# LONG WALKS IN THE PLANE WITH FEW COLLINEAR POINTS 

Joseph L. Gerver

Let $S$ be a set of vectors in $R^{n}$. An $S$-walk is any (finite or infinite) sequence $\left\{z_{i}\right\}$ of vectors in $R^{n}$ such that $z_{i+1}-z_{i} \in S$ for all $i$. We will show that if the elements of $S$ do not all lie on the same line through the origin, then for each integer $K \geqq 2$, there exists an $S$-walk $W_{K}=\left\{z_{i}\right\}_{i=1}^{N(K)}$ such that no $K+1$ elements of $W_{K}$ are collinear and $N(K)$ grows faster than any polynomial function of $K$.

Specifically, we will prove that

$$
\log _{2} N(K)>\frac{1}{9}\left(\log _{2} K-1\right)^{2}-\frac{1}{6}\left(\log _{2} K-1\right)
$$

We will then show that if the elements of $S$ lie on at least $L$ distinct lines through the origin, then there exists an $S$-walk of length $N(K, L)$ with no $K+1$ elements collinear, such that $N(K, L) \geqq$ $(1 / 4) L^{*} N(K-1)$, where $L-2 \leqq L^{*} \leqq L+1$ and $L^{*} \equiv 0 \bmod 4$. In [3] it was shown that if $S \subset Z^{2}$, and for all $s \in S$ we have $\|s\| \leqq M$, then there does not exist an $S$-walk $W=\left\{z_{i}\right\}_{i=1}^{N(K, M)}$ such that no $K+1$ elements of $W$ are collinear and

$$
\log _{2} N(K, M)>2^{13} M^{4} K^{4}+\log _{2} K
$$

Before proving these theorems we introduce some notation. If $A=\left(\boldsymbol{a}_{1}, \cdots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n}\right)$ and $B=\left(\boldsymbol{b}_{1}, \cdots, \boldsymbol{b}_{m}\right)$ are ordered sets of vectors, we let $R A=\left(a_{n}, \cdots, a_{1}\right)$ and we let $(A, B)=\left(a_{1}, \cdots, \boldsymbol{a}_{n}, \boldsymbol{b}_{1}, \cdots, \boldsymbol{b}_{m}\right)$. We let $2 A=(A, A)$ and, for every positive integer $k$, we let $(k+1) A=$ $(k A, A)$. If $J$ is a vector operator, we let $J A=\left(J a_{1}, \cdots, J a_{n}\right)$.

Theorem 1. Let $S$ contain two vectors independent over $\boldsymbol{R}$, and let $K$ be an integer greater than or exual to 2. There exists an S-walk $W_{K}=\left\{z_{p}\right\}_{p=1}^{N(K)}$ such that no $K+1$ elements of $W_{K}$ are collinear and such that

$$
\log _{2} N(K)>\frac{1}{9}\left(\log _{2} K-1\right)^{2}-\frac{1}{6}\left(\log _{2} K-1\right)
$$

Proof. If we let $\left(\log _{2} K-1\right)^{2} / 9-\left(\log _{2} K-1\right) / 6=\log _{2} K$, then $\log _{2} K=(25+3 \sqrt{65}) / 4>12$ or $(25-3 \sqrt{65}) / 4<1$. Therefore if $1 \leqq \log _{2} K \leqq 12$, and $2 \leqq K \leqq 4096$, then

$$
\frac{1}{9}\left(\log _{2} \mathrm{~K}-1\right)^{2}-\frac{1}{6}\left(\log _{2} K-1\right)<\log _{2} K
$$

Since $W_{K}$ cannot have more than $N(K)$ collinear points, we need only consider $K>4096$.

We may let $S=\{i, j\}$ without loss of generality, where $\boldsymbol{i}$ and $\boldsymbol{j}$ are orthonormal unit vectors.

