On the boundary of the closure of the set of contractive polynomials

Attila Pethő[1]
University of Debrecen, Department of Computer Science and
Number Theory Research Group, Hungarian Academy of Sciences
H-4010 Debrecen POBox 12
pethoe@inf.unideb.hu

1. Introduction

Let[2] $(r_1, \dots, r_d)^T = \mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Akiyama, Borbély, Brunotte, Thuswaldner and myself introduced [1] the nearly linear mapping $\tau_{\mathbf{r}} : \mathbb{Z}^d \mapsto \mathbb{Z}^d$ such that if $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_d)^T \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ then

$$\tau_{\mathbf{r}}(\mathbf{a}) = (a_2, \dots, a_d, -\lfloor \mathbf{r}^T \mathbf{a} \rfloor)^T. \tag{1}$$

For $k \geq 0$ let

$$\tau^k(\mathbf{a}) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{a}, & \text{if} \quad k = 0, \\ \tau\big(\tau^{k-1}(\mathbf{a})\big), & \text{if} \quad k > 0 \end{cases}$$

and $a_{d+k+1} = -\lfloor \mathbf{r}^T \tau_{\mathbf{r}}^k(\mathbf{a}) \rfloor$. We also defined the sets

$$\mathcal{D}_d = \{\mathbf{r} \ : \ \{\tau_{\mathbf{r}}^k(\mathbf{a})\}_{k=0}^{\infty} \quad \text{is bounded for all} \quad \mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^d\}$$

and $\mathcal{E}_d$, which is the set of real monic polynomials, whose roots are lying in the closed unit circle. We proved in the same paper that if $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{D}_d$ then $R(X) = X^d + r_d X^{d-1} + \cdots + r_2 X + r_1 \in \mathcal{E}_d$ and if $R(X)$ is lying in the interior of $\mathcal{E}_d$ then $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{D}_d$.

It is natural to ask what happens if $R(X)$ belongs to the boundary of $\mathcal{E}_d$, i.e. some of its roots are lying on the unit circle. The case $d = 2$ was studied by Akiyama et al in [2], but they was not able to completely settle it. They proved that $\mathcal{D}_2$ is equal to the closed triangle with vertices $(-1, 0), (1, -2), (1, 2)$, but without the points $(1, -2), (1, 2)$, the line segment $\{(x, -x-1) \ : \ 0 < x < 1\}$ and, possible, some points of the line segment $\{(1, y) \ : \ -2 < y < 2\}$. Write in the last case $y = 2\cos\alpha$ and $\omega = \cos\alpha + i\sin\alpha$. It is easy to see, that if $y = 0, \pm 1$ (i.e. $\alpha = 0, \pm\pi/2$) then $(1, y)$ belongs to $\mathcal{D}_2$ and we conjectured in [2] that this is true for all points of the line segment. In [3] the conjecture was proved for the golden mean, i.e. for $y = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$ and in [4] for those ω, which are quadratic algebraic numbers.

Kirschenhofer, Pethő and Thuswaldner [5] studied the sequences $\{\tau_{\mathbf{r}}^k(\mathbf{a})\}$ for $\mathbf{r} = (1, \lambda^2, \lambda^2)$, where λ denotes the golden mean. They not only proved that $\mathbf{r} \notin \mathcal{D}_3$, but found some connection between the Zeckendorf expansion of the coordinates of the initial vector $\mathbf{a}$ and the periodicity of $\{\tau_{\mathbf{r}}^k(\mathbf{a})\}$.

---

[1]The author was supported partially by the Hungarian National Foundation for Scientific Research Grant No. T67580 and by TéT project JP-26/2006.

[2]In this note a vector is always a column vector and $\mathbf{v}^T$ means its transpose

In the present notes we continue the above investigations about the boundary of $\mathcal{E}_d$ for $d \geq 3$ in a systematic way. Our most general result is

Theorem 1. *Assume that some t-th roots of unity $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_s$ are simple zeroes of $R(X)$ and the other zeroes of it have modulus less than one. Then there exist constants c_1 depending on $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_s$ and c_2 depending on $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_s$ and $a_1, \ldots, a_d$ such that if $k > c_2$ then*

$$|a_{k+t} - a_k| < c_1.$$

Further, if t is even and $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_s$ are primitive t-th roots of unity, then

$$|a_{k+t/2} + a_k| < c_1$$

holds as well.

The importance of Theorem 1 is that c_1 does not depend on the initial vector $\mathbf{a}$, with other words, the sequence $\{\tau_{\mathbf{r}}^k(\mathbf{a})\}$ is the union of a finite set and finitely many sequences with bounded growth.

Let define the integral vectors $\mathbf{1} = (1, \ldots, 1)^T$, $\bar{\mathbf{1}} = (1, -1, \ldots, (-1)^{d-1})^T$, $\mathbf{i} = (1, 0, -1, 0, \ldots)$ and $\bar{\mathbf{i}} = (0, 1, 0, -1, \ldots)$. As a consequence of Theorem 1 we prove

Theorem 2. *Assume that $1, -1$ or i is a simple zero of $R(X)$ and the other zeroes of it have modulus less than one. Then there exists a computable finite set $A \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ with the following property: for all $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ there exist a constant k depending on the zeroes of $R(X)$ and $\mathbf{a}$ and integers L, K such that $\tau_{\mathbf{r}}^k(\mathbf{a} - L\mathbf{1}) \in A, \tau_{\mathbf{r}}^k(\mathbf{a} - L\bar{\mathbf{1}}) \in A$ and $\tau_{\mathbf{r}}^k(\mathbf{a} - L\mathbf{i} - K\bar{\mathbf{i}}) \in A$ respectively.*

Theorem 2 implies immediately an algorithm to test $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{D}_d$ provided $1, -1$ or i is a simple root of $R(X)$. Of course we have to test for all $\mathbf{a} \in A$ whether the sequence $\{\tau_{\mathbf{r}}^n(\mathbf{a})\}$ is ultimately periodic or divergent. We show that for $d = 3$ both cases occur.

