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#### Abstract

The minimum of the polynomial $f_{2 n}(x)=1+x+\cdots+x^{2 n}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is studied. Results show that for all $n$ the minimum is unique, resides on the interval $[-1,-1 / 2]$, and corresponds to $\partial_{x} f_{2 n}(x)=0$. Perturbation theory is applied to generate rapidly converging and asymptotically exact approximations to $x_{2 n}=\arg \inf _{x \in \mathbb{R}} f_{2 n}(x)$. A closed-form expression for $x_{2 n}$ is conjectured, which is shown to yield the correct result for the case $n=1$. Numerical studies are carried out to show how many terms of the perturbation expansion of $x_{2 n}$ are needed to obtain suitably precise approximations.


## 1 Introduction

The inspiration for this work came from a question asked on the Mathematics Stack Exchange on March 13, 2021, which sought a solution to the minimum of the polynomial $1+x+\cdots+x^{2 n}$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ [2]. The original poster (OP) of the question noted that the minimum appeared to correspond to a vanishing derivative and thus could be found by solving for the roots of $\partial_{x}\left(1+x+\cdots x^{2 n}\right)$. For $n=1,2$ these roots are explicitly solved using the standard formulae for linear and cubic equations. However for $n \geq 3$, no explicit formula exists; hence, motivating the need for more powerful methods. Given the broad and pervasive applications of geometric sums in the literature, further study of this polynomial and its minimum is a worthwhile venture.

## 2 Preliminaries

Throughout this work we define $\mathbb{N}=\{1,2, \ldots\}, \mathbb{N}_{0}=\mathbb{N} \cup\{0\}$, and $\mathbb{E}=$ $\{2,4, \ldots\}$ to be the sets of positive integers, nonnegative integers, and positive even integers, respectively. For the sake of brevity we shall denote $m=2 n$ so that the the polynomial of interest and its minimizer becomes

$$
f_{m}(x):=1+x+\cdots+x^{m}, \quad m \in \mathbb{E}
$$

and

$$
x_{m}:=\underset{x \in \mathbb{R}}{\arg \inf } f_{m}(x),
$$

respectively. With these definitions at hand we are ready to begin studying properties of $f_{m}$ and $x_{m}$ for use in $\S 4$.

## 3 Properties of $f_{m}$ and $x_{m}$

Our first goal is to establish that $x_{m}$ exists and is unique for all $m \in \mathbb{E}$. To accomplish this it will be helpful to use the known closed-form for geometric sums and write $f_{m}$ in the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{m}(x)=\frac{1-x^{m+1}}{1-x} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Lemma 1. For all $m \in \mathbb{E}, f_{m}(x)$ is strictly convex on $x \in \mathbb{R}$.
Proof. To establish strict convexity it is sufficient to show $f_{m}^{\prime \prime}(x)>0$ everywhere on $x \in \mathbb{R}$. It is trivial to show that $f_{m}^{\prime \prime}(x)>0$ holds for $x \geq 0$ so all that is left is to consider the complementary case $x<0$. Equating the second derivative of $f_{m}$ with zero we find $f_{m}^{\prime \prime}(x)=0 \Longleftrightarrow h_{m}(x)=0$, where

$$
h_{m}(x)=(m-1) m x^{m+1}-2\left(m^{2}-1\right) x^{m}+m(m+1) x^{m-1}-2 .
$$

The signs of the coefficients for $h_{m}(-x)$ in order of descending variable exponent gives the sequence $(-1,-1,-1,-1)$, which are all negative. It follows from Descartes' rule of signs that $f_{m}^{\prime \prime}(x)$ has zero roots on the interval $x \in(-\infty, 0)$. But, $f_{m}^{\prime \prime}(-1)=\frac{1}{2} m^{2}>0$; thus, we conclude $f_{m}^{\prime \prime}(x)>0$ also holds for all $x<0$. The proof is now complete.

Theorem 1. For all $m \in \mathbb{E}, x_{m}$ exists, is unique, and resides on the interval $[-1,-1 / 2]$.

