PERFECT POWERS IN VALUE SETS AND ORBITS OF POLYNOMIALS
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Abstract. We show the finiteness of perfect powers in orbits of polynomial dynamical systems over an algebraic number field. We also obtain similar results for perfect powers represented by ratios of consecutive elements in orbits. Assuming the \(abc\)-Conjecture for number fields, we obtain a finiteness result for powers in ratios of arbitrary elements in orbits.

1. Introduction and statements of main results

1.1. Motivation. Cahn, Jones and Spear [4] have recently obtained a series of results about the structure of intersections of orbits of a rational function \(\psi \in \mathbb{L}(X)\) over a field \(\mathbb{L}\) of characteristic zero, with the image \(\varphi(\mathbb{L})\) of \(\mathbb{L}\) for another rational function \(\varphi \in \mathbb{L}(X)\). In the special case of \(\varphi(X) = X^m\), with a fixed integer \(m \geq 2\), this corresponds to the case of powers in orbits of rational functions, see [4, Corollaries 1.6–1.8]. In particular, Cahn, Jones and Spear [4, Corollary 1.8] give a very explicit characterisation of polynomials \(f(X) \in \mathbb{L}[X]\) for which for some \(\alpha \in \mathbb{L}\) the intersection of the orbit of \(\alpha\) with the set of \(m\)-th powers \(\mathbb{L}^m\) is finite.

Here we consider this question for polynomials \(f(X) \in \mathbb{K}[X]\) over a number field \(\mathbb{K}\) and extend it in two directions, namely, we consider the union of all orbits over all \(\alpha \in \mathbb{K}\), and we study its intersection with the set of all nontrivial powers of \(S\)-integers, see Section 1.2 for exact definitions.

In fact we put this question in a more general context of powers in images of polynomials, that is, in \(f(\mathbb{K})\) and reduce it to a much more studied question about powers in the set \(f(R_S)\), where \(R_S\) is a ring of \(S\)-integers of \(\mathbb{K}\), see Section 1.2 for exact definitions. An application of Northcott’s Theorem [13] allows us to study powers in orbits.

1.2. Notation and conventions. We now set the following notation, which remains fixed for the remainder of this paper:
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• \(K\) is a number field.
• \(\mathbb{Z}_K\) is the ring of algebraic integers of \(K\).
• \(M_K\) is the set of all places of \(K\), and \(M_K^0\) (resp. \(M_K^\infty\)) is the set of all non-Archimedean (resp. Archimedean) places of \(K\).
• \(\mathcal{S} \subseteq M_K\) is a finite set of places of \(K\), including the Archimedean ones.
• \(\mathcal{R}_S\) is the ring of \(S\)-integers of \(K\).
• \(\mathcal{R}_S^*\) is the group of \(S\)-units of \(K\).
• \(K\) is an algebraic closure of \(K\).
• \(f(X) \in K[X]\) is a polynomial of degree \(d \geq 2\).
• For \(n \geq 0\), we write \(f^{(n)}(X)\) for the \(n\)th iterate of \(f\), that is, \(f^{(n)}(X) = f \circ f \circ \cdots \circ f(X)\).
• For \(\alpha \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)\), we write \(O_f(\alpha)\) for the (forward) orbit of \(\alpha\), that is, \(O_f(\alpha) = \{f^{(n)}(\alpha) : n \geq 0\}\).
• \(\text{Per}(f)\) is the set of periodic points of \(f\) in \(\overline{K}\), that is, the set of points \(\alpha \in \overline{K}\) such that \(f^{(n)}(\alpha) = \alpha\) for some \(n \geq 1\).
• \(\text{PrePer}(f)\) is the set of preperiodic points of \(f\) in \(\overline{K}\), that is, the set of points \(\alpha \in \overline{K}\) such that \(O_f(\alpha)\) is finite.
• \(\text{Wander}_K(f)\) is the complement of the set \(\text{PrePer}(f)\) in \(K\), that is, the set \(K \setminus \text{PrePer}(f)\) of \(K\)-rational wandering points for \(f\).
• \(\mathbb{Z}_{\geq r}\) denotes the set of integers \(n \geq r\), where \(r\) is a real number.
• \(\mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0,1}\) denotes the set of integers different from 0 and 1.

It is also convenient to define the function
\[
\log^+ t = \log \max\{t, 1\}.
\]

For every \(v \in M_K\) we denote by \(|.|_v\) the corresponding absolute value on \(K\), normalized so that the absolute logarithmic Weil height \(h : \overline{K} \to [0, \infty)\) is defined by
\[
h(\beta) = \sum_{v \in M_K} \log^+ (|\beta|_v).
\]

(1.1)

Every \(v \in M_K^0\) is induced by a prime ideal \(p_v \subset \mathbb{Z}_K\). For any \(\alpha \in \mathbb{K}\) and any \(v \in M_K^0\) we set \(v(\alpha) = \text{ord}_{p_v}(\alpha)\). Hence, the map \(v : \mathbb{K} \to \mathbb{Z}\) is the normalized valuation on \(K\) corresponding to the non-Archimedean absolute value \(|.|_v\). See [3, 10, 12] for further details on absolute values and height functions.

Throughout, the notations \(U = O(V)\) and \(U \ll V\) are each equivalent to the statement that the inequality \(|U| \leq cV\) holds with some
constant \( c > 0 \) which may occasionally (where obvious) depend on the polynomial \( f \).

1.3. Main results. Below we define three sets of “exceptional values”. Our goal is to characterise when these sets may be infinite.

