

COMPOSITIO MATHEMATICA

JULIA MUELLER

WOLFGANG M. SCHMIDT

The generalized thue inequality

Compositio Mathematica, tome 96, n° 3 (1995), p. 331-344

http://www.numdam.org/item?id=CM_1995__96_3_331_0

© Foundation Compositio Mathematica, 1995, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Compositio Mathematica » (<http://http://www.compositio.nl/>) implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (<http://www.numdam.org/conditions>). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

NUMDAM

Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme
Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques

<http://www.numdam.org/>

The generalized Thue inequality

JULIA MUELLER¹ and WOLFGANG M. SCHMIDT^{2*}

¹Fordham University, Bronx, New York

²University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado

Received: 17 December 1993; accepted in final form 11 May 1994

Abstract. Let $F(\underline{x}) = F(x, y)$ be a form in $\mathbb{Z}[x, y]$ of degree $r \geq 3$ and without multiple factors. A generalization of the classical Thue inequality $|F(\underline{x})| \leq h$ is the inequality $|F(\underline{x})| \leq h|\underline{x}|^\gamma$ where $|\underline{x}|$ is the maximum norm. When $\gamma < r - 2$ this inequality has only finitely many solutions in integers. The present paper deals with upper bounds for the number of such solutions.

1. Introduction

As is well known, a *Thue equation*

$$F(x, y) = h$$

has only finitely many solutions in integers. Here F is a form of degree $r \geq 3$ with coefficients in \mathbb{Z} and without multiple factors, and $h \in \mathbb{Z}$. Upper bounds $B_1(r, h)$ for the number of solutions which depend only on r and h but are independent of the coefficients of F were given by Evertse [2] and then by Bombieri and Schmidt [1]. Clearly the *Thue inequality*

$$|F(x, y)| \leq h \tag{1.1}$$

also has only finitely many solutions. Upper bounds $B_2(r, h)$ for the number of solutions were given by Schmidt [7] and by Thunder [9], [10]. It is an immediate consequence of Roth's Theorem that a *generalized Thue inequality*

$$|F(x, y)| \leq h|\underline{x}|^\gamma \tag{1.2}$$

where $|\underline{x}| = \max(|x|, |y|)$ and where $\gamma < r - 2$, has only finitely many solutions. The obvious question whether there is a bound $B_3(r, \gamma, h)$ for the number of solutions of (1.2) has a negative answer, as may be seen as follows.

Given two forms F, G as above, write $F \sim G$ if there is a transformation $T \in \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$ with $F(\underline{x}) = G(T\underline{x})$; here we use the notation $\underline{x} = (x, y)$. We will show that given $\gamma > 0$ and given a form G there is a constant $c_1(G, \gamma) > 0$ and there are infinitely many forms $F \sim G$ such that the inequality $|F(\underline{x})| \leq |\underline{x}|^\gamma$

* Partially supported by NSF grant DMS-9108581.

has at least $c_1(G, \gamma)H(F)^{2\gamma/r^2}$ primitive solutions. Here a pair (x, y) is called *primitive* if $\gcd(x, y) = 1$, and $H(F)$ is the maximum modulus of the coefficients of F .

For natural k let T be the map $(x, y) \mapsto (X, Y)$ with $X = kx + y$, $Y = (k - 1)x + y$, and set $F(\underline{X}) = G(T^{-1}\underline{X})$. Then $F \sim G$ and $H(F) \ll_G k^r$, with the implicit constant in \ll depending only on G . We have $|G(\underline{x})| \ll_G |\underline{x}|^r$ for $\underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2$, and therefore when k is large, the inequality $|G(\underline{x})| \leq k^\gamma$ will have $\gg_{G,\gamma} k^{2\gamma/r}$ integer solutions \underline{x} . In fact it will have $\gg_{G,\gamma} k^{2\gamma/r}$ primitive solutions with $xy > 0$, and these solutions will have $|G(\underline{x})| \leq |kx + y|^\gamma$. When \underline{x} is such a solution and $\underline{X} = T\underline{x}$, then \underline{X} is again primitive and $|F(\underline{X})| = |G(\underline{x})| \leq |kx + y|^\gamma = |\underline{X}|^\gamma$. Thus $|F(\underline{X})| \leq |\underline{X}|^\gamma$ has $\gg_{G,\gamma} k^{2\gamma/r} \gg_{G,\gamma} H(F)^{2\gamma/r^2}$ primitive solutions.

