

On the *abc* conjecture

C. L. Stewart^{1,*} and Kunrui Yu^{2,**,***}

¹ Department of Pure Mathematics, Faculty of Mathematics, The University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario, N2L 3G1, Canada

² Institute of Mathematics, Academia Sinica, Beijing 100080, People's Republic of China

Received September 12, 1990

1 Introduction

Let x , y , and z be positive integers and define $G = G(x, y, z)$ by

$$G = G(x, y, z) = \prod_{\substack{p|xyz \\ p \text{ a prime}}} p.$$

Thus G is the greatest square-free factor of xyz . Oesterlé, motivated by a conjecture of Szpiro concerning elliptic curves (cf. Frey [2], Oesterlé [5], Szpiro [8]), asked if there exists a positive number c_1 such that for all positive integers x , y , and z with

$$(x, y, z) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad x + y = z, \quad (1)$$

$$z < G^{c_1}. \quad (2)$$

Masser [4] then conjectured, by analogy with a result of Mason [3] in the function field case, that for each positive real number ε there is a positive number $c_2(\varepsilon)$ which depends on ε only such that in place of (2) we have

$$z < c_2(\varepsilon)G^{1+\varepsilon}. \quad (3)$$

Both (2) and (3) are known as the *abc* conjecture. We refer the reader to Chap. 5 of Vojta [9] for a generalization of (3) and the statement of several related conjectures. Conjectures (2) and (3) have profound implications, in particular for the study of Diophantine equations, cf. [7].

* Research supported in part by Grant A3528 from the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada by a Killam Research Fellowship

** Member of Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, 1989–90, supported by NSF grant DMS-8610730. The second author would like to express his cordial gratitude to IAS, Princeton for the hospitality

*** Current address: School of Mathematics, Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, NJ 08540, USA

In [7] Stewart and Tijdeman proved that there exists an effectively computable constant c_3 such that for all positive integers $x, y,$ and z satisfying (1),

$$\log z < c_3 G^{1.5}.$$

The proof depends on a p -adic estimate for linear forms in the logarithms of algebraic numbers due to van der Poorten [6]. (However, see Yu [11] for a discussion of some defects in the proof of [6].) In this note we shall combine two estimates proved by Baker's method, a recent p -adic estimate for linear forms in the logarithms of algebraic numbers due to Yu [12] and an earlier Archimedean estimate due to Waldschmidt [10], to prove the following result.

Theorem. *There exists an effectively computable positive constant c such that for all positive integers $x, y,$ and z with $(x, y, z) = 1, z > 2,$ and $x + y = z,$*

$$\log z < G^{2/3 + c/\log \log G}.$$

In particular, for each $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a number $c_4(\epsilon)$ which is effectively computable in terms of ϵ such that for all positive integers $x, y,$ and z with $(x, y, z) = 1$ and $x + y = z,$

$$z < \exp(c_4(\epsilon)G^{2/3 + \epsilon}).$$

2 Preliminary lemmas

Let p be a prime number and put

$$q = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } p > 2 \\ 3 & \text{if } p = 2 \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_0 = \begin{cases} \zeta_4 & \text{if } p > 2 \\ \zeta_6 & \text{if } p = 2 \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

where $\zeta_m = e^{2\pi i/m}$ for $m = 1, 2, 3, \dots$. Put $K = \mathbb{Q}(\alpha_0)$ and let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ be non-zero algebraic integers in K with absolute values at most A_1, \dots, A_n respectively and with $A_i \geq 4$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Put $A = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} A_i$. Let b_1, \dots, b_n be rational integers with

absolute values at most $B (\geq 3)$. Let \wp be a prime ideal of the ring of algebraic integers of K lying above the prime p . For $\alpha \in K \setminus \{0\}$, write $\text{ord}_\wp \alpha$ for the exponent of \wp in the prime factorization of the fractional ideal (α) . Denote by e_\wp the ramification index of \wp and by f_\wp the residue class degree of \wp . Next put

$$\Theta = \alpha_1^{b_1} \dots \alpha_n^{b_n} - 1.$$

Lemma 1. *Suppose that $[K(\alpha_0^{1/q}, \dots, \alpha_n^{1/q}) : K] = q^{n+1}, \text{ord}_\wp \alpha_j = 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, n,$ and $\Theta \neq 0$. Then*

$$\text{ord}_\wp \Theta < (c_5 n)^n p^2 \cdot \log B \cdot \log \log A \cdot \log A_1 \cdot \dots \cdot \log A_n$$

where c_5 is an effectively computable positive number.

