

On the Equations $y^2 - 10x^2 = 9$ and $z^2 - 17x^2 = 16$

Bilge Peker

Elementary Mathematics Education Programme
Ahmet Kelesoglu Education Faculty
Necmettin Erbakan University, Konya, Turkey

Selin (Inag) Cenberci

Secondary Mathematics Education Programme
Ahmet Kelesoglu Education Faculty
Necmettin Erbakan University, Konya, Turkey

Copyright © 2017 Bilge Peker and Selin (Inag) Cenberci. This article is distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Abstract

Let k be an integer, A is a set $\{x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_n\}$ with n positive different integers. A set is called P_k , if $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $i \neq j$, $x_i x_j + k$ is a square of an integer. The purpose of this article is to give another proof of the non-extendibility of the set $P_{-1} = \{1, 10, 17\}$.

Mathematics Subject Classification: 11D45, 11D99

Keywords: Diophantine m -tuples, Pell equations

1. INTRODUCTION

The problem of extending P_k sets is an old one dating from the times of Diophantus [4]. The most famous result in this area is due to Baker and Davenport [1], who proved that the P_1 set $\{1, 3, 8, 120\}$ can not be extended. Dujella [5] has a vast amount of literature about this interesting problem.

Brown [2] proved the conjecture for the triples $\{n^2 + 1, (n + 1)^2 + 1, (2n + 1)^2 + 1\}$ where $n \not\equiv 0 \pmod{4}$ and for the triples $\{2, 2n^2 + 2n + 1, 2n^2 + 6n + 5\}$ where $n \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$. Then Brown proved non-extendibility of triples $\{1, 2, 5\}$ and $\{17, 26, 68\}$.

Mohanty and Ramasamy [8] proved that the P_{-1} set $\{1, 5, 10\}$ has no extension. Kedlaya [7] gave a list of P_{-1} triples $\{1, 2, 145\}$, $\{1, 2, 4901\}$, $\{1, 5, 65\}$, $\{1, 5, 20737\}$, $\{1, 10, 17\}$ and $\{1, 26, 37\}$. While he was constructing the list, he used a general elementary approach based on an idea of Cohn and the theory of the Pell equation.

Muriefah and Rashed [9] proved that the set $P_{-1} = \{1, 5, 442\}$ can not be extended.

Filipin [6] proved that there do not exist different positive integers $c, d > 1$ such that the product of any two distinct elements of the set $\{1, 10, c, d\}$ diminished by 1 is a perfect square. Peker, Dujella and Cenberci [10] showed that for an integer k such that $|k| \geq 2$, the $D(-2k+1)$ -triple $\{1, k^2, k^2 + 2k - 1\}$ can not be extended to a $D(-2k+1)$ -quadruple.

In this paper, we give another proof of the non-extendibility of the P_{-1} set $\{1, 10, 17\}$ by using the same method with Muriefah and Rashed.

For proof, we need the following lemma from [3].

Lemma 1. *Let $u_n + v_n\sqrt{D}$ ($n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$) be the solution of $u^2 - Dv^2 = N$ in a fixed class k , where N is given nonzero integer, then*

$$(1) \quad u_{-r} = u_r$$

$$(2) \quad v_{-r} = -v_r$$

$$(3) \quad u_{r+s} = A_s u_r + DB_s v_r$$

$$(4) \quad v_{r+s} = B_s u_r + A_s v_r$$

where $A_s + B_s\sqrt{D} = (a + b\sqrt{D})^s$, $s = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ and $a + b\sqrt{D}$ is the fundamental solution of the Pell equation $A^2 - DB^2 = 1$.

Now we can give our theorem.

Theorem 1. *The P_{-1} set $\{1, 10, 17\}$ can not be extended.*

Proof. Assume that there is a positive integer m and the set $P_{-1} = \{1, 10, 17\}$ can be extended with m . Then let us find integers x, y, z such that,

$$m - 1 = x^2 \tag{1}$$

$$10m - 1 = y^2 \tag{2}$$

$$17m - 1 = z^2 \tag{3}$$

where x, y, z are some integers satisfying the above equations. Eliminating of m between (1), (2) and (1), (3) yields

$$y^2 - 10x^2 = 9 \tag{4}$$

$$z^2 - 17x^2 = 16 \tag{5}$$

respectively. So we have to obtain the solutions of the Pell equation (4) with the restriction given by (5).