Now suppose that F is a form of degree r with $s + 1$ nonzero coefficients in \mathbb{Z} :

$$F(x, y) = \sum_{i=0}^s a_i x^{r_i} y^{r-r_i}, \tag{1.3}$$

where $0 = r_0 < r_1 < \dots < r_s = r$. We will not need to assume that F has no multiple factors. As we saw in [6], new methods can be used for the Thue inequality when F is ‘‘sparse,’’ i.e., when $r > 2s$. It turns out that the analogous condition $r - \gamma > 2s$ works for the generalized Thue inequality. In what follows, set

$$\rho = r - \gamma. \tag{1.4}$$

THEOREM. *Let F be of the type (1.3), ρ a number with*

$$2s < \rho \leq r, \tag{1.5}$$

and $\gamma = r - \rho$. Then the number of primitive solutions of the generalized Thue inequality (1.2) is

$$\leq c_2(r, \rho)h^\kappa,$$

where

$$\kappa = \max(2/\rho, 1/(\rho - 2s)). \tag{1.6}$$

When $4s \leq \rho \leq r$, the number of primitive solutions is

$$\ll c_3(r, s, \rho)h^{2/\rho}$$

with an absolute constant in \ll and

$$c_3(r, s, \rho) = s^{1+(r/\rho)} \exp(\rho^{-1}(12r + 4rs\rho^{-1} \log s + 3200s \log^3 r)).$$

In particular when $\rho \geq s \log s$, $r \geq s \log^3 s$, then $s \log^3 r \ll r$ and $c_3 \leq s(c_4s)^{r/\rho}$ with an absolute constant c_4 , so that the number of primitive solutions is $\ll s(c_4s)^{r/\rho}h^{2/\rho}$. When $\rho = r$, we recover the bound $\ll s^2h^{2/r}$ of [6, below (1.9)], at least for primitive solutions. A special case of (1.2) is

$$|ax^r - by^r| \leq h|\underline{x}|^{r-\rho}.$$

The number of primitive solutions, assuming $4 \leq \rho \leq r$, is $\leq c_4^{r/\rho}h^{2/\rho}$.

Note that we have to restrict ourselves to primitive solutions. For there certainly are forms F for which the Thue equation $F(\underline{x}) = 1$ has a solution \underline{x}_0 with $|\underline{x}_0|$ arbitrarily large. Then $\underline{x} = t\underline{x}_0$ will have $|F(\underline{x})| \leq |\underline{x}|^\gamma$ precisely when $|t|^r \leq |\underline{x}_0|^\gamma|t|^\gamma$, i.e., when $|t|^\rho \leq |\underline{x}_0|^\gamma$. The number of choices for t cannot be bounded in terms of r, s, ρ .

Let $f(x, y)$ be a polynomial of total degree $\gamma < r - 2s$. Suppose f has coefficients of modulus $\leq M$. The diophantine equation

$$F(x, y) = f(x, y) \tag{1.7}$$

yields (1.2) with $h = \binom{\gamma + 2}{2} M$. When $\underline{x} = t\underline{x}_0$ with x_0 primitive, then also \underline{x}_0 satisfies (1.2), so that the number of possibilities for \underline{x}_0 is estimated by our Theorem. Once \underline{x}_0 is fixed, (1.7) gives an algebraic equation for t of degree r , hence with at most r solutions t . Hence the number of solutions of (1.7) is

$$\leq c_5(r)M^\kappa,$$

with κ given by (1.6). Again, under suitable conditions on r, s, ρ , good explicit bounds may be given.

Mahler [4] gave an asymptotic formula for the number $N_F(h)$ of solutions of the Thue inequality (1.1). He established that $N_F(h) \sim A_F h^{2/r}$ as $h \rightarrow \infty$, where A_F is the area of the region of $\underline{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2$ with $|F(\underline{x})| \leq 1$. We expect that for $0 \leq \gamma < r - 2$ there is an analogous formula for the number $N_{F,\gamma}(h)$ of solutions of the generalized Thue inequality (1.2):

$$N_{F,\gamma}(h) \sim A_{F,\gamma} h^{2/\rho} \quad \text{as } h \rightarrow \infty,$$

where $A_{F,\gamma}$ is the area of the plane region $|F(\underline{x})| \leq |\underline{x}|^\gamma$. This should hold generally, i.e., for forms F not necessarily of the sparse type (1.3); but good error estimates are more likely for sparse forms.

2. The Plan of the Paper

We will follow [6] very closely – our task will be to show that the method developed in that paper for Thue inequalities extends to generalized Thue inequalities.

The Mahler height of a form

$$F(x, y) = a_0(x - \alpha_1 y) \dots (x - \alpha_r y) \tag{2.1}$$

is

$$M(F) = |a_0| \prod_{i=1}^r \max(1, |\alpha_i|).$$

It has the properties that $M(F(x, y)) = M(F(y, x))$, and $M(FG) = M(F)M(G)$. The Mahler height $M(\alpha)$ of an algebraic number α is the height of its homogenized defining polynomial (chosen to have coprime coefficients in \mathbb{Z}). If F as above has coefficients in \mathbb{Z} , each $M(\alpha_i) \leq M(F)$.

