

# Chapter 1

## A Dual-Radix Approach to Steiner's 1-Cycle Theorem

Andrey Rukhin

### Abstract

This article presents three algebraic proofs of Steiner's *1-Cycle Theorem* [14] within the context of the (accelerated)  $3x + 1$  dynamical system. Furthermore, under an assumption of an exponential upper-bound on the iterates, the article demonstrates that the only 1-cycles in the (accelerated)  $3x - 1$  dynamical system are (1) and (5, 7).

### 1.1 Introduction

Within the context of the  $3x + 1$  Problem, Steiner's *1-cycle Theorem* [14] is a result pertaining to the non-existence of 1-cycles (or *circuits*): for all  $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$ , Steiner shows that a rational expression of the form

$$\frac{2^a - 1}{2^{a+b} - 3^b} \quad (1.1)$$

does not assume a positive integer value except in the case where  $a = b = 1$ . In the proof, the author appeals to the continued fraction expansion of  $\log_2 3$ , transcendental number theory, and extensive numerical computation (see [13]). This argument serves as the basis for demonstrating the non-existence of 2-cycles in [12], and the non-existence of  $m$ -cycles in [13] where  $m \leq 68$ .

The result has been strengthened in [4] as follows: Let  $C$  denote a cycle in the (accelerated)  $3x + 1$  dynamical system  $T : 2\mathbb{Z} + 1 \rightarrow 2\mathbb{Z} + 1$ , defined by the mapping

$$T(x) = \frac{3x + 1}{2^{e(x)}}$$

where  $e(x)$  is the 2-adic valuation of the quantity  $3x + 1$ . If  $e(x) \geq 2$ , the element  $x$  is said to be a *descending element* in  $C$ , and we define  $\delta(C)$  to be the number of descending elements in  $C$ . Theorem 1.1 in [4] demonstrates that the number of cycles satisfying the inequality  $\delta(C) < 2 \log(|C|)$  is finite;

---

Andrey Rukhin  
email: [andrey.rukhin@gmail.com](mailto:andrey.rukhin@gmail.com)

This work was supported by the Naval Surface Warfare Center Dahlgren Division's In-House Laboratory Independent Research Program.

Steiner’s result addresses the case where  $d(C) = 1$  by showing that the only (accelerated) cycle with a single descending element is the cycle including 1.

However, the author in [9] declares that the “most remarkable thing about [Steiner’s theorem] is the weakness of its conclusion compared to the strength of the methods used in its proof.” This article offers alternative proofs of this theorem by demonstrating the non-integrality of the maximal element of a 1-cycle

$$\frac{(2^{a+1} + 1)3^{b-1} - 2^{a+b}}{2^{a+b} - 3^b} = 2 \cdot 3^{b-1} \left( \frac{2^a - 1}{2^{a+b} - 3^b} \right) - 1$$

within a variety of algebraic settings. Assuming the upper bound on periodic iterates established in [2], these proofs exploit that fact that the denominator in the above expression is coprime to both 2 and 3. Based on the results in [11], the first proof appeals to elementary modular arithmetic, the second proof exploits identities on weighted binomial coefficients and the Fibonacci numbers, and the third proof analyzes the 2-adic and 3-adic digits of the values in a 1-cycle.

The article concludes with a similiar analyses of the existence of 1-cycles within the (accelerated)  $3x - 1$  dynamical system: we will demonstrate that, under the assumption of an exponential upper bound on the iterate values of a periodic orbit, the only 1-cycles are (1) and (5, 7).

## 1.2 Overview

### 1.2.1 Notation

This manuscript inherits all of the notation and definitions established in [11], which we summarize here. Let  $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$ , and let  $\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{N}^\tau$  where  $\mathbf{e} = (e_0, \dots, e_{\tau-1})$  and  $\mathbf{f} = (f_0, \dots, f_{\tau-1})$ . For each  $u \in \mathbb{Z}$ , define  $E_u = \sum_{0 \leq w < u} e_{w \bmod \tau}$  and  $\bar{E}_u = \sum_{0 \leq w < u} e_{(\tau-1-w) \bmod \tau}$ ; we will define  $F_u$  and  $\bar{F}_u$  in an analogous manner with the elements of  $\mathbf{f}$ .

For a positive integer  $b$ , we will write  $[b] = \{1, \dots, b\}$  and  $[b] = \{1, \dots, b - 1\}$ ; furthermore, we will write  $[b]_0 = [b] \cup \{0\}$  and  $[b]_0 = [b] \cup \{0\}$ .

For any integer  $a$  and positive base  $b$  ( $b \geq 1$ ), let  $[a]_b$  denote the element<sup>1</sup> of  $[b]_0$  that satisfies the equivalence  $[a]_b \equiv a \pmod{b}$ . We will also write  $[a]_b^{-1}$  to denote the element in  $[b]_0$  that satisfies the equivalence  $[a]_b [a]_b^{-1} \equiv 1$ .

For the maximal iterate value  $n_{\max}$  within a 1-cycle, we will define  $\mu_\tau = n_{\max} \bmod 3^\tau$  and  $\lambda_\tau = n_{\max} \bmod 2^{e+\tau-1}$  for  $e, \tau \in \mathbb{N}$

We will write  $(-)^u$  to denote the quantity  $(-1)^u$  for each  $u \in \mathbb{N}_0$ .

### 1.2.2 Argument Overview

The dual-radix approach to the non-existence of circuits is based upon the following premises:

---

<sup>1</sup> This element is also known as the *standard* (or *canonical*) *representative* of the equivalence class  $\bar{a} \pmod{b}$ .

- i. We will establish an upper bound of  $3^\tau$  for a potential, periodic iterate value over  $\mathbb{N}$  for the (accelerated)  $3x + 1$  Problem. In this context, the authors in [2] have demonstrated that the maximal iterate  $n_{\max}$  within a periodic orbit admits the upper bound

$$n_{\max} < \frac{\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{\tau-1}}{1 - \frac{3^\tau}{2^{\overline{E}_\tau}}} \leq \tau^C \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{\tau-1} = o(3^{\tau-1}) \quad (1.2)$$

for some effectively computable constant  $C$  (by applying the result in [1]). A recent upper bound on  $C$  is available in [10], in which the author establishes the inequality<sup>2</sup>

$$|-\overline{E}_\tau \log 2 + \tau \log 3| \geq \overline{E}_\tau^{-13.3}; \quad (1.3)$$

consequently, assuming  $2^{\overline{E}_\tau} > 3^\tau$ , we can bound<sup>3</sup> the denominator in (1.2) from below  $1 - \frac{3^\tau}{2^{\overline{E}_\tau}} \geq \frac{\overline{E}_\tau^{-13.3}}{2}$ . According to [5], for a periodic orbit over  $\mathbb{N}$  of length  $\overline{E}_\tau$ , the ratio  $\frac{\overline{E}_\tau}{\tau}$  satisfies the inequality

$$\frac{\overline{E}_\tau}{\tau} \leq \lg \left( 3 + \frac{1}{n_{\min}} \right) \leq 2;$$

numerical computation yields  $n_{\max} < \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{\tau-1} 2 \cdot (2\tau)^{13.3} < 3^\tau$  when  $\tau \geq 103$ .

