

## ON LARGE VALUES OF BINARY FORMS

B. BRINDZA

**1. Introduction.** Let  $F(X, Y)$  be an irreducible binary form with rational integral coefficients of degree  $n \geq 3$ . Moreover, let  $m$  be a positive integer having  $s$  distinct prime factors. Improving several earlier results, Bombieri and Schmidt [2] proved that the equation

$$(1) \quad |F(x, y)| = m \quad \text{in coprime integers } x \text{ and } y$$

has at most  $cn^{s+1}$  solutions where  $c$  is an effectively computable constant (the solutions  $(x, y)$  and  $(-x, -y)$  are considered as the same). Most likely the bound  $cn^{s+1}$  is not the best possible; however, it does not seem to be very easy to improve it in this generality. Langmann [7] showed that  $n^s$  can be achieved for almost every  $m$ . For further results and different approaches related to the number of solutions of (1) we refer to [3, 4, 8, 9, 10]. The purpose of this note is to derive a bound linear in  $n$ , provided that  $m$  is large enough. More exactly, we have

**Theorem.** *There exists an effectively computable constant  $C$  depending only on the discriminant of  $F$ , such that  $m > C$  and  $n > 5$  imply that the number of solutions of (1) does not exceed*

$$n \left( \left( n^{4/(n-2)} \right)^s + 6 \right).$$

*Remarks.* The term  $n^{4/(n-2)}$  can be improved a bit and it is certainly bounded, however its “shape” shows that if  $s$  is fixed then the dependence of the bound above is improving in  $s$  as  $n$  is getting larger.

Schmidt [8] conjectures the existence of a bound like  $c(F)(\log m)^{c'}$ ,  $m > 1$ , where  $c(F)$  may depend on  $F$  and  $c'$  is an absolute constant.

---

Received by the editors on November 17, 1994, and in revised form on June 6, 1995.

It is known that

$$s = \log \log m + O(\sqrt{\log \log m})$$

for almost every  $m$ ; therefore our Theorem implies Schmidt's conjecture, but just for almost every  $m$ .

**2. Preliminaries.** The *Mahler height* of a binary form

$$G(X, Y) = b(X - \beta_1 Y) \cdots (X - \beta_n Y)$$

is defined by

$$M(G) = |b| \prod_{i=1}^n \max\{1, |\beta_i|\}.$$

The following profound lemma is a generalized effective version of the Birch-Merriman theorem.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $G_1(X, Y) \in \mathbf{Z}[X, Y]$  be an irreducible binary form of degree  $n \geq 3$  with discriminant  $D$ . Then  $n \leq (2/\log 3) \log |D(G_1)|$  and there exists a binary form  $G_2(X, Y) \in \mathbf{Z}[X, Y]$  equivalent<sup>1</sup> to  $G_1$  for which  $M(G_2) < C_1$  where  $C_1$  is an effectively computable constant depending only on  $D$ .*

*Proof.* It is a simple consequence of Theorem 1 in [6] and Corollary 1 in [5].  $\square$

Following the notation of Bombieri and Schmidt [2] the height of an integer point  $(x, y)$  is defined by

$$H(x, y) = \max\{|x|, |y|\}.$$

**Lemma 2** (Bombieri and Schmidt [2]). *Let  $(x, y)$  be a solution to (1) with  $y \neq 0$ . Then*

$$\min_{F(\alpha, 1)=0} \min_{\alpha} \left\{ 1, \left| \alpha - \frac{x}{y} \right| \right\} \leq \frac{(2\sqrt{n}M(F))^n m}{(H(x, y))^n}.$$

**Lemma 3** (Thue-Siegel principle). *Let  $(x, y)$  and  $(x', y')$  be two solutions to (1) with  $yy' \neq 0$ ,*

$$\min_{1 \leq j \leq n} \left| \alpha_j - \frac{x}{y} \right| = \left| \alpha_1 - \frac{x}{y} \right|; \quad \min_{1 \leq j \leq n} \left| \alpha_j - \frac{x'}{y'} \right| = \left| \alpha_1 - \frac{x'}{y'} \right|.$$

*For  $0 < t < \sqrt{2/n}$  and  $\sqrt{2 - nt^2} < \tau < t$  put  $\lambda = 2/(t - \tau)$ ,  $\delta = (nt^2 + \tau^2 - 2)/(n - 1)$ ,  $A = (t^2n/(2 - nt^2))((1/n) \log M(F) + 1/2)$ . If we have  $|\alpha_1| \leq 1$ ,*

$$\left| \alpha_1 - \frac{x}{y} \right| < \min\{1, t - \tau, (e^{A + \log 3} H(x, y))^{-\lambda}\},$$

$$\left| \alpha_1 - \frac{x'}{y'} \right| < \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{2}(t - \tau)^2, (e^{A + \log 3} H(x', y'))^{-\lambda} \right\}$$

*then we also have*

$$(2) \quad \log 3 + A + \log H(x', y') < \frac{1}{\delta}(\log 3 + A + \log H(x, y)).$$

