A Proof of a Conjecture of Knuth

Peter Paule

CONTENTS

From numerical experiments, D. E. Knuth conjectured that $0 < D_{n+4} < D_n$ for a combinatorial sequence (D_n) defined as the difference $D_n = R_n - L_n$ of two definite hypergeometric sums. The conjecture implies an identity of type $L_n = \lfloor R_n \rfloor$, involving the floor function. We prove Knuth's conjecture by applying Zeilberger's algorithm as well as classical hypergeometric machinery.

1. THE CONJECTURE

In a combinatorial study, D. E. Knuth [1994] was led to consider a nonterminating hypergeometric series representation of the numbers

$$L_n := \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{2k}{k}, \quad \text{where } n \geq 0.$$

The (ordinary) generating function of the sequence $t_k := \binom{2k}{k}$ is $1/\sqrt{1-4z}$, a special instance of the binomial series, and thus

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} L_n z^n = \frac{1}{(1-z)\sqrt{1-4z}}.$$

Expanding $1/(1-z)$ as a series in powers of $(1-4z)$ and equating like coefficients results in

$$L_n = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \tfrac{4}{3}(-\tfrac{1}{3})^k \binom{k-\frac{1}{2}}{n} (-4)^n.$$

Let $r_{n,k}$ denote the summand expression, and recall a bit of hypergeometric notation, for instance, from [Graham et al. 1994]. The rising factorials are defined as $x^{\bar{k}} = x(x+1)\dots(x+k-1)$ for $k \geq 1$, $x^{\bar{0}} = 1$, and the general hypergeometric series as

$${}_pF_q\left(\begin{matrix} a_1, \dots, a_p \\ b_1, \dots, b_q \end{matrix}; z\right) = \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{a_1^{\bar{k}} \dots a_p^{\bar{k}}}{b_1^{\bar{k}} \dots a_q^{\bar{k}}} \frac{z^k}{k!}.$$

1058-6458/96 \$0.50 per page

Now, if the series representation of L_n is rewritten in hypergeometric form,

$$L_n = \sum_{k\geq 0} r_{n,k} = \tfrac{4}{3}\binom{2n}{n}\,{}_2F_1\left(\begin{matrix}\frac{1}{2},1\\ -n+\frac{1}{2}\end{matrix};-\tfrac{1}{3}\right),$$

the essential asymptotic information about L_n for $n \to \infty$ becomes explicit. But Knuth observed a good deal more. Assuming n as fixed, we quote from [Knuth 1994]: "First the terms $r_{n,k}$ decrease rapidly, until $k = \lfloor \frac{3}{4}n + \frac{1}{2} \rfloor$, after which they increase and begin to oscillate wildly—so they look like they're diverging for sure. But then after $k = \lfloor \frac{3}{2}n + \frac{1}{2} \rfloor$ they begin to settle down and soon are converging like $(-\frac{1}{3})^k$". He added some numerical evaluations; for instance, for $n = 10$ the partial sum

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor \frac{3}{4}10+\frac{1}{2}\rfloor} r_{10,k} = 250953.29$$

is quite close to the exact value of $L_{10} = 250953$. From those experiments he became convinced of the "curious" identity

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n}\binom{2k}{k} = \left\lfloor \sum_{k=0}^{\lfloor (3n+2)/4 \rfloor} \tfrac{4}{3}(-\tfrac{1}{3})^k \binom{k-\frac{1}{2}}{n}(-4)^n \right\rfloor. \tag{1.1}$$

More generally, if R_n denotes the sum inside the floor brackets on the right hand side of (1.1), Knuth proposed the following conjecture:

Conjecture 1.1 (Knuth). *For* $D_n := R_n - L_n$,

$$0 < D_{n+4} < D_n \quad \textit{for all } n \geq 0. \tag{1.2}$$

Indeed, this implies (1.1), because the four initial values are less than 1 ($D_0 = \frac{1}{3}$, $D_1 = \frac{5}{9}$, $D_2 = \frac{7}{9}$, $D_3 = \frac{1}{27}$), and

$$0 = \lfloor D_n \rfloor = \lfloor R_n - L_n \rfloor = \lfloor R_n \rfloor - L_n.$$

In view of the preceding derivation one could guess that there are many more identities involving the floor function like (1.1). But up to now identities of this type have not been discussed in the literature, and no standard tools are available for their treatment. The object of this note is to show that the key for the proof of Knuth's conjecture consists in applying methods belonging to different, sometimes even considered as opposite, paradigms, the Zeilberger algorithm and the classical hypergeometric machinery. For an introduction to both theories see, for instance, [Graham et al. 1994].

