



ON THE MULTIPLICATIVE ORDER OF F_{N+1}/F_N MODULO F_M

Takao Komatsu¹

Graduate School of Science and Technology, Hirosaki University, Hirosaki, Japan
komatsu@cc.hirosaki-u.ac.jp

Florian Luca²

Fundación Marcos Moshinsky, UNAM, Circuito Exterior, C.U., Apdo. Postal
70-543, México D.F. 04510, México
fluca@matmor.unam.mx

Yohei Tachiya

Graduate School of Science and Technology, Hirosaki University, Hirosaki, Japan
tachiya@cc.hirosaki-u.ac.jp

Received: 3/8/12, Accepted: 2/18/13, Published: 3/1/13

Abstract

Here, we show that if $s \notin \{1, 2, 4\}$ is a fixed positive integer and m and n are coprime positive integers such that the multiplicative order of F_{n+1}/F_n modulo F_m is s , where F_k is the k th Fibonacci number, then $m < 500s^2$.

1. Introduction

Let $\{F_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ be the Fibonacci sequence given by $F_0 = 0$, $F_1 = 1$ and

$$F_{k+2} = F_{k+1} + F_k \quad \text{for all } k \geq 0.$$

Let $m \geq 3$ and n be positive integers such that F_m and F_n are coprime. Since $\gcd(F_m, F_n) = F_{\gcd(m, n)}$, this last property holds when $\gcd(m, n) \in \{1, 2\}$. Then F_n is invertible modulo F_m . Assuming also that F_{n+1} is coprime to F_m , we can think of the rational number F_{n+1}/F_n as an invertible element modulo F_m . Here, we look at its order denoted by s . Formally, s depends on both m and n , but we shall omit this dependence in what follows.

¹T. K. was supported in part by the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific research (C) (No.22540005), the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science.

²F. L. worked on this project during a visit to Hirosaki in January and February of 2012 with a JSPS Fellowship (No.S-11021).

It is quite possible that this order is $s = 1$. Indeed, this happens precisely when $F_{n+1} \equiv F_n \pmod{F_m}$, so $F_m \mid F_{n+1} - F_n = F_{n-1}$, and this holds when $m \mid n - 1$. Hence, when $n \equiv 1 \pmod{m}$.

It is also possible that $s = 2$. In this case, $F_{n+1}^2 \equiv F_n^2 \pmod{F_m}$, so

$$F_m \mid F_{n+1}^2 - F_n^2 = (F_{n+1} - F_n)(F_{n+1} + F_n) = F_{n-1}F_{n+2}.$$

Assume that $m > 12$. Then, by Carmichael's Primitive Divisor Theorem (see [1]), F_m has a primitive prime factor p . This primitive prime has the property that $p \mid F_m$ but $p \nmid F_\ell$ for any positive integer $1 \leq \ell < m$. Furthermore, $p \mid F_\ell$ if and only if $m \mid \ell$. From the above divisibilities, we see that either $p \mid F_{n-1}$, case in which $m \mid n - 1$, or $p \mid F_{n+2}$, case in which $m \mid n + 2$. The situation when $m \mid n - 1$ leads to $s = 1$ and this is not convenient, so we must have $m \mid n + 2$. Thus, $n \equiv -2 \pmod{m}$.

It is also possible that $s = 4$. In this case, $F_{n+1}^4 \equiv F_n^4 \pmod{F_m}$, so

$$F_m \mid F_{n+1}^4 - F_n^4 = (F_{n+1} - F_n)(F_{n+1} + F_n)(F_{n+1}^2 + F_n^2) = F_{n-1}F_{n+2}F_{2n+1}.$$

If $m > 12$, then F_m has a primitive prime factor p . Since p divides the right-hand side of the above divisibility relation, we get that m divides one of $n - 1$, $n + 2$ or $2n + 1$. The first two cases lead to $s \in \{1, 2\}$. The third case is possible only when m is odd and $n \equiv (m - 1)/2 \pmod{m}$.

From the above discussion, we see that for each of $s \in \{1, 2, 4\}$, there exist infinitely many positive integers m such that the set of invertible residue classes modulo F_m contains a class representable as F_{n+1}/F_n for some appropriate positive integer n whose multiplicative order is s . We asked ourselves if this property holds for some other positive integers s . Maybe quite surprisingly, the answer is no.

Our main result is the following.

Theorem 1. *If $s \notin \{1, 2, 4\}$ is a positive integer and m is such that there exists an invertible class modulo F_m of the form F_{n+1}/F_n of multiplicative order s , then $m < 500s^2$.*

For an algebraic number field \mathbb{K} we put $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{K}}$ for the ring of algebraic integers in \mathbb{K} .

2. Preliminary Results

We need the following four lemmas.

