

PUSH-FORWARD OF GEOMETRIC DISTRIBUTIONS UNDER COLLATZ ITERATION: PART 1

MARY REES

ABSTRACT. Two conjectures are presented. The first, Conjecture 1, is that the pushforward of a *geometric distribution* on the integers under n Collatz iterates, modulo 2^p , is usefully close to uniform distribution on the integers modulo 2^p , if p/n is small enough. Conjecture 2 is that the density is bounded from zero for the incidence of both 0 and 1 for the coefficients in the dyadic expansions of $-3^{-\ell}$ on all but an exponentially small set of paths of a *geometrically distributed* random walk on the two-dimensional array of these coefficients. It is shown that Conjecture 2 implies Conjecture 1. At present, Conjecture 2 is unresolved.

1. INTRODUCTION

Like many of the best mathematical problems, the origin of the Collatz Conjecture is hazy. I cannot do better than refer to the introductory articles of Jeffrey Lagarias in the volume of papers edited by him [7]. My colleague Terry (CTC) Wall, whose engagement with this question has been important to me (if not completely voluntary), has confirmed that he and fellow mathematicians came across the Conjecture in Cambridge in the 1950's [7]. My personal obsession took hold during the covid pandemic. In April 2020, I was looking online for advice to pass on, and I came across Terence Tao's paper [9]. This paper is a very important motivation for much of what follows, and so will be referred to very frequently, but first, here are a couple of observations, facile but worth note.

The Collatz Conjecture is about an iteration on the integers, a dynamical system for which the phase space is the set of integers. These are fascinating but generally impossible exercises. Collatz' notebooks from the 1930's onwards contain many interesting examples ([6], [7]), most of them still unsolved. Dynamicists always want to work with a topological space, preferably compact, or locally compact. A common technique, when studying Collatz iteration, is to use the embedding of the integers into the ring of dyadic integers – or triadic integers. Triadic integers appear, largely implicitly, in [9]. Dyadic integers appear in

this paper, for essentially the same reason as triadic in [9]. Dyadic and triadic will appear together in Part 2. It is possible to extend Collatz iteration to the ring of dyadic integers [6], and this embedding will be used here. But we will not be using the larger dynamical system. That is basically much simpler – just because it is a standard shift space, a typical chaotic dynamical system.

Another tool which has become ubiquitous across mathematics is probability. Probability can be added in any context, and one can ask how “most” mathematical objects behave. If a problem seems intractable, put a probability on the phase space and try to prove the conjecture with high probability, preferably with probability approaching one. There is a long history of introducing probability into the Collatz Conjecture, back to the 1970’s. Stochastic models were constructed by Lagarias and Weiss [8]. [9] is a more recent and extremely powerful application. There might be some hope that probabilistic arguments not only give interesting new results but, ultimately, resolve the original conjecture. Tao passes on an argument from Ben Green that a “probability one” result for the Collatz Conjecture could be as difficult to prove as the original conjecture. The current work grew out of an attempt to do something for the integers that get “left behind” by Tao’s method. At the time of writing this remains a string of conjectures, each implied by the next, but there does seem to be potential for further progress. The first and final conjectures in the sequence will be given shortly, as Conjecture 1 and Conjecture 2, appearing later as Corollary 4.2 to Conjecture 4.1, and Conjecture 4.13.

1.1. Definitions. $Col : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ is defined by

$$(1.1.1) \quad Col(N) = \begin{cases} 3N + 1 & \text{if } N \text{ is odd,} \\ \frac{1}{2}n & \text{if } N \text{ is even} \end{cases}$$

So $Col(0) = 0$ and Col preserves the sets of strictly positive integers $\mathbb{N} + 1$ and strictly negative integers. $Syr : \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow 2\mathbb{Z} + 1$ is defined by

$$(1.1.2) \quad Syr(N) = N_2 = Col^{x+y+1}(N)$$

if $N = 2^y N_1$ with N_1 odd and $Col(N_1) = 2^x N_2$ and N_2 is odd. Then $Syr(1) = 1$ and $Syr(-1) = -1$. It is convenient to extend Syr to all nonzero integers, not just the odd ones, although of course $\text{Im}(Syr) = 2\mathbb{Z} + 1$, and Syr , too, preserves the sets of strictly positive, and strictly negative, integers. If a_i ($i \geq 1$) is a sequence of numbers then we write

(following [9])

$$a_{[1,n]} = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i.$$

If $N \in 2\mathbb{Z} + 1$ then the sequence $x_i = x_i(N)$ of strictly positive integers associated to N is defined by

$$\text{Syr}^i(N) = \text{Col}^{x_i+1}(\text{Syr}^{i-1}(N)) = \text{Col}^{x_{[1,i]}+i}(N).$$

If $n \neq 0$ is even and $n = 2^{x_0}n_1$ with n_1 odd then for all $i \geq 1$,

$$\text{Syr}^i(n) = \text{Col}^{x_{[0,i]}+i}(n)$$

1.2. Collatz Conjecture. There are several equivalent forms. The equivalence for the last form follows from the well-known Theorem 2.6.

- If $N \in \mathbb{N} + 1$ then $\text{Col}^k(N) \in \{1, 2, 4\}$ for all sufficiently large k .
- if $n \in \mathbb{N} + 2$ then for some k we have $\text{Col}^k(N) < N$.
- If N is a positive odd integer then $\text{Syr}^k(N) = 1$ for all sufficiently large N .
- If N is a positive odd integer and $N > 1$ then $\text{Syr}^k(N) < N$ for some k .
- If N is a positive odd integer with corresponding sequence x_k , then $x_k = 2$ for all sufficiently large k .

For negative integers the conjecture is that all orbits of the Syracuse map Syr end in one of three periodic orbits:

$$\begin{aligned} & -1 \rightarrow -1; \quad -5 \rightarrow -7 \rightarrow -5; \\ & -17 \rightarrow -25 \rightarrow -37 \rightarrow -55 \rightarrow -41 \rightarrow -61 \rightarrow -91 \rightarrow -17. \end{aligned}$$

In terms of the sequence x_i the conjecture is that the sequence x_i ends in the cycle $\dot{a} = aaa \cdots$ where a is one of the following:

$$1 : \quad 12; \quad 1112114.$$

The content of this Part 1 is that Conjecture 2 implies Conjecture 1. Definitions are given properly later.

Conjecture 1 *Let $1 < \mu < \infty$. Let x_i be independent, identically distributed random variables on $\mathbb{N} + 1$ with geometric distribution with mean μ , that is, the probability that $x_i = m$ is $(\mu - 1)^{m-1} \mu^{-m}$.*

There is a constant $c > 0$ which is bounded from 0 if μ is bounded and bounded from 1, such that the following holds for k sufficiently large and any $p \leq ck$. Let $N = N(x_1, \dots, x_k, 1)$ be the smallest odd positive number with $x_i = x_i(N)$ for $i \leq k$.

Then for any set $Y \subset \{i \in \mathbb{N} : 0 \leq i < 2^p\}$, and for $N = N(x_1, \dots, x_k, 1)$, we have

$$|\text{Prob}(\text{Syr}^k(N) \in Y \bmod 2^p)| \leq 4k \cdot 2^{-p} \#(Y).$$

Conjecture 2 *The following holds for a constant $c > 0$ depending on μ with $1 < \mu < \infty$. Fix k and $p \leq k$. Let the random variables x_i be as in Conjecture 1. Let the dyadic expansion of -3^{-j} be*

$$-3^{-j} = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_{i,j} 2^i.$$

Consider the paths $(\ell, x_{[\ell,k]} + p)$, $1 \leq \ell \leq k$. Then apart from a set of paths with probability $< e^{-ck}$, the density of $\ell \leq k$ with $a_{x_{[\ell,k]}+p,\ell} = 0$ is $\leq (1-c)k$ and similarly for the density of the set of ℓ with $a_{x_{[\ell,k]}+p,\ell} = 1$.

2. BASIC RESULTS

Versions of 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 appear in publications from the 1970's onwards ([2], [4], [5]). They are the basis of proofs of existence results for integers whose Collatz orbits terminate in the $1 \mapsto 4 \mapsto 2 \mapsto 1$ cycle or Syracuse orbits terminate in $1 \mapsto 1$, in particular for results of the type that the number of integers $N < N_0$ for which the Syracuse orbit terminates in $1 \mapsto 1$ is $\geq N_0^\alpha$ for some $\alpha > 0$, for all sufficiently large N_0 . These existence results are for integers N such that the orbit $\text{Syr}^k(N)$ is strictly decreasing in k , until $\text{Syr}^k(N) = 1$. The difficulty with computing Syracuse or Collatz orbits is that they generally are not strictly decreasing. It is quite easy to see that for “most” N , in any reasonable sense, there will be k for which $x_k = x_k(N) = 1$ and in that case we have $\text{Syr}^k(N) > \text{Syr}^{k-1}(N)$. Generally if orbits increase, control is lost. Tao’s very powerful methods [9] cannot handle this. Nor indeed can the methods presented here, at least, not yet.

Lemma 2.1.

$$\text{Syr}(N) = \frac{3N+1}{2^k} \Leftrightarrow N = (-1)^k c_k + a_1 2^{k+1}$$

for some $a_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ if k is even, and $a_1 \in \mathbb{N} + 1$ if k is odd, where

$$(2.1.1) \quad \begin{aligned} c_k &= \begin{aligned} &2^{k-1} - 2^{k-2} + \dots + 1 = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} (-1)^j 2^j \quad \text{if } k \text{ is odd,} \\ &1 + 2^2 + \dots + 2^{k-2} = \sum_{j=0}^{k/2-1} 4^j \quad \text{if } k \text{ is even.} \end{aligned} \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\text{Syr}(N) = 6a_1 + (-1)^k.$$

Proof

$$3c_k = 2^k - (-1)^k$$

So

$$3(-1)^k c_k + 1 = (-1)^k 2^k.$$

So if $N = (-1)^k c_k + a_1 2^{k+1}$ we have

$$\frac{3N + 1}{2^k} = \frac{6a_1 2^k + (-1)^k 2^k}{2^k} = 6a_1 + (-1)^k.$$

□

- Lemma 2.2.** 1. $Syr(4N - 1) = 6N - 1$.
 2. $Syr(8N + 1) = 6N + 1$.
 3. $Syr^2(16N - 5) = Syr(24N - 7) = 18N - 5$.