Proof. We begin by establishing that $f_{m}^{\prime}(x)$ has exactly one real root. It is immediately obvious that $f_{m}^{\prime}(x)>0$ for all $x \geq 0$. Now assuming $x<0$, we deduce $f_{m}^{\prime}(x)=0 \Longleftrightarrow g_{m}(x)=0$, where $g_{m}(x)=m x^{m+1}-(m+1) x^{m}+1$. The signs of the coefficients for $g_{m}(-x)$ in order of descending variable exponent gives the sequence $(-1,-1,+1)$; showing a single variation in sign. Again appealing to Descartes' rule of signs we conclude $f_{m}^{\prime}(x)$ must have exactly one real root
on the interval $x \in(-\infty, 0)$. However, $f_{m}^{\prime}(-1)=-\frac{1}{2} m$ and $f_{m}^{\prime}(-1 / 2)=$ $\frac{1}{9} 2^{1-m}\left(2^{m+1}-3 m-2\right) \geq 0$ with the latter inequality following from induction on $m \in \mathbb{E}$. Consequently, $f_{m}^{\prime}(x)$ has a single root on the real line contained in the interval $[-1,-1 / 2]$ for all $m \in \mathbb{E}$. Furthermore, the strict convexity of $f_{m}$ proven in Lemma 1 implies that the root of $f_{m}^{\prime}(x)=0$ also corresponds to the unique global minimum of $f_{m}$, which completes the proof.

With the existence and uniqueness of $x_{m}$ proven, we turn to finding a simple formula for the minimum of $f_{m}$ as a function of $x_{m}$.

Lemma 2. Let $x_{m} \in[-1,-1 / 2]$ denote the unique minimizer of $f_{m}$ such that $f_{m}\left(x_{m}\right)=\inf _{x \in \mathbb{R}} f_{m}(x)$. Then,

$$
f_{m}\left(x_{m}\right)=\frac{1+m}{1+m\left(1-x_{m}\right)}
$$

Proof. From Theorem 1 we know that $x_{m}$ satisfies $m x_{m}^{m+1}-(m+1) x_{m}^{m}+1=0$. Solving this equality for $x_{m}^{m+1}$ we have $x_{m}^{m+1}=x_{m} /\left(1+m\left(1-x_{m}\right)\right)$, which upon substituting into (1) yields the desired result.

## 4 Perturbation series expansion of $x_{m}$

In the previous section we showed that the minimizer $x_{m}$ exists, is unique, and resides in the interval $[-1,-1 / 2]$ for all $m \in \mathbb{E}$. Furthermore, we were able to establish a very simple expression for $\inf f_{m}$ as a function of this minimizer so that the problem of evaluating inf $f_{m}$ is equivalent to finding $x_{m}$. For $m=2,4$ we may apply the standard equations for roots of linear and cubic equations to derive exact expressions for $x_{m}$. Furthermore, as $m \rightarrow \infty$ we find $f_{m}(x) \rightarrow \infty$ at $x=-1$ and $f_{m}(x) \rightarrow(1-x)^{-1}$ for all other $x \in(-1,-1 / 2]$. Bringing these observations together we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
& x_{2}=-\frac{1}{2} \\
& x_{4}=-\frac{1}{4}(1+\sqrt[3]{5 / 9}(\sqrt[3]{9+4 \sqrt{6}}-\sqrt[3]{4 \sqrt{6}-9})) \\
& \vdots \\
& x_{\infty}=-1
\end{aligned}
$$

For all remaining $m \geq 6$, no explicit formula for $x_{m}$ exists and so we must turn to alternative methods.

From Theorem 1 we know that $x_{m}$ satisfies

$$
g_{m}\left(x_{m}\right)=0, \quad \text { with } \quad g_{m}(x)=x^{m}\left(1-x+\frac{1}{m}\right)-\frac{1}{m}
$$

and $x_{m} \rightarrow-1$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. The fact that $x_{m}+1$ vanishes as $m$ becomes large suggests we apply the methods of perturbation theory to the problem

