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#### Abstract

We shall show that, for any positive integer $D>0$ and any primes $p_{1}, p_{2}$ not dividing $D$, the diophantine equation $x^{2}+D=2^{s} p_{1}^{k} p_{2}^{l}$ has at most 63 integer solutions $(x, k, l, s)$ with $x, k, l \geq 0$ and $s \in\{0,2\}$.


## 1 Introduction

It is known that the equation $x^{2}+7=2^{n}$ has five solutions, as conjectured by Ramanujan and shown by Nagell [26] and other authors. According to this history, this diophantine equation has been called the Ramanujan-Nagell equation and several authors have studied various analogues.

Apéry [1] showed that, for each integer $D>0$ and prime $p$, the equation $x^{2}+D=p^{n}$ has at most two solutions unless $(p, D)=(2,7)$ and, for any odd prime $p$, the equation $x^{2}+D=4 p^{n}$, which is equivalent to $y^{2}+y+(D+1) / 4=p^{n}$ with $y$ odd, also has at most two solutions. Beukers [5] showed that, if $D>0$ and $x^{2}+D=2^{n}$ has two solutions, then $D=23$ or $D=2^{k}-1$ for some $k>3$ and also gave an effective upper bound: if $w=x^{2}+D=2^{n}$ with $D \neq 0$, then $w<2^{435}|D|^{10}$.

Further generalizations have been made by Le [18] [19] [20], Skinner [29] and Bender and Herzberg [2] to prove that, for any given integers $A, B, s, p$ with $\operatorname{gcd}(A, B)=1, s \in\{0,2\}$ and $p$ prime, $A x^{2}+B=2^{s} p^{n}$ has at most two solutions except $2 x^{2}+1=3^{k}, 3 x^{2}+5=2^{k}, x^{2}+11=4 \times 3^{k}, x^{2}+19=4 \times 5^{k}$ with three solutions and the Ramanujan-Nagell one $x^{2}+7=2^{k}$ with five solutions.

Bender and Herzberg [2] also found some necessary conditions for the equation $D_{1} x^{2}+D_{2}=2^{s} a^{n}$ with $D_{1}>0, D_{2}>0, \operatorname{gcd}\left(D_{1}, D_{2}\right)=\operatorname{gcd}\left(D_{1} D_{2}, k\right)=1, s \in$ $\{0,2\}$ to have more than $2^{\omega(a)}$ solutions. With the aid of the primitive divisor theorem of Bilu, Hanrot and Voutier [7] concerning Lucas and Lehmer sequences, Bugeaud and Shorey 10 determined all cases $D_{1} x^{2}+D_{2}=2^{m} a^{n}$ with $D_{1}>$

[^0]$0, D_{2}>0, \operatorname{gcd}\left(D_{1}, D_{2}\right)=\operatorname{gcd}\left(D_{1} D_{2}, k\right)=1, m \in\{0,1,2\}$ has more than $2^{\omega(a)-1}$ solutions, although they erroneously refer to $2 x^{2}+1=3^{n}$ as it has just two solutions $n=1,2$, which in fact has exactly three solutions $n=1,2,5$, as pointed out by Leu and Li [23] (this fact immediately follows from Ljunggren's result 24] since $2 x^{2}+1=3^{n}$ is equivalent to $\left.\left(3^{n}-1\right) / 2=x^{2}\right)$.

We note that it is implicit in Le [15] that, if $D_{1}>3$, then $D_{1} x^{2}+1=p^{n}$ has at most one solution except $\left(D_{1}, p\right)=(7,2)$. But it is erroneously cited in another work of Le [21, stating that $D_{1} x^{2}+1=p^{n}$ has at most one solutions for each $D_{1} \geq 1$ and odd prime $p$. This may have caused the failure in [10] mentioned above.

Le [16] studied another generalized Ramanujan-Nagell equation $x^{2}+D^{m}=p^{n}$ with $m, n, x>0, p$ a prime not dividing $D$ to show that this equation has at most two solutions except for some special cases. Further studies by Bugeaud [8] and Yuan and $\mathrm{Hu}[33]$ concluded that this equation has at most two solutions except for $(D, p)=(7,2),(2,5)$ and $(4,5)$, in which cases, this equation has, respectively, exactly six, three and three. Hu and Le [14] showed that, for integers $D_{1}, D_{2}>1$ and a prime $p$ not dividing $D_{1} D_{2}$, the equation $D_{1} x^{2}+D_{2}^{m}=p^{n}, x, m, n>0$ has at most two solutions except for $\left(D_{1}, D_{2}, p\right)=(2,7,13),(10,3,13),(10,3,37)$ and $\left(\left(3^{2 l}-1\right) / a^{2}, 3,4 \times 3^{2 l-1}-1\right)$ with $a, l \geq 1$, in which cases this equation has exactly three solutions.