The proof of this is straightforward calculation.

Lemma 2.3. For all $k \geq 1$,

$$(2.3.1) \quad Im(Syr^k) = (6\mathbb{N} + 1) \cup (6\mathbb{N} + 5).$$

Proof It follows from Lemma 2.1 (or 2.2) that (2.3.1) holds for $k = 1$. It will follow by induction if we can show that (2.3.1) also holds for $k = 2$. Using Lemma 2.1, it suffices to show that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, then for some even j

$$k2^{j+1} + c_j \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{6}$$

and for some odd ℓ

$$k2^{\ell+1} - c_\ell \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{6}$$

For then by Lemma 2.1

$$Syr(k2^{j+1} + c_j) = 6k + 1$$

and

$$Syr(k2^{\ell+1} - c_\ell) = 6k - 1$$

But also by Lemma 2.1, $k2^{j+1} + c_j \in Im(Syr)$ and $k2^{\ell+1} - c_\ell \in Im(Syr)$. First we consider the case of even $j = 2t$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} k2^{2t+1} + c_{2t} &= k2^{2t+1} + 1 + 2^2 + \cdots + 2^{2t-2} \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{6} \\ \Leftrightarrow k2^{2t} + 2(1 + \cdots + 2^{2t-4}) &\equiv (\pm 1 - 1)/2 \pmod{3} \\ \Leftrightarrow k + 2(t - 1) &\equiv (\pm 1 - 1)/2 \pmod{3} \\ \Leftrightarrow 2k + t &\equiv \pm 1 \pmod{3} \end{aligned}$$

Whatever k is, there are infinitely many integers t and $j = 2t$ so that this holds. Now we consider odd $\ell = 2t - 1$. Then we need

$$\begin{aligned} k2^{2t} + 1 - 2 + 2^2 \cdots + 2^{2t-2} &\equiv \pm 1 \pmod{6} \\ \Leftrightarrow k2^{2t} + 1(1 + 2 \cdots + 2^{2t-3}) &\equiv (\pm 1 - 1)/2 \pmod{3} \end{aligned}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow 2k + 2 + t - 2 \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{3}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow 2k + t \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{3}$$

which is the same equation as before. Once again, given k , there are infinitely many t and $\ell = 2t - 1$ such that this holds. \square

Most of us will have, at some stage, computed by hand Collatz orbits for numbers up to (say) 2^{10} , and will have used results such as 2.4 and 2.5.

Lemma 2.4. *For any i and j , if $x_{[1,i-1]}(p) < j$ and $x_{[1,i]}(p) \geq j$ and $0 < p < 2^j$ is odd, then*

$$(2.4.1) \quad \begin{aligned} x_\ell(p + 2^j) &= x_\ell(p) \text{ for } \ell \leq i - 1 \\ x_{[1,i]}(p + 2^j) &\geq j \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore:

$$(2.4.2) \quad \begin{aligned} x_{[1,i]}(p + 2^j) &= j \text{ if } x_{[1,i]}(p) > j \\ x_{[1,i]}(p + 2^j) &> j \text{ if } x_{[1,i]}(p) = j \end{aligned}$$

In particular $x_{[1,i]}(p + 2^j) \geq j + 1$ if $x_{[1,i]}(p) = j$.

Proof $x_i(p)$ is the least integer $\ell \geq 1$ such that

$$Col^{1+\ell}(Syr^{i-1}(p)) = Col^{1+x_{[1,i-1]}+\ell}(p)$$

is odd. By induction we have, for $1 \leq t \leq i - 1$

$$\begin{aligned} Syr^t(p + 2^j) &= Col^{x_t+1}(Syr^{t-1}(p + 3^{t-1}2^{j-x_{[1,t-1]}})) \\ &= Col^{x_t}(3Syr^{t-1}(p) + 1 + 3^t2^{j-x_{[1,t-1]}}) \\ &= Syr^t(p) + 3^t2^{j-x_{[1,t]}} \end{aligned}$$

and hence)

$$(2.4.3) \quad Syr^t(p + 2^j) = Syr^t(p) + 3^t2^{j-x_{[1,t]}}$$

Similarly

$$(2.4.4) \quad Col^{1+j-x_{[1,i-1]}}(Syr^{i-1}(p + 2^j)) = Col^{1+j-x_{[1,i-1]}}(Syr^{i-1}(p)) + 3^i$$

where the right-hand side is odd if $x_{[1,i]} > j$, and even if $x_{[1,i]} = j$. It follows that

$$(2.4.5) \quad \begin{aligned} x_{[1,i]}(p + 2^j) &= j & \text{if } x_{[1,i]}(p) > j \\ &> j & \text{if } x_{[1,i]}(p) = j \end{aligned}$$

\square

Lemma 2.5. *1. $2^m - 1$ and $2^{m-1} - 1$ have the same Syracuse orbit if m is even.*

2. $2^m - 1$ and $2^m + 2^{m-1} - 1$ have the same Syracuse orbit for all $m \geq 2$

3. $2^m + 2^{m-3} - 5$ and $2^m - 5$ have the same Syracuse orbit for all $m \geq 6$.

Proof. There are many variations on these statements. The first is certainly well known. Unfortunately there are nowhere near enough common orbits for this to be the basis for an induction.

1.

$$\text{Syr}^m(2^m - 1) = (3^m - 1)/2^q$$

where 2^{q-2} is the highest power of 2 which divides m — so that 2^q is the highest power of 2 dividing $3^m - 1$ — and

$$\text{Syr}^{m-1}(2^{m-1} - 1) = (3^{m-1} - 1)/2, \quad \text{Syr}((3^{m-1} - 1)/2) = (3^m - 1)/2^q,$$

where q is as before.

2.

$$\text{Syr}^{m-2}(2^m + 2^{m-1} - 1) = 2^2 \cdot 3^{m-2} + 2 \cdot 3^{m-2} - 1,$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Syr}^{m-1}(2^m + 2^{m-1} - 1) &= (2^2 \cdot 3^{m-1} + 2 \cdot 3^{m-1} - 2)/2^{q+1} \\ &= (3^m - 1)/2^q = \text{Syr}^m(2^m - 1), \end{aligned}$$

where 2^q is the highest power of 2 dividing $3^m - 1$.

3. For each $p \geq 1$ with $3p < n$,

$$\text{Syr}^{2p}(2^n - 5) = 3^{2p} \cdot 2^{n-3p} - 5,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Syr}^{2p-2}(2^n + 2^{n-3} - 5) &= \text{Syr}^{2p-2}(3^2 \cdot 2^{n-3} - 5) \\ &= 3^{2+2p-2} \cdot 2^{n-3-3(p-1)} - 5 = 3^{2p} \cdot 2^{n-3p} - 5 = \text{Syr}^{2p}(2^n - 5). \end{aligned}$$

□

The following well-known and very important identity is proved by straightforward induction.

Theorem 2.6. *The following are equivalent.*

1. $N = 2^{x_0} N_1$ for $N_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ odd, and $\text{Syr}^i(N) = \text{Col}^{x_{[0,i]}+i}(N)$ for $1 \leq i < k$ and $\text{Syr}^k(N) = \text{Col}^{r+1}(\text{Syr}^{k-1}(N))$ for $r \geq x_k$.
- 2.

$$(2.6.1) \quad N \equiv - \sum_{i=0}^k 3^{-i-1} 2^{x_{[0,i]}} \pmod{2^{x_{[0,k]}}}.$$

Then

$$(2.6.2) \quad \text{Col}^{x_{[0,k]}+k}(N) \equiv \frac{3^k}{2^{x_{[0,k]}}} N + \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{3^{k-j}}{2^{x_{[j,k]}}} \pmod{3^k}$$

2.7. The numbers $N(x_1, \dots, x_k)$.

We will usually consider (2.6.1) for N odd that is $x_0 = 0$. We will write $N = N(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ for the unique odd integer $N < 2^{x_{[1,k]}}$ such that (2.6.1) holds. This then identifies the odd positive integers $< 2^n$ with finite sequences (x_1, \dots, x_k) (for varying k) such that $x_{[1,k]} = n$. Given $N = N(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ one can, of course, extend to an infinite sequence $x_i(N)$, where $x_i = x_i(N)$ for $i \leq k-1$ and $x_k(N) \geq x_k$ and $x_i(N)$ is determined by N for all i , that is, by (x_1, \dots, x_k) . We also note that $N = N(x_1, \dots, x_k, 1)$ is the unique odd integer N with $0 < N < 2^{x_{[1,k]}+1}$ and $x_i(N) = x_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$. The Collatz conjecture is that $x_i = 2$ for all sufficiently large i . This identification of an odd integer with a sequence x_i of strictly positive integers is then the basis of all probabilistic results and conjectures. It is natural to regard the x_i as independent random variables, usually identically distributed. Like [9] we will focus on *geometric distributions*, which will be defined in the next section.

According to Lagarias [6] the first integer k such that $3^k 2^{-x_{[1,k]}} < 1$ is known as the *coefficient stopping time* and apparently it is unknown whether the coefficient stopping time coincides with the *stopping time*, that is, the first k for which $Syr^k(N) < N$. Such an estimate can be used for the famous probabilistic result, first known to be proved independently by Terras and Everett ([10], [3]) that, for a positive density set of numbers $N < 2^n$, approaching 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the stopping time is $< n$. A slightly more sophisticated estimate was used by Allouche [1] to prove that for a density approaching 1, for various θ , and for some least k , we have $Syr^k(N) < N^\theta$. The difficulty is always in proving that this happens again. (But this was done in [9] to a remarkable extent.) The following, for example, can be used to get it once.

