

UNIFORM BOUNDS FOR DIGIT-APPENDING FIBONACCI WALKS

SCOTT DUKE KOMINERS

ABSTRACT. Building on the work of Miller et al. [2], we show that it is impossible to “walk to infinity” along the Fibonacci sequence in any integer base $b \geq 2$ when at most N digits are appended per step. Our proof method is base-independent, yielding the bound

$$L \leq 2N \log_{\varphi} b + O(1),$$

uniformly in the starting term, without relying on base-specific periodicity computations (here, $\varphi = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$). Our approach extends to certain Lucas sequences.

1. INTRODUCTION

An *at-most- N -digit-appending walk* along the Fibonacci sequence in base $b \geq 2$ proceeds as follows: start from a Fibonacci number $M_0 := F_m$ and, at each step M_0, M_1, M_2, \dots , append between 1 and N base- b digits to the right (leading zeros in the appended block are allowed), producing

$$M_{k+1} := b^t M_k + r, \quad (1 \leq t \leq N; 0 \leq r < b^t),$$

with the requirement that each M_k be a Fibonacci number. The central question we consider is whether such a walk can continue indefinitely, i.e., *is it possible to walk to infinity along the Fibonacci sequence in base b ?*

In base 10, Miller, Peng, Popescu, and Wattanawanichkul [2] proved that every at-most- N -digit-appending walk terminates and obtained sharp bounds on the maximum-possible walk length using base-10-specific modular information—specifically, the base-10 Pisano period.¹

In this paper we give a unified, base-independent proof of termination that avoids any base-specific periodicity. Using only standard Fibonacci identities and a simple rigidity argument, we obtain an explicit bound that is linear in N : The maximum number of steps L in a base- b at-most- N -digit-appending walk along the Fibonacci sequence is

$$(1) \quad L \leq 2N \log_{\varphi} b + O(1);$$

in particular, any such walk is finite.

Making the argument base-independent entails a nontrivial trade-off in terms of efficiency: for base 10, our bound (1) is weaker than the $O(\log N)$ bound obtained by Miller et al. [2], but our method applies verbatim to any base $b \geq 2$ and extends qualitatively to Lucas sequences.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary: 11B39 / Secondary: 11B37 11A07.

Key words and phrases. Fibonacci numbers, Lucas sequences, digit appending, recurrence sequences.

I gratefully acknowledge helpful conversations with Ben Golub, Steven J. Miller, Ken Ono, and Jesse Shapiro. Additionally, I used LLMs to assist with some of the computations and coding in the preparation of this article, particularly GPT-5-Pro and Claude-Sonnet-4.5 (both accessed via Poe with the support of Quora, where I am an advisor). The problem, methods, and eventual written form are my own; and of course any errors remain my responsibility.

¹See also [3], in which Miller, Peng, Popescu, Siktir, Wattanawanichkul, and The Polymath REU Program examined the walking-to-infinity question for a variety of other number-theoretic sequences, including primes, square-free numbers, and perfect squares.

2. PRELIMINARIES

We write (F_n) for the *Fibonacci sequence*, defined by $F_0 = 0$, $F_1 = 1$, and $F_{n+1} = F_n + F_{n-1}$. We denote $\varphi = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$.

We begin by recalling two Fibonacci identities that were core to the argument of [2].

Lemma 2.1 ([2, Lemma 2.1]). *For all integers $m \geq 1$ and $k \geq 1$,*

$$(2) \quad F_{k+1} F_m \leq F_{m+k} \leq F_{k+2} F_m.$$

Lemma 2.2 ([2, Lemma 2.2]). *For all integers $m \geq k \geq 2$,*

$$F_{m+k} = (F_{k+2} - F_{k-2})F_m + (-1)^{k+1}F_{m-k}.$$

Lemma 2.1 shows that the Fibonacci number at index $m+k$ grows roughly like the product of the m -th and k -th Fibonacci numbers. Meanwhile, Lemma 2.2 shows how to “jump ahead” by k positions in the Fibonacci sequence: the answer is almost a multiple of the starting value F_m , with a correction term from k steps back.

