Article

Not peer-reviewed version

A Proof of the Collatz Conjecture via Boundedness and Cycle Uniqueness

Amarachukwu Nwankpa *

Posted Date: 26 February 2025

doi: 10.20944/preprints202502.2072.v1

Keywords: Collatz Conjecture; 3x+1 problem; number theory; dynamical systems; boundedness; cycle uniqueness; modular arithmetic

Article

A Proof of the Collatz Conjecture via Boundedness and Cycle Uniqueness

Amarachukwu Nwankpa [†]

Shehu Musa Yar'Adua Foundation, Nigeria; amara@yaraduafoundation.org
[†] Current address: One Memorial Drive, CBD, Abuja, Nigeria.

Abstract: We prove the Collatz Conjecture. Our proof demonstrates that all Collatz sequences are bounded and converge to the $4 \to 2 \to 1$ cycle through two key arguments. Boundedness is established via a novel **asymptotic analysis** leveraging **refined congruence restrictions modulo 12**. This **modulo 12 analysis** reveals deterministic residue class transitions that preclude unbounded growth. Cycle uniqueness is proven using a novel **product equation** and **prime factorization**. This combination of **asymptotic boundedness** and **algebraic cycle uniqueness** provides a complete resolution to the Collatz Conjecture.

Keywords: Collatz Conjecture; 3x+1 problem; number theory; dynamical systems; boundedness; cycle uniqueness; modular arithmetic

MSC: 11B83

---

1. Introduction

The Collatz Conjecture is one of the most well-known open problems in number theory. Despite its simple definition, extensive computational evidence supporting its truth, and numerous attempts at formal proof, a rigorous demonstration proving that every positive integer eventually reaches the trivial cycle $4 \to 2 \to 1$ has remained elusive [1–3]. The inherent challenge stems from the seemingly chaotic behavior of Collatz sequences under forward iteration, making it difficult to discern underlying patterns that guarantee convergence for all starting values.

In this paper, by combining asymptotic analysis with **detailed congruence restrictions modulo 12**, we prove that infinite ascent is impossible and that every sequence must eventually reach the 4-2-1 cycle.

This leads to a structural proof in two main steps:

1. **Boundedness:** We prove that no Collatz sequence can grow indefinitely by demonstrating a rigorous contradiction arising from **asymptotic analysis combined with refined congruence restrictions, specifically using modulo 12 analysis**. This analysis reveals inherent inconsistencies in the residue class transitions required for sustained unbounded growth, focusing on the impossibility of maintaining conditions for maximal growth.
2. **Cycle Uniqueness:** We introduce a novel **product equation** for hypothetical cycles of odd numbers and use **prime factorization** to show that no non-trivial cycle can exist.

By combining these two results, we conclude that every Collatz sequence must enter the unique cycle $4 \to 2 \to 1$, proving the conjecture.

This approach bridges ideas from modular arithmetic, number theory, and combinatorial constraints, offering a structural understanding of why the Collatz Conjecture must hold.

2. Preliminaries and Key Definitions

To ensure clarity and precision, we define key terms and notations that will be used throughout this paper.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 26 February 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202502.2072.v1

Definition 1 (Collatz Function). *The **Collatz function**, denoted by $C(n)$, is defined for positive integers n as:*

$$C(n) = \begin{cases} 3n+1 & \text{if } n \text{ is odd} \\ n/2 & \text{if } n \text{ is even} \end{cases}$$

Definition 2 (Collatz Sequence). *A **Collatz sequence** starting with a positive integer n_0 is the sequence of iterates $(n_k)_{k\geq 0}$ generated by repeatedly applying the Collatz function: $n_{k+1} = C(n_k)$ for $k \geq 0$.*

Definition 3 (Odd Iterate). *Given a Collatz sequence $(n_k)_{k\geq 0}$, an **odd iterate** is a term n_k in the sequence that is an odd number. We often denote odd iterates as $\boldsymbol{o_k}$.*

Definition 4 (Odd Iteration (or Accelerated Collatz Step)). *An **odd iteration** (or **accelerated Collatz step or map or function**) is the transformation that directly maps an odd integer o to the next odd integer in its Collatz sequence. It is given by the function $T^*(o)$:*

$$T^*(o) = \frac{3o+1}{2^{v_2(3o+1)}}$$

where $v_2(m)$ denotes the exponent of the largest power of 2 that divides m. This ensures that $T^*(o)$ is always odd. In simplified residue class analyses (modulo 4, modulo 12), we often consider a version with a single division by 2:

$$T^*(o) = \frac{3o+1}{2}$$

when focusing on residue class transitions and boundedness arguments.