With \( K, S \) and \( f \) as defined in Section 1.2, and fixed \( a \in K^* \) we define the set

\[
U_a(K, f, S) = \left\{ \alpha \in K : \exists (\ell, u) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0,1} \times R_S \text{ such that } f(\alpha) = au^\ell \right\},
\]

and show its finiteness under some natural conditions.

Additionally, motivated by obtaining a finiteness result for ratios of elements in orbits which are perfect powers, we study the finiteness of the set

\[
V_{a,m}(K, f, S) = \left\{ \alpha \in K : \exists (n, \ell, u) \in \{1, \ldots, m\} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0,1} \times R_S \text{ such that } f^{(n)}(\alpha) = au^\ell \alpha \right\},
\]

where \( m \geq 1 \) is a fixed rational integer. Our main interest in the set \( V_{a,m}(K, f, S) \) stems from Conjecture 1.5 below on the finiteness of the set

\[
W_a(K, f, S) = \left\{ \alpha \in K : \exists (n, \ell, u) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0,1} \times R_S \text{ such that } f^{(n)}(\alpha) = au^\ell \alpha \right\}.
\]

Remark 1.1. Our motivation to investigate the set \( W_a(K, f, S) \) stems from the observation that its finiteness, coupled with Northcott’s Theorem [13], see also [2, Lemma 2.3], immediately implies the finiteness of the set of \( \alpha \in K \), for which the ratio of two elements in \( O_f(\alpha) \) is in a given coset of the set of powers. In other words, it implies the finiteness of the set

\[
\widetilde{W}_a(K, f, S)
\]

\[
= \left\{ \alpha \in K : \exists (n, k, \ell, u) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0,1} \times R_S \text{ such that } f^{(n+k)}(\alpha) = au^\ell f^{(k)}(\alpha) \right\}.
\]

If \( u \in R_S^* \) in the sets above, then finiteness conditions for these sets have been given in [2, Theorems 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4].

Theorem 1.2. Let \( f \in K[X] \) be of degree \( d \geq 3 \), having only simple roots and with \( f(0) \neq 0 \). Then for any finite set of places \( S \) of \( K \) and an element \( a \in K^* \), the set \( U_a(K, f, S) \) is finite.

By Northcott’s Theorem [13], for any \( \beta \in K \) there are only finitely many \( \alpha \in K \) such that \( \beta \in O_f(\alpha) \). Hence, from Theorem 1.2, we have the following direct consequence about powers in orbits.
Corollary 1.3. Let \( f \in K[X] \) be of degree \( d \geq 3 \), having only simple roots and such that \( 0 \notin \text{Per}(f) \). Then for any finite set of places \( S \) of \( K \) and an element \( a \in K^* \), there are at most finitely many \( \alpha \in K \) such that \( f^{(n)}(\alpha) \in aR_S^\ell \) for some \((n, \ell) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0,1} \).

Remark 1.4. We note that Theorem 1.2 shows finiteness of the set of tuples \((n, \ell, \alpha, u) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0,1} \times \text{Wander}_K(f) \times R_S \) such that \( f^{(n)}(\alpha) = au^\ell \) as it implies the finiteness of possible values for \( f^{(n-1)}(\alpha) \) for \((n, \alpha, u) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \times \text{Wander}_K(f) \).

We also make:

Conjecture 1.5. Let \( f \in K[X] \) be of degree \( d \geq 3 \), having only simple roots and such that \( 0 \notin \text{Per}(f) \). Then for any finite set of places \( S \) of \( K \) and an element \( a \in K^* \), the set \( W_a(K, f, S) \) is finite.

We now provide several results towards Conjecture 1.5. First we consider the set \( V_{a,m}(K, f, S) \) which corresponds to the choices \( n \leq m \) in the definition of \( W_a(K, f, S) \).

Theorem 1.6. Let \( m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \) and \( f \in K[X] \) be of degree \( d \geq 3 \), having only simple roots and such that \( f^{(k)}(0) \neq 0 \) for all \( k \in \{1, \ldots, m\} \). Then for any finite set of places \( S \) of \( K \) and an element \( a \in K^* \), the set \( V_{a,m}(K, f, S) \) is finite.

As in the above, combining Theorem 1.6 with Northcott’s Theorem [13], we have the following direct consequence about the ratio of two consecutive elements in orbits.

Corollary 1.7. Let \( f \in K[X] \) be of degree \( d \geq 3 \), having only simple roots and such that \( 0 \notin \text{Per}(f) \). Then for any finite set of places \( S \) of \( K \) and an element \( a \in K^* \), there are at most finitely many \( \alpha \in K \) such that \( f^{(n+1)}(\alpha)/f^{(n)}(\alpha) \in aR_S^\ell \) for some \( n \geq 1 \) and some \( \ell \neq 0,1 \).

Remark 1.8. The proof of Theorem 1.6 splits into several cases, depending on some additional assumptions of \( \alpha \) and \( u \). As a step towards a proof of Conjecture 1.5 for most of them we actually give a finiteness result for their contribution to the set \( W_a(K, f, S) \) and only in one case we have to assume that \( n \) is bounded. Hence we end up with a complete proof of finiteness only of the set \( V_{a,m}(K, f, S) \).

We now produce an infinite class of polynomials for which Conjecture 1.5 holds.