The diophantine equation $x^{2}+D=y^{n}$ with only $D$ given also has been studied. Lebesgue [22] solved this equation for $D=1$, Nagell solved for $D=3$ and Cohn [11] solved for many values of $D$. By the theorem of Shorey, van der Poorten, Tijdeman and Schinzel [28], we have $x, y, n \leq C$ with an effectively computable constant $C$ depending only on $D$. Combining a modular approach developed by Taylor and Wiles [31] 32 and Bennett and Skinner [3] and other methods, Bugeaud, Mignotte and Siksek [9] solved $x^{2}+D=y^{n}$ in $(x, y, n)$ with $n \geq 3$ for each $1 \leq D \leq 100$. Furthermore, Le [17] showed that if $x^{2}+2^{m}=y^{n}$ with $m, x>0, n>2$ and $y$ odd, then $(x, m, y, n)=(5,3,1,3),(7,3,5,4)$ or $(11,5,2,3)$. Pink [27] solved $x^{2}+D=y^{n}, n \geq 3, \operatorname{gcd}(x, y)=1$ for $D=2^{a} 3^{b} 5^{c} 7^{d}$ except the case $D \equiv 7(\bmod 8)$ and $y$ is even. A brief survey on further results to such equations is given by Bérczes and Pink [4. More recently, Godinho, Diego Marques and Alain Togbé [13] solved $x^{2}+D=y^{n}, n \geq 3, \operatorname{gcd}(x, y)=1$ for $D=2^{a} 3^{b} 17^{c}$ and $D=2^{a} 13^{b} 17^{c}$.

In this paper, we shall study another generalization of the Ramanujan-Nagell equation

$$
\begin{equation*}
x^{2}+D=2^{s} p_{1}^{k} p_{2}^{l} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $s \in\{0,2\}$.
Evertse [12] showed that, for every nonzero integer $D$ and $r$ prime numbers $p_{1}, p_{2}, \ldots, p_{r}, x^{2}+D=p_{1}^{k_{1}} p_{2}^{k_{2}} \cdots p_{r}^{k_{r}}$ has at most $3 \times 7^{4 r+6}$ solutions. Hence, (1) has at most $3 \times 7^{14}$ solutions for any given $D, p_{1}, p_{2}$. The purpose of this paper is to improve this upper bound for the number of solutions of (1).

Theorem 1.1. For every positive integer $D$ and primes $p_{1}, p_{2}$, (1) has at most 63 integral solutions ( $x, s, k, l$ ) with $k, l \geq 0, s \in\{0,2\}$.

It seems that we cannot use the primitive divisor theory for such types of equations. Instead, we shall use Beukers' method. However, we need more complicated argument than Beukers' original argument in [5].

Let $P(x)=x^{2}+D$. Hence, (11) can be rewritten as $P(x)=2^{s} p_{1}^{k} p_{2}^{l}$. In order to extend Beukers' argument for (11), we shall divide the set of solutions of this equation. Let $S(\alpha, \alpha+\delta, X, Y)=S_{P(x)}(\alpha, \alpha+\delta, X, Y)$ be the set of solutions of the equation $P(x)=2^{s} p_{1}^{k} p_{2}^{l}$ with $X \leq P(x)<Y, s \in\{0,2\}$ and $\left(p_{1}^{k} p_{2}^{l}\right)^{\alpha} \leq p_{1}^{k} \leq\left(p_{1}^{k} p_{2}^{l}\right)^{\alpha+\delta}$ and we write $S(\alpha, \alpha+\delta)=S(\alpha, \alpha+\delta, 0, \infty)$ for brevity. Moreover, for $u, v(\bmod 2)$, let $S(\alpha, \alpha+\delta, X, Y ; u, v)=S_{P(x)}(\alpha, \alpha+\delta, X, Y ; u, v)$ be the set of solutions $x^{2}+D=2^{s} p^{k} q^{l} \in S(\alpha, \alpha+\delta, X, Y)$ with $k \equiv u(\bmod 2), l \equiv$ $v(\bmod 2)$ and $S(\alpha, \alpha+\delta ; u, v)=S(\alpha, \alpha+\delta, 0, \infty ; u, v)$. Finally, let us write $S^{(j)}(X, Y ; u, v)=S(j / 4,(j+1) / 4, X, Y ; u, v)$ for $j=0,1,2,3$ and so on.

Now, we shall state our result in more detail.
Theorem 1.2. Let $Y=4883601$ and $W$ be the constant defined in Lemma 3.1 with $\delta=1 / 4$ and $\delta_{1}=0.04377667$. Moreover, let $y_{1}$ be the smallest solution of (11). For every positive integer $D$ and primes $p_{1}<p_{2}$, we have
(i) Each $S^{(j)}(W, \infty ; u, v)$ contains at most three solutions for $j=1,2$ and two solutions for $j=0,3$. Hence, there exist at most 30 solutions with $x^{2}+D \geq W$.
(ii) If $D \geq Y$ or $y_{1} \geq Y$, then $S^{(j)}\left(y_{1}, W\right)$ contains at most nine solutions for $j=1,2$ and five solutions for $j=0,3$. Hence, there exist at most 28 solutions with $x^{2}+D<W$.
(iii) If $D, y_{1}, p_{2}<Y$, then there exist at most 29 solutions with $x^{2}+D<W$.
(iv) If $D, y_{1}<Y<p_{2}$, then $S^{(j)}(Y, W)$ contains at most nine solutions for $j=1,2$ and five solutions for $j=0,3$. Hence, there exist at most 28 solutions with $Y \leq x^{2}+D<W$. Moreover, there exist at most 5 solutions with $x^{2}+D<Y$.