By a recent result of Paul Surer [10] the boundary of $\mathcal{E}_3$ can be parametrized by the union of the sets $B_1 = \{(-s, s - (s+1)t, (s+1)t - 1) : -1 \leq s, t \leq 1\}$, $B_2 = \{(s, s + (s+1)t, (s+1)t + 1) : -1 \leq s, t \leq 1\}$ and $B_3 = \{(v, 1 + 2tv, 2t + v) : -1 \leq t, v \leq 1\}$. We prove that large portions of B_1 belong to $\mathcal{D}_3$ and others do not belong. For example if $0 \leq (s+1)(t+1) < 1$ and $a_0 = 0, a_1 = 1, a_2 = 2$ then $\tau_{\mathbf{r}}^k(\mathbf{a}) = (k, k+1, k+2)$ hold for all k, i.e. $\mathbf{r} \notin \mathcal{D}_3$. On the other hand if $s \geq 0, s \leq (s+1)t \leq 1$ then $\{\tau_{\mathbf{r}}^k(\mathbf{a})\}$ is ultimately constant, i.e. $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{D}_3$. Experiments show that these examples are typical for elements both for B_1 and B_2.

Choosing the values $s = 1, t = \frac{\lambda}{2}, v = 1$ shows that the point $\mathbf{r} = (1, \lambda^2, \lambda^2)^T$ studied in [5] belongs to $B_2 \cap B_3$.

2. Preparatory results

To prove Theorem 1 we need some preparation from linear algebra and from linear recurring sequences. We recapitulate here with minor changes

Chapter 2 of [7], because we need the notations in the sequel. First of all we analyze the mapping $\tau = \tau_{\mathbf{r}}$ defined by equation (1). Let $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{r}) \in \mathbb{Z}^{d\times d}$ be the companion matrix of $R(X)$, i.e.

$$\mathbf{P} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 \\ -r_1 & -r_2 & \dots & -r_d \end{pmatrix}.$$

With this definition we have the following assertion

Lemma 1. *Let* $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_d)^T \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ *and* $1 \le k \in \mathbb{Z}$. *Then there exist* $-1 < \delta_1, \dots, \delta_k \le 0$ *such that*

$$\tau^k(\mathbf{a}) = \mathbf{P}^k \mathbf{a} + \sum_{j=1}^{k} \mathbf{P}^{k-j} \boldsymbol{\delta}_j$$

holds, where $\boldsymbol{\delta}_j = (0, \dots, 0, \delta_j)^T \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Proof. See the simple proof of Lemma 2 of [7]. $\square$

Let $\{G_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ be the linear recurring sequence defined by the initial terms $G_0 = \dots = G_{d-2} = 0$, $G_{d-1} = 1$ and by the difference equation

$$G_{n+d} = -r_d G_{n+d-1} - \dots - r_1 G_n. \tag{2}$$

Let further $\mathbf{G}_n = (G_n, \dots, G_{n+d-1})^T$ and for $n \ge 0$ denote by $\mathcal{G}_n$ the $d \times d$ matrix, whose columns are $\mathbf{G}_n, \dots, \mathbf{G}_{n-d+1}$. Then we have obviously

$$\mathcal{G}_n = \mathbf{P}\mathcal{G}_{n-1} \quad \text{for} \quad n = 1, 2, \dots .$$

This implies

$$\mathcal{G}_n = \mathbf{P}^n \, \mathcal{G}_0 \qquad \text{for} \quad n \ge 0. \tag{3}$$

As

$$\mathcal{G}_0 = \begin{pmatrix} G_{d-1} & G_{d-2} & \dots & G_0 \\ G_d & G_{d-1} & \dots & G_1 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ G_{2d-1} & G_{2d-2} & \dots & G_{d-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

is a lower triangular matrix with entries 1 in the main diagonal, it is non singular and its invers is

$$\mathcal{G}_0^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ r_d & 1 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ r_3 & r_4 & \dots & 1 & 0 \\ r_2 & r_3 & \dots & r_d & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus we get

$$\mathbf{P}^n = \mathcal{G}_n \mathcal{G}_0^{-1}. \tag{4}$$

Denoting by $p_{ij}^{(n)}$, $1 \le i,\, j \le d$, $n \ge 0$ the entries of $\mathbf{P}^n$ and setting $r_{d+1} = 1$ we obtain

$$p_{1j}^{(n)} = \sum_{u=0}^{d-j} r_{j+u+1} G_{n+u},\ j = 1, \dots, d, \tag{5}$$

in particular $p_{1d}^{(n)} = G_n$.

As a_{k+1} is the first coordinate of $\tau^k(\mathbf{a})$, Lemma 1 and (5) imply

$$a_{k+1} = \sum_{j=1}^{d} p_{1j}^{(k)} a_j + \sum_{j=1}^{k} p_{1d}^{(k-j)} \delta_j = \sum_{j=1}^{d} p_{1j}^{(k)} a_j + \sum_{j=1}^{k} G_{k-j} \delta_j. \tag{6}$$

On the other hand if $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_h$ denote the distinct zeroes of the polynomial $R(X) = X^d + r_d X^{d-1} + \cdots + r_1$ with multiplicity $e_1, \dots, e_h \ge 1$ respectively, then

$$G_n = g_1(n)\beta_1^n + \cdots + g_h(n)\beta_h^n \tag{7}$$

holds for any $n \ge 0$, where $g_i(X)$, $1 \le i \le h$ denote polynomials with coefficients of the field $\mathbb{Q}(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_h)$ of degree at most $e_i - 1$. (See e.g. [8].)

