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Abstract
Let \( N \) be a positive integer. A sequence \( X = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_N) \) of points in the unit interval \([0, 1)\) is piercing if \( \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\} \cap \left[\frac{i}{N}, \frac{i+1}{N}\right] \neq \emptyset \) holds for every \( n = 1, 2, \ldots, N \) and every \( i = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1 \). In 1958 Steinhaus asked whether piercing sequences can be arbitrarily long. A negative answer was provided by Schinzel, who proved that any such sequence may have at most 74 elements. This was later improved to the best possible value of 17 by Warmus, and independently by Berlekamp and Graham.

In this paper we study a more general variant of piercing sequences. Let \( f(n) \geq n \) be an infinite nondecreasing sequence of positive integers. A sequence \( X = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{f(N)}) \) is \( f \)-piercing if \( \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{f(n)}\} \cap \left[\frac{i}{f(n)}, \frac{i+1}{f(n)}\right] \neq \emptyset \) holds for every \( n = 1, 2, \ldots, N \) and every \( i = 0, 1, \ldots, n-1 \). A special case of \( f(n) = n + d \), with \( d \) a fixed nonnegative integer, was studied by Berlekamp and Graham. They noticed that for each \( d \geq 0 \), the maximum length of any \((n+d)\)-piercing sequence is finite. Expressing this maximum length as \( s(d) + d \), they obtained an exponential upper bound on the function \( s(d) \), which was later improved to \( s(d) = O(d^3) \) by Graham and Levy. Recently, Konyagin proved that \( 2d \leq s(d) < 200d \) for all sufficiently big \( d \).

Using a different technique based on the Farey fractions and stick-breaking games, we prove here that the function \( s(d) \) satisfies \( |c_1d| \leq s(d) \leq c_2d + o(d) \), where \( c_1 = \frac{\ln 2}{\ln 3} \approx 2.25 \) and \( c_2 = \frac{1+\ln 2}{1-\ln 2} \approx 5.52 \). We also prove that there exists an infinite \( f \)-piercing sequence with \( f(n) = \gamma n + o(n) \) if and only if \( \gamma \geq \frac{1}{\ln 2} \approx 1.44 \).
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1 Introduction

In his book *Sto zadań* [11] from 1958, in English translation *One Hundred Problems in Elementary Mathematics* [12], Steinhaus posed the following problem (Problems 6 and 7 in Chapter 1):

Does there exist for every positive integer $N$ a sequence $X = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_N)$ of real numbers in $[0, 1]$ such that $\{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\} \cap \left[\frac{i}{n}, \frac{i+1}{n}\right) \neq \emptyset$ holds for every $n = 1, 2, \ldots, N$ and every $i = 0, 1, \ldots, n - 1$?

We call such sequences *piercing of order* $N$. The first solution was given by Schinzel (see [12]) who proved that no piercing sequence can have more than 74 elements. Then, Warmus [13] gave a complete solution by proving that the longest piercing sequence has 17 elements and constructing essentially all the possible solutions of which there are 768.

In the present paper we study a more general variant of piercing sequences. Let $f(n) \geq n$ be an infinite nondecreasing sequence of positive integers. A sequence $X = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{f(N)})$ is called $f$-piercing of order $N$ if $\{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{f(n)}\} \cap \left[\frac{i}{n}, \frac{i+1}{n}\right) \neq \emptyset$ holds for every $n = 1, 2, \ldots, N$ and every $i = 0, 1, \ldots, n - 1$. The original question of Steinhaus concerns the extremal case of $f(n) = n$.

A natural class of $f$-piercing sequences with the function $f(n) = n + d$, where $d$ is a fixed nonnegative integer, was introduced by Berlekamp and Graham [1]. They noticed that a fundamental result of Roth [10] on the discrepancy of sequences implies easily that for each $d \geq 0$, the maximum order of any $(n + d)$-piercing sequence is bounded. Denoting this order by $s(d)$, they proved (indeedly of Warmus) that $s(0) = 17$ and gave an exponential upper bound on $s(d)$. Later, a proof of the polynomial upper bound $s(d) \leq O(d^3)$ was sketched by Graham [3]. A full proof of this bound was recently completed by Levy [6], who also provided a lower bound $s(d) \geq \Omega(\sqrt{d})$. These results were very recently improved by Konyagin [4], who proved that $s(d) \geq 2d$ for all $d \geq 0$, and $s(d) < 200d$ for all $d \geq 4 \cdot 10^{16}$.

Using different techniques, we obtain here a further improvement on the bounds for the function $s(d)$. One of our main results reads as follows.

**Theorem 1.** The function $s(d)$ satisfies $[c_1 d] \leq s(d) \leq c_2 d + o(d)$, where $c_1 = \frac{\ln 2}{1 - \ln 2} \approx 2.25$ and $c_2 = \frac{1 + \ln 2}{1 - \ln 2} \approx 5.52$.

A natural question arising from the problem of Steinhaus is to determine the minimum growth of a function $f(n)$ allowing for arbitrarily long $f$-piercing sequences. It is not hard to see that $f(n) = 2n$ is one such function. Actually, it allows even for an infinite $f$-piercing sequence $X = (x_1, x_2, \ldots)$, defined by the natural condition that every prefix of $X$ of the form $(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{f(N)})$ is an $f$-piercing sequence of order $N$, for every $N \geq 1$. We prove the following general result.

