

JOURNAL

de Théorie des Nombres
de BORDEAUX

anciennement Séminaire de Théorie des Nombres de Bordeaux

Wadim ZUDILIN

A new lower bound for $\|(3/2)^k\|$

Tome 19, n° 1 (2007), p. 311-323.

http://jtnb.cedram.org/item?id=JTNB_2007__19_1_311_0

© Université Bordeaux 1, 2007, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux articles de la revue « Journal de Théorie des Nombres de Bordeaux » (<http://jtnb.cedram.org/>), implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (<http://jtnb.cedram.org/legal/>). Toute reproduction en tout ou partie cet article sous quelque forme que ce soit pour tout usage autre que l'utilisation à fin strictement personnelle du copiste est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

cedram

Article mis en ligne dans le cadre du
Centre de diffusion des revues académiques de mathématiques
<http://www.cedram.org/>

A new lower bound for $\|(3/2)^k\|$

par WADIM ZUDILIN

RÉSUMÉ. Nous démontrons que pour tout entier k supérieur à une constante K effectivement calculable, la distance de $(3/2)^k$ à l'entier le plus proche est minorée par $0,5803^k$.

ABSTRACT. We prove that, for all integers k exceeding some effectively computable number K , the distance from $(3/2)^k$ to the nearest integer is greater than 0.5803^k .

1. Historical overview of the problem

Let $[\cdot]$ and $\{\cdot\}$ denote the integer and fractional parts of a number, respectively. It is known [12] that the inequality $\{(3/2)^k\} \leq 1 - (3/4)^k$ for $k \geq 6$ implies the explicit formula $g(k) = 2^k + [(3/2)^k] - 2$ for the least integer $g = g(k)$ such that every positive integer can be expressed as a sum of at most g positive k th powers (Waring's problem). K. Mahler [10] used Ridout's extension of Roth's theorem to show that the inequality $\|(3/2)^k\| \leq C^k$, where $\|x\| = \min(\{x\}, 1 - \{x\})$ is the distance from $x \in \mathbb{R}$ to the nearest integer, has finitely many solutions in integers k for any $C < 1$. The particular case $C = 3/4$ gives one the above value of $g(k)$ for all $k \geq K$, where K is a certain absolute but ineffective constant. The first non-trivial (i.e., $C > 1/2$) and effective (in terms of K) estimate of the form

$$(1) \quad \left\| \left(\frac{3}{2} \right)^k \right\| > C^k \quad \text{for } k \geq K,$$

with $C = 2^{-(1-10^{-64})}$, was proved by A. Baker and J. Coates [1] by applying effective estimates of linear forms in logarithms in the p -adic case. F. Beukers [4] improved on this result by showing that inequality (1) is valid with $C = 2^{-0.9} = 0.5358\dots$ for $k \geq K = 5000$ (although his proof yielded the better choice $C = 0.5637\dots$ if one did not require an explicit evaluation of the effective bound for K). Beukers' proof relied on explicit Padé approximations to a tail of the binomial series $(1-z)^m = \sum_{n=0}^m \binom{m}{n} (-z)^n$ and was later used by A. Dubickas [7] and L. Habsieger [8] to derive inequality (1) with $C = 0.5769$ and 0.5770 , respectively. The latter work also includes

Manuscrit reçu le 8 juillet 2005.

The work is partially supported by grant no. 03-01-00359 of the Russian Foundation for Basic Research.

the estimate $\|(3/2)^k\| > 0.57434^k$ for $k \geq 5$ using computations from [6] and [9].

By modifying Beukers' construction, namely, considering Padé approximations to a tail of the series

$$(2) \quad \frac{1}{(1-z)^{m+1}} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \binom{m+n}{m} z^n$$

and studying the explicit p -adic order of the binomial coefficients involved, we are able to prove

Theorem 1. *The following estimate is valid:*

$$\left\| \left(\frac{3}{2} \right)^k \right\| > 0.5803^k = 2^{-k \cdot 0.78512916\dots} \quad \text{for } k \geq K,$$

where K is a certain effective constant.

2. Hypergeometric background

The binomial series on the left-hand side of (2) is a special case of the generalized hypergeometric series

$$(3) \quad {}_{q+1}F_q \left(\begin{matrix} A_0, A_1, \dots, A_q \\ B_1, \dots, B_q \end{matrix} \middle| z \right) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{(A_0)_k (A_1)_k \cdots (A_q)_k}{k! (B_1)_k \cdots (B_q)_k} z^k,$$

where

$$(A)_k = \frac{\Gamma(A+k)}{\Gamma(A)} = \begin{cases} A(A+1)\cdots(A+k-1) & \text{if } k \geq 1, \\ 1 & \text{if } k = 0, \end{cases}$$

denotes the Pochhammer symbol (or shifted factorial). The series in (3) converges in the disc $|z| < 1$, and if one of the parameters A_0, A_1, \dots, A_q is a non-positive integer (i.e., the series terminates) the definition of the hypergeometric series is valid for all $z \in \mathbb{C}$.

