

# Egyptian fractions meet the Sierpinski triangle

L. De Carli, A. Echezabal, and I. Morell

**ABSTRACT.** We explore a novel link between two seemingly disparate mathematical concepts: Egyptian fractions and fractals. By examining the decomposition of rationals into sums of distinct unit fractions, a practice rooted in ancient Egyptian mathematics, and the arithmetic operations that can be performed using this decomposition, we uncover fractal structures that emerge from these representations.

## 1. Egyptian fractions

The ancient Egyptians wrote fractions as a formal sum of distinct unit fractions  $\frac{1}{n}$ , with  $n \geq 2$ . For example, they wrote  $\frac{2}{5}$  as  $\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{15}$  or as  $\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{12} + \frac{1}{15}$  but not as  $\frac{1}{5} + \frac{1}{5}$ . Unit fractions were represented with an almond-shaped symbol (the "mouth") over the hieroglyphic symbol for the number which indicated the denominator.<sup>1</sup>

This peculiar representation of fraction lead to define *Egyptian fractions* as formal sums of distinct unit fractions. Egyptian fractions have captivated mathematicians for centuries due to their unique properties and historical significance and are still an active topic of research in number theory. See e.g. [9], the recent [2] and the references cited there.

An efficient algorithm first introduced by Fibonacci in 1202 in the *Liber Abaci* can be used to express any given proper fraction  $\frac{p}{q}$  as an Egyptian fraction with at most  $p$  terms. For instance, the Fibonacci algorithm gives

$$\frac{2}{2k+1} = \frac{1}{k+1} + \frac{1}{(k+1)(2k+1)} \quad (1.1)$$

for every integer  $k > 0$ . For a detailed description and applications of the Fibonacci greedy algorithm see e.g. [1], [5].

Natural numbers can be represented as a Egyptian fractions too: for instance,  $1 = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{12} + \frac{1}{18} + \frac{1}{36}$ . Repeated applications of this identity and the formula (1.1) allow to represent any positive integer as a sum of

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 11A67 28A80:

<sup>1</sup>There were some exceptions to this rule: for example, the Egyptian had special symbols for the fractions  $\frac{1}{2}$  and  $\frac{2}{3}$ .




FIGURE 1. Hieroglyphic for Egyptian fractions

unit fractions. However, these representations can be extremely lengthy and computationally complex.

The sum of two Egyptian fractions can be expressed as a formal sum of terms of the form  $\frac{a}{n}$ , where  $a = 1, 2$ . When  $n$  is even, terms of the form  $\frac{2}{n}$  can be simplified and when  $n$  is odd they can be rewritten as a sum of unit fractions using the formula (1.1). The ancient Egyptian scribes used tables to write  $\frac{2}{n}$  as sums of unit fractions; one of these tables is part of the Rhind Mathematical Papyrus (circa 1650 BC), which is now housed in the British Museum.

Also the difference of Egyptian fractions is straightforward, as long as terms in the form of  $\frac{a}{n}$ , with  $a = \pm 1$ , can be considered in the result. For example, the difference of  $\frac{1}{5} + \frac{1}{10} + \frac{1}{20}$  and  $\frac{1}{10} + \frac{1}{30}$  (which are Egyptian fractions that represent  $\frac{7}{20}$  and  $\frac{2}{15}$ ) can be written as  $\frac{1}{5} + \frac{1}{20} - \frac{1}{30}$ .

In this paper we identify standard Egyptian fractions with unique sets of the form  $X = \{\frac{x_j}{j+1}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ , where  $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, \dots\}$  is the set of positive integers,  $x_j \in \{0, 1\}$  and only finitely many  $x_j$  are nonzero. Different sets correspond to different Egyptian fractions even when the terms of the sets add up to the same number.

We also define the *signed Egyptian fractions* as formal sums and differences of unit fractions, and we identify them with unique sets of the form  $X = \{\frac{x_j}{j+1}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ , where  $x_j \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$  and only finitely many  $x_j$  are nonzero. When the context makes it clear and no distinction is required, we will use the term "Egyptian fractions" to refer to both standard and signed Egyptian fractions.

We say that two Egyptian fractions  $X = \{\frac{x_j}{j+1}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  and  $Y = \{\frac{y_j}{j+1}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$  are *equivalent* if their terms add up to the same number and they are *disjoint* if  $x_j y_j = 0$  for every  $j$ . For instance, the Egyptian fraction  $\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{4}$  and  $\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{5}$  are disjoint, but  $\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{4}$  and  $-\frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{5}$  are not.

