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Abstract

Generalizing a geometric idea due to J. Sondow, we give a geometric proof for the Cantor’s Theorem. Moreover, it is given an irrationality measure for some Cantor series.
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1 Introduction

In 2006, Jonathan Sondow gave a nice geometric proof that $e$ is irrational. Moreover, he said that a generalization of his construction may be used to prove the Cantor’s theorem. But, he did not do that in his paper, see [2]. So we give a geometric proof to Cantor’s theorem using a generalization to Sondow’s construction. After, it is given an irrationality measure for some Cantor series, for that we generalize the Smarandache function. Also we give an irrationality measure for $e$ that is a bit better than the given one in [2].
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2 Cantor’s Theorem

Definition 1 Let \( a_0, a_1, \ldots, b_1, b_2, \ldots \) be sequences of integers that satisfy the inequalities \( b_n \geq 2 \), and \( 0 \leq a_n \leq b_n - 1 \) if \( n \geq 1 \). Then the convergent series

\[
\theta := a_0 + \frac{a_1}{b_1} + \frac{a_2}{b_1b_2} + \frac{a_3}{b_1b_2b_3} + \ldots
\]

is called Cantor series.

Example 1 The number \( e \) is a Cantor series. For see that, take \( a_0 = 2, a_n = 1, b_n = n + 1 \) for \( n \geq 1 \).

We recall the following theorem due to Cantor [1].

Theorem (Cantor) Let \( \theta \) be a Cantor series. Suppose that each prime divides infinitely many of the \( b_n \). Then \( \theta \) is irrational if and only if both \( a_n > 0 \) and \( a_n < b_n - 1 \) hold infinitely often.

Proof For proving the necessary condition, observe that if \( a_n = 0 \) for \( n \geq n_0 \), then the series is a finite sum, hence \( \theta \) is rational. If \( a_n > 0 \) infinitely often, let us to construct a nested sequence of closed intervals \( I_n \) with intersection \( \theta \). Let \( I_1 = [a_0 + \frac{a_1}{b_1}, a_0 + \frac{a_1+1}{b_1}] \). Proceeding inductively, we have two possibilities, the first one, if \( a_n = 0 \), so define \( I_n = I_{n-1} \). When \( a_n \neq 0 \), divide the interval \( I_{n-1} \) into \( b_n - a_n + 1 \) (\( \geq 2 \)) subintervals, the first one with length \( \frac{a_n}{b_1\ldots b_n} \) and the other ones with equal length, namely, \( \frac{1}{b_1\ldots b_n} \), and let the first one be \( I_n \). By construction, \( |I_n| \geq \frac{1}{b_1\ldots b_n} \), for all \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) and when \( a_n \neq 0 \), the length of \( I_n \) is exactly \( \frac{1}{b_1\ldots b_n} \). By hypothesis on \( a_n \), there exist infinitely many \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), such that \( |I_n| = \frac{1}{b_1\ldots b_n} \). Thus, we have

\[
I_n = \left[ a_0 + \frac{a_1}{b_1} + \ldots + \frac{a_n}{b_1\ldots b_n}, a_0 + \frac{a_1}{b_1} + \ldots + \frac{a_n+1}{b_1\ldots b_n} \right] = \left[ \frac{A_n}{b_1\ldots b_n}, \frac{A_n+1}{b_1\ldots b_n} \right]
\]

where \( A_n \in \mathbb{Z} \) for each \( n \in \mathbb{N} \). Also \( \theta \in I_n \) for all \( n \geq 1 \). In fact, by hypothesis it is easy see that \( \theta > \frac{A_n}{b_1\ldots b_n} \), for all \( n \geq 1 \). For the other inequality, note that \( \frac{a_n}{b_n} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{b_n} \), for all \( m \in \mathbb{N} \), therefore

\[
b_1\ldots b_n (\theta - (a_0 + \frac{a_1}{b_1} + \ldots + \frac{a_n}{b_1\ldots b_n})) \leq 1 \tag{2}
\]

Now if \( a_n = b_n - 1 \) for \( n \geq n_0 \), then \( \theta \) is the right-hand endpoint of \( I_{n_0-1} \), because each \( I_n \) contains that endpoint and the lengths of the \( I_n \) tend to zero. Hence again \( \theta \) is rational. For showing the sufficient condition, note that if \( a_m < b_m - 1 \), then holds the strict inequality in (2), for each \( n < m \). Since \( a_n > 0 \) holds infinitely often,
\[ \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} I_n = \theta. \]

Suppose that \( \theta = \frac{p}{q} \in \mathbb{Q} \). Each prime number divides infinitely many \( b_n \), so there exist \( n_0 \) sufficiently large such that \( q|b_1 \cdots b_{n_0} \) and \( a_{n_0} \neq 0 \). Hence \( b_1 \cdots b_{n_0} = kq \) for some \( k \in \mathbb{N} \). Take \( N \geq n_0 \), such that, \( a_{N+1} < b_{N+1} - 1 \). Hence \( \theta \) lies in interior of \( I_N \). Also \( I_N = I_{n_0} + k \) for some \( k \geq 0 \). Suppose \( I_N = I_{n_0} \). We can write \( \theta = kpb_{n_0+1} \cdots b_{n_0+k} b_1 \cdots b_{n_0+c} \), thus \( A_n b_1 \cdots b_n < \theta - A_n + 1 < \frac{kp}{b_1 \cdots b_{n_0+c}} \). But that is a contradiction. If \( I_N = I_{n_0+k} \), for \( k \geq 1 \), then we write \( \theta = \frac{kp}{b_1 \cdots b_{n_0+k}} \). But that is again a contradiction. Therefore, it follows the irrationality of \( \theta \). \( \square \)

### 3 Irrationality measure

The next step is to give an irrationality measure for some Cantor series. Now, we construct an uncountable family of functions, where one of the \( m \) is exactly a well-known function for us.

