

THE POLYLOG QUOTIENT AND THE GONCHAROV QUOTIENT IN COMPUTATIONAL CHABAUTY-KIM THEORY II

ISHAI DAN-COHEN AND DAVID CORWIN

ABSTRACT. Building on Dan-Cohen–Wewers [DCW2], Dan-Cohen [DC], and Brown [Bro1], we push the computational boundary of our explicit motivic version of Kim’s method in the case of the thrice punctured line over an open subscheme of $\text{Spec } \mathbb{Z}$. To do so, we develop a refined version of the algorithm of [DCW2] tailored specifically to this case. We also commit ourselves fully to working with the polylogarithmic quotient. This allows us to restrict our calculus with motivic iterated integrals to the so-called depth-one part of the mixed Tate Galois group studied extensively by Goncharov. An application was given in [CDC] where we verified Kim’s conjecture in an interesting new case.

1. INTRODUCTION

Work by Dan-Cohen–Wewers [DCW1, DCW2] and by Dan-Cohen [DC] produced an algorithm, based on the Chabauty–Kim method, for computing the integral points of $\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0, 1, \infty\}$ over open integer schemes (which are assumed to obey a certain technical condition) whose halting was, and remains, conditional on deep conjectures by Kim and by Goncharov, among others.¹ This algorithm restricted attention to the polylogarithmic quotient of the unipotent fundamental group $\pi_1^{\text{un}}(X)$, but minimized its reliance on the polylogarithmic quotient with a view towards eventually constructing an algorithm for the full unipotent

Date: November 20, 2018.

I.D. was supported by an ISF grant for work titled *Around Kim’s conjecture: from homotopical foundations to algorithmic applications*.

¹ Practical (and unconditional) methods for solving the S -unit equation predate this work, and can be found, for instance, in de Weger [dW] who uses the theory of logarithmic forms of Baker–Wüstholz [BW] (see also Everste–Györy [EG] for a general discussion). A more recent approach, due to Känel–Matchke [vKM] is based on the Shimura–Taniyama conjecture. Our primary purpose here is not to compete with these other methods, but rather, to develop Kim’s theory in a special case, to explore its interaction with the theory of mixed Tate motives and motivic iterated integrals, and to provide new numerical evidence for Kim’s conjecture.

fundamental group. The resulting algorithm (to quote an anonymous referee) provides proof of concept. It is not, however suited to practical application.

Francis Brown [Bro1] introduced various new techniques which he was able to use to construct functions for open subschemes of $\text{Spec } \mathbb{Z}$ in several examples. His techniques capitalize on the relative simplicity of $\text{Spec } \mathbb{Z}$ and of the polylogarithmic quotient, and inspired us to attempt to construct a simpler algorithm, and to continue to push the computational boundary, for open subschemes of $\text{Spec } \mathbb{Z}$. Brown also suggested (in private communication) that we might be able to replace the full mixed Tate Galois group with a quotient tailored specifically to the polylogarithmic quotient of the unipotent fundamental group.

In this second installment in a (so far) two-part series, we present such an algorithm, based on Goncharov’s investigations of the *depth-1* quotient [Gon1].² Let K be a number field and let Z be either $\text{Spec } K$ (a “number scheme”) or open in $\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_K$ (an “open integer scheme”). Associated to the *Goncharov quotient*, as we will call it, is a Hopf subalgebra $A^G(Z)$ of the mixed Tate Hopf algebra $A(Z)$ of framed mixed Tate motives over Z . This subalgebra already contains the extension spaces

$$K_{2n-1}^{(n)}(Z) = \text{Ext}_Z^1(\mathbb{Q}(0), \mathbb{Q}(n)) \subset A_n(Z),$$

and was studied extensively by Goncharov in connection with Zagier’s conjecture relating special values of zeta functions of number fields to polylogarithms. This eventually lead to his *depth filtration conjecture* [Gon2]; its depth-1 part says that $A^G(\text{Spec } K)$ is generated by Goncharov’s (unipotent) motivic polylogarithms $\text{Li}_i^{\text{un}}(x)$ (for $i \geq 1$ and x a K -point of $\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0, 1, \infty\}$). Although Zagier’s conjecture, if stated in terms of values of zeta functions, is vacuous for \mathbb{Q} , the *depth-1 conjecture* is still open even in this case. For our purposes we must refine this conjecture somewhat with respect to ramification. The resulting *integral depth-1 conjecture* (§2.3.6) for open subschemes of $\text{Spec } \mathbb{Z}$ is based on a study of the *half-weight-2* part from [DCW1], and is of interest, we hope, in its own right. Indeed, we believe that an investigation of

² The remainder of the introduction presupposes some familiarity with the surrounding literature (on mixed Tate motives, the unipotent fundamental group, motivic iterated integrals, p -adic polylogarithms, Kim’s method, and Kim’s conjecture) as well as passing familiarity with the previously constructed algorithm of [DCW2, DC], and focuses on comparing old with new. The reader who is unfamiliar with this material may wish to skip forward to section 2 (where some of this background material is reviewed), or to go back to [DCW2] for a general introduction.

this conjecture and an attempt to generalize it to higher number fields (even in half-weight 2, where the case $Z = \text{Spec } K$ is known and where the difference between $A(Z)$ and $A^G(Z)$ is not yet visible) may lead to near-term progress towards Goncharov’s conjecture.

Focusing attention on the *Goncharov quotient* presents several simultaneous advantages. Most obviously, the dimensions of the graded pieces $A_n^G(Z)$ are far smaller than those of $A(Z)$. Correspondingly, if our integral depth-1 conjecture holds, our search through the vast collection of motivic iterated integrals for candidate basis elements may be limited to the comparatively small set of n -logarithms. In turn, working with n -logarithms allows us to avoid the complex combinatorics of the Goncharov coproduct formula. Less obvious but perhaps equally important is that working with the Goncharov and polylogarithmic quotients allows us to make the geometry of the “geometric algorithm” (which computes the scheme theoretic image of the universal cocycle-evaluation map) fully explicit: we obtain a homomorphism of polynomial \mathbb{Q} -algebras given by an explicit family of polynomials about which we learned from Brown. As a result, our new algorithm is far simpler and more efficient than the algorithm of [DCW2]. It is therefore reasonable and worth-while to give a more explicit construction, with the promise of actual Sage code and ensuing numerical results (beyond those of [CDC]) in the near future.