The Pell equation $u^2 - 10v^2 = 1$ has the fundamental solution $u_1 = 19$, $v_1 = 6$. The equation (4) has six general solutions (6) (7) (8) (9) (10) (11), but it is enough to analyze the first three equations (6) (7) (8).

$$y_n + x_n\sqrt{10} = (7 + 2\sqrt{10}) (19 + 6\sqrt{10})^n \tag{6}$$

$$y_n + x_n\sqrt{10} = (7 - 2\sqrt{10}) (19 + 6\sqrt{10})^n \tag{7}$$

$$y_n + x_n\sqrt{10} = 3 (19 + 6\sqrt{10})^n \tag{8}$$

$$y_n + x_n\sqrt{10} = (-7 + 2\sqrt{10}) (19 + 6\sqrt{10})^n \tag{9}$$

$$y_n + x_n\sqrt{10} = (7 - 2\sqrt{10}) (19 + 6\sqrt{10})^n \tag{10}$$

$$y_n + x_n\sqrt{10} = -3 (19 + 6\sqrt{10})^n \tag{11}$$

respectively. Since $u_n + v_n\sqrt{10} = (19 + 6\sqrt{10})^n$, we get the following table of values:

n	u_n	v_n
0	1	0
1	19	6
2	721	228
3	27379	8658
4	1039681	328776

Table 1

If we consider the equation (6), we can calculate the following values:

n	y_n	x_n
0	7	2
1	253	80
2	9607	3038
3	364813	115364
4	13853287	4380794

Table 2

From the *Lemma 1* we can write $x_{n+4} = 328776y_n + 1039681x_n$, so $x_{n+4} \equiv 53353x_n \pmod{328776}$ which implies $x_{n+4} \equiv x_n \pmod{19}$. Equation (5) becomes

$$z^2 \equiv 16 + 17x_n^2 \pmod{19}$$

We must think four different cases for this equation.

The first one is $n \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$, then $x_n \equiv x_0 \equiv 2 \pmod{19}$. This implies $z^2 \equiv 8 \pmod{19}$, but the Legendre symbol $\left(\frac{8}{19}\right) = -1$.

The second case is $n \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$, then $x_n \equiv x_1 \equiv 80 \pmod{19}$. This implies $z^2 \equiv 3 \pmod{19}$, but $\left(\frac{3}{19}\right) = -1$.

The third case is $n \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$, then $x_n \equiv x_2 \equiv 3038 \equiv 17 \pmod{19}$. This implies $z^2 \equiv 8 \pmod{19}$ and this is the same result with the first case.

The last case is $n \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, then $x_n \equiv x_3 \equiv 115364 \equiv 15 \pmod{19}$. This implies $z^2 \equiv 3 \pmod{19}$ and this is the same result with the second case.

For the four cases, there exists no integer such that x_n simultaneously satisfies (4) and (5).

Now if we consider the equation (7), then one can check that the following table of values:

n	y_n	x_n
0	7	-2
1	13	4
2	487	154
3	18493	5848
4	702247	222070

Table 3

From the *Lemma 1* we can write $x_{n+4} = 328776y_n + 1039681x_n$, so $x_{n+4} \equiv 53353x_n \pmod{328776}$ which implies $x_{n+4} \equiv x_n \pmod{19}$. Equation (5) becomes

$$z^2 \equiv 16 + 17x_n^2 \pmod{19}$$

We must check four different cases for this equation.

The first one, if $n \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$, then $x_n \equiv x_0 \equiv -2 \pmod{19}$. This implies $z^2 \equiv 8 \pmod{19}$, but the Legendre symbol $\left(\frac{8}{19}\right) = -1$.

The second case, if $n \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$, then $x_n \equiv x_1 \equiv 4 \pmod{19}$. This implies $z^2 \equiv 288 \equiv 3 \pmod{19}$, but $\left(\frac{3}{19}\right) = -1$.

The third case, if $n \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$, then $x_n \equiv x_2 \equiv 154 \equiv 2 \pmod{19}$. This implies $z^2 \equiv 4929 \equiv 8 \pmod{19}$ but we know from the first case $\left(\frac{8}{19}\right) = -1$.

The last case, if $n \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, then $x_n \equiv x_3 \equiv 5848 \equiv -4 \pmod{19}$. This implies $z^2 \equiv 288 \equiv 3 \pmod{19}$ and this is the same result with the second case.