Performing arithmetic operations on disjoint Egyptian fractions is straightforward. Specifically, the sum of two disjoint Egyptian fractions identified by the sets  $X$  and  $Y$  by  $X \cup Y$  and their difference by  $X \cup (-Y)$ , where  $-Y = \{\frac{-y_j}{j+1}\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ .

It can be proved that two Egyptian fractions have equivalent disjoint Egyptian fraction representations, but we will not provide a proof here.

## 2. Egyptian fractions and decimals in base two or three

Our system of numbers is in base ten; each position in the number represents a power of ten, and the value of the number is determined by summing these weighted positions.

More generally, any base  $m \geq 2$  and any set of  $m$  symbol, each corresponding to one of the integers  $0, \dots, m - 1$ , can be used to represent numbers. In base  $m$ , the symbol  $[a_k \dots a_1 a_0 . a_{-1} a_{-2} \dots]_m$  denotes the number

$$a = a_k m^k + \dots + a_1 m + a_0 + \frac{a_{-1}}{m} + \frac{a_{-2}}{m^2} + \dots$$

Decimal representations of a number in any base may not be unique; for instance,  $1 = 0.9999\dots$  in base ten. In base two, the fraction  $\frac{1}{2}$  is represented by the decimal  $[0.100\dots]_2$  and also by  $[0.01111\dots]_2$ .

We say that a number  $x \in [0, 1)$  has a *finite decimal representation* in a given base if such representation contains only finitely many nonzero digits.

It is not difficult to verify that a number cannot have two different finite decimal representations in a given basis, but the examples above show that it can have a finite and an infinite decimal representations.

When multiplying or dividing a decimal number by a power of the base, the position of the decimal point shifts either to the right (when multiplying) or to the left (when dividing). For instance,  $m^2 * [0.x_1 x_2 x_3 \dots]_{m\dots} = [x_1 x_2 . x_3 \dots]_m$  and  $\frac{1}{m^2} * [0.x_1 x_2 x_3 \dots]_{m\dots} = [0.00 x_1 x_2 x_3 \dots]_m$ .

The basis  $m = 2$  is especially relevant in the applications; we can write every non-negative real number as  $x = x_k 2^k + \dots + 2x_1 + x_0 + \frac{x_{-1}}{2} + \frac{x_{-2}}{2^2} + \dots$  where each  $x_j$  is either 0 or 1, and we can represent  $x$  by the binary number  $[x_k \dots x_1 x_0 . x_{-1} x_{-2} \dots]_2$ .

Numbers can also be represented using the so-called *balanced ternary* basis. This is a numerical system in base 3 but with digits  $\{0, 1, -1\}$ .

The balanced ternary representation offers computational advantages over the standard base 3 representation, such as simpler rules for performing arithmetic operations. It is used in some analog circuit design where signals have three states (positive, zero, and negative) and in modern machine learning algorithms. See e.g. [3], [8] and the references cited there.

Each real number  $\omega$  can be written as  $[\omega_k \dots \omega_1 \omega_0 . \omega_{-1} \omega_{-2} \dots]_3 = \omega_k 3^k + \dots + 3\omega_1 + \omega_0 + \frac{\omega_{-1}}{3} + \frac{\omega_{-2}}{3^2} + \dots$  where the coefficients  $\omega_j$  are either 0, 1 or  $-1$ .

When  $\omega$  is a non-negative integer, we can find its balanced ternary representation as follows. Start by setting  $n_0 = \omega$  and let  $r_0$  be the remainder of the division of  $n_0$  by 3. If  $r_0 = 0$  or  $r_0 = 1$ , set  $\omega_0 = r_0$  and if  $r_0 = 2$ , set  $\omega_0 = -1$ . Then, set  $n_1 = (n_0 - \omega_0)/3$ , replace  $n_0$  with  $n_1$  and repeat the process until  $n_k = 0$ .

For instance, the number 8 can be represented in balanced ternary using the following steps:

- $n_0 = 8 = 3 * 2 + 2$ , so  $\omega_0 = -1$ ,  $n_1 = (8 - (-1))/3 = 3$

- $n_1 = 3 * 1 + 0$ , so  $\omega_1 = 0$ ,  $n_2 = (3 - (0))/3 = 1$
- $n_2 = 3 * 0 + 1$ , so  $\omega_2 = 1$ ,  $n_3 = 0$

If we let  $-1 = \bar{1}$ , we can write  $8 = [10\bar{1}]_3$ .