Lemma 2.8. *Let $0 < \alpha < 1/2$. Let $N = N(x_1, \dots, x_k, 1)$. Suppose that*

$$(2.8.1) \quad \begin{aligned} N &\geq 2^{(1-\alpha)x_{[1,k]}} \\ 3^{-k} 2^{x_{[1,k]}} &\geq 2^{\alpha x_{[1,k]}} \\ 3^{-j} 2^{\alpha x_{[1,k]}} &\leq 2^{x_{[j,k]}} \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq k. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$(2.8.2) \quad Syr^k(N) \leq 2^{-\alpha x_{[1,k]}} (1+k)N < N^{1-\alpha/2}$$

assuming k is large enough given α .

Proof. We have, from (2.6.2)

$$\begin{aligned}
 (2.8.3) \quad & \text{Syr}^k(N) = 3^k \cdot 2^{-x_{[1,k]}} \left(N + \sum_{j=1}^k 2^{x_{[1,j-1]}} \cdot 3^{-j} \right) \\
 & \leq 3^k \cdot 2^{-x_{[1,k]}} N \left(1 + \sum_{j=1}^k 3^{-j} 2^{\alpha x_{[1,k]} - x_{[j,k]}} \right) \\
 & \leq 2^{-\alpha x_{[1,k]}} N(1+k)
 \end{aligned}$$

□

2.9. Dyadic integers. The ring of dyadic integers is the completion of the ring of integers using the metric $d_2(n, m) = |n - m|_2 = 2^{-r}$, where 2^r is the highest power of 2 dividing $n - m$. Every dyadic integer has a unique expansion

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i 2^i$$

with $a_i \in \{0, 1\}$ for all i . The natural numbers \mathbb{N} are precisely the dyadic integers which have a finite expansion of this form. All integers and all rational numbers with odd denominator are dyadic integers. For example

$$-1 = (1 - 2)^{-1} = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} 2^i$$

and

$$-3^{-1} = (1 - 2^2)^{-1} = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} 2^{2i}$$

All odd integers are units in the ring of dyadic integers, and 2 is the only prime, modulo units. Rather trivially, the ring of dyadic integers is a unique factorisation domain. So the highest power of 2 dividing a dyadic integer has meaning. Therefore the formulae for the Collatz map and the Syracuse map in (1.1.1) and (1.1.2) extend to the ring of dyadic integers. The ring is also the inverse limit of the rings $\mathbb{Z}/2^p\mathbb{Z}$. The Collatz and Syracuse maps do not extend to the quotient domain $\mathbb{Z}/2^p\mathbb{Z}$ — unless, as 2.4 shows, we quotient the range by $3^k\mathbb{Z}$ (for Syr^k , for example). Nevertheless, if we keep the domain as the integers, we can quotient the image by $2^p\mathbb{Z}$. We will use the following formula $\text{Col}^{x_{[1,k]}+k}(N)$ as a dyadic integers, for $N = N(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ as in 2.7. We can then project down to $\mathbb{Z}/2^p\mathbb{Z}$ for any p .

Theorem 2.10. *Let $N = N(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ be an odd integer as in 2.7. As a dyadic integer*

(2.10.1)

$$\text{Col}^{x_{[1,k]}+k}(N) = \text{Col}^{x_k+1}(\text{Syr}^{k-1}(N)) = -3^k \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} a_{m+x_{[i,k]}} 2^m + A \right)$$

where $A = A(N)$ is an integer with $0 \leq A \leq k$ and, as a dyadic integer,

$$-3^{-i} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_{j,i} 2^j.$$

Now let $N = N(x_1, \dots, x_k, 1)$. Then as a dyadic integer

$$(2.10.2) \quad \text{Syr}^k(N) = -1 + 3^{-1} - 3^k \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} a_{m+x_{[i,k]},i} 2^m + A_1 \right)$$

where A_1 is an integer with $-k \leq A_1 \leq 2k + 2$.

Proof By (2.6.1), remembering that $x_0 = 0$ as N is odd,

$$(2.10.3) \quad N \equiv - \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} 3^{-i-1} 2^{x_{[1,i]}} \pmod{2^{x_{[1,k]}},$$

where $x_{[1,0]} = 0$ and in general $x_{[i,j]} = 0$ if $i > j$. This implies that

$$(2.10.4) \quad N = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \{-3^{-i-1}\}_{x_{[i+1,k]}} 2^{x_{[1,i]}} - A 2^{x_{[1,k]}}$$

where, if y is an integer $\pmod{2^\ell}$ for any $\ell \geq m$, then $\{y\}_m$ is the integer with $0 \leq \{y\}_m < 2^m$ and $y \equiv \{y\}_m \pmod{2^m}$. Then $A = A(N)$ is an integer and since $0 < N < 2^{x_{[1,k]}}$ we have $0 \leq A \leq k$. From (2.10.4) we have

$$(2.10.5) \quad \text{Col}^{x_1+1}(N) = \sum_{i=1}^{k-1} 3\{-3^{-i-1}\}_{x_{[i+1,k]}} 2^{x_{[2,i]}} + (1 + 3\{-3^{-1}\}_{x_{[1,k]}}) 2^{-x_1} - 3A 2^{x_{[2,k]}}$$

By induction we have, for $j < k$

$$(2.10.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{Col}^{x_{[1,j]}+j}(N) &= \sum_{i=j}^{k-1} 3^j \{-3^{-i-1}\}_{x_{[i+1,k]}} 2^{x_{[j+1,i]}} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=1}^j 3^{j-i} (1 + 3^i \{-3^{-i}\}_{x_{[i,k]}}) 2^{-x_{[i,j]}} - 3^j A 2^{x_{[j+1,k]}} \end{aligned}$$

and finally, for $j = k$, we have

$$(2.10.7) \quad \text{Col}^{x_{[1,k]}+k}(N) = \sum_{i=1}^k 3^{k-i} (1 + 3^i \{-3^{-i}\}_{x_{[i,k]}}) 2^{-x_{[i,k]}} - 3^k A$$

Now 3^{-i} is a dyadic integer. If we write

$$(2.10.8) \quad -3^{-i} = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} a_{m,i} 2^m$$

for $a_{m,i} \in \{0, 1\}$ for all m , then we always have $a_{0,i} = 1$ and

$$(2.10.9) \quad \{-3^{-i}\}_{x_{[i,k]}} = \sum_{m=0}^{x_{[i,k]}-1} a_{m,i} 2^m.$$

So as a dyadic integer

$$(2.10.10) \quad 3^{k-i}(1+3^i\{-3^{-i}\}_{x_{[i,k]}}) = -3^k(-3^{-i}-\{-3^{-i}\}_{x_{[i,k]}}) = -3^k \sum_{m=x_{[i,k]}}^{\infty} a_{m,i} 2^{m-x_{[i,k]}}.$$

So interpreting all quantities as dyadic integers, (2.10.7) becomes (2.10.1)

Now we apply this to $N = N(x_1, \dots, x_k, 1)$, so that $x_{k+1} = 1$. Then we have

$$(2.10.11) \quad \begin{aligned} Col^2(Syr^k(N)) &= -3^{k+1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} a_{m+x_{[i,k]}+1,i} 2^m + A \right) \\ &= \frac{3}{2} (Syr^k(N) + 1). \end{aligned}$$

where now $0 \leq A \leq k+1$. Now multiplying through by $2/3$, we obtain

$$(2.10.12) \quad \begin{aligned} Syr^k(N) &= -1 - 3^k \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} a_{m+x_{[i,k]},i} 2^m + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} a_{m,k+1} 2^m + 2A \right) \\ &= -1 + 3^{-1} - 3^k \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} a_{m+x_{[i,k]},i} 2^m - \sum_{i=1}^k a_{x_{[i,k]},i} + 2A \right) \\ &= -1 + 3^{-1} - 3^k \left(\sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} a_{m+x_{[i,k]},i} 2^m + A_1 \right) \end{aligned}$$

for an integer A_1 with $-k \leq A_1 \leq 2(k+1)$. This gives (2.10.2), as required. \square

The quantity $A = A(N)$ in (2.10.1) could be determined more precisely, if not exactly. As they stand, (2.10.1) and (2.10.2) are not precise formulae. But they will be useful. The now-classical probabilistic results of Terras and Everett show that for some $\beta < 1$ (which will be made more precise in Section 3), for all odd $1 < N < 2^n$ outside a set with at most $2^{\beta n}$ elements, we have $Syr^k(N) < N$ for some $k < n$. If we could use induction on this result we could make progress on the Collatz Conjecture. But we do not know how Syr^k transforms sets of integers of large positive density. Tao [9] makes substantial advance on this question. The statements of his results are quite involved, for very good reasons.

We note that if $k \leq Cp$ and $X \subset \{x : 0 \leq x < 2^p\}$ is a set with $\leq 2^{\beta p}$ elements for some $\mu < 1$ then $\{x + A \bmod 2^p : x \in X, 0 \leq$

$A \leq k\}$ has $\leq (k+1)2^{\beta p} \leq (Cp+1)2^{\beta p} = o(2^p)$ elements. So although the imprecise formula (2.10.2) cannot show that Syracuse orbits are approximately uniformly distributed mod 2^p (for example) it might be useful for showing the image of a sparse set is sparse mod 2^p .

