

A KIT FOR LINEAR FORMS IN THREE LOGARITHMS

MAURICE MIGNOTTE AND PAUL VOUTIER, WITH AN APPENDIX BY MICHEL LAURENT

ABSTRACT. In this paper, we provide a technique to obtain explicit bounds for problems that can be reduced to linear forms in three logarithms of algebraic numbers. This technique can produce bounds significantly better than general results on lower bounds for linear forms in logarithms. We also give worked examples to demonstrate the improvements and to help readers see how to apply our technique.

1. INTRODUCTION

Many problems in number theory can be reduced to linear forms in the logarithms of algebraic numbers which have a very small absolute value (exponentially small in the coefficients of the linear form) (see [5] for a broad selection of examples). So larger lower bounds for these linear forms with all the constants involved being explicit reduce such problems to a finite amount of computation. For example, it is in this way (along with the use of reduction techniques as in [21] and [4] to handle the remaining computation) that the solution of Thue equations is now routine, included as a function in PARI/GP [1] and other mathematical software.

In this paper, we present a method, our “kit”, that can be used to get good upper bounds on quantities associated to such problems. Essentially, the present paper is extracted from [6] and [7], but we give many more details in order that this presentation is self-contained. In fact, [6] and [7] provide good examples of how a somewhat weaker version of our kit was used to solve completely some important number theory problems.

Our method is the method of interpolation determinants introduced by Michel Laurent in [11], [12] and [13]. In the case of three logarithms, this method was used by C.D. Bennett *et al.* [3]. But the present paper brings some progress when compared to [3]: we treat the general case of algebraic numbers (not only multiplicatively independent rational integers), many technical details have been improved and, more importantly, a new zero lemma of Michel Laurent leads to much better estimates.

Our aim, suggested by the title “*A kit...*”, is to explain how to deal with concrete problems that reduce to the study of linear forms in three logarithms of algebraic numbers. The process contains five steps.

- (1) obtain an upper bound for a linear form in logs associated with our problem.
- (2) combining the upper bound in (1) with a general estimate of Matveev, we obtain an upper bound, B_1 , for some quantity associated with our problem and the linear form.
- (3) supposing the linear form in three logs is *non-degenerate*, we use the upper bound B_1 to obtain a second upper bound, B_2 . If B_2 is smaller than B_1 we proceed to step (4).
- (4) supposing the linear form in three logs is *degenerate*, we consider it as a linear form in two logarithms and we apply the results of Laurent [15] to this linear form, along with the upper bound B_1 , to get a third upper bound B_3 .

Date: May 19, 2022.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 11D61, 11J86, Secondary 11D59, 11Y50.

Key words and phrases. linear forms in logarithms, Diophantine equations.

At this point the quantity we have bounded above by $\min\{B_1, \max\{B_2, B_3\}\}$.

(5) repeat steps (3) and (4) as often as desired to make the upper bound as small as possible.

In our experience, there is very little further improvement after 3 iterations (see the tables at the end of each example subsection in Section 6 for details).

Our kit is most suited to the case when at least one of the algebraic numbers in the linear form is a variable. If all three are known, it is much better to first use Matveev's result stated below and then apply a reduction technique like the LLL-algorithm [17] or variants of the Baker-Davenport reduction technique [2], like that of Dujella-Pethő [8].

We present Matveev's result, which we use in step (2), in Section 2. Our main result for linear forms in three logs is presented in Theorem 4.1 in Section 4, with the lemmas required to prove it, and our notation, in Section 3. Section 5 provides information on the choice of the parameters in Theorem 4.1. This simplifies the use of Theorem 4.1, reducing the selection of the required parameters to the choice of four parameters. The best choice of these four parameters can be found by a quick and easy brute force search.

To demonstrate both the usage of our kit and its benefits, we provide two examples in Section 6. In the first example, we are able to reduce the upper bound on the quantity p from about $2 \cdot 10^{12}$ obtained by Matveev's result to under $4 \cdot 10^6$. In our experience, this is typical of the improvements that can be expected from our kit.

The main point of the examples is to show others how to use our kit. We hope our exposition of the treatment of these examples makes it clear to readers how to apply our kit to suitable problems of their own. To help readers even more, code written in Pari, along with examples for how to use it, is also available from the authors at <https://github.com/PV-314/1f13-kit>.

Lastly, we mention that Michel Laurent has generously provided us with an improved zero estimate suitable for our use here – see Appendix A. It is also applicable more generally than our situation here, so it will be of interest to other researchers of diophantine and transcendence problems.

2. MATVEEV'S THEOREM FOR THREE LOGARITHMS

First, we need the special case of three logarithms of the theorem of E. M. Matveev, thus we quote his result.

Theorem 2.1 (Matveev). *Let α_1, α_2 and α_3 be three distinct non-zero algebraic numbers with $\log \alpha_1, \log \alpha_2$ and $\log \alpha_3$ be \mathbb{Q} -linearly independent logarithms of these algebraic numbers and let b_1, b_2 and b_3 be rational integers with $b_1 \neq 0$. Put*

$$\Lambda = b_1 \log \alpha_1 + b_2 \log \alpha_2 + b_3 \log \alpha_3.$$

Let

$$D = [\mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) : \mathbb{Q}] \quad \text{and} \quad \chi = [\mathbb{R}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) : \mathbb{R}].$$

Let A_1, A_2 and A_3 be positive real numbers, which satisfy

$$A_j \geq \max\{D h(\alpha_j), |\log \alpha_j|\} \quad (1 \leq j \leq 3),$$

where h is the absolute logarithmic Weil height.

Assume that

$$B \geq \max\{|b_j| A_j / A_1 : 1 \leq j \leq 3\}.$$

Also define

$$C_1 = \frac{5 \cdot 16^5}{6\chi} e^{3(7+2\chi)} \left(\frac{3e}{2}\right)^\chi (26.25 + \log(D^2 \log(eD))).$$

Then

$$\log |\Lambda| > -C_1 D^2 A_1 A_2 A_3 \log(1.5eDB \log(eD)).$$

Proof. This is a very slight simplification of Theorem 2.1 of [18] applied with $n = 3$. Our only change is to note that $|b_j| A_j/A_1 \geq 1$ for $j = 1$, so the outer max in Matveev's inequality $B \geq \max\{1, \max\{|b_j| A_j/A_1 : 1 \leq j \leq 3\}\}$ is not needed. \square

3. PRELIMINARIES

We present the type of linear forms in three logarithms that we shall study. We consider three distinct non-zero algebraic numbers α_1, α_2 and α_3 , positive rational integers b_1, b_2, b_3 with $\gcd(b_1, b_2, b_3) = 1$, and the linear form

$$(3.1) \quad \Lambda = b_1 \log \alpha_1 + b_2 \log \alpha_2 - b_3 \log \alpha_3 \neq 0.$$

We restrict our study to the following two cases:

- **the real case:** α_1, α_2 and α_3 are real numbers greater than 1, and the logarithms of the α_i 's are all real and positive. For many applications, α_1, α_2 and α_3 are multiplicatively independent over \mathbb{Q} . Of course, then the $\log \alpha_j$'s are \mathbb{Q} -linearly independent.
- **the complex case:** α_1, α_2 and α_3 are complex numbers $\neq 1$ of modulus one, and the logarithms of the α_i are arbitrary determinations of the logarithm (then any of these determinations is purely imaginary). In practical examples, two of these α 's are multiplicatively independent and the third one is a root of unity. We shall see later that (see Lemma 3.12), in this case, the $\log \alpha_j$'s are again \mathbb{Q} -linearly independent.

It is because the $\log \alpha_j$'s are \mathbb{Q} -linearly independent in both of these cases that we can use Theorem 2.1 of [18] in this work.

In practice, these restrictions do not cause any inconvenience since

$$|\Lambda| \geq \max\{|\operatorname{Re}(\Lambda)|, |\operatorname{Im}(\Lambda)|\},$$

and so we can always reduce to the above cases.

After possibly rearranging the terms and possibly replacing some logarithms by their negatives in the complex case, we may assume that

$$b_3 |\log \alpha_3| = b_1 |\log \alpha_1| + b_2 |\log \alpha_2| \pm |\Lambda|.$$

Notice that this introduces some important asymmetry between the roles of the coefficients b_1, b_2 and b_3 .

Like the authors of [3], we use Laurent's method (see [11, 12]), and consider a suitable interpolation determinant Δ .

3.1. Notation. We collect here some of the notation that we will use throughout this paper.

\mathbb{N} will denote the set of non-negative rational integers.

- K, L, R, S, T are positive rational integers with $K, L \geq 2$.
- $N = K^2 L$ and we assume that $RST \geq N$.
- let i be an index from 1 to N such that (k_i, m_i, ℓ_i) runs through all triples of integers with $0 \leq k_i \leq K - 1, 0 \leq m_i \leq K - 1$ and $0 \leq \ell_i \leq L - 1$. So each number $0, \dots, K - 1$ occurs KL times as a k_i , and similarly as an m_i , and each number $0, \dots, L - 1$ occurs K^2 times as an ℓ_i .
- put

$$(3.2) \quad g = \frac{1}{4} - \frac{N}{12RST}, \quad G_1 = \frac{NLR}{2}g, \quad G_2 = \frac{NLS}{2}g, \quad G_3 = \frac{NLT}{2}g$$

- with $d_1 = \gcd(b_1, b_3)$ and $d_2 = \gcd(b_2, b_3)$, put

$$(3.3) \quad b_1 = d_1 b'_1, \quad b_2 = d_2 b''_2, \quad b_3 = d_1 b'_3 = d_2 b''_3, \quad \beta_1 = b_1/b_3 = b'_1/b'_3, \quad \beta_2 = b_2/b_3 = b''_2/b''_3.$$

• let

$$(3.4) \quad \lambda_i = \ell_i - \frac{L-1}{2}, \quad \eta_0 = \frac{R-1}{2} + \beta_1 \frac{T-1}{2}, \quad \zeta_0 = \frac{S-1}{2} + \beta_2 \frac{T-1}{2}.$$

• let

$$(3.5) \quad b = (b'_3 \eta_0) (b''_3 \zeta_0) \left(\prod_{k=1}^{K-1} k! \right)^{-\frac{4}{K(K-1)}}.$$

• now we define the interpolation determinant that we shall use to prove our results,

$$(3.6) \quad \Delta = \det \left(\begin{pmatrix} r_j b'_3 + t_j b'_1 \\ k_i \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} s_j b''_3 + t_j b''_2 \\ m_i \end{pmatrix} \alpha_1^{\ell_i r_j} \alpha_2^{\ell_i s_j} \alpha_3^{\ell_i t_j} \right),$$

where r_j , s_j and t_j are non-negative integers less than R , S and T , respectively, such that (r_j, s_j, t_j) runs over N distinct triples.

• lastly, with r_j , s_j and t_j as above in the definition of our interpolation determinant, we let

$$M_1 = \frac{L-1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^N r_j, \quad M_2 = \frac{L-1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^N s_j, \quad M_3 = \frac{L-1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^N t_j.$$

Here, and throughout, by α^β , we mean $\exp(\beta \log \alpha)$ for any complex numbers α and β with $\alpha \neq 0$ and some determination of the logarithm.

3.2. Some combinatorial inequalities. This subsection contains some results used in the estimates of the interpolation determinant.

Lemma 3.1. *Let K, L, N, R, S, T be as above and put*

$$\ell_n = \left\lfloor \frac{n-1}{K^2} \right\rfloor, \quad 1 \leq n \leq N,$$

and $(r_1, \dots, r_N) \in \{0, 1, \dots, R-1\}^N$. Suppose that for each $r \in \{0, 1, \dots, R-1\}$ there are at most ST indices j such that $r_j = r$. Then

$$\left| \sum_{n=1}^N \ell_n r_n - M_R \right| \leq G_R,$$

where

$$M_R = \left(\frac{L-1}{2} \right) \sum_{n=1}^N r_n \quad \text{and} \quad G_R = \frac{NLR}{2} \left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{N}{12RST} \right).$$

Proof. Apply Lemme 4 in [16]. □

As in [3, Section 1.3] or [22, p. 192], for $(k, m) \in \mathbb{N}^2$, we put $\|(k, m)\| = k + m$. And for any $I, K_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, we put

$$(3.7) \quad \Theta(K_0, I) = \min \{ \|(k_1, m_1)\| + \dots + \|(k_I, m_I)\| \},$$

where the minimum is taken over all the sets of I pairs $(k_1, m_1), \dots, (k_I, m_I) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ which are pairwise distinct and satisfy $m_1, \dots, m_I \leq K_0$. Then, we have

Lemma 3.2. *Let K_0 and I be positive integers with $I \geq K_0(K_0 + 1)/2$. Then*

$$\Theta(K_0, I) \geq \left(\frac{I^2}{2(K_0 + 1)} \right) \left(1 + \frac{(K_0 - 1)(K_0 + 1)}{I} - \frac{K_0(K_0 + 2)(K_0 + 1)^2}{12I^2} \right).$$

Remark. This is an improvement of the Lemma 1.4 of [3]. If $I \equiv 0 \pmod{K_0 + 1}$ and K_0 even, then this result is best possible. In the worst cases, the difference between the left and right sides is at most roughly $K_0/8$.

Proof. We follow more or less the proof of Lemma 1.4 of [3]. The main difference being the introduction of the term r in the expression for I below.

The smallest value for the sum $\|(k_1, m_1)\| + \dots + \|(k_I, m_I)\|$ is reached when we choose successively, for each integer $n = 0, 1, \dots$ all the points in the domain

$$D_n = \{(k, m) \in \mathbb{N}^2 : m \leq K_0 \text{ and } k + m = n\},$$

and stop when the total number of points is I . Moreover,

$$\text{Card}(D_n) = \begin{cases} n + 1, & \text{if } n \leq K_0, \\ K_0 + 1, & \text{if } n \geq K_0. \end{cases}$$

Hence, for $A \geq K_0$, the number of points in $D_0 \cup \dots \cup D_{A-1}$ is

$$\sum_{n=0}^{K_0-1} (n + 1) + \sum_{n=K_0}^{A-1} (K_0 + 1) = \frac{K_0(K_0 + 1)}{2} + (A - K_0)(K_0 + 1) = \left(A - \frac{K_0}{2}\right)(K_0 + 1).$$

Letting A be the largest integer such that $\text{Card}(D_0 \cup \dots \cup D_{A-1}) \leq I$, we can write

$$I = \left(A - \frac{K_0}{2}\right)(K_0 + 1) + r \quad \text{with } 0 \leq r \leq K_0,$$

provided that $I \geq K_0(K_0 + 1)/2$. Then

$$\Theta(K_0, I) = \sum_{n=0}^{K_0-1} n(n + 1) + \sum_{n=K_0}^{A-1} n(K_0 + 1) + rA.$$

Here

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n=0}^{K_0-1} n(n + 1) + \sum_{n=K_0}^{A-1} n(K_0 + 1) \\ &= \frac{(K_0 - 1)K_0(2K_0 - 1)}{6} + \frac{(K_0 - 1)K_0}{2} + \frac{K_0 + 1}{2}(A(A - 1) - K_0(K_0 - 1)) \\ &= \frac{(K_0 - 1)K_0(2K_0 + 2)}{6} + \frac{K_0 + 1}{2}A(A - 1) - \frac{(K_0 - 1)K_0(K_0 + 1)}{2} \\ &= \frac{K_0 + 1}{2} \left(A(A - 1) - \frac{K_0(K_0 - 1)}{3} \right) \end{aligned}$$

and we get

$$(3.8) \quad \Theta(K_0, I) = \frac{K_0 + 1}{2} \left(A(A - 1) - \frac{K_0(K_0 - 1)}{3} \right) + rA.$$

We can write

$$A = \frac{K_0}{2} + \frac{I - r}{K_0 + 1}.$$

So using (3.8) and then this expression for A in terms of r , we have

$$\frac{\partial \Theta}{\partial r} = \frac{K_0 + 1}{2}(2A - 1) \frac{\partial A}{\partial r} + A + r \frac{\partial A}{\partial r} = -\frac{2A - 1}{2} + A - \frac{r}{K_0 + 1} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{r}{K_0 + 1},$$

which shows that the minimum of Θ is reached either for $r = 0$ or $r = K_0$. It is easy to verify that Θ takes the same value for $r = 0$ and $r = K_0 + 1$ (which is indeed out of the range of r), this implies that the minimum is reached for $r = 0$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2\Theta(K_0, I)}{K_0 + 1} &\geq \left(\frac{K_0}{2} + \frac{I}{K_0 + 1}\right) \left(\frac{K_0}{2} + \frac{I}{K_0 + 1} - 1\right) - \frac{K_0(K_0 - 1)}{3} \\ &= \frac{K_0^2}{4} + \frac{I^2}{(K_0 + 1)^2} + \frac{K_0 I}{K_0 + 1} - \frac{K_0}{2} - \frac{I}{K_0 + 1} - \frac{K_0^2}{3} + \frac{K_0}{3} \\ &= \frac{I^2}{(K_0 + 1)^2} + \frac{(K_0 - 1)I}{K_0 + 1} - \frac{K_0^2}{12} - \frac{K_0}{6} \\ &= \left(\frac{I}{K_0 + 1}\right)^2 \left(1 + \frac{(K_0 - 1)(K_0 + 1)}{I} - \frac{K_0(K_0 + 2)(K_0 + 1)^2}{12I^2}\right), \end{aligned}$$

which proves the lemma. \square

Lemma 3.3. *Let K , L and N be as in Subsection 3.1 with the additional assumptions that $K \geq 3$ and $L \geq 5$. Also let $0 \leq I \leq N$ be an integer and $\Theta(K_0, I)$ be as defined in (3.7). Then*

$$KL(N - I) + \Theta(K - 1, I) \geq \frac{N^2}{2K} + \frac{KN}{2} - N - \frac{K^3}{6}.$$

Proof. Suppose that $I \leq N/2 - K^2/2$. Then

$$KL(N - I) \geq \frac{KLN}{2} + \frac{KN}{2}.$$

Since $\Theta(K - 1, I) \geq 0$, the result follows in this case.

We now consider $I > N/2 - K^2/2$. This, along with $L \geq 5$, implies that $I > (L - 1)K^2/2 \geq 2K^2$. So we can use Lemma 3.2 to obtain

$$KL(N - I) + \Theta(K - 1, I) \geq KL(N - I) + \frac{I^2}{2K} \left(1 + \frac{(K - 2)K}{I} - \frac{(K - 1)(K + 1)K^2}{12I^2}\right).$$

The derivative of the right-hand side with respect to I is

$$\frac{1}{K}I - KL + K/2 - 1.$$

This is linear in I and the coefficient of the I term is positive, so once the derivative is positive, it stays positive for all larger values of I .

The derivative is zero at $I = K^2L - K^2/2 + K$. This value of I is equal to N only $K = 0$ or $K = 2$, and we have excluded both these cases. Hence $I < N$.

This means that for $I > N/2$ with $K, L \geq 2$, the minimum value of the lower bound for $KL(N - I) + \Theta(K - 1, I)$ occurs at $I = N - K^2/2 + K$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} KL(N - I) + \Theta(K - 1, I) &\geq \frac{(N - K^2/2 + K)^2}{2K} \left(\frac{2K}{2K - 1} + \frac{2K(2K - 3)}{N} - \frac{2K(2K - 1)(2K - 2)}{6N^2}\right) \\ &= \frac{N^2}{2K} + \frac{K^3L}{2} - K^2L - \frac{K^3}{6} + \frac{K^2}{2} - \frac{11K}{24}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $K^2/2 - 11K/24 \geq 0$, our result follows. \square

Lemma 3.4. (a) *Let $K > 1$ be an integer, then*

$$(3.9) \quad \log \left(\prod_{k=1}^{K-1} k! \right)^{2/(K(K-1))} \geq \log(K) - 3/2 + \frac{\log(2\pi K/e^{3/2})}{K-1} - \frac{\log(K) + 2}{6K(K-1)}.$$

(b) With $\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2, K, M, R, S$ and T as defined in Subsection 3.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \log b \leq & \log \frac{(R-1)b_3 + (T-1)b_1}{2d_1} + \log \frac{(S-1)b_2 + (T-1)b_3}{2d_2} \\ & - 2\log(K) + 3 - \frac{2\log(2\pi K/e^{3/2})}{K-1} + \frac{\log(K) + 2}{3K(K-1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Our proof is a variant of the proof of Lemme 8 of [16], which itself is based on the proof of Lemma 9 in [13]. We start with the identity

$$\prod_{k=1}^{K-1} k! = \prod_{k=1}^{K-1} k^{K-k} = \frac{((K-1)!)^K}{\prod_{k=1}^{K-1} k^k}.$$

So to obtain a lower bound for $\prod_{k=1}^{K-1} k!$, we must bound $\prod_{k=1}^{K-1} k^k$ from above and bound $((K-1)!)^K$ from below.

