Research Article

A Reduced Collatz Dynamics Maps to a Residue Class, and Its Count of $(x/2)$ over the Count of $3 * x + 1$ Is Larger than $\ln 3 / \ln 2$

Wei Ren ^{1,2}

¹School of Computer Science, China University of Geosciences, Wuhan, China

²Guizhou Provincial Key Laboratory of Public Big Data, Guizhou University, Guizhou, China

Correspondence should be addressed to Wei Ren; weirencs@cug.edu.cn

Received 9 May 2020; Accepted 30 June 2020; Published 25 August 2020

Academic Editor: Aloys Krieg

Copyright © 2020 Wei Ren. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

We propose reduced Collatz conjecture and prove that it is equivalent to Collatz conjecture but more primitive due to reduced dynamics. We study reduced dynamics (that consists of occurred computations from any starting integer to the first integer less than it) because it is the component of original dynamics (from any starting integer to 1). Reduced dynamics is denoted as a sequence of “I” that represents $(3 * x + 1)/2$ and “O” that represents $(x/2)$. Here, $3 * x + 1$ and $(x/2)$ are combined together because $3 * x + 1$ is always even and thus followed by $(x/2)$. We discover and prove two key properties on reduced dynamics: (1) Reduced dynamics is invertible. That is, given reduced dynamics, a residue class that presents such reduced dynamics can be computed directly by our derived formula. (2) Reduced dynamics can be constructed algorithmically, instead of by computing concrete $3 * x + 1$ and $(x/2)$ step by step. We discover the sufficient and necessary condition that guarantees a sequence consisting of “I” and “O” to be a reduced dynamics. Counting from the beginning of a sequence, if and only if the count of $(x/2)$ over the count of $3 * x + 1$ is larger than $\ln 3 / \ln 2$, reduced dynamics will be obtained (i.e., current integer will be less than starting integer).

1. Introduction

The Collatz conjecture can be stated simply as follows. Take any positive integer number x . If x is even, divide it by 2 to get $(x/2)$. If x is odd, multiply it by 3 and add 1 to get $3 * x + 1$. Repeat the process again and again. The Collatz conjecture is that no matter what the number (i.e., x) is taken, the process will always eventually reach 1.

The current known integers that have been verified are about 60 bits by Silva using normal personal computers [1, 2]. They verified all integers that are less than 60 bits.

Ren et al. [3] verified that $2^{100000} - 1$ can return to 1 after 481603 times of $3 * x + 1$ computation, and 863323 times of $(x/2)$ computation, which is the largest integer being verified in the world. Ren [4] also pointed out a new approach for the possible proof of Collatz conjecture. Ren [5] proposed to use a tree-based graph to observe two key inner properties in reduced Collatz dynamics: one is ratio of the count of $(x/2)$ over the count of $3 * x + 1$, and the other is

partition (all positive integers are partitioned regularly corresponding to ongoing dynamics). Ren and Xiao [6] also proposed an automata method for fast computing Collatz dynamics. All source code and output data by computer programs in those related papers can be accessed in public repository [7].

2. Preliminaries

Notation 1

- (1) $\mathbb{N}^*$: positive integers
- (2) $\mathbb{N} = \mathbb{N}^* \cup \{0\}$
- (3) $[1]_2 = \{x \mid x \equiv 1 \pmod{2}, x \in \mathbb{N}^*\};$
 $[0]_2 = \{x \mid x \equiv 0 \pmod{2}, x \in \mathbb{N}^*\}$
- (4) $[i]_m = \{x \mid x \equiv i \pmod{m}, x \in \mathbb{N}^*\}, m \geq 2, m \in \mathbb{N}^*, 0 \leq i \leq m - 1, i \in \mathbb{N}$

Proposition 1. $(x/2)$ always follows after $3 * x + 1$.

Proof. When $x \in [1]_2$, then next computation is $3 * x + 1$. Obviously, $3 * x + 1 \in [0]_2$; thus, the next computation must be $(x/2)$ consequently.

We thus can represent required computation as $((3 * x + 1)/2)$ and $(x/2)$, which are denoted by $I(x)$ and $O(x)$, respectively. $\square$

Notation 2. $I(x) = ((3 * x + 1)/2)$, $O(x) = (x/2)$.

Note that $I(x)$ and $O(x)$ can be simply denoted as $I(\cdot)$ and $O(\cdot)$, or I and O , respectively. Obviously, $\forall x \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $I(x) = ((3 * x + 1)/2) > x$, and $O(x) = (x/2) < x$. That is, the reason of notation, I , represents “Increase” and, O , represents “dOwn.”

Definition 1. Collatz transformation, denoted as $f(\cdot)$, where $f(\cdot) = I(\cdot) = ((3 * x + 1)/2)$ if $x \in [1]_2$, and $f(\cdot) = O(\cdot) = (x/2)$ if $x \in [0]_2$.

Remark 1

- (1) We assume $f^0(x) = x$.
 - (2) Obviously, $f_1 \| f_2 \| \dots \| f_n(x) = f_n(f_{n-1}(\dots f_2(f_1(x))))$, where $f_i(\cdot) \in \{I(\cdot), O(\cdot)\}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, and “ $\|$ ” is concatenation of Collatz transformations. For simplicity, we just denote $f_i(\cdot)$ as $f \in \{I, O\}$.
 - (3) $f^n(x) = \underbrace{f \dots f}_n(x)$, $f^n(x) = f(f^{n-1}(x))$, $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$.
- Note that whether f is I or O in $f(f^{n-1}(x))$, is determined by $f^{n-1}(x) \in [1]_2$ or $[0]_2$.

Definition 2 (Collatz conjecture). $\forall x \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $\exists L \in \mathbb{N}^*$, such that $f^L(x) = 1$, where $f \in \{I, O\}$.

Obviously, Collatz conjecture is held when $x = 1$. In the following, we mainly concern $x \geq 2$, $x \in \mathbb{N}^*$.

Definition 3 (reduced Collatz conjecture). $\forall x \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $x \geq 2$, and $\exists L \in \mathbb{N}^*$, such that $f^L(x) < x$ and $f^i(x) < x$, $i = 0, 1, \dots, L - 1$, $f \in \{I, O\}$.

Obviously, L must be the minimal positive integer such that $f^L(x) < x$.

Theorem 1. Collatz conjecture is equivalent to reduced Collatz conjecture.

Proof. $\forall x, L \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $x \geq 2$, it is obvious that $f^L(x) \in \mathbb{N}^*$, i.e., $f^L(x) \geq 1$.

- (1) Suppose Collatz conjecture is true. That is, $\forall x \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $x \geq 2$, $\exists L \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $f^L(x) = 1$. Thus, $f^L(x) < x$. Hence, reduced Collatz conjecture is true.
- (2) Inversely, suppose reduced Collatz conjecture is true. That is, $\forall x \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $x \geq 2$, $\exists q_0 \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $f^{q_0}(x) < x$.

If $f^{q_0}(x) = 1$, then Collatz conjecture is true.

If $f^{q_0}(x) > 1$, then let $y_1 = f^{q_0}(x)$. As reduced Collatz conjecture is true, $\exists q_1 \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $f^{q_1}(y_1) < y_1$.

For better notation, let $y_0 = x$. Iteratively, if $y_i = f^{q_{i-1}}(y_{i-1}) = 1$, $i \in \mathbb{N}^*$, then Collatz conjecture is true. If $y_i = f^{q_{i-1}}(y_{i-1}) > 1$, then $\exists q_i \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $y_{i+1} = f^{q_i}(y_i) < y_i$.

Thus, $y_{i+1} < y_i < \dots < y_1 < y_0 = x$. y_i ($i \in \mathbb{N}^*$) is a strictly decreasing sequence.

Besides, $y_{i+1} = f^{q_0+q_1+q_2+\dots+q_i}(x) \geq 1$.

Therefore, after finite times of iterations, $\exists n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $y_n = 1$.

That is, $\exists q = q_0 + q_1 + \dots + q_{n-1} = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} q_i$, $q \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $f^q(x) = 1$.

Thus, Collatz conjecture is true. $\square$

Remark 2

- (1) We call an ordered sequence $f^q \in \{I, O\}^q$ in the above proof as original dynamics (referring to $f^q(x) = 1$), which consists of q occurred Collatz transformations during the computing procedure from a starting integer to 1. For example, the original dynamics of 5 is $IOOO$ due to $5 \longrightarrow 16 \longrightarrow 8 \longrightarrow 4 \longrightarrow 2 \longrightarrow 1$.
- (2) In contrast, we call f^{q_0} in the above proof as reduced dynamics (referring to $f^{q_0}(x) < x$), which is represented by a sequence of occurred Collatz transformations during the computing procedure from a starting integer (i.e., x) to the first transformed integer that is less than the starting integer (i.e., $f^{q_0}(x)$). For example, the reduced dynamics of 5 is IO due to $5 \longrightarrow 16 \longrightarrow 8 \longrightarrow 4$.
- (3) Obviously, reduced dynamics is more primitive than original dynamics because original dynamics consists of reduced dynamics. Simply speaking, reduced dynamics are building blocks of original dynamics.

Due to above theorem, we concentrate on reduced dynamics.

Notation 3. $(RD[x])$. It denotes reduced dynamics of x that are represented by $f \in \{I, O\}$. Formally, $\forall x \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $x \geq 2$, if $\exists L \in \mathbb{N}^*$ such that $f^L(x) < x$ and $f^i(x) < x$, $i = 0, 1, \dots, L - 1$, where $f \in \{I, O\}$; then, let $s = f^L \in \{I, O\}^L$ and s is called as reduced dynamics of x , denoted as $RD[x] = f^L = s$.

Remark 3

- (1) Simply speaking (or recall that), $RD[x]$ represents occurred Collatz transformations in terms of I and O during the computing process from starting integer x to the first transformed integer that is less than x .
- (2) Recall that, $f^L \in \{I, O\}^L$ is an ordered sequence consisting of I and O . Besides, $f^L = f^{L-1} \| f$, $f^L(x) = f(f^{L-1}(x))$, and $f^0(x) = x$. Furthermore, this sequence implicitly matches the parity of all occurred intermediate transformed integers that are taken as input of $f(\cdot)$.
- (3) Roughly speaking, in $RD[x] = f^L$, x is called the starting integer. $f^i(x)$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, L$ are called transformed integers. $f^L(x)$ is the first transformed integer that is less than the starting integer x . In other words, $f^i(x) < x$, $i = 0, 1, \dots, L - 1$, and $f^L(x) < x$. ($f^0(x) = x$). Besides, the parity of $f^i(x)$ determines the selection of the intermediately next $f \in \{I, O\}$ after f^i .

- (4) Obviously, $RD[x \in [0]_2] = O$.
- (5) For example, $RD[3] = IIOO$, $RD[5] = IO$, $RD[7] = IIIIOIOO$, $RD[9] = IO$, and $RD[11] = IIOIO$. Indeed, we design computer programs that output all $RD[x]$, $\forall x \in [1, 99999999]$ [7]. From the data we discover the property—period and its relation to the number of computing $(x/2)$ in reduced dynamics—which will be proved in the remainder of this paper.
- (6) In fact, we proved some results on $RD[x]$ for specific x , e.g., $RD[x \in [1]_4] = IO$, $RD[x \in [3]_{16}] = IIOO$, and $RD[x \in [11]_{32}] = IIOIO$ [5].
- (7) $IIOO$ can be denoted in short as I^2O^2 . $IIIIOIOO$ can be denoted in short as I^3OIO^2 . In other words, we denote $\underbrace{I \dots I}_n$ as I^n , and we denote $\underbrace{O \dots O}_n$ as O^n , where $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $n \geq 2$. We also assume $I^1 = I$ and $O^1 = O$. $I^0 = O^0 = \emptyset$ means no transformation occurs.
- (8) We will formally prove that the ratio exists in any reduced Collatz dynamics. That is, the count of $(x/2)$ over the count of $3 * x + 1$ is larger than $\log_2 3$ in this paper. The ratio can also be observed and verified in my proposed tree-based graph [5].

Example 1. $RD[5] = IO$, if and only if

- (1) “I” is due to $5 \in [1]_2$
- (2) $I(5) = ((3 * 5 + 1)/2) = 8 < 5$, and thus it continues
- (3) “O” is due to $I(5) = 8 \in [0]_2$
- (4) $IO(5) = O(I(5)) = O(8) = (8/2) = 4 < 5$, and thus it ends

To better present above the implicity in reduced dynamics, we introduce two functions as follows.