Thus, if  $n_{\max} > 3^\tau$  and  $n_{\max} \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $\tau < 103$ . However, the author in [7] demonstrates that the length of a non-trivial periodic orbit (excluding 1) over  $\mathbb{N}$  must satisfy the inequality  $2\tau \geq \overline{E}_\tau \geq 35,400$ .

Thus, if  $n_{\max} \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $n_{\max} < 3^\tau < 2^{\overline{E}_\tau}$ , and the equalities  $n_{\max} = \mu_\tau = \lambda_\tau$  must hold.

- ii. Within a circuit of order  $\tau$  in the (accelerated)  $3x + 1$  dynamical system, the maximal element equals

$$\frac{(2^e + 1)3^{\tau-1} - 2^{e+\tau-1}}{2^{e+\tau-1} - 3^\tau} = 2 \cdot 3^{\tau-1} \left( \frac{2^{e-1} - 1}{2^{e+\tau-1} - 3^\tau} \right) - 1$$

for some  $e \in \mathbb{N}$  (see [3]).

When  $\tau = 1$ , we note that  $2^e - 3 \geq 2^{e-1} - 1$  for  $e \geq 2$ ; thus the ratio in (1.1), evaluated at  $a = e - 1$  and  $b = 1$ , is at most one. When  $e = 1$ , the left-hand side of the equality above is negative, and the ratio in (1.1) vanishes.

When  $\tau > 1$ , we will analyze the difference of canonical residues

$$\mu_\tau = [(2^e + 1)3^{\tau-1} - 2^{e+\tau-1}] [2^{e+\tau-1}]^{-1} \bmod 3^\tau$$

and

$$\lambda_\tau = [(2^e + 1)3^{\tau-1} - 2^{e+\tau-1}] [-3^\tau]^{-1} \bmod 2^{\overline{E}_\tau};$$

we will demonstrate the inequality  $\mu_\tau \neq \lambda_\tau$  (contradicting the assumption that  $n_{\max} = \mu_\tau = \lambda_\tau$  as per above).

<sup>2</sup> In their notation, we set  $u_0 = 0$ ,  $u_1 = -\overline{E}_\tau$ , and  $u_2 = \tau$ .

<sup>3</sup> We can shed the logarithms: when  $|w| < 1$ , the power series expansion of  $\log(1+w) = \sum_{u \geq 1} (-1)^{u-1} \frac{w^u}{u}$  yields  $|\log(1+w)| \leq 2|w|$  when  $|w| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ . See [6] (Corollary 1.6).

We will also perform similar analyses on the maximal element of a circuit within the (accelerated)  $3x - 1$  dynamical system; we will show that, assuming<sup>4</sup> the inequality  $n_{\max} < 2^{\overline{E}_\tau}$ , a circuit over  $\mathbb{N}$  exists if and only if either  $e = 1$ , or  $\tau = e = 2$ .

### 1.3 Circuits with the $3x + 1$ Dynamical System

Throughout the remainder of the manuscript, unless otherwise stated, we assume that

- i.  $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $\tau \geq 2$ ;
- ii.  $\mathbf{f} = (1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{N}^\tau$ ;
- iii.  $\mathbf{e} = (\underbrace{1, \dots, 1}_{\tau-1}, e)$  for some  $e \in \mathbb{N}$ ; and
- iv.  $\mathbf{a} = (a_0, \dots, a_{\tau-1}) \in \{-1, +1\}^\tau$ .

We begin with the following assumptions.

**Assumptions 1.3.1 (1.3.1)** *Assume 3.1 and 3.3 from [11], and let  $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{1}^\tau$ . Let  $N = (2^e + 1)3^{\tau-1} - 2^{e+\tau-1}$ , and let  $D = 2^{e+\tau-1} - 3^\tau$  where  $D > 0$ .*

*Assume that*

$$n_{\max} = \frac{N}{D} < \min(3^\tau, 2^{\overline{E}_\tau}),$$

*let  $\mu_\tau = n_{\max} \bmod 3^\tau$ , and let  $\lambda_\tau = n_{\max} \bmod 2^{e+\tau-1}$ .*

Under these assumptions, if  $n_{\max} \in \mathbb{N}$ , then the chain of equalities  $n_{\max} = \mu_\tau = \lambda_\tau$  holds.

Our goal for the remainder of this subsection is to prove the following theorem:

**Theorem 1.** *Assume (1.3.1).*

*We have the equalities*

$$\mu_\tau = \begin{cases} 3^{\tau-1} - 1 & e \equiv_2 0 \\ 3^\tau - 1 & e \equiv_2 1 \end{cases}$$

*when  $\tau \equiv_2 0$ , and*

$$\mu_\tau = \begin{cases} 2 \cdot 3^{\tau-1} - 1 & e \equiv_2 0 \\ 3^\tau - 1 & e \equiv_2 1 \end{cases}$$

*when  $\tau \equiv_2 1$ .*

*Furthermore, when  $\tau \equiv_2 1 \equiv_2 e - 1$ , then*

$$\lambda_\tau = 2^e \left( \frac{2^{\tau-1} - 1}{3} \right) + \frac{2^{e+\tau-1} - 1}{3} = \frac{(2^\tau - 1)2^e - 1}{3}.$$

For completeness, we have

<sup>4</sup> Appealing to a similar argument outlined above, this condition holds for finitely many  $\tau$  for each fixed  $e \in \mathbb{N}$ .

$$\lambda_\tau = \begin{cases} \frac{(2^{\tau-1}-1)2^e-1}{3} & e \equiv_2 0 \\ 2^{e+\tau-1} - \frac{2^e+1}{3} & e \equiv_2 1 \end{cases}$$

when  $\tau \equiv_2 0$ , and

$$\lambda_\tau = \begin{cases} \frac{(2^\tau-1)2^e-1}{3} & e \equiv_2 0 \\ 2^{e+\tau-1} - \frac{2^e+1}{3} & e \equiv_2 1 \end{cases}$$

when  $\tau \equiv_2 1$ . However, in order to expedite the proofs, we exclude three out of the four cases when the corresponding canonical 3-residue  $\mu_\tau$  is even (assuring the inequality  $\mu_\tau \neq \lambda_\tau$ ). We exclude the remaining case with the following lemma.