In what follows we will often use the ${}_{q+1}F_q$ -notation. We will require two classical facts from the theory of generalized hypergeometric series: the Pfaff–Saalschütz summation formula

$$(4) \quad {}_3F_2 \left(\begin{matrix} -n, A, B \\ C, 1+A+B-C-n \end{matrix} \middle| 1 \right) = \frac{(C-A)_n (C-B)_n}{(C)_n (C-A-B)_n}$$

(see, e.g., [11], p. 49, (2.3.1.3)) and the Euler–Pochhammer integral for the Gauss ${}_2F_1$ -series

$$(5) \quad {}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} A, B \\ C \end{matrix} \middle| z \right) = \frac{\Gamma(C)}{\Gamma(B)\Gamma(C-B)} \int_0^1 t^{B-1} (1-t)^{C-B-1} (1-zt)^{-A} dt,$$

provided $\operatorname{Re} C > \operatorname{Re} B > 0$ (see, e.g., [11], p. 20, (1.6.6)). Formula (5) is valid for $|z| < 1$ and also for any $z \in \mathbb{C}$ if A is a non-positive integer.

3. Padé approximations of the shifted binomial series

Fix two positive integers a and b satisfying $2a \leq b$. Formula (2) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
 (6) \quad \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{3(b+1)} &= \left(\frac{27}{8}\right)^{b+1} = 3^{b+1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{9}\right)^{-(b+1)} \\
 &= 3^{b+1} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \binom{b+k}{b} \left(\frac{1}{9}\right)^k = 3^{b-2a+1} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \binom{b+k}{b} 3^{2(a-k)} \\
 &= \text{an integer} + 3^{b-2a+1} \sum_{k=a}^{\infty} \binom{b+k}{b} 3^{2(a-k)} \\
 &\equiv 3^{b-2a+1} \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} \binom{a+b+\nu}{b} 3^{-2\nu} \pmod{\mathbb{Z}}.
 \end{aligned}$$

This motivates (cf. [4]) constructing Padé approximations to the function

$$(7) \quad F(z) = F(a, b; z) = \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} \binom{a+b+\nu}{b} z^{\nu} = \binom{a+b}{b} \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} \frac{(a+b+1)_{\nu}}{(a+1)_{\nu}} z^{\nu}$$

and applying them with the choice $z = 1/9$.

Remark 1. The connection of $F(a, b; z)$ with Beukers' auxiliary series $H(\tilde{a}, \tilde{b}; z)$ from [4] is as follows:

$$F(a, b; z) = z^{-a} \left((1-z)^{-b-1} - \sum_{k=0}^{a-1} \binom{b+k}{b} z^k \right) = H(-a-b-1, a; z).$$

Although Beukers considers $H(\tilde{a}, \tilde{b}; z)$ only for $\tilde{a}, \tilde{b} \in \mathbb{N}$, his construction remains valid for any $\tilde{a} \in \mathbb{C}$, $\tilde{b} \in \mathbb{N}$ and $|z| < 1$. However the diagonal Padé approximations, used in [4] for $H(z)$ and used below for $F(z)$, are different.

Taking an arbitrary integer n satisfying $n \leq b$, we follow the general recipe of [5], [13]. Consider the polynomial

$$\begin{aligned}
 (8) \quad Q_n(x) &= \binom{a+b+n}{a+b} {}_2F_1\left(\begin{matrix} -n, a+n \\ a+b+1 \end{matrix} \middle| x\right) \\
 &= \sum_{\mu=0}^n \binom{a+n-1+\mu}{\mu} \binom{a+b+n}{n-\mu} (-x)^{\mu} = \sum_{\mu=0}^n q_{\mu} x^{\mu} \in \mathbb{Z}[x]
 \end{aligned}$$

of degree n . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 (9) \quad Q_n(z^{-1})F(z) &= \sum_{\mu=0}^n q_{n-\mu} z^{\mu-n} \cdot \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} \binom{a+b+\nu}{b} z^{\nu} \\
 &= \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} z^{l-n} \sum_{\substack{\mu=0 \\ \mu \leq l}}^n q_{n-\mu} \binom{a+b+l-\mu}{b} \\
 &= \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} r_l z^{l-n} + \sum_{l=n}^{\infty} r_l z^{l-n} = P_n(z^{-1}) + R_n(z).
 \end{aligned}$$

