

Analytical Study and Efficient Evaluation of the Josephus Function

Yunier Bello-Cruz and Roy Quintero-Contreras

Abstract. A new approach to analyzing intrinsic properties of the Josephus function, J_k , is presented in this paper. The linear structure between extreme points of J_k is fully revealed, leading to the design of an efficient algorithm for evaluating $J_k(n)$. Algebraic expressions that describe how recursively compute extreme points, including fixed points, are derived. The existence of consecutive extreme and also fixed points for all $k \geq 2$ is proven as a consequence, which generalizes Knuth result for $k = 2$. Moreover, an extensive comparative numerical experiment is conducted to illustrate the performance of the proposed algorithm for evaluating the Josephus function compared to established algorithms. The results show that the proposed scheme is highly effective in computing $J_k(n)$ for large inputs.

1. INTRODUCTION The Josephus problem is a game of elimination that has been studied for nearly two millennia. The earliest known formulation of the problem appears in the historical text [11] written by historian Flavius Josephus. Josephus described a method of serial elimination by casting lots, which he and 40 of his soldiers applied while trapped in a cave by the Roman army and facing imminent capture and inevitable massacre.

The general formulation of the problem is as follows: a certain number of people n is arranged in a circle, and an execution method is established. An initial counting point and a direction of rotation are fixed, and after $k - 1$ number of people are counted, the next person is executed and removed from the circle. This procedure is repeated with the remaining people until only one person remains, who is released. The objective is to determine the position of the survivor $J_k(n) \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ in the initial circle.

The problem received little attention throughout the first millennium, but new formulations were proposed in the second millennium, such as the rhyming games traced by Oring [16]. In the following centuries, more specific versions of the problem emerged, and it was integrated into a certain category of puzzles or riddles. One notable example is Bachet's presentation [2], where was established a formal procedure to solve the case $k = 3$ and $n = 41$ with total accuracy. In 1776, Euler heuristically found a recursive formula that connects the survivor's position for a given number of condemned with the position of the corresponding survivor when one more condemned is added; see [6]. This was a significant development in the mathematical treatment of the problem, as it required logical argumentation, appropriate symbolic notation, and exploration. However, the computational aspect of the problem has received more attention in recent years, as the advancement of technology allows for the efficient calculation of the survivor's position $J_k(n)$ for large numbers of people n . In [22], Tait presents some discussion and figures in this direction, highlighting the importance of fast computational methods for solving the problem. Over time, the problem has attracted the attention of mathematicians from various areas, and the study of the problem was recently extended to the field of permutations. Mathematicians such as Herstein, Kaplansky, Ball, and others studied the problem in group theory and algorithmically; see, for instance, [1, 3, 5, 10, 20, 24]. The Josephus problem also has various modern applications such as computer algorithms, data structures, and image encryption; see, for instance, [4, 13, 25, 26]. When the number of jumps, $k - 1$, is equal to one, Knuth derived a closed-form expression for $J_2(n)$ as $2n - 2^{\lfloor \log_2 n \rfloor + 1} + 1$ and developed an efficient algorithm for evaluating J_k for arbitrary values of k ; see, for instance, [12]. This algorithm avoids the recursive nature of the Josephus function and is presented in [7]. We invite the reader interested in delving deeper into the historical origin of this problem and applications to review references such as [9, 14, 15, 17–19, 21] and [8, Appendix].

This paper introduces a new approach for analyzing the intrinsic properties of the Josephus function, J_k . We formulate algebraic expressions that describe all extreme points of J_k , including recurrence formulas to compute extreme points. Additionally, we prove the existence of consecutive extreme and fixed points for all $k \geq 3$, generalizing Knuth result for $k = 2$; see [7]. Moreover, by revealing the piecewise linear structure of J_k between extreme points, we design an efficient algorithm for evaluating $J_k(n)$ for large n . A comparative computational study is conducted at the last section of the paper to evaluate the performance of the proposed algorithm against established methods, such as Euler/Woodhouse [6, 25], Knuth [7], and Uchiyama [23]. The results of the numerical comparison indicate that the proposed scheme is highly effective for computing $J_k(n)$ for large inputs k and n .

Notation and Definitions The mathematical formulation of the classical Josephus problem can be stated as follows: Let n people be arranged in a circle which closes up its ranks as individuals are picked out. Starting anywhere (person 1st spot), go sequentially around clockwise, picking out each k th person (this number k is called the *reduction constant*) until but one person is left (this person is called the *survivor*). The position of the survivor is denoted by $J_k(n)$, which belongs to the natural numbers \mathbb{N} . This procedure is called the *elimination process*, and it naturally generates a discrete function $J_k : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ for each $k \geq 2$ that we will call the Josephus function. Given $n \geq 1$ and $k \geq 2$ integers, we say that the Josephus problem has been solved once we have determined the value of J_k at n . For any two integers ℓ and m such that $\ell < m$, the set $\{\ell, \ell + 1, \dots, m\}$ will be denoted by $[[\ell, m]]$. Notice further that $J_k(n) \in [[1, n]]$ for every n .

Definition (Fixed and Extremal points). A *fixed point* of J_k is a value n_p such that $n_p = J_k(n_p)$. Additionally, an *extremal point* n_e is defined as a point that satisfies either $J_k(n_e) \in [[1, k - 1]]$ or $J_k(n_e) \in [[n_e - k + 2, n_e]]$. If $J_k(n_e) \in [[1, k - 1]]$, we refer to n_e as a *low extremal point*. On the other hand, if $J_k(n_e) \in [[n_e - k + 2, n_e]]$, we refer to n_e as a *high extremal point*.

Note that, a fixed point n_p is also a high extremal point because $J_k(n_p) = n_p$. However, there are high extremal points that are not fixed points; see Figure 1 below.

2. PROPERTIES OF THE JOSEPHUS FUNCTION In this section, we first recall a well-known recursive formula appeared first in Euler paper [6, & 8, pp. 130-131], which establishes a way of determining $J_k(n + 1)$ in terms of $J_k(n)$.

Theorem 1 (Euler formula). Let $k \geq 2$ and denote $p := J_k(n)$. Then, $J_k(n + 1) = p + k - \ell(n + 1)$, if $p + k \in [[\ell(n + 1) + 1, (\ell + 1)(n + 1)]]$ for some non-negative integer ℓ .