**Theorem 2.** There exists an infinite $f$-piercing sequence with $f(n) = \gamma n + o(n)$ if and only if $\gamma \geq \frac{1}{\ln 2} \approx 1.44$.

The proof uses the following more general idea of *strongly* piercing sequences. A sequence $X = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{f(N)})$ is called strongly $f$-piercing of order $N$ if $\{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{f(n)}\} \cap
\[(y, y + \frac{1}{n}) \neq \emptyset \] holds for every \( n = 1, 2, \ldots, N \) and every real \( 0 \leq y \leq 1 - \frac{1}{n} \), i.e., \( \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{f(n)}\} \) intersects every interval of length \( \frac{1}{n} \) that is contained in \([0, 1)\). Clearly, any strongly \( f \)-piercing sequence is \( f \)-piercing in the former sense. Also, we may define analogously infinite sequences with this stronger piercing property.

We will prove in Section 2 that the assertion of Theorem 2 holds for strongly piercing sequences. Actually, the same result was obtained independently by de Bruijn and Erdős [2] already in 1948, by a different argument. Next, in Section 3 we explore connections between piercing and strongly piercing sequences more closely, using as a tool the well known Farey fractions. This will allow for deriving the only if part of Theorem 2 and the proof of Theorem 1 in Section 4. In the last section we pose some open problems.

2 Strongly piercing sequences via stick-breaking games

Consider the following stick-breaking game. At the beginning we have a segment of unit length. In each subsequent round we choose one of the existing segments and break it into two subsegments. Before the \( k \)-th round we have exactly \( k \) segments with the total length always equal to one. Let \( M_k \) denote the the maximum length of a segment before the \( k \)-th round. Our goal in the game is to minimize the value of the limit \( \gamma = \limsup(kM_k) \) as \( k \to \infty \). Notice that \( kM_k \) is equal to the ratio \( M_k/M \), where \( M \) is the average length of a segment before the \( k \)-th round.

The idea of studying uniform distribution of a sequence of points via stick-breaking games was explored earlier by Ramshaw [9]. Clearly, any infinite sequence \( X = (x_1, x_2, \ldots) \) of points in the unit segment determines uniquely a strategy in the stick-breaking game, and vice versa, any stick-breaking strategy gives rise to a unique sequence \( X \). Moreover, it is not hard to check that the sequence \( X \) is strongly \((\gamma n + o(n))\)-piercing if and only if \( \gamma \geq \limsup_{k \to \infty}(kM_k) \).

Consider now the following stick-breaking strategy. In each round we choose one of the longest segments and break it into two in the ratio \((1 - r) : r\), where \( 0 < r < 1/2 \) is a fixed number. We call this strategy nonchalant with parameter \( r \).

\[ \text{Theorem 3. For every irrational } 0 < r < \frac{1}{2}, \text{ the nonchalant strategy with parameter } r \text{ satisfies} \]
\[ \gamma = \limsup_{k \to \infty}(kM_k) = -\frac{1}{r \ln r + (1 - r) \ln(1 - r)} . \]

\[ \text{Proof. We need to find the limit of the ratio } M_k/M \text{ as } k \to \infty. \text{ For that purpose we are going to define a corresponding continuous process of cell splitting in time. In the original setting, every segment (cell) is characterized with its length } d, \text{ and, as the number of round } k \text{ increases, the cells with the highest } d \text{ split. Instead of that, we will consider the number } \tau = -\ln(d/M_k) \text{ as the cell's characteristic, representing the moment when the cell will split (or, equivalently, its remaining lifetime). Note that the cell with the highest length } d = M_k \text{ has the split moment equal to } 0, \text{ which is consistent with the fact that it is the cell that splits exactly at the round } k. \]

The process thus begins with one cell that divides at time \( t = 0 \) and each cell (of length \( d \), say) splits after the prescribed time into two parts, one of which has length \( dr \) and the other \( d(1 - r) \), living for the time equal to \( a = -\ln r \) and \( b = -\ln(1 - r) \), respectively.

In order to find the average length of the interval, we need to find \( E(e^{-\tau}) \), the average value of \( e^{-\tau} \) under the condition that the oldest cells (having \( \tau = 0 \), which means the longest in the original process) are splitting. Note that by the definition of \( \tau \) we have \( E(e^{-\tau}) = M/M_k \).
If $\frac{p}{q}$ is a rational number, equal to $\frac{b}{a}$ with $\gcd(p, q) = 1$, then we can define $t = \frac{a}{q} = \frac{b}{p}$ as the unit of time and observe that at any particular moment there can be at most $q+1$ "generations" of existing cells, with splitting moments different by an integer multiplicity of $t$.

Let us focus on the sequence $d_n$, defined as the number of cells that split at the moment $nt$. By construction, $d_n = d_{n-p} + d_{n-q}$ for $n \geq q$, which together with the initial conditions gives us the generating function

$$D(x) = \sum d_n x^n = \frac{1}{1-x^p-x^q}.$$ 

The above formula shows that asymptotically $d_n \approx C \beta^{-n}$, where $\beta$ is the smallest (in the absolute value) complex root of $1-x^p-x^q$. This root is the only positive real number satisfying $\beta^p + \beta^q = 1$, which in turn is the positive number satisfying $\beta^q = r$ and $\beta^p = 1-r$. Thus, $\beta = e^{-t}$.