**Lemma 1.** *Assume that  $\tau \equiv_2 1 \equiv_2 e - 1$ ; furthermore, let  $\mu_\tau = 2 \cdot 3^{\tau-1} - 1$ , and  $\lambda_\tau = \frac{(2^\tau-1)2^e-1}{3}$ . Then, the inequality  $\mu_\tau \neq \lambda_\tau$  holds.*

*Proof.* By way of contradiction, assume that the natural number  $e$  satisfies the equality  $2 \cdot 3^{\tau-1} - 1 = \frac{(2^\tau-1)2^e-1}{3}$ ; equivalently, we require that the equality  $2(3^\tau - 1) = (2^\tau - 1)2^e$  holds. However, we have that

$$2^{e-2}(2^\tau - 1) = \frac{3^\tau - 1}{2} \equiv_2 \sum_{0 \leq w < \tau} 3^w \equiv_2 1$$

for all odd, positive  $\tau$ . When  $e = 2$ , the value of  $\tau$  must satisfy the equality  $2 - \frac{1}{2^\tau} = \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^\tau$ ; however, this equality fails to hold for  $\tau > 1$ .

Lemma 1, Assumptions (1.3.1), and Theorem 1, along with the bounds provided in [13], [5], and [7], demonstrate the non-existence of circuits in the  $3x + 1$  dynamical system.

### 1.3.1 Elementary Modular Arithmetic

Our first proof of Theorem 1 appeals to elementary modular arithmetic.

*Proof.* We will write

$$\mu_\tau \equiv_{3^\tau} ND^{-1} \equiv_{3^\tau} [(2^e + 1)3^{\tau-1} - 2^{e+\tau-1}] [2^{e+\tau-1}]^{-1} \equiv_{3^\tau} \left[ [2^{\tau-1}]_{3^1}^{-1} + [2^{e+\tau-1}]_{3^1}^{-1} \right] 3^{\tau-1} - 1.$$

It follows that  $\mu_\tau \equiv_{3^\tau} 3^{\tau-1} (-)^{\tau-1} [1 + (-)^e] - 1$ . Thus, when  $e \equiv_2 1$ , we have  $\mu_\tau = 3^\tau - 1 \equiv_2 0$ . Similarly, when  $e \equiv_2 0$  and  $\tau \equiv_2 0$ , we have  $\mu_\tau = 3^{\tau-1} - 1 \equiv_2 0$ . When  $\tau \equiv_2 1 \equiv_2 e - 1$ , we arrive at the equality  $\mu_\tau = 2 \cdot 3^{\tau-1} - 1$ .

For the **2**-remainder, we begin by writing

$$\lambda_\tau \equiv_{2^{e+\tau-1}} ND^{-1} \equiv_{2^{e+\tau-1}} [(2^e + 1)3^{\tau-1} - 2^{e+\tau-1}] [-3^\tau]^{-1} \equiv_{2^{e+\tau-1}} 2^e [-3]_{2^{\tau-1}}^{-1} + [-3]^{-1}.$$

When  $\tau \equiv_2 1 \equiv_2 e - 1$ , we have  $[-3^1]_{2^{\tau-1}}^{-1} = \frac{2^{\tau-1}-1}{3}$  and  $[-3^1]_{2^{e+\tau-1}}^{-1} = \frac{2^{e+\tau-1}-1}{3}$ .

As

$$2^e \left( \frac{2^{\tau-1} - 1}{3} \right) + \frac{2^{e+\tau-1} - 1}{3} = \frac{2(2^{e+\tau-1}) - 2^e - 1}{3} < 2^{e+\tau-1},$$

we arrive at the chain of equalities  $\lambda_\tau = 2^e \left( \frac{2^{\tau-1}-1}{3} \right) + \frac{2^{e+\tau-1}-1}{3} = \frac{(2^\tau-1)2^e-1}{3}$ .

### 1.3.2 Weighted Binomial Coefficients

The previous approach is apparently limited; it is unclear to the author how to extrapolate this approach to admissible sequences of order  $\tau$  with an arbitrary  $\mathbf{2}$ -grading  $(e_0, \dots, e_{\tau-1})$ . In this subsection, we introduce a more robust approach to identifying the 3-residues and  $\mathbf{2}$ -remainders of the iterates of an admissible cycle in a  $(3, 2)$ -system. Moreover, we do so by connecting the residues of  $(3, 2)$ -systems to the well-known *Fibonacci sequence* by way of elementary equivalence identities, which we establish first.

**Lemma 2.** For  $a, b, z \in \mathbb{N}$ , the equivalence

$$\left( \sum_{0 \leq w < b} z^w \right)^a \equiv_{z^b} \sum_{0 \leq w < b} \binom{a-1+w}{w} z^w$$

holds.

*Proof.* Define  $S_b(z) = \sum_{0 \leq w < b} z^w$ , and define  $T_{a,b}(z) = \sum_{0 \leq w < b} \binom{a-1+w}{w} z^w$ . The proof is by induction on  $b$ .

When  $b = 1$ , we arrive at the equivalence  $1^a \equiv_{z^1} \binom{a-1}{0}$  for all  $a, z \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Assume the claim holds for  $b \in \mathbb{N}$ . The identity  $S_{b+1}(z) = zS_b(z) + 1$  allows the chain of equivalences

$$[S_{b+1}(z)]^a \equiv_{z^{b+1}} \sum_{0 \leq y < b+1} \binom{a}{y} z^y [S_b(z)]^y \equiv_{z^{b+1}} \binom{a}{0} z^0 + \sum_{1 \leq y < b+1} \binom{a}{y} z^y T_{y,b}(z).$$

We will recast the coefficient of  $z^0$  as  $\binom{a-1}{0}$ , and we will write

$$\sum_{1 \leq y < b+1} \binom{a}{y} z^y T_{y,b}(z) = \sum_{1 \leq y < b+1} \sum_{0 \leq u < b} z^{u+y} \binom{a}{y} \binom{y-1+u}{u}.$$

For each  $w \in [b+1)$ , the coefficient of  $z^w$  is  $\sum_{1 \leq y \leq w} \binom{a}{y} \binom{w-1}{w-y} = \sum_{0 \leq y < w} \binom{a}{w-y} \binom{w-1}{y}$ , which equals  $\binom{a-1+w}{w}$  as per the *Vandermonde-Chu* identity.

**Identity 1.3.1 (Fibonacci Identity)** Let  $F_0 = 0$ ,  $F_1 = 1$ , and  $F_n = F_{n-1} + F_{n-2}$  for  $n \geq 2$ . The equality  $F_n = \sum_{0 \leq k < n} \binom{n-1-k}{k}$  holds.

We will use these identities to establish the *remainder approximation functions*.