While the Goncharov quotient holds much promise, it also presented us with a challenge. Unlike the full mixed Tate Galois group, the Goncharov quotient is not free, and so its coordinate ring $A^G(Z)$ is not a shuffle algebra. This threatened to send us looking through Goncharov’s intricate analysis for information (actual or conjectural) about higher extension groups in the corresponding category of “Goncharov motives”. Fortunately, as we discovered, by remembering the inclusion

$$A^G(Z) \subset A(Z)$$

and working sometimes in $A^G(Z)$ and sometimes in $A(Z)$, we can avoid direct confrontation with the structure of $A^G(Z)$.

A key observation for our work is that replacing the full mixed Tate Galois group of Z by its Goncharov quotient does not shrink the p -adic analytic loci $X(\mathbb{Z}_p)_n \subset X(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ that our algorithm computes. Actually, our loci are *larger* than those that intervene in Kim’s conjecture [BDCKW]. One difference comes, of course, from considering only the polylogarithmic quotient of the unipotent fundamental group in place of the full unipotent fundamental group. The belief that we should

nevertheless have equality

$$(*) \quad X(Z) = X(\mathbb{Z}_p)_n \quad \text{for } n \text{ sufficiently large}$$

has travelled down a somewhat bumpy road. Kim showed in [Kim1] that the loci $X(\mathbb{Z}_p)_n$ associated to the polylogarithmic quotient are finite for sufficiently large n and in [Kim2] that the same holds for open integer schemes associated to totally real number fields. Experts expressed the hope (if only tentatively and quietly) that the polylogarithmic quotient should be *big enough* for Kim’s conjecture. However, upon completing our realization of the case $\mathbb{Z}[1/3]$ in [CDC] we discovered by computing numerically that $-1 \in X(\mathbb{Z}_p)_4$ in that case, and subsequently showed more generally that for $Z = \text{Spec } \mathbb{Z}[1/q]$ (for any prime $q \neq p$), we have

$$-1 \in X(\mathbb{Z}_p)_n \quad \text{for all } n.$$

This meant that (*) was in fact false as stated, since for $q \neq 2$, $X(\mathbb{Z}[1/q]) = \emptyset$ (so, in particular, does *not* contain -1). Nevertheless, we view this bump in the road as reflecting a particular interaction of the polylogarithmic quotient with roots of unity, or, at the very least, as a result of its symmetry-breaking nature. We may thus symmetrize our loci with respect to the S_3 action and, thus modified, expect property (*) to hold after all.

There is also a second, less obvious difference between Kim’s loci and ours. This too intervened already in [DC]. While Kim’s version may be defined in terms of the scheme-theoretic image of a p -adic realization map between nonabelian cohomology varieties over \mathbb{Q}_p , our algorithm computes the scheme theoretic image of the rationally-defined universal cocycle evaluation map, and only then pulls back the result to \mathbb{Q}_p . The result is again a possible enlargement of the resulting loci. However, as discussed in loc. cit., if the p -adic period conjecture holds, then there is no such enlargement after all. Period conjecture or no period conjecture, the final result is that our algorithm may be used to *verify* Kim’s conjecture, but can have little bearing on any attempt to falsify the conjecture.

Because of its relative simplicity, we find it appropriate to describe the new algorithm in a somewhat more informal style than that of loc. cit., which we hope will make the present article more approachable. A concrete example (“ $\mathbb{Z}[1/3]$ in depth 4”), which provides new numerical evidence for Kim’s conjecture, is worked out in [CDC]. Let us point out, however, that *that* work should not be viewed as merely executing the algorithm constructed in *this* work since the history is rather reversed: as the numbering suggests, the example worked out in [CDC] came

first, and many of the ideas that went into constructing the present algorithm first developed in working out the example.

Acknowledgements. We would like to thank Bjorn Poonen and Herbert Gangl for their interest and encouragement.

2. CONJECTURES AND THEOREMS

In this section, which doubles as a long introduction, we give precise statements of the conjectures on which our algorithm depends for halting. We also declare the success of our algorithm in computing the set of integral points and the conditional halting in a complementary pair of theorems similar to the main theorems of [DC]. As promised, we begin by summarizing background material; details may be found in [DCW2, DC] and the references given there.

2.1. Mixed Tate motives and mixed Tate Galois group. Fix an open subscheme $Z \subset \text{Spec } \mathbb{Z}$ and a prime $p \in Z$. Write

$$S := \text{Spec } \mathbb{Z} \setminus Z = \{q_1, \dots, q_s\}.$$

We let $K_m^{(n)}(Z)$ denote the n -eigenspace for the Adams operations on the rational Quillen K-group $K_m(Z) \otimes \mathbb{Q}$. Historically (due in large part to the work of Borel [Bor1, Bor2]), it was known that

$$K_{2n-1}^{(n)}(Z) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{Q}\langle \log^u(q_1), \dots, \log^u(q_s) \rangle & n = 1, \\ \mathbb{Q}\zeta^u(n) & n \text{ odd } \geq 3, \end{cases}$$

and that all other Adams pieces vanish. Here, $\log^u(q_i)$ and $\zeta^u(n)$ are certain special elements. Moreover, there were certain naturally defined p -adic regulator maps

$$\text{reg} : K_{2n-1}^{(n)} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_p$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{reg}(\log^u(q_i)) &= \log^p(q_i) \\ \text{reg}(\zeta^u(n)) &= \zeta^p(n), \end{aligned}$$

the p -adic logarithm and zeta value respectively.