Writing down the asymptotic formulas for the cardinalities of all generations of cells we obtain the following formula for the average value of $e^{-\tau}$:

$$E(e^{-\tau}) \approx \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{p-1} \beta^p \beta^i + \sum_{i=0}^{q-1} \beta^q \beta^i}{\sum_{i=0}^{p-1} \beta^i + \sum_{i=0}^{q-1} \beta^i} = (1-\beta)(p\beta^p + q\beta^q) = -\frac{1}{t} \left( r \ln r + (1-r) \ln(1-r) \right).$$

Since $E(e^{-\tau}) = M/M_k$, we have

$$kM_k = \frac{M_k}{M} = -\frac{1}{r \ln r + (1-r) \ln(1-r)} \frac{t}{1-e^{-t}}.$$ 

For an irrational $b/a$, we use an approximating sequence of irreducible rational numbers $p_n/q_n \to b/a$. Since in such a sequence $q_n \to \infty$ and $a$ is fixed, the sequence of time units $t_n = a/q_n \to 0$, which implies $t_n/(1-e^{-t_n}) \to 1$, and thus in the limit we obtain

$$\text{lim sup}_{k \to \infty} (kM_k) = -\frac{1}{r \ln r + (1-r) \ln(1-r)},$$

as asserted.

The above theorem easily implies the following result due to de Bruijn and Erdős [2].

**Corollary 4 (de Bruijn and Erdős [2]).** There exists a strongly $f$-piercing sequence with $f(n) = \frac{1}{\ln 2} n + o(n)$.

**Proof.** We choose any sequence $r_n$ of irrational numbers approaching $1/2$ as $n \to \infty$. By applying Theorem 3 we obtain

$$\text{lim sup}_{k \to \infty} (kM_k) = -\frac{1}{1/2 \ln 1/2 + (1 - 1/2) \ln(1/2)} = \frac{1}{\ln 2}.$$ 

The original proof of this statement in [2] provides an elegant explicit example of the desired sequence. Namely, it is proved there that the sequence of fractional parts of the numbers $x_i = \log_2(2i - 1)$, $i = 1, 2, \ldots$, has the claimed strong piercing property. It is also proved in [2] that the constant $\frac{1}{\ln 2}$ in this result is optimal. For the sake of completeness, we present their proof of this fact. In particular, the key Lemma [5] also plays a role in the proof of Theorem 1.

For any positive integer $n$, let $H_n$ denote the $n$-th Harmonic number, i.e., $H_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{i}$. 

Lemma 5 (de Bruijn and Erdős [2]). For every integer \( N \geq 2 \), define \( \gamma_N = \frac{1}{m_N - m_{N-1}} \). For every sequence \( X = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{2N}) \) of reals in \([0, 1]\), for every \( N \leq n \leq 2N \), let \( Y^n \) be the sequence of numbers \( 0, x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n, 1 \) arranged in increasing order, i.e., \( Y^n = (y^n_0, y^n_1, \ldots, y^n_n) = \text{sorted}(0, 1, x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n) \), and \( b_n \) be the maximum difference between any two consecutive elements of \( Y^n \), i.e., \( b_n = \max_{i=1,2,\ldots,n+1} (y^n_{i+1} - y^n_i) \). Then, for at least one \( N \leq n \leq 2N \), we have \( b_n \geq \gamma_N \cdot \frac{1}{n} \).

Proof. Assume to the contrary that \( b_n < \gamma_N \cdot \frac{1}{n} \) holds for every \( N \leq n \leq 2N \). Let \( d_1 \geq d_2 \geq \ldots \geq d_{N+1} \) be the sequence of differences between consecutive elements of \( Y^n \) arranged in non-increasing order. First, observe that \( d_1 + d_2 + \ldots + d_{N+1} = 1 \). Second, as adding one point to the sequence splits only one difference between two consecutive elements, we have \( b_N = d_1, b_{N+1} \geq d_2, b_{N+2} \geq d_3, \ldots, b_{2N} \geq d_{N+1} \). Thus, we get

\[
1 = \sum_{i=1}^{N+1} d_i \leq 2N, \quad b_n < \gamma_N \sum_{n=N}^{2N} \frac{1}{n} = \gamma_N (H_{2N} - H_{N-1})
\]

which contradicts the choice of \( \gamma_N \).

Theorem 6 (de Bruijn and Erdős [2]). There does not exist a strongly \( f \)-piercing sequence with \( f(n) = \gamma n + o(n) \) for any real number \( \gamma < \frac{1}{\ln 2} \).

Proof. Let \( X \) be an infinite strongly \( f \)-piercing sequence with \( f(n) = \gamma n + o(n) \) and \( \gamma < \frac{1}{\ln 2} \). As \( H_{2N} - H_{N-1} \rightarrow \ln 2 \) when \( N \rightarrow \infty \), we can choose \( N_0 \) big enough so that for every \( n > N_0 \), we have that \( f(n) \geq \frac{n}{m_n} \) for every \( n \leq 2N \). For every \( f(N_0) \leq n \leq 2f(N_0) \) we have that \( Z_n = (X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n) \) is strongly \( f \)-piercing of order \( \frac{n}{m_n} \). Lemma 5 states that for some \( f(N_0) \leq n \leq 2f(N_0) \) we have that the maximum distance between elements of \([0, 1, X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n]\) is bigger than \( \frac{1}{(H_{2N} - H_{N-1})n} \) which gives a contradiction.

3 Piercing sequences and Farey fractions

Our main tool are the well known sequences of Farey fractions. Recall that the sequence of Farey fractions of order \( p \) consists of all irreducible fractions in the unit interval \([0, 1]\) whose denominators do not exceed \( p \) (see [7]). We use the term Farey points for the points on the real line corresponding to Farey fractions.