Figure 1. Graphs of the Josephus functions J_3 and J_{10}

Remark. For some special values of the reduction constant k , we have the following observations:

(a) If $k \leq n + 1$, the formula given in Theorem 1 can be simplified as follows:

$$J_k(n + 1) = \begin{cases} p + k, & \text{if } p + k \leq n + 1 \\ p + k - (n + 1), & \text{if } p + k > n + 1. \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

(b) When $k = 3$, (1) holds for every n . In fact, we just need to check (1) for $n = 1$. In this case, we have $J_3(n + 1) = J_3(2) = 2 = J_3(1) + 3 - (1 + 1) = J_3(n) + k - (n + 1)$.

(c) When $k = 2$, no recursive formula is necessary hereafter since Knuth [7] has deduced the following explicit formula: $J_2(n) = 2n - 2^{\lceil \log_2 n \rceil + 1} + 1$, for all n .

- (d) It is possible for two consecutive values of n to have the same image under J_k . For example, when $k = 8$, $J_8(3) = J_8(4) = 3$.
- (e) If $n \leq k - 1$, $J_k(n) \leq n \leq k - 1$, which implies that n is a low, and also high, extremal point. Moreover, if $n \geq 2k - 3$, then there is an alternating sequence of pure low and high extremal points for the Josephus function J_k for every $k \geq 2$.

In Figure 1, we present the graphs of J_3 and J_{10} for various values of n . The extremal points of J_k , n_e , i.e., $J_k(n_e) \in [[1, k - 1]] \cup [[n_e - k + 2, n_e]]$, which will be fully studied in the next subsection, are indicated in blue. Moreover, the fixed points n_p of J_k , i.e., $n_p = J_k(n_p)$, that are also extreme points, are depicted in red.

Note that for n_e to be both a low and high extremal point, $J_k(n_e) \in [[1, k - 1]] \cap [[n_e - k + 2, n_e]]$, which always happens if $n_e \leq k - 1$. In addition, if $n_e \geq 2k - 3$ is a high extremal point then $n_e + 1$ is a low extremal point, which reveals a sequence of alternated extreme points. The two graphs depicted in Figure 1 exhibit the intrinsic piecewise linear structure of J_k between its low and high extremal points. Moreover, in general the fixed points for $k \geq 3$ exhibit a chaotic behavior in contrast with the case $k = 2$; see Figure 1 above for the cases $k = 3$ and $k = 10$, and also Table 1 below with $k = 2, 3, \dots, 12, 15$. Note that the fixed points of J_2 can be described by the formula: $n_p^{(i)} = 2^i - 1$, where i is a natural number. Note further that $J_2(2^i) = 1$, which makes $n_e = 2^i$ be a low extreme point, for every i ; see, for instance, [12, pp. 184].

In Table 1 below, we illustrate the first fixed points of the Josephus functions $J_k(n)$ for some values of k .

Fixed points \ Functions	J_2	J_3	J_4	J_5	J_6	J_7	J_8	J_9	J_{10}	J_{11}	J_{12}	J_{15}
1st	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
2nd	3	2	21	2	20	2	3	2	4	2	10	2
3rd	7	13	38	46	51	3	13	7	475	4	11	52
4th	15	20	51	542	794	12	15	8	8177	5	19	388
5th	31	46	122	2587	953	68	26	15	11217	49	55	1899
6th	63	157	163	3234	17629	274	1276	17	28954	54	111	30003
7th	127	236	689	6317	21155	593	1905	375	126567	188	290	136887

Table 1. First seventh fixed points of J_k for $k = 2, 3, \dots, 12, 15$.

Now based on Theorem 1, we present a formula for the Josephus function for the value of $n = n_p + 1$, i.e., just after a fixed point $n_p = J_k(n_p)$ is attained.

Proposition 2 (Values of J_k after reaching a fixed point). *Let $k \geq 2$ and n_p be a fixed point. Then,*

$$J_k(n_p + 1) = \begin{cases} k - 1, & \text{if } k \leq n_p + 1 \\ n_p + 1, & \text{if } k = s_\ell + 1 \text{ for some } \ell \geq 1 \\ k_1 - 1, & \text{if } k = s_\ell + k_1 \text{ for some } \ell \geq 1 \text{ and } 2 \leq k_1 \leq n_p \\ n_p, & \text{if } k = s_{\ell+1} \text{ for some } \ell \geq 1, \end{cases}$$

where $s_\ell = \ell(n_p + 1)$. Moreover, if $J_k(n_p + 1) = k - 1$ then n_p is a fixed point.

Proof. Let us consider the four cases for the values of k with respect to n_p as follows:

Case 1. Assume $k \leq n_p + 1$. Note that $s_1 + 1 = n_p + 2 \leq n_p + k \leq 2n_p + 1 < s_2$. It follows from Theorem 1 that $J_k(n_p + 1) = n_p + k - s_1 = n_p + k - (n_p + 1) = k - 1$.

Case 2. Assume $k = s_\ell + 1$. So, $n_p + k = s_{\ell+1}$. Then, by Theorem 1, $J_k(n_p + 1) = n_p + k - s_\ell = n_p + 1$.

Case 3. Assume $k = s_\ell + k_1$ ($2 \leq k_1 \leq n_p$). Note that $s_{\ell+1} + 1 \leq n_p + k \leq 2n_p + s_\ell = s_{\ell+1} + n_p - 1 < s_{\ell+2}$. Then, by Theorem 1, $J_k(n_p + 1) = n_p + k - s_{\ell+1} = k_1 - 1$.

Case 4. Assume $k = s_{\ell+1}$. Then, $s_{\ell+1} + 1 \leq n_p + k < s_{\ell+2}$. Theorem 1 implies $J_k(n_p + 1) = n_p + k - s_{\ell+1} = n_p$.

On the other hand, assume that $k \leq n_p + 1$ and $J_k(n_p + 1) = k - 1$. By using Euler formula backwards, we can determine the value of $p = J_k(n_p)$. In particular, p must satisfy the equation $k - 1 = p + k - s_\ell$ for some non-negative integer ℓ . This is equivalent to $p = s_\ell - 1$. If $\ell = 0$, then $p = -1$, which is not possible. If $\ell \geq 2$, then $p \geq s_2 - 1 > s_1 - 1 = n_p$, which is also not possible. Hence, $\ell = 1$ and $p = n_p$, which implies that n_p is a fixed point of J_k . ■

Remark. If n_p is a fixed point, then the following interesting facts can be derived from Proposition 2:

- (a) If $n_p \geq k - 1$, then $J_k(n_p + 1) = k - 1$. In particular, $J_3(n_p + 1) = 2$ for any n_p .
- (b) It is possible for two consecutive fixed points to exist for a given value of k . For example, when $k = 9$, 7 and 8 are both fixed points of J_9 .
- (c) Note that, if a fixed point $n_p \leq k - 1$, then n_p is also a low extremal point.

We will now provide a formal presentation of a partially generalized version of Euler’s formula, which was previously stated without proof in [19, p. 47].

