Journal of Integer Sequences, Vol. 8 (2005),
Article 05.1.3

Concatenations with Binary Recurrent Sequences

William D. Banks
Department of Mathematics
University of Missouri
Columbia, MO 65211
USA
bbanks@math.missouri.edu

Florian Luca
Instituto de Matemáticas
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
C.P. 58089
Morelia, Michoacán
México
fluca@matmor.unam.mx

Abstract

Given positive integers $A_1, \ldots, A_t$ and $b \geq 2$, we write $\overline{A_1 \cdots A_t}_{(b)}$ for the integer whose base-b representation is the concatenation of the base-b representations of $A_1, \ldots, A_t$. In this paper, we prove that if $(u_n)_{n\geq 0}$ is a binary recurrent sequence of integers satisfying some mild hypotheses, then for every fixed integer $t \geq 1$, there are at most finitely many nonnegative integers $n_1, \ldots, n_t$ such that $\overline{|u_{n_1}| \cdots |u_{n_t}|}_{(b)}$ is a member of the sequence $(|u_n|)_{n\geq 0}$. In particular, we compute all such instances in the special case that $b = 10$, $t = 2$, and $u_n = F_n$ is the sequence of Fibonacci numbers.

1 Introduction

A result of Senge and Straus [24, 25] asserts that if $b_1, b_2 \geq 2$ are multiplicatively independent integers, there are at most finitely many positive integers with the property that the sum of the digits in each of the two bases b_1 and b_2 lies below any prescribed bound. An effective version of this statement is due to Stewart [28], who gave a lower bound on the overall sum of the digits of n in base b_1 and in base b_2. A somewhat more general version of Stewart's result has been obtained by Luca [16].

A variety of arithmetical questions about integers whose base-b digits satisfy certain restrictions has been considered by many authors; see, for example, [1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 16, 18, 19, 27] and the references contained therein. Here, we consider integers whose base-b digits are formed by concatenating (absolute values of) terms in a binary recurrent sequence.

Let $(u_n)_{n\ge 0}$ be a *binary recurrent sequence* of integers; i.e., a sequence of integers satisfying the recurrence relation

$$u_{n+2} = ru_{n+1} + su_n \qquad (n \ge 0), \tag{1}$$

where r and s are nonzero integers with $r^2 + 4s \neq 0$. It is well known that if α and β are the roots of the equation $x^2 - rx - s = 0$, then $u_n = c\alpha^n + d\beta^n$ holds for all $n \ge 0$, where c and d are constants given by

$$c = \frac{-\beta u_0 + u_1}{\alpha - \beta} \qquad \text{and} \qquad d = \frac{\alpha u_0 - u_1}{\alpha - \beta}.$$

Throughout the paper, we assume that $(u_n)_{n\ge 0}$ is *nondegenerate* (i.e., α/β is not a root of 1, and $\alpha\beta cd \neq 0$). Reordering the roots if necessary, we can further assume that $|\alpha| \ge |\beta|$ and $|\alpha| > 1$.

Let $b \ge 2$ be a fixed integer base. Given positive integers $A_1, \ldots, A_t$, we denote by $\overline{A_1 \cdots A_t}_{(b)}$ the integer whose base-b representation is equal to the concatenation (in order) of the base-b representations of $A_1, \ldots, A_t$. Thus, if l_i is the smallest positive integer such that $A_i < b^{l_i}$, we have

$$\overline{A_1 \cdots A_t}_{(b)} = b^{l_2+\cdots+l_t}A_1 + b^{l_3+\cdots+l_t}A_2 + \cdots + b^{l_t}A_{t-1} + A_t\,.$$

We always assume that $A_1 \neq 0$, and in the special case that $b = 10$, we omit the subscript to simplify the notation.

In this paper, we study the set of positive integers $|u_n|$, where $(u_n)_{n\ge 0}$ is a binary recurrent sequence, that are the base-b concatenations of other numbers of the form $|u_{n_j}|$, $j = 1, \ldots, t$. We show that if $t \ge 2$ is fixed, then there are only finitely many instances of the equality

$$|u_n| = \overline{|u_{n_1}| \cdots |u_{n_t}|}_{(b)}$$

provided that the sequence $(u_n)_{n\ge 0}$ satisfies certain mild hypotheses. Note that some assumptions are clearly needed in order to rule out certain obvious counterexamples; for instance, the result does not hold for the sequence $u_n = b^n - 1$, $n \ge 0$, since the concatenation of any two or more terms produces another term of the same sequence.

Theorem 1. *Let $u_n = c\alpha^n + d\beta^n$ be a nondegenerate binary recurrent sequence of integers, and let $b \ge 2$ be a fixed integer base. Assume that $\dim_{\mathbb{Z}}\langle \log\alpha,\ \log\beta,\ \log b\rangle \ge 2$. Then for every fixed integer $t \ge 2$, there are at most finitely many positive integers n for which the equality*

$$|u_n| = \overline{|u_{n_1}|\underbrace{0\cdots0}_{m_1}|u_{n_2}|\underbrace{0\cdots0}_{m_2}\cdots|u_{n_t}|\underbrace{0\cdots0}_{m_t}}_{(b)} \tag{2}$$

holds for some nonnegative integers $n_1, \ldots, n_t$ and $m_1, \ldots, m_t$ with $u_{n_1} \neq 0$.

Here, $\log(\cdot)$ stands for any fixed determination of the natural logarithm function, and $\dim_{\mathbb{Z}}\langle \log\alpha,\ \log\beta,\ \log b\rangle$ denotes the rank of (the free part of) the additive subgroup of $\mathbb{C}$ generated by $\{\log\alpha,\ \log\beta,\ \log b\}$.

Although our proof of Theorem 1 is ineffective, this result can be seen as an extension of the aforementioned results of Senge and Straus [24, 25].

In some special cases, one can employ effective methods to completely determine all the solutions to an equation such as (2). Perhaps the best known example of a binary recurrent sequence is the *Fibonacci sequence* $(F_n)_{n\ge 0}$, where $F_0 = 0$ and $F_1 = 1$, and (1) holds with $r = s = 1$. In this case, one has $\alpha = (1+\sqrt{5})/2$, $\beta = -\alpha^{-1}$, $c = 1/(\alpha-\beta)$, and $d = -c$. For this special sequence, we obtain the following computational result:

Theorem 2. *If (m, n, k) is an ordered triple of nonnegative integers with $m > 0$ and such that $\overline{F_m F_n} = F_k$, then $F_k \in \{13, 21, 55\}$.*

Throughout the paper, we use the Vinogradov symbols $\ll$ and $\gg$, as well as the Landau symbol O, with the understanding that the implied constants are computable and depend at most on the given data.

2 Preliminaries

Let $\mathbb{L}$ be an algebraic number field of degree D over $\mathbb{Q}$. Denote by $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{L}}$ the ring of algebraic integers and by $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{L}}$ the set of places. For a fractional ideal $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathbb{L}$, let $\mathrm{Nm}_{\mathbb{L}}(\mathcal{I})$ be the usual norm; we recall that $\mathrm{Nm}_{\mathbb{L}}(\mathcal{I}) = \#(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{L}}/\mathcal{I})$ if $\mathcal{I}$ is an ideal of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{L}}$, and the norm map is extended multiplicatively (using unique factorization) to all of the fractional ideals of $\mathbb{L}$.

For a prime ideal $\mathcal{P}$, we denote by $\mathrm{ord}_{\mathcal{P}}(x)$ the order at which $\mathcal{P}$ appears in the ideal factorization of the principal ideal $[x]$ generated by x in $\mathbb{L}$.