In the next section, we prove a weaker gap principle using only elementary argument using congruences, which is used to bound the number of middle solutions (and as an auxiliary tool to prove a stronger gap principle in Section 4). In Section 3, we use Beukers' argument to show that if we have one large solution $w=x^{2}+D$ in a class $S^{(j)}(W, \infty ; u, v)$, then other solutions in the same class as $w$ must be bounded by $w$. Combining an gap argument proved in Section 4, we obtain an upper bound for the number of solutions in each class. The number of small solutions can be checked by computer search.

## 2 An elementary gap argument

In this section, we shall give the following two gap principles shown by elementary arguments using congruence.

Lemma 2.1. Let $x_{1}<x_{2}$ be two integers such that $y_{i}=x_{i}^{2}+D(i=1,2)$ belong to the same set $S_{P(x)}(\alpha, \alpha+\delta)$, where $\alpha, \delta$ are two real numbers satisfying $0 \leq \delta<1 / 4$ and $\alpha=0$ or $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1 \leq \alpha+\delta$. Then we have $x_{2}>\frac{1}{2}\left(P\left(x_{1}\right) / 4\right)^{3 / 4}$.

Proof. Let $x_{1}<x_{2}$ be two integers in $S_{P(x)}(3 / 4,1)$. Then we can easily see that $P\left(x_{i}\right) \equiv 0\left(\bmod p_{1}^{e_{i}}\right)$ with $p_{1}^{e_{i}} \geq\left(P\left(x_{1}\right) / 4\right)^{3 / 4}$. This implies that $P\left(x_{1}\right) \equiv$ $P\left(x_{2}\right) \equiv 0\left(\bmod p_{1}^{f}\right)$, where $f=\min \left\{e_{1}, e_{2}\right\}$. Hence, we have $x_{1}+x_{2} \geq p_{1}^{f} \geq$ $\left(P\left(x_{1}\right) / 4\right)^{3 / 4}$ and therefore $x_{2}>\frac{1}{2}\left(P\left(x_{1}\right) / 4\right)^{3 / 4}$. Similarly, if $x_{1}<x_{2}$ are two integers in $S_{P(x)}(0,1 / 4)$, then $x_{2}>\frac{1}{2}\left(P\left(x_{1}\right) / 4\right)^{3 / 4}$. This proves the lemma.

Lemma 2.2. Let $x_{1}<x_{2}<x_{3}$ be three integers such that $y_{i}=x_{i}^{2}+D(i=1,2,3)$ belong to the same set $S_{P(x)}(\alpha, \alpha+\delta)$ for some $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ with $0 \leq \delta \leq 1 / 4$. Then we have $x_{3}>\frac{1}{2}\left(P\left(x_{1}\right) / 4\right)^{3 / 4}$.

Proof. For each $i=1,2,3$, we have $P\left(x_{i}\right) \equiv 0\left(\bmod p_{1}^{f} p_{2}^{g}\right)$, where $f=\left\lceil\alpha \log \left(P\left(x_{1}\right) / 4\right) / \log p_{1}\right\rceil$ and $g=\left\lceil\left(\frac{3}{4}-\alpha\right) \log \left(P\left(x_{1}\right) / 4\right) / \log p_{2}\right\rceil$.

We see that the congruent equation $X^{2}+D \equiv 0\left(\bmod p_{1}^{f} p_{2}^{g}\right)$ has exactly four distinct solutions $0<X_{1}<X_{2}<X_{3}<X_{4}<p_{1}^{f} p_{2}^{g}$ with $X_{1}+X_{4}=X_{2}+X_{3}=$ $p_{1}^{f} p_{2}^{g}$. Hence, we have $X_{3}, X_{4}>\frac{1}{2} p_{1}^{f} p_{2}^{g}$ and $x_{3}>\frac{1}{2} p_{1}^{f} p_{2}^{g} \geq \frac{1}{2}\left(P\left(x_{1}\right) / 4\right)^{3 / 4}>$ $\frac{1}{2^{5 / 2}} x_{1}^{3 / 2}$.

## 3 Hypergeometric functions and finiteness results

Let $F(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, z)$ be the hypergeometric function given by the series

$$
\begin{equation*}
1+\frac{\alpha \cdot \beta}{1 \cdot \gamma} z+\frac{\alpha(\alpha+1) \beta(\beta+1)}{1 \cdot 2 \cdot \gamma(\gamma+1)} z^{2}+\cdots \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

converging for all $|z|<1$ and for $z=1$ if $\gamma>\alpha+\beta$. Define $G(z)=G_{n_{1}, n_{2}}(z)=$ $F\left(-\frac{1}{2}-n_{2},-n_{1},-n, z\right), H(z)=G_{n_{1}, n_{2}}(z)=F\left(-\frac{1}{2}-n_{1},-n_{2},-n, z\right)$ and $E(z)=$ $F\left(n_{2}+1, n_{1}+\frac{1}{2}, n+2, z\right) / F\left(n_{2}+1, n_{1}+\frac{1}{2}, n+2,1\right)$ for positive integers $n, n_{1}, n_{2}$ with $n=n_{1}+n_{2}$ and $n_{1} \geq n_{2}$.