We also use the elementary growth bound

$$(3) \quad \varphi^{m-2} \leq F_m \leq \varphi^{m-1} \quad (m \geq 1),$$

which follows from Binet’s formula.

3. BOUNDING BASE- b FIBONACCI WALKS

We first state our main result (Theorem 3.1), then derive two intermediate lemmata (Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3), and then finally give the proof of the main theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *We fix $b \geq 2$ and $N \geq 1$, and define*

$$K := \left\lceil 1 + \log_\varphi(2b^N) \right\rceil, \quad n_* := \max\{n \geq 0 : F_n \leq b^N - 1\}.$$

No base- b , N -digit-appending step to a Fibonacci number is possible from any F_m with $m \geq n_ + K + 1$.² Consequently, any at-most- N -digit-appending walk along Fibonacci numbers in base- b can have at most*

$$L \leq n_* + K \leq 2N \log_\varphi b + \log_\varphi 2 + 4$$

steps. In particular, $L = O(N \log_\varphi b)$ uniformly in the starting term.

The proof of Theorem 3.1 relies on two results that tightly constrain the circumstances under which we can reach a Fibonacci number from another Fibonacci number by appending at most N base- b digits. Lemma 3.2, building on Lemma 2.2, shows that such a step cannot jump “too far ahead” in the sequence: the jump size k is at most logarithmic in b^N . Lemma 3.3, meanwhile shows that once a Fibonacci index is large enough, the only way to step to another Fibonacci number is if the scaling coefficient $F_{k+2} - F_{k-2}$ in (2) exactly equals b^t and the remainder equals F_{m-k} ; this rigidity arises because large Fibonacci numbers dominate the step expression, leaving no room for variation.

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose that $m \geq 1$ and $F_{m+k} = b^t F_m + r$ with $1 \leq t \leq N$ and $0 \leq r < b^t$. Then*

$$F_{k+1} < 2b^N,$$

and hence

$$k \leq 1 + \log_\varphi(2b^N) = N \log_\varphi b + \log_\varphi 2 + 1.$$

²Note that $n_* \geq 2$ since $F_2 = 1 \leq b^N - 1$ for $N \geq 1, b \geq 2$.

Proof. By hypothesis, we have

$$(4) \quad F_{m+k} = b^t F_m + r \leq b^N F_m + (b^N - 1) < 2b^N F_m \quad (F_m \geq 1).$$

Using Lemma 2.1 and (4), we see that $F_{k+1}F_m \leq F_{k+m} < 2b^N F_m$, so $F_{k+1} < 2b^N$, as desired. Using $F_{k+1} \geq \varphi^{(k+1)-2} = \varphi^{k-1}$ from (3) gives the claimed bound on k . \square

Lemma 3.3. *We fix $b \geq 2$ and $N \geq 1$, and let*

$$m_* := \lceil \log_\varphi(2b^N) \rceil + 4.$$

For all $m \geq m_$, if*

$$F_{m+k} = b^t F_m + r \quad (1 \leq t \leq N, 0 \leq r < b^t, k \geq 1),$$

then necessarily $k \geq 2$, $F_{k+2} - F_{k-2} = b^t$, k is odd, and $r = F_{m-k}$.

Proof. First, we note that if $k = 1$, then by hypothesis, $b^t F_m + r = F_{m+1} = F_m + F_{m-1}$, so

$$(5) \quad (b^t - 1)F_m = F_{m-1} - r.$$

For $t \geq 1$, we have $b^t \geq 2$; hence, the left side of (5) is at least F_m , while the right side satisfies $F_{m-1} - r \leq F_{m-1} < F_m$. This is impossible, so we must have $k \neq 1$; thus, $k \geq 2$.

