

# REPDIGITS AS PRODUCTS OF CONSECUTIVE BALANCING OR LUCAS-BALANCING NUMBERS

SAI GOPAL RAYAGURU AND GOPAL KRISHNA PANDA

ABSTRACT. Repdigits are natural numbers formed by the repetition of a single digit. In this paper, we explore the presence of repdigits in the product of consecutive-balancing or Lucas-balancing numbers.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The balancing sequence  $\{B_n : n \geq 0\}$  and the Lucas-balancing sequence  $\{C_n : n \geq 0\}$  are solutions of the binary recurrence  $x_{n+1} = 6x_n - x_{n-1}$  with initial terms  $B_0 = 0, B_1 = 1$ , and  $C_0 = 1, C_1 = 3$ , respectively. The balancing sequence is a variant of the sequence of natural numbers since natural numbers are solutions of the binary recurrence  $x_{n+1} = 2x_n - x_{n-1}$  with initial terms  $x_0 = 0$  and  $x_1 = 1$ . The balancing numbers have certain properties identical with those of natural numbers [9]. It is important to note that the balancing sequence is a strong divisibility sequence, that is,  $B_m \mid B_n$  if and only if  $m \mid n$  [6].

In 2004, Liptai [2] searched for Fibonacci numbers in the balancing sequence and observed that 1 is the only number of this type. In a recent paper [5], the second author proved that there is no perfect square in the balancing sequence other than 1. Subsequently, Panda and Davala [7] verified that 6 is the only balancing number that is also a perfect number.

For a given integer  $g > 1$ , a number of the form  $N = a\left(\frac{g^m - 1}{g - 1}\right)$  for some  $m \geq 1$ , where  $a \in \{1, 2, \dots, g - 1\}$  is called a repdigit with respect to base  $g$  or  $g$ -repdigit. For  $g = 10$ ,  $N$  is called a repdigit and if, in addition,  $a = 1$ , then  $N$  is called a repunit. Luca [3] identified the repdigits in Fibonacci and Lucas sequences. Subsequently, Faye and Luca [1] explored all repdigits in Pell and Pell-Lucas sequences. Marques and Togbé [4] searched for the repdigits that are products of consecutive Fibonacci numbers. In this paper, we search for repdigits in the balancing and Lucas-balancing sequences. In addition, we explore repdigits that are products of consecutive-balancing or Lucas-balancing numbers.

## 2. MAIN RESULTS

In this section, we prove some theorems assuring the absence of certain classes of repdigits in the balancing and Lucas-balancing sequences. As generalizations, we also show that the product of consecutive-balancing or Lucas-balancing numbers is never a repdigit with more than one digit.

In the balancing sequence, the first two balancing numbers  $B_1 = 1$  and  $B_2 = 6$  are repdigits. We have checked the next 200 balancing numbers, but none is a repdigit. The following theorem excludes the presence of some specific types of repdigits in the balancing sequence.

**Theorem 2.1.** *If  $m$ ,  $n$ , and  $a$  are natural numbers,  $m \geq 2$ ,  $a \neq 6$ , and  $1 \leq a \leq 9$ , then the Diophantine equation*

$$B_n = a \left( \frac{10^m - 1}{9} \right) \tag{2.1}$$

*has no solution.*

*Proof.* To prove this theorem, we need all the least residues of the balancing sequence modulo 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 11, and 20 (see [8]). We list them in the following table.

| Row no. | $m$ | $B_n \bmod m$                            | Period |
|---------|-----|--|--------|
| 1       | 3   | 0, 1, 0, 2                               | 4      |
| 2       | 4   | 0, 1, 2, 3                               | 4      |
| 3       | 5   | 0, 1, 1, 0, 4, 4                         | 6      |
| 4       | 7   | 0, 1, 6                                  | 3      |
| 5       | 8   | 0, 1, 6, 3, 4, 5, 2, 7                   | 8      |
| 6       | 9   | 0, 1, 6, 8, 6, 1, 0, 8, 3, 1, 3, 8       | 12     |
| 7       | 11  | 0, 1, 6, 2, 6, 1, 0, 10, 5, 9, 5, 10     | 12     |
| 8       | 20  | 0, 1, 6, 15, 4, 9, 10, 11, 16, 5, 14, 19 | 12     |

