

An exponential Diophantine equation related to the difference of powers of two Fibonacci numbers

Zafer Şiar

Bingöl University, Department of Mathematics, Bingöl/TURKEY
zsiar@bingol.edu.tr

November 16, 2021

Abstract

In this paper, we prove that there is no $x \geq 4$ such that the difference of x -th powers of two consecutive Fibonacci numbers greater than 0 is a Lucas number. Also we show that the Diophantine equation

$$F_{n+l}^x - F_n^x = L_r$$

with $l \in \{2, 3, 4\}$, $n > 0$, and $r \geq 0$ has no solutions for $x \geq 4$. Finally, we conjecture that the Diophantine equation

$$F_n^x - F_m^x = L_r$$

with $(n, m) \neq (1, 0), (2, 0)$, and $r \geq 0$ has no solutions for $x \geq 4$.

Keywords: Fibonacci and Lucas numbers, Exponential Diophantine equations, Linear forms in logarithms; Baker's method

AMS Subject Classification(2010): 11B39, 11D61, 11J86,

1 Introduction

Let (F_n) and (L_n) be the sequences of Fibonacci numbers and of Lucas numbers defined by $F_0 = 0$, $F_1 = 1$, $F_n = F_{n-1} + F_{n-2}$ and $L_0 = 2$, $L_1 = 1$, $L_n = L_{n-1} + L_{n-2}$ for $n \geq 2$, respectively. Binet formulas for these numbers are

$$F_n = \frac{\alpha^n - \beta^n}{\sqrt{5}} \text{ and } L_n = \alpha^n + \beta^n,$$

where $\alpha = \frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{2}$ and $\beta = \frac{1 - \sqrt{5}}{2}$, which are the roots of the characteristic equation $x^2 - x - 1 = 0$. It can be seen that $1 < \alpha < 2$, $-1 < \beta < 0$ and $\alpha\beta = -1$. The most known identity related to these numbers is

$$L_n = F_{n-1} + F_{n+1}. \quad (1)$$

If $n \geq 1$, then the relation between F_n and α is given by

$$\alpha^{n-2} \leq F_n \leq \alpha^{n-1} \quad (2)$$

and similarly, the relation between n -th Lucas number L_n and α is

$$\alpha^{n-1} \leq L_n < 2\alpha^n. \quad (3)$$

The inequalities (2) and (3) can be proved by induction. For more information about the Fibonacci and Lucas sequences with their applications, one can see [9].

The problem of finding the perfect powers in the Fibonacci sequence was a classical problem that attracted much attention over the last decades. One can consult [5] for Fibonacci numbers that are a square or twice a square, and [3, 4, 11] for the similar studies. In all these works, the authors have used elementary methods, congruences, modular approach, and linear forms in logarithms. But, in recent years, many mathematicians started to use particularly linear forms in logarithms of algebraic numbers in order to solve some Diophantine equations including Fibonacci, Lucas, Pell, and balancing numbers. For example, in [11], Marques and Togbe showed that if $s \geq 1$ is an integer such that $F_m^s + F_{m+1}^s$ is a Fibonacci number for all sufficiently large m , then $s \in \{1, 2\}$. Then, Luca and Oyono, in [10], solved completely this problem. That is, they proved that the equation $F_m^s + F_{m+1}^s = F_n$ has no solutions (m, n, s) with $m \geq 2$ and $s \geq 3$. After that, in [15], the authors extended this problem to the k -generalized Fibonacci numbers. In [13], Rihane et al. tackled the Diophantine equation

$$P_n^x + P_{n+1}^x = P_m$$

and gave all the solutions of this equation in nonnegative integers m, n, x . Same authors, in [14], proved that the Diophantine equation

$$B_{n+1}^x - B_n^x = B_m$$

has the solutions $(m, n, x) = (2n + 2, n, 2), (1, 0, x), (0, n, 0)$ in nonnegative integers m, n , and x .

On the other hand, the relation

$$F_{n+2} - F_{n-2} = L_n \quad (4)$$

is well known. Motivated by this equality and the above mentioned studies, we present a new problem. We will try to answer the question such that when does the difference of x -th powers of any two Fibonacci numbers become a Lucas number? Clearly, a trivial solution of this question for $x = 1$ is seen immediately from (4). In this study, we show that the Diophantine equation

$$F_{n+l}^x - F_n^x = L_r$$

with $l \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, $n > 0$, and $r \geq 0$ has no solutions for $x \geq 4$. Finally, we conjecture that the Diophantine equation

$$F_n^x - F_m^x = L_r \quad (5)$$

with $(n, m) \neq (1, 0), (2, 0)$, and $r \geq 0$ has no solutions for $x \geq 4$. Here, we will prove this conjecture for $n \leq 2m + 4$. But, the proof of this conjecture for $n > 2m + 4$ is really difficult.