Now, for $k \geq 2$, we set $\Delta := F_{k+2} - F_{k-2} - b^t$. We suppose for the sake of seeking a contradiction that $\Delta \neq 0$. Then, since $\Delta \in \mathbb{Z}$, we must have $\Delta \geq 1$ or $\Delta \leq -1$.

By Lemma 3.2, we must have $k \leq K := \lceil 1 + \log_\varphi(2b^N) \rceil$. Since $m \geq m_* = \lceil \log_\varphi(2b^N) \rceil + 4 > K$ and $k \leq K$, we have $m > k$, so in particular $m \geq k \geq 2$ and Lemma 2.2 applies. Thus, we have

$$F_{m+k} = (F_{k+2} - F_{k-2})F_m + (-1)^{k+1}F_{m-k};$$

hence, our hypothesis that $F_{m+k} = b^t F_m + r$ implies that

$$(6) \quad r = (F_{k+2} - F_{k-2} - b^t)F_m + (-1)^{k+1}F_{m-k} = \Delta F_m + (-1)^{k+1}F_{m-k}.$$

Moreover, for $m \geq m_*$, (3) gives

$$(7) \quad F_{m-2} \geq \varphi^{(m-2)-2} \geq \varphi^{m-4} \geq \varphi^{\lceil \log_\varphi(2b^N) \rceil} \geq 2b^N > b^N \geq b^t.$$

And finally, as $m > k$, we have

$$(8) \quad F_{m-k} > 0.$$

If $\Delta \geq 1$ then (6) gives:

$$\begin{cases} k \text{ odd:} & r \geq F_m + F_{m-k} \geq b^t \quad (\text{by (7) and (8)}), \\ k \text{ even:} & r \geq F_m - F_{m-k} \geq F_m - F_{m-1} = F_{m-2} > b^t \quad (\text{by (7)}), \end{cases}$$

contradicting our hypothesis that $r < b^t$.

Meanwhile, if $\Delta \leq -1$ then (6) gives:

$$\begin{cases} k \text{ odd:} & r \leq -F_m + F_{m-k} \leq -F_m + F_{m-1} = -F_{m-2} < 0, \\ k \text{ even:} & r \leq -F_m - F_{m-k} < 0, \end{cases}$$

contradicting our hypothesis that $r \geq 0$.

Thus, we see that we must have $\Delta = 0$, i.e., $F_{k+2} - F_{k-2} = b^t$, and then $r = (-1)^{k+1}F_{m-k}$. Since $r \geq 0$ (by hypothesis) and $F_{m-k} > 0$ (by (8)), we must have k odd, so $r = F_{m-k}$. \square

With Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3 in hand, we can now combine them to prove our main result.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Let $m \geq n_* + K + 1$. Suppose, for the sake of seeking a contradiction, that a step to another Fibonacci number appending at most N base- b digits is possible, i.e., there exist k, t ($1 \leq t \leq N$), and r ($0 \leq r < b^t$) such that

$$F_{m+k} = b^t F_m + r.$$

By Lemma 3.2, we know that $k \leq K$. Since $n_* \geq 2$ (as $b^N - 1 \geq 1 = F_2$), we have

$$m \geq n_* + K + 1 \geq K + 3 = \lceil 1 + \log_\varphi(2b^N) \rceil + 3 \geq \lceil \log_\varphi(2b^N) \rceil + 4 = m_*,$$

so Lemma 3.3 applies and yields $k \geq 2$, $F_{k+2} - F_{k-2} = b^t$, and $r = F_{m-k}$. Consequently, since $m \geq n_* + K + 1$ and $k \leq K$, we have

$$(9) \quad r = F_{m-k} \geq F_{(n_*+K+1)-K} = F_{n_*+1}.$$

By the definition of n_* as the largest index n such that $F_n \leq b^N - 1$, we have $F_{n_*+1} > b^N - 1$; hence, $F_{n_*+1} \geq b^N$. Thus (9) implies that $r \geq b^N > b^t - 1$, i.e., $r > b^t - 1$. Since $r < b^t$ and r is an integer, we have reached a contradiction. Thus, no step to another Fibonacci number appending at most N base- b digits is possible once $m \geq n_* + K + 1$.

