

A Conjecture Equivalent to the Collatz Conjecture

Ashish Tiwari¹[0000-0002-5153-2686]

Microsoft, Redmond WA 98052, USA
ashish.tiwari@microsoft.com
<http://www.csl.sri.com/users/tiwari>

Abstract. We present a formulation of the Collatz conjecture that is potentially more amenable to modeling and analysis by automated termination checking tools.

Keywords: Collatz Conjecture · Dynamical Systems · Rewrite Systems.

1 A Conjecture

Consider an organization where we have a linear hierarchy among the employees. Each employee can be in one of 3 different “state of mind”: **sleepy**, **confused**, or **motivated**. Furthermore, each employee can get a *gentle-nudge* or *big-push* (that is generated by their supervisor), and each employee can generate either a *gentle-nudge* or *big-push* for their subordinate.

Formally, an employee is a Mealy machine [3,2] with 3 states (**sleepy**, **confused**, **motivated**) and two input (and output) symbols (*gentle-nudge*, *big-push*). An organization is formally an ordered list of employees. Consequently, the *state* of an organization is a list of states of its employees; for example, a possible state of an organization with 3 employees is [**motivated**, **confused**, **sleepy**].

Every morning the top member of the organization gets a *gentle-nudge*, which is propagated down through the day to all the employees in the hierarchy based on the following rules:

1. When a **sleepy** gets a *gentle-nudge*, they continue to remain a **sleepy** and generate a *gentle-nudge* for the next person.
2. When a **sleepy** gets a *big-push*, they turn **confused** and generate a *big-push* for the next person.
3. When a **confused** gets a *gentle-nudge*, they turn **sleepy** and generate a *big-push* for the next person.
4. When a **confused** gets a *big-push*, they turn **motivated** and generate a *gentle-nudge* for the next person.
5. When a **motivated** gets a *gentle-nudge*, they turn **confused** and generate a *gentle-nudge* for the next person.
6. When a **motivated** gets a *big-push*, they continue to remain **motivated** and generate a *big-push* for the next person.

If the last person in the hierarchy generates a *big-push*, then a new junior **motivated** person is hired (and added to the organization).

If at the end of the day all members of an organization turn **sleepy** but for possibly the last member, then the organization goes *bankrupt*.

Example 1. Let us illustrate the dynamics of an organization with an example. We start an organization with 3 people, who initially are in the state **motivated**, **confused**, **sleepy** in that order. So, on Day 0, the state of the organization is the tuple [**motivated**, **confused**, **sleepy**].

On Day 1, **motivated** gets a *gentle-nudge*, so, they turn **confused** and generate a *gentle-nudge*, which turns the **confused** into a **sleepy** and makes it generate a *big-push* for the third employee (**sleepy**). As a result, **sleepy** turns **confused** and hires a **motivated**. Thus, at the end of Day 1, the state of the organization is [**confused**, **sleepy**, **confused**, **motivated**].

Continuing this way, we notice that at the end of Day 2, Day 3, Day 4, and Day 5 we get to states

Day2 : [**sleepy**, **confused**, **motivated**, **confused**]

Day3 : [**sleepy**, **sleepy**, **motivated**, **motivated**]

Day4 : [**sleepy**, **sleepy**, **confused**, **confused**]

Day5 : [**sleepy**, **sleepy**, **sleepy**, **motivated**]

The organization goes bankrupt on Day 5.

We can easily formalize the six rules enumerated above as defining the transition relation and output function of a Mealy machine. We write $s \rightarrow t$ to denote that state s of an organization (at the start of a day) changes to state t (at the end of that day). A state s is *bankrupt* if only its last element is possibly not **sleepy**.

Conjecture 1. Every organization eventually goes bankrupt; that is, for any state s of an organization, there is a $k \geq 0$ such that if $s \rightarrow s_1 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow s_k$ is a derivation, then s_k is a bankrupt state.

2 Conjecture 1 is equivalent to Collatz Conjecture

We first recall the Collatz conjecture [1].

Conjecture 2 (Collatz Conjecture). Let $f(n)$ be $n/2$ if n is even and $3n + 1$ if n is odd. Then, for every positive natural number n , there exists a $k \geq 0$ s.t. $f^k(n) = 1$.

We now show that Conjecture 1 is equivalent to the Collatz conjecture. We use a novel representation of numbers for this purpose. Each digit in our representation is either 0, 2, or 4, and the place value is interpreted as in Base-3 representation. For example, the number 420 in our new representation denotes the decimal number $4 * 3^2 + 2 * 3^1 + 0 * 3^0$, which is 42 in base-10. We can only

represent even numbers in this new representation. In this new representation, if 0 is written as `sleepy`, 2 as `confused`, and 4 as `motivated`, then each number n can be seen as a state of an organization. For example, 42 is represented by the organization `[motivated, confused, sleepy]`.

We modify the iterations in the statement of Collatz conjecture to go from even number to an even number as follows: Define $g(n)$ to be $n/2$ if $n/2$ is even, and $3(n/2) + 1$ if $n/2$ is odd. Now, it is an easy exercise to see that if $m = g(n)$, and s is a state representing n , then $s \rightarrow t$ where t represents m . This shows the equivalence to Collatz conjecture.

Example 2. Let us map the scenario in Example 1 to numbers. At the end of Day 0, we have the number 42. At the end of the next 5 days, we get the numbers 64, 32, 16, 8, 4. Note that 4 is represented as `[sleepy, sleepy, sleepy, motivated]`. Note that a `sleepy` member at the head of a state can be dropped without affecting the numerical interpretation of that state.

There is some recent work [4] on trying to prove the Collatz conjecture using automated termination proving techniques for rewriting systems. For this purpose, one needs a rewriting system that mimics the iterations in Collatz conjecture. There is one such rewriting system in [4]. The formulation presented here can also be turned into a (different) rewrite system.

Remark 1 (Open loop interpretation.). Note that the “control input action” is fixed in our setting; the top member of the organization *always* gets a *gentle-nudge* at the start of the day. One can consider the *open-loop setting* where the input to the top element is a control input, and one could study the problem of synthesizing a controller. We do not do so here.

References

1. Collatz conjecture: Collatz conjecture - wikipedia (2021), https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Collatz_conjecture, [Online; accessed Aug 2021]
2. Mealy, G.H.: A method for synthesizing sequential circuits. Bell System Technical Journal **34**, 1045–1079 (1955)
3. Mealy machine: Mealy machine - wikipedia (2021), https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mealy_machine, [Online; accessed Aug 2021]
4. Yolcu, E., Aaronson, S., Heule, M.J.H.: An automated approach to the collatz conjecture. CoRR [abs/2105.14697](https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.14697) (2021), <https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.14697>