We denote with  $\mathbb{Z}_2 = \{0, 1\}$  the set of integers modulo 2 and with  $\mathbb{Z}_3 = \{0, 1, -1\}$  the set of integers modulo 3. Addition and multiplication in  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  and  $\mathbb{Z}_3$  are defined in the usual way, but with results taken modulo 2, or in balanced ternary. The sets  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  and  $\mathbb{Z}_3$  form commutative rings; they are also fields because every nonzero element has a multiplicative inverse.

We define  $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_2)$  as the set of vectors  $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n \dots)$  with  $\epsilon_j \in \{0, 1\}$  and  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \epsilon_k < \infty$ . Similarly, we define  $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_3)$  as the set of vectors  $\omega = (\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n \dots)$  with  $\omega_j \in \{0, 1, -1\}$  and  $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} |\omega_k| < \infty$ . These definitions imply that only finitely many entries  $\epsilon_j$  and  $\omega_j$  are nonzero.

It is not too difficult to verify that the sets  $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_2)$  and  $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_3)$  are vector spaces on  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  and  $\mathbb{Z}_3$ , respectively. In both cases, scalar multiplication is performed componentwise, and vector addition is carried out componentwise in base 2 (or in balanced base 3).

For example, given  $\omega = (1, -1, 1, 1, 0, \dots 0\dots)$ ,  $\omega' = (0, 1, 1, 1, 0, \dots 0\dots)$  in  $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_3)$ , we have  $\omega + \omega' = (1, 0, -1, -1, 0, \dots 0\dots)$  and  $(-1)\omega = (-1, 1, -1, -1, 0, \dots 0\dots)$ .

In the previous section we have identified signed Egyptian fractions with sets  $X = \left\{ \frac{x_j}{j+1} \right\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}$ , where  $x_j \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ . When all  $x_j$  are non-negative,  $X$  is a standard Egyptian fraction.

We let  $\mathcal{E}$  be the set of the standard Egyptian fractions, and we define the map

$$h : \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_2) \rightarrow \mathcal{E}, \quad h(\epsilon) = \left\{ \frac{\epsilon_j}{j+1} \right\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}.$$

Similarly, we let  $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}$  be the set of the signed Egyptian fractions and we define the map

$$h : \ell^2(\mathbb{Z}_3) \rightarrow \tilde{\mathcal{E}}, \quad h(\omega) = \left\{ \frac{\omega_j}{j+1} \right\}_{j=1}^{\infty}.$$

These mappings establish a natural correspondence between standard (or signed) Egyptian fractions and  $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}_2)$  (or  $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}_3)$ ).

We let  $\Sigma : \tilde{\mathcal{E}} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$  be the map that associates to an Egyptian fraction (standard or signed) the sum of its term. That is,

$$\Sigma\left(\left\{ \frac{x_j}{j+1} \right\}_{j \in \mathbb{N}}\right) = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \frac{x_j}{j+1}.$$

The mappings  $\Sigma h(\epsilon) = \Sigma(h(\epsilon))$  map  $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_2)$  and  $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_3)$  onto  $\mathbb{Q}$ . Two equivalent Egyptian fractions have the same image.

It is natural to ask whether the map  $\Sigma h$  is linear in  $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_2)$  or  $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_3)$ . Specifically, we ask:

**Q1:** For which  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_2)$  we have  $\Sigma h(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) = \Sigma h(\mathbf{x}) + \Sigma h(\mathbf{y})$  ?

**Q2:** For which  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_3)$  we have  $\Sigma h(\mathbf{x} \pm \mathbf{y}) = \Sigma h(\mathbf{x}) \pm \Sigma h(\mathbf{y})$ ?

To best answer these questions we introduce the following notation: given the vectors  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}$  in  $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_2)$  or in  $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_3)$ , we let  $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  be the vector for which  $z_j = 1$  when  $x_j = y_j = 1$ ,  $z_j = -1$  when  $x_j = y_j = -1$  and  $z_j = 0$  for all other  $j$ .

When  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_2)$ , the vector  $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  is zero if and only  $x_j y_j = 0$  for each index  $j$ , which implies that the Egyptian fractions  $h(\mathbf{x}')$  and  $h(\mathbf{y}')$  are disjoint. If  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_3)$ , the vector  $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  is zero if and only either  $x_j y_j = 0$  or  $x_j + y_j = 0$  for each index  $j$ .

The following proposition answers **Q1**.

**PROPOSITION 2.1.** *Let  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_2)$ . Then,  $\Sigma h(\mathbf{x}) + \Sigma h(\mathbf{y}) = \Sigma h(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y})$  if and only if  $\mathbf{z} = 0$ .*

**PROOF.** If  $\mathbf{z} = 0$ , the Egyptian fractions  $h(\mathbf{x})$  and  $h(\mathbf{y})$  are disjoint; their sum by is represented by the union of the sets associated to them, and  $\Sigma h(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) = \Sigma h(\mathbf{x}) + \Sigma h(\mathbf{y})$ .

