

# Lacunary formal power series and the Stern-Brocot sequence

J.-P. Allouche

CNRS, Institut de Mathématiques de Jussieu

Équipe Combinatoire et Optimisation

Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Case 247, 4 Place Jussieu

F-75252 Paris Cedex 05

France

`allouche@math.jussieu.fr`

M. Mendès France

Université Bordeaux I

Mathématiques

F-33405 Talence Cedex

France

`michel.mendes-france@math.u-bordeaux1.fr`

*À la mémoire de Philippe Flajolet*

## Abstract

Let  $F(X) = \sum_{n \geq 0} (-1)^{\varepsilon_n} X^{-\lambda_n}$  be a real lacunary formal power series, where  $\varepsilon_n = 0, 1$  and  $\lambda_{n+1}/\lambda_n > 2$ . It is known that the denominators  $Q_n(X)$  of the convergents of its continued fraction expansion are polynomials with coefficients  $0, \pm 1$ , and that the number of nonzero terms in  $Q_n(X)$  is the  $n$ th term of the Stern-Brocot sequence. We show that replacing the index  $n$  by any 2-adic integer  $\omega$  makes sense. We prove that  $Q_\omega(X)$  is a polynomial if and only if  $\omega \in \mathbb{Z}$ . In all the other cases  $Q_\omega(X)$  is an infinite formal power series, the algebraic properties of which we discuss in the special case  $\lambda_n = 2^{n+1} - 1$ .

Keywords: Stern-Brocot sequence, continued fractions of formal power series, automatic sequences, algebraicity of formal power series.

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Lacunary power series and continued fraction expansions

Let  $\Lambda = (\lambda_n)_{n \geq 0}$  be a sequence of positive integers with  $0 < \lambda_0 < \lambda_1 < \dots$  satisfying  $\lambda_{n+1}/\lambda_n > 2$  for all  $n \geq 0$ . Consider the formal power series  $F(X) := \sum_{n \geq 0} (-1)^{\varepsilon_n} X^{-\lambda_n}$ , where  $\varepsilon_n = 0, 1$ . As is well known, power series in  $X^{-1}$  can be represented by a continued fraction  $[A_0(X), A_1(X), A_2(X), \dots]$ , where the  $A_j$ 's are polynomials in  $X$ , and for all  $i > 0$ ,  $A_i(X)$  is a non-constant polynomial. Quite obviously, in the case of the above  $F(X)$ , one has  $A_0(X) = 0$ .

Let  $P_n(X)/Q_n(X) = [0, A_1(X), A_2(X), \dots, A_n(X)]$  be the  $n$ th convergent of  $F(X)$ . As was already discovered in [3] and [28], the denominators  $Q_n(X)$  are particularly interesting to study: their coefficients are  $0, \pm 1$ .

## 1.2 A sequence of polynomials and a sequence of integers

The denominators  $Q_n(X)$  introduced above can be quite explicitly expressed (see [28]):

$$Q_n(X) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \sigma(k, \varepsilon) \binom{\frac{n+k}{2}}{k}_2 X^{\mu(k, \Lambda)}.$$

The exponent of  $X$  is given by  $\mu(k, \Lambda) = \sum_{q \geq 0} e_q(k)(\lambda_q - \lambda_{q-1})$ , with  $\lambda_{-1} = 0$ , where  $e_q(k)$  is the  $q$ th binary digit of  $k = \sum_{q \geq 0} e_q(k)2^q$ . The sign of the monomials is given by  $\sigma(k, \varepsilon) = (-1)^{\nu(k) + \bar{\mu}(k, \varepsilon)}$  where  $\nu(k)$  is the number of occurrences of the block 10 in the usual left-to-right reading of the binary expansion of  $k$  (e.g.,  $\nu(\text{twelve}) = 1$ ), and where  $\bar{\mu}(k, \varepsilon) = \sum_{q \geq 0} e_q(k)(\varepsilon_{k-1} - \varepsilon_{k-2})$ , with  $\varepsilon_{-1} = \varepsilon_{-2} = 0$ . The symbol  $\binom{a}{b}_2$  is the **integer** equal to 0 or 1, according to the value modulo 2 of the binomial coefficient  $\binom{a}{b}$ , with the following convention: if  $a$  is not an integer, or if  $a$  is a positive integer and  $a < b$ , then  $\binom{a}{b} := 0$ . For example, as soon as  $n$  and  $k$  have opposite parities,  $\binom{\frac{n+k}{2}}{k}_2 = 0$ . In [3] it was observed that the number of non-zero monomials in  $Q_n(X)$  is  $u_n$ , the  $n$ th term of the celebrated Stern-Brocot sequence defined by  $u_0 = u_1 = 1$ , and the recursive relations  $u_{2n} = u_n + u_{n-1}$ ,  $u_{2n+1} = u_n$  for all  $n \geq 1$ . This sequence is also called the Stern diatomic series (see sequence A002487 in [30]). It was studied by several authors, see, e.g., [17] and its list of references (including the historical references [9, 31]), see also [33, 29], or see [23] for a relation between the Stern sequence and the Towers of Hanoi. (Note that some authors have the slightly different definition:  $v_0 = 0$ ,  $v_{2n} = v_n$ ,  $v_{2n+1} = v_n + v_{n+1}$ ; clearly  $u_n = v_{n+1}$  for all  $n \geq 0$ .)

Our purpose here is to pursue our previous discussions on the sequence of polynomials  $Q_n(X)$  in relationship with the Stern-Brocot sequence.

**Remark 1** The sequence  $(\nu(n))_{n \geq 0}$  happens to be related to the paperfolding sequence. Indeed, define  $v(n) := (-1)^{\nu(n)}$  and  $w(n) := v(n)v(n+1)$ . From the definition of  $\nu$ , we have for every  $n \geq 0$  the relations  $v(2n+1) = v(n)$ ,  $v(4n) = v(2n)$ , and  $v(4n+2) =$

$-v(n)$ . Equivalently, for every  $n \geq 0$ , we have  $v(2n+1) = v(n)$ , and  $v(2n) = (-1)^n v(n)$ . Hence, for every  $n \geq 0$ , we have  $w(n) = v(2n)v(2n+1) = (-1)^n (v(n)^2) = (-1)^n$ , and  $w(2n+1) = v(2n+1)v(2n+2) = (-1)^{n+1} v(n)v(n+1) = (-1)^{n+1} w(n)$ . It is then clear that, if  $z(n) := w(2n+1)$ , then  $z(2n) = -w(2n) = -(-1)^n$  and  $z(2n+1) = z(n)$ . In other words the sequence  $(z(n))_{n \geq 0}$  is the classical paperfolding sequence, and the sequence  $(w(n))_{n \geq 0}$  itself is a paperfolding sequence, see e.g., [26, p. 125] where the sequences are indexed by  $n \geq 1$  instead of  $n \geq 0$ .