Definition 4. Is Matched: $x \times c \longrightarrow \text{bool}$. It takes input $x \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $c \in \{I, O\}$, and outputs $\text{bool} \in \{\text{True}, \text{False}\}$. If $x \in [1]_2$ and $c = I$, or if $x \in [0]_2$ and $c = O$, then output $\text{bool} = \text{True}$. Otherwise, output $\text{bool} = \text{False}$.

Remark 4. Simply speaking, this function checks whether the forthcoming Collatz transformation (i.e., $c \in \{I, O\}$) matches with the current transformed integer x .

Definition 5. Get S: $s \times i \times j \longrightarrow s'$. It takes input s, i , and j , where $s \in \{I, O\}^{|s|}$, $1 \leq i \leq |s|$, and $1 \leq j \leq |s| - (i - 1)$, and outputs s' , where $s = s_a \| s' \| s_b$, $|s_a| = i - 1$, $|s'| = j$, and $|s_b| = |s| - |s_a| - |s'|$, and “ $|\cdot|$ ” returns length in terms of the total count of I or O .

Remark 5

- (1) For example, $\text{Get S}(IIOO, 1, 4) = IIOO$ and $\text{Get S}(IIOO, 1, 3) = IIO$.
- (2) Especially, $\text{Get S}(s, 1, |s|) = s$. $\text{Get S}(s, |s|, 1)$ returns the last transformation in s . $\text{Get S}(s, 1, 1)$ returns the

first transformation in s . $\text{Get S}(s, j, 1)$ returns the j th transformation in s .

- (3) In other words, s' is a selected segment in s that starts from the location i and has the length of j . Indeed, that is, the reason we call this function as “Get Substring.”
- (4) Simply speaking, this function can obtain the Collatz transforms from i to $i + j - 1$ from a given inputting transform sequence (e.g., reduced dynamics) in terms of $s \in \{I, O\}^{|s|}$.
- (5) Note that $\text{Get S}(\cdot)$ itself is a function. In other words, it can be looked as $\text{Get S}(\cdot)(\cdot)$. For example, $\text{Get S}(IIOO, 1, 1)(3) = I(3) = ((3 * 3 + 1)/2) = 5$, $\text{Get S}(IIOO, 1, 2)(3) = II(3) = I(I(3)) = I(5) = ((3 * 5 + 1)/2) = 8$, $\text{Get S}(IIOO, 1, 3)(3) = IIO(3) = O(II(3)) = O(8) = (8/2) = 4$, and $\text{Get S}(IIOO, 1, 4)(3) = IIOO(3) = O(IIO(3)) = O(4) = (4/2) = 2 < 3$.
- (6) It is worth to stress that, although in the above definition $j \geq 1$, it can be extended to $j \geq 0$ by assuming $\text{Get S}(\cdot, \cdot, 0)(x) = x$.

Proposition 2. Suppose $x \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $x \geq 2$. If $RD[x]$ exists, then

- (1) $s(x) < x$, where $s = RD[x]$
- (2) $\text{Get S}(s, 1, i)(x) < x$, where $i = 1, 2, \dots, |s| - 1$
- (3) $\text{Is Matched}(\text{Get S}(s, 1, j - 1)(x), \text{Get S}(s, j, 1)) = \text{True}$, where $j = 1, 2, \dots, |s|$

Proof. Straightforward by the definition of $RD[x]$. $\square$

Remark 6

- (1) $s(x)$ is the last transformed integer, or the first transformed integer that is less than the starting integer.
- (2) $\text{Get S}(s, 1, i)(x)$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, |s| - 1$) are all intermediate transformed integers.
- (3) When $j = 1$, $\text{Get S}(s, 1, j - 1)(x) = \text{Get S}(s, 1, 0)(x) = x$. $\text{Get S}(s, j, 1)$ is the first transformation.
- (4) If $\text{Get S}(s, 1, j - 1)(x)$ ($j = 2, \dots, |s|$) is the current transformed integer; then, $\text{Get S}(s, j, 1)$ is the next intermediate Collatz transformation.

Proposition 3. $\forall x \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $x \geq 2$, if $RD[x]$ exists; then, $RD[x]$ is unique.

Proof. Straightforward. Given x , either $I(x)$ or $O(x)$ is deterministic and unique. Similarly, given x , $s'(x)$ is deterministic and unique, where $s' = \text{Get S}(s, 1, i)$, $s = RD[x]$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, |s|$. Thus, s is unique for any given x . $\square$

Remark 7. We assume $RD[x = 1] = IO$, although $IO(1) = O((3 * 1 + 1)/2) = O(2) = (2/2) = 1 < x$. In other words, we assume the reduced dynamics of $x = 1$ is IO . In the following, we always concern $x \geq 2$, $x \in \mathbb{N}^*$.

Proposition 4. Given $x \in \mathbb{N}^*$, if $RD[x]$ exists, then $RD[x]$ ends by O .

Proof. Straightforward due to $I(x) = ((3 * x + 1)/2) > x$. Suppose $\exists x \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $x \geq 2$, $s(x) < x$, and $RD[x] = s\|I$. Then, $\{s\|I\}(x) = I(s(x)) > s(x)$; thus, $RD[x] = \{s\|I\}(x) < x$. Contradiction occurs. $\square$

Proposition 5. $RD[x \in [0]_2] = O$ and $RD[x \in [1]_4] = IO$.

Proof

- (1) $x \in [0]_2$, thus O occurs. $(x/2) < x$, thus $RD[x] = O$.
- (2) If $x = 1$, $RD[1] = IO$ (by assumption).

If $x \geq 2$, $x = 4t + 1 \in [1]_2$, where $t \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Thus, I occurs. $I(x) = ((3 * x + 1)/2) = ((3 * (4t + 1) + 1)/2) = ((12t + 4)/2) = 2 * (3t + 1) \in [0]_2$. $2 * (3t + 1) > x = 4t + 1$, thus further transformation occurs. $O(I(x)) = (2 * (3t + 1)/2) = 3t + 1 < 4t + 1 = x$ ($\because t \in \mathbb{N}^*$), thus $RD[x] = IO$. $\square$

Proposition 6. Given $x \in [3]_4$, if $RD[x]$ exists, then $RD[x] \in I^p O \| \{I, O\}^{\geq 1}$, $p \geq 2$.

Proof. Let $x = 4t + 3$, $t \in \mathbb{N}$. Obviously, $x \in [1]_2$. $I(x) = ((3x + 1)/2) = ((12t + 10)/2) = 6t + 5 \in [1]_2$. $I^2(x) = I(I(x)) = ((3(6t + 5) + 1)/2) = 9t + 8$.

- (1) If $t \in [0]_2 \cup \{0\}$, then $9t + 8 \in [0]_2$. Thus, the next transformation is “ $(x/2)$.” Thus, current occurred transformations are “ IIO .” Besides, $IIO(x) = ((9t + 8)/2) = 4.5t + 4 > 4t + 3 = x$. Further transformation thus occurs. Hence, if $RD[x]$ exists, then $RD[x] \in I^2 O \| \{I, O\}^{\geq 1}$.
- (2) If $t \in [1]_2$, then $9t + 8 \in [1]_2$. Thus, current occurred transformations are “ III .” Besides, $III(x) = ((3(9t + 8) + 1)/2) = ((27t + 25)/2) = 13.5t + 12.5 > 4t + 3 = x$. Further transformation occurs. Hence, if $RD[x]$ exists, then $RD[x] \in I^3 \| \{I, O\}^{\geq 1}$.

If $III(x) \in [1]_2$, then more “ I ” occurs. Obviously, $IIII(x) > x$. Further transformation occurs. Hence, if $RD[x]$ exists, then $RD[x] \in I^4 \| \{I, O\}^{\geq 1}$. If $III(x) \in [0]_2$, then $IIIO(x) = ((13.5t + 12.5)/2) = 6.75t + 6.25 > 4t + 3 = x$. Further transformation occurs consequently. Hence, if $RD[x]$ exists, then $RD[x] \in I^3 \| O \| \{I, O\}^{\geq 1}$.

Suppose $RD[x] = f^L \in \{I, O\}^L$. There exists at least one “ O ” in L transformations, otherwise $f^L(x) = I^L(x) > I^{L-1}(x) > \dots > I(x) > x$, which contradicts with $f^L(x) < x$. Besides, $I^p O(x) = (I^p(x)/2) > (I^{p-1}(x)/2) = I^{p-1} O(x) > \dots > IIO(x) > x$, $p \geq 3$; thus, there exists further transformation after $I^p O$ ($p \geq 3$).

In summary, if $RD[x \in [3]_4]$ exists, then $RD[x] \in I^p O \| \{I, O\}^{\geq 1}$, $p \geq 2$. $\square$

Theorem 2 (format theorem). Given $x \in \mathbb{N}^*$, if $RD[x]$ exists, then $RD[x] \in I^p O \| \{I, O\}^q$, where $p \in \mathbb{N}$ and $q = |RD[x]| - p - 1$. Besides,

$$p = \begin{cases} 0, & x \in [0]_2, \\ 1, & x \in [1]_4, \\ 2, & x \in [3]_8, \\ \alpha + 2 & t + 1 = 2^\alpha * A, A \in [1]_2, \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^* & x \in [7]_8. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

$q = 0$ when $p = 0, 1$; $q \geq 1$ when $p \geq 2$.

Proof. The range of q is straightforward due to Propositions 5 and 6; thus, we mainly concern p .

By Proposition 5, if $x \in [0]_2$, then $RD[x] = O$ and $p = 0$. If $x \in [1]_4$, then $RD[x] = IO$ and $p = 1$.

Next, we concentrate on $x \in [3]_4$.

$RD[3] = IIOO = I^2 O^2$, which can be manually and easily verified.

Let $x = 4t + 3, t \in \mathbb{N}^*$.

- (1) Case I: $t \in [0]_2$.

As $x = 4t + 3 \in [1]_2$, $I(\cdot)$ is conducted consequently. As $I(x) = ((3x + 1)/2) = 1.5x + 1.5 > x$ and $II(x) > I(x) > x$, the checking on whether the current transformed number is less than the starting number may be omitted in some straightforward cases.

$I(x) = ((3x + 1)/2) = ((3(4t + 3) + 1)/2) = ((12t + 10)/2) = 6t + 5 \in [1]_2$; thus, transformation $I(\cdot)$ is conducted consequently.

$I(I(x)) = II(x) = ((3(6t + 5) + 1)/2) = ((18t + 16)/2) = 9t + 8 \in [0]_2$. Thus, $O(\cdot)$ is conducted consequently.

$O(I(I(x))) = IIO(x) = ((9t + 8)/2) = 4.5t + 4 > 4t + 3$. Thus, further transformation is conducted consequently.

Therefore, $RD[x] \in I^2 O \| \{I, O\}^{\geq 1}$.

- (2) Case II: $t \in [1]_2$.

As $x = 4t + 3 \in [1]_2$, $I(\cdot)$ is conducted consequently.

$I(x) = ((3x + 1)/2) = ((3(4t + 3) + 1)/2) = ((12t + 10)/2) = 6t + 5 \in [1]_2$; thus, $I(\cdot)$ is conducted consequently.

$II(x) = ((3(6t + 5) + 1)/2) = ((18t + 16)/2) = 9t + 8 \in [1]_2$. Thus, $I(\cdot)$ is conducted consequently.

$III(x) = ((3(9t + 8) + 1)/2) = ((27t + 25)/2)$. It depends on the partition of t (more specifically, $t \in [1]_4$ or $[3]_4$) whether $((27t + 25)/2)$ is even or odd.

- (2.1) If $t \in [1]_4$, $III(x) = ((27t + 25)/2) = ((27 * (4 * k + 1) + 25)/2) = ((108k + 52)/2) = 54k + 26 \in [0]_2$ ($k \in \mathbb{N}^*$); thus, $O(\cdot)$ will occur consequently.
- (2.2) If $t \in [3]_4$, $III(x) = ((27t + 25)/2) = ((27 * (4 * k + 3) + 25)/2) = ((108k + 106)/2) = 54k + 53 \in [1]_2$; thus, $I(\cdot)$ will occur consequently.

$IIIO(x) = (((27t + 25)/2)/2) = ((54k + 26)/2) = 27k + 13$, whose parity depends on the parity of k .

$IIII(x) = (((3(27t + 25)/2) + 1)/2) = ((3(54k + 53) + 1)/2) = ((162k + 160)/2) = 81k + 80$, whose parity depends on the parity of k .

In other words, the judgement on the parity of $IIIO(x)$ is undecidable, unless the domain $(t \in [1]_4 \text{ or } t \in [3]_4)$ is partitioned further.