**Lemma 3.** Define the map  $M_\tau : \mathbb{N}^\tau \times \mathbb{N}^\tau \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  to be

$$M_\tau = M_\tau(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{a}) = \sum_{0 \leq w < u} (-)^{E_{w+1}} 3^w a_w \sum_{0 \leq y < \tau - w} \binom{E_{w+1} - 1 + y}{y} 3^y,$$

and define the map  $\Lambda_\tau : \mathbb{N}^\tau \times \mathbb{N}^\tau \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  to be

$$\Lambda_\tau = \Lambda_\tau(\mathbf{e}, \mathbf{a}) = \sum_{0 \leq w < \tau} (-)^w 2^{\overline{E}_w} a_{\tau-1-w} \sum_{0 \leq y < \eta_w} \binom{w+y}{y} 4^y,$$

where  $\eta_w = \left\lceil \frac{E_{\tau-w}}{2} \right\rceil$ .

Then, the equivalences  $M_\tau \equiv_{3^\tau} \mu_\tau$  and  $\Lambda_\tau \equiv_{2^{\overline{E}_\tau}} \lambda_\tau$  hold.

*Proof.* We will make use of the following elementary identities involving Euler's totient function  $\phi$ : we have  $3^{\phi(2)} - 1 = 2$  and  $2^{\phi(3)} - 1 = 3$ . In light of these identities, we will appeal to Lemma 2: for  $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$ , we will write

$$[2^a]^{-1} \equiv_{3^b} \left( \frac{1 - 3^{\phi(2) \lceil \frac{b}{\phi(2)} \rceil}}{2} \right)^a \equiv_{3^b} (-)^a \left( \sum_{0 \leq y < b} 3^y \right)^a \equiv_{3^b} (-)^a \sum_{0 \leq y < b} \binom{a-1+y}{y} 3^y,$$

and

$$[3^b]^{-1} \equiv_{2^a} \left( \frac{1 - 2^{\phi(3) \lceil \frac{a}{\phi(3)} \rceil}}{3} \right)^b \equiv_{2^a} (-)^b \left( \sum_{0 \leq y < \lceil \frac{a}{2} \rceil} 4^y \right)^b \equiv_{2^a} (-)^b \sum_{0 \leq y < \lceil \frac{a}{2} \rceil} \binom{b-1+y}{y} 4^y.$$

We derive the 3-remainder approximation function as follows:

$$\mu_\tau \equiv_{3^\tau} [ND^{-1}]_{3^\tau} \equiv_{3^\tau} \sum_{0 \leq w < \tau} 3^w 2^{\overline{E}_{\tau-1-w}} a_w [2^{\overline{E}_\tau}]^{-1} \equiv_{3^\tau} \sum_{0 \leq w < \tau} (-)^{E_{w+1}} 3^w a_w \sum_{0 \leq y < \tau - w} \binom{E_{w+1} - 1 + y}{y} 3^y.$$

We derive the 2-remainder approximation function analogously:

$$\lambda_\tau \equiv_{2^{\overline{E}_\tau}} \sum_{0 \leq w < \tau} 3^w 2^{\overline{E}_{\tau-1-w}} a_w [-3^\tau]^{-1} \equiv_{2^{\overline{E}_\tau}} \sum_{0 \leq w < \tau} (-)^w 2^{\overline{E}_w} a_{\tau-1-w} \sum_{0 \leq y < \eta_w} \binom{w+y}{y} 4^y.$$

It will prove useful to re-index these double-sums: for example, in the 3-residue approximation, for each fixed  $w \in [\tau]_0$  the coefficient of  $3^w$  is

$$S_w = \sum_{0 \leq y \leq w} (-)^{E_{y+1}} \binom{E_{y+1} - 1 + w - y}{w - y} a_y;$$

thus, we can write  $M_\tau = \sum_{0 \leq w < \tau} 3^w S_w$ .

The following example illustrates the connection between an orbit over  $\mathbb{N}$  within the  $3x + 1$  dynamical system and the Fibonacci Sequence.

### 1.3.2.1 Example: The (1, 4, 2)-Orbit in the $3x + 1$ Dynamical System

For this example, define  $e_y = 2$  and  $a_y = 1$  for each  $y \in [\tau]_0$ ; thus, the sum  $E_{y+1} = 2(y+1) \equiv 0$ . We can express the 3-remainder approximation as  $M_\tau = \sum_{0 \leq w < \tau} 3^w S_w$ , where

$$S_w := \sum_{0 \leq y \leq w} (-1)^{2(y+1)} \binom{2(y+1) - 1 + w - y}{w - y} = \sum_{0 \leq y \leq w} \binom{2w + 1 - y}{y}.$$

The sequence  $(S_w)_{w \geq 0}$  is the even-indexed bisection of the Fibonacci sequence  $(F_w)_{w \geq 0}$  as per Identity 1.3.1; we have  $S_w = F_{2(w+1)}$  for  $w \geq 0$ . It is known<sup>5</sup> that this bisection satisfies the recurrence<sup>6</sup>  $F_{2w} = 3F_{2(w-1)} - F_{2(w-2)}$  for  $w \geq 0$ ; thus, we will write  $M_\tau = \sum_{0 \leq w < \tau} 3^w S_w = \sum_{0 \leq w < \tau} 3^w F_{2(w+1)}$ , and we continue by writing

$$\sum_{0 \leq w < \tau} 3^w [3F_{2w} - F_{2(w-1)}] = \sum_{0 \leq w < \tau-1} 3^{w+1} F_{2w} + 3^\tau F_{2(\tau-1)} - F_{-2} - \sum_{1 \leq w < \tau} 3^w F_{2(w-1)} = 3^\tau F_{2(\tau-1)} + 1.$$

For the **2**-remainder approximation, we have the equalities  $A_\tau = \sum_{0 \leq w < \tau} 4^w \sum_{0 \leq y \leq w} \binom{w}{y} (-1)^y = \sum_{0 \leq w < \tau} 4^w (1-1)^w = 1$  for  $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$ .

The Fibonacci sequence appears within the **2**-remainder approximation for the following proof of Theorem 1. In order to expedite the derivation of this **2**-remainder, we will first prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.** For  $a \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , let  $F_a$  denote the  $a$ -th Fibonacci number; furthermore, for  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , define  $\sigma(a, k) = 2 \binom{a+1}{k} - \binom{a}{k}$ , and define  $\mathcal{S}(k) = \sum_{0 \leq i < k} \sigma(2k-i, i+1)$ .

For  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , the equality  $\mathcal{S}(k) = F_{2k+2} + 2F_{2k+1} - 3$  holds.