Theorem 1.9. Let \( f \in K[X] \) be of degree \( d \geq 3 \), having only simple roots and such that \( 0 \in \text{PrePer}(f) \setminus \text{Per}(f) \). Then for any finite set of places \( S \) of \( K \) and an element \( a \in K^* \), the set \( W_a(K, f, S) \) is finite.
For example, the classes of polynomials

\[ f(X) = X^n(X^m - 1) + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad f(X) = X^k(X - a) + a \]

satisfy the conditions of Theorem 1.9, for all \( n, m \geq 1 \) with \( n + m \geq 3 \) and \( k \geq 2, a \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\} \), respectively.

Next, we prove that Conjecture 1.5 follows from the abc-Conjecture for the number field \( \mathbb{K} \), see [3, Chapter 14]. To formulate the abc-Conjecture for \( \mathbb{K} \), for each \( v \in M_0^0 \) we fix some element \( \pi_v \in \mathbb{K} \) with \( v(\pi_v) = 1 \).

**Conjecture 1.10 (\( \mathbb{K} \)-rational abc-Conjecture).** For every \( \varepsilon > 0 \), there exists a constant \( C(\varepsilon) \) such that for all \( \alpha \in \mathbb{K} \setminus \{0, 1\} \) we have

\[
(1 - \varepsilon)h(\alpha) \leq \sum_{v(\alpha) > 0} \log \left| \frac{1}{\pi_v} \right|_v + \sum_{v(1 - \alpha) > 0} \log \left| \frac{1}{\pi_v} \right|_v + \sum_{v(1/\alpha) > 0} \log \left| \frac{1}{\pi_v} \right|_v + C(\varepsilon).
\]

**Remark 1.11.** In the case \( \mathbb{K} = \mathbb{Q} \), the validity of Conjecture 1.10 for any \( \varepsilon > 0 \) is equivalent to the classical abc-Conjecture of Masser and Oesterlé. Namely, for any \( \varepsilon > 0 \), there exists a constant \( C(\varepsilon) \), such that for all pairwise coprime \( a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \), with \( a + b = c \), it is

\[
\prod_{\text{prime } p | abc} p \geq C(\varepsilon)c^{1-\varepsilon}.
\]

For a proof of this and further information on Conjecture 1.10 we refer to [3, Chapter 14].

**Theorem 1.12.** Let \( f \in \mathbb{K}[X] \) be of degree \( d \geq 3 \), having only simple roots and such that \( 0 \notin \text{Per}(f) \). Assuming the validity of the \( \mathbb{K} \)-rational abc-Conjecture 1.10, for any \( a \in \mathbb{K}^* \) and any finite set of places \( S \) of \( \mathbb{K} \), the set \( W_a(\mathbb{K}, f, S) \) is finite.

Clearly, Theorem 1.12 can be abbreviated to

Conjecture 1.10 \( \implies \) Conjecture 1.5.

**Remark 1.13.** Examining the proof of Theorem 1.12 one can see that for a fixed polynomial \( f \in \mathbb{K}[x] \) satisfying the assumptions from Theorem 1.12, we do not need the full power of the \( \mathbb{K} \)-rational abc-Conjecture to prove the finiteness of \( W_a(\mathbb{K}, f, S) \). We prove that for any such \( f \), there exists an \( \varepsilon(f) > 0 \) such that if (1.2) holds for \( \varepsilon(f) \), then
\( W_a(\mathbb{K}, f, \mathcal{S}) \) is finite, see also Remark 2.1 in the proof of Theorem 1.12 for more details.

2. Proofs of main results

2.1. Preliminary discussion. As usual, we say that a polynomial

\[ f(X) = c_0 + c_1 X + \cdots + c_d X^d \]

has bad reduction at \( v \in M^0_{\mathbb{K}} \) if either \( v(c_i) < 0 \) for some \( i \) or if \( v(c_d) > 0 \); otherwise we say it has good reduction. We fix \( a \in \mathbb{K}^* \) and let

\[ S_{a,f} = \mathcal{S} \cup \{ v \in M^0_{\mathbb{K}} : f \text{ has bad reduction at } v \} \cup \{ v \in M^0_{\mathbb{K}} : v(a) \neq 0 \}. \]

In particular, for all \( v \notin S_{a,f} \) we have

\[ |c_d|_v = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad |c_i|_v \leq 1, \quad i = 0, \ldots, d - 1. \]  

(2.1)

It is easy to see that if \( f \) has good reduction at \( v \), then so do all of its iterates; in fact this is also true even for rational functions, see [15, Proposition 2.18(b)]. Hence

\[ S_{a,f}(m) \subseteq S_{a,f}, \quad \text{for all } m \geq 1. \]  

(2.2)

We let

\[ R_{S_{a,f}} = \{ \vartheta \in \mathbb{K} : v(\vartheta) \geq 0 \text{ for all } v \notin S_{a,f} \} \]

be the ring of \( S_{a,f} \)-integers in \( \mathbb{K} \), and \( R_{S_{a,f}}^* \) denotes the group of \( S_{a,f} \)-units in \( \mathbb{K} \). Clearly \( R_S \subseteq R_{S_{a,f}} \).

2.2. Proof of Theorem 1.2. We replace the set \( R_S \) with \( R_{S_{a,f}} \) and thus investigate the equation

\[ f(\alpha) = au^\ell, \quad (\alpha, \ell, u) \in \mathbb{K} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\neq 0,1} \times R_{S_{a,f}}. \]  

(2.3)

We consider two cases, one in which \( \alpha \in R_{S_{a,f}} \) and one in which \( \alpha \notin R_{S_{a,f}} \).

Case A: \( \alpha \in R_{S_{a,f}} \).

We also treat separately the case when \( \ell \) is positive or negative.

