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Abstract. Elsner, Luca and Tachiya [4] proved that the values of the Jacobi-theta constants
$\theta_3(m\tau)/4$ and $\theta_3(n\tau)/4$ are algebraically independent over $\mathbb{Q}$ for distinct integers $m, n$ under some
conditions on $\tau$. On the other hand, in 2018 Elsner and Tachiya [3] also proved that three values
$\theta_3(m\tau)/4$, $\theta_3(n\tau)/4$ and $\theta_3(\ell\tau)/4$ are algebraically dependent over $\mathbb{Q}$. In this article we prove the non-
vanishing of linear forms in $\theta_3(m\tau)/4$, $\theta_3(n\tau)/4$ and $\theta_3(\ell\tau)/4$ under various conditions on $m, n, \ell$.
Among other things we prove that for odd and distinct positive integers $m, n > 3$ the three
numbers $\theta_3(\tau)/4$, $\theta_3(m\tau)/4$ and $\theta_3(n\tau)/4$ are linearly independent over $\mathbb{Q}$ when $\tau$ is an algebraic number
of some degree greater or equal to 3. In some sense this fills the gap between the above-mentioned
former results on theta constants. A theorem on the linear independence over $\mathbb{C}(\tau)$ of the functions
$\theta_3(a_1\tau)/4, \ldots, \theta_3(a_m\tau)/4$ for distinct positive real numbers $a_1, \ldots, a_m$ is also established.

1. INTRODUCTION

For a complex number $\tau$ from the upper complex half plane $\mathbb{H}$, the theta functions are defined
as follows:

$$
\theta_2(\tau) = 2 \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} q^{(n+1/2)^2}, \quad \theta_3(\tau) = 1 + 2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} q^n, \quad \text{and} \quad \theta_4(\tau) = 1 + 2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^n q^{n^2},
$$

where $q = e^{i\pi\tau}$.

We define the $j$- function as follows;

$$
j(\tau) = 256 \frac{(\lambda^2 - \lambda + 1)^3}{\lambda^2(\lambda - 1)^2}, \quad \text{where} \quad \lambda = \lambda(\tau) = \frac{\theta_4^4}{\theta_3^4},
$$

which is a modular function with respect to the group $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$.

The motivation of this article comes from the following sources: In 2018, C. Elsner and Y. Tachiya [3]
proved that for distinct integers $\ell, m, n$, the functions $\theta_3(\ell\tau)$, $\theta_3(m\tau)$ and $\theta_3(n\tau)$ are algebraically
dependent over $\mathbb{Q}$. Recently, in 2019, C. Elsner, F. Luca and Y. Tachiya [4] proved the following:
let $\tau$ be any complex number with $\text{Im}(\tau) > 0$ such that $e^{i\pi\tau}$ is algebraic. Let $m, n \geq 1$
be distinct positive integers, then the numbers $\theta_3(m\tau)$ and $\theta_3(n\tau)$ are algebraically independent
over $\mathbb{Q}$.

Naturally the following two questions arise.

**Question 1.** Let $m \geq 2$ and let $a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m$ be distinct positive real numbers. Are the functions

$$
\theta_3(a_1\tau), \theta_3(a_2\tau), \ldots, \theta_3(a_m\tau)
$$

linearly independent over $\mathbb{C}(\tau)$?
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Question 2. Let \( m \geq 2 \) and let \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \) be distinct positive real numbers. What are the values of \( \tau \) such that the numbers
\[
\theta_3(\ell \tau), \quad \theta_3(m \tau), \quad \theta_3(n \tau)
\]
are \( \mathbb{Q} \)-linearly independent?

In this article, we give the complete answer to the question 1 and partially answer the question 2. We divide the remaining part of our article into three sections: In section 2 we will state our theorems, in section 3 we collect all the tools to prove our results, and in the last section we give the proof of all the theorems from section 2.

2. Our results

2.1. The linear independence over \( \mathbb{C}(\tau) \) of the functions \( \theta_3(a_1 \tau), \ldots, \theta_3(a_m \tau) \) in \( \tau \).

We begin with the following result on the linear independence over \( \mathbb{C}(\tau) \) of Jacobi-theta constants.

**Theorem 2.1.** Let \( a_1, a_2, \ldots, a_m \) be distinct positive real numbers. Then the \( m \) functions
\[
\theta_3(a_1 \tau), \quad \theta_3(a_2 \tau), \ldots, \theta_3(a_m \tau)
\]
in \( \tau \in \mathbb{H} \) are linearly independent over \( \mathbb{C}(\tau) \).

2.2. On the linear independence of values of Jacobi-theta constants for \( \theta_3(2^m \tau), \theta_3(2^{m+1} \tau), \theta_3(2^{m+2} \tau) \), and for \( \theta_3(\tau), \theta_3(m \tau), \theta_3(n \tau) \) with odd integers \( m, n \).

**Theorem 2.2.** Let \( m \geq 0 \) be an integer. If one of the following conditions holds, namely

1. \( \tau \) is an algebraic number of degree \( \geq 3 \),
2. \( \tau \in \mathbb{H} \) such that \( q = e^{i \pi \tau} \) is algebraic over \( \mathbb{Q} \),

then the three numbers
\[
\theta_3(2^m \tau), \quad \theta_3(2^{m+1} \tau), \quad \theta_3(2^{m+2} \tau)
\]
are \( \mathbb{Q} \)-linearly independent.

In Theorem 2.2 it is not possible to avoid the condition \( \deg_{\mathbb{Q}}(\tau) \geq 3 \). This follows for \( \tau = i \) and \( m = 0 \) from the nontrivial relation
\[
\sqrt{2 + \sqrt{2}} \theta_3(i) - 2 \theta_3(2i) = 0
\]
due to Ramanujan, cf. [1, p. 325]. We can also find similar relations for the theta-constants \( \theta_2 \) and \( \theta_4 \):
\[
\sqrt{2 - \sqrt{2}} \theta_2(i) - \sqrt{8} \theta_2(2i) = 0, \quad \sqrt{2} \theta_4(i) - \theta_4(2i) = 0.
\]

**Theorem 2.3.** Let \( 3 \leq n < m \) be two odd integers. Let \( \tau \in \mathbb{H} \) be as in Theorem 2.2 then the three numbers
\[
\theta_3(\tau), \quad \theta_3(m \tau) \quad \theta_3(n \tau)
\]
are \( \mathbb{Q} \)-linearly independent.