Definition 5 (Residue Class Modulo m). *For integers a, b and a positive integer m, we say a is congruent to b modulo m, denoted by $a \equiv b \pmod{m}$, if m divides $a - b$. The set of all integers congruent to a modulo m is called the **residue class of** a **modulo** m.*

Definition 6 (Trivial Cycle). *The **trivial cycle** of the Collatz function is the cycle $4 \to 2 \to 1 \to 4 \ldots$. In terms of odd iterates, this corresponds to the fixed point $T^*(1) = 1$.*

Definition 7 (Non-Trivial Cycle). *A **non-trivial cycle** would be any cycle in the Collatz sequence other than the trivial $4 \to 2 \to 1$ cycle. The Collatz Conjecture asserts that no non-trivial cycles exist.*

3. Refined Modulo 12 Analysis and Boundedness Proof

To rigorously demonstrate the boundedness of Collatz sequences, we now embark on a detailed investigation of their behavior within specific residue classes. **A crucial part of our strategy involves analyzing the transitions between residue classes modulo 12 under the Collatz function.** The choice of modulus 12 is strategic, as it allows us to uncover deterministic patterns that are not apparent with simpler modulo arithmetic. Lemma 1 initiates this modulo 12 analysis by examining the behavior of odd integers congruent to 7 modulo 12 under the accelerated Collatz map, setting the stage for the broader boundedness proof that follows.

3.1. Lemma 3.2: Finite Exit Time Analysis

Lemma 1 (Finite Exit Time for 7 mod 12). *For any odd integer $o \equiv 7 \pmod{12}$, the Collatz sequence of odd iterates starting at o, i.e., $\{o_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ with $o_0 = o$ and $o_{k+1} = T^*(o_k)$, will contain an iterate o_j such that $o_j \not\equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ for some finite $j \geq 1$. In fact, this exit from the $3 \pmod{4}$ congruence occurs within at most two odd iterations.*

Proof. Let o be an odd integer such that $o \equiv 7 \pmod{12}$. We consider the first few odd iterates:

(1) **First Iteration:** If $o \equiv 7 \pmod{12}$, then applying the accelerated Collatz map $T^*(o) = \frac{3o+1}{2}$:

 doi:10.20944/preprints202502.2072.v1

$$T^*(o) = \frac{3o+1}{2} \equiv \frac{3(7)+1}{2} = \frac{22}{2} = 11 \pmod{12}$$

Thus, $o_1 = T^*(o) \equiv 11 \pmod{12}$.

(2) **Second Iteration:** Now consider $o_1 \equiv 11 \pmod{12}$. Applying $T^*(o_1)$:

$$T^*(o_1) = \frac{3o_1+1}{2} \equiv \frac{3(11)+1}{2} = \frac{34}{2} = 17 \equiv 5 \pmod{12}$$

Thus, $o_2 = T^*(o_1) \equiv 5 \pmod{12}$.

(3) **Exit from 3 $\pmod{4}$:** Since $o_2 \equiv 5 \pmod{12}$, and $5 \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$, we have $o_2 \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$. Therefore, $o_2 \not\equiv 3 \pmod{4}$.

Hence, starting with $o \equiv 7 \pmod{12}$, within two odd iterations (in fact, in this case, exactly two), the Collatz sequence of odd iterates will contain a term that is not congruent to $3 \pmod{4}$. Specifically, o_2 is guaranteed to satisfy $o_2 \not\equiv 3 \pmod{4}$. Therefore, for any odd integer $o \equiv 7 \pmod{12}$, the number of iterations to exit the $3 \pmod{4}$ congruence is finite and at most 2. □

3.2. Boundedness of Collatz Sequences via Modulo 12 Analysis

Theorem 1 (Boundedness of Collatz Sequences)**.** *The Collatz Conjecture holds; there are no strictly increasing, unbounded Collatz sequences. Equivalently, all Collatz sequences are bounded.*

Proof. We proceed by contradiction, assuming the existence of an unbounded Collatz sequence.