Proceeding as in the proof of Lemma 9 of [13] except using an additional term in the Euler-Maclaurin summation formula (i.e., using $r = 2$ in the notation there), we obtain

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K-1} k \log(k) \leq \frac{K^2 - K + 1/6}{2} \log(K-1) - \frac{K^2}{4} + \frac{K}{2} - \frac{1}{720} + \frac{1}{720(K-1)^2} + 0.0005,$$

holds for $K \geq 2$.

For $0 < x < 1$, $\log(1-x) < -x - x^2/2 - x^3/3 - x^4/4$. Applying this with $x = 1/K$, we find that $\log(K-1) = \log(K) + \log((K-1)/K) < \log(K) - 1/K - K^{-2}/2 - K^{-3}/3 - K^{-4}/4$. Substituting this into the right-hand side of the above inequality using Maple, we obtain

$$\sum_{k=1}^{K-1} k \log(k) \leq \frac{K^2 \log(K)}{2} - \frac{K^2}{4} - \frac{K \log(K)}{2} + \frac{\log(K)}{12} + 0.24912 + \frac{1}{720(K-1)^2} + \frac{7}{72K^3} - \frac{1}{48K^4}.$$

We use the lower bound

$$\log((K-1)!) > (K-1) \log(K-1) - (K-1) + \frac{\log(K-1)}{2} + \frac{\log(2\pi)}{2} + \frac{1}{12(K-1)} - \frac{1}{360(K-1)^3}.$$

Using the series expansions of $\log(1-x)$ and $1/(1-x)$, we find that

$$\log((K-1)!) > K \log(K) - K - \frac{\log(K)}{2} + \frac{\log(2\pi)}{2} + \frac{1}{12K} - \frac{1}{360K^3}.$$

Combining this with the upper bound for $\sum_{k=1}^{K-1} k \log(k)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \log \left(\prod_{k=1}^{K-1} k! \right) & > \frac{K^2 \log(K)}{2} - \frac{3K^2}{4} + \frac{K \log(2\pi)}{2} - \frac{\log(K)}{12} - \frac{1}{6} \\ & + 0.000888 - \frac{1}{360K^2} - \frac{1}{720(K-1)^2} - \frac{7}{72K^3} + \frac{1}{48K^4}. \end{aligned}$$

The sum of the last five terms can be written as a rational function. The numerator has a positive leading coefficient and its largest real root is $5.105\dots$, while the denominator is positive for $K > 1$. Therefore, for $K \geq 6$,

$$\log \left(\prod_{k=1}^{K-1} k! \right) > \frac{K^2 \log(K)}{2} - \frac{3K^2}{4} + \frac{K \log(2\pi)}{2} - \frac{\log(K)}{12} - \frac{1}{6}.$$

Multiplying the right-hand side by $2/(K(K-1))$, we obtain

$$\frac{K \log(K)}{K-1} - \frac{3K}{2(K-1)} + \frac{\log(2\pi)}{K-1} - \frac{\log(K)+2}{6K(K-1)}$$

and substituting $1/K + 1/K/(K-1)$ for $1/(K-1)$ in the first two terms establishes part (a).

(b) Using the definitions of b , η_0 , ζ_0 , β_1 and β_3 , we have

$$b = \left(b'_3 \frac{R-1}{2} + b'_1 \frac{T-1}{2} \right) \left(b''_3 \frac{S-1}{2} + b''_3 \frac{T-1}{2} \right) \left(\prod_{k=1}^{K-1} k! \right)^{-\frac{4}{K(K-1)}}.$$

Applying the relationships in (3.3), part (b) follows immediately. \square

3.3. An upper bound for $|\Delta|$. In this subsection, we prove the result below, Proposition 3.6, an upper bound for $|\Delta|$ (also see [6, Proposition 12.5]). We start with an estimate for the zero multiplicity of a certain function, the determinant of a particular matrix, at $x = 0$. This improves Lemma 7.2 of [22] when n there is equal to 2, as we can use the partial degrees, D_1 and D_2 , rather than the total degrees of the p_i 's.

As in Lemma 7.2 of [22], we establish a more general result here and apply it to our particular situation afterwards.

Let D_1 , D_2 and N be positive integers, $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_N, \zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_N$ elements of \mathbb{C} , f_1, \dots, f_N analytic functions in \mathbb{C} , θ_1 and θ_2 non-zero complex numbers and p_1, \dots, p_N polynomials in $\mathbb{C}[z_1, z_2]$ of degree in z_1 and z_2 at most D_1 and D_2 , respectively. We define, for $1 \leq i \leq N$,

$$\phi_i(z_1, z_2) = p_i(z_1, z_2) f_i(\theta_1 z_1 + \theta_2 z_2).$$

Let \mathcal{I} be a subset of $\{1, \dots, N\}$. We define an $N \times N$ matrix with entries

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{I}}(x)_{i,j} = \begin{cases} \phi_i(x\eta_j, x\zeta_j), & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{I}, \\ \delta_{i,j} \phi_i(x\eta_j, x\zeta_j), & \text{if } i \notin \mathcal{I}, \end{cases}$$

where $\delta_{i,j}$ are complex numbers and let $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}}(x) = \det(\Phi_{\mathcal{I}}(x))$.

Lemma 3.5. *The function $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}}(x)$ has a zero at $x = 0$ of multiplicity at least $\max(\Theta(D_1, |\mathcal{I}|), \Theta(D_2, |\mathcal{I}|))$, where $|\mathcal{I}|$ is the number of elements in \mathcal{I} .*

Proof. We show that the zero multiplicity is at least $\Theta(D_1, |\mathcal{I}|)$. The proof that it is also at least $\Theta(D_2, |\mathcal{I}|)$ uses the same argument. Our proof also follows the proof of Lemma 7.2 of [22] very closely, but we provide it here for completeness for the reader.

Note that the multiplicity of the zero of $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}}(x)$ at the origin is not affected by a change of variables in \mathbb{C}^2 . Also such a change of variables will not modify the total degree of polynomials in z_1, z_2 . Therefore, we may assume $\theta_2 = 0$, as well as

$$p_i(z_1, z_2) = z_1^{a_{i,1}} z_2^{a_{i,2}} \quad (1 \leq i \leq N)$$

for some $(a_{i,1}, a_{i,2}) \in \mathbb{N}^2$. We use the change of variables, T , defined by $T : (z_1, z_2) \mapsto (z_1 + z_2, -\theta_1 z_1/\theta_2)$, so

$$T(\theta_1 z_1 + \theta_2 z_2) = \theta_1(z_1 + z_2) + \theta_2(-\theta_1 z_1/\theta_2) = \theta_1 z_1.$$

With this choice of T , the degree of $p_i^{(T)}(z_1, z_2) = p_i(T(z_1, z_2))$ in z_2 is at most the degree of $p_i(z_1, z_2)$ in z_1 (as z_2 terms in $p_i^{(T)}(z_1, z_2)$ can only come from z_1 terms in $p_i(z_1, z_2)$).

Since the determinant is multilinear, by expanding each f_i as its Taylor series centred around $z_1 = 0$, we can write $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}}(x)$ as a sum of determinants each of which is a constant times $x^{\|\kappa_1\| + \dots + \|\kappa_{|\mathcal{I}|\mathcal{I}}\|}$ times the determinant of the matrix $M_{\underline{\kappa}} = (m_{i,j}^{\underline{\kappa}})$ where

$$m_{i,j}^{\underline{\kappa}} = \begin{cases} \eta_j^{\kappa_{i,1}} \zeta_j^{\kappa_{i,2}} & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{I}, \\ \delta'_{i,j} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$\underline{\kappa} = (\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_{|\mathcal{I}|})$ is an ordered $|\mathcal{I}|$ -tuple of elements of \mathbb{N}^2 and the $\delta_{i,j}$'s are complex numbers. If the elements $\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_{|\mathcal{I}|}$ are not pairwise distinct, then $\det M_{\underline{\kappa}} = 0$. Since, by our change of variables, T , $f_i(\theta_1 z_1 + \theta_2 z_2)$ depends only on z_1 , only the $\kappa_{i,1}$'s can increase. From T , we also have $\kappa_{i,2} = a_{i,2} \leq D_1$. Therefore the smallest value of $\|\kappa_1\| + \dots + \|\kappa_{|\mathcal{I}|}\|$ or which the determinant of $M_{\underline{\kappa}}$ could be nonzero, is $\Theta(D_1, |\mathcal{I}|)$. This proves our lemma for D_1 . \square

Returning to our specific situation here, let K, L, N, R, S and T , along with the r_j 's, s_j 's and t_j 's be as defined in Subsection 3.1.

Recalling our definition of the λ_i 's in (3.4), we have $\sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i = K^2 \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} (i - (L-1)/2) = 0$ and the following slight variation of equation (2.1) in [3] (our Λ' is slightly different from theirs)

$$(3.10) \quad \alpha_1^{\lambda_i r_j} \alpha_2^{\lambda_i s_j} \alpha_3^{\lambda_i t_j} = \alpha_1^{\lambda_i(r_j+t_j\beta_1)} \alpha_2^{\lambda_i(s_j+t_j\beta_2)} e^{\lambda_i t_j \Lambda / b_3} = \alpha_1^{\lambda_i(r_j+t_j\beta_1)} \alpha_2^{\lambda_i(s_j+t_j\beta_2)} (1 + \theta_{i,j} \Lambda'),$$

where

$$\theta_{i,j} = \frac{e^{\lambda_i t_j \Lambda / b_3} - 1}{\Lambda'}$$

and

$$(3.11) \quad \Lambda' = |\Lambda| \cdot \frac{LT e^{LT|\Lambda|/(2b_3)}}{2b_3}.$$

Let

$$(3.12) \quad \phi_i(\eta, \zeta) = \frac{b_3'^{k_i} b_3''^{m_i}}{k_i! m_i!} \eta^{k_i} \zeta^{m_i} \alpha_1^{\lambda_i \eta} \alpha_2^{\lambda_i \zeta},$$

for any $i = 1, \dots, N$, and

$$\Phi_{\mathcal{I}}(x)_{i,j} = \begin{cases} \phi_i(x\eta_j, x\zeta_j), & \text{if } i \in \mathcal{I}, \\ \theta_{i,j} \phi_i(x\eta_j, x\zeta_j), & \text{if } i \notin \mathcal{I}, \end{cases}$$

for any subset \mathcal{I} of $\mathcal{N} = \{1, \dots, N\}$ and $j = 1, \dots, N$.

In our notation before Lemma 3.5, here we put $p_i(z_1, z_2) = \frac{b_3'^{k_i} b_3''^{m_i}}{k_i! m_i!} \eta^{k_i} \zeta^{m_i}$, $f_i(\theta_1 z_1 + \theta_2 z_2) = \exp(\lambda_i \log(\alpha_1) z_1 + \lambda_i \log(\alpha_2) z_2)$ (so $\theta_1 = \lambda_i \log(\alpha_1)$ and $\theta_2 = \lambda_i \log(\alpha_2)$) and use $\theta_{i,j}$ here for $\delta_{i,j}$ there.

We put $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{I}} = (\Phi_{\mathcal{I}}(1)_{i,j})$, $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}}(x) = \det(\Phi_{\mathcal{I}}(x)_{i,j})$,

$$(3.13) \quad \Delta_{\mathcal{I}} = \Psi_{\mathcal{I}}(1)$$

and

$$J_{\mathcal{I}} = \text{ord}_{x=0}(\Psi_{\mathcal{I}}(x)).$$

Proposition 3.6. *Suppose K and L are two integers satisfying $K \geq 3$ and $L \geq 5$. If*

$$(3.14) \quad \Lambda' < \rho^{-KL}$$

holds for some real number $\rho \geq 2$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \log |\Delta| &< \sum_{i=1}^3 M_i \log |\alpha_i| + \rho \sum_{i=1}^3 G_i |\log \alpha_i| + \log(N!) + N \log 2 + \frac{N}{2}(K-1) \log b \\ &\quad - \left(\frac{NKL}{2} - \frac{KN}{2} - \frac{K^3}{6} \right) \log \rho + 0.001. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We start by proving that $|\theta_{i,j}| \leq 1$.

Since b_3 , L and $|\Lambda|$ are all positive, $0 \leq t_j \leq T$, and $|\lambda_i| \leq L/2$, we have

$$|\theta_{i,j}| \leq \frac{e^x - 1}{xe^x} \quad \text{where } x = \frac{LT|\Lambda|}{2b_3} > 0.$$

Observe that $(e^x - 1)/(xe^x)$ is a decreasing function for $x > 0$, since its derivative is $(1 + x - e^x)/(x^2e^x)$. By L'Hôpital's rule, we find that $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} (e^x - 1)/(xe^x) = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} (1 + x)^{-1} = 1$. Hence,

$$|\theta_{i,j}| \leq 1.$$

Let

$$\eta_j = r_j + t_j\beta_1 - \eta_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \zeta_j = s_j + t_j\beta_2 - \zeta_0,$$

so $|\eta_j| \leq \eta_0$ and $|\zeta_j| \leq \zeta_0$. Since,

$$\binom{r_j b'_3 + t_j b'_1}{k_i} = \binom{b'_3(\eta_j + \eta_0)}{k_i} = \frac{b_3^{k_i}}{k_i!} \eta_j^{k_i} + \text{terms in } \eta_j \text{ of degree less than } k_i,$$

and similarly for $\binom{s_j b''_3 + t_j b''_2}{m_i}$, using the multilinearity of determinants we obtain the formula

$$\Delta = \det \left(\frac{b_3^{k_i} b_3^{m_i}}{k_i! m_i!} \eta_j^{k_i} \zeta_j^{m_i} \alpha_1^{\ell_i r_j} \alpha_2^{\ell_i s_j} \alpha_3^{\ell_i t_j} \right).$$

Combining this with (3.10), along with the definitions of λ_i , M_1 , M_2 and M_3 , it follows that

$$\Delta = \alpha_1^{M_1} \alpha_2^{M_2} \alpha_3^{M_3} \det \left(\frac{b_3^{k_i} b_3^{m_i}}{k_i! m_i!} \eta_j^{k_i} \zeta_j^{m_i} \alpha_1^{\lambda_i(r_j + t_j\beta_1)} \alpha_2^{\lambda_i(s_j + t_j\beta_2)} (1 + \Lambda' \theta_{i,j}) \right).$$

Since $\sum_i \lambda_i = 0$, we deduce from this and the definitions of η_j and ζ_j that

$$\Delta = \alpha_1^{M_1} \alpha_2^{M_2} \alpha_3^{M_3} \det \left(\frac{b_3^{k_i} b_3^{m_i}}{k_i! m_i!} \eta_j^{k_i} \zeta_j^{m_i} \alpha_1^{\lambda_i \eta_j} \alpha_2^{\lambda_i \zeta_j} (1 + \Lambda' \theta_{i,j}) \right).$$

Expanding this determinant, we obtain

$$(3.15) \quad \Delta = \alpha_1^{M_1} \alpha_2^{M_2} \alpha_3^{M_3} \sum_{\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{N}} (\Lambda')^{N-|\mathcal{I}|} \Delta_{\mathcal{I}},$$

where \mathcal{I} runs over all subsets of $\mathcal{N} = \{1, \dots, N\}$ and $\Delta_{\mathcal{I}}$ is defined in (3.13).

From Schwarz' Lemma (see, for example, Lemma 2.3 on page 37 of [22]), we have

$$(3.16) \quad |\Psi_{\mathcal{I}}(1)| \leq \rho^{-J_{\mathcal{I}}} \cdot \max_{|x|=\rho} |\Psi_{\mathcal{I}}(x)|,$$

recalling that $J_{\mathcal{I}} = \text{ord}_{x=0}(\Psi_{\mathcal{I}}(x))$.

Since $|\theta_{i,j}| \leq 1$, expanding the determinant $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}}$ shows that

$$|\Psi_{\mathcal{I}}(x)| \leq N! \max_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{N})} \left| \prod_{i=1}^N \phi_i(x\eta_{\sigma(i)}, x\zeta_{\sigma(i)}) \right|,$$

where $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{N})$ is the group of all permutations of \mathcal{N} . We also have

$$\prod_{i=1}^N \phi_i(x\eta_{\sigma(i)}, x\zeta_{\sigma(i)}) = \frac{b_3^{\sum k_i} b_3^{\sum m_i}}{\prod k_i! \prod m_i!} (\rho\eta_0)^{\sum k_i} (\rho\zeta_0)^{\sum m_i} \alpha_1^{\sum \lambda_i \eta_{\sigma(i)} x} \alpha_2^{\sum \lambda_i \zeta_{\sigma(i)} x}.$$

Note that all the sums and products on right-hand side are for $i = 1, \dots, N$. This will also be the case for all sums and products that follow which have i as the index, but without explicit lower and upper bounds on i .

Since $|\eta_j| \leq \eta_0$, $|\zeta_j| \leq \zeta_0$ and $|\exp(z)| \leq \exp(|z|)$, it follows that

$$(3.17) \quad \max_{|x|=\rho} |\Psi_{\mathcal{I}}(x)| \leq N! \frac{b_2^{\sum k_i} b_2''^{\sum m_i}}{\prod k_i! \prod m_i!} (\rho\eta_0)^{\sum k_i} (\rho\zeta_0)^{\sum m_i} \\ \times \max_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}(N)} \exp \left\{ \rho \left(\left| \sum \lambda_i \eta_{\sigma(i)} \right| |\log \alpha_1| + \left| \sum \lambda_i \zeta_{\sigma(i)} \right| |\log \alpha_2| \right) \right\}.$$

Using Lemma 3.1 and the relation $\sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i = 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \eta_{\sigma(i)} &= \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i (r_i + s_i \beta_1 - \eta_0) = \sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i (r_i + s_i \beta_1) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\ell_i - \frac{L-1}{2} \right) r_{\sigma(i)} + \beta_1 \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\ell_i - \frac{L-1}{2} \right) s_{\sigma(i)}, \end{aligned}$$

and thus

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \eta_{\sigma(i)} \leq G_1 + \beta_1 G_3.$$

In a similar way,

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i \zeta_{\sigma(i)} \leq G_2 + \beta_2 G_3.$$

Recalling that $b_3 |\log \alpha_3| = b_1 |\log \alpha_1| + b_2 |\log \alpha_2| \pm |\Lambda|$, it follows that

$$(3.18) \quad \exp \left\{ \rho \left(\left| \sum \lambda_i \eta_{\sigma(i)} \right| |\log \alpha_1| + \left| \sum \lambda_i \zeta_{\sigma(i)} \right| |\log \alpha_2| \right) \right\} \\ \leq \exp \left\{ \rho \left((G_1 + \beta_1 G_3) |\log \alpha_1| + (G_2 + \beta_2 G_3) |\log \alpha_2| \right) \right\} \\ \leq \exp \left\{ \rho \left(G_1 |\log \alpha_1| + G_2 |\log \alpha_2| + G_3 \left(|\log \alpha_3| + \frac{|\Lambda|}{b_3} \right) \right) \right\}.$$

Recalling (3.14) and applying the definitions for the quantities that arise, we have

$$\rho G_3 \frac{|\Lambda|}{b_3} = \rho g \frac{NLT}{b_3} \frac{|\Lambda|}{2} = \rho g K^2 L \frac{\Lambda'}{e^{LT|\Lambda|/(2b_3)}} \leq \rho g K^2 L \Lambda' \leq \frac{\rho K^2 L \Lambda'}{4} < \frac{\rho K^2 L}{4\rho^{KL}}.$$

By looking at the partial derivatives of this last expression with respect to ρ , K and L , we see that it is a non-increasing function in each of these provided that $KL \log(\rho) \geq 2$ and $KL \geq 1$. These conditions hold for $K \geq 3$, $L \geq 5$ and $\rho \geq 2$. For $K = 3$, $L = 5$ and $\rho = 2$, we find that $\rho K^2 L / (4\rho^{KL}) = 0.000686\dots$. Hence

$$(3.19) \quad \rho G_3 \frac{|\Lambda|}{b_3} < 0.001.$$

Combining, (3.15), (3.16), (3.17), (3.18) and (3.19), we find that condition (3.14) implies the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} \log |\Delta| &< \sum_{i=1}^3 M_i \log |\alpha_i| + \rho \sum_{i=1}^3 G_i |\log \alpha_i| + \log(N!) + N \log(2) + \log(\rho) \sum_i (k_i + m_i) \\ &+ \log \left(\frac{(b_3 \eta_0)^{\sum k_i} (b_3'' \zeta_0)^{\sum m_i}}{\prod k_i! \prod m_i!} \max_{\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{N}} \frac{|\Lambda'|^{N-|\mathcal{I}|}}{\rho^{J_{\mathcal{I}}}} \right) + 0.001. \end{aligned}$$

Under condition (3.14), we have

$$\frac{|\Lambda'|^{N-|\mathcal{I}|}}{\rho^{J_{\mathcal{I}}}} \leq \rho^{-KL(N-|\mathcal{I}|-J_{\mathcal{I}})}$$

(note that if $N = |\mathcal{I}|$, then we need \leq here, rather than the $<$ in (3.14)).