One may consider Theorems 2.1 and 2.3 as the main results of our paper.
2.3. Results on linear forms $\theta_3(\tau) + \alpha_1 \theta_3(m\tau) + \alpha_2 \theta_3(n\tau)$ for $mn \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$ under certain restrictions on $\alpha_2$.

Let $m, n$ be two different positive integers, and let $\tau \in \mathbb{H}$ satisfying the conditions in Theorem 2.2. Since the numbers $\theta_3(m\tau)$ and $\theta_3(n\tau)$ are algebraically independent by Lemma 3.4 below, we consider the linear relations

$$\alpha_0 \theta_3(\tau) + \alpha_1 \theta_3(m\tau) + \alpha_2 \theta_3(n\tau)$$

with $\alpha_0 \neq 0$. Without loss of generality we may assume that $\alpha_0 = 1$. In order to state our next result we introduce the following set. Let $s \geq 3$ be any odd integer. Set

$$M_s := \{ \pm \sqrt{u}, \pm i\sqrt{u} : u \in \mathbb{N} \land s \equiv 0 \pmod{u} \}.$$

**Theorem 2.4.** Let $m = 2^a s_1$ and $n = 2^b s_2$ be two different integers with $a, b \geq 1$ and odd integers $s_1, s_2 \geq 3$. Let $\tau \in \mathbb{H}$ such that $e^{i\pi \tau}$ is an algebraic number. Then, the inequality

$$\theta_3(\tau) + \alpha_1 \theta_3(m\tau) + \alpha_2 \theta_3(n\tau) \neq 0$$

holds for all algebraic numbers $\alpha_1, \alpha_2$ satisfying

$$\alpha_2 \notin M_{s_1} \cap M_{s_2}.$$

In the case when additionally $s_1$ and $s_2$ are coprime odd integers, we have $M_{s_1} \cap M_{s_2} = \{\pm 1, \pm i\}$. Then we obtain from Theorem 2.4 the following corollary.

**Corollary 2.1.** Let $m = 2^a s_1$ and $n = 2^b s_2$ be two different integers with $a, b \geq 1$ and odd coprime integers $s_1, s_2 \geq 3$. Let $\tau \in \mathbb{H}$ such that $e^{i\pi \tau}$ is an algebraic number. Then, the inequality

$$\theta_3(\tau) + \alpha_1 \theta_3(m\tau) + \alpha_2 \theta_3(n\tau) \neq 0$$

holds for all algebraic numbers $\alpha_1, \alpha_2$, where $\alpha_2$ is no unit of the Gaussian integers $\mathbb{Z}[i]$.

For any positive integer $n$ let

$$\psi(n) := n \prod_{p | n} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p}\right),$$

where $p$ runs through all primes dividing $n$.

**Theorem 2.5.** Let $m = 2^a s$ and $n = 2^b s$ be two integers with $a \geq 1$ and odd integers $n, s \geq 3$. Let $\tau \in \mathbb{H}$ be as in Theorem 2.2. Then, the inequality

$$\theta_3(\tau) + \alpha_1 \theta_3(m\tau) + \alpha_2 \theta_3(n\tau) \neq 0$$

holds for all algebraic numbers $\alpha_1, \alpha_2$ satisfying

$$\deg_Q (\alpha_2^4) > \psi(n).$$

The preceding Theorems do not treat $\theta_3(\tau), \theta_3(2\tau)$, and $\theta_3(3\tau)$ simultaneously. For this situation we cite a result from [3, Example 1.5]: Let $\tau \in \mathbb{H}$, and define

$$P(X, Y, Z) := 27X^8 - 18X^4Y^4 - 64X^2Y^2Z^2 + 64X^2Y^2Z^4 - 8X^2Z^6 - Z^8.$$

Then $P(X_0, Y_0, Z_0) = 0$ holds for

$$X_0 := \theta_3(3\tau), \quad Y_0 := \theta_3(2\tau), \quad Z_0 := \theta_3(\tau).$$

This shows that $X_0, Y_0, Z_0$ are homogeneously algebraically dependent of degree 8.
3. Main Tools towards the proof of our results

**Theorem 3.1.** [8, page 5]
Let \( \tau \in \mathbb{H} \) be an algebraic number of some degree not equal to 2. Then \( j(\tau) \) is transcendental.

**Theorem 3.2.** [2, Theorem 4]
For any \( \tau \in \mathbb{H} \), if \( q = e^{i\pi \tau} \) is an algebraic number, and for integers \( j, k, \ell \in \{2, 3, 4\} \) with \( j \neq k \), the three values \( \theta_j(\tau), \theta_k(\tau) \) and \( D\theta_\ell(\tau) \) are algebraically independent over \( \mathbb{Q} \). Here,
\[
D := \frac{1}{\pi i} \frac{d}{d\tau}
\]
is a differential operator.

**Theorem 3.3.** [7, Theorem 1, Corollary 4]
For any odd integer \( n \geq 3 \) there exists an integer polynomial \( P_n(X,Y) \) with \( \deg_X P_n(X,Y) = \psi(n) \) such that
\[
P_n \left( n^2 \frac{\theta_4^4(n\tau)}{\theta_2^4(n\tau)}, 16 \frac{\theta_2^4(\tau)}{\theta_3^4(\tau)} \right) = 0
\]
holds for all \( \tau \in \mathbb{H} \). Moreover, the polynomial \( P_n(X,Y) \) is of the form
\[
P_n(X,Y) := X^{\psi(n)} + R_1(Y)X^{\psi(n)-1} + \cdots + R_{\psi(n)-1}(Y)X + R_\psi(n)(Y),
\]
where \( R_j(Y) \in \mathbb{Z}[Y] \) for \( j = 1, \ldots, \psi(n) \), and
\[
\deg R_k(Y) \leq k \cdot \frac{n-1}{n} \quad (1 \leq k \leq \psi(n)).
\]
Moreover, \( P_n(X,Y) \) can be written as
\[
P_n(X,Y) = \sum_{j=0}^{d_n} S_{n,j}(X)Y^j,
\]
where \( S_{n,j}(X) \in \mathbb{Z}[X] \) with \( 0 \leq j \leq d_n \) and \( d_n > 0 \), such that
\[
S_{n,j}(0) = 0 \quad (1 \leq j \leq d_n), \quad S_{n,d_n}(X) \neq 0,
\]
\[
S_{n,0}(0) = P_n(0,0) \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}.
\]

The properties (1.2) to (1.4) of \( P_n(X,Y) \) follow from the proof of Lemma 7 in [4]; cf. formula (9).