Now let us give some inequalities, which will be useful for the proof of our main theorem. We observe that the inequality

$$\frac{F_{n-1}}{F_n} \leq \frac{2}{3}$$

holds for all $n \geq 3$. This implies that

$$\frac{F_n}{F_m} \geq \frac{3}{2} \tag{6}$$

for $m < n$ and $n \geq 3$. Also, it follows that

$$\left(\frac{F_m}{F_n}\right)^x \leq \left(\frac{F_m}{F_n}\right)^2 = \frac{1}{(F_n/F_m)^2} \leq \frac{4}{9}$$

for $x \geq 2$ and $n \geq 3$. And thus,

$$1 - \left(\frac{F_m}{F_n}\right)^x \geq \frac{1}{2}. \tag{7}$$

Our main theorem is

Theorem 1 *Let x be a positive integer and let n, m, r be non-negative integers such that $n \leq 2m + 4$ if $m \neq 0$. Then all solutions (n, m, r, x) of the Diophantine equation $F_n^x - F_m^x = L_r$ are the elements of the sets*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (1, 0, 1, x), (2, 0, 1, x), (3, 0, 3, 2), (3, 0, 0, 1), \\ (4, 0, 2, 1), (3, 1, 1, 1), (3, 2, 1, 1), (3, 1, 2, 2), (3, 2, 2, 2), \\ (3, 1, 4, 3), (3, 2, 4, 3), (4, 1, 0, 1), (4, 2, 0, 1), (5, 4, 0, 1), \\ (4, 3, 1, 1), (5, 2, 3, 1), (6, 5, 2, 1), (6, 1, 4, 1), (5, 3, 2, 1) \end{array} \right\}$$

or $\{(k + 1, k - 3, k - 1, 1)\}$ with $k \geq 4$.

2 Auxiliary results

In order to solve some Diophantine equations as in (5), many mathematicians have used Baker's theory of lower bounds for a nonzero linear form in logarithms of algebraic numbers. Since such bounds are of crucial importance in effectively solving of the Diophantine equation (5), we start with recalling some basic notions from algebraic number theory.

Let η be an algebraic number of degree d with minimal polynomial

$$a_0x^d + a_1x^{d-1} + \cdots + a_d = a_0 \prod_{i=1}^d (x - \eta^{(i)}) \in \mathbb{Z}[x],$$

where the a_i 's are relatively prime integers with $a_0 > 0$ and $\eta^{(i)}$'s are conjugates of η . Then

$$h(\eta) = \frac{1}{d} \left(\log a_0 + \sum_{i=1}^d \log \left(\max \{ |\eta^{(i)}|, 1 \} \right) \right) \quad (8)$$

is called the logarithmic height of η . In particular, if $\eta = a/b$ is a rational number with $\gcd(a, b) = 1$ and $b > 1$, then $h(\eta) = \log(\max\{|a|, b\})$.

The following properties of logarithmic height are found in many works stated in the references:

$$h(\eta \pm \gamma) \leq h(\eta) + h(\gamma) + \log 2, \quad (9)$$

$$h(\eta\gamma^{\pm 1}) \leq h(\eta) + h(\gamma), \quad (10)$$

$$h(\eta^m) = |m|h(\eta). \quad (11)$$

The following theorem is deduced from Corollary 2.3 of Matveev [12] and provides a large upper bound for the subscripts in the equation (5) (also see Theorem 9.4 in [3]).

Theorem 2 *Assume that $\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_t$ are positive real algebraic numbers in a real algebraic number field \mathbb{K} of degree D , b_1, b_2, \dots, b_t are rational integers, and*

$$\Lambda := \gamma_1^{b_1} \cdots \gamma_t^{b_t} - 1$$

is not zero. Then

$$|\Lambda| > \exp(-1.4 \cdot 30^{t+3} \cdot t^{4.5} \cdot D^2(1 + \log D)(1 + \log B)A_1A_2 \cdots A_t),$$

where

$$B \geq \max\{|b_1|, \dots, |b_t|\},$$

and $A_i \geq \max\{Dh(\gamma_i), |\log \gamma_i|, 0.16\}$ for all $i = 1, \dots, t$.

The following lemma, which will be used in the main theorem, gives a sufficient condition for a rational number to be a convergent of a given real number.

Lemma 3 ([2]) *Let γ be a real number. Any non-zero rational number $\frac{a}{b}$ with*

$$\left| \gamma - \frac{a}{b} \right| < \frac{1}{2b^2}$$

is a convergent of γ .