*Proof.* It is a special case of an up-to-date version of Thue-Siegel principle done by Bombieri and Mueller [1], (cf. [2]). □

**3. Proof of the Theorem.** The number of solutions of (1) is the same for equivalent forms and equivalent forms have the same discriminant, that is, we may assume by using Lemma 1 that  $M(F)$  and  $n$  are bounded by a constant depending only on the discriminant of  $F$ . The binary form  $F$  can be factorized as

$$F(X, Y) = a(X - \alpha_1 Y) \cdots (X - \alpha_n Y)$$

where  $a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$  are the leading coefficient and the zeros of the associated polynomial  $F(X, 1)$ , respectively. It will be convenient in much of the sequel to write (1) in the form

$$|(ax - a\alpha_1 y) \cdots (ax - a\alpha_n y)| = |a|^{n-1} m$$

where  $a\alpha_1, \dots, a\alpha_n$  are pairwise distinct algebraic integers. Let  $D$  and  $\mathbf{K}$  be denote the discriminant and the splitting field of  $F(X, 1)$ ,

respectively. A prime ideal  $\mathfrak{p}$  in  $\mathbf{K}$  is called *essential* if either  $\mathfrak{p}$  does not divide  $Da$  or

$$(3) \quad \text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} m > n \max_{i \neq j} \text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} a^2 (\alpha_i - \alpha_j) > 0.$$

If  $(x, y)$  is a solution to (1) and  $\mathfrak{p}|m$  is an essential prime ideal, then there exists a unique  $1 \leq k \leq n$  for which

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} (ax - a\alpha_i y) = \text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} (ax - a\alpha_k y);$$

furthermore,

$$(4) \quad \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq n \\ i \neq k}} \text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} (ax - a\alpha_i y) \leq \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq n \\ i \neq k}} \text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} a^2 (\alpha_k - \alpha_i) \\ \leq \text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} a^{n(n-1)} D.$$

The index  $k$  is called the *location* of  $\mathfrak{p}$  with respect to the solution  $(x, y)$  and denoted by  $\text{loc}(\mathfrak{p}; x, y)$ . By taking any  $\mathbf{Q}$ -isomorphism  $\phi$  of  $\mathbf{K}$ , the prime ideal  $\phi(\mathfrak{p})$  is also essential and its location depends only on  $\text{loc}(\mathfrak{p}; x, y)$  and  $\phi$ . We now write  $m$  in the form  $m = m_0 m_E$ , where  $m_0$  and  $m_E$  are relatively prime positive integers for which  $m_E$  is divisible by the essential prime ideal divisors of  $m$ , only, and  $m_0$  is not divisible by any of them. The inequality  $|a| \leq M(F)$  and Lemma 1 imply that  $m_0$  is bounded by an effective constant depending only on  $D$ . Let  $p_1^{k_1} > \dots > p_t^{k_t}$  denote the distinct prime factors of  $m_E$ . Then  $1 \leq t (\leq s)$  provided that  $m$  is large enough.

For a rational  $0 < \omega < 1$  put

$$\mathcal{N}(\omega) = 1 + n^{[\omega]+1},$$

and let  $\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_t$  be a fixed set of prime ideals (in  $\mathbf{K}$ ) with  $\mathfrak{p}_l | p_l$ ,  $l = 1, \dots, t$ . If (1) has at least  $\mathcal{N}(\omega)$  solutions, then we get at least two among them,  $(x, y)$  and  $(x', y')$ , say, for which

$$\text{loc}(\mathfrak{p}_l; x, y) = \text{loc}(\mathfrak{p}_l; x', y'), \quad l = 1, \dots, [\omega] + 1.$$

The greatest common divisor of the principal ideals generated by  $ax - a\alpha_i y$  and  $ax' - a\alpha_i y'$ , respectively, divides  $a(xy' - x'y)$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$

which is a nonzero rational integer; hence, (3) and (4) yield that  $p_1^{k_1} \cdots p_{[t\omega]+1}^{k_{[t\omega]+1}}$  divides  $a^{n(n-1)}Da(xy' - x'y)$ , therefore

$$m_E^{([t\omega]+1)/t} < p_1^{k_1} \cdots p_{[t\omega]+1}^{k_{[t\omega]+1}} \leq 2|a|^{n^2-n+1}D(\max\{|x|, |y|, |x'|, |y'|\})^2.$$

Let  $d$  denote the denominator of  $\omega$ . From the inequality

$$m^{1/t} \geq m^{1/s} \geq (\log m)^{c_1},$$

where  $c_1$  is an effective absolute constant, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} m_E^{([t\omega]+1)/t} &\geq m_E^{(1/t)(t\omega+1/d)} \\ &\geq m_E^\omega m_0(2|a|^{n^2-n+1}|D|) \\ &\geq m^\omega(2|a|^{n^2-n+1}|D|), \end{aligned}$$

provided that  $m$  is large enough compared with  $\omega$  and  $D$ . In other words (1) has at most  $n^{[t\omega]+1}$  solutions satisfying

$$H(x, y) \leq m^{\omega/2}$$

(under the condition imposed on  $m$ ). By taking

$$\omega = 2\left(\frac{1}{n-2} + \frac{1}{n-1}\right)$$

it remains to estimate the number of “larger” solutions  $(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_k, y_k)$  with