**Remark 1.** From (1.1), we can observe that for any complex number \( \alpha \), the polynomial \( P_n(X,\alpha) \) is non-zero.

The following Lemmas are very crucial for the proof of our results.

**Lemma 3.1.** [2, Lemma 2.5]
Let \( n = 2^a s \) be an integer with \( a \geq 1 \) and an odd integer \( s \geq 3 \). Then there exists an integer polynomial \( Q_n(X,Y) \) such that
\[
Q_n \left( \frac{\theta_4^4(n\tau)}{\theta_2^4(n\tau)}, \frac{\theta_4^4(\tau)}{\theta_3^4(\tau)} \right) = 0
\]
holds for all \( \tau \in \mathbb{H} \). Moreover, the polynomial \( Q_n(X,Y) \) is of the form
\[
Q_n(X,Y) = c_n^{2^a}Y^{2^a\psi(s)-1} + \sum_{j=0}^{2^a\psi(s)-1} R_{n,j}(X)Y^j,
\]
(2.1)
where $c_n$ is a non-zero integer. Moreover,
\[
\deg R_{n,j}(X) \leq 2^a \psi(s) - j \quad (0 \leq j < 2^a \psi(s)),
\]
and
\[
Q_n(0, Y) = c_n^{2^a} Y^{2^a \psi(s)}, \tag{2.3}
\]
\[
R_{n,0}(X) = Q_n(X, 0) = 2^{4(2^a-1)\psi(s)} X^{(2^a-1)\psi(s)} P_s(s^2 X, 0). \tag{2.4}
\]

**Proof.** Apart from formula (2.4) the statements are given in [3, Lemma 2.5]. It remains to prove (2.4). We proceed by induction with respect to $a$ and follow the lines of the proof of Lemma 2.5 in [3]. Set $Q_s(X, Y) := P_s(s^2 X, Y)$. As in the first part of the proof of Lemma 2.5 (corresponding to $a = \alpha = 1$) we construct the polynomials $B_{2s}(X, Y), \tilde{Q}_{2s}(X, Y),$ and $Q_{2s}(X, Y)$, where
\[
\tilde{Q}_{2s}(X^4, Y^4) = B_{2s}(X, Y)B_{2s}(X, iY)
\]
and
\[
Q_{2s}(X, Y) = \tilde{Q}_{2s}(X, 1 - Y).
\]
From the proof of Lemma 2.5 we obtain
\[
B_{2s}(X, 1) = 2^{2\psi(s)} P_s(s^2 X^4, 0), \quad B_{2s}(X, i) = 2^{2\psi(s)} X^{4\psi(s)}.
\]
This gives
\[
\tilde{Q}_{2s}(X^4, 1) = B_{2s}(X, 1)B_{2s}(X, i) = 2^{4\psi(s)} X^{4\psi(s)} P_s(s^2 X^4, 0),
\]
and, consequently,
\[
Q_{2s}(X, 0) = \tilde{Q}_{2s}(X, 1) = 2^{4\psi(s)} X^{\psi(s)} P_s(s^2 X, 0).
\]
This shows that (2.4) holds for $a = 1$. Next, let (2.4) be already proven for some fixed $a \geq 1$. For the induction step we construct the polynomials $B_{2a+1,s}(X, Y), \tilde{Q}_{2a+1,s}(X, Y),$ and $Q_{2a+1,s}(X, Y)$, where
\[
\tilde{Q}_{2a+1,s}(X^4, Y^4) = B_{2a+1,s}(X, Y)B_{2a+1,s}(X, iY)
\]
and
\[
Q_{2a+1,s}(X, Y) = \tilde{Q}_{2a+1,s}(X, 1 - Y).
\]
Since $\deg X Q_{2a,s}(X, Y) = 2^a \psi(s)$, we obtain by applying the induction hypothesis,
\[
B_{2a+1,s}(X, 1) = 2^{2-2^a \psi(s)} Q_{2a,s}(X^4) = 2^{2^a+1 \psi(s)} \left( 2^{4(2^a-1)\psi(s)} X^{4(2^a-1)\psi(s)} P_s(s^2 X^4, 0) \right),
\]
\[
B_{2a+1,s}(X, i) = 2^{2-2^a \psi(s)} X^{4\psi(s)} = 2^{2^a+1 \psi(s)} X^{4\psi(s)}.
\]
Therefore, it turns out that
\[
\tilde{Q}_{2a+1,s}(X^4, 1) = B_{2a+1,s}(X, 1)B_{2a+1,s}(X, i)
\]
\[
= 2^{2^a+1 \psi(s)+4(2^a-1)\psi(s)} X^{4-2^a \psi(s)+4(2^a-1)\psi(s)} P_s(s^2 X^4, 0)
\]
\[
= 2^{4(2^a+1-1)\psi(s)} X^{4(2^a+1-1)\psi(s)} P_s(s^2 X^4, 0).
\]
We complete the proof of the lemma by observing that
\[
Q_{2a+1,s}(X, 0) = \tilde{Q}_{2a+1,s}(X, 1) = 2^{4(2^a+1-1)\psi(s)} X^{2^a+1-1)\psi(s)} P_s(s^2 X, 0),
\]
which is the identity in (2.4) with $a$ replaced by $a + 1$. \qed
Lemma 3.2. Let \( s \geq 3 \) be an odd integer. Then we have

\[
P_s(s^2X, 0) = s^{2\psi(s)} \prod_{u | s, u \geq 1} \left( X - u^{-2} \right)^{w(s/u, u)},
\]

where \( w(a, b) \) is defined by the number of integers \( k \) with

\[
0 \leq k < b \quad \text{and} \quad \gcd(a, b, k) = 1.
\]

**Proof.** This follows from the identity given in Lemma 4 in [4], namely,

\[
P_s(X, 0) = \prod_{u | s, u \geq 1} \left( X - u^2 \right)^{w(u, s/u)}.
\]

\( _\Box \)

Lemma 3.3. Let \( \tau \in \mathbb{H} \) be as in Theorem 2.2. Then the numbers \( \theta_3/\theta_4 \) and \( \theta_2/\theta_3 \) are transcendental.