Lemma 4 ([16], Weger's Lemma 2.2) *Let $a, u \in \mathbb{R}$ and $0 < a < 1$. If $|u| < a$, then*

$$|\log(1 + u)| < \frac{-\log(1 - a)}{a} \cdot |u|$$

and

$$|u| < \frac{a}{1 - e^{-a}} \cdot |e^u - 1|.$$

The following lemma can be found in [6].

Lemma 5 *If $F_n | L_m$, then $n \leq 4$.*

The following two theorems are given in [5] and [8], respectively.

Theorem 6 *If $L_n = x^2$, then $n = 1, 3$ and if $L_n = 2x^2$, then $n = 0, 6$.*

Theorem 7 *If $L_n = L_m x^2$ with $m \geq 2$, then $n = m$.*

The following two theorems are proved in [7].

Theorem 8 *Let $1 \leq m \leq n$. Then all solutions of the equation $F_n + F_m = F_r$ are*

$$(n, m, r) = (n, n-1, n+1), (1, 1, 3), (2, 1, 3), (2, 2, 3), (3, 1, 4).$$

Theorem 9 *All solutions (n, m, r, k) of the Diophantine equation $F_k = F_n + F_m + F_r$ with $1 \leq r \leq m \leq n$ are the elements of the sets*

$$\{(n, n-2, n-3, n+1), (n, n, n-1, n+2)\}$$

and

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} (1, 1, 1, 4), (4, 1, 1, 5), (4, 2, 2, 5), (5, 3, 1, 6), \\ (2, 1, 1, 4), (2, 2, 2, 4), (3, 3, 1, 5) \end{array} \right\}.$$

The following lemma can be deduced from Theorem 2 given in [1].

Lemma 10 *The Diophantine equation $L_n = 2^x - 1$ for some nonnegative integers n, x has only the solutions $(n, x) = (1, 1), (2, 2), (4, 3)$.*

3 The proof of Theorem 1

Proof. Let $x > 0$ be an integer and let n, m, r be non-negative integers such that $n \leq 2m + 4$ if $m \neq 0$. Assume that $F_n^x - F_m^x = L_r$. It is clear that $n \neq m$ since $L_r \neq 0$ for all integer r . Then, $n > m$. If $m = 0$, then we have $F_n^x = L_r$. Since $F_n | L_r$, it follows that $n \leq 4$ by Lemma 5. It is obvious that $n \neq 0$. If $n = 1$ or $n = 2$, then $(n, m, r, x) = (1, 0, 1, x), (2, 0, 1, x)$. If $n = 3$ or $n = 4$, then we have $L_r = \square$ or $L_r = 2\square$, or $L_r = L_2\square$. In these cases, we get the solutions $(n, m, r, x) = (3, 0, 3, 2), (3, 0, 0, 1), (4, 0, 2, 1)$ by Theorems 6 and 7. Now let $m \geq 1$. If $m = 1$ or $m = 2$, then we see that $n \geq 3$. Assume that $n = 3$. Hence, we have the equation $L_r = 2^x - 1$. Then by Lemma 10, we get

$$(n, m, r, x) \in \{(3, 1, 1, 1), (3, 2, 1, 1), (3, 1, 2, 2), (3, 2, 2, 2), (3, 1, 4, 3), (3, 2, 4, 3)\}.$$

From now on, assume that $m \geq 1$, $n \geq 4$, and $x \geq 1$. Now let $x = 1$. Then we have the equation $F_n - F_m = L_r$, i.e., $F_n = F_m + F_{r-1} + F_{r+1}$ by (1). By Theorems 8 and 9, we obtain

$$(n, m, r, x) \in \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (3, 1, 1, 1), (3, 2, 1, 1), (4, 3, 1, 1), (4, 1, 0, 1), (4, 2, 0, 1), \\ (5, 4, 0, 1), (5, 2, 3, 1), (6, 5, 2, 1), (6, 1, 4, 1), (5, 3, 2, 1) \end{array} \right\},$$

and $(n, m, r, x) \in \{(k+1, k-3, k-1, 1)\}$ with $k \geq 4$. Thus, we can suppose that $x \geq 2$. Since $n \geq 4$ and $n > m$, it follows that $5 \leq 3^x - 2^x \leq F_n^x - F_m^x = L_r$, which implies that $r \geq 4$. On the other hand, using (2), (3) and (7), we get

$$\alpha^{r-1} \leq L_r = F_n^x - F_m^x \leq F_n^x \leq \alpha^{(n-1)x} \quad (12)$$

and also,

$$2\alpha^r > L_r = F_n^x - F_m^x = F_n^x \left(1 - \left(\frac{F_m}{F_n}\right)^x\right) \geq \frac{F_n^x}{2} \geq \frac{\alpha^{(n-2)x}}{2}. \quad (13)$$