Here the polynomial

$$(10) \quad P_n(x) = \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} r_l x^{n-l} \in \mathbb{Z}[x], \quad \text{where} \quad r_l = \sum_{\mu=0}^l q_{n-\mu} \binom{a+b+l-\mu}{b},$$

has degree at most n , while the coefficients of the remainder

$$R_n(z) = \sum_{l=n}^{\infty} r_l z^{l-n}$$

are of the following form:

$$\begin{aligned}
 r_l &= \sum_{\mu=0}^n q_{n-\mu} \binom{a+b+l-\mu}{b} \\
 &= \sum_{\mu=0}^n (-1)^{n-\mu} \binom{a+2n-1-\mu}{n-\mu} \binom{a+b+n}{\mu} \binom{a+b+l-\mu}{b} \\
 &= (-1)^n \frac{(a+b+n)!}{(a+n-1)!n!b!} \sum_{\mu=0}^n (-1)^{\mu} \binom{n}{\mu} \frac{(a+2n-1-\mu)!(a+b+l-\mu)!}{(a+l-\mu)!(a+b+n-\mu)!} \\
 &= (-1)^n \frac{(a+b+n)!}{(a+n-1)!n!b!} \\
 &\quad \times \frac{(a+2n-1)!(a+b+l)!}{(a+l)!(a+b+n)!} \sum_{\mu=0}^n \frac{(-n)_{\mu}(-a-l)_{\mu}(-a-b-n)_{\mu}}{\mu!(-a-2n+1)_{\mu}(-a-b-l)_{\mu}} \\
 &= (-1)^n \frac{(a+2n-1)!(a+b+l)!}{(a+n-1)!(a+l)!n!b!} \cdot {}_3F_2 \left(\begin{matrix} -n, -a-l, -a-b-n \\ -a-2n+1, -a-b-l \end{matrix} \middle| 1 \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

If we apply (4) with the choice $A = -a-l$, $B = -a-b-n$ and $C = -a-b-l$, we obtain

$$r_l = (-1)^n \frac{(a+2n-1)!(a+b+l)!}{(a+n-1)!(a+l)!n!b!} \cdot \frac{(-b)_n(n-l)_n}{(-a-b-l)_n(a+n)_n}.$$

The assumed condition $n \leq b$ guarantees that the coefficients r_l do not vanish identically (otherwise $(-b)_n = 0$). Moreover, $(n - l)_n = 0$ for l ranging over the set $n \leq l \leq 2n - 1$, therefore $r_l = 0$ for those l , while

$$\begin{aligned} r_l &= \frac{(a + 2n - 1)!(a + b + l)!}{(a + n - 1)!(a + l)!n!b!} \\ &\quad \times \frac{b!(b - n)! \cdot (l - n)!/(l - 2n)!}{(a + b + l)!/(a + b + l - n)! \cdot (a + 2n - 1)!/(a + n - 1)!} \\ &= \frac{(a + b + l - n)!(l - n)!}{n!(b - n)!(a + l)!(l - 2n)!} \quad \text{for } l \geq 2n. \end{aligned}$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} (11) \quad R_n(z) &= \sum_{l=2n}^{\infty} r_l z^{l-n} = z^n \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} r_{\nu+2n} z^{\nu} \\ &= z^n \frac{1}{n!(b - n)!} \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} \frac{(a + b + n + \nu)!(n + \nu)!}{\nu!(a + 2n + \nu)!} z^{\nu} \\ &= z^n \binom{a + b + n}{b - n} \cdot {}_2F_1 \left(\begin{matrix} a + b + n + 1, n + 1 \\ a + 2n + 1 \end{matrix} \middle| z \right). \end{aligned}$$

Using the integral (5) for the polynomial (8) and remainder (11) we arrive at

Lemma 1. *The following representations are valid:*

$$Q_n(z^{-1}) = \frac{(a + b + n)!}{(a + n - 1)!n!(b - n)!} \int_0^1 t^{a+n-1}(1 - t)^{b-n}(1 - z^{-1}t)^n dt$$

and

$$R_n(z) = \frac{(a + b + n)!}{(a + n - 1)!n!(b - n)!} z^n \int_0^1 t^n(1 - t)^{a+n-1}(1 - zt)^{-(a+b+n+1)} dt.$$

We will also require linear independence of a pair of neighbouring Padé approximants, which is the subject of

Lemma 2. *We have*

$$(12) \quad Q_{n+1}(x)P_n(x) - Q_n(x)P_{n+1}(x) = (-1)^n \binom{a + 2n + 1}{a + n} \binom{a + b + n}{b - n} x.$$