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{1 \leq j \leq n} \left| \alpha_j - \frac{x_i}{y_i} \right| &= \left| \alpha_1 - \frac{x_i}{y_i} \right|; \quad i = 1, \dots, k, \\ m^{1/(n-2)+1/(n-1)} &< H(x_1, y_1) \leq \dots \leq H(x_k, y_k). \end{aligned}$$

Following the “gap principle” argument of Bombieri and Schmidt [2] based upon Lemma 2 one can obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (5) \quad H(x_k, y_k) &\geq \left( (2\sqrt{n}M(F))^{-n/(n-2)} m^{-1/(n-2)} H(x_1, y_1) \right)^{(n-1)^{k-1}} \\ &\geq (2\sqrt{n}M(F))^{-n(n-1)^{k-1}/(n-2)} m^{(n-1)^{k-2}}, \quad k \geq 2. \end{aligned}$$

If  $|\alpha_1| \leq 1$  and we choose  $t = \sqrt{n+a^2}$ ,  $\tau = bt$  (cf. [2]) with  $b = 0.21$  and  $a = 0.01$ , say, then we get  $0 < t < \sqrt{2/n}$ ,  $\sqrt{2-nt^2} < \tau < t$ ,  $0 < \delta < 25n^2/2$ ,  $\lambda = 2/((1-b)t) < n - (3/2)$ ,  $n \geq 6$ ,

$$\frac{(2\sqrt{n}M(F))^n m}{(H(x_i, y_i))^n} < \min\{1, t - \tau, e^{A+\log 3}(H(x_i, y_i))^{-\lambda}\}, \quad i \geq 2;$$

therefore, for  $k > 2$  the solutions  $(x_2, y_2)$  and  $(x_k, y_k)$  (if any) satisfy all the conditions of Lemma 3 supposing  $m$  is large enough. The comparison of inequalities (2) and (5) leads to  $k \leq 6$ .

In case of  $|\alpha_1| > 1$  the whole argument can be repeated, noting that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{\alpha_1} - \frac{y_i}{x_i} \right| &\leq \left| \frac{y_i}{x_i} \right| \left| \alpha_1 - \frac{x_i}{y_i} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{|x_i| + m^{\frac{1}{n}}}{|\alpha_1 x_i|} \left| \alpha_1 - \frac{x_i}{y_i} \right| \\ &< 2 \left| \alpha_1 - \frac{x_i}{y_i} \right|, \end{aligned}$$

$i = 1, \dots, k$ . Since  $\alpha_1$  is an arbitrary zero of  $F(X, 1)$  the Theorem is proved.  $\square$

**Acknowledgment.** I wish to thank Ákos Pintér for his indispensable help.

#### ENDNOTES

1. Two binary forms, say  $G_1$  and  $G_2$ , are said to be equivalent if there exists a matrix  $\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in SL(2, \mathbf{Z})$  such that  $G_2(X, Y) = G_1(aX + bY, cX + dY)$ .

#### REFERENCES

1. E. Bombieri and J. Mueller, *On effective measures of irrationality for  $\sqrt[n]{a/b}$* , J. Reine Angew. Math. **342** (1983), 173–196.
2. E. Bombieri and W.M. Schmidt, *On Thue's equation*, Invent. Math. **88** (1987), 69–81.
3. J.H. Evertse, *Upper bounds for the numbers of solutions of diophantine equations*, Ph.D. thesis, Amsterdam, 1983.

4. J.H. Evertse and K. Györy, *Thue-Mahler equations with a small number of solutions*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **399** (1989), 60–80.
5. ———, *Effective finiteness results for binary forms with given discriminant*, Compositio Math. **79** (1991), 169–204.
6. K. Györy, *Sur les polynômes à coefficients entiers et de discriminant donné II.*, Publ. Math. Debrecen **21** (1974), 125–144.
7. K. Langmann, *Eindeutigkeit der Lösungen der Gleichung  $x^d + y^d = ap$* , Compositio Math. **88** (1993), 25–38.
8. W.M. Schmidt, *Diophantine approximations and diophantine equations*, Lecture Notes in Math. **1467** (1991), 75–76.
9. J.H. Silverman, *Integer points and the rank of Thue elliptic curves*, Invent. Math. **66** (1982), 395–404.
10. C.L. Stewart, *On the number of solutions of polynomial congruences and Thue equations*, Jour. Amer. Math. Soc. **4** (1991), 793–835.

KUWAIT UNIVERSITY, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, P.O. Box 5969, 13060 SAFAT, KUWAIT