Equations (5) and (7) imply that there exist polynomials $g_{ij\ell}(X)$ with coefficients of the field $\mathbb{Q}(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_h)$ of degree at most $e_\ell - 1$ such that

$$p_{ij}^{(n)} = \sum_{\ell=1}^{h} g_{ij\ell}(n) \beta_\ell^n. \tag{8}$$

Using this equality, (7) and (6) we obtain

$$a_{k+1} = \sum_{j=1}^{d} a_j \sum_{\ell=1}^{h} g_{1j\ell}(k) \beta_\ell^k + \sum_{j=1}^{k} \delta_j \sum_{\ell=1}^{h} g_\ell(k-j) \beta_\ell^{k-j}. \tag{9}$$

3. Proof of Theorems 1 and 2

Proof of Theorem 1. Our starting point is equation (9). It was used in a simpler form in [1] for the proof that if all roots of $R(X)$ have modulus less than one, then $\{\tau_{\mathbf{r}}^k(\mathbf{a})\}$ is ultimately periodic. This is true, because both summands in (9) are bounded. If, however, one of the roots of $R(X)$ is lying on the unit circle, then we have usually no control on the second summand, it can be bounded or unbounded. A closer look at (9) makes it possible to prove our theorem.

Let $t \geq 1$. Then equation (9) implies

$$\begin{aligned} a_{k+t+1} - a_{k+1} &= \sum_{\ell=1}^{h} \beta_\ell^k \sum_{j=1}^{d} a_j \left(\beta_\ell^t g_{1j\ell}(k+t) - g_{1j\ell}(k) \right) \\ &+ \sum_{j=k+1}^{k+t} \delta_j \sum_{\ell=1}^{h} g_\ell(k+t-j) \beta_\ell^{k+t-j} \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^{k} \delta_j \sum_{\ell=1}^{h} \beta_\ell^{k-j} \left(g_\ell(k+t-j)\beta_\ell^t - g_\ell(k-j) \right). \end{aligned}$$

As $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_s$ are t-th roots of unity, we have $\beta_i^t = 1, i = 1, \dots, s$. Further, as they are simple zeroes of $R(X)$, the polynomials $g_{1j\ell}(X), j = 1, \dots, d, \ell = 1, \dots, s$ and $g_\ell(X), \ell = 1, \dots, s$ are constants depending only on $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_h$. Thus

$$\beta_\ell^t g_{1j\ell}(k+t) - g_{1j\ell}(k) = g_\ell(k+t-j)\beta_\ell^t - g_\ell(k-j) = 0 \tag{10}$$

for all $\ell = 1, \dots, s, j = 1, \dots, d$. Thus our expression for $a_{k+t+1} - a_{k+1}$ simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} |a_{k+t+1} - a_{k+1}| &\leq \left| \sum_{\ell=s+1}^{h} \beta_\ell^k \sum_{j=1}^{d} a_j \left(\beta_\ell^t g_{1j\ell}(k+t) - g_{1j\ell}(k) \right) \right| \\ &+ \left| \sum_{j=k+1}^{k+t} \delta_j \sum_{\ell=1}^{h} g_\ell(k+t-j) \beta_\ell^{k+t-j} \right| \\ &+ \left| \sum_{j=1}^{k} \delta_j \sum_{\ell=s+1}^{h} \beta_\ell^{k-j} \left(g_\ell(k+t-j)\beta_\ell^t - g_\ell(k-j) \right) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Changing j to $j+k$ we can estimate the second summand as follows

$$\left| \sum_{j=1}^{t} \delta_{j+k} \sum_{\ell=1}^{h} g_\ell(t-j) \beta^{t-j} \right| \leq \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} \sum_{\ell=1}^{h} |g_\ell(j)|.$$

As $|\beta_\ell| < 1$ for $\ell = s+1, \dots, h$ and $|\delta_j| < 1$ for $j = 1, \dots, k$ there exists a constant c_3 depending only on the roots of $R(X)$ and $\mathbf{a}$ such that if $k \geq c_3$ then

$$\left| \beta_\ell^k \sum_{j=1}^{d} a_j \left(g_{1j\ell}(k+t)\beta_\ell^t - g_{1j\ell}(k) \right) \right| < \frac{1}{2h}.$$

By the same reason there exists a constant c_4 depending only on the roots of $R(X)$ such that if $k \geq c_4$ then

$$\left| \sum_{\ell=s+1}^{h} \beta_\ell^k \left(g_\ell(k+t)\beta_\ell^t - g_\ell(k) \right) \right| < |\beta_\ell|^{k/2}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
|a_{k+t+1}-a_{k+1}| &\le 1/2+\sum_{j=0}^{t-1}\sum_{\ell=1}^{h}|g_\ell(j)| \\
&+ \left|\sum_{j=1}^{k-c_4}\delta_j\sum_{\ell=s+1}^{h}\beta_\ell^{k-j}\left(g_\ell(k+t-j)\beta_\ell^t-g_\ell(k-j)\right)\right| \\
&+ \left|\sum_{j=k-c_4+1}^{k}\delta_j\sum_{\ell=s+1}^{h}\beta_\ell^{k-j}\left(g_\ell(k+t-j)\beta_\ell^t-g_\ell(k-j)\right)\right|.
\end{aligned}$$

The third summand is bounded by

$$\sum_{j=0}^{\infty}|\beta_\ell^{j/2}|=\frac{1}{1-|\beta_\ell^{1/2}|},$$

while the fourth summand can be estimated as above and we get for it the upper bound

$$\sum_{j=0}^{c_4-1}\sum_{\ell=s+1}^{h}\left|g_\ell(t+j)\beta_\ell^t-g_\ell(j)\right|,$$

which is a constant depending only on the roots of $R(X)$. The sum of these bounds depends only on the roots of $R(X)$ and we can choose it as c_1. To finish the proof of the first statement put $c_2=\max\{c_3,c_4\}$.