Set

$$R = e^{800 \log^3 r}, \tag{2.2}$$

$$C = (2r^{1/2}M(F))^r h R, \tag{2.3}$$

$$Y_L = C^{2/(\rho-2)}, \quad Y_S = Y_0^{1/(\rho-2s)}, \tag{2.4}$$

with

$$Y_0 = (e^6 s)^r R^{2s} h. \tag{2.5}$$

Then

$$Y_S^\rho > Y_0 > (rs)^{2s} (4e^3 s)^r h \tag{2.6}$$

since $R > rs$.

We will distinguish *large*, *medium* and *small* solutions to (1.2). Writing $\underline{x} = (x, y)$, $|\underline{x}| = \max(|x|, |y|)$, $\langle \underline{x} \rangle = \min(|x|, |y|)$, a solution will be called

- large* if $|\underline{x}| > Y_L$,
- medium* if $|\underline{x}| \leq Y_L$ and $\langle \underline{x} \rangle \geq Y_S$,
- small* if $\langle \underline{x} \rangle < Y_S$.

PROPOSITION 1. *The number of primitive large solutions is $\leq c_6(s, r, \rho)$. When $\rho \geq 4$, this number is*

$$\ll s \left(\frac{\log r}{\log \rho} \right)^2 \left(1 + \frac{\log \log r}{\log \rho} \right). \tag{2.7}$$

PROPOSITION 2. *The number of primitive medium solutions is*

$$\ll \frac{s^2 r^2}{\rho(\rho - 2)}(1 + r^{-2} \log h). \tag{2.8}$$

PROPOSITION 3. *The number of small solutions is $\leq c_7(s, r, \rho)h^\kappa$ with κ given by (1.6). When $\rho \geq 4s$, the number of small solutions is $\ll c_3 h^{2/\rho}$ with $c_3 = c_3(r, s, \rho)$ as in the Theorem.*

The Theorem follows from these propositions since the bound (2.7) is

$$\ll s(\log r / \log \rho)^3 \ll s \exp(\rho^{-1}r),$$

and the bound in (2.8) is

$$\ll s^2(r/\rho)^2 h^{2/\rho} \ll s^2 \exp(\rho^{-1}r) h^{2/\rho}.$$

3. Large Solutions

LEMMA 1. *For every $\underline{x} = (x, y)$ with (1.2) and $y \neq 0$ there is an α_i (as given in (2.1)) with*

$$\min \left(1, \left| \alpha_i - \frac{x}{y} \right| \right) \leq (2^{r/2} M(F))^r h |\underline{x}|^{-\rho}.$$

Proof. This lemma corresponds to Lemma 4 of [6] and the proof is the same. In fact one just has to recall (1.4) and to substitute in Lemma 1 of [1], which essentially is already in Lewis and Mahler [3].

LEMMA 2. *There is a subset S of the set $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r\}$ of cardinality $|S| \leq 6s + 4$ such that for every \underline{x} with (1.2) and $y \neq 0$ there is an $\alpha_i \in S$ with*

$$\min \left(1, \left| \alpha_i - \frac{x}{y} \right| \right) \leq C |\underline{x}|^{-\rho}. \tag{3.1}$$

Proof. This corresponds to Lemma 8 of [6] and is deduced in exactly the same way.

Now if $|\underline{x}| \geq Y_L$, say $y \geq Y_L$, we have from (2.4) that the minimum in (3.1) is $< y^{-(\rho+2)/2}$, and therefore

$$\left| \alpha_i - \frac{x}{y} \right| < y^{-(\rho+2)/2}.$$

Observe that $y \geq Y_L = C^{2/(\rho-2)} > M(F)^{2r/(\rho-2)} \geq M(F) \geq M(\alpha_i)$. But in [8] it was pointed out that the number of solutions of $\left| \alpha_i - \frac{x}{y} \right| < y^{-\rho}$ with $y > M(\alpha_i)$

is $\leq c_8(r, \rho)$, and when $\rho \geq 3$, it is in fact $\ll (\log r / \log \rho)^2(1 + \log \log r / \log \rho)$. If we apply this with $(\rho + 2)/2$ in place of ρ and note that $\log((\rho + 2)/2) \gg \log \rho$, we see that for fixed α_i our number of solutions is under an analogous bound. After multiplication by $|S| \ll s$ we obtain the estimates of Proposition 1.

4. Medium Solutions

Given (1.3), let P_i for $0 \leq i \leq s$ be the point in the plane with coordinates $(r_i, -\log |a_i|)$. In [6] we defined the Newton Polygon to be the “lower boundary” of the convex hull of P_0, \dots, P_s , and denoted its vertices by $P_{i(0)}, P_{i(1)}, \dots, P_{i(\ell)}$; here $1 \leq \ell \leq s$. Also $\sigma(i, j)$ for $i \neq j$ was the slope of the segment $P_i P_j$. Further for $0 < j \leq \ell$ we set $\sigma(i(j)) = \sigma(i(j - 1), i(j))$ and for $0 \leq j < \ell$ we set $\sigma^+(i(j)) = \sigma(i(j), i(j + 1))$, so that $\sigma(i(j)), \sigma^+(i(j))$ are the slopes of the segments of the Newton polygon to the left and to the right of $P_{i(j)}$. For each root α of $f(x) = F(x, 1)$ we defined integers $k(\alpha), K(\alpha)$ having $0 \leq k(\alpha) < K(\alpha) \leq \ell$. Also, $H = H(f)$ was the maximum modulus of the coefficients a_i , and q an integer with $|a_q| = H$.