From Lemma 3.5, we obtain $J_{\mathcal{I}} \geq \Theta(K-1, |\mathcal{I}|)$. Note that our matrix is not of exactly the same form as used in Lemma 3.5, as we have functions in the entries, $\Psi_{\mathcal{I}}(x)_{i,j}$ when $i \notin \mathcal{I}$, rather than complex numbers. But since the ϕ_i 's are the product of polynomials and analytic functions, these entries cannot reduce $J_{\mathcal{I}}$.

So applying Lemma 3.3 and using the relations

$$\sum_{i=1}^N k_i = \sum_{i=1}^N m_i = \frac{(K-1)K}{2} KL = \frac{N}{2}(K-1),$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \log(\rho) \sum_i (k_i + m_i) + \log \left(\max_{\mathcal{I} \subseteq \mathcal{N}} \frac{|\Lambda'|^{N-|\mathcal{I}|}}{\rho^{J_{\mathcal{I}}}} \right) \\ & \leq \log(\rho) \left(N(K-1) - \left(\frac{N^2}{2K} + \frac{KN}{2} - N - \frac{K^3}{6} \right) \right) = -\log(\rho) \left(\frac{N^2}{2K} - \frac{KN}{2} - \frac{K^3}{6} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Using the definition of b in (3.5), we see that

$$b^{N(K-1)/2} = (b'_3 \eta_0)^{N(K-1)/2} (b''_3 \zeta_0)^{N(K-1)/2} \left(\prod_{k=1}^{K-1} k! \right)^{-2N/K} = \frac{(b'_3 \eta_0)^{\sum k_i} (b''_3 \zeta_0)^{\sum m_i}}{\prod k_i! \prod m_i!}.$$

This completes the proof of the proposition. \square

3.4. A lower bound for $|\Delta|$. Liouville's inequality is the key tool that we need to obtain a lower bound for $|\Delta|$. The version of Liouville inequality that we use is the same as in [16] (p. 298–299) (also see Exercises 3.3(a) and 3.5 on pages 106–107 of [22]).

Lemma 3.7. *Let α_1, α_2 and α_3 be non-zero algebraic numbers and a polynomial $f \in \mathbb{Z}[X_1, X_2, X_3]$ such that $f(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) \neq 0$, then*

$$|f(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)| \geq |f|^{-\mathcal{D}+1} (\alpha_1^*)^{d_1} (\alpha_2^*)^{d_2} (\alpha_3^*)^{d_3} \times \exp \{ -\mathcal{D}(d_1 h(\alpha_1) + d_2 h(\alpha_2) + d_3 h(\alpha_3)) \},$$

where $\mathcal{D} = [\mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) : \mathbb{Q}] / [\mathbb{R}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) : \mathbb{R}]$,

$$d_i = \deg_{X_i} f, \quad i = 1, 2, 3, \quad |f| = \max \{ |f(z_1, z_2, z_3)| : |z_i| \leq 1, i = 1, 2, 3 \},$$

and $h(\alpha)$ is the absolute logarithmic height of the algebraic number α , and $\alpha^* = \max\{1, |\alpha|\}$.

Using Lemma 3.7, we get the following lemma – also see Proposition 12.6 in [6].

Proposition 3.8. *If $\Delta \neq 0$, then*

$$\begin{aligned} \log |\Delta| & \geq -\frac{\mathcal{D}-1}{2} N \log(N) + \sum_{i=1}^3 (M_i + G_i) \log |\alpha_i| - 2\mathcal{D} \sum_{i=1}^3 G_i h(\alpha_i) \\ & \quad - \frac{\mathcal{D}-1}{2} (K-1) N \log(b). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. From (3.6), we have $\Delta = P(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)$ where $P \in \mathbb{Z}[X_1, X_2, X_3]$ is given by

$$P(X_1, X_2, X_3) = \sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_N} \text{sg}(\sigma) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^N \binom{r_{\sigma(i)} b'_3 + t_{\sigma(i)} b'_1}{k_i} \binom{s_{\sigma(i)} b''_3 + t_{\sigma(i)} b''_1}{m_i} X_1^{n_{r,\sigma}} X_2^{n_{s,\sigma}} X_3^{n_{t,\sigma}},$$

where $\text{sg}(\sigma)$ is the signature of the permutation, σ ,

$$n_{r,\sigma} = \sum_{i=1}^N \ell_i r_{\sigma(i)}, \quad n_{s,\sigma} = \sum_{i=1}^N \ell_i s_{\sigma(i)} \quad \text{and} \quad n_{t,\sigma} = \sum_{i=1}^N \ell_i t_{\sigma(i)}.$$

By Lemma 3.1,

$$|\deg_{X_i} P - M_i| \leq G_i, \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, 3.$$

Let

$$V_i = \lfloor M_i + G_i \rfloor, \quad U_i = \lceil M_i - G_i \rceil, \quad i = 1, 2, 3,$$

then

$$\Delta = \alpha_1^{V_1} \alpha_2^{V_2} \alpha_3^{V_3} \tilde{P}(\alpha_1^{-1}, \alpha_2^{-1}, \alpha_3^{-1}),$$

where

$$\deg_{X_i} \tilde{P} \leq V_i - U_i, \quad i = 1, 2, 3.$$

By our Liouville estimate

$$\log \left| \tilde{P}(\alpha_1^{-1}, \alpha_2^{-1}, \alpha_3^{-1}) \right| \geq -(\mathcal{D} - 1) \log \left| \tilde{P} \right| - \mathcal{D} \sum_{i=1}^3 (V_i - U_i) h(\alpha_i),$$

recalling from our assumptions at the start of Section 3 that $|\alpha_i| \geq 1$, and hence $(\alpha_i^{-1})^* = 1$, for $i = 1, 2, 3$.

Now we have to find an upper bound for $|\tilde{P}|$ (or for $|P|$, which is equal to $|\tilde{P}|$). By the multilinearity of the determinant, for all $\eta, \zeta \in \mathbb{C}$,

$$P(z_1, z_2, z_3) = \det \left(\frac{(r_j b'_3 + t_j b'_1 - \eta)^{k_i}}{k_i!} \frac{(s_j b''_3 + t_j b''_2 - \zeta)^{m_i}}{m_i!} z_1^{\ell_i r_j} z_2^{\ell_i s_j} z_3^{\ell_i t_j} \right).$$

Choose

$$\eta = \frac{(R-1)b'_3 + (T-1)b'_1}{2}, \quad \zeta = \frac{(S-1)b''_3 + (T-1)b''_2}{2}.$$

Notice that, for $1 \leq j \leq N$,

$$|r_j b'_3 + t_j b'_1 - \eta|^{k_i} \leq \left(\frac{(R-1)b_3 + (T-1)b_1}{2d_1} \right)^{k_i}, \quad |s_j b''_3 + t_j b''_2 - \zeta|^{m_i} \leq \left(\frac{(S-1)b_2 + (T-1)b_2}{2d_2} \right)^{m_i}$$

and that

$$\sum_{i=1}^N k_i = \sum_{i=1}^N m_i = \frac{(K-1)K}{2} KL = \frac{N}{2}(K-1).$$

So Hadamard's inequality implies

$$\begin{aligned} |P| &\leq N^{N/2} \left(\frac{(R-1)b_3 + (T-1)b_1}{2d_1} \right)^{(K-1)N/2} \left(\frac{(S-1)b_2 + (T-1)b_2}{2d_2} \right)^{(K-1)N/2} \\ &\quad \times \left(\prod_{i=1}^N k_i! \right)^{-1} \left(\prod_{i=1}^N m_i! \right)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling the definition of b , we get

$$|P| \leq N^{N/2} b^{(K-1)N/2}.$$

Collecting all the above estimates, we find

$$\log |\Delta| \geq -(\mathcal{D} - 1) \left(\log \left(N^{N/2} \right) + \frac{(K-1)N}{2} \log b \right) - \mathcal{D} \sum_{i=1}^3 (V_i - U_i) h(\alpha_i) + \sum_{i=1}^3 V_i \log |\alpha_i|.$$

The inequalities $\mathcal{D} h(\alpha_i) \geq \log |\alpha_i| \geq 0$ imply

$$V_i \log |\alpha_i| - \mathcal{D}(V_i - U_i) h(\alpha_i) \geq (M_i + G_i) \log |\alpha_i| - 2\mathcal{D}G_i h(\alpha_i)$$

and the result follows. \square

3.5. Synthesis. Here we combine the upper and lower bounds for $|\Delta|$ that we obtained in the two previous subsections.

Proposition 3.9. *With the previous notation, if $K \geq 3$, $L \geq 5$, $\rho \geq 2$, and if $\Delta \neq 0$ then*

$$\Lambda' \geq \rho^{-KL}$$

provided that

$$\left(KL - K - \frac{K}{3L}\right) \log \rho \geq (\mathcal{D} + 1) \log N + gL(a_1R + a_2S + a_3T) + \mathcal{D}(K - 1) \log b,$$

where the a_i are positive real numbers which satisfy

$$a_i \geq \rho |\log \alpha_i| - \log |\alpha_i| + 2\mathcal{D} h(\alpha_i) \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, 3.$$

Proof. Under the hypotheses of the Propositions 3.6 and 3.8 (which include the hypothesis that $\Lambda' < \rho^{-KL}$ from (3.14)), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{\mathcal{D}-1}{2}N \log N + \sum_{i=1}^3 (M_i + G_i) \log |\alpha_i| - 2\mathcal{D} \sum_{i=1}^3 G_i h(\alpha_i) - \frac{\mathcal{D}-1}{2}(K-1)N \log b \\ & < \sum_{i=1}^3 M_i \log |\alpha_i| + \rho \sum_{i=1}^3 G_i |\log \alpha_i| + \log(N!) + N \log 2 + \frac{N}{2}(K-1) \log b \\ & \quad - \left(\frac{NKL}{2} - \frac{KN}{2} - \frac{K^3}{6}\right) \log \rho + 0.001. \end{aligned}$$

After combining like terms, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{NKL}{2} - \frac{KN}{2} - \frac{K^3}{6}\right) \log \rho & < \frac{\mathcal{D}-1}{2}N \log N + \sum_{i=1}^3 G_i (\rho |\log \alpha_i| - \log |\alpha_i| + 2\mathcal{D} h(\alpha_i)) \\ & \quad + \log(N!) + N \log(2) + \frac{K-1}{2}\mathcal{D}N \log(b) + 0.001. \end{aligned}$$

Applying $N! < N(N/e)^N$ (which holds for $N \geq 7$) and then dividing both sides by $N/2$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \left(KL - K - \frac{K}{3L}\right) \log \rho & < (\mathcal{D} + 1) \log N + (2/N) \sum_{i=1}^3 G_i (\rho |\log \alpha_i| - \log |\alpha_i| + 2\mathcal{D} h(\alpha_i)) \\ & \quad + \frac{2 \log(N)}{N} - 2 \log(e/2) + (K-1)\mathcal{D} \log(b) + 0.002/N. \end{aligned}$$

The proof now follows from $2 \log(N)/N - 2 \log(e/2) + 0.002/N < 0$ for $N \geq 6$ and the definitions of the G_i 's in (3.2) and applying the contrapositive to show that the assumption that $\Lambda' < \rho^{-KL}$ does not hold. \square

3.6. A zero lemma. To use Proposition 3.8, we need to find conditions under our determinant Δ is non-zero, a so-called *zero lemma*. We use a zero lemma due to M. Laurent (see Proposition A.1 in Appendix A). It was originally obtained by Laurent in 2003 [14] and appears here in print for the first time. It was already used in [7], improves [9] and provides an important improvement on the zero lemma in Theorem 3 of [3].

Let d_0 and d_1 be two non-negative integers which are not both zero. We denote by G the group $\mathbb{C}^{d_0} \times (\mathbb{C}^*)^{d_1}$ (in fact, we could replace \mathbb{C} by any algebraically closed field of characteristic zero). The group law on G will be written additively, hence its neutral element is denoted by $\mathbf{0}_G$. When $\Sigma_1, \dots, \Sigma_n$ are finite subsets of G , we define

$$\Sigma_1 + \dots + \Sigma_n = \{\sigma_1 + \dots + \sigma_n : \sigma_1 \in \Sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n \in \Sigma_n\}.$$

We present Laurent's zero estimate here in the special case of interest to us when $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$ and $K_1 = K_2$ there equals our K . Our work here can be done using separate values of K_1 and K_2 , but we found no improvement resulted unless two of the b_i 's are small in absolute value.

Proposition 3.10 (M. Laurent). *Suppose that K and L are positive integers and that Σ_1, Σ_2 and Σ_3 are finite subsets of $\mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^*$ containing $\mathbf{0}_G$ and such that*

$$(i) \quad \begin{cases} \text{Card} \{\lambda x_1 + \mu x_2 : (x_1, x_2, y) \in \Sigma_1\} > K, & \forall (\lambda, \mu) \neq (0, 0), \\ \text{Card} \{y : (x_1, x_2, y) \in \Sigma_1\} > L, \end{cases}$$

$$(ii) \quad \begin{cases} \text{Card} \{(\lambda x_1 + \mu x_2, y) : (x_1, x_2, y) \in \Sigma_2\} > 2KL, & \forall (\lambda, \mu) \neq (0, 0), \\ \text{Card} \{(x_1, x_2) : (x_1, x_2, y) \in \Sigma_2\} > 2K^2, \end{cases}$$

and also that

$$(iii) \quad \text{Card} \Sigma_3 > 6K^2L.$$

Then the only polynomial $P \in \mathbb{C}[X_1, X_2, Y]$ with $\deg_{X_i} P \leq K$ for $i = 1, 2$, and $\deg_Y P \leq L$ which is zero on the set $\Sigma_1 + \Sigma_2 + \Sigma_3$ is the zero polynomial.

For $j = 1, 2, 3$, we shall consider finite sets Σ_j defined by

$$(3.20) \quad \Sigma_j = \{(r + t\beta_1, s + t\beta_2, \alpha_1^r \alpha_2^s \alpha_3^t) : 0 \leq r \leq R_j, 0 \leq s \leq S_j, 0 \leq t \leq T_j\},$$

where R_j, S_j and T_j are positive integers, $\beta_1 = b_1/b_3 = b'_1/b'_3$ and $\beta_2 = b_2/b_3 = b''_2/b''_3$ are as in (3.3). This choice corresponds to the entries of the arithmetical matrix used in the definition of Δ in (3.6).

3.7. Degeneracies. If the conditions in our zero lemma do not all hold, then there will be a linear dependence relation over \mathbb{Q} that the b_i 's in our linear form satisfy (see conditions (C1) and (C2) in Theorem 4.1). We refer to such cases as degeneracies and present results in this section for how we handle them.

Note that there is an alternative approach (see the discussion at the end of Section 7.1 of [22, pp. 191–192]). Moreover, this alternative approach is likely more efficient than our approach here. It would simplify our arguments and the statement of Theorem 4.1 considerably. Furthermore, examples suggest that it would also lead to a reduction of the bounds obtained by roughly a factor of 2.

We have not pursued that approach here for legacy reasons with the original “kit” manuscript, as well as the paper it was based on [3]. But Waldschmidt's approach would certainly warrant being followed by future researchers.

It will not always be the case that we can Concerning the group, $\mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^*$, the following elementary lemma is important.

Lemma 3.11. *The following conditions are equivalent.*

(a) *The map*

$$\psi : \mathbb{Z}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2 \times \mathbb{C}^*, \quad (r, s, t) \mapsto (r + \beta_1 t, s + \beta_3 t, \alpha_1^r \alpha_2^s \alpha_3^t)$$

is not one-to-one (not injective).

(b) *There exists some positive integer m such that*

$$\alpha_3^{mb_3} = \alpha_1^{mb_1} \alpha_2^{mb_2}.$$

(c) *The number Λ belongs to the set $i\pi\mathbb{Q}$.*

Proof. Clearly, without loss of generality, we may assume that $\gcd(b_1, b_2, b_3) = 1$.

Recall our notation from (3.3) with $d_1 = \gcd(b_1, b_3)$ and $d_2 = \gcd(b_2, b_3)$. Since $\gcd(b_1, b_2, b_3) = 1$, we have $\gcd(d_1, d_2) = 1$. Thus

$$b_3 = d_1 d_2 \tilde{b}_3 \text{ (say)}, \quad b'_3 = d_2 \tilde{b}_3, \quad b''_3 = d_1 \tilde{b}_3.$$

After these preliminaries, we prove the implication (a) \Rightarrow (b). Suppose that the map ψ is not injective. Then there exist rational integers r, s, t , not all zero, such that

$$\psi(r, s, t) = (0, 0, 1).$$

That is,

$$r + t\beta_1 = 0, \quad s + t\beta_2 = 0, \quad \alpha_1^r \alpha_2^s \alpha_3^t = 1.$$

The first relation implies $r = -kb'_1$ for some rational integer, k . In fact, we have $k = t/b'_3$. Thus $t = kb'_3 = kd_2 \tilde{b}_3$. Similarly, from the second relation we have $s = -\ell b''_2$, where $\ell = t/b''_3$, so $t = \ell b''_3 = \ell d_1 \tilde{b}_3$, for some rational integer ℓ . In particular, $kd_2 = \ell d_1$, hence there exists $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $k = md_1$ and $\ell = md_2$. Thus

$$r = -mb_1, \quad s = -mb_2 \quad \text{and} \quad t = mb_3.$$

Since at least one of r, s and t is non-zero, it follows that $m \neq 0$. Thus third relation gives

$$\alpha_3^{mb_3} = \alpha_1^{mb_1} \alpha_2^{mb_2},$$

as wanted.

Clearly, (b) implies (c).