2. THE PROOF

Because of the floor function arising in the upper summation bound of R_n, we consider the problem separately for each congruence class mod 4. First, for $n = 4m$, $m \geq 0$, let $l_m = L_{4m}$, $r_m = R_{4m}$, and $d_m = D_{4m}$ The proof of (1.2) splits into the monotonicity part, $d_{m+1} < d_m$, and the positivity part, $0 < d_m$.

The Monotonicity Part

The Mathematica implementation by Paule and Schorn [1995] of Zeilberger's algorithm is able to treat also definite hypergeometric sums where the summation bounds are integer linear in the recurrence parameter. Applying the program to $l_m = \sum_{k=0}^{4m}\binom{2k}{k}$ and $r_m = \sum_{k=0}^{3m} r_{4m,k}$ delivers the simple inhomogeneous recurrences

$$l_{m+1} - l_m = a(m) \quad \text{and} \quad r_{m+1} - r_m = a(m) - b(m),$$

where

$$a(m) = 16\,(680m^3 + 1302m^2 + 784m + 147) \times \frac{(8m+1)!}{(4m)!\,(4m+4)!}$$

and

$$b(m) = \tfrac{4}{27}\,(8m+7)\,(\tfrac{1}{3})^{3m}\,\frac{(2m+1)!\,(6m+1)!}{(m+1)!\,(3m)!\,(4m+3)!}.$$

The proof of the computer result is human-verifiable and is also delivered by the program.

Combining the recurrences by subtraction yields

$$d_m - d_{m+1} = b(m), \tag{2.1}$$

which, because of $b(m) > 0$, proves the monotonicity part of (1.2) for $n = 4m$.

The other cases work analogously; see (2.5) below.

The Positivity Part

Applying the computer program from [Paule and Schorn 1995], monotonicity turned out to be surprisingly simple to prove. In this section we demonstrate that recursion (2.1), derived with the help of the computer, also provides the key for the proof of positivity, i.e., of $0 < d_m$ for all $m \geq 0$. But to this end we have to make extensive use of classical hypergeometric machinery. Nevertheless, the Mathematica package hyp.m developed by C. Krattenthaler [1996] greatly facilitates the work.

From (2.1) and $d_0 = \frac{1}{3}$, for all $M \geq 0$ we have

$$d_M = d_0 + \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} (d_{m+1} - d_m) = d_0 - \sum_{m=0}^{M-1} b(m) > \tfrac{1}{3} - \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} b(m).$$

Hence positivity is proved once we can show that

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} b(m) = \tfrac{1}{3}. \tag{2.2}$$

The convergence of this series is extremely slow, and all computer algebra systems I have access to failed on its evaluation.

The hypergeometric evaluation proceeds as follows. First one rewrites the series as a hypergeometric ${}_5F_4$, and, because no standard summation formula can be found, one—in view of there being a top entry 1 and a bottom entry 2—applies contiguous relation C16 of Krattenthaler's package,

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} b(m) = \tfrac{14}{81}\, {}_5F_4\left(\begin{matrix} \frac{1}{2}, \frac{5}{6}, \frac{7}{6}, \frac{15}{8}, 1 \\ \frac{7}{8}, \frac{5}{4}, \frac{7}{4}, 2 \end{matrix} ; 1 \right) = \tfrac{1}{3} - \tfrac{1}{3}\, {}_4F_3\left(\begin{matrix} -\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{6}, \frac{7}{8} \\ -\frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{4} \end{matrix} ; 1 \right).$$