For a place $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{L}}$ and a number $x \in \mathbb{L}$, we define the absolute value $|x|_\mu$ as follows:

(*i*) $|x|_\mu = |\sigma(x)|^{1/D}$ if μ corresponds to a real embedding $\sigma : \mathbb{L} \to \mathbb{R}$;

(*ii*) $|x|_\mu = |\sigma(x)|^{2/D} = |\overline{\sigma}(x)|^{2/D}$ if μ corresponds to some pair of complex conjugate embeddings $\sigma, \overline{\sigma} : \mathbb{L} \to \mathbb{C}$;

(*iii*) $|x|_\mu = \mathrm{Nm}_{\mathbb{L}}(\mathcal{P})^{-\mathrm{ord}_{\mathcal{P}}(x)/D}$ if μ corresponds to a nonzero prime ideal $\mathcal{P}$ of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{L}}$.

In the case (*i*) or (*ii*), we say that μ is *real infinite* or *complex infinite*, respectively; in the case (*iii*), we say that μ is *finite*.

The set of absolute values are well known to satisfy the following *product formula*:

$$\prod_{\mu\in\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{L}}} |x|_\mu = 1, \qquad \text{for all } x \in \mathbb{L}^*. \tag{3}$$

One of our principal tools is the following simplified version of a result of Schlickewei [22, 23], which is commonly known as the *Subspace Theorem*:

Theorem 3. *Let $\mathbb{L}$ be an algebraic number field of degree D. Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a finite set of places of $\mathbb{L}$ containing all the infinite ones. Let $\{L_{1,\mu},\dots,L_{N,\mu}\}$ for $\mu \in \mathcal{S}$ be linearly independent sets of linear forms in N variables with coefficients in $\mathbb{L}$. Then, for every fixed $0<\varepsilon<1$, the set of solutions $\mathbf{x}=(x_1,\dots,x_N)\in \mathbb{L}^N\backslash\{\mathbf{0}\}$ to the inequality*

$$\prod_{\mu\in\mathcal{S}}\prod_{i=1}^{N}|L_{i,\mu}(\mathbf{x})|_\mu \le (\max\{|x_i| : i=1,\dots,N\})^{-\varepsilon} \tag{4}$$

is contained in finitely many proper linear subspaces of $\mathbb{L}^N$.

Let $\mathcal{S}$ be a finite subset of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbb{L}}$ containing all the infinite places. An element $x\in\mathbb{L}$ is called a $\mathcal{S}$*-unit* if $|x|_\mu = 1$ for all $\mu\notin\mathcal{S}$. An equation of the form

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i x_i = 0, \tag{5}$$

where each $a_i\in\mathbb{L}^*$, is called an $\mathcal{S}$*-unit equation* if each x_i is an $\mathcal{S}$-unit; it is said to be *nondegenerate* if no proper subsum of the left hand side vanishes. It is clear that if $\mathbf{x}=(x_1,\dots,x_N)$ is a solution of the $\mathcal{S}$-unit equation (5), and ρ is a $\mathcal{S}$-unit in $\mathbb{L}^*$, then $\rho\mathbf{x}=(\rho x_1,\dots,\rho x_N)$ is a also a solution of (5); in this case, the solutions $\mathbf{x}$ and $\rho\mathbf{x}$ are said to be *equivalent*. We recall the following result of Schlickewei [21] (see also [8]) on $\mathcal{S}$-unit equations:

Theorem 4. *Let $a_1,\dots,a_N$ be fixed numbers in $\mathbb{L}^*$. Then the $\mathcal{S}$-unit equation (5) has only finitely many equivalence classes of nondegenerate solutions $(x_1,\dots,x_N)$. Moreover, the number of such equivalence classes is bounded by a constant that depends only on N and the cardinality of $\mathcal{S}$.*

An immediate consequence of Theorem 4 is that if $\mathbf{x}=(x_1,\dots,x_N)$ is a solution of the $\mathcal{S}$-unit equation (5), then the ratios x_i/x_j for $1\le i<j\le N$ can assume only finitely many values.

We shall also need some estimates from the theory of lower bounds for linear forms in logarithms, both in the complex and the p-adic cases.

Let α_1 and α_2 be algebraic numbers. Put $\mathbb{L}=\mathbb{Q}[\alpha_1,\alpha_2]$, and let D be the degree of $\mathbb{L}$ over $\mathbb{Q}$. Let A_1 and A_2 be two positive integers such that

$$\log A_i \ge \max\left\{h(\alpha_i), \frac{|\log\alpha_i|}{D}, \frac{1}{D}\right\} \qquad (i=1,2). \tag{6}$$

Here, for an algebraic number α whose minimal polynomial over $\mathbb{Z}$ is $a\prod_{i=1}^{d}(X-\alpha^{(i)})$, we write $h(\alpha)$ for the logarithmic height of α, which is given by

$$h(\alpha)=\frac{1}{d}\left(\log|a|+\sum_{i=1}^{d}\log\left(\max\{1,|\alpha^{(i)}|\}\right)\right).$$

Let b_1 and b_2 be positive integers, and put $\Lambda=b_2\log\alpha_2-b_1\log\alpha_1$. Finally, let

$$b'=\frac{b_1}{D\log A_2}+\frac{b_2}{D\log A_1}.$$

The following result is Corollaire 2 on page 288 of [20], which gives an effective lower bound on the size of $\log|\Lambda|$:

Theorem 5. *Assume that α_1 and α_2 are real, positive, and multiplicatively independent. Then*

$$\log|\Lambda| \geq -24.34 D^4 \left(\max\left\{\log b' + 0.14, \frac{21}{D}, \frac{1}{2}\right\}\right)^2 \log A_1 \log A_2.$$

We also need a p-adic lower bound on Λ, that is, an upper bound on the order at which a prime ideal $\mathcal{P}$ can appear in the factorization of the principal ideal generated by $\Lambda_1 = \alpha_1^{b_1} - \alpha_2^{b_2}$ inside $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{L}}$. For this, let p be the prime number such that $\mathcal{P} \mid p$ (i.e., $p\mathbb{Z} = \mathcal{P} \cap \mathbb{Z}$), and let f be such that the finite field $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{L}}/\mathcal{P}$ has p^f elements. Let g be the smallest positive integer such that $\mathcal{P}$ divides both $\alpha_1^g - 1$ and $\alpha_2^g - 1$. Assume further that A_i satisfies the inequality (6) as well as the inequality $\log A_i \geq f(\log p)/D$, for $i = 1, 2$. The following result is an easy consequence of Corollaire 2 on page 315 of [4]:

Theorem 6. *Assume that α_1 and α_2 are multiplicatively independent. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{ord}_{\mathcal{P}}(\Lambda_1) \quad &\leq \quad \frac{24pgD^5}{f^4(p-1)(\log p)^4} \\ &\times \quad \left(\max\left\{\log b' + \log\log p + 0.4, \frac{10 f \log p}{D}, 10\right\}\right)^2 \log A_1 \log A_2. \end{aligned}$$

3 Proof of Theorem 1

Our proof of Theorem 1 also treats the (slightly more general) case in which we allow $t = 1$, but in this case we add the additional hypothesis that $m_1 \geq 1$ (clearly, this condition is needed to insure that the number of solutions to (2) is finite).

Since α/β is not a root of unity, at most one element of the sequence $(u_n)_{n\geq 0}$ is equal to 0. Hence, if $u_{n_i} = 0$ for some i in (2), then n_i is uniquely determined. Note that $i \neq 1$. If this happens, then equation (2) can be viewed as an equation of the same form, but with t replaced by $t-1$ (and with only $2t-1$ unknowns). Thus, to prove the theorem, it suffices to show that there at most finitely many solutions to (2) with $u_{n_i} \neq 0$, $i = 1, \ldots, t$.

Let $\mathbb{L} = \mathbb{Q}[\alpha, \beta]$, and let $\mathcal{S}$ be the set of all infinite places of $\mathbb{L}$ and all finite places that divide $sb = -\alpha\beta b$. For a positive integer m, let $\ell_b(m)$ denote the number of the digits in the base-b representation of m.