Lemma 3 (Generalization of the Euler formula). *Let $n \geq 1$ and $k \geq 2$ be positive integers and denote $p := J_k(n)$ ($1 \leq p \leq n$). Then,*

- (a) *If $p + km \leq n + m$, for any $m \in \mathbb{N}$, then $J_k(n + m) = p + km$.*
- (b) *If $m \in \mathbb{N}$ is the smallest value for which $p + km > n + m$, then $J_k(n + m) = p + km - (n + m)$.*

Proof. (a) Let m be any natural number. First of all, $p + km \leq n + m$, if and only if, $m \leq (n - p)/(k - 1)$. Thus, $p + k\check{m} \leq n + \check{m}$ for every $0 \leq \check{m} \leq m$. Let us define the finite sequences: $r_{\check{m}} := n + \check{m}$, and $t_{\check{m}} := J_k(r_{\check{m}})$ for every integer $\check{m} = 0, \dots, m$. Since, $p + k \leq n + 1$, by Theorem 1, we get $t_1 = p + k$. Now, since $t_1 + k = p + k(2) \leq n + 2 = r_1 + 1$, again by Theorem 1, we get $t_2 = t_1 + k$. By applying this procedure m times, we get that $t_{\check{m}} = t_{\check{m}-1} + k$ for $\check{m} \in [[1, m]]$. Then,

$$J_k(n + m) = J_k(r_m) = t_m = t_{m-1} + k = \dots = p + km,$$

proving item (a).

(b) Let us denote $p' := p + k(m - 1)$ and $n' := n + (m - 1)$. Note that $p' \leq n'$ by hypothesis. Thus, by part (a), $J_k(n') = p'$. Moreover $p' + k > n' + 1$. We claim that $p' + k \leq 2(n' + 1)$. Otherwise, $2(n + m) = 2(n' + 1) < p' + k \leq n' + k = (n + m) + k - 1$, which implies that $n + m < k - 1$. Then, $k < p + k(m - 1) \leq (n + m) - 1 < k - 2$, which is a contradiction. Hence, it follows from equation (1) that $J_k(n + m) = J_k(n' + 1) = p' + k - (n' + 1) = p + k - (n + m)$, which proves item (b). ■

In the following subsection, we will use Lemma 3 to derive several general conclusions regarding the behavior of the Josephus function J_k .

Characterization of extremal points We start by characterizing some initial extreme points for the Josephus function.

Corollary 4 (The first known high extremal point). *The point $2k - 2$ is always an extremal point for J_k . In particular,*

$$n_e := \begin{cases} 2k - 3, & \text{if } J_k(2k - 2) \leq k - 1 \\ 2k - 2, & \text{if } J_k(2k - 2) > k - 1, \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

is a high extremal point and $n_e + 1$ is a low extremal point.

Proof. When $j := J_k(2k - 2) \leq k - 1$, by the definition of low extremal point and (2), we have that $n_e + 1 = 2k - 2$ is a low extremal point and $n_e = 2k - 3$ a high extremal point.

On the other hand, when $j > k - 1$, $n_e = 2k - 2$ must be a high extremal point. Indeed, $j \in [[k, 2k - 2]]$. Moreover, by Lemma 3(b),

$$J_k(2k - 1) = J_k(2k - 2) + k - ((2k - 2) + 1) = j - k + 1 \in [[1, k - 1]].$$

Hence, $2k - 1 = n_e + 1$ is a low extremal point. Therefore, by definition $2k - 2 = n_e$ is a high extremal point, as desired. ■

In the following, we present our main results. From now on, let us assume that $k \geq 2$ and $n \geq k - 1$, which allows an alternating sequence of low and high extremal points for the Josephus function J_k where $k \geq 2$. We next reveal a recurrence procedure to find successive extreme points of the function J_k . In particular, we prove that there is an infinite number of fixed points for J_k .

First, we introduce the following sequences:

$$\{\delta_k(r, j)\}_{r=0, j=1}^{k-2, k-1} \quad \text{with} \quad \delta_k(r, j) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } r < j - 1 \\ 0, & \text{if } r \geq j - 1, \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

$$\{a_k(n, r)\}_{n=k-1, r=0}^{\infty, k-2} \quad \text{with} \quad a_k(n, r) := \frac{k(n+1) - (r+1)}{k-1}, \quad (4)$$

$$\{M_k(n, r, j)\}_{n=k-1, r=0, j=1}^{\infty, k-2, k-1} \quad \text{with} \quad M_k(n, r, j) := \frac{n-r}{k-1} - \delta_k(r, j). \quad (5)$$

The meaning of each sequence term can be summarized as follows: $\delta_k(r, j)$ serves as a variation of Kronecker's delta, while $a_k(n, r)$ is associated with the extremal points of the Josephus function. Lastly, $M_k(n, r, j)$ defines the upper bound of an interval where the Josephus function exhibits linear behavior. We outline some important properties of these sequences in the following lemma.

Lemma 5 (Properties of the Josephus function). *Denote $j := J_k(n+1)$. Then,*

(a) *If $j \in [[1, k-1]]$, $m_0 := \left\lfloor \frac{n - (j-1)}{k-1} \right\rfloor$ is the largest nonnegative integer m that satisfies the inequality*

$$j + km \leq n + 1 + m. \quad (6)$$

and $[[0, m_0]]$ is the solution set of (6). Moreover, $m_0 \geq 1$ if $n \geq k - 2 + j$.

(b) *If $j \in [[1, k-1]]$ and $n \equiv r \pmod{k-1}$, then $m_0 = M_k(n, r, j)$ and $n + 1 + m_0 = a_k(n, r) - \delta_k(r, j)$.*

(c) *$a_k(n, r)$ is an integer, if and only if, $n \equiv r \pmod{k-1}$.*

Proof. (a) First note that (6) is equivalent to $m \leq (n - (j-1))/(k-1)$. Then, since $n \geq k-1$, we have $m_0 = \lfloor (n - (j-1))/(k-1) \rfloor$ as the largest non-negative integer satisfying (6). Therefore, any non-negative integer m satisfying $0 \leq m \leq m_0$ clearly satisfies the inequality (6), since 0 is a trivial solution. Now, note that $n \geq k-2+j$ happens automatically when $n \geq 2k-3$ since $j \leq k-1$. Moreover, since $(n - (j-1))/(k-1) \geq (2k-3 - (k-2))/(k-1) = 1$, we have $m_0 \geq 1$.