For every positive integer $m$ and nonnegative integer $n$, let $A_{0}^{m}=i$, and let

$$
A_{n+1}^{m}=\left(m A_{n}^{m}, 2^{n} R J A_{n}^{m}\right),
$$

where $J \boldsymbol{i}=\boldsymbol{j}$ and $J \boldsymbol{j}=\boldsymbol{i}$. Let $V=\left\{\boldsymbol{v}_{p}\right\}_{p=1}^{N}=\mu A_{\nu}^{\mu}$, where $\mu$ is the greatest integer less than or equal to $((7 / 9) K)^{1 / 3}$, and $\nu$ is the least integer greater than or equal to $\log _{2} \mu-3 / 2$. Note that since $K>$ 4096, we have $\mu \geqq 14$, and $\nu \geqq 3$. Let $z_{p}=\sum_{q=1}^{p} \boldsymbol{v}_{q}$ for each $p$, and let $W=\left\{z_{p}\right\}_{p=1}^{N}$. We maintain that $W$ has no more than $K$ collinear points and that $\log _{2} N>\left(\log _{2} K-1\right)^{2} / 9-\left(\log _{2} K-1\right) / 6$.

Let $b_{0}=1$ and let $b_{n+1}=\left(\mu+2^{n}\right) b_{n}$. Then $b_{n}$ is the cardinality of $A_{n}^{\mu}$, and $N=\mu b_{\nu}$. Clearly $b_{n} \geqq \mu^{n}$, so $N \geqq \mu^{\nu+1}$ and $\log _{2} N \geqq$ $(\nu+1) \log _{2} \mu \geqq\left(\log _{2} \mu-1 / 2\right) \log _{2} \mu$. Since $\mu$ is the greatest integer less than or equal to $((7 / 9) K)^{1 / 3}$, and $((7 / 9) K)^{1 / 3}>14$, we have $\mu>$ $(14 / 15)((7 / 9) K)^{1 / 3}>((1 / 2) K)^{1 / 3}$. It follows that $\log _{2} N>1 / 9\left[\log _{2}((1 / 2) K)\right]^{2}-$ $\log _{2}((1 / 2) K) / 6=\left(\log _{2} \mathrm{~K}-1\right)^{2} / 9-\left(\log _{2} K-1\right) / 6$.

We now prove that $W$ has no more than $K$ collinear points.
Let $C_{n}^{\alpha}=\left\{z_{p}: \alpha b_{n} \leqq p \leqq(\alpha+1) b_{n}\right\}$. For each $n$, all $C_{n}^{\alpha}$ are congruent; specifically one can get from any one to any other by a translation plus, possibly, a reflection about the major diagonal (i.e., a reflection about the line passing through the vector $\boldsymbol{i}+\boldsymbol{j}$, which interchanges $\boldsymbol{i}$ and $\boldsymbol{j}$ ), followed by a rotation about the origin of $180^{\circ}$. This reflection plus rotation is equivalent to a reflection about the line perpendicular to the major diagonal (i.e., the line passing through the vector $\boldsymbol{i}-\boldsymbol{j}$ ). We will refer to this latter line as the minor diagonal. Let

$$
\begin{aligned}
U_{n}^{\beta} & =\left\{C_{n}^{\alpha}: \beta\left(\mu+2^{n}\right) \leqq \alpha<(\beta+1)\left(\mu+2^{n}\right)\right. \\
& \text { if } n \neq \nu \text { and } U_{\nu}^{\rho}=\left\{C_{\nu}^{\alpha}: 0 \leqq \alpha \leqq \mu\right\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that $C_{n+1}^{\beta}=\left\{z_{p}: \beta\left(\mu+2^{n}\right) b_{n} \leqq p \leqq(\beta+1)\left(\mu+2^{n}\right) b_{n}\right\}$, so $U_{n}^{\beta}$ is a partition of $C_{n+1}^{\beta}$ and $U_{\nu}$ is a partition of $W$. We now consider a line with slope $m$ and determine for each $n$, the maximum number of elements of $U_{n}^{\beta}$ which the line can intersect (the maximum number cannot depend on $\beta$, since all $C_{n+1}^{\beta}$ are congruent). Let $r_{n}$ be this maximum number. Then the line cannot intersect more than $r=$ $\prod_{n=0}^{\nu} r_{n}$ points of $W$.

Let $s_{n}$ be the slope of $z_{b_{n}}$; i.e., $s_{n}=y_{n} / x_{n}$ where $z_{b_{n}}=x_{n} \boldsymbol{i}+y_{n} \boldsymbol{j}$. The slope of $z_{(\alpha+1) b_{n}}-z_{\alpha b_{n}}$ is then either $s_{n}$ or $s_{n}^{-1}$, depending on whether $C_{n}^{\alpha}$ is a simple translation of $C_{n}^{0}$, or a translation of the reflection of $C_{n}^{0}$ about the minor diagonal. We wish to find a lower bound on $s_{n} / s_{n-1}$.