LEMMA 3. *Suppose (1.2) holds with $|x| \leq |y|$, $y \neq 0$. Let α be a root of $f(x)$ with*

$$|x - \alpha y| = \min_{1 \leq j \leq r} |x - \alpha_j y|. \tag{4.1}$$

Suppose that $q < i(K)$ where $K = K(\alpha)$. Then there is a u , $1 \leq u \leq i(K)$, with

$$\left| \alpha - \frac{x}{y} \right| < \frac{1}{H^{(1/u)-(1/r)}} \left(\frac{(rs)^{2s}(2e^3s)^r h}{|y|^\rho} \right)^{1/u}. \tag{4.2}$$

Proof. Our lemma corresponds to Lemma 15 in [6]. The only difference in the proof is that in Lemma 10 of [6], h is to be replaced by $h|x|^\gamma = h|y|^\gamma = h|y|^{r-\rho}$, and therefore the conclusion of that Lemma is true with $|y|^\rho$ in place of $|y|^r$.

LEMMA 4. *Suppose (1.2) holds with $|x| \leq |y|$ and*

$$|y|^\rho \geq 2^r(rs)^{2s}h. \tag{4.3}$$

Let α be a root of $f(x)$ with (4.1). Suppose that $i(k) < q$ where $k = k(\alpha)$. Then there is a v , $1 \leq v \leq s - i(k)$, with

$$\left| \alpha^{-1} - \frac{y}{x} \right| < \frac{1}{H^{(\rho/rv)-(1/r)}} \left(\frac{(rs)^{2s}(4e^3s)^r h}{|x|^\rho} \right)^{1/v}. \tag{4.4}$$

Proof. The lemma corresponds to Lemma 16 of [6]. In analogy to (8.8) of that paper we now have

$$\left| \alpha - \frac{x}{y} \right| < \left(\frac{2^r(rs)^{2s}h}{\Delta^*|y|^\rho} \right)^{1/v}$$

with

$$\Delta^* = \Delta^*(\alpha, v) = |a_{i(k)}||\alpha|^{r_{i(k)}-v}.$$

As in [6] we have $\log(|\alpha|^v \Delta^*(\alpha, v)) > 0$, so that

$$\left| \alpha - \frac{x}{y} \right| < |\alpha| \left(\frac{2^r(rs)^{2s}h}{|y|^\rho} \right)^{1/v} \leq |\alpha|$$

by (4.3), and therefore $|x| < 2|\alpha y|$. We may infer that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \alpha^{-1} - \frac{y}{x} \right| &= \left| \frac{y}{\alpha x} \right| \left| \alpha - \frac{x}{y} \right| < \left(\frac{2^r(rs)^{2s}h}{\Delta^*|\alpha^v y^{\rho-v} x^v} \right)^{1/v} \\ &< \left(\frac{4^r(rs)^{2s}h}{|a_{i(k)}||\alpha|^{-(\rho-v-r_{i(k)})}|x|^\rho} \right)^{1/v} \\ &= \left(\frac{4^r(rs)^{2s}h}{\Gamma(\alpha, v)|x|^\rho} \right)^{1/v} \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

with

$$\Gamma(\alpha, v) = |a_{i(k)}||\alpha|^{-(\rho-v-r_{i(k)})},$$

so that

$$\log \Gamma(\alpha, v) = -(\rho - v - r_{i(k)}) \log |\alpha| + \log |a_{i(k)}|. \tag{4.6}$$

Case 1. $\rho - v - r_{i(k)} \geq 0$. We proceed as in [6]. The number $k = k(\alpha)$ has $\sigma^+(i(k)) > \log |\alpha| - \log(e^3 s)$, and on the other hand $\sigma(i(k), q) \geq \sigma^+(i(k))$ by $q > i(k)$ and by convexity considerations. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \log \Gamma(\alpha, v) &\geq -(\rho - v - r_{i(k)})\sigma(i(k), q) + \log |a_{i(k)}| - r \log(e^3 s) \\ &= -(\rho - v - r_q)\sigma(i(k), q) + \log |a_q| - r \log(e^3 s), \end{aligned}$$

for clearly $\sigma(i(k), q) = (\log |a_q| - \log |a_{i(k)}|)/(r_{i(k)} - r_q)$. When $\rho - v - r_q \geq 0$, we observe that $\sigma(i(k), q) \leq 0$ by the choice of q and that

$$\log \Gamma(\alpha, v) \geq \log |a_q| - r \log(e^3 s). \tag{4.7}$$

When $\rho - v - r_q < 0$, we observe that $\sigma(i(k), q) \geq \sigma(0, q)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \log \Gamma(\alpha, v) &\geq -(\rho - v - r_q)\sigma(0, q) + \log |a_q| - r \log(e^3 s) \\ &= (\rho - v - r_q)((\log |a_q| - \log |a_0|)/r_q) \\ &\quad + \log |a_q| - r \log(e^3 s) \\ &\geq ((\rho - v)/r_q) \log |a_q| - r \log(e^3 s). \end{aligned}$$