*Proof.* Assume the conditions within the statement of the lemma. For  $k = 0$ , we have  $\mathcal{S}(k) = 0 = F_2 + 2F_1 - 3$ . When  $k > 0$ , we will write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}(k) &= \sum_{0 \leq i < k} \left[ 2 \binom{2k-i+1}{i+1} - \binom{2k-i}{i+1} \right] \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq i < k+1} \left[ 2 \binom{2k+2-i}{i} - \binom{2k+1-i}{i} \right] \\ &= 2 \left[ F_{2k+3} - \binom{2k+2}{0} - \binom{k+1}{k+1} \right] - \left[ F_{2k+2} - \binom{2k+1}{0} \right] \\ &= F_{2k+2} + 2F_{2k+1} - 3. \end{aligned}$$

We proceed with the proof of the theorem.

<sup>5</sup> OEIS:A001906

<sup>6</sup> We assume the standard definition  $F_{-u} = (-1)^{u-1} F_u$  for  $u \in \mathbb{N}$ .



*Proof.* First, we will demonstrate the equality  $M_\tau = -1 + 3^{\tau-1}(-)^{\tau-1}[1 + (-)^e]$ ; afterwards, when assuming  $\tau \equiv 1 \equiv e - 1$ , we will show that

$$\Lambda_\tau = 2^e \left( \frac{2^{\tau-1} - 1}{3} \right) + \frac{2^{e+\tau-1} - 1}{3} + 2^{e+\tau-1}(F_{\tau-2} - 1).$$

In circuits, we have

$$E_w = \begin{cases} w & w < \tau \\ e + \tau - 1 & w = \tau, \end{cases}$$

for  $w \in [\tau)$ . Thus, when  $w < \tau - 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} S_w &= \sum_{0 \leq y \leq w} (-)^{E_{y+1}} \binom{E_{y+1} - 1 + w - y}{w - y} \\ &= \sum_{0 \leq y \leq w} (-)^{y+1} \binom{w}{w - y} \\ &= - \sum_{0 \leq y \leq w} (-)^{w-y} \binom{w}{y} \\ &= -(1 - 1)^w \\ &= \begin{cases} 0 & w > 0 \\ -1 & w = 0. \end{cases}; \end{aligned}$$

when  $w = \tau - 1 \geq 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} S_{\tau-1} &= \sum_{0 \leq y \leq \tau-1} (-)^{E_{y+1}} \binom{E_{y+1} - 1 + \tau - 1 - y}{\tau - 1 - y} \\ &= \sum_{0 \leq y \leq \tau-2} (-)^{y+1} \binom{\tau - 1}{\tau - 1 - y} + (-)^{e+\tau-1} \binom{e + \tau - 2}{0} \\ &= -(1 - 1)^{\tau-1} + (-)^{\tau-1} \binom{\tau - 1}{\tau - 1} + (-)^{e+\tau-1} \binom{e + \tau - 2}{0} \\ &= (-)^{\tau-1} [1 + (-)^e]. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that  $M_\tau = -1 + 3^{\tau-1}(-)^{\tau-1}[1 + (-)^e]$ . Thus, when  $e \equiv 1$ , we have  $\mu_\tau = 3^\tau - 1$ . Similarly, when  $e \equiv 0$  and  $\tau \equiv 0$ , we have  $\mu_\tau = 3^{\tau-1} - 1$ .

When  $\tau \equiv 1 \equiv e - 1$ , we arrive at the equality  $\mu_\tau = 2 \cdot 3^{\tau-1} - 1$ . Continuing with these parity conditions, we let  $T_w$  denote the sum  $\sum_{0 \leq y < \lceil \frac{E_{\tau-w}}{2} \rceil} \binom{w+y}{y} 4^y$ . We write

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda_\tau &= \sum_{0 \leq w < \tau} (-)^w 2^{\overline{E}_w} T_w \\
&= T_0 + \sum_{1 \leq w < \tau} (-)^w 2^{\overline{E}_w} T_w \\
&= \sum_{0 \leq y < \frac{e+\tau-1}{2}} \binom{y}{y} 4^y + \sum_{1 \leq w < \tau} (-)^w 2^{\overline{E}_w} \binom{w}{0} + \sum_{1 \leq w < \tau} (-)^w 2^{\overline{E}_w} \left[ T_w - \binom{w}{0} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

We proceed with the first two sums in the final expression. When  $e + \tau - 1 \equiv 0$ , we will write

$$T_0 = \sum_{0 \leq y < \frac{e+\tau-1}{2}} \binom{y}{y} 4^y = \frac{2^{e+\tau-1} - 1}{3}.$$

In circuits, we have  $\overline{E}_w = e + w - 1$  for  $w \in [\tau]$ ; thus, when  $\tau - 1 \equiv 0$ , we will also write

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{1 \leq w < \tau} (-)^w 2^{\overline{E}_w} \binom{w}{0} &\equiv_{2^{e+\tau-1}} 2^e \sum_{0 \leq w < \tau-1} (-)^{w+1} 2^w \\
&\equiv_{2^{e+\tau-1}} 2^e \sum_{0 \leq w < \frac{\tau-1}{2}} [2^{2w+1} - 2^{2w}] \\
&\equiv_{2^{e+\tau-1}} 2^e \sum_{0 \leq w < \frac{\tau-1}{2}} 4^w \\
&\equiv_{2^{e+\tau-1}} 2^e \left( \frac{2^{\tau-1} - 1}{3} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

What remains to be shown is that  $\sum_{1 \leq w < \tau} (-)^w 2^{\overline{E}_w} [T_w - \binom{w}{0}] \equiv_{2^{e+\tau-1}} 0$ . To this end, for each  $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ , we will define

$$\widehat{\Lambda}_{2k+1} = \sum_{1 \leq w < 2k-1} (-)^w 2^{w-1} \sum_{1 \leq y < \lceil \frac{2k+1-w}{2} \rceil} \binom{w+y}{y} 4^y;$$

we will show that

$$\sum_{1 \leq w < \tau} (-)^w 2^{\overline{E}_w} \left[ T_w - \binom{w}{0} \right] = 2^e \widehat{\Lambda}_\tau = 2^{e+\tau-1} (F_{\tau-2} - 1).$$

Assume the notation from the statement of Lemma 4. We will demonstrate the chain of equalities

$$\widehat{\Lambda}_{2k+1} = \widehat{\Lambda}_{2k-1} + 4^{k-1} \mathcal{S}(k-1) = 4^k (F_{2k-1} - 1)$$

inductively for  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Firstly, we have  $\widehat{\Lambda}_3 = 0 + 4^0 \mathcal{S}(0) = 4^0 (F_1 - 1) = 0$  for  $k = 1$ . Assuming the inductive claim, we proceed with the chain of equalities for  $k \geq 2$ :

$$\widehat{\Lambda}_{2k+1} = \sum_{1 \leq w < 2k-1} (-)^w 2^{w-1} \sum_{1 \leq y < \lceil \frac{2k+1-w}{2} \rceil} \binom{w+y}{y} 4^y = \widehat{\Lambda}_{2k-1} + A_k,$$

where

$$A_k = \sum_{1 \leq w < 2k-1} (-)^w 2^{w-1} \binom{w + \lceil \frac{2k-1-w}{2} \rceil}{\lceil \frac{2k-1-w}{2} \rceil} 4^{\lceil \frac{2k-1-w}{2} \rceil}.$$