We quote some properties from Lemmas 2-4 of [5]:
(a) $|G(z)-\sqrt{1-z} H(z)|<z^{n+1} G(1)$,
(b) $\binom{n}{n_{1}} G(4 z)$ and $\binom{n}{n_{1}} H(4 z)$ are polynomials with integer coefficients of degree $n_{1}$ and $n_{2}$ respectively,
(c) $G(1)<G(z)<G(0)=1$ for $0<z<1$,
(d) $G(1)=\binom{n}{n_{1}}^{-1} \prod_{m=1} n_{1}\left(1-\frac{1}{2 m}\right)$ and
(e) $G_{n_{1}+1, n_{2}+1}(z) H_{n_{1}, n_{2}}(z)-G_{n_{1}, n_{2}}(z) H_{n_{1}+1, n_{2}+1}(z)=c z^{n+1}$ for some constant $c \neq 0$.

Now we obtain the following upper bound for solutions of (1) relative to a given large one.

Lemma 3.1. Let $\alpha, \delta$ and $\delta_{1}$ be real numbers with $0 \leq \alpha<\alpha+\delta \leq 1$ and $0<\delta_{1}<1 / 12$ and $A, B, w, q, s_{1}, k_{1}, l_{1}, s_{2}, k_{2}, l_{2}$ be nonnegative integers such that both $A^{2}+D=w=2^{s_{1}} p_{1}^{k_{1}} p_{2}^{l_{1}}$ and $B^{2}+D=q=2^{s_{2}} p_{1}^{k_{2}} p_{2}^{l_{2}}$ belong to $S(\alpha, \alpha+\delta ; u, v)$ with $B>A$. Moreover, put $W_{1}=\left(2^{772+210 \delta} D^{241}\right)^{1 /(35(2-3 \delta)-(3 \delta+1) / 2)}, W_{2}=$ $\left(2^{22 / 9+2 \delta / 3} 3^{7 / 3}\right)^{1 / \delta_{1}}$ and $W=\max \left\{W_{1}, W_{2}\right\}$.

If $w \geq W$, then $q<4^{70} w^{71}$ or

$$
\begin{equation*}
q^{1-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{5}{3}+\delta+\delta_{1}\right)}<2^{\frac{31}{9}+s_{1}+\frac{2}{3} \delta} 3^{\frac{16}{3}} D w^{\frac{19}{6}+\frac{3}{2} \delta-\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{5}{3}+\delta+\delta_{1}\right)} . \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proof. Substituting $z=\frac{D}{w}$, we see that $\sqrt{1-z}=\frac{A}{w^{\frac{1}{2}}}$ and it follows from the property (b) that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\binom{n}{n_{1}} G(z)=\frac{P}{(4 w)^{n_{1}}} \text { and }\binom{n}{n_{1}} H(z)=\frac{Q}{(4 w)^{n_{2}}} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

for some integers $P$ and $Q$.
Now the property (a) gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\frac{P}{(4 w)^{n_{1}}}-\frac{A Q}{w^{\frac{1}{2}}(4 w)^{n_{2}}}\right|<\binom{n}{n_{1}}\left(\frac{D}{w}\right)^{n+1} G(1) \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

and therefore

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|1-\frac{A Q}{w^{\frac{1}{2}}(4 w)^{n_{2}-n_{1}} P}\right|<\frac{(4 w)^{n_{1}}}{|P|}\binom{n}{n_{1}}\left(\frac{D}{w}\right)^{n+1} G(1) . \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Letting

$$
\begin{equation*}
K=\left|\frac{B}{q^{\frac{1}{2}}}-\frac{A Q}{w^{\frac{1}{2}}(4 w)^{n_{2}-n_{1}} P}\right| \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
K<\epsilon+\frac{(4 w)^{n_{1}}}{|P|}\binom{n}{n_{1}}\left(\frac{D}{w}\right)^{n+1} G(1) \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\epsilon=\left|\frac{B}{q^{\frac{1}{2}}}-1\right|<\frac{D}{2 B^{2}} \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let $\lambda$ be the integer such that $(4 w)^{\lambda-1}<(q / w)^{1 / 2} \leq(4 w)^{\lambda}$ and choose $n_{1}, n_{2}$ such that $\frac{2}{3} \lambda-\frac{2}{3} \leq n_{1} \leq \frac{2}{3} \lambda+1, n_{2}=n_{1}+\lambda$ and $K \neq 0$. Following the proof of Theorem 1 in [5], the property (e) allows such choice. Moreover, we may assume without loss of generality that $q \geq 4^{70} w^{71}$, which yields that $\lambda \geq 35$ and $n_{1} \geq 23$.