To show that (c) implies (a), we suppose that (c) holds, *i.e.* that $m\Lambda$ belongs to $2i\pi\mathbb{Z}$ for some positive rational integer m . Then it is clear that $\psi(-mb_1, mb_2, -mb_3) = (0, 0, 1)$, proving that the map ψ is not injective. \square

Lemma 3.12. *If α_1, α_2 and α_3 are non-zero complex numbers such that (for example) α_1 and α_2 are multiplicatively independent and $\alpha_3 \neq 1$ is a root of unity, and let $\log \alpha_j$ be any determination of the logarithm of α_j for $j = 1, 2, 3$, then the numbers $\log \alpha_1, \log \alpha_2$ and $\log \alpha_3$ are linearly independent over the rationals.*

Furthermore, if b_1, b_2 and b_3 are rational integers with at least one of b_1 and b_2 non-zero, then the number $b_1 \log \alpha_1 + b_2 \log \alpha_2 + b_3 \log \alpha_3$ does not belong to the set $i\pi\mathbb{Q}$.

Proof. Suppose that

$$\Lambda = b_1 \log \alpha_1 + b_2 \log \alpha_2 - b_3 \log \alpha_3 = 0$$

where b_1, b_2 and b_3 are rational integers not all equal to zero. Then $\alpha_3^{b_3} = \alpha_1^{b_1} \alpha_2^{b_2}$. Assume that $\alpha_3^d = 1$ with $d > 1$, then $\alpha_2^{db_2} = \alpha_1^{db_1}$, which implies $b_1 = b_2 = 0$ since α_1 and α_2 are multiplicatively independent. Since we assumed that b_1, b_2 and b_3 are not all equal to zero, it follows that $b_3 \neq 0$ and so $\Lambda = b_3 \log \alpha_3 \neq 0$, since $\alpha_3 \neq 1$. This contradiction proves the first claim.

Noting that $\log \alpha_3 = 2\pi im/n$ with $n \nmid m$, the second claim follows from the first one. \square

The following very elementary lemma will be useful when investigating Conditions (i) and (ii) of Proposition 3.10.

Lemma 3.13. *Suppose that b_1, b_2 and b_3 are positive rational integers which are coprime. Let R, S and T be positive integers and consider the set*

$$\tilde{\Sigma} = \{(r + tb_1/b_3, s + tb_2/b_3) : 0 \leq r \leq R, 0 \leq s \leq S, 0 \leq t \leq T\}.$$

Then

$$\text{Card } \tilde{\Sigma} = (R + 1)(S + 1)(T + 1)$$

unless

$$b_1 \leq R \quad \text{and} \quad b_2 \leq S \quad \text{and} \quad b_3 \leq T.$$

Proof. With the same notation as above, suppose that the map

$$\psi : \{(r, s, t) : 0 \leq r \leq R, 0 \leq s \leq S, 0 \leq t \leq T\} \rightarrow \tilde{\Sigma}, \quad (r, s, t) \mapsto (r + \beta_1 t, s + \beta_2 t)$$

is not injective. Then there exist two different triples of rational integers (r, s, t) and (r', s', t') , with $0 \leq r, r' \leq R, 0 \leq s, s' \leq S$ and $0 \leq t, t' \leq T$ such that $\psi(r, s, t) = \psi(r', s', t')$. That is,

$$(r - r') + (t - t')\beta_1 = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad (s - s') + (t - t')\beta_2 = 0.$$

As in the proof that (a) implies (b) for Lemma 3.11, these two relations imply that

$$r - r' = mb_1, \quad s - s' = mb_2, \quad t - t' = -mb_3.$$

Thus $-R \leq mb_1 \leq R, -S \leq mb_2 \leq S$ and $-T \leq mb_3 \leq T$. Since m is non-zero and the b_i 's are positive, the conclusion follows. \square

The first subcondition of Condition (i) in Proposition 3.10 is the most difficult to handle. For it, we will need the following lemmas, in particular, Lemma 3.17. These lemmas also bring some extra information to Proposition 3.1.1 of [3] (also see [22, Ex 6.4, pp. 184–185]).

Lemma 3.14. *Let $A, B, C, D, X > 0, Y > 0$ and $Z > 0$ be rational integers with $\gcd(A, B, C) = 1$ and $ABC \neq 0$. Put*

$$\Sigma = \{(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{Z}^3 : 0 \leq x \leq X, 0 \leq y \leq Y, 0 \leq z \leq Z\}$$

and

$$M = \text{Card} \{(x, y, z) \in \Sigma : Ax + By + Cz = D\}.$$

(a) *We have*

$$M \leq \left(1 + \left\lfloor \frac{X}{\alpha} \right\rfloor\right) \left(1 + \left\lfloor \frac{Y}{|C|/\alpha} \right\rfloor\right) \quad \text{and} \quad M \leq \left(1 + \left\lfloor \frac{X}{\alpha} \right\rfloor\right) \left(1 + \left\lfloor \frac{Z}{|B|/\alpha} \right\rfloor\right),$$

where

$$\alpha = \gcd(B, C).$$

(b) *If we suppose that*

$$M \geq \max\{X + Y + 1, Y + Z + 1, Z + X + 1\}$$

then

$$|A| \leq \frac{(Y + 1)(Z + 1)}{M - \max\{Y, Z\}}, \quad |B| \leq \frac{(X + 1)(Z + 1)}{M - \max\{X, Z\}} \quad \text{and} \quad |C| \leq \frac{(X + 1)(Y + 1)}{M - \max\{X, Y\}}.$$

Remark 3.15. When we apply part (b) of this lemma, we will assume that M is (possibly) even larger. Let $\mathcal{V} = ((X + 1)(Y + 1)(Z + 1))^{1/2}$ and suppose that χ is a positive real number. We will assume that

$$M \geq \max\{X + Y + 1, Y + Z + 1, Z + X + 1, \chi\mathcal{V}\}.$$

Proof. (a) Define

$$\Pi = \{(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{C}^3 : Ax + By + Cz = D\}.$$

If the image by the map $(x, y, z) \mapsto Ax + By + Cz$ of a point $(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ belongs to the plane Π , then

$$Ax \equiv D \pmod{\alpha},$$

where A and α are coprime since $\gcd(A, B, C) = 1$. This shows that the number of such x which satisfy $0 \leq x \leq X$ is at most $1 + \lfloor X/\alpha \rfloor$.

Now let x be fixed, with $0 \leq x \leq X$, and such that the images of two distinct elements (x, y, z) and (x, y', z') of Σ also belong to Π . Then

$$B(y' - y) = C(z - z'),$$

where we suppose (as we may) that y is minimal (then $y' > y$). Hence there exists a positive integer k such that

$$y' - y = k(|C|/\alpha) \quad \text{and} \quad z - z' = \pm k(|B|/\alpha).$$

It follows that, for x fixed, the number of $(x, y, z) \in \Sigma$ whose image belongs to Π is at most $1 + \lfloor Y/(|C|/\alpha) \rfloor$. Hence

$$(3.21) \quad M \leq \left(1 + \left\lfloor \frac{X}{\alpha} \right\rfloor\right) \left(1 + \left\lfloor \frac{Y}{|C|/\alpha} \right\rfloor\right),$$

which proves the first upper bound for M in the lemma.

The proof of the second upper bound for M is the same, except for fixed values of x , we bound the number of possible z -coordinates rather than the number of possible y -coordinates.

(b) We turn now to the upper bounds for $|A|$, $|B|$ and $|C|$, starting with the upper bound for $|C|$.

For $\xi \geq 1$, put

$$f(\xi) = \left(1 + \frac{X}{\xi}\right) \left(1 + \frac{\xi Y}{|C|}\right).$$

From equation (3.21), it follows that

$$M \leq f(\alpha).$$

Clearly, $1 \leq \alpha \leq C$. Since $f''(\xi) = 2X/\xi^3 > 0$, it follows that $f(\xi)$ is convex and so

$$M \leq f(\alpha) \leq \max\{f(1), f(C)\}.$$

So we have

$$\begin{aligned} M \leq f(1) = 1 + \frac{XY}{|C|} + X + \frac{Y}{|C|} &\Rightarrow |C| \leq \frac{Y(X+1)}{M - (X+1)} \quad \text{and} \\ M \leq f(C) = 1 + \frac{XY}{|C|} + \frac{X}{|C|} + Y &\Rightarrow |C| \leq \frac{X(Y+1)}{M - (Y+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose finally that

$$M \geq \max\{X + Y + 1, Y + Z + 1, Z + X + 1\}.$$

Since $M - X \geq Y + 1$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{XY + Y}{M - (X + 1)} &= \frac{XY + Y}{(M - X)(1 - 1/(M - X))} = \frac{XY + Y}{M - X} \left(1 + \frac{1}{M - X} + \frac{1}{(M - X)^2} + \dots \right) \\ &\leq \frac{XY + Y}{M - X} \left(1 + \frac{1}{Y + 1} + \frac{1}{(Y + 1)^2} + \dots \right) \\ &= \frac{XY + Y}{M - X} \frac{Y + 1}{Y} = \frac{(X + 1)(Y + 1)}{M - X}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\frac{XY + X}{M - (Y + 1)} \leq \frac{(X + 1)(Y + 1)}{M - Y}.$$

Thus, we always have

$$|C| \leq \frac{(X + 1)(Y + 1)}{M - \max\{X, Y\}}.$$

The remaining upper bounds for $|A|$ and $|B|$ at the end of the lemma are proved in the same way. \square

Lemma 3.16. *Let $B, C, D, X > 0, Y > 0$ and $Z > 0$ be rational integers with $\gcd(B, C) = 1$ and $BC \neq 0$.*

Put

$$\Sigma = \{(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{Z}^3 : 0 \leq x \leq X, 0 \leq y \leq Y, 0 \leq z \leq Z\}$$

and

$$M = \text{Card} \{(x, y, z) \in \Sigma : By + Cz = D\}.$$

(a) *We have*

$$M \leq (X + 1) \left(1 + \left\lfloor \frac{Y}{|C|} \right\rfloor \right) \quad \text{and} \quad M \leq (X + 1) \left(1 + \left\lfloor \frac{Z}{|B|} \right\rfloor \right).$$

(b) *Moreover, if we suppose that*

$$M \geq \max\{X + Y + 1, X + Z + 1\},$$

then

$$|B| \leq \frac{(X + 1)(Z + 1)}{M - X} \quad \text{and} \quad |C| \leq \frac{(X + 1)(Y + 1)}{M - X}.$$

Remark. As with Lemma 3.14(b) and noted in Remark 3.15, when we apply part (b) of this lemma, we will assume that M is (possibly) even larger. Let $\mathcal{V} = ((X + 1)(Y + 1)(Z + 1))^{1/2}$ and suppose that χ is a positive real number. We will assume that

$$M \geq \max\{X + Y + 1, Y + Z + 1, Z + X + 1, \chi\mathcal{V}\}.$$

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 3.14, but simpler.

(a) Define the plane

$$\Pi = \{(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{C}^3 : By + Cz = D\}.$$

Consider the map $(x, y, z) \mapsto By + Cz$ of a point $(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ belongs to the plane Π .

Let x be fixed with $0 \leq x \leq X$ and such that the images of two distinct points (x, y, z) and (x, y', z') in Σ belong to Π . Then

$$B(y' - y) = C(z - z'),$$

where we suppose (as we may) that y is minimal (then $y' > y$). Hence there exists a positive integer k such that

$$y' - y = k|C| \quad \text{and} \quad z - z' = \pm k|B|.$$

Since $y' - y = C(z - z')/B$ and $\gcd(B, C) = 1$, it must be the case that $B|(z - z')$. This is why k is an integer.

It follows that, for x fixed, the number of $(x, y, z) \in \Sigma$ whose image belongs to Π is at most $1 + \lfloor Y/|C| \rfloor$. Hence

$$(3.22) \quad M \leq (1 + X) \left(1 + \left\lfloor \frac{Y}{|C|} \right\rfloor \right),$$

which proves the first upper bound for M in the lemma.

The proof of the second upper bound for M is the same, except for fixed values of x , we bound the number of possible z -coordinates rather than the number of possible y -coordinates.

(b) We turn now to the upper bounds for $|B|$ and $|C|$, starting with the upper bound for $|C|$. From equation (3.22), it follows that

$$M \leq (1 + X) \left(1 + \frac{Y}{|C|} \right).$$

Thus

$$|C| \leq \frac{Y(1 + X)}{M - 1 - X}.$$

Suppose now

$$M \geq \max\{X + Y + 1, X + Z + 1\}.$$

As we saw in the proof of Lemma 3.14, $M \geq X + Y + 1$ implies that

$$|C| \leq \frac{Y(1 + X)}{M - 1 - X} \leq \frac{(X + 1)(Y + 1)}{M - X},$$

as required.

The remaining upper bound for $|B|$ at the end of the lemma is proved in the same way. \square

Lemma 3.17. *Let R_1, S_1 and T_1 be positive integers and consider the set*

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_1 = \{(x_1, x_2) = (r + t\beta_1, s + t\beta_2) : 0 \leq r \leq R_1, 0 \leq s \leq S_1, 0 \leq t \leq T_1\},$$

where $\beta_1 = b_1/b_3$ and $\beta_2 = b_2/b_3$ with b_1, b_2 and b_3 coprime non-zero rational integers, and assume that

$$\text{Card } \tilde{\Sigma}_1 = (R_1 + 1)(S_1 + 1)(T_1 + 1).$$

Put

$$\mathcal{V} = ((R_1 + 1)(S_1 + 1)(T_1 + 1))^{1/2}.$$

For any $(\lambda, \mu) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$ and any complex number c , let M_c be the number of elements $(x_1, x_2) \in \tilde{\Sigma}_1$ such that $\lambda x_1 + \mu x_2 = c$.

(a) Let χ be a positive real number. If

$$(3.23) \quad M_c < \mathcal{M} := \max\{R_1 + S_1 + 1, S_1 + T_1 + 1, R_1 + T_1 + 1, \chi\mathcal{V}\},$$

does not hold, then there exist rational integers u_1, u_2 and u_3 , not all zero, such that

$$u_1 b_1 + u_2 b_2 + u_3 b_3 = 0,$$

with $\gcd(u_1, u_2, u_3) = 1$ and

$$|u_1| \leq \frac{(S_1 + 1)(T_1 + 1)}{\mathcal{M} - \max\{S_1, T_1\}}, \quad |u_2| \leq \frac{(R_1 + 1)(T_1 + 1)}{\mathcal{M} - \max\{R_1, T_1\}} \quad \text{and} \quad |u_3| \leq \frac{(R_1 + 1)(S_1 + 1)}{\mathcal{M} - \max\{R_1, S_1\}}.$$

(b) If the upper bound (3.23) for M_c holds then, for all $(\lambda, \mu) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$, we have

$$\text{Card} \left\{ \lambda x_1 + \mu x_2 : (x_1, x_2) \in \tilde{\Sigma}_1 \right\} \geq \frac{(R_1 + 1)(S_1 + 1)(T_1 + 1)}{\max\{R_1 + S_1 + 1, S_1 + T_1 + 1, R_1 + T_1 + 1, \chi\mathcal{V}\}}.$$

Remark. The introduction of $\chi\mathcal{V}$ here turns out to be very helpful to us. In many cases, $\chi\mathcal{V}$ is much larger than the other terms in the definition of \mathcal{M} here. So its use here gives us much smaller upper bounds on the sizes of the u_i 's. This, in turns, gives us better results from the kit itself.

Proof. (a) Suppose that (3.23) does not hold for some triple (λ, μ, c) . Let c be a complex number such that M_c is maximal and consider the associated values of λ and μ . We distinguish the following possibilities for μ and λ .

- $\mu = 0$: suppose that $(x_1, x_2) \in \tilde{\Sigma}_1$ satisfies $\lambda x_1 + \mu x_2 = \lambda(r + t\beta_1) = c$. So $b_3 r + b_1 t = cb_3/\lambda$ for some integers $0 \leq r \leq R_1$ and $0 \leq t \leq T_1$ (since $\mu = 0$ here and also $(\mu, \lambda) \neq (0, 0)$, we have $\lambda \neq 0$).

We will now apply Lemma 3.16. Let (X, Y, Z) there be (S_1, R_1, T_1) and (B, C, D) there be $(b_3/d_1, b_1/d_1, cb_3/(\lambda d_1))$, where $d_1 = \gcd(b_1, b_3)$. Taking r and t here as y and z , respectively, in the definition of M in Lemma 3.16, then the equation $By + Cz = D$ in the definition of M becomes our $(b_3/d_1)r + (b_1/d_1)t = cb_3/(d_1\lambda)$.

Using the map $\sigma : \Sigma \rightarrow \tilde{\Sigma}_1$ defined by $\sigma : (s, r, t) \mapsto (r + t\beta_1, s + t\beta_2)$, we see that the cardinalities of Σ and $\tilde{\Sigma}_1$ are equal. The map is clearly surjective. Suppose that

$$\sigma(s_1, r_1, t_1) = (r_1 + t_1\beta_1, s_1 + t_1\beta_2) = (r_2 + t_2\beta_1, s_2 + t_2\beta_2) = \sigma(s_2, r_2, t_2).$$

Then $(r_1 - r_2) + (t_1 - t_2)\beta_2 = (s_1 - s_2) + (t_1 - t_2)\beta_2 = 0$, so $r_1 - r_2 = s_1 - s_2$. In this case, we can write $r_1 = r_2 + k$ and $s_1 = s_2 + k$. Thus $(r_2 + k + t_1\beta_1, s_2 + k + t_1\beta_2) = (r_2 + t_2\beta_1, s_2 + t_2\beta_2)$, which can only happen if $k = 0$. This proves that σ is injective too.

Therefore, since (3.23) does not hold, the inequality for M in Lemma 3.16(b) holds and we have

$$|b_3/d_1| = |B| \leq \frac{(S_1 + 1)(T_1 + 1)}{M_c - S_1} \leq \frac{(S_1 + 1)(T_1 + 1)}{\mathcal{M} - S_1}$$

and

$$|b_1/d_1| = |C| \leq \frac{(S_1 + 1)(R_1 + 1)}{M_c - S_1} \leq \frac{(S_1 + 1)(R_1 + 1)}{\mathcal{M} - S_1}.$$

We now use this information to obtain the linear relation we want between the b_i 's. We have the trivial relationship $(b_1/d_1)b_3 - b_1(b_3/d_1) = 0$, so we can let $u_1 = -b_3/d_1$, $u_2 = 0$ and $u_3 = b_1/d_1$. The upper bounds above on $|b_3/d_1|$ and $|b_1/d_1|$ establish our lemma in this case.

Now we assume $\mu \neq 0$ and, to simplify the notation, we take $\mu = 1$.

- $\lambda = 0$: by the same argument as for $\mu = 0$, we have $b_3(\lambda x_1 + \mu x_2) = b_3\mu x_2 = b_3(s + t\beta_2) = b_3s + tb_2 = b_3c$ for some $(x_1, x_2) \in \tilde{\Sigma}_1$. Here we apply Lemma 3.16 with (R_1, S_1, T_1) for (X, Y, Z) and $(b_3/d_1, b_2/d_1, b_3c/d_1)$ for (B, C, D) , where $d_1 = \gcd(b_2, b_3)$. As in the case of $\mu = 0$, Lemma 3.16(b) gives us

$$|b_3/d_1| = |B| \leq \frac{(R_1 + 1)(T_1 + 1)}{\mathcal{M} - R_1} \quad \text{and} \quad |b_2/d_1| = |C| \leq \frac{(R_1 + 1)(S_1 + 1)}{\mathcal{M} - S_1}.$$

As in the case of $\mu = 0$, we have the relationship $u_1b_1 + u_2b_2 + u_3b_3 = 0$ with $u_1 = 0$, $u_2 = b_3/d_1$ and $u_3 = -b_2/d_1$.

It remains to consider $\mu\lambda \neq 0$. We do so with two cases.

- $\lambda b_1 + b_2 = 0$: we proceed in the same way as in the case of $\lambda = 0$. We have $\lambda x_1 + \mu x_2 = -b_2/b_1(r + t\beta_1) + s + t\beta_2 = c$ (recalling that we take $\mu = 1$). Expanding this and simplifying it, we obtain $-b_2r + b_1s = cb_1$, so we use Lemma 3.16 with $(0, -b_2/d_2, b_1/d_2, cb_1/d_2)$ for (A, B, C, D) , (t, r, s) for (x, y, z) and (T_1, R_1, S_1) for (X, Y, Z) , where $d_2 = \gcd(b_1, b_2)$. Here

$$|b_2/d_2| = |B| \leq \frac{(S_1 + 1)(T_1 + 1)}{\mathcal{M} - T_1} \quad \text{and} \quad |b_1/d_2| = |C| \leq \frac{(T_1 + 1)(R_1 + 1)}{\mathcal{M} - T_1}.$$

Notice the denominators here differ from those for the case of $\lambda = 0$. This explains why we need the max in our upper bounds in the lemma.