Subcase A.1: \( \ell \geq 2 \).

Since \( u \in R_{S_{a,f}} \), we can apply [1, Theorem 2.3] to conclude that the exponent \( \ell \geq 2 \) is bounded by a constant depending only on \( \mathbb{K}, f, \mathcal{S} \) and \( a \). Since \( \deg f \geq 3 \), we can apply [1, Theorem 2.2] to conclude that \( h(\alpha) \) and \( h(u) \) are bounded by a constant depending only on \( \mathbb{K}, f, \mathcal{S} \) and \( a \), and since \( \alpha, u \in \mathbb{K} \), then Northcott’s Theorem [15, Theorem 3.7] tells us that there are finitely many such \( \alpha \) and \( u \).
Subcase A.2: $\ell < 0$.

Let us define the rational function $g(X) = f(X^{-1})^{-1}$. Then, since $f$ has at least three simple roots and $f(0) \neq 0$, the function $g$ has at least three distinct poles.

We have a solution $f(\alpha) = au^\ell$ with $\alpha u \neq 0$, if and only if

$$g(\alpha^{-1}) = f(\alpha)^{-1} = a^{-1}u^{-\ell}.$$  

Since $-\ell > 0$, $u^{-\ell} \in R_{S_a,f}$, and thus we can apply Siegel’s Theorem [10, Theorem D.8.4] (we also recall that $a^{-1} \in R_{S_a,f}^*$) to conclude that there are finitely many $\beta \in K$ such that $g(\beta) \in R_{S_a,f}$. This concludes this case.

Case B: $\alpha \not\in R_{S_a,f}$.

We start with observing that for any $v \in M_K \setminus S_{a,f} \subseteq M^0_K$, since $u \in R_{S_a,f}$, we have

(2.4) \hspace{1cm} v(u) \geq 0.

We now prove that for any $v \in M_K \setminus S_{a,f}$ we have the equivalence

(2.5) \hspace{1cm} v(\alpha) < 0 \iff v(u^\ell) < 0.

In one direction, when $v(\alpha) < 0$ from the proof of [14, Theorem 4.11], we have $v(f(\alpha)) = dv(\alpha)$. This applied to (2.3) gives

(2.6) \hspace{1cm} 0 > dv(\alpha) = v(f(\alpha)) = v(u^\ell),

which implies $v(u^\ell) < 0$.

Conversely, let $v \in M_K \setminus S_{a,f}$ be such that $v(u^\ell) < 0$ or equivalently, that $|u^\ell|_v > 1$, which also means that

(2.7) \hspace{1cm} \ell < 0.

Now, if $f(X) = c_0 + c_1X + \cdots + c_dX^d$, the fact that $v \in M_K \setminus S_{a,f}$ implies that $|c_i|_v \leq 1$ for all $i = 0,\ldots,d$. An easy computation then shows that

$$1 < |u^\ell|_v = |f(\alpha)|_v \leq \max\{1,|\alpha|^d\}.$$  

From here we must have $|\alpha|_v > 1$, or equivalently, that $v(\alpha) < 0$, concluding the proof of (2.5).

Let now $v \in M_K \setminus S_{a,f} \subset M^0_K$ be such that

$$v(\alpha) < 0,$$

which exists by our assumption that $\alpha \not\in R_{S_a,f}$. Thus, from now on we assume that (2.7) holds.
We see from (2.7) that for any \( v \in M_\mathbb{K} \setminus S_{a,f} \) we can now simplify (2.5) as
\[
v(\alpha) < 0 \iff v(u) > 0.
\]
Then by (2.6) we have the divisibility
\[(2.8) \quad d \mid v(u^\ell).\]

Hence (2.8) holds for any \( v \in M_\mathbb{K} \setminus S_{a,f} \), that is, under the condition (2.4) (since it is also trivially true when \( v(u) = 0 \)).

Thus, using (2.8), we see that in the case under consideration, that is, for any solution \((\ell, \alpha, u)\) to (2.3), and \( \alpha \notin R_{S_{a,f}} \), we can write \( u^\ell = \eta \gamma^d \), where \( \gamma \in \mathbb{K} \) and \( \eta \in R_{S_{a,f}}^\ast \) and thus
\[
f(\alpha) = a\eta \gamma^d.
\]
Since the group \( R_{S_{a,f}}^\ast \) is finitely generated, we can replace \( \mathbb{K} \) by the extension field \( \mathbb{L} \) such that all the \( d \)-th roots of the generators of \( R_{S_{a,f}}^\ast \) belong to \( \mathbb{L} \). This is a finite extension depending only on \( \mathbb{K}, d, \) and \( S_{a,f} \).

Thus, we reduce the equation above to
\[
f(\alpha) = \gamma^d, \quad \alpha, \gamma \in \mathbb{L}.
\]
We are thus led to proving finiteness for the set of solutions \((x, y)\) \( \in \mathbb{K}^2 \) of the superelliptic curve defined by
\[
C : \quad f(X) = Y^d.
\]
Since \( f \) has only simple roots, applying the genus formula \([10, Exercise A.4.6] \) for a smooth projective model \( \bar{C} \) of the affine curve \( C \), we have
\[
\text{genus}(\bar{C}) = \frac{(d - 1)(d^2 - 2)}{2} \geq 7.
\]
Therefore, by Faltings’ theorem \([7, 8] \), the set of \( \mathbb{K} \)-rational points \( C(\mathbb{K}) \) on \( C \) is finite and we conclude thus the proof.

