

# ANTI-FIBONACCI NUMBERS: A FORMULA

NOTES BY THOMAS ZASLAVSKY  
 BINGHAMTON UNIVERSITY (SUNY)  
 BINGHAMTON, NEW YORK 13902-6000

SEPTEMBER 26, 2016

The non-anti-Fibonacci numbers (see [2, Sequence A249031]) are the unparenthesised numbers in

$$1, 2, (3 = 1 + 2), 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, (9 = 4 + 5), 10, 11, 12, \\
 (13 = 6 + 7), 14, 15, 16, 17, (18 = 8 + 10), 19, 20, 21, 22, \\
 (23 = 11 + 12), 24, \dots;$$

this is [2, Sequence A249031]. The numbers in parentheses are the *anti-Fibonacci numbers*  $\bar{F}_n$  (with  $\bar{F}_0 = 3$ ); they are defined as the sums of pairs of consecutive non-anti-Fibonacci natural numbers (beginning with 1), each non-anti-Fibonacci number occurring in one such sum. These anti-Fibonacci numbers are

$$3, 9, 13, 18, 23, 29, 33, 39, \dots;$$

they are [2, Sequence A075326] (we omit 0, which does not fit the pattern). We deduce an anti-Fibonacci number formula from the jumps (first-order differences, [2, Sequence A249032]) in the sequence.<sup>1</sup>

Define an integer to be *utterly odd* if the terminal string of 1's in its binary representation has odd length. For instance, that string has the even length 0 for an even integer. A number  $2^{k+1}m + (2^k - 1)$  where  $m \geq 0$  (every non-negative integer has this form) is utterly odd if and only if  $k$  is odd. Utterly odd positive numbers are

$$1, 5, 7, 9, 13, 17, 21, 23, 25, 29, 31, \dots$$

The *utterly odd nature* of an integer is the property of being, or not being, utterly odd. Most odd integers are utterly odd; those that are not are

$$3, 11, 15, 19, 27, 35, \dots$$

(see [2, Sequence A131323]).

**Theorem 1.** *The anti-Fibonacci numbers  $\bar{F}_n$  of the second kind, indexed so  $\bar{F}_0 = 3$ , are*

$$\bar{F}_n = \begin{cases} 5n + 3 & \text{if } n \text{ is even,} \\ 5n + 3 & \text{if } n \text{ is odd and } (n - 1)/2 \text{ is not utterly odd,} \\ 5n + 4 & \text{if } n \text{ is odd and } (n - 1)/2 \text{ is utterly odd.} \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* This is a restatement of Theorem 2. □

**Theorem 2.** *Indexing so that  $\bar{f}_0 = 4$ , the non-anti-Fibonacci numbers are*

$$\bar{f}_n = \frac{1}{4}[5n - (n \bmod 8)] + c \quad \text{for } n \geq -2,$$

---

<sup>1</sup>I am grateful to Tao-Ming Wang for leading me deep into this question at Indira Gandhi International Airport.

where

$$c = \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if } (n \bmod 8) < 4, \text{ or if } (n \bmod 8) = 4 \text{ and } \lfloor n/8 \rfloor \text{ is utterly odd,} \\ 5 & \text{if } (n \bmod 8) > 4, \text{ or if } (n \bmod 8) = 4 \text{ and } \lfloor n/8 \rfloor \text{ is not utterly odd.} \end{cases}$$

By  $(n \bmod m)$  I mean the least non-negative residue of  $n$  modulo  $m$ , which is a number in the range  $0, 1, \dots, m - 1$ .

The difficult part was finding the formula, which I did by interpreting the following replication lemma as defining the locations and relationships of missing numbers.

**Lemma 1.** *The anti-Fibonacci number sequence  $3, 9, 13, 18, 23, \dots$  has jumps that occur in consecutive pairs  $A = (6, 4)$  or  $B = (5, 5)$ . The pattern of jump pairs is generated from the sequence  $A$  by the substitution rules  $A \mapsto AB$  and  $B \mapsto AA$ .*

*Proof.* The first four jumps, which are  $AB$ , follow this rule. The rest of the proof proceeds by induction after some preparation.

Consider four consecutive non-anti-Fibonacci numbers,  $\bar{f}_i, \bar{f}_{i+1}, \bar{f}_{i+2}, \bar{f}_{i+3}$  (call them, collectively,  $C$ ), that constitute two summed pairs. The pairs sums  $s_1 = \bar{f}_i + \bar{f}_{i+1}$  and  $s_2 = \bar{f}_{i+2} + \bar{f}_{i+3}$  satisfy  $s_2 > s_1 + 3$ . Therefore, any two anti-Fibonacci numbers differ by at least 4. Furthermore, they differ by 4 only if  $C$  is four consecutive integers; otherwise they differ by 5. There is no other possibility because anti-Fibonacci numbers differ by at least 4.