Equation (2) is equivalent to

$$|u_n| = \sum_{i=1}^{t} |u_{n_i}| b^{s_i}, \tag{7}$$

where

$$s_i = \sum_{j=i}^{t} m_j + \sum_{j=i+1}^{t} \ell_b(|u_{n_j}|) \qquad (i = 1, \ldots, t).$$

We remark that, if $n = n_i$ for some i, it follows that $t = 1$ (since each $u_{n_i} \neq 0$) and $s_1 = m_1 = 0$ (since $b \geq 2$), which contradicts our assumption that $m_1 \geq 1$ when $t = 1$. Hence, $n \neq n_i$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, t$. Now write (7) in the form

$$\varepsilon_0(c\alpha^n + d\beta^n) = \sum_{i=1}^{t} \varepsilon_i \left(c\alpha^{n_i} + d\beta^{n_i}\right) b^{s_i}, \tag{8}$$

where $\varepsilon_i \in \{\pm 1\}$ for $i = 0, \ldots, t$.

Suppose first that $n_i > n - \kappa$ for some $i \in \{1, \ldots, t\}$, where $\kappa \geq 0$ is a constant to be specified later. From (7), we have that $|u_n| \geq |u_{n_i}| b^{s_i}$. It is known that the estimate $|u_m| = |\alpha|^{m+O(\log m)}$ holds for all positive integers $m \geq 2$ (see Theorem 3.1 on page 64 in [26]). Moreover, if α is real, then $|\alpha| > |\beta|$, and one has the estimate $|u_m| = |\alpha|^{m+O(1)}$. Therefore, since $|\alpha| > 1$, the following bound holds if $n_i > n - \kappa$:

$$\max\{n_i - n, s_i\} \ll \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}; \\ \log n, & \text{if } \alpha \notin \mathbb{R} \quad (\text{i.e., } \alpha = \overline{\beta}\,). \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

Next, we show that if $n_i \leq n - \kappa$ for every $i = 1, \ldots, t$, then there exists an index $i \in \{1, \ldots, t\}$ for which the following bound holds:

$$\max\{n - n_i, s_i\} \ll 1. \tag{10}$$

To do this, we first observe that (8) is an $\mathcal{S}$-unit equation with $N = 2t + 2$ terms, coefficients $(a_1, \ldots, a_N) = (c, d, -c, -d, \ldots, -c, -d)$, and the $\mathcal{S}$-unit unknowns $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \ldots, x_N) = (\varepsilon_0\alpha^n, \varepsilon_0\beta^n, \varepsilon_1\alpha^{n_1}b^{s_1}, \ldots, \varepsilon_t\beta^{n_t}b^{s_t})$.

If the $\mathcal{S}$-unit equation (8) is nondegenerate, then $x_1/x_2 = (\alpha/\beta)^n$ can assume only finitely many values; since α/β is not a root of unity, it follows that n can take at most finitely many values.

On the other hand, if the $\mathcal{S}$-unit equation (8) is degenerate, let E_1 and E_2 be two (not necessarily distinct) nondegenerate subequations of (8) that contain the unknowns $x_1 = \varepsilon_0\alpha^n$ and $x_2 = \varepsilon_0\beta^n$, respectively. Clearly, E_1 and E_2 can be chosen in at most finitely many ways. The preceding argument shows that n can assume only finitely many values if the unknowns x_1 and x_2 both lie in E_1 or both lie in E_2. Therefore, we may assume that E_1 does not contain x_2, and E_2 does not contain x_1. We now distinguish the following cases:

(*i*) *E_1 contains an unknown of the form $x_{2i+1} = \varepsilon_i\alpha^{n_i}b^{s_i}$ for some $i \geq 1$ and E_2 contains an unknown of the form $x_{2j} = \varepsilon_j\beta^{n_j}b^{s_j}$ for some $j \geq 2$.*

In this case, both $x_1/x_{2i+1} = \pm\alpha^{n-n_i}b^{-s_i}$ and $x_2/x_{2j} = \pm\beta^{n-n_j}b^{-s_j}$ can assume only finitely many values. Since $\dim_{\mathbb{Z}}\langle \log\alpha, \log\beta, \log b\rangle \geq 2$, it follows that either the pair (α, b) or the pair (β, b) is multiplicatively independent; thus, either $\max\{n - n_i, s_i\} \ll 1$ or $\max\{n - n_j, s_j\} \ll 1$.

(*ii*) *E_1 contains only unknowns of the form $x_{2i} = \varepsilon_i\beta^{n_i}b^{s_i}$ with $i \geq 2$ (except for x_1) and E_2 contains only unknowns of the form $x_{2j+1} = \varepsilon_j\alpha^{n_j}b^{s_j}$ with $j \geq 1$ (except for x_2).*

For each choice of the indices i and j, both $x_1/x_{2i} = \pm\alpha^n\beta^{-n_i}b^{-s_i}$ and $x_2/x_{2j+1} = \pm\beta^n\alpha^{-n_j}b^{-s_j}$ can have at most finitely many values. Since we may assume that n

takes infinitely many values (otherwise, there is nothing to prove), it follows that there exist numbers n^*, n_i^*, n_j^*, s_i^*, and s_j^* such that both relations

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha^n\beta^{-n_i}b^{-s_i} &= \alpha^{n^*}\beta^{-n_i^*}b^{-s_i^*}, \\ \beta^n\alpha^{-n_j}b^{-s_j} &= \beta^{n^*}\alpha^{-n_j^*}b^{-s_j^*}, \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

hold for arbitrarily large values of n. Among all possible choices for the quintuple $(n^*, n_i^*, n_j^*, s_i^*, s_j^*)$ of such numbers, we fix one for which n_i^* is as small as possible; thus, $n_i \geq n_i^*$ whenever the relations (11) hold.

Since there are only finitely many possibilities for E_1 and E_2 and (once these are fixed) for the indices i and j, we obtain in this way a finite list of such quintuples $(n^*, n_i^*, n_j^*, s_i^*, s_j^*)$. Hence, the constant κ can be initially chosen such that the inequality $\kappa > \max\{n^* - n_i^*, n^* - n_j^*\}$ holds in all cases.

Now let E_1, E_2, i, and j be fixed, and suppose that the relations (11) hold with $n > n^*$. Taking logarithms, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} (n-n^*)\log\alpha &= (n_i-n_i^*)\log\beta + (s_i - s_i^*)\log b, \\ (n-n^*)\log\beta &= (n_j-n_j^*)\log\alpha + (s_j - s_j^*)\log b. \end{aligned}$$

Let $v_1 = (n_i - n_i^*)/(n-n^*)$ and $v_2 = (n_j - n_j^*)/(n-n^*)$, and note that both numbers are rational. Since we are assuming that $n_i \leq n - \kappa$ for $i = 1, \ldots, t$, it follows that

$$n^* - n_i^* < \kappa \leq n - n_i,$$

which implies that $v_1 < 1$. Similarly, $v_2 < 1$. Since $n_i \geq n_i^*$ by our choice of the quintuple $(n^*, n_i^*, n_j^*, s_i^*, s_j^*)$, we also see that $v_1 \geq 0$. These statements together imply that $v_1v_2 \neq 1$, which is all we need. From the preceding relations, we obtain that

$$\log\alpha = v_1\log\beta + w_1\log b = v_1(v_2\log\alpha + w_2\log b) + w_1\log b,$$

where $w_1 = (s_i - s_i^*)/(n-n^*)$ and $w_2 = (s_j - s_j^*)/(n-n^*)$ are rational numbers. Since $v_1v_2 \neq 1$, this implies that $\log\alpha/\log b$ is rational. Similarly, we see that $\log\beta/\log b$ is rational. But these statements contradict our hypothesis that $\dim_{\mathbb{Z}}\langle\log\alpha, \log\beta, \log b\rangle \geq 2$; therefore, n is bounded, and it follows that n_i, n_j, s_i, and s_j are bounded as well.