Since by hypothesis $\rho > 2s > v$, we obtain

$$\log \Gamma(\alpha, v) \geq ((\rho - v)/r) \log |a_q| - r \log(e^3 s). \quad (4.8)$$

By (4.7) this holds always in Case 1, and therefore

$$\Gamma(\alpha, v) \geq (e^3 s)^{-r} H^{(\rho-v)/r},$$

which in conjunction with (4.5) yields (4.4).

Case 2. $\rho - v - r_{i(k)} < 0$. Then $i(k) > 0$, since $v \leq s < \rho$. We claim that

$$\sigma^+(i(k)) < \log |\alpha| + \log(e^3 s). \quad (4.9)$$

This is certainly true if $\sigma(s) = \sigma(i(\ell)) < \log |\alpha| + \log(e^3 s)$, and otherwise $K = K(\alpha)$ was smallest with $\sigma^+(i(K)) \geq \log |\alpha| + \log(e^3 s)$ (see [6, Sect. 6]). But $k < K$, so that indeed (4.9) holds. Now (4.6) gives

$$\log \Gamma(\alpha, v) > -(\rho - v - r_{i(k)})(\sigma^+(i(k)) - \log(e^3 s)) + \log |a_{i(k)}|.$$

But

$$\sigma^+(i(k)) \geq \sigma(0, i(k)) = (\log |a_0| - \log |a_{i(k)}|)/r_{i(k)} \geq -\log |a_{i(k)}|/r_{i(k)}.$$

Thus

$$\log \Gamma(\alpha, v) > ((\rho - v)/r_{i(k)}) \log |a_{i(k)}| - r \log(e^3 s). \quad (4.10)$$

We observe that $0 < i(k) < q$, therefore $\sigma(0, i(k)) < \sigma(0, q)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} r_{i(k)}^{-1} \log |a_{i(k)}| &= r_{i(k)}^{-1} \log |a_0| - \sigma(0, i(k)) > r_q^{-1} \log |a_0| - \sigma(0, q) \\ &= r_q^{-1} \log |a_q| \geq r^{-1} \log |a_q|, \end{aligned}$$

which together with (4.10) gives (4.8) again, and therefore (4.4).

Now if

$$Y_S \leq |x| \leq |y|, \quad (4.11)$$

we have (4.3) by (2.6), and since either $q < i(K)$ or $q > i(k)$ will certainly hold, the conclusion of Lemma 3 or Lemma 4 will hold. Moreover, the right hand sides of (4.2), (4.4) will increase in u resp. v , so that we may replace u, v by s . Combining this with Lemma 7 of [6] we obtain the following lemma, which corresponds to Lemma 17 of [6].

LEMMA 5. *There is a set S of roots of $F(x, 1)$ and a set S^* of roots of $F(1, y)$, both of cardinality $\leq 6s + 4$, such that every solution of (1.2) with (4.11) either has*

$$\left| \alpha - \frac{x}{y} \right| < \frac{R}{H^{(1/s)-(1/r)}} \left(\frac{(rs)^{2s}(4e^3s)^r h}{|y|^\rho} \right)^{1/s} \tag{4.12}$$

for some $\alpha \in S$, or has

$$\left| \alpha^* - \frac{y}{x} \right| < \frac{R}{H^{(\rho/rs)-(1/r)}} \left(\frac{(rs)^{2s}(4e^3s)^r h}{|x|^\rho} \right)^{1/s} \tag{4.13}$$

for some $\alpha^* \in S^*$.

The medium solutions to (1.2) were those with $Y_S \leq \langle \underline{x} \rangle, |\underline{x}| \leq Y_L$. Without loss of generality we may restrict ourselves to solutions with

$$Y_S \leq |x| \leq |y| \leq Y_L.$$

We will estimate such solutions with (4.13) (the case (4.12) being easier since the exponent of H is better). We have

$$\left| \alpha^* - \frac{y}{x} \right| < K/(2|x|^{\rho/s}) \tag{4.14}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} K &= 2R(rs)^2(4e^3s)^{r/s}h^{1/s}H^{(1/r)-(\rho/rs)} \\ &< R^2(e^5s)^{r/s}h^{1/s}H^{-\rho/2rs} \end{aligned} \tag{4.15}$$