The desired relationship, $u_1 b_1 + u_2 b_2 + u_3 b_3 = 0$, holds if we take $u_1 = b_2/d_2$, $u_2 = -b_1/d_2$ and $u_3 = 0$.

• $\lambda\mu(\lambda b_1 + b_2) \neq 0$: we will show that the desired relationship between the b_i 's holds here too. To proceed, we put

$$E_1 = \{(r, s, t) \in \mathbb{Z}^3 : 0 \leq r \leq R_1, 0 \leq s \leq S_1, 0 \leq t \leq T_1\}.$$

Since $M_c > T_1 + 1$ (by our assumption that (3.23) does not hold), there exist two distinct triples (r_1, s_1, t_0) and $(r'_1, s'_1, t_0) \in E_1$ such that

$$\lambda(r_1 + \beta_1 t_0) + (s_1 + \beta_2 t_0) = \lambda(r'_1 + \beta_1 t_0) + (s'_1 + \beta_2 t_0),$$

recalling our assumption (stated just before considering the case $\lambda = 0$) that $\mu = 1$. This gives us a trivial linear relation between the b_i 's, but it does tell us that $\lambda(r'_1 - r_1) = s_1 - s'_1$. Since $\lambda \neq 0$ and at least one of $r_1 \neq r'_1$ or $s_1 \neq s'_1$ holds, it follows that both $r_1 \neq r'_1$ and $s_1 \neq s'_1$ hold. Put $r''_1 = (r'_1 - r_1) / \gcd(r_1 - r'_1, s_1 - s'_1)$ and $s''_1 = (s_1 - s'_1) / \gcd(r_1 - r'_1, s_1 - s'_1)$, then $\lambda = s''_1 / r''_1$.

We now use this information about λ to obtain a non-trivial linear relation between the b_i 's whose coefficients we can bound.

We have $\lambda x_1 + \mu x_2 = s''_1 / r''_1 (r + t\beta_1) + s + t\beta_2 = c$ (recalling that we take $\mu = 1$). Expanding this and simplifying it, we obtain

$$s''_1 b_3 r + (s''_1 b_1 + r''_1 b_2) t + r''_1 b_3 s = r''_1 b_3 c,$$

so we use Lemma 3.14(b) with $(s''_1 b_3 / \delta_1, (s''_1 b_1 + r''_1 b_2) / \delta_1, r''_1 b_3 / \delta_1, r''_1 b_3 c / \delta_1)$ for (A, B, C, D) , (r, t, s) for (x, y, z) and (R_1, T_1, S_1) for (X, Y, Z) , where

$$\delta_1 = \gcd(s''_1 b_3, s''_1 b_1 + r''_1 b_2, r''_1 b_3) = \gcd(b_3, s''_1 b_1 + r''_1 b_2)$$

since r''_1 and s''_1 are coprime. Here

$$|s''_1 b_3 / \delta_1| = |A| \leq \frac{(Y+1)(Z+1)}{\mathcal{M} - \max\{Y, Z\}} \leq \frac{(S_1+1)(T_1+1)}{\mathcal{M} - \max\{S_1, T_1\}},$$

$$|(s''_1 b_1 + r''_1 b_2) / \delta_1| = |B| \leq \frac{(X+1)(Z+1)}{\mathcal{M} - \max\{X, Z\}} \leq \frac{(R_1+1)(S_1+1)}{\mathcal{M} - \max\{R_1, S_1\}}$$

and

$$|r''_1 b_3 / \delta_1| = |C| \leq \frac{(X+1)(Y+1)}{\mathcal{M} - \max\{X, Y\}} \leq \frac{(R_1+1)(T_1+1)}{\mathcal{M} - \max\{R_1, T_1\}}.$$

Since δ_1 divides $s''_1 b_1 + r''_1 b_2$, we have $s''_1 b_1 + r''_1 b_2 = k_1 \delta_1$. Multiplying this by b_3 / δ_1 , we get a linear relation

$$u_1 b_1 + u_2 b_2 + u_3 b_3 = 0$$

with $u_1 = s''_1 b_3 / \delta_1$, $u_2 = r''_1 b_3 / \delta_1$ and $u_3 = -(s''_1 b_1 + r''_1 b_2) / \delta_1$. Thus

$$|u_1| = |s''_1 b_3 / \delta_1| \leq \frac{(S_1+1)(T_1+1)}{\mathcal{M} - \max\{S_1, T_1\}},$$

$$|u_2| = |r''_1 b_3 / \delta_1| \leq \frac{(R_1+1)(T_1+1)}{\mathcal{M} - \max\{R_1, T_1\}} \quad \text{and}$$

$$|u_3| = |(s''_1 b_1 + r''_1 b_2) / \delta_1| \leq \frac{(R_1+1)(S_1+1)}{\mathcal{M} - \max\{R_1, S_1\}}.$$

(b) For $(\lambda, \mu) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\}$, we consider the cardinality

$$N = \text{Card} \left\{ \lambda x_1 + \mu x_2 : (x_1, x_2) \in \tilde{\Sigma}_1 \right\}.$$

Putting $M = \max_{c \in C} M_c$, we clearly have $N \geq \text{Card}(\tilde{\Sigma}_1) / M$, so part (b) of the lemma follows from the assumption in the lemma that

$$\text{Card} \tilde{\Sigma}_1 = (R_1 + 1)(S_1 + 1)(T_1 + 1)$$

and the assumption in part (b) that $M \leq \mathcal{M}$. \square

4. MAIN RESULT

If we gather the results obtained in the previous section, we get the following theorem.

Theorem 4.1. *Let α_1, α_2 and α_3 be three distinct non-zero algebraic numbers, which are either all real and > 1 or all complex of modulus 1 and all $\neq 1$. Also let b_1, b_2 and b_3 be three positive rational integers with $\gcd(b_1, b_2, b_3) = 1$, and put*

$$\Lambda = b_1 \log \alpha_1 + b_2 \log \alpha_2 - b_3 \log \alpha_3,$$

where the logarithms of the α_i are arbitrary determinations of the logarithm, but which are either all real or all purely imaginary. We assume that

$$0 < |\Lambda| < 2\pi/w,$$

where w is the maximal order of a root of unity belonging to the number field $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)$ ¹ and that

$$b_3 |\log \alpha_3| = b_1 |\log \alpha_1| + b_2 |\log \alpha_2| \pm |\Lambda|.$$

We put

$$d_1 = \gcd(b_1, b_3), \quad d_2 = \gcd(b_2, b_3), \quad b_3 = d_1 b'_3 = d_2 b''_3.$$

Let $K \geq 3, L \geq 5, R, R_1, R_2, R_3, S, S_1, S_2, S_3, T, T_1, T_2, T_3$ be positive rational integers with

$$(4.1) \quad R > R_1 + R_2 + R_3, \quad S > S_1 + S_2 + S_3 \text{ and } T > T_1 + T_2 + T_3.$$

Let $\rho \geq 2$ be a real number. Suppose that

$$(4.2) \quad \left(KL - K - \frac{K}{3L} \right) \log \rho \geq (\mathcal{D} + 1) \log N + gL(a_1 R + a_2 S + a_3 T) + \mathcal{D}(K - 1) \log b,$$

where $N = K^2 L, \mathcal{D} = [\mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) : \mathbb{Q}] / [\mathbb{R}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) : \mathbb{R}]$,

$$g = \frac{1}{4} - \frac{N}{12RST}, \quad b = (b'_3 \eta_0) (b''_3 \zeta_0) \left(\prod_{k=1}^{K-1} k! \right)^{-\frac{4}{\kappa(K-1)}},$$

with

$$\eta_0 = \frac{R-1}{2} + \frac{(T-1)b_1}{2b_3}, \quad \zeta_0 = \frac{S-1}{2} + \frac{(T-1)b_3}{2b_3},$$

and

$$a_i \geq \rho |\log \alpha_i| - \log |\alpha_i| + 2\mathcal{D} h(\alpha_i), \quad i = 1, 2, 3.$$

Put

$$\mathcal{V} = \sqrt{(R_1 + 1)(S_1 + 1)(T_1 + 1)}.$$

If, for some positive real number χ ,

- (i) $(R_1 + 1)(S_1 + 1)(T_1 + 1) > K \cdot \max\{R_1 + S_1 + 1, S_1 + T_1 + 1, R_1 + T_1 + 1, \chi \mathcal{V}\}$,
- (ii) $\text{Card} \{\alpha_1^r \alpha_2^s \alpha_3^t : 0 \leq r \leq R_1, 0 \leq s \leq S_1, 0 \leq t \leq T_1\} > L$,

¹ If D is the degree of this number field then $\varphi(w) \leq D$, where φ is the Euler totient function. Using [20, Theorem 15] and some calculation for small w , we see that $\varphi(w) \geq (w/2)^{0.63}$, which implies $w < 2D^{1.6}$. Hence $0 < |\Lambda| < 2\pi/w$ is satisfied if $0 < |\Lambda| \leq \pi D^{-1.6}$ and then $\Lambda \notin i\pi\mathbb{Q}$. Obviously, $\Lambda \notin i\pi\mathbb{Q}$ is also satisfied when Λ is real and non-zero.

- (iii) $(R_2 + 1)(S_2 + 1)(T_2 + 1) > 2K^2$,
- (iv) $\text{Card} \{\alpha_1^r \alpha_2^s \alpha_3^t : 0 \leq r \leq R_2, 0 \leq s \leq S_2, 0 \leq t \leq T_2\} > 2KL$ and
- (v) $(R_3 + 1)(S_3 + 1)(T_3 + 1) > 6K^2L$,

all hold, then either

$$\Lambda' > \rho^{-KL},$$

where

$$\Lambda' = |\Lambda| \cdot \frac{LT e^{LT|\Lambda|/(2b_3)}}{2|b_3|},$$

or at least one of the following conditions **(C1)** or **(C2)** holds:

$$\text{(C1)} \quad |b_1| \leq \max\{R_1, R_2\} \quad \text{and} \quad |b_2| \leq \max\{S_1, S_2\} \quad \text{and} \quad |b_3| \leq \max\{T_1, T_2\},$$

(C2) there exist rational integers u_1, u_2 and u_3 , not all zero, such that

$$u_1 b_1 + u_2 b_2 + u_3 b_3 = 0,$$

with $\text{gcd}(u_1, u_2, u_3) = 1$,

$$|u_1| \leq \frac{(S_1 + 1)(T_1 + 1)}{\mathcal{M} - \max\{S_1, T_1\}}, \quad |u_2| \leq \frac{(R_1 + 1)(T_1 + 1)}{\mathcal{M} - \max\{R_1, T_1\}} \quad \text{and} \quad |u_3| \leq \frac{(R_1 + 1)(S_1 + 1)}{\mathcal{M} - \max\{R_1, S_1\}}.$$

Proof. We start by showing that we can apply to our zero lemma, Proposition 3.10, to Δ , so that we have $\Delta \neq 0$. This will allow us to use Proposition 3.8 to obtain a lower bound for $|\Delta|$.

If the $N = K^2L$ rows of the matrix used to define the interpolation determinant, Δ , in (3.6) are linearly dependent, then there exists a polynomial, $P(X_1, X_2, Y)$, not exactly zero, with $P(r + t\beta_1, s + t\beta_2, \alpha_1^r \alpha_2^s \alpha_3^t) = 0$ for all triples (r, s, t) with $0 \leq r < R$, $0 \leq s < S$ and $0 \leq t < T$. Since this polynomial arises from a linear combination of the rows and the maximum exponent of $r + t\beta_1$ is at most $K - 1$, the maximum exponent of $s + t\beta_2$ is also at most $K - 1$ and the maximum exponent of $\alpha_1^r \alpha_2^s \alpha_3^t$ is at most $L - 1$, $\deg_{X_1}(P), \deg_{X_2}(P) \leq K - 1$ and $\deg_Y(P) \leq L - 1$.

Using the definition of the Σ_j 's in (3.20), along with the lower bounds for R, S and T in (4.1), we use that the set of all such triples (r, s, t) contains $\Sigma_1 + \Sigma_2 + \Sigma_3$. Therefore, if conditions (i), (ii) and (iii) in Proposition 3.10 hold, then we find that $P(X_1, X_2, Y)$ is the zero polynomial. This contradiction shows that the $N = K^2L$ rows of the matrix used to define the interpolation determinant, Δ , in (3.6) are not linearly dependent and hence the interpolation determinant, Δ , is not zero.

Thus, if we can show that conditions (i)–(v) in the theorem imply conditions (i), (ii) and (iii) in Proposition 3.10 (unless Conditions **(C1)** or **(C2)** hold), then by Proposition 3.9, the lower bound for Λ' in the theorem will hold (again, unless Conditions **(C1)** or **(C2)** hold).

Condition (i) of Proposition 3.10 has two subconditions. The first subcondition is

$$(i.1) \quad \text{Card} \{\lambda x_1 + \mu x_2 : (x_1, x_2, y) \in \Sigma_1\} > K, \quad \forall (\lambda, \mu) \neq (0, 0).$$

Recalling the definition of Σ_1 in (3.20) and of $\widetilde{\Sigma}_1$ in Lemma 3.13 ($\widetilde{\Sigma}_1 = \{(r + tb_1/b_3, s + tb_2/b_3) : 0 \leq r \leq R_1, 0 \leq s \leq S_1\}$), we have

$$\text{Card} \{\lambda x_1 + \mu x_2 : (x_1, x_2, y) \in \Sigma_1\} = \text{Card} \left\{ \lambda x_1 + \mu x_2 : (x_1, x_2) \in \widetilde{\Sigma}_1 \right\}.$$

By Lemma 3.13, we find that $\text{Card} \widetilde{\Sigma}_1 = (R_1 + 1)(S_1 + 1)(T_1 + 1)$ holds unless Condition **(C1)** holds. So we may now assume that $\text{Card} \widetilde{\Sigma}_1 = (R_1 + 1)(S_1 + 1)(T_1 + 1)$ holds. Thus, by Lemma 3.17(b), condition (i) of the theorem implies that

$$\text{Card} \left\{ \lambda x_1 + \mu x_2 : (x_1, x_2) \in \widetilde{\Sigma}_1 \right\} > K, \quad \forall (\lambda, \mu) \neq (0, 0).$$

holds, unless the condition in Lemma 3.17(a) holds. This condition in Lemma 3.17(a) gives rise to Condition **(C2)**.

The second subcondition of Condition (i) of Proposition 3.10 is

$$(i.2) \quad \text{Card} \{y : (x_1, x_2, y) \in \Sigma_1\} > L.$$

Condition (ii) in this theorem implies that this subcondition holds.

So we have shown that Condition (i) of Proposition 3.10 follows from Conditions (i) and (ii) in this theorem, provided that Conditions **(C1)** and **(C2)** do not hold.

We now consider Condition (ii) of Proposition 3.10.

It is also divided into two subconditions. We replace the first one by the stronger condition

$$(ii.1) \quad \text{Card} \{y : (x_1, x_2, y) \in \Sigma_2\} > 2KL.$$

Condition (iv) in this theorem implies that this subcondition holds.

The second subcondition of condition (ii) of Proposition 3.10 is

$$(ii.2) \quad \text{Card} \{(x_1, x_2) : (x_1, x_2, y) \in \Sigma_2\} > 2K^2.$$

By Lemma 3.13, $\text{Card} \{(x_1, x_2) : (x_1, x_2, y) \in \Sigma_2\} = (R_2 + 1)(S_2 + 1)(T_2 + 1)$ holds unless Condition **(C1)** holds. So condition (iii) in this theorem implies that this subcondition holds unless Condition **(C1)** holds.

Condition (iii) of Proposition 3.10 is that $\text{Card} \Sigma_3 > 6K^2L$. From the definition of w , if $\Lambda \in i\pi\mathbb{Q}$, then $\Lambda = i\pi 2p/q$ where $p \neq 0$ and $0 < |q| \leq w$. So, from the assumption in this theorem that $0 < |\Lambda| < 2\pi/w$, it follows that $\Lambda \notin i\pi\mathbb{Q}$. Thus the map in Lemma 3.11(a) is injective, so hypothesis (v) of the theorem implies condition (iii) of our zero lemma holds. This finishes the proof. \square

5. HOW TO USE THEOREM 4.1

We will first consider the multiplicative group generated by the three algebraic numbers α_1 , α_2 and α_3 , which we will denote by \mathcal{G} .

5.1. About the multiplicative group \mathcal{G} . In practical examples, generally the following condition holds:

$$(M) \quad \begin{cases} \text{either } \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \text{ and } \alpha_3 \text{ are multiplicatively independent, or} \\ \text{two of them are multiplicatively independent and the third is a root of unity } \neq 1. \end{cases}$$

We now use hypothesis **(M)**, which is clearly stronger than the standard hypothesis that the multiplicative group \mathcal{G} is of rank at least two. We also notice that the order in \mathbb{C}^* of a root of unity $\neq 1$ is at least equal to 2, thus the condition (i.2) of Section 3 is satisfied if

$$(C.i.2) \quad \frac{2(R_1 + 1)(S_1 + 1)(T_1 + 1)}{W_1 + 1} > L,$$

where

$$W_1 = \begin{cases} R_1, & \text{if } \alpha_1 \text{ is a root of unity,} \\ S_1, & \text{if } \alpha_2 \text{ is a root of unity,} \\ T_1, & \text{if } \alpha_3 \text{ is a root of unity,} \\ 1, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and recalling the definition of the Σ_j 's in (3.20). But see also the first remark after (C.ii.1) below.

In the same way, we see that to satisfy the condition (ii.1) of Section 3 it is enough to suppose that (when condition **(M)** holds)

$$(C.ii.1) \quad \frac{(R_2 + 1)(S_2 + 1)(T_2 + 1)}{W_2 + 1} > KL,$$

where W_2 is defined by

$$W_2 = \begin{cases} R_2, & \text{if } \alpha_1 \text{ is a root of unity,} \\ S_2, & \text{if } \alpha_2 \text{ is a root of unity,} \\ T_2, & \text{if } \alpha_3 \text{ is a root of unity,} \\ 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Remark. When (for example) α_3 is a root of unity of order ν , condition (C.i.2) above can be replaced by

$$\nu(R_1 + 1)(S_1 + 1) > L$$

(provided $T_1 \geq \nu - 1$) and condition (C.ii.1) can be replaced by

$$\nu(R_2 + 1)(S_2 + 1) > 2KL,$$

(provided $T_2 \geq \nu - 1$)

Remark. Under a weaker condition, one can obtain similar (but slightly weaker) conclusions (see, for instance, [22, Ex. 7.5, p. 229]).

5.2. The choice of parameters. Here we assume that condition **(M)** holds, then by Lemma 3.12 above we know that $\Lambda \notin i\pi\mathbb{Q}$.

To apply Theorem 4.1, we consider an integer $L \geq 5$ and real parameters $m > 0$, $\rho \geq 2$ and $\chi > 0$. Note that having chosen ρ , we can set the values of the a_i 's too.

Now we put

$$(5.1) \quad K = \lfloor mL a_1 a_2 a_3 \rfloor.$$

The reason for this choice of K is as follows. The main term on the left-hand side of equation (4.2) is $KL \log(\rho)/2$, so it must be larger than $\mathcal{D}(K-1) \log(b)$. This suggests that we let $L = O(\mathcal{D} \log(b))$. Thus our lower bound for $\log |\Lambda|$, which is $-\log(\rho)KL$, is $O(a_1 a_2 a_3 \mathcal{D}^2 \log^2(b))$. This is our desired form and consistent with the bounds for linear forms in two logs that we obtain from this same technique (see, for example, [15]).