(*iii*) *The remaining cases.*

For the remaining cases, there are only two possibilities:

- *E_1 contains an unknown of the form $x_{2i+1} = \varepsilon_i\alpha^{n_i}b^{s_i}$ for some $i \geq 1$ and E_2 contains only unknowns of the form $x_{2j+1} = \varepsilon_j\alpha^{n_j}b^{s_j}$ with $j \geq 1$ (except for x_2).*
- *E_1 contains only unknowns of the form $x_{2i} = \varepsilon_i\beta^{n_i}b^{s_i}$ with $i \geq 2$ (except for x_1) and E_2 contains an unknown of the form $x_{2j} = \varepsilon_j\beta^{n_j}b^{s_j}$ for some $j \geq 2$.*

We treat only the first case, as the second case is similar.

We note that the ratio $x_1/x_{2i+1} = \pm\alpha^{n-n_i}b^{-s_i}$ assumes only finitely many values. If α and b are multiplicatively independent, it follows that both $n-n_i$ and s_i are bounded, and we are done. On the other hand, if $n-n_i$ is not bounded, it follows that $\log\alpha/\log b$ is rational. If j is such that $x_{2j+1}\in E_2$, then $x_2/x_{2j+1} = \pm\beta^n\alpha^{-n_j}b^{-s_j}$ can take at most finitely many values. Since α and b are multiplicatively dependent, β and b must be multiplicatively independent, and it follows that n can take only finitely many values. But this is impossible if $n-n_i$ is unbounded.

The analysis above completes our proof that (10) holds for some i in the case that $n_i \le n-\kappa$ for all $i=1,\ldots,t$. Combining (9) and (10), we see that the bound

$$\max\{|n-n_i|, s_i\} \ll \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \alpha\in\mathbb{R}; \\ \log n, & \text{if } \alpha\notin\mathbb{R} \quad (\text{i.e., } \alpha=\overline{\beta}\,) \end{cases} \tag{12}$$

holds for some $i\in\{1,\ldots,t\}$ in every case.

We now select i such that (12) holds and rewrite (8) in the form

$$c\alpha^n + d\beta^n + Ab^{s_{i-1}} + c_1\alpha^{n_i}b^{s_i} + d_1\beta^{n_i}b^{s_i} + B = 0, \tag{13}$$

where $c_1 = -\varepsilon_i\varepsilon_0 c$, $d_1 = -\varepsilon_i\varepsilon_0 d$,

$$A = -\sum_{j=1}^{i-1}\varepsilon_j\varepsilon_0 u_{n_j}b^{s_j-s_{i-1}} \qquad \text{and} \qquad B = -\sum_{j=i+1}^{t}\varepsilon_i\varepsilon_0 u_{n_j}b^{s_j}.$$

Since

$$b^{s_{i-1}} \ge |u_{n_i}| \ge |\alpha|^{n_i+O(\log n_i)} = |\alpha|^{n+O(\log n)},$$

we see that $A=\exp(O(\log n))$. Similarly, since $b^{s_i}\ge B$, it follows that $B=\exp(O(\log n))$.

Assume first that both $n-n_i$ and s_i are bounded (this is the case, for instance, if $\mathbb{L}$ is real). In this case, A and B are bounded as well; hence, we can assume that they are fixed. Here, (13) becomes

$$C_1\alpha^n + D_1\beta^n + Ab^{s_{i-1}} + B = 0, \tag{14}$$

where $C_1 = c+c_1\alpha^{n_i-n}$ and $D_1 = d+d_1\beta^{n_i-n}$ can also be regarded as fixed numbers. The case $A=B=C_1=D_1=0$ leads to $i=t=1$, $\alpha^{n-n_i} = -cc_1^{-1} = \pm1$ and $\beta^{n-n_i} = -dd_1^{-1} = \pm1$; therefore, $t=1$, $n=n_1$, and $m_1=0$, which contradicts our assumption that $m_1\ge1$ when $t=1$. Consequently, the equation (14) is nontrivial. If any two of the coefficients A, B, C_1, D_1 are zero, then either n or s_{i-1} is bounded, and this leads to at most finitely many possibilities for n. A similar argument based on Theorem 4 can be used if one of the coefficients A, B, C_1, D_1 is zero, or if $ABC_1D_1\ne0$, to show that there are at most finitely many possibilities for n.

Thus, from now on, we can suppose that either $n-n_i$ or s_i is unbounded over the set of solutions to (13). In this case, α and β are complex conjugates.

Assume first that $B\ne0$ in equation (13). Suppose also that $A\ne0$. We apply Theorem 3 with $N=5$, the linear forms $L_{j,\mu}(\mathbf{x}) = x_j$ for each $j=1,\ldots,5$, and $\mu\in\mathcal{S}$, except when $j = 1$ and μ is infinite, in which case we take $L_{1,\mu}(\mathbf{x}) = cx_1 + dx_2 + x_3 + c_1x_4 + d_1x_5$ (note that, as $\mathbb{L}$ is complex quadratic, there is only one infinite place). We evaluate the double product appearing in Theorem 3 for our system of forms and the points $\mathbf{x} = (\alpha^n, \beta^n, Ab^{s_{i-1}}, \alpha^{n_i}b^{s_i}, \beta^{n_i}b^{s_i})$. Clearly,

$$\prod_{\mu\in\mathcal{S}} |L_{j,\mu}(\mathbf{x})| = 1 \tag{15}$$

if $j \in \{2, 4, 5\}$, since x_2, x_4 and x_5 are $\mathcal{S}$-units. Moreover,

$$\prod_{\mu\in\mathcal{S}} |L_{3,\mu}(\mathbf{x})| \le A = \exp(O(\log n)). \tag{16}$$

Finally, since x_1 is an $\mathcal{S}$-unit, it follows from the product formula (3) that

$$\prod_{\substack{\mu\in\mathcal{S}\\ \mu \text{ finite}}} |L_{1,\mu}(\mathbf{x})|_\mu = \frac{1}{|\mathrm{Nm}_{\mathbb{L}}(\alpha^n)|} \le \frac{1}{|\alpha|^n}, \tag{17}$$

while by equation (13), we have

$$\prod_{\substack{\mu\in\mathcal{S}\\ \mu \text{ is infinite}}} |L_{1,\mu}(\mathbf{x})|_\mu = B^2 \le \exp(O(\log n)). \tag{18}$$

Multiplying the estimates (15), (16), (17) and (18), we derive that

$$\prod_{j=1}^{N}\prod_{\mu\in\mathcal{S}} |L_{j,\mu}(\mathbf{x})| \le \frac{AB^2}{\alpha^n} \le \exp\left(-n\log\alpha + O(\log n)\right). \tag{19}$$

Since $\max\{|x_j| : j = 1, \ldots, N\} = |\alpha|^n$, the inequality (19) together with Theorem 3 (for example, with $\varepsilon = 1/2$ and $n > n_\varepsilon$), imply that there exist finitely many proper subspaces of $\mathbb{L}^N$ containing all solutions $\mathbf{x}$. Thus, the relation

$$C_2\alpha^n + D_2\beta^n + C_3\alpha^{n_i}b^{s_i} + D_3\beta^{n_i}b^{s_i} + EAb^{s_i-1} = 0 \tag{20}$$

holds for some fixed coefficients C_2, D_2, C_3, D_3 and E in $\mathbb{L}$, which are not all equal to zero. If $A = 0$, then the same argument with $N = 4$ also yields an identity of the shape (20). Finally, if $B = 0$, then (13) is the same as (20) with $C_2 = c$, $D_2 = d$, $C_3 = c_1$, $D_3 = d_1$, and $E = 1$. Clearly, we may assume that C_2 and D_2 are conjugate (over $\mathbb{L}$), that C_3 and D_3 are conjugate (over $\mathbb{L}$), and that $E \in \mathbb{Z}$ (if not, we can conjugate (20) and subtract the result from (20) to obtain a "shorter" nontrivial equation of the same type with the desired properties).