Lemma 1. *Let $X \geq 3$ be a real number. Let a and b be positive integers with $\max\{a, b\} \leq X$. Then there exist integers u, v not both zero with $\max\{|u|, |v|\} \leq \sqrt{X}$ such that $|au + bv| \leq 3\sqrt{X}$.*

Proof. Consider the nonnegative numbers $as+bt$ for $s, t \in \{0, 1, \dots, \lfloor \sqrt{X} \rfloor\}$. There are $(\lfloor \sqrt{X} \rfloor + 1)^2 > X$ such numbers all in $[0, 2X\sqrt{X}]$. By the Pigeon Hole Principle, there exist $(s_1, t_1) \neq (s_2, t_2)$ such that

$$|a(s_1 - s_2) + b(t_1 - t_2)| = |(as_1 + bt_1) - (as_2 + bt_2)| \leq \frac{2X\sqrt{X}}{X - 1} \leq 3\sqrt{X}.$$

Putting $u = s_1 - s_2$ and $v = t_1 - t_2$, we get the desired conclusion. □

We put $\alpha = (1 + \sqrt{5})/2$ and $\beta = -\alpha^{-1}$.

Lemma 2. *Let $\zeta = e^{2\pi i u/v}$ with coprime positive integers u and v be a primitive root of unity of order v . If $v \notin \{1, 2, 4\}$, then the two numbers*

$$\alpha \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\alpha - \zeta}{\alpha + \zeta}$$

are multiplicatively independent.

Proof. Assume on the contrary that there exist integers m and n not both zero such that

$$\left(\frac{\alpha - \zeta}{\alpha + \zeta}\right)^m = \alpha^n. \tag{1}$$

If $m = 0$, then $\alpha^n = 1$, therefore $n = 0$, which is impossible. So, we assume that $m \neq 0$. Up to replacing the pair (m, n) by $(-m, -n)$, we may assume that $m > 0$. Assume first that v is coprime to 5. Then $\alpha \in \mathbb{K} = \mathbb{Q}(e^{2\pi i/5})$ and $\zeta \in \mathbb{L} = \mathbb{Q}(e^{2\pi i/v})$ and \mathbb{K} and \mathbb{L} are both Galois extensions of \mathbb{Q} whose intersection is trivial (i.e., equal to \mathbb{Q}). Thus, every Galois automorphism σ of $G = \text{Gal}(\mathbb{L}/\mathbb{Q})$ can be extended to a Galois automorphism of the compositum $\mathbb{M} = \mathbb{K}\mathbb{L} = \mathbb{Q}(e^{2\pi i/5v})$ of \mathbb{K} and \mathbb{L} in such a way that $\sigma(\alpha) = \alpha$. Applying an arbitrary such $\sigma \in G$ to (1), we deduce that equation (1) holds when we replace ζ by any conjugate of it. In particular, given $u_1, u_2 \in \{1, \dots, v\}$ both coprime to v , we have

$$\left(\frac{\alpha - e^{2\pi i u_1/v}}{\alpha + e^{-2\pi i u_1/v}}\right)^m = \alpha^n = \left(\frac{\alpha - 2e^{2\pi i u_2/v}}{\alpha + e^{-2\pi i u_2/v}}\right)^m. \tag{2}$$

Taking absolute values in (2) and then extracting m th roots, we get

$$\begin{aligned} -1 + \frac{2\alpha^2 + 2}{\alpha^2 + 2\alpha \cos(2\pi u_1/v) + 1} &= \frac{\alpha^2 - 2\alpha \cos(2\pi u_1/v) + 1}{\alpha^2 + 2\alpha \cos(2\pi u_1/v) + 1} \\ &= \left| \frac{\alpha - e^{2\pi i u_1/v}}{\alpha + e^{-2\pi i u_1/v}} \right|^2 = \left| \frac{\alpha - e^{2\pi i u_2/v}}{\alpha + e^{-2\pi i u_2/v}} \right|^2 \\ &= \frac{\alpha^2 - 2\alpha \cos(2\pi u_2/v) + 1}{\alpha^2 + 2\alpha \cos(2\pi u_2/v) + 1} \\ &= -1 + \frac{2\alpha^2 + 2}{\alpha^2 + 2\alpha \cos(2\pi u_2/v) + 1}, \end{aligned}$$

giving

$$\cos(2\pi u_1/v) = \cos(2\pi u_2/v).$$

This gives

$$\begin{aligned} \sin(2\pi u_1/v) &= \pm\sqrt{1 - \cos(2\pi u_1/v)^2} = \pm\sqrt{1 - \cos(2\pi u_2/v)^2} \\ &= \pm\sin(2\pi u_2/v). \end{aligned}$$