### 1.3 A partial order on the integers

Let  $m = e_0(m)e_1(m)\dots$  and  $k = e_0(k)e_1(k)\dots$  be two nonnegative integers together with their binary expansion, which of course terminates with a tail of 0's. Lucas [25] observed that

$$\binom{m}{k} \equiv \prod_{i \geq 0} \binom{e_i(m)}{e_i(k)} \pmod{2}.$$

This implies the following relation (in  $\mathbb{Z}$ )

$$\binom{m}{k}_2 = \prod_{i \geq 0} \binom{e_i(m)}{e_i(k)},$$

so that we have  $\binom{m}{k}_2 = 1$  if and only if  $e_i(k) \leq e_i(m)$  for all  $i \geq 0$ .

We will say that  $m$  *dominates*  $k$  and we write  $k \ll m$ , if  $e_i(k) \leq e_i(m)$  for all  $i \geq 0$ . In other words the sequence  $k \rightarrow \binom{m}{k}_2$  is the characteristic function of the  $k$ 's dominated by  $m$ . (This order was used in, e.g., [2].)

As a consequence of our remarks, the Stern-Brocot sequence has the following representation

$$u_n = \sum_{k \ll \frac{k+n}{2}} 1.$$

**Remark 2** This last relation can be easily deduced from a result of Carlitz [11, 12] (Carlitz calls  $\theta_0(n)$  what we call  $u_n$ ):

$$u_n = \sum_{0 \leq 2r \leq n} \binom{n-r}{r}_2.$$

Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \ll \frac{k+n}{2}} 1 &= \sum_{\substack{0 \leq k \leq n \\ k \equiv n \pmod{2}}} \binom{\frac{k+n}{2}}{k}_2 = \sum_{\substack{0 \leq k' \leq n \\ k' \equiv 0 \pmod{2}}} \binom{n - \frac{k'}{2}}{n - k'}_2 \quad (\text{by letting } k' = n - k) \\ &= \sum_{0 \leq 2r \leq n} \binom{n-r}{n-2r}_2 = \sum_{0 \leq 2r \leq n} \binom{n-r}{r}_2 \quad (\text{by using } \binom{a}{b} = \binom{a}{a-b}). \end{aligned}$$

Also note that in [12] the range  $0 \leq 2r < n$  should be replaced by  $0 \leq 2r \leq n$  as in [11] (see also [17, Corollary 6.2] where the index  $n$  should be adjusted). Let us finally indicate that this remark is also Corollary 13 in [3].

**Remark 3** The relation  $u_n = \sum_{0 \leq 2r \leq n} \binom{n-r}{r}_2$  can give the idea (inspired by the classical *binomial transform*) of introducing a map on sequences  $(a_n)_{n \geq 0} \rightarrow (b_n)_{n \geq 0}$  with  $b_n := \sum_{0 \leq 2r \leq n} \binom{n-r}{r}_2 a_r$ , so that in particular the image of the constant sequence 1 is the Stern-Brocot sequence. One can also go a step further by defining a map  $\mathcal{C}$  which associates with two sequences  $\mathbf{a} = (a_n)_{n \geq 0}$  and  $\mathbf{b} = (b_n)_{n \geq 0}$  the sequence

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) := \left( \sum_{0 \leq 2r \leq n} \binom{n-r}{r}_2 a_r b_{n-r} \right)_{n \geq 0}.$$

It is unexpected that some variations on the Stern-Brocot sequences (different from but in the spirit of the twisted Stern sequence of [8]) are related to the celebrated Thue-Morse sequence (see, e.g., [5]). In fact, recall that the  $\pm 1$  Thue-Morse sequence  $\mathbf{t} = ((t_n)_{n \geq 0})$  can be defined by  $t_0 = 1$  and, for all  $n \geq 0$ ,  $t_{2n} = t_n$  and  $t_{2n+1} = -t_n$ . Now define the sequences  $\alpha = (\alpha_n)_{n \geq 0}$ ,  $\beta = (\beta_n)_{n \geq 0}$ ,  $\gamma = (\gamma_n)_{n \geq 0}$  by

$$\alpha := \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{1}), \quad \beta := \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{t}), \quad \gamma := \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{t}).$$

Then the reader can check that these sequences satisfy respectively

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(0) = 1, \quad \alpha(1) = 1, \quad & \text{and for all } n \geq 1, \quad \alpha_{2n} = \alpha_n - \alpha_{n-1}, \quad \alpha_{2n+1} = \alpha_n \\ \beta(0) = 1, \quad \beta(1) = -1, \quad & \text{and for all } n \geq 1, \quad \beta_{2n} = \beta_n - \beta_{n-1}, \quad \beta_{2n+1} = -\beta_n \\ \gamma(0) = 1, \quad \gamma(1) = -1, \quad & \text{and for all } n \geq 1, \quad \gamma_{2n} = \gamma_n + \gamma_{n-1}, \quad \gamma_{2n+1} = -\gamma_n \end{aligned}$$

so that, with the notation of [30],

$$(\alpha_n)_{n \geq 0} = (A005590(n+1))_{n \geq 0}, \quad (\beta_n)_{n \geq 0} = (A177219(n+1))_{n \geq 0}, \quad (\gamma_n)_{n \geq 0} = (A049347(n))_{n \geq 0}.$$

The last sequence  $(\gamma_n)_{n \geq 0}$  is the 3-periodic sequence with period  $(1, -1, 0)$  (hint: prove by induction on  $n$  that for all  $j \leq n$  one has  $(\gamma_{3j}, \gamma_{3j+1}, \gamma_{3j+2}) = (1, -1, 0)$ ).

## 2 More on the sequence $Q_n(X)$ and a note on $P_n(X)$ for a special $\Lambda$

We now specialize to the case  $\lambda_n = 2^{n+1} - 1$ . In that case,  $\mu(k, \Lambda) = k$ . Also note that  $\sigma(k, \varepsilon) \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$ . Let  $P_n(X)/Q_n(X)$  denote as previously the  $n$ th convergent of the continued fraction of the formal power series  $\sum_{i \geq 1} (-1)^{\varepsilon_i} X^{1-2^i}$ . We begin with a short section on  $P_n$ . The rest of the section will be devoted to the ‘‘simpler’’ polynomials  $Q_n$ .

### 2.1 The sequence $P_n$ modulo 2

**Theorem 1** *We have  $P_n(X) \equiv Q_{n-1}(X) \pmod{2}$  for  $n \geq 1$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $F(X) = \sum_{i \geq 1} (-1)^{\varepsilon_i} X^{1-2^i}$ . Define the formal power series  $\Phi(X)$  by its continued fraction expansion  $\Phi(X) = [0, X, X, \dots]$ . Its  $n$ th convergent is given by  $\pi_n(X)/\kappa_n(X) = [0, X, \dots, X]$  ( $n$  partial quotients equal to  $X$ ). An immediate induction shows that  $\pi_n(X) = \kappa_{n-1}$  for  $n \geq 1$ . Reducing  $F(X)$  modulo 2, we see that  $F^2(X) + XF(X) + 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$ . On the other hand  $\Phi(X) = 1/(X + \Phi(X))$ , hence  $\Phi^2(X) + X\Phi(X) + 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$ . This implies that  $F(X) \equiv \Phi(X) \pmod{2}$ . Hence  $P_n(X) \equiv \pi_n(X) \pmod{2}$  and  $Q_n(X) \equiv \kappa_n(X) \pmod{2}$ : to be sure that the convergents of the reduction modulo 2 of  $F$  are equal to the reduction modulo 2 of the convergents of  $F(X)$ , the reader can look at, e.g., [34]. Thus  $P_n(X) \equiv \pi_n(X) = \kappa_{n-1}(X) \equiv Q_{n-1}(X) \pmod{2}$ .