For exploring more general results, we put it in another way as follows.

Suppose there exist at most p times of “ I ” at head (i.e., $I^p \| O \| \dots$) for $x \in [3]_4$. Observing the following equation for $I^p(x)$ after consecutive $p \geq 2$ times of “ I ”,

$$\begin{aligned} I^p(x) &= \frac{3(\dots(((3(3x+1)/2)+1)/2)\dots)+1}{2} \\ &= \frac{3}{2} \left(\frac{3}{2} \left(\dots \frac{3}{2} \left(\frac{3}{2}x + \frac{1}{2} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \right) + \dots + \frac{1}{2} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \\ &= \left(\frac{3}{2} \right)^p x + \frac{1}{2} \left(\left(\frac{3}{2} \right)^{p-1} + \left(\frac{3}{2} \right)^{p-2} + \dots + 1 \right) \\ &= \left(\frac{3}{2} \right)^p x + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{(3/2)^p - 1}{(3/2) - 1} \right) \\ &= \left(\frac{3}{2} \right)^p x + \left(\frac{3}{2} \right)^p - 1 \\ &= \left(\frac{3}{2} \right)^p (x+1) - 1 \quad (\because x = 4t+3, t \in \mathbb{N}) \\ &= \left(\frac{3}{2} \right)^p (4t+3+1) - 1 = \left(\frac{3^p}{2^{p-2}} \right) (t+1) - 1 \in \mathbb{N}^*. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Note that the above computation implicitly includes two requirements due to p times of consecutive $I(\cdot)$ as follows:

- (i) All intermediate transformed numbers during processes (i.e., computing p times of consecutive “ I ”) satisfy $(3^i/2^{i-2})(t+1) - 1 \in [1]_2$, where $2 \leq i \leq p-1, i \in \mathbb{N}^*$.
- (ii) Besides, $(3^i/2^{i-2})(t+1) - 1 \in [0]_2$, where $i = p$, as only (or at most) p consecutive $I(\cdot)$ occur.

In other words, p can also be looked as the minimal value to let the current transformed number be in $[0]_2$. Thus, we need to explore the requirement on p for given t such that

$$\begin{cases} \left(\frac{3^i}{2^{i-2}} \right) (t+1) - 1 \in [1]_2, & 2 \leq i \leq p-1, \\ \left(\frac{3^i}{2^{i-2}} \right) (t+1) - 1 \in [0]_2, & i = p. \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Represent $t+1$ as $2^\alpha * A, A \in [1]_2, \alpha \in \mathbb{N}^*$. That is, $t+1 = 2^\alpha * A$. Obviously, this representation is unique. We thus need to prove that the requirement in equation (3) is satisfied if and only if $p = \alpha + 2$. Note that we will see that here p is indeed determined by α .

For $2 \leq i < p = \alpha + 2, i \in \mathbb{N}^*$, we have $\alpha + 2 - i > 0$:

$$\left(\frac{3^i}{2^{i-2}} \right) (t+1) - 1 = \left(\frac{3^i}{2^{i-2}} \right) * 2^\alpha * A - 1 = 3^i * 2^{\alpha-i+2} * A - 1. \quad (4)$$

$$\alpha + 2 - i > 0 \implies 2^{\alpha-i+2} \in [0]_2 \implies 3^i * 2^{\alpha-i+2} * A \in [0]_2 \implies 3^i * 2^{\alpha-i+2} * A - 1 \in [1]_2.$$

When $i = p = \alpha + 2$, we have exactly

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{3^p}{2^{p-2}} \right) (t+1) - 1 &= \left(\frac{3^p}{2^{p-2}} \right) * 2^\alpha * A - 1 \\ &= 3^p * 2^{\alpha-p+2} * A - 1 \\ &= 3^p * A - 1 \in [0]_2, \quad \because A, 3^p \in [1]_2. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

It is easy to see that $p = \alpha + 2$ is the one and only one for the requirement in equation (3), as desired. $\square$

Corollary 1 (t determines p corollary). Given starting integer $x \in [3]_4$ (i.e., $x = 4t+3, t \in \mathbb{N}$), the count of consecutive “ I ” (denoted as p) is determined by t as follows.

If $t \in [0]_2$, then $p = 2$; if $t \in [1]_2$, then $p = \alpha + 2$, where $\alpha = \log_2((t+1)/A) \in \mathbb{N}^*$, and $A = \max\{a \mid a \in [1]_2, a \mid (t+1)\}$.

Proof. It is straightforward by Theorem 2. $\square$

Corollary 2. Given the starting integer $x \in [3]_4, t = ((x-3)/4) \in \mathbb{N}$, the first p count of Collatz transformations must be I^p and p can be determined by t , and the transformed integer after I^p transformations is

$$I^p(x) = \left(\frac{3}{2} \right)^p (x+1) - 1 = \left(\frac{3^p}{2^{p-2}} \right) (t+1) - 1 \in \mathbb{N}^*, \quad p \geq 2. \quad (6)$$

Proof. It is straightforward by Theorem 2 and Corollary 1. $\square$

Remark 8

- (1) Note that, due to Corollary 1, p for I^p in $RD[x]$ can be computed by $t = ((x-3)/4)$ and $\log_2((t+1)/A)$ directly without conducting concrete Collatz transformations, which can shorten the computation delay for reduced dynamics.
- (2) Besides, by equation (2) or Corollary 2, if $t = 0$, we then have $p = 2$ because $I^p(x) = (3^p/2^{p-2})(t+1) - 1 = (3^p/2^{p-2}) - 1 \in \mathbb{N}^*$, which matches with the result $RD[3] = IIIO$ by manually computing.
- (3) Indeed, equation (2) can be extended to include all cases (i.e., for $p = 0, 1$). If $p = 0$, by assuming $I^0(x) = x$, $I^0(x) = x = (3/2)^0(x+1) - 1 = (3/2)^0(x+1) - 1$. If $p = 1$, $I^1(x) = I(x) = ((3*x+1)/2) = (3/2)^1(x+1) - 1 = (3/2)^1(x+1) - 1$. Therefore, $I^p(x) = (3/2)^p(x+1) - 1$ for $p \in \mathbb{N}^*$.

Corollary 3. Suppose $x = 2^n - 1, n \in \mathbb{N}^*$. If $RD[x]$ exists, then $RD[x] \in I^n \| O \| \{I, O\}^{\geq 0}$.

Proof. Straightforward. $\square$

Remark 9. Simply speaking, above corollary states that if $RD[x = 2^n - 1, n \in \mathbb{N}^*]$ exists, then the first $n + 1$ Collatz transformations for x must be I^nO . Indeed, the resumption on the existence of the reduced dynamics of x can be omitted. That is, the first $n + 1$ Collatz transformations in original dynamics of x must also be I^nO .

Example 2. $RD[7] = IIIIOIOO = I^3\|O\|IOO$, as $7 \longrightarrow 22 \longrightarrow 11 \longrightarrow 34 \longrightarrow 17 \longrightarrow 52 \longrightarrow 26 \longrightarrow 13 \longrightarrow 40 \longrightarrow 20 \longrightarrow 10 \longrightarrow 5 < 7$.

Next, corollary states that reduced dynamics consists of segment or segments with a unified form as $I^pO^q, p \geq 1$ and $q \geq 1$.

Corollary 4. Given $x \in [3]_4$, if $RD[x]$ exists, then

$$RD[x] \in I^{p_0 \geq 2} \| O^{q_0 \geq 1} \| I^{p_1 \geq 1} \| O^{q_1 \geq 1} \| \dots I^{p_n \geq 1} \| O^{q_n \geq 1}. \quad (7)$$

Proof (straightforward). $x \in [1]_2$, thus I occurs. After p times of I transformations, $I^p(x) \in [0]_2$ and thus O follows. After q times of O transformations, $I^pO^q(x) \in [1]_2$, thus I occurs. Indeed, q can be determined by $I^p(x)$ by $q = \log_2(I^p(x)/B)$, $B = \max(\{b \mid b \in [1]_2, b \mid I^p(x)\})$.

Iteratively, each segment has a unified form I^pO^q , where $p, q \in \mathbb{N}^*$.

The first segment is listed solely because the distinction between the first segment and the other segments is that $p_0 \geq 2$ but $p_i \geq 1, i \in \mathbb{N}^*$ (in other words, when and only when an intermediate transformed number is in $[1]_4, p_i = 1$. Otherwise, $p_i \geq 2$). $\square$

3. Derive x from $RD[x]$

3.1. Preparation

Notation 4. $\text{Set}_{RD} = \{s \mid x \in \mathbb{N}^*, \exists RD[x], s = RD[x], s \in \{I, O\}^{\geq 1}\}$.

That is, $\forall x \in \mathbb{N}^*$, if $RD[x]$ exists, then $RD[x] = s$ will be included in Set_{RD} , which is a set of existing reduced dynamics.

In this section, we will study two problems as follows:

- (1) *Inverse problem:* given $s \in \text{Set}_{RD}$, is it possible to derive starting integer x such that $RD[x] = s$?
- (2) What is the *sufficient and necessary* conditions for any existing reduced dynamics, that is, given $s \in \{I, O\}^{\geq 1}$, how to decide whether $s \in \text{Set}_{RD}$?

Before exploring general situations, we give two trivial cases.

Proposition 7. $O \in \text{Set}_{RD}$ and $IO \in \text{Set}_{RD}$.

Proof (straightforward). $RD[x \in [0]_2] = O$ and $RD[x \in [1]_4] = IO$ by Proposition 5.

In the following, we thus mainly concentrate on $x \in [3]_4$, where their reduced dynamics presents the form such as $I^{p \geq 2} O \| \{I, O\}^{q \geq 1}$, $p, q \in \mathbb{N}^*$ once it exists (recall Proposition 6). $\square$

Theorem 3 (subset theorem). Suppose $s \in \text{Set}_{RD}$, $|s| \geq 2$, $x \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $i = 0, 1, \dots, |s| - 2$. We have

- (1.1) $\{x \mid \text{Get } S(s, 1, i + 1)(x) \in [1]_2\} \subset \{x \mid \text{Get } S(s, 1, i)(x) \in [0]_2\}$
- (1.2) $\{x \mid \text{Get } S(s, 1, i + 1)(x) \in [0]_2\} \subset \{x \mid \text{Get } S(s, 1, i)(x) \in [0]_2\}$
- (2.1) $\{x \mid \text{Get } S(s, 1, i + 1)(x) \in [1]_2\} \subset \{x \mid \text{Get } S(s, 1, i)(x) \in [1]_2\}$
- (2.2) $\{x \mid \text{Get } S(s, 1, i + 1)(x) \in [0]_2\} \subset \{x \mid \text{Get } S(s, 1, i)(x) \in [1]_2\}$

Proof. When $i = 0$, there exists two and only two cases as follows:

- (1) If $\text{Get } S(s, i + 1, 1) = O$, then $\text{Get } S(s, 1, i)(x) \in [0]_2$. There exists two subcases as follows:
 - (1.1) If $\text{Get } S(s, i + 2, 1) = I$, then $O(\text{Get } S(s, 1, i)(x)) \in [1]_2 \implies (\text{Get } S(s, 1, i)(x)/2) \in [1]_2 \implies \text{Get } S(s, 1, i)(x) \in [2]_4 \subset [0]_2$. Thus, $\{x \mid \text{Get } S(s, 1, i + 1)(x) \in [1]_2\} \subset \{x \mid \text{Get } S(s, 1, i)(x) \in [0]_2\}$.
 - (1.2) If $\text{Get } S(s, i + 2, 1) = O$, then $O(\text{Get } S(s, 1, i)(x)) \in [0]_2 \implies (\text{Get } S(s, 1, i)(x)/2) \in [0]_2 \implies \text{Get } S(s, 1, i)(x) \in [0]_4 \subset [0]_2$. Thus, $\{x \mid \text{Get } S(s, 1, i + 1)(x) \in [0]_2\} \subset \{x \mid \text{Get } S(s, 1, i)(x) \in [0]_2\}$.
- (2) If $\text{Get } S(s, i + 1, 1) = I$, then $\text{Get } S(s, 1, i)(x) \in [1]_2$. There exist two subcases as follows:
 - (2.1) If $\text{Get } S(s, i + 2, 1) = I$, then $I(\text{Get } S(s, 1, i)(x)) \in [1]_2 \implies ((3 * \text{Get } S(s, 1, i)(x) + 1)/2) \in [1]_2 \implies 3 * \text{Get } S(s, 1, i)(x) + 1 \in [2]_4 \implies 3 * \text{Get } S(s, 1, i)(x) \in [1]_4 \implies \text{Get } S(s, 1, i)(x) \in [3]_4 \subset [1]_2$. Thus, $\{x \mid \text{Get } S(s, 1, i + 1)(x) \in [1]_2\} \subset \{x \mid \text{Get } S(s, 1, i)(x) \in [1]_2\}$.
 - (2.2) If $\text{Get } S(s, i + 2, 1) = O$, then $I(\text{Get } S(s, 1, i)(x)) \in [0]_2 \implies ((3 * \text{Get } S(s, 1, i)(x) + 1)/2) \in [0]_2 \implies 3 * \text{Get } S(s, 1, i)(x) + 1 \in [0]_4 \implies 3 * \text{Get } S(s, 1, i)(x) \in [3]_4 \implies \text{Get } S(s, 1, i)(x) \in [1]_4 \subset [1]_2$. Thus, $\{x \mid \text{Get } S(s, 1, i + 1)(x) \in [0]_2\} \subset \{x \mid \text{Get } S(s, 1, i)(x) \in [1]_2\}$.