If t is even we estimate $|a_{k+t/2+1}+a_{k+1}|$ as in the previous case. The only important difference is that we use

$$\beta_\ell^t g_{1j\ell}(k+t)+g_{1j\ell}(k)=g_\ell(k+t-j)\beta_\ell^t+g_\ell(k-j)=0$$

instead of (10). This is true because $\beta_1\dots,\beta_s$ are primitive t-th roots of unity, thus $\beta_j^{t/2}=-1, j=1,\dots,s$. □

Proof of Theorem 2. If $R(1)=0$ then $\mathbf{r}^T\mathbf{1}=r_1+\cdots+r_d=-1$, thus $\tau_{\mathbf{r}}(\mathbf{1})=\mathbf{1}$. Let n be an integer, then $\mathbf{r}^T(n\mathbf{1})=nr_1+\cdots+nr_d=-n$, thus $\tau_{\mathbf{r}}(n\mathbf{1})=n\mathbf{1}$, i.e $(n\mathbf{1})$ is a fixed point of $\tau_{\mathbf{r}}$ for all integers n.

We apply Theorem 1 with $t=1$. Let $\mathbf{a}\in\mathbb{Z}^d$. There exist a constant c_1 such that if k is large enough, then $|a_{k+1}-a_k|<c_1$. Fix such a k and consider d consecutive terms $a_{k+i}, i=0,\dots,d-1$ of $\{a_n\}$. Put $L=\min\{a_{k+i}, i=0,\dots,d-1\}$ and assume that $L=a_{k+j}$ for some $j\in[0,d-1]$. If $h\in[0,d-1]$ then $0\le a_{k+h}-L\le(d-1)c_1$. Indeed the lower bound holds by the choice of L. To prove the upper bound assume that $h>j$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
a_{k+h}-L &= a_{k+h}-a_{k+j}=a_{k+h}-a_{k+h-1}+\cdots+a_{k+j+1}-a_{k+j} \\
&\le |a_{k+h}-a_{k+h-1}|+\cdots+|a_{k+j+1}-a_{k+j}| \\
&\le (d-1)c_1.
\end{aligned}$$

The case $h<j$ can be handled similarly.

Let $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{a} - L\mathbf{1}$. Then we have

$$\tau_{\mathbf{r}}^u(\mathbf{b}) = \tau_{\mathbf{r}}^u(\mathbf{a}) - \tau_{\mathbf{r}}^u(L\mathbf{1}) = \tau_{\mathbf{r}}^u(\mathbf{a}) - L\mathbf{1}$$

for all $u \geq 0$. Putting $u = k-1$ we get $\tau_{\mathbf{r}}^{k-1}(\mathbf{a} - L\mathbf{1}) = \tau_{\mathbf{r}}^{k-1}(\mathbf{a}) - L\mathbf{1} = (a_k - L, \dots, a_{k+d-1} - L)$. Thus the set $A = \{0, \dots, (d-1)c_1\}^d$ satisfies the assertion.

If $R(-1) = 0$ then $\mathbf{r}^T\bar{\mathbf{1}} = r_1 + r_2(-1) + \cdots + r_d(-1)^{d-1} = (-1)^{d+1}$, thus $\tau_{\mathbf{r}}(\bar{\mathbf{1}}) = (-1)^d\bar{\mathbf{1}}$. This implies that if n is an integer, then $\mathbf{r}^T(n\bar{\mathbf{1}}) = (-1)^d n\bar{\mathbf{1}}$, i.e $n\bar{\mathbf{1}}$ is a fixed point of $\tau_{\mathbf{r}}$ or $\tau_{\mathbf{r}}^2$ according as d is even or odd. Using that -1 is a primitive second root of unity we have not only $|a_{k+2} - a_k| < c_1$, but also $|a_{k+1} + a_k| < c_1$. The rest of the proof is analogous as in the case $R(1) = 0$ and we conclude that $A = \{0, \dots, (2d-1)c_1\}^d$ satisfies the assertion of the theorem.

Finally, if i is a root of $R(X)$, then $R(X) = (X^2+1)(X^{d-2} + q_{d-3}X^{d-3} + \cdots + q_0)$ with $q_{d-3}, \dots, q_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. It is easy to check that if $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbf{v} = n\mathbf{i} + m\bar{\mathbf{i}}$ then $\tau_{\mathbf{r}}^4(\mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{v}$. Further, as i is a primitive fourth root of unity we have $|a_{k+4} - a_k| < c_1$ and $|a_{k+2} + a_k| < c_1$. The rest of the proof is analogous again to the case $R(1) = 0$. $\square$

4. The case $d = 3$

In this section we specialize the results of Theorems 1 and 2 to the case $d = 3$. First we compute $p_{1j}^{(n)}$ by using (5) and get $p_{11}^{(n)} = r_2G_n + r_3G_{n+1} + r_4G_{n+2} = -r_1G_{n-1}, p_{12}^{(n)} = r_3G_n + G_{n+1}$ and $p_{13}^{(n)} = G_n$. Inserting these values into (6) we obtain

$$a_{k+1} = -r_1G_{k-1}a_1 + (G_{k+1} + r_3G_k)a_2 + G_ka_3 + \sum_{j=1}^{k} G_{k-j}\delta_j. \tag{11}$$

In the sequel we need the following lemma of M. Ward [9].

Lemma 2. *Let the linear recurring sequence $\{G_n\}_{n=0}^\infty$ be defined by (2). Assume that $R(X)$ is square-free and denote $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d$ its roots. Then*

$$G_n = \sum_{h=1}^{d} \frac{\alpha_h^n}{R'(\alpha_h)},$$

where $R'(X)$ denotes the derivative of $R(X)$.

By a recent result of Paul Surer [10] the boundary of $\mathcal{E}_3$ is the union of the sets $B_1 = \{(-s, s-(s+1)t, (s+1)t-1) \ : \ -1 \leq s, t \leq 1\}$, $B_2 = \{(s, s+(s+1)t, (s+1)t+1) \ : \ -1 \leq s, t \leq 1\}$ and $B_3 = \{(v, 1+2tv, 2t+v) \ : \ -1 \leq t, v \leq 1\}$.