Proof. Clearly, the left-hand side in (12) is a polynomial; its constant term is 0 since $P_n(0) = P_{n+1}(0) = 0$ by (10). On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} &Q_{n+1}(z^{-1})P_n(z^{-1}) - Q_n(z^{-1})P_{n+1}(z^{-1}) \\ &= Q_{n+1}(z^{-1})(Q_n(z^{-1})F(z) - R_n(z)) \\ &\quad - Q_n(z^{-1})(Q_{n+1}(z^{-1})F(z) - R_{n+1}(z)) \\ &= Q_n(z^{-1})R_{n+1}(z) - Q_{n+1}(z^{-1})R_n(z), \end{aligned}$$

and from (8), (11) we conclude that the only negative power of z originates with the last summand:

$$\begin{aligned} & -Q_{n+1}(z^{-1})R_n(z) \\ &= (-1)^n \binom{a+2n+1}{a+n} z^{-n-1}(1+O(z)) \cdot \binom{a+b+n}{b-n} z^n(1+O(z)) \\ &= (-1)^n \binom{a+2n+1}{a+n} \binom{a+b+n}{b-n} \frac{1}{z} + O(1) \quad \text{as } z \rightarrow 0. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

4. Arithmetic constituents

We begin this section by noting that, for any prime $p > \sqrt{N}$,

$$\text{ord}_p N! = \left\lfloor \frac{N}{p} \right\rfloor \quad \text{and} \quad \text{ord}_p N = \lambda\left(\frac{N}{p}\right),$$

where

$$\lambda(x) = 1 - \{x\} - \{-x\} = 1 + [x] + [-x] = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{Z}, \\ 0 & \text{if } x \notin \mathbb{Z}. \end{cases}$$

For primes $p > \sqrt{a+b+n}$, let

$$\begin{aligned} (13) \quad e_p &= \min_{\mu \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(-\left\{ -\frac{a+n}{p} \right\} + \left\{ -\frac{a+n+\mu}{p} \right\} + \left\{ \frac{\mu}{p} \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \left\{ \frac{a+b+n}{p} \right\} + \left\{ \frac{a+b+\mu}{p} \right\} + \left\{ \frac{n-\mu}{p} \right\} \right) \\ &= \min_{\mu \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(\left\lfloor -\frac{a+n}{p} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor -\frac{a+n+\mu}{p} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{\mu}{p} \right\rfloor \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left\lfloor \frac{a+b+n}{p} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{a+b+\mu}{p} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{n-\mu}{p} \right\rfloor \right) \\ &\leq \min_{0 \leq \mu \leq n} \text{ord}_p \frac{a+n}{a+n+\mu} \binom{a+n+\mu}{\mu} \binom{a+b+n}{n-\mu} \\ &= \min_{0 \leq \mu \leq n} \text{ord}_p \binom{a+n-1+\mu}{\mu} \binom{a+b+n}{n-\mu} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(14) \quad e'_p = \min_{\mu \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(-\left\{ \frac{a+n+\mu}{p} \right\} + \left\{ \frac{a+n}{p} \right\} + \left\{ \frac{\mu}{p} \right\} \right. \\ \left. - \left\{ \frac{a+b+n}{p} \right\} + \left\{ \frac{a+b+\mu}{p} \right\} + \left\{ \frac{n-\mu}{p} \right\} \right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \min_{\mu \in \mathbb{Z}} \left(\left\lfloor \frac{a+n+\mu}{p} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{a+n}{p} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{\mu}{p} \right\rfloor \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + \left\lfloor \frac{a+b+n}{p} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{a+b+\mu}{p} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{n-\mu}{p} \right\rfloor \right) \\
 &\leq \min_{0 \leq \mu \leq n} \text{ord}_p \binom{a+n+\mu}{\mu} \binom{a+b+n}{n-\mu}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Set

(15)

$$\Phi = \Phi(a, b, n) = \prod_{p > \sqrt{a+b+n}} p^{e_p} \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi' = \Phi'(a, b, n) = \prod_{p > \sqrt{a+b+n}} p^{e'_p}.$$

From (8), (10) and (13), (15) we deduce

Lemma 3. *The following inclusions are valid:*

$$\Phi^{-1} \cdot \binom{a+n-1+\mu}{\mu} \binom{a+b+n}{n-\mu} \in \mathbb{Z} \quad \text{for } \mu = 0, 1, \dots, n,$$

hence

$$\Phi^{-1} Q_n(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x] \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi^{-1} P_n(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x].$$

Supplementary arithmetic information for the case n replaced by $n+1$ is given in

Lemma 4. *The following inclusions are valid:*

(16)

$$(n+1)\Phi'^{-1} \cdot \binom{a+n+\mu}{\mu} \binom{a+b+n+1}{n+1-\mu} \in \mathbb{Z} \quad \text{for } \mu = 0, 1, \dots, n+1,$$

hence

$$(n+1)\Phi'^{-1} Q_{n+1}(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x] \quad \text{and} \quad (n+1)\Phi'^{-1} P_{n+1}(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x].$$