**Corollary 1** *The following congruence is satisfied by  $Q_n(X)$  for  $n \geq 1$ :*

$$Q_n^2(X) - Q_{n+1}(X)Q_{n-1}(X) \equiv 1 \pmod{2}.$$

*Proof.* Use the classical identity  $P_{n+1}(X)Q_n(X) - P_n(X)Q_{n+1}(X) = (-1)^n$  for the convergents of a continued fraction.

## 2.2 The sequence $Q_n$ and the Chebyshev polynomials

We have the formula

$$Q_n(X) \equiv \sum_{k \geq 0} \binom{\frac{n+k}{2}}{k}_2 X^k \equiv \sum_{\substack{0 \leq k \leq n \\ k \equiv n \pmod{2}}} \binom{\frac{k+n}{2}}{k}_2 X^k \pmod{2}.$$

The Chebyshev polynomials of the second kind (see, e.g., [20, p. 184–185]) are defined by

$$U_n(\cos \theta) = \frac{\sin(n+1)\theta}{\sin \theta}.$$

They have the well-known explicit expansion

$$U_n(X) = \sum_{0 \leq k \leq n/2} (-1)^k \binom{n-k}{k} (2X)^{n-2k}.$$

We thus get a relationship between  $Q_n$  and  $U_n$  (compare with the related but not identical result [17, Proposition 6.1]).

**Theorem 2** *The reductions modulo 2 of  $Q_n(X)$  and of  $U_n(X/2)$  are equal.*

*Proof.* We can write modulo 2

$$\begin{aligned} Q_n(X) &\equiv \sum_{\substack{0 \leq k' \leq n \\ k' \equiv 0 \pmod{2}}} \binom{n - \frac{k'}{2}}{n - k'}_2 X^{n-k'} \quad (\text{by letting } k' = n - k) \\ &\equiv \sum_{0 \leq 2r \leq n} \binom{n-r}{n-2r}_2 X^{n-2r} \\ &\equiv \sum_{0 \leq 2r \leq n} \binom{n-r}{r}_2 X^{n-2r} \quad (\text{by using } \binom{a}{b} = \binom{a}{a-b}). \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $Q_n(X) \equiv U_n(X/2) \pmod{2}$ .  $\square$

As an immediate application of Theorem 2 (and of Remark 2) we have the following corollaries.

**Corollary 2** *The number of odd coefficients in the (scaled) Chebyshev polynomial of the second kind  $U_n(X/2)$  is equal to the Stern-Brocot sequence  $u_n$ .*

**Remark 4** Corollary 1 above can also be deduced from Theorem 2 using a classical relation for Chebyshev polynomials implied by their expression using sines.

**Remark 5** The polynomials  $Q_n(X)$  are also related to the Fibonacci polynomials (see, e.g., [19]) and to Morgan-Voyce polynomials which are a variation on the Chebyshev polynomials (on Morgan-Voyce polynomials, introduced by Morgan-Voyce in dealing with electrical networks see, e.g., [32, 7, 22] and the references therein). Indeed, the Fibonacci polynomials satisfy

$$F_{n+1}(X) = \sum_{2j \leq n} \binom{n-j}{j} X^{n-2j}$$

(compare with the proof of Theorem 2), while the Morgan-Voyce polynomials satisfy

$$b_n(X) = \sum_{k \leq n} \binom{n+k}{n-k} X^k \quad \text{and} \quad B_n(X) = \sum_{k \leq n} \binom{n+k+1}{n-k} X^k$$

(note that  $\binom{n+k}{n-k} = \binom{n+k}{2k}$ , that  $\binom{n+k+1}{n-k} = \binom{n+k+1}{2k+1}$ , and see Lemmas 1 and 2 below).

**Remark 6** The polynomials that we have defined are related to the Stern-Brocot sequence, but they differ from Stern polynomials occurring in the literature, in particular they are not the same as those introduced in [24]. They also differ from the polynomials studied in [17, 18].

### 2.3 Extension of $Q_n(X)$ to $Q_\omega(X)$ with $\omega \in \mathbb{Z}_2$

**Definition 1** Let  $\omega = \sum_{i \geq 0} \omega_i 2^i = \omega_0 \omega_1 \omega_2 \dots \in \mathbb{Z}_2$  be a 2-adic integer, or equivalently an infinite sequence of 0's and 1's. For a nonnegative integer  $k$  whose binary expansion is given by  $k = \sum_{i \geq 0} k_i 2^i$ , we define

$$\binom{\omega}{k}_2 = \prod_{i \geq 0} \binom{\omega_i}{k_i}.$$

The infinite product  $\binom{\omega}{k}_2$  is well defined since, for large  $i$ ,  $\binom{\omega_i}{k_i}$  reduces to  $\binom{\omega_i}{0} = 1$ . It is equal to 0 or 1. The above product extends Lucas' observation to all 2-adic integers  $\omega$ . In particular, since  $-1 = \sum_{i \geq 0} 2^i = 1^\infty$ , we see that  $-1$  dominates all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  (where the order introduced in Section 1.3 is generalized in the obvious way). A similar definition (binomials and order) occurs in [27].

**Definition 2** In the general case for  $\Lambda$ , with  $\lambda_{n+1}/\lambda_n > 2$ , and  $\varepsilon = 0, 1$ , the polynomials  $Q_n(X)$  above naturally extend to formal power series  $Q_\omega(X)$  defined for  $\omega = \omega_0\omega_1\omega_2\dots \in \mathbb{Z}_2$  by

$$Q_\omega(X) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \sigma(k, \varepsilon) \binom{\frac{\omega+k}{2}}{k}_2 X^{\mu(k, \Lambda)} = \sum_{\substack{k \equiv \omega \pmod{2} \\ k \ll \frac{\omega+k}{2}}} \sigma(k, \varepsilon) X^{\mu(k, \Lambda)}.$$

**Remark 7** The reader can check (e.g., by using integer truncations of  $\omega$  tending to  $\omega$ ) that

$$\binom{\omega}{k} \equiv \binom{\omega}{k}_2 \pmod{2}$$

where the binomial coefficient  $\binom{\omega}{k}$  is defined by

$$\binom{\omega}{k} = \frac{\omega(\omega-1)\dots(\omega-k+1)}{k!} \in \mathbb{Z}_2.$$

In particular, we see that for any 2-adic integer  $\ell$ ,

$$\binom{-\ell}{k} = (-1)^k \binom{\ell+k-1}{k}, \quad \text{hence} \quad \binom{-\ell}{k}_2 = \binom{\ell+k-1}{k}_2.$$