by (2.2) and since $\rho > 2s$. Let $y_0/x_0, \dots, y_\nu/x_\nu$ be the solutions of (4.14) with $Y_S \leq x \leq Y_L$, ordered such that $x_0 \leq \dots \leq x_\nu$. Then for $0 \leq i < \nu$,

$$\frac{1}{x_i x_{i+1}} \leq \left| \alpha^* - \frac{y_i}{x_i} \right| + \left| \alpha^* - \frac{y_{i+1}}{x_{i+1}} \right| < \frac{1}{2}K(x_i^{-\rho/s} + x_{i+1}^{-\rho/s}) \leq Kx_i^{-\rho/s},$$

so that we have the ‘‘gap principle’’

$$x_{i+1} > K^{-1}x_i^{(\rho/s)-1} \geq K^{-1}Y_S^{(\rho/s)-2}x_i = K^{-1}Y_0^{1/s}x_i > e^{r/s}H^{\rho/2rs}x_i$$

by (2.4), (2.5), (4.15). Therefore

$$x_\nu > (e^{r/s} H^{\rho/2rs})^\nu,$$

$$\log x_\nu > \nu((\rho/2rs) \log H + (r/s)) > (\nu\rho/2rs)(\log H + r). \tag{4.16}$$

On the other hand, by the definitions (2.2), (2.3), (2.4) of R, C, Y_L , we get

$$\log Y_L = 2(\rho - 2)^{-1} \log C \ll (\rho - 2)^{-1}(r \log M(F) + r \log r + \log h).$$

But $M(F) \leq (r + 1)H$ according to Mahler [5], so that we obtain

$$\log Y_L \ll r(\rho - 2)^{-1}(\log H + \log r + \log h^{1/r}).$$

The same upper bound holds for $\log x_\nu$. Comparison with (4.16) yields

$$\nu \ll r^2 s \rho^{-1} (\rho - 2)^{-1} (1 + r^{-1} \log h^{1/r}).$$

Taking account of the summation over $\alpha^* \in S^*$ we obtain Proposition 2.

5. Small Solutions

LEMMA 6. *Let $p(y) = A_s y^{r_s} + \dots + A_1 y^{r_1} + A_0$ be a polynomial with real coefficients with $r = r_s > \dots > r_1 > r_0 = 0$ and with $|A_s| \geq 1$. Let $h > 0$ and $0 \leq \gamma < r - s, \rho = r - \gamma$ as in (1.4). Then the real numbers y with*

$$|p(y)| \leq h|y|^\gamma \tag{5.1}$$

make up a set of measure

$$\mu < 18(rs^2(\gamma + 1))^{s/\rho} h^{1/\rho}. \tag{5.2}$$

Given $x \geq 1$, the numbers y with (5.1) and $|y| > x$ make up a set of measure

$$\mu < 18(\gamma + 1)rs^2 h^{1/s} x^{1-(\rho/s)}. \tag{5.3}$$

This lemma corresponds to Lemma 19 of [6], but the role of the variables has been interchanged.

Proof. Define

$$p_i(y) = \sum_{j=i}^s (r_j - r_0)(r_j - r_1) \dots (r_j - r_{i-1}) A_j y^{r_j - r_i}, \quad (0 \leq i \leq s).$$

Then $p_0(y) = p(y)$,

$$p'_i(y) = p_{i+1}(y)y^{r_{i+1} - r_i - 1}, \quad (0 \leq i < s). \tag{5.4}$$

We now introduce a new parameter Z . We will initially concentrate on numbers y with

$$|y| \geq Z. \tag{5.5}$$

Set

$$g(y) = p'(y) - hs^2|y|^\gamma/Z. \tag{5.6}$$

Then $g(y)$ restricted to $y > 0$ (or to $y < 0$) is a polynomial of degree $r - 1$ if $\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}$, and in general is a linear combination of powers of y (or of $-y$), the highest power of y occurring being y^{r-1} . In fact it is a sum of at most $s + 1$ powers, therefore has at most $2s + 1$ real zeros. The same is true if the $-$ sign in (5.6) is replaced by $+$. Therefore there are at most $4s + 2$ real numbers y with $|p'(y)| = hs^2|y|^\gamma/Z$. The real numbers y with (5.5) and $|p'(y)| > hs^2|y|^\gamma/Z$ make up at most $4s + 4 \leq 8s$ intervals and half-lines. If y_1, y_2 with (5.1) lie in such an interval, we have on the one hand

$$|p(y_2) - p(y_1)| < h(|y_1|^\gamma + |y_2|^\gamma).$$

On the other hand, if, say, $0 < y_1 < y_2$, then

$$\begin{aligned} |p(y_2) - p(y_1)| &= \left| \int_{y_1}^{y_2} p'(y) \, dy \right| > hs^2Z^{-1} \int_{y_1}^{y_2} y^\gamma \, dy \\ &= hs^2(\gamma + 1)^{-1}Z^{-1}(y_2^{\gamma+1} - y_1^{\gamma+1}) \\ &> hs^2(\gamma + 1)^{-1}Z^{-1}(y_2 - y_1)y_2^\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore $y_2 - y_1 < 2(\gamma + 1)s^{-2}Z$, so that our interval is of length $< 2(\gamma + 1)s^{-2}Z$. Thus if we neglect a set of measure $< 16(\gamma + 1)s^{-1}Z$, we may concentrate on numbers y with $|p'(y)| \leq hs^2|y|^\gamma/Z$, i.e., with