If $E = 0$, then (20) is a $\mathcal{S}$-unit equation. If it is nondegenerate, we see that $\alpha^n\beta^{-n}$ can take only finitely many values; since α/β is not a root of unity, there are at most finitely many possibilities for n. If the $\mathcal{S}$-unit equation is degenerate, then either $C_2 = D_2 = 0$, in which case n_i can take only finitely many values (and since $|n - n_i| \ll \log n$, it follows that

n is bounded as well), or $C_2D_2 \neq 0$ but $C_3 = D_3 = 0$, in which case n can again take only finitely many values, or $C_2C_3D_2D_3 \neq 0$. In the last case, either $\alpha^{n-n_i}b^{-s_i}$ and $\beta^{n-n_i}b^{-s_i}$ can take only finitely many values, or $\alpha^n\beta^{-n_i}b^{-s_i}$ and $\beta^n\alpha^{-n_i}b^{-s_i}$ can take only finitely many values; but these are cases that have already been considered.

Finally, we are left with the possibility that $E \neq 0$, in which case we can assume that $E = 1$. We now rewrite (20) in the form

$$C_4\alpha^n + D_4\beta^n = -Ab^{s_{i-1}}, \tag{21}$$

where $C_4 = C_2 + C_3\alpha^{n_i-n}b^{s_i}$ and $D_4 = D_2 + D_3\beta^{n_i-n}b^{s_i}$. Since C_4 and D_4 are conjugated in $\mathbb{L}$, it follows that they are simultaneously zero or nonzero.

Assume first that $C_4 = D_4 = 0$. Then both relations

$$C_2 = -C_3\alpha^{n-n_i}b^{s_i} \qquad \text{and} \qquad D_2 = -D_3\beta^{n-n_i}b^{s_i} \tag{22}$$

hold. If $C_2 = 0$ then $C_3 = 0$ (by (22)), $D_2 = 0$ (because C_2 and D_2 are conjugated), and therefore $D_3 = 0$ (by (22)); together with equation (20), these lead to $E = 0$, which is a contradiction. Thus, $C_2 \neq 0$, and the preceding argument implies that $C_2C_3D_2D_3 \neq 0$. Now, equation (22) together with our hypothesis that $\dim_{\mathbb{Q}}\langle \log\alpha, \log\beta, \log b\rangle \geq 2$ lead to the conclusion that both $n - n_i$ and s_i are bounded, which is a case already treated.

We now assume that $C_4D_4 \neq 0$. Let $\ell = \gcd(r^2, s)$, where r and s are the coefficients of the recurrence (1). Set $\alpha_1 = \alpha^2/\ell$, $\beta_1 = \beta^2/\ell$. Applying Lemma A.10 on page 20 in [26], we see that α_1 and β_1 are algebraic integers and that the principal ideals they generate in $\mathbb{L}$ are coprime. Clearly, α_1 and β_1 are complex conjugates, and $|\alpha_1| > 1$. Write $n = 2m + \delta$, where $\delta \in \{0, 1\}$. Put $(C_5, D_5) = (C_4, D_4)$ if $\delta = 0$ and $(C_5, D_5) = (\alpha C_4, \beta D_4)$ if $\delta = 1$. Dividing both sides of equation (21) by ℓ^m, we see that the expression

$$C_5\alpha_1^m + D_5\beta_1^m$$

is a rational number such that every prime factor of its numerator or denominator divides either $Ab\alpha\beta$ or one of the denominators of C_2, D_2, C_3, or D_3. Let $\mathcal{P} = \{p_1, \ldots, p_v\}$ be the set consisting of all of these primes, and write

$$C_5\alpha^m + D_5\beta^m = \prod_{i=1}^{v} p_i^{r_i}.$$

We now bound the order r_i of p_i. Let π_i be some prime ideal of $\mathbb{L}$ lying above p_i. If $\pi_i|\alpha_1$, then $\mathrm{ord}_{\pi_i}(\alpha_1^m) \geq m \geq n/2 - 1$. On the other hand, it is clear that

$$\max\{|\mathrm{ord}_{\pi_i}(C_5)|, |\mathrm{ord}_{\pi_i}(D_5)|\} \ll \max\{|n - n_i|, s_i\} \ll \log n.$$

Thus, for large n, we get that

$$\mathrm{ord}_{\pi_i}(C_5\alpha_1^m + D_5\beta_1^m) = \mathrm{ord}_{\pi_i}(D_5\beta_1^m) = \mathrm{ord}_{\pi_i}(D_5) \ll \log n, \tag{23}$$

since α_1 and β_1 are coprime. A similar analysis can be used if $\pi_i|\beta_1$. Assume now that π_i does not divide $\alpha_1\beta_1$. Then

$$r_i = \mathrm{ord}_{\pi_i}\left(C_5\alpha_1^m + D_5\beta_1^m\right) = \mathrm{ord}_{\pi_i}(C_5\beta_1^m) + \mathrm{ord}_{\pi_1}\left((\alpha_1/\beta_1)^m - (-D_5/C_5)\right).$$

Certainly,

$$\mathrm{ord}_{\pi_i}(C_5\beta_1^m) = \mathrm{ord}_{\pi_i}(C_5) \ll \log n,$$

while from Theorem 6, we deduce that

$$\mathrm{ord}_{\pi_i}\left((\alpha_1/\beta_1)^m - (-D_5/C_5)\right) \ll (\log n)^2 |\log |C_5|| \ll (\log n)^3.$$

Thus,

$$\mathrm{ord}_{\pi_i}(C_5\alpha_1^m + D_5\beta_1^m) \ll (\log n)^3 \tag{24}$$

in this case. Comparing inequalities (23) and (24), we see that inequality (24) always holds. Since this is true for all $i = 1, \ldots, v$, we conclude that

$$\log |C_5\alpha_1^m + D_5\beta_1^m| \le \sum_{i=1}^{v} r_i \log p_i \ll (\log n)^3. \tag{25}$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\log |C_5\alpha_1^m + D_5\beta_1^m| = \log |C_5| + m\log |\alpha_1| + \log |1 + (D_5C_5^{-1}(\beta_1\alpha_1^{-1})^m|.$$

Clearly,

$$\log |C_5| \gg -\log n, \tag{26}$$

and using Theorem 5, we get that

$$\log |1 + (D_5C_5^{-1})(\beta_1\alpha_1^{-1})^m| \gg -(\log n)^2 |\log |C_5||. \tag{27}$$

Putting together inequalities (25), (26), (27), and using the fact that $m \gg n$ and $|\alpha_1| > 1$, we obtain that

$$n \ll (\log n)^3,$$

which shows that n can take only finitely many values.

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.

4 Proof of Theorem 2

Before proceeding to the proof of Theorem 2, we gather a few useful facts about the Fibonacci sequence.

We first recall the following special case of the *Primitive Divisor Theorem*, which is due to Carmichael [5]:

Lemma 7. *For all $n \ge 13$, there exists a prime factor p of F_n such that p does not divide F_m for any positive integer $m < n$. Furthermore, any such prime p satisfies $p \equiv \pm 1 \mod n$.*

Next, we record the following estimate for the function $\ell(n) = \ell_{10}(F_n)$, which gives the number of digits in the decimal expansion of F_n:

Lemma 8. *For all $n \ge 1$, we have*

$$\frac{(n-2)\log\alpha}{\log 10} < \ell(n) \le \frac{(n-1)\log\alpha}{\log 10} + 1.$$

Proof. By induction on k, it is easy to see that $\alpha^{k-2} \le F_k \le \alpha^{k-1}$ holds for all $k \ge 1$. Since $\ell(k)$ is the unique integer for which $10^{\ell(k)-1} \le F_k < 10^{\ell(k)}$, the result follows. □

We keep the notation used in the proof of Theorem 1. In particular, $\mathbb{L} = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{5})$, $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{L}} = \mathbb{Z}[\alpha]$, and $D = 2$ is the degree of $\mathbb{L}$ over $\mathbb{Q}$. Notice that $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{L}}$ is a UFD. We also put $\varpi = \sqrt{5}$ and $\mathcal{P} = [\varpi]$; then $[p] = [5] = \mathcal{P}^2$, and $f = 1$. We need the following elementary lemma:

Lemma 9. *If $r \ge 2$, we have*

$$\mathrm{ord}_{\mathcal{P}}(\alpha^r - 1) \le \frac{2\log(r/4)}{\log 5} + 1.$$

The same inequality holds with α replaced by β.