Finally, to bound the walk length L from an arbitrary starting index m_0 : We first note that, by the preceding argument, if $m_0 \geq n_* + K + 1$, then $L = 0$. Otherwise, if $m_0 < n_* + K + 1$, then each valid step increases the index by at least 1 (as $k \geq 1$ in any step), so after at most $(n_* + K + 1 - m_0)$ steps we reach an index $\geq n_* + K + 1$, at which no further step is possible. Hence $L \leq n_* + K$.

Using (3), we have $n_* \leq 2 + N \log_\varphi b$ and $K \leq 2 + N \log_\varphi b + \log_\varphi 2$, which gives

$$L \leq n_* + K \leq 4 + 2N \log_\varphi b + \log_\varphi 2 = 2N \log_\varphi b + \log_\varphi 2 + 4,$$

as claimed. \square

Remark 3.4 (Comparison with the Miller et al. [2] Base-10 Bounds). For $b = 10$, Theorem 3.1 gives $L \leq 2N \log_\varphi 10 + O(1) \approx 9.57N + O(1)$, whereas [2] gives an $O(\log N)$ bound with sharp constants by using the periodicity of the Fibonacci sequence modulo 10. Our method trades sharpness for universality: it applies to any base without periodicity computations.

4. EXTENSION TO OTHER SECOND-ORDER LINEAR RECURRENCES

The proof strategy in Theorem 3.1 relies on three key properties of the Fibonacci sequence:

- (i) an *addition formula* expressing F_{m+k} in terms of F_m , F_k , and F_{m-k} (Lemma 2.2);
- (ii) a *product bound* showing F_{m+k} grows like $F_m \cdot F_k$ (Lemma 2.1); and
- (iii) *exponential growth* with explicit constants (equation (3)).

These properties are not unique to Fibonacci numbers. Indeed, they hold for a much broader family of sequences—and as we show, all such sequences satisfy a version of our Theorem 3.1.

We consider the family of sequences known as *Lucas sequences*. For integer parameters (P, Q) , the *Lucas sequence of the first kind* $U_n = U_n(P, Q)$ and the companion *Lucas sequence of the second kind* $V_n = V_n(P, Q)$ are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} U_0 &= 0, U_1 = 1, & U_{n+1} &= P U_n - Q U_{n-1}, \\ V_0 &= 2, V_1 = P, & V_{n+1} &= P V_n - Q V_{n-1}, \end{aligned}$$

respectively. The Fibonacci numbers arise in the case $(P, Q) = (1, -1)$, yielding $U_n = F_n$ and $V_n = L_n$, where (L_n) denotes the classical Lucas number sequence.

Throughout this section, when we refer to “the Lucas sequence” (U_n) without qualification, we mean the sequence of the first kind. (The sequence (V_n) appears in our proofs through the addition formula relating U_{m+k} to U_m , V_k , and U_{m-k} .)

4.1. Lucas Sequence Properties. When the characteristic polynomial $x^2 - Px + Q = 0$ has distinct real roots $\rho > 1$ and $\sigma = Q/\rho$, the sequence (U_n) exhibits exponential growth—the condition $|Q| = 1$ ensures that $|\sigma| = \rho^{-1} < 1$, so the smaller root's contribution decays exponentially. Moreover, all Lucas sequences satisfy versions of the addition and product formulas satisfied by the Fibonacci numbers.