If we make necessary calculations by using the inequalities (12) and (13), we get

$$(m-3)x \leq (n-3)x \leq r < nx \leq (2m+4)x, \quad (14)$$

where we used the facts that $n \geq 4$ and $m < n \leq 2m+4$. Rearranging the equation $F_n^x - F_m^x = L_r$ as $F_n^x - \alpha^r = F_m^x + \beta^r$ and taking absolute values of both sides of last equality, we get

$$|F_n^x - \alpha^r| \leq F_m^x + |\beta|^r. \quad (15)$$

Dividing both sides of (15) by F_n^x yields to

$$|1 - F_n^{-x}\alpha^r| \leq \frac{1}{(F_n/F_m)^x} + \frac{|\beta|^r}{F_n^x} \leq \frac{1}{(1.5)^x} + \frac{1}{\alpha^{(n-2)x}} < \frac{2}{(1.5)^x}, \quad (16)$$

where we used the inequality (6) and the fact that $\alpha^{(n-2)x} \geq \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^x$ for $m \geq 1$ and $n \geq 4$. Put

$$\Lambda_1 := 1 - F_n^{-x}\alpha^r.$$

If $\Lambda_1 = 0$, then we get $F_n^x = \alpha^r$, which is impossible since α^r is irrational for all positive integers r . So $\Lambda_1 \neq 0$. Now, let us apply Theorem 2 with $\gamma_1 := \alpha$, $\gamma_2 := F_n$ and $b_1 := -x$, $b_2 := r$. Note that the numbers γ_1 and γ_2 are positive real numbers and elements of the field $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{5})$. It is obvious that the degree of the field \mathbb{K} is 2. So $D = 2$. Moreover, since

$$h(\gamma_1) = h(\alpha) = \frac{\log \alpha}{2} = \frac{0.4812\dots}{2}$$

and

$$h(\gamma_2) = h(F_n) = n \log \alpha$$

by (10), we can take $A_1 := 0.5$ and $A_2 := 2n \log \alpha$. Also, it is obvious that $r \geq x$ by (14) since $n \geq 4$. Therefore, we can take $B = r$. Thus, taking into account the inequality (16) and using Theorem 2, we obtain

$$2(1.5)^x > |\Lambda_1| > \exp(-1.4 \cdot 30^5 \cdot 2^{4.5} \cdot 2^2(1 + \log 2)(1 + \log r)(0.5)2n \log \alpha).$$

Taking logarithms in the above inequality, we get

$$x \log(1.5) - \log 2 < 2.51 \cdot 10^9 \cdot (1 + \log r) \cdot n.$$

Thus, it follows that

$$x < 6.2 \cdot 10^9 \cdot (1 + \log nx) \cdot n \quad (17)$$

by (14). Now we assume that $n \leq 270$. Then, the inequality (17) gives us that $x < 6.43 \cdot 10^{13}$.

Let

$$z_1 := r \log \alpha - x \log F_n$$

and $u = e^{z_1} - 1$. By considering the inequality (16), we have

$$|u| = |e^{z_1} - 1| < \frac{2}{(1.5)^x} < 0.9$$

for $x \geq 2$. Choosing $a = 0.9$ in Lemma 4, we get

$$|z_1| = |\log(u + 1)| < \frac{-\log(1 - 0.9)}{(0.9)} \cdot \frac{2}{(1.5)^x} < \frac{5.12}{(1.5)^x}.$$

Hence, it follows that

$$0 < |r \log \alpha - x \log F_n| < \frac{5.12}{(1.5)^x}.$$

Dividing both sides of this inequality by $x \log \alpha$, we get

$$0 < \left| \frac{\log F_n}{\log \alpha} - \frac{r}{x} \right| < \frac{11}{x \cdot (1.5)^x}. \quad (18)$$

Now assume that $x \geq 103$. Then it can be seen that

$$\frac{(1.5)^x}{22} > 6.23 \cdot 10^{16} > 6.43 \cdot 10^{13} > x,$$

and so we have

$$\left| \frac{\log F_n}{\log \alpha} - \frac{r}{x} \right| < \frac{11}{x \cdot (1.5)^x} < \frac{1}{2x^2}.$$