### 2.3. Proof of Theorem 1.6.
As we have explained in Remark 1.8, we follow the proof in the general case of proving Conjecture 1.5, except for one case which breaks down, and thus prove this case only for \( n \leq m \), for some fixed \( m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \), which concludes only the proof of Theorem 1.6. In particular, we consider the equation
\[
(2.9) \quad f^{(n)}(\alpha) = au^\ell \alpha.
\]
Moreover, since by Northcott’s Theorem \([13] \) (see also see \([15, Theorem 3.12] \)), the set \( \text{PrePer}(f) \cap \mathbb{K} \) is finite, we need only to prove finiteness of the set \( W_a(\mathbb{K}, f, S) \cap \text{Wander}_\mathbb{K}(f) \).

We split now the proof into two cases depending on \( \ell \) being positive and negative, and then some further subcases.
Case A: $\ell \geq 2$.
Assume there is a solution $\alpha \in \text{Wander}_{\mathbb{K}}(f)$ to (2.9). Since $\ell \geq 0$, for all $v \not\in S_{a,f}$, one has
\[ |f^{(n)}(\alpha)|_v \leq |\alpha|_v. \]
We apply now [5, Lemma 3.5] or [14, Lemma 3.5] to conclude that for all $v \not\in S_{a,f}$,
\[ |\alpha|_v \leq \max_{j=0, \ldots, d-1} \{1, |c_j/c_d|_v, |c_d|_v^{-1}\}. \]
However, since for all $v \not\in S_{a,f}$, (2.1) holds, we obtain that
\[ \alpha \in R_{S_{a,f}}. \]
We now consider the following three subcases.

Subcase A.1: $u \in R_{S_{a,f}}^*$.
The finiteness in this case follows directly from [2, Theorem 1.3].

Subcase A.2: $u \in R_{S_{a,f}} \setminus R_{S_{a,f}}^*$ and $\alpha \in R_{S_{a,f}}^*$.
In this case, we can rewrite (2.9) as
\[ f(f^{(n-1)}(\alpha)) = a\alpha u^\ell, \]
and thus, by [2, Lemma 2.8], the exponent $\ell \geq 2$ in the equation $f(x) = a\alpha y^\ell$ having a solution $(f^{(n-1)}(\alpha), u) \in R_{S_{a,f}} \times (R_{S_{a,f}} \setminus R_{S_{a,f}}^*)$ is bounded by a constant depending only on $\mathbb{K}, S, f$ and $a$ (note that the constant does not depend on $\alpha$). Thus, we may assume that $\ell$ is fixed.

By [1, Theorem 2.2], since $\deg f \geq 3$, the heights $h(f^{(n-1)}(\alpha))$ and $h(u)$ are bounded by a constant depending only on $\mathbb{K}, S, f$ and $a$ (here it is important that $\alpha \in R_{S_{a,f}}^*$), and thus, by Northcott’s Theorem, there are only finitely many such elements
\[ (f^{(n-1)}(\alpha), u) \in R_{S_{a,f}} \times (R_{S_{a,f}} \setminus R_{S_{a,f}}^*). \]
Applying [2, Lemma 2.3], we conclude that there are finitely many such $\alpha \in \text{Wander}_{\mathbb{K}}(f)$.

Subcase A.3: $u \in R_{S_{a,f}} \setminus R_{S_{a,f}}^*$ and $\alpha \in R_{S_{a,f}} \setminus R_{S_{a,f}}^*$.
In this case, since $\alpha \in R_{S_{a,f}} \setminus R_{S_{a,f}}^*$, there exists $v \not\in S_{a,f}$ such that $v(\alpha) > 0$. Since $u \in R_{S_{a,f}}$, we also have $v(u) \geq 0$, and thus $v(f^{(n)}(\alpha)) > 0$ (since $\ell > 0$).

Now, let us write
\[ f^{(n)}(X) = \sum_{i=0}^{d} c_{i,n} X^i, \]
with \( v(c_{i,n}) \geq 0 \), which follows from (2.1) and (2.2). Thus \( v(c_{i,n}\alpha^i) > 0 \), and

\[
v(f^{(n)}(0)) = v(c_{0,n}) = v\left( f^{(n)}(\alpha) - \sum_{i=1}^{d_n} c_{i,n}\alpha^i \right)
\geq \min\{v(f^{(n)}(\alpha)), \min_{i=1,\ldots,d_n} v(c_{i,n}\alpha^i)\} > 0.
\]

Thus, for any \( v \notin S_{a,f} \) such that \( v(\alpha) > 0 \), one has \( v(f^{(n)}(0)) > 0 \).

This is where we do not know how to conclude the proof in full generality and thus for the rest of Subcase A.3 only we assume

\[ n \leq m. \]

By (2.10), for any \( v \notin S_{a,f} \) such that \( v(\alpha) > 0 \), one has \( v(f^{(n)}(0)) > 0 \).

However, since \( f^{(n)}(0) \neq 0 \) for all \( n \leq m \), there are at most finitely many \( v \in M_{K}^0 \setminus S_{a,f} \) such that \( v(f^{(n)}(0)) > 0 \) for some \( n \in \{1,\ldots,m\} \). Thus, extending \( S_{a,f} \) to include all these places and denoting this new set by \( T_{a,f,m} \), we can conclude that \( \alpha \in R_{T_{a,f,m}} \).

**Case B:** \( \ell < 0 \).

We continue now the proof for arbitrary \( n \geq 1 \).

