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In a recent paper [1], J. L. Brown, Jr., and R. L. Duncan showed that the sequence $\left\{\ell n F_{n}\right\}$ is uniformly distributed modulo 1 (u.d. mod 1), where en denotes the natural logarithm and $F_{n}$ is the $n^{\text {th }}$ Fibonacci number. In this paper we show that some modifications of these ideas have some interesting consequences concerning the distribution of the first digits of the Fibonacci numbers. This also answers a question raised in Problem $\mathrm{H}-125$.

It has been noticed, and proved in the probabilitic or measure theoretic sense, that the proportion of physical constants whose first significant digit is less than or equal to a given digit a (in base 10), is $\log _{10}(1+a)$. See [2], [4]. We will show that a wide class of sequences, including the Fibonacci numbers, have a natural density satisfying a similar distribution. Hence, roughly speaking, a large percentage of the Fibonacci numbers have a small first digit.
Let $b$ be a given positive integer. All of our numbers will now be written in base $b$. Let $\left\{a_{n}\right\}$ be a given sequence of positive numbers. For any digit $d$ in base $b$, let $x_{d}=$ number of $n \leqslant x$ such that the first digit of $a_{n}$ is $\leqslant d$. More generally, if

$$
a=a_{0} b^{k}+a_{1} b^{k-1}+\ldots, \quad a_{0} \neq 0,
$$

define

$$
a^{*}=a b^{-k} \quad ;
$$

so that $1 \leqslant a^{*}<b$ and $a$ and $a^{*}$ have the same digits. Then if $\lambda$ is any number $1 \leqslant \lambda \leqslant b$, define $x_{\lambda}=$ the number of $n \leqslant x$ such that $a_{n}^{*} \leqslant \lambda$. Also, let $x_{\lambda}(k)=$ the number of $n \leqslant x$ such that $b^{k} \leqslant a_{n} \leqslant \lambda b^{k}$. Hence

$$
x_{\lambda}=\sum x_{\lambda}(k)
$$

We will say that a sequence $\left\{a_{n}\right\}$ is logarithmicly distributed (LD) if $x_{\lambda} \sim x \log \lambda$, where $\log$ means $\log _{b}$. The connection between this type of distribution of first digits and uniform distribution mod 1 is given by:
Theorem 1. $\left\{a_{n}\right\}$ is LD in base $b$ if and only if $\left\{\log a_{n}\right\}$ is u.d. mod 1.
Proof. $1 \leqslant a_{n}^{*} \leqslant \lambda$, if and only if $b^{k} \leqslant a_{n} \leqslant \lambda b^{k}$ for some integer $k$, if and only if $k \leqslant \log a_{n} \leqslant k+\log \lambda$ for some integer $k$, if and only if $\left(\log a_{n}\right) \leqslant \log \lambda$, where $(m)$ denotes the fractional part of $m$. Hence $x_{\lambda}=$ number of $n \leqslant x$ such that $\left(\log a_{n}\right) \leqslant \log \lambda$, and so $x_{\lambda} \sim x \log \lambda$ if and only if $\left\{\log a_{n}\right\}$ is u.d. $\bmod 1$.
Corollary 1. $\left\{a^{n}\right\}$ is LD if and only if $a$ is not a rational power of $b$.
Proof. This follows immediately from the fact that $\{n \log a\}$ is $u . d . \bmod 1$ if and only if $\log a$ is irrational [3].
This last result follows from Weyl's theorem that $\left\{\beta_{j}\right\}$ is u.d. mod 1 if and only if

$$
\lim _{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} e^{2 \pi i h \beta_{j}}=0
$$

for all integers $h>0$ [3].
Using Weyl's theorem and results concerning trigonometric sums, we can show that sequences such as $\left\{a^{p_{n}}\right\}$ and $\left\{n^{n}\right\}$ are LD where $p_{n}$ denotes the $n^{\text {th }}$ prime.