This reduces the original problem to showing that the ${}_4F_3$ evaluates to zero. Again no standard summation formula can found. But, observing that top entry $\frac{7}{8}$ and bottom entry $-\frac{1}{8}$ differ exactly by 1, a further reduction is possible by applying contiguous relation C30 of Krattenthaler's package,

$${}_4F_3\left(\begin{matrix} -\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{6}, \frac{7}{8} \\ -\frac{1}{8}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{4} \end{matrix} ; 1 \right) = {}_3F_2\left(\begin{matrix} -\frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{2} \\ \frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{4} \end{matrix} ; 1 \right) - \tfrac{4}{9}\, {}_3F_2\left(\begin{matrix} \frac{1}{2}, \frac{5}{6}, \frac{7}{6} \\ \frac{5}{4}, \frac{7}{4} \end{matrix} ; 1 \right). \tag{2.3}$$

Now the decisive step consists in using an important but less known cubic transformation of W. N. Bailey [Bailey 1928, Eq. (4.06)], which the author found in a paper by I. Gessel and D. Stanton [Gessel and Stanton 1982, Eq. (5.6)], namely

$${}_3F_2\left(\begin{matrix} a,\, a+\frac{1}{3},\, a+\frac{2}{3} \\ b+\frac{1}{2},\, 3a-b+1 \end{matrix} ; \frac{27x^2}{4(1-x)^3} \right) = (1-x)^{3a}\, {}_3F_2\left(\begin{matrix} 3a,\, b,\, 3a-b+\frac{1}{2} \\ 2b,\, 6a-2b+1 \end{matrix} ; 4x \right). \tag{2.4}$$

The two ${}_3F_2$ from (2.3) correspond to the left-hand side of (2.4) with $x = \frac{1}{4}$ and $(a,b) = (-\frac{1}{6}, -\frac{1}{4})$ or $(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{3}{4})$, respectively. In both cases we have $3a = 2b$. This means that applying (2.4) reduces each of the two ${}_3F_2$ from (2.3) to a ${}_2F_1$ with argument 1, which can be evaluated in closed form by using well-known Gauss summation

$${}_2F_1\left(\begin{matrix} \alpha, \beta \\ \gamma \end{matrix} ; 1 \right) = \frac{\Gamma(\gamma-\alpha-\beta)\Gamma(\gamma)}{\Gamma(\gamma-\alpha)\Gamma(\gamma-\beta)}.$$

For the latter see, for instance, [Graham et al. 1994]. From the closed form evaluations it is easily verified that the difference on the right hand side of (2.3) indeed is zero, which completes the proof of the positivity part of (1.2) for $n = 4m$. The other cases work analogously as made explicit in the following section.

Summary

In order to give a complete picture of the situation, let $d_m^{(i)} := D_{4m+i}$. The general version of the monotonicity result, including (2.1), is this:

Proposition 2.1 (Monotonicity). *For $i \in \{0,1,2,3\}$ and $m \geq 0$ we have*

$$d_m^{(i)} - d_{m+1}^{(i)} = b^{(i)}(m) \tag{2.5}$$

where $b^{(0)}(m) = b(m)$ and

$$b^{(1)}(m) = \tfrac{16}{81}\,(168m^2 + 343m + 170)\left(\tfrac{1}{3}\right)^{3m} \times \frac{(2m+1)!\,(6m+1)!}{m!\,(3m)!\,(4m+5)!},$$

$$b^{(2)}(m) = \tfrac{4}{243}\,(40m + 47)\left(\tfrac{1}{3}\right)^{3m} \times \frac{(2m)!\,(6m+5)!}{m!\,(3m+2)!\,(4m+5)!},$$

$$b^{(3)}(m) = \tfrac{8}{243}\,(8m+7)(2m+3)\left(\tfrac{1}{3}\right)^{3m} \times \frac{(2m+1)!\,(6m+5)!}{m!\,(3m+2)!\,(4m+7)!}.$$

This settles monotonicity, i.e., $D_{n+4} < D_n$, for all $n \geq 0$; the proof is analogous to that of (2.1).