Proof. Write

$$\binom{a+n+\mu}{\mu} \binom{a+b+n+1}{n+1-\mu} = \binom{a+n+\mu}{\mu} \binom{a+b+n}{n-\mu} \cdot \frac{a+b+n+1}{n+1-\mu}.$$

Therefore, if $p \nmid n+1-\mu$ then

(17)

$$\text{ord}_p \binom{a+n+\mu}{\mu} \binom{a+b+n+1}{n+1-\mu} \geq \text{ord}_p \binom{a+n+\mu}{\mu} \binom{a+b+n}{n-\mu} \geq e'_p;$$

otherwise $\mu \equiv n + 1 \pmod{p}$, hence $\mu/p - (n + 1)/p \in \mathbb{Z}$ yielding

$$\begin{aligned}
 (18) \quad & \text{ord}_p \binom{a+n+\mu}{\mu} \binom{a+b+n+1}{n+1-\mu} \\
 &= -\left\{ \frac{a+n+\mu}{p} \right\} + \left\{ \frac{a+n}{p} \right\} + \left\{ \frac{\mu}{p} \right\} \\
 &\quad - \left\{ \frac{a+b+n+1}{p} \right\} + \left\{ \frac{a+b+\mu}{p} \right\} + \left\{ \frac{n+1-\mu}{p} \right\} \\
 &= -\left\{ \frac{a+2n+1}{p} \right\} + \left\{ \frac{a+n}{p} \right\} + \left\{ \frac{n+1}{p} \right\} \\
 &= \text{ord}_p \binom{a+2n+1}{n+1} = \text{ord}_p \binom{a+2n}{n} + \text{ord}_p \frac{a+2n+1}{n+1} \\
 &= \text{ord}_p \binom{a+n+\mu}{\mu} \binom{a+b+n}{n-\mu} \Big|_{\mu=n} + \text{ord}_p \frac{a+2n+1}{n+1} \\
 &\geq e'_p - \text{ord}_p(n+1).
 \end{aligned}$$

Combination of (17) and (18) gives us the required inclusions (16). \square

5. Proof of theorem 1

The parameters a , b and n will now depend on an increasing parameter $m \in \mathbb{N}$ in the following way:

$$a = \alpha m, \quad b = \beta m, \quad n = \gamma m \quad \text{or} \quad n = \gamma m + 1,$$

where the choice of the positive integers α , β and γ , satisfying $2\alpha \leq \beta$ and $\gamma < \beta$, is discussed later. Then Lemma 1 and Laplace's method give us

$$\begin{aligned}
 (19) \quad C_0(z) &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |R_n(z)|}{m} \\
 &= (\alpha + \beta + \gamma) \log(\alpha + \beta + \gamma) - (\alpha + \gamma) \log(\alpha + \gamma) \\
 &\quad - \gamma \log \gamma - (\beta - \gamma) \log(\beta - \gamma) + \gamma \log |z| \\
 &\quad + \max_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \text{Re}(\gamma \log t + (\alpha + \gamma) \log(1 - t) - (\alpha + \beta + \gamma) \log(1 - zt))
 \end{aligned}$$

and

(20)

$$\begin{aligned}
 C_1(z) &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log |Q_n(z^{-1})|}{m} \\
 &= (\alpha + \beta + \gamma) \log(\alpha + \beta + \gamma) - (\alpha + \gamma) \log(\alpha + \gamma) \\
 &\quad - \gamma \log \gamma - (\beta - \gamma) \log(\beta - \gamma) \\
 &\quad + \max_{0 \leq t \leq 1} \text{Re}((\alpha + \gamma) \log t + (\beta - \gamma) \log(1 - t) + \gamma \log(1 - z^{-1}t)).
 \end{aligned}$$

In addition, from (13)–(15) and the prime number theorem we deduce that

$$(21) \quad \begin{aligned} C_2 &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \Phi(\alpha m, \beta m, \gamma m)}{m} = \int_0^1 \varphi(x) \, d\psi(x), \\ C'_2 &= \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log \Phi'(\alpha m, \beta m, \gamma m)}{m} = \int_0^1 \varphi'(x) \, d\psi(x), \end{aligned}$$

where $\psi(x)$ is the logarithmic derivative of the gamma function and the 1-periodic functions $\varphi(x)$ and $\varphi'(x)$ are defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(x) &= \min_{0 \leq y < 1} \widehat{\varphi}(x, y), & \varphi'(x) &= \min_{0 \leq y < 1} \widehat{\varphi}'(x, y), \\ \widehat{\varphi}(x, y) &= -\{-(\alpha + \gamma)x\} + \{-(\alpha + \gamma)x - y\} + \{y\} \\ &\quad - \{(\alpha + \beta + \gamma)x\} + \{(\alpha + \beta)x + y\} + \{\gamma x - y\}, \\ \widehat{\varphi}'(x, y) &= -\{(\alpha + \gamma)x + y\} + \{(\alpha + \gamma)x\} + \{y\} \\ &\quad - \{(\alpha + \beta + \gamma)x\} + \{(\alpha + \beta)x + y\} + \{\gamma x - y\}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5. *The functions $\varphi(x)$ and $\varphi'(x)$ differ on a set of measure 0, hence*

$$(22) \quad C_2 = C'_2.$$

Remark 2. The following proof is due to the anonymous referee. In an earlier version of this article, we verify directly assumption (22) for our specific choice of the integer parameters α , β and γ .