This argument shows that there exist at most 2 primitive roots of unity of order v , therefore $\phi(v) \leq 2$, and since $v \notin \{1, 2, 4\}$, we get that $v \in \{3, 6\}$. Let us look at these cases. In this instance, $\mathbb{M} = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{5}, i\sqrt{3})$ is of degree 4 over \mathbb{Q} . We compute

$$\frac{\alpha - \zeta}{\alpha + \zeta} \in \left\{ \left(\frac{2 + \sqrt{5} + \varepsilon i\sqrt{3}}{\sqrt{5} + \varepsilon i\sqrt{3}} \right)^{\pm 1} : \varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\} \right\}.$$

Since α is a unit, equation (1) tells us that the principal ideals in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{M}}$ given by $(\sqrt{5} + \varepsilon i\sqrt{3})^m \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{M}}$ and $(2 + \sqrt{5} + \varepsilon i\sqrt{3})^m \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{M}}$ are equal for some $\varepsilon \in \{\pm 1\}$. By unique factorization of ideals in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{M}}$, we get that

$$(\sqrt{5} + \varepsilon i\sqrt{3})\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{M}} = (2 + \sqrt{5} + \varepsilon i\sqrt{3})\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{M}}.$$

In particular, we deduce that $\sqrt{5} + \varepsilon i\sqrt{3} \mid 2$. Taking norms in this last divisibility relation, we get that

$$64 = |N_{\mathbb{M}/\mathbb{Q}}(\sqrt{5} + \varepsilon i\sqrt{3})| \mid |N_{\mathbb{M}/\mathbb{Q}}(2)| = 16,$$

which is false.

A similar argument applies when $5 \mid v$. In this case $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{Q}(e^{2\pi i/5}) \subseteq \mathbb{L}$, so $\mathbb{M} = \mathbb{L}$ and $G = \text{Gal}(\mathbb{M}/\mathbb{Q})$ is isomorphic with the group of invertible elements modulo v which has order $\phi(v)$. Further, by Galois theory, there are exactly $\phi(v)/2$ Galois automorphisms σ such that $\sigma(\alpha) = \alpha$. We deduce that there exists a subset $\mathcal{U} \subset \{1, 2, \dots, v\}$ of positive integers coprime to v having exactly $\phi(v)/2$ elements, such that equation (1) holds for all $\zeta = e^{2\pi i u/v}$ with all $u \in \mathcal{U}$. The preceding argument shows that

$$\cos(2\pi u_1/v) = \cos(2\pi u_2/v) \quad \text{holds for all } u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{U},$$

therefore

$$\sin(2\pi u_1/v) = \pm\sin(2\pi u_2/v) \quad \text{holds for all } u_1, u_2 \in \mathcal{U}.$$

This shows that the number of elements in \mathcal{U} is at most 2, so $\phi(v) \leq 4$. Since we already have that $5 \mid v$, we get that $v \in \{5, 10\}$. We calculated that all numbers of the form

$$\frac{\alpha - \zeta}{\alpha + \zeta},$$

when ζ is a primitive root of unity of order $v \in \{5, 10\}$, are algebraic numbers in $\mathbb{M} = \mathbb{Q}(e^{2\pi i/5})$ of norm $11^{\pm 1}$, and therefore equation (1) does not hold in this instance either for any pair of integers m, n with not both zero. \square

Lemma 3. *Let $\zeta = e^{2\pi i u/v}$, where $v \neq 4$ is a positive integer and $u \in \{1, 2, \dots, v\}$ is coprime to v . Then the divisibility relation $1 + \zeta^2 \mid 2v$ holds in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{K}}$, where \mathbb{K} is any number field containing $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)$.*

Proof. We distinguish four cases. For a positive integer m we put $\Phi_m(X)$ for the m th cyclotomic polynomial.

- If v is odd, then ζ^2 is also a primitive root of order v of unity, so

$$1 + \zeta^2 \mid \Phi_v(-1) \mid X^v - 1 \Big|_{X=-1} = -2.$$

- If $2 \mid v$ and $v/2$ is odd, then ζ^2 is a primitive root of unity of order $v/2$ and

$$1 + \zeta^2 \mid \Phi_{v/2}(-1) \mid X^{v/2} - 1 \Big|_{X=-1} = -2.$$

- If $4 \mid v$ and $v/4$ is odd, then, since $v/4 > 1$, it follows that $(X^{v/4} - 1)$ and $(X + 1)$ are proper divisors of $X^{v/2} - 1$ and they do not have any common roots. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + \zeta^2 \mid \Phi_{v/2}(-1) \mid \frac{X^{v/2} - 1}{(X^{v/4} - 1)(X + 1)} \Big|_{X=-1} &= \frac{X^{v/4} + 1}{X + 1} \Big|_{X=-1} \\ &= X^{v/4-1} - X^{v/4-2} + \dots + 1 \Big|_{X=-1} = v/4. \end{aligned}$$

- If $8 \mid v$, then

$$1 + \zeta^2 \mid \Phi_{v/2}(-1) \mid \frac{X^{v/2} - 1}{X^{v/4} - 1} \Big|_{X=-1} = X^{v/4} + 1 \Big|_{X=-1} = 2.$$

\square

For a prime number p and a nonzero integer m , we put $\nu_p(m)$ for the exponent of the prime p in the factorization of m . For a finite set of primes \mathcal{S} and a positive integer m , we put

$$m_{\mathcal{S}} = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{S}} p^{\nu_p(m)}$$

for the largest divisor of m whose prime factors are in \mathcal{S} .