Now $x_{0}=1, y_{0}=0, x_{n+1}=\mu x_{n}+2^{n} y_{n}$, and $y_{n+1}=\mu y_{n}+2^{n} x_{n}$. It follows that $x_{n}, y_{n}$, and $s_{n}$ are strictly positive for all $n \geqq 1$. We now prove by induction that $s_{n}<2^{n} / \mu$. Clearly $s_{0}=0<2^{\circ} / \mu$ and $s_{1}=1 / \mu<2^{1} / \mu$. Suppose $s_{n}<2^{n} / \mu$. Let $t_{n}=2^{n} / s_{n} \mu$. Then $t_{n}>1$. Now

$$
\begin{aligned}
s_{n+1} & =\left(\mu y_{n}+2^{n} x_{n}\right) /\left(\mu x_{n}+2^{n} y_{n}\right) \\
& =\left(\mu s_{n}+2^{n}\right) /\left(\mu+2^{n} s_{n}\right) \\
& =\left(\mu s_{n}+\mu s_{n} t_{n}\right) /\left(\mu+\mu s_{n}^{2} t_{n}\right) \\
& =\left(s_{n}+s_{n} t_{n}\right) /\left(1+s_{n}^{2} t_{n}\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus

$$
\begin{aligned}
t_{n+1} & =2^{n+1} / s_{n+1} \mu=2 s_{n} t_{n} / s_{n+1} \\
& =2 s_{n} t_{n}\left(1+s_{n}^{2} t_{n}\right) /\left(s_{n}+s_{n} t_{n}\right) \\
& =2 t_{n}\left(1+s_{n}^{2} t_{n}\right) /\left(t_{n}+1\right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

We now view $t_{n+1}$ as a function of the real variables $t_{n}$ and $s_{n}$, and compute its partial derivatives:

$$
\partial t_{n+1} / \partial t_{n}=2\left(s_{n}^{2} t_{n}^{2}+2 s_{n}^{2} t_{n}+1\right) /\left(t_{n}+1\right)>0
$$

and

$$
\partial t_{n+1} / \partial s_{n}=4 t_{n}^{2} s_{n} /\left(t_{n}+1\right)>0
$$

Since $t_{n+1}$ has the value 1 when $s_{n}=0$ and $t_{n}=1$, it follows that $t_{n+1}>1$ when $s_{n} \geqq 0$ and $t_{n}>1$, as is the case here. Therefore $s_{n+1}<2^{n+1} / \mu$.

Next, recall that $\nu-1<\log _{2} \mu-3 / 2$, so if $n \leqq \nu-1$, then $2^{n} \leqq 2^{\nu-1}<2^{-3 / 2} \mu$. Since $2^{n}>s_{n} \mu$, it follows firstly that $s_{n}<2^{-3 / 2}$, and secondly that

$$
\begin{aligned}
s_{n+1} / s_{n} & =\left(\mu s_{n}+2^{n}\right) /\left(\mu s_{n}+2^{n} s_{n}^{2}\right) \\
& >2 \mu s_{n} /\left(\mu s_{n}+2^{-3 / 2} \mu s_{n}^{2}\right) \\
& =2 /\left(1+2^{-3 / 2} s_{n}\right)>2 /\left(1+\frac{1}{8}\right)=\frac{16}{9}
\end{aligned}
$$

It follows that, given $m$, there is at most one $n$ such that $(3 / 4) s_{n} \leqq m \leqq(4 / 3) s_{n}$. Suppose there exists $\lambda$ such that $(3 / 4) s_{l} \leqq m \leqq$ $(4 / 3) s_{\lambda}$. Then $m<(3 / 4) s_{\lambda+1}$ and $m>(4 / 3) s_{\lambda_{1}}$. Moreover, for all $n>$ $\lambda+1$, we have $m<(27 / 64) s_{n}<(1 / 2) s_{n}$, and for all $n<\lambda-1$, we
have $m>(64 / 27) s_{n}>2 s_{n}$. All of the above also holds if we replace $s_{n}$ by $s_{n}^{-1}$, except that some of the inequalities are reversed and constants replaced by their reciprocals in the obvious way.