$$|p_1(y)y^{r_1-1}| \leq hs^2|y|^\gamma/Z. \tag{5.7}$$

We now repeat the argument with hs^2/Z in place of h and $q(y) = p_1(y)y^{r_1-1}$ in place of $p(y)$. If we neglect a further set of measure $< 16(\gamma + 1)s^{-1}Z$, we may suppose that $|q'(y)| \leq hs^4|y|^\gamma/Z^2$. Now $q'(y) = p_1'(y)y^{r_1-1} + (r_1 - 1)p_1(y)y^{r_1-2}$. The second summand here is of modulus $\leq (r_1 - 1)hs^2|y|^\gamma/Z^2$ by (5.5), (5.7), so that we obtain $|p_1'(y)y^{r_1-1}| \leq r_1hs^4|y|^\gamma/Z^2$, whence by (5.4),

$$|p_2(y)y^{r_2-2}| \leq r_1s^4h|y|^\gamma/Z^2.$$

We now deal with this in a manner analogous to (5.7). We have to replace p_1, r_1, h by $p_2, r_2 - 1, r_1s^2h/Z$. So if we neglect a further set of measure $< 16(\gamma + 1)s^{-1}Z$, we may suppose that

$$|p_3(y)y^{r_3-3}| \leq r_1(r_2 - 1)s^6h|y|^\gamma/Z^3.$$

And so on. The conclusion is that except for a set of measure $\leq s \cdot 16(\gamma + 1)s^{-1}Z = 16(\gamma + 1)Z$, the numbers y with (5.1), (5.5) have

$$|p_i(y)y^{r_i-i}| \leq r_1 \dots r_{i-1} s^{2i} h |y|^\gamma / Z^i, \quad (i = 1, \dots, s) \tag{5.8}$$

(where $r_1 \dots r_{i-1} = 1$ when $i = 1$). Incidentally, here we have used the fact that $p_i(y)y^{r_i-i}$ has degree $r - i$, so that its derivative is of degree $r - i - 1 \geq r - s > \gamma$ for $i < s$, and therefore the analogue of the function in (5.6) at the i th step of the argument is not zero.

We now apply (5.8) with $i = s$ and note that $p_s(y)$ is a constant of modulus $\geq r$. We get

$$Z^s |y|^{\rho-s} \leq r^{s-2} s^{2s} h. \tag{5.9}$$

If we also neglect y with $|y| \leq (\gamma + 1)Z$, then altogether we are neglecting a set of measure $< 18(\gamma + 1)Z$. Now (5.5) holds, and $|y| > (\gamma + 1)Z$ in conjunction with (5.9) yields $Z^\rho (\gamma + 1)^{\rho-s} < r^{s-2} s^{2s} h$. This is impossible if we choose $Z = Z_0 = (r^s s^{2s} h)^{1/\rho} (\gamma + 1)^{(s/\rho)-1}$. Therefore the numbers y with (5.1) constitute a set of measure $< 18(\gamma + 1)Z_0$, giving (5.2).

On the other hand when $|y| \geq x$, then (5.9) gives $Z^s < r^s s^{2s} h x^{s-\rho}$. This is impossible if we choose $Z = Z_1 = r s^2 h^{1/s} x^{1-(\rho/s)}$. Therefore the numbers y with (5.1), (5.5) and $|y| \geq x$ constitute a set of measure $< 16(\gamma + 1)Z_1$. The interval $|y| < Z_1$ (the complement of (5.5)) has measure $2Z_1$, so that we get altogether $< 18(\gamma + 1)Z_1$, i.e., (5.3).

We now turn to the proof of Proposition 3. The problem is to estimate the number of solutions with $\langle \underline{x} \rangle < Y_S$. We may suppose that $|x| \leq |y|$ and $|x| < Y_S$. This number is $\sum z(x)$ over x with $|x| < Y_S$, where $z(x)$ is the number of integers y with (1.2) and $|x| \leq |y|$. Given x , the number of *real* y with $F(x, y) = \pm |y|^\gamma$ or with $y = \pm x$ is $\leq 4s + 7$ (e.g. $\leq s + 1$ solutions of $F(x, y) = |y|^\gamma$ with $y > 0$, and the same for $y < 0$ or $F(x, y) = -|y|^\gamma$, plus 3 solutions with $y = \pm x$ or $y = 0$). Thus the real numbers y with $|x| \leq |y|$, $|F(x, y)| \leq h |y|^\gamma$ make up at most $2s + 4$ intervals. The number $z(x)$ then is $\leq \mu(x) + 2s + 4$, where $\mu(x)$ is the total measure of these intervals. The number of small solutions then is