Since \( f \) is a polynomial of degree \( d \geq 3 \) with only simple roots, \( f \) is not of the form \( cX^d \) and moreover 0 is not an exceptional point for \( f \) (if 0 would be an exceptional point, then the cardinality of the backward orbit of 0 would be 1 or 2, see for example [15, Theorem 1.6], which is impossible).

We study the finiteness of the set of elements \( \alpha \in \text{Wander}_K(f) \) such that

\[
|f^{(n)}(\alpha)|_v = |u|^\ell_v|\alpha|_v, \quad \forall v \in M_K \setminus S_{a,f},
\]

for some \( (n, \ell, u) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \times \mathbb{Z}_{<0} \times (R_{S_{a,f}} \setminus \{0\}) \).

We now proceed as in the proof of [2, Theorem 1.3] and we indicate only what is new. For an arbitrary choice of \( \varepsilon \), to be specified later, we let \( C_3(K, S_{a,f}, f, \varepsilon) \) be the constant from [2, Lemma 2.5], and we split the proof into two cases, depending whether \( n \) is large or small.

**Subcase B.1:** \( n \geq C_3(K, S_{a,f}, f, 1/3) \).

In this case, by [2, Lemma 2.5] applied with \( \varepsilon = 1/3 \), we see that \( (n, \alpha) \) satisfies

\[
\sum_{v \in S_{a,f}} \log^+ \left( |f^{(n)}(\alpha)|_v^{-1} \right) \leq \frac{1}{3} h_f \left( f^{(n)}(\alpha) \right),
\]

with \( v(c_{i,n}) \geq 0 \), which follows from (2.1) and (2.2). Thus \( v(c_{i,n}\alpha^i) > 0 \), and

\[
v(f^{(n)}(0)) = v(c_{0,n}) = v\left( f^{(n)}(\alpha) - \sum_{i=1}^{d_n} c_{i,n}\alpha^i \right)
\geq \min\{v(f^{(n)}(\alpha)), \min_{i=1,\ldots,d_n} v(c_{i,n}\alpha^i)\} > 0.
\]
where \( \hat{h}_f \) is the canonical height associated to \( f \), see [15, Section 3.4] for a definition and standard properties.

Since \( h(\gamma) = h(\gamma^{-1}) \) and using (1.1), we compute
\[
\begin{align*}
    h \left( f^{(n)}(\alpha) \right) &= h \left( f^{(n)}(\alpha)^{-1} \right) = \sum_{v \in \mathbb{M}_K} \log^{+} (|f^{(n)}(\alpha)|_{v}^{-1}) \\
    &= \sum_{v \in S_{a,f}} \log^{+} (|f^{(n)}(\alpha)|_{v}^{-1}) + \sum_{v \in \mathbb{M}_K \setminus S_{a,f}} \log^{+} (|f^{(n)}(\alpha)|_{v}^{-1}).
\end{align*}
\]

Now, using (2.11) and (2.12) and the fact that \( \ell < 0 \) (and thus \( |u^{-\ell}|_{v} \leq 1 \) for all \( v \in \mathbb{M}_K \setminus S_{a,f} \)), we have
\[
\begin{align*}
    h \left( f^{(n)}(\alpha) \right) &\leq \frac{1}{3} \hat{h}_f \left( f^{(n)}(\alpha) \right) + \sum_{v \in \mathbb{M}_K \setminus S_{a,f}} \log^{+} (|u^{\ell}\alpha|_{v}^{-1}) \\
    &\leq \frac{1}{3} \hat{h}_f \left( f^{(n)}(\alpha) \right) + h (\alpha^{-1}) = \frac{1}{3} \hat{h}_f \left( f^{(n)}(\alpha) \right) + h (\alpha).
\end{align*}
\]

From now on the proof goes word by word as in the proof of [2, Theorem 1.3] with \( \rho = 1 \) and \( k = 0 \) (where also a somewhat arbitrary value \( \varepsilon = 1/3 \) has been used). This implies also the finiteness of the set \( W_{a}(\mathbb{K}, f, S) \) in this case.

**Subcase B.2: \( n < C_3(\mathbb{K}, S_{a,f}, f, 1/3) \).**

Let \( g(X) = f^{(n)}(X)/X \), and we note that \( g \) has at least three nonzero distinct roots, which follows immediately form the fact that \( f \) has this property. Since \( n \) is bounded, proving finiteness of the set \( W_{a}(\mathbb{K}, f, S) \) in this case reduces to proving finiteness of the 3-tuples \( (\alpha, u, \ell) \) such that \( g(\alpha) = au^{\ell} \). This follows exactly as in the proof of Theorem 1.2, **Subcase A.2**, applying Siegel’s Theorem [10, Theorem D.8.4]. Indeed, we follow the proof of **Subcase A.2** of Theorem 1.2 above with \( f(X) \) replaced by the rational function \( g(X) \), and apply Siegel’s Theorem to the function \( G(X) = g(X^{-1})^{-1} \) (taking also into account that \( f^{(n)}(0) \neq 0 \)) to conclude that \( G(\mathbb{K}) \cap R_{S} \) is finite.

**2.4. Proof of Theorem 1.9.** We recall that in the proof of Theorem 1.6 only **Subcase A.3** requires the assumption that \( n \) is bounded. Hence we consider only this case. Recall that this assumption appears after it has been shown that for any \( v \notin S_{a,f} \) such that \( v(\alpha) > 0 \), one has \( v(f^{(n)}(0)) > 0 \). Since \( 0 \in \text{PrePer}(f) \setminus \text{Per}(f) \) we see that there are only finitely many \( v \in \mathbb{M}_{\mathbb{K}} \) with this property. Hence \( \alpha \in R_{\gamma}^{\ast} \) for some finite set \( T_{a,f} \) depending only on \( a \) and \( f \). We now proceed as in **Subcase A.1** in the proof of Theorem 1.6 and obtain the desired result.
2.5. Proof of Theorem 1.12. All constants in this proof may depend on the fixed number field $K$, even when we do not explicitly state this dependence.