Now if we consider the equation (8), we can calculate following table:

n	y_n	x_n
0	3	0
1	57	18
2	2163	684
3	82137	25974
4	3119043	986328

Table 4

From the *Lemma 1*, we get $x_{n+4} = 328776y_n + 1039681x_n$, so $x_{n+4} \equiv 53353x_n \pmod{328776}$ which implies $x_{n+4} \equiv x_n \pmod{19}$. Equation (5) becomes

$$z^2 \equiv 16 + 17x_n^2 \pmod{19}$$

We must check four different cases for this equation.

If $n \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$, then $x_n \equiv x_1 \equiv 18 \pmod{19}$. This implies $z^2 \equiv 5524 \equiv 14 \pmod{19}$, but $\left(\frac{14}{19}\right) = -1$.

We know $x_{n+4} \equiv 53353x_n \pmod{328776}$, which implies $x_{n+4} \equiv -x_n \pmod{103}$. Equation (5) becomes

$$z^2 \equiv 16 + 17x_n^2 \pmod{103}$$

If $n \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$ then $x_n \equiv x_2 \equiv 684 \equiv 66 \pmod{103}$. This implies $z^2 \equiv 74068 \equiv 11 \pmod{103}$, but $\left(\frac{11}{103}\right) = -1$.

If $n \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ then $x_n \equiv x_3 \equiv 25974 \equiv 18 \pmod{103}$. This implies $z^2 \equiv 5524 \equiv 65 \pmod{103}$, but $\left(\frac{65}{103}\right) = -1$.

If $n \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$, $x_{n+4} = 328776y_n + 1039681x_n$ which implies $x_{n+4} \equiv 328776y_n \pmod{1039681}$. If we use $x_{n+4} \equiv 328776y_n \pmod{1039681}$ to the equation (4), we find $2y^2 \equiv 9 \pmod{1039681}$. Then we get $20x^2 \equiv -9 \pmod{1039681}$. The equation (5) implies that $z^2 \equiv 519924 \pmod{1039681}$, but Legendre symbol $\left(\frac{519924}{1039681}\right) = -1$, so (5) is impossible.

From all of the cases, the equation system can not be solved simultaneously, so this means the P_{-1} set $\{1, 10, 17\}$ can not be extended. This completes the proof. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Baker and H. Davenport, The equations $3x^2 - 2 = y^2$ and $8x^2 - 7 = z^2$, *The Quarterly Journal of Mathematics*, **20** (1969), 129-137. <https://doi.org/10.1093/qmath/20.1.129>
- [2] E. Brown, Sets in which $xy + k$ is always a square, *Math. Comp.*, **45** (1985), 613-620. <https://doi.org/10.1090/s0025-5718-1985-0804949-7>
- [3] G. N. Copley, Recurrence relations for solutions of Pell's equation, *The Amer. Math. Monthly*, **66** (1959), 288-290. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2309637>

- [4] L. E. Dickson, *History of the Theory of Numbers*, Vol. 2, Chelsea New York, 1996.
- [5] A. Dujella, *Diophantine m -tuples*, <http://www.math.hr/~duje/dtuples.html>
- [6] A. Filipin, Non-extendibility of $D(-1)$ -triples of the form $\{1, 10, c\}$, *International Journal of Mathematics and Mathematical Sciences*, **14** (2005), 2217–2226.
<https://doi.org/10.1155/ijmms.2005.2217>
- [7] K. S. Kedlaya, Solving constrained Pell equations, *Math. Comp.*, **67** (1998), 833-842.
<https://doi.org/10.1090/s0025-5718-98-00918-1>
- [8] S. P. Mohanty and A. M. S. Ramasamy, The simultaneous Diophantine equations $5y^2 - 20 = x^2$ and $2y^2 + 1 = z^2$, *Journal of Number Theory*, **18** (1984), 356-359.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-314x\(84\)90068-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-314x(84)90068-4)
- [9] F. S. A. Muriefah and A. Rashed, The Simultaneous Diophantine equations $y^2 - 5x^2 = 4$ and $z^2 - 442x^2 = 441$, *The Arabian Journal for Sci. and Engineering*, **31** (2006), no. 2A, 207-211.
- [10] B. Peker, A. Dujella and S.I. Cenberci, The non-extendibility of $D(-2k + 1)$ -triples $\{1, k^2, k^2 + 2k - 1\}$, *Miskolc Mathematical Notes*, **16** (2015), no. 1, 385-390.

Received: July 4, 2017; Published: July 20, 2017