We need the following notation and terminology. For any integers \( 0 < n \leq m \), let

\[
\text{FP}_m^n = \left\{ \frac{a}{p} : n \leq p \leq m, 0 \leq a \leq p \right\}
\]

denote the set of Farey points that can be expressed by a fraction with denominator between \( n \) and \( m \). We say that two points \( \frac{a}{p}, \frac{b}{q} \in \text{FP}_m^n \) are consecutive in \( \text{FP}_m^n \), \( \frac{a}{p} \) is previous for \( \frac{b}{q} \) in \( \text{FP}_m^n \), and \( \frac{b}{q} \) is next for \( \frac{a}{p} \) in \( \text{FP}_m^n \), when \( \frac{a}{p} < \frac{b}{q} \) and there is no other \( \frac{c}{r} \in \text{FP}_m^n \) with \( \frac{a}{p} < \frac{c}{r} < \frac{b}{q} \). Similarly, let

\[
\text{FP}_m^m = \left\{ \frac{a}{p}, \frac{a+1}{p} : n \leq p \leq m, 0 \leq a \leq p - 1 \right\}
\]
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denote the set of Farey intervals defined by Farey points in $\text{FP}_n^m$. Lastly, let

$$\text{AI}^n = \left\{ \left[ y, y + \frac{1}{n} \right] : 0 \leq y \leq \frac{n-1}{n} \right\}$$

denote the set of all intervals of length $\frac{1}{n}$ that are contained in $[0,1)$.

We begin our investigation with a lemma, that captures the following intuition. Given any two reals $\alpha > \beta > 1$ and $n$ big enough, almost every interval of length $\frac{1}{n}$ contains one of the Farey intervals with denominator between $\beta n$ and $\alpha n$. There are some exceptional regions in $[0,1)$, but not too many.

**Lemma 7.** Let $W \geq 2$ be a fixed integer, $\alpha = \frac{W+1}{W-1}$, and $\beta = \frac{W}{W+1}$. For every $N > N_0 = N_0(W) = 2W^3$, and every interval $[y, y + \frac{1}{W}] \in \text{AI}^N$, we have that either

1. \([y, y + \frac{1}{W}]\) contains one of Farey intervals $\left[ \frac{c}{r}, \frac{c+1}{r} \right] \in \text{FI}_{\lceil \alpha N \rceil}$, or
2. $|y - \frac{b}{q}| < \frac{W+1}{N}$ for some Farey point $\frac{b}{q} \in \text{FP}_1^{W-1}$.

**Proof.** For any $y \in [0, \frac{N-1}{N})$, we say that a Farey point $\frac{c}{r}$ in $\text{FP}_{\lceil \alpha N \rceil}^1$ is a valid cover of $y$ when $y < \frac{c}{r} \leq y + \frac{1}{W}$. Observe that for any valid cover $\frac{c}{r}$ of $y$, we get

$$y < \frac{c}{r} < \frac{c+1}{r} \leq y + \frac{1}{W} \leq y + \frac{1}{W} + \frac{1}{r} = y + \frac{1}{r},$$

and the interval $[y, y + \frac{1}{W}]$ contains Farey interval $\left[ \frac{c}{r}, \frac{c+1}{r} \right]$. Further, if $\frac{a}{p}$ is a valid cover of $\frac{b}{q}$, then $\frac{c}{r}$ is a valid cover of all $y$ in $\left[ \frac{a}{p}, \frac{b}{q} \right]$. Thus, we are interested in finding all pairs of Farey points consecutive in $\text{FP}_{\lceil \alpha N \rceil}^1$ that are in distance larger than $\frac{1}{W}$. We show that for every $\frac{a}{p} \in \text{FP}_{\lceil \beta N \rceil}^1$ either

1. there is a valid cover $\frac{c}{r}$ of $\frac{a}{p}$, or
2. there is a Farey point $\frac{b}{q} \in \text{FP}_1^{W-1}$ with $\left| \frac{a}{p} - \frac{b}{q} \right| < \frac{W}{N}$.

Now, fix any $\frac{b}{q} \in \text{FP}_1^{W-1}$ and observe that for an $\frac{a}{p} \in \text{FP}_{\lceil \beta N \rceil}^1$:

- If $\frac{a}{p} < \frac{b}{q}$ and $a \geq \frac{b(W-1)p - p - q}{q(W-1)}$, then for $\frac{c}{r} = \frac{a+b}{p+q}$ we have:

$$b(W-1)p - p - q \leq a(W-1)q$$

$$+ (a+b)(W-1)p \leq a(W-1)(p+q) + (p+q)$$

$$a + b \leq \frac{a}{p} + \frac{1}{(W-1)p}$$

$$\frac{a}{p} < \frac{c}{r} = \frac{a+b}{p+q} \leq \frac{a}{p} + \frac{1}{(W-1)p} \leq \frac{a}{p} + \frac{1}{(W-1)p} = \frac{a}{p} + \frac{1}{ WN}.$$ 

Hence, $\frac{c}{r}$ is a valid cover of $\frac{a}{p}$, if $p+q = r \leq \lfloor \alpha N \rfloor$.