$$\leq (2s + 4) \sum_{\substack{x \\ |x| < Y_s}} 1 + \sum_x \mu(x). \tag{5.10}$$

The first summand here is

$$\ll s Y_S \ll c_9(r, s, \rho) h^{1/(\rho-2s)},$$

with

$$c_9(r, s, \rho) = s((e^6 s)^r R^{2s})^{1/(\rho-2s)}$$

by (2.4), (2.5). In the case when $\rho \geq 4s$ we obtain

$$\ll c_9(r, s, \rho)h^{2/\rho},$$

with

$$c_9(r, s, \rho) = s((e^6 s)^r R^{2s})^{1/(\rho-2s)} \ll s^a e^{12r/\rho} R^{4s/\rho},$$

where

$$a = 1 + r(\rho - 2s)^{-1} = 1 + r\rho^{-1} + 2rs/\rho(\rho - 2s) \leq 1 + r\rho^{-1} + 4rs\rho^{-2}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} c_9(r, s, \rho) &\ll s^{1+(r/\rho)} \exp(\rho^{-1}(12r + 3200s \log^3 r + 4rs\rho^{-1} \log s)) \\ &= c_3(r, s, \rho). \end{aligned}$$

The second summand in (5.10) is $\Sigma_1 + \Sigma_2$, with Σ_1, Σ_2 respectively a sum over $|x| \leq c_{10}h^{1/\rho}, |x| > c_{10}h^{1/\rho}$ where

$$c_{10} = ((\gamma + 1)rs^2)^{s/\rho}.$$

By (5.2) of Lemma 6

$$\Sigma_1 \ll c_{10}((\gamma + 1)rs^2)^{s/\rho}h^{2/\rho} = ((\gamma + 1)rs^2)^{2s/\rho}h^{2/\rho}.$$

By (5.3) of Lemma 6

$$\Sigma_2 \ll (\gamma + 1)rs^2h^{1/s} \sum_{x > c_{10}h^{1/\rho}} x^{1-(\rho/s)}.$$

The sum on the right is

$$\begin{aligned} &\ll (c_{10}h^{1/\rho})^{1-(\rho/s)} + (\rho s^{-1} - 2)^{-1}(c_{10}h^{1/\rho})^{2-(\rho/s)} \\ &\ll \rho(\rho - 2s)^{-1}c_{10}^{2-(\rho/s)}h^{(2/\rho)-(1/s)}, \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\Sigma_2 \ll (\gamma + 1)(\rho - 2s)^{-1}\rho rs^2 c_{10}^{2-(\rho/s)}h^{2/\rho} = c_{11}(r, s, \rho)h^{2/\rho},$$

with

$$c_{11}(r, s, \rho) = \rho(\rho - 2s)^{-1}(rs^2(\gamma + 1))^{2s/\rho}.$$

When $\rho \geq 4s$ we have

$$c_{11}(r, s, \rho) \ll (rs)^{4s/\rho} \leq r^{8s/\rho} = \exp(\rho^{-1} \cdot 8s \log r) \leq c_3(r, s, \rho).$$

Combining our results we see that the total number of small solutions to (1.2) is $\ll c_6(r, s, \rho)h^\kappa$ with $\kappa = \max(2/\rho, 1/(\rho - 2s))$, and a certain constant c_6 , and it is $\ll c_3(r, s, \rho)h^{2/\rho}$ when $\rho \geq 4s$.

References

1. Bombieri, E. and Schmidt, W. M.: On Thue's equation, *Invent. Math.* 88 (1987), 69–81.
2. Evertse, J. H.: Uper bounds for the number of solutions of diophantine equations, *Math. Centrum Amsterdam*, 1983, 1–127.
3. Lewis, D. J. and Mahler, K.: Representation of integers by binary forms, *Acta Arith.* 6 (1961), 333–363.
4. Mahler, K.: Zur Approximation algebraischer Zahlen. III., *Acta Math.* 62 (1934), 91–166.
5. Mahler, K.: An application of Jensen's formula to Polynomials, *Mathematika* 7 (1960), 98–100.
6. Mueller, J. and Schmidt, W. M.: Thue's equation and a conjecture of Siegel, *Acta Math.* 160 (1988), 207–247.
7. Schmidt, W. M.: Thue equations with few coefficients, *Trans. A.M.S.* 303 (1987), 241–255.
8. Schmidt, W. M.: The number of exceptional approximations in Roth's Theorem, (submitted).
9. Thunder, J. L.: The number of solutions to cubic Thue inequalities, *Acta Arith.*, *J. of the Austral. Math. Soc.* (to appear).
10. Thunder, J. L.: On Thue inequalities and a conjecture of Schmidt, *J. of Number Theory*, (to appear).