On the other hand, if $n \in [[k-1, 2k-4]]$ then, from a direct inspection to the value of $(n - (j-1))/(k-1)$, we get that

$$m_0 = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } n < k - 2 + j \\ 1, & \text{if } n \geq k - 2 + j. \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

So, in this case, it follows from (7) that $m_0 = 1$ is the largest integer satisfying (6) if $n \geq k - 2 + j$, proving this item.

(b) Suppose that $n \equiv r \pmod{k-1}$. Note that $\frac{(j-1)-r}{k-1} \in [\frac{1}{k-1}, \frac{j-1}{k-1}] \subset (0, 1)$ when $r < j-1$, and $\frac{r-(j-1)}{k-1} \in [\frac{1}{k-1}, 1 - \frac{j}{k-1}] \subset (0, 1)$ when $r > j-1$. Thus, using the definition of $M_k(n, r, j)$ given in (5), we get

$$m_0 = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \left\lfloor \frac{n-r}{k-1} - \frac{(j-1)-r}{k-1} \right\rfloor = \frac{n-r}{k-1} - 1, & \text{if } r < j-1 \\ \frac{n-r}{k-1}, & \text{if } r = j-1 \\ \left\lfloor \frac{n-r}{k-1} + \frac{r-(j-1)}{k-1} \right\rfloor = \frac{n-r}{k-1}, & \text{if } r > j-1 \end{array} \right\} = M_k(n, r, j).$$

The equality $n + 1 + m_0 = a_k(n, r) - \delta_k(r, j)$ follows directly from previous equation and by the definition of $a_k(n, r)$ and $\delta_k(r, j)$ in (3) and (4), respectively.

(c) If $a_k(n, r) = \frac{k(n+1) - (r+1)}{k-1}$ is an integer, clearly $k(n+1) \equiv r+1 \pmod{k-1}$. In this case,

$$n \equiv kn - (k-1)n \equiv kn \equiv k(n+1) - k \equiv r+1 - k \equiv r - (k-1) \equiv r \pmod{k-1}.$$

Now if $n \equiv r \pmod{k-1}$ then $k(n+1) \equiv n+1 + (k-1)(n+1) \equiv n+1 \equiv r+1 \pmod{k-1}$, which implies that $a_k(n, r)$ is an integer. ■

We now present formulas characterizing extremal points and their images in the Josephus function J_k . These expressions will be useful in determining recurrence formulas between extremal points and a formula for the image of J_k at any arbitrary n in terms of the high and low extremal points.

Theorem 6 (Extremal points formulas). *Let $n_e \geq 2k - 3$ be a high extremal point and denote $j := J_k(n_e + 1)$. Then,*

(a) $J_k(n_e + 1 + m) = j + km$, for all $m \in [[0, \lfloor (n_e - (j - 1)) / (k - 1) \rfloor]]$.

(b) If $n_e \equiv r \pmod{k-1}$, then the next high extremal point of J_k is $n_e^+ := a_k(n_e, r) - \delta_k(r, j)$. Moreover,

$$J_k(n_e^+) = n_e^+ - \delta_k(r, j)(k-1) - r + (j-1), \tag{8}$$

$$J_k(n_e^+ + 1) = (1 - \delta_k(r, j))(k-1) - r + (j-1), \tag{9}$$

and

$$J_k(n_e^+ + 1) = (k-1) - [n_e^+ - J_k(n_e^+)]. \tag{10}$$

(c) n_e^+ is a fixed point of J_k , if and only if, $r - (j - 1) = 0$ and $n_e^+ = \frac{k(n_e + 1) - j}{k - 1}$.

(d) J_k is a linear function on $[[n_e + 1, n_e^+]]$.

Proof. (a) By Lemma 5(a), $j + km \leq n_e + 1 + m$ for every $m \in [[0, m_0]]$ where $m_0 := \lfloor (n_e - (j - 1)) / (k - 1) \rfloor$. Additionally, Lemma 3(a) implies that $J_k(n_e + 1 + m) = j + km$ for every $m \in [[0, \lfloor (n_e - (j - 1)) / (k - 1) \rfloor]]$ as desired.

(b) It follows from the previous item, and Lemma 5(b) that $m_0 \geq 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned} J_k(n_e^+) &= J_k(n_e + 1 + m_0) = j + km_0 \\ &= \begin{cases} j + k \left(\frac{n_e - r}{k - 1} - 1 \right), & \text{if } r < j - 1 \\ j + k \left(\frac{n_e - r}{k - 1} \right), & \text{if } r \geq j - 1 \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} a_k(n_e, r) - 1 - (k - 1) - (r - (j - 1)), & \text{if } r < j - 1 \\ a_k(n_e, r) - (r - (j - 1)), & \text{if } r \geq j - 1 \end{cases} \\ &= n_e^+ - \delta_k(r, j)(k - 1) - r + j - 1, \end{aligned}$$

where $m_0 = \lfloor (n_e - (j - 1)) / (k - 1) \rfloor$, which proves (8). Now using Lemma 3(b) and Lemma 5(b), we have

$$\begin{aligned} J_k(n_e^+ + 1) &= J_k(n_e + 1 + (m_0 + 1)) = j + k(m_0 + 1) - (n_e + 1 + (m_0 + 1)) \\ &= \begin{cases} j + k \left(\frac{n_e - r}{k - 1} \right) - n_e - 1 - \frac{n_e - r}{k - 1}, & \text{if } r < j - 1 \\ j + k \left(\frac{n_e - r}{k - 1} + 1 \right) - n_e - 2 - \frac{n_e - r}{k - 1}, & \text{if } r \geq j - 1 \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \begin{cases} -(r - (j - 1)), & \text{if } r < j - 1 \\ (k - 1) - (r - (j - 1)), & \text{if } r \geq j - 1 \end{cases} \\
&= (1 - \delta_k(r, j))(k - 1) - r + j - 1,
\end{aligned}$$

establishing (9). On the other hand, since $(1 - \delta_k(r, j))(k - 1) - r + j - 1 \in [[1, k - 1]]$, n_e^+ is certainly the next high extremal point of J_k . Additionally,

$$\begin{aligned}
(k - 1) - [n_e^+ - J_k(n_e^+)] &= (k - 1) - [n_e^+ - (n_e^+ - \delta_k(r, j)(k - 1) - r + j - 1)] \\
&= (k - 1) - [\delta_k(r, j)(k - 1) + r - j + 1] \\
&= (1 - \delta_k(r, j))(k - 1) - r + j - 1 \\
&= J_k(n_e^+ + 1),
\end{aligned}$$

proving (10).