TABLE 1

Since  $m \geq 2$ , it follows that  $n \geq 3$ . We claim that  $m$  is odd. Observe that if  $m$  is even, then

$$11 \mid \left\lfloor \frac{10^m - 1}{9} \right\rfloor B_n$$

and from the seventh row of Table 1, it follows that  $6 \mid n$  and consequently  $B_6 \mid B_n$ . Since  $10 \mid B_6$ , it follows that  $10 \mid B_n = a \cdot \frac{10^m - 1}{9}$ , which is a contradiction. Now, to complete the proof, we distinguish eight different cases corresponding to the values of  $a$ .

Case 1:  $a = 1$ . Assume that  $B_n$  is of the form  $\frac{10^m - 1}{9}$  for some  $m$ . Since  $m$  is odd,  $B_n \equiv 1 \pmod{11}$  and also  $B_n \equiv 11 \pmod{20}$ . From the last row of Table 1, it follows that if  $B_n \equiv 11 \pmod{20}$ , then  $n \equiv 7 \pmod{12}$ . But, from the seventh row of Table 1, it follows that whenever  $n \equiv 7 \pmod{12}$ ,  $B_n \equiv 10 \pmod{11}$ , a contradiction to  $B_n \equiv 1 \pmod{11}$ . Hence, no  $B_n$  is of the form  $\frac{10^m - 1}{9}$ .

Case 2:  $a = 2$ . If  $B_n = 2 \cdot \frac{10^m - 1}{9}$ , then  $B_n \equiv 2 \pmod{5}$ . But, in view of the third row of Table 1, it follows that for no value of  $n$ ,  $B_n \equiv 2 \pmod{5}$ . Hence,  $B_n$  cannot be of the form  $2 \cdot \frac{10^m - 1}{9}$ .

Case 3:  $a = 3$ . If  $B_n = 3 \cdot \frac{10^m - 1}{9}$ , then  $B_n \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ . But, in view of the first row of Table 1,  $n \equiv 0, 2 \pmod{4}$ . So,  $B_2 \mid B_n$ , and consequently,  $2 \mid \frac{10^m - 1}{9}$ , which is a contradiction. Hence,  $B_n$  cannot be of the form  $3 \cdot \frac{10^m - 1}{9}$ .

Case 4:  $a = 4$ . If  $B_n = 4 \cdot \frac{10^m - 1}{9}$ , then  $B_n \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$  and, in view of the second row of Table 1,  $4 \mid n$ , which implies  $B_4 \mid B_n$ . Since  $17 \mid B_4$ , it follows that  $17 \mid (10^m - 1)$ . But this is possible if  $16 \mid m$ , which is a contradiction, since  $m$  is odd. Hence,  $B_n$  cannot be of the form  $B_n = 4 \cdot \frac{10^m - 1}{9}$ .

Case 5:  $a = 5$ . If  $B_n = 5 \cdot \frac{10^m-1}{9}$ , then  $B_n \equiv 0 \pmod{5}$  and in view of the third row of Table 1, this is possible only if  $3 \mid n$ . Hence,  $B_3 \mid B_n$  and since  $7 \mid B_3$ , it follows that  $7 \mid \frac{10^m-1}{9}$ , which implies that  $6 \mid m$ , a contradiction since  $m$  is odd. Hence,  $B_n$  cannot be of the form  $B_n = 5 \cdot \frac{10^m-1}{9}$ .