**Proof.**

**Case 1.** \( \tau \) is an algebraic number of degree \( \geq 3 \).

By Theorem 3.1 the number

\[
j(\tau) = 256 \frac{(\lambda^2 - \lambda + 1)^3}{\lambda^2(\lambda - 1)^2}
\]

is transcendental. This implies that \( \lambda = \theta_2^4/\theta_3^4 \) is transcendental, and so is \( \theta_2/\theta_3 \). Now by using the identity \( \theta_2^4 + \theta_4^4 = \theta_3^4 \), we conclude that the number \( \theta_3/\theta_4 \) is transcendental.

**Case 2.** \( \tau \in \mathbb{H} \) such that \( q = e^{i\pi\tau} \) is algebraic over \( \mathbb{Q} \).

Since \( q = e^{i\pi\tau} \) is an algebraic number, \( \theta_3 \) and \( \theta_4 \) are algebraically independent as well as \( \theta_2 \) and \( \theta_3 \) (cf. Theorem 3.2). Therefore, the numbers \( \theta_3/\theta_4 \) and \( \theta_2/\theta_3 \) are transcendental. By Case 1 and 2, we complete the proof of the lemma.

\( _\Box \)

Lemma 3.4. Let \( m \geq 3 \) be an integer which is either odd or it is an even number of the form \( 2^a s \), where \( a \geq 1 \), and \( s \geq 3 \) is an odd integer. Then, for any \( \tau \in \mathbb{H} \) satisfying the conditions in Theorem 2.2, the number

\[
\frac{\theta_3(m\tau)}{\theta_3(\tau)}
\]

is transcendental.

**Proof.** We assume that \( \theta_3(m\tau)/\theta_3(\tau) \) is algebraic. By Theorem 3.3 and Lemma 3.1 there exists an integer polynomial \( T_m(X, Y) \) defined by

\[
T_m(X, Y) := \begin{cases} 
P_m(m^2X, 16Y) & \text{if } m \equiv 1 \pmod{2}, \\
Q_m(X, Y) & \text{if } m \equiv 0 \pmod{2},
\end{cases}
\]

such that

\[
T_m \left( \frac{\theta_3^4(m\tau)}{\theta_3^4(\tau)}, \frac{\theta_2^4(\tau)}{\theta_3^4(\tau)} \right) = 0. \tag{2.5}
\]

Now we consider the polynomial \( R_m(Y) = T_m \left( \frac{\theta_3^4(m\tau)}{\theta_3^4(\tau)}, Y \right) \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}}[Y] \) having algebraic coefficients by our assumption. The polynomial \( R_m(Y) \) does not vanish identically: for odd integers \( m \) this
follows from Lemma 2.1 in [3], for even $m$ this is a consequence of Lemma 3.1 cf. (2.1). Hence, by (2.5), we obtain
\[
R_m \left( \frac{\theta_3^4(\tau)}{\theta_3^4(\tau)} \right) = T_m \left( \frac{\theta_3^4(it)}{\theta_3^4(\tau)} \right) = 0.
\]
This implies that $\theta_2/\theta_3$ is algebraic, which is a contradiction to Lemma 3.3. Therefore, we conclude that the number $\theta_3(m\tau)/\theta_3(\tau)$ is transcendental.\)

\section{Proof of our results}

\textbf{Proof of Theorem 2.1.} Suppose that these functions are linearly dependent over $\mathbb{C}(\tau)$. Then there exist $c_1(\tau), \ldots, c_m(\tau) \in \mathbb{C}[\tau]$, not all zero and with minimal degree, such that
\[
c_1(\tau)\theta_3(a_1 \tau) + \cdots + c_m(\tau)\theta_3(a_m \tau) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \tau \in \mathbb{H}. \tag{3.1}
\]
Notice that for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, m$,
\[
\theta_3(a_i (\tau + 2)) = 1 + 2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{i\pi a_i \tau n^2} = 1 + 2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{i\pi a_i \tau n^2} = \theta_3(a_i \tau).
\]
Hence, the functions $\theta_3(a_1 \tau), \theta_3(a_2 \tau), \ldots, \theta_3(a_m \tau)$ are periodic.

Replacing $\tau$ by $\tau + 2$ and using the periodicity, we have
\[
c_1(\tau + 2)\theta_3(a_1 \tau) + \cdots + c_m(\tau + 2)\theta_3(a_m \tau) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \tau \in \mathbb{H}. \tag{3.2}
\]
Thus, from (3.1) and (3.2), we obtain
\[
(c_1(\tau) - c_1(\tau + 2))\theta_3(a_1 \tau) + \cdots + (c_1(\tau) - c_m(\tau + 2))\theta_3(a_m \tau) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \tau \in \mathbb{H}.
\]
Note that the degree of the polynomial $c_i(\tau + 2) - c_i(\tau)$ is strictly less than the degree of the polynomial $c_i(\tau)$. Therefore, by the minimality of the polynomials $c_1(\tau), \ldots, c_m(\tau)$, we get $c_i(\tau + 2) = c_i(\tau)$ for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, which in turns implies that $c_1(\tau), \ldots, c_m(\tau)$ are constant polynomials. Hence, in order to proof that these functions are linearly independent over $\mathbb{C}(\tau)$, it suffices to prove the linear independence over $\mathbb{C}$.