The theory of mixed Tate motives puts these K -groups inside a big Hopf algebra. To define it, let $\text{MT}(Z)$ denote the category of mixed Tate motives unramified over Z . The category $\text{MT}(Z)$ is \mathbb{Q} -Tannakian; its simple objects up to isomorphism are precisely the tensor powers of $\mathbb{Q}(1)$. De Rham cohomology gives rise to a fiber functor

$$\text{dR}^* : \text{MT}(Z) \rightarrow \mathbf{Vect } \mathbb{Q}.$$

We have

$$\text{Hom}(\mathbb{Q}(0), \mathbb{Q}(0)) = \mathbb{Q},$$

$$\mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathbb{Q}(0), \mathbb{Q}(n)) = K_{2n-1}^{(n)}(Z)$$

and all other Ext groups $\mathrm{Ext}^i(\mathbb{Q}(0), \mathbb{Q}(n))$ vanish. Consequently there is a semi-direct product decomposition

$$\pi_1^{\mathrm{MT}}(Z) := \mathrm{Aut}^{\otimes}(\mathrm{dR}^*) = \pi_1^{\mathrm{un}}(Z) \rtimes \mathbb{G}_m$$

in which $\pi_1^{\mathrm{un}}(Z)$ is free pronunipotent with abelianization

$$(*) \quad \pi_1^{\mathrm{un}}(Z)^{\mathrm{ab}} = \bigoplus_{n \geq 1} \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathbb{Q}(0), \mathbb{Q}(n))^{\vee},$$

and $A(Z) := \mathcal{O}(\pi_1^{\mathrm{un}}(Z))$ is a *shuffle algebra*: in terms of homogeneous generators

$$\tau_1, \dots, \tau_s \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_3, \sigma_5, \sigma_7, \dots$$

(with τ_i in degree 1 and σ_i in degree i) $A(Z)$ has vector space basis

$$\{f_w \mid w \text{ a word in } \tau_1, \dots, \tau_s, \sigma_3, \sigma_5, \dots\}$$

called a “shuffle basis” on which the “shuffle” product is given by

$$f_{w'} f_{w''} = \sum_{\text{shuffles } w \text{ of } w', w''} f_w,$$

and the “deconcatenation” coproduct is given by

$$\Delta f_w = \sum_{w=w'w''} f_{w'} \otimes f_{w''}.$$

Equation (*) may be written dually as a family of exact sequences

$$0 \rightarrow \mathrm{Ext}^1(\mathbb{Q}(0), \mathbb{Q}(n)) \rightarrow A_n \xrightarrow{\Delta'} \bigoplus_{i+j=n, i, j \geq 1} A_i \otimes A_j$$

where Δ' is the *reduced coproduct*:

$$\Delta'(a) = \Delta(a) - (1 \otimes a + a \otimes 1).$$

2.2. Unipotent fundamental group and motivic polylogarithms.

Let $X = \mathbb{P}_Z^1 \setminus \{0, 1, \infty\}$. We use the tangent vector $\vec{1}_0$ as base point. We define $\pi_1^{\mathrm{un}}(X)$ to be the fundamental group $\mathrm{Aut}^{\otimes}(\omega_0)$ of the Tannakian category of unipotent connections on $X_{\mathbb{Q}}$ at the fiber functor associated to $\vec{1}_0$. Similarly, we define the path torsor associated to a point $x \in X(Z)$ by

$$\pi_1^{\mathrm{un}}(X, 0, x) := \mathrm{Isom}^{\otimes}(\omega_0, \omega_x).$$

According to Deligne [Del], $\pi_1^{\mathrm{un}}(X, 0, x)$ is canonically trivialized by a path ${}_x p_0^{\mathrm{dR}} \in \pi_1^{\mathrm{un}}(X, 0, x)(\mathbb{Q})$ (related, for instance, to the fact that

the KZ-connection is a connection on a trivial vector bundle). Moreover, $\pi_1^{\text{un}}(X)$ is free prounipotent on two generators e_0, e_1 representing monodromy about 0 and 1, respectively. Consequently,

$$A(X) := \mathcal{O}(\pi_1^{\text{un}}(X))$$

is a shuffle algebra on the shuffle basis e_0, e_1 . Deligne–Goncharov [DG] (with subsequent different approaches for instance by Levine [Lev] and Dan-Cohen–Schlank [DCS]) construct a natural action of $\pi_1^{\text{MT}}(Z)$ on $\pi_1^{\text{un}}(X, 0, x)$.

Special elements $\text{Li}_n^{\text{u}}(x) \in A_n(Z)$ were constructed by Goncharov [DG]; these were called *motivic polylogarithms* in loc. cit. but are called *unipotent motivic polylogarithms* by Francis Brown [Bro2] to distinguish them from his somewhat different notion. (In fact the n -logarithms (or *polylogarithms*) $\text{Li}_n^{\text{u}}(x)$ form a special class among the more general *multiple polylogarithms*, which, in turn, are a special class of (unipotent motivic) iterated integrals defined and studied in [Gon2]). In the case of $Z \subset \text{Spec } \mathbb{Z}$ (rather than more general integer schemes) these elements may be defined quite simply in terms of the action of $\pi_1^{\text{MT}}(Z)$ on $\pi_1^{\text{un}}(X, 0, x)$ and in terms of the special de Rham paths ${}_x p_0^{\text{dR}}$, as we now recall.³