3. GEOMETRIC DISTRIBUTIONS

3.1. x_i sequences with fixed mean. Write $N = N(x_1, \dots, x_k, 1)$. 2.8 gives conditions, including $3^k 2^{-x_{[1,k]}} < 2^{\alpha x_{[1,k]}}$ under which

$$\text{Syr}^j(N) < N^{1-\alpha/2}.$$

If $x_{[1,k]} \leq k \log 3 / (\log 2(1-\alpha))$ then this does not happen. Such sequences are not extremely rare. Now we consider sequences x_i for which $x_{[1,k]} = n$ for fixed k and n . We know from the generating function

$$x^k(1-x)^{-k}$$

that there are $(-1)^k \binom{-k}{n-k} = \binom{n-1}{k-1}$ such sequences (x_1, \dots, x_k) and hence the same number of integers $N(x_1, \dots, x_k)$. Now write

$$\mu = \frac{n}{k}$$

Then

$$1 \leq \mu \leq n$$

We know that the most common value of μ — fixing n and varying k — is 2.

Tao [9] defined *geometric distributions*. For $0 < \lambda < 1$, the probability distribution \mathbb{G}_λ on $\mathbb{N} + 1$ (not Tao's notation) is defined by

$$\mathbb{G}_\lambda(X = m) = \lambda^{m-1}(1-\lambda), \quad m \in \mathbb{N} + 1.$$

This probability distribution has mean

$$\begin{aligned} (1-\lambda) \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} m \lambda^{m-1} &= (1-\lambda) \frac{d}{d\lambda} \left(\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \lambda^m \right) \\ &= (1-\lambda) \frac{d}{d\lambda} \frac{\lambda}{1-\lambda} = (1-\lambda) \left(\frac{1}{1-\lambda} + \frac{\lambda}{(1-\lambda)^2} \right) = \frac{1}{1-\lambda} \end{aligned}$$

So if the mean is μ we have

$$\lambda = 1 - \mu^{-1}$$

and the geometric probability distribution with mean μ is $\mathbb{G}_{1-\mu^{-1}}$. This probability distribution extends to a joint distribution on k independent random variables, for each k , and hence to a probability measure

on $\cup_{k=1}^{\infty}(\mathbb{N} + 1)^k$ which we will also denote by $\mathbb{G}_{1-\mu^{-1}}$. We denote by $[x_1, \dots, x_k]$ the set, or *cylinder* defined by

$$\bigcup_{m \geq k} \{[y_1, \dots, y_m] : y_i = x_i, 1 \leq i \leq k\}.$$

Then the probability measure $\mathbb{G}_{1-\mu^{-1}}$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{G}_{1-\mu^{-1}}([x_1 \dots x_k]) &= \prod_{i=1}^k \mu^{-1} (1 - \mu^{-1})^{x_i - 1} \\ &= (\mu - 1)^{-k} \left(\frac{\mu - 1}{\mu} \right)^{x_{[1,k]}} = \mu^{-k} (1 - \mu^{-1})^{x_{[1,k]} - k} \end{aligned}$$

So all k -cylinders $[x_1, \dots, x_k]$ with $x_{[1,k]} = n$, for fixed k and n , have the same measure. If $\mu = 2$, then all k -cylinders, for varying k and fixed n , have the same measure. If we fix k , $\mathbb{G}_{1-\mu^{-1}}$ can also be regarded as a probability measure on the set of odd integers $N(x_1, \dots, x_k, 1)$, by identifying $N(x_1, \dots, x_k, 1)$ with the cylinder $[x_1, \dots, x_k]$. For fixed $n = x_{[1,k]}$, for varying k , this is a set of 2^{n-1} odd positive integers $N < 2^{n+1}$, that is, exactly half of the odd positive integers $< 2^{n+1}$. We note that all the odd positive integers $< 2^{n+1}$ are of the form $N(x_1, \dots, x_{k+1})$ for some $k \geq 0$ and $x_{[1,k+1]} = n + 1$. If $\mu = 2$ the mass assigned by $\mathbb{G}_{1-\mu^{-1}}$ to each integer $N(x_1, \dots, x_k, 1)$ with $x_{[1,k]} = n$ is 2^{-n} . Without a bound on $x_{[1,k]}$, the set of integers $N(x_1, \dots, x_k, 1)$ is infinite because, for each i , x_i can take any positive integer value. However, there are advantages in considering this infinite set, because if we fix μ then the $\mathbb{G}_{1-\mu^{-1}}$ -measure of the cylinders $[x_1, \dots, x_k, 1]$ is concentrated on those $[x_1, \dots, x_k, 1]$ with $|x_{[1,k]} - \mu k| \leq C\sqrt{k}$, for C sufficiently large.

Of course one can also identify the cylinder $[x_1, \dots, x_k]$ with the coset of integers which are equal to $N(x_1, \dots, x_k, 1) \bmod 2^{x_{[1,k]}+1}$. That is more the approach of [9], but is more appropriate when restricting to $\mu > \log 3 / \log 2$.

We recall the following completely standard lemma, which is no surprise.

Lemma 3.2. *If $\mu > 1$ and $k/n \sim \nu < 1$ then*

$$\begin{aligned} (3.2.1) \quad & \binom{n-1}{k-1} \mu^{-k} (1 - \mu^{-1})^{n-k} \\ & \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi n \nu (1 - \nu)}} \exp n(\nu \log(\mu^{-1} \nu^{-1}) + (1 - \nu) \log(1 - \mu^{-1})(1 - \nu)^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover the maximum of this is attained at $\nu = \mu^{-1}$, when the exponential term on the right becomes 1.

Proof. We repeat the standard proof, using Stirling's formula

$$m! \sim \sqrt{2\pi m} m^{m+1/2} e^{-m}.$$

So

$$\begin{aligned} & \binom{n-1}{k-1} \mu^{-k} (1 - \mu^{-1})^{n-k} \\ & \sim \frac{\sqrt{n-1}}{\sqrt{2\pi(k-1)(n-k)}} \exp n \left(\frac{k}{n} \left(\log \frac{n}{k} + \log \mu^{-1} \right) + \frac{n-k}{n} \left(\log \frac{n}{n-k} + \log(1 - \mu^{-1}) \right) \right) \\ & \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi n \nu (1-\nu)}} \exp n (\nu \log(\nu^{-1} \mu^{-1}) + (1-\nu) \log((1-\nu)^{-1} (1 - \mu^{-1}))). \end{aligned}$$

To compute the maximum in ν , write

$$g(\nu) = g_\mu(\nu) = \nu \log \frac{\mu^{-1}}{\nu} + (1-\nu) \log \frac{1 - \mu^{-1}}{1 - \nu}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} g'(\nu) &= \log \frac{\mu^{-1}}{\nu} - \log \frac{1 - \mu^{-1}}{\nu} - 1 + 1 = 0 \Leftrightarrow \frac{\mu^{-1}}{\nu} = \frac{1 - \mu^{-1}}{1 - \nu} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \nu = \mu^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$g''(\nu) = -\frac{1}{\nu} - \frac{1}{1-\nu} < 0$$

and so $\nu = \mu^{-1}$ gives a maximum. □

Applying 3.2 with $\mu = 2$ we have the following.

Corollary 3.3. *If $k/n \sim \nu$ then*

$$\begin{aligned} (3.3.1) \quad & \binom{n-1}{k-1} \sim 2^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi n \nu (1-\nu)}} \exp n (\nu \log(\nu^{-1}/2) + (1-\nu) \log((1-\nu)^{-1}/2)) \\ & = 2^n \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi n \nu (1-\nu)}} 2^{-n\lambda(\nu)} \end{aligned}$$

with $\lambda(\nu) \leq 0$ and bounded from 0 if $0 < \nu < 1$ and ν is bounded from $1/2$.

From 3.3 the number of cylinders $[x_1, \dots, x_k]$ with $x_{[1,k]} = n$ and $3^k < 2^{n(1-\varepsilon)}$ for a sufficiently small ε is $< 2^n e^{-\lambda n}$ for a $\lambda > 0$. By 2.6 this is also the number of integers $N(x_1, \dots, x_k)$ with $x_{[1,k]} = n$ — that is, $0 < N(x_1, \dots, x_k) < 2^n$ — and $3^k < 2^{n(1-\varepsilon)}$. Hence by 2.8, as

$n \rightarrow \infty$, the proportion of $N < 2^n$ for which $Col^{x_{[1,k]}+k}(N) < N$ for some $k < n$ is at least $1 - ce^{-\lambda n}$ for constants $\lambda > 0$ $c > 0$.

Lemma 3.2 also gives a direct proof of the Central Limit Theorem for the probability measure/joint distribution $\mathbb{G}_{1-\mu^{-1}}$. More accurate information can be obtained by using the Fourier transform method applied to this example. The Central Limit Theorem shows (of course) that the measure $G_{1-\mu^{-1}}$ is concentrated on those cylinders $x_{[1,k]}$ — equivalently on those integers $N(x_1, \dots, x_k, 1)$ — such that $|x_{[1,k]} - k\mu| \leq C\sqrt{k}$, where, as $C \rightarrow \infty$, the measure outside this set tends to 0 for all sufficiently large k given C .

Theorem 3.4. *Let $A \subset [-L, L] \subset \mathbb{R}$ be an interval. Then for a constant C depending only on L ,*

$$\left| \mathbb{G}_{1-\mu^{-1}} \left(\frac{x_{[1,k]} - k\mu}{\sqrt{k}} \in A \right) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi\mu(\mu-1)}} \int_A e^{-t^2/(2\mu(\mu-1))} dt \right| \leq Ck^{-1/50}$$

The proof is redacted.

The map $N \mapsto Syr^k(N)$ is many-to-one in general and of course that is the whole point of the Collatz conjecture. However, it is possible that $N \mapsto Syr^k(N)$ is injective restricted to the set of numbers for which the Syracuse stopping time $i > k$ where i is the first integer (if it exists) with $Syr^i(N) < N$. [9] gives a result of this type, which is at first sight surprising (Corollary 6.3), which holds for numbers which are generic for $\mathbb{G}_{1/2}$. We have the following for $\mathbb{G}_{1-\mu^{-1}}$ for any $\mu < \log 3 / \log 2$, which is an easy result of this type, rather far from what might be true.