We now calculate for each of the five cases, $n=\lambda, n=\lambda+1$, $n=\lambda-1, n>\lambda+1$, and $n<\lambda-1$, the maximum number $r_{n}$ of elements of $U_{n}^{\beta}$ which a line of slope $m$ can intersect. We can assume without loss of generality that $C_{n+1}^{\beta}$ is a simple translation of $C_{n+1}^{o}$; if $C_{n+1}^{\beta}$ is a translation of the reflection of $C_{n+1}^{0}$ about the minor diagonal, then we can apply the same argument, replacing $s_{n}$ by $s_{n}^{-1}$. Then $C_{n}^{\alpha}$ is a simple translation of $C_{n}^{0}$ for $\beta\left(\mu+2^{n}\right) \leqq$ $\alpha<\beta\left(\mu+2^{n}\right)+\mu$, and a translation of the reflection of $C_{n}^{n}$ for $\beta\left(\mu+2^{n}\right)+\mu \leqq \alpha<(\beta+1)\left(\mu+2^{n}\right)$. For each $\alpha$, the first point of $C_{n}^{\alpha+1}$ coincides with the last point of $C_{n}^{\alpha}$. It is easy to prove by induction on $n$ that $C_{n}^{0}$ (and therefore $C_{n}^{\alpha}$ for all $\alpha$ ) lies entirely within a right triangle, with sides $x_{n}$ and $y_{n}$ adjacent to the right angle, and with the first and last points of $C_{n}^{0}$ at opposite ends of the hypotenuse. Therefore the sets $C_{n}^{\alpha}: \beta\left(\mu+2^{n}\right) \leqq \alpha<\beta\left(\mu+2^{n}\right)+$ $\mu$ lie within congruent right triangles, whose hypotenuses are adjacent segments of a line with slope $s_{n}$ (see Fig. 1). It follows


Figure 1
that a line with slope $m>s_{n} q /(q-1)$ or $m<s_{n}(q-1) / q$ can intersect at most $q$ of the sets $C_{n}^{\alpha}: \beta\left(\mu+2^{n}\right) \leqq \alpha<\beta\left(\mu+2^{n}\right)+\mu$ at distinct points (i.e., assign the last point of each set $C_{n}^{\alpha}$ to the set $C_{n}^{\alpha+1}$, and do not count the line as intersecting $C_{n}^{\alpha}$ if it only intersects this last point). Suppose $m \leqq 1$. Then $m<(1 / 2) s_{s}^{-1}$, and a line of slope $m$ can intersect no more than two of the sets $C_{n}^{\alpha}: \beta\left(\mu+2^{n}\right)+$ $\mu \leqq \alpha<(\beta+1)\left(\mu+2^{n}\right)$. If $n=\lambda$, then a line of slope $m$ can intersect all $\mu$ of the sets $C_{n}^{\alpha}: \beta\left(\mu+2^{n}\right) \leqq \alpha<\beta\left(\mu+2^{n}\right)+\mu$ for a total of $\mu+2$. If $n=\lambda+1$ or $\lambda-1$, the line can intersect at most 4 of the sets $C_{n}^{\alpha}: \beta\left(\mu+2^{n}\right) \leqq \alpha<\beta\left(\mu+2^{n}\right)+\mu$, for a total of 6 , while if $n>\lambda+1$ or $n<\lambda-1$, the line can intersect at most two of the sets $C_{n}^{\alpha}: \beta\left(\mu+2^{n}\right) \leqq \alpha<\beta\left(\mu+2^{n}\right)+\mu$ for a total of 4 . If $m>1$, then we obtain essentially the same results by redefining $\lambda$ so that ( $3 / 4$ ) $s_{\lambda}^{-1} \leqq m \leqq(4 / 3) s_{\lambda}^{-1}$, the only difference being that $\mu$ is replaced by $2^{n}$, which in any case is less than $\mu$. Therefore we have $r_{n} \leqq \mu+2$ if $n=\lambda, r_{n} \leqq 6$ if $n=\lambda-1$ or $\lambda+1$, and $r_{n} \leqq 4$ for all other $n$. Finally, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
r & =\prod_{n=0}^{\nu} r_{n} \leqq(\mu+2) \cdot 6^{2} \cdot 4^{\nu-2}<36(\mu+2) \cdot 4^{1 \log _{2 \mu-5 / 2}} \\
& =\frac{36}{32} \mu^{2}(\mu+2) \leqq \frac{9}{7} \mu^{3} \leqq K
\end{aligned}
$$

If $\lambda$ does not exist, then there are at most two values of $n$ for which $(27 / 64) s_{n} \leqq m \leqq(64 / 27) s_{n}$, and these two values can take the place of $\lambda-1$ and $\lambda+1$ in our argument.