4.1. **The set B_1.** In this case $R(X) = X^3 + ((s+1)t-1)X^2 + (s-(s+1)t)X - s = (X-1)(X^2+(s+1)tX+s) = (X-1)(X-\alpha)(X-\beta)$. We have

$$(1-\alpha)(1-\beta) = R'(1) = 3 + 2((s+1)t-1) + (s-(s+1)t) = (s+1)(t+1).$$

Using this and Lemma 2 we get

$$\begin{aligned} G_n &= \frac{1}{R'(1)} + \frac{\alpha^n}{R'(\alpha)} + \frac{\beta^n}{R'(\beta)} \\ &= \frac{1}{(s+1)(t+1)} + \frac{\alpha^n(\beta-1)-\beta^n(\alpha-1)}{(\alpha-\beta)(\alpha-1)(\beta-1)} \\ &= \frac{1}{(s+1)(t+1)}\left(1 + \frac{\alpha^n(\beta-1)-\beta^n(\alpha-1)}{\alpha-\beta}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Later we need the difference of two consecutive terms of the sequence $\{G_n\}$, which is

$$\begin{aligned} G_n - G_{n-1} &= \frac{1}{(s+1)(t+1)}\left(\frac{\alpha^n(\beta-1)-\alpha^{n-1}(\beta-1)-\beta^n(\alpha-1)+\beta^{n-1}(\alpha-1)}{\alpha-\beta}\right) \\ &= \frac{\alpha^{n-1}-\beta^{n-1}}{\alpha-\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

Using this expression and (11) we are able to compute $a_{k+1}-a_k$ for any $k \geq 2$.

$$\begin{aligned} a_{k+1}-a_k &= sa_1\frac{\alpha^{k-2}-\beta^{k-2}}{\alpha-\beta} + a_2\left(\frac{\alpha^k-\beta^k}{\alpha-\beta} + ((s+1)t-1)\frac{\alpha^{k-1}-\beta^{k-1}}{\alpha-\beta}\right) \\ &+ \frac{\alpha^{k-1}-\beta^{k-1}}{\alpha-\beta}a_3 + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1}\delta_j\frac{\alpha^{k-j-1}-\beta^{k-j-1}}{\alpha-\beta}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the summand $G_0\delta_k = 0$, therefore we omitted it. We estimate the last summand

$$\left|\sum_{j=1}^{k-1}\delta_j\frac{\alpha^{k-j-1}-\beta^{k-j-1}}{\alpha-\beta}\right| \leq \frac{1}{|\alpha-\beta|}\left(\frac{1}{1-|\alpha|} + \frac{1}{1-|\beta|}\right).$$

As $|\alpha|, |\beta| < 1$ the absolute value of the first three summands can be made arbitrary small choosing k large enough. Thus we get

Theorem 3. *Assume that $-1 < s, t < 1$, $\mathbf{r} = (-s, s-(s+1)t, (s+1)t-1)^T$. Let α, β be the roots of $R(X) = X^3 + ((s+1)t-1)X^2 + (s-(s+1)t)X - s$, which have modulus less than 1. Let*

$$c_{11} = \left\lfloor \frac{1}{|\alpha-\beta|}\left(\frac{1}{1-|\alpha|} + \frac{1}{1-|\beta|}\right)\right\rfloor$$

and $A = A(c_{11}) = \{(x_1, x_2, x_3) \in \mathbb{Z}^3 : 0 \leq x_1 \leq c_{11}, x_1 - c_{11} \leq x_2 \leq x_1 + c_{11}, x_2 - c_{11} \leq x_3 \leq x_2 + c_{11}\}$. There exist for any $(a_1, a_2, a_3) \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ integers L, k such that $\tau_{\mathbf{r}}^k(a_1 - L, a_2 - L, a_3 - L) \in A$.

We present later an application of Theorem 3. Before that we show that a large portion of B_1 does not belong to $\mathcal{D}_3$.

Theorem 4. *Assume that* $-1 < s, t < 1$, $\mathbf{r} = (-s, s-(s+1)t, (s+1)t-1)^T$ *and put* $u = (s+1)t$.

(1) *If* $u < -s$ *and* $\mathbf{a} = (0,1,2)^T$ *then* $a_{n+1} = a_n + 1$ *holds for all* $n \geq 0$.
(2) *If* $u \geq -s$ *and* $s < 0$ *and* $\mathbf{a} = (0,0,1)^T$ *then* $a_3 = 1$ *and* $a_{n+2} = a_n + 1$ *holds for all* $n \geq 0$.
(3) *If* $1-2s \leq u < -s/2$ *and* $s > 2/3$ *and* $\mathbf{a} = (0,1,3)^T$ *then* $a_3 = 4, a_4 = 3$ *and* $a_{n+2} = a_n + 2$ *holds for all* $n \geq 0$.
(4) *If* $\frac{s+2}{2} < u < \frac{2s+3}{3}$ *and* $s > 3/4$ *and* $\mathbf{a} = (0,1,2)^T$ *then* $a_3 = 0, a_4 = 3$ *and* $a_{n+5} = a_n + 1$ *holds for all* $n \geq 0$.
(5) *If* $\frac{3s+4}{4} < u < \frac{4s+5}{5}$ *and* $s > 10/11$ *and* $\mathbf{a} = (0,3,2)^T$ *then* $a_3 = 1, a_4 = 4, a_5 = 0, a_6 = 5$ *and* $a_{n+7} = a_n + 1$ *holds for all* $n \geq 0$.

In the above cases $\mathbf{r}$ *does not belong to* $\mathcal{D}_3$.