Lemma 3.5. *For any $\mu < \log 3 / \log 2$, let*

$$M(\mu) = 3^{-1}(1 - 2^\mu 3^{-1})^{-1}.$$

Then for $N = N(x_1, \dots, x_k, 1)$ and $N' = N(x'_1, \dots, x'_k, 1)$ with $x_{[1,k]} = x'_{[1,k]} = n$ and $x_{[1,i]} \leq \mu i$ and $x'_{[1,i]} \leq \mu i$ for all $i \leq k$, we have

$$(3.5.1) \quad |Syr^k(N) - Syr^k(N')| > 3^k 2^{-n} (|N - N'| - M(\mu)).$$

Consequently the map $N \mapsto Syr^k(N)$ is at most $\lfloor M(\mu) \rfloor$ -to-one restricted to the set of $N = N(x_1, \dots, x_k, 1)$ with $x_{[1,k]} = n$ and $x_{[1,i]} \leq \mu i$ for all $i \leq k$.

Proof. We have

$$Syr^k(N) = \sum_{i=1}^k 3^{k-i} 2^{-x_{[i,k]}} + 3^k 2^{-x_{[1,k]}} N = 3^k 2^{-x_{[1,k]}} \left(N + \sum_{i=1}^k 2^{x_{[1,i-1]}} 3^{-i} \right)$$

So since $x_{[1,k]} = x'_{[1,k]} = n$ we have

$$Syr^k(N) - Syr^k(N') = 3^k 2^{-n} (N - N' + \sum_{i=1}^k 2^{x_{[1,i-1]}} 3^{-i} - \sum_{i=1}^k 2^{x'_{[1,i-1]}} 3^{-i}).$$

Now

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{i=1}^k 3^{-i} (2^{x_{[1,i-1]}} - 2^{x'_{[1,i-1]}}) \right| &< \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} 3^{-i} 2^{(i-1)\mu} \\ &= M(\mu). \end{aligned}$$

This gives (3.5.1), and the final deduction is immediate. The righthand-side of (3.5.1) might of course be negative, but can only be so for at most $\lfloor M(\mu) \rfloor$ values of N' , given N . \square

We remark that if $\mu = n_0/k_0$ for coprime positive integers n_0 and k_0 then $M(\mu)$ can be replaced by $M'(\mu)$ where $M'(\mu)$ is defined as the maximum of all numbers of the form

$$\sum_{i=2}^{k_0} 2^{x_{[1,i-1]}} 3^{-i} (1 - 2^{n_0} 3^{-k_0}) - \frac{2}{3}$$

where $x_{[1,n_0]} = k_0$, $x_{[1,i]} \leq \mu i$ for all $i < n_0$. The k -tuple (x_1, \dots, x_k) which achieves the maximum has the maximum value of $x_{[1,i-1]}$ for each $i \leq k$. The subtraction of $2/3$ is because if x'_i is the sequence for N' then $x'_i \geq 1$ for all i and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} 2^i 3^{-i-1} = \frac{2}{9} \left(1 - \frac{2}{3}\right)^{-1} = \frac{2}{3}.$$

4. THE CONJECTURES

We start with the main theorem of [9], Tao's Theorem 1.3.

Almost all orbits attain almost bounded values *Let $f : \mathbb{N} + 1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be any function with $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} f(N) = +\infty$. Then one has $Col_{min}(N) < f(N)$ for almost all $N \in \mathbb{N} + 1$.*

For technical reasons “almost all” is in terms of what Tao calls “logarithmic density”, rather than the normal density which weights all integers in a finite interval equally. The proof uses a sophisticated induction, in order to show that, for a suitable constant $\alpha > 1$ for “almost all” N , there are successive iterates $Syr^{i_{[1,j]}}$ in the Syracuse orbit with $N_j = Syr^{i_{[1,j]}}(N) < N^{1/\alpha^j}$, for $j \leq J$, where J can be taken arbitrarily large if N is large enough. The first step in the induction, with $j = 1$ is Allouche's refinement [1] of the result of Terras and Everett. That

removes a proportion $N_0^{-\beta}$ of numbers $< N_0$ permanently from consideration for a suitable $\beta > 0$. After that first step it becomes much more difficult, because it is not clear how Syr^{i_1} transforms sets of large positive density or very small density. These are numbers mod 3^n for some suitable n . Rather than looking at all numbers mod 3^n , Tao works with fibres of projections mod 3^m for $m < n$: probably with good reason, although at first sight it seems a strange thing to do. It turns out that the Fourier transform of the key Proposition 1.14 can actually be solved. This then allows the inductive step to be completed. After the first step, in getting $Syr^{i_{j+1}}(N_j) < N_j^{1/\alpha}$, the proportion of logarithmic density lost is bigger, being $1/\log^c(N_j)$ — but that is enough, with the telescoping series.

It is an astonishing result. But as already mentioned in the introduction, at each stage numbers are lost and cannot be recovered. This seems to always be the way in dealing with Collatz iteration. From the second step of the induction, the numbers which are considered are those for which $x_{[1,k]}/k$ is close to 2. At least for the very first step, following Terras, it is only the numbers with $x_{[1,k]}/k > \log 3 / \log 2$ but after that it is close to 2.

Our first conjecture is as follows. We use the notation of 2.10. In particular the $a_{j,i}$ are the coefficients in the dyadic expansion of -3^{-i} .

Conjecture 4.1. *Define*

(4.1.1)

$$Syr_{k,p}(x_1, \dots, x_k) = -3^k \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=0}^{p-1} a_{j+x_{[i,k]}, i} 2^j$$

$$(Syr_{k,p})_* \mathbb{G}_{1-\mu^{-1}}(X) = \mathbb{G}_{1-\mu^{-1}}(\bigcup \{[x_1, \dots, x_k] : Syr_{k,p}(x_1, \dots, x_k) \bmod 2^p \in X\})$$

$$\mathbb{S}_{k,p,\mu} = (S_{k,p})_* \mathbb{G}_{1-\mu^{-1}}$$

That is, $(Syr_{k,p})_* \mathbb{G}_{1-\mu^{-1}}$ denotes the pushforward of the measure $\mathbb{G}_{1-\mu^{-1}}$ under the map $(Syr)_{k,p}$. Then for any $1 < \mu < \infty$ and $0 < c_1$ there exists $c_0 > 0$, depending on c_1 and μ , bounded from 0 if μ is bounded from 1 and c_1 bounded from 0 such that if $p \leq c_0 k$ and for any $0 \leq m < 2^p$,

$$(4.1.2) \quad |(\mathbb{S}_{k,p,\mu}(\{m\}) - 2^{-p})| \leq c_1 2^{-p}$$

If Conjecture 4.1 is true then using Theorem 2.10 and Lemma 2.8, we have a result close to uniform distribution on the odd integers mod 2^p of the iterates $Syr^k(N)$ — not quite because the presence of the constant A in 2.10.

Corollary 4.2. *Let $1 < \mu < \infty$. Then if Conjecture 4.1 is true, for c_0 as in 4.1 if $p \leq c_0 k$ then for any set $Y \subset \{i \in \mathbb{N} : 0 \leq i < 2^p\}$ we have*

$$(4.2.1) \quad |\mathbb{G}_{1-\mu^{-1}}([x_1, \dots, x_k]) : \text{Syr}^k(N(x_1, \dots, x_k, 1)) \in Y| \\ \leq (1 + c_1) \cdot (2k + 2)2^{-p} \#(Y)$$

Consequently, for a suitable universal constant $\alpha_1 > 0$, outside a set of $\mathbb{G}_{1-\mu^{-1}}$ -measure $\leq k2^{-\alpha_1 p}$ we will have for $N = N(x_1, \dots, x_k, 1)$ and for any r with $p/4 \leq r \leq p/3$

$$(4.2.2) \quad \text{Syr}^{k+r}(N) < 2^{-r/5} \text{Syr}^k(N).$$

Proof. We apply 2.8 with N replaced by $N_1 = \text{Syr}^k(N) \bmod 2^p$. More precisely, we apply (2.8.1) to (2.8.3) with N replaced by N_1 and with k , $x_{[1,k]}$ and $x_{[j+1,k]}$ replaced by r , $x_{[k+1,k+r]}$ and $x_{[k+j+1,k+r]}$, because $x_j(N_1) = x_{k+j}(N)$. In (2.8.2) and (2.8.3) we replace $\text{Syr}^k(N)$ by $\text{Syr}^r(N_1)$. For any fixed $p/4 \leq r \leq p/3$ and $\alpha = 1/5$ (for example) the following conditions are satisfied for N_1 outside a set of $\leq 2^{p(1-\alpha_1)}$ elements, where throughout, this x_j means $x_j(N_1)$, that is, $x_{k+j}(N)$ and α_1 is a constant depending only on α .

$$(4.2.3) \quad \begin{aligned} 3r/2 &\leq x_{[1,r]} \leq 3r, \\ N_1 &\geq 2^{(1-\alpha)x_{[1,r]}}, \\ 3^{-r}2^{x_{[1,r]}} &\geq 2^{\alpha x_{[1,r]}}, \\ 3^{-j}2^{\alpha x_{[1,r]}} &\leq 2^{x_{[j,r]}} \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq r. \end{aligned}$$

The last three conditions are simply the conditions of (2.8.3) with the replacements indicated. We apply (3.2) to see that for fixed $p \geq r \geq p/3$ and $\alpha = 1/5$ these conditions hold for N_1 outside a set of $\leq 2^{p(1-\alpha_1)}$ elements, where α_1 is simply a universal constant given by 3.2. For the penultimate condition of (4.2.3) we note that $2^8 > 3^5$ and so $\log 3 / \log 2 < 8/5$ and yet

$$3^{-r}2^{x_{[1,r]}} < 2^{x_{[1,r]}}/5 \Rightarrow x_{[1,r]} < (5/4) \log 3 / \log 2 = 2 - (2 - (5/4) \log 3 / \log 2).$$