Let $R$ be the l.c.m. of $q$ and $w(4 w)^{2 \lambda}$. Then, since $k_{1} \equiv l_{1}, k_{2} \equiv l_{2}(\bmod 2)$ and we have chosen $n_{1}, n_{2}$ such that $K \neq 0$, we see that the denominator $K$ must divide $R^{1 / 2}|P|$.

Since both $w$ and $q$ belong to $S(\alpha, \alpha+\delta ; u, v)$, we have $p_{1}^{k_{2}} \leq\left(q / 2^{s_{2}}\right)^{\alpha+\delta} \leq$ $\left(2^{4 \lambda-s_{2}} w^{2 \lambda+1}\right)^{\alpha+\delta}$ and $p_{2}^{l_{2}} \leq\left(q / 2^{s_{2}}\right)^{1-\alpha} \leq\left(2^{4 \lambda-s_{2}} w^{2 \lambda+1}\right)^{1-\alpha}, p_{1}^{k_{1}} \leq w^{\alpha+\delta}$ and $p_{2}^{l_{1}} \leq w^{1-\alpha}$. Hence, we see that $R \leq 2^{8 \lambda+(2 \lambda+1) s_{1}+\left(4 \lambda-s_{2}\right) \delta} w^{(1+\delta)(2 \lambda+1)}$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
K \geq \frac{1}{|P| \sqrt{R}} \geq \frac{1}{|P| w^{(1+\delta)\left(\lambda+\frac{1}{2}\right)} 2^{\left(4+2 \delta+s_{1}\right) \lambda+\frac{s_{1}-s_{2} \delta}{2}}} . \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Combining (8) and (10) we have

$$
\begin{align*}
& \epsilon|P| w^{(1+\delta)\left(\lambda+\frac{1}{2}\right)} 2^{\left(4+2 \delta+s_{1}\right) \lambda+\frac{s_{1}-s_{2} \delta}{2}} \\
& >1-2^{2 n_{1}+\left(4+2 \delta+s_{1}\right) \lambda+\frac{s_{1}-s_{2} \delta}{2}} w^{n_{1}+(1+\delta)\left(\lambda+\frac{1}{2}\right)}\binom{n}{n_{1}}\left(\frac{D}{w}\right)^{n+1} G(1) . \tag{11}
\end{align*}
$$

Since $G(1)\binom{n}{n_{1}}=\prod_{1 \leq m \leq n_{1}}\left(1-\frac{1}{2 m}\right)<\frac{1}{8}$ for $n_{1} \geq 23$, the last term of (111) is at most

$$
\begin{align*}
& 2^{2 n_{1}+\left(4+2 \delta+s_{1}\right) \lambda+\frac{s_{1}-s_{2} \delta}{2}} w^{n_{1}+(1+\delta)\left(\lambda+\frac{1}{2}\right)}\left(\frac{D}{w}\right)^{n+1} \\
& \leq 2^{2 n_{1}+\left(4+2 \delta+s_{1}\right) \lambda+\frac{s_{1}-s_{2} \delta}{2}} w^{n_{2}+\delta \lambda+\frac{1+\delta}{2}-(n+1)} D^{n+1} \\
& =2^{\left(4+2 \delta+s_{1}\right) \lambda+\frac{s_{1}-s_{2} \delta}{2}} w^{\delta \lambda+\frac{\delta-1}{2}} D^{\lambda}\left(\frac{4 D^{2}}{w}\right)^{n_{1}}  \tag{12}\\
& \leq 2^{\left(\frac{16}{3}+2 \delta+s_{1}\right) \lambda-\frac{1}{3}} w^{\left(\delta-\frac{2}{3} \lambda\right)+\frac{\delta}{2}+\frac{1}{6}} D^{\frac{7}{3} \lambda-\frac{4}{3}} \\
& =\frac{w^{\frac{1}{6}+\frac{\delta}{2}}}{2^{\frac{1}{3}}} D^{\frac{4}{3}}\left(\frac{2^{16+6 \delta+3 s_{1}} D^{7}}{w^{2-3 \delta}}\right)^{\frac{\lambda}{3}} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{2}
\end{align*}
$$

provided that $w^{35(2-3 \delta)-(3 \delta+1) / 2} \geq 2^{562+210 \delta+105 s_{1}} D^{241}$, which follows from our assumption that $w \geq W \geq W_{1}$. Hence, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\epsilon|P| w^{(1+\delta)\left(\lambda+\frac{1}{2}\right)} 2^{\left(4+s_{1}\right) \lambda+\frac{s_{1}-s_{2}}{2}}>\frac{1}{2} . \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

By the property (c), we have, with the aid of Lemma 5 of [5],

$$
\begin{align*}
|P| & <(4 w)^{n_{1}}\binom{n}{n_{1}} \\
& <\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{3}{4^{1 / 3}}\right)^{\frac{7}{3} \lambda+2}(4 w)^{\frac{2}{3} \lambda+1}  \tag{14}\\
& =2^{-\frac{2}{9} \lambda-\frac{1}{3}} 3^{\frac{7}{3} \lambda+2} w^{\frac{2}{3} \lambda+1} .
\end{align*}
$$