Lemma 3 tells us that the rational number $\frac{r}{x}$ is a convergent to $\gamma = \frac{\log F_n}{\log \alpha}$. Then, let $[a_0, a_1, a_2, \dots]$ be the continued fraction of γ and let p_k/q_k be its k -th convergent. Assume that $\frac{r}{x} = \frac{p_t}{q_t}$ for some t . Then we have $1.7 \cdot 10^{23} > q_{34} > 6.43 \cdot 10^{13} > x$ for every $n \in [4, 270]$. Thus $t \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, 33\}$. Furthermore, $a_M = \max\{a_i | i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, 33\} = 1598$. From the known properties of continued fraction, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\log F_n}{\log \alpha} - \frac{r}{x} \right| &= \left| \gamma - \frac{p_t}{q_t} \right| = \frac{1}{(\gamma_{t+1} q_t + q_{t-1}) q_t} \\ &= \frac{1}{(\gamma_{t+1} + \frac{q_{t-1}}{q_t}) q_t^2} > \frac{1}{(a_{t+1} + 2) q_t^2} > \frac{1}{(a_M + 2) q_t^2} \geq \frac{1}{1600x^2}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the facts that $a_t = \lfloor \gamma_t \rfloor$ and $q_{t-1} < q_t$. Thus, from (18), we obtain

$$\frac{11}{x \cdot (1.5)^x} > \frac{1}{1600x^2},$$

that is,

$$\frac{1}{12.46 \cdot 10^{16}} > \frac{11}{(1.5)^x} > \frac{1}{1600x} \geq \frac{1}{10.288 \cdot 10^{16}},$$

a contradiction. Therefore $x \leq 102$. Taking into account the inequality (14), a quick computation with Mathematica gives us that the equation $F_n^x - F_m^x = L_r$ has no solutions for $n \in [4, 270]$ and $x \in [2, 102]$. Since this completes the analysis in the case $n \in [4, 270]$, from now on, we can assume that $n > 270$. This implies that $m \geq 134$. Since $n \leq 2m + 4$, from (17), we can write

$$x < 6.2 \cdot 10^9 \cdot (1 + \log(2m + 4)x) \cdot (2m + 4). \quad (19)$$

Here, since $(m + 2)x \geq 6$ implies that $(1 + \log(2m + 4)x) \leq 2 \log(m + 2)x$, we can rewrite the inequality (19) as

$$x < 24.8 \cdot 10^9 \cdot (m + 2) \log((m + 2)x) \quad (20)$$

If $x \leq m + 2$, then we have an inequality, which is better than inequality (20). So, we are through. Contrast to this, if $x > m + 2$, then (20) yields to us that $x < 49.6 \cdot 10^9 \cdot (m + 2) \log x$, which can be rearranged as

$$\frac{x}{\log x} < 49.6 \cdot 10^9 \cdot (m + 2). \quad (21)$$

Using the fact that

$$\text{if } A \geq 3 \text{ and } \frac{x}{\log x} < A, \text{ then } x < 2A \log A,$$

we obtain

$$x < 99.2 \cdot 10^9 \cdot (m + 2) \log(49.6 \cdot 10^9 \cdot (m + 2)),$$

or

$$x < 595.2 \cdot 10^9 (m + 2) \log(m + 2). \quad (22)$$

Now, put $y := \frac{x}{\alpha^{2m}}$. Then, since $m \geq 134$, from the inequality (22), we get

$$y < \frac{595.2 \cdot 10^9 (m + 2) \log(m + 2)}{\alpha^{2m}} < \frac{1}{\alpha^m}. \quad (23)$$

Particularly, note that $y < \frac{1}{\alpha^m} \leq \alpha^{-134} < 10^{-28}$. On the other hand, it can be seen that

$$F_n^x = \frac{\alpha^{nx}}{5^{x/2}} \left(1 - \frac{(-1)^n}{\alpha^{2n}} \right)^x$$

and

$$F_m^x = \frac{\alpha^{mx}}{5^{x/2}} \left(1 - \frac{(-1)^m}{\alpha^{2m}} \right)^x.$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &< \left(1 - \frac{1}{\alpha^{2n}} \right)^x < 1 < \left(1 + \frac{1}{\alpha^{2n}} \right)^x = 1 + \frac{x}{\alpha^{2n}} + \frac{x(x-1)}{\alpha^{4n}} + \dots \\ &< e^y < 1 + 2y \end{aligned}$$

because $y < 10^{-28}$. If we write m instead of n in the above inequality, it holds. Thus, we see that

$$\max \left\{ \left| F_n^x - \frac{\alpha^{nx}}{5^{x/2}} \right|, \left| F_m^x - \frac{\alpha^{mx}}{5^{x/2}} \right| \right\} < \frac{2y\alpha^{nx}}{5^{x/2}}. \quad (24)$$

Let us rearrange the equation $F_n^x - F_m^x = L_r$ as

$$\alpha^r - \frac{\alpha^{nx}}{5^{x/2}} + \frac{\alpha^{mx}}{5^{x/2}} = F_n^x - \frac{\alpha^{nx}}{5^{x/2}} - F_m^x + \frac{\alpha^{mx}}{5^{x/2}} - \beta^r.$$