The sum

$$\begin{aligned} A_k &= \sum_{1 \leq w < 2k-1} (-)^w 2^{w-1} \binom{k+w + \lceil \frac{-1-w}{2} \rceil}{k + \lceil \frac{-1-w}{2} \rceil} 4^{k + \lceil \frac{-1-w}{2} \rceil} \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq w < \frac{2k-1}{2}} \left[ 2^{2w-1} \binom{k+w}{k-w} - 2^{2w-2} \binom{k-1+w}{k-w} \right] 4^{k-w} \\ &= 4^{k-1} \sum_{1 \leq w < k} \left[ 2 \binom{k+w}{k-w} - \binom{k-1+w}{k-w} \right] \\ &= 4^{k-1} \sum_{1 \leq w < k} \left[ 2 \binom{2k-w}{w} - \binom{2k-1-w}{w} \right] \\ &= 4^{k-1} \sum_{0 \leq w < k-1} \left[ 2 \binom{2k-1-w}{w+1} - \binom{2k-2-w}{w+1} \right] \\ &= 4^{k-1} \mathcal{S}(k-1). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, with Lemma 4 and the inductive hypothesis, we can write

$$\widehat{\Lambda}_{2k+1} = \widehat{\Lambda}_{2k-1} + 4^{k-1} \mathcal{S}(k-1) = 4^{k-1} [F_{2k-3} + F_{2k-2} + 3F_{2k-1} - 4] = 4^k [F_{2k-1} - 1]$$

as required. Consequently, when  $\tau \equiv 1 \equiv e - 1$ , the **2**-remainder approximation

$$A_\tau = 2^e \left( \frac{2^{\tau-1} - 1}{3} \right) + \frac{2^{e+\tau-1} - 1}{3} + 2^{e+\tau-1} (F_{\tau-2} - 1) \equiv_{2^{e+\tau-1}} 2^e \left( \frac{2^{\tau-1} - 1}{3} \right) + \frac{2^{e+\tau-1} - 1}{3}.$$

Note that the approach within this subsection exploits the serendipitous pair of identities  $3^{\phi(2)} - 1 = 2$  and  $2^{\phi(3)} - 1 = 3$ . In general, Euler's Theorem allows one to write  $m^{\phi(l)} - 1 = [-l]_{m^{\phi(l)}}^{-1} l$ , and  $l^{\phi(m)} - 1 = [-m]_{l^{\phi(m)}}^{-1} m$ ; however, for arbitrary, coprime  $m$  and  $l$  exceeding 1, the terms  $[-l]_{m^{\phi(l)}}^{-1}$  and  $[-m]_{l^{\phi(m)}}^{-1}$  may prevent one from executing the approach above in an analogous manner.

### 1.3.3 Dual-Radix Modular Division

The approach in this section, based on the work in [11], demonstrates a different method of proving Theorem 1 using *dual-radix modular division*.

*Proof.* Under the assumption that

$$e_w = \begin{cases} 1 & w \in [\tau - 1]_0 \\ e & w = \tau - 1, \end{cases}$$

we have the following initial conditions for the recurrence in Theorem 4.4 in [11]. For  $v \in [\tau]_0$ , the 3-adic digit  $d_{v,0} \equiv_3 [2^{e_v}]^{-1}$ ; thus, we have

$$d_{v,0} = \begin{cases} 2 & v \in [\tau - 1]_0 \\ 1 + e \pmod 2 & v = \tau - 1; \end{cases}$$

furthermore, the 2-adic digit  $b_{v,0} \equiv_{2^{e_{v-1}}} [-3]^{-1}$ ; thus, we have

$$b_{v,0} = \begin{cases} \frac{2^{2\lceil \frac{v}{2} \rceil} - 1}{3} & v = 0 \\ 1 & v \in [\tau - 1]. \end{cases}$$

For  $u > 0$ , the equivalences

$$d_{v,u} \equiv_3 [2^{e_v}]^{-1} [d_{v+1,u-1} - b_{v+u,u-1}]$$

and

$$b_{v,u} \equiv_{2^{e_{v-1-u}}} [-3]^{-1} [d_{v-u,u-1} - b_{v-1,u-1}]$$

yield, by induction on  $u$ , the equalities  $d_{v,u} = 2[2 - 1] = 2$  for  $v < \tau - 1 - u$ , and  $b_{v,u} = 1[2 - 1] = 1$  for  $v > u$ .

Firstly, we will identify the 3-adic digits of the 3-remainder of  $n_0 = n_{\max}$ . When  $e \equiv_2 1$ , we have the initial condition  $d_{\tau-1,0} = 2$ . Thus, for  $u \in [\tau)$ , the digit  $d_{\tau-1-u,u} \equiv_3 [2^{e_{\tau-1-u}}]^{-1} [d_{\tau-u,u-1} - b_{\tau-1,u-1}] \equiv_3 2[2 - 1] \equiv_3 2$ , and thus we have  $d_{0,\tau-1} = 2$ . Consequently, we have  $\mu_\tau = \sum_{0 \leq w < \tau} 3^w d_{0,w} = 3^\tau - 1$ .

When  $e \equiv_2 0$ , we have the initial condition  $d_{\tau-1,0} = 1$ , and  $d_{\tau-2,1} \equiv_3 [2^1]^{-1} [d_{\tau-1,0} - b_{\tau-1,0}] \equiv_3 [2^1]^{-1} [1 - 1] \equiv_3 0$ . By induction, for  $u \in [\tau)$  where  $u \equiv_2 0$ , the digit

$$d_{\tau-1-u,u} \equiv_3 [2^{e_{\tau-1-u}}]^{-1} [d_{\tau-u,u-1} - b_{\tau-1,u-1}] \equiv_3 2[0 - 1] \equiv_3 1.$$

For  $u \equiv_2 1$ , the digit  $d_{\tau-1-u,u} \equiv_3 [2^{e_{\tau-1-u}}]^{-1} [d_{\tau-u,u-1} - b_{\tau-1,u-1}] \equiv_3 2[1 - 1] \equiv_3 0$ . Thus, the digit  $d_{0,\tau-1} = \tau \pmod 2$ . Thus, when  $\tau \equiv_2 0$ , the 3-adic remainder  $\mu_\tau = \sum_{0 \leq w < \tau-1} 3^w(2) + 3^{\tau-1}(0) = 3^{\tau-1} - 1$ ; and, when  $\tau \equiv_2 1$ , the 3-adic residue  $\mu_\tau = \sum_{0 \leq w < \tau-1} 3^w(2) + 3^{\tau-1}(1) = 2 \cdot 3^{\tau-1} - 1$ .

