2^8$		
		$*332640 = 2^5 \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5 \cdot 7 \cdot 11$	192
$*345600 = 2^9 \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5^2$	$61436 \cdot 2^9$		
$*362880 = 2^7 \cdot 3^4 \cdot 5 \cdot 7$	$267219 \cdot 2^7$		
$*414720 = 2^{10} \cdot 3^4 \cdot 5$	$47576 \cdot 2^{10}$		
$*483840 = 2^9 \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5 \cdot 7$	$116256 \cdot 2^9$		
		$498960 = 2^4 \cdot 3^4 \cdot 5 \cdot 7 \cdot 11$	200
$552960 = 2^{12} \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5$	$14652 \cdot 2^{12}$		
		$*554400 = 2^5 \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5^2 \cdot 7 \cdot 11$	216
$604800 = 2^7 \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5^2 \cdot 7$	$480953 \cdot 2^7$		
$622080 = 2^9 \cdot 3^5 \cdot 5$	$156278 \cdot 2^9$		
		$*665280 = 2^6 \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5 \cdot 7 \cdot 11$	224
$691200 = 2^{10} \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5^2$	$86362 \cdot 2^{10}$		
		$*720720 = 2^4 \cdot 3^2 \cdot 5 \cdot 7 \cdot 11 \cdot 13$	240
$*725760 = 2^8 \cdot 3^4 \cdot 5 \cdot 7$	$422932 \cdot 2^8$		
$829440 = 2^{11} \cdot 3^4 \cdot 5$	$65018 \cdot 2^{11}$		
$*967680 = 2^{10} \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5 \cdot 7$	$163934 \cdot 2^{10}$		
Recursively super-abundant but not recursively highly composite			
$*181440 = 2^6 \cdot 3^4 \cdot 5 \cdot 7$			

References

[1] N.J.A. Sloane (Ed.), The on-line encyclopedia of integer sequences, published electronically at https://oeis.org.

[2] L. Alaoglu, P. Erdös, On highly composite and similar numbers, Trans. Am. Math. Soc. 56 (1944) 448.
[3] E. Canfield, P. Erdös, C. Pomerance, On a problem of Oppenheim concerning "factorisatio numerorum", J. Number Theory 17 (1983) 1.
[4] B. Chor, P. Lemke, Z. Mador, On the number of ordered factorizations of natural numbers, Discrete Math. 214 (2000) 123.
[5] M. Deléglise, M. Hernane, J.-L. Nicolas, Grandes valeurs et nombres champions de la fonction arithmétique de Kalmár, J. Number Theory 128 (2008) 1676.
[6] T. Fink, Recursively abundant and recursively perfect numbers, arXiv:2008.10398.
[7] E. Hille, A problem in factorisatio numerorum, Acta Arith. 2 (1936) 134.
[8] L. Kalmar, A factorisatio numerorum probelmajarol, Mat. Fiz. Lapok 38 (1931) 1.
[9] M. Klazar, F. Luca, On the maximal order of numbers in the factorisatio numerorum problem, J. Number Theory 124 (2007) 470.
[10] J. Müller-Brockmann, Grid Systems in Graphic Design, Verlag Niggli, 1999.
[11] S. Ramanujan, Highly composite numbers, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. 14 (1915) 347. (The part of this paper on super-abundant numbers was originally suppressed.)