Proof. The inequality for β follows from the one for α by conjugation. Note that the right hand side of the stated inequality is positive for all $r \ge 2$. Since

$$\alpha = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2} \equiv 2^{-1} \pmod{\varpi},$$

it follows that $\mathrm{ord}_{\mathcal{P}}(\alpha^r - 1) = 0$ if $4 \nmid r$; hence, it suffices to assume that $4 \mid r$ in what follows. Since

$$\alpha^4 - 1 = \frac{5+3\sqrt{5}}{2},$$

it follows that $\mathrm{ord}_{\mathcal{P}}(\alpha^4 - 1) = 1$. Thus, we may write $\alpha^4 = 1 + \varpi u$, where u is coprime to ϖ. If $s \ge 1$ is an integer and $5 \nmid s$, then

$$\alpha^{4s} - 1 = (\alpha^4 - 1)\sum_{j=0}^{s-1} \alpha^{4j} = \varpi u \sum_{j=0}^{s-1}(1+\varpi u)^j \equiv \varpi u s \pmod{\varpi},$$

which shows that $\mathrm{ord}_{\mathcal{P}}(\alpha^{4s} - 1) = 1$ as well. One checks similarly that if $s \ge 1$ and $5 \nmid s$, then $\mathrm{ord}_{\mathcal{P}}(\alpha^{20s} - 1) = 3$.

We now claim that, for all $t \ge 0$ and $s \ge 1$ such that $5 \nmid s$, we have

$$\mathrm{ord}_{\mathcal{P}}(\alpha^{4s\cdot 5^t} - 1) = 2t + 1. \tag{28}$$

To prove this, we use induction on the parameter t. Since the claim is true for $t = 0$ or 1, let us suppose that $t \ge 2$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha^{4s\cdot 5^t} - 1 &= (\alpha^{4s\cdot 5^{t-1}} - 1)\sum_{j=0}^{4} \alpha^{4sj\cdot 5^{t-1}} \\ &= 5(\alpha^{4s\cdot 5^{t-1}} - 1) + (\alpha^{4s\cdot 5^{t-1}} - 1)\sum_{j=1}^{4}(\alpha^{4sj\cdot 5^{t-1}} - 1). \end{aligned}$$

By the induction hypothesis, we have

$$\mathrm{ord}_{\mathcal{P}}\left(5(\alpha^{4s\cdot 5^{t-1}}-1)\right) = 2 + (2(t-1)+1) = 2t+1,$$

while

$$\mathrm{ord}_{\mathcal{P}}\left((\alpha^{4s\cdot 5^{t-1}}-1)\sum_{j=1}^{4}(\alpha^{4sj\cdot 5^{t-1}}-1)\right) \geq 2\,(2(t-1)+1) = 4t-2 > 2t+1,$$

and (28) follows.

Finally, writing r in the form $r = 4s\cdot 5^t$, where $t \geq 0$, $s \geq 1$, and $5 \nmid s$, we have

$$\mathrm{ord}_{\mathcal{P}}(\alpha^r - 1) = 2t+1 = \frac{2\log(r/4s)}{\log 5} + 1 \leq \frac{2\log(r/4)}{\log 5} + 1,$$

which finishes the proof. □

Lemma 10. *If (m,n,k) is an ordered triple of positive integers such that $\overline{F_mF_n} = F_k$, and $(m,n,k) \neq (1,4,7)$ or $(2,4,7)$, then $m \geq 3$ and $k-n \geq 4$.*

Proof. Suppose that $n \geq 13$. First, suppose that $m=1$ or $m=2$. Then $10^{\ell(n)} + F_n = F_k$; hence, $2F_n \leq F_k \leq 11F_n$, which (by simple estimates) implies that $n+2 \leq k \leq n+5$. Since $n \geq 13$, we have that $\ell(n) \geq 3$, and thus,

$$F_n \equiv F_k \pmod 8.$$

An analysis of the sequence of Fibonacci numbers modulo 8 shows that this congruence is not possible when $k = n+4$ or $k = n+5$; therefore, $k = n+2$ or $k = n+3$. If $k = n+2$, then $10^{\ell(n)} = F_{n+1}$, while for $k = n+3$, we have $10^{\ell(n)} = 2F_{n+1}$. However, by Lemma 7, there exists a prime $p \geq n$ dividing F_{n+1}, which is not possible in our cases. Consequently, if $m \leq 2$, we must have $n \leq 12$. Checking the remaining possibilities, the only solutions found are $(1,4,7)$ and $(2,4,7)$.

Assuming now that $\overline{F_mF_n} = F_k$, $n \geq 15$, and $k \leq n+3$, we then have

$$F_m \cdot 10^{\ell(n)} = F_k - F_n = \begin{cases} F_{n-1}, & \text{if } k = n+1; \\ F_{n+1}, & \text{if } k = n+2; \\ 2F_{n+1}, & \text{if } k = n+3. \end{cases} \tag{29}$$

Moreover, $m < n-1$, for otherwise

$$F_k = F_m \cdot 10^{\ell(n)} + F_n > 1000F_{n-1} > F_{n+3},$$

contradicting our assumption that $k \leq n+3$. Using Lemma 7 again, we see that there exist primes $p \mid F_{n-1}$ and $q \mid F_{n+1}$ with $\gcd(pq, F_m) = 1$ and $\min\{p,q\} \geq 13$, which is not possible in view of (29). Hence, if $k \leq n+3$, we must have $n \leq 14$, and thus $k \leq 17$. Examining these possibilities reveals no solutions other than the two found in the previous case. □

Lemma 11. *If $r \geq 1$ is even, then*

$$\frac{\alpha^r - 1}{\beta^r - 1} = -\alpha^r,$$

while if $r \geq 5$ is odd, then the numbers $(\alpha^r - 1)/(\beta^r - 1)$ and α are multiplicatively independent.

Proof. The first statement is trivial since $\alpha\beta = -1$. For the second statement, we note that if r is odd then

$$\frac{\alpha^r - 1}{\beta^r - 1} = -\alpha^r \left(\frac{\alpha^r - 1}{\alpha^r + 1}\right).$$

We now observe that if $\mathcal{D}$ is the common divisor in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{L}}$ of $\alpha^r - 1$ and $\alpha^r + 1$, then $\mathcal{D} \mid 2$. Since 2 is inert in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{L}}$, it follows that $\mathcal{D} \in \{1, 2\}$. The above arguments show that if $(\alpha^r - 1)/(\beta^r - 1)$ and α are multiplicatively dependent, then so are $(\alpha^r - 1)/(\alpha^r + 1)$ and α. Using the fact that $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{L}}$ is a UFD and the computation of $\mathcal{D}$, it follows that $\alpha^r - 1$ is either a unit, or it is an associate of 2. Hence, we get an equation of the form

$$\alpha^r - 1 = \pm 2^\lambda \alpha^t$$

with integers $\lambda \in \{0, 1\}$ and t. Since $r > 3$, it follows that $\alpha^r - 1 > \alpha^3 - 1 > 2$; hence, the sign in this equation is positive, and $t \geq 1$. Clearly, $t < r$. Thus, $\alpha^r - 1 = 2^\lambda \alpha^t$. By conjugation, we also have $\beta^r - 1 = 2^\lambda \beta^t$. Subtracting these two equations and dividing the result by $\alpha - \beta$, we obtain that $F_r = 2^\lambda F_t$. If $r \geq 13$, this equation is impossible in view of Lemma 7. The fact that $F_r = 2^\lambda F_t$ is also impossible for $5 \leq r \leq 13$ can be checked by hand, and the result follows. $\square$