Therefore we can consider the identity
\[
c_1\theta_3(a_1 \tau) + \cdots + c_m\theta_3(a_m \tau) = 0, \quad \text{for all } \tau \in \mathbb{H} \text{ and fixed } c_i \in \mathbb{C}.
\]
This can be rewritten as
\[
c_1 \left( 1 + 2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{i\pi a_1 \tau n^2} \right) + \cdots + c_m \left( 1 + 2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{i\pi a_m \tau n^2} \right) = 0 \quad \text{for all } \tau \in \mathbb{H}. \tag{3.3}
\]
Putting $\tau = iX$ and letting $X \to \infty$ in the above equality, we have
\[
(c_1 + \cdots + c_m) + 2 \lim_{X \to \infty} \left( c_1 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\pi X a_1 n^2} + \cdots + c_m \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\pi X a_m n^2} \right) = 0.
\]
Since $\lim_{X \to \infty} \left( \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\pi X a_i n^2} \right) = 0$ for all $i = 1, 2, \ldots, m$, we have
\[
c_1 + c_2 + \cdots + c_m = 0.
\]
Therefore (3.3) becomes
\[
c_1 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\pi X a_1 n^2} + \cdots + c_m \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\pi X a_m n^2} = 0 \quad \text{for all } X > 0. \tag{3.4}
\]
Without loss of generality we can assume that $a_1 < a_2 < \cdots < a_m$. Multiplying the above equality by $e^{a_1 \pi X}$, we get

$$-c_1 = c_1 \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} e^{-\pi a_1 n^2 + \pi a_1} + \left( c_2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\pi a_2 n^2 + \pi a_1} + \cdots + c_m \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\pi a_m n^2 + \pi a_1} \right)$$

(3.5)

Since $-\pi a_1 n^2 + \pi a_1 < 0$ for $n \geq 2$ and $-\pi a_i n^2 + \pi a_1 < 0$ for all $i = 2, 3, \ldots, m$, we see that the right-hand side of (3.5) tends to zero as $X \to \infty$. Therefore, we conclude that $c_1 = 0$, and (3.4) becomes

$$c_2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\pi a_2 n^2} + \cdots + c_m \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\pi a_m n^2} = 0$$

for all $X \in \mathbb{N}$. Now we multiply the above equality by $e^{a_1 \pi X}$ and proceed by the same process in order to get $c_2 = 0$. Hence, by continuing this process, we get $c_1 = c_2 = \cdots = c_m = 0$, which gives a contradiction. This proves the theorem. □

**Proof of Theorem 2.2.** Replacing $\tau$ by $2^m \tau$, it suffices to prove the assertion for the three numbers $\theta_3(\tau), \theta_3(2\tau), \theta_3(4\tau)$.

We have the following identities:

$$2\theta_3^2(2\tau) = \theta_3^2 + \theta_4^2,$$

$$2\theta_3(4\tau) = \theta_3 + \theta_4.$$  

(3.6)

Suppose there exist algebraic numbers $\alpha, \beta, \gamma$ not all zero such that

$$2\alpha \theta_3(\tau) + 2\beta \theta_3(2\tau) + 2\gamma \theta_3(4\tau) = 0.$$  

(3.7)

Substituting (3.6) into (3.7), we get

$$2\alpha \theta_3 + 2\beta \sqrt{\frac{\theta_3^2 + \theta_4^2}{2}} + \gamma (\theta_3 + \theta_4) = 0.$$  

By rearranging this formula, we get

$$((2\alpha + \gamma)^2 - 2\beta^2)^2 \theta_3^2 + (\gamma^2 - 2\beta^2) \theta_4^2 + 2\gamma(2\alpha + \gamma) \theta_3 \theta_4 = 0.$$  

(3.8)

Dividing (3.8), by $\theta_3^2$, we obtain

$$((2\alpha + \gamma)^2 - 2\beta^2)^2 + (\gamma^2 - 2\beta^2) \left( \frac{\theta_4}{\theta_3} \right)^2 + 2\gamma(2\alpha + \gamma) \frac{\theta_4}{\theta_3} = 0.$$  

(3.9)

Hence, by Lemma 3.3, we have

$$2\alpha \gamma - 2\beta^2 = 0,$$

$$\gamma^2 - 2\beta^2 = 0,$$

$$2\gamma(2\alpha + \gamma) = 0.$$  

(3.10)  

(3.11)  

(3.12)

By (3.10), (3.11) and (3.12), we conclude that $\alpha = \beta = \gamma = 0$. This proves Theorem 2.2. □

**Proof of Theorem 2.3.** It is suffices to prove that the three numbers

$$1, \frac{\theta_3(m\tau)}{\theta_3(\tau)}, \frac{\theta_3(n\tau)}{\theta_3(\tau)}$$
are $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly independent. Suppose that these numbers are $\mathbb{Q}$-linearly dependent. Then, there exist algebraic integers $\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2$ not all zero such that

$$\alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \frac{\theta_3(m\tau)}{\theta_3(\tau)} + \alpha_2 \frac{\theta_3(n\tau)}{\theta_3(\tau)} = 0. \quad (3.13)$$

It is clear that neither $\alpha_1$ nor $\alpha_2$ vanishes, sine otherwise (when $\alpha_1 = 0$, $\alpha_2 \neq 0$ or $\alpha_1 \neq 0$, $\alpha_2 = 0$) there is a contradiction to Lemma 3.4. By Lemma 3.4, both the numbers

$$\frac{\theta_3(m\tau)}{\theta_3(\tau)} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\theta_3(n\tau)}{\theta_3(\tau)}$$

are transcendental. This implies that both $\alpha_1$ and $\alpha_2$ are non-zero. Then from (3.13) and Theorem 3.3, we have

$$P_m \left( m^2 \left( -\frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_1} - \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} \frac{\theta_3(n\tau)}{\theta_3(\tau)} \right)^4, 16 \frac{\theta_4(\tau)}{\theta_3(\tau)} \right) = 0. \quad (3.14)$$

By the explicit form of the polynomials $P_m(X, Y)$ and $P_n(X, Y)$, we see that the polynomials

$$H_m(X) = P_m \left( m^2 \left( -\frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_1} - \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} X \right)^4, 16 \frac{\theta_4(\tau)}{\theta_3(\tau)} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad S_n(X) = P_n \left( n^2 X^4, 16 \frac{\theta_4(\tau)}{\theta_3(\tau)} \right)$$

are non-zero. The polynomials

$$P_m \left( m^2 \left( -\frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_1} - \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} \frac{\theta_3(n\tau)}{\theta_3(\tau)} \right)^4, 16 Y \right) \quad \text{and} \quad P_n \left( n^2 \frac{\theta_4(n\tau)}{\theta_3(\tau)}, 16 Y \right)$$

have the same common root $Y_0 := \frac{\theta_4(\tau)}{\theta_3(\tau)}$. Hence, the resultant