- Similarly, if $\frac{a}{p} > \frac{b}{q}$ and $a \leq \frac{b(W-1)p - p - q}{q(W-1)}$, then for $\frac{c}{r} = \frac{a-b}{p-q}$ we have:

$$\frac{a}{p} < \frac{c}{r} = \frac{a-b}{p-q} \leq \frac{a}{p} + \frac{1}{(W-1)p}$$

$$\frac{a}{p} < \frac{c}{r} = \frac{a-b}{p-q} \leq \frac{a}{p} + \frac{1}{(W-1)p} \leq \frac{a}{p} + \frac{1}{(W-1)p} = \frac{a}{p} + \frac{1}{ WN}.$$ 

Thus, $\frac{c}{r}$ is a valid cover of $\frac{a}{p}$, if $p-q = r \geq \lceil \beta N \rceil$.

Inspired by these observations, we say that a Farey point $\frac{b}{q} \in \text{FP}_1^{W-1}$ provides cover of a Farey point $\frac{a}{p} \in \text{FP}_{\lceil \alpha N \rceil}^1$, if either

$$\frac{a}{p} < \frac{b}{q}, p+q \leq \lfloor \alpha N \rfloor, \text{ and } a \geq \frac{b(W-1)p - p - q}{q(W-1)}, \text{ or}$$

$$\frac{a}{p} > \frac{b}{q}, p-q \geq \lceil \beta N \rceil, \text{ and } a \leq \frac{b(W-1)p - p - q}{q(W-1)}.$$
We say that such an
\[ W \]
with
\[ \alpha N \]
are depicted regions of those \( \frac{a}{p} \) for which \( \frac{b}{q} \) provides cover. It is not a coincidence that in
\[ W \]
regions covered by any two consecutive Farey points overlap. It is known that for any two Farey points \( \frac{b_1}{q_1} < \frac{b_2}{q_2} \) that are consecutive in \( \text{FP}_1^W \), there we have that \( q_1 + q_2 \geq W \), and \( b_2q_1 - b_1q_2 = 1 \) (see [7]). Thus, for any \( p \geq \beta N > 2W^3 > (W - 1)q_1q_2 \), we have
\[
q_2 + q_1 \geq (b_2q_1 - b_1q_2)(W - 1) + 1
\]
\[
\frac{b_1(W - 1)pq_2 + pq_1}{p}\]
\[
\frac{b_1(W - 1)pq_2 + pq_1 - q_1q_2}{q_1q_2}
\]
\[
\frac{b_1(W - 1)p - p - q_1q_2}{q_2}
\]
\[
\frac{(W - 1)q_1}{q_2}
\]
We get that for every \( \frac{a}{p} \) with \( p \in [\lceil \beta N \rceil + W - 1, \lceil \alpha N \rceil - W + 1] \) there is at least one \( \frac{b}{q} \in \text{FP}_1^{W - 1} \) that provides cover of \( \frac{a}{p} \). Further, for any two \( \frac{b_1}{q_1} < \frac{b_2}{q_2} \) consecutive in \( \text{FP}_1^{W - 1} \), and every \( p \geq \lceil \beta N \rceil \), there is at least one \( a \) such that \( \frac{b_2(W - 1)p - p - q_2}{q_1q_2} \leq \frac{b_2(W - 1)p - p - q_1q_2}{q_1q_2} \). We say that such an \( \frac{a}{p} \) glues \( \frac{b_1}{q_1} \) with \( \frac{b_2}{q_2} \). Observe that if \( \frac{a}{p} \) glues \( \frac{b_1}{q_1} \) with \( \frac{b_2}{q_2} \) and additionally \( p \leq \lceil \alpha N \rceil - q_2 \) then \( \frac{b_2}{q_2} \) provides cover for \( \frac{a}{p} \). Similarly, if \( p \geq \lceil \beta N \rceil + q_1 \), then \( \frac{b_1}{q_1} \) provides cover for \( \frac{a}{p} \). At least one of these is true and \( \frac{a}{p} \) always has a valid cover.

The last remaining problem is to find valid covers of Farey points with denominators close to \( \beta N \), or \( \alpha N \). We begin with those which are close to \( \alpha N \). Again, fix any \( \frac{b}{q} \in \text{FP}_1^{W - 1} \) and \( \frac{a}{p} \) with \( \frac{a}{p} \leq \frac{b}{q} - \frac{W}{N} \), \( \frac{a}{p} \geq \frac{b(W - 1)p - p - q}{q_1q_2} \), and \( p \geq \lceil \alpha N \rceil - q + 1 \). Let \( \frac{b}{q} \) be previous for \( \frac{b}{q} \) in \( \text{FP}_1^{W - 1} \). If \( \frac{b}{q} \) provides cover for \( \frac{a}{p} \) then we are done, so we know that \( \frac{a}{p} \) does not glue \( \frac{b}{q} \) with \( \frac{b}{q} \). Let \( \frac{a}{p} \) be such that \( \beta N \leq \frac{a}{p} \leq \frac{a}{p} + \frac{W}{N} \), \( r \equiv p \pmod{q} \), and \( c = \left\lfloor \frac{ar}{p} \right\rfloor \). We have that \( \frac{c}{r} \leq \frac{a}{p} \leq \frac{c + 1}{r} \). As \( \frac{a}{p} \) does not glue \( \frac{b}{q} \) with \( \frac{b}{q} \) and there is at least one \( c' \) such that \( \frac{c}{r} \) glue \( \frac{b}{q} \) with \( \frac{b}{q} \) we get that \( \frac{c}{r} \leq \frac{c'}{r} \leq \frac{a}{p} \), and \( \frac{b}{q} \) provides cover of both \( \frac{c}{r} \) and \( \frac{a}{p} \).