The proof of positivity, i.e., of $0 < D_n$ (which equals $d_m^{(i)}$ if $n = 4m + i$), follows analogously to that of the case $i = 0$ using this result:

Proposition 2.2 (Positivity). *For $i \in \{0,1,2,3\}$,*

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} b^{(i)}(m) = d_0^{(i)}. \tag{2.6}$$

These evaluations can be obtained by following essentially the same steps as in the derivation of the corresponding result (2.2) for $i = 0$. For the reader who is interested in the underlying hypergeometric structure, we spell out a more conceptual proof of (2.6) in Section 3. It is based on one-parameter generalizations of the crucial cubic Bailey transform evaluation; it also explains a slight subtlety that arises in the case $i = 1$.

Combining monotonicity (2.5) and the positivity result (2.6) Knuth's conjecture (1.2) is proved for all $n \geq 0$.

We conclude this section with a corollary.

Corollary 2.3. *For the differences $d_M^{(i)} = R_{4M+i} - L_{4M+i}$, with $i \in \{0,1,2,3\}$ and $M \geq 0$, we have*

$$d_M^{(i)} = \sum_{m=M}^{\infty} b^{(i)}(m) \tag{2.7}$$

Proof. The monotonicity part (2.5) establishes (2.7) up to a constant; the positivity part (2.6) establishes (2.7) for $M = 0$. □

3. GENERALIZATIONS

In Section 2 (page 85), we evaluated $\sum_{m\geq 0} b^{(0)}(m)$ to $= \frac{1}{3}$, using Bailey's transform (2.4). Here we state one-parameter generalizations (Proposition 3.2) that, in certain combinations, specialize to evaluations of $\sum_{m\geq 0} b^{(i)}(m)$ for all residues i. The two-parameter generalization (3.3) sheds additional light on the underlying hypergeometric structure.

For base case evaluation we need the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *If $3a + 1 = 2b$ then*

$${}_3F_2\left(\begin{matrix} a,\ a+\frac{1}{3},\ a+\frac{2}{3} \\ b+\frac{1}{2},\ 3a-b+2 \end{matrix};1\right) = \frac{(\frac{3}{2})^{3a}}{a+1}. \tag{3.1}$$

Proof. By contiguous relation C34 from Krattenthaler's package, the left-hand side of (3.1) equals

$$\frac{3a-b+1}{2a-b+1}\,{}_3F_2\left(\begin{matrix} a, a+\frac{1}{3},\ a+\frac{2}{3} \\ b+\frac{1}{2},\ 3a-b+1 \end{matrix};1\right) - \frac{a}{2a-b+1}\,{}_3F_2\left(\begin{matrix} a+\frac{1}{3},\ a+\frac{2}{3}, a+1 \\ b+\frac{1}{2},\ 3(a+\frac{1}{3})-b+1 \end{matrix};1\right).$$

Now on each of the ${}_3F_2$'s Bailey's transform (2.4) can be applied and the lemma follows by

$$\frac{\Gamma(\frac{1}{2})\Gamma(2b)}{\Gamma(b)\Gamma(b+\frac{1}{2})} = 2^{2b-1},$$

which is a consequence of the factorial duplication formula, for example [Graham et al. 1994, Exercise 5.22]. □

For $\delta \in \{1,2\}$ let

$$K_\delta(a,b,c) := {}_5F_4\left(\begin{matrix} a,\ a+\frac{1}{3},\ a+\frac{2}{3},\ c+1,\ 1 \\ b+\frac{1}{2},\ 3a-b+\delta,\ c,\ 2 \end{matrix};1\right).$$

Then the generalizations involving the extra parameter c read as follows:

Proposition 3.2. (i) *If* $3a = 2b$ *then*

$$K_1(a,b,c) = -\frac{(\frac{3}{2})^2}{a-1}\frac{b(c-1)}{(b-1)c} + \frac{(\frac{3}{2})^{2b}}{c}\left(1 + \frac{c-1}{(a-1)(b-1)}\right).$$

(ii) *If* $3a + 1 = 2b$ *then*

$$K_2(a,b,c) = -\frac{(\frac{3}{2})^2}{a-1}\frac{(b-\frac{1}{2})b(c-1)}{(b-\frac{3}{2})(b-1)c} + \frac{(\frac{3}{2})^{2b}}{(a-1)c}\left(\frac{a-c}{b+1} + \frac{a(c-1)}{(a-\frac{2}{3})(b-1)}\right).$$

Proof. The evaluations can be derived by following the same steps as in Section 2 (page 85); in the situation of part (ii) one needs the above lemma for base case evaluation. □

Now positivity can be derived as follows; note that because of (2.5) it suffices to prove (2.7) for $M = 0$.