After enlarging the set $S$ to $S_{a,f}$, we may assume that $a \in R_{S_{a,f}}$ and $f \in R_{S_{a,f}}[x]$.

Again, we only have to consider Subcase A.3 from the proof of Theorem 1.6. Hence, we have to prove the finiteness of

$$\{ \alpha \in R_{S_{a,f}} : \exists (n, \ell, u) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq m} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2} \times R_{S_{a,f}} \text{ such that } f^{(n)}(\alpha) = au^\ell \alpha \},$$

for some fixed positive integer $m$.

It follows from [15, Theorem 3.11] that there exists a constant $C(f)$ such that for all $k \geq 1$ and all $\alpha \in K$ we have

$$d^k h(\alpha) - d^k C(f) \leq h(f^{(k)}(\alpha)) \leq d^k h(\alpha) + d^k C(f).$$

In particular, the set of $\alpha \in K$ such that $f^{(k)}(\alpha) = 0$ for some $k$ is a set of bounded height, and hence it is finite. Therefore, we may assume without loss of generality that $f^{(k)}(\alpha) \neq 0$ for all $k \geq 1$.

Let us fix some further notations in order to apply the $K$-rational $abc$-Conjecture 1.10. If $D$ is a divisor on $\mathbb{P}^1_K$, then $h_D$ denotes the height associated to $D$. This is, if $(\lambda_v)_{v \in M_K}$ is a local height associated to $D$, then

$$h_D(P) = \sum_{v \in M_K} \lambda_v(P)$$

for all $P \in \mathbb{P}^1(\overline{K}) \setminus \text{Supp}(D)$, where $\text{Supp}(D)$ is the support of $D$.

A height associated to the canonical divisor of $\mathbb{P}^1_K$ can be chosen to be $-2h$, where

$$h([x_0 : x_1]) = \sum_{v \in M_K} \max\{|x_0|_v, |x_1|_v\}$$

is the standard height on $\mathbb{P}^1(\overline{K})$ (for example, see [3, Example 14.4.4]). Therefore, we have the following link between Conjecture 1.10 and Vojta’s conjectured height inequality (see [3, Theorem 14.4.16 and Remark 14.4.17]).

Let $D$ be a reduced divisor on $\mathbb{P}^1_K$. We see that if the $K$-rational $abc$-Conjecture 1.10 is true, then for all $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a constant $C(\epsilon, D)$ such that for all $P \in \mathbb{P}^1(\overline{K}) \setminus \text{Supp}(D)$ one has

$$h_D(P) - (2 + \epsilon) h(P) \leq \sum_{\lambda_v(P) > 0} \log \left| \frac{1}{\pi_v} \right| + C(\epsilon, D).$$
Recall that $\pi_v \in \mathbb{K}$ is just a fixed element satisfying $v(\pi_v) = 1$. Since $\mathcal{S}_{a,f}$ is finite, this inequality implies that for all $P \in \mathbb{P}^1(\mathbb{K}) \setminus \text{Supp}(D)$ one has
\begin{equation}
(2.16) \quad h_D(P) - (2 + \epsilon) h(P) \leq \sum_{\lambda_v(P) > 0} \log \left( \frac{1}{\pi_v} \right) + C(\epsilon, D, \mathcal{S}_{a,f}),
\end{equation}
for some constant $C(\epsilon, D, \mathcal{S}_{a,f})$ only depending on $\epsilon$, $D$, and $\mathcal{S}_{a,f}$.

We define $F(X,Y) = Y^{d+1} f(X/Y) \in R_S[X,Y]$. This is a homogeneous polynomial of degree $d + 1$. Since $f$ does not have any multiple roots and $f(0) \neq 0$, the polynomial $F$ does not have any multiple linear factors. Hence, $\text{Div}(F)$ is a reduced divisor on $\mathbb{P}_K^1$. For all $v \in M_K$ we choose the usual local height
\[ \lambda_v([x_0 : x_1]) = \log \left( \frac{\max\{|x_0|_v^{d+1}, |x_1|_v^{d+1}\}}{|F(x_0, x_1)|_v} \right) \]
for all $[x_0 : x_1] \in \mathbb{P}_K^1 \setminus \text{Supp}(\text{Div}(F))$. By the functoriality of the height, we have $h_{\text{Div}(F)} = (d+1)h + O(1)$. We restrict our attention to elements of the form $[\alpha : 1] \in \mathbb{P}_K^1$, with $\alpha \in R_{S_{a,f}}$. Let $v \in M_K^0 \setminus \mathcal{S}_{a,f}$ be arbitrary. Since we assume that $\alpha$ and $f(\alpha)$ are in $R_{S_{a,f}}$, we have
\[ \lambda_v([\alpha : 1]) > 0 \iff \frac{\max\{|\alpha|_v^{d+1}, 1\}}{|F(\alpha, 1)|_v} = \frac{1}{|f(\alpha)|_v} > 1 \iff v(f(\alpha)) > 0. \]
Hence, for $D = \text{Div}(F)$ the equation (2.16) restricted to elements of the form $[\alpha : 1]$, with $\alpha \in R_{S_{a,f}}$, reads
\begin{equation}
(2.17) \quad (d - 1 - \epsilon) h(\alpha) \leq \sum_{v(f(\alpha)) > 0} \log \left( \frac{1}{\pi_v} \right) + C(\epsilon, f, \mathcal{S}_{a,f}), \quad \forall \alpha \in R_{S_{a,f}}.
\end{equation}
This bound is indeed valid for all elements in $R_{S_{a,f}}$, once we enlarge $C(\epsilon, f, \mathcal{S}_{a,f})$ such that it exceeds $dh(\beta)$ for all roots $\beta$ of $f$.