(c) If n_e^+ is a fixed point of J_k , then (8) implies that $\delta_k(r, j)(k - 1) + r - j + 1 = 0$. Therefore, $r - j + 1 = 0$ and $n_e^+ = a_k(n_e, j - 1) = (k(n_e + 1) - j)/(k - 1)$. Conversely, if $r - j + 1 = 0$ and $n_e^+ = (k(n_e + 1) - j)/(k - 1)$, then (8) implies $J_k(n_e^+) = n_e^+ - \delta_k(r, j)(k - 1) - r + j - 1 = n_e^+ - 0(k - 1) - 0 = n_e^+$. Thus, n_e^+ is a fixed point of J_k .

(d) It follows from (a). ■

The following results present a recurrence formula that allows us to compute successive high extremal points for the Josephus function J_k . We also provide algebraic expressions for the images of J_k at extremal points and at an arbitrary n . This recurrence relation is of great importance in establishing the existence of fixed points and developing an effective extremal algorithm for evaluating the Josephus function.

Corollary 7 (Recurrence formula for computing high extremal points). *Let $n_e^{(i)} \geq 2k - 3$ be a high extremal point of the Josephus function J_k , with corresponding functional value $J_k(n_e^{(i)})$. Given*

$$r_i := \text{mod}(n_e^{(i)}, k - 1), \quad (11)$$

and

$$c_i := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } r_i < k - 2 - n_e^{(i)} + J_k(n_e^{(i)}) \\ 0, & \text{if } r_i \geq k - 2 - n_e^{(i)} + J_k(n_e^{(i)}), \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

Then, we can compute the next high extremal point

$$n_e^{(i+1)} = \frac{k(n_e^{(i)} + 1) - (r_i + 1)}{k - 1} - c_i, \quad (13)$$

and its functional value

$$J_k(n_e^{(i+1)}) = (k - 1) - n_e^{(i)} + J_k(n_e^{(i)}) + k \left\lfloor \frac{2n_e^{(i)} - J_k(n_e^{(i)}) - (k - 2)}{k - 1} \right\rfloor. \quad (14)$$

Moreover, for any $n \in [[n_e^{(i)} + 1, n_e^{(i+1)}]]$, we have

$$J_k(n) = k(n - n_e^{(i+1)}) + J_k(n_e^{(i+1)}). \quad (15)$$

Proof. Assume that $n_e^{(i)}$ is a given high extremal point and its corresponding value through J_k is known. Then, by Theorem 6(c), $J_k(n_e^{(i)} + 1) = (k - 1) - [n_e^{(i)} - J_k(n_e^{(i)})]$.

Set $j := (k - 1) - [n_e^{(i)} - J_k(n_e^{(i)})]$. Notice that $j - 1 = k - 2 - n_e^{(i)} + J_k(n_e^{(i)})$. Find r_i and c_i by employing equations (11) and (12), respectively.

Then, on the one hand, by Theorem 6(b), the next high extremal point of $J_k, n_e^{(i+1)}$, is

$$n_e^{(i+1)} = a_k(n_e^{(i)}, r_i) - \delta_k(r_i, j) = \frac{k(n_e^{(i)} + 1) - (r_i + 1)}{k - 1} - c_i,$$

which tell us that (13) holds. Also, it follows from Theorem 6(b) that:

$$\begin{aligned} J_k(n_e^{(i+1)}) &= j + k \left\lfloor \frac{n_e^{(i)} - (j - 1)}{k - 1} \right\rfloor \\ &= (k - 1) - n_e^{(i)} + J_k(n_e^{(i)}) + k \left\lfloor \frac{2n_e^{(i)} - J_k(n_e^{(i)}) - (k - 2)}{k - 1} \right\rfloor, \end{aligned}$$

which verifies the validity of (14). Now, if $n \in [[n_e^{(i)} + 1, n_e^{(i+1)}]]$, the point $(n, J_k(n))$ can be determined by finding the intersection of the vertical line at (n, n) and the line with slope k that passes through $(n_e^{(i+1)}, J_k(n_e^{(i+1)}))$, which gives us (15). ■

We now include a similar recurrence formula for the low extremal points.

Corollary 8 (Recurrence formula for computing low extremal points). *Let $\check{n}_e^{(i)} \geq 2k - 3$ be a low extremal point of the Josephus function J_k , with functional value $J_k(\check{n}_e^{(i)})$. Given $\check{r}_i := \pmod{\check{n}_e^{(i)}, k - 1}$ and*

$$\check{c}_i := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \check{r}_i < J_k(\check{n}_e^{(i)}) \\ 0, & \text{if } \check{r}_i \geq J_k(\check{n}_e^{(i)}). \end{cases}$$

Then, we can compute the next low extremal point as follows:

$$\check{n}_e^{(i+1)} = \frac{k\check{n}_e^{(i)} - \check{r}_i}{k - 1} - \check{c}_i + 1, \tag{16}$$

and its functional value as:

$$J_k(\check{n}_e^{(i+1)}) = k - \check{n}_e^{(i+1)} + J_k(\check{n}_e^{(i)}) + k \left\lfloor \frac{\check{n}_e^{(i)} - J_k(\check{n}_e^{(i)})}{k - 1} \right\rfloor. \tag{17}$$

Moreover, for any $n \in [[\check{n}_e^{(i)} + 1, \check{n}_e^{(i+1)}]]$, we have

$$J_k(n) = kn + J_k(\check{n}_e^{(i+1)}) - (k - 1)\check{n}_e^{(i+1)}. \tag{18}$$

Proof. The proof of the formulas for $\check{n}_e^{(i+1)}$ and $J_k(\check{n}_e^{(i+1)})$ are similar to Corollary 7. $J_k(n)$ follows directly from (15) and (10). ■

Remark (Knuth formula is recovered). When $k = 2$, the above corollary can be used to derive the Knuth formulas for the low and high extremal (fixed) points, as well as the explicit formula for $J_2(n)$ for every $n \geq 1$. To do this, we substitute $k = 2$ into equations (16) and (17), which yields $\check{r}_i = 0$ and $\check{c}_i = 1$ for all $i \geq 1$. More than that, Corollary 4 can be used to start a straightforward induction argument, to show that the low extremal point $\check{n}_e^{(i)} = 2^i$ and the high extremal point, which in this case coincides with a fixed point, $n_p^{(i)} = \check{n}_e^{(i)} - 1 = 2^i - 1$ for all $i \geq 1$. Moreover, the explicit formula for $J_2(n)$ can be obtained directly from (18) by observing that $J_2(\check{n}_e^{(i)}) = 1$ and $i = \lfloor \log_2 n \rfloor$ whenever $n_e^{(i)}$ is a low extremal point and $n \geq n_e^{(i)}$. Specifically, we have $J_2(n) = 2n - 2^{\lfloor \log_2 n \rfloor + 1} + 1$.