Proof of of Proposition 2.2. The cases $i = 2$ and $i = 3$ are immediate from the representations

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} b^{(2)}(m) = \frac{2\cdot 3\cdot 47}{3^5\cdot 5}K_1(\tfrac{5}{6},\tfrac{5}{4},\tfrac{47}{40}) + \frac{2^2\cdot 47}{3^5\cdot 5}K_2(\tfrac{1}{2},\tfrac{5}{4},\tfrac{47}{40}),$$

and

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} b^{(3)}(m) = \frac{2}{3^5}K_1(\tfrac{7}{6},\tfrac{7}{4},\tfrac{7}{8}),$$

which can be verified easily. The $i = 1$ evaluation is more delicate, because $b^{(1)}(m)$ involves the polynomial factor $168m^2+343m+170$ which turns out to be irreducible over the rational number field. Nonetheless, a suitable representation can be found *automatically* by using the software mentioned earlier [Paule and Schorn 1995]. Calling the procedure `Gosper[F, m, order]` with `order` $= 2$ and `F` $=$ $F(m) = b^{(1)}(m)/(168m^2+343m+170)$ one finds a quadratic-polynomial multiple $f(m)$ of $F(m)$,

$$f(m) = (72m^2 + 139m + 65)\cdot F(m),$$

such that

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} b^{(1)}(m) = \frac{2\cdot 7}{3^4}K_1(\tfrac{1}{2},\tfrac{3}{4},\tfrac{7}{8}) + \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} f(m) \qquad (3.2)$$

and that $f(m) = g(m+1) - g(m)$, where

$$g(m) = -9(m+1)(4m+3)(4m+5)\cdot F(m).$$

Hence $\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} f(m)$ telescopes and reduces to $-g(0)$, which equals $\frac{2}{9}$. Finally, evaluating

$$2\cdot\tfrac{7}{3^4}\,K_1(\tfrac{1}{2},\tfrac{3}{4},\tfrac{7}{8}) + \tfrac{2}{9} = \tfrac{5}{9} = d_0^{(1)}$$

completes the proof. □

Remark. Case $i = 1$ can be put in a somehow more natural hypergeometric context if one climbs up the "hypergeometric hierarchy" as follows. Let

$$L_2(a,b,c,d) := {}_6F_5\left(\begin{matrix} a,\ a+\frac{1}{3},\ a+\frac{2}{3},\ c+1,\ d+1,\ 1 \\ b+\frac{1}{2},\ 3a-b+2,\ c,\ d,\ 2 \end{matrix};1\right).$$

Then one can prove (details are left to the reader):

Proposition 3.3. *If* $3a + 1 = 2b$, *then*

$$L_2(a,b,c,d) = -\frac{(\frac{3}{2})^2}{a-1}\frac{(b-\frac{1}{2})b(c-1)(d-1)}{(b-\frac{3}{2})(b-1)c\,d} + \frac{(\frac{3}{2})^{2b}}{c\,d}r(a,b,c,d), \qquad (3.3)$$

where

$$r(a,b,c,d) = \frac{2}{3}\frac{(b-\frac{1}{2})b(c-1)(d-1)}{(a-1)(b-\frac{3}{2})(b-1)} - \frac{4b}{3}\frac{(a-c)(a-d)}{(a-1)(a+1)} + 3a\frac{(b-c)(b-d)}{(b-1)(b+1)}.$$

One easily checks that $L_2(a,b,c,\infty) = K_2(a,b,c)$. For $i = 1$ we have

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} b^{(1)}(m) = \frac{2^4\cdot 7\cdot c\cdot d}{3^4\cdot 5}L_2(\tfrac{1}{2},\tfrac{5}{4},c,d),$$

where

$$c = \frac{343 - \sqrt{3409}}{336} \quad \text{and} \quad d = \frac{343 + \sqrt{3409}}{336}.$$

We also get an alternative and simpler representation for the case $i = 2$, namely