Case 6:  $a = 7$ . If  $B_n = 7 \cdot \frac{10^m-1}{9}$ , then  $B_n \equiv 0 \pmod{7}$  and, in view of the fourth row of Table 1, this is possible only if  $3 \mid n$ . Hence,  $B_3 \mid B_n$  and since  $5 \mid B_3$ , it follows that  $5 \mid \frac{10^m-1}{9}$ , which is a contradiction. Hence,  $B_n$  cannot be of the form  $B_n = 7 \cdot \frac{10^m-1}{9}$ .

Case 7:  $a = 8$ . If  $B_n = 8 \cdot \frac{10^m-1}{9}$ , then  $B_n \equiv 0 \pmod{8}$ , and in view of the fifth row of Table 1, this is possible only if  $8 \mid n$ . Hence,  $B_8 \mid B_n$  and since  $17 \mid B_8$ , it follows that  $17 \mid (10^m - 1)$ . But this is possible if  $16 \mid m$ , which is a contradiction, since  $m$  is odd. Hence,  $B_n$  cannot be of the form  $B_n = 8 \cdot \frac{10^m-1}{9}$ .

Case 8:  $a = 9$ . If  $B_n = 9 \cdot \frac{10^m-1}{9}$ , then  $B_n \equiv 0 \pmod{9}$  and, in view of the sixth row of Table 1, this is possible only if  $6 \mid n$ . Consequently,  $B_6 \mid B_n$  and since  $11 \mid B_6$ , it follows that  $11 \mid \frac{10^m-1}{9}$ . But this is possible only if  $m$  is even, which is a contradiction since  $m$  is odd. Hence,  $B_n$  cannot be of the form  $B_n = 9 \cdot \frac{10^m-1}{9}$ .

Thus, (2.1) has no solution if  $m \geq 2$  and  $a \neq 6$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

Next, we study the presence of repdigits in the products of consecutive balancing numbers. The product  $B_1B_2 = 6$  is a repdigit. So, a natural question is: "Is there any other repdigit that is a consecutive product of balancing numbers?" In the following theorem, we answer this question in negative.

**Theorem 2.2.** *If  $m, n, k$ , and  $a$  are natural numbers such that  $m > 1$  and  $1 \leq a \leq 9$ , then the Diophantine equation*

$$B_n B_{n+1} \cdots B_{n+k} = a \left( \frac{10^m - 1}{9} \right) \quad (2.2)$$

has no solution.

*Proof.* First, we show that (2.2) has no solution for  $k \geq 2$ . Assume, to the contrary that (2.2) has a solution in positive integers  $n, m$ , and  $a$  for  $k \geq 2$ . Then,  $2 \mid (n+i)$  and  $3 \mid (n+j)$  for some  $i, j \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$ . Since  $2 \mid B_2$  and  $5 \mid B_3$ , it follows that  $2 \mid B_{n+i}$  and  $5 \mid B_{n+j}$ . Hence,  $10 \mid B_n B_{n+1} \cdots B_{n+k} = a \left( \frac{10^m-1}{9} \right)$ , which is a contradiction. Hence, (2.2) has no solution for  $k \geq 2$ .

Next, we show that (2.2) has no solution if  $k = 1$ . If  $k = 1$ , (2.2) reduces to

$$B_n B_{n+1} = a \left( \frac{10^m - 1}{9} \right).$$

One of  $n$  and  $n+1$  is even and consequently, either  $B_n$  or  $B_{n+1}$  is also even. Hence,  $a \in \{2, 4, 6, 8\}$ . Since  $m > 1$ ,  $B_n B_{n+1} \geq 11$  and hence,  $n$  must be greater than 1.

In the following table, we list all the least residues of  $B_n B_{n+1}$  modulo 5 and 100, which will be useful in the proof.