Remark. We can use this method to get slightly better results as follows: The method works by partitioning $W$ into a heiarchy of sets, each set of order $n+1$ being partitioned into $\mu+2^{n}$ sets of order $n$, and showing that for almost all $n$, a given line can intersect at most four sets of order $n$ within a given set of order $n+1$. Suppose that instead of using the partition based on the sets $C_{n}^{\alpha}$, we modify this partition slightly by splitting each $C_{n}^{\alpha}$ into two sets of order $n$, namely $\left\{z_{p}: \alpha b_{n} \leqq p \leqq \alpha b_{n}+\mu b_{n-1}\right\}$ and $\left\{z_{p}: \alpha b_{n}+\right.$ $\left.\mu b_{n-1} \leqq p \leqq(\alpha+1) b_{n}\right\}$. Then each set of order $n+1$ would have either $2 \mu$ or $2^{n+1}$ sets of order $n$, and it should not be hard to show that for almost all $n$, a given line can intersect at most three sets of order $n$ within a given set of order $n+1$. We would then have $r=c \mu \cdot 3^{\nu}=c \mu^{1+\log _{2} 3}$, where $c$ is a constant which does not depend on $K$, and finally

$$
\log _{2} N=\left(1+\log _{2} 3\right)^{-2}\left(\log _{2} K\right)^{2}+O\left(\log _{2} K\right)
$$

However, it seems impossible to push this method any further.
Theorem 2. Suppose that $S$ contains $L$ elements which are pairwise independent over $\boldsymbol{R}$. Then there exists an $S$-walk $\Omega=$ $\left\{\boldsymbol{u}_{i}\right\}_{i=1}^{N}$ containing no set of $K+1$ collinear points, such that

$$
\log _{2} N>\frac{1}{9}\left[\log _{2}(K-1)-1\right]^{2}-\frac{1}{6}\left[\log _{2}(K-1)-1\right]+\log _{2} L^{*}-2
$$

where $L-2 \leqq L^{*} \leqq L+1$ and $L^{*} \equiv 0 \bmod 4$.
Proof. The $L$ elements of $S$ with distinct arguments must include $L / 2$ elements (if $L$ is even) or ( $L+1$ )/2 elements (if $L$ is odd) in the same half-plane. Label these elements $s_{1}, s_{2}, s_{3}, \ldots$ in order of their arguments. For $1 \leqq n \leqq(1 / 4) L^{*}$, let $W_{n}=\varphi_{n} W$ where $W$ is defined as in the proof of Theorem 1 , and $\varphi_{n}$ is the linear vector operator which maps $i$ to $s_{2 n-1}$ and $\boldsymbol{j}$ to $\boldsymbol{s}_{2 n}$. Let $N_{0}$ be the cardinality of $W$ and let $w_{n}=x s_{2 n-1}+y s_{2 n}$ be the final element of $W_{n}$. For $1 \leqq i \leqq N_{0}$, let $z_{i}$ be defined as in the proof of Theorem 1, and let $u_{i}=\varphi_{1} z_{1}$. Let $u_{N_{0} n+i}=\sum_{j=1}^{n} w_{j}+\varphi_{n+1} z_{i}$ for
$1 \leqq n \leqq(1 / 4) L^{*}-1$. Finally, let $N=(1 / 4) L^{*} N_{0}$ and let $\Omega=\left\{\boldsymbol{u}_{i}\right\}_{i=1}^{N}$. Note that $\Omega$ is constructed by placing the $W_{n}$ end to end in sequence.