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} b^{(2)}(m) = \frac{2 \cdot 47}{3^5} L_2(\tfrac{1}{2}, \tfrac{5}{4}, \tfrac{47}{40}, \tfrac{5}{6}).$$

It is clear that several further families of hypergeometric series evaluations could be found along similar lines. For instance, as pointed out by one of the referees, Lemma 3.1 can be generalized to

$$ {}_3F_2\left(\begin{matrix} a, a+\frac{1}{3}, a+\frac{2}{3} \\ b+\frac{1}{2}, 3a-b+2 \end{matrix} ; w \right) = \frac{3a+1}{a+1}\left(\frac{1-x}{y}\right)^{3a} - \frac{2a}{a+1}\left(\frac{1-x}{y}\right)^{3a+1},$$

where again $3a+1 = 2b$, but $w = \frac{27}{4} \cdot x^2/(1-x)^3$ and $y = (1+\sqrt{1-4x})/2$. The proof is almost the same as that of Lemma 3.1, which has $x = \frac{1}{4}$; the only difference is that instead of Gauss summation one uses the summation formula

$$ {}_2F_1\left(\begin{matrix} \alpha, \alpha+\frac{1}{2} \\ 2\alpha+1 \end{matrix} ; z \right) = \left(\frac{1+\sqrt{1-z}}{2}\right)^{-2\alpha} \tag{3.4}$$

for evaluating the resulting ${}_2F_1$'s. This formula follows directly from Gauss's quadratic transformation [Graham et al. 1994, Eq. (5.110)].

The same referee also indicated that analogously explicit formulae for

$$ {}_3F_2\left(\begin{matrix} a, a+\frac{1}{3}, a+\frac{2}{3} \\ (3a+n)/2, (3a+n+1)/2 \end{matrix} ; w \right),$$

where n is an integer, and for an x-generalization of Proposition 3.2 can be found. For instance, Proposition 3.2 generalizes as follows:

Proposition 3.4. *For $\delta \in \{1,2\}$ and*

$$w = \tfrac{27}{4} \cdot x^2/(1-x)^3,$$

let

$$K_\delta(a,b,c;w) := {}_5F_4\left(\begin{matrix} a,\ a+\frac{1}{3},\ a+\frac{2}{3},\ c+1,\ 1 \\ b+\frac{1}{2},\ 3a-b+\delta,\ c,\ 2 \end{matrix} ; w \right).$$

(i) *If $3a = 2b$ and $y = \frac{1}{2}(1+\sqrt{1-4x})$, then*

$$K_1(a,b,c;w) = -\frac{1}{w}\frac{(\frac{3}{2})^2}{a-1}\frac{b(c-1)}{(b-1)c} + \frac{1}{w}\frac{(\frac{3}{2})^2}{a-1}\frac{b(c-1)}{(b-1)c}\left(\frac{1-x}{y}\right)^{2b-2} + \frac{a-c}{(a-1)c}\left(\frac{1-x}{y}\right)^{2b}.$$

(ii) *If $3a+1 = 2b$ and y is as above then*

$$\begin{aligned} K_2(a,b,c) = &-\frac{1}{w}\frac{(\frac{3}{2})^2}{a-1}\frac{(b-\frac{1}{2})b(c-1)}{(b-\frac{3}{2})(b-1)c} \\ &+\frac{1}{w}\frac{(\frac{3}{2})^2}{a-1}\frac{(b-\frac{1}{2})(c-1)}{(b-\frac{3}{2})(b-1)c} \\ &\times\left(3(b-1)\left(\frac{1-x}{y}\right)^{2b-3} - 2(b-\tfrac{3}{2})\left(\frac{1-x}{y}\right)^{2b-2}\right) \\ &+\frac{a-c}{(a-1)(b+1)c}\left(3b\left(\frac{1-x}{y}\right)^{2b-1} - 2(b-\tfrac{1}{2})\left(\frac{1-x}{y}\right)^{2b}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Again, the proof is almost the same as that of Proposition 3.2, which has $x = \frac{1}{4}$; the only difference is using (3.4) for evaluating the resulting ${}_2F_1$'s.