Conversely, we assume that  $\Sigma h(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) = \Sigma h(\mathbf{x}) + \Sigma h(\mathbf{y})$ ; letting  $\mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}$  and  $\mathbf{y}' = \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{z}$  and recalling that addition in  $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}_2)$  follows binary rules, we have that  $\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x}' + \mathbf{y}' + 2\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{x}' + \mathbf{y}'$ . The Egyptian fractions  $h(\mathbf{x}')$  and  $h(\mathbf{y}')$  are disjoint, and by the first part of the proof,

$$\Sigma h(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) = \Sigma h(\mathbf{x}' + \mathbf{y}') = \Sigma h(\mathbf{x}') + \Sigma h(\mathbf{y}').$$

But since we also have  $\Sigma h(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) = \Sigma h(\mathbf{x}) + \Sigma h(\mathbf{y}) = \Sigma h(\mathbf{x}') + \Sigma h(\mathbf{y}') + 2\Sigma h(\mathbf{z})$ ; necessarily  $2\Sigma h(\mathbf{z}) = 0$ , and so  $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{0}$ .  $\square$

The answer to **Q2** is slightly more complicated.

**PROPOSITION 2.2.** *a) Let  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_3)$ . If  $\mathbf{z} = 0$ , then  $\Sigma h(\mathbf{x}) + \Sigma h(\mathbf{y}) = \Sigma h(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y})$ .*

*b) If  $\Sigma h(\mathbf{x}) + \Sigma h(\mathbf{y}) = \Sigma h(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y})$ , then  $\Sigma h(\mathbf{z}) = 0$ .*

**PROOF.** If  $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = 0$ , then either  $x_j y_j = 0$  or  $x_j + y_j = 0$  for every index  $j$ . If  $x_j y_j = 0$  for every  $j$ , the Egyptian fractions  $h(\mathbf{x})$  and  $h(\mathbf{y})$  are disjoint and  $\Sigma h(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) = \Sigma h(\mathbf{x}) + \Sigma h(\mathbf{y})$ . If the set  $I$  of indices  $j$  for which  $x_j y_j \neq 0$  and  $x_j + y_j = 0$  is nonempty, we have that

$$\sum_{j \in I} \frac{x_j}{j+1} + \sum_{j \in I} \frac{y_j}{j+1} = \sum_{j \in I} \frac{x_j + y_j}{j+1} = 0,$$

and so

$$\Sigma h(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}-I} \frac{x_j + y_j}{j+1} = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}-I} \frac{x_j}{j+1} + \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}-I} \frac{y_j}{j+1} = \Sigma h(\mathbf{x}) + \Sigma h(\mathbf{y})$$

as required.

Let us prove b). We let  $\mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{z}$  and  $\mathbf{y}' = \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{z}$  and we observe that the components of  $\mathbf{x}'$  and  $\mathbf{y}'$  satisfy either  $x'_j y'_j = 0$  or  $x'_j + y'_j = 0$ . Furthermore,  $\mathbf{x}' + \mathbf{y}'$  and  $\mathbf{z}$  are disjoint.

The operations in  $\ell^2(\mathbb{Z}_3)$  follows balanced ternary rules, and so  $2\mathbf{z} = -\mathbf{z}$ . Thus,  $\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{x}' + \mathbf{y}' + 2\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{x}' + \mathbf{y}' - \mathbf{z}$  and by the previous observations and the first part of the proof

$$\Sigma h(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) = \Sigma h(\mathbf{x}' + \mathbf{y}' + 2\mathbf{z}) = \Sigma h(\mathbf{x}' + \mathbf{y}' - \mathbf{z}) = \Sigma h(\mathbf{x}' + \mathbf{y}') - \Sigma h(\mathbf{z}). \quad (2.1)$$

We also have

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma h(\mathbf{x}) + \Sigma h(\mathbf{y}) &= \Sigma h(\mathbf{x}' + \mathbf{z}) + \Sigma h(\mathbf{y}' + \mathbf{z}) \\ &= \Sigma h(\mathbf{x}') + \Sigma h(\mathbf{y}') + 2\Sigma h(\mathbf{z}) = \Sigma h(\mathbf{x}' + \mathbf{y}') + 2\Sigma h(\mathbf{z}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

By assumption,  $\Sigma h(\mathbf{x}) + \Sigma h(\mathbf{y}) = \Sigma h(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y})$  and so from (2.1) and (2) follows that  $-\Sigma h(\mathbf{z}) = 2\Sigma h(\mathbf{z})$ , and so  $\Sigma h(\mathbf{z}) = 0$ . □

### 3. Egyptian fractions and fractals

The Sierpinski triangle is the set obtained from a recursive process of removing smaller and smaller triangles from an initial triangle. It is named after the Polish mathematician Waclaw Sierpinski (1882 -1969) but appeared as a decorative pattern many centuries before his work.