Proof. First note that $\widehat{\varphi}(x, 0) = \widehat{\varphi}'(x, 0) \in \{0, 1\}$, which implies $\varphi(x) \in \{0, 1\}$ and $\varphi'(x) \in \{0, 1\}$.

From the definition we see that

$$\Delta(x, y) = \widehat{\varphi}(x, y) - \widehat{\varphi}'(x, y) = \lambda((\alpha + \gamma)x) - \lambda((\alpha + \gamma)x + y).$$

Assume that $(\alpha + \gamma)x \notin \mathbb{Z}$; we plainly obtain $\Delta(x, y) = -\lambda((\alpha + \gamma)x + y) \leq 0$, hence $\Delta(x, y) = 0$ unless $y = -\{(\alpha + \gamma)x\}$. Therefore the only possibility to get $\varphi(x) \neq \varphi'(x)$ is the following one:

$$(23) \quad \begin{aligned} \widehat{\varphi}(x, y) &\geq 1 && \text{for } y \neq -\{(\alpha + \gamma)x\} && \text{and} \\ \widehat{\varphi}(x, y) &= 0 && \text{for } y = -\{(\alpha + \gamma)x\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\widehat{\varphi}'(x, 0) \geq 1$, we have $\{(\alpha + \beta)x\} + \{\gamma x\} = 1$; furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} &\{(\alpha + \beta)x + y\} + \{\gamma x - y\} - \{(\alpha + \beta + \gamma)x\} \\ &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } 0 \leq y < 1 - \{(\alpha + \beta)x\}, \\ 0 & \text{if } 1 - \{(\alpha + \beta)x\} \leq y < \{\gamma x\}, \\ 1 & \text{if } \{\gamma x\} \leq y < 1, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\{-(\alpha + \gamma)x - y\} + \{y\} - \{-(\alpha + \gamma)x\} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } 0 \leq y \leq \{-(\alpha + \gamma)x\}, \\ 1 & \text{if } \{-(\alpha + \gamma)x\} < y < 1. \end{cases}$$

The above conditions (23) on $\widehat{\varphi}(x, y)$ imply $1 - \{(\alpha + \beta)x\} = \{-(\alpha + \gamma)x\}$ or, equivalently, $(\beta - \gamma)x \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Finally, the sets $\{x \in \mathbb{R} : (\alpha + \gamma)x \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ and $\{x \in \mathbb{R} : (\beta - \gamma)x \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ have measure 0, thus proving the required assertion. \square

Our final aim is estimating the absolute value of ε_k from below, where

$$\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^k = M_k + \varepsilon_k, \quad M_k \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad 0 < |\varepsilon_k| < \frac{1}{2}.$$

Write $k \geq 3$ in the form $k = 3(\beta m + 1) + j$ with non-negative integers m and $j < 3\beta$. Multiply both sides of (9) by $\widetilde{\Phi}^{-1}3^{b-2a+j+1}$, where $\widetilde{\Phi} = \Phi(\alpha m, \beta m, \gamma m)$ if $n = \gamma m$ and $\widetilde{\Phi} = \Phi'(\alpha m, \beta m, \gamma m)/(\gamma m + 1)$ if $n = \gamma m + 1$, and substitute $z = 1/9$:

$$(24) \quad \begin{aligned} Q_n(9)\widetilde{\Phi}^{-1}2^j \cdot \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^j 3^{b-2a+1} F\left(a, b; \frac{1}{9}\right) \\ = P_n(9)\widetilde{\Phi}^{-1}3^{b-2a+j+1} + R_n\left(\frac{1}{9}\right)\widetilde{\Phi}^{-1}3^{b-2a+j+1}. \end{aligned}$$