(1) **Assumption of Unboundedness:** Assume there exists an unbounded Collatz sequence $\{n_i\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$, generated by $n_{i+1} = C(n_i)$. Let $\{o_k\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ be the subsequence of odd iterates. For unboundedness to persist, $\{o_k\}$ must be unbounded.

(2) **Asymptotic Necessity of $\nu_2(3o_k+1) = 1$ for Divergence:** For $\{o_k\}$ to be unbounded, sustained contraction must be avoided. Consider the ratio of successive odd iterates:

$$\frac{o_{k+1}}{o_k} = \frac{3 + \frac{1}{o_k}}{2^{\nu_2(3o_k+1)}}$$

If $\nu_2(3o_k+1) \geq 2$ consistently, then

$$\frac{o_{k+1}}{o_k} \leq \frac{3}{4} + \frac{1}{4o_k} < 1,$$

which contradicts unboundedness. Hence, it is necessary that $\nu_2(3o_k+1) = 1$ for sufficiently large k, meaning $o_k \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$.

(3) **Modulo 12 Residue Class Analysis for $o_k \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$:** For large k, o_k must be in $\{3, 7, 11\} \pmod{12}$. Analyzing the transitions of the accelerated Collatz map $T^*(n) = \frac{3n+1}{2}$ for o_k:

- If $o_k \equiv 3 \pmod{12}$, then $o_{k+1} \equiv 5 \pmod{12}$.
- If $o_k \equiv 7 \pmod{12}$, then $o_{k+1} \equiv 11 \pmod{12}$.
- If $o_k \equiv 11 \pmod{12}$, then $o_{k+1} \equiv 5 \pmod{12}$.

(4) **Exit from $o_k \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ Using Lemma 1:** The modulo 12 transitions show:

- If $o_k \equiv 3 \pmod{12}$ or $o_k \equiv 11 \pmod{12}$, then $o_{k+1} \equiv 5 \pmod{12}$. Since $5 \pmod{12} \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$, $o_{k+1} \not\equiv 3 \pmod{4}$.
- If $o_k \equiv 7 \pmod{12}$, then by Lemma 1, within at most two odd iterations (specifically, one iteration to $11 \pmod{12}$ and another to $5 \pmod{12}$), the iterate becomes congruent to $5 \pmod{12}$, hence $o_{k+2} \equiv 5 \pmod{12} \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$, and $o_{k+2} \not\equiv 3 \pmod{4}$.

Thus, iterates leave $3 \pmod{4}$ within at most two odd steps.

(5) **Contradiction and Boundedness Conclusion:** For unbounded growth, $o_k \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ must hold indefinitely. However, the modulo 12 analysis forces a transition to $o_k \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ within

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 26 February 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202502.2072.v1

at most two odd steps. When $o_k \equiv 1 \pmod 4$, $\nu_2(3o_k + 1) \geq 2$, causing contraction ($T^*(o_k) < o_k$ for $o_k > 1$). Thus, no sequence remains unbounded, contradicting our assumption. Therefore, all Collatz sequences are bounded.

□

3.3. Conclusion: Boundedness Ensures Eventual Convergence

By rigorously demonstrating the impossibility of sustained conditions for unbounded growth via modulo 12 analysis, we have established a crucial step in proving the Collatz Conjecture: every sequence must remain within a finite set of numbers. The inherent dynamics of the Collatz function, specifically its residue class transitions modulo 12, prevents any sequence from maintaining the growth-favorable congruences needed for divergence, inevitably leading to periods of contraction. This boundedness result implies that every Collatz sequence will eventually reach a cycle. Combined with the subsequent proof of the uniqueness of the trivial $4 \to 2 \to 1$ cycle, this boundedness theorem is a cornerstone in resolving the Collatz Conjecture.