For the last condition of (4.2.3) we can, for example, split into the cases $j \leq r/2$ and $j \geq r/2$. If $j \leq r/2$ then the condition is implied by

$$2^{x_{[1,r]}/5} \leq 2^{x_{[r/2,r]}}$$

and if $j \geq r/2$ we can use

$$3^{-r/2}2^{x_{[1,r]}/5} \leq 1.$$

□

All work to date has been on proving Conjecture 4.1. I believe progress has been made - producing a string of conjectures each implying the previous one, with a final conjecture which looks plausible

and doable (to me) but which so far remains unresolved. Even if Conjecture 4.1 is proved, it is not, on its own, a useful analogue of the Tao's method [9] for his second inductive step for any value of μ . This is because we have no lower bound on c_0 and almost certainly have $p \ll \mu k$ with current methods, if they can be made to work. By 3.3, we must have $p = O((\mu - 1) \log(\mu - 1)k)$. We only have information (from 4.2.1) about $Syr^k(N(x_1, \dots, x_k, 1)) \bmod 2^p$, when we start with $N(x_1, \dots, x_k, 1)$ being any odd integer and if $\mu < \log 3 / \log 2$ we will get

$$Syr^k(N) > N$$

on a set of large $\mathbb{G}_{1-\mu^{-1}}$ -measure.

It does not look as if there is any particular advantage in having the constant c_1 in Conjecture 4.1 being small, and one might as well choose $c_1 = 1$, for example. The question then is how small c_0 needs to be in terms of μ for fixed c_1 .

Question 4.3. *How large can the constant c_0 of Conjecture 4.1 be, depending on μ , for fixed c_1 ?*

Tao's proof of the main result in [9] uses Fourier transform, which is natural to do in any probability proof. So now we consider the Fourier transform of $\mathbb{S}_{k,p,\mu}$. We have

$$\widehat{\mathbb{S}}_{k,p,\mu}(\xi) = \sum_{m=0}^{2^p-1} \mathbb{S}_{k,p,\mu}(\{m\}) e^{-2\pi i m \xi / 2^p}.$$

Then $\widehat{\mathbb{S}}_{k,p,\mu}(0) = 1$, as is of course true for any probability measure. Also, $|\widehat{\mathbb{S}}_{k,p,\mu}(\xi)| \leq 1$ for all ξ , and with strict inequality unless $\mathbb{S}_{k,p,\mu}$ is a point mass. Again, this fact about probability measure transforms is generally true. Now we have the following basic lemma.

Lemma 4.4. *Conjecture 4.1 is true if*

$$(4.4.1) \quad \sum_{\xi \neq 0} |\widehat{\mathbb{S}}_{k,p,\mu}(\xi)| \leq c_1.$$

Proof By Fourier inversion

$$\mathbb{S}_{k,p,\mu}(\{m\}) = 2^{-p} \sum_{\xi} \widehat{\mathbb{S}}_{k,p,\mu}(\xi) e^{2\pi i m \xi / 2^p} = 2^{-p} + 2^{-p} \sum_{\xi \neq 0} \widehat{\mathbb{S}}_{k,p,\mu}(\xi) e^{2\pi i m \xi / 2^p}.$$

□

So we give another conjecture, which, by 4.4 would imply Conjecture 4.1.

Conjecture 4.5. *For some $c_2(\mu) > 0$ for k sufficiently large and $p \leq k$, for all $0 < \xi < 2^p$*

$$(4.5.1) \quad |\widehat{\mathbb{S}}_{k,p,\mu}(\xi)| \leq 2^{-c_2 k}.$$

Conjecture 4.5 looks a lot stronger than 1.17. of [9], just as 4.1 looks a lot stronger than the result 1.14 of [9]. Then if $c_0 < c_2$ we have

$$\sum_{0 < \xi < 2^p} |\widehat{\mathbb{S}}_{k,p,\mu}(\xi)| \leq 2^{(c_0 - c_2)k}$$

Conjecture 4.5 itself does not, therefore, make much restriction on p . But to deduce Conjecture 4.1 we need $p \leq c_0 k$ with $c_0 < c_2$ and k sufficiently large given $c_2 - c_0$ and c_1 . In the longer term it would be better not to take modulus of $\widehat{\mathbb{S}}_{k,p,\mu}(\xi)$ but for the moment the effort is concentrated on proving 4.5. If that is achieved, improvements will be sought.

4.6. A first thought is that there should be an inductive procedure for obtaining an estimate such as Conjecture 4.5 on $|\widehat{\mathbb{S}}_{k,p,\mu}(\xi)|$. But the roughly corresponding bound Proposition 1.17 of [9] is difficult and follows on from Tao's rather simple Lemma 6.2 which has no analogue in our case. However, we can consider what an inductive procedure would involve. We will fix μ in what follows. We will also fix p making only the restriction that $p \leq k$. We drop μ and k as indices, so write \mathbb{S}_k for $\mathbb{S}_{k,p,\mu}$ and \mathbb{G} for $\mathbb{G}_{1-\mu^{-1}}$. Write

$$(4.6.1) \quad m_i = m_i(x_{[i,k]}) = \sum_{t=0}^{p-1} a_{t+x_{[i,k]},i} 2^t \bmod 2^p$$

The Fourier transform $\widehat{\mathbb{S}}_k$, like the Fourier transform of any probability measure on $\mathbb{Z}/2^p\mathbb{Z}$, is a convex sum of 2^p 'th roots of unity. We have

$$(4.6.2) \quad \widehat{\mathbb{S}}_k(\xi) = \sum_{x_1, \dots, x_k} \mathbb{G}([x_1, \dots, x_k]) \exp(-2\pi i \sum_{j=1}^k m_j([x_{[j,k]}]) \xi / 2^p)$$

We note that $\mathbb{G}([x_1, \dots, x_k])$ depends only on $x_{[1,k]}$. Since \mathbb{G} is a product measure this is a sum of products. We now want to write this as a sum of products of sums. We can break up into segments. Fix r and k_j such that $k_0 = 0$ and $k_j \geq 1$ for $1 \leq j \leq r$ such that $k_{[1,r]} = k$. Now write

(4.6.3)

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathbb{S}}_{k,p[j,r],p_j}(\xi) &= \\ \sum \{ \prod_{\ell=k_{j-1}+1}^{k_j} \exp(-2\pi i m_\ell(x_{[\ell,k]})\xi/2^p) \mathbb{G}([x_{k_{j-1}+1}, \dots, x_{k_j}]) : x_{[k_{j-1}+1,k_j]} = p_j \} \\ &= \left(\frac{\mu-1}{\mu} \right)^{p_j} \mu^{k_j-k_{j-1}} \sum \left\{ \exp \left(-2\pi i \sum_{\ell=k_{j-1}+1}^{k_j} m_\ell(x_{[\ell,k]})\xi/2^p \right) : x_{[k_{j-1}+1,k_j]} = p_j \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we have

$$(4.6.4) \quad \widehat{\mathbb{S}}_k(\xi) = \sum_{p_1, \dots, p_r} \prod_{j=1}^r \widehat{\mathbb{S}}_{k,p[1,j-1],p_j}(\xi).$$

We also have

(4.6.5)

$$\begin{aligned} |\widehat{\mathbb{S}}_{k,p[j,r],p_j}(\xi)| &\leq \\ \sum \{ \mathbb{G}([x_{k_{j-1}+1}, \dots, x_{k_j}]) : x_{[k_{j-1}+1,k_j]} = p_j \} &= \binom{p_j-1}{k_j-k_{j-1}-1} \left(\frac{\mu-1}{\mu} \right)^{p_j} \mu^{k_j-k_{j-1}} \end{aligned}$$

Write

(4.6.6)

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda(\ell_1, \ell_2, q, u, \xi/2^p) &= \\ \left(\binom{q-1}{\ell_2-\ell_1-1} \right)^{-1} \sum \left\{ \exp \left(-\frac{2\pi i \xi}{2^p} \sum_{\ell_1+1}^{\ell_2} m_\ell(x_{[\ell,\ell_2]+u}) \right) : x_{\ell_1+1} + \dots + x_{\ell_2} = q \right\} \end{aligned}$$

 Then we have , for fixed $k_1 \dots k_r$

(4.6.7)

$$\begin{aligned} |\widehat{\mathbb{S}}_k(\xi)| &\leq \\ \sum_{p_1, \dots, p_r} \left(\prod_{j=1}^r \lambda(k_{j-1}, k_j, p_j, p[j+1,r], \xi/2^p) \cdot \binom{p_j-1}{k_j-k_{j-1}-1} \left(\frac{\mu-1}{\mu} \right)^{p_j} \mu^{k_j-k_{j-1}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Now we make the following conjecture.

Conjecture 4.7. For $p \leq k$ and constants $c_3, c_4 > 0$ which are independent of k and for fixed $k_1 \dots k_r$ with $k_j - k_{j-1} \leq c_3^{-1}$ and any $\xi \neq 0$, we have, for at least $c_4 r$ of the numbers $j \leq r$:

$$(4.7.1) \quad |\lambda(k_{j-1}, k_j, p_j, p[j+1,r], \xi/2^p)| \leq e^{-c_4}$$

apart from a set A of (p_1, \dots, p_r) such that

$$(4.7.2) \quad \sum_{(p_1, \dots, p_r) \in A} \prod_{j=1}^r \binom{p_j - 1}{k_j - k_{j-1} - 1} \left(\frac{\mu - 1}{\mu} \right)^{p_j} \mu^{k_j - k_{j-1}} \leq e^{-c_4 k}.$$

Conjecture 4.7 would then imply that

$$(4.7.3) \quad \widehat{\mathbb{S}}_k(\xi) \leq e^{-c_3 c_4^2 k} + e^{-c_4 k}$$

and hence implies Conjecture 4.5 and hence Conjecture 4.1. So this leads us to consider sums of the form

$$\sum_{j=1}^t e^{2\pi i b_j}$$

where $0 \leq b_j < 1$. We have the following frequently used lemma.