Now for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we have

$$Q_{-n}(X) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \sigma(k, \varepsilon) \binom{\frac{-n+k}{2}}{k}_2 X^{\mu(k, \Lambda)} = \sum_{k \geq 0} \sigma(k, \varepsilon) \binom{\frac{-(n-k)}{2}}{k}_2 X^{\mu(k, \Lambda)},$$

thus

$$Q_{-n}(X) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \sigma(k, \varepsilon) \binom{\frac{n-k}{2} + k - 1}{k}_2 X^{\mu(k, \Lambda)} = \sum_{k \geq 0} \sigma(k, \varepsilon) \binom{\frac{n-2+k}{2}}{k}_2 X^{\mu(k, \Lambda)} = Q_{n-2}(X).$$

In particular  $Q_{-n}$  and  $Q_{n-2}$  have same degree. Also note that the definition of  $Q_{-n}$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  yields

$$Q_{-1}(X) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \sigma(k, \varepsilon) \binom{\frac{k-1}{2}}{k}_2 X^{\mu(k, \Lambda)} = 0.$$

**Remark 8** If  $\lambda_n = 2^{n+1} - 1$ , Corollary 1 can be extended to 2-adic integers: using again truncations of  $\omega$  tending to  $\omega$  yields, for any 2-adic integer  $\omega$ ,

$$Q_\omega^2(X) - Q_{\omega+1}(X)Q_{\omega-1}(X) \equiv 1 \pmod{2}.$$

## 2.4 Extension of the sequence $(u_n)_{n \geq 0}$ to negative indices

What precedes suggests two ways of extending the sequence  $(u_n)_{n \geq 0}$  to negative integer indices. First, we noted the relation  $u_n = \sum_{k \ll \frac{n+k}{2}} 1$ , i.e.,  $u_n$  is the number of monomials with non-zero coefficient in  $Q_n(X)$ . But from the previous section, we can define  $Q_{-n}(X)$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and we have that  $Q_{-n}(X) = Q_{n-2}(X)$ . This suggests the definition

$$u_{-n} := u_{n-2} \text{ for all } n \geq 2.$$

Strictly speaking, this definition leaves the value  $u_{-1}$  indeterminate, but, since  $u_n$  is the number of monomials with nonzero coefficients in  $Q_n$ , the remark above that  $Q_{-1} = 0$  implies  $u_{-1} = 0$ .

Another way of generalizing  $u_n$  to negative indices would be to use the recursion

$$u_{2n} = u_n + u_{n-1}, \quad u_{2n+1} = u_n, \quad \text{for all } n \geq 1,$$

allowing non-positive values for  $n$ . Allowing first  $n = 0$  leads to  $u_0 = u_0 + u_{-1}$ , hence  $u_{-1} = 0$ . On the other hand we claim that the relation  $u_{-n} := u_{n-2}$  for all  $n \geq 2$  leads to the same recursion formulas with  $u_{2n}$  and  $u_{2n+1}$  for non-positive  $n$ . Indeed, let  $m = -n$ , with  $n \geq 2$ . Then

$$u_{2m} = u_{-2n} = u_{2n-2} = u_{2(n-1)} = u_{n-1} + u_{n-2} = u_{-n-1} + u_{-n} = u_{m-1} + u_m$$

and

$$u_{2m+1} = u_{-2n+1} = u_{2n-3} = u_{2(n-2)+1} = u_{n-2} = u_{-n} = u_m.$$

We thus finally have a generalization compatible with both approaches, yielding

$$\dots u_{-4} = 2, \quad u_{-3} = 1, \quad u_{-2} = 1, \quad u_{-1} = 0, \quad u_0 = 1, \quad u_1 = 1, \quad u_2 = 2, \quad u_3 = 1, \quad u_4 = 3 \dots$$

and the definition

**Definition 3** The Stern-Brocot sequence  $(u_n)_{n \geq 0}$  can be extended to a sequence  $(u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$  by letting  $u_{-n} = u_{n-2}$  for  $n \geq 2$ , and  $u_{-1} = 0$ . This sequence satisfies the same recursive relations as the initial sequence  $(u_n)_{n \geq 0}$ , namely  $u_{2n} = u_n + u_{n-1}$  and  $u_{2n+1} = u_n$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

## 3 The arithmetical nature of the power series $Q_\omega(X)$

Recall that the formal series  $Q_\omega(X)$ , where  $\omega = \omega_0 \omega_1 \dots$  belongs to  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ , is given by

$$Q_\omega(X) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \sigma(k, \varepsilon) \binom{\frac{\omega+k}{2}}{k}_2 X^{\mu(k, \Lambda)} = \sum_{\substack{k \equiv \omega \pmod{2} \\ k \ll \frac{\omega+k}{2}}} \sigma(k, \varepsilon) X^{\mu(k, \Lambda)}.$$

We have seen that  $Q_\omega(X)$  reduces to a polynomial if  $\omega$  belongs to  $\mathbb{Z}$ . We will prove that this is a necessary and sufficient condition for this series being a polynomial. Then we will address the question of the algebraicity of  $Q_\omega(X)$ , on  $\mathbb{Q}(X)$  and on  $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}(X)$ , in the special case  $\lambda_n = 2^{n+1} - 1$ . We begin with a lemma.



**Lemma 1** *Let  $\omega = \omega_0\omega_1 \dots$  belong to  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ . Then the following properties hold.*

(i) *For every  $j \geq 0$ ,*

$$\binom{\omega + 2^j}{2^{j+1}}_2 \equiv \omega_j + \omega_{j+1} \pmod{2}.$$

(ii) *The sequence  $((\frac{\omega+2^j}{2^{j+1}})_2)_{j \geq 0}$  is ultimately periodic if and only if  $\omega$  is rational.*

(iii) *The sequence  $((\frac{\omega+2^j}{2^{j+1}})_2)_{j \geq 0}$  is ultimately equal to 0 if and only if  $\omega$  is an integer.*

(iv) *For every  $k \geq 0$*

$$\binom{\frac{\omega+k}{2}}{k}_2 = \binom{\omega + k + 1}{2k + 1}_2.$$

(v) *If  $\omega \neq -1$ , there exist an integer  $\ell \geq 0$  and a 2-adic integer  $\omega'$  such that  $\omega = 2^\ell - 1 + 2^{\ell+1}\omega'$ . Let  $f_\omega(k) := \binom{\frac{\omega+k}{2}}{k}_2 = \binom{\omega+k+1}{2k+1}_2$ . Then for any integer  $k'$  we have  $f_\omega(2^\ell - 1 + 2^{\ell+1}k') = \binom{\omega'+k'}{2k'}_2$ .*

(vi) *Suppose that there exist  $\ell \geq 0$  and  $j \geq 0$  such that  $\omega = 2^\ell - 1 + 2^{\ell+1}(2^j(2\omega' + 1))$ . Then for any integer  $k'$  we have  $f_\omega(2^\ell - 1 + 2^{\ell+1}(2^j(2k' + 1))) = \binom{\omega'+k'+1}{2k'+1}_2$ .*