Now, let \( t = \frac{c - b}{q} \), and consider the sequence \( \frac{b_i}{q_i} = \frac{c - ib}{q} \), for \( i = 0, 1, \ldots, \frac{b - t}{q} = t \) and observe that for each \( i \geq 1 \), \( \frac{b_i}{q_i} \) is a valid cover of \( \frac{c - i}{r - i} \). See [2] for an example with \( W = 5, N = 300, \frac{a}{p} = \frac{2}{3}, \frac{a}{p} = \frac{285}{328}, \text{ and } \frac{285}{328} = \left( \frac{238}{370}, \frac{239}{379}, \ldots, \frac{285}{328} \right) \). For \( i = 0 \), we have...
Figure 2 $W = 5$, $N = 300$, $\alpha N = 450$, $\beta N = 375$. Farey point $\frac{2}{3}$ does not provide cover of $\frac{285}{448}$ (as $448 + 3 > \alpha N$, but line parallel to $\frac{2}{3}$ through points $\frac{238}{376}$ and $\frac{286}{448}$ crosses line $\frac{285}{448}$ somewhere above $\lceil \beta N \rceil$).

So, $\frac{c_i}{r_i} \leq \frac{a}{p} < \frac{c_i}{r_i}$, and there is some $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, t\}$, such that $\frac{c_{i-1}}{r_{i-1}} \leq \frac{a}{p} < \frac{c_i}{r_i}$. As $\frac{c_i}{r_i}$ is a valid cover of $\frac{c_{i-1}}{r_{i-1}}$, it is also a valid cover of $\frac{a}{p}$.

It remains to find valid covers for Farey points with denominators close to $\beta N$. Similarly to previous case, for $\frac{2}{3} \leq \frac{b}{q} + \frac{W}{N}$, $a \leq \frac{b(W-1)p - p}{Wq(W-1)}$, and $p \leq \lceil \beta N \rceil + q - 1$, we choose $\frac{c_i}{r_i}$ with $[\alpha N] - q < r \leq [\alpha N]$, $r \equiv p \pmod{q}$, and $c = a + 1 + b \cdot \frac{W-1}{q}$. Now, consider the sequence $\frac{c_i}{r_i} = \frac{c_i - b}{r_i}$ for $i = 0, 1, \ldots, t = \frac{W}{q}$, and observe that for each $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, t\}$, $\frac{c_i}{r_i}$ is a valid cover of $\frac{c_{i-1}}{r_{i-1}}$. For $i = t$ we have $\frac{c_i}{r_i} = \frac{a + 1}{p} > \frac{a}{p}$. By an analogous calculation as in the previous case, we get that $\frac{c_i}{r_i} \leq \frac{a}{p}$. Thus, for some $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, t\}$ we have $\frac{c_{i-1}}{r_{i-1}} \leq \frac{a}{p} < \frac{c_i}{r_i}$. As $\frac{c_i}{r_i}$ is a valid cover of $\frac{c_{i-1}}{r_{i-1}}$, it is also a valid cover of $\frac{a}{p}$.

We have found a valid cover of every Farey point in $\text{FP}_{\lceil \alpha N \rceil}$, except those that are in
there is an $g$ from some Farey point in $\text{FP}_1^{W-1}$. This gives a valid cover of every real point $y$ except possibly those that are in distance smaller than $\frac{W+1}{N_0}$ from some Farey point in $\text{FP}_1^{W-1}$ and ends the proof.

Observe that there are only $O(W^2)$ Farey points in $\text{FP}_1^{W-1}$, and the length of the union of all intervals in $\text{AI}^n$ that do not include any interval from $\text{FI}_{\alpha N}^\beta$ is $O(W^3)$. This length tends to zero as $N$ tends to infinity. The next lemma exploits this fact to construct a strongly piercing sequence from a piercing one having similar parameters.

Lemma 8. Let $W \geq 2$ be a fixed integer, and let $\alpha = \frac{W+1}{W-1}$. For every function $f(n) = \gamma n + o(n)$, there exist $N_0$ and a function $g(n) = \alpha^2 \gamma n + o(n)$ such that for every $N \geq N_0$ if there is an $f$-piercing sequence $X$ of order $\lfloor \alpha N \rfloor$, then there is a strongly $g$-piercing sequence $Z$ of order $N$.

Proof. Let $\beta = \frac{W-1}{W}$, and choose $N_0 > 2W^3$ so that $f(N) < \alpha \gamma N$ for all $N \geq N_0$. We define $g(n) = \alpha^2 \gamma n + N_0 + 5W^3(\log_2 n + 1)$. Assume that $X = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_f(\lfloor \alpha N \rfloor))$ is an $f$-piercing sequence of order $\lfloor \alpha N \rfloor$.

Now, for any $N_0 \leq n \leq N$ and any interval $[y, y + \frac{1}{n}] \in \text{AI}^n$, we have that either $|y - \frac{a}{b}| < \frac{W+1}{n}$ for some Farey point in $\text{FP}_1^{W-1}$, or $[y, y + \frac{1}{n}]$ contains at least one of the intervals from $\text{FI}_{\alpha N}^\beta$. As the first $f(\lfloor \alpha N \rfloor)$ elements of $X$ is an $f$-piercing sequence of order $\lfloor \alpha N \rfloor$, we have that for each interval $I$ in $\text{FI}_{\alpha N}^\beta$, there is at least one $x_i \in I$ for some $i = 1, 2, \ldots, f(\lfloor \alpha N \rfloor)$.