Lemma 4.8.

$$(4.8.1) \quad \left| \sum_{j=1}^t e^{2\pi i b_j} \right| = \sqrt{t^2 - 4 \sum_{j < \ell} \sin^2 \pi(b_j - b_\ell)}.$$

Proof. Simple calculation.

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{j=1}^t e^{2\pi i b_j} \right|^2 &= \sum_{j=1}^t e^{2\pi i b_j} \overline{\sum_{\ell=1}^t e^{2\pi i b_\ell}} \\ &= t + \sum_{j \neq \ell} e^{2\pi i(b_j - b_\ell)} \\ (4.8.2) \quad &= t + 2 \sum_{j < \ell} \cos 2\pi(b_j - b_\ell) \\ &= t^2 - 2 \sum_{j < \ell} (1 - \cos 2\pi(b_j - b_\ell)) \\ &= t^2 - 4 \sum_{j < \ell} \sin^2 \pi(b_j - b_\ell). \end{aligned}$$

□

4.9. Now we apply 4.8 to obtain a simpler condition to obtain (4.7.1) for all $\xi \neq 0$ in the case when $k_t - k_{t-1}$ and p_t are bounded but $p_t - (k_t - k_{t-1})$ is sufficiently big. Since we expect $p_t - (k_t - k_{t-1})$ to be close to $(\mu - 1)(k_t - k_{t-1})$ this means that we need $k_t - k_{t-1}$ to be sufficiently big, and we cannot expect better than $k_t - k_{t-1} = O((\mu - 1)^{-1})$, that is $c_3^{-1} = O((\mu - 1)^{-1})$ for c_3 as in Conjecture 4.7. We assume that ξ is odd (replacing p by $p - u$ if u is the maximum power of 2 such that 2^u divides ξ) and by replacing ξ by $-\xi$ if necessary, we assume that

$0 < \xi < 2^{p-1}$. Now fix such a ξ . If m is any integer, write $\{m\}$ for the integer mod 2^p such that

$$(4.9.1) \quad \begin{aligned} 1 - 2^{p-1} &\leq \{m\} \leq 2^{p-1}, \\ m &\equiv \{m\} \pmod{2^p}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we have

$$(4.9.2) \quad \begin{aligned} |\{m\}| &\leq |m|, \\ |\{m\}| &\leq 2^{p-1} \\ |\{m_1 + m_2\}| &\leq |\{m_1\}| + |\{m_2\}| \\ |2^r \{m\}| &\leq 2^r |\{m\}| \end{aligned}$$

Fix t . Fix $x_{k_{t-1}}, \dots, x_\ell, \dots, x_{k_t}$, where $x_{[\ell, k_t]} - (k_t - \ell)$ is sufficiently large that x_ℓ can be varied by at least n' for some suitable n' (to be determined), keeping x_i fixed for $k_{t-1} \leq i \leq k_t$ and $i \neq \ell$. Write $n = x_{[\ell, k]}$. Write

$$(4.9.3) \quad m(j + n, \ell) = \sum_{i=0}^{p-1} a_{i+n+j, \ell} 2^i$$

From 4.8, $\lambda(k_{t-1}, k_t, p_t, p_{[t+1, r]}, \xi/2^p)$ will be boundedly less than 1 if we can show that for some fixed constant $C_0 > 0$, the following holds for some $n' \leq p_t - (k_t - k_{t-1})$, and some ℓ with $k_{t-1} \leq \ell < k_t$ and $x_{[k_{t-1}+1, \ell-1]}$ with

$$x_{[k_{t-1}+1, \ell-1]} + n' + k_t - \ell \leq p_t.$$

For some $j_1 \neq j_2$ with $1 \leq j_1, j_2 \leq n'$

$$(4.9.4) \quad |\{(m(j_1 + n, \ell) - m(j_2 + n, \ell))\xi\}| \geq C_0 2^p.$$

So now we find a simpler sufficient condition for (4.9.4). We note that if p is bounded then for $C_0 < 2^{-p}$, if (4.9.4) does *not* hold then $m(j_1 + n, \ell) = m(j_2 + n, \ell)$. The only way that can be true is if

$$(4.9.5) \quad \begin{aligned} a_{n+i+j_1, \ell} &= a_{n+i+j_2, \ell} \text{ for all } 1 \leq j_1 \leq j_2 \leq n' \text{ and } 0 \leq i < p, \text{ that is} \\ a_{n+i+j, \ell} &= a_{n+i+1, \ell} \text{ for all } 1 \leq j \leq n' \end{aligned}$$

. So the case $p \leq n'$ is reduced to a simpler condition. From now on we assume that p is sufficiently large that (in particular) $p > n'$. We fix ℓ, ξ, n .

Now for $1 \leq j \leq n'$
 (4.9.6)

$$m(j+n, \ell) =$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=0}^{n'-1-j} a_{n+i+j, \ell} 2^i + 2^{n'-j} \sum_{i=0}^{p-1-n'} a_{n+n'+i, \ell} 2^i + 2^{p-j} \sum_{i=0}^{j-1} a_{n+p+i, \ell} 2^i \\ & = b(j, n') + 2^{n'-j} d + 2^{p-j} c(j) \end{aligned}$$

So

$$(4.9.7) \quad b(n', n') = 0, \quad b(j, n') < 2^{n'-j}, \quad c(j) < 2^j.$$

Then

(4.9.8)

$$m(j+n, \ell) - m(n'+n, \ell) = b(j, n') + (2^{n'-j} - 1)d + 2^{p-n'}(2^{n'-j}c(j) - c(n'))$$

So

(4.9.9)

$$\begin{aligned} & (2^{n'-j_2} - 1)(m(j_1+n, \ell) - m(n'+n, \ell)) - (2^{n'-j_1} - 1)(m(j_2+n, \ell) - m(n'+n, \ell)) \\ & = f(j_1, j_2, n') + 2^{p-n'}g(j_1, j_2, n') \end{aligned}$$

where

(4.9.10)

$$f(j_1, j_2, n') = (2^{n'-j_2} - 1)b(j_1, n') - (2^{n'-j_1} - 1)b(j_2, n')$$

$$\begin{aligned} g(j_1, j_2, n') & = (2^{n'-j_2} - 1)(2^{n'-j_1}c(j_1) - c(n')) - (2^{n'-j_1} - 1)(2^{n'-j_2}c(j_2) - c(n')) \\ & = 2^{2n'-j_1-j_2}(c(j_1) - c(j_2)) + 2^{n'-j_2}c(j_2) - 2^{n'-j_1}c(j_1) + (2^{n'-j_1} - 2^{n'-j_2})c(n'). \end{aligned}$$

where both $f(j_1, j_2, n')$ and $g(j_1, j_2, n')$ are $O(2^{n'})$. In fact

$$(4.9.11) \quad |f(j_1, j_2, n')| < 2^{2n'-j_1-j_2}$$

So if $|\{(m(j_1+n, \ell) - m(j_2+n, \ell))\xi\}| \leq 2^{p-n''}$ for all choices of $j_1 < j_2 \leq n'$, that is, (4.9.4) does *not* hold, then it is also true that

$$(4.9.12) \quad |\{(f(j_1, j_2, n') + 2^{p-n'}g(j_1, j_2, n'))\xi\}| \leq 2^{p-n''+n'}$$

for all choices of j_1 and j_2 . We now assume that n'' is bounded but somewhat larger than n' .

Write

(4.9.13)

$$\begin{aligned} \xi & = \xi_1 + 2^{n'}\xi_2 + 2^{p-1-n''}\xi_4 = \xi_3 + 2^{p-1-n''}\xi_4 \text{ with} \\ 0 & < \xi_1 < 2^{n'}, \quad 0 \leq \xi_2 < 2^{p-1-n''-n'}, \quad 0 \leq \xi_4 < 2^{n''}, \quad 0 < \xi_3 < 2^{p-1-n''} \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$(4.9.14) \quad 2^{p-n'}g(j_1, j_2)\xi \equiv 2^{p-n'}g(j_1, j_2)\xi_1 \pmod{2^p}$$

$$|\{f(j_1, j_2, n')\xi_3\}| < 2^{p-1-n''+2n'-j_1-j_2}$$

So if (4.9.12) holds we have

$$(4.9.15) \quad |\{f(j_1, j_2, n')\xi_4 2^{p-1-n''} + 2^{p-n'}g(j_1, j_2, n'))\xi_1\}| < 2^{p-n''+2n'-j_1-j_2} + 2^{p-n''+n'}$$

that is

$$(4.9.16) \quad |\{f(j_1, j_2, n')\xi_4 + 2^{n''-n'+1}g(j_1, j_2, n'))\xi_1\}_{n''+1}| < 2^{2n'-j_1-j_2+1} + 2^{n'+1},$$

that is for some integer A with

$$|A| < 2^{2n'-j_1-j_2+1} + 2^{n'+1},$$

we have

$$(4.9.17) \quad f(j_1, j_2, n')\xi_4 + 2^{n''-n'}g(j_1, j_2, n')\xi_1 \equiv A \pmod{2^{n''+1}}$$

Now we consider this for choices of j_1, j_2, n', n''

