

## A REMARK ON THE CONTINUED FRACTIONS OF CONJUGATE ALGEBRAIC NUMBERS

door K. Mähler (Manchester)

In the theory of continued fractions, two real numbers  $\xi_0$  and  $\xi_1$  are called *equivalent*:  $\xi_0 \sim \xi_1$ , if their regular continued fractions

$$\xi_0 = b_0 + \frac{1}{|b_1|} + \frac{1}{|b_2|} + \dots, \quad \xi_1 = b_0' + \frac{1}{|b_1'|} + \frac{1}{|b_2'|} + \dots$$

are identical except for at most a finite number of terms, i.e. if

$$b_k = b_{k+r}' \text{ for some } r \text{ and for all sufficiently large } k.$$

The following theorem has been proved: <sup>1)</sup>

The two numbers  $\xi_0$  and  $\xi_1$  are equivalent if and only if there are four integers  $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$  of determinant  $\alpha\delta - \beta\gamma = \mp 1$  such that

$$(1): \quad \xi_1 = s(\xi_0), \text{ where } s(x) = \frac{\alpha x + \beta}{\gamma x + \delta} \neq x.$$

By means of a classical method of ABEL <sup>2)</sup>, we construct in this note all irreducible algebraic equations

$$(2): \quad f(x) \equiv a_0 x^n + a_1 x^{n-1} + \dots + a_n = 0 \quad (a_0 \neq 0)$$

with integral coefficients and of degree  $n \geq 2$ , with the property of admitting two different real equivalent roots  $\xi_0$  and  $\xi_1$ . This construction proceeds as follows:

Denote by

$$s^2(x) = s(s(x)), \quad s^3(x) = s^2(s(x)), \quad s^4(x) = s^3(s(x)), \dots$$

$$g(x) = (\gamma x + \delta)^n f(s(x)),$$

$$h(x) = (\gamma x + \delta) \{x - s(x)\} = \gamma x^2 + (\delta - \alpha)x - \beta.$$

By (1), the two equations  $f(x) = 0$  and  $g(x) = 0$  have the root  $\xi_0$  in common, and so, since  $f(x)$  is irreducible, both equations have the same roots,

$$(3): \quad \xi_0, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_{n-1}$$

say, therefore all numbers

<sup>1)</sup> O. PERRON, Kettenbrüche, (1929), p. 64—65.

<sup>2)</sup> N. H. ABEL, Oeuvres I (1881), 478 f.

$$(4): \quad \xi_\nu, s(\xi_\nu), s^2(\xi_\nu), \dots \quad (\nu = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n-1)$$

belong to the finite set (3).

Next, none of the numbers (3) is a fixpoint of  $s(x)$ , i.e. a root of the equation  $h(x) = 0$ . For then  $f(x) = 0$  and  $h(x) = 0$  had a root in common, and so we should have  $n = 2$ ,  $\gamma \neq 0$ , and both equations had the same roots. This would mean, in particular, that  $\xi_0$  were a fixpoint of  $s(x)$ , i.e. that  $\xi_1 = s(\xi_0) = \xi_0$ , contrary to the hypothesis that  $\xi_1 \neq \xi_0$ .

Then, since the numbers (4) form a finite set and none of them is a fixpoint of  $s(x)$ , the substitution  $y = s(x)$  is elliptical and of finite period,  $m$  say<sup>1)</sup>; thus

$$(5): \quad s^m(x) \equiv x$$

identical in  $x$ , but

$$(6): \quad s^\mu(x) \not\equiv x \quad (\mu = 1, 2, \dots, m-1).$$

Therefore the substitution  $y = s(x)$  can be written as

$$\frac{y - \Theta_0}{y - \Theta_1} = \kappa \frac{x - \Theta_0}{x - \Theta_1},$$

where

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \Theta_0 \\ \Theta_1 \end{array} \right\} = \frac{\alpha - \delta \mp \sqrt{(\alpha + \delta)^2 - 4(\alpha\delta - \beta\gamma)}}{2\gamma}$$

are the fixpoints of  $s(x)$ , while

$$\kappa = \frac{\alpha - \gamma\Theta_0}{\alpha - \gamma\Theta_1} = \frac{\alpha + \delta + \sqrt{(\alpha + \delta)^2 - 4(\alpha\delta - \beta\gamma)}}{\alpha + \delta - \sqrt{(\alpha + \delta)^2 - 4(\alpha\delta - \beta\gamma)}}$$

is its multiplier. By (5) and (6),

$$\kappa^m = 1, \text{ but } \kappa^\mu \neq 1 \text{ if } \mu = 1, 2, \dots, m-1.$$

Therefore either  $m = 2$  and

$$\kappa = -1, \alpha + \delta = 0, \alpha\delta - \beta\gamma = \mp 1;$$

or  $m > 2$  and  $\kappa$  is non-real, hence

$$(\alpha + \delta)^2 - 4(\alpha\delta - \beta\gamma) < 0,$$

whence  $m = 3$  and

$$\kappa = \frac{-1 \mp i\sqrt{3}}{2}, \alpha + \delta = \mp 1, \alpha\delta - \beta\gamma = +1.$$

Hence, if the notation is chosen suitably, then only the following two cases arise: Either

<sup>1)</sup> KLEIN-FRICKE, *Modulfunktionen I* (1890), 164.