We also want to note that independently P. W. Karlsson [Karlsson 1995] derived some evaluations of type ${}_3F_2\left(\begin{smallmatrix} a_1,a_2,a_3 \\ b_1,b_2 \end{smallmatrix}; z\right)$ at $z = \frac{1}{4}$ from transformations related to Bailey's other cubic transformation [Bailey 1928, Eq. (4.05)], listed also as [Gessel and Stanton 1982, Eq. (5.3)]. There the results are based on a limit formula [Karlsson 1995, Eq. (1)], but contiguous relations are used in an analogous manner.

4. CONCLUSION

In his letter, D. E. Knuth asked whether his conjecture can be proved with "mechanical summation methods". With respect to this question the solution presented here succeeds only partially. Despite the fact that Krattenthaler's package was significantly helpful, it has to be viewed as a collection of manipulation rules that provides computer assistance in classical hypergeometric work. Hence, not only concerning the ${}_5F_4$ arising in (2.2) and

(2.6), but also in general, the problem of mechanical evaluation of (nonterminating) hypergeometric series seems to be quite far from being solved.

One possible approach is to make algorithmic use of contiguous relations. With respect to terminating cases this has been suggested by G. E. Andrews in connection with his recent work on "Pfaff's method" [Andrews 1996; a; b]. A first interesting attempt has been made by N. Takayama [1996].

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Don Knuth for valuable comments on a preliminary version of this paper. Evaluation (3.3) was derived following a suggestion of Dick Askey. Helmut Prodinger made me aware of Karlsson's paper. One of the referees observed that (3.4) can be brought into action.

REFERENCES

[Andrews 1996] G. E. Andrews, "Pfaff's method III: comparison with the WZ method", *Electronic. J. Comb.* **3**(2) (1996), R21, 1–18.

[Andrews a] G. E. Andrews, "Pfaff's method I: the Mills-Robbins-Rumsey determinant", to appear in *Discrete Math.*

[Andrews b] G. E. Andrews, "Pfaff's method II: diverse applications", to appear in *J. Comput. Appl. Math.*

[Bailey 1928] W. N. Bailey, "Products of generalized hypergeometric series", *Proc. London Math. Soc.* **28** (1928), 242–254.

[Gessel and Stanton 1982] I. Gessel and D. Stanton, "Strange evaluations of hypergeometric series", *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **13** (1982), 295–308.

[Graham et al. 1994] R. L. Graham, D. E. Knuth, and O. Patashnik, *Concrete Mathematics, A Foundation for Computer Science*, 2nd ed., Addison–Wesley, Reading, MA, 1994.

[Karlsson 1995] P. W. Karlsson, *Clausen's hypergeometric series with variable* $\frac{1}{4}$, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* **196** (1995), 172–180.

[Knuth 1994] D. E. Knuth, letter of August 30, 1994 to the author.

[Krattenthaler 1996] C. Krattenthaler, "HYP and HYPQ: Mathematica packages for the manipulation of binomial sums and hypergeometric series, respectively q-binomial sums and basic hypergeometric series", to appear in *J. Symb. Comput.* (special issue on "Symbolic Computation in Combinatorics Δ_1", edited by P. Paule and V. Strehl). The software is available at ftp://pap.univie.ac.at.

[Paule and Schorn 1995] P. Paule and M. Schorn, "A Mathematica version of Zeilberger's algorithm for proving binomial coefficient identities", RISC-Linz, Report Series 95–10; to appear in *J. Symb. Comput.* (special issue on "Symbolic Computation in Combinatorics Δ_1", edited by P. Paule and V. Strehl). The softare is available at ftp://ftp.risc.uni-linz.ac.at/pub/combinatorics/mathematica/PauleSchorn.

[Takayama 1996] N. Takayama, "An algorithm for finding recurrence relations of binomial sums and its complexity", to appear in *J. Symb. Comput.* (special issue on "Symbolic Computation in Combinatorics Δ_1", edited by P. Paule and V. Strehl).

Peter Paule, Institut für Mathematik, RISC, J. Kepler Universität Linz, A–4040 Linz, Austria (peter.paule@risc.uni-linz.ac.at)

Received February 7, 1996; accepted in revised form March 31