We can prove similarly for $i = 1, 2, \dots, |s| - 2$. $\square$

Corollary 5. Suppose $s \in \text{Set}_{RD}$, $|s| \geq 2$, $i = 0, 1, \dots, |s| - 2$, $x \in \mathbb{N}^*$. We have

- (1.1) $\{x \mid \text{Get } S(s, 1, i + 1)(x) \in [1]_2\} = \{x \mid \text{Get } S(s, 1, i)(x) \in [2]_4\}$
- (1.2) $\{x \mid \text{Get } S(s, 1, i + 1)(x) \in [0]_2\} = \{x \mid \text{Get } S(s, 1, i)(x) \in [0]_4\}$
- (2.1) $\{x \mid \text{Get } S(s, 1, i + 1)(x) \in [1]_2\} = \{x \mid \text{Get } S(s, 1, i)(x) \in [3]_4\}$
- (2.2) $\{x \mid \text{Get } S(s, 1, i + 1)(x) \in [0]_2\} = \{x \mid \text{Get } S(s, 1, i)(x) \in [1]_4\}$

Proof. Straightforward by Theorem 3. $\square$

Remark 10

- (1) Corollary 5 states that the residue classes are partitioned regularly into halves and either half will present either next intermediate transformation in terms of I or O (indeed, the partition property is thoroughly explored and proved in my other paper [8]. Note that this paper is independent from the cited paper.)
- (2) Note that Theorem 3 is not only guaranteed for reduced dynamics but also for original dynamics.

Corollary 6. Suppose $s \in \text{Set}_{RD}$, $|s| \geq 2$, $i = 2, 3, \dots, |s|$, $x \in \mathbb{N}^*$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \{x \mid \text{Is Matched}(\text{Get } S(s, 1, i-1)(x), \text{Get } S(s, i, 1)) = \text{True}\} \\ & \subset \{x \mid \text{Is Matched}(\text{Get } S(s, 1, i-2)(x), \\ & \cdot \text{Get } S(s, i-1, 1)) = \text{True}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Proof. Straightforward by Theorem 3.

Roughly speaking, above corollary asserts that the last parity requirement is sufficient to guarantee all previous parity requirements. That is, the residue equation for last parity requirement is sufficient for deriving the required residue class for satisfying all parity requirements.

In the following, notation $[i]_m$ is extended in which i could be larger than m or less than 0. That is, $[i]_m = \{x \mid x = k * m + i, k \in \mathbb{N}, i \in \mathbb{Z}, m \in \mathbb{N}^*, m \geq 2\}$. $\mathbb{Z}$ is the integer. $\square$

Lemma 1. $a \in \mathbb{N}, x, b, c \in \mathbb{N}^*, b \geq 2$, thus

- (1) $x + c \in [a]_b \iff x \in [a - c]_b$
- (2) $c * x \in [a]_b \iff x \in [c^{-1} * a]_b$, if $\text{gcd}(c, b) = 1$
- (3) $(x/c) \in [a]_b \iff x \in [a * c]_{b * c}$

Proof

$$(1) \quad x + c \in [a]_b \iff x + c = k * b + a, k \in \mathbb{N} \iff x = k * b + a - c \iff x \in [a - c]_b.$$

(2)

$$\begin{aligned} c * x \in [a]_b & \iff c * x = k * b + a, k \in \mathbb{N} \\ & \iff (k * b + [c]_b) * x = k * b + a, \because c \\ & = k * b + [c]_b, k \in \mathbb{N} \\ & \iff [c]_b * x = (k - k * b) * b + a \\ & \iff [c]_b * x \in [a]_b \\ & \iff [c^{-1}]_b * [c]_b * x \in [c^{-1}]_b * [a]_b : \text{gcd}(c, b) \\ & = 1, \exists [c^{-1}]_b, \text{ s.t. } [c^{-1}]_b * [c]_b = [1]_b \\ & \iff x \in [c^{-1} * a]_b. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

$$(3) \quad (x/c) \in [a]_b \iff (x/c) = k * b + a, k \in \mathbb{N} \iff x = k * b * c + a * c, k \in \mathbb{N} \iff x \in [a * c]_{b * c}.$$

Indeed, if $\text{gcd}(c, b) = 1$, then $[c^{-1}]_b$ exists and is the inverse of $[c]_b$ in group $(\mathbb{Z}/b\mathbb{Z})^* = \langle (\mathbb{Z}/b\mathbb{Z}) \setminus \{0\}, * \bmod b \rangle$ such that $[c^{-1}]_b * [c]_b = [1]_b$. $\square$

3.2. Derive x if $RD[x] = I^p O^q$. In this section, we assume $p, q \in \mathbb{N}^*, p \geq 2, x \in [3]_4$ if no explicitly declaration exists.

Lemma 2. Suppose $p, q \in \mathbb{N}^*, p \geq 2$.

$\exists x \in [3]_4$ such that $RD[x] = I^p O^q$, if and only if

$$\text{Req-I): } I^p(x) \in [0]_{2^q}$$

$$\text{Req-II): } I^p O^q(x) < x \wedge I^p O^{q-1}(x) < x$$

Proof. By Theorem 3 or Corollary 6, all parity sequence can be guaranteed if the last parity requirement is guaranteed.

$$I^p O^{q-1}(x) \in [0]_2 \iff (I^p(x)/2^{q-1}) \in [0]_2 \iff I^p(x) \in [0]_{2^q}, \text{ by Lemma 1 (3).}$$

Thus, Req-I is sufficient for the requirements for all parities.

Any x such that $I^p O^{q-1}(x) < x$ can guarantee $I^p O^i(x) > x, i = 1, 2, \dots, q-2$, because $I^p O^i(x) = I^p O^{q-1}(x) * 2^{(q-1)-i}$. Besides, $I^i(x) > x, i = 1, 2, \dots, p$, due to $I(x) = ((3 * x + 1)/2) > x$. Thus, Req-II is sufficient for the requirements for all transformed integers.

Next, we check the requirement for Req-I. $\square$

Lemma 3. $I^p(x) \in [0]_{2^q} \iff x \in [(3^p)^{-1} * 2^p - 1]_{2^{p+q}}$.

Proof. $I^p(x) \in [0]_{2^q}$

$$\iff (3/2)^p(x+1) - 1 \in [0]_{2^q} \because \text{Equation (2)}$$

$$\iff (3/2)^p(x+1) \in [1]_{2^q} \because \text{Lemma 1(1)}$$

$$\iff 3^p(x+1) \in [2^p]_{2^{p+q}} \because \text{Lemma 1(3)}$$

$$\iff [3^p]_{2^{p+q}}(x+1) \in [2^p]_{2^{p+q}} \because \text{Lemma 1(2)}$$

$$\iff x + 1 \in [(3^p)^{-1} * 2^p]_{2^{p+q}} \because \text{Lemma 1(2) and } \text{gcd}(3^p, 2^{p+q}) = 1 \iff x \in [(3^p)^{-1} * 2^p - 1]_{2^{p+q}} \because \text{Lemma 1 (1)}$$

Indeed, $[(3^p)^{-1}]_{2^{p+q}}$ is the inverse of $[3^p]_{2^{p+q}}$ in group $(\mathbb{Z}/2^{p+q}\mathbb{Z})^* = \langle (\mathbb{Z}/2^{p+q}\mathbb{Z}) \setminus \{0\}, * \bmod 2^{p+q} \rangle$. Besides, even if $p = 1$, the above lemma still holds due to Corollary 2 and Remark (3).

Next, we explore Req-II, assuming that Req-I is already guaranteed— $x \in [(3^p)^{-1} * 2^p - 1]_{2^{p+q}}$. $\square$

Notation 5. $\lambda = \log_2 1.5$.

Lemma 4. $I^p O^q(x) < x \wedge I^p O^{q-1}(x) \geq x \iff q = \lceil \lambda * p \rceil \wedge x > ((3^p - 2^p)/(2^{p+q} - 3^p))$.

Proof. (1) $I^p O^q(x) < x \iff (((3/2)^p(x+1) - 1)/2^q) < x \because \text{equation (2)}$

$$\iff 3^p x + 3^p < (2^q x + 1) 2^p \iff 3^p x + 3^p < 2^{p+q} x + 2^p$$

$$\iff 3^p - 2^p < (2^{p+q} - 3^p) x \because x > 0, 3^p - 2^p > 0$$

$$\iff 2^{p+q} - 3^p > 0 \wedge x > \frac{3^p - 2^p}{2^{p+q} - 3^p}.$$

(10)

- (2) $2^{p+q} - 3^p > 0 \iff 2^q > (3^p/2^p) \iff q > \log_2 1.5 * p \iff q \geq \lceil \log_2 1.5 * p \rceil$, since $q \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $\log_2 1.5 \in \mathbb{Q}$, $\log_2 1.5 * p \in \mathbb{N}^*$.
- (3) $I^p O^q(x) < x \wedge I^p O^{q-1}(x) \geq x \iff q = \lceil \log_2 1.5 * p \rceil$, as q is the minimal one in $q \geq \lceil \log_2 1.5 * p \rceil$.

Next theorem proves that $q = \lceil \log_2 1.5 * p \rceil$ is the necessary condition for $I^p O^q \in \text{Set}_{RD}$. $\square$

Theorem 4. If $I^p O^q \in \text{Set}_{RD}$, $p, q \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $p \geq 2$, then

- (1) $\exists x \in [(3^p)^{-1} * 2^p - 1]_{2^{p+q}} \wedge x > ((3^p - 2^p)/(2^{p+q} - 3^p))$
such that $RD[x] = I^p O^q$
- (2) $q = \lceil \log_2 1.5 * p \rceil$

Proof. It is straightforward due to Lemmas 2–4.

Next theorem proves that $q = \lceil \log_2 1.5 * p \rceil$ is also the sufficient condition for $I^p O^q \in \text{Set}_{RD}$. $\square$

Theorem 5. If $q = \lceil \log_2 1.5 * p \rceil$, $p, q \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $p \geq 2$, then

- (1) $\exists x \in [(3^p)^{-1} * 2^p - 1]_{2^{p+q}} \wedge x > ((3^p - 2^p)/(2^{p+q} - 3^p))$
such that $RD[x] = I^p O^q$
- (2) $I^p O^q \in \text{Set}_{RD}$

Proof. It is due to Lemmas 2–4.

Next corollary claims sufficient and necessary condition for $I^p O^q \in \text{Set}_{RD}$ ($p \geq 2$). $\square$

Corollary 7. $q = \lceil \log_2 1.5 * p \rceil \iff I^p O^q \in \text{Set}_{RD}$, where $p, q \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $p \geq 2$.

Proof. It is straightforward by Theorems 4 and 5.

Next corollary extends above corollary by tackling the cases $p = 0$ and $p = 1$. $\square$

Corollary 8. $q = \max(1, \lceil \log_2 1.5 * p \rceil) \iff I^p O^q \in \text{Set}_{RD}$, where $p \in \mathbb{N}$, $q \in \mathbb{N}^*$.

Proof

(1) $p = 0$ and $q = \max(1, 0) = 1$. $I^0 O^1 = O \in \text{Set}_{RD}$, as $RD[x \in [0]_2] = O$.

(2) $p = 1$ and $q = \max(1, \lceil \log_2 1.5 * 1 \rceil) = \lceil \log_2 1.5 * 1 \rceil = 1$. $I^1 O^1 = IO \in \text{Set}_{RD}$, as $RD[x \in [1]_4] = IO$.