Assume, as is true initially, that eight consecutive non-anti-Fibonacci numbers, call them  $E$ , are  $\bar{f}_{8a} = 10a+4, \dots, \bar{f}_{8a+7} = 10a+12$  with one anti-Fibonacci number internally at  $10a+8$  or  $10a+9$ , they are preceded by the anti-Fibonacci number  $10a+3$ , and the summed pairs in  $E$  begin with  $\bar{f}_{8a} = 10a+4$  and  $\bar{f}_{8a+1} = 10a+5$ . This sequence generates anti-Fibonacci numbers  $\bar{f}_{8a} + \bar{f}_{8a+1} = 20a+9$ ,  $\bar{f}_{8a+2} + \bar{f}_{8a+3} = 20a+13$ ,  $\bar{f}_{8a+4} + \bar{f}_{8a+5} = 20a+18$  or  $20a+19$ , and  $\bar{f}_{8a+6} + \bar{f}_{8a+7} = 20a+23$ . The jumps generated by  $E$  are 6 from  $\bar{f}_{8a-2} + \bar{f}_{8a-1} = 20a+3$ , 4, 5 or 6, and 5 or 4; thus, they are 6, 4, 5, 5 or 6, 4, 6, 4, also known as  $AB$  or  $AA$ . Thus, the pattern of jumps  $A$  or  $B$  in a decade of integers  $8a+3, \dots, 8a+12$  replicates itself (imperfectly) in the two decades  $16a+3, \dots, 16a+22$  as  $AB$  or  $AA$ , respectively. That proves the first and second assertions of the lemma.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.* We already established in the course of proving Lemma 1 that the non-anti-Fibonacci numbers have the values in Theorem 2, except that we have not determined when  $c$  in the one ambiguous residue class  $n \equiv 4 \pmod{8}$  equals 4 or 5. The Theorem does give the right values for  $\bar{f}_0, \dots, \bar{f}_{15}$ , so we can perform an induction.

Let's perform a few steps of replication. We get  $A, B$  sequences

Step 0:  $A$   
 Step 1:  $AB$   
 Step 2:  $ABAA$   
 Step 3:  $ABAA ABAB$   
 Step 4:  $ABAA ABAB \quad ABAA ABAA$

in which the locations of  $B$ 's are at the following positions, beginning at position 0 and written in binary. Parentheses denote positions with an  $A$ . We omit even numbers because

all even positions are occupied by  $A$ 's.

Step 0: –

Step 1: 1

Step 2: 01 (11)

Step 3: 001 (011) 101 111

Step 4: 0001 (0011) 0101 0111 1001 (1011) 1101 (1111)

We call a sequence of consecutive odd numbers from 0 to  $2^k - 1$  in fixed-length binary, ignoring parentheses, a *binary odd sequence* and the step from one to the next *doubling*. We observe that the  $B$ 's are in the utterly odd positions. We also see that the first and second halves of each sequence are identical except for the very last element, which differs, alternating between  $A$  in the first half and  $B$  in the second, and the reverse.

Now we show that pattern continues. First, we show that replication preserves that pattern in  $A, B$  strings. Let  $\rho$  denote the replication operator. If we have an  $A, B$  pattern  $\Pi$  of the form  $\Sigma\alpha\Sigma\bar{\alpha}$  where  $\Sigma$  is a string of  $A$ 's and  $B$ 's,  $\alpha$  denotes either  $A$  or  $B$ , and  $\bar{\alpha}$  is the opposite letter, then

$$\rho(\Pi) = \rho(\Sigma)\rho(\alpha)\rho(\Sigma)\rho(\bar{\alpha}) = \rho(\Sigma)A\bar{\alpha}\rho(\Sigma)A\alpha.$$

Thus, the result has the form  $\Sigma'\bar{\alpha}\Sigma'\alpha$ , the same shape as  $\Pi$  but with the terminal letter of each half reversed.

Now we show that doubling a binary odd sequence transforms it in the same way. Write  $\delta$  for the doubling operator. Consider a binary odd sequence  $\pi = (\sigma_0, \dots, \sigma_{2^k-1})$  where  $\sigma_j = \beta_{j,k-1} \cdots \beta_{j,1}1$  is a string of length  $k$  and each  $\beta_{j,i} \in \{0, 1\}$ . In terms of binary strings,  $\delta$  transforms  $\pi$  to

$$\delta(\pi) = (0\sigma_0, \dots, 0\sigma_{2^k-1})(1\sigma_0, \dots, 1\sigma_{2^k-1}),$$

where juxtaposition of sequences denotes concatenation. The string  $0\sigma_j$  has the same utterly odd nature as does  $\sigma_j$ . The string  $1\sigma_j$  has the same utterly odd nature as  $\sigma_j$  does if there is a 0 in  $\sigma_j$ . The only way  $1\sigma_j$  can differ from  $\sigma_j$  is for  $\sigma_j$  to consist entirely of 1's; then  $1\sigma_j$  has the opposite nature to  $\sigma_j$ . This proves that, if at some Step  $k$  in the application of  $\rho$  and  $\delta$  the  $B$ 's appear exactly where there are utterly odd numbers, then the same holds true at Step  $k + 1$ . The theorem is therefore proved.  $\square$

Hofstadter [1] used rewriting rules to develop a recursive construction for the sequence  $\{\bar{F}_n\}$ , but his rules are not doubling rules. Possibly for that reason, he did not detect the binary rule for locating  $B$ 's that led me to our theorems.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Doug Hofstadter, Anti-Fibonacci numbers. Manuscript, 2014.  
[http://oeis.org/A075326/a075326\\_1.pdf](http://oeis.org/A075326/a075326_1.pdf)
- [2] N. J. A. Sloane, *The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences*.  
<http://oeis.org/>