$$
g_{m, \epsilon}\left(x_{m, \epsilon}\right)=0, \quad \text { with } \quad g_{m, \epsilon}(x)=x^{m}\left(2-(1+x) \epsilon+\frac{1}{m}\right)-\frac{1}{m}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{m, \epsilon}=\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_{k} \epsilon^{k} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Upon inspection we observe $g_{m, 1}(x)=g_{m}(x)$ and so it follows that $x_{m}$ can be recovered by evaluating the perturbation series (2) at $\epsilon=1$. To determine the coefficients of the perturbation series $x_{m, \epsilon}$ we first consider the following well known result for integer powers of power series:

$$
x_{m}^{p}=\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_{k, p} \epsilon^{k}, \quad p \in \mathbb{N}
$$

with $c_{0, p}=a_{0}^{p}$ and

$$
c_{k, p}=\frac{1}{a_{0} k} \sum_{\ell=1}^{k}((p+1) \ell-k) a_{\ell} c_{k-\ell, p}
$$

Using Faá di Bruno's formula we may also obtain a closed-form for the coefficients $c_{k, p}$ as

$$
c_{k, p}=\frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\ell=1}^{k}(p)^{(\ell)} a_{0}^{p-l} B_{k, \ell}\left(1!a_{1}, \ldots,(k-\ell+1)!a_{k-\ell+1}\right),
$$

where $(s)^{(n)}=\Gamma(s+1) / \Gamma(s-n+1)$ is the falling factorial and $B_{n, k}\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n-k+1}\right)$ is the partial Bell-polynomial. Using these results we substitute $x_{m, \epsilon}$ into $g_{m, \epsilon}$ and collect terms by powers of $\epsilon$ yielding

$$
g_{m, \epsilon}\left(x_{m}\right)=\left(2+\frac{1}{m}\right) a_{0}^{m}-\frac{1}{m}+\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\left[\left(2+\frac{1}{m}\right) c_{k, m}-c_{k-1, m}-c_{k-1, m+1}\right] \epsilon^{k} .
$$

Since $g_{m, \epsilon}\left(x_{m, \epsilon}\right)=0$ we may equate the coefficients of $\epsilon^{k}$ with zero to yield an infinite system of equations that allow us to solve for the perturbation series coefficients $a_{k}$. Setting the constant term equal to zero gives $a_{0}^{m}=(1+2 m)^{-1}$. Knowing that $x_{m} \in[-1,-1 / 2]$ and $m \in \mathbb{E}$ we take the negative solution to this equation and then set the higher-order coefficients of $\epsilon^{k}$ equal with zero to get

$$
\begin{equation*}
a_{0}=-(1+2 m)^{-\frac{1}{m}}, \quad(1+2 m) c_{k, m}-m\left(c_{k-1, m}+c_{k-1, m+1}\right)=0 \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

To this point, a method for solving the recursion given in (3) has proven to be elusive. Perhaps the biggest challenge in finding the solution is the presence of the $c_{k-1, m+1}$ term, which can be expressed in terms of $c_{*, m}$ by writing $c_{k-1, m+1}=\sum_{\ell=0}^{k-1} a_{\ell} c_{k-\ell-1, m}$. Given no clear path to a solution we evaluated the first several coefficients and observed a pattern of the form

$$
a_{k}=\frac{a_{0}}{(1+2 m)^{k} k!} \sum_{\ell=0}^{k}\binom{k}{\ell}\left[\prod_{j=1}^{k-1}(\ell+1+m j)\right] a_{0}^{\ell}
$$

Using symbolic calculations in Mathematica this pattern was confirmed to satisfy the recurrence relation (3) for at least $k=0, \ldots, 15$. With a few algebraic manipulations and the following definition we are able to conjecture a closedform for $a_{k}$.

Definition 1 ( $k$-gamma function and Pochhammer $k$-symbol). The $k$-gamma and $k$-Pochhammer functions are given by

$$
\Gamma_{k}(x):=k^{\frac{x}{k}-1} \Gamma\left(\frac{x}{k}\right)
$$

and

$$
(x)_{n, k}:=\frac{\Gamma_{k}(x+n k)}{\Gamma_{k}(x)},
$$

respectively, where $\Gamma(x)=\int_{0}^{\infty} t^{x-1} e^{-t} \mathrm{~d} t$ denotes the ordinary gamma function [1].