(3) $p \geq 2$ and $q = \max(1, \lceil \log_2 1.5 * p \rceil) = \lceil \log_2 1.5 * p \rceil$. $I^p O^q \in \text{Set}_{RD}$ due to Corollary 7.

Inverse direction can be proved similarly. $\square$

Corollary 9. $\|\text{Set}_{RD}\| = +\infty$.

Proof. $\forall p \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $p \geq 2$, let $q = \lceil \log_2 1.5 * p \rceil$. Thus, $2^{p+q} > 3^p$. $\exists x \in [(3^p)^{-1} * 2^p - 1]_{2^{p+q}} \wedge x > ((3^p - 2^p)/(2^{p+q} - 3^p))$ such that $RD[x] = I^p O^q$. Hence, $\|\text{Set}_{RD}\| = +\infty$. $\square$

3.3. Derive x if $RD[x] = I^{p_1} O^{q_1} I^{p_2} O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n} O^{q_n}$. In this section, we assume $p_i, q_i \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $p_1 \geq 2$, $n \geq 2$, and $x \in [3]_4$; if there exists no explicitly declaration.

Lemma 5. Suppose $s = I^{p_1} O^{q_1} I^{p_2} O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n} O^{q_n}$ and $k_j = \sum_{i=1}^j (p_i + q_i)$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$.

- (1) Get $S(s, 1, k_j)(x) \geq x \implies \text{Get } S(s, 1, k_j - m)(x) > x$,
 $m = 1, 2, \dots, q_j$
- (2) Get $S(s, 1, k_j)(x) \geq x \implies \text{Get } S(s, 1, k_j + m)(x) > x$,
 $m = 1, 2, \dots, p_{j+1}$

Proof. Straightforward.

- (1) Because $\text{Get } S(s, 1, k_j)(x) \geq x$ and $\text{Get } S(s, 1, k_j - m)(x) = \text{Get } S(s, 1, k_j)(x) * 2^m > \text{Get } S(s, 1, k_j)(x)$, we have $\text{Get } S(s, 1, k_j - m)(x) > x$, $m = 1, 2, \dots, q_j$
- (2) Because $\text{Get } S(s, 1, k_j)(x) \geq x$ and $\text{Get } S(s, 1, k_j + m)(x) = I^m(\text{Get } S(s, 1, k_j)(x)) > \text{Get } S(s, 1, k_j)(x)$ (due to $I(x) > x$), we have $\text{Get } S(s, 1, k_j + m)(x) > x$, $m = 1, 2, \dots, p_{j+1}$ $\square$

Remark 11. For better understanding the above lemma, we can explain the conclusion as follows: if “going Down” stage ends with a transformed integer that is not less than the starting integer, then all transformed integers in its “left” and “right” will be larger than the starting integer.

Lemma 6. Suppose $p_i, q_i \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $p_1 \geq 2$, $n \geq 2$.

$\exists x \in [3]_4$ such that $RD[x] = I^{p_1} O^{q_1} I^{p_2} O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n} O^{q_n}$, if and only if

Req-I): $I^{p_1} O^{q_1} I^{p_2} O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n}(x) \in [0]_{2^{q_n}}$

Req-II): $(I^{p_1} O^{q_1} I^{p_2} O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n} O^{q_n}(x) < x) \wedge (I^{p_1} O^{q_1} I^{p_2} O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n} O^{q_{n-1}}(x) \geq x)$

Req-III):

$I^{p_1} O^{q_1} I^{p_2} O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_j} O^{q_j}(x) \geq x$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$

Proof. Roughly speaking, Req-I is a residue equation to specify the requirement for parity sequence, and Req-II and Req-III are two inequalities to specify the requirements for transformed integers.

(1) Req-I is sufficient and necessary because of Theorem 3.

(2) Req-II. $I^{p_1} O^{q_1} I^{p_2} O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n} O^i(x) = I^{p_1} O^{q_1} I^{p_2} O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n} O^{q_{n-1}}(x) * 2^{(q_n-1)-i}$. Thus,

$I^{p_1} O^{q_1} I^{p_2} O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n} O^{q_{n-1}}(x) \geq x$

$\implies I^{p_1} O^{q_1} I^{p_2} O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n} O^i(x) > x$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, q_n - 2$.

(11)

Together with $I^{p_1} O^{q_1} I^{p_2} O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n} O^{q_n}(x) < x$, q_n is thus the minimal one to let $I^{p_1} O^{q_1} I^{p_2} O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n} O^i(x) < x$.

- (3) Req-III. Obviously, $I^i(x) > x, i = 1, 2, \dots, p_1$. Besides, let $s = \text{RD}[x]$. By Lemma 5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Get } S\left(s, 1, \sum_{i=1}^j p_i + q_i\right)(x) \geq x, j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1 \\ & \implies \text{Get } S(s, 1, k)(x) > x, k \\ & = p_1 + 1, p_1 + 2, \dots, \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (p_i + q_i) + p_n. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Lemma 7. $I^{p_1} O^{q_1} I^{p_2} O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n}(x) \in [0]_{2^{q_n}, n}, p_i, q_i \in \mathbb{N}^*, p_1 \geq 2, i = 1, 2, \dots, n, \iff x \in [-\sum_{i=1}^n A_i B_i C_{i-1}]_{C_n}$, where $A_i = 3^{p_i} - 2^{p_i}, B_i = (3^{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} p_j})^{-1} \bmod C_n$, and $C_i = 2^{\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} (p_j + q_j)}, C_0 = 1$.

The proof is somewhat straightforward but the computation is tedious; we thus move them to Appendix (Section 4.1).

Remark 12

- (1) The conclusion for $n = 1$ is identical with that in Theorem 5.
- (2) When $p_1 = q_1 = 1$, the conclusion $[3^{-p_1} 2^{p_1} - 1]_{2^{p_1+q_1}} = [3^{-1} 2^1 - 1]_4 = [3 \cdot 2 - 1]_4 = [1]_4$, which is identical with that in Proposition 7. Thus, $p_1 \geq 2$ in Lemma 7 can be extended to $p_1 \geq 1$.

Next lemma is stated only for $x \in [-\sum_{i=1}^n A_i B_i C_{i-1}]_{C_n}$, since Req-I should be guaranteed for ordered parity sequence firstly.

Lemma 8. $I^{p_1} O^{q_1} I^{p_2} O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n} O^{q_n}(x) < x, n, p_i, q_i \in \mathbb{N}^*, p_1 \geq 2, i = 1, 2, \dots, n \iff x > \Psi * (2^{\sum_{i=1}^n (p_i + q_i)} / (2^{\sum_{i=1}^n (p_i + q_i)} - 3^{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i})) \wedge 2^{\sum_{i=1}^n (p_i + q_i)} - 3^{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i} > 0$.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} & I^{p_1} O^{q_1} I^{p_2} O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n} O^{q_n}(x) < x \\ & \iff \prod_{i=1}^n a_i x + \prod_{i=2}^n a_i b_1 + \prod_{i=3}^n a_i b_2 + \dots + \prod_{i=n-1}^n a_i b_{n-2} \\ & \quad + \prod_{i=n}^n a_i b_{n-1} + b_n < x, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

(due to the equation in the proof of Lemma 7 (7))
 $\iff (1 - \prod_{i=1}^n a_i) x > \Psi$

where $\Psi = \prod_{i=2}^n a_i b_1 + \prod_{i=2}^n a_i b_2 + \dots + \prod_{i=n-1}^n a_i b_{n-2} + \prod_{i=n}^n a_i b_{n-1} + b_n$

$$\iff \left(1 - \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{3^{p_i}}{2^{p_i+q_i}}\right) * x > \Psi \iff \left(1 - \frac{3^{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i}}{2^{\sum_{i=1}^n (p_i+q_i)}}\right) * x > \Psi$$

$$\iff x > \Psi * \frac{2^{\sum_{i=1}^n (p_i+q_i)}}{2^{\sum_{i=1}^n (p_i+q_i)} - 3^{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i}} \wedge 2^{\sum_{i=1}^n (p_i+q_i)} - 3^{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i} > 0, \quad \because x > 0, \Psi > 0.$$

(14)

Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi &= \prod_{i=2}^n a_i b_1 + \prod_{i=3}^n a_i b_2 + \dots + \prod_{i=n-1}^n a_i b_{n-2} + \prod_{i=n}^n a_i b_{n-1} + b_n \\ &= \frac{(3^{p_1} - 2^{p_1}) 3^{\sum_{i=2}^n p_i}}{2^{\sum_{i=1}^n (p_i+q_i)}} + \frac{(3^{p_2} - 2^{p_2}) 3^{\sum_{i=3}^n p_i}}{2^{\sum_{i=2}^n (p_i+q_i)}} + \dots + a_n b_{n-1} + b_n \\ &= \frac{(3^{p_1} - 2^{p_1}) 3^{\sum_{i=2}^n p_i}}{2^{\sum_{i=1}^n (p_i+q_i)}} + \frac{(3^{p_2} - 2^{p_2}) 3^{\sum_{i=3}^n p_i}}{2^{\sum_{i=2}^n (p_i+q_i)}} + \dots + \frac{3^{p_n}}{2^{p_n+q_n}} \frac{3^{p_{n-1}} - 2^{p_{n-1}}}{2^{p_{n-1}+q_{n-1}}} + \frac{3^{p_n} - 2^{p_n}}{2^{p_n+q_n}} \\ &= \frac{(3^{p_1} - 2^{p_1}) 3^{\sum_{i=2}^n p_i}}{2^{\sum_{i=1}^n (p_i+q_i)}} + \frac{(3^{p_2} - 2^{p_2}) 3^{\sum_{i=3}^n p_i}}{2^{\sum_{i=2}^n (p_i+q_i)}} + \dots + \frac{(3^{p_{n-1}} - 2^{p_{n-1}}) 3^{p_n}}{2^{p_n+q_n+p_{n-1}+q_{n-1}}} + \frac{3^{p_n} - 2^{p_n}}{2^{p_n+q_n}}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Remark 13. (1) When $n = 1, \Psi = ((3^{p_n} - 2^{p_n}) / 2^{p_n+q_n}) = ((3^{p_1} - 2^{p_1}) / 2^{p_1+q_1})$;

$$I^{p_1} O^{q_1}(x) < x$$

$$\iff x > \Psi * \frac{2^{\sum_{i=1}^n (p_i+q_i)}}{2^{\sum_{i=1}^n (p_i+q_i)} - 3^{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i}} \wedge 2^{\sum_{i=1}^n (p_i+q_i)} - 3^{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i} > 0$$

$$\iff x > \Psi * \frac{2^{p_1+q_1}}{2^{p_1+q_1} - 3^{p_1}} \wedge 2^{p_1+q_1} - 3^{p_1} > 0$$

$$\iff x > \frac{3^{p_1} - 2^{p_1}}{2^{p_1+q_1}} * \frac{2^{p_1+q_1}}{2^{p_1+q_1} - 3^{p_1}} \wedge 2^{p_1+q_1} - 3^{p_1} > 0$$

$$\iff x > \frac{3^{p_1} - 2^{p_1}}{2^{p_1+q_1} - 3^{p_1}} \wedge 2^{p_1+q_1} - 3^{p_1} > 0,$$

(16)

which is exactly identical with that of Theorem 5. Therefore, the conclusion can be extended to $n = 1$.

- (2) When $n = 1$ with $p_1 = 1, q_1 = 1, x > \Psi * (2^{\sum_{i=1}^n (p_i+q_i)} / (2^{\sum_{i=1}^n (p_i+q_i)} - 3^{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i})) = ((3^{p_1} - 2^{p_1}) / (2^{p_1+q_1} - 3^{p_1})) = ((3 - 2) / (2^2 - 3^1)) = (1/1) = 1$. It is consistent with the conclusion in Proposition 7 for $\text{RD}[x \in [1]_4] = IO$.

Note that, here, $2^{\sum_{i=1}^n (p_i+q_i)} - 3^{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i} > 0$ is a necessary condition for $I^{p_1}O^{q_1}I^{p_2}O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n}O^{q_n}(x) < x$.

Next, we check the requirement Req-III. Again, the next lemma is discussed only for $x \in [-\sum_{i=1}^n A_i B_i C_{i-1}]_{C_n}$, since Req-I should be guaranteed for designated parity sequence as a prerequisite.

Lemma 9. $I^{p_1}O^{q_1}I^{p_2}O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_j}O^{q_j}(x) \geq x, j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1, n \geq 2 \iff 2^{\sum_{i=1}^j (p_i+q_i)} - 3^{\sum_{i=1}^j p_i} < 0$.