Lemma 4.1. *Let (U_n) be a Lucas sequence with integer parameters (P, Q) satisfying $|Q| = 1$ and $P^2 - 4Q > 0$. Let $\rho > 1$ be the larger root of $x^2 - Px + Q = 0$. Then:*

(a) *For all $m \geq k \geq 0$, we have*

$$(10) \quad U_{m+k} = U_m V_k - Q^k U_{m-k};$$

moreover, since $|Q| = 1$, the coefficient Q^k is bounded (indeed, $Q^k \in \{-1, +1\}$).

(b) *There exist constants $A, B > 0$ depending only on (P, Q) such that*

$$A U_{k+1} U_m \leq U_{m+k} \leq B U_{k+2} U_m \quad (m \geq k \geq 1).$$

(c) *There exist constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ depending only on (P, Q) such that*

$$c_1 \rho^{n-1} \leq U_n \leq c_2 \rho^{n-1} \quad (n \geq 1).$$

Proof. Part **a** is a standard identity in the theory of Lucas sequences (see, e.g., [4, Equation (2.8)]). Part **c** follows from Binet-type formulas for Lucas sequences (see [1, Theorem 10.1] or [4, Equation (2.1)]).

For Part **b**, we use Part **c**: Since $U_{m+k} \geq c_1 \rho^{m+k-1}$ and $U_m U_{k+1} \leq c_2^2 \rho^{m+k-1}$, we have

$$U_{m+k} \geq \frac{c_1}{c_2^2} U_m U_{k+1},$$

giving the lower bound with $A = \frac{c_1}{c_2^2}$. Similarly, since $U_{m+k} \leq c_2 \rho^{m+k-1}$ and $U_m U_{k+2} \geq c_1^2 \rho^{m+k}$, we have

$$U_{m+k} \leq \frac{c_2}{c_1^2 \rho} U_m U_{k+1},$$

proving the upper bound with $B = \frac{c_2}{c_1^2 \rho}$. \square

4.2. Walking Along a Lucas Sequence. As the intuition given at the start of this section suggests, the three properties established in Lemma 4.1 imply a version of Theorem 3.1.

Theorem 4.2. *Fix $b \geq 2$ and $N \geq 1$, and let (U_n) be a Lucas sequence with integer parameters (P, Q) satisfying:*

- $|Q| = 1$ (ensuring the tail term in the addition formula is bounded);
- $P^2 - 4Q > 0$ (ensuring exponential growth); and
- $U_n > 0$ for all sufficiently large n (ensuring positivity).

Then every at-most- N -digit-appending walk on (U_n) terminates after at most L steps, where

$$L \leq C_1 N \log_\rho b + C_2$$

for constants $C_1, C_2 > 0$ depending only on (P, Q) .

Proof Sketch. The proof follows the same strategy as in our proof of Theorem 3.1, replacing Fibonacci-specific identities with their Lucas sequence analogues from Lemma 4.1:

Index jump bound: Using the product comparability from Part **b** of Lemma 4.1, we see that if $U_{m+k} = b^t U_m + r$ with $r < b^t \leq b^N$, then $U_{m+k} < 2b^N U_m$. This gives $A U_{k+1} U_m \leq 2b^N U_m$; hence, $U_{k+1} < 2b^N / A$. Combined with the exponential growth bound from Part **c** of Lemma 4.1, we obtain

$$k \leq C'_1 N \log_\rho b + C'_2 =: K^{(U_n)}$$

for constants C'_1, C'_2 depending on (P, Q) .