Relation 1 ([3, Prop. 3.1]). If $n \in \mathbb{N}_{0}$ then $(\alpha)_{n, k}=k^{n}(\alpha / k)_{n}$, where $(s)_{n}=$ $\Gamma(s+n) / \Gamma(n)$ denotes the ordinary Pochhammer symbol.

Conjecture 1. The sequence of coefficients $\left\{a_{k}\right\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ with $a_{0}=-(1+2 m)^{-\frac{1}{m}}$ and

$$
a_{k}=\sum_{\ell=0}^{k} \frac{(\ell+m+1)_{k-1, m}}{\ell!(k-\ell)!} a_{0}^{m k+\ell+1}
$$

satisfies (3) for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_{0}$.
Assuming Conjecture 1 holds we are able to derive some useful properties of $x_{m}$ including a closed-form expression in terms of generalized hypergeometric functions of unity argument.

Corollary 1. Let

$$
\tilde{x}_{m, n}=\sum_{k=0}^{n} a_{k}
$$

If Conjecture 1 holds then $x_{m} \sim \tilde{x}_{m, n}$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_{0}$.
Proof. Using the expression for $a_{k}$ given in Conjecture 1 we have $\lim _{m \rightarrow \infty} a_{0}=$ -1 and $\lim _{m \rightarrow \infty} a_{k}=0$ for all $k \geq 1$; thus, $\lim _{m \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{x}_{m, n}=-1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_{0}$. Since $\lim _{m \rightarrow \infty} x_{m}=-1$ the result follows.

Theorem 2. If Conjecture 1 holds then

$$
x_{m}=\sum_{k=1}^{m} \frac{(-m)^{k-2}}{(1+m)^{\frac{(m+1) k}{m}}-1} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{(m+1) k}{m}-1\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{m+k}{m}\right) \Gamma(k)}{ }_{m+2} F_{m+1}\binom{1,\left\{\frac{k}{m}+\frac{\ell-1}{m+1}\right\}_{\ell=0}^{m} ; 1}{\frac{m+k}{m},\left\{\frac{k+\ell}{m}\right\}_{\ell=0}^{m-1}} .
$$

Proof. We begin by considering the closed-form for $x_{m}$ claimed in the statement of the theorem, which consists of a sum of $m$ hypergeometric functions. Denoting $\left\{a_{j, k}\right\}_{j=1}^{m+2}$ as the top parameters and $\left\{b_{j, k}\right\}_{j=1}^{m+1}$ as the bottom parameters of
the hypergeometric function in the $k$ th term we find $\gamma_{k}=\left(b_{1}+\cdots+b_{m+1}\right)-$ $\left(a_{1}+\cdots+a_{m+2}\right)=\frac{1}{2}$ for all $k=1, \ldots, m$. Since $\gamma_{k}>0$, each of the $m$-terms of $x_{m}$ can be written as absolutely convergent series; hence, this expression must also be absolutely convergent. Now calling on Conjecture 1 we write

$$
x_{m}=\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\ell=0}^{k} \frac{m^{k-1}}{\ell!(k-\ell)!} \frac{\Gamma\left(k+\frac{\ell+1}{m}\right)}{\Gamma\left(1+\frac{\ell+1}{m}\right)} a_{0}^{m k+\ell+1} .
$$

If this expression is equal to that given in the statement of the theorem, then it is also absolutely convergent and permits rearrangement of its term. Interchanging the order of summation we find after some simplification

$$
x_{m}=\frac{a_{0}}{m} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{(m+1) \ell+1}{m}\right)}{\Gamma\left(1+\frac{\ell+1}{m}\right)} \frac{\left(m a_{0}^{m+1}\right)^{\ell}}{\ell!} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty}\left(\frac{(m+1) \ell+1}{m}\right)_{k} \frac{\left(m a_{0}^{m}\right)^{k}}{k!} .
$$