We abbreviate words in e_0, e_1 by writing words in 0 and 1, especially when these appear as subscripts. We let o denote the orbit map associated to the de Rham path ${}_x p_0^{\text{dR}}$ and we let τ denote the trivialization of the path torsor $\pi_1^{\text{un}}(X, 0, x)$ associated to the same path. Then $\text{Li}_n^{\text{u}}(x)$ is defined to be the composite map

$$(*) \quad \pi_1^{\text{un}}(Z) \xrightarrow{o} \pi_1^{\text{un}}(X, 0, x) \xrightarrow[\tau]{\sim} \pi_1^{\text{un}}(X) \xrightarrow{f_{10\dots 0}} \mathbb{A}^1$$

with $n - 1$ zeroes below the ‘ f ’. (The intermediate map

$$\kappa(x) := \tau \circ o$$

is a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant 1-cocycle and will play an important role below.) The unipotent logarithm is defined similarly by using the one-letter word ‘0’ and satisfies

$$\text{Li}_1^{\text{u}}(x) = -\log^{\text{u}}(1 - x).$$

³ When $Z \subset \text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_K$, K a number field bigger than \mathbb{Q} , the de Rham fiber functor is no longer \mathbb{Q} -rational. Instead, one must work with the *canonical* realization of the unipotent fundamental group, which thus loses its Tannakian interpretation in terms of connections. The ensuing construction, which is due to Goncharov, is more complicated.

The unipotent special zeta value $\zeta^u(n)$ is defined (using the tangential end-point $-\vec{1}_1$ in place of x) by

$$\zeta^u(n) := \text{Li}_n^u(-\vec{1}_1).$$

p -Adic integration gives rise to a ring homomorphism

$$\text{per}_p : A(Z) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}_p$$

which extends the regulator maps and

$$\text{per}_p(\text{Li}_n^u(x)) = \text{Li}_n^{(p)}(x)$$

is the p -adic n -logarithm of x .

2.3. The polylog quotient and the Goncharov quotient. The natural inclusion

$$X \hookrightarrow \mathbb{G}_m$$

gives rise to a map

$$\pi_1^{\text{un}}(X) \rightarrow \pi_1^{\text{un}}(\mathbb{G}_m) = \mathbb{Q}(1).$$

Let N be the kernel. The polylog quotient is defined as

$$\pi^{\text{PL}}(X) := \pi_1^{\text{un}}(X)/[N, N].$$

Let $\mathfrak{n}^{\text{PL}}(X) := \text{Lie } \pi^{\text{PL}}(X)$. According to Deligne [Del], $\mathfrak{n}^{\text{PL}}(X)$ is a sum of Tate motives. Hence $\pi_1^{\text{un}}(Z)$ acts trivially on $\pi^{\text{PL}}(X)$. Consequently, the projection $\kappa^{\text{PL}}(x)$ of the cocycle $\kappa(x)$ (associated to $x \in X(Z)$) to $\pi^{\text{PL}}(X)$ is simply a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant homomorphism

$$\pi_1^{\text{un}}(X) \rightarrow \pi^{\text{PL}}(X).$$

Lemma 2.3.1. The functions f_0 and $f_1, f_{10}, f_{100}, \dots$ on $\pi_1^{\text{un}}(X)$ factor through $\pi^{\text{PL}}(X)$ and form a set of homogeneous coordinates on the latter.

Proof. After forgetting the $\pi_1^{\text{un}}(Z)$ action, $\mathfrak{n}(X)$ is just the free pronilpotent Lie algebra on generators e_0, e_1 , and the ideal associated to N is generated by e_1 . So this is purely formal. \square

We will denote the function f_0 on $\pi^{\text{PL}}(X)$ by \log^u and the function $f_{10\dots 0}$ with $(n-1)$ zeroes by Li_n^u .

2.3.2. Let $\mathfrak{n} = \mathfrak{n}(Z) = \text{Lie } \pi_1^{\text{un}}(Z)$. We define the *Goncharov quotient* by

$$\mathfrak{n}^G(Z) := \mathfrak{n}/[\mathfrak{n}_{\leq -2}, \mathfrak{n}_{\leq -2}].$$

We also consider the associated quotient $\pi^G(Z)$ of $\pi_1^{\text{un}}(Z)$ and the associated Hopf subalgebra

$$A^G(Z) \subset A(Z).$$

Lemma 2.3.3. Every \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant homomorphism

$$\pi_1(Z) \rightarrow \pi_1^{\text{PL}}(X)$$

factors through $\pi^G(Z)$.

Proof. Any degree zero graded homomorphism

$$\mathfrak{n}(Z) \rightarrow \mathfrak{n}^{\text{PL}}(X)$$

must send $\mathfrak{n}(Z)_{\leq -2}$ to $\mathfrak{n}^{\text{PL}}(X)_{\leq -2}$. But

$$[\mathfrak{n}^{\text{PL}}(X)_{\leq -2}, \mathfrak{n}^{\text{PL}}(X)_{\leq -2}] = 0. \quad \square$$

Proposition 2.3.4. The unipotent motivic polylogarithmic values $\text{Li}_i^u(x)$ ($x \in X(Z)$) belong to $A^G(Z)$.

Proof. Returning to 2.2(*), we saw in lemma 2.3.1 that the function $f_{10\dots 0}$ factors through $\pi^{\text{PL}}(X)$, and we saw in lemma 2.3.3 that the cocycle $\kappa^{\text{PL}}(x)$ factors through $\pi^G(Z)$. \square

Proposition 2.3.5. The map

$$Z^1(\pi_1^{\text{un}}(Z), \pi^{\text{PL}}(X))^{\mathbb{G}_m} \leftarrow Z^1(\pi^G(Z), \pi^{\text{PL}}(X))^{\mathbb{G}_m}$$

induced by pulling back a \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant cocycle along the projection

$$\pi_1(Z) \twoheadrightarrow \pi^G(Z)$$

is bijective. In particular (given that we're working with the polylogarithmic quotient of $\pi_1^{\text{un}}(X)$), replacing the full mixed Tate Galois group $\pi_1^{\text{un}}(Z)$ by its Goncharov quotient will have no further effect on the resulting loci $X(\mathbb{Z}_p)_n$.

Proof. Direct consequence of lemma 2.3.3. \square

We consider the following strengthening of the depth-1 part of Goncharov's depth filtration conjecture [Gon2].