$$R(X) := \text{Res}_Y \left( P_m \left( m^2 \left( -\frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_1} - \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} X \right)^4, 16 Y \right), P_n \left( n^2 X^4, 16 Y \right) \right) \quad (3.15)$$

is given by the determinant of a square matrix where the dimensions and elements of the corresponding Sylvester matrix depend on the coefficients of the polynomials

$$P_m \left( m^2 \left( -\frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_1} - \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} \right) X, 16 Y \right)$$

and $P_n(n^2 X, 16 Y)$. By Lemma 3.4, we know that $\frac{\theta_3(n\tau)}{\theta_3(\tau)}$ is transcendental. Then, from $S_{n,dn} \neq 0$ in (1.3), we have

$$S_m,d_m \left( m^2 \left( -\frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_1} - \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} \frac{\theta_3(n\tau)}{\theta_3(\tau)} \right)^4 \right) \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad S_n,d_n \left( n^2 \frac{\theta_4(n\tau)}{\theta_3(\tau)} \right) \neq 0.$$ 

Hence, there is some real number $\delta > 0$ depending on $n, m, \alpha_0, \alpha_1, \alpha_2$, and $\tau$ such that

$$S_m,d_m \left( m^2 \left( -\frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_1} - \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} X \right)^4 \right) \neq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad S_n,d_n \left( n^2 X^4 \right) \neq 0$$

hold for

$$\left| X - \frac{\theta_3(n\tau)}{\theta_3(\tau)} \right| < \delta.$$ 

Then, for all $X$ from this circle, we have

$$\text{deg}_Y P_m \left( m^2 \left( -\frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_1} - \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} X \right)^4, 16 Y \right) = \text{deg}_Y P_m \left( m^2 \left( -\frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_1} - \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} \frac{\theta_3(n\tau)}{\theta_3(\tau)} \right)^4, 16 Y \right) = d_m,$$
Then, by (3.15) and (3.17),

\[ \text{deg}_Y P_n(n^2X^4, 16Y) = \text{deg}_Y P_n\left(n^2\frac{\theta_3^4(n\tau)}{\theta_3^4(\tau)}, 16Y \right) = d_n. \]

For \( X \) restricted to the above circle, \( R(X) \) can be considered as a polynomial in \( X \) depending on the elements of a Sylvester matrix with fixed dimensions \( d_n + d_m \). On the scale of things \( R(X) \) is some polynomial with algebraic coefficients such that

\[ R(\theta_3(n\tau)/\theta_3) = 0, \quad (3.16) \]

since \( Y_0 \) is a common root of the polynomials under consideration. First we note that the polynomial \( R(X) \) is not identically zero. We assume the contrary, namely

\[ R(X) \equiv 0. \quad (3.17) \]

Then, by (3.15) and (3.17),

\[ \text{Res}_Y \left( P_m \left( m^2\left( -\frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_1} - \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1}X \right)^4, 16Y \right) , P_n(n^2X^4, 16Y) \right) = R(X) \equiv 0, \]

and so there exists a common factor \( H(X,Y) \in \mathbb{C}[X,Y] \) with positive degree in \( Y \) of the polynomials

\[ P_m \left( m^2\left( -\frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_1} - \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1}X \right)^4, 16Y \right) \quad \text{and} \quad P_n(n^2X^4, 16Y). \]

Let

\[ P_m \left( m^2\left( -\frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_1} - \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1}X \right)^4, 16Y \right) = H(X,Y)G(X,Y). \]

By substituting \( Y = \lambda(\tau) \) into the above equation, we have

\[ P_m \left( m^2\left( -\frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_1} - \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1}X \right)^4, 16\lambda(\tau) \right) = H(X, \lambda(\tau))G(X, \lambda(\tau)). \quad (3.18) \]

By \( \text{deg}_X T(X,Y) \) and \( \text{deg}_Y T(X,Y) \) we denote the degree of the polynomial \( T(X,Y) \) with respect to \( X \) and \( Y \), respectively; and \( \text{deg} T(X,Y) \) denotes the total degree of the polynomial \( T(X,Y) \). Since, by Theorem [3.3]

\[ \text{deg}_Y R_k(Y) \leq k \cdot \frac{m - 1}{m} < k, \quad (1 \leq k \leq \psi(m)), \]

such that we have

\[ \text{deg}_X P_m \left( m^2\left( -\frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_1} - \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1}X \right)^4, 16\lambda(\tau) \right) = \psi(m) = \text{deg} P_m \left( m^2\left( -\frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_1} - \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1}X \right)^4, 16Y \right). \]

Hence, by the above identities, we obtain

\[ \text{deg}_X H(X, \lambda(\tau)) + \text{deg}_X G(X, \lambda(\tau)) = \text{deg} H(X,Y) + \text{deg} G(X,Y). \]

Additionally, we have the obvious inequalities

\[ \text{deg}_X H(X, \lambda(\tau)) \leq \text{deg} H(X,Y) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{deg}_X G(X, \lambda(\tau)) \leq \text{deg} G(X,Y). \]

Thus, we obtain \( \text{deg}_X H(X, \lambda(\tau)) = \text{deg} H(X,Y), \) and consequently