Our goal is to construct a strongly $g$-piercing sequence $Z$ of order $N$. Sequence $Z$ will include $X$ as a subsequence, and thus have a point in almost every interval of length $\frac{1}{n}$. Intuitively, it remains to add some points to $Z$ that handle correctly $n < N_0$, and intervals $[y, y + \frac{1}{n}]$ with $y$ close to some Farey point in $\text{FP}_1^{W-1}$.

Now, for any nonnegative integer $r$ we define the set

$$H_r^W = \left\{ \frac{b}{q} + \frac{a}{2^r} : \frac{b}{q} \in \text{FP}_1^{W-1}, -2(W+1) \leq a \leq 2(W+1) \right\} \cap [0, 1].$$

As there are less than $(W-1)^2$ points in $\text{FP}_1^{W-1}$, there are less than $5W^3$ elements in any $H_r^W$. Observe, that for every $2^{r-1} \leq n \leq 2^r$, every $\frac{b}{q} \in \text{FP}_1^{W-1}$, and every $y$ with $|y - \frac{a}{b}| < \frac{W+1}{n}$ we have that interval $[y, y + \frac{1}{n}]$ contains at least one of the points in $H_r^W$. In what follows, we treat $H_r^W$ as a sequence of points arranged in any order.

We are ready to construct a sequence $Z$ that combines sequences $H_r^W$ with $X$. We construct $Z$ incrementally by adding some sequences to the end. For two finite sequences $P$ and $Q$, we write $P \odot Q$ to denote their concatenation.

First, we explicitly add points to all intervals in $\text{AI}^1, \text{AI}^2, \ldots, \text{AI}^{N_0}$, and elements $x_1, \ldots, x_{f(1)}$. Let

$$Z_0 = \left( \frac{1}{N_0}, \frac{2}{N_0}, \ldots, \frac{N_0 - 1}{N_0} \right) \odot (x_1, \ldots, x_{f(1)}).$$

Next, let $l = \lfloor \log_2 \lfloor \alpha N \rfloor \rfloor$, and for each $r = 1, \ldots, l$, we extend $Z$ with points from $H_r^W$ and part of $X$. Let

$$Z_r = Z_{r-1} \odot H_r^W \odot (x_{f(2^{r-1})+1}, \ldots, x_{f(2^r)}).$$

Finally, let

$$Z = Z_l \odot H_{l+1}^W \odot (x_{f(2^l)+1}, \ldots, x_{f(\lfloor \alpha N \rfloor)}).$$

Now we show that $Z$ is strongly $g$-piercing of order $N$. For every $1 \leq n \leq N_0$ we have $g(n) \geq N_0$, and every interval of length $\frac{W}{N_0}$ contains one of the points from $Z_0$. For every $N_0 < n \leq N$, the first $g(n)$ elements of $Z$ contain:
We are ready to prove our two main theorems stated in the Introduction.

\section{Proofs of the main results}

We are ready to prove our two main theorems stated in the Introduction.

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textbf{Theorem 1.} \textit{There exists an infinite f-piercing sequence with f(n) = \gamma n + o(n) if and only if} \( \gamma \geq \frac{1}{\ln 2} \approx 1.44 \).

\textbf{Proof.} \textit{The} \( f \) \textit{part follows immediately from Corollary \ref{corollary}}.

For the \textit{only if} part, suppose that there exist some infinite \( f \)-piercing sequence \( X \) with \( f(n) = \gamma n + o(n) \) and \( \gamma < \frac{1}{\ln 2} \). Choose \( W \geq 2 \) big enough, so that for \( \alpha = \frac{W+1}{\ln 2} \), we have that \( \alpha^2 \gamma < \frac{1}{\ln 2} \). By Lemma \ref{lemma}, we get \( N_0 \) and \( g(n) \) with \( g(n) = \alpha^2 \gamma n + o(n) \). For every \( N > N_0 \) we can apply Lemma \ref{lemma} to the prefix of the first \( \lfloor \alpha N \rfloor \) elements of \( X \) and obtain sequence \( Z_N \). It is obvious from the construction used in Lemma \ref{lemma} that the sequence of sequences \( Z_N \) for all \( N > N_0 \) converges to an infinite sequence \( Z \), and that sequence \( Z \) is strongly \( g \)-piercing. This contradicts Theorem \ref{theorem}.

\item \textbf{Theorem 2.} \textit{The function} \( s(d) \) \textit{satisfies} \( [c_1 d] \leq s(d) \leq c_2 d + o(d) \), where \( c_1 = \frac{\ln 2}{1 - \ln 2} \approx 2.25 \) and \( c_2 = \frac{1 + \ln 2}{1 - \ln 2} \approx 5.52 \).

\textbf{Proof.} \textit{For the lower bound, we may use the strongly} \( \left( \left\lceil \frac{\ln 2}{\ln \alpha} \right\rceil \right) \)-\textit{piercing sequence} \( X \) \textit{given by de Bruijn and Erdős, defined by} \( x_i = \log_2(2i + 1) \pmod{1} \), for \( i = 1, 2, \ldots, \left\lfloor \frac{\ln 2}{\ln \alpha} \right\rfloor \). For \( N \leq \left\lfloor \frac{\ln 2}{\ln \alpha} d \right\rfloor \), we have that \( N + d \geq \left\lceil \frac{N}{\ln 2} \right\rceil \) and \( X \) is strongly \((n + d)\)-piercing of order \( N \).