We are now ready to embark on the proof of Theorem 2. For this, let (m, n, k) be a fixed triple of nonnegative integers for which $\overline{F_m F_n} = F_k$ holds. We note that $n > 0$, since for $n = 0$ we have $10F_m = F_k$, which has no positive integer solutions (m, k) (by Lemma 7, for example). Put $r = k - n$, and assume that $k > 10^6$. By Lemma 10, we can further suppose that $m \geq 3$ and $r \geq 4$. Since $\beta = -1/\alpha$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_m \cdot 10^{\ell(n)} = F_k - F_n &= \varpi^{-1}(\alpha^k - \beta^k - \alpha^n + \beta^n) \\ &= \varpi^{-1}(\alpha^n(\alpha^r - 1) - \beta^n(\beta^r - 1)) \\ &= \varpi^{-1}\alpha^n(\beta^r - 1)\left(\left(\frac{\alpha^r - 1}{\beta^r - 1}\right) - (-\alpha^{-2})^n\right). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\mathrm{ord}_{\mathcal{P}}(F_m) + 2\ell(n) = -1 + \mathrm{ord}_{\mathcal{P}}(\beta^r - 1) + \mathrm{ord}_{\mathcal{P}}\left(\left(\frac{\alpha^r - 1}{\beta^r - 1}\right) - (-\alpha^{-2})^n\right). \tag{30}$$

Assume first that r is odd. We apply Theorem 6 with the choices $\alpha_1 = (\alpha^r - 1)/(\beta^r - 1)$, $\alpha_2 = -\alpha^{-2}$, $b_1 = 1$, and $b_2 = n$. The condition that α_1 and α_2 are multiplicatively independent is satisfied by Lemma 11 because $r \geq 5$. Furthermore, note that

$$h(\alpha_1) \leq \tfrac{1}{2}(\log|(\alpha^r - 1)(\beta^r - 1)| + \log|\alpha_1|) \leq \tfrac{1}{2}\log\alpha^{2r} = r\log\alpha,$$

and $h(\alpha_2) = \log\alpha$. Since $r \geq 5$, we can choose $A_1 = \alpha^r$ and $A_2 = \varpi$; hence,

$$b' = \frac{1}{\log 5} + \frac{n}{2r\log\alpha} \leq \frac{1}{2\log\alpha} + \frac{n}{10\log\alpha} \leq \frac{3n}{4\log\alpha}.$$

Finally, as $\alpha \equiv \beta \pmod{\varpi}$, and $\mathrm{ord}_{\mathcal{P}}(\alpha^r - 1) = \mathrm{ord}_{\mathcal{P}}(\beta^r - 1) = 0$ (by Lemma 9), it follows that $\mathcal{P}$ divides $\alpha_1 - 1$. Moreover, noting that $-\alpha^{-2} \equiv 1 \pmod{\varpi}$, it follows that $\mathcal{P}$ also divides $\alpha_2 - 1$. Thus, we can take $g = 1$. By Theorem 6, we obtain the bound

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{ord}_{\mathcal{P}}&\left(\left(\frac{\alpha^r - 1}{\beta^r - 1}\right) - (-\alpha^{-2})^n\right)\\ &\leq \frac{480r\log\alpha}{(\log 5)^3}\left(\max\left\{\log n + \log\left(\frac{3\log 5}{4\log\alpha}\right) + 0.4, 10\right\}\right)^2\\ &\leq 56r\left(\max\left\{\log n + 2, 10\right\}\right)^2.\end{aligned}$$

Next, consider the case that r is even; then

$$\frac{\alpha^r - 1}{\beta^r - 1} - (\alpha^{-2})^n = -\alpha^r - (-\alpha^2)^n = (-1)^{n+1}\alpha^{-2n}(\alpha^{k+n} \pm 1),$$

and the last expression divides $\alpha^{2k+2n} - 1$ in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{L}}$; hence, by Lemma 9, we obtain that

$$\mathrm{ord}_{\mathcal{P}}\left(\left(\frac{\alpha^r - 1}{\beta^r - 1}\right) - (-\alpha^{-2})^n\right) \leq \frac{2\log((k+n)/2)}{\log 5} + 1.$$

Substituting the estimates above into (30), and applying Lemmas 8 and 9, we derive that

$$2\frac{(n-2)\log\alpha}{\log 10} < \ell(n) \leq \frac{2\log(r/4)}{\log 5} + 56r\left(\max\left\{\log n + 2, 10\right\}\right)^2, \tag{31}$$

if r is odd, and

$$2\frac{(n-2)\log\alpha}{\log 10} < \ell(n) \leq \frac{2\log(r/4)}{\log 5} + \frac{2\log((k+n)/2)}{\log 5} + 1, \tag{32}$$

if r is even.

From the equality $\overline{F_m F_n} = F_k$, we also see that

$$\alpha^m \cdot 10^{\ell(n)} - \alpha^k = \beta^m \cdot 10^{\ell(n)} - \alpha^n + \beta^n - \beta^k, \tag{33}$$

and, since $10^{\ell(n)} < 10F_n$ and $m \geq 3$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}|\alpha^{m-k} \cdot 10^{\ell(n)} - 1| &= \alpha^{-k}|\beta^m \cdot 10^{\ell(n)} - \alpha^n + \beta^n - \beta^k|\\ &\leq \alpha^{-k}(10|\beta|^3 F_n + \alpha^n + 2) < 4\alpha^{-r}.\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

Since $m \geq 3$, both sides of (33) are *negative*, and since $r \geq 4$, we have $4\alpha^{-r} < \frac{3}{5}$; thus,

$$\tfrac{2}{5} < \alpha^{m-k} \cdot 10^{\ell(n)} < 1.$$

It follows that

$$|\alpha^{m-k} \cdot 10^{\ell(n)} - 1| > \tfrac{2}{5}|(k-m)\log\alpha - \ell(n)\log 10|. \qquad (35)$$

We now apply Theorem 5 with the choices $\Lambda = (k-m)\log\alpha - \ell(n)\log 10$, $\alpha_1 = 10$, $\alpha_2 = \alpha$, $b_1 = \ell(n)$, and $b_2 = k-m$. Here, $h(\alpha_1) = \log 10$ and $h(\alpha_2) = \frac{1}{2}\log\alpha$; hence, we can choose $A_1 = 10$, and $A_2 = \alpha^2$, and

$$b' = \frac{\ell(n)}{4\log\alpha} + \frac{k-m}{20} < b'' = \frac{\ell(n)}{4\log\alpha} + \frac{k}{20}.$$

Using Theorem 5, we get that

$$|(k-m)\log\alpha - \ell(n)\log 10| \geq \exp\left(-864\left(\max\{\log b'' + 0.14, 10.5\}\right)^2\right).$$

Combining the above estimates, we derive the bound

$$r < \frac{\log 10}{\log\alpha} + \frac{864}{\log\alpha}\left(\max\{\log b'' + 0.14, 10.5\}\right)^2. \qquad (36)$$

Now, if $k > 2n$, then, by Lemma 8, we have

$$b'' = \frac{\ell(n)}{4\log\alpha} + \frac{k}{20} \leq \frac{n-1}{4\log 10} + \frac{1}{4\log\alpha} + \frac{k}{20} < \frac{(k/2)-1}{4\log 10} + \frac{1}{4\log\alpha} + \frac{k}{20},$$

and $r = k - n > k/2$; hence, the inequality (36) is not possible for $k > 500000$. On the other hand, if $k \leq 2n$, then

$$b'' = \frac{\ell(n)}{4\log\alpha} + \frac{k}{20} \leq \frac{n-1}{4\log 10} + \frac{1}{4\log\alpha} + \frac{n}{10}.$$

When r is even, estimate (32) gives

$$\frac{(n-2)\log\alpha}{\log 10} < \frac{\log(n/4)}{\log 5} + \frac{\log(3n/2)}{\log 5} + \frac{1}{2},$$

which implies that $n < 20$; hence, $k < 40$. When r is odd, by combining the inequalities (31), and (36), we obtain a contradiction unless $n \leq 1.1 \times 10^{11}$ and $k \leq 2n \leq 2.2 \times 10^{11}$.

