

## 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

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  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$ , 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

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



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  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$  and  $\gamma$ .

*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  $\varepsilon_k$  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  $z = 1/9$ :

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

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  $\delta$ . 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  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$ , 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

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

and

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

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:*

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

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. DESHOUILERS, *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  $\pi$* . 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](mailto:wadim@ips.ras.ru)