

*Answer.* The only such positive integers are  $a = 2$  and  $b = c = 1$ .

*Solution.* For all positive integers  $n$ , let  $(2 + \sqrt{-3})^n = x_n + y_n\sqrt{-3}$ , where  $x_n$  and  $y_n$  are integers. Then also  $(2 - \sqrt{-3})^n = x_n - y_n\sqrt{-3}$ , and so

$$x_n^2 + 3y_n^2 = (x_n + y_n\sqrt{-3})(x_n - y_n\sqrt{-3}) = (2 + \sqrt{-3})^n(2 - \sqrt{-3})^n = 7^n.$$

We will show that, up to sign,  $x_n$  and  $y_n$  are the unique integers such that  $x_n$  and  $y_n$  are relatively prime and  $x_n^2 + 3y_n^2 = 7^n$ .

We proceed by induction on  $n$ . The base case  $n = 1$  is clear. For the induction step, suppose that we have already established uniqueness for  $n$ , and that  $x^2 + 3y^2 = 7^{n+1}$  with  $x$  and  $y$  relatively prime. Then

$$(x - 2y)(x + 2y) = x^2 - 4y^2 \equiv x^2 + 3y^2 \equiv 0 \pmod{7}.$$

Without loss of generality, 7 divides  $x - 2y$ . (Otherwise, if 7 divides  $x + 2y$ , we replace  $y$  with  $-y$ .) Set  $u = (2x + 3y)/7$  and  $v = (-x + 2y)/7$ . Then  $u$  and  $v$  are integers;  $x + y\sqrt{-3} = (2 + \sqrt{-3})(u + v\sqrt{-3})$ ;  $u$  and  $v$  are relatively prime; and  $u^2 + 3v^2 = 7^n$ . By the induction hypothesis,  $u = \pm x_n$  and  $v = \pm y_n$ , and the rest is straightforward.

To solve the problem, we must find all  $n$  such that  $n$  divides  $y_n$ , and furthermore  $n$  and  $y_n/n$  are relatively prime. We proceed to show that the only such  $n$  is  $n = 1$ .

Let  $p$  be any prime such that  $p$  divides  $y_n$  for some  $n$ . We define the *order* of  $p$  to be the least positive integer  $d$  such that  $p$  divides  $y_d$ . We will show that  $p$  divides  $y_n$  if and only if  $d$  divides  $n$ .

To this end, observe that the sequence  $y_1, y_2, \dots$  satisfies the second-order homogeneous linear recurrence relation  $y_n = 4y_{n-1} - 7y_{n-2}$ . Consequently, modulo  $p$  this sequence is congruent to

$$\begin{array}{cccccccccccc} y_1, & y_2, & \dots, & y_{d-1}, & 0, & -7y_1y_{d-1}, & -7y_2y_{d-1}, & \dots, & -7y_{d-1}^2, & 0, \\ 7^2y_1y_{d-1}^2, & 7^2y_2y_{d-1}^2, & \dots, & 7^2y_{d-1}^3, & 0, & -7^3y_1y_{d-1}^3, & -7^3y_2y_{d-1}^3, & \dots \end{array}$$

The claim follows.

We proceed to show that, when  $p \geq 5$ , the order  $d$  of  $p$  divides either  $p - 1$  or  $p + 1$ . To this end, it suffices to show that  $p$  divides either  $y_{p-1}$  or  $y_{p+1}$ . We work modulo  $p$ .

By expanding  $(2 + \sqrt{-3})^n$  we get that, for all  $n$ ,

$$y_n = \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \frac{n-1}{2} \rfloor} \binom{n}{2k+1} 2^{n-(2k+1)} (-3)^k.$$

Let  $r$  be the unique remainder modulo  $p$  such that  $p$  divides  $4r + 3$ . By Fermat's little theorem,  $p$  divides  $r^{p-1} - 1 = (r^{\frac{p-1}{2}} - 1)(r^{\frac{p-1}{2}} + 1)$ .

Suppose first that  $p$  divides  $r^{\frac{p-1}{2}} - 1$ . We will show that in this case  $p$  divides  $y_{p-1}$ .