Conjecture 2.3.6 (Integral depth-1 conjecture). Let q be a prime and let

$$Z_{>q} = \text{Spec } \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{\text{primes } \leq q\}.$$

Then $A^G(Z_{>q})$ is generated as a \mathbb{Q} -algebra by the elements $\log^u(q')$ for q' prime $\leq q$, the elements $\zeta^u(n)$ for n odd ≥ 3 and the elements $\text{Li}_i^u(x)$ for $i \geq 2$ and $x \in X(Z_{>q})$.

2.3.7. We say that an open subscheme of $\text{Spec } \mathbb{Z}$ is *tapered* if it is of the form $Z_{>p}$ appearing in conjecture 2.3.6.

2.3.8. As an example $A^G(\text{Spec } \mathbb{Z})$ is spanned by $\zeta^u(n)$ for n odd ≥ 3 , so the integral depth-1 conjecture holds for $\text{Spec } \mathbb{Z}$.

2.3.9. *Remark.* Let us put this conjecture in context with a brief preview of things to come: in section 4 below we construct an algorithm which takes a natural number n and a prime number q as input, and which upon halting outputs a family of points $a_{i,j} \in X(Z_{>q})$, such that

- (1) If the algorithm halts then $\{\text{Li}_i^u(a_{i,j})\}_{i,j}$ forms an algebra basis of $A^G(Z_{>q})$ in half-weights $\leq n$, and
- (2) If conjecture 2.3.6 holds, then the algorithm halts.

We emphasize that while the halting is conditional, the validity of the output is unconditional. In particular, our algorithm may be used to verify the conjecture experimentally up to any given bound on the weight.

2.3.10. *Remark.* Let us further explain the role played by the tapered scheme $Z_{>q}$ in our point-counting algorithm. For general Z , $A^G(Z)$ may not be generated by polylogarithms $\text{Li}_i^u(x)$ with $x \in X(Z)$. For example, if $Z = \text{Spec } \mathbb{Z}[1/q]$ for q a prime $\neq 2$ then

$$A^G(\mathbb{Z}) \neq A^G(\mathbb{Z}[1/q])$$

(and $A^G(\mathbb{Z}[1/q])$ is not even generated over $A^G(\mathbb{Z})$ by $\log^u(q)$) but

$$X(Z) = \emptyset.$$

Moreover, we have no direct way of deciding if a given rational linear combination of $\text{Li}_n^u(x)$'s ($x \in X(\mathbb{Q})$) is unramified over Z (i.e. is contained in $A^G(Z)$). Our method, present already in a more general (but less precise) form in [DC], is rather indirect. We first *taper* Z down to a $Z_{>q}$. We then construct a polylogarithmic basis of $A^G(Z_{>q})$ (up to a given weight). If we insist that our basis be compatible with the extension spaces, we may then generate an associated shuffle basis. We then construct a change-of-basis matrix which relates our polylogarithmic basis to our shuffle basis. Finally, we use our shuffle basis to identify the subspace $A^G(Z) \subset A^G(Z_{>q})$.⁴

⁴ However, there's a caveat, which is why there's a further remark, which should be thought of as being in smaller print.

2.3.11. *Further to remark 2.3.10.* Actually, since our change of basis matrix is only a p -adic approximation, we can only identify the subspace $A^G(Z)$ up to given p -adic precision. This means that, for all we know, the polylogarithmic basis we construct may only be a linearly independent set of the right size, p -adically close to $A^G(Z)$. This issue may be dealt with roughly as follows. We make sure that our basis elements are sufficiently spread out (modifying if necessary) to ensure that their projection onto $A^G(Z)$ remains linearly independent. We refer to the resulting basis as our “abstract basis” since its definition is not constructive. We subsequently carry out all computations for both the abstract and the (“concrete”) polylogarithmic basis, keeping track of the accumulated error.

Issues of this sort were already treated quite carefully in [DC], which is consequently littered with double-tildes. Here we limit ourselves to mentioning these issues only in passing, since they tend to cloud the exposition and obscure the essential features of our construction. Rather, we feel that these issues are best relegated to a future computational article in which the algorithm presented here is given in a sort of paragraph-style pseudo code, divorced entirely from its theoretical backdrop. *That* article, we hope, will come along with Sage code and a wealth of numerical results. In the meantime, in working out small-scale examples with a human touch (as we did in [CDC]), these issues can usually be circumvented by replacing p -adic approximations of relations between values of polylogarithms by actual known relations found in the literature about polylogarithms.⁵

2.3.12. *Further to remark 2.3.11.* Actually, this particular issue was dealt with differently in [DC]. There, we completely avoided constructing a basis of $A(Z)$. Instead, after finding an open subscheme $Z^\circ \subset Z$ (which plays the role played by our $Z_{>q}$) and a basis of $A(Z^\circ)$, we modified the universal evaluation map to allow coefficients in the larger $A(Z^\circ)$. This meant that the difference between $A(Z)$ and $A(Z^\circ)$ was dealt with within the *geometric algorithm*. However, as we noticed during our work on [CDC], this made our algorithm quite inefficient in cases of interest. For instance, it meant that the geometric algorithm for the case $Z = \text{Spec } \mathbb{Z}[1/q]$ must grow with q .

A different issue, which comes up only for larger number fields, was, however, dealt with in a manner similar to that indicated in remark 2.3.11. When a basis for the extension spaces is not known, we are unable to construct one algorithmically. Instead, we construct a linearly

⁵ But here again there is a caveat, which is why there’s yet another remark, in an even smaller font.

independent set p -adically close to the extension space in question and proceed as indicated above.