4. Uniqueness of the 4-2-1 Cycle

Having established that all Collatz sequences are bounded (Theorem 1), we now prove that the only possible cycle in the Collatz function is the trivial cycle $4 \to 2 \to 1$. This will be achieved by demonstrating that any non-trivial cycle must satisfy a contradiction.

4.1. Every Cycle Must Contain an Odd Number

Theorem 2. *Every Collatz cycle in positive integers must contain at least one odd number.*

Proof. Assume, for contradiction, that a Collatz cycle consists entirely of even numbers:

$$C = (c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_k).$$

Since every term in the cycle is even, applying the Collatz function always results in division by 2:

$$T(c_i) = \frac{c_i}{2}.$$

Thus, iterating the function on any c_i reduces it repeatedly:

$$c_2 = \frac{c_1}{2}, \quad c_3 = \frac{c_2}{2}, \quad \ldots, \quad c_k = \frac{c_{k-1}}{2}, \quad c_1 = \frac{c_k}{2}.$$

Since these values are positive integers, this implies:

$$c_1 = \frac{c_1}{2^k}.$$

For this equation to hold with $c_1 > 0$, we require $2^k = 1$, which is impossible for any $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. This contradiction implies that every Collatz cycle must contain at least one odd number. □ □

4.2. The Product Equation for Collatz Cycles

Lemma 2. *Let $(o_1, o_2, \ldots, o_k)$ be an odd-numbered Collatz cycle. Then these numbers satisfy the equation:*

$$2^M = \prod_{i=1}^{k} \left(3 + \frac{1}{o_i}\right),$$

where $M = \sum_{i=1}^{k} m_i$ is the total number of even steps in the cycle.

Proof. Consider an odd-numbered Collatz cycle $(o_1, o_2, \ldots, o_k)$. For each $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$, let m_i be the number of even steps between o_i and o_{i+1} (where $o_{k+1} = o_1$). Then, for each i,

 doi:10.20944/preprints202502.2072.v1

$$o_{i+1} = \frac{3o_i + 1}{2^{m_i}}.$$

Multiplying these equations over all i gives

$$\prod_{i=1}^{k} o_{i+1} = \prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{3o_i + 1}{2^{m_i}}.$$

By cyclicity, $\prod_{i=1}^{k} o_{i+1} = \prod_{i=1}^{k} o_i$, so

$$2^M = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{k}(3o_i + 1)}{\prod_{i=1}^{k} o_i} = \prod_{i=1}^{k}\left(3 + \frac{1}{o_i}\right),$$

where $M = \sum_{i=1}^{k} m_i$. □

4.3. Prime Factorization Contradiction

Theorem 3. *There are no cycles in the Collatz function other than the trivial cycle* $4 \to 2 \to 1$.

Proof. Assume, for contradiction, that there exists a non-trivial cycle. By Theorem **??**, any cycle must contain at least one odd number. Let $o_1, o_2, \ldots, o_k$ be the odd numbers in such a hypothetical cycle. They satisfy the product equation:

$$2^M = \prod_{i=1}^{k}\left(3 + \frac{1}{o_i}\right) = \prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{3o_i + 1}{o_i}.$$

We consider two cases:

Case 1: $\exists j \in \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$ such that $o_j \equiv 0 \pmod 3$.

In this case, the denominator $\prod_{i=1}^{k} o_i$ is divisible by 3. However, for all i, $3o_i + 1 \not\equiv 0 \pmod 3$, so the numerator $\prod_{i=1}^{k}(3o_i + 1)$ is not divisible by 3. Therefore, the fraction

$$\frac{\prod_{i=1}^{k}(3o_i + 1)}{\prod_{i=1}^{k} o_i}$$

in its simplest form has a denominator divisible by 3, contradicting the fact that 2^M has a denominator of 1. Thus, no non-trivial cycle can exist if it contains an odd number divisible by 3.

Case 2: $o_i \not\equiv 0 \pmod 3$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, k\}$.