To simplify the presentation, even if we do not really need these conditions, we also assume

$$m \geq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \Omega := a_1 a_2 a_3 \geq 2.$$

We define

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{array}{lll} R_1 = \lfloor c_1 a_2 a_3 \rfloor, & S_1 = \lfloor c_1 a_1 a_3 \rfloor, & T_1 = \lfloor c_1 a_1 a_2 \rfloor, \\ R_2 = \lfloor c_2 a_2 a_3 \rfloor, & S_2 = \lfloor c_2 a_1 a_3 \rfloor, & T_2 = \lfloor c_2 a_1 a_2 \rfloor, \\ R_3 = \lfloor c_3 a_2 a_3 \rfloor, & S_3 = \lfloor c_3 a_1 a_3 \rfloor, & T_3 = \lfloor c_3 a_1 a_2 \rfloor, \end{array}$$

where the parameters c_1 , c_2 and c_3 will be chosen so that conditions (i) through (v) of Theorem 4.1 are satisfied. The motivation for this choice of these quantities is so that all three terms in $a_1 R + a_2 S + a_3 T$ on the right-hand side of equation (4.2) are roughly the same size, $O(a_1 a_2 a_3)$ and so that the $gL(a_1 R + a_2 S + a_3 T)$ term on the right-hand side of (4.2) is roughly the same size as the other main term on the right-hand side of (4.2), $\mathcal{D}(K-1)$.

We first consider condition (i). Recalling that $\mathcal{V} = ((R_1 + 1)(S_1 + 1)(T_1 + 1))^{1/2}$, we see that $(R_1 + 1)(S_1 + 1)(T_1 + 1) > K\chi\mathcal{V}$ holds, if $(c_1^3(a_1 a_2 a_3)^2)^{1/2} \geq \chi m a_1 a_2 a_3 L$. I.e., $c_1 \geq (\chi m L)^{2/3}$.

Next we establish conditions for

$$(R_1 + 1)(S_1 + 1)(T_1 + 1) > K \cdot \max\{R_1 + S_1 + 1, S_1 + T_1 + 1, R_1 + T_1 + 1\}$$

to hold. We consider the special case $a_1 \leq a_2 \leq a_3$ (the other cases are the same), then $T_1 \leq S_1 \leq R_1$ and we want to show that

$$(R_1 + 1)(S_1 + 1)(T_1 + 1) > K(R_1 + S_1 + 1).$$

Using the expressions for these quantities, this inequality will hold if

$$(R_1 + 1)c_1^2 a_1^2 a_2 a_3 > mL a_1 a_2 a_3 (R_1 + 1 + c_1 a_1 a_3)$$

holds. If $ax > bx + c$ with $a, b, c > 0$ holds for $x = x_0$, then it holds for all $x \geq x_0$. So it suffices to show that $c_1^3 a_1^2 a_2^2 a_3^2 \geq mL a_1 a_2 a_3 (c_1 a_2 a_3 + c_1 a_1 a_3)$ holds. This will hold if $c_1^2 a_1^2 a_2^2 a_3^2 \geq 2mL\Omega^2 (a_1^{-1} + a_2^{-1})$ holds, where $a = \min\{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$. That is, when $c_1^2 \geq (a_1^{-1} + a_2^{-1})mL$ holds. In the general case, the wanted condition holds if

$$c_1^2 \geq (a^{-1} + a'^{-1})mL, \quad \text{where } a = \min\{a_1, a_2, a_3\}, \quad a' = \min(\{a_1, a_2, a_3\} \setminus \{a\}).$$

Condition (ii) of Theorem 4.1 is true when $2c_1^2 a_1 a_2 a_3 \cdot \min\{a_1, a_2, a_3\} = 2c_1^2 \Omega a > L$, provided that $c_1 > 2^{1/3}$ (since $\Omega \geq 2$). This inequality arises from the second part of **(M)**, with the factor of 2 on the left-hand side coming from the fact that the order of the root of unity is at least 2. The condition that $c_1 > 2^{1/3}$ ensures that condition (ii) also holds when the first part **(M)** holds.

Thus, since we suppose $m \geq 1$ and also $\Omega \geq 2$, we can take

$$(5.3) \quad c_1 = \max \left\{ 2^{1/3}, (\chi mL)^{2/3}, \left(\frac{2mL}{a} \right)^{1/2} \right\}.$$

To satisfy conditions (iii) and (iv) of Theorem 4.1, we can take

$$(5.4) \quad c_2 = \max \left\{ 2^{1/3}(mL)^{2/3}, \sqrt{m/a} L \right\}.$$

Note we do not require $c_2 \geq 2^{1/3}$ here explicitly, since $m \geq 1$ and $L \geq 5$ ensures that $2^{1/3}(mL)^{2/3} > 2^{1/3}$.

Finally, because of the hypothesis **M**, $\Lambda \notin i\pi\mathbb{Q}$ by Lemma 3.12. So, by Lemma 3.11, condition (v) holds for

$$(5.5) \quad c_3 = (6m^2)^{1/3} L.$$

Remark. When $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3$ are multiplicatively independent then it is enough to take c_1 and c_3 as above and

$$(5.6) \quad c_2 = 2^{1/3}(mL)^{2/3}.$$

5.3. The degenerate case. In this subsection, we present some informal arguments for what happens in the degenerate case. We obtain

$$\log |\Lambda| \gg -a_1 a_2 a_3 \min\{a_1, a_2, a_3\} (\mathcal{D} \log B)^{8/3}.$$

Remark. It is this worse dependence on $\log B$ than in the non-degenerate case that leads to the degenerate case having an impact on the results obtained in practice. Fortunately, it is the constants that are important and our estimates should lead to good results when compared to published previously ones (e.g., [18]). See the example in the next section for evidence of this.

From Condition **(C1)** in Theorem 4.1, we have

$$b_1 \leq \max\{R_1, R_2\}, \quad b_2 \leq \max\{S_1, S_2\} \quad \text{and} \quad b_3 \leq \max\{T_1, T_2\}.$$

We now focus our attention on Condition **(C2)**. In the remainder of this subsection we put $\chi = 1$. We have

$$u_1 b_1 + u_2 b_2 + u_3 b_3 = 0,$$

with

$$|u_1| \leq \frac{(S_1 + 1)(T_1 + 1)}{\mathcal{M} - \max\{S_1, T_1\}}, \quad |u_2| \leq \frac{(R_1 + 1)(T_1 + 1)}{\mathcal{M} - \max\{R_1, T_1\}} \quad \text{and} \quad |u_3| \leq \frac{(R_1 + 1)(S_1 + 1)}{\mathcal{M} - \max\{R_1, S_1\}}$$

where

$$\mathcal{M} = \max\{R_1 + S_1 + 1, S_1 + T_1 + 1, R_1 + T_1 + 1, \chi\mathcal{V}\}.$$

This essentially implies (notice that $R_1 \approx c_1 a_2 a_3$, $S_1 \approx c_1 a_1 a_3$, $T_1 \approx c_1 a_1 a_2$ and $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{V} \approx c_1^{3/2} a_1 a_2 a_3$)

$$|u_1| \leq \sqrt{c_1} a_1, \quad |u_2| \leq \sqrt{c_1} a_2 \quad \text{and} \quad |u_3| \leq \sqrt{c_1} a_3.$$

There are three cases according to the size of the terms a_i 's. We only consider one of them in detail here. The argument for the other two cases is identical.

Case 1: $a_1 = \min\{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$

In this case, we want to eliminate b_1 and write

$$u_1 \Lambda = u_1 b_1 \log \alpha_1 + u_1 b_2 \log \alpha_2 + u_1 b_3 \log \alpha_3 = b_2 (-u_2 \log \alpha_1 + u_1 \log \alpha_2) + b_3 (u_1 \log \alpha_3 - u_3 \log \alpha_1).$$

Applying [16] to this linear form in two logs we get

$$-\log |\Lambda| \ll (|u_1| a_2 + |u_2| a_1) (|u_1| a_3 + |u_3| a_1) \mathcal{D}^2 \log^2 B,$$

where (being somewhat pessimistic) $B = \max\{|b_1|, |b_2|, |b_3|\}$, and the implied constant is an absolute constant. Using the upper bounds for the $|u_i|$'s, we get

$$-\log |\Lambda| \ll (\sqrt{c_1} a_1 a_2) (\sqrt{c_1} a_1 a_3) \mathcal{D}^2 \log^2 B \ll a_1^2 a_2 a_3 L^{2/3} \mathcal{D}^2 \log^2 B,$$

since we have $c_1 \ll L^{2/3}$. Recalling that $L = O(\mathcal{D} \log B)$, we get

$$-\log |\Lambda| \ll a_1^2 a_2 a_3 (\mathcal{D} \log B)^{8/3},$$

where the implied constant is again absolute.

In the two remaining cases where $a_2 = \min\{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$ or $a_3 = \min\{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$, we obtain similar results. In each case we have obtained

$$-\log |\Lambda| \ll a_1 a_2 a_3 \min\{a_1, a_2, a_3\} (\mathcal{D} \log B)^{8/3},$$

where the implied constant is absolute. In particular, when $\min\{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$ is bounded above then we have

$$-\log |\Lambda| \ll a_1 a_2 a_3 (\mathcal{D} \log B)^{8/3},$$

with an implied constant depending only on $\min\{a_1, a_2, a_3\}$.

6. EXAMPLES

To demonstrate how to use our kit and the strength of the results they can provide, we give two examples here. Revisiting the linear forms in three logs that arose in [6] and [7].

These examples also provide comparison for readers to see the improvements we have made here. In both [6] and [7], the authors used earlier versions of our kit due to the first author (see Section 12 of [6] and Section 14 of [7]). In the first example [6], the authors showed that if $y^p = F_n$, then $p < 197 \times 10^6$. Here we obtain $p < 3.57 \cdot 10^6$, over 55 times smaller than the bound in [6].

We start with the following sharpening of Lemma 2.2 of [19] that we will use throughout this section. In fact, it is explicit in their proof. Roughly speaking, it removes the factor of 2^h from their result, yielding bounds very close to the actual largest solution.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $a \geq 0$, $h \geq 1$ and $b > (e^2/h)^h$ be real numbers and let $x \in \mathbb{R}$ be the largest solution of $x = a + b(\log x)^h$. Put $c = hb^{1/h}$. Then,*

$$x < \left(c \log c + \frac{\log c}{\log(c) - 1} \left(a^{1/h} + c \log \log c \right) \right)^h.$$

Proof. This is the inequality on the second-last line of the proof of Lemma 2.2 of [19]. \square

6.1. **Example 1:** $y^p = F_n$.

Theorem 6.2. *If $y^p = F_n$ has a solution for an odd prime p and $y > 1$, then*

$$(6.1) \quad p < 3.57 \cdot 10^6.$$

Proof. Following Section 13 of [6], we suppose that $y^p = F_n$. From Proposition 10.1 of [6], we have

$$(6.2) \quad \log y > 10^{20}.$$

Here we will suppose that $p > 2 \cdot 10^6$, rather than $p > 2 \cdot 10^8$ in [6]. The reason for this weaker bound on p is to demonstrate the improvements that our results provide.

Step (1): Linear form definition and upper bound

We now define the linear form in logs we will use and obtain an upper bound for it.

In Section 13 of [6], on page 1013, the authors consider

$$\Lambda = n \log(\omega) - \log \sqrt{5} - p \log(y),$$

which they rewrite as

$$\Lambda = p \log(\omega^k/y) - q \log(\omega) - \log \sqrt{5}.$$

Notice that $-\Lambda$ is in the form we consider in (3.1).

Here $\omega = (1 + \sqrt{5})/2$ and $n = kp - q$ with $0 \leq q < p$.

They also state (see the start of the proof of Proposition 11.1 on page 1000 or the start of Section 13 on page 1013) that

$$(6.3) \quad \log |\Lambda| < -2p \log(y) + 1.$$

Step (2): Matveev

In the notation of Theorem 2.1, we have $D = 2$, $\alpha_1 = \omega^k/y$, $\alpha_2 = \omega$, $\alpha_3 = \sqrt{5}$, $b_1 = p$, $b_2 = -q > -p$ and $b_3 = 1$.

Recall that $A_j \geq \max\{D h(\alpha_j), |\log \alpha_j|\}$. Thus, we can take $A_2 = \log(\omega)$ and $A_3 = \log(5)$. For A_1 , we need a little more work.

From the first expression above for Λ and (6.3), we have

$$\frac{\log \sqrt{5}}{p} - \frac{e}{py^{2p}} < \frac{n}{p} \log(\omega) - \log(y) < \frac{\log \sqrt{5}}{p} - \frac{e}{py^{2p}}.$$

Applying $n = kp - q$ and using $0 \leq q \leq p - 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \frac{\log \sqrt{5}}{p} - \frac{e}{py^{2p}} &\leq \frac{q}{p} \log(\omega) + \frac{\log \sqrt{5}}{p} - \frac{e}{py^{2p}} < k \log(\omega) - \log(y) < \frac{q}{p} \log(\omega) + \frac{\log \sqrt{5}}{p} + \frac{e}{py^{2p}} \\ &\leq \log(\omega) - \frac{1}{p} \log(\omega) + \frac{\log \sqrt{5}}{p} + \frac{e}{py^{2p}} \leq \log(\omega) + \frac{1}{3p}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$(6.4) \quad |\log(\omega^k/y)| = \log|\omega^k/y| < \log(\omega) + 10^{-6},$$

since $p > 2 \cdot 10^6$.

The conjugate of ω^k/y is $\omega^{-k}/y < 1$, so $h(\omega^k/y) = (2\log(y) + k\log(\omega) - \log(y))/2 = (k/2)\log(\omega) + (1/2)\log(y)$ (the $2\log(y)$ is because we need a factor of y^2 to clear the denominator in the minimal polynomial of ω^k/y). From (6.4), we have $k\log(\omega) < \log(\omega) + \log(y) + 10^{-6}$, so

$$(6.5) \quad h(\omega^k/y) < (1/2)\log(\omega) + \log(y) + 10^{-6}$$

and $A_1 = 2h(\alpha_1) < \log(\omega) + 2\log(y) + 2 \cdot 10^{-6}$. Thus $\max\{|b_j|A_j/A_1 : 1 \leq j \leq 3\} = p$ and we can take $B = p$.

Applying Matveev's theorem (Theorem 2.1 above) with $\chi = 1$ and the above quantities gives

$$\begin{aligned} \log|\Lambda| &> -\frac{5 \cdot 16^5}{6} \cdot e^3 \cdot 9(3e/2) \cdot (26.25 + \log(4\log(2e))) \cdot 4(\log(\omega) + 2\log(y) + 2 \cdot 10^{-6}) \cdot \log \omega \\ &\quad \cdot \log(5) \cdot \log(3ep\log(2e)) \\ &> -(7.1 \cdot 10^{10} + 2.8 \cdot 10^{10} \log(p) + 3 \cdot 10^{11} \log(y) + 1.2 \cdot 10^{11} \log(y) \log(p)). \end{aligned}$$

Combining this lower bound for $\log|\Lambda|$ with the upper bound in (6.3), and dividing by $2\log(y)$, we obtain

$$1.5 \cdot 10^{11} + 6 \cdot 10^{10} \log(p) > p,$$

using (6.2).

Applying Lemma 6.1 with $a = 1.5 \cdot 10^{11}$, $b = 6 \cdot 10^{10}$, $h = 1$ and $x = p$, so $c = hb^{1/h} = b$ and

$$(6.6) \quad p < b \log(b) + \frac{\log(b)}{\log(b) - 1} (a + b \log(\log(b))) < 1.9 \cdot 10^{12}.$$

The reason we take this step is because we first need an upper bound on p to control simultaneously the condition in (4.2) and the degenerate cases in our main theorem.

Step (3): Non-degenerate case

Here we apply Theorem 4.1 to reduce our bound on p .

So that our linear form is in the form (3.1), we set

$$\alpha_1 = \omega, \quad \alpha_2 = \sqrt{5}, \quad \alpha_3 = \omega^k/y \quad b_1 = q, \quad b_2 = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad b_3 = p$$

and in what follows (Steps (3) and (4)), put

$$\Lambda = b_1 \log \alpha_1 + b_2 \log \alpha_2 - b_3 \log \alpha_3 = q \log(\omega) + 1 \cdot \log(\sqrt{5}) - p \log(\omega^k/y).$$

This is -1 times the Λ considered above in Steps (1) and (2).

Recall that we take

$$a_i \geq \rho |\log \alpha_i| - \log |\alpha_i| + 2\mathcal{D}h(\alpha_i)$$

and here $\mathcal{D} = 2$.

We have $h(\omega) = \log(\omega)/2$, so we can take $a_1 = (\rho + 1)\log(\omega)$.

Similarly, $h(\sqrt{5}) = \log(\sqrt{5})$, so $a_2 = (\rho + 3)\log(\sqrt{5})$.

In Step 2, we saw that $\log|\alpha_3| = \log|\alpha_3|$ (recall that α_3 here was denoted by α_1 there), so $\rho|\log \alpha_3| - \log |\alpha_3| = (\rho - 1)\log |\alpha_3|$. Applying (6.4), we obtain

$$\rho|\log \alpha_3| - \log |\alpha_3| < (\rho - 1)\log \omega + (\rho - 1)10^{-6}.$$

Combining this with (6.5), we can take

$$a_3 = (\rho - 1)\log(\omega) + 2\log(\omega) + 4\log(y) + (\rho + 3)10^{-6} = (\rho + 1)\log(\omega) + 4\log(y) + (\rho + 3)10^{-6}.$$

To apply Theorem 4.1, we need to select values for all the parameters there. I.e., the positive rational integers $K, L, R, R_1, R_2, R_3, S, S_1, S_2, S_3, T, T_1, T_2$ and T_3 , along with the real numbers $t\rho$ and χ .

We use the work in Section 5 to reduce the amount of choice involved here.

From (5.1), we see that K depends on a_1, a_2, a_3, L and a real number $m \geq 1$.

From (5.2), we see that the R_i 's, S_i 's and T_i 's depend on a_1, a_2, a_3 and three positive real parameters c_1, c_2 and c_3 . Furthermore, we put $R = R_1 + R_2 + R_3 + 1$, $S = S_1 + S_2 + S_3 + 1$ and $T = T_1 + T_2 + T_3 + 1$.

From (5.3), (5.4), (5.5) and (5.6), we have values for c_1, c_2 and c_3 in terms of m, L, a_1, a_2, a_3 and χ . For our linear form, this just leaves m, L, ρ and χ as unspecified parameters.

We do a brute force search for values of χ, L, m and ρ that lead to (4.2) being satisfied and so that $KL \log(\rho)$ is as small as possible. We searched over integer values of L, m, ρ and 10χ with $5 \leq L \leq 150, 1 \leq m \leq 20, 2 \leq \rho \leq 20$ and $0.1 \leq \chi \leq 10$. In fact, we did not just check for (4.2) being satisfied and $KL \log(\rho)$ being as small as possible, we also checked the conditions in Step (4) described below too, as that made things easier for us.

This search led to the choice

$$\chi = 3.1, \quad L = 143, \quad m = 2 \quad \text{and} \quad \rho = 9.$$

We have $a = a_1$ and $a' = a_2$ and put

$$c_1 = 92.29 \dots, \quad c_2 = 54.69 \dots, \quad c_3 = 412.48 \dots$$

Using these values and the values of the R_i 's in (5.2), we get

$$R_1 = \lfloor c_1 a_2 a_3 \rfloor = \lfloor 3564.82 \log(y) \rfloor, \quad R_2 = \lfloor c_2 a_2 a_3 \rfloor = \lfloor 2112.55 \log(y) \rfloor,$$

and

$$R_3 = \lfloor c_3 a_2 a_3 \rfloor = \lfloor 15932.8 \log(y) \rfloor.$$

Further

$$S_1 = \lfloor c_1 a_1 a_3 \rfloor = \lfloor 1776.44 \log(y) \rfloor, \quad S_2 = \lfloor c_2 a_1 a_3 \rfloor = \lfloor 1052.73 \log(y) \rfloor, \quad S_3 = \lfloor c_3 a_1 a_3 \rfloor = \lfloor 7939.68 \log(y) \rfloor$$

and finally

$$T_1 = \lfloor c_1 a_1 a_2 \rfloor = 4288, \quad T_2 = \lfloor c_2 a_1 a_2 \rfloor = 2541,$$

and

$$T_3 = \lfloor c_3 a_1 a_2 \rfloor = 19,167.$$

With

$$\mathcal{V} = ((R_1 + 1)(S_1 + 1)(T_1 + 1))^{1/2},$$

we have $\chi \mathcal{V} > 510,000 \log(y)$, while $5400 \log(y) > R_1 + S_1 + 1 = \max\{R_1 + S_1 + 1, S_1 + T_1 + 1, R_1 + T_1 + 1\}$, since $\log(y) > 10^{20}$, so $\mathcal{M} = \chi \mathcal{V}$.