Proof. This follows from Corollary 2.3 of Yu [12] when $n \geq 2$ and from Lemma 1.4 of [12] when $n = 1$, on noting that K is an imaginary quadratic field and so $f_\wp \leq 2$ and $h(\alpha_j) = \log |\alpha_j|$.

Lemma 2. *If $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ are positive rational integers,*

$$[\mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1^{1/2}, \dots, \alpha_n^{1/2}) : \mathbb{Q}] = 2^n \quad \text{and} \quad b_1 \log \alpha_1 + \dots + b_n \log \alpha_n \neq 0$$

then

$$|b_1 \log \alpha_1 + \dots + b_n \log \alpha_n| > \exp(-(c_6 n)^n \log B(\log \log A)^2 \log A_1 \dots \log A_n),$$

where c_6 is an effectively computable positive number.

Proof. This follows from Proposition 3.8 of Waldschmidt [10].

Lemma 3. Let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ be prime numbers with $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \dots < \alpha_n$. Then

$$[\mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1^{1/2}, \dots, \alpha_n^{1/2}) : \mathbb{Q}] = 2^n.$$

Let $q=2$ and $\alpha_0 = \zeta_4$ or $q=3$ and $\alpha_0 = \zeta_6$ and put $K = \mathbb{Q}(\alpha_0)$. Then

$$[K(\alpha_0^{1/q}, \alpha_1^{1/q}, \dots, \alpha_n^{1/q}) : K] = q^{n+1}$$

except when $q=2$, $\alpha_0 = \zeta_4$, and $\alpha_1 = 2$ and in this case

$$[K(\alpha_0^{1/2}, (1+i)^{1/2}, \alpha_2^{1/2}, \dots, \alpha_n^{1/2}) : K] = 2^{n+1}.$$

Proof. We shall prove the result in the case when $q=2$, $\alpha_0 = \zeta_4 = i$, and $\alpha_1 = 2$. The other cases are proved in a similar fashion. For brevity we redefine α_1 to be $1+i$ for the balance of the argument. Since $K = \mathbb{Q}(\alpha_0)$ and $\alpha_0 = i$ we have $[K(\alpha_0^{1/2}) : K] = 2$. Thus it suffices to prove that for each integer j with $j=1, \dots, n$ that $[K_j(\alpha_j^{1/2}) : K_j] = 2$ where $K_j = K(\alpha_0^{1/2}, \dots, \alpha_{j-1}^{1/2})$. If for some integer j with $1 \leq j \leq n$ this is not the case then by Lemma 3 of Baker and Stark [1] we have

$$\alpha_j = \alpha_0^{k_0} \dots \alpha_{j-1}^{k_{j-1}} \gamma^2 \tag{5}$$

for some γ in K and some integers k_0, \dots, k_{j-1} with

$$0 \leq k_l < 2 \text{ for } l=0, \dots, j-1.$$

Let \wp be a prime ideal of the ring of algebraic integers of K which divides the ideal generated by α_j . Since $2(= -i(1+i)^2)$, $\alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_j$ are distinct prime numbers we deduce from (5) that

$$\text{ord}_{\wp} \alpha_j = 2 \text{ord}_{\wp} \gamma. \tag{6}$$

The only prime number which ramifies in $K = \mathbb{Q}(i)$ is 2 and thus $\text{ord}_{\wp} \alpha_j = 1$. By (6) this is a contradiction and the result follows.

Lemma 4. Let $2 = p_1, p_2, \dots$ be the sequence of prime numbers in increasing order. Then there is an effectively computable positive constant c_7 such that for every positive integer r we have

$$\prod_{j=1}^r \frac{p_j}{\log p_j} > \left(\frac{r+3}{c_7} \right)^{r+3}.$$

Proof. By the prime number theorem with error term, or indeed by the Chebyshev estimates for $\pi(x)$, there exists an effectively computable positive number c_8 for which

$$\frac{p_j}{\log p_j} > \frac{j}{c_8}.$$

We now apply the inequality $r! \geq (r/e)^r$ to conclude that

$$\prod_{j=1}^r \frac{p_j}{\log p_j} > \frac{r!}{c_8^r} \geq \left(\frac{r}{c_8 e} \right)^r > \left(\frac{r+3}{c_9} \right)^{r+3}.$$