*Proof.* In order to prove (i) we write

$$\begin{aligned} \omega + 2^j &= \omega_0 \ \omega_1 \ \dots \ \omega_j \ \omega_{j+1} \ \dots \\ &+ 0 \ \ 0 \ \dots \ 1 \ \ 0 \ \dots \\ &= \omega_0 \ \omega_1 \ \dots \ \alpha_j \ \alpha_{j+1} \ \dots \end{aligned}$$

where  $\alpha_j$  and  $\alpha_{j+1}$  are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{if } \omega_j = 0 \text{ and } \omega_{j+1} = 0, & \quad \text{then } \alpha_j = 1 \text{ and } \alpha_{j+1} = 0 \\ \text{if } \omega_j = 0 \text{ and } \omega_{j+1} = 1, & \quad \text{then } \alpha_j = 1 \text{ and } \alpha_{j+1} = 1 \\ \text{if } \omega_j = 1 \text{ and } \omega_{j+1} = 0, & \quad \text{then } \alpha_j = 0 \text{ and } \alpha_{j+1} = 1 \\ \text{if } \omega_j = 1 \text{ and } \omega_{j+1} = 1, & \quad \text{then } \alpha_j = 0 \text{ and } \alpha_{j+1} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

By inspection we see that  $\alpha_{j+1} \equiv \omega_j + \omega_{j+1} \pmod{2}$ . Now we write

$$\binom{\omega + 2^j}{2^{j+1}}_2 = \left( \prod_{0 \leq k \leq j-1} \binom{\omega_k}{0}_2 \right) \binom{\alpha_j}{0}_2 \binom{\alpha_{j+1}}{1}_2 \left( \prod_{k \geq j+2} \binom{\alpha_k}{0}_2 \right) = \alpha_{j+1} \equiv \omega_j + \omega_{j+1} \pmod{2}.$$

Let us prove (ii). We note that the sequence  $((\omega_j + \omega_{j+1}) \pmod{2})_{j \geq 0}$  is ultimately periodic if and only if the sequence  $(\omega_j \pmod{2})_{j \geq 0}$  is ultimately periodic (hence if and only if the sequence  $(\omega_j)_{j \geq 0}$  itself is ultimately periodic): indeed,  $((\omega_j + \omega_{j+1}) \pmod{2})_{j \geq 0}$  is ultimately periodic if and only if the formal power series  $G(X) := \sum_{j \geq 0} (\omega_j + \omega_{j+1}) X^j$  is rational (as an element of  $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}[[X]]$ ). But, if we let  $H(X)$  denote the formal power series  $H(X) := \sum_{j \geq 0} \omega_j X^j \in \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}[[X]]$ , then  $XG(X) + \omega_0 = (1 + X)H(X)$ . So  $G(X)$  is rational if and

only if  $H$  is, if and only if  $(\omega_j \bmod 2)_{j \geq 0}$  is ultimately periodic, i.e., if the 2-adic integer  $\omega$  is rational.

To prove (iii), we note that  $\binom{\omega+2^j}{2^{j+1}}_2 = 0$  for  $j$  large enough implies from Lemma 1 (i) that  $\omega_j + \omega_{j+1} \equiv 0 \pmod 2$  for  $j$  large enough. This means that  $\omega_j \equiv \omega_{j+1} \pmod 2$  for  $j$  large enough, or equivalently  $\omega_j = \omega_{j+1}$  for  $j$  large enough. But then either  $\omega_j = \omega_{j+1} = 0$  for large  $j$ , hence  $\omega$  is a nonnegative integer, or  $\omega_j = \omega_{j+1} = 1$  for large  $j$ , hence  $\omega$  is a negative integer. We thus finally get that  $\omega$  belongs to  $\mathbb{Z}$ . The converse is straightforward.

We prove (iv) by considering the parities of  $\omega$  and  $k$ . First note that if  $\omega$  and  $k$  have opposite parities, then  $\binom{\frac{\omega+k}{2}}{k}_2 = 0$  while  $\binom{\omega+k+1}{2k+1}_2 = 0$  (use Definition 1 and look at the last digit of  $\omega + k + 1$  and of  $2k + 1$ ). Now if  $\omega = 2\omega'$  and  $k = 2k'$ , we have  $\binom{\frac{\omega+k}{2}}{k}_2 = \binom{\omega'+k'}{2k'}_2$  while  $\binom{\omega+k+1}{2k+1}_2 = \binom{2(\omega'+k')+1}{4k'+1}_2 = \binom{\omega'+k'}{2k'}_2$  (use Definition 1 again). Finally if  $\omega = 2\omega' + 1$  and  $k = 2k' + 1$ , we have  $\binom{\frac{\omega+k}{2}}{k}_2 = \binom{\omega'+k'+1}{2k'+1}_2$  while  $\binom{\omega+k+1}{2k+1}_2 = \binom{2(\omega'+k'+1)+1}{4k'+3}_2 = \binom{\omega'+k'+1}{2k'+1}_2$  (use Definition 1 again).

Let us prove (v). Since  $\omega \neq -1$ , its 2-adic expansion contains at least one zero. Write  $\omega = 11 \dots 10\omega_{\ell+1}\omega_{\ell+2} \dots$ , so that the 2-adic expansion of  $\omega$  begins with exactly  $\ell \geq 0$  ones. Defining  $\omega' := \omega_{\ell+1}\omega_{\ell+2} \dots$ , we thus have  $\omega = 2^\ell - 1 + 2^{\ell+1}\omega'$ . Now for any integer  $k'$  we have from Definition 1

$$f_\omega(2^\ell - 1 + 2^{\ell+1}k') = \binom{\omega + 2^\ell + 2^{\ell+1}k'}{2^{\ell+1} - 1 + 2^{\ell+1}(2k')}_2 = \binom{2^{\ell+1} - 1 + 2^{\ell+1}(\omega' + k')}{2^{\ell+1} - 1 + 2^{\ell+1}(2k')}_2 = \binom{\omega' + k'}{2k'}_2.$$

We finally prove (vi). Using (v) we see that

$$f_\omega(2^\ell - 1 + 2^{\ell+1}(2^j(2k' + 1))) = \binom{2^j(2\omega' + 1 + 2k' + 1) + 1}{2^{j+1}(2k' + 1) + 1}_2 = \binom{\omega' + k' + 1}{2k' + 1}_2.$$

Now we can prove the following result.

**Theorem 3** *Let  $\omega$  be a 2-adic integer. The formal power series  $Q_\omega(X)$  is a polynomial if and only if  $\omega$  belongs to  $\mathbb{Z}$ .*

*Proof.* If  $n$  is a nonnegative integer, then  $Q_n(X)$  is a polynomial. So is  $Q_{-n}(X)$  for  $n \neq 1$  because  $Q_{-n} = Q_{n-2}$  as we have seen in Remark 7. On the other hand  $Q_{-1}(X)$  is also a polynomial since  $Q_{-1}(X) = 0$ . Conversely suppose that  $Q_\omega(X)$  is a polynomial, for some  $\omega = \omega_0\omega_1 \dots$  in  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ . The coefficients of the monomials  $X^{\mu(k,\Lambda)}$  in  $Q_\omega(X)$ , i.e.,  $\sigma(k, \varepsilon) \binom{\frac{\omega+k}{2}}{k}_2$ , are equal to zero for  $k$  large enough. Thus  $f_\omega(k) = \binom{\frac{\omega+k}{2}}{k}_2$  is equal to zero for  $k$  large enough. We may suppose that  $\omega \neq -1$ ; thus, using the notation in Lemma 1 (v), we certainly have that  $f_\omega(2^\ell - 1 + 2^{\ell+1}k') = 0$  for  $k'$  large enough. Using Lemma 1 (v), we thus have  $\binom{\omega'+k'}{2k'}_2 = 0$  for  $k'$  large enough. This implies  $\binom{\omega'+2^j}{2^{j+1}}_2 = 0$  for  $j$  large enough. Lemma 1 (iii) yields that  $\omega'$ , hence  $\omega$ , belongs to  $\mathbb{Z}$ .