The interior sum over $k$ can now be evaluated in terms of ${ }_{1} F_{0}(\alpha ;-; z)=(1-$ $z)^{-\alpha}$, which after reintroducing $a_{0}$ yields

$$
x_{m}=-\frac{(1+m)^{-\frac{1}{m}}}{m} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{(m+1) \ell+1}{m}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{m+\ell+1}{m}\right)} \frac{\left(-m(1+m)^{-\frac{m+1}{m}}\right)^{\ell}}{\ell!}
$$

To evaluate the remaining series we write $x_{m}=\sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} c_{\ell}=\sum_{i=1}^{m} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} c_{m \ell+i-1}$, which results in $m$ new series containing Pochhammer symbols of the form $(\cdot)_{(m+1) \ell}$ and $(\cdot)_{m \ell}$. Using the identity [3, Eq. 2.13]

$$
(\alpha)_{r n}=r^{r n} \prod_{j=0}^{r-1}\left(\frac{\alpha+j}{r}\right)_{n}, \quad r \in \mathbb{N}
$$

we arrive at

$$
x_{m}=\sum_{k=1}^{m} \frac{(-m)^{k-2}}{(1+m)^{\frac{(m+1) k}{m}}-1} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{(m+1) k}{m}-1\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{m+k}{m}\right) \Gamma(k)} \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \frac{(1)_{\ell} \prod_{j=0}^{m}\left(\frac{i}{m}+\frac{j-1}{m+1}\right)_{\ell}}{\left(\frac{m+i}{m}\right)_{\ell} \prod_{j=0}^{m-1}\left(\frac{i+j}{m}\right)_{\ell}} \frac{1}{\ell!}
$$

which is the desired result.
Corollary 2. The conjectured form of $x_{m}$ in Theorem 2 holds for $m=2$.
Proof. Substituting $m=2$ into the conjectured expression for $x_{m}$ we have

$$
x_{2}=-\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}{ }_{2} F_{1}\left(\begin{array}{c}
\frac{1}{6}, \frac{5}{6} \\
\frac{3}{2}
\end{array} 1\right)-\frac{1}{3 \sqrt{3}}{ }_{3} F_{2}\binom{\frac{2}{3}, \frac{3}{3}, \frac{4}{3}}{\frac{3}{2}, \frac{4}{2}} .
$$

The ${ }_{2} F_{1}(\cdot)$ term is simplified using Gauss's hypergeometric summation theorem

$$
{ }_{2} F_{1}\left(\begin{array}{c}
\alpha, \beta \\
\gamma
\end{array} ; 1\right)=\frac{\Gamma(\gamma) \Gamma(\gamma-\alpha-\beta)}{\Gamma(\gamma-\alpha) \Gamma(\gamma-\beta)}, \quad \Re(\gamma-\alpha-\beta)>0 .
$$

Likewise, the ${ }_{3} F_{2}(\cdot)$ term is reduced by [4, Eq. 07.27.03.0120.01]

$$
{ }_{3} F_{2}\left(\begin{array}{c}
1, \beta, \gamma \\
2, \epsilon
\end{array} ; z\right)=\frac{\epsilon-1}{(\beta-1)(\gamma-1) z}\left({ }_{2} F_{1}\left(\begin{array}{c}
\beta-1, \gamma-1 \\
\epsilon-1
\end{array} ; z\right)-1\right)
$$

and then applying Gauss's summation theorem to the remaining ${ }_{2} F_{1}(\cdot)$ term. After some simplification we have

$$
x_{2}=-\frac{1}{2}
$$

which is the exact value of $x_{2}$.

## 5 Numerical results

Even if Conjecture 1 holds, the closed-form for $x_{m}$ given in Theorem 2 is not amenable to numerical implementation and so we instead wish to approximate $x_{m}$ with

$$
\tilde{x}_{m, n}=\sum_{k=0}^{n} a_{k}
$$

From Corollary 1 we know that $x_{m} \sim \tilde{x}_{m, n}$ for at least $n=0, \ldots, 15$ and so we expect the number $n$ needed to guarantee $\left|x_{m}-\tilde{x}_{m, n}\right|<\epsilon$ should decrease as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Since we have a closed-form for $x_{4}$, which can be computed to arbitrary precision, our first task will be to study the convergence of $\tilde{x}_{4, n} \rightarrow x_{4}$ by counting the number of correct digits given by $\tilde{x}_{4, n}$ as a function of $n$. Given that we expect less terms will be needed for larger values of $m$, the results of this exercise should give us a worst case scenario for how large $n$ must be to obtain a desired precision in our approximation.