Although the preceding argument shows that there are only finitely many solutions (m, n, k) to the equation $\overline{F_m F_n} = F_k$, it would be computationally infeasible to search for solutions over the entire range $k \leq 2.2 \times 10^{11}$. In order to reduce the range further, we use a standard technique involving the continued fraction expansion of $(\log 10)/(\log\alpha)$.

Suppose that $n \leq 1.1 \times 10^{11}$ and $r \geq 56$. By (34) and (35), we have

$$\left|\frac{\log 10}{\log\alpha} - \frac{(k-m)}{\ell(n)}\right| < \frac{10}{\alpha^r \ell(n)} \leq \frac{1}{2\ell(n)^2}.$$

Here, the last inequality is equivalent to $20\ell(n) \leq \alpha^r$, which holds (by Lemma 8) for this choice of parameters. By well known properties of continued fractions, it follows that the fraction $(k-m)/\ell(n)$ is a convergent of $(\log 10)/(\log\alpha)$. Writing $(k-m)/\ell(n) = p_j/q_j$ for some $j \geq 0$, where p_j/q_j denotes the jth convergent to $(\log 10)/(\log \alpha)$, and using Lemma 8 again to bound $\ell(n)$ for n in our range, we see that $q_j \leq \ell(n) \leq 2.3 \times 10^{10}$, which implies that $j \leq 23$. Noting that

$$10\alpha^{-r} > |\ell(n) \log 10 - (k-m) \log \alpha| \geq \min_{1 \leq j \leq 23} |q_j \log 10 - p_j \log \alpha| > 1.6 \times 10^{-11},$$

we conclude that $r \leq 57$. Substituting this estimate into (31), we derive the more tractable upper bound $n \leq 2.1 \times 10^6$.

At this point, we turn to the computer. Note that if $n \geq 74$, one has $\ell(n) \geq 15$; therefore, if $\overline{F_m F_n} = F_k$, it follows that $F_n \equiv F_k \pmod{10^{15}}$. However, a computer search quickly reveals that there is no solution to this congruence with $74 \leq n \leq 2.1 \times 10^6$ and $k \leq n+57$. Thus, it remains only to search for solutions (m, n, k) with $n \leq 73$ and $k \leq n+57$, and one obtains only solutions with $k = 7$, 8 or 10; that is $F_k \in \{13, 21, 55\}$.

This completes the proof of Theorem 2.

5 Acknowledgements

The authors wish to thank the referee for his detailed and insightful comments on the original manuscript, which led to improvements in the quality, accuracy, and completeness of the paper. This work was done during a visit by the second author to the University of Missouri, Columbia; the hospitality and support of this institution are gratefully acknowledged. During the preparation of this paper, W. B. was supported in part by NSF grant DMS-0070628, and F. L. was supported in part by grants SEP-CONACYT 37259-E and 37260-E.

References

[1] W. Banks, A. Conflitti and I. E. Shparlinski, Character sums over integers with restricted g-ary digits, *Illinois J. Math.* **46** (2002), 819–836.

[2] W. Banks, D. Hart and M. Sakata, Almost all palindromes are composite, *Math. Res. Lett.* **11** (2004), 853–868.

[3] W. Banks and I. E. Shparlinski, On the number of sparse RSA exponents, *J. Number Theory* **95** (2002), 340–350.

[4] Y. Bugeaud and M. Laurent, Minoration effective de la distance p-adique entre puissances de nombres algébriques, *J. Number Theory* **61** (1996), 311–342.

[5] R. D. Carmichael, On the numerical factors of the arithmetic forms $\alpha^n 1 \beta^n$, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **15** (1913/14), 30–70.

[6] P. Erdős, C. Mauduit and A. Sárközy, On arithmetic properties of integers with missing digits, I, *J. Number Theory* **70** (1998), 99–120.

[7] P. Erdős, C. Mauduit and A. Sárközy, On arithmetic properties of integers with missing digits, II, *Discrete Math.* **200** (1999), 149–164.

[8] J.-H. Evertse, H. P. Schlickewei and W. M. Schmidt, Linear equations with variables which lie in a multiplicative group, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **155** (2002), 807–836.

[9] M. Filaseta and S. V. Konyagin, Squarefree values of polynomials all of whose coefficients are 0 and 1, *Acta Arith.* **74** (1996), 191–205.

[10] E. Fouvry and C. Mauduit, Methódes des crible et fonctions sommes des chiffres, *Acta Arith.* **77** (1996), 339–351.

[11] E. Fouvry and C. Mauduit, Sommes des chiffres et nombres presque premiers, *Math. Ann.* **305** (1996), 571–599.

[12] J. B. Friedlander and I. E. Shparlinski, On the distribution of Diffie–Hellman triples with sparse exponents, *SIAM J. Discrete Math.* **14** (2001), 162–169.

[13] A. O. Gel'fond, Sur les nombres qui ont des propriétés additives et multiplicatives données, *Acta Arith.* **13** (1968), 259–265.

[14] S. V. Konyagin, Arithmetic properties of integers with missing digits: distribution in residue classes, *Period. Math. Hungar.* **42** (2001), 145–162.

[15] S. V. Konyagin, C. Mauduit and A. Sárkőzy, On the number of prime factors of integers characterized by digit properties, *Period. Math. Hungar.* **40** (2000), 37–52.

[16] F. Luca, Distinct digits in base b expansions of linear recurrence sequences, *Quaest. Math.* **23** (2000), 389–404.

[17] F. Luca, Arithmetic properties of positive integers with fixed digit sum, to appear in *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana.*

[18] C. Mauduit and A. Sárközy, On the arithmetic structure of sets characterized by sum of digits properties, *J. Number Theory* **61** (1996), 25–38.

[19] C. Mauduit and A. Sárközy, On the arithmetic structure of the integers whose sum of digits is fixed, *Acta Arith.* **81** (1997), 145–173.

[20] M. Laurent, M. Mignotte and Y. Nesterenko, Formes linéaires en deux logarithmes et déterminants d'interpolation, *J. Number Theory* **55** (1995), 285–321.

[21] H. P. Schlickewei, S-unit equations over number fields, *Invent. Math.* **102** (1990), 95–107.

[22] W. M. Schmidt, *Diophantine Approximations*, Springer Verlag, LNM **785** (1980).

[23] W. M. Schmidt, *Diophantine Approximations and Diophantine Equations*, Springer Verlag, LNM **1467** (1991).

[24] H. G. Senge and E. G. Straus, PV-numbers and sets of multiplicity, in *Proceedings of the Washington State Conference in Number Theory (Washington State Univ., Pullman, Wash., 1971)*, 55–67, Dept. Math. Washington State Univ., Pullman, Washington, 1971.

[25] H. G. Senge and E. G. Straus, PV-numbers and sets of multiplicity, in "Collection of articles dedicated to the memory of Alfréd Rényi, II", *Period. Math. Hungar.* **3** (1973), 93–100.

[26] T. N. Shorey and R. Tijdeman, *Exponential diophantine equations*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1986.

[27] I. E. Shparlinski, Prime divisors of sparse integers, *Period. Math. Hungar.* **46** (2003), 215–222.

[28] C. L. Stewart, On the representation of an integer in two different bases, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **319** (1980), 63–72.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: Primary 11B37; Secondary 11B39, 11J86 .
Keywords: binary recurrent sequences, Fibonacci numbers, digits.

Received August 30 2004; revised version received January 13 2005. Published in *Journal of Integer Sequences*, January 14 2005. Small revisions, January 17 2005.

Return to Journal of Integer Sequences home page.