

# SOME CONDITIONS FOR "ALL OR NONE" DIVISIBILITY OF A CLASS OF FIBONACCI-LIKE SEQUENCES

**Juan Pla**

315 rue de Belleville 75019 Paris, France  
(Submitted May 1994)

In reference [1], the following theorem has been proved:

**Theorem:** Let  $u_n$  be the general term of a given sequence of integers such that  $u_{n+1} = u_{n+1} + u_n$ , where  $u_0$  and  $u_1$  are arbitrary integers. Let  $x$  be an arbitrary integer other than  $-2, -1, 0$  and  $1$ . Let  $D$  be any divisor of  $x^2 + x - 1$  other than  $1$ . Then the sequence  $w_n = xu_{n+1} - u_n$ , where  $n \geq 0$  is such that:

- (a)  $D$  divides every  $w_n$ ;
- (b)  $D$  divides no  $w_n$ .

The aim of this paper is to provide some precise conditions for the "all" situation.

**Theorem 1:** A necessary, but not sufficient, condition for the sequence with general term  $w_n = xu_{n+1} - u_n$  to display the "all" property relative to a given *prime* divisor  $p$  of  $x^2 + x - 1$  is that the distribution of the residues of  $(u_n)$  modulo  $p$  be either constant or periodic with period  $p - 1$ .

### 1) Proof that the condition is necessary:

Let us define the transformation  $T_x(u_n)$ , for any  $n$ , by  $T_x(u_n) = xu_{n+1} - u_n$ . If  $(T_x(u_n))^{(m)}$  denotes the  $m^{\text{th}}$  iterate of this transformation on  $(u_n)$ , it is quite easy to prove by induction that, for any  $n$  and  $m$ :

$$(T_x(u_n))^{(m)} = \sum_{k=0}^{k=m} (-1)^{m+k} \binom{m}{k} (x)^k u_{n+k}.$$

Put  $m = p$  in this formula. Since  $p$  is prime, the binomial coefficients are all divisible by  $p$ , except the two extreme ones ([2], p. 417). Therefore,

$$(T_x(u_n))^{(p)} \equiv x^p u_{n+p} + (-1)^p u_n \pmod{p}.$$

Since no even number can divide  $x^2 + x - 1$ ,  $p$  is always an odd prime, and therefore,

$$(T_x(u_n))^{(p)} \equiv x^p u_{n+p} - u_n \pmod{p}$$

for any  $n$ . But, since by construction  $(T_x(u_n))^{(p)}$  is a linear combination (with integral coefficients) of  $w_n$  terms all supposedly divisible by  $p$ , this entails

$$x^p u_{n+p} - u_n \equiv 0 \pmod{p}.$$

Since  $p$  is prime,  $x^p \equiv x \pmod{p}$ , and the previous congruence becomes

$$xu_{n+p} - u_n \equiv 0 \pmod{p}.$$

By hypothesis, for any  $n$ ,  $xu_{n+1} - u_n \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ . From the difference of the previous congruences, we obtain

$$x(u_{n+p} - u_{n+1}) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}.$$

Since  $p$  and  $x$  are relatively prime, this implies that, for any  $n$ ,  $u_{n+p} - u_{n+1} \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ , which proves the necessity of the condition stated above.

**Example:** In reference [1], we have seen that  $w_n = xL_{n+1} - L_n$  displays the property "all" for  $x = 2$  and  $p = 5$ . Therefore, we must have, for any  $n$ ,  $L_{n+5} - L_{n+1} \equiv 0 \pmod{5}$ , which property can easily be confirmed.

**2) Proof that the condition is not sufficient:**

To prove this, we shall find an appropriate counter-example deduced from the following lemma.

**Lemma:** For any  $x$  and any prime  $p$  dividing  $x^2 + x - 1$ , the sequence  $(w_n) = (xF_{n+1} - F_n)$  displays the "none" property.

Its demonstration is immediate, since  $w_0 = x$ , and  $p$  cannot divide  $x$ .

Now, for  $x = 7$ , we have  $x^2 + x - 1 = 55 = 5 \cdot 11$ .

But we have  $F_{n+11} - F_{n+1} \equiv 0 \pmod{11}$  for  $n = 0$  and  $n = 1$ . By using the fundamental recurrence property of the Fibonacci numbers, it is then easy to prove this property for any  $n$ . However, the above Lemma proves that it is not sufficient to imply the "all" property relative to  $p = 11$ .

**Theorem 2:** If, for a sequence  $w_n = xu_{n+1} - u_n$ , the "all" situation occurs for a nontrivial divisor  $D$  of  $x^2 + x - 1$ , then  $D$  divides the quantity  $(u_1)^2 - u_0u_2$ .

**Proof:** By definition of  $D$ :  $x^2 + x - 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{D}$ . By multiplying both sides of this congruence by  $(u_1)^2$ , we obtain  $(xu_1)^2 + (xu_1)u_1 - (u_1)^2 \equiv 0 \pmod{D}$ . But since  $xu_1 \equiv u_0 \pmod{D}$ , this is equivalent to  $(u_0)^2 + u_0u_1 - (u_1)^2 \equiv 0 \pmod{D}$ . And since  $(u_1)^2 - u_0u_1 - (u_0)^2 = (u_1)^2 - u_0u_2$ , the proof is complete.

This property helps to sharply reduce the number of divisors possible for an "all" situation to occur. For instance, for  $u_n = L_n$ ,  $(u_1)^2 - u_0u_2 = -5$ . Therefore, 5 is the only possible (positive) divisor of  $w_n = xL_{n+1} - L_n$  among those of  $x^2 + x - 1$ .

But this property of  $D$  is not sufficient to warrant the "all" situation, as shown by taking  $u_0 = -1$ ,  $u_1 = 4$ , and  $x = 4$ . In this case,  $x^2 + x - 1 = 19$ , so the only possible  $D$  is 19 and, on the other hand,  $(u_1)^2 - u_0u_2 = 19$ . But since  $w_0 = 4u_1 - u_0 = 17$ , we are in the "none" situation.

**REFERENCES**

1. Juan Pla. "An 'All or None' Divisibility Property for a Class of Fibonacci-Like Sequences of Integers." *The Fibonacci Quarterly* **32.3** (1994):226-27.
2. Edouard Lucas. *Théorie des Nombres*. Paris, 1891; rpt. Paris: Jacques Gabay, 1991.

AMS Classification Numbers: 11B37, 11B39