**Definition 2** Given \( \sigma = (b_1, b_2, \ldots) \in \mathbb{N}^{\infty} \), satisfying

\((*)\) For all \( p \) prime number, the set \( \{ n \in \mathbb{N} \mid p|b_n \} \) is infinite.

We define the function \( D(\cdot, \sigma) : \mathbb{Z}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \), by

\[ D(q, \sigma) := \min\{ n \in \mathbb{N} \mid q|b_1 \cdots b_n \} \]

Note that \( D(\cdot, \sigma) \) is well defined, by condition \((*)\) and the well-ordering theorem.

In [2], J. Sondow showed that for all integers \( p \) and \( q \) with \( q > 1 \),

\[ \left| e - \frac{p}{q} \right| > \frac{1}{(S(q) + 1)!} \]

where \( S(q) \) is the smallest positive integer such that \( S(q)! \) is a multiple of \( q \) (the so-called Smarandache function, see [3]). Note that if \( \eta = (1, 2, 3, \ldots) \), then \( D(q, \eta) = S(q) \). Since \( e \) is a Cantor series and \( D(\cdot, \sigma) \) is a generalization of Smarandache function, it is natural to think in a generalization or an improvement to the inequality in (3).

**Lemma** Given \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), we have

\[ \left| \theta - \frac{m}{b_1 \cdots b_n} \right| \geq \min\left\{ \left| \theta - \frac{A_n}{b_1 \cdots b_n} \right|, \left| \theta - \frac{A_n + 1}{b_1 \cdots b_n} \right| \right\} \]

3
for all \( m \in \mathbb{Z} \).

**Proof** Suppose that the result fail for some \( m \in \mathbb{Z} \). So, \( \frac{m}{b_1 \cdots b_n} \) lies in interior of \( I_n \). Contradiction. Hence (4) holds for all \( m \in \mathbb{Z} \). \( \square \)

**Proposition** Suppose that a Cantor series \( \theta \), like in (1) and satisfying (\(*\)), is an irrational number. For all integers \( p \in \mathbb{Z} \) and \( q \in \mathbb{Z}^* \), with \( D(q, \sigma) > 1 \), let \( k \) be the smallest integer greater than \( D(q, \sigma) \) such that the interval \( I_k \) lies in the interior of \( I_{D(q, \sigma)} \). Then

\[
\left| \theta - \frac{p}{q} \right| > \frac{\min\{a_k, b_k - a_k - 1\}}{b_1 \cdots b_k}
\]  

(5)

where \( \sigma = (b_1, b_2, \ldots) \).

**Proof** Let \( \sigma = (b_1, b_2, \ldots) \). Set \( n = D(q, \sigma) \) and \( m = \frac{pb_1 \cdots b_n}{q} \). Therefore \( m \) and \( n \) are integers and

\[
\left| \theta - \frac{p}{q} \right| = \left| \theta - \frac{m}{b_1 \cdots b_n} \right|
\]

\[
\geq \min \left\{ \left| \theta - \frac{A_n}{b_1 \cdots b_n} \right|, \left| \theta - \frac{A_n + 1}{b_1 \cdots b_n} \right| \right\}
\]

(6)

\[
> \frac{\min\{a_k, b_k - a_k - 1\}}{b_1 \cdots b_k}
\]

(7)

The inequalities (6) and (7) follow respectively by Lemma 1 and the hypothesis on \( k \).

\( \square \)

The result below gives a slight improvement to (3).

**Corollary** If \( p \) and \( q \) are integers, with \( q \neq 0 \), then

\[
\left| e - \frac{p}{q} \right| > \frac{1}{(D(q, \sigma) + 2)!},
\]

(8)

where \( \sigma = (2, 3, 4, \ldots) \).

**Proof** Since that \( \min_{p \in \mathbb{Z}} |e - p| > 0.28 > \frac{1}{6} \), then (8) holds in the case \( q = \pm 1 \). In case \( q \neq \pm 1 \) the inequality also holds by Proposition and Example 1. Moreover, in this case we have \( S(q) - 1 \in \{ n \in \mathbb{N} \mid q|(n+1)! \} \) and \( D(q, \sigma) + 1 \in \{ n \in \mathbb{N} \mid q|n! \} \). Thus \( S(q) = D(q, \sigma) + 1 \). Hence

\[
\left| e - \frac{p}{q} \right| > \frac{1}{(D(q, \sigma) + 2)!} = \frac{1}{(S(q) + 1)!}
\]
Actually, the improvement happens only because (8) also holds for $q = \pm 1$.

**Example 2** The number $\xi := \frac{1}{(1)!^5} + \frac{1}{(2)!^5} + \frac{1}{(3)!^5} + \ldots = 1.031378...$ is irrational, moreover for $p, q \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $q \neq 0$, we have

$$\left|\xi - \frac{p}{q}\right| > \frac{1}{(D(q, \sigma) + 2)!^5}$$

where $\sigma = (2^5, 3^5, ...)$.
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