Now, by our assumption that $w \geq W \geq W_{2}$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
2^{\frac{4}{9}+\frac{2}{3} \delta+s_{1}} 3^{\frac{7}{3}}<(4 w)^{\delta_{1}} \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

and therefore

$$
\begin{align*}
|P| w^{(1+\delta)\left(\lambda+\frac{1}{2}\right)} 2^{\left(4+2 \delta+s_{1}\right) \lambda+1} & <2^{\left(\frac{34}{9}+2 \delta+s_{1}\right) \lambda+\frac{2}{3}} 3^{\frac{7}{3} \lambda+2} w^{\left(\frac{5}{3}+\delta\right) \lambda+\frac{3+\delta}{2}} \\
& =2^{\frac{2}{3}} 3^{2} w^{\frac{3+\delta}{2}}\left(2^{\frac{4}{9}+s_{1}-\frac{4}{3} \delta} 3^{\frac{7}{3}}\right)^{\lambda}(4 w)^{\left(\frac{5}{3}+\delta\right) \lambda} \\
& \leq 2^{4+2 \delta} 3^{2} w^{\frac{19}{6}+\frac{3}{2} \delta}\left(2^{\frac{4}{9}+s_{1}-\frac{4}{3} \delta} 3^{\frac{7}{3}}\right)^{\lambda}\left(\frac{q}{w}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{5}{3}+\delta\right)}  \tag{16}\\
& \leq 2^{\frac{40}{9}+s_{1}+\frac{2}{3} \delta} 3^{\frac{13}{3}} w^{\frac{19}{6}+\frac{3}{2} \delta}\left(\frac{q}{w}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{5}{3}+\delta+\delta_{1}\right)}
\end{align*}
$$

Combining (13) and (16), we have
and (3) immediately follows.

## 4 Arithmetic of quadratic fields and the stronger gap principle

In this section, we shall prove a gap principle for larger solutions using some arithmetic of quadratic fields.

Let $d$ be the unique squarefree integer such that $D=B^{2} d$ for some integer $B$. We can factor $\left[p_{1}\right]=\mathfrak{p}_{1} \overline{\mathfrak{p}}_{1}$ and $\left[p_{2}\right]=\mathfrak{p}_{2} \overline{\mathfrak{p}}_{2}$ using some prime ideals $\mathfrak{p}_{1}$ and $\mathfrak{p}_{2}$ in $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-d})$. Moreover, if $[\alpha]=[\beta]$ in $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-d})$, then $\alpha=\theta \beta$, where $\theta$ is a sixth root of unity if $d=3$, a fourth root of unity if $d=1$ and $\pm 1$ otherwise.

Assume that $A^{2}+D=A^{2}+B^{2} d=2^{2 e} p_{1}^{k} p_{2}^{l}$ with $e \in\{0,1\}$. We must have $\left[(A+B \sqrt{-d}) / 2^{e}\right]=\mathfrak{p}_{1}^{k} \mathfrak{p}_{2}^{l}, \overline{\mathfrak{p}}_{1}^{k_{1}} \mathfrak{p}_{2}^{l_{1}}, \mathfrak{p}_{1}^{k} \overline{\mathfrak{p}}_{2}^{l}$ or $\overline{\mathfrak{p}}_{1}^{k} \overline{\mathfrak{p}}_{2}^{l}$. In any case we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[\frac{A+B \sqrt{-d}}{A-B \sqrt{-d}}\right]=\left(\frac{\overline{\mathfrak{p}}_{1}}{\mathfrak{p}_{1}}\right)^{ \pm k_{1}}\left(\frac{\overline{\mathfrak{p}}_{2}}{\mathfrak{p}_{2}}\right)^{ \pm l_{1}} \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

## 4 ARITHMETIC OF QUADRATIC FIELDS AND THE STRONGER GAP PRINCIPLE8

for some appropriate choices of signs.
We shall show a gap principle for solutions much stronger than Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2

Lemma 4.1. Let $c$ denote that constant $\sqrt{\log 2 \log 3 / 2^{7 / 2}}=0.2594 \cdots$. If $x_{3}>$ $x_{2}>x_{1}>10^{6} D$ belong to the same set $S^{(j)}$ with $j=0$ or 3 and $y_{i}=x_{i}^{2}+D$ for $i=1,2,3$, then $y_{3}>\exp \left(c y_{1}^{1 / 8}\right)$. Furthermore, if $x_{4}>x_{3}>x_{2}>x_{1}>10^{6} D$ belong to the same set $S^{(j)}$ with $j=1$ or 2 and $y_{i}=x_{i}^{2}+D$ for $1 \leq i \leq 4$, then $y_{4}>\exp \left(c y_{1}^{1 / 8}\right)$.