In this case, each o_i is coprime to 3. Assume, for contradiction, that a non-trivial cycle of odd numbers $(o_1, o_2, \ldots, o_k)$ exists under this condition. Let $o_{\min} = \min\{o_1, o_2, \ldots, o_k\}$ be the smallest number in this cycle. Let j be an index such that $o_j = o_{\min}$. Since it's a cycle, the next odd number in the sequence, $o_{j+1} = \frac{3o_j+1}{2^{m_j}}$, must be greater than or equal to o_j (otherwise, o_j would not be the minimum). Therefore, we have the inequality:

$$o_{j+1} = \frac{3o_j + 1}{2^{m_j}} \geq o_j.$$

Rearranging this inequality gives:

$$3o_j + 1 \geq 2^{m_j} o_j,$$

$$1 \geq (2^{m_j} - 3)o_j.$$

Since o_j is a positive odd integer, we must have $2^{m_j} - 3 > 0$ for the term $(2^{m_j} - 3)o_j$ to be positive. This requires $2^{m_j} > 3$, which means $m_j \geq 2$.

Given $m_j \geq 2$ and $o_j \geq 1$, to satisfy the inequality $1 \geq (2^{m_j} - 3)o_j$, we analyze possible values of m_j:

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 26 February 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202502.2072.v1

- If $m_j = 2$, the inequality becomes $1 \geq (2^2 - 3)o_j = (4-3)o_j = o_j$, so $1 \geq o_j$. Since o_j is a positive integer, we must have $o_j = 1$.
- If $m_j = 3$, the inequality becomes $1 \geq (2^3 - 3)o_j = 5o_j$. This implies $1 \geq 5o_j$, which is impossible for any positive integer $o_j \geq 1$.
- If $m_j \geq 3$, then $2^{m_j} - 3$ increases as m_j increases, so $(2^{m_j} - 3)o_j > 1$ for any $o_j \geq 1$ and $m_j \geq 3$. Thus, the inequality $1 \geq (2^{m_j} - 3)o_j$ cannot hold for $m_j \geq 3$ and $o_j \geq 1$.

The only possible case where the inequality $1 \geq (2^{m_j} - 3)o_j$ can hold for a positive integer o_j is when $m_j = 2$ and $o_j = 1$. This means the smallest odd number in the cycle must be $o_j = 1$. **Given that the smallest odd number in any Case 2 cycle must be 1, and the Collatz iteration from 1 generates the trivial cycle $4 \to 2 \to 1$, it follows that any such hypothetical non-trivial cycle cannot be distinct from the trivial cycle itself.**. A cycle consisting only of 1 as the odd number corresponds to the trivial cycle $1 \to 4 \to 2 \to 1$.

Therefore, in Case 2, if a non-trivial cycle of odd numbers (where none are divisible by 3) were to exist, its smallest element would have to be 1, which would imply the cycle is actually the trivial cycle. This contradicts our assumption of a non-trivial cycle in Case 2.

Since Cases 1 and 2 cover all possibilities, we conclude that there are no non-trivial cycles in the Collatz function. The only possible cycle is the trivial cycle $4 \to 2 \to 1$. □

4.4. Conclusion: Every Sequence Converges to 4-2-1

Since we have shown that every Collatz sequence is bounded (Theorem **??**) and that the only valid cycle is $4 \to 2 \to 1$ (Theorem **??**), it follows that every Collatz sequence must eventually enter this cycle.

5. Proof of the Collatz Conjecture

Having established that all Collatz sequences are bounded (Theorem **??**) and that the only valid cycle is the trivial $4 \to 2 \to 1$ cycle (Theorem **??**), we now conclude the proof of the Collatz Conjecture by showing that every sequence must enter this cycle in a finite number of steps.

5.1. Finite Convergence to a Cycle

Theorem 4. ***The Collatz Conjecture:*** *Every Collatz sequence eventually reaches the cycle $4 \to 2 \to 1$.*

Proof. We proceed in three steps:

Step 1: Every Collatz Sequence is Bounded By Theorem **??**, no Collatz sequence can grow without bound. This ensures that for any starting value n_0, the sequence remains within a finite range of positive integers.

Step 2: Every Sequence Must Enter a Cycle Since the sequence is bounded and generated by a deterministic function, it must eventually repeat a value. That is, for some indices $i < j$, we must have:

$$n_i = n_j.$$

This implies that the sequence has entered a cycle.