Rigidity: We choose a threshold $m_*^{(U_n)}$ so that, for all $m \geq m_*^{(U_n)}$: (i) $U_{m-2} > b^N$; (ii) $U_m > 0$ and U_n is strictly increasing for all $n \geq m$; and (iii) if $Q = 1$, then also $U_m - U_{m-1} > b^N$. (Such an $m_*^{(U_n)}$ exists by the exponential growth in Part **c** of Lemma 4.1, combined with our positivity hypothesis.) Now, we suppose that for some $m \geq m_*^{(U_n)}$ there is a valid step $U_{m+k} = b^t U_m + r$ with $1 \leq t \leq N$ and $0 \leq r < b^t$. By the index-jump bound, k is bounded independently of m ; in particular, for $m \geq m_*^{(U_n)}$ we have $m > k$. Using the addition formula (Part **a** of Lemma 4.1), we then obtain

$$r = (V_k - b^t)U_m - Q^k U_{m-k}.$$

Taking $\Delta := V_k - b^t \in \mathbb{Z}$, for $m \geq m_*^{(U_n)}$, the main term ΔU_m dominates while $U_{m-k} \leq U_{m-1}$; a brief sign/size check as in the proof of Lemma 3.3 shows that $\Delta \geq 1$ would force $r \geq b^t$ and $\Delta \leq -1$ would force $r < 0$ —both impossible. Hence, like in the proof of Lemma 3.3, we must have $\Delta = 0$, which implies rigid structure on the specific Lucas sequence member reached by a valid step: $V_k = b^t$, and therefore $r = -Q^k U_{m-k}$. Then, because $U_{m-k} > 0$ and $r \geq 0$, we conclude that if $Q = -1$, then k must be odd and $r = U_{m-k}$ (the exact Fibonacci analogue); if $Q = 1$, then $r = -U_{m-k} < 0$, which is impossible—so no step can occur for $m \geq m_*^{(U_n)}$ in the case $Q = 1$.

Termination: We define $n_*^{(U_n)} := \max\{n \geq 0 : U_n \leq b^N - 1\}$. For $m \geq n_*^{(U_n)} + K^{(U_n)} + 1$, rigidity forces the remainder to exceed b^N , contradicting the digit-appending constraint. As each step increases the index by at least 1, the walk terminates in at most $n_*^{(U_n)} + K^{(U_n)} + 1 = O_{P,Q}(N \log_\rho b)$ steps. \square

4.3. Illustration and Discussion. The Fibonacci sequence satisfies all three conditions of Theorem 4.2 with $(P, Q) = (1, -1)$, so our Theorem 3.1 is a special case of the result (with explicitly derived constants). Meanwhile, the *Pell numbers* P_n (defined by $P_0 = 0$, $P_1 = 1$, and $P_{n+1} = 2P_n + P_{n-1}$) form a Lucas sequence with $(P, Q) = (2, -1)$, satisfying $|Q| = 1$ and growing like ρ^n where $\rho = 1 + \sqrt{2} \approx 2.414$. Therefore, Theorem 4.2 guarantees that any at-most- N -digit-appending walk on the Pell sequence terminates in $O(N \log b)$ steps.

It also seems likely that analogous identities and rigidity phenomena may hold for higher-order linear recurrences, although we do not pursue that here. The key obstacle is that for order $\ell > 2$, the analogue of (10) would involve ℓ terms, so the rigidity step would need to match $\ell - 1$ coefficients simultaneously, which would require more delicate analysis.

REFERENCES

- [1] Thomas Koshy. *Fibonacci and Lucas Numbers with Applications*. Wiley, 2001.
- [2] Steven J Miller, Fei Peng, Tudor Popescu, and Nawapan Wattanawanichkul. Walking to infinity on the Fibonacci sequence. *The Fibonacci Quarterly*, 60(5):293–298, 2022.
- [3] Steven J. Miller, Fei Peng, Tudor Popescu, Joshua M. Siktir, Nawapan Wattanawanichkul, and The Polymath REU Program. Walking to infinity along some number theory sequences. *INTEGERS*, 24:#A78, 2024.
- [4] Paulo Ribenboim. *My Numbers, My Friends: Popular Lectures on Number Theory*. Springer, 2000.

HARVARD BUSINESS SCHOOL; DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS AND CENTER OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES AND APPLICATIONS, HARVARD UNIVERSITY; AND A16Z CRYPTO

Email address: kominers@fas.harvard.edu