\[ \text{deg}_X H(X, \lambda(\tau)) \geq \text{deg}_Y H(X,Y) \geq 1. \quad (3.19) \]
By [4, Lemma 1], the polynomial $P_m(X, 16\lambda(\tau))$ is irreducible, which implies that the polynomial $P_m \left( m^2 \left( -\frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_1} - \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} X \right)^4, 16\lambda(\tau) \right)$ is also irreducible. Thus, from (3.18) and (3.19), we obtain
\[
P_m \left( m^2 \left( -\frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_1} - \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} X \right)^4, 16\frac{\theta_4^4(\tau)}{\theta_3^4(\tau)} \right) = \beta_1 H(X, \lambda(\tau))
\]
for some non-zero complex number $\beta_1$. Similarly, there exists a non-zero complex number $\beta_2$ such that
\[
P_n(n^2 X^4, 16\lambda(\tau)) = \beta_2 H(X, \lambda(\tau)),
\]
and hence
\[
P_m \left( m^2 \left( -\frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_1} - \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} X \right)^4, 16\lambda(\tau) \right) = cP_n(n^2 X^4, 16\lambda(\tau)), \quad c := \beta_1/\beta_2.
\]
This polynomial identity holds for all complex numbers $\tau \in \mathbb{H}$. We know that for $\tau \to i\infty$ the function $\lambda(\tau)$ tends to zero. Hence, taking $\tau \to i\infty$ into the above equality, we have by [4, Lemma 2],
\[
\prod_{d|m} \left( m^2 \left( -\frac{\alpha_0}{\alpha_1} - \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} X \right)^4 - d^2 \right)^{\omega(d,m/d)} = e \prod_{d|n} (n^2 X^4 - d^2)^{\omega(d,n/d)}.
\]
Then, comparing the multiplicity of the zero of these polynomials at $X = - (\alpha_0 + \alpha_1/\sqrt{m})/\alpha_2$ (and $d = 1$ on the left-hand side), we obtain
\[
m = \omega(1, m) \leq \max_d \omega(d, n/d) \leq n,
\]
which is a contradiction to the condition $n < m$ from the Theorem. Hence, the polynomial $R(X)$ is non-zero. Therefore, it follows from (3.16) that the number $\theta_3(n\tau)/\theta_3(\tau)$ is algebraic, which is a contradiction to the fact from Lemma 3.4 that the number $\theta_3(n\tau)/\theta_3(\tau)$ is transcendental. This proves the assertion. □

Proof of Theorem 2.4 Let $m = 2^a s_1$ and $n = 2^b s_2$ be two different integers with $a, b \geq 1$ and odd integers $s_1, s_2 \geq 3$. By Lemma 3.1 there exist integer polynomials $Q_m(X, Y)$ and $Q_n(X, Y)$ such that
\[
Q_m \left( \frac{\theta_4^4(m\tau)}{\theta_3^4(\tau)}, \frac{\theta_3^4(\tau)}{\theta_3^4(\tau)} \right) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad Q_n \left( \frac{\theta_3^4(n\tau)}{\theta_3^4(\tau)}, \frac{\theta_4^4(\tau)}{\theta_3^4(\tau)} \right) = 0.
\]
We assume that the linear equation (3.13) holds, where $\alpha_1, \alpha_2$ are algebraic numbers satisfying the hypothesis in Theorem 2.4 with $\alpha_1 \neq 0$ and $\alpha_2 \neq 0$. By the hypotheses of the Theorem we may assume without loss of generality that $\alpha_2 \not\in M_{s_1}$. Then we obtain
\[
Q_m \left( \left( -\frac{1}{\alpha_1} - \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} \frac{\theta_3(n\tau)}{\theta_3(\tau)} \right)^4, \frac{\theta_4(\tau)}{\theta_3^4(\tau)} \right) = 0.
\]
By the explicit form of the polynomials $Q_m(X, Y)$ and $Q_n(X, Y)$, we see that the polynomials
\[
Q_m \left( \left( -\frac{1}{\alpha_1} - \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} X \right)^4, \frac{\theta_4^4(\tau)}{\theta_3^4(\tau)} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad Q_n \left( X^4, \frac{\theta_4^4(\tau)}{\theta_3^4(\tau)} \right)
\]
are non-zero. Hence the polynomials
\[
Q_m \left( \left( -\frac{1}{\alpha_1} - \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} \frac{\theta_3(n\tau)}{\theta_3(\tau)} \right)^4, Y \right) \quad \text{and} \quad Q_n \left( \frac{\theta_3^4(n\tau)}{\theta_3^4(\tau)}, Y \right)
\]
have the same common root $Y_0 = \theta_2^4(\tau)/\theta_3^4(\tau)$.

Let

$$H_m(X,Y) := Q_m \left( \left( -\frac{1}{\alpha_1} - \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} X \right)^4, Y \right)$$

and

$$W(X) := \text{Res}_Y(H_m(X,Y), Q_n(X^4, Y)) \in \mathbb{Q}[X].$$

From Lemma 3.1 we know that both, $\deg_Y Q_m(X,Y)$ and $\deg_Y Q_n(X,Y)$, do not depend on $X$, since the coefficients of the leading terms with respect to $Y$ are non-zero integers. Thus, $W(X)$ can be considered as a polynomial for all $X$.

In order to show that the polynomial $W(X)$ does not vanish identically, we shall prove the existence of a number $\eta$ satisfying $W(\eta) \neq 0$, or, equivalently, that the polynomials $H_m(\eta, Y)$ and $Q_n(\eta^4, Y)$ are coprime. Let

$$\eta := -\frac{1}{\alpha_2}.$$

On the one side, by using (2.3), we obtain

$$H_m(\eta, Y) = Q_m(0, Y) = c_m^{2\eta} Y^{2\psi(s_1)}.$$

Therefore, $H_m(\eta, Y)$ is a nonvanishing polynomial in $Y$ having exclusively a multiple root at $Y = 0$.

On the other side, by applying formulas (2.1) and (2.2) in Lemma 3.1, we have

$$Q_n(\eta^4, Y) = c_n^{2b} Y^{2b\psi(s_2)} + \sum_{j=0}^{2b\psi(s_2)-1} R_{n,j}(\eta^4) Y^j$$

with $c_n \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ and $R_{n,0}(X) \neq 0$ by (2.3) and Lemma 3.2. By the assumption $\alpha_2 \notin M_{s_2}$ we have

$$0 \neq \eta^4 = \frac{1}{\alpha_2} \neq \frac{1}{u^2} \quad \text{with} \quad u | s_2 \quad \text{and} \quad u \geq 1.$$

This implies by (2.4) and Lemma 3.2 that $R_{n,0}(\eta^4) \neq 0$, and consequently $Q_n(\eta^4, 0) = R_{n,0}(\eta^4) \neq 0$.

Altogether, the polynomials $H_m(\eta, Y)$ and $Q_n(\eta^4, Y)$ have no common root. More precisely, we obtain for $W(X)$,

$$W(\eta) = \text{Res}_Y(H_m(\eta, Y), Q_n(\eta^4, Y)) \neq 0.$$

This shows that $W(X)$ does not vanish identically. By construction, we know that $W(X_0)$ vanishes for

$$X_0 := \frac{\theta_3(n\tau)}{\theta_3(\tau)},$$

which implies the algebraicity of $\theta_3(n\tau)/\theta_3(\tau)$, a contradiction to Lemma 3.4. This finally shows that the linear relation (3.13) cannot hold.