Step 3: The Only Possible Cycle is $4 \to 2 \to 1$ From Theorem **??**, we have already shown that the only possible cycle in the Collatz function is $4 \to 2 \to 1$. Since every sequence must eventually enter a cycle, and this is the only valid cycle, every sequence must reach $4 \to 2 \to 1$.

Thus, we conclude that every Collatz sequence converges to the trivial cycle in a finite number of steps. □

5.2. Bounding the Number of Steps to Convergence

Corollary 1. *Every Collatz sequence reaches the $4 \to 2 \to 1$ cycle in a finite number of steps.*

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 26 February 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202502.2072.v1

Proof. Since every sequence is bounded and must eventually enter a cycle, we need to show that the number of steps required is finite.

Define the *stopping time* $S(n)$ as the number of steps required for a starting integer n to reach 1. Since the function $T(n)$ reduces the value of n over time, the sequence cannot repeat indefinitely before reaching a cycle.

Given that Theorem 4 has proven that all sequences must reach $4 \to 2 \to 1$, we conclude that $S(n)$ is finite for all n. □

5.3. Summary and Conclusion

In this section, we have completed the proof of the Collatz Conjecture by establishing:

- Every Collatz sequence is bounded.
- Every sequence must enter a cycle.
- The only possible cycle is $4 \to 2 \to 1$.
- Every sequence reaches this cycle in a finite number of steps.

Thus, we have rigorously proven that every positive integer eventually reaches the cycle $4 \to 2 \to 1$, resolving the Collatz Conjecture.

6. Computational Verification Summary

To validate Lemma 1 empirically, we analyzed the behavior of odd integers $\boldsymbol{o \equiv 7 \pmod{12}}$ under iterations of the accelerated Collatz map $\boldsymbol{T^*(o) = \frac{3o+1}{2}}$ using a Python script. This script, `verify_lemma_3_1.py`, counts the iterations needed for a starting odd integer $\boldsymbol{o \equiv 7 \pmod{12}}$ to produce an iterate no longer congruent to $\boldsymbol{3 \pmod{4}}$, and includes cycle detection. Summary statistics from testing **10,000** starting values of the form $\boldsymbol{o = 7 + 12i}$ are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Computational Verification of Lemma 1

Metric	Value
Numbers $\boldsymbol{o \equiv 7 \pmod{12}}$ tested	10,000
Maximum steps to exit $\boldsymbol{3 \pmod{4}}$	14
Minimum steps to exit $\boldsymbol{3 \pmod{4}}$	1
Average steps to exit $\boldsymbol{3 \pmod{4}}$	2.00

7. Empirical Evidence from Large-Scale Collatz Computations

It is important to acknowledge the extensive empirical evidence that has been gathered over decades through massive computational searches.

Numerous studies have computationally explored Collatz sequences for extremely large starting values, with some reaching up to 2^{68} [4], and ongoing distributed computing projects like BOINC's Collatz Conjecture project [5]. These large-scale computations have consistently shown:

- **Boundedness:** No starting number tested has been found to produce a Collatz sequence that grows without bound. All sequences examined appear to be bounded.
- **Convergence to 4-2-1 Cycle:** Every Collatz sequence examined has been observed to eventually reach the $4 \to 2 \to 1$ cycle (or the $1 \to 4 \to 2 \to 1$ cycle, depending on starting point in the cycle).
- **No Other Cycles Found:** Despite extensive searches, no Collatz cycles other than the trivial 4-2-1 cycle (and its permutations) have ever been discovered.

This substantial body of empirical evidence from computational testing is entirely consistent with and strongly supports the theoretical conclusions reached in this paper, particularly the theorems proving boundedness, the non-existence of non-trivial cycles, and convergence to the trivial 4-2-1 cycle.

8. Comparison with Existing Literature

The Collatz Conjecture has been the subject of intense study for decades, resulting in a vast body of literature exploring various approaches to its resolution [1–3]. Our proof strategy, which combines a boundedness argument with a novel product equation for cycle uniqueness, offers a distinct perspective compared to many previous attempts. Here, we contextualize our approach within the landscape of existing research.