2.4. Application to integral points. Let $I_{\text{BC}} = \text{per}^\sharp$ denote the map

$$\text{Spec } \mathbb{Q}_p \rightarrow \pi_1^{\text{un}}(Z)$$

induced by the period map (since it is essentially given by *Besser-Coleman Integration*). Let $\pi^{\text{PL}}(X)_{\geq -n}$ denote the quotient by the n th step of the descending central series. As explained in [DCW2], the functor

$$R \mapsto Z^1(\pi^G(Z)_R, \pi^{\text{PL}}(X)_{\geq -n, R})^{\mathbb{G}_m} = \text{Hom}^{\mathbb{G}_m}(\pi^G(Z)_R, \pi^{\text{PL}}(X)_{\geq -n, R})$$

of \mathbb{G}_m -equivariant cocycles, is represented by an affine space

$$\mathbf{Z}^1(\pi^G(Z), \pi^{\text{PL}}(X)_{\geq -n})^{\mathbb{G}_m}$$

over \mathbb{Q} .⁶ Let \mathbf{ev} denote the universal evaluation map

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^G(Z) \times \mathbf{Z}^1(\pi^G(Z), \pi^{\text{PL}}(X)_{\geq -n})^{\mathbb{G}_m} &\rightarrow \pi^G(Z) \times \pi^{\text{PL}}(X)_{\geq -n} \\ \mathbf{ev}(\gamma, \phi) &= (\gamma, \phi(\gamma)). \end{aligned}$$

2.4.1. Upon taking \mathbb{Q}_p -points, the evaluation map fits into a commuting square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X(Z) & \xrightarrow{\quad\quad\quad} & X(\mathbb{Z}_p) \\ \kappa \downarrow & & \downarrow \beta \\ \left(\pi^G(Z) \times \mathbf{Z}^1(\pi^G(Z), \pi^{\text{PL}}(X)_{\geq -n})^{\mathbb{G}_m}\right)(\mathbb{Q}_p) & \xrightarrow{\quad \mathbf{ev} \quad} & \left(\pi^G(Z) \times \pi^{\text{PL}}(X)_{\geq -n}\right)(\mathbb{Q}_p) \end{array}$$

sending

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \begin{array}{c} x \\ \downarrow \kappa \end{array} & & \begin{array}{c} y \\ \downarrow \beta \end{array} \\ \left(I_{\text{BC}}, \kappa(x)\right) & \xrightarrow{\quad \mathbf{ev} \quad} & \left(I_{\text{BC}}, \begin{pmatrix} \log^p(x) \\ \text{Li}_1^p(x) \\ \text{Li}_2^p(x) \\ \vdots \end{pmatrix}\right) & \left(I_{\text{BC}}, \begin{pmatrix} \log^p(y) \\ \text{Li}_1^p(y) \\ \text{Li}_2^p(y) \\ \vdots \end{pmatrix}\right) \end{array}$$

which constitutes our computable cousin of “Kim’s cutter”.⁷

⁶ A particularly concrete construction of the isomorphism to affine space is given in [CDC] and indicated in remark 7.2 below.

⁷ We recall that the commutativity is a rather long story which, at least in one possible approach, starts with Olsson’s nonabelian p -adic Hodge theory; see [DCW2].

2.4.2. For us, the *polylogarithmic Chabauty-Kim locus* $X(\mathbb{Z}_p)_n$ is a locally analytic (or “Coleman analytic”) subspace of $X(\mathbb{Z}_p)$. To define it, we take the scheme theoretic image of $\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{v}$, we pull back along β , and finally we symmetrize with respect to the S_3 action. This last step means that we close the set of generators under the three operations $F(z) \mapsto$

$$(*) \quad F\left(\frac{z}{1-z}\right), \quad F(1-z), \quad \text{and} \quad F\left(\frac{1}{z}\right).$$

We also consider $X(Z)$ as a locally analytic subspace of $X(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ with reduced structure.⁸

Conjecture 2.4.3 (Convergence of polylogarithmic loci). Let Z be an open subscheme of $\text{Spec } \mathbb{Z}$ and let p be a closed point of Z . Then for n sufficiently large we have an equality of locally analytic subspaces of $X(\mathbb{Z}_p)$

$$X(Z) = X(\mathbb{Z}_p)_n.$$

(In particular, for such n , the points of $X(Z)$ are not double roots of the n th Chabauty-Kim ideal.)

2.4.4. *Remark.* In segment 8.2 below, we construct an algorithm which upon halting computes the locus $X(\mathbb{Z}_p)_n$ to given precision; this is our *loci algorithm*. This algorithm proceeds in several steps. In the first of these, which we refer to as the *geometric algorithm*, we compute the scheme theoretic image of the map $\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{v}$. In the second step, we use the change of basis matrix constructed in the *change of basis algorithm* (§5) to convert the resulting equations into equations in coordinates associated to the polylogarithmic basis constructed in our *basis algorithm* (§4). The remaining steps amount to a straightforward application of *Lip service* [BdJ]. Pulling back along β merely means replacing unipotent motivic polylogarithms by p -adic polylogarithms. The symmetrization was spelled out in 2.4.2(*). Finally, the algorithm of loc. cit. allows us to obtain local power series expansions to given p -adic and geometric precision. Theorem 2.4.1 of [DC] shows how to make the meaning of the data output by this algorithm entirely precise, a matter on which we choose however not to dwell again in this article.

2.4.5. *Remark.* In terms of the *loci algorithm* our *loci algorithm* from [DC] remains unchanged. We review its construction in segment 9 below, referring back to [DC] for details. In terms of the conjectures above and the algorithm below, our point-counting theorem (which may equally be called a *point-finding* theorem) is as follows.

Theorem 2.4.6 (Point-counting). Let Z be an open subscheme of $\text{Spec } \mathbb{Z}$.

- (1) If the point-counting algorithm halts for the input Z , then its output is equal to $X(Z)$.

⁸ In [CDC] we use the notation $X(\mathbb{Z}_p)_n^{S_3}$ to distinguish this locus from the *unsymmetrized* version considered previously.