Proof. (1) We have $a_k = k$ for $k = 0,1,2$. Assume that this is true for $k < n+2$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} a_{n+2} &= -\lfloor -s(n-1) + (s-u)n + (u-1)(n+1) \rfloor \\ &= -\lfloor -n-1+s+u \rfloor = n+2 \end{aligned}$$

because $u < -s$.

(2) We have $a_3 = -\lfloor u-1 \rfloor = 1$. Assume that $a_{2n} = a_{2n+1} = n$ and $a_{2n+2} = n+1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} a_{2n+3} &= -\lfloor -sn + (s-u)n + (u-1)(n+1) \rfloor \\ &= -\lfloor -n-1+u \rfloor = n+1 = a_{2n+1} + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Similar computation shows that if $a_{2n+1} = n$ and $a_{2n+1} = a_{2n+2} = n+1$ then $a_{2n+4} = n+2 = a_{2n+2} + 1$.

(2) As $\mathbf{a} = (0,1,2)$ we have $a_3 = -\lfloor s+u-2 \rfloor$. Using the inequalities for u and s we get

$$\begin{aligned} s+u-2 &\geq s + s/2 - 1 > 0 \\ &< 5s/3 - 1 < 1 \end{aligned}$$

thus $a_3 = 0$. Similarly $a_4 = -\lfloor s - 2u \rfloor$ and as

$$\begin{aligned} s-2u &\geq s-s-2 = -2 \\ &< s - 4s/3 - 2 = -s/3 - 2 > -3 \end{aligned}$$

$a_4 = 3$; $a_5 = -\lfloor -2s + 3u - 3 \rfloor$ and as

$$\begin{aligned} -2s+3u-3 &\geq -2s + 3s/2 + 3 - 3 > -1 \\ &< 2s - 2s + 3 - 3 = 0 \end{aligned}$$

$a_5 = 1$; $a_6 = -\lfloor 3s - 2u - 1 \rfloor$ and as

$$\begin{aligned} 3s-2u-1 &\geq 3s - 4s/3 - 3 > -2 \\ &< 3s - s - 2 - 1 < -1 \end{aligned}$$

$a_6 = 2$; $a_7 = -\lfloor -2s + u - 2 \rfloor$ and as

$$\begin{aligned} -2s + u - 2 &\geq -2s + s/2 > -3 \\ &< -2s + 2s/3 - 1 < -2 \end{aligned}$$

$a_7 = 3$. As $(a_5, a_6, a_7) = (a_0, a_1, a_2) + \mathbf{1}$ and $\tau_{\mathbf{r}}^k(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{1}) = \tau_{\mathbf{r}}^k(\mathbf{a}) + \mathbf{1}$ for $k \geq 0$ the assertion follows.

The proof of case (5) is similar, therefore we omit it. □

In contrast to the last theorem we prove now that large portions of B_1 belong to $\mathcal{D}_3$.

Theorem 5. *Assume that* $-1 < s, t < 1$, $\mathbf{r} = (-s, s - (s+1)t, (s+1)t - 1)^T$ *and* $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^3$. *If*

(1) $-s, s - (s+1)t, (s+1)t - 1) \leq 0$ *or*
(2) $s \in (0.334, 0.399)$ *and* $t = -\frac{s}{s+1}$

then $\{\tau_{\mathbf{r}}^k(\mathbf{a})\}$ *is ultimately constant, i.e.* $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{D}_3$.

Proof. (1) As $\tau_{\mathbf{r}}^k(\mathbf{a} + L\mathbf{1}) = \tau_{\mathbf{r}}^k(\mathbf{a}) + L\mathbf{1}$ adding $L\mathbf{1}$ with a suitable integer L we arrive that all coordinates of $\mathbf{a}+L\mathbf{1}$ are non negative, thus we may assume this already for the initial vector $\mathbf{a}$. Now assume that $a_{n-1}, a_n, a_{n+1} \geq 0$ for some $n \geq 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} -\max\{a_{n-1}, a_n, a_{n+1}\} &\leq -sa_{n-1} + (s - (s+1)t)a_n + ((s+1)t - 1)a_{n+1} \\ &\leq -\min\{a_{n-1}, a_n, a_{n+1}\} \end{aligned}$$

and equality holds if and only if $a_{n-1} = a_n = a_{n+1}$, in which case we are done. Otherwise, $\min\{a_{n-1}, a_n, a_{n+1}\} + 1 \leq a_{n+2} \leq \max\{a_{n-1}, a_n, a_{n+1}\}$, i.e., the minimum of three consecutive terms is increasing, but their maximum is not, thus the sequence becomes constant after some steps.

(2) In this case we apply Theorem 3. In the actual case the polynomial $R(X)$ has the form $R(X) = (X-1)(X^2 - sX + s)$. Its roots α, β are for $0 \leq s \leq 1$ conjugate complex numbers, hence $|\alpha| = |\beta| = \sqrt{s}$. Further $|\alpha - \beta| = \sqrt{4s - s^2}$. Using these expressions Theorem 3 implies $c_{11} = \frac{2}{(1-\sqrt{s})\sqrt{4s-s^2}}$. It is easy to see, that c_{11} as a function of s is always larger than 4 and is less than 5 provided $s \in (0.079, 0.478)$.

For the initial points $\mathbf{a} \in A(4)$ we tested the sequence $\{a_n\}$ for $s \in (0.334, 0.399)$. Of course it is impossible to do this directly, because there are uncountable many values in the interval, but the convexity property of the mapping $\tau_{\mathbf{r}}$ (see [1] Theorem 4.6) allows us to test only the end points of the interval. We done this by using the computer algebra system MAPLE 9 and found that $\tau_{\mathbf{r}(0.334)}(\mathbf{a}) = \tau_{\mathbf{r}(0.399)}(\mathbf{a})$ except when $\mathbf{a} = (0, 4, 0), (0, -4, 0)$. If $\mathbf{a} = (0, -4, 0)$ then $\{a_n\} = (0, -4, 0, 3, 3, 2, 2, 3, 4, 4, 4)$, if $0.334 \leq s \leq 0.375$ and $\{a_n\} = (0, -4, 0, 4, 4, 3, 3, 4, 5, 5, 5)$, if $0.375 < s \leq 0.468$. Similarly if $\mathbf{a} = (0, 4, 0)$ then $\{a_n\} = (0, 4, 0, -2, -1, 1, 2, 2, 2)$, if $0.334 \leq s < 0.375$ and $\{a_n\} = (0, 4, 0, -3, -2, 0, 1, 1, 1)$, if $0.375 \leq s \leq 0.468$. This completes the proof of case (2). □

Remark that the examples of the last two theorems seems to be typical in the sense that if $\{a_n\}$ is bounded then it is ultimately periodic.