In this paper, the initial triangle  $T_0$  is the closed triangle with vertices  $(0, 0)$ ,  $(0, 1)$  and  $(1, 0)$ ,

$$T_0 = \{(x, y) \in [0, 1] \times [0, 1] : 0 \leq x + y \leq 1\}. \quad (3.1)$$




FIGURE 2. The Sierpinski triangle

To formally define the Sierpinski triangle, we define recursively a decreasing sequence of sets  $\{S_i\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$ , where  $S_0 = T_0$  and each  $S_i$  is the union of  $3^i$  scaled down copies of  $T_0$ .

To construct  $S_1$ , we let  $T_1$  be the triangle  $T_0$  scaled by a factor of  $\frac{1}{2}$  and we consider the translates of  $T_1$  by vectors  $v = (\frac{1}{2}, 0)$  and  $w = (0, \frac{1}{2})$ . We let  $S_1 = T_1 \cup (T_1 + v) \cup (T_1 + w)$ . See Figure 3.




FIGURE 3. The first two steps of the construction of the Sierpinski triangle

To construct  $S_{j+1}$  from  $S_j$ , we let  $S'_j$  denote the set  $S_j$  scaled by a factor  $\frac{1}{2}$  and we define  $S_{j+1} = S'_j \cup (S'_j + v) \cup (S'_j + w)$ . The Sierpinski Triangle is then defined as the set  $S_T := \bigcap_{j=0}^{\infty} S_j$ .

Every point  $P$  in the Sierpinski triangle belongs to  $S_i$  for all  $i \geq 0$ ; we can denote by  $\tau_i(P)$  the triangle in the set  $S_i$  that contains  $P$  and for every  $P \in S_T$ , we can construct a decreasing sequence of triangles  $\tau(P) = \{\tau_i(P)\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that  $P = \bigcap_{i=0}^{\infty} \tau_i(P)$ . The sequence  $\tau(P)$  can be used to identify the position of  $P$  in the Sierpinski triangle; for details, we refer the reader to [7] or to other books on fractals.

The next theorem establishes a connection between the Sierpinski triangle  $S_T$  and the standard Egyptian fractions.

**THEOREM 3.1.** *Let  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_2)$  and let  $h(\mathbf{x})$  and  $h(\mathbf{y})$  be the associated Egyptian fractions. If*

$$\Sigma h(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) = \Sigma h(\mathbf{x}) + \Sigma h(\mathbf{y}) \tag{3.2}$$

*the point  $(x, y)$  for which  $x = [0.x_1x_2\dots]_2$  and  $y = [0.y_1y_2\dots]_2$  lies in the Sierpinski triangle  $S_T$ .*

Recall that the binary decimal  $[0.s_1s_2\dots]_2$  represents the number  $\frac{s_1}{2} + \frac{s_2}{2^2} + \dots$ . If  $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, s_2, \dots)$  is in  $\ell^1(\mathbb{Z})$ , the decimal binary number  $[0.s_1s_2\dots]_2$  is finite.

To prove Theorem 3.1 we need the following

**PROPOSITION 3.2.** *Let  $(x, y) \in [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ .*

*a) If  $(x, y)$  lies in the Sierpinski triangle  $S_T$ , there exist binary representations of  $x$  and  $y$  given by  $[0.x_1x_2\dots]_2$  and  $[0.y_1y_2\dots]_2$  for which  $x_jy_j = 0$  for every index  $j$ .*

*b) If the binary representations of  $x$  and  $y$  are finite and satisfy  $x_jy_j = 0$  for every index  $j$ , then the point  $(x, y)$  lies in  $S_T$*

A similar version of this proposition is known when the starting triangle is equilateral, but since we are working with a right triangle, it is helpful to provide a proof here.

Our proof allows us to establish part b) of Proposition 3.2 only when  $x$  and  $y$  have finite binary decimal expansions, which is enough to prove Theorem 3.1. However, it is also possible to prove that part b) holds when the binary decimal expansions of  $x$  and  $y$  are not finite, or in other words that the converse of part a) holds.