Proof. $I^{p_1}O^{q_1}I^{p_2}O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_j}O^{q_j}(x) \geq x, j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$

$$\iff \prod_{i=1}^j a_i x + \prod_{i=2}^j a_i b_1 + \prod_{i=3}^j a_i b_2 + \dots + \prod_{i=j-1}^j a_i b_{j-2} + \prod_{i=j}^j a_i b_{j-1} + b_j \geq x, \quad (17)$$

(due to the equation in the proof of Lemma 7 (7))
 $\iff (1 - \prod_{i=1}^j a_i)x \leq \Psi_j$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_j &= \prod_{i=2}^j a_i b_1 + \prod_{i=3}^j a_i b_2 + \dots + \prod_{i=j-1}^j a_i b_{j-2} + \prod_{i=j}^j a_i b_{j-1} + b_j \\ &\iff \left(1 - \prod_{i=1}^j \frac{3^{p_i}}{2^{p_i+q_i}}\right) * x \leq \Psi_j \\ &\iff \left(1 - \frac{3^{\sum_{i=1}^j p_i}}{2^{\sum_{i=1}^j (p_i+q_i)}}\right) * x \leq \Psi_j \\ &\iff \left(x \leq \Psi_j * \frac{2^{\sum_{i=1}^j (p_i+q_i)}}{2^{\sum_{i=1}^j (p_i+q_i)} - 3^{\sum_{i=1}^j p_i}} \wedge 2^{\sum_{i=1}^j (p_i+q_i)} - 3^{\sum_{i=1}^j p_i} > 0\right) \\ &\quad \vee \left(2^{\sum_{i=1}^j (p_i+q_i)} - 3^{\sum_{i=1}^j p_i} < 0\right). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Next, we will prove that $2^{\sum_{i=1}^j (p_i+q_i)} - 3^{\sum_{i=1}^j p_i} > 0, j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$ is impossible by contradiction.

Suppose $I^{p_1}O^{q_1}I^{p_2}O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_j}O^{q_j}(x) \in [0]_{2^{q_j}} \iff x \in S_j, j = 1, 2, \dots, n$. By Lemma 6 (1) or Theorem 3, $S_{j+1} \subset S_j, j = n-1, n-2, \dots, 1$.

Suppose $\exists j \in [1, n-1]$ such that $2^{\sum_{i=1}^j (p_i+q_i)} - 3^{\sum_{i=1}^j p_i} > 0$. Select the minimal one in them (thus, for $1 \leq k \leq j-1$, $2^{\sum_{i=1}^k (p_i+q_i)} - 3^{\sum_{i=1}^k p_i} < 0$). Because of the generality of n in q_n in Lemma 8, we have $I^{p_1}O^{q_1}I^{p_2}O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_j}O^{q_j}(x) < x$, when $x > \Psi_j = \Psi_j * (2^{\sum_{i=1}^j (p_i+q_i)} / (2^{\sum_{i=1}^j (p_i+q_i)} - 3^{\sum_{i=1}^j p_i}))$, $j \in [1, n-1]$.

Let $\Psi'_n = \Psi * (2^{\sum_{i=1}^n (p_i+q_i)} / (2^{\sum_{i=1}^n (p_i+q_i)} - 3^{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i}))$.

Therefore, if $x > \max(\Psi'_j, \Psi'_n)$ and $x \in S_n$, then $I^{p_1}O^{q_1}I^{p_2}O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_j}O^{q_j}(x) \in [0]_{2^{q_j}}, I^{p_1}O^{q_1}I^{p_2}O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n}O^{q_n}(x) < x$, and $I^{p_1}O^{q_1}I^{p_2}O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_k}O^{q_k}(x) \geq x, k = 1, 2, \dots, j-1$. Thus, $RD[x \in S_n] = I^{p_1}O^{q_1}I^{p_2}O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_j}O^{q_j}$, which contradicts with $RD[x \in S_n] = I^{p_1}O^{q_1}I^{p_2}O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n}O^{q_n}$ in assumption. Thus, $\nexists j \in [1, n-1], 2^{\sum_{i=1}^j (p_i+q_i)} - 3^{\sum_{i=1}^j p_i} > 0$. That is, $2^{\sum_{i=1}^j (p_i+q_i)} - 3^{\sum_{i=1}^j p_i} < 0, j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$. $\square$

Lemma 10. $2^{\sum_{i=1}^n (p_i+q_i)} - 3^{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i} > 0 \iff \sum_{i=1}^n q_i \geq \lceil \lambda * \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \rceil$.

Proof. Let $U = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i, D = \sum_{i=1}^n (p_i + q_i)$:

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{\sum_{i=1}^n (p_i+q_i)} - 3^{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i} > 0 &\iff 2^D > 3^U \iff D > \log_2 3 * U \\ &\iff D \geq \lceil \log_2 3 * U \rceil, \because U, D \in \mathbb{N}^*, \log_2 3 \in \mathbb{Q}^*, \log_2 3 * U \in \mathbb{N}^* \\ &\iff D - U \geq \lceil \log_2 3 * U \rceil - U \\ &\iff D - U \geq \lceil \log_2 3 * U - U \rceil \\ &\iff D - U \geq \lceil \log_2 1.5 * U \rceil \\ &\iff \sum_{i=1}^n q_i \geq \lceil \lambda * \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \rceil. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Lemma 11. $2^{\sum_{i=1}^j (p_i+q_i)} - 3^{\sum_{i=1}^j p_i} < 0 \iff \sum_{i=1}^j q_i \geq \lceil \lambda * \sum_{i=1}^j p_i \rceil, j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$.

Proof. Let $U' = \sum_{i=1}^j p_i, D' = \sum_{i=1}^j (p_i + q_i)$:

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{\sum_{i=1}^j (p_i+q_i)} - 3^{\sum_{i=1}^j p_i} < 0 &\iff 2^{D'} < 3^{U'} \iff D' < \log_2 3 * U' \\ &\iff D' \leq \lceil \log_2 3 * U' \rceil - 1, \because U', D' \in \mathbb{N}^*, \log_2 3 \in \mathbb{Q}^*, \log_2 3 * U' \in \mathbb{N}^* \\ &\iff D' - U' \leq \lceil \log_2 3 * U' \rceil - U' - 1 \\ &\iff D' - U' \leq \lceil \log_2 3 * U' - U' \rceil - 1 \\ &\iff D' - U' \leq \lceil \log_2 1.5 * U' \rceil - 1 \\ &\iff \sum_{i=1}^j q_i < \lceil \lambda * \sum_{i=1}^j p_i \rceil. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Lemma 12. $I^{p_1}O^{q_1}I^{p_2}O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n}O^{q_n}(x) < x \wedge I^{p_1}O^{q_1}I^{p_2}O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n}O^{q_{n-1}}(x) \geq x \iff q_n = \lceil \lambda * \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \rceil - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} q_i \wedge x > \Psi * (2^{\sum_{i=1}^n (p_i+q_i)} / (2^{\sum_{i=1}^n (p_i+q_i)} - 3^{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i}))$.

Proof. By Lemma 10, $\sum_{i=1}^n q_i \geq \lceil \lambda * \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \rceil$.

$I^{p_1}O^{q_1}I^{p_2}O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n}O^{q_n}(x) < x \wedge I^{p_1}O^{q_1}I^{p_2}O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n}O^{q_{n-1}}(x) \geq x$, thus q_n is the minimal one. Therefore, $q_n = \lceil \lambda * \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \rceil - \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} q_i$. $\square$

Theorem 6. If $I^{p_1}O^{q_1}I^{p_2}O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n}O^{q_n} \in \text{Set}_{RD}$, $p_i, q_i \in \mathbb{N}^*, p_1 \geq 2, i = 1, 2, \dots, n, n \in \mathbb{N}^*, n \geq 2$, then

- (1) $\exists x \in [-\sum_{i=1}^n A_i B_i C_{i-1}]_{C_n} \wedge x > \Psi * (2^{\sum_{i=1}^n (p_i+q_i)} / (2^{\sum_{i=1}^n (p_i+q_i)} - 3^{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i}))$ such that $RD[x] = I^{p_1}O^{q_1}I^{p_2}O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n}O^{q_n}$, where $A_i = 3^{p_i} - 2^{p_i}, B_i = (3^{\sum_{j=1}^i p_j})^{-1} \bmod C_n, C_i = 2^{\sum_{j=1}^i (p_j+q_j)}, C_0 = 1, \Psi = \prod_{i=2}^n a_i b_1 + \prod_{i=3}^n a_i b_2 + \dots + \prod_{i=n-1}^n a_i b_{n-2} + \prod_{i=n}^n a_i b_{n-1} + b_n, a_i = (3^{p_i} / 2^{p_i+q_i}), b_i = ((3^{p_i} - 2^{p_i}) / 2^{p_i+q_i}), i = 1, 2, \dots, n$
- (2) $\sum_{i=1}^n q_i = \lceil \lambda * \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \rceil \wedge \sum_{i=1}^j q_i < \lceil \lambda * \sum_{i=1}^j p_i \rceil, j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1, n \geq 2$

Proof. It is straightforward due to Lemmas 7–12.

Next theorem proves that $\sum_{i=1}^n q_i = \lceil \lambda * \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \rceil$ and $\sum_{i=1}^j q_i < \lceil \lambda * \sum_{i=1}^j p_i \rceil$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$, $n \geq 2$ is also the sufficient condition for $I^{p_1}O^{q_1}I^{p_2}O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n}O^{q_n} \in \text{Set}_{\text{RD}}$. $\square$

Theorem 7. If $\sum_{i=1}^n q_i = \lceil \lambda * \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \rceil$, $\sum_{i=1}^j q_i < \lceil \lambda * \sum_{i=1}^j p_i \rceil$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$, $p_i, q_i \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $p_1 \geq 2$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $n \geq 2$, then

- (1) $\exists x \in [-\sum_{i=1}^n A_i B_i C_{i-1}]_{C_n} \wedge x > \Psi * (2 \sum_{i=1}^n (p_i + q_i) / (2 \sum_{i=1}^n (p_i + q_i) - 3 \sum_{i=1}^n p_i))$ such that $\text{RD}[x] = I^{p_1}O^{q_1}I^{p_2}O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n}O^{q_n}$, where $A_i = 3^{p_i} - 2^{p_i}$, $B_i = (3 \sum_{j=1}^i p_j)^{-1} \bmod C_n$, and $C_i = 2 \sum_{j=1}^i (p_j + q_j)$, $C_0 = 1$; $\Psi = \prod_{i=2}^n a_i b_1 + \prod_{i=3}^n a_i b_2 + \dots + \prod_{i=n-1}^n a_i b_{n-2} + \prod_{i=n}^n a_i b_{n-1} + b_n$, $a_i = (3^{p_i} / 2^{p_i + q_i})$ and $b_i = ((3^{p_i} - 2^{p_i}) / 2^{p_i + q_i})$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$
- (2) $I^{p_1}O^{q_1}I^{p_2}O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n}O^{q_n} \in \text{Set}_{\text{RD}}$

Proof. By Lemma 12,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n q_i &= \lceil \lambda * \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \rceil \wedge x > \Psi * \frac{2 \sum_{i=1}^n (p_i + q_i)}{2 \sum_{i=1}^n (p_i + q_i) - 3 \sum_{i=1}^n p_i} \\ &\implies I^{p_1}O^{q_1}I^{p_2}O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n}O^{q_n}(x) \\ &< x \wedge I^{p_1}O^{q_1}I^{p_2}O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n}O^{q_{n-1}}(x) \geq x. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Together with $x \in [-\sum_{i=1}^n A_i B_i C_{i-1}]_{C_n}$, we have $I^{p_1}O^{q_1}I^{p_2}O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n}(x) \in [0]_{2^{q_n}}$ due to Lemma 7.

Besides, $I^{p_1}O^{q_1}I^{p_2}O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_j}O^{q_j}(x) \geq x$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$ by Lemmas 9 and 11. Therefore, by Lemma 6, $\exists x \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $\text{RD}[x] = I^{p_1}O^{q_1}I^{p_2}O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n}O^{q_n}$.

Note that the above theorem indeed implies that $\text{RD}[x] = \text{RD}[x + P] = I^{p_1}O^{q_1}I^{p_2}O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n}O^{q_n}$, where $P = 2^{p_1+q_1+2^{p_2+q_2}+\dots+2^{p_n+q_n}} = 2^{\lceil \text{RD}[x] \rceil}$ when x is sufficient large (i.e., $x > \Psi * (2 \sum_{i=1}^n (p_i + q_i) / (2 \sum_{i=1}^n (p_i + q_i) - 3 \sum_{i=1}^n p_i))$).