4.10. $j_1 = 1, j_2 = 2, n' = 3, n'' = 6$. We have

$$(4.10.1) \quad b(2, 3) = a_{n+2, \ell}, \quad b(1, 3) = a_{n+1, \ell} + 2a_{n+2, \ell},$$

$$c(1) = a_{n+p, \ell},$$

$$c(2) = a_{n+p, \ell} + 2a_{n+p+1, \ell}$$

$$c(3) = a_{n+p, \ell} + 2a_{n+p+1, \ell} + 4a_{n+p+2, \ell}.$$

$$f(1, 2, 3) = b(1, 3) - 3b(2, 3) = a_{n+1, \ell} - a_{n+2, \ell}$$

$$g(1, 2, 3) = 8(c(1) - c(2)) + 2c(2) - 4c(1) + 2c(3)$$

$$= -16a_{n+p+1, \ell} + 2a_{n+p, \ell} + 4a_{n+p+1, \ell} - 4a_{n+p, \ell} + 2a_{n+p, \ell} + 4a_{n+p+1, \ell} + 8a_{n+p+2, \ell}$$

$$= -8a_{n+p+1, \ell} + 8a_{n+p+2, \ell}$$

So we have

$$(4.10.2) \quad f(1, 2, 3)\xi_4 + 2^3g(1, 2, 3)\xi_1 \equiv (a_{n+1, \ell} - a_{n+2, \ell})\xi_4 + 2^6(a_{n+p+2, \ell} - a_{n+p+1, \ell})\xi_1 \pmod{2^7}$$

Then if (4.9.16) holds and if

$$(4.10.3) \quad \begin{aligned} N &\equiv (a_{n+1,\ell} - a_{n+2,\ell})\xi_4 + 2^6(a_{n+p+2,\ell} - a_{n+p+1,\ell})\xi_1 \pmod{2^7} \\ 0 &\leq N < 2^7 \end{aligned}$$

then since $|\{N\}|_7 < 2^5$ that means either $0 \leq N < 2^5$ or $2^5 + 2^6 < N < 2^7$. So the coefficients of 2^5 and 2^6 in the dyadic expansion of N are both 0 or both 1. Clearly one way in which this can happen is if $a_{n+p+1,\ell} = a_{n+p+2,\ell}$ and either $0 \leq \xi_4 < 2^5$ or $a_{n+1,\ell} = a_{n+2,\ell}$. Now suppose that $a_{n+p+1,\ell} \neq a_{n+p+2,\ell}$. Then since $-2^6 \equiv +2^6 \pmod{2^7}$, we get a solution to (4.10.3) only if the coefficient of 2^5 in the dyadic expansion of N_1 is 1 and the coefficient of 2^6 is 0 where $0 \leq N_1 < 2^6$ and $N_1 \equiv (a_{n+1,\ell} - a_{n+2,\ell})\xi_4 \pmod{2^7}$. We need $a_{n+1,\ell} \neq a_{n+2,\ell}$ for this. But if $a_{n+1,\ell} = 0$ and $a_{n+2,\ell} = 1$ then

$$(4.10.4) \quad \begin{aligned} -2^6 &< (a_{n+1,\ell} - a_{n+2,\ell})\xi_4 \leq 0 \\ N_1 &= 2^7 - 2^6 < (a_{n+1,\ell} - a_{n+2,\ell})\xi_4 \geq 2^6 \end{aligned}$$

So the only possibility is that $a_{n+1,\ell} = 1$ and $a_{n+2,\ell} = 0$. In addition, it is only possible if $2^5 \leq \xi_4 < 2^6$.

In summary, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 4.11. *Fix a suitable M and*

$$x_{[k_{t-1}, k_t]} \geq M' \geq M^2 + p_t - (k_t - k_{t-1}).$$

Then there exists $0 < \lambda_0 = \lambda_0(M, M') < 1$ such that the following holds for any odd integer ξ with $0 < \xi < 2^{p-1}$. Write

$$(4.11.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \xi &= \xi_1 + 2^3\xi_2 + 2^{p-7}\xi_4 \\ 0 &< \xi_1 < 2^3, \quad 0 \leq \xi_2 < 2^{p-10}, \quad 0 \leq \xi_4 < 2^6 \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$(4.11.2) \quad \lambda(k_{t-1}, k_t, p_t, p_{[t+1, r]}, \xi/2^p) \leq \lambda_0$$

if there is ℓ such that $k_{j-1} < \ell < \ell + M < k_j$ and $x_{[k_{j-1}, \ell+M]} < p_j$ and for all $1 \leq u \leq M$ and $0 \leq v \leq M$, and $n = x_{[\ell, k]}$ the following does not hold:

$$(4.11.3) \quad \begin{aligned} a_{n+p+u, \ell+v} &= a_{n+p, \ell}, \quad 0 \leq u, v \leq M \\ 0 &\leq \xi_4 < 2^5 \text{ or } a_{n+u, \ell+v} = a_{n+1, \ell}, \quad 0 \leq u, v \leq M \end{aligned}$$

Proof. This is the analysis in 4.9. $\lambda(k_{t-1}, k_t, p_t, p_{[t+1, r]}, \xi)$ is a convex sum of roots of unity where the number of roots of unity is

$$\binom{p_t}{k_t - k_{t-1} - 1}$$

and thus bounded in terms of M' and the coefficient of each root of unity is the inverse of this. Since p_t is bounded there are only finitely many values for $(x_{[k_{t-1}+1,k]}, \dots, x_{[\ell,k]} \dots x_{[k_t,k]})$ and again the number of values is bounded in terms of M' . But given the condition $M' \geq M^2 + p_t - (k_t - k_{t-1})$, there will be at least one $(x_{[k_{t-1}+1,k]}, \dots, x_{[\ell,k]} \dots x_{[k_t,k]})$ with an $\ell \in (k_{t-1}, k_t)$ such that $x_{[\ell+v,k]} > x_{[\ell+v+1,k]} + M$ for $0 \leq v \leq M$. So the analysis of 4.9 can be applied with $n = x_{[\ell+v,k]}$ for each $0 \leq v < M$. \square

So then Conjecture 4.7 is implied by Conjecture 4.12.

Conjecture 4.12. *For $1 < \mu < \infty$ and suitable constants $M > 0$, and $c > 0$, and for k sufficiently large, and $p \leq k$: apart from a set of $[x_1, \dots, x_k]$ of $\mathbb{G}_{1-\mu^{-1}}$ -measure $< e^{-ck}$ the set of $\ell \leq k$ such that (4.12.1) holds is of density $\leq (1-c)k$, where $n = x_{[\ell,k]}$,*

$$(4.12.1) \quad a_{n+p+u, \ell+v} = a_{n+p, \ell} \text{ for } 1 \leq u \leq M, \ 0 \leq v \leq M$$

This can be simplified as follows - where c does not transfer from 4.12 to 4.13.

Conjecture 4.13. *For $1 < \mu < \infty$ and a suitable constant $c > 0$, and k sufficiently large and $p \leq k$ apart from a set of $[x_1, \dots, x_k]$ of $\mathbb{G}_{1-\mu^{-1}}$ -measure $< e^{-ck}$ the set of $\ell \leq k$ such that $a_{x_{[\ell,k]}+p, \ell} = 0$ has density $\leq (1-c)k$ and similarly for the set of $\ell \leq k$ such that $a_{x_{[\ell,k]}+p, \ell} = 1$.*

4.14. Comments on Conjecture 4.13. The parallel with Section 7 of [9] is striking. We have an infinite array with entries labelled (j, ℓ) for $j \geq 0$ and $\ell \geq 1$. and we also have random paths on this infinite array. It is convenient to label the axes so that the horizontal axis labelled j runs from left to right starting from $j = 0$ and the vertical axis labelled ℓ points downwards, starting from $\ell = 1$. This is because one usually starts writing from the top of the page and in roman script from left to right. The ℓ 'th row of the array is the coefficients $a_{\ell, j} \in \{0, 1\}$ where

$$-3^{-\ell} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_{j, \ell} 2^j.$$

The paths $(\ell, x_{[\ell,k]})$ in 4.12 run upwards and to the right – which actually is also the case in [9] for paths $(j, b_{[1,j]})$. But the analogues of the “black triangles” in [9], “constant triangles” of 0’s or of 1’s, which will appear in Part 2 (hopefully), will be differently oriented because of the different axes direction. The array in [9] is somewhat more closely associated with triadic expansions of 2^{-n} , while here we are working explicitly with dyadic expansions of -3^{-k} . Actually as we shall see in Part 2, dyadic expansions of -3^{-k} and triadic expansions of 2^{-n} are

closely related, and it is helpful to consider them together, with yet another axis change and an affine transformation of constant triangles.

REFERENCES

- [1] Allouche, J-P., Sur la conjecture de “Syracuse-Kakutani-Collatz”, Séminaire de Théorie des Nombres 1978-9, Exp. no 9, 15 pp., CNRS, Talence, 1979.
- [2] Crandall, R.E., on the “ $3x + 1$ ” Problem, Mathematics of Computation 32, no 144 (1978) 1281-1292
- [3] Everett, C.J., Iteration of the number-theoretic function $f(2n) = n$, $f(2n + 1) = 3n + 2$. Advances in Math 25 (1977) 42-45.
- [4] Krasikov, I., How many numbers satisfy the $3X + 1$ conjecture?, International J. Math. & Math. Sci., 12 no 4 (1989), 791-796.
- [5] Krasikov, I. and Lagarias, J., Bounds for the $3x + 1$ problem using difference equations, Acta Arithmetica 109 no 3 (2003) 238-258
- [6] Lagarias, J., The $3x + 1$ Problem and its Generalizations, The American Mathematical Monthly 92, no. 1(1985) 3-23
- [7] Lagarias, J. , editor, The Ultimate Challenge: The $3x + 1$ problem. Amer. Math. Soc 2010
- [8] Lagarias, J. and Weiss, A., The $3x + 1$ problem: Two stochastic models, Annals of Probability 2 (1992) 229-261.
- [9] Tao, T., Almost all Collatz orbits attain almost bounded values. Forum of Mathematics, Pi, Volume 10,2022, e12
- [10] Terras, R., A stopping time problem on the positive integers, Acta Arith. 30 (1976) 241-252.