Taking absolute values of both sides of the above equality and using (24), we get

$$\left| \alpha^r - \frac{\alpha^{nx}}{5^{x/2}} \left(1 - \alpha^{(m-n)x} \right) \right| \leq \left| F_n^x - \frac{\alpha^{nx}}{5^{x/2}} \right| + \left| F_m^x - \frac{\alpha^{mx}}{5^{x/2}} \right| + |\beta|^r < \frac{4y\alpha^{nx}}{5^{x/2}} + |\beta|^r.$$

Dividing both sides of this inequality by $\frac{\alpha^{nx}}{5^{x/2}}$, we obtain

$$\left| \alpha^{r-nx} \cdot 5^{x/2} + \alpha^{(m-n)x} - 1 \right| < \frac{4}{\alpha^m} + \frac{1}{\alpha^r} \cdot \left(\frac{\sqrt{5}}{\alpha^n} \right)^x, \quad (25)$$

where we used the fact that $\alpha\beta = -1$ and $y < \frac{1}{\alpha^m}$. Since

$$\left| \alpha^{r-nx} \cdot 5^{x/2} - 1 \right| \leq \left| \alpha^{r-nx} \cdot 5^{x/2} + \alpha^{(m-n)x} - 1 \right| + \alpha^{(m-n)x},$$

from (25), we get

$$\left| \alpha^{r-nx} \cdot 5^{x/2} - 1 \right| < \frac{4}{\alpha^m} + \frac{1}{\alpha^r} \cdot \left(\frac{\sqrt{5}}{\alpha^n} \right)^x + \frac{1}{\alpha^{(n-m)x}} < \frac{4}{\alpha^m} + \frac{1.05}{\alpha^x}, \quad (26)$$

where we used the fact that $\left(\frac{\sqrt{5}}{\alpha^n} \right)^x \leq 0.05$ for $n > 270$ and $r \geq x$. Put

$$\Lambda_2 := 1 - \alpha^{r-nx} \cdot 5^{x/2}.$$

If $\Lambda_2 = 0$, then we see that $\alpha^{2(nx-r)} = 5^x$, which is possible only when $nx = r$ since $5^x \in \mathbb{Z}$. This is impossible since $r < nx$ by (14). Therefore $\Lambda_2 \neq 0$. Also,

$$|\Lambda_2| < \frac{4}{\alpha^m} + \frac{1.05}{\alpha^x} < \frac{1}{2} \quad (27)$$

since $m \geq 134$ and $x \geq 2$. Thus $\alpha^{r-nx} \cdot 5^{x/2} \in [\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{2}]$. Particularly, making necessary calculations, it is seen that

$$1.659x - 0.86 < nx - r < 1.7x + 1.46. \quad (28)$$

Let $k_1 = \min\{m, x\}$. Then we see from (26) that

$$\left| \alpha^{r-nx} \cdot 5^{x/2} - 1 \right| < \frac{5.05}{\alpha^{k_1}}. \quad (29)$$

Now, let us apply Theorem 2 to the inequality (29). Take $\gamma_1 := \sqrt{5}$, $\gamma_2 := \alpha$, and $b_1 := x$, $b_2 := r - nx$. Observe that the numbers γ_1 and γ_2 are positive real numbers and belong to the field $K = Q(\sqrt{5})$. Therefore $D = 2$. Also, since $h(\gamma_1) = \log \sqrt{5} = 0.804\dots$, and $h(\gamma_2) = \frac{\log \alpha}{2} = \frac{0.4812\dots}{2}$ by (8), we can take $A_1 := 1.61$ and $A_2 := 0.5$. Besides, from (28), it is clear that $nx - r < (2.5)x$ for $x \geq 2$. So, we can take $B = (2.5)x \geq \max\{|x|, |r - nx|\}$. Thus, Theorem 2 tells us that

$$\frac{5.05}{\alpha^{k_1}} > |\Lambda_2| > \exp(-C(1 + \log 2)(1 + \log(2.5)x)(1.61)(0.5))$$

or

$$k_1 \log \alpha - \log 5.05 < C(1 + \log 2)(1 + \log(2.5)x)(1.61)(0.5), \quad (30)$$

where $C = 1.4 \cdot 30^5 \cdot 2^{4.5} \cdot 2^2$. If $k_1 = x$, then a computer search with Mathematica gives us that $x < 2.46 \cdot 10^{11}$. If $k_1 = m$, then, by using (22), we get

$$m \log \alpha - \log 5.05 < C(1 + \log 2)(1 + \log(2.5) + \log(595.2 \cdot 10^9(m+2) \log(m+2)))(1.61)(0.5). \quad (31)$$

With the help of a program in Mathematica, the inequality (31) gives us that $m < 5.18 \cdot 10^{11}$. Substituting this value of m into (22), we obtain $x < 8.32 \cdot 10^{24}$.