By Theorem 1,

$$
\log _{2} N>\frac{1}{9}\left(\log _{2} K-1\right)^{2}-\frac{1}{6}\left(\log _{2} K-1\right)+\log _{2} L^{*}-2 .
$$

We will now prove that no $K+2$ points of $\Omega$ are collinear. Substituting $K-1$ for the bound variable $K$ then gives us Theorem 2 for the case $K \geqq 3$. For the case $K=2$, we simply let $u_{i}=$ $\sum_{j=1}^{i} \boldsymbol{s}_{j}$. The resulting set $\left\{\boldsymbol{u}_{i}\right\}$, which contains at least ( $1 / 2$ ) $L^{*}$ elements, is the set of vertices of a convex polygon; hence no three elements are collinear.

Let $T_{n}=\left\{u_{i}\right\}_{i=N_{0}(n-1)+1}^{N_{0}^{n}}$ and let $\boldsymbol{t}_{n}=\sum_{j=1}^{n} \boldsymbol{w}_{j}$, so that $\boldsymbol{t}_{n}$ is the final element of $T_{n}$. Let $t_{0}=0$ and let $r_{n}=t_{n-1}+x s_{2 n-1}$ for $n \geqq 1$. Note that $t_{n}=r_{n}+y s_{2 n}$. Note also that from results proved previously, the set $T_{n}$ must lie entirely on or in the interior of the triangle $\Delta_{n}$ with vertices $t_{n-1}, r_{n}$, and $t_{n}$. Consequently any line which intersects $T_{n}$ must intersect $\Delta_{n}$. Now consider the polygon $P$ with vertices $\boldsymbol{t}_{0}, \boldsymbol{r}_{1}, \boldsymbol{t}_{1}, \boldsymbol{r}_{2}, \boldsymbol{t}_{2}, \cdots, \boldsymbol{r}_{L^{*} / 4}, \boldsymbol{t}_{L^{*} / 4}$ in that order. The (directed) edges of this polygon are the vectors $x s_{1}, y s_{2}, x s_{3}, \cdots$, $y s_{L^{*} / 2}$, and $-x \sum_{n=1}^{I * / 4} s_{2 n-1}-y \sum_{n=1}^{L^{* * / 4}} \boldsymbol{s}_{2 n}$. Since the vectors $\boldsymbol{s}_{1}, \boldsymbol{s}_{2}, \boldsymbol{s}_{3}, \cdots$ are listed in order of increasing argument, and the range of all their arguments is less than $180^{\circ}$, it follows that the interior angles of $P$ are all less than $180^{\circ}$, so $P$ is convex. Now any line intersecting $\Delta_{n}$, and in particular any line intersecting $T_{n}$, must intersect at least two sides of $\Delta_{n}$ (including each vertex in its two adjacent sides), and therefore must intersect $P$. Since $P$ is convex, a line can only intersect $P$ at one or two points, or along an edge. Therefore no line can intersect more than two of the $T_{n}$. Unless the slope of a line is between that of $s_{2 n-1}$ and $s_{2 n}$ inclusive, it can only intersect one point of $T_{n}$. By Theorem 1, no line can intersect more than $K$ points of $T_{n}$. Therefore, no line can contain more than $K+1$ points of $\Omega$.

Remark. In order to compare these results with the upper bound in [3], we can consider the case where $S=\left\{\boldsymbol{s} \in Z^{2}:\|s\| \leqq M\right\}$. Since the number of lattice points in a disc of radius $R$ is $\pi R^{2}+$ $O(R)$ [2], we know that the number of lattice points with both coordinates divisible by $q$, in a disc of radius $M$, is $\pi M^{2} / q^{2}+O(M / q)$. Therefore the number $L$ of lattice points with relatively prime coordinates is

$$
\pi M^{2} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty}(-1)^{n} \sum_{q \in Q_{n}} q^{-2}+O\left(M \sum_{q \in Q} q^{-1}\right),
$$

where $Q$ is the set of square free positive integers less than or equal to $M$, and $Q_{n}$ is the set of integers in $Q$ with $n$ distinct prime factors. It follows [1] that

$$
L=6 M^{2} / \pi+O(M \log M)
$$

Finally, if we let $N(K, M)$ be the length of the longest $S$-walk with no more than $K$ collinear points, and we choose any constants $c_{1}<(9 \log 2)^{-1}$ and $c_{2}>2^{13} \log 2$, then we have

$$
M^{2} \exp \left[c_{1}(\log K)^{2}\right]<N(K, M)<\exp \left[c_{2} M^{4} K^{4}\right]
$$

for all $M$ and all but a finite number of $K$.
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