Indeed, the requirement for being sufficient large can be omitted and proved by us in another paper [9]. Note that this paper is independent with cited paper.

Following corollary states the necessary and sufficient condition for guaranteeing that any $I^{p_1}O^{q_1}I^{p_2}O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n}O^{q_n}$, where $p_i, q_i \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $p_1 \geq 2$ and $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $n \geq 2$, is a reduced dynamics of some $x \in \mathbb{N}^*$. $\square$

Corollary 10. $\sum_{i=1}^n q_i = \lceil \lambda * \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \rceil$, $p_i, q_i \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $p_1 \geq 2$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $n \geq 2$ $\iff \sum_{i=1}^j q_i < \lceil \lambda * \sum_{i=1}^j p_i \rceil$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1 \iff I^{p_1}O^{q_1}I^{p_2}O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n}O^{q_n} \in \text{Set}_{\text{RD}}$.

Proof. Straightforward due to Theorems 6 and 7. $\square$

Theorem 8 (prefix-free theorem). Suppose $p_i, q_i \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, $p_1 \geq 2$, $n \geq 2$. If $s = I^{p_1}O^{q_1}I^{p_2}O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n}O^{q_n} \in \text{Set}_{\text{RD}}$, then $\text{Get } S(s, 1, \sum_{i=1}^j (p_i + q_i)) \in \text{Set}_{\text{RD}}$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$.

Proof. $I^{p_1}O^{q_1}I^{p_2}O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n}O^{q_n} \in \text{Set}_{\text{RD}}$

$$\implies \forall x \in [-\sum_{i=1}^n A_i B_i C_{i-1}]_{C_n}, I^{p_1}O^{q_1}I^{p_2}O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_j}O^{q_j}(x) \geq x, j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$$

$$\implies 2 \sum_{i=1}^j (p_i + q_i) - 3 \sum_{i=1}^j p_i < 0, j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1 \because \text{Lemma 9}$$

$$\implies \nexists x \in \mathbb{N}^*, \text{Get } S(s, 1, \sum_{i=1}^j (p_i + q_i))(x) < x \because \text{Lemma 8}$$

$$\implies \text{Get } S(s, 1, \sum_{i=1}^j (p_i + q_i)) \in \text{Set}_{\text{RD}}, j = 1, 2, \dots, n-1.$$

Simply speaking, Theorem 8 shows that Set_{RD} is prefix-free. Regarding more general conclusion by including O or IO (i.e., for $x \in [3]_4$) and $n = 1$ (i.e., for I^pO^q), we have following corollary. $\square$

Corollary 11. $s \in \text{Set}_{\text{RD}} \implies s \lceil \{I, O\}^{\geq 1} \subset \text{Set}_{\text{RD}}$.

Proof. Straightforward.

Next, we give more general results by introducing two functions as follows: $\square$

Definition 6. Function $\text{CntI}(\cdot)$. $\text{CntI}: c \longrightarrow y$ takes as input $c \in \{I, O\}^{\geq 1}$, and outputs $y \in \mathbb{N}$ that is the count of “I” in c .

Definition 7. Function $\text{CntO}(\cdot)$. $\text{CntO}: c \longrightarrow y$ takes as input $c \in \{I, O\}^{\geq 1}$, and outputs $y \in \mathbb{N}^*$ that is the count of “O” in c .

For example, $\text{CntI}(IIIOO) = 2$, $\text{CntO}(IIIOO) = 2$, $\text{CntI}(IIIOIO) = 3$, and $\text{CntO}(IIIOIO) = 2$.

Corollary 8 states the sufficient and necessary condition for $s = I^{p_1}O^{q_1}I^{p_2}O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n}O^{q_n} \in \text{Set}_{\text{RD}}$, $n \geq 2$. It can be extended by using $\text{Get } S(s, 1, k)$, $k = 1, 2, \dots, |s| - 1$ instead of $\text{Get } S(s, 1, \sum_{i=1}^j (p_i + q_i))$ as follows.

Corollary 12. $s = I^{p_1}O^{q_1}I^{p_2}O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n}O^{q_n} \in \text{Set}_{\text{RD}}$, $p_i, q_i \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $p_1 \geq 2$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $n \geq 2$, if and only if

$$(1) \text{CntO}(s) = \lceil \lambda * \text{CntI}(s) \rceil$$

$$(2) \text{CntO}(\text{Get } S(s, 1, k)) < \lceil \lambda * \text{CntI}(\text{Get } S(s, 1, k)) \rceil, k = 1, 2, \dots, |s| - 1$$

Proof. Straightforward.

If $n = 1$ and $p = 0, 1$ for I^pO^q are both included, the above corollary can be extended to the following corollary. $\square$

Corollary 13. $s = I^{p_1}O^{q_1}I^{p_2}O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n}O^{q_n} \in \text{Set}_{\text{RD}}$, $p_i \in \mathbb{N}$, $q_i \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, if and only if

$$(1) p_1 = 0, n = 1. s = O$$

$$(2) p_1 \geq 1. \text{CntO}(s) = \lceil \lambda * \text{CntI}(s) \rceil, \text{ and } \text{CntO}(\text{Get } S(s, 1, k)) < \lceil \lambda * \text{CntI}(\text{Get } S(s, 1, k)) \rceil, k = 1, 2, \dots, |s| - 1$$

Proof

$$(1) \text{ It is trivial } s = O \implies s \in \text{Set}_{\text{RD}}. \text{ Inversely, } n = 1, p_1 = 0, s = I^{p_1}O^{q_1} = O^{q_1} \in \text{Set}_{\text{RD}} \implies s = O.$$

$$(2) n = 1, s = I^{p_1}O^{q_1}, p_1, q_1 \in \mathbb{N}^*.$$

(2.1) $p_1 = 1$. $\text{Get } S(s, 1, 1) = I$. Obviously, $\text{CntO}(\text{Get } S(s, 1, 1)) = 0 < \lceil \lambda * \text{CntI}(\text{Get } S(s, 1, 1)) \rceil = \lceil \lambda * 1 \rceil = \lceil \log_2 1.5 \rceil = 1$.

$s = IO^{q_1}$, thus $\text{Get } S(s, 1, 2) = IO$. Then, $\text{CntO}(\text{Get } S(s, 1, 2)) = 1$, $\lceil \lambda * \text{CntI}(\text{Get } S(s, 1, 2)) \rceil = \lceil \lambda * 1 \rceil = 1$. Thus, $|s| = 2$ and $s = IO$. Obviously, $IO \in \text{Set}_{\text{RD}}$.

Inversely,

$s = IO \in \text{Set}_{\text{RD}} \implies (\text{CntO}(s) = 1 = \lceil \lambda * 1 \rceil = \lceil \lambda * \text{CntI}(s) \rceil) \wedge (\text{CntO}(\text{Get } S(s, 1, k)) = 0 < \lceil \lambda * \text{CntI}(\text{Get } S(s, 1, k)) \rceil = 1, k = |s| - 1 = 1)$.

(2.2) $p_1 \geq 2$. $q_1 = \lceil \lambda * p_1 \rceil \iff I^{p_1} O^{q_1} \in \text{Set}_{\text{RD}}$ by Corollary 7. Thus, $q_1 = \lceil \lambda * p_1 \rceil \iff \text{CntO}(s) = \lceil \lambda * \text{CntI}(s) \rceil$ because $\text{CntO}(s) = q_1, \text{CntI}(s) = p_1$.

Besides, $q_1 = \lceil \lambda * p_1 \rceil \implies \text{CntO}(\text{Get } S(s, 1, k)) < \lceil \lambda * \text{CntI}(\text{Get } S(s, 1, k)) \rceil, k = 1, 2, \dots, |s| - 1$. The reason is as follows:

When $k = 1, 2, \dots, p_1$, $\text{CntO}(\text{Get } S(s, 1, k)) = 0 < \lceil \lambda * \text{CntI}(\text{Get } S(s, 1, k)) \rceil \in \mathbb{N}^*$ is trivial.

When $k = p_1 + 1, p_1 + 2, \dots, p_1 + q_1 - 1$,

$q_1 = \lceil \lambda * p_1 \rceil \implies \text{CntO}(\text{Get } S(s, 1, k)) = k - p_1 \leq q_1 - 1 < q_1 = \lceil \lambda * p_1 \rceil = \lceil \lambda * \text{CntI}(\text{Get } S(s, 1, k)) \rceil$ as $p_1 = \text{CntI}(\text{Get } S(s, 1, k))$.

(3) $n \geq 2$. $p_1 \geq 2$. By Corollary 10, $\text{CntO}(c) = \lceil \lambda * \text{CntI}(c) \rceil \wedge \text{CntO}(\text{Get } S(s, 1, k)) < \lceil \lambda * \text{CntI}(\text{Get } S(s, 1, k)) \rceil, k = 1, 2, \dots, |s| - 1 \iff s \in \text{Set}_{\text{RD}}$.

Next, we use $\text{CntO}(\cdot)$ and $\text{CntI}(\cdot)$ to restate sufficient and necessary condition for $s \in \text{Set}_{\text{RD}}$ as follows. $\square$

Corollary 14 (form corollary). $s \in \{I, O\}^{\geq 1}$ is a reduced dynamics, if and only if

(1) $|s| = 1, s = O$.

(2) $|s| \geq 2$,

$$\begin{cases} \text{CntO}(s) = \lceil \lambda * \text{CntI}(s) \rceil, \\ \text{CntO}(s') < \lceil \lambda * \text{CntI}(s') \rceil, \quad s' = \text{Get } S(s, 1, i), i = 1, 2, \dots, |s| - 1. \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

Proof. It is straightforward due to Theorem 8 and Corollary 8–11.

Finally, we obtain the following inverse theorem as a summary. $\square$

Theorem 9 (inverse theorem)

(1) If $|s| = 1, s = O$, then $\exists x \in [0]_2$ such that $\text{RD}[x] = O$

(2) If $|s| \geq 2$, $s = I^{p_1} O^{q_1} I^{p_2} O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n} O^{q_n}$, $p_i, q_i \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n, n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $\text{CntO}(s) = \lceil \lambda * \text{CntI}(s) \rceil, \text{CntO}(s') < \lceil \lambda * \text{CntI}(s') \rceil$, $s' = \text{Get } S(s, 1, k), k = 1, 2, \dots, |s| - 1$

Then, $\exists x \in [-\sum_{i=1}^n A_i B_i C_{i-1}]_{C_n} \wedge x > \Psi * (2^{\sum_{i=1}^n (p_i + q_i)} / (2^{\sum_{i=1}^n (p_i + q_i)} - 3^{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i}))$ such that $\text{RD}[x] = s$, where

$$A_i = 3^{p_i} - 2^{p_i}, \quad B_i = (3^{\sum_{j=1}^i p_j})^{-1} \bmod C_n, \quad C_i = 2^{\sum_{j=1}^i (p_j + q_j)}, \quad C_0 = 1, \quad \Psi = \prod_{i=2}^n a_i b_1 + \prod_{i=3}^n a_i b_2 + \dots + \prod_{i=n-1}^n a_i b_{n-2} + \prod_{i=n}^n a_i b_{n-1} + b_n, \quad a_i = (3^{p_i} / 2^{p_i + q_i}), b_i = ((3^{p_i} - 2^{p_i}) / 2^{p_i + q_i}).$$

Proof. It is straightforward due to Theorem 7 and form corollary (Corollary 12).

Following corollary states that Set_{RD} can be constructed by generating $s \in \{I, O\}^{\geq 1}$ which satisfies requirements algorithmically instead of by conducting concrete Collatz transformations for enumerated starting integers. $\square$

Corollary 15. $\text{Set}_{\text{RD}} = \{O\} \cup \{s \mid s \in \{I, O\}^L, L \in \mathbb{N}^*, L \geq 2, \text{CntO}(s) = \lceil \lambda * \text{CntI}(s) \rceil, \text{CntO}(s') < \lceil \lambda * \text{CntI}(s') \rceil, s' = \text{Get } S(s, 1, i), i = 1, 2, \dots, L - 1\}$.

Proof. It is straightforward due to Corollary 12.

Following corollary states the relations between $\text{CntI}(s)$ and $\text{CntO}(s) + \text{CntI}(s) = |s|$, $s \in \text{Set}_{\text{RD}}$. Indeed, $\text{CntI}(s)$ is the count of $((3 * x + 1)/2)$ that equals the count of $3 * x + 1$ computation, and $\text{CntO}(s) + \text{CntI}(s)$ equals the total count of $(x/2)$ computation in reduced dynamics. $\square$

Corollary 16. If $s \in \text{Set}_{\text{RD}}$, then

(1) $D \geq \lceil \log_2 3 * U \rceil$, where $U = \text{CntI}(s)$, $D = |s|$

(2) $3^U < 2^D$

Proof

(1) When $s = O$, $U = 0$, $D = 1$. $1 > \lceil \log_2 3 * 0 \rceil = 0$ by Corollary 13.