The following results can be proved using Weyl's theorem, but they can also be obtained directly from the definition of $x_{\lambda}$ without recourse to any considerations of uniform distribution.
Theorem 2. If $\left\{a_{n}\right\}$ is $L D$ then
(i) $\left\{c a_{n}\right\}$ is LD for all constants $c>0$,
(ii) $\left\{a_{n}^{k}\right\}$ is $L D$ for all positive integers $k$
(iii) $\left\{1 / a_{n}\right\}$ is LD
(iv) $\left\{\beta_{n}\right\}$ is LD if $\beta_{n} \sim a_{n}$.

Proof. We illustrate the methods used by proving (iii).
Let $S=\left\{a_{n}\right\}$ be LD and let $S^{\prime}=\left\{1 / a_{n}\right\}$. Let $x_{\lambda}$ refer to $S, x_{\lambda}^{\prime}$ refer to $S^{\prime}$, etc. Then

$$
b^{k} \leqslant \frac{1}{a_{n}} \leqslant \lambda b^{k}
$$

if and only if

$$
\frac{1}{\lambda} b^{-k} \leqslant a_{n} \leqslant b^{-k}
$$

hence

$$
x_{\lambda}^{\prime}(k)=x_{b}(-k-1)-x_{b / \lambda}(-k-1)
$$

which implies

$$
\begin{aligned}
x_{\lambda}^{\prime} & =\sum x_{\lambda}^{\prime}(k)=\sum x_{b}(-k-1)-x_{b \lambda}(-k-1) \\
& =x_{b}-x_{b \lambda} \sim x-x \log (b / \lambda) \sim x \log \lambda .
\end{aligned}
$$

We are now ready to show:
Theorem 3. $\left\{F_{n}\right\}$ is LD.
Proof.

$$
F_{n}=\frac{\left(\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}\right)^{n}-\left(\frac{1-\sqrt{5}}{2}\right)^{n}}{\sqrt{5}}
$$

Since

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(\frac{1-\sqrt{5}}{2}\right)^{n} \rightarrow 0 \\
& F_{n} \sim \frac{\left(\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}\right)^{n}}{\sqrt{5}}
\end{aligned}
$$

Now

$$
\left(\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}\right)^{n}
$$

is LD by Corollary 1 ,

$$
\frac{\left(\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}\right)^{n}}{\sqrt{5}}
$$

is LD by Theorem 2-(i), and so $F_{n}$ is LD by Theorem 2-(iv).
Theorem 3 is easily extended to other recurrence sequences.
It should also be noted that examples can be constructed which show that

$$
\left\{a_{n}\right\} \quad \text { and } \quad\left\{\beta_{n}\right\}
$$

LD does not imply that any of

$$
\left\{a_{n}^{1 / k}\right\}, \quad\left\{a_{n} \beta_{n}\right\}, \quad \text { or } \quad\left\{a_{n}+\beta_{n}\right\}
$$

are LD. It might be interesting to obtain necessary and/or sufficient conditions for these implications to hold.
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if and only if

$$
\begin{aligned}
& (-1 / a) \neq(-1 / b)=-1 ; \\
& ((-1 / a) /(-1 /-b))=-1
\end{aligned}
$$

if and only if

$$
\begin{aligned}
(-1 / a) \neq(-1 / b) & =1 ; \\
((-1 /-a) /(-1 /-b)) & =-1
\end{aligned}
$$

if and only if

$$
(-1 / a)=(-1 / b)=1
$$

Now stipulate that

$$
(a /-1)=(b /-1)=1
$$

Then, by the classic Law of Quadratic Reciprocity,

$$
\begin{equation*}
(a / b)(b / a)=((-1 / a) /(-1 / b)) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

But

$$
(-a / b)=(a / b)(-1 / b)
$$

and

$$
(b /-a)=(b / a)(b /-1)
$$

Since $(b /-1)=1$, therefore
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