Proof. Assume that $S^{(j)}$ has three elements $x_{1}<x_{2}<x_{3}$ in the case $j=0,3$ and four elements $x_{1}<x_{2}<x_{3}<x_{4}$ in the case $j=1,2$. By Lemmas 2.1] and 2.2, we have $x_{4}>x_{3}>\frac{1}{2}\left(y_{1} / 4\right)^{3 / 4}>\frac{1}{2^{5 / 2}} x_{1}^{\frac{3}{2}}$ and we have $x_{3}>x_{2}>\frac{1}{2}\left(y_{1} / 4\right)^{3 / 4}>\frac{1}{2^{5 / 2}} x_{1}^{\frac{3}{2}}$ in both cases respectively. So that, setting $\left(X_{1}, X_{2}, X_{3}\right)=\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, x_{3}\right)$ in the case $j=0,3$ and $\left(X_{1}, X_{2}, X_{3}\right)=\left(x_{1}, x_{3}, x_{4}\right)$ in the case $j=1,2$, we have $X_{3}>X_{2}>$ $\frac{1}{2^{5 / 2}} X_{1}^{\frac{3}{2}}$ in any case.

Moreover, (18) yields that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[\frac{X_{i}+\sqrt{-D}}{X_{i}-\sqrt{-D}}\right]=\left(\frac{\overline{\mathfrak{p}}_{1}}{\mathfrak{p}_{1}}\right)^{ \pm k_{i}}\left(\frac{\overline{\mathfrak{p}}_{2}}{\mathfrak{p}_{2}}\right)^{ \pm l_{i}} \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

for each $i=1,2,3$. Hence, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[\frac{X_{1}+\sqrt{-D}}{X_{1}-\sqrt{-D}}\right]^{e_{1}}\left[\frac{X_{2}+\sqrt{-D}}{X_{2}-\sqrt{-D}}\right]^{e_{2}}\left[\frac{X_{3}+\sqrt{-D}}{X_{3}-\sqrt{-D}}\right]^{e_{3}}=[1] \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $e_{1}= \pm k_{2} l_{3} \pm k_{3} l_{2}, e_{2}= \pm k_{3} l_{1} \pm k_{1} l_{3}, e_{3}= \pm k_{1} l_{2} \pm k_{2} l_{1}$ with appropriate signs are not all zero. In other words, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\frac{X_{1}+\sqrt{-D}}{X_{1}-\sqrt{-D}}\right)^{f e_{1}}\left(\frac{X_{2}+\sqrt{-D}}{X_{2}-\sqrt{-D}}\right)^{f e_{2}}\left(\frac{X_{3}+\sqrt{-D}}{X_{3}-\sqrt{-D}}\right)^{f e_{3}}=1 \tag{21}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $f=6$ if $d=3,4$ if $d=1$ and 2 otherwise. This implies that $\Lambda=$ $e_{1} \arg \left(X_{1} \pm \sqrt{-D}\right)+e_{2} \arg \left(X_{2} \pm \sqrt{-D}\right)+e_{3} \arg \left(X_{3} \pm \sqrt{-D}\right)$ must be a multiple of $2 \pi / f$.

If $\Lambda \neq 0$, then we see that $\left(\frac{\left|e_{1}\right|}{X_{1}}+\frac{\left|e_{2}\right|}{X_{2}}+\frac{\left|e_{3}\right|}{X_{3}}\right) \sqrt{D}>|\Lambda| \geq 2 \pi / f$ and therefore $2.01 \mathrm{fKL} \sqrt{D} \geq 2 X_{1} \pi$ and $1.92 K L \sqrt{D}>X_{1}$. Since $X_{1}=x_{1}>10^{6} D$, we have $1.92 K L>2 \sqrt{X_{1}}>\left(X_{1}^{2}+D\right)^{1 / 4}=y^{1 / 4}$.

Assume that $\Lambda=0$. If $e_{1}=0$, then we must have $\Lambda=e_{2} \arg \left(X_{2} \pm \sqrt{-D}\right)+$ $e_{3} \arg \left(X_{3} \pm \sqrt{-D}\right)=0$ and $\left(X_{2}^{2}+D\right)^{e_{2}}=\left(X_{3}^{2}+D\right)^{e_{3}}$. Hence, we must have $\left|e_{2}\right|>\left|e_{3}\right|>0$ and $\left|\arg \left(X_{2} \pm \sqrt{-D}\right)\right|>\left|\arg \left(X_{3} \pm \sqrt{-D}\right)\right|>0$ from $X_{3}>X_{2}$ and $\Lambda \neq 0$, which is a contradiction. Thus $e_{1}$ cannot be zero. The triangle
inequality immediately gives that $\left|\arg \left(X_{1} \pm \sqrt{-D}\right)\right| \leq\left|e_{2} \arg \left(X_{2} \pm \sqrt{-D}\right)\right|+$ $\left|e_{3} \arg \left(X_{3} \pm \sqrt{-D}\right)\right|$ and therefore