If  $a = 2$  or  $a = 4$ , then

$$B_n B_{n+1} = a \cdot \frac{10^m - 1}{9} \equiv a \pmod{5}.$$

| $m$ | $B_n B_{n+1} \pmod m$  | Period |
|-----|--|--------|
| 5   | 0, 1, 0  | 3      |
| 100 | 0, 6, 10, 40, 56, 70, 30, 56, 80, 70, 6, 40, 60, 6, 50, 0, 56, 10, 90, 56, 20, 30, 6, 80, 20, 6, 90, 60, 56, 50, 50, 56, 60, 90, 6, 20, 80, 6, 30, 20, 56, 90, 10, 56, 0, 50, 6, 60, 40, 6, 70, 80, 56, 30, 70, 56, 40, 10, 6, 0 | 60     |

TABLE 2

If  $a = 8$ , then

$$B_n B_{n+1} = 8 \cdot \frac{10^m - 1}{9} \equiv 3 \pmod 5.$$

Similarly, if  $a = 6$ , then

$$B_n B_{n+1} = 6 \cdot \frac{10^m - 1}{9} \equiv 66 \pmod{100}.$$

Since the least residues of the last three congruences do not appear in the appropriate row of Table 2, it follows that  $B_n B_{n+1}$  is not a repdigit if  $n > 1$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

In Theorem 2.1, we proved the absence of certain types of repdigits in the sequence of balancing numbers. However, in the case of Lucas-balancing numbers,  $C_1 = 3$  and  $C_3 = 99$  are two known repdigits. Thus, a natural question is: “Does this sequence contain any other larger repdigit?” In the following theorem, we answer this question in negative.

**Theorem 2.3.** *If  $m, n$ , and  $a$  are natural numbers and  $1 \leq a \leq 9$ , then the Diophantine equation*

$$C_n = a \left( \frac{10^m - 1}{9} \right) \tag{2.3}$$

*has the only solutions  $(m, n, a) = (1, 1, 3), (2, 3, 9)$ .*

*Proof.* To prove this theorem, we need all the least residues of the Lucas-balancing sequence modulo 5, 7, and 8. We list them in the following table.

| Row no. | $m$ | $C_n \pmod m$    | Period |
|---------|-----|------------------|--------|
| 1       | 5   | 1, 3, 2, 4, 2, 3 | 6      |
| 2       | 7   | 1, 3, 3          | 3      |
| 3       | 8   | 1, 3             | 2      |

TABLE 3

Among the first three Lucas-balancing numbers,  $C_1 = 3$  and  $C_3 = 99$  are repdigits and (2.3) is satisfied for  $(m, n, a) = (1, 1, 3), (2, 3, 9)$ . Now, let  $n \geq 4$  and hence,  $m \geq 3$ . Since  $C_n$  is always odd,  $a \in \{1, 3, 5, 7, 9\}$ . Since no zero appears in the first two rows of Table 3, it follows that  $C_n$  is not divisible by 5 or 7 and hence, the possible values of  $a$  are limited to 1, 3, and 9.

If  $a \in \{1, 9\}$ , then

$$C_n = a \cdot \frac{10^m - 1}{9} \equiv 10^m - 1 \equiv 7 \pmod 8.$$

Similarly, if  $a = 3$ , then

$$C_n = 3 \cdot \frac{10^m - 1}{9} \equiv 5 \pmod{8}.$$

Since, the least residues 5 and 7 do not appear in the last row of Table 3, it follows that (2.3) has no solution for  $n > 3$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

In Theorem 2.2, we noticed that no product of consecutive balancing numbers is a repdigit with more than one digit, although the only product  $B_1B_2 = 6$  is a single digit repdigit. The following theorem negates the possibility of any repdigit as the product of consecutive Lucas-balancing numbers.