- (2) If the integral depth-1 conjecture (2.3.6) holds for the tapered scheme associated to Z , and if convergence of polylogarithmic loci (2.4.3) holds for Z , then the point-counting algorithm halts for the input Z .

Unlike in [DC], here we do not separate the proof of the *point-counting theorem* from the construction of the *point-counting algorithm*. Rather, we set ourselves the task of computing the data to be computed, and explain in down to earth terms, how we go about computing algorithmically. Thus, we consider the theorem to be proved as soon as the algorithm has been constructed. This task occupies the remainder of the article.

3. SETUP

3.1. We continue to work with an open subscheme Z of $\text{Spec } \mathbb{Z}$ and a prime $p \in \mathbb{Z}$. Recall that $\pi_1^{\text{un}}(Z)$ denotes the unipotent part of the fundamental group of mixed Tate motives unramified over Z and $\mathfrak{n}(Z)$ denotes its Lie algebra, which has a natural grading — we call the graded degree of a homogeneous element its *half-weight*. Recall that $\mathfrak{n}^G(Z)$ denotes the Goncharov quotient of $\mathfrak{n}(Z)$ and that

$$\pi^G(Z) = \exp \mathfrak{n}^G(Z)$$

denotes the associated quotient of $\pi_1^{\text{un}}(Z)$. Recall that $A(Z) = \mathcal{O}(\pi_1^{\text{un}}(Z))$ denotes the graded Hopf algebra of functions on $\pi_1^{\text{un}}(Z)$, and that $A^G(Z)$ denotes the subalgebra associated to $\pi_1^G(Z)$.

Let

$$d_i = \dim_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathfrak{n}^G(Z)_i.$$

Let $D_n^G(Z)$ denote the image of the product map

$$\bigoplus_{i+j=n, i,j \geq 1} A_i^G \otimes A_j^G \rightarrow A_n^G.$$

The Lie coalgebra $L^G := (\mathfrak{n}^G)^\vee$ is equal to the quotient

$$L^G = A_{>0}^G / D^G = A_{>0}^G / (A_{>0}^G)^2$$

of the augmentation ideal by its square.

Recall that $\mathcal{U}(Z) = A(Z)^\vee$ denotes the completed universal enveloping algebra of $\pi_1^{\text{un}}(Z)$ and, adding the decoration ‘ G ’ as usual, $\mathcal{U}^G(Z) = A^G(Z)^\vee$ denotes the completed universal enveloping algebra of $\pi^G(Z)$.

Proposition 3.2. Any set of homogeneous elements of $A_{>0}^G$ which maps to a basis of L^G forms an algebra basis for A^G .

Proof. By its very definition, \mathfrak{n} surjects onto \mathfrak{n}^G , so L^G injects into L . Thus, our family \mathcal{B}^G of homogeneous elements of $A_{>0}^G$ remains linearly independent in L . It may thus be extended to a family \mathcal{B} of homogeneous elements of

$A_{>0}$ which map to a basis of L . We then have by proposition 3.1.1 of [DC] a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{Q}[\mathcal{B}] & \xrightarrow{\cong} & A \\ \cup & & \cup \\ \mathbb{Q}[\mathcal{B}^G] & \hookrightarrow & A^G. \end{array}$$

Thus, in bounded weights, the lower inclusion corresponds (by taking Spec) to a hyperplane projection between affine spaces of same dimension, hence it's an isomorphism. \square

3.3. Remark. Recall that the kernel $E_n = E_n(Z)$ of the reduced coproduct on $A(Z)_n$ is canonically isomorphic to the space

$$\text{Ext}_Z^1(\mathbb{Q}(0), \mathbb{Q}(n))$$

of extensions in mixed Tate motives over Z . Similarly, the kernel $E_n^G = E_n^G(Z)$ of the reduced coproduct on $A_n^G(Z)$ is equal to a space of extensions in the full subcategory of the category of mixed Tate motives consisting of objects whose associated representation factors through the Goncharov quotient. We will refer to such objects as ‘‘Goncharov motives’’.

It follows directly from the definition however, that we have an equality of spaces of extensions $E^G = E$; in the case at hand, both are spanned by logarithms and by the motivic zeta elements $\zeta^u(n)$ for n odd. Consequently, the category of Goncharov motives must have nontrivial higher extension groups. This complicates the structure of the Hopf algebra A^G . As mentioned in the introduction, instead of analyzing its structure, we will work inside of A .

Let q_M denote the largest prime in the complement S of Z in $\text{Spec } \mathbb{Z}$ and let $Z_{>q_M}$ denote the subscheme of $\text{Spec } \mathbb{Z}$ obtained by removing all primes $\leq q_M$. After constructing a polylogarithmic algebra basis \mathcal{B}^G for $A^G(Z_{>q_M})$ (which includes the zeta elements) we will extend it arbitrarily to an algebra basis \mathcal{B} of $A(Z_{>q_M})$. We will then define the generators σ_n , n odd ≥ 3 , to be dual to the zeta elements relative to the given choice of basis. We will then have according to proposition 3.2.3 of [DC],

$$\mathcal{U}(Z_{>q_M}) = \mathbb{Q}\langle\langle \{\tau_q\}_{q \leq q_M}, \{\sigma_r\}_{r \text{ odd } \geq 3} \rangle\rangle$$

but with the σ_r well defined only in the quotient

$$\mathcal{U} \twoheadrightarrow \mathcal{U}^G.$$

3.4. Returning to $X = \mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0, 1, \infty\}$, we recall that $\pi_1^{\text{un}}(X)$ denotes the unipotent fundamental group at the tangent vector $\vec{1}_0$, and that $\pi^{\text{PL}}(X)$ denotes its polylogarithmic quotient. We recall that the polylogarithmic quotient has canonical coordinates, which we denote by

$$\mathcal{O}(\pi^{\text{PL}}(X)) = \mathbb{Q}[\log^u, \text{Li}_1^u, \text{Li}_2^u, \dots]$$