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{\sqrt{X_{1}^{2}+D}}<\frac{e_{2}}{X_{2}}+\frac{e_{3}}{X_{3}}<\frac{2 K L}{X_{2}}<\frac{8 \sqrt{2} K L}{\left(X_{1}^{2}+D\right)^{\frac{3}{4}}} . \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus we obtain $8 \sqrt{2} K L>\left(X_{1}^{2}+D\right)^{1 / 4}=y_{1}^{1 / 4}$.
Hence, in any case we have $8 \sqrt{2} K L>y_{1}^{1 / 4}$ and $\max \left\{K \log p_{1}, L \log p_{2}\right\}>$ $y_{1}^{1 / 8} \sqrt{\log p_{1} \log p_{2} /(8 \sqrt{2})}$. Thus, we conclude that

$$
\begin{equation*}
X_{3}^{2}+D \geq \max \left\{p_{1}^{K}, p_{2}^{L}\right\}>\exp \left(y_{1}^{\frac{1}{8}} \sqrt{\frac{\log p_{1} \log p_{2}}{8 \sqrt{2}}}\right) \geq \exp \left(c y_{1}^{\frac{1}{8}}\right), \tag{23}
\end{equation*}
$$

proving the Lemma.

## 5 Proof of the Theorem

We set $\delta_{1}=0.04377667$. We shall begin by proving (i).
Let $y_{1}=x_{1}^{2}+D$ be the smallest solution in a given class $S^{(j)}(W, \infty ; u, v)$ and $y_{2}=x_{2}^{2}+D$ be the third or fourth smallest one in this class for $j=0,3$ or $j=1,2$, respectively. Lemma 3.1 with $\delta=1 / 4$ gives that

$$
\begin{equation*}
y_{2}<\max \left\{4^{70} y_{1}^{71},\left(2^{\frac{101}{18}} 3^{\frac{16}{3}} D y_{1}^{\frac{31}{12}-\frac{\delta_{1}}{2}}\right)^{1 /\left(\frac{1}{24}-\frac{\delta_{1}}{2}\right)}\right\} \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

But Lemma 4.1 immediately yields that $y_{2}>\exp \left(c y_{1}^{1 / 8}\right)$. We observe that these two inequalities are incompatible for $y_{1} \geq W=\max \left\{W_{1}, W_{2}\right\}$. Hence, we see that $\# S^{(j)}(W, \infty ; u, v) \leq 2$ for each $j, u, v$ for $j=0,3$ and $\# S^{(j)}(W, \infty ; u, v) \leq 3$ for each $j, u, v$ for $j=1,2$. Combining these estimates, we obtain $\# S(0,1, W, \infty) \leq$ 30 after the easy observation that $S(0,1, W, \infty ; 0,0)$ must be empty since $W>$ $D^{2}$. This proves (i).

Now we shift our concern to smaller solutions. Let $f(y)=y^{3 / 2} / 2^{5 / 2}, g(y)=$ $\exp \left(c y_{1}^{1 / 8}\right)$ and $f^{(m)}$ be the $m$-th iteration of $f . y_{1}=x^{2}+D=2^{s} p_{1}^{k} p_{2}^{l}$ denotes the smallest solution. We have the following three cases.

Case 1. $D \geq Y$ or $y_{1} \geq Y$.
If $D \geq Y$, then $W=W_{1}<g\left(f^{(3)}(D)\right) \leq g\left(f^{(3)}\left(y_{1}\right)\right)$. If $D \leq Y-1$ and $y_{1} \geq Y$, then we have that $W=W_{2}<g\left(f^{(3)}(Y)\right) \leq g\left(f^{(3)}\left(y_{1}\right)\right)$. Hence, we always have $W \leq g\left(f^{(3)}\left(y_{1}\right)\right)$ in Case 1 and therefore, using Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2, we obtain $\# S^{(j)}\left(y_{1}, W\right) \leq 9$ if $j=0,3$ and $\# S^{(j)}\left(y_{1}, W\right) \leq 5$ if $j=1,2$. So that, $\# S(0,1,0, \infty) \leq 30+28=58$. This proves (ii).

Case 2. $D, y_{1}, p_{2} \leq Y-1$.
Let $W_{3}=f^{(2)}(Y)=3545401233665.83 \cdots$. Since $y_{1} \leq Y-1$, then $D \leq y_{1} \leq$ $Y-1$ and $p_{1} \leq y_{1} \leq Y-1$. A computer search revealed that $\# S\left(0,1,0, W_{3}\right) \leq 13$ for any $D, p_{1}, p_{2} \leq Y-1$. Since $W<g\left(f^{(3)}(Y)\right)=g\left(f\left(W_{3}\right)\right)$, from Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2 we see that $\# S^{(j)}\left(W_{3}, W\right) \leq 5$ if $j=0,3$ and $\# S^{(j)}\left(W_{3}, W\right) \leq 3$ if $j=1,2$. This proves (iii).

Case 3. $D, y_{1} \leq Y-1$ and $p_{2} \geq Y$.
If $x^{2}+D=2^{s} p_{1}^{k} p_{2}^{l} \leq Y-1$, then, since $p_{2} \geq Y$, we must have $x^{2}+D=2^{s} p_{1}^{k}$, which has at most five solutions from the results mentioned in the introduction. The number of the other solutions can be bounded as in Case 2 and we obtain (iv). This completes the proof of the Theorem.
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