Using Mathematica software, the first one-hundred fifty digits of $x_{4}$ were computed and compared to those of $\tilde{x}_{4, n}$. For each $n$, the number of uninterrupted correct digits after the decimal point were counted with the results given in Figure 1. From the figure, we observe that the number $n$ grows approximately linearly with the number of correct digits ${ }^{1}$. Fitting a line to this data we find

$$
n \approx 1.311 \times\left(\# \text { of correct digits in } \tilde{x}_{4, n}\right)-3.007,
$$

which shows that we obtain a correct digit for every $\approx 1.3$ additional terms added to our approximation. Since the actual value of $n$ fluctuates about this line we will ignore the intercept term and conclude $n=13$ should give approximately ten correct digits for the case $m=4$. Indeed, since $x_{m} \sim \tilde{x}_{m, 13}$ we expect $n=13$ to give approximately ten or more correct digits of $x_{m}$ for $m>4$. To verify this observation, the value of $x_{m}$ was numerically approximated using a bisection method. For each $m, x_{m}$ was successively approximated until the

[^0]interval width was small enough to guarantee $\left|x_{m}-\tilde{x}_{m, 13}\right| \leq 5 \times 10^{-12}$. Comparing the numerical approximations of $x_{m}$ from the bisection routine to $\tilde{x}_{m, 13}$ showed agreement to ten decimal places for all $m=2,4, \ldots, 100$. Finally, Table 1 presents numerical values for $x_{m}$ and $f_{m}\left(x_{m}\right)$ based on the formula in Lemma 2 and $\tilde{x}_{m, 15}$.
$n$ vs. the number of correct digits given by $\tilde{x}_{4, n}$


Figure 1: Plot of the number $n$ versus the number correct digits after the decimal place given by $\tilde{x}_{4, n}$.

## 6 Conclusions

In this note, we were able to establish many useful facts about the polynomial $f_{m}(x)=1+x+\cdots+x^{m}$ and its minimum value on the real line. In particular, we were able to show that this minimum always occurs on the interval $[-1,-1 / 2]$ as well as provide a very simple formula for the minimum as a function of the minimizer $x_{m}$. Perturbation theory was applied to derive a series expansion for $x_{m}$ and a closed-form for the coefficients of this series was conjectured and confirmed for $k=0, \ldots 15$. We were able to show that the conjectured closedform for the sequence of coefficients $\left\{a_{k}\right\}$ leads to a closed-form expression for $x_{m}$, which yields the correct value for the special case of $m=2$. Furthermore, numerical studies were conducted which gave a rule of thumb for how large $n$ must be to achieve a desired precision in approximating $x_{m}$ with $\tilde{x}_{m, n}$. Further improvements to this work include more efficient code to compute the coefficients $a_{k}$ past $k=15$ as well as a proof to Conjecture 1 .
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Table 1: Numerical values for $x_{m}$ and $f_{m}\left(x_{m}\right)$.