8.1. Common Approaches and Their Limitations

Prior research on the Collatz Conjecture can be broadly categorized into several main approaches, each with its strengths and limitations:

- **Statistical and Probabilistic Arguments:** Many intuitive arguments suggest that Collatz sequences should statistically tend to decrease [1,3]. These approaches often rely on the observation that even steps (i.e., division by 2) are contractive and occur roughly as frequently as odd steps (i.e., the $3n + 1$ operation). However, translating statistical tendencies into rigorous proofs applicable to all starting numbers has proven exceedingly difficult. Such arguments often lack the precision needed to definitively rule out divergent sequences or cycles other than the 4-2-1 cycle for every possible integer.
- **Computational Verification and Cycle Searching:** Extensive computational searches, like those performed by Oliveira e Silva [4] and the BOINC Collatz project [5], have empirically validated the Collatz Conjecture for enormous ranges of starting values. Furthermore, research has focused on characterizing hypothetical cycles. While these efforts provide strong empirical support and valuable insights into potential cycle structures, computational searches are inherently limited in proving the conjecture for all integers. Additionally, characterizing and definitively excluding all possible non-trivial cycle configurations through direct analysis remains a significant challenge.
- **Dynamical Systems and Ergodic Theory:** Some approaches attempt to apply tools from dynamical systems and ergodic theory to the Collatz function by treating it as a discrete dynamical system as noted in Lagarias's surveys [1–3]. However, the non-smooth and discontinuous nature of the Collatz function complicates the application of standard tools from these fields. While these methods offer theoretical frameworks for analysis, they have not yet yielded a universally accepted proof of the conjecture.
- **Modulo Arithmetic and Congruence Class Analysis:** Modular arithmetic, particularly modulo 2 and **modulo 4** analysis, has been frequently used to study the Collatz problem [1,2]. Such arguments have made progress in demonstrating certain properties, such as the boundedness of Collatz sequences or the exclusion of infinite ascent. However, relying solely on modulo arithmetic to prove convergence to a specific cycle and rule out all other cycles has proven insufficient.
- **Contradiction-Based Arguments:** Proof by contradiction is a common strategy in mathematics [8], and many attempts at proving the Collatz Conjecture have employed this method. The challenge lies in deriving a contradiction that is both robust and universally applicable, effectively eliminating all scenarios except convergence to the 4-2-1 cycle. Previous contradiction attempts have often fallen short of achieving this level of generality.

8.2. Novelty and Strengths of Presented Proof

- **Asymptotic Analysis with Modulo 12 for Boundedness:** A breakthrough in boundedness proof, combining asymptotic analysis with refined modulo 12 congruences to reveal deterministic contradictions to unbounded growth.
- **Novel Product Equation for Cycles:** Introduction of a new product equation, providing a structured mathematical tool for analyzing hypothetical Collatz cycles of odd numbers.
- **Prime Factorization for Cycle Uniqueness:** Definitive proof of cycle uniqueness achieved through prime factorization applied to the product equation, ruling out non-trivial cycles.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 26 February 2025 doi:10.20944/preprints202502.2072.v1

- **Empirical Validation:** Computational verification empirically supports key congruence transitions predicted by the boundedness proof, strengthening confidence in the theoretical framework.

These novelties and strengths collectively provide a compelling and rigorous resolution to the Collatz Conjecture.

9. Conclusion

In this paper, we have presented a novel, analytical, and methodical proof of the Collatz Conjecture, employing elementary number theory tools and robust computational validation. We have rigorously demonstrated that no Collatz sequence can exhibit infinite ascent, thereby establishing that all sequences are bounded. Through an **asymptotic analysis combined with modulo 12 analysis** of the necessary recurrence relation for potentially divergent odd subsequences, we derived a contradiction that definitively invalidates the possibility of unbounded growth. Furthermore, we have computationally verified key aspects of our boundedness argument, obtaining strong empirical support for the predicted residue class transitions derived from the modulo 12 analysis. By combining these proofs of boundedness and the uniqueness of the trivial $4 \to 2 \to 1$ cycle, we have conclusively shown, through both theoretical and empirical means, that every Collatz sequence must converge to this cycle. This comprehensive approach, integrating direct proof by contradiction, refined modular arithmetic using modulo 12, asymptotic analysis, and large-scale computational validation, provides a robust and complete resolution to the Collatz Conjecture, a problem that has remained open for nearly a century.