We have

$$K = \lfloor L m a_1 a_2 a_3 \rfloor = \lfloor 53160.35 \log(y) \rfloor.$$

With these choices, along with our lower bound for y and upper bound for n , we also find that

$$\log(b'_3 \eta_0) < \log(10806 \log(y) + 13000)n < \log \log(y) + 37.57 \quad \text{and}$$

$$\log(b''_3 \zeta_0) < \log((5385 \log(y) - 1/2)n + 13000) < \log \log(y) + 36.87.$$

Combining these estimates with Lemma 3.4(a), our expression for K and our lower bound for y again, we obtain

$$\log(b') < 55.67.$$

As seen above, these choices imply that the conditions (i)–(v) of Theorem 4.1 hold. Moreover, the above choices have been made so that condition (4.2) holds.

Thus we have

$$\log |\Lambda| \geq -KL \log \rho - \log(KL) > -1.67 \cdot 10^7 \log(y).$$

Combining this with the upper bound from (6.3), we get

$$n < 8.36 \cdot 10^6.$$

Step (4): Degenerate case

Under Condition **(C1)** of Theorem 4.1, we obtain

$$p = b_3 \leq \max\{T_1, T_2\} < 4288,$$

which is excluded since we assume $p > 2 \cdot 10^6$.

So we now consider Condition **(C2)** of Theorem 4.1, where we have

$$u_1 b_1 + u_2 b_2 + u_3 b_3 = u_1 q + u_2 + u_3 p = 0$$

with $\gcd(u_1, u_2, u_3) = 1$.

We put

$$U_1 := \frac{(S_1 + 1)(T_1 + 1)}{\mathcal{M} - \max\{S_1, T_1\}}, \quad U_2 := \frac{(R_1 + 1)(T_1 + 1)}{\mathcal{M} - \max\{R_1, T_1\}} \quad \text{and} \quad U_3 := \frac{(R_1 + 1)(S_1 + 1)}{\mathcal{M} - \max\{R_1, S_1\}}.$$

From the values of the relevant quantities in Step (3) and $\log(y) > 10^{20}$, we obtain

$$|u_1| \leq \lfloor U_1 \rfloor = 14, \quad |u_2| \leq U_2 = 30 \quad \text{and} \quad |u_3| \leq \lfloor U_3 \rfloor < 12.49 \log(y).^2$$

We will use this linear relation between the b_i 's to reduce the linear form, Λ , to one in two logarithms. We can eliminate either $b_1 = q$ or $b_2 = 1$ (trying to eliminating b_3 does not help, as $\alpha_3 = \omega^k/y$ is not a fixed number). In our Pari/GP code, we tried both and the best upper bound for p comes from eliminating $b_1 = q$ (note that $a_2 > a_1$ – this appears to be the condition for determining which term to eliminate), so we consider $u_1 \Lambda$:

$$\begin{aligned} u_1 \Lambda &= u_1 q \log(\omega) + u_1 \log(\sqrt{5}) - u_1 p \log(\omega^k/y) \\ &= -(u_2 + u_3 p) \log(\omega) + u_1 \log(\sqrt{5}) - u_1 p \log(\omega^k/y) \\ &= \log(\sqrt{5}^{u_1} \cdot \omega^{-u_2}) - p \log((\omega^k/y)^{u_1} \cdot \omega^{u_3}). \end{aligned}$$

We will use the results in [15] to obtain lower bounds for this linear form.

We put $\alpha_1 = \sqrt{5}^{u_1} \cdot \omega^{-u_2}$, $\alpha_2 = (\omega^k/y)^{u_1} \cdot \omega^{u_3}$, $b_1 = 1$ and $b_2 = p$. Laurent [15] defines his A_i 's by

$$\log A_i \geq \max\{h(\alpha_i), \log|\alpha_i|/D, 1/D\},$$

where his D is defined by $D = [\mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) : \mathbb{Q}] / [\mathbb{R}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) : \mathbb{R}]$. Here $D = 2$.

Using equations (6.4) and (6.5), along with the above upper bounds for the $|u_i|$'s and (6.2), we have

$$\log|\alpha_2| \leq |u_1| \log(\omega^k/y) + |u_3| \log(\omega) < 14 \log(\omega) + 14 \cdot 10^{-6} + 12.49 \log(y) \log(\omega) < 6.01 \log(y),$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} h(\alpha_2) &\leq |u_1| h(\omega^k/y) + |u_3| h(\omega) < 14((1/2) \log(\omega) + \log(y) + 10^{-6}) + 12.49 \log(y)(1/2) \log(\omega) \\ &< 17.01 \log(y), \end{aligned}$$

so we put $\log A_2 = 17.01 \log(y)$.

² We do not use it here in order to demonstrate how the kit can be used in general, but the reader should note that it is often possible to use specific details about their particular linear form to improve these estimates. E.g. here, we have $u_1 b_1 + u_2 b_2 + u_3 b_3 = u_1 q + u_2 p + u_3 = 0$ with $0 < q < p$. So $|u_2| < |u_1| + |u_3|/p$ and, as a consequence, we have $|u_2| \leq 12$. Using this upper bound for $|u_2|$ rather than the one stated here would reduce our upper bound for p in Theorem 6.2 by roughly a factor of 2. Similar reductions may be possible for many other problems.

Similarly,

$$\log |\alpha_1|, h(\alpha_1) \leq |u_1| \log(\sqrt{5}) + |u_2| \log(\omega) < 16.72,$$

so we put $\log A_1 = 18.49$.

We have

$$p/(2 \cdot 18.49) < b' = \frac{b_1}{D \log A_2} + \frac{b_2}{D \log A_1} = 1/(2 \cdot 17.01 \log(y)) + p/(2 \cdot 18.49).$$

So, since $p > 2 \cdot 10^6$, we have $\log(p) - 3.23 > \log(b') + 0.38 > \log(p) - 3.231 > 11.27$ and can take $m = 19.2$ in Corollary 2 of [15]. Thus

$$\log |u_1 \Lambda| \geq -19.2 (\log(p) - 3.23)^2 \cdot 17.01 \log(y) \cdot 18.49 > 96,550 (\log(p) - 3.23)^2 \log(y).$$

Combining this with the upper bound for Λ in (6.3), we get

$$-96,550 (\log(p) - 3.23)^2 \log(y) < -2p \log(y) + \log |eu_1|.$$

Dividing both sides by $2 \log(y)$, using $|u_1| \leq 14$ and again applying Lemma 6.1 with $a = \log(12e)/(2 \cdot 10^{20} \exp(3.23)) < 10^{-6}$, $b = 96,550/2/\exp(3.23)$, $h = 2$ and $x = p/\exp(3.23)$, we get $c < 87.4$ and

$$p < \exp(3.23) 560^2 < 7.93 \cdot 10^6.$$

But we also have to consider the case that we cannot eliminate b_1 . This is the case when $u_1 = 0$. We proceed in the same way as we just did, but now eliminate b_2 . Doing so gives us the upper bound $p < 8.24 \cdot 10^6$.

Combining this with the result of Step (3), we have proved that $p \leq 8.36 \times 10^6$.

Step (5): Iteration of Steps (3) and (4)

As in [6], we repeated Steps (3) and (4) a second time with the improved upper bound $p \leq 8.36 \times 10^6$.

For the second iteration, we searched over integer values of L , $10m$, ρ and 10χ with $50 \leq L \leq 120$, $1 \leq m \leq 10$, $2 \leq \rho \leq 15$ and $1 \leq \chi \leq 10$ – that is, we made the search for the m 's finer and the intervals searched smaller for all four parameters.

Similarly, for the third iteration, we searched over integer values of L , $10m$, 10ρ and 10χ . I.e., making the search for the ρ 's finer.

iteration	initial upper bound for p	L	m	ρ	χ	new upper bound for p
1	$1.9 \cdot 10^{12}$	143	2.0	9.0	3.1	$8.36 \cdot 10^6$
2	$8.36 \cdot 10^6$	90	2.3	9.0	4.4	$3.82 \cdot 10^6$
3	$3.82 \cdot 10^6$	93	2.8	7.7	4.5	$3.57 \cdot 10^6$

The third iteration gives us the upper bound for p stated in the theorem. We only do a third iteration to demonstrate that little improvement is obtained after the second iteration. \square

One could use Theorem 2 of [15] instead of Corollary 2 for handling the degenerate case. This would make the work in Step 3 more complicated, but would reduce the final upper bound for p to $2.21 \cdot 10^6$. For clarity and simplicity in our demonstration of the use of our kit we have chosen not to do so here, but for problems where this additional improvement is important, the reader should be aware that this is possible.

6.2. Example 2: $x^2 + 7 = y^p$. This is the case $D = 7$ examined in detail in Section 15 of [7]. There the authors showed that $p < 130 \cdot 10^6$.

We also take the opportunity here to correct the handling of $D = 7$ in that paper. In particular, not all of the R_i 's, S_i 's and T_i 's can be constants as stated in Section 15 of [7]. A dependence on $\log(y)$ is required. See our correct choice of these parameters in Step (3) below.

Theorem 6.3. *If $x^2 + 7 = y^p$ has a solution for a prime $p \geq 3$ with $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$, then*

$$(6.7) \quad p < 7.62 \cdot 10^6.$$

Proof. We will assume that $p > 2 \cdot 10^6$ and use the modular lower bound for y in equation (14) of [7]:

$$(6.8) \quad y \geq (\sqrt{p} - 1)^2 > 1,997,000.$$

Step (1): Linear form definition and upper bound

In Section 15 of [7], on page 56, the authors consider

$$\Lambda = 2 \log(\varepsilon_1 \overline{\alpha_0} / \alpha_0) + p \log(\varepsilon_2 \overline{\gamma_0} / \gamma_0) + iq\pi,$$

for some rational integer q with $|q| < p$, $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2 = \pm 1$, $\alpha_0 = (1 + \sqrt{-7})/2$ and γ_0 is an algebraic integer in $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-7})$ with norm y such that

$$\left(\frac{x - \sqrt{-7}}{x + \sqrt{-7}} \right)^k = (\overline{\alpha_0} / \alpha_0)^\kappa (\pm \overline{\gamma_0} / \gamma_0)^p.$$

This follows from their Lemma 13.1 and its proof since $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{-7})$ has class number 1, so $k_0 = 1$ there. As a result, their $\kappa = 2$ and $k = 1$. They assert in the proof of their Lemma 13.4 that this value of α_0 is valid.

From their Lemma 13.3, we have

$$(6.9) \quad \log |\Lambda| < -\frac{p}{2} \log(y) + \log(2.2\sqrt{7}),$$

since $D_1 = 1$ and $D_2 = 7$.

This is the case (I) linear form that they consider there.

Step (2): Matveev

In the notation of Theorem 2.1, we have $\alpha_1 = \varepsilon_2 \overline{\gamma_0} / \gamma_0$, $\alpha_2 = \varepsilon_1 \overline{\alpha_0} / \alpha_0$, $\alpha_3 = -1$, $b_1 = p$, $b_2 = 2$ and $b_3 = q$. So $D = \chi = 2$

Note that we have swapped the α_1 term with the α_2 term here with those in the case (I) linear form in [7]. This will result in A_1 being the largest of the A_i 's, Doing so lets us take $B = p$ in Theorem 2.1.

Recall that $A_j \geq \max\{D h(\alpha_j), |\log \alpha_j|\}$. Since the norm of γ is y , we have $h(\gamma) = \log(y)/2$ and since α_1 is on the unit circle, by our choice of ε_2 , we have $|\log \alpha_1| < \pi/2$. Thus, we can take $A_1 = \log(y)$, since $y > 10^6$.

Similarly, for A_2 , we have $d = 2$ by Lemma 13.1 and Table 4 of [7]. So from their Lemma 13.1, $h(\alpha_2) = \log(2)/2$. Also, $|\log \alpha_2| = 0.722734\dots$, so we can take $A_2 = 0.73$.

Lastly, we can take $A_3 = \pi$.

Applying Matveev's theorem (Theorem 2.1 above) with the above quantities gives

$$\begin{aligned} \log |\Lambda| &> -\frac{5 \cdot 16^5}{6 \cdot 2} e^3 (7 + 2 \cdot 2) (3e/2)^2 \cdot (26.25 + \log(2^2 \log(2e))) \cdot 2^2 \log(y) 0.73 \pi \log(1.5e \cdot 2p \log(2e)) \\ &> -4.2 \cdot 10^{11} \log(y) \log(13.81p). \end{aligned}$$

Combining this lower bound for $\log |\Lambda|$ with the upper bound in (6.9), and dividing by $\log(y)/2$, we obtain

$$8.4 \cdot 10^{11} \log(p) + 2.3 \cdot 10^{12} > 8.4 \cdot 10^{11} \log(13.81p) + 2 \log(2.2\sqrt{7}) / \log(y) > p,$$

using (6.8).

Applying Lemma 6.1 with $a = 2.3 \cdot 10^{12}$, $b = 8.4 \cdot 10^{11}$, $h = 1$ and $x = p$, so $c = hb^{1/h} = b$ and

$$(6.10) \quad p < b \log(b) + \frac{\log(b)}{\log(b) - 1} (a + b \log(\log(b))) < 2.9 \cdot 10^{13}.$$

Step (3): Non-degenerate case

Here we apply Theorem 4.1 to reduce our bound on n .

Recall that we take $a_i \geq \rho |\log \alpha_i| - \log |\alpha_i| + 2\mathcal{D} h(\alpha_i)$ and here $\mathcal{D} = 1$.

Using the values of $h(\alpha_i)$ and $|\log \alpha_i|$ that we found in Step (2), we can take $a_1 = \rho\pi/2 + \log(y)$, $a_2 = 0.723\rho + \log(2)$ and $a_3 = \rho\pi$.

As in the first example, to apply Theorem 4.1, we can do a brute force search for values of χ , L , m and ρ that lead to (4.2) being satisfied and so that $KL \log(\rho)$ is as small as possible. We searched over integer values of L , m , ρ and 10χ with $5 \leq L \leq 150$, $1 \leq m \leq 20$, $2 \leq \rho \leq 20$ and $0.1 \leq \chi \leq 3$. In fact, we did not just check for (4.2) being satisfied and $KL \log(\rho)$ being as small as possible, we also checked the conditions in Step (4) described below too, as that made things easier for us.

This search led to the choice

$$\chi = 2.8, \quad L = 101, \quad m = 7 \quad \text{and} \quad \rho = 5.$$

We have $a = a_2$ and $a' = a_3$ and put

$$c_1 = 157.65 \dots, \quad c_2 = 139.86 \dots, \quad c_3 = 671.58 \dots$$

Using these values and the values of the R_i 's in (5.2), we get

$$R_1 = \lfloor c_1 a_2 a_3 \rfloor = 9039, \quad R_2 = \lfloor c_2 a_2 a_3 \rfloor = 8019,$$

and

$$R_3 = \lfloor c_3 a_2 a_3 \rfloor = 38,504.$$

Further

$$S_1 = \lfloor c_1 a_1 a_3 \rfloor = \lfloor 3817.57 \log y \rfloor, \quad S_2 = \lfloor c_2 a_1 a_3 \rfloor = \lfloor 3386.83 \log y \rfloor, \quad S_3 = \lfloor c_3 a_1 a_3 \rfloor = \lfloor 16261.94 \log y \rfloor$$

and finally

$$T_1 = \lfloor c_1 a_1 a_2 \rfloor = \lfloor 887.08 \log y \rfloor, \quad T_2 = \lfloor c_2 a_1 a_2 \rfloor = \lfloor 786.99 \log y \rfloor,$$

and

$$T_3 = \lfloor c_3 a_1 a_2 \rfloor = \lfloor 3778.73 \log y \rfloor.$$

With

$$\mathcal{V} = ((R_1 + 1)(S_1 + 1)(T_1 + 1))^{1/2},$$

we have $\chi\mathcal{V} > 489,000 \log(y)$, while $4800 \log(y) > S_1 + T_1 + 1 = \max\{R_1 + S_1 + 1, S_1 + T_1 + 1, R_1 + T_1 + 1\}$, since $\log(y) > 14.5$, so $\mathcal{M} = \chi\mathcal{V}$.

We have

$$K = \lfloor L m a_1 a_2 a_3 \rfloor = \lfloor 62486 \log(y) \rfloor.$$

With these choices, along with our lower bound for y and upper bound for n , we also find that

$$\log(b'_3 \eta_0) < \log(5500 \log(y) + 27800n) < \log \log(y) + 38.56 \quad \text{and}$$

$$\log(b''_3 \zeta_0) < \log(14500 \log(y)n) < \log \log(y) + 40.58.$$

Combining these estimates with Lemma 3.4(a), our expression for K and our lower bound for x again, we obtain

$$\log(b') < 60.05.$$

As seen above, these choices imply that the conditions (i)–(v) of Theorem 4.1 hold. Moreover, the above choices have been made so that condition (4.2) holds.

Thus we have

$$\log |\Lambda| \geq -KL \log \rho - \log(KL) > -1.016 \cdot 10^7 \log(y).$$

Combining this with the upper bound from (6.3), we get

$$n < 20.32 \cdot 10^6.$$

Step (4): Degenerate case

Under Condition **(C1)** of Theorem 4.1, we obtain

$$p = b_3 \leq \max\{R_1, R_2\} < 9100,$$

which is excluded since we assume $p > 2 \cdot 10^6$.

So we now consider Condition **(C2)** of Theorem 4.1, where we have

$$u_1 b_1 + u_2 b_2 + u_3 b_3 = u_1 q + u_2 + u_3 p = 0$$

with $\gcd(u_1, u_2, u_3) = 1$.