We are now ready to prove the existence of infinitely many fixed points for J_k when $k \geq 3$, which has already been established by Knuth for $k = 2$. The approach we take to prove the existence of fixed points will involve applying the recurrence form of Corollary 7 successively. We state this formally in the following theorem.

Theorem 9 (Existence of infinitely many fixed points). *The Josephus function J_k will eventually reach a fixed point.*

Proof. When $k = 2$ the result was proved by Knuth [12, pp. 162 & 184]. So, let us assume that $k \geq 3$. Then, if $n \geq 2k - 3$ and $J_k(n)$ is known, and if n is either a low extremal point or a point that is not a high extremal point, then we can reach a high extremal point by using Lemma 3. Without loss of generality, we can assume that n is a high extremal point that is not a fixed point of J_k , and we seek to find a fixed point.

The proof will proceed by contradiction. Assume that the repeated application of Corollary 7 generates only high extremal points, which are no fixed points of J_k . Let us denote n as $n_e^{(0)}$. So, $n_e^{(0)} + 1$ is a low extremal point of J_k , and by Proposition 2, $j_0 := J_k(n_e^{(0)} + 1) < k - 1$. Let $r_0 \leq k - 2$ such that $n_e^{(0)} \equiv r_0 \pmod{k - 1}$. Then, by applying Corollary 7, the integer $n_e^{(1)}$ is a high extremal point. Based on our general assumption $r_0 \neq j_0 - 1$. Notice that $n_e^{(1)}$ can be written as follows:

$$n_e^{(1)} = \alpha(n_e^{(0)} + 1) - \frac{r_0 + 1}{k - 1} - c_0 = \alpha(n + 1) + d_0 - 1,$$

where $\alpha := k/(k - 1)$ and $d_0 := (1 - c_0) - (r_0 + 1)/(k - 1)$. Based on our assumption and on Corollary 7, an infinite sequence $\{n_e^{(m)}\}_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ of high extremal points can be generated, where none of its terms is a fixed point such that $j_m := J_k(n_e^{(m)} + 1) < k - 1$ (a low extremal point), $n_e^{(m)} \equiv r_m \pmod{k - 1}$ ($r_m \neq j_m - 1$), and for $m \geq 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} n_e^{(m)} &= \alpha^m(n_e^{(0)} + 1) + (\alpha^{m-1}d_0 + \dots + d_{m-1}) - 1 \\ &= \alpha^m(n + 1) + \left(\sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \alpha^{m-1-i}d_i \right) - 1, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where $d_i := (1 - c_i) - (r_i + 1)/(k - 1)$. Therefore, (19) holds for all $m \geq 1$. Now, observe that it can be rewritten as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} n_e^{(m)} &= \alpha^{m-1} \left(\alpha(n + 1) + \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \frac{d_i}{\alpha^i} - \frac{1}{\alpha^{m-1}} \right) \\ &= \frac{k^{m-1}}{(k-1)^{m-1}} \left(\frac{k}{k-1}(n + 1) + \frac{1}{k-1} \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \frac{(k-1)d_i}{\alpha^i} - \frac{(k-1)^{m-1}}{k^{m-1}} \right) \\ &= \frac{k^{m-1}}{(k-1)^m} \left(k(n + 1) + \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} (k-1)d_i \left(\frac{k-1}{k} \right)^i - \frac{(k-1)^m}{k^{m-1}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Note further that $(k-1)d_i = (k-1)(1 - c_i) - r_i - 1$, where $r_i \in [[0, k - 2]]$ and $c_i \in \{0, 1\}$. Hence, if we define

$$\beta_m := k(n + 1) + \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} (k-1)d_i \left(\frac{k-1}{k} \right)^i - \frac{(k-1)^m}{k^{m-1}},$$

then, for all $m \geq 1$, β_m satisfies:

$$1 \leq k(n - k + 2) - 1 \leq \beta_m \leq k(n + k - 1), \quad (21)$$

where we have used that $-(k-1) \leq (k-1)d_i \leq k-2$, the fact that $n \geq 2k - 3$ implies that $n \geq k - 1$ because $k \geq 3$, and

$$\sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \left(\frac{k-1}{k} \right)^i = \frac{1 - \left(\frac{k-1}{k} \right)^m}{1 - \left(\frac{k-1}{k} \right)} \leq k.$$

Using now (20), we get

$$n_e^{(m)} = \frac{k^{m-1}}{(k-1)^m} \cdot \beta_m,$$

and hence, $n_e^{(m)}$ is a positive integer number for all m , if β_m grows as $(k-1)^m$ for m large, or it approaches to 0 as $\frac{k^{m-1}}{(k-1)^m}$. These two possibilities clearly do not happen because (21) guarantees that β_m is uniformly far from 0 and bounded. Thus, for some $m_0 \geq 1$, r_{m_0} coincides with $j_{m_0} - 1$ and $n_e^{(m_0)}$ is a fixed point by Theorem 6(c), proving the result. ■

3. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS In this section, we present a numerical comparison of four algorithms to evaluate the Josephus function. The computational experiments were carried out on an iMac 3.6 GHz 10-Core Intel Core i9 with 32GB of RAM. The algorithms were implemented in the Julia programming language v1.8 and the code of Extremal algorithm is provided below for reference.

The algorithms First, let's describe three well-known methods for solving the Josephus problem (Euler, Knuth and Uchiyama algorithms); see, for instance, [7, 23, 25]. Moreover, we propose a novel scheme for evaluating the Josephus function called the Extremal algorithm.

Euler algorithm: The Euler algorithm is a natural interpretation of the recurrence relation proposed first in [6, & 8, pp. 130-131]. In [25, p. 57], Woodhouse gave the following modern algorithmic description:

$$J_k(n) = ((\dots((1+k)_{(2)} + k)_{(3)} + \dots + k)_{(n-1)} + k)_{(n)}$$

where for any positive integers r and s the symbol $(r)_{(s)}$ denotes the integer satisfying: $(r)_{(s)} \equiv r \pmod s$ and $1 \leq (r)_{(s)} \leq s$. This scheme clearly has an intrinsic recursive behavior and complexity $O(n)$, i.e., there is necessary about n function evaluations to reach the solution.

To compute the Josephus function J_k at n , the Euler algorithm requires evaluating J_k for all preceding values, that is, $n - 1$ evaluations of J_k .