**Theorem 2.4.** *If  $m, n, k$ , and  $a$  are natural numbers and  $1 \leq a \leq 9$ , then the Diophantine equation*

$$C_n C_{n+1} \cdots C_{n+k} = a \left( \frac{10^m - 1}{9} \right) \tag{2.4}$$

*has no solution.*

*Proof.* All the Lucas-balancing numbers are odd and, in view of (2.4),  $a \in \{1, 3, 5, 7, 9\}$ . It is easy to see that (2.4) has no solution if  $m = 1, 2$ . In the following table, we list all the nonnegative residues of Lucas-balancing numbers and their consecutive product, modulo 5, 7, and 8, which will play an important role in proving this theorem.

| $m$ | $C_n \pmod{m}$   | $C_n C_{n+1} \cdots C_{n+k} \pmod{m}$ |
|-----|------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 5   | 1, 3, 2, 4, 2, 3 | $\in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$                  |
| 7   | 1, 3, 3          | $\in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$            |
| 8   | 1, 3             | $\in \{1, 3\}$                        |

TABLE 4

For  $m \geq 3$ ,  $C_n C_{n+1} \cdots C_{n+k} = a \left( \frac{10^m - 1}{9} \right) \equiv 7a \pmod{8}$ . But from the last row of Table 4, it follows that  $7a \equiv 1, 3 \pmod{8}$  and hence,  $a = 5$  or  $a = 7$ . Now, reducing (2.4) modulo  $a$ , we get  $C_n C_{n+1} \cdots C_{n+k} \equiv 0 \pmod{a}$ . Since, 0 does not appear as a residue of  $C_n C_{n+1} \cdots C_{n+k}$  modulo 5 or 7, it follows that (2.4) has no solution for  $m \geq 3$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

### 3. CONCLUSION

In the last section, we noticed that the Lucas-balancing sequence contains only two repdigits, namely  $C_1 = 3$  and  $C_3 = 99$ , whereas we could not explore all repdigits in the balancing sequence. In Theorem 2.1, we proved that  $B_n$  is not a repdigit ( $B_n \neq a \left( \frac{10^m - 1}{9} \right)$ ), with more than one digit, if  $a \neq 6$ . Thus, repdigits in the balancing sequence having all digits 6 is yet unexplored. In this connection, one can verify that if  $n \not\equiv 14 \pmod{96}$ , then  $B_n$  is not a repdigit. Further, if  $m \not\equiv 1 \pmod{6}$ , then also  $B_n$  is not a repdigit. We believe that,  $B_1 = 1$  and  $B_2 = 6$  are the only repdigits in the balancing sequence. It is still an open problem to prove the existence or nonexistence of repdigits that are 6 times of some repunit other than  $B_2 = 6$ .

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

We thank the anonymous referee whose comments helped us in improving the paper to a great extent.

## REFERENCES

- [1] B. Faye and F. Luca, *Pell and Pell-lucas numbers with only one distinct digit*, Ann. Math. Inform., **45** (2015), 55–60.
- [2] K. Liptai, *Fibonacci balancing numbers*, The Fibonacci Quarterly, **42.4** (2004), 330–340.
- [3] F. Luca, *Fibonacci and Lucas numbers with only one distinct digit*, Port. Math., **57** (2000), 243–254.
- [4] D. Marques and A. Togbé, *On repdigits as product of consecutive Fibonacci numbers*, Rend. Istit. Mat. Univ. Trieste, **44** (2012), 393–397.
- [5] G. K. Panda, *Arithmetic progression of squares and solvability of the Diophantine equation  $8x^4 + 1 = y^2$* , East-West J. Math., **14.2** (2012), 131–137.
- [6] G. K. Panda, *Some fascinating properties of balancing numbers*, Congr. Numer., **194** (2009), 185–189.
- [7] G. K. Panda and R. K. Davala, *Perfect balancing numbers*, The Fibonacci Quarterly, **53.2** (2015), 261–264.
- [8] G. K. Panda and S. S. Rout, *Periodicity of balancing numbers*, Acta Math. Hungar., **143.2** (2014), 274–286.
- [9] P. K. Ray, *Balancing and Cobalancing Numbers*, Ph.D. Thesis, National Institute of Technology, Rourkela, 2009.

MSC2010: 11B39, 11A63, 11B50.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, ROURKELA-769008, ODISHA, INDIA

*E-mail address:* saigopalrs@gmail.com

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, ROURKELA-769008, ODISHA, INDIA

*E-mail address:* gkpanda\_nit@rediffmail.com