

# A Mathematical Reformulation of the Collatz Conjecture: Final Report and Roadmap

Author: Imad Aissani — Université de Guelma

Contact: imadarc95@gmail.com

Date: 2025-10-09 UTC

## Executive Summary

We developed a hybrid analytic-computational framework that reformulates Collatz trajectories via the Diophantine identity  $2^S C = 3^r N + 1$  and its logarithmic form  $\Lambda = r \cdot \ln 3 - S \cdot \ln 2 = \ln(1 + 1/(3^r N))$ . This document summarizes work completed, derivations, computational workflow, and the advanced experimental stage where the project paused pending large-scale runs.

### 1. Key derivation (step-by-step)

Start from an initial integer  $N$  and consider a finite prefix of its Collatz trajectory that applies  $r$  odd steps  $(3n+1)$  and interleaved halving runs. Let  $b_j \geq 0$  be the number of immediate halving steps after the  $j$ -th odd step. Define  $B_j = \sum_{i=1}^j b_i$  and  $S = \sum_{i=1}^r b_i$  the total number of halvings. Writing the contribution of each odd step in place value yields:  $3^r N + \sum_{j=1}^r 3^{r-j} 2^{B_j} = 2^S C$ , where  $C = \sum_{j=1}^r 2^{B_j - S}$  is a positive integer aggregating the shift-pattern. Rearranging gives  $2^S C = 3^r N + 1$ .

### 2. Logarithmic linear form and Matveev application

From the main identity divide both sides by  $3^r N$  and take logarithms to obtain  $\Lambda = r \ln 3 - S \ln 2 = \ln(1 + 1/(3^r N))$ . Matveev's theorem gives explicit lower bounds for  $|\Lambda|$  (if nonzero) in terms of heights. The computational strategy compares an upper bound  $U = \ln(1 + 1/(3^r N))$  with a Matveev lower bound  $L_{\text{mat}}$ ; if  $L_{\text{mat}} > U$  the pair is ruled out.



### 3. Detailed computational workflow (step-by-step)

1. Theoretical preprocessing: compute convergents of  $\ln 3 / \ln 2$  and estimate thresholds  $(R_0, S_0)$  via Matveev inequalities.
2. Modular sieving: for primes  $p$  up to  $P_{\max}$  precompute residues  $2^S \bmod p$  and  $3^r \bmod p$ ; eliminate mismatches.
3. Baker–Davenport reduction: use continued fraction convergents to shrink windows.
4. Beam-guided DP search: construct  $C$  via DP, prune by residue scores.
5. ECM factorization: factor  $D = 2^S - 3^r$  where helpful.
6. LLL refinement: use lattice reduction to find contradictions.
7. Distributed execution: split  $r$  ranges across nodes with checkpointing.
8. Final certification: emit witnesses or exclusion certificates.

### 4. Flowchart (textual)

Preprocess → Modular Sieve → Baker–Davenport → Beam DP → ECM / LLL → Distributed Run → Certification

### 5. Implementation deliverables and commands

We prepared a C/GMP OpenMP implementation with checkpointing (file: `collatz_beam.c`).

Recommended build and run commands:

```
$ gcc -O3 -march=native -fopenmp -lgmp -o collatz_beam collatz_beam.c
$ ./collatz_beam -r 31867 -S 50508 -block 50 -beam 200 -threads 16 -checkpoint
/data/ckpt.tsv -runtime 43200
```

Checkpoint files are plain-text and contain hex-coded mpz numbers for independent replay.

### 6. Proof sketches and rigorous components

- A. Exact derivation of main identity is algebraic and contains no approximation.
- B. Upper bound:  $|\Lambda| \leq 1/(3^r N)$ .
- C. Matveev lower bound: existence of effective lower bound  $Q^{-A}$  for nonzero  $\Lambda$ . Compute  $Q^{-A}$  and compare with upper bound.
- D. If Matveev lower bound exceeds upper bound, contradiction, hence parameter excluded.

### 7. Resources, timeline and checkpoints

Minimal recommended cluster: 16 cores, 64 GB RAM, 1 TB SSD. Suggested timeline: preparatory analysis 1 week; modular sieving 2–7 days; beam-search 3–10 days; final LLL/Matveev tightening 1–2 weeks.



## Contact and next steps

Author: Imad Aissani — Université de Guelma

Contact email: [imadarc95@gmail.com](mailto:imadarc95@gmail.com)

Next step: provision an HPC instance or provide system access to run distributed checkpoints; alternatively we package the executable and scripts for immediate deployment.

---- End of report ----