$$(I): m = 2, s(x) = \frac{\alpha x + \beta}{\gamma x - a} \neq x, s^2(x) \equiv x, \quad \alpha^2 + \beta\gamma = \mp 1,$$

or

$$(II): m = 3, s(x) = \frac{\alpha x + \beta}{\gamma x - (a-1)} \neq x, s^2(x) = \frac{(a-1)x + \beta}{\gamma x - a} \neq x,$$

$$s^3(x) \equiv x, (a-1)\alpha + \beta\gamma = -1.$$

The roots (3) are all different, and none is a fixpoint of  $s(x)$ ; therefore  $n$  is an integral multiple  $n = jm$  of  $m$ , and the roots (3) can be distributed among  $j$  sets

$$(7): \quad \xi_{vm}, \xi_{vm+1}, \dots, \xi_{(v+1)m-1} \quad (v = 0, 1, \dots, j-1)$$

of  $m$  roots each, such that

$$\text{in case (I),} \quad \xi_{vm+1} = s(\xi_{vm}) \quad (v=0, 1, \dots, j-1),$$

$$\text{in case (II),} \quad \xi_{vm+1} = s(\xi_{vm}), \xi_{vm+2} = s^2(\xi_{vm}) \quad (v=0, 1, \dots, j-1).$$

Put

$$\text{in case (I),} \quad \eta_v = \begin{cases} \xi_{vm} + \xi_{vm+1} & \text{if } \gamma \neq 0, \\ \xi_{vm} \xi_{vm+1} & \text{if } \gamma = 0, \end{cases}$$

$$\text{in case (II),} \quad \eta_v = \xi_{vm} + \xi_{vm+1} + \xi_{vm+2},$$

so that

$$(8): \eta_v = \Phi(\xi_{vm}) = \Phi(\xi_{vm+1}) = \dots = \Phi(\xi_{(v+1)m-1}) \quad (v=0, 1, \dots, j-1),$$

where  $\Phi(x)$  denotes the following rational functions:

$$\text{in case (I),} \quad \Phi(x) = \begin{cases} x + s(x) = \frac{\gamma x^2 + \beta}{\gamma x - a} & \text{if } \gamma \neq 0, \alpha^2 + \beta\gamma = \mp 1, \\ x s(x) = -x(x + \beta) & \text{if } \gamma = 0, a = 1, \end{cases}$$

$$\text{in case (II),} \quad \Phi(x) = x + s(x) + s^2(x) = \frac{\gamma^2 x^3 - 3(\alpha^2 - \alpha + 1)x - (2\alpha - 1)\beta}{(\gamma x - \alpha + 1)(\gamma x - \alpha)} \text{ if } \alpha(\alpha - 1) + \beta\gamma = -1.$$

In case (II),  $\gamma$  cannot vanish since the equation  $\alpha(\alpha - 1) = -1$  has no integral solutions.

From (8), the sums

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{v=0}^{j-1} \eta_v^\rho &= \sum_{v=0}^{j-1} \Phi(\xi_{vm})^\rho = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{v=0}^{j-1} \left( \Phi(\xi_{vm})^\rho + \dots + \Phi(\xi_{(v+1)m-1})^\rho \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{l=0}^{n-1} \Phi(\xi_l)^\rho, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\rho = 1, 2, 3, \dots$ , are rational *symmetrical* functions with *rational* coefficients in the roots (3) of  $f(x) = 0$ . Hence, by classical

theorems on symmetrical functions, they are themselves *rational* numbers, and so are the coefficients of the polynomial.

$$p(x) = (x - \eta_0)(x - \eta_1) \dots (x - \eta_{j-1}) = x^j + p_1 x^{j-1} + \dots + p_j.$$

Moreover, this polynomial is *irreducible*. For otherwise the root  $\eta_0$  of  $p(x) = 0$  would be of degree less than  $j$ , and so  $\xi_0$  would be of degree less than  $jm = n$ , contrary to hypothesis.

Assume, conversely, that  $\Phi(x)$  is the function defined above, that  $p(x)$  is any irreducible polynomial of degree  $j$  with rational coefficients, and that the polynomial  $f(x)$  of degree  $n = mj$  is defined as the numerator of the rational function  $p(\Phi(x))$ . Then the roots of  $f(x) = 0$  can again be distributed among  $j$  sets (7) of  $m$  roots each such that the roots in each set are connected with one and the same root  $\eta_\nu$  of  $p(x) = 0$  by the formulae (8). It is possible that  $f(x)$  is reducible; a simple discussion shows, however, that this may not happen unless  $f(x)$  is the product of  $m$  irreducible factors  $f_0(x), \dots, f_{m-1}(x)$  of degree  $j$  satisfying the identities

$$f_\mu(x) = (\gamma x + \delta)^j f_0(s^\mu(x)) \quad (\mu = 0, 1, \dots, m-1).$$

If  $p(x)$  is chosen suitably, this exceptional case does not arise, and so we conclude that our problem has solutions for every degree  $n$  which is divisible by 2 or 3.

By way of example, let  $n = m = 3$ , and put

$$s(x) = \frac{x+1}{-x}, \quad s^2(x) = \frac{-1}{x+1}, \quad \Phi(x) = \frac{x^3 - 3x - 1}{x^2 + x}, \quad p(x) = x + 1.$$

We then obtain the irreducible equation

$$f(x) = (x^2 + x) \{ \Phi(x) + 1 \} = x^3 + x^2 - 2x - 1 = 0,$$

its roots

$$\xi_0 = 2 \cos \frac{2\pi}{7}, \quad \xi_1 = 2 \cos \frac{6\pi}{7}, \quad \xi_2 = 2 \cos \frac{4\pi}{7}$$

are equivalent since

$$\xi_1 = s(\xi_0), \quad \xi_2 = s^2(\xi_0),$$

and in fact have the continued fractions,

$$\xi_0 = 1 + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{20} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} + \dots,$$

$$\xi_1 = -1 + \frac{1}{1} + \frac{1}{1} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{20} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} + \dots,$$

$$\xi_2 = -2 + \frac{1}{5} + \frac{1}{20} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} + \dots$$

Manchester, 10th January, 1946

Mathematics Department of the University.