Proposition 3.2 leads to Theorem 3.1. In fact, according to Proposition 2.1, the identity (3.2) is true if and only if  $x_j y_j = 0$  for all indices  $j$ . By Proposition 3.2 (b), all points  $(x, y)$  in the square  $[0, 1] \times [0, 1]$  whose finite binary expansions satisfy  $x_j y_j = 0$  are located in the Sierpinski triangle  $S_T$ .

To prove Proposition 3.2 we need the following

**LEMMA 3.3.** *For every  $n \geq 0$ , we let  $T_n$  be a scaled copy of the triangle  $T_0$  defined in (3.1) by a factor  $\frac{1}{2^n}$ . The points  $(x, y) \in T_n$  have binary representations  $x = [0.x_1 x_2 \dots]_2$ ,  $y = [0.y_1 y_2 \dots]_2$ , with  $x_j = y_j = 0$  for all  $j \leq n$  and  $x_{n+1} y_{n+1} = 0$ .*

**PROOF.** We first observe that the set of points  $x = [0.x_1 x_2 \dots]_2$  for which  $x_1 = 1$  is bounded below by  $\frac{1}{2} = [0.1000\dots]_2$  and it is bounded above by  $1 = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2^2} + \frac{1}{2^3} + \dots$ . Thus,  $x_1 = 1$  when  $x \in [\frac{1}{2}, 1)$ , and  $x_1 = 0$  when  $x \in [0, \frac{1}{2})$ . Since the points in the initial triangle  $T_0$  satisfy  $0 \leq x + y \leq 1$ , we can easily verify that  $P = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$  is the only point in  $T_0$  for which  $x_1 = y_1 = 1$ . However, we can also write  $\frac{1}{2} = [0.01111\dots]_2$ , and so also the components of  $P$  satisfy  $x_1 y_1 = 0$ .

Since dividing by powers of 2 shifts the decimal point in the binary representation in base two, we can verify by induction that the first  $n$  decimal digits of points in the interval  $[0, \frac{1}{2^n})$  are zero, and the triangle  $T_n$  with vertices  $(0, 0)$ ,  $(\frac{1}{2^n}, 0)$ ,  $(0, \frac{1}{2^n})$  contains points  $(x, y)$  whose binary representation satisfies  $x_j = y_j = 0$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq n$  and  $x_{n+1} y_{n+1} = 0$ .  $\square$

**PROOF OF PROPOSITION 3.2.** We recall that  $S_T = \bigcap_{n=0}^{\infty} S_n$ , where  $S_0$  is the initial triangle  $T_0$  and each  $S_j$  is the union of re-scaled and translated copies of  $S_{j-1}$ .

We prove by induction that the binary decimal expansions of points  $(x, y) \in S_n$  satisfy  $x_j y_j = 0$  for every  $j \leq n + 1$ . Furthermore, we also prove that  $S_n$  contains all points  $(x, y)$  for which  $x_j y_j = 0$  for every  $j \leq n + 1$  and  $x_j = y_j = 0$  whenever  $j \geq n + 2$ .

We have proved in Lemma 3.3 that points in the initial triangle  $T_0$  have a decimal representations that satisfy  $x_1 y_1 = 0$ . The only points  $(x, y)$  for which  $x_j = y_j = 0$  whenever  $j \geq 2$  and  $x_1 y_1 = 0$  are  $(0, 0)$ ,  $(\frac{1}{2}, 0)$  and  $(0, \frac{1}{2})$ , and these points belong to  $T_0$ .

Assume that the decimal expansion of points  $(x, y)$  in  $S_n$  satisfies  $x_j y_j = 0$  for every  $j \leq n + 1$ ; assume also that  $S_n$  contains all points  $(x, y)$  for which  $x_j = y_j = 0$  whenever  $j \geq n + 2$  and  $x_j y_j = 0$  for every  $j \leq n + 1$ .



Let  $\tilde{S}_n$  represent the scaled copy of  $S_n$  by a factor  $\frac{1}{2}$ . This scaling shifts the binary decimal point of each coordinate in  $S_n$ , and so for any  $(x, y)$  in  $\tilde{S}_n$  we have  $x_1 = y_1 = 0$  and  $x_j y_j = 0$  for  $j = 2, \dots, n + 1$ .