We will now determine the 2-adic digits of  $n$  when  $\tau \equiv_2 1 \equiv_2 e - 1$ : the initial 2-adic digit  $b_{0,0} = \frac{2^e - 1}{3}$ , and the digit  $b_{0,1} \equiv_{2^{e_{\tau-2}}} [-3]^{-1} [d_{\tau-1,0} - b_{\tau-1,0}] \equiv_{2^1} (1) \cdot [1 - 1] \equiv_{2^1} 0$ . For  $u \in [\tau)$  where  $u \equiv_2 0$ , we have  $b_{0,u} \equiv_{2^{e_{\tau-1-u}}} [-3]^{-1} [d_{\tau-u,u-1} - b_{\tau-1,u-1}] \equiv_{2^1} (1) \cdot [0 - 1] \equiv_{2^1} 1$ , and, when  $u \equiv_2 1$ , we

have  $b_{0,u} \equiv_{2^{e\tau-1-u}} [-3]^{-1} [d_{\tau-u,u-1} - b_{\tau-1,u-1}] \equiv_{2^1} (1) \cdot [1-1] \equiv_{2^1} 0$ . Thus, when  $\tau \equiv 1 \equiv e-1$ , the 2-adic remainder

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_\tau &= b_{0,0} + \sum_{1 \leq u < \tau} 2^{\overline{E}_u} b_{0,u} \\
&= \frac{2^e - 1}{3} + 2^e \sum_{2 \leq u < \tau} 2^{u-1} [u \equiv 0] \\
&= \frac{2^e - 1}{3} + 2^{e+1} \sum_{0 \leq u < \tau-2} 2^u [u \equiv 0] \\
&= \frac{2^e - 1}{3} + 2^{e+1} \sum_{0 \leq u \leq \frac{\tau-3}{2}} 4^u \\
&= \frac{2^e - 1}{3} + 2^{e+1} \left( \frac{4^{\frac{\tau-1}{2}} - 1}{3} \right) \\
&= 2^e \left( \frac{2^{\tau-1} - 1}{3} \right) + \frac{2^{e+\tau-1} - 1}{3}.
\end{aligned}$$

### 1.3.4 Circuits in the $3x - 1$ Dynamical System

We conclude this article by applying the previous analyses to the  $3x - 1$  dynamical system; now, we will consider the case where  $a_w = -1$  for all  $w \in [\tau]_0$ .

We will extend the argument in [2] to the case where  $3^\tau > 2^{\overline{E}_\tau}$ : the magnitude of the numerator of a maximal iterate in a periodic orbit can be bound from above as follows:

$$\left| (2^e + 1) 3^{\tau-1} - 2^{\overline{E}_\tau} \right| = 3^\tau \left[ \frac{2^e + 1}{3} - \frac{2^{\overline{E}_\tau}}{3^\tau} \right] < 3^{\tau-1} (2^e + 1).$$

We can bound the denominator  $3^\tau - 2^{\overline{E}_\tau}$  from below by appealing to the inequality (1.3) once again to conclude that the maximal iterate  $n_{\max}$  within a periodic orbit in the  $3x - 1$  dynamical system satisfies the inequality

$$n_{\max} < \frac{\frac{2^e+1}{3}}{1 - \frac{2^{e+\tau-1}}{3^\tau}} < \left( \frac{2^e + 1}{3} \right) 2(e + \tau - 1)^{13.3} = o(2^{e+\tau-1})$$

for any fixed  $e \in \mathbb{N}$ . Thus, we will reuse the notation of the previous section and begin with the following assumptions.

**Assumptions 1.3.2 (1.3.2)** *Assume 1.3.1, except that now we assume that  $N = 2^{e+\tau-1} - (2^e + 1)3^{\tau-1}$ , and  $D = 2^{e+\tau-1} - 3^\tau < 0$ .*

*As before, define  $\mu_\tau = ND^{-1} \bmod 3^\tau$  and  $\lambda_\tau = ND^{-1} \bmod 2^{e+\tau-1}$ .*

Our goal for the remainder of this subsection is to prove the following theorem:

**Theorem 2.** *Assume (1.3.2).*

*The 3-remainder*

$$\mu_\tau = \begin{cases} 2 \cdot 3^{\tau-1} + 1 & e \equiv 0 \\ 1 & e \equiv 1 \end{cases}$$

when  $\tau \equiv 0$ , and

$$\mu_\tau = \begin{cases} 3^{\tau-1} + 1 & e \equiv 0 \\ 1 & e \equiv 1 \end{cases}$$

when  $\tau \equiv 1$ .

*The 2-remainder*

$$\lambda_\tau = \begin{cases} \frac{2^e(2^\tau+1)+1}{3} & e \equiv 0 \\ \frac{2^e+1}{3} & e \equiv 1 \end{cases}$$

when  $\tau \equiv 0$ , and

$$\lambda_\tau = \begin{cases} \frac{2^e(2^{\tau-1}+1)+1}{3} & e \equiv 0 \\ \frac{2^e+1}{3} & e \equiv 1 \end{cases}$$

when  $\tau \equiv 1$ .

Analogous to Lemma 1, the following lemma will aid in identifying circuits within the  $3x - 1$  Dynamical System.

**Lemma 5.** *Assume that the 3-remainder is*

$$\mu_\tau = \begin{cases} 2 \cdot 3^{\tau-1} + 1 & e \equiv 0 \\ 1 & e \equiv 1 \end{cases}$$

when  $\tau \equiv 0$ , and

$$\mu_\tau = \begin{cases} 3^{\tau-1} + 1 & e \equiv 0 \\ 1 & e \equiv 1 \end{cases}$$

when  $\tau \equiv 1$ . Moreover, assume that the 2-remainder is

$$\lambda_\tau = \begin{cases} \frac{2^e(2^\tau+1)+1}{3} & e \equiv 0 \\ \frac{2^e+1}{3} & e \equiv 1 \end{cases}$$

when  $\tau \equiv 0$ , and

$$\lambda_\tau = \begin{cases} \frac{2^e(2^{\tau-1}+1)+1}{3} & e \equiv 0 \\ \frac{2^e+1}{3} & e \equiv 1 \end{cases}$$

when  $\tau \equiv 1$ .

The equality  $\mu_\tau = \lambda_\tau$  holds if and only if either i.)  $e = 1$  or ii.)  $e = \tau = 2$ .

*Proof.* When  $e \equiv 1$ , we require that the equality  $\frac{2^e+1}{3} = 1$  holds; consequently, we require that  $e = 1$  (irrespective of the parity of  $\tau$ ).