\textbf{Proof of Theorem 2.2} Let $m = 2^a s$ and $n$ be two integers with $a \geq 1$ and odd integers $n, s \geq 3$. By Theorem 3.3 and Lemma 3.1 there exist integer polynomials $P_n(X,Y)$ and $Q_m(X,Y)$ such that

$$Q_m \left( \frac{\theta_3^4(m\tau)}{\theta_3^4(\tau)}, \frac{\theta_3^4(\tau)}{\theta_3^4(\tau)} \right) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad P_n \left( n^2 \frac{\theta_3^4(n\tau)}{\theta_3^4(\tau)}, 16 \frac{\theta_2^4(\tau)}{\theta_3^4(\tau)} \right) = 0.$$
We assume that the linear equation (3.13) holds, where $\alpha_1, \alpha_2$ are algebraic numbers satisfying the hypothesis in Theorem 2.5 with $\alpha_1 \neq 0$ and $\alpha_2 \neq 0$. Then we obtain

$$Q_m \left( \left( -\frac{1}{\alpha_1} - \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} \frac{\theta_3(n\tau)}{\theta_3(\tau)} \right)^4, \frac{\theta_3^4(\tau)}{\theta_3^4(\tau)} \right) = 0.$$  

By the explicit form of the polynomials $Q_m(X,Y)$ and $P_n(X,Y)$ given by Theorem 3.3 and Lemma 3.1 we see that the polynomials

$$Q_m \left( \left( -\frac{1}{\alpha_1} - \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} \frac{\theta_3(n\tau)}{\theta_3(\tau)} \right)^4, Y \right) \text{ and } P_n \left( n^2 X^4, 16 \frac{\theta_3^4(n\tau)}{\theta_3^4(\tau)} \right)$$

are non-zero. Hence the polynomials

$$Q_m \left( \left( -\frac{1}{\alpha_1} - \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} \frac{\theta_3(n\tau)}{\theta_3(\tau)} \right)^4, Y \right) \text{ and } P_n \left( n^2 \frac{\theta_3^4(n\tau)}{\theta_3^4(\tau)}, 16 Y \right)$$

have the same common root $Y_0 = \frac{\theta_3^4(\tau)}{\theta_3^4(\tau)}$. Let

$$H_m(X,Y) := Q_m \left( \left( -\frac{1}{\alpha_1} - \frac{\alpha_2}{\alpha_1} X \right)^4, Y \right)$$

and

$$W(X) := \text{Res}_{Y} \left( H_m(X,Y), P_n(n^2 X^4, 16 Y) \right).$$

From Lemma 3.1 formula (2.1), we know that $\deg_Y Q_m(X,Y)$ does not depend on $X$, since the coefficient of the leading term with respect to $Y$ is the non-zero integer $c_m^{2a}$. For all real numbers $X$ which are not a root of the polynomial $S_{n,d_n}(X)$ in (1.2), the leading term of $P_n(X,Y)$ with respect to $Y$ does not vanish. Consequently, $W(X)$ is given by the same polynomial for these $X$, since $\deg_Y H_m(X,Y)$ and $\deg_Y P_n(n^2 X^4, 16 Y)$ does not change. Note that $S_{n,d_n}(X) \neq 0$ by (1.3). In order to show that $W(X)$ does not vanish identically for $X$ with $S_{n,d_n}(X) \neq 0$, we shall prove the existence of a number $\eta$ satisfying $W(\eta) \neq 0$, or, equivalently, that the polynomials $H_m(\eta,Y)$ and $P_n(n^2 \eta^4, 16 Y)$ are coprime. Let

$$\eta := -\frac{1}{\alpha_2}.$$  

On the one side, by using (2.3), we obtain

$$H_m(\eta,Y) = Q_m(0,Y) = c_m^{2a} Y^{2s} \psi(s).$$

Therefore, $H_m(\eta,Y)$ is a nonvanishing polynomial in $Y$ having exclusively a multiple root at $Y = 0$. On the other side, by the hypothesis on the algebraic degree of $\alpha_2^4$ in Theorem 2.5 and by

$$\deg_X S_{n,d_n}(X) \leq \deg_X P_n(X,Y) = \psi(n)$$

(cf. (1.2) in Theorem 3.3), we know that

$$S_{n,d_n}(n^2 \eta^4) = S_{n,d_n} \left( \frac{n^2}{\alpha_2^4} \right) \neq 0.$$  

Moreover, it follows from (1.4) that $S_{n,0} \neq 0$, and therefore the inequality

$$\deg_X S_{n,0}(X) \leq \deg_X P_n(X,Y) = \psi(n)$$

implies

$$S_{n,0}(n^2 \eta^4) = S_{n,0} \left( \frac{n^2}{\alpha_2^4} \right) \neq 0.$$
Thus, again the application of (1.2) gives

\[ P_n(n^2\eta^4, 0) \neq 0 \]

 Altogether, the polynomials \( H_m(\eta, Y) \) and \( P_n(n^2\eta^4, 16Y) \) have no common root. More precisely, we obtain for \( W(X) \),

\[ W(\eta) = \text{Res}_Y(H_m(\eta, Y), P_n(n^2\eta^4, 16Y)) \neq 0. \]

This shows that \( W(X) \) does not vanish identically for all \( X \) satisfying \( S_{n,d_n}(n^2X^4) \neq 0 \). By construction, we know that \( W(X_0) \) vanishes for

\[ X_0 := \frac{\theta_3(n\tau)}{\theta_3(\tau)}, \]

and since \( \theta_3(n\tau)/\theta_3(\tau) \) is transcendental by Lemma 3.4, we have by (1.3) that

\[ S_{n,d_n}\left(n^2\frac{\theta_3^4(n\tau)}{\theta_3^4(\tau)}\right) \neq 0. \]

Thus, \( X = X_0 \) is a zero of the function \( W(X) \), which restricted to all values \( X \) satisfying \( S_{n,d_n}(n^2X^4) \neq 0 \) results in the same nonvanishing polynomial \( W(X) \). This implies the algebraicity of \( \theta_3(n\tau)/\theta_3(\tau) \), a contradiction to Lemma 3.4. This finally shows that the linear relation (3.13) cannot hold.
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