Before proving our Theorem 4 characterizing the algebraicity of the series  $Q_\omega(X)$  for a special  $\Lambda$ , we need a lemma.

**Lemma 2** *Let  $\omega = \omega_0\omega_1 \dots$  be a 2-adic integer. We let  $(f_\omega(k))_{k \geq 0}$ ,  $(g_\omega(k))_{k \geq 0}$ ,  $(h_\omega(k))_{k \geq 0}$  denote the sequences*

$$f_\omega(k) := \binom{\omega + k + 1}{2k + 1}_2, \quad g_\omega(k) := \binom{\omega + k}{2k}_2, \quad h_\omega(k) := \binom{\omega + k}{2k + 1}_2.$$

Then we have the following relations.

$$\begin{aligned} f_{2\omega}(2k) &= g_\omega(k), & f_{2\omega+1}(2k) &= 0, & f_{2\omega}(2k+1) &= 0, & f_{2\omega+1}(2k+1) &= f_\omega(k) \\ g_{2\omega}(2k) &= g_\omega(k), & g_{2\omega+1}(2k) &= g_\omega(k), & g_{2\omega}(2k+1) &= h_\omega(k), & g_{2\omega+1}(2k+1) &= f_\omega(k) \\ h_{2\omega}(2k) &= 0, & h_{2\omega+1}(2k) &= g_\omega(k), & h_{2\omega}(2k+1) &= h_\omega(k), & h_{2\omega+1}(2k+1) &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

*Proof.* The proof is easy: it uses the definition of  $\binom{\omega}{\ell}_2$ , which in particular shows for any 2-adic integer  $\omega$  and any integer  $\ell$  that

$$\begin{aligned} \binom{2\omega}{2\ell}_2 &= \binom{\omega}{\ell}_2 \binom{0}{0}_2 = \binom{\omega}{\ell}_2 & \binom{2\omega+1}{2\ell}_2 &= \binom{\omega}{\ell}_2 \binom{1}{0}_2 = \binom{\omega}{\ell}_2 \\ \binom{2\omega}{2\ell+1}_2 &= \binom{\omega}{\ell}_2 \binom{0}{1}_2 = 0 & \binom{2\omega+1}{2\ell+1}_2 &= \binom{\omega}{\ell}_2 \binom{1}{1}_2 = \binom{\omega}{\ell}_2. \end{aligned}$$

**Remark 9** The sequences above occur in the OEIS [30] when  $\omega = n$  is an integer. In particular,  $(\binom{\frac{n+k}{2}}{k})_{n,k} = ((\binom{n+k+1}{2k+1}))_{n,k}$  is equal to A168561; also  $(\binom{n+k}{2k})_{n,k}$  is equal to A085478; finally, up to shifting  $k$ , we have that  $(\binom{n+k}{2k+1})_{n,k}$  is equal to A078812.

We can also note that  $f_\omega(k) \equiv g_\omega(k) + h_\omega(k) \pmod{2}$ , for any integer  $k \geq 0$ .

**Theorem 4** *Suppose that  $\lambda_n = 2^{n+1} - 1$ . The following results then hold.*

– *The formal power series  $Q_\omega(X)$  is either a polynomial if  $\omega \in \mathbb{Z}$  or a transcendental series over  $\mathbb{Q}(X)$  if  $\omega \in \mathbb{Z}_2 \setminus \mathbb{Z}$ .*

– *The formal power series  $Q_\omega(X)$  is algebraic over  $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}(X)$  if and only if  $\omega$  is rational. It is rational if and only if it is a polynomial, which happens if and only if  $\omega$  is a rational integer.*

*Proof.* The first assertion is a consequence of a classical theorem of Fatou [21] which states that a power series  $\sum_{n \geq 0} a_n z^n$  with integer coefficients that converges inside the unit disk is either rational or transcendental over  $\mathbb{Q}(z)$ . This implies that the formal power series  $Q_\omega(X)$  is either rational or transcendental over  $\mathbb{Q}(X)$ . We then have to prove that if  $Q_\omega$  is a rational function, then it is a polynomial, or equivalently that  $\omega$  is a rational integer (use Theorem 3). Now to say that  $Q_\omega$  is rational is to say that the sequence of its coefficients is ultimately periodic, which implies that the sequence of their absolute values  $(f_\omega(k))_{k \geq 0} = (\binom{\omega+k+1}{2k+1}_2)_{k \geq 0}$  is ultimately periodic. Let  $\theta$  be its period. We have, for large  $k$ , that  $\binom{\omega+k+1}{2k+1}_2 = \binom{\omega+k+\theta+1}{2(k+\theta)+1}_2$ . If  $\theta$  is odd, the left side is zero for  $\omega + k$  odd while the right side is zero for  $\omega + k$  even. Thus  $\binom{\omega+k+1}{2k+1}_2 = 0$  for large  $k$ , and  $Q_\omega$  is a polynomial. So suppose that  $\theta$  is even. Let

us suppose that  $\omega$  does not belong to  $\mathbb{Z}$ , then its 2-adic expansion contains infinitely many blocks 01. Consider the first such block: there exist  $\ell \geq 0$  and  $j \geq 0$  such that  $\omega = 2^\ell - 1 + 2^{\ell+1}(2^j(2\omega' + 1))$ . Then for any integer  $k'$  we have  $f_\omega(2^\ell - 1 + 2^{\ell+1}(2^j(2k' + 1))) = \binom{\omega'+k'+1}{2k'+1}_2$ . The sequence  $(f_\omega(2^\ell - 1 + 2^{\ell+1}(2^j(2k' + 1))))_{k' \geq 0}$  is ultimately periodic and  $\theta/2$  is a period. But from Lemma 1 (vi) this sequence is equal to  $(\binom{\omega'+k'+1}{2k'+1}_2)_{k' \geq 0}$ . As previously, either  $\theta/2$  is odd and this sequence is ultimately equal to zero or  $\theta/2$  is even. In the first case, as above,  $\omega'$  belongs to  $\mathbb{Z}$ , so does  $\omega$ , which is impossible. In the second case, we iterate the reasoning that used Lemma 1 (vi), with  $\omega$  replaced by  $\omega'$  and  $k$  by  $k'$ , where the first block 01 occurring in  $\omega$  is replaced by the first such block occurring in  $\omega'$ . The fact that  $\theta$  cannot be divisible by arbitrarily large powers of 2 gives the desired contradiction.