When  $e \equiv 0$  and  $\tau \equiv 0$ , we require that the equality  $2 \cdot 3^{\tau-1} + 1 = \frac{2^e(2^\tau+1)+1}{3}$  holds. Equivalently, we require that  $2 \cdot 3^\tau + 3 = 2^e(2^\tau + 1) + 1$ ; after simplifying, we require that  $\frac{3^\tau+1}{2^e-1} = 2^\tau + 1$ . When  $\tau \equiv 0$ , the numerator on the left-hand side  $9^{\frac{\tau}{2}} + 1 \equiv 2$ ; thus, it follows that we require that  $e = 2$ . The equality  $3^\tau = 2^{\tau+1} + 1$  holds only when  $\tau = 2$  as per a result of Gersonides<sup>7</sup> on *harmonic numbers*.

When  $e \equiv 0$  and  $\tau \equiv 1$ , we have  $\mu_\tau \equiv 0$  and  $\lambda_\tau \equiv 1$ .

*Proof (Theorem 2).*

We can write

$$\mu_\tau \equiv_{\frac{3}{3^\tau}} N [2^{e+\tau-1} - 3^\tau]^{-1} \equiv_{\frac{3}{3^\tau}} [2^{e+\tau-1} - (2^e + 1)3^{\tau-1}] [2^{e+\tau-1}]^{-1} \equiv_{\frac{3}{3^\tau}} 1 - \left[ [2^{\tau-1}]_{3^1}^{-1} + [2^{e+\tau-1}]_{3^1}^{-1} \right] 3^{\tau-1}.$$

As  $[2^u]_{3^1}^{-1} \equiv_{\frac{3}{3}} (-)^u$  for  $u \in \mathbb{N}$ , it follows that  $\mu_\tau \equiv_{\frac{3}{3^\tau}} 1 + 3^{\tau-1} (-)^\tau [1 + (-)^e]$ . For the **2**-remainder, we begin by writing

$$\lambda_\tau \equiv_{\frac{2}{2^{e+\tau-1}}} N \left[ 2^{\overline{E}_\tau} - 3^\tau \right]^{-1} \equiv_{\frac{2}{2^{e+\tau-1}}} [2^{e+\tau-1} - (2^e + 1)3^{\tau-1}] [-3^\tau]^{-1} \equiv_{\frac{2}{2^{e+\tau-1}}} 2^e [3]_{2^{\tau-1}}^{-1} + [3]_{2^{e+\tau-1}}^{-1}.$$

We will write  $[3]_{2^{\tau-1}}^{-1} = \frac{2^{\tau-(\tau-1) \bmod 2+1}}{3}$ , and  $[3]_{2^{e+\tau-1}}^{-1} = \frac{2^{e+\tau-(e+\tau-1) \bmod 2+1}}{3}$ , and we will complete the proof by cases.

- i. ( $e \equiv 0, \tau \equiv 0$ )  $\mu_\tau = 2 \cdot 3^{\tau-1} + 1$ , and  $\lambda_\tau = \left[ 2^e \left( \frac{2^{\tau-1}+1}{3} \right) + \frac{2^{e+\tau-1}+1}{3} \right] \bmod 2^{e+\tau-1} = \frac{2^{e+\tau}+2^e+1}{3}$
- ii. ( $e \equiv 0, \tau \equiv 1$ )  $\mu_\tau = 3^{\tau-1} + 1$ , and  $\lambda_\tau = \left[ 2^e \left( \frac{2^\tau+1}{3} \right) + \frac{2^{e+\tau}+1}{3} \right] \bmod 2^{e+\tau-1} = \frac{2^{e+\tau-1}+2^e+1}{3}$ .
- iii. ( $e \equiv 1, \tau \equiv 0$ )  $\mu_\tau = 1$ , and  $\lambda_\tau = \left[ 2^e \left( \frac{2^{\tau-1}+1}{3} \right) + \frac{2^{e+\tau}+1}{3} \right] \bmod 2^{e+\tau-1} = \frac{2^e+1}{3}$ .
- iv. ( $e \equiv 1, \tau \equiv 1$ )  $\mu_\tau = 1$ , and  $\lambda_\tau = \left[ 2^e \left( \frac{2^\tau+1}{3} \right) + \frac{2^{e+\tau-1}+1}{3} \right] \bmod 2^{e+\tau-1} = \frac{2^e+1}{3}$ .

Thus, under the assumption that  $n < 2^{e+\tau-1}$ , the only circuits within the  $3x - 1$  dynamical system are (1) and (5, 7).

## References

1. A. Baker and G. Wüstholz Logarithmic forms and group varieties. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, 442:19–62, 1993.
2. E.G. Belaga and M. Mignotte. Embedding the  $3x + 1$  conjecture in a  $3x + d$  context. *Experimental Mathematics*, 7(2):145–151, 1998.

<sup>7</sup> Levi Ben Gerson, 1342 AD. See [8].

3. C. Böhm and G. Sontacchi. On the Existence of Cycles of Given Length in Integer Sequences Like  $x_{n+1} = x_n/2$  if  $x_n$  Even, and  $x_{n+1} = 3x_n + 1$  Otherwise. *Atti Accad. Naz. Lincei Rend. Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Natur.* (8), 64(3):260–264, 1978.
4. T. Brox. Collatz cycles with few descents. *Acta Arithmetica*, 92(2):181–188, 2000.
5. S. Eliahou. The  $3x+1$  problem: new lower bounds on nontrivial cycle lengths. *Discrete Mathematics*, 118(1):45–56, 1993.
6. J. Evertse. Linear forms in logarithms. Available at <http://www.math.leidenuniv.nl/~evertse/dio2011-linforms.pdf>, April 2011.
7. L. E. Garner. On the collatz  $3n + 1$  algorithm. *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 82(1):19–22, 1981.
8. I. Grattan-Guinness. *The Norton History of the Mathematical Sciences: The Rainbow of Mathematics*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1998.
9. J. Lagarias. The  $3x + 1$  problem and its generalizations. *American Mathematical Monthly*, 92(1):3–23, 01 1985.
10. G. Rhin. *Approximants de Padé et mesures effectives d'irrationalité*, Goldstein C. (eds) *Seminaire de Théorie des Nombres*, Paris 1985-86, *Progress in Mathematics*, vol. 71. Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1987.
11. A. Rukhin. A dual-radix division algorithm for computing periodic orbits within syracuse dynamical systems. *preprint, submitted*, 2018.
12. J. Simons. On the nonexistence of 2-cycles for the problem. *Mathematics of Computation*, 74:1565–1572, 2005.
13. J. Simons and B. de Weger. Theoretical and computational bounds for m-cycles of the  $3n+1$ -problem. *Acta Arithmetica*, 117(1):51–70, 2005.
14. R. Steiner. A theorem on the syracuse problem. *Proceedings of the Seventh Manitoba Conference on Numerical Mathematics and Computing*, 1977.