3 Proof of main theorem

Let c_{10}, c_{11}, \dots denote effectively computable positive constants. We may suppose, without loss of generality, that $x \leq y$. Since $x + y = z$, $(x, y, z) = 1$ and $z > 2$ we see that $x < y < z$ and that $G \geq 6$. We write

$$x = g_1^{k_1} \dots g_s^{k_s}, \quad y = q_1^{l_1} \dots q_t^{l_t}, \quad z = h_1^{m_1} \dots h_u^{m_u}, \tag{7}$$

where $g_1, \dots, g_s, q_1, \dots, q_t, h_1, \dots, h_u$ are distinct prime numbers with $s \geq 0, t \geq 1$, and $u \geq 1$ and $k_1, \dots, k_s, l_1, \dots, l_t, m_1, \dots, m_u$ are positive integers. Denote the largest prime dividing x by p_x except when $x = 1$ and in that case put $p_x = 1$. Similarly denote the largest primes dividing y and z by p_y and p_z respectively. Plainly for any prime p ,

$$\max \{ \text{ord}_p x, \text{ord}_p y, \text{ord}_p z \} \leq \frac{\log z}{\log 2}. \tag{8}$$

Observe that we have

$$\log z = \sum_{p|z} (\text{ord}_p z) \log p \leq \left(\max_{p|z} \text{ord}_p z \right) \cdot \log G. \tag{9}$$

Since $(x, y, z) = 1$ and $x + y = z$ we have $(x, y) = (x, z) = (y, z) = 1$. Thus for each prime p which divides z ,

$$\text{ord}_p z = \text{ord}_p \left(\frac{z}{y} \right) = \text{ord}_p \left(\frac{x}{-y} - 1 \right) \leq \text{ord}_p \left(\left(\frac{x}{y} \right)^4 - 1 \right).$$

We now estimate

$$\text{ord}_p \left(\left(\frac{x}{y} \right)^4 - 1 \right) = \text{ord}_p (g_1^{4k_1} \dots g_s^{4k_s} q_1^{-4l_1} \dots q_t^{-4l_t} - 1)$$

for each prime p which divides z by means of Lemma 1. Put $\Theta = (x/y)^4 - 1$. If $p = 2$ we put $K = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_8)$ while if $p > 2$ we put $K = \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_4)$. Further we define q and α_0 as in (4). We then take \wp to be a prime ideal of the ring of algebraic integers of K lying above the prime p . We have

$$\text{ord}_p \Theta \leq \text{ord}_\wp \Theta$$

and we may estimate $\text{ord}_\wp \Theta$ from above by applying Lemma 1 with $n = s + t$ and $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ given by the primes $g_1, \dots, g_s, q_1, \dots, q_t$ arranged in increasing order, except in the case when $p > 2$ and $\alpha_1 = 2$, and in that case we take $\alpha_1 = 1 + i$ in place of $\alpha_1 = 2$. In this connection, note that $2^4 = (1 + i)^8$. Since $p|z$ and $(x, z) = (y, z) = 1$ we have $\text{ord}_p \alpha_i = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, s + t$. Certainly $\Theta \neq 0$ and by Lemma 3,

$$[K(\alpha_0^{1/q}, \alpha_1^{1/q}, \dots, \alpha_{s+t}^{1/q}) : K] = q^{s+t+1}.$$

Further, we may take

$$B = \max \{ 8k_1, \dots, 8k_s, 8l_1, \dots, 8l_t \}$$

hence, by (8), $B \leq 8 \log z / \log 2$. Thus by Lemma 1

$$\text{ord}_p z \leq \text{ord}_\wp \Theta < (c_{10}(s+t))^{s+t} p^2 \cdot \log \log z \cdot \log \log G \cdot \prod_{p|xy} \log p. \tag{10}$$

Similarly if $p|y$ then, by considering $\text{ord}_p((z/x)^4 - 1)$ we find that

$$\text{ord}_p y < (c_{11}(s+u))^{s+u} p^2 \cdot \log \log z \cdot \log \log G \cdot \prod_{p|xz} \log p \tag{11}$$

and if $p|x$ then by considering $\text{ord}_p(z/y)^4 - 1$ we find that

$$\text{ord}_p x < (c_{12}(t+u))^{t+u} p^2 \cdot \log \log z \cdot \log \log G \cdot \prod_{p|yz} \log p. \tag{12}$$

It follows from (9) and (10) that

$$\frac{\log z}{\log \log z} < (c_{10}(s+t))^{s+t} p_z^2 \cdot \prod_{p|xy} \log p \cdot (\log G)^2. \tag{13}$$