Knuth algorithm: In equation (3.19) from [7, Chapter 3, Section 3, p. 81] Knuth presents the following algorithm:

$$\begin{aligned} D &:= 1; \\ \text{While } D &\leq (k-1)n \text{ do } D := \left\lceil \frac{k}{k-1} D \right\rceil; \\ J_k(n) &= kn + 1 - D. \end{aligned}$$

Knuth algorithm significantly reduces the number of evaluations required to compute $J_k(n)$ compared to the Euler algorithm. Instead of the recursive computation of the Euler algorithm, the Knuth algorithm only requires a $O(\ln(n))$ evaluations before computing $J_k(n)$. This results in a more efficient computation process than Euler's.

Uchiyama algorithm: In equation (11) from [23, Section 4, p. 329], Uchiyama presents the following algorithm:
Let $n_1 = 1$,

$$c_1^* = c_1 := J_k(2) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } k \text{ is even} \\ 2, & \text{if } k \text{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

For $i \geq 1$ compute:

$$\begin{aligned} n_{i+1} &= \left\lfloor \frac{k(n_i + 1) - c_i}{k - 1} \right\rfloor; \\ c_{i+1}^* &:= c_i + (k - 1)(n_{i+1} + 1) - k(n_i + 1); \\ c_{i+1} &\equiv \begin{cases} c_{i+1}^* \bmod (n_{i+1} + 1), & \text{if } 1 \leq c_{i+1}^* \leq n_{i+1} + 1 \\ c_{i+1}^*, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

If $n_i < n \leq n_{i+1}$, $J_k(n) = c_i + k(n - n_i - 1)$.

Uchiyama algorithm like Knuth algorithm improves to $O(\ln(n))$ the number of evaluations required to compute $J_k(n)$ compared to the Euler algorithm.

Extremal algorithm: To evaluate the Josephus function J_k , we proposed the Extremal algorithm, which employs a strategy of computing recursively high extremal points $n_e^{(i)}$ ($i = 1, 2, \dots, m$) until $n_e^{(m)}$ is greater than or equal to n ; see Corollary 7. This approach capitalizes on the linear piecewise structure of the Josephus function, enabling the Extremal algorithm to efficiently compute $J_k(n)$ compared to other methods.

The Extremal algorithm for evaluating J_k at $n \geq 2k - 3$ can be described as follows. We start by defining $j := J_k(2k - 2)$ and our first high extremal point $n_e^{(1)}$ and $J_k(n_e^{(1)})$ as follows:

$$\left(n_e^{(1)}, J_k(n_e^{(1)}) \right) := \begin{cases} (2k - 3, j + k - 2), & \text{if } j \leq k - 1 \\ (2k - 2, j), & \text{if } j > k - 1. \end{cases}$$

We iterate from $i = 1, 2, \dots$ until $n_e^{(i)} < n$ as follows:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} r_i &:= \text{mod}(n_e^{(i)}, k - 1); \\ c_i &:= \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } r_i < k - 2 - n_e^{(i)} + J_k(n_e^{(i)}) \\ 0, & \text{if } r_i \geq k - 2 - n_e^{(i)} + J_k(n_e^{(i)}); \end{cases} \\ J_k(n_e^{(i+1)}) &= (k - 1) - n_e^{(i)} + J_k(n_e^{(i)}) + k \left\lfloor \frac{2n_e^{(i)} - J_k(n_e^{(i)}) - (k - 2)}{k - 1} \right\rfloor; \\ n_e^{(i+1)} &= \frac{k(n_e^{(i)} + 1) - (r_i + 1)}{k - 1} - c_i. \end{aligned} \right\}$$

If $n_e^{(i)} < n \leq n_e^{(i+1)}$, then $J_k(n) = J_k(n_e^{(i+1)}) + k(n - n_e^{(i+1)})$.

The Extremal algorithm has the following JULIA code:

```
function josephus_Extremal(n::Int, k::Int)
    j = josephus_Knuth(2*k - 2, k)
    (ne, j_ne) = ifelse(j <= k - 1, (2*k - 3, j + k - 2), (2*k - 2, j))
    while ne < n
        r = mod(ne, k-1)
        c = ifelse(r < k - 2 - ne + j_ne, 1, 0)
        j_ne = k - 1 - ne + j_ne + k*floor{Int, (2*ne - j_ne - (k - 2))/(k - 1)}
        ne = (k*(ne + 1) - (r + 1))/(k - 1) - c
    end
    return j_ne + k*(n-ne)
end
```

The Extremal algorithm is also more efficient than Euler algorithm. Like the Knuth and Uchiyama algorithms, it requires $O(\ln(n))$ evaluations before computing $J_k(n)$.

A Comparative Computational Study To compare the performance of all algorithms, we conducted extensive numerical experiments by measuring their CPU time. We employed a Performance Profile testing a total of 452500 problems, uniformly distributed for $n \in [50000 : 100 : 100000]$ and $k \in [50 : 10 : 1000]$. We compared the Extremal algorithm with three other algorithms, namely Euler, Knuth, and Uchiyama, and our results indicate that the Extremal algorithm outperformed the other three in almost all problem instances (see Figure 2), making it an excellent choice for solving the Josephus problem for large inputs.




Figure 2. Performance Profiles (PP) for $n \in [50000 : 100 : 100000]$, $k \in [50 : 10 : 1000]$

To provide a more detailed analysis of our results, we present Table 2, which summarizes descriptive statistics of the benchmark of problems, including the minimum (min), mean, maximum (max), and standard deviation (std) of total CPU time. The Extremal algorithm consistently performed better than Euler, Knuth, and Uchiyama algorithms, indicating its superiority for solving the Josephus problem.

Table 2. Statistics of the experiments

Algorithms	min	mean	max	std
Euler	0.000813209	0.00120984	0.00161632	0.000231202
Knuth	0.000659197	0.00101147	0.00137245	0.00019701
Uchiyama	7.234e-5	0.000518487	0.0010305	0.000246989
Extremal	7.6873e-5	0.000367613	0.000633953	0.000144699

4. CONCLUDING REMARKS In this paper, we presented a novel study characterizing the Josephus function structure. We use the function’s piecewise linear structure to identify extreme points (including fixed points) of the Josephus function, J_k , via a recurrence formula. We have developed an efficient algorithm for evaluating J_k for large values of n based on the successive computation of the high extreme points of J_k . The effectiveness of the proposed scheme was validated through its comparison to established algorithms. The results of the comparative study demonstrate the remarkable performance of the proposed approach in computing the Josephus function for large inputs. It is noteworthy that we can employ the recurrence formula to calculate low extremal points, and a similar approach can be designed to address the Josephus problem. The analytical study presented in this paper can have substantial practical implications for applications such as scheduling, network optimization, and distributed algorithms. However, finding a recurrence formula for computing fixed points, analogous to the one we obtained for extremal points, remains an open problem. Addressing this problem could lead to further insights and improvements in solving the Josephus problem.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT. The first author would like to express gratitude for the support provided by the internal research and artistry (R&A) grant at Northern Illinois University. The second author wishes to thank the Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania for its online public source “The Josephus Game”, which was used hundreds of times to check out values of the Josephus function along the first stages of this research, and wants to dedicate this paper to his *alma mater* “Universidad Central de Venezuela” (UCV) for its 300th anniversary of creation.