For the upper bound, assume to the contrary that \( s(d) \) is not \( \frac{1 + \ln 2}{1 - \ln 2} d + o(d) \). Then there exists a constant \( c > \frac{1 + \ln 2}{1 - \ln 2} \) such that \( s(d) > cd \) for infinitely many values of \( d \). Choose an integer \( W \) \textit{large enough so that for} \( \alpha = \frac{W+1}{\ln 2} \), we have that \( \frac{1 + \alpha^2 \ln 2}{\alpha^2 - 1} < c \). Then, choose \( d \) \textit{large enough so that} \( s(d) > \left\lceil \frac{1 + \alpha^2 \ln 2}{\alpha^2 - 1} d + 500W^3 \right\rceil \), and for \( N_0 = \left\lfloor \frac{s(d)}{\alpha} \right\rfloor \) we additionally have \( \frac{1}{\alpha n} H_{\lfloor \alpha n \rfloor / 2} - H_{\lfloor \alpha n / 2 \rfloor - 1} > \frac{1}{\alpha n} \). Observe that \( N_0 = \left\lfloor \frac{s(d)}{\alpha} \right\rfloor > \frac{1 + \alpha^2 \ln 2}{\alpha(1 - \alpha^2 \ln 2)} d + 400W^3 \), and let \( X = (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_{\lfloor \alpha N_0 \rfloor + d}) \) be an \((n + d)\)-piercing sequence of order \( \lfloor \alpha N_0 \rfloor \).

Let

\[ Z = H^W_{\lceil \log_3 \frac{N_0}{\alpha} \rceil} \oplus H^W_{\lceil \log_3 \frac{N_0}{\alpha} \rceil} \oplus H^W_{\lceil \log_3 \frac{N_0}{\alpha} \rceil} \oplus H^W_{\lceil \log_3 \frac{N_0}{\alpha} \rceil} \oplus H^W_{\lfloor \log_2 N_0 \rfloor} \oplus X \]

be a sequence of length \( 2L \) (as we can remove last element if necessary). We have \( 2L > \alpha N_0 \) and \( L > \frac{N_0}{\alpha} \). Observe that for every \( L \leq l \leq 2L \), we have that the first \( l \) elements of \( Z \) includes sequences \( H^W_{\lceil m \rceil} \), and at least first \( l - 20W^3 - 1 \) elements of \( X \). Observe that for \( M = l - 20W^3 - 1 - d \), as \( X \) is \((n + d)\)-piercing, we have that the first \( l - 20W^3 - 1 \) elements of \( X \) include a point in every interval \( \lceil \frac{1}{\alpha m} \rceil \) for every \( m = 1, 2, \ldots, M \), and \( i = 0, 1, \ldots, m - 1 \). Further, \( \frac{N_0}{\alpha} < \frac{M}{\alpha} \leq N_0 \), and Lemma \ref{lemma} gives that the maximum distance between consecutive first \( l \) elements of \( Z \) is at most \( \frac{1}{\alpha} \).

On the other hand, applying Lemma \ref{lemma} to \( Z \) we get that for some \( L \leq l \leq 2L \) we have that the maximum distance between consecutive elements of \( \{0, 1, Z_1, Z_2, \ldots, Z_l\} \) is bigger
than \( \frac{1}{(H_{2L} - H_{L-1})} > \frac{1}{(H_{\lfloor N_0/2 \rfloor} - H_{\lfloor N_0/2 \rfloor - 1})} > \frac{1}{\alpha l \ln 2} \). It remains to prove that \( \frac{\alpha}{M} \leq \frac{1}{\alpha l \ln 2} \) to get a contradiction.

Starting with the assumption on the order of \( s(d) \) we get the following.

\[
\begin{align*}
    s(d) & \geq \frac{d(1 + \alpha^2 \ln 2) + 2 + 40W^3}{1 - \alpha^2 \ln 2} / +d \\
    2L & \geq s(d) + d \geq \frac{2d + 2 + 40W^3}{1 - \alpha^2 \ln 2} / : 2 \\
    l & \geq L \geq \frac{d + 1 + 20W^3}{1 - \alpha^2 \ln 2} \\
    l(1 - \alpha^2 \ln 2) & \geq d + 1 + 20W^3 \\
    M = l - 20W^3 - 1 - d & \geq \alpha^2 l \ln 2 / : \alpha \\
    \frac{M}{\alpha} & \geq \alpha l \ln 2.
\end{align*}
\]

5 Final remarks

Let us conclude the paper with some discussion on possible future directions of studies in this topic.

Perhaps the most natural and challenging one concerns the determination of the concrete values of the function \( s(d) \). We know only that \( s(0) = 17 \), by the result of Warmus [13], and that \( s(1) \geq 31 \), by an explicit example found by Oliveira e Silva [8], who also claims that \( s(1) = 31 \) was verified by computer search. Some computational experiments were also made by Levy in his PhD thesis [5], but no conjecture is stated there. Even now, though we know of quite close linear bounds from both sides for the function \( s(d) \), a more exact formula for \( s(d) \) seems rather elusive. However, it would be interesting to determine exactly the multiplicative constant in the presumed asymptotics of \( s(d) \). We conjecture that our lower bound is the correct value.

\[\text{Conjecture 9. The limit } \lim_{d \to \infty} \frac{s(d)}{d} = \frac{\ln 2}{1 - \ln 7}.\]

Let us stress, however, that it is not known whether the above limit actually exists.
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