Now, let

$$z_2 := x \log \sqrt{5} - (nx - r) \log \alpha$$

and $u := e^{z_2} - 1$. Then $|u| = |e^{z_2} - 1| = |\Lambda_2| < \frac{1}{2}$ by (27). Thus, taking $a = 1/2$ in Lemma 3 and making necessary calculations, we get

$$|z_2| = |\log(1 + u)| < \frac{-\log(1 - \frac{1}{2})}{1/2} |u| < 1.4 \left(\frac{4}{\alpha^m} + \frac{1.05}{\alpha^x} \right).$$

That is,

$$0 < \left| x \log \sqrt{5} - (nx - r) \log \alpha \right| < 1.4 \left(\frac{4}{\alpha^m} + \frac{1.05}{\alpha^x} \right).$$

Dividing both sides of the above inequality by $x \log \alpha$, we obtain

$$\left| \frac{\log \sqrt{5}}{\log \alpha} - \frac{(nx - r)}{x} \right| < \frac{2.91}{x} \left(\frac{4}{\alpha^m} + \frac{1.05}{\alpha^x} \right). \quad (32)$$

Since $m \geq 134$, it follows that $\alpha^m \geq \alpha^{134} > 10^{28} > 1000x$. Now we suppose that $x > 100$. Then it can be seen that $\alpha^x > 1000x$. Hence, we can rewrite (32) as

$$\left| \frac{\log \sqrt{5}}{\log \alpha} - \frac{(nx - r)}{x} \right| < \frac{2.91}{x} \left(\frac{4}{1000x} + \frac{1.05}{1000x} \right) < \frac{1}{66x^2}.$$

This implies by Lemma 3 that the rational number $\frac{(nx-r)}{x}$ is a convergent to $\gamma = \frac{\log \sqrt{5}}{\log \alpha}$. Now let $[a_0, a_1, a_2, \dots]$ be the continued fraction of γ and let p_k/q_k be its k -th convergent. Assume that $\frac{(nx-r)}{x} = p_t/q_t$ for some t . Then we have $2 \cdot 10^{26} > q_{48} > 8.32 \cdot 10^{24} > x$. Thus $t \in \{0, 1, 2, \dots, 47\}$. Furthermore, $a_M = \max\{a_i | i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, 47\} = 29$. From the known properties of continued fraction, we get

$$\frac{1}{66x^2} > \left| \frac{\log \sqrt{5}}{\log \alpha} - \frac{(nx - r)}{x} \right| = \left| \gamma - \frac{p_t}{q_t} \right| > \frac{1}{(a_M + 2)q_t^2} \geq \frac{1}{31x^2},$$

a contradiction. So, $x \leq 100$. Then $x < m$. Hence, from (26), we get

$$\left| \alpha^{r-nx} \cdot 5^{x/2} - 1 \right| < \frac{5.05}{\alpha^x}. \quad (33)$$

From (28), we know that

$$1.659x - 0.86 < nx - r < 1.7x + 1.46.$$

Put $t = nx - r$. We found that the inequality (33) is not satisfied for all $x \in [2, 100]$ and $t \in [[1.659x - 0.86], [1.7x + 1.46]]$. Thus the proof is completed.

Thus, we can give the following result.

Corollary 11 *Let $x > 0$ be an integer and let n, r be nonnegative integers. Then all the solutions (n, r, x) of the Diophantine equation $F_{n+l}^x - F_n^x = L_r$ with $l \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ are given by*

$$\begin{aligned} (n, r, x) &= (0, 1, x), (2, 1, 1), (2, 2, 2), (2, 4, 3), (4, 0, 1), (3, 1, 1), (5, 2, 1) \text{ if } l = 1, \\ (n, r, x) &= (0, 1, x), (1, 1, 1), (1, 2, 2), (1, 4, 3), (2, 0, 1), (3, 2, 1) \text{ if } l = 2, \\ (n, r, x) &= (0, 3, 2), (0, 0, 1), (1, 0, 1), (2, 3, 1) \text{ if } l = 3, \\ (n, r, x) &= (0, 2, 1) \text{ if } l = 4. \end{aligned}$$

As one can see from the above result, the Diophantine equation

$$F_{n+l}^x - F_n^x = L_r$$

with $l \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, $n > 0$, and $r \geq 0$ has no solutions for $x \geq 4$. If we pay attention, this equation has solutions only for $n \leq 5$. From the equations obtained by substituting these values of n (except for $n = 0$) into the last equation, the equations, which have a solution are given as follows:

Corollary 12 *The Diophantine equation $3^x - 2^x = L_r$ in nonnegative integers r, x has only the solution $(r, x) = (1, 1)$.*

Corollary 13 *The Diophantine equation $5^x - 3^x = L_r$ in nonnegative integers r, x has only the solution $(r, x) = (0, 1)$.*

Corollary 14 *The Diophantine equation $8^x - 5^x = L_r$ in nonnegative integers r, x has only the solution $(r, x) = (2, 1)$.*

Corollary 15 *The Diophantine equation $3^x - 1 = L_r$ in nonnegative integers r, x has only the solution $(r, x) = (0, 1)$.*

Corollary 16 *The Diophantine equation $5^x - 2^x = L_r$ in nonnegative integers r, x has only the solution $(r, x) = (2, 1)$.*

Corollary 17 *The Diophantine equation $5^x - 1 = L_r$ in nonnegative integers r, x has only the solution $(r, x) = (3, 1)$.*

4 Concluding Remarks

We were not able to solve Diophantine equation (5) for $n > 2m + 4$. But we conjecture that the Diophantine equation (5) has no solutions in nonnegative integers n, m, r , and x when $n > 2m + 4$. We think the following conjecture is true and a computer search with Mathematica enables us to give it.

Conjecture 18 *The Diophantine equation (5) with $(n, m) \neq (1, 0), (2, 0)$ has no solutions for $x \geq 4$.*

References

- [1] J. J. Bravo and F. Luca, *Powers of two as sums of two Lucas numbers*, Journal of Integer Sequences, 17(2014), Article 14.8.3.
- [2] Y. Bugeaud, *Linear Forms in Logarithms and Applications*, IRMA Lectures in Mathematics and Theoretical Physics, 28, Zurich: European Mathematical Society, 2018.
- [3] Y. Bugeaud, M. Mignotte and S. Siksek, *Classical and modular approaches to exponential Diophantine equations I. Fibonacci and Lucas perfect powers*, Ann. of Math. **163**(3), (2006), 969-1018.
- [4] Y. Bugeaud, F. Luca, M. Mignotte and S. Siksek, *Fibonacci numbers at most one away from a perfect power*, Elem. Math., 63 (2008) 65–75.
- [5] J. H. E. Cohn, *Square Fibonacci numbers, etc.* Fibonacci Quart. 2.2 (1964), 109–113.

- [6] P. Hilton, J. Pedersen, and L. Somer, *On Lucasian numbers*, The Fibonacci Quarterly, 35(1997), 43–47.
- [7] N. Irmak, Z. Şiar, and R. Keskin, *On the sum of the three arbitrary Fibonacci and Lucas numbers*, Notes on Number Theory and Discrete Mathematics, 25(4) (2019), 96-101.
- [8] R. Keskin and Z. Yosma, *On Fibonacci and Lucas numbers of the form cx^2* , J. Integer Seq., 14 (9) (2011), article 11.9.3.
- [9] T. Koshy, *Fibonacci and Lucas Numbers With Applications*, Wiley-Interscience Pub., New York, 2001.
- [10] F. Luca and R. Oyono, *An exponential Diophantine equation related to powers of two consecutive Fibonacci numbers*, Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci., 87 (2011), 45–50.
- [11] D. Marques and A. Togbe, *On the sum of powers of two consecutive Fibonacci numbers*, Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci., 86 (2010), 174–176.
- [12] E. M. Matveev, *An Explicit lower bound for a homogeneous rational linear form in the logarithms of algebraic numbers II*, Izv. Ross. Akad. Nauk Ser. Mat., **64**(6) (2000), 125-180 (Russian). Translation in Izv. Math. **64**(6) (2000), 1217-1269.
- [13] S. E. Rihane, B. Faye, F. Luca and A. Togbe, *On the exponential Diophantine equation $P_n^x + P_{n+1}^x = P_m$* , Turk J Math, 43 (2019), 1640-1649.
- [14] S. E. Rihane, B. Faye, F. Luca and A. Togbe, *An exponential Diophantine equation related to the difference between powers of two consecutive Balancing numbers*, Annales Mathematicae et Informaticae, 50 (2019), 167–177.
- [15] C. A. G. Ruiz and F. Luca, *An exponential Diophantine equation related to the sum of powers of two consecutive k -generalized Fibonacci numbers*, Col. Math. 137(2) (2014), 171–188.
- [16] B. M. M. Weger, *Algorithms for Diophantine Equations*, CWI Tracts 65, Stichting Maths. Centrum, Amsterdam,1989.