4.2. **The set** B_2**.** In this case $R(X) = X^3 + ((s+1)t+1)X^2 + (s+(s+1)t)X + s = (X+1)(X^2+(s+1)tX+s) = (X+1)(X-\alpha)(X-\beta)$. We show again that large portions of B_2 belong to $\mathcal{D}_3$ and others do not.

First we prove the analogue of Theorem 3 for the actual case.

Theorem 6. *Assume that* $-1 < s,t < 1$, $\mathbf{r} = (s, s+(s+1)t, (s+1)t+1)^T$. *Let* α, β *be the roots of* $R(X) = X^3 + ((s+1)t+1)X^2 + (s+(s+1)t)X + s$, *which have modulus less than* 1. *Let*

$$c_{12} = \left\lfloor \frac{1}{|\alpha-\beta|} \left(\frac{\max\{1, |\alpha+1|\}}{1-|\alpha|} + \frac{\max\{1, |\beta+1|\}}{1-|\beta|} \right) \right\rfloor$$

and $A = A(c_{12}) = \{(x_1,x_2,x_3,x_4) \in \mathbb{Z}^4 \ : \ 0 \le x_1 \le c_{12}, -x_1 - c_{12} \le x_2 \le -x_1 + c_{12}, x_2 - c_{12} \le x_3 \le x_2 + c_{12}, -x_3 - c_{12} \le x_4 \le -x_3 + c_{12}\}$. *For* $(a_1,a_2,a_3)^T \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ *and* $L, k \in \mathbb{Z}$ *define* $a_{d+k+1}^{(L)} = -\lfloor \mathbf{r}^T \tau_{\mathbf{r}}^k (a_1+L, a_2-L, a_3+L)$. *Then there exist for any* $(a_1,a_2,a_3) \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ *integers* L, k *such that* $(a_k^{(L)}, a_{k+1}^{(L)}, a_{k+2}^{(L)}, a_{k+3}^{(L)}) \in A$.

Proof. The proof is analogous to the proof of Theorem 3 therefore we present only the important differences. We have

$$G_n = \frac{1}{(s+1)(1-t)} \left((-1)^n + \frac{\alpha^n(\beta+1) - \beta^n(\alpha+1)}{\alpha-\beta}, \right)$$

thus

$$G_{n+1} + G_n = \frac{\alpha^n - \beta^n}{\alpha - \beta} \quad \text{and} \quad G_{n+2} - G_n = \frac{\alpha^n(\alpha+1) - \beta^n(\beta+1)}{\alpha-\beta},$$

which imply the inequalities

$$|a_{k+1} + a_k| \le \frac{1}{|\alpha-\beta|} \left(\frac{1}{1-|\alpha|} + \frac{1}{1-|\beta|} \right)$$

and

$$|a_{k+2} - a_k| \le \frac{1}{|\alpha-\beta|} \left(\frac{|\alpha+1|}{1-|\alpha|} + \frac{|\beta+1|}{1-|\beta|} \right).$$

Taking the maximum of the right hand sides and using that $a_{k+1} + a_k$ and $a_{k+2} - a_k$ are integers we get the assertion. □

In the next theorem we show that some portion of B_2 belong to $\mathcal{D}_3$, while other does not.

Theorem 7. *Assume that* $-1 < s,t < 1$, $\mathbf{r} = (s, s+(s+1)t, (s+1)t+1)^T$ *and put* $u = (s+1)t$.

(1) *If* $-1 < s \le 0$ *and* $t > 0$, *but* $(s,t) \ne (-1,1)$ *and* $\mathbf{a} = (0,0,1)^T$, *then* $a_{2n+f} = (-1)^f n, n = 0,1,\dots, f = 0,1$.
(2) *If* $s \le 0$ *and* $1 + 2s < u < 1 + \frac{s}{2}$ *and* $\mathbf{a} = (0,-1,3)^T$ *then* $a_3 = -4, a_4 = 6, a_5 = -7$ *and* $a_{n+6} = a_n + 9$ *holds for all* $n \ge 0$.

(3) *If $s, u+1 \geq 0$, but $s+u<0$ then the sequence $\{a_n\}$ is for all initial vectors ultimately periodic with period $L, -L$ for some integer L.*

In cases (1) *and* (2) $\mathbf{r}$ *does not belong to $\mathcal{D}_3$, while in case* (3) *it does belong.*

Proof. (1) For the initial vector the statement is true. Assume that it is true for $a_{2n}, a_{2n+1}, a_{2n+2}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} a_{2n+3} &= -\lfloor sn-(s+u)n+(u+1)(n+1)\rfloor \\ &= -\lfloor n+1+u\rfloor = -(n+1) \end{aligned}$$

because $u=(s+1)t$ is positive and less than 1. The case $a_{2n+1}, a_{2n+2}, a_{2n+3}$ can be treated similarly.

(2) We have $a_3 = -\lfloor -(s+u)+3(u+1)\rfloor = -\lfloor -s+2u+3\rfloor = -4$, $a_4 = -\lfloor -s+3(s+u)-4(u+1)\rfloor = -\lfloor 2s-u-4\rfloor = 6$. The proof of the remaining statements is similar.