In order to prove the second assertion, we first suppose that  $Q_\omega(X)$  is algebraic over  $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}(X)$ . If  $\omega = -1$ ,  $Q_\omega(X) = 0$ . Otherwise write  $\omega = 2^\ell - 1 + 2^{\ell+1}\omega'$  as in Lemma 1 (v). The algebraicity of  $Q_\omega(X)$  over  $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}(X)$  implies that the sequence  $(\binom{\frac{\omega+k}{2}}{k}_2 \bmod 2)_{n \geq 0}$  is 2-automatic (from a theorem of Christol, see [15, 16] or [6]). Using Lemma 2 (i) we thus have that the sequence  $(\binom{\omega+k+1}{2k+1}_2)_{k \geq 0}$  is 2-automatic. Thus its subsequence obtained for  $k = 2^\ell - 1 + 2^{\ell+1}k'$ , namely  $(\binom{\omega+2^\ell+2^{\ell+1}k'}{2^{\ell+1}-1+2^{\ell+1}(2k')}_2)_{k' \geq 0}$  is also 2-automatic (see, e.g., [6, Theorem 6.8.1, page 189]). But this last sequence is equal to  $(\binom{2^{\ell+1}-1+2^{\ell+1}(\omega'+k')}{2^{\ell+1}-1+2^{\ell+1}(2k')}_2)_{k' \geq 0}$ , i.e., to  $(\binom{\omega'+k'}{2k'}_2)_{k' \geq 0}$  (look at the 2-adic expansions and use Definition 1). But this in turns implies (see, e.g., [6, Corollary 5.5.3, page 167]) that the subsequence  $(\binom{\omega'+2^j}{2^{j+1}}_2)_{j \geq 0}$  is ultimately periodic. Using Lemma 1 (ii) this means that  $\omega$  is rational.

Now suppose that  $\omega$  is rational. Denote by  $T\omega$  the 2-adic integer defined by  $T\omega = (\omega - \omega_0)/2$  (i.e.,  $T\omega$  is the 2-adic integer obtained by shifting the sequence of digits of  $\omega$ ). Also note  $T^j$  the  $j$ -th iteration of  $T$ . Define (with the notation of Lemma 2) the set  $\mathcal{K}$  by

$$\mathcal{K} =: \{(f_{T^j\omega}(k))_{k \geq 0}, j \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{(g_{T^j\omega}(k))_{k \geq 0}, j \in \mathbb{N}\} \cup \{(h_{T^j\omega}(k))_{k \geq 0}, j \in \mathbb{N}\}.$$

As a consequence of Lemma 2, we see that  $\mathcal{K}$  is stable by the maps defined on  $\mathcal{K}$  by  $(v_k)_{k \geq 0} \rightarrow (v_{2k})_{k \geq 0}$  and  $(v_k)_{k \geq 0} \rightarrow (v_{2k+1})_{k \geq 0}$  (use that for any 2-adic integer  $\omega = \omega_0\omega_1\dots$  one has  $\omega = 2T\omega + \omega_0$ ). On the other hand we have from Lemma 1 (iv) that  $(\binom{\omega+k}{2k}_2) = f_\omega(k)$ . Hence the 2-kernel of the sequence  $(\binom{\omega+k}{2k}_2)_{k \geq 0}$ , i.e., the smallest set of sequences containing that sequence and stable under the maps  $(v_k)_{k \geq 0} \rightarrow (v_{2k})_{k \geq 0}$  and  $(v_k)_{k \geq 0} \rightarrow (v_{2k+1})_{k \geq 0}$ , is a subset of  $\mathcal{K}$ . Now, since  $\omega$  is rational, the set of 2-adic integers  $\{T^j\omega, j \in \mathbb{N}\}$  is finite. Hence the 2-kernel of  $(\binom{\omega+k}{2k}_2)_{k \geq 0}$  is finite and this sequence is 2-automatic (see, e.g., [6]). This implies that the formal power series  $Q_\omega(X)$  is algebraic over  $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}(X)$  (using again Christol's theorem, see [15, 16] or [6]).

Finally,  $Q_\omega(X)$  reduced modulo 2 is rational if and only if the sequence of its coefficients  $(f_\omega(k))_{k \geq 0} = (\binom{\omega+k+1}{2k+1}_2)_{k \geq 0}$  modulo 2 is ultimately periodic, which is the same as saying that the sequence  $(f_\omega(k))_{k \geq 0} = (\binom{\omega+k+1}{2k+1}_2)_{k \geq 0}$  itself is ultimately periodic. But from the first part of the proof this implies that  $Q_\omega(X)$  (not reduced modulo 2) is a polynomial, hence that  $Q_\omega(X)$  modulo 2 is a polynomial. Conversely, if  $Q_\omega(X)$  modulo 2 is a polynomial, then the sequence of its coefficients  $(f_\omega(k))_{k \geq 0} = (\binom{\omega+k+1}{2k+1}_2)_{k \geq 0}$  modulo 2 is ultimately equal to 0, and

so is  $(f_\omega(k))_{k \geq 0}$  not reduced modulo 2. Thus  $Q_\omega(X)$  not reduced modulo 2 is a polynomial, thus  $\omega$  is a rational integer by using Theorem 3.

### Remark 10

- The authors of [4] prove that the formal power series  $(1 + X)^\omega = \sum_{k \geq 0} \binom{\omega}{k}_2 X^k$  is algebraic over  $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}(X)$  if and only if  $\omega$  is rational. They do not ask when that series is rational, i.e., belongs to  $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}(X)$ , but this is clear since for rational  $\omega = a/b$ , with integers  $a, b > 0$ , we have  $((1 + X)^\omega)^b \equiv (1 + X)^a \pmod{2}$ . Hence if  $(1 + X)^\omega$  is a rational function  $A/B$  with  $A$  and  $B$  coprime polynomials, then  $A^b \equiv (1 + X)^a B^b$  hence  $B$  is constant, i.e.,  $(1 + X)^\omega$  is a polynomial. Now if  $a < 0$  and  $b > 0$ , we have that  $(1 + X)^{-\omega}$  is a polynomial, hence  $(1 + X)^\omega$  is the inverse of a polynomial. Finally  $(1 + X)^\omega$  is a rational function if and only if  $\omega \in \mathbb{Z}$ .
- In the same vein, the authors of [4] prove that, if  $\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_d$  are 2-adic integers, then the formal power series  $(1 + X)^{\omega_1}, (1 + X)^{\omega_2}, \dots, (1 + X)^{\omega_d}$  are algebraically independent over  $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}(X)$  if and only if  $1, \omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_d$  are linearly independent over  $\mathbb{Z}$ . Is a similar statement true for the  $Q_\omega$ ?
- Another question is to ask whether a similar study can be done in the  $p$ -adic case (here  $p = 2$ ). The two papers [13, 14] might prove useful.
- Results of transcendence, hypertranscendence, and algebraic independence of values for the generating function of the Stern-Brocot sequence have been obtained very recently by Bundschuh (see [10], see also the references therein).
- A last question is the arithmetic nature of the real numbers  $A(\varepsilon, \omega, g)$  defined by  $A(\varepsilon, \omega, g) = \sum_{k \ll \frac{k+\omega}{2}} \sigma(k, \varepsilon) g^{-k}$  where  $g \geq 2$  is an integer, the sequence  $(\varepsilon_n)_n$  is ultimately periodic, and  $\omega \in \mathbb{Z}_2 \setminus \mathbb{Z}$ . Take in particular  $\varepsilon = 0$  (thus  $\sigma(k, \varepsilon) = (-1)^{\nu(k)}$ ). We already know that the number  $A(0, \omega, g)$  is transcendental for  $\omega \in (\mathbb{Q} \cap \mathbb{Z}_2) \setminus \mathbb{Z}$  by using [1], the fact that the sequence  $((-1)^{\nu(k)})_{k \geq 0}$  is 2-automatic as recalled above, and the fact that the sequence  $(\binom{\frac{k+\omega}{2}}{k}_2)_{k \geq 0}$  is 2-automatic for  $\omega$  rational as seen in the course of the proof of Theorem 4 (the fact that  $A(0, \omega, g)$  is not rational is a consequence of the non-ultimate periodicity of the sequence  $((-1)^{\nu(k)} \binom{\frac{k+\omega}{2}}{k}_2)_{k \geq 0}$  for  $\omega$  rational but not a rational integer, which has also been seen in the course of the proof of Theorem 4).