Lemma 4. *If \mathcal{S} is any finite set of primes and m is a positive integer, then*

$$(F_m)_{\mathcal{S}} \leq 2m \prod_{p \in \mathcal{S}} F_{p+1}.$$

Proof. For a prime p , let f_p be its order of appearance in the Fibonacci sequence, which is the minimal positive integer k such that $p \mid F_k$. It is well-known that

$$\nu_p(F_m) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } m \not\equiv 0 \pmod{f_p}; \\ \nu_p(F_{f_p}) + \nu_p(m/f_p) & \text{if } m \equiv 0 \pmod{f_p}, \quad p \text{ is odd}; \\ 1 & \text{if } m \equiv 3 \pmod{6}, \quad p = 2; \\ 2 + \nu_2(m) & \text{if } m \equiv 0 \pmod{6}, \quad p = 2. \end{cases}$$

In particular, the inequality

$$\nu_p(F_m) \leq \nu_p(F_{f_p}) + \nu_p(m) + \delta_{p,2}$$

always holds with $\delta_{p,2}$ being 0 if p is odd and 1 if $p = 2$. Since $f_p \leq p + 1$ holds for all primes p , we get that

$$\begin{aligned} (F_m)_S &\leq \left(\prod_{p \in S} p^{\nu_p(F_{f_p})} \right) \left(\prod_{\substack{p|m \\ p>2}} p^{\nu_p(m)} \right) 2^{\nu_2(m)+1} \\ &\leq 2m \prod_{p \in S} F_{f_p} \leq 2m \prod_{p \in S} F_{p+1}, \end{aligned}$$

which is what we wanted to prove. □

3. Proof of Theorem 1

We use the Binet formula

$$F_n = \frac{\alpha^n - \beta^n}{\alpha - \beta} \quad \text{valid for all } n \geq 0. \tag{3}$$

We also use the inequalities

$$\alpha^{n-2} \leq F_n \leq \alpha^{n-1} \quad \text{valid for all } n \geq 1. \tag{4}$$

We also use the fact that if $m \geq 1$, then the sequence $\{F_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ is periodic modulo F_m with period $4m$. Assume now that $s \neq \{1, 2, 4\}$ is a positive integer and that $m > 1000$ is such that there exist n with F_n coprime to F_m and F_{n+1}/F_n is invertible modulo F_m of multiplicative order exactly s . From the periodicity of $\{F_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ modulo F_m , we may assume that $n \leq 4m$, and since $F_n F_{n+1}$ and F_m are coprime, we may assume that $n \leq 4m - 2$. We shall exploit the relation

$$F_m \mid F_{n+1}^s - F_n^s = \prod_{\zeta: \zeta^s=1} (F_{n+1} - \zeta F_n). \tag{5}$$

We split F_m into various factors.

Step 1. We put

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \gcd(F_m, F_{n+1} - F_n), \\ B &= \gcd(F_m, F_{n+1} + F_n), \\ C &= \gcd(F_m, F_{n+1}^2 + F_n^2), \end{aligned}$$

and we bound ABC .

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \gcd(F_m, F_{n-1}) = F_{d_1}, \quad \text{where } d_1 = \gcd(m, n-1); \\ B &= \gcd(F_m, F_{n+2}) = F_{d_2}, \quad \text{where } d_2 = \gcd(m, n+2); \\ C &= \gcd(F_m, F_{2n+1}) = F_{d_3}, \quad \text{where } d_3 = \gcd(m, 2n+1). \end{aligned}$$

The numbers d_1, d_2, d_3 are divisors of m and they are proper, since if $d_i = m$ for some $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, then, from what we have seen in the Introduction, we would get that $s \in \{1, 2, 4\}$, which is not the case. Observe that any two of d_1, d_2, d_3 are coprime, or the greatest common divisors of any two of them is exactly 3. The second condition holds precisely when $m \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ and $n \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$. Indeed, this holds because

$$\begin{aligned} \gcd(d_1, d_2) &= \gcd(m, n-1, n+2) = \gcd(m, n-1, 3); \\ \gcd(d_1, d_3) &= \gcd(m, n-1, 2n+1) = \gcd(m, n-1, 3); \\ \gcd(d_2, d_3) &= \gcd(m, n+2, 2n+1) = \gcd(m, n+2, 3) = \gcd(m, n-1, 3). \end{aligned}$$