By definition,  $S_{n+1} = \tilde{S}_n \cup +[(0, \frac{1}{2}) + \tilde{S}_n] \cup [(\frac{1}{2}, 0) + \tilde{S}_n]$ . Adding  $\frac{1}{2}$  only affects the first digits of the binary decimal expansion of the coordinates, and so for every points  $(x, y) \in S_{n+1}$  and every  $j = 1, \dots, n + 2$ , we have  $x_j y_j = 0$ . Furthermore, our construction shows that  $S_{n+1}$  contains all points  $(x, y) \in [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$  for which  $x_j = y_j = 0$  whenever  $j \geq n + 3$ .

The Sierpinski triangle  $S_T$  is the intersection of the  $S_n$ , and so all points  $(x, y)$  in  $S_T$  have binary decimal expansions that satisfy  $x_j y_j = 0$  for every index  $j$ . Our proof also shows that if the decimal binary representation of points  $(x, y) \in [0, 1] \times [0, 1]$  are finite and satisfy  $x_j y_j = 0$  for every index  $j$ , then  $(x, y)$  lie in  $S_T$ .  $\square$

**3.1. The hexagon snowflake fractal.** In this section we construct the fractal in figure 4 and we show how it can be used to characterize the sum of signed Egyptian fractions.




FIGURE 4. The hexagon snowflake fractal  $S_F$

The *hexagon snowflake fractal* is formally defined as the intersection of a decreasing sequence of sets  $\{G_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$  defined recursively as follows.

$G_0$  is the gray polygon  $H_0$  in figure 5.  $G_1$  consists 7 copies of  $H_0$  scaled by a factor  $\frac{1}{3}$  and translated by vectors  $v_0 = (0, 0)$ ,  $v_1 = (\frac{1}{3}, 0)$ ,  $v_2 = (0, \frac{1}{3})$ ,  $v_3 = (\frac{1}{3}, -\frac{1}{3})$ ,  $v_4 = -v_1$ ,  $v_5 = -v_2$  and  $v_6 = -v_3$ , and each subsequent  $G_j$  is a union of 7 scaled-down copies of  $G_{j-1}$  translated by vectors  $v_0, \dots, v_6$ . We let  $S_F := \bigcap_{n=0}^\infty G_n$ .

The following is an analog of Theorem 3.1 for signed Egyptian fractions.

**THEOREM 3.4.** *Let  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \ell^1(\mathbb{Z}_3)$  and let  $h(\mathbf{x})$  and  $h(\mathbf{y})$  be the associated signed Egyptian fractions. If*

$$\Sigma h(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) = \Sigma h(\mathbf{x}) + \Sigma h(\mathbf{y}) \tag{3.3}$$

*and  $\mathbf{z}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = 0$ , then the point  $(x, y)$  with  $x = [0.x_1 x_2 \dots]_3$ ,  $y = [0.y_1 y_2 \dots]_3$  lies in the fractal snowflake  $S_F$ .*




FIGURE 5. The first two steps of the construction of the hexagon snowflake fractal  $S_F$ .

Recall that  $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{z}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  is the vector whose components  $z_j$  are equal to 1 if  $x_j = y_j = 1$ , to  $-1$  if  $x_j = y_j = -1$  and to zero in all other cases.

The proof of Theorem 3.4 is based on Proposition 3.5 below.

PROPOSITION 3.5. *Let  $(x, y) \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}] \times [\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$ .*

a) *If  $(x, y)$  lies in the hexagon snowflake fractal  $S_F$ , there exist ternary decimal representations of  $x$  and  $y$  given by  $[0.x_1x_2\dots]_3$  and  $[0.y_1y_2\dots]_3$  for which either  $x_jy_j = 0$  or  $x_j + y_j = 0$  for every index  $j$ .*

b) *If the ternary decimal representations of  $x$  and  $y$  are finite and satisfy either  $x_jy_j = 0$  or  $x_j + y_j = 0$  for every index  $j$ , then  $(x, y)$  lies in  $S_F$ .*

According to Proposition 2.2 (b), the identity (3.3) holds whenever  $\mathbf{z} = 0$ ; as noted in Section 2,  $\mathbf{z} = 0$  if and only if the components of  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{y}$  satisfy either  $x_jy_j = 0$  or  $x_j + y_j = 0$  for every index  $j$ . By Proposition 3.5 (b), all points  $(x, y)$  whose decimal ternary expansions are finite and satisfy either  $x_jy_j = 0$  or  $x_j + y_j = 0$  for every index  $j$  are contained in the hexagon snowflake fractal  $S_F$ . Therefore, Theorem 3.4 is proved.