When $s \neq O$, $s \in \text{Set}_{\text{RD}} \implies D = \text{CntO}(s) + \text{CntI}(s) = \lceil \log_2 1.5 * \text{CntI}(s) \rceil + \text{CntI}(s) = \lceil \log_2 1.5 * U \rceil + U = \lceil \log_2 3 * U \rceil$ by Corollary 13.

In summary, $s \in \text{Set}_{\text{RD}} \implies D \geq \lceil \log_2 3 * U \rceil$, and note that “ $>$ ” is obtained when and only when $s = O$.

(2)

$D \geq \lceil \log_2 3 * U \rceil \implies D \geq \log_2 3^U \implies 3^U \leq 2^D \implies 3^U < 2^D$. $\square$

Corollary 17. $s \in \text{Set}_{\text{RD}}, |s| \geq 2 \implies 3^{\text{CntI}(\text{Get } S(s, 1, i))} > 2^i$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, |s| - 1$.

Proof. Let $s' = \text{Get } S(s, 1, i), i = 1, 2, \dots, |s| - 1$. Obviously, $|s'| = i$.

$s \in \text{Set}_{\text{RD}} \implies \text{CntO}(s') < \lceil \log_2 1.5 * \text{CntI}(s') \rceil \therefore$ Corollary 12

$\implies \text{CntO}(s') < \log_2 1.5 * \text{CntI}(s'), \therefore \log_2 1.5 \in \mathbb{Q}$,

$\text{CntI}(s), \text{CntO}(s) \in \mathbb{N}^*$

$\implies \text{CntO}(s') + \text{CntI}(s') < \log_2 3 * \text{CntI}(s') \quad (23)$

$\implies |s'| < \log_2 3 * \text{CntI}(s') \implies 2^{|s'|} < 3^{\text{CntI}(s')}$

$\implies 3^{\text{CntI}(\text{Get } S(s, 1, i))} > 2^i$. $\square$

Example 3. By using the conclusion in fForm corollary (Corollary 12), $CntO(s)$ can be computed from $CntI(s)$ directly as follows:

- (1) $s \in \{I, O\}^{\geq 1}, s \in \text{Set}_{RD}$,
 $CntI(s) = 1 \implies CntO(s) = \lceil \lambda *$
 $CntI(s) \rceil = \lceil \lambda * 1 \rceil = \lceil \log_2 1.5 * 1 \rceil = \lceil 0.58496250 * 1 \rceil$
 $= 1$
- (2) $s \in \{I, O\}^{\geq 1}, s \in \text{Set}_{RD}$,
 $CntI(s) = 2 \implies CntO(s) = \lceil \lambda *$
 $CntI(s) \rceil = \lceil \lambda * 2 \rceil = \lceil \log_2 1.5 * 2 \rceil = \lceil 0.58496250 * 2 \rceil$
 $= 2$
- (3) $s \in \{I, O\}^{\geq 1}, s \in \text{Set}_{RD}$,
 $CntI(s) = 3 \implies CntO(s) = \lceil \lambda *$
 $CntI(s) \rceil = \lceil \lambda * 3 \rceil = \lceil \log_2 1.5 * 3 \rceil = \lceil 0.58496250 * 3 \rceil$
 $= 2$
- (4) $s \in \{I, O\}^{\geq 1}, s \in \text{Set}_{RD}$,
 $CntI(s) = 4 \implies CntO(s) = \lceil \lambda *$
 $CntI(s) \rceil = \lceil \lambda * 4 \rceil = \lceil \log_2 1.5 * 4 \rceil = \lceil 0.58496250 * 4 \rceil$
 $= 3$

Due to inverse theorem (Theorem 9), each $s \in \text{Set}_{RD}$ cannot map to more than one residue class with the module $2^{|s|}$. Thus, a function called *InvrS* can be defined as follows.

Definition 8. Function *InvrS*($\cdot$). *InvrS*: $s \longrightarrow rs$ takes input $s = O$ or

$$s = I^{p_1} O^{q_1} I^{p_2} O^{q_2} \dots I^{p_n} O^{q_n} \in \{I, O\}^{\geq 2},$$

$$p_i, q_i \in \mathbb{N}^*, i = 1, 2, \dots, n, n \in \mathbb{N}^*$$

$$CntO(s) = \lceil \log_2 1.5 * CntI(s) \rceil, \quad (24)$$

$$CntO(s') < \lceil \log_2 1.5 * CntI(s') \rceil, s' = \text{Get } S(s, 1, k),$$

$$k = 1, 2, \dots, |s| - 1,$$

and outputs $r = [0]_2$ when $s = O$, or

$$r = \left(\left[- \sum_{i=1}^n A_i B_i C_{i-1} \right]_{2^{|s|}} \cap \left\{ x \mid x > \Psi * \frac{2^{\sum_{i=1}^n (p_i + q_i)}}{2^{\sum_{i=1}^n (p_i + q_i)} - 3^{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i}} \right\} \right), \quad (25)$$

when $|s| \geq 2$, where $A_i = 3^{p_i} - 2^{p_i}$, $B_i = (3^{\sum_{j=1}^i p_j})^{-1} \bmod C_n$, $C_i = 2^{\sum_{j=1}^i (p_j + q_j)}$, $C_0 = 1$, $\Psi = \prod_{i=2}^n a_i b_1 + \prod_{i=3}^n a_i b_2 + \dots + \prod_{i=n-1}^n a_i b_{n-2} + \prod_{i=n}^n a_i b_{n-1} + b_n$, $a_i = (3^{p_i} / 2^{p_i + q_i})$, and $b_i = ((3^{p_i} - 2^{p_i}) / 2^{p_i + q_i})$.

The following corollary states that *InvrS*($\cdot$) is injective. It is straightforward because the reduced dynamics of a starting integer is unique (Proposition 3).

Corollary 18. $\forall s_1, s_2 \in \text{Set}_{RD}, s_1 \neq s_2 \implies r_1 \neq r_2$, where $r_1 = \text{InvrS}(s_1)$ and $r_2 = \text{InvrS}(s_2)$.

Proof. It is straightforward by proving converse-negative proposition:

$$r_1 = r_2 \implies \text{RD}[x \in r_1] = \text{RD}[x \in r_2] \implies s_1 = s_2. \quad (26)$$

If *InvrS*($\cdot$) is surjective, then Collatz conjecture will be true. That is, if $\cup_{s \in \text{Set}_{RD}} \text{InvrS}(s) = \mathbb{N}^*$, then Collatz conjecture

will be true. However, it is difficult to be proved because each residue class is partial due to the requirement of $\{x \mid x > \Psi * (2^{\sum_{i=1}^n (p_i + q_i)} / (2^{\sum_{i=1}^n (p_i + q_i)} - 3^{\sum_{i=1}^n p_i}))\}$.

(Thanks to the period theorem that is proved in [9]; this requirement can be omitted. Besides, all the above conclusions, e.g., subset theorem (Theorem 3), prefix-free theorem (Theorem 8), form corollary (Corollary 12), and Inverse theorem (Theorem 9), can be observed in my proposed tree-based graph to present reduced dynamics [5]). $\square$

4. Conclusion

We use $\text{RD}[x]$ to denote the reduced dynamics of x , which is represented by a sequence of computation of “I” or “O,” where “I” denotes $((3 * x + 1) / 2)$ and “O” denotes $(x / 2)$.

This paper discovered and proved two major facts as follows:

- (1) The relation between the count of $(x/2)$ (i.e., “O”) and the count of $((3 * x + 1) / 2)$ (i.e., “I”) in any reduced dynamics is proved by form corollary (Corollary 12). That is, given any $s \in \{I, O\}^{\geq 1}$, the sufficient and necessary condition for $s \in \text{Set}_{RD}$ is as follows:

$$(i) |s| = 1, s = O$$

$$(ii) |s| \geq 2,$$

$$CntO(s) = \lceil \lambda * CntI(s) \rceil, \lambda =$$

$$\log_2 1.5, CntO(s') < \lceil \lambda * CntI(s') \rceil, s' =$$

$$\text{Get } S(s, 1, i), i = 1, 2, \dots, |s| - 1$$

Therefore, any reduced dynamics can be generated by guaranteeing sufficient and necessary condition in form Corollary, instead of by enumerating all integers one by one and computing concrete Collatz transformations step by step. That is, $\text{Set}_{RD} = \{O\} \cup \{s \mid s \in \{I, O\}^L, L \in \mathbb{N}^*, L \geq 2, CntO(s) = \lceil \lambda * CntI(s) \rceil, CntO(s') < \lceil \lambda * CntI(s') \rceil, s' = \text{Get } S(s, 1, i), i = 1, 2, \dots, L - 1\}$.

If $CntO(s) = \lceil \lambda * CntI(s) \rceil$, then reduced dynamics will be available. That is, if and only if the count of “O” is larger than $\lambda = \log_2 1.5$ times the count of “I,” then reduced dynamics will be available (i.e., transformed integer will be less than starting integer immediately).

The count of $(x/2)$ equals $CntO(s) + CntI(s)$ and the count of $3 * x + 1$ equals $CntI(s)$. $CntO(s) + CntI(s) = \lceil \lambda * CntI(s) \rceil + CntI(s) = \lceil \lambda * CntI(s) + CntI(s) \rceil = \lceil (\lambda + 1) * CntI(s) \rceil$. In other words, if and only if the count of $(x/2)$ computation over the count of $3 * x + 1$ computation is larger than $\lambda + 1 = \log_2 1.5 + 1 = \log_2 3 = (\ln 3 / \ln 2)$, then the transformed integer will be less than the starting integer.

- (2) Given a reduced dynamics, a residue class of the starting integer can be derived by inverse theorem (Theorem 9). That is, given $s \in \text{Set}_{RD}$, a residue class r can be calculated from s directly by proposed formula (algorithm), such that $\text{RD}[x \in r] = s$, where the module of r is $2^{|s|}$ (for sufficient large x).

Data Availability

Previously reported data were used to support this study, and these prior studies (and datasets) are cited at relevant places within the text as references.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

Acknowledgments

This research was financially supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (no. 61972366), Major Scientific and Technological Special Project of Guizhou Province (no. 20183001), and the Foundation of Guizhou Provincial Key Laboratory of Public Big Data (nos. 2018BDKFJJ009, 2019BDKFJJ003, and 2019BDKFJJ011).

Supplementary Materials

The appendix is the proof of a lemma. (*Supplementary Materials*)

References

- [1] T. O. e. Silva, "Maximum excursion and stopping time record-holders for the $3x + 1$ problem: computational results," *Mathematics of Computation*, vol. 68, no. 225, pp. 371–385, 1999.
- [2] T. O. e. Silva, "Empirical verification of the $3x + 1$ and related conjectures," in *The Ultimate Challenge: The $3x + 1$ Problem*, pp. 189–207, AMS, Providence, RI, USA, 2010.
- [3] W. Ren, S. Li, R. Xiao, and W. Bi, "Collatz conjecture for $2^{100000} - 1$ is true—algorithms for verifying extremely large numbers," in *Proceedings of 2018 IEEE UIC*, pp. 411–416, Guangzhou, China, October 2018.
- [4] W. Ren, "A new approach on proving Collatz conjecture," *Journal of Mathematics*, vol. 2019, Article ID 6129836, 12 pages, 2019.
- [5] W. Ren, "Ratio and partition are revealed in proposed graph on reduced Collatz dynamics," in *Proceedings of 2019 IEEE ISPA*, pp. 474–483, Xiamen, China, December 2019.
- [6] W. Ren and R. Xiao, "How to fast verify Collatz conjecture by automata," in *Proceedings of 2019 IEEE HPCC*, pp. 2720–2729, Zhangjiajie, China, August 2019.
- [7] W. Ren, "Reduced Collatz dynamics data reveals properties for the future proof of Collatz conjecture," *Data*, vol. 4, no. 2, p. 89, 2019.
- [8] W. Ren, "Collatz dynamics is partitioned by residue class regularly," *Information and Computation*, 2019, in Submission.
- [9] W. Ren, "Reduced Collatz dynamics is periodical and the period equals 2 to the power of the count of $x/2$," *Journal of Number Theory*, 2020, in Submission.