Let $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ be such that $d_i = \max\{d_1, d_2, d_3\}$ and let j, k be indices such that $\{i, j, k\} = \{1, 2, 3\}$. Noting that since d_i is a proper divisor of m , we have $d_i \leq m/2$. When any two of d_1, d_2, d_3 are coprime, we then have that

$$d_1 d_2 d_3 \leq m, \quad \text{therefore } d_j d_k \leq m^{2/3}. \tag{6}$$

When the greatest common divisor of any two of the numbers d_1, d_2, d_3 is exactly 3, we get

$$\left(\frac{d_1}{3}\right) \left(\frac{d_2}{3}\right) \left(\frac{d_3}{3}\right) \leq \frac{m}{3}, \quad \text{therefore } \left(\frac{d_j}{3}\right) \left(\frac{d_k}{3}\right) \leq \left(\frac{m}{3}\right)^{2/3},$$

leading to the slightly worse bound than (6), namely

$$d_j d_k \leq 3^{4/3} m^{2/3}. \tag{7}$$

Thus, using (4), we get that

$$ABC = F_{d_1} F_{d_2} F_{d_3} \leq \alpha^{d_1+d_2+d_3-3} \leq \alpha^{m/2+d_j+d_k-3} \leq \alpha^{m/2+3^{4/3}m^{2/3}-2}, \tag{8}$$

where we used also the fact that the inequality $a + b \leq ab + 1$ is valid for all positive integers a and b with $a = d_j$ and $b = d_k$.

Step 2. We put $\mathcal{S} = \{2\} \cup \{p : p \mid s\}$ and $D = (F_m)_{\mathcal{S}}$, and bound D .

By Lemma 4 and inequalities (4), we have that

$$D \leq 2mF_3 \prod_{p \mid s} F_{p+1} < 4m\alpha^{\sum_{p \mid s} p} < \alpha^{s + \log(4m)/\log \alpha}, \tag{9}$$

where we used the fact that $\sum_{p \mid s} p \leq s$, which is easily proved by induction on the number of distinct prime factors of s .

Step 3. We put

$$E = \frac{F_m}{\gcd(ABCD, F_m)},$$

and bound E .

We shall estimate the number E by using the fact that E is coprime to $2s$, as well as divisibility (5), which in particular tell us that

$$F_m \mid ABC \prod_{\substack{\zeta: \zeta^s = 1 \\ \zeta \notin \{\pm 1, \pm i\}}} (F_{n+1} - \zeta F_n),$$

which shows that

$$E \mid \prod_{\substack{\zeta: \zeta^s = 1 \\ \zeta \notin \{\pm 1, \pm i\}}} (F_{n+1} - \zeta F_n). \tag{10}$$

Let $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{Q}(e^{2\pi i/s}, \sqrt{5})$, which is a number field of degree d equal to $\phi(s)$ or to $2\phi(s)$, according to whether s is a multiple of 5 or not. Assume that there are ℓ roots of unity ζ participating in the product appearing in the right-hand side of (10) and label them $\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_\ell$. Clearly, $\ell \in [s - 4, s - 1]$. Write

$$\mathcal{E}_i = \gcd(E, F_{n+1} - \zeta_i F_n) \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, \ell, \tag{11}$$

where \mathcal{E}_i are ideals in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{K}}$. Then relations (10) and (11) tell us that

$$E\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{K}} \mid \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} \mathcal{E}_i. \tag{12}$$

Our next goal is to bound the norm $N_{\mathbb{K}/\mathbb{Q}}(\mathcal{E}_i)$ of \mathcal{E}_i for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$. First of all, $F_m \in \mathcal{E}_i$. Thus, with formula (3) and the fact that $\beta = -\alpha^{-1}$, we get

$$\alpha^m \equiv (-1)^m \alpha^{-m} \pmod{\mathcal{E}_i}.$$

Multiplying the above congruence by α^m , we get

$$\alpha^{2m} \equiv (-1)^m \pmod{\mathcal{E}_i}. \tag{13}$$

We next use formulae (3) and (11) to deduce that

$$(\alpha^{n+1} - (-1)^{n+1}\alpha^{-n-1}) - \zeta(\alpha^n - (-1)^n\alpha^{-n}) \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathcal{E}_i}, \quad (\zeta = \zeta_i).$$

Multiplying both sides above by α^n , we get

$$\alpha^{2n}(\alpha - \zeta) - (-1)^{n+1}(\alpha^{-1} + \zeta) \equiv 0 \pmod{\mathcal{E}_i}. \tag{14}$$