| $m$ | $x_{m}$ | $f_{m}\left(x_{m}\right)$ |  |  | $m$ | $x_{m}$ | $f_{m}\left(x_{m}\right)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | -0.5000000000 | 0.7500000000 |  | 78 | -0.9376111258 | 0.5192801905 |  |
| 4 | -0.6058295862 | 0.6735532235 |  | 80 | -0.9388198625 | 0.5188795643 |  |
| 6 | -0.6703320476 | 0.6350938940 |  | 82 | -0.9399784542 | 0.5184964771 |  |
| 8 | -0.7145377272 | 0.6115666906 |  | 84 | -0.9410900592 | 0.5181297723 |  |
| 10 | -0.7470540749 | 0.5955429324 |  | 86 | -0.9421575717 | 0.5177783938 |  |
| 12 | -0.7721416355 | 0.5838576922 |  | 88 | -0.9431836485 | 0.5174413759 |  |
| 14 | -0.7921778546 | 0.5749221276 |  | 90 | -0.9441707340 | 0.5171178332 |  |
| 16 | -0.8086048979 | 0.5678463037 |  | 92 | -0.9451210804 | 0.5168069528 |  |
| 18 | -0.8223534102 | 0.5620909079 |  | 94 | -0.9460367670 | 0.5165079864 |  |
| 20 | -0.8340533676 | 0.5573090540 |  | 96 | -0.9469197164 | 0.5162202447 |  |
| 22 | -0.844148047 | 0.5532669587 |  | 98 | -0.9477717091 | 0.5159430910 |  |
| 24 | -0.8529581644 | 0.5498010211 |  | 100 | -0.9485943966 | 0.5156759367 |  |
| 26 | -0.8607238146 | 0.5467931483 |  | 102 | -0.9493893132 | 0.5154182363 |  |
| 28 | -0.8676269763 | 0.5441558518 |  | 104 | -0.9501578860 | 0.5151694840 |  |
| 30 | -0.8738090154 | 0.5418228660 |  | 106 | -0.9509014444 | 0.5149292100 |  |
| 32 | -0.8793814184 | 0.5397430347 |  | 108 | -0.9516212282 | 0.5146969770 |  |
| 34 | -0.884433818 | 0.5378762052 |  | 110 | -0.9523183955 | 0.5144723780 |  |
| 36 | -0.8890371830 | 0.5361903986 |  | 112 | -0.9529940289 | 0.5142550329 |  |
| 38 | -0.8932520563 | 0.5346598151 |  | 114 | -0.9536491420 | 0.5140445872 |  |
| 40 | -0.8971270425 | 0.5332633990 |  | 116 | -0.9542846846 | 0.5138407092 |  |
| 42 | -0.9007031162 | 0.5319837878 |  | 118 | -0.9549015479 | 0.5136430885 |  |
| 44 | -0.9040147981 | 0.5308065300 |  | 120 | -0.9555005690 | 0.5134514340 |  |
| 46 | -0.9070913919 | 0.5297194951 |  | 122 | -0.9560825347 | 0.5132654729 |  |
| 48 | -0.9099579456 | 0.5287124219 |  | 124 | -0.9566481855 | 0.5130849489 |  |
| 50 | -0.9126360054 | 0.5277765690 |  | 126 | -0.9571982191 | 0.5129096209 |  |
| 52 | -0.9151442141 | 0.5269044410 |  | 128 | -0.9577332933 | 0.5127392623 |  |
| 54 | -0.9174987898 | 0.5260895727 |  | 130 | -0.9582540286 | 0.5125736594 |  |
| 56 | -0.9197139122 | 0.5253263565 |  | 132 | -0.9587610115 | 0.5124126108 |  |
| 58 | -0.9218020367 | 0.5246099035 |  | 134 | -0.9592547961 | 0.5122559267 |  |
| 60 | -0.9237741513 | 0.5239359311 |  | 136 | -0.9597359069 | 0.5121034274 |  |
| 62 | -0.9256399895 | 0.5233006711 |  | 138 | -0.9602048403 | 0.5119549436 |  |
| 64 | -0.9274082062 | 0.5227007942 |  | 140 | -0.9606620669 | 0.5118103146 |  |
| 66 | -0.9290865244 | 0.5221333471 |  | 142 | -0.9611080328 | 0.5116693885 |  |
| 68 | -0.9306818591 | 0.5215957008 |  | 144 | -0.9615431615 | 0.5115320215 |  |
| 70 | -0.9322004214 | 0.5210855067 |  | 146 | -0.9619678551 | 0.5113980772 |  |
| 72 | -0.9336478067 | 0.5206006599 |  | 148 | -0.9623824957 | 0.5112674259 |  |
| 74 | -0.9350290699 | 0.5201392683 |  | 150 | -0.9627874469 | 0.5111399447 |  |
| 76 | -0.9363487901 | 0.5196996259 |  | $\infty$ | -1.0000000000 | 0.5000000000 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The fact that $\tilde{x}_{4, n}$ is able to reproduce $x_{4}$ to hundreds of decimal places further points to the veracity of Conjecture 1 .