(3) As $\tau_{\mathbf{r}}^k(\mathbf{a}+L(1,-1,1)^T) = \tau_{\mathbf{r}}^k(\mathbf{a}) + (-1)^k L(1,-1,1)^T$ holds for all $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ and $k \geq 0$, we may assume that $a_1, a_3 \geq 0$ and $a_2 \leq 0$. Let $k = \min\{a_1, |a_2|, a_3\}$ and $K = \max\{a_1, |a_2|, a_3\}$ and assume that $k \neq K$, otherwise we are done. Then

$$sa_1 + (s+u)a_2 + (u+1)a_3 = sa_1 - (s+u)|a_2| + (u+1)a_3.$$

Here all summands are non-negative, therefore the sum is greater than k and less than K and we get $-K+1 \leq a_4 \leq -k$. We have $a_2, a_4 \leq 0$ and $a_3 \geq 0$, which justify the equality

$$sa_2 + (s+u)a_3 + (u+1)a_4 = -(s|a_2| - (s+u)a_3 + (u+1)|a_4|).$$

As the summands in the bracket are non-negative we obtain $-K \leq sa_2 + (s+u)a_3 + (u+1)a_4 \leq -k$ and equality holds only if $a_2 = -a_3 = a_4$. If this is not true then $k+1 \leq a_5 \leq K$. This means that the lower bound for the absolute value of the terms $|a_n|$ is increasing, but the upper bound is not decreasing, thus $\{|a_n|\}$ must became ultimately constant. □

4.3. **The set B_3.** By Surer's [10] characterization $R(X) = X^3 + (2t+v)X^2 + (2tv+1)X + v = (X+v)(X^2+2tX+1) = (X+v)(X-\alpha)(X-\bar{\alpha})$. We study only the case $t=0, |v| \leq 1$ and prove

Theorem 8. *The points $\mathbf{r} = (v,1,v)^T, |v| \leq 1$ belong to $\mathcal{D}_3 \setminus \mathcal{D}_3^0$.*

Proof. Let $\{a_n\}$ be a sequence of integers satisfying

$$0 \leq va_{n-1} + a_n + va_{n+1} + a_n < 1$$

for all $n \geq 1$. Putting $b_n = a_n + a_{n+2}, n \geq 0$ we rewrite the last inequality as

$$0 \leq vb_{n-1} + b_n < 1. \tag{12}$$

If $0 \leq v < 1$ then $v \in \mathcal{D}_1^0$ by Proposition 4.4. [2], i.e. the sequence $\{b_n\}$ is ultimately zero. We prove that for the other values of v, i.e. $-1 \leq v < 0$ and $v=1$ the sequence $\{b_n\}$ is ultimately constant. This is obviously true for $v = \pm 1$. If $b_0 = 0$ then $b_n = 0$ for all $n \geq 0$.

Assume that $-1 < v < 0$. If $b_0 > 0$ then $1 \leq b_n \leq b_{n-1}$ holds for all $n \geq 1$. Indeed $b_n \geq -vb_{n-1} > 0$, which proves the left inequality. On the other hand $b_n < 1 - vb_{n-1} < 1 + b_{n-1}$. As both b_n and b_{n-1} are integers we get the right hand side inequality. We proved that $\{b_n\}$ is non-negative and monotonically decreasing, thus it is ultimately constant. If $b_0 < 0$ then one can analogously prove that $\{b_n\}$ is non-positive and monotonically increasing, thus it is ultimately constant to.

After this preparation we turn to the proof of the theorem. We may assume without loss of generality that $b_n = b, n \geq 0$. Let $a_0, a_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then $a_2 = b - a_0, a_3 = b - a_1$ and $a_{4k+j} = a_j$ for all $j = 0, 1, 2, 3; k = 0, 1, \ldots$. Thus $\{a_n\}$ is an ultimately periodic sequence, i.e. $\mathbf{r} \in \mathcal{D}_3$. As we may choose a_0, a_1 arbitrarily, e.g. such that $\{a_n\}$ is not the zero sequence, thus $\mathbf{r} \notin \mathcal{D}_3^0$. This completes the proof of the theorem. $\square$

References

[1] S. Akiyama, T. Borbély, H. Brunotte, A. Pethő and J. M. Thuswaldner, *Generalized radix representations and dynamical systems I, Acta Math. Hungar.*, **108** (2005), 207–238.

[2] S. Akiyama, H. Brunotte, A. Pethő and J. M. Thuswaldner, *Generalized radix representations and dynamical systems II*, Acta Arith. **121** (2006), 21-61.

[3] S. Akiyama, H. Brunotte, A. Pethő and W. Steiner, *Remarks on a conjecture on certain integer sequences*, Periodica Mathematica Hungarica, **52** (2006), 1-17.

[4] S. Akiyama, H. Brunotte, A. Pethő and W. Steiner, *Periodicity of certain piecewise affine planar maps*, to appear.

[5] P. Kirschenhofer, A. Pethő and J.M. Thuswaldner, *On a family of three term nonlinear recurrences*, Int. J. Number Theory, **4** (2008), 135-146.

[6] A. Pethő, On a polynomial transformation and its application to the construction of a public key cryptosystem, *Computational Number Theory*, Proc., Walter de Gruyter Publ. Comp., Eds.: A. Pethő, M. Pohst, H. G. Zimmer and H. C. Williams, 31 – 44 (1991).

[7] A. Pethő, *Notes on CNS polynomials and integral interpolation*, In: More Sets, Graphs and Numbers, Eds.: E Györy, G.O.H. Katona and L. Lovász, pp.301-315.

[8] T.N. Shorey and R. Tijdeman, *Exponential Diophantine Equations*, Cambridge Univ. Press 1986.

[9] M. Ward, *The maximal prime divisors of linear recurrences*, Can. J. Math. **6**, 455–462 (1954).

[10] P. Surer, private communication.