Let us show that $\alpha - \zeta$ and \mathcal{E}_i are coprime. Assume this is not so and let π be some prime ideal of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{K}}$ dividing both $\alpha - \zeta$ and \mathcal{E}_i . Then we get $\alpha \equiv \zeta \pmod{\pi}$ and so $\alpha^{-1} \equiv -\zeta \pmod{\pi}$ by (14). Multiplying these two congruences we get $1 \equiv -\zeta^2 \pmod{\pi}$. Hence, $\pi \mid 1 + \zeta^2$, so by Lemma 3, we get that $\pi \mid 2s$. However, this contradicts the fact that $\pi \mid \mathcal{E}_i \mid E$, with E an integer coprime to $2s$. Thus, indeed $\alpha - \zeta$ and \mathcal{E}_i are coprime, so $\alpha - \zeta$ is invertible modulo \mathcal{E}_i . Now congruence (14) shows that

$$\alpha^{2n} \equiv (-1)^{n+1} \frac{\alpha^{-1} + \zeta}{\alpha - \zeta} \pmod{\mathcal{E}_i},$$

therefore

$$\alpha^{2n+1} \equiv (-1)^{n+1} \zeta \left(\frac{\alpha + \bar{\zeta}}{\alpha - \zeta} \right) \pmod{\mathcal{E}_i}. \tag{15}$$

We now apply Lemma 1 to $a = 2m$ and $b = 2n + 1 \leq 2(4m - 2) + 1 < 8m$ with the choice $X = 8m$ to deduce that there exist integers u, v not both zero with $\max\{|u|, |v|\} \leq \sqrt{X}$ such that $|2mu + (2n + 1)v| \leq 3\sqrt{X}$. We raise congruence (13) to u and congruence (15) to v and multiply the resulting congruences getting

$$\alpha^{2mu+(2n+1)v} = (-1)^{mu+(n+1)v} \zeta^v \left(\frac{\alpha + \bar{\zeta}}{\alpha - \zeta} \right)^v \pmod{\mathcal{E}_i}.$$

We record this as

$$\alpha^a \equiv \eta \left(\frac{\alpha + \bar{\delta}}{\alpha - \delta} \right)^b \pmod{\mathcal{E}_i} \tag{16}$$

for suitable roots of unity η and δ of order dividing $2s$ with δ not of order 1, 2 or 4, where $a = 2mu + (2n + 1)v$ and $b = v$. We may assume that $a \geq 0$, for if not, we replace the pair (u, v) by the pair $(-u, -v)$, thus replacing (a, b) by $(-a, -b)$ and η by η^{-1} and leaving δ unaffected. We may additionally assume that $b \geq 0$, for if not, we replace b by $-b$ and $\delta = \zeta$ by $\delta = -\bar{\zeta}$, again a root of unity of order dividing $2s$ but not of order 1, 2 or 4, and leave a and η unaffected. Thus, \mathcal{E}_i divides the algebraic integer

$$E_i = \alpha^a(\alpha - \delta_i)^b - \eta_i(\alpha + \bar{\delta}_i)^b, \tag{17}$$

where $\delta_i \in \{\zeta_i, -\overline{\zeta_i}\}$ and η_i is some suitable root of unity of order dividing $2s$. Let us show that $E_i \neq 0$. If $E_i = 0$, we then get

$$\alpha^a = \eta_i \left(\frac{\alpha + \overline{\delta_i}}{\alpha - \delta_i} \right)^b,$$

and after raising both sides of the above equality to the power $2s$, we get, since $\eta_i^{2s} = 1$, that

$$\alpha^{2sa} = \left(\frac{\alpha + \overline{\delta_i}}{\alpha - \delta_i} \right)^{2bs}.$$

By Lemma 2, we have that $as = bs = 0$, so $a = b = 0$. Since $b = 0$, we get that $v = 0$, and later since $2mu + (2n + 1)v = a = 0$ and $v = 0$, we get $mu = 0$, so $u = 0$, therefore $u = v = 0$, but this is not allowed. We now bound the absolute values of the conjugates of E_i . We find it more convenient to work with the associate of E_i given by

$$G_i = \alpha^{-\lfloor a/2 \rfloor} E_i = \alpha^{a-\lfloor a/2 \rfloor} (\alpha - \delta_i)^b - \alpha^{-\lfloor a/2 \rfloor} \eta_i (\alpha + \overline{\delta_i})^b.$$

Note that

$$a \leq |2m + (2n + 1)v| \leq 3\sqrt{X} = 6\sqrt{2m}, \quad \text{and} \quad b = |v| \leq \sqrt{X} = 2\sqrt{2m}.$$