This inequality is the application of Conjecture 1.10 in the proof of Theorem 1.12. More precisely, we assume that (2.17) is true for some $\epsilon < d/2 - 1$.

**Remark 2.1.** The $\mathbb{K}$-rational abc-conjecture implies (2.15) in the following way: If inequality (1.2) holds for some fixed $\epsilon > 0$, then (2.15) holds for $\epsilon = \epsilon/n$, where $n$ only depends on the degree of a Belyi map defined over $\mathbb{K}$ associated to $\text{Supp}(D)$. Such a Belyi map can always be chosen as a polynomial defined over $\mathbb{Q}$, and an explicit bound on its
degree has been calculated in [11]. Then, \( n \) is twice the degree of this map. For a proof of this statement, the interested reader may follow the proof of [3, Theorem 14.4.16: (a) \( \Rightarrow \) (b)]. We conclude that there exists an (effectively computable) \( \varepsilon(f) \), depending solely on \( f \), such that (1.2) for \( \varepsilon(f) \) implies (2.17) for \( \epsilon = d/2 - 1.0001 \). As one can see below, this again implies the finiteness of \( W_n(\mathbb{K}, f, S_{a,f}) \).

Now, we calculate an upper bound for

\[
\sum_{v(f^{(n)}(\alpha)) > 0 \atop v \in M_1^0 \setminus S_{a,f}} \log \left| \frac{1}{\pi_v} \right|_v = \sum_{|f^{(n)}(\alpha)|_v < 1 \atop v \in M_1^0 \setminus S_{a,f}} \log \left| \frac{1}{\pi_v} \right|_v,
\]

if \( \alpha \) satisfies \( f^{(n)}(\alpha) = au^\ell \alpha \neq 0 \) for some \( n, \ell \geq 2, u \in R_{S_{a,f}} \) and a fixed \( a \in \mathbb{K}^* \). In this case it is

\[
\sum_{|f^{(n)}(\alpha)|_v < 1 \atop v \in M_1^0 \setminus S_{a,f}} \log \left| \frac{1}{\pi_v} \right|_v = \sum_{a |u| \atop v \in M_1^0 \setminus S_{a,f}} \log \left| \frac{1}{\pi_v} \right|_v \leq \sum_{v \in M_1^0 \setminus S_{a,f}} \log^+ \left| (au\alpha)^{-1} \right|_v
\]

(2.18)

\[
\leq h((au\alpha)^{-1}) = h(au\alpha).
\]

For any choice of the \( \ell \)-th roots, we have

\[
h(au\alpha) = h((au^\ell \alpha)^{1/\ell} a^{(\ell-1)/\ell} \alpha^{(\ell-1)/\ell})
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{\ell} h(au^\ell \alpha) + \frac{\ell - 1}{\ell} h(a) + \frac{\ell - 1}{\ell} h(\alpha)
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{\ell} h(f^{(n)}(\alpha)) + h(\alpha) + h(a).
\]

Now, recalling (2.14), we obtain

\[
h(au\alpha) \leq \left( \frac{1}{2}d^n + 1 \right) h(\alpha) + \frac{1}{2}d^n C(f) + h(a).
\]

(2.19)

We define \( \mathcal{C} = C(\epsilon, f, S_{a,f}) + h(\alpha) \), which is a constant independent of \( \alpha \) and \( n \). Then, combining (2.18) and (2.19) with (2.17) yields

\[
(d - 1 - \epsilon)h(f^{(n-1)}(\alpha)) \leq \left( \frac{1}{2}d^n + 1 \right) h(\alpha) + \frac{1}{2}d^n C(f) + \mathcal{C}.
\]

A further application of (2.14) implies that

\[
\left( \frac{1}{2}d^n - (1 + \epsilon)d^{n-1} - 1 \right) h(\alpha) - \left( \frac{3}{2}d^n - (1 + \epsilon)d^{n-1} \right) C(f) \leq \mathcal{C}.
\]
Since we assume that $\epsilon < d/2 - 1$, it follows that either $n$ is bounded independently on $\alpha$, or $h(\alpha)$ is bounded independently on $n$. In the first case, finiteness of the set in (2.13) follows immediately. In the second case the claimed finiteness follows as there are only finitely many points of bounded height and bounded degree.

**Remark 2.2.** That the classical abc-conjecture implies (2.17) in the case of $K = \mathbb{Q}$ is well known. In particular, this statement has been used by Granville [9] to count squarefree values of integer polynomials under the assumption of the classical abc-Conjecture. The implication for number fields is due to Elkies [6, Equation (26)]. In Elkies inequality, the term $(d - 1 - \epsilon)$ in (2.17) is replaced by $(d - 2 - \epsilon)$. This bound comes from the same arguments using the usual homogenization $Y^d f(X/Y)$ of $f$ instead of $F(X,Y) = Y^{d+1} f(X/Y)$.
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