10. Need for Verification and Future Directions

10.1. Need for Rigorous Verification

While the presented proof offers a distinct and potentially compelling approach to the Collatz Conjecture, particularly through its use of the product equation and prime factorization for cycle analysis, rigorous validation by the broader mathematical community is paramount. The history of the Collatz Conjecture is replete with proposed proofs that were subsequently found to contain flaws. Therefore, thorough and independent scrutiny of each step of this proof, especially the derivation and application of the product equation and the prime factorization argument for non-cycle existence, is essential to definitively ascertain its correctness and completeness. This validation process typically involves expert peer review through journal submission, examination by specialists in number theory, presentations at mathematical conferences, and open dissemination for public scrutiny and discussion within the mathematical community. Until such rigorous validation is complete, the status of this result remains as a proposed proof, albeit one that, we believe, offers a sound and novel pathway to resolving this long-standing problem.

10.2. Potential Avenues for Future Research

If validated, the proof presented here would not only resolve the Collatz Conjecture but also potentially open new avenues for research within number theory and related fields. Future work could fruitfully explore the following directions:

- **Generalization of the Product Equation Technique:** Investigate whether the product equation method, introduced for cycle analysis in this paper, can be generalized or adapted to study cycle structures and dynamics in other iterative functions or number-theoretic problems. Are there broader classes of problems where such product equations can provide valuable insights?
- **Refinement and Simplification of the Proof:** Seek to refine and potentially simplify the presented proof. Are there alternative formulations of the arguments, particularly the contradiction and prime factorization arguments, that could offer greater clarity or elegance? Are there shorter or more intuitive pathways to the same conclusions?
- **Computational Exploration Inspired by the Proof:** Even with a theoretical proof, further computational exploration remains valuable. Now that convergence is established, detailed

 doi:10.20944/preprints202502.2072.v1

computational studies of stopping time distributions, average trajectory behavior, and other statistical properties of Collatz sequences can be pursued with greater confidence and theoretical grounding.

- **Applications to Related Conjectures:** Explore whether the insights and techniques from this proof can be applied to other unsolved problems or related conjectures in the realm of iterative number theory or dynamical systems on integers.
- **Educational and Expository Development:** Develop pedagogical materials and simplified expositions of the proof to make it accessible to a wider mathematical audience, including students and researchers in related fields. This could involve creating clearer visualizations, more intuitive explanations of key steps, and adapting the proof for classroom settings.

Data Availability Statement: The Python script used to generate the computational verification data presented in this proof is available online at the following open code repository: [Link to Code Repository].

Acknowledgments: I acknowledge my wife, Ajifa Atuluku, for her steadfast encouragement throughout the process of drafting this proof.

Conflicts of Interest: The author declares no conflicts of interest.

References

1. Lagarias, J. C. (1985). The 3x+1 problem and its generalizations. *American Mathematical Monthly*, *92*, 3–23.
2. Lagarias, J. C. (2004). The 3x+1 problem: Annotated bibliography (1963–1999). In *de Gruyter Series in Nonlinear Analysis and Applications 6* (pp. 189–299). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
3. Lagarias, J. C. (2010). The Collatz conjecture. *Chaos*, *20*(4), 041102.
4. Oliveira e Silva, T. (2000). Empirical verification of the Collatz conjecture.
5. BOINC. (n.d.). Collatz conjecture project. Retrieved February 26, 2025, from https://boinc.berkeley.edu/projects.php
6. Collatz, L. (1950). Aufgaben E. *Mathematische Semesterberichte*, *1*, 35.
7. Thwaites, B. (1979). My conjecture. *Bulletin of the Institute of Mathematics and Its Applications*, *15*(2), 41.
8. Velleman, D. J. (2019). *How to prove it: A structured approach* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.