## References

- [1] B. Adamczewski, Y. Bugeaud, On the complexity of algebraic numbers. I. Expansions in integer bases, *Ann. of Math.* 165 (2007) 547–565.
- [2] J.-P. Allouche, P. Flajolet, M. Mendès France, Algebraically independent formal power series: A language theory interpretation, in *Analytic Number Theory* (Tokyo, 1988), pp. 11–18, Lecture Notes in Math., 1434, Springer, Berlin, 1990.

- [3] J.-P. Allouche, A. Lubiw, M. Mendès France, A. van der Poorten, J. Shallit, Convergents of folded continued fractions, *Acta Arith.* **77** (1996) 77–96.
- [4] J.-P. Allouche, M. Mendès France, A. van der Poorten, Indépendance algébrique de certaines séries formelles, *Bull. Soc. Math. France* **116** (1988) 449–454.
- [5] J.-P. Allouche, J. Shallit, The ubiquitous Prouhet-Thue-Morse sequence, *in* Sequences and Their Applications, Proceedings of SETA'98, C. Ding, T. Hellesteth and H. Niederreiter (eds.), Springer, 1999, pp. 1–16.
- [6] J.-P. Allouche, J. Shallit, *Automatic Sequences. Theory, Applications, Generalizations*, 2003, Cambridge University Press.
- [7] R. André-Jeannin, A generalization of Morgan-Voyce polynomials, *Fibonacci Quart.* **32** (1994) 228–231.
- [8] R. Bacher, Twisting the Stern sequence, Preprint, 2010, available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1005.5627>
- [9] A. Brocot, Calcul des rouages par approximation, *Rev. Chronométrique* **3** (1859–1861) 186–194; R. Chavigny, *Les Brocot, une dynastie d'horlogers*, Antoine Simonin, Neuchâtel (1991), pp. 187–197 (reprinted).
- [10] P. Bundschuh, Transcendence and algebraic independence of series related to Stern's sequence, *Int. J. Number Theory* **8** (2012) 361–376.
- [11] L. Carlitz, Single variable Bell polynomials, *Collect. Math.* **14** (1962) 13–25.
- [12] L. Carlitz, A problem in partitions related to the Stirling numbers, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **70** (1964) 275–278.
- [13] L. Carlitz, Some partition problems related to the Stirling numbers of the second kind, *Acta Arith.* **10** (1965) 409–422.
- [14] S. H. Chan, Analogs of the Stern sequence, *Integers* **11** (2011) #A26.
- [15] G. Christol, Ensembles presque périodiques  $k$ -reconnaissables, *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* **9** (1979) 141–145.
- [16] G. Christol, T. Kamae, M. Mendès France, G. Rauzy, Suites algébriques, automates et substitutions, *Bull. Soc. Math. France* **108** (1980), 401–419.
- [17] K. Dilcher, K. B. Stolarsky, A polynomial analogue to the Stern sequence, *Int. J. Number Theory* **3** (2007) 85–103.
- [18] K. Dilcher, K. B. Stolarsky, Stern polynomials and double-limit continued fractions, *Acta Arith.* **140** (2009) 119–134.
- [19] Encyclopedia of Mathematics, Springer, see [http://www.encyclopediaofmath.org/index.php/Fibonacci\\_polynomials](http://www.encyclopediaofmath.org/index.php/Fibonacci_polynomials)

- [20] A. Erdélyi (ed.), *Higher Transcendental Functions*, Volume II, Mc Graw Hill Book Company Inc., New York, 1953.
- [21] P. Fatou, Séries trigonométriques et séries de Taylor, *Acta Math.* **30** (1906) 335–400.
- [22] N. Garnier, O. Ramaré, Fibonacci numbers and trigonometric identities, *Fibonacci Quart.* **46/47** (2008/09) 56–61.
- [23] A. M. Hinz, S. Klavžar, U. Milutinović, D. Parisse, C. Petr, Metric properties of the Tower of Hanoi graphs and Stern’s diatomic sequence, *European J. Combin.* **26** (2005) 693–708.
- [24] S. Klavžar, U. Milutinović, C. Petr, Stern polynomials, *Adv. in Appl. Math.* **39** (2007) 86–95.
- [25] É. Lucas, Sur les congruences des nombres eulériens et des coefficients différentiels des fonctions trigonométriques, *Bull. Soc. Math. France* **6** (1878) 49–54.
- [26] M. Mendès France, A. van der Poorten, Arithmetic and analytic properties of paper-folding sequences, *Bull. Austral. Math. Soc.* **24** (1981) 123–131.
- [27] M. Mendès France, A. van der Poorten, Automata and the arithmetic of formal power series, *Acta Arith.* **46** (1986) 211–214.
- [28] M. Mendès France, A. van der Poorten, J. Shallit, On lacunary formal power series and their continued fraction expansion, in *Number Theory in Progress*, Vol. 1 (Zakopane-Kościelisko, 1997), 321–326, de Gruyter, Berlin, 1999.
- [29] S. Northshield, Stern’s diatomic sequence 0, 1, 1, 2, 1, 3, 2, 3, 1, 4, ..., *Amer. Math. Monthly* **117** (2010) 581–598.
- [30] *The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences* (<http://oeis.org>).
- [31] M. A. Stern, Über eine zahlentheoretische Funktion, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **55** (1858) 193–220.
- [32] M. N. S. Swamy, Properties of the polynomials defined by Morgan-Voyce, *Fibonacci Quart.* **4** (1966) 73–81.
- [33] I. Urbiha, Some properties of a function studied by De Rham, Carlitz and Dijkstra and its relation to the (Eisenstein-)Stern’s diatomic sequence, *Math. Commun.* **6** (2001) 181–198.
- [34] A. J. van der Poorten, Specialisation and reduction of continued fractions of formal power series, *Ramanujan J.* **9** (2005) 83–91.