with \log^u in degree 1 and Li_i^u in degree i . Recall that in §2.2 we associated to a Z -valued base-point a of X a 1-cocycle

$$\kappa(a) : \pi_1^{\text{un}}(Z) \rightarrow \pi^{\text{PL}}(Z)$$

and defined the (unipotent) motivic n -logarithm of a by

$$\text{Li}_n^u(a) := \kappa(a)^\sharp(\text{Li}_n^u).$$

More generally, if R is a \mathbb{Q} -algebra and

$$c : \pi_1^{\text{un}}(Z)_R \rightarrow \pi^{\text{PL}}(Z)_R$$

is a family of cocycles parametrized by $\text{Spec } R$, we set

$$\text{Li}_n^u(c) := c^\sharp(\text{Li}_n^u).$$

Proposition 3.5. We denote the reduced coproduct by Δ' . We have

$$\Delta' \text{Li}_n^u = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \frac{(\log^u)^i}{i!} \otimes \text{Li}_{n-i}^u.$$

Proof. In view of the formula

$$(\text{Li}_{e_0}^u)^m = m! \text{Li}_{(e_0)^m}^u,$$

this is just the deconcatenation coproduct of shuffle coordinates on a free pronipotent group. \square

Corollary 3.6. A similar formula holds for $\Delta' \text{Li}_n^u(c)$ for any cocycle c , as well as for $\Delta' \text{Li}_n^u(z)$ for any $z \in X(Z)$.

Proof. This represents a trivial case of the Goncharov coproduct in which the cocycle condition reduces to the homomorphism-condition, which means, dually, that c^\sharp respects the coproduct. \square

3.7. Fix arbitrarily a set

$$\Sigma = \bigcup_{i \leq -1} \Sigma_i$$

of homogeneous free generators for $\mathfrak{n}(Z)$ and let

$$c : \pi_1^{\text{un}}(Z)_R \rightarrow \pi^{\text{PL}}(Z)_R$$

be a family of cocycles parametrized by $\text{Spec } R$, R an arbitrary \mathbb{Q} -algebra. The functions \log^u and Li_n^u on $\pi^{\text{PL}}(Z)$ pull back to functions on $\pi^{\text{PL}}(Z)_R$ and we again denote the further pullbacks along c by $\log^u(c)$ and $\text{Li}_n^u(c) \in A(Z) \otimes R$. Any word w in the generators is naturally an element of the completed universal enveloping algebra $\mathcal{U}(Z)$. We denote the natural pairing

$$A(Z) \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \mathcal{U}(Z) \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}$$

by $\langle -, - \rangle$, and the same after base-change to R .

Proposition 3.8. Continuing with the situation and the notation of segment 3.7, fix natural numbers $0 \leq r < n$ and generators $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_r \in \Sigma_{-1}$, and $\sigma \in \Sigma_{r-n}$. We then have

$$\langle \text{Li}_n^u(c), \sigma \tau_1 \cdots \tau_r \rangle = \langle \text{Li}_r^u(c), \sigma \rangle \langle \log^u(c), \tau_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \log^u(c), \tau_r \rangle$$

and all other values $\langle \text{Li}_n^u(c), w \rangle$ (w a word in Σ) vanish.

Proof. This formula appeared in a letter written by Francis Brown and is proved in [CDC]. \square

3.9. Definition. Let k be a field with an absolute value. We say that vectors

$$v_1, \dots, v_d \in k^n$$

are ϵ -linearly independent if all determinants of minors are $> \epsilon$.

3.10. Proposition. Let k be a field with an absolute value, $v_1, \dots, v_d, \tilde{v}_1, \dots, \tilde{v}_d$ vectors in k^n such that for each $i = 1, \dots, d$,

$$|v_i - \tilde{v}_i| < \epsilon.$$

If the vectors $\tilde{v}_1, \dots, \tilde{v}_d$ are ϵ -linearly independent, then the vectors v_1, \dots, v_d are linearly independent.

We omit the proof, which is elementary.

4. BASIS FOR Z TAPERED

We construct an algorithm which takes as input two primes

$$p > q_M,$$

and a natural number n , and outputs a doubly indexed family

$$\{a_{i,j}\}_{\substack{2 \leq i \leq n \\ 1 \leq j \leq d_i}}$$

For i odd, we will set $a_{i,1} = -\bar{1}_1$, so that

$$\text{Li}_i^u(a_{i,1}) = \zeta^u(i).$$

The remaining elements $a_{i,j}$ are $Z_{>q_M}$ -points of X . We first announce the meaning of the output in a proposition.

Proposition 4.1. Let

$$Z_{>q_M} = \text{Spec } \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{\text{primes} \leq q_M\}.$$

If the basis algorithm halts, then the unipotent logarithms

$$\log^u q$$

for q prime $\leq q_M$, together with the unipotent polylogarithms and zeta elements

$$\text{Li}_i^u(a_{i,j})$$

for $2 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq j \leq d_i$, form an algebra basis for $A^G(Z_{>q_M})$ in half-weights $\leq n$. In particular, the integral depth-one conjecture holds for $Z_{>q_M}$ in half-weights $\leq n$.

4.2. **Remark.** The algorithm below may be made more efficient as follows. We have a series of inclusions of sets

$$X(Z_{>2}) \subset X(Z_{>3}) \subset \cdots \subset X(Z_{>q_M})$$

and a series of inclusions of graded Hopf subalgebras

$$A^G(Z_{>2}) \subset A^G(Z_{>3}) \subset \cdots \subset A^G(Z_{>q_M}).$$

Instead of constructing a basis for all of $A^G(Z_{>q_M})$ right from the start, we may construct algebra bases for the subalgebras $A^G(Z_{>q})$ ($q \leq q_M$) consecutively, looking for a basis for the latter among the polylogarithmic values $\text{Li}_i^u(a)$ for

$$a \in X(Z_{>q}) \setminus