From (6), (7) we see that

$$\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^j 3^{b-2a+1} F\left(a, b; \frac{1}{9}\right) \equiv \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{3(b+1)+j} \pmod{\mathbb{Z}} = \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^k,$$

hence the left-hand side equals $M'_k + \varepsilon_k$ for some $M'_k \in \mathbb{Z}$ and we may write equality (24) in the form

$$(25) \quad Q_n(9)\widetilde{\Phi}^{-1}2^j \cdot \varepsilon_k = M''_k + R_n\left(\frac{1}{9}\right)\widetilde{\Phi}^{-1}3^{b-2a+j+1},$$

where

$$M''_k = P_n(9)\widetilde{\Phi}^{-1}3^{b-2a+j+1} - Q_n(9)\widetilde{\Phi}^{-1}2^j M'_k \in \mathbb{Z}$$

by Lemmas 3 and 4. Lemma 2 guarantees that, for at least one of $n = \gamma m$ or $\gamma m + 1$, we have $M''_k \neq 0$; we make the corresponding choice of n . Assuming furthermore that

$$(26) \quad C_0\left(\frac{1}{9}\right) - C_2 + (\beta - 2\alpha) \log 3 < 0,$$

from (19) and (21) we obtain

$$\left| R_n\left(\frac{1}{9}\right)\widetilde{\Phi}^{-1}3^{b-2a+j+1} \right| < \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{for all } m \geq N_1,$$

where $N_1 > 0$ is an effective absolute constant. Therefore, by (25) and $|M''_k| \geq 1$ we have

$$|Q_n(9)\tilde{\Phi}^{-1}2^j| \cdot |\varepsilon_k| \geq |M''_k| - \left| R_n\left(\frac{1}{9}\right)\tilde{\Phi}^{-1}3^{b-2a+j+1} \right| > \frac{1}{2},$$

hence from (19), (20) we conclude that

$$|\varepsilon_k| > \frac{\tilde{\Phi}}{2^{j+1}|Q_n(9)|} \geq \frac{\tilde{\Phi}}{2^{3\beta}|Q_n(9)|} > e^{-m(C_1(1/9)-C_2+\delta)}$$

for any $\delta > 0$ and $m > N_2(\delta)$, provided that $C_1(1/9)-C_2+\delta > 0$; here $N_2(\delta)$ depends effectively on δ . Finally, since $k > 3\beta m$, we obtain the estimate

$$(27) \quad |\varepsilon_k| > e^{-k(C_1(1/9)-C_2+\delta)/(3\beta)}$$

valid for all $k \geq K_0(\delta)$, where the constant $K_0(\delta)$ may be determined in terms of $\max(N_1, N_2(\delta))$.

Taking $\alpha = \gamma = 9$ and $\beta = 19$ (which is the optimal choice of the integer parameters α, β, γ , at least under the restriction $\beta \leq 100$) we find that

$$C_0\left(\frac{1}{9}\right) = 3.28973907\dots, \quad C_1\left(\frac{1}{9}\right) = 35.48665992\dots,$$

and

$$\varphi(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \{x\} \in \left[\frac{2}{37}, \frac{1}{18} \right] \cup \left[\frac{3}{37}, \frac{1}{10} \right] \cup \left[\frac{4}{37}, \frac{1}{9} \right] \cup \left[\frac{6}{37}, \frac{1}{6} \right] \cup \left[\frac{7}{37}, \frac{1}{5} \right] \\ & \cup \left[\frac{8}{37}, \frac{2}{9} \right] \cup \left[\frac{10}{37}, \frac{5}{18} \right] \cup \left[\frac{11}{37}, \frac{3}{10} \right] \cup \left[\frac{12}{37}, \frac{1}{3} \right] \cup \left[\frac{14}{37}, \frac{7}{18} \right] \\ & \cup \left[\frac{16}{37}, \frac{4}{9} \right] \cup \left[\frac{18}{37}, \frac{1}{2} \right] \cup \left[\frac{20}{37}, \frac{5}{9} \right] \cup \left[\frac{22}{37}, \frac{3}{5} \right] \cup \left[\frac{24}{37}, \frac{2}{3} \right] \\ & \cup \left[\frac{28}{37}, \frac{7}{9} \right] \cup \left[\frac{32}{37}, \frac{8}{9} \right] \cup \left[\frac{36}{37}, 1 \right), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

hence

$$C_2 = C'_2 = 4.46695926\dots$$

Using these computations we verify (26),

$$C_0\left(\frac{1}{9}\right) - C_2 + (\beta - 2\alpha) \log 3 = -0.07860790\dots,$$

and find that with $\delta = 0.00027320432\dots$

$$e^{-(C_1(1/9)-C_2+\delta)/(3\beta)} = 0.5803.$$

This result, in view of (27), completes the proof of Theorem 1. □

6. Related results

The above construction allows us to prove similar results for the sequences $\|(4/3)^k\|$ and $\|(5/4)^k\|$ using the representations

$$\begin{aligned}
 (28) \quad \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^{2(b+1)} &= 2^{b+1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{8}\right)^{-(b+1)} \\
 &\equiv (-1)^a 2^{b-3a+1} F\left(a, b; -\frac{1}{8}\right) \pmod{\mathbb{Z}}, \\
 &\text{where } 3a \leq b,
 \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 (29) \quad \left(\frac{5}{4}\right)^{7b+3} &= 2 \cdot 5^b \left(1 + \frac{3}{125}\right)^{-(2b+1)} \\
 &\equiv (-1)^a 2 \cdot 3^a \cdot 5^{b-3a} F\left(a, 2b; -\frac{3}{125}\right) \pmod{\mathbb{Z}}, \\
 &\text{where } 3a \leq b.
 \end{aligned}$$