Let σ be an arbitrary element of $G = \text{Gal}(\mathbb{K}/\mathbb{Q})$. We then have that $\sigma(\eta_i) = \eta'_i$, $\sigma(\delta_i) = \delta'_i$, where η'_i and δ'_i are roots of unity of order dividing $2s$. Furthermore, $\sigma(\alpha) \in \{\alpha, \beta\}$. If $\sigma(\alpha) = \alpha$, we then get

$$\begin{aligned} |\sigma(G_i)| &= |\alpha^{a-\lfloor a/2 \rfloor} (\alpha - \delta'_i)^b - \eta'_i \alpha^{-\lfloor a/2 \rfloor} (\alpha + \overline{\delta'_i})^b| \\ &\leq \alpha^{(a+1)/2} (\alpha + 1)^b + (\alpha + 1)^b \\ &\leq 2\alpha^{(a+1)/2} (\alpha + 1)^b \leq (2\sqrt{\alpha}) \alpha^{3\sqrt{2m}} \times (\alpha^2)^{2\sqrt{2m}} \\ &= (2\sqrt{\alpha}) \alpha^{7\sqrt{2m}}, \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

while if $\sigma(\alpha) = \beta$, we also get

$$\begin{aligned} |\sigma(G_i)| &= |\beta^{a-\lfloor a/2 \rfloor} (\beta - \delta'_i)^b - \beta^{-\lfloor a/2 \rfloor} \eta'_i (\beta + \overline{\delta'_i})^b| \\ &\leq (\alpha^{-1} + 1)^b + \alpha^{a/2} (\alpha^{-1} + 1)^b \\ &= \alpha^b + \alpha^{a/2+b} \leq 2\alpha^{3\sqrt{2m}} \alpha^{2\sqrt{2m}} \\ &= 2\alpha^{5\sqrt{2m}}. \end{aligned}$$

In conclusion, inequality (18) holds for all $\sigma \in G$. Thus, if we write $G_i^{(1)}, \dots, G_i^{(d)}$ for the d conjugates of G_i in \mathbb{K} , we then get that

$$|N_{\mathbb{K}/\mathbb{Q}}(\mathcal{E}_i)| \leq |N_{\mathbb{K}/\mathbb{Q}}(E_i)| = |N_{\mathbb{K}/\mathbb{Q}}(G_i)| \leq (2\sqrt{\alpha})^d \alpha^{7d\sqrt{2m}},$$

where the first inequality above follows because \mathcal{E}_i divides E_i ; hence G_i , and $E_i \neq 0$. Multiplying the above inequalities for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ we get, using also (12), that

$$\begin{aligned} E^d &= N_{\mathbb{K}/\mathbb{Q}}(E) = N_{\mathbb{K}/\mathbb{Q}}(E\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{K}}) \leq N\left(\prod_{i=1}^{\ell} \mathcal{E}_i\right) \\ &\leq \prod_{i=1}^{\ell} N_{\mathbb{K}/\mathbb{Q}}(G_i) \leq (2\sqrt{\alpha})^{\ell d} \alpha^{7d\ell\sqrt{2m}}, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$E \leq (2\sqrt{\alpha})^{\ell} \alpha^{7\ell\sqrt{2m}} = \alpha^{7\ell\sqrt{2m} + \ell \log(2\sqrt{\alpha}) / \log \alpha}. \tag{19}$$

Thus, we have bounded E .

Step 4. The final inequality.

We now use (4) to bound F_m from below as $F_m > \alpha^{m-2}$, and the fact that $F_m \leq ABCDE$ and the estimates (8), (9) and (19), to bound F_m from above as

$$F_m \leq \alpha^{m/2 + 3^{4/3}m^{2/3} - 2 + s + \log(4m) / \log \alpha + 7\ell\sqrt{2m} + \ell \log(2\sqrt{\alpha}) / \log \alpha},$$

to conclude that

$$m - 2 < \frac{m}{2} + 3^{4/3}m^{2/3} - 2 + s + \frac{\log(4m)}{\log \alpha} + 7\ell\sqrt{2m} + \frac{\ell \log(2\sqrt{\alpha})}{\log \alpha}, \tag{20}$$

where $\ell \leq s - 1$. We look at

$$f(m, s) = \frac{m}{2} - 3^{4/3}m^{2/3} - s - \frac{\log(4m)}{\log \alpha} - 7(s-1)\sqrt{2m} - \frac{(s-1) \log(2\sqrt{\alpha})}{\log \alpha}.$$

Computing the partial derivative with respect to m , we get

$$g(m, s) = \frac{\partial f}{\partial m}(m, s) = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{2 \times 3^{1/3}}{m^{1/3}} - \frac{1}{m \log \alpha} - \frac{7(s-1)}{\sqrt{2m}}. \tag{21}$$

The function $g(m, s)$ is positive when $m \geq 500s^2$ and $s \geq 3$, because in this range

$$g(m, s) \geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{2 \times 3^{1/3}}{(4500)^{1/3}} - \frac{1}{4500 \log \alpha} - \frac{7}{\sqrt{1000}} > 0.103.$$