Since $y > z/2$ and $z \geq 3$,

$$\log y > \log z - \log 2 > \frac{\log z}{4}.$$

But (9) holds with z replaced by y and so from (11)

$$\frac{\log z}{4 \log \log z} < (c_{11}(s+u))^{s+u} p_y^2 \cdot \prod_{p|xz} \log p \cdot (\log G)^2. \tag{14}$$

Next, either $x \geq y^{1/2}$ in which case

$$\log x \geq \frac{1}{2} \log y > \frac{\log z}{8}$$

or $x < y^{1/2}$ in which case

$$\log \left(\frac{x+y}{y} \right) = \log \left(1 + \frac{x}{y} \right) < \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{y^{1/2}} \right) < \frac{1}{y^{1/2}} < \frac{\sqrt{2}}{z^{1/2}}. \tag{15}$$

In the former case we may appeal to (9), with z replaced by x , and (12) to conclude that

$$\frac{\log z}{8 \log \log z} < (c_{12}(t+u))^{t+u} p_x^2 \cdot \prod_{p|yz} \log p \cdot (\log G)^2. \tag{16}$$

In the latter case,

$$0 < \log \left(\frac{z}{y} \right) = \log \left(\frac{x+y}{y} \right) = m_1 \log h_1 + \dots + m_u \log h_u - l_1 \log q_1 - \dots - l_t \log q_t.$$

By Lemma 3 we may apply Lemma 2 to obtain a lower bound for $\log(z/y)$. Comparing this with the upper bound given by (15) we again obtain (16) with c_{12} replaced by c_{13} . Put $r = t + s + u$. From (13), (14), and (16), we deduce that

$$\left(\frac{\log z}{4 \log \log z} \right)^3 < (c_{14}r)^{2r} (p_x p_y p_z)^2 \left(\prod_{p|xyz} \log p \right)^2 (\log G)^6. \tag{17}$$

By Lemma 4,

$$\left(\frac{r}{c_{15}} \right)^r < \prod_{i=1}^{r-3} \frac{p_i}{\log p_i} < 2 \prod_{\substack{p|xyz \\ p \notin \{p_x, p_y, p_z\}}} \frac{p}{\log p},$$

with the usual convention that the empty product is 1. Thus, by (17),

$$\left(\frac{\log z}{4 \log \log z} \right)^3 < c_{16}^r G^2 (\log G)^{12}. \tag{18}$$

Again by Lemma 4 we see that

$$c_{16}^* < G^{c_{17}/\log \log G},$$

and the result now follows from (18).

References

1. Baker, A., Stark, H.M.: On a fundamental inequality in number theory. *Ann. Math.* **94**, 190–199 (1971)
2. Frey, G.: Elliptic curves and solutions of $A - B = C$. In: Goldstein, C. (ed.) *Séminaire de Théorie des Nombres Paris 1985–86*. (Prog. Math., vol. 71, pp. 39–51) Boston Basel Stuttgart: Birkhäuser 1987
3. Mason, R.C.: *Diophantine equations over function fields*. (Lond. Math. Soc. Lect. Note Ser., vol. 96). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1984
4. Masser, D.W.: Open problems. In: Chen, W.W.L. (ed.) *Proc. Symp. Analytic Number Theory*. London: Imperial College 1985
5. Oesterlé, J.: Nouvelles approches du “Théorème” de Fermat: *Séminaire Bourbaki*, 1987–88, no. 694. (Astérisque, vols. 161–162, pp. 165–186) Paris: Soc. Math. Fr. 1988
6. Van der Poorten, A.J.: Linear forms in logarithms in the p -adic case. In: Baker, A., Masser, D.W. (ed.) *Transcendence Theory: Advances and Applications*, pp. 29–57. London: Academic Press 1977
7. Stewart, C.L., Tijdeman, R.: On the Oesterlé-Masser conjecture. *Monatsh. Math.* **102**, 251–257 (1986)
8. Szpiro, L.: La conjecture de Mordell [d’après Faltings]. *Séminaire Bourbaki*, 1983–84, no. 619. (Astérisque, vols. 121–122, pp. 93–103) Paris: Soc. Math. Fr. 1985
9. Vojta, P.: *Diophantine approximations and value distribution theory*. (Lect. Notes Math., vol. 1239) Berlin Heidelberg New York: Springer 1987
10. Waldschmidt, M.: A lower bound for linear forms in logarithms. *Acta Arith.* **37**, 257–283 (1980)
11. Yu, Kunrui: Linear forms in p -adic logarithms. *Acta Arith.* **53**, 107–186 (1989)
12. Yu, Kunrui: Linear forms in p -adic logarithms. II. *Compos. Math.* **74**, 15–113 (1990)