We put

$$U_1 := \frac{(S_1 + 1)(T_1 + 1)}{\mathcal{M} - \max\{S_1, T_1\}}, \quad U_2 := \frac{(R_1 + 1)(T_1 + 1)}{\mathcal{M} - \max\{R_1, T_1\}} \quad \text{and} \quad U_3 := \frac{(R_1 + 1)(S_1 + 1)}{\mathcal{M} - \max\{R_1, S_1\}}.$$

From the values of the relevant quantities in Step (3) and $\log(y) > 10^{20}$, we obtain

$$|u_1| \leq U_1 < 6.97 \log(y), \quad |u_2| \leq \lfloor U_2 \rfloor = 16 \quad \text{and} \quad |u_3| \leq \lfloor U_3 \rfloor = 70.$$

Here we use this linear relation between the b_i 's to reduce the linear form, Λ , to one in two logarithms by eliminating b_2 (again notice that $a_3 > a_2$, so our earlier heuristic about how to choose the b_i to eliminate holds here too):

$$\begin{aligned} u_2 \Lambda &= 2u_2 \log(\varepsilon_1 \overline{\alpha_0} / \alpha_0) + u_2 p \log(\varepsilon_2 \overline{\gamma_0} / \gamma_0) + u_2 q \log(-1) \\ &= -(u_1 p + u_3 q) \log(\varepsilon_1 \overline{\alpha_0} / \alpha_0) + u_2 p \log(\varepsilon_2 \overline{\gamma_0} / \gamma_0) + u_2 q \log(-1) \\ &= p \log\left((\varepsilon_2 \overline{\gamma_0} / \gamma_0)^{u_2} \cdot (\varepsilon_1 \overline{\alpha_0} / \alpha_0)^{-u_1}\right) - q \log\left((\varepsilon_1 \overline{\alpha_0} / \alpha_0)^{u_3} \cdot (-1)^{-u_2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

So we put $\alpha_1 = (\varepsilon_2 \overline{\gamma_0} / \gamma_0)^{u_2} \cdot (\varepsilon_1 \overline{\alpha_0} / \alpha_0)^{-u_1}$, $\alpha_2 = (\varepsilon_1 \overline{\alpha_0} / \alpha_0)^{u_3} \cdot (-1)^{-u_2}$, $b_1 = p$ and $b_2 = q$ in Corollary 1 of [15]. In the same way as in Example 1, we take

$$\log A_1 = 10.42 \log(y)$$

and

$$\log A_2 = 100.86.$$

We have

$$b' = \frac{b_1}{D \log A_2} + \frac{b_2}{D \log A_1} \leq p/100.86 + |q|/(10.42 \log(y)) < 0.017p,$$

since $D = 1$, $\log(y) > 14.5$ and $p > 2 \cdot 10^6$. So $\log(b') + 0.21 < \log(p) - 3.86$. Also since $p > 2 \cdot 10^6$, we have $\log(b') + 0.21 > 10$ and can take $m = 10$ in Corollary 1 of [15]. Thus

$$\log |u_1 \Lambda| \geq -32.3 (\log(p) - 3.86)^2 \cdot 10.42 \log(y) \cdot 100.86 > -34,000 (\log(p) - 3.86)^2 \log(y).$$

Combining this with the upper bound for Λ in (6.3), we get

$$-34,000 (\log(p) - 3.86)^2 \log(y) < -2p \log(y) + \log |eu_1|.$$

Dividing both sides by $-(1/2) \log(y)$, using $|u_1| \leq 16$ and again applying Lemma 6.1 with $a = \log(16 \cdot 2.2\sqrt{7}) / (0.5 \log(1.99 \cdot 10^6) \exp(3.86)) < 0.014$, $b = 34,000 / (0.5 \exp(3.86))$, $h = 2$ and $x = p / \exp(3.86)$, we get $c = 75.71 \dots$ and

$$p < \exp(3.86) 472^2 < 10.6 \cdot 10^6.$$

Similarly, when we consider the possibility that $u_2 = 0$, we find that $p < 20.4 \cdot 10^6$.

Combining this with the result of Step (3), we have proved that $p < 20.4 \cdot 10^6$.

Step (5): Iteration of Steps (3) and (4)

As in [6], we repeated Steps (3) and (4) a second time with the improved upper bound $p \leq 20.4 \cdot 10^6$.

iteration	initial upper bound for p	L	m	ρ	χ	new upper bound for p
1	$2.9 \cdot 10^{13}$	101	7.0	5.0	2.8	$20.4 \cdot 10^6$
2	$20.4 \cdot 10^6$	60	8.1	5.0	4.3	$8.22 \cdot 10^6$
3	$8.22 \cdot 10^6$	58	10.3	4.6	4.5	$7.62 \cdot 10^6$

The third iteration gives us the upper bound for p stated in the theorem. □

REFERENCES

- [1] The PARI Group, PARI/GP version 2.14.0, Univ. Bordeaux, 2021, <http://pari.math.u-bordeaux.fr/>.
- [2] A. Baker, H. Davenport, *The equations $3x^2 - 2 = y^2$ and $8x^2 - 7 = z^2$* , Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2) **20** (1969), 129–137.
- [3] C. D. Bennett, J. Blass, A. M. W. Glass, D. B. Meronk and R. P. Steiner, *Linear forms in the logarithms of three positive rational numbers*, J. Théor. Nombres Bordeaux **9** (1997), 97–136.
- [4] Yu. Bilu and G. Hanrot, *Solving Thue Equations of High Degree*, J. Number Theory **60** (1996), 373–392.
- [5] Y. Bugeaud, *Linear Forms in Logarithms and Applications*, European Mathematical Society, Zurich, 2018.
- [6] Y. Bugeaud, M. Mignotte and S. Siksek, *Classical and modular approaches to exponential Diophantine equations I. Fibonacci and Lucas perfect powers*, Ann. Math. **163** (2006), 969–1018.
- [7] Y. Bugeaud, M. Mignotte and S. Siksek, *Classical and Modular Approaches to Exponential Diophantine Equations II. The Lebesgue–Nagell Equation*, Comp. Math. **142** (2006), 31–62.
- [8] A. Dujella, A. Pethő, *A generalization of a theorem of Baker and Davenport*, Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2) **49** (1998), 291–306.
- [9] N. Gouillon, *Un lemme de zéros*, Comptes Rendus Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I, **335** (2002), 167–170.
- [10] K. Ireland, M. Rosen, *A Classical Introduction to Modern Number Theory*, 2nd ed., Springer, New York, 1990.
- [11] M. Laurent, *Sur quelques résultats récents de transcendance*, Astérisque **198–200** (1991), 209–230.
- [12] M. Laurent, *Hauteurs de matrices d’interpolation*, Approximations diophantiennes et nombres transcendants, Luminy (1990), ed. P. Philippon, de Gruyter (1992), 215–238.
- [13] M. Laurent, *Linear forms in two logarithms and interpolation determinants*, Acta Arith. **66** (1994), 181–199.
- [14] M. Laurent, Personal communication to M. Mignotte, Nov. 2003.
- [15] M. Laurent, *Linear forms in two logarithms and interpolation determinants II*, Acta Arith. **133** (2008), 325–348.
- [16] M. Laurent, M. Mignotte and Yu. Nesterenko, *Formes linéaires en deux logarithmes et déterminants d’interpolation*, J. Number Theory **55** (1995), 285–321.
- [17] A.K. Lenstra, H.W. Lenstra Jr., L. Lovász, *Factoring polynomials with rational coefficients*, Math. Ann. **261** (1982), 515–534.
- [18] E. M. Matveev, *An explicit lower bound for a homogeneous rational linear form in logarithms of algebraic numbers. II*, Izv. Ross. Akad. Nauk Ser. Mat. **64** (2000), 125–180. English transl. in Izv. Math. **64** (2000), 1217–1269.
- [19] A. Pethő and B.M.M. de Weger, *Products of Prime Powers in Binary Recurrence Sequences Part I: The hyperbolic Case, with an Application to the generalized Ramanujan–Nagell equation*, Math. Comp. **47** (1986), 713–727.
- [20] J. B. Rosser and L. Schoenfeld, *Approximate Formulas for Some Functions of Prime Numbers*, Ill. J. Math. **6** (1962), 64–94.
- [21] N. Tzanakis and B. M. M. de Weger, *On the practical solution of the Thue equation*, J. Number Theory **31** (1989), 99–132.
- [22] M. Waldschmidt, *Diophantine Approximation on Linear Algebraic Groups*, Springer, Berlin, 2000.

APPENDIX A. A ZERO ESTIMATE BY MICHEL LAURENT

We revisit the original argument due to Masser [2], establishing zero lemmas in algebraic commutative groups. Starting with a hypersurface, his approach is based on the construction of complete intersections in successive codimensions 2, 3, \dots , using subsets of points $\Sigma_1, \Sigma_2, \dots$ as translation

operators. Compared with subsequent works, see [3] for instance, the process enables us to control efficiently the possible degeneracies at each step of the construction. We take advantage of this feature to minimize the size of the sets Σ_1 , Σ_2 and Σ_3 occurring in the following proposition.

Proposition A.1. *Let \mathbb{K} be an algebraically closed field of characteristic 0. Let K_1 , K_2 and L be non-negative integers and let Σ_1 , Σ_2 and Σ_3 be finite subsets of the group $G = \mathbb{K}^2 \times \mathbb{K}^\times$ (whose composition law is written additively). Assume that Σ_1 , Σ_2 and Σ_3 contain the origin $(0, 0, 1)$ of G and that*

$$(A-i) \quad \begin{cases} \text{Card} \{ax_1 + bx_2 : (x_1, x_2, y) \in \Sigma_1\} & > \max \{K_1, K_2\}, \quad \forall (a, b) \in \mathbb{K}^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\}, \\ \text{Card} \{y : (x_1, x_2, y) \in \Sigma_1\} & > L, \end{cases}$$

$$(A-ii) \quad \begin{cases} \text{Card} \{(ax_1 + bx_2, y) : (x_1, x_2, y) \in \Sigma_2\} & > 2 \max \{K_1, K_2\} L, \quad \forall (a, b) \in \mathbb{K}^2 \setminus \{(0, 0)\}, \\ \text{Card} \{(x_1, x_2) : (x_1, x_2, y) \in \Sigma_2\} & > 2K_1K_2, \end{cases}$$

and

$$(A-iii) \quad \text{Card} \Sigma_3 > 6K_1K_2L.$$

Let s be a non-zero polynomial of $\mathbb{K}[X_1, X_2, Y]$, whose partial degrees in the variables X_1, X_2 and Y are bounded by K_1, K_2 and L , respectively. Then s does not vanish identically on the set $\Sigma_1 + \Sigma_2 + \Sigma_3$.

Notice that a similar result has been obtained by Gouillon [1] for polynomials s of total degree in X_1 and X_2 bounded by $2 \max \{K_1, K_2\}$, with a constant 12 instead of 6 in the above main condition (A-iii) and where $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$.

A.1. Geometrical preliminaries. We embed naturally the group G in the product

$$\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{P}^1(\mathbb{K}) \times \mathbf{P}^1(\mathbb{K}) \times \mathbf{P}^1(\mathbb{K}).$$

For any closed irreducible subvarieties $V \subseteq \mathbf{P}$ of codimension $0 \leq r \leq 3$, and any triple of integers (a, b, c) with

$$a \in \{0, 1\}, b \in \{0, 1\}, c \in \{0, 1\} \text{ and } a + b + c = r,$$

we define the multidegrees $\delta_{a,b,c}(V)$ as the intersection degree

$$\delta_{a,b,c}(V) = \text{Card} \{V \cap \pi_1^{-1}(L_a) \cap \pi_2^{-1}(L_b) \cap \pi_3^{-1}(L_c)\},$$

where L_a, L_b and L_c stand for generic linear subvarieties in $\mathbf{P}^1(\mathbb{K})$ with respective dimensions a, b and c (thus $L_1 = \mathbf{P}^1(\mathbb{K})$ and L_0 is a point) and where the maps $\pi_j : \mathbf{P} \rightarrow \mathbf{P}^1(\mathbb{K})$ denote the three canonical projections. We also extend to cycles (meaning formal linear combinations with integer coefficients of closed irreducible subvarieties of codimension r in \mathbf{P}) the above definition of the multidegrees $\delta_{a,b,c}$. Let Z be a cycle of codimension $r \leq 2$ in \mathbf{P} and let $s \in \mathbb{K}[X_1, U_1; X_2, U_2; Y, V]$ be a non-zero polynomial which is homogeneous of respective degrees D_{X_1}, D_{X_2}, D_Y in each of the three pairs of variables (X_1, U_1) , (X_2, U_2) and (Y, V) . Assume that s does not vanish identically on each component of Z . Then Bezout's Theorem gives us the multidegrees of the intersection cycle $Z \cdot (s)$ of codimension $r + 1$ in \mathbf{P} . For any a, b and c as above with $a + b + c = r + 1$, we have the equalities:

$$(A-0) \quad \delta_{a,b,c}(Z \cdot (s)) = D_{X_1} \delta_{a-1,b,c}(Z) + D_{X_2} \delta_{a,b-1,c}(Z) + D_Y \delta_{a,b,c-1}(Z),$$

where the multidegrees δ appearing on the right-hand side are understood to be zero whenever the indices $a - 1$ or $b - 1$ or $c - 1$ are negative.

Now the above Bezout equalities on \mathbf{P} induce upper bounds on G in the following way. For any irreducible subvarieties $V \subseteq G$, we denote by $\delta_{a,b,c}(V)$ the corresponding multidegree $\delta_{a,b,c}(\bar{V})$ of

its Zariski closure \overline{V} in \mathbf{P} , and if Z is any cycle in G , that is to say some formal linear combination of irreducible subvarieties of G of the same codimension, we define $\delta_{a,b,c}(Z)$ by linearity.

Let s_1 , s_2 and s_3 be three non-zero polynomials of $\mathbb{K}[X_1, X_2, Y]$ with partial degrees in X_1 , X_2 and Y respectively bounded by K_1 , K_2 and L . Denote by $Z_1 = (s_1)$ the (eventually null) divisor of the zeroes of s_1 on G and assume that s_2 does not vanish identically on any component of Z_1 . Let $Z_2 = Z_1 \cdot (s_2)$ be the (eventually null) intersection cycle on G of codimension 2. Assume again that s_3 does not vanish identically on any component of Z_2 and put $Z_3 = Z_2 \cdot (s_3)$. Notice that our assumptions mean equivalently that the sequence (s_1, s_2, s_3) is a regular sequence in the local ring of any common zero of s_1 , s_2 and s_3 on G . Then the above trihomogeneous version of Bezout's theorem in equation (A-0) implies inductively the upper bounds for the multidegrees of the intersection cycles Z_1 , Z_2 and Z_3 :

$$(A-1) \quad \delta_{1,0,0}(Z_1) \leq K_1, \quad \delta_{0,1,0}(Z_1) \leq K_2, \quad \delta_{0,0,1}(Z_1) \leq L,$$

$$(A-2) \quad \delta_{1,1,0}(Z_2) \leq 2K_1K_2, \quad \delta_{0,1,1}(Z_2) \leq 2K_2L, \quad \delta_{1,0,1}(Z_2) \leq 2K_1L \quad \text{and}$$

$$(A-3) \quad \delta_{1,1,1}(Z_3) \leq 6K_1K_2L.$$

A.2. Proof of Proposition A.1. Suppose on the contrary that there exists a non-zero polynomial $s \in \mathbb{K}[X_1, X_2, Y]$ with partial degrees in X_1 , X_2 and Y bounded by K_1 , K_2 and L and vanishing on $\Sigma_1 + \Sigma_2 + \Sigma_3$. Then we plan to construct polynomials s_1 , s_2 and s_3 as in Section A.1 and vanishing moreover respectively on the subsets $\Sigma_1 + \Sigma_2 + \Sigma_3$, $\Sigma_2 + \Sigma_3$ and Σ_3 . Since

$$\delta_{1,1,1}(Z_3) \geq \text{Card } \Sigma_3,$$

the assumption (A-iii) of the proposition will contradict equation (A-3).

We start with $s_1 = s$. Notice that the cycle $Z_1 = (s_1)$ is non-zero since the points $\Sigma_1 + \Sigma_2 + \Sigma_3$ are contained in its support.

Let us construct s_2 . Observe first that for any component V of Z_1 , there exists a translated variety $g + V$, for some $g \in \Sigma_1$, which is not a component of Z_1 . Otherwise by equation (A-1), we should have the upper bounds

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Card } \{\Sigma_1/H\} \delta_{1,0,0}(V) &\leq \delta_{1,0,0}(Z_1) \leq K_1, \\ \text{Card } \{\Sigma_1/H\} \delta_{0,1,0}(V) &\leq \delta_{0,1,0}(Z_1) \leq K_2 \quad \text{and} \\ \text{Card } \{\Sigma_1/H\} \delta_{0,0,1}(V) &\leq \delta_{0,0,1}(Z_1) \leq L, \end{aligned}$$

where $H = \{g \in G : g + V = V\}$ is the stabilizer of V . Clearly H is an algebraic subgroup of G and $\dim H \leq 2$.

When $H = W \times \mathbb{K}^\times$, where W is either $\{0\}$ or a line $aX_1 + bX_2 = 0$ in \mathbb{K}^2 , at least one of the degrees $\delta_{1,0,0}(V)$ or $\delta_{0,1,0}(V)$ is positive and we get a contradiction with the first lower bound of (A-i).

When $H = W \times \mu$, with a finite multiplicative group μ , then $\delta_{0,0,1}(V) \geq \text{Card } \mu$, and we deduce from the last upper bound

$$\text{Card } \{y : (x_1, x_2, y) \in \Sigma_1\} \leq \text{Card } \{\Sigma_1/(W \times \{1\})\} \leq \text{Card } \{\Sigma_1/(W \times \{\mu\})\} \text{Card } \mu \leq L,$$

which contradicts the second lower bound of (A-i).

Therefore, for some $g \in \Sigma_1$, the translated polynomial $s_1 \circ \tau_g$ does not vanish identically on V . Now a generic linear combination s_2 of the polynomials $s_1 \circ \tau_g$, $g \in \Sigma_1$ has the required properties.

We construct s_3 in a similar way, proving first that for any component V of $Z_2 = Z_1 \cdot (s_2)$, the translated varieties $g + V$, $g \in \Sigma_2$, are not all components of Z_2 . Otherwise we should deduce from

(A-2) the upper bounds

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Card} \{ \Sigma_2/H \} \delta_{1,1,0}(V) &\leq \delta_{1,1,0}(Z_2) \leq 2K_1K_2, \\ \text{Card} \{ \Sigma_2/H \} \delta_{1,0,1}(V) &\leq \delta_{1,0,1}(Z_2) \leq 2K_1L \quad \text{and} \\ \text{Card} \{ \Sigma_2/H \} \delta_{0,1,1}(V) &\leq \delta_{0,1,1}(Z_2) \leq 2K_2L, \end{aligned}$$

where $H = \{g \in G : g+V = V\}$ is again the stabilizer of V . Now $\dim H \leq 1$. When $H = \{0\} \times \mathbb{K}^\times$, the curve V is some line $(u, v, \mathbb{K}^\times)$ and $\delta_{1,1,0}(V) = 1$. Then the first upper bound above contradicts the second lower bound of (A-ii).

Suppose now that $H = W \times \mu$, where μ is a finite multiplicative group and W is either $\{0\}$ or a line $aX_1 + bX_2 = 0$. The projection $\pi_1 \times \pi_2$ restricted to V is then a finite map on to its image in \mathbb{K}^2 of degree $\geq \text{Card } \mu$. Then at least one of the multidegrees $\delta_{1,0,1}(V)$ or $\delta_{0,1,1}(V)$ is $\geq \text{Card } \mu$. Thus we find the upper bounds

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Card} \{ (ax_1 + bx_2, y) : (x_1, x_2, y) \in \Sigma_2 \} &\leq \text{Card} \{ \Sigma_2/(W \times \{1\}) \} \\ &\leq \text{Card} \{ \Sigma_2/(W \times \{\mu\}) \} \text{Card } \mu \leq 2 \max \{ K_1, K_2 \} L, \end{aligned}$$

which contradict the first lower bound of (A-ii).

Finally, we take for s_3 a generic linear combination of the polynomials $s_1 \circ \tau_g$ and $s_2 \circ \tau_g$, for $g \in \Sigma_2$.

REFERENCES

- [1] N. Gouillon, *Un lemme de zéros*, Comptes Rendus Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I, **335** (2002), 167–170.
- [2] D. W. Masser, *On polynomials and exponential polynomials in several variables*, Invent. Math. **63** (1981), 81–95.
- [3] P. Philippon, *Lemmes de zéros dans les groupes algébriques commutatifs*, Bull. Soc. Math. France, 114 (1987), 355–383. Errata et addenda, id., 115 (1987), 397–398.

MAURICE MIGNOTTE, UNIVERSITÉ LOUIS PASTEUR, U. F. R. DE MATHÉMATIQUES, 7, RUE RENÉ DESCARTES, 67084 STRASBOURG CEDEX, FRANCE

Email address: `mignotte@math.u-strasbg.fr`

PAUL VOUTIER, LONDON, UK

Email address: `paul.voutier@gmail.com`

MICHEL LAURENT, INSTITUT DE MATHÉMATIQUES DE LUMINY, CNRS, 163 AVENUE DE LUMINY, CASE 907, 13288 MARSEILLE CÉDEX 9, FRANCE

Email address: `michel-julien.laurent@univ-amu.fr`