Thus, in order to prove that $m < 500s^2$, it suffices to prove $f(500s^2, s) > 0$. We checked with Mathematica that this inequality holds for $s \geq 17$. For the remaining values $s \in [3, 16]$, we checked individually by noticing that for each one of these values of s a slightly better inequality than (20) holds. For example, in the case when $s \in \{3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15\}$, there is no need for d_2 and d_3 because s is odd. Thus, the analogue of inequality (20) for such values of s is simply

$$m - 2 < \frac{m}{2} - 1 + s + \frac{\log(4m)}{\log \alpha} + 7(s-1)\sqrt{2m} + \frac{(s-1) \log(2\sqrt{\alpha})}{\log \alpha}. \tag{22}$$

Plugging in $s = 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13,$ and 15 into (22), we got m bounded by $2000, 7000, 15000, 26000, 40000, 57000,$ and $77000,$ respectively, so definitely the inequality $m < 500s^2$ holds for these values of s as well. When $s = 6, 10, 14,$ we keep only two divisors in Case 1, namely d_1 and d_2 since there is no need for d_3 . Putting $i \in \{1, 2\}$ such that $d_i = \max\{d_1, d_2\}$ and letting j be such that $\{i, j\} = \{1, 2\},$ the analog of inequality (7) is

$$d_j \leq \sqrt{3m}.$$

Since $\ell \leq s - 2,$ when $s = 6, 10, 14,$ the analog of inequality (20) in this case is

$$m - 2 < \frac{m}{2} + \sqrt{3m} - 2 + s + \frac{\log(4m)}{\log \alpha} + 7(s - 2)\sqrt{2m} + \frac{(s - 2) \log(2\sqrt{\alpha})}{\log \alpha}, \quad (23)$$

giving for $s = 6, 10,$ and 14 that m is bounded by $8000, 27000,$ and $60000,$ respectively. Thus, the inequality $m < 500s^2$ holds also for $s = 6, 10, 14.$

Finally, for $s = 8, 12, 16,$ we use the analog of inequality (20) with the value $\ell \leq s - 4,$ yielding

$$m - 2 < \frac{m}{2} + 3^{4/3}m^{2/3} - 2 + s + \frac{\log(4m)}{\log \alpha} + 7(s - 4)\sqrt{2m} + \frac{(s - 4) \log(2\sqrt{\alpha})}{\log \alpha}, \quad (24)$$

which at $s = 8, 12,$ and 16 gives that m is bounded by $16000, 45000,$ and $88000,$ respectively, so the inequality $m < 500s^2$ holds in these last three cases as well.

This completes the proof of the theorem.

4. Comments and Numerical Results

Numerical results are few because the bounds of Theorem 1 are very weak. However, from what we have said at Step 4 of the proof of Theorem 1 above, we have that $m < 2000$ when $s = 3,$ and $m < 7000$ for $s = 5.$ We ran a Mathematica code ran for about a day and searched for all such m and for all $n \in [1, 4m]$ for which F_{n+1}/F_n is indeed an element of order s modulo $F_m.$ No example was found with $s = 3,$ and the example F_7/F_6 modulo F_{10} is the only example with $s = 5.$

In [3], it was shown that the Diophantine equation

$$F_n^x + F_{n+1}^x = F_m$$

has no positive integer solutions with $n \geq 2$ and $x \geq 3.$ The method there was based on linear forms in logarithms. Since for any potential solution of the above equation it is easy to check that F_{n+1}/F_n is an invertible element modulo F_m which is not of order $1, 2$ or 4 but whose order divides $2x,$ we get right away from Theorem 1 that $m < 2000x^2.$ Next, by (4), we get

$$\alpha^{nx} \leq F_{n+1}^x < F_n^x + F_{n+1}^x = F_m < \alpha^{m-1} < \alpha^{2000x^2-1},$$

and we derive that $n < 2000x$. However, we could not find an elementary upper bound on x out of this equation (without appealing to linear forms in logarithms). We conclude by mentioning that all the solutions of the more general Diophantine equation $F_n^x + F_{n+1}^x = F_m^y$ in positive integers (n, m, x, y) were found in [2].

Acknowledgements. We thank the referee for comments which improved the quality of this paper.

References

- [1] R. D. Carmichael, “On the numerical factors of the arithmetic forms $\alpha^n \pm \beta^n$ ”, *Ann. Math. (2)* **15** (1913), 30–70.
- [2] N. Hirata-Kohno and F. Luca, “On the Diophantine equation $F_n^x + F_{n+1}^x = F_m^y$ ”, *preprint*, 2012.
- [3] F. Luca and R. Oyono, “On the sum of powers of two consecutive Fibonacci numbers”, *Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A* **87** (2011), 45–50.