Namely, taking $a = 5m, b = 15m, n = 6m(+1)$ in case (28) and $a = 3m, b = 9m, n = 7m(+1)$ in case (29) and repeating the arguments of Section 5, we arrive at

Theorem 2. *The following estimates are valid:*

$$\begin{aligned}
 \left\| \left(\frac{4}{3}\right)^k \right\| &> 0.4914^k = 3^{-k \cdot 0.64672207\dots} \quad \text{for } k \geq K_1, \\
 \left\| \left(\frac{5}{4}\right)^k \right\| &> 0.5152^k = 4^{-k \cdot 0.47839775\dots} \quad \text{for } k \geq K_2,
 \end{aligned}$$

where K_1, K_2 are certain effective constants.

The general case of the sequence $\|(1 + 1/N)^k\|$ for an integer $N \geq 5$ may be treated as in [4] and [2] by using the representation

$$\left(\frac{N+1}{N}\right)^{b+1} = \left(1 - \frac{1}{N+1}\right)^{-(b+1)} \equiv F\left(0, b; \frac{1}{N+1}\right) \pmod{\mathbb{Z}}.$$

The best result in this direction belongs to M. Bennett [2]: $\|(1 + 1/N)^k\| > 3^{-k}$ for $4 \leq N \leq k3^k$.

Remark 3. As mentioned by the anonymous referee, our result for $\|(4/3)^k\|$ is of special interest. It completes Bennett’s result [3] on the order of the additive basis $\{1, N^k, (N+1)^k, (N+2)^k, \dots\}$ for $N = 3$ (case $N = 2$ corresponds to the classical Waring’s problem); to solve this problem one needs the bound $\|(4/3)^k\| > (4/9)^k$ for $k \geq 6$. Thus we remain verification of the bound in the range $6 \leq k \leq K_1$.

We would like to conclude this note by mentioning that a stronger argument is required to obtain the effective estimate $\|(3/2)^k\| > (3/4)^k$ and its relatives.

Acknowledgements. I am very grateful to the anonymous referee for his valuable comments (incorporated into the current presentation as Remarks 1–3), providing the proof of Lemma 5 and indicating misprints. My profound gratitude goes to Anne de Roton, for supporting my talk at the *24th Journées Arithmétiques* as a muse. I thank kindly J. Sondow for several suggestions.

References

- [1] A. BAKER, J. COATES, *Fractional parts of powers of rationals*. Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **77** (1975), 269–279.
- [2] M. A. BENNETT, *Fractional parts of powers of rational numbers*. Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **114** (1993), 191–201.
- [3] M. A. BENNETT, *An ideal Waring problem with restricted summands*. Acta Arith. **66** (1994), 125–132.
- [4] F. BEUKERS, *Fractional parts of powers of rationals*. Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **90** (1981), 13–20.
- [5] G. V. CHUDNOVSKY, *Padé approximations to the generalized hypergeometric functions. I*. J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **58** (1979), 445–476.
- [6] F. DELMER, J.-M. DESHOULLERS, *The computation of $g(k)$ in Waring’s problem*. Math. Comp. **54** (1990), 885–893.
- [7] A. K. DUBICKAS, *A lower bound for the quantity $\|(3/2)^k\|$* . Russian Math. Surveys **45** (1990), 163–164.
- [8] L. HABSIEGER, *Explicit lower bounds for $\|(3/2)^k\|$* . Acta Arith. **106** (2003), 299–309.
- [9] J. KUBINA, M. WUNDERLICH, *Extending Waring’s conjecture up to 471600000*. Math. Comp. **55** (1990), 815–820.
- [10] K. MAHLER, *On the fractional parts of powers of real numbers*. Mathematika **4** (1957), 122–124.
- [11] L. J. SLATER, *Generalized hypergeometric functions*. Cambridge University Press, 1966.
- [12] R. C. VAUGHAN, *The Hardy–Littlewood method*. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics **125**, Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- [13] W. ZUDILIN, *Ramanujan-type formulae and irrationality measures of certain multiples of π* . Mat. Sb. **196:7** (2005), 51–66.

Wadim ZUDILIN
 Department of Mechanics and Mathematics
 Moscow Lomonosov State University
 Vorobiovy Gory, GSP-2
 119992 Moscow, Russia
 URL: <http://wain.mi.ras.ru/>
 E-mail: wadim@ips.ras.ru