REFERENCES

1. Arhens, W. (1901). *Mathematische Unterhaltungen und Spiele*. Leipzig: Druck und Verlag Von B. G. Teubner.
2. Bachet, C. G. (1624). *Problemes plaisants et d'electables qui se font par les nombres*. 2nd ed. Lyon: Pierre Rigaud & Associates.
3. Chai, Z.; Liang, S.; Zhang, L.; Wu, Y.; Cao, C. (2018). Periodic characteristics of the Josephus ring and its application in image scrambling. *EURASIP J. Wirel. Commun. Netw.* 132: 11 pages. doi.org/10.1186/s13638-018-1167-5.
4. Cosulschi, M.; Gabroveanu, M.; Constantinescu, N. (2009). Usage of advanced data structure for improving efficiency for large (n, m) permutations inspired from the Josephus problem. *Rom. J. Inf. Sci. Technol.* Vol. 12 (1): 13–24. www.imt.ro/romjist/Volum12/Number12_1/pdf/02-MCosulschi.pdf.
5. Dowdy, J.; Mays, M. E. (1989). Josephus Permutations. *J. Comb. Math. Comb. Comput.* Vol. 6: 125–130. www.math.wvu.edu/~mays/papers.htm.
6. Euler, L. (1776). Observations circa novum et singulare progressionum genus. *Euler Archive—All Works*. 476.
7. Graham, R.; Knuth, D.; Patashnik, O. (1994). *Concrete Mathematics: A Foundation for Computer Science*. 2nd ed. New Jersey: Addison-Wesley.
8. Groer, C. (2003). The Mathematics of Survival: From Antiquity to the Playground. *Amer. Math. Monthly*. Vol. 110 (9): 812-825. doi.org/10.2307/3647800.
9. Halbeisen, L.; Hungerbuhler, N. (1997). The Josephus Problem. *J. Theor. Nombres Bordeaux*. 9 (2): 303–318. https://jtnb.centre-mersenne.org/item/JTNB_1997__9_2_303_0.pdf.
10. Herstein, I. N.; Kaplansky, I. (1974). *Mathematical Matters*. Harper and Row.
11. Josephus, F. (2013). *The Jewish War*. 75. ISBN 0-14-044420-3.
12. Knuth, D. E. (1997). *The art of computer programming* (3rd ed.). Addison Wesley.
13. Naim, M.; Pacha, A. A.; Serief, C. (2021). A novel satellite image encryption algorithm based on hyperchaotic systems and Josephus problem. *Adv. Space Res.* Vol. 67 (7): 2077-2103. doi.org/10.1016/j.asr.2021.01.018.
14. Newman, J. R. (1956). *The World of Mathematics*. Simon and Schuster. New York. Vol. 4: 2428–2429.
15. Odlyzko, A.; Wilf, H. (1991). Functional iteration and the Josephus problem. *Glasg. Math. J.* 33(2): 235–240. doi.org/10.1017/S0017089500008272.
16. Oring, E. (1997). On the Tradition and Mathematics of Counting-Out. *Western Folklore*. 56(2): 139–152. doi.org/10.2307/1500203.
17. Petkovic, M. S. (2009). *Famous Puzzles of Great Mathematicians*. American Mathematical Society.
18. Recreations in Mathematics and Natural Philosophy (1835). *The Dublin Penny Journal*. Vol. 3 (135): 243–244. www.jstor.org/stable/30003530.
19. Robinson, W. J. (1960). The Josephus Problem. *Math. Gaz.* 44(347): 47–52. www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/3608532.pdf.
20. Rouse Ball, W. W. (1905). *Mathematical Recreations and Essays*. 4th ed. London: Macmillan.
21. Smith, D. E. (1917). On the Origin of Certain Typical Problems. *Amer. Math. Monthly*. Vol. 24 (2): 64–71. doi.org/10.1080/00029890.1917.11998275.
22. Tait, P. G. (1899). On the Generalization of Josephus' Problem. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh*. 22: 165–168.
23. Uchiyama, S. (2003). On the Generalized Josephus Problem. *Tsukuba J. Math.* Vol. 27 (2): 319–339. www.jstor.org/stable/43686318.
24. Wilson, G. L.; Morgan, C. L. (2010). An application of Fourier transforms on finite Abelian groups to an enumeration arising from the Josephus problem. *J. Number Theory*. 130: 815–827. doi.org/10.1016/j.jnt.2009.11.004.
25. Woodhouse, D. (1978). Programming the Josephus problem. *ACM SIGCSE Bull.* Vol. 10 (4): 56–58. doi.org/10.1145/988906.988919.
26. Yang, G.; Jin, H.; Bai, N. (2014). Image Encryption Using the Chaotic Josephus Matrix. *Mathematical Problems in Engineering*. Vol. 2014: 13 pages. doi.org/10.1155/2014/632060.

YUNIER BELLO-CRUZ earned his Bachelor and Master degrees in mathematics from the University of Havana (2002 and 2005, Havana) and his Ph.D. in Mathematics from the Instituto de Matematica Pura e Aplicada (IMPA) (2009, Rio de Janeiro). He has held various academic positions, including a Postdoctoral Research Fellowship at the University of British Columbia (2013–2015, Vancouver) and tenured Assistant Professor roles at Federal University of Goias (2009–2016, Goiania). Currently, Bello-Cruz is an Associate Professor at Northern Illinois University, where his research focuses on numerical analysis and continuous optimization. Bello-Cruz has received numerous research grants, including a CNPq Grant in 2014 and an NSF Grant in 2018, which have supported his work.

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb IL 60115
yunierbello@niu.edu

ROY QUINTERO-CONTRERAS received his Bachelor, Master, and Ph.D. degrees in mathematics from Universidad Central de Venezuela (1985, Caracas), Universidad de Los Andes (1992, Merida), and the University of Iowa (1997, Iowa City), respectively. He currently holds an Instructor position at the Northern Illinois University. His previous appointments were at the University of Southern California as a Lecturer (2019–2021) and at the University of Iowa as a visiting professor (2016–2019). He retired from Universidad de Los Andes, Trujillo-Venezuela, as a Full Professor where he worked for more than 25 years.

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Northern Illinois University, DeKalb IL 60115
rqinterocontreras@niu.edu