To prove Proposition 3.5 we need the following

LEMMA 3.6. *For every  $n \geq 0$ , we let  $H_n$  be a scaled copy of the polygon  $H_0$  by a factor  $\frac{1}{3^n}$ . The points  $(x, y) \in H_n$  have balanced ternary representation  $x = [0.x_1x_2\dots]_3$ ,  $y = [0.y_1y_2\dots]_3$  for which  $x_j = y_j = 0$  for all  $j \leq n$ , and either  $x_{n+1}y_{n+1} = 0$  or  $x_{n+1} + y_{n+1} = 0$ .*

PROOF. We begin by noting that the set of points  $x = [0.x_1x_2\dots]_3$  for which  $x_1 = 0$  is bounded above by  $\frac{1}{3^2} + \frac{1}{3^3} + \dots = \frac{1}{6}$  and it is bounded below by  $-\frac{1}{3^2} - \frac{1}{3^3} - \dots = -\frac{1}{6}$ . Thus, the points in the interval  $[-\frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{6}]$  are the only points in  $[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$  that have a balanced ternary representation that starts with  $x_1 = 0$ . The points in the intervals  $(\frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{2}]$  and  $[-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{6})$  can be written as  $[0.1x_2x_3\dots]_3$  and  $[0.\bar{1}x_2x_3\dots]_3$ , resp. Note that  $\frac{1}{6}$  and  $-\frac{1}{6}$  can also be represented as  $[0.1\bar{1}\bar{1}\dots]_3$  and  $[0.\bar{1}11\dots]_3$ , resp.

For the points  $(x, y)$  in the squares  $[\frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{2}] \times [-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{6}]$  (resp.  $[-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{6}] \times [\frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{2}]$ ) we have  $x_1 = 1$  and  $y_1 = -1$  (resp.  $x_1 = -1$  and  $y_1 = 1$ ) and so

$x_1 + y_1 = 0$ . For the points in the rectangle  $(-\frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{6}) \times [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$ , we have  $x_1 = 0$ , so  $x_1 y_1 = 0$ . Similarly,  $y_1 = 0$  for the points in the rectangle  $[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}] \times (-\frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{6})$

Based on these observations, we can conclude that the polygon  $H_0$  consists of points  $(x, y) \in [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}] \times [-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$  for which either  $x_1 y_1 = 0$  or  $x_1 + y_1 = 0$ .

Since dividing by powers of 3 shifts the decimal point in the balanced ternary representation, we can verify by induction that points in the polygon  $H_n$  satisfy Lemma 3.6.  $\square$

The proof of Proposition 3.5 is similar to that of Proposition 3.2 and it is omitted.

## References

- [1] Croot III, E.S., *On a coloring conjecture about unit fractions*, Annals of Mathematics, 157 (2003), 545–556.
- [2] Eppstein, D., *Egyptian Fractions with Denominators from Sequences Closed Under Doubling*, Journal of Integer Sequences, Vol. 24, Article 21.8.8 (2021)
- [3] E. Faghieh , M. Taheri , K.Navi , N. Bagherzadeh *Efficient realization of quantum balanced ternary reversible multiplier building blocks: A great step towards sustainable computing*, Sustainable Computing: Informatics and Systems 40 (2023)
- [4] Graham, R. L., Knuth, D. E., Patashnik, O. *Concrete Mathematics: A Foundation for Computer Science* (1994).
- [5] Lebowitz-Lockard, N. *Egyptian fractions of bounded length* , Res. Number Theory 10, no.1, Paper No. 16, (2024)
- [6] Leskovec, J.; Faloutsos, C. *Scalable modeling of real graphs using Kronecker multiplication* ICML '07: Proceedings of the 24th international conference on Machine learning, 497 – 504, (2007). <https://doi.org/10.1145/1273496.1273559>.
- [7] Schroeder, M. *Fractals, Chaos, Power Laws: Minutes from an Infinite Paradise*. Dover Publications (2009)
- [8] M.Toulabinejad, M. Taheri , K.Navi , N. Bagherzadeh *Toward efficient implementation of basic balanced ternary arithmetic operations in CNFET technology*, Microelectronics Journal Volume 90 (2019) 267–277.
- [9] Vose, M. *Egyptian fractions*. Bulletin of the London Mathematical Society, 17(1) (1985) 21–24.

Laura De Carli, DEPT. OF MATHEMATICS, FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY, MIAMI, FL 33199, USA.

*Email address:* `decarlil@fiu.edu`

Andrew Echezabal, DEPT. OF MATHEMATICS, FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY, MIAMI, FL 33199, USA.

*Email address:* `ancheza@fiu.edu`

Ismael Morell, DEPT. OF MATHEMATICS, FLORIDA INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY, MIAMI, FL 33199, USA.

*Email address:* `imore040@fiu.edu`