Since, for all  $\ell = 0, 1, \dots, p-1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \binom{p-1}{\ell} &= \frac{(p-1)!}{\ell!(p-1-\ell)!} \equiv \frac{1 \cdot 2 \cdot \dots \cdot (p-1)}{1 \cdot 2 \cdot \dots \cdot \ell \cdot (-[\ell+1]) \cdot (-[\ell+2]) \cdot \dots \cdot (-[p-1])} \\ &\equiv (-1)^{(p-1)-\ell} = (-1)^\ell, \end{aligned}$$

we obtain

$$y_{p-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\frac{p-3}{2}} \binom{p-1}{2k+1} 2^{(p-1)-(2k+1)} (-3)^k \equiv -2^{p-2} \sum_{k=0}^{\frac{p-3}{2}} r^k = -2^{p-2} \cdot \frac{r^{\frac{p-1}{2}} - 1}{r - 1} \equiv 0,$$

as needed. (Here,  $r \not\equiv 1 \pmod p$  because that would imply  $p = 7$ , whereas 7 does not divide  $y_n$  for any  $n$ .)

Otherwise, suppose that  $p$  divides  $r^{\frac{p-1}{2}} + 1$ . We will show that in this case  $p$  divides  $y_{p+1}$ . Since, for all  $\ell = 2, 3, \dots, p-1$ ,

$$\binom{p+1}{\ell} = \frac{(p+1)!}{\ell!(p+1-\ell)!} \equiv 0,$$

we obtain

$$y_{p+1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\frac{p-1}{2}} \binom{p+1}{2k+1} 2^{(p+1)-(2k+1)} (-3)^k \equiv 2^p \left( \binom{p+1}{1} r^0 + \binom{p+1}{p} r^{\frac{p-1}{2}} \right) \equiv 2^p (r^{\frac{p-1}{2}} + 1) \equiv 0,$$

as needed.

Suppose that  $n \geq 2$  and  $n$  divides  $y_n$ . We will show that either 2 or 3 divides  $n$ .

To this end, let  $p$  be the least prime factor of  $n$  and suppose, for the sake of contradiction, that  $p \geq 5$ . Let  $d$  be the order of  $p$ . Since  $p$  divides  $n$  and  $n$  divides  $y_n$ , we obtain that  $p$  divides  $y_n$ . Consequently,  $d$  divides  $n$ . However,  $d$  also divides at least one of  $p-1$  and  $p+1$ . Therefore, all prime factors of  $d$  are smaller than  $p$ . Since  $d \geq 2$  and  $d$  divides  $n$ , we arrive at a contradiction.

To complete the solution, we introduce the following lemma.

*Lemma.* Let  $k$  and  $\ell$  be arbitrary positive integers. Then  $y_k$  divides  $y_{k\ell}$  and  $\gcd(y_k, y_{k\ell}/y_k) = \gcd(y_k, \ell)$ .

*Proof.* Setting  $\alpha = 2 + \sqrt{-3}$  and  $\beta = 2 - \sqrt{-3}$ , we obtain

$$y_{k\ell} = \frac{\alpha^{k\ell} - \beta^{k\ell}}{2\sqrt{-3}} = \frac{\alpha^k - \beta^k}{2\sqrt{-3}} \cdot \sum_{m=0}^{\ell-1} (\alpha^k)^m (\beta^k)^{(\ell-1)-m} = y_k \sum_{m=0}^{\ell-1} (x_k + y_k \sqrt{-3})^m (x_k - y_k \sqrt{-3})^{(\ell-1)-m}.$$

When we expand the above sum for  $y_{k\ell}/y_k$ , all terms that contain  $\sqrt{-3}$  to an odd power cancel out and all of the remaining terms that contain  $y_k$  are congruent to zero modulo  $y_k$ . Gathering together the remaining terms, we arrive at

$$\frac{y_{k\ell}}{y_k} \equiv \sum_{m=0}^{\ell-1} x_k^m x_k^{(\ell-1)-m} = \ell \cdot x_k^{\ell-1} \pmod{y_k}.$$

Since  $x_k$  and  $y_k$  are relatively prime for all  $k$ , this completes the proof.  $\square$

The order of 2 is 2. Then, from  $y_2 = 2^2$  and the Lemma, by induction on  $\nu_2(n)$  we obtain that  $\nu_2(y_n) = \nu_2(n) + 1$  for all even  $n$ . Similarly, the order of 3 is 3. Then, from  $y_3 = 3^2$  and the Lemma, by induction on  $\nu_3(n)$  we obtain that  $\nu_3(y_n) = \nu_3(n) + 1$  for all  $n$  such that 3 divides  $n$ .

Suppose that  $n \geq 2$  and  $n$  divides  $y_n$ . Then, as we established already, either 2 or 3 divides  $n$ . However, again as we established already, in the former case both  $n$  and  $y_n/n$  are multiples of 2, and in the latter case both  $n$  and  $y_n/n$  are multiples of 3. Therefore,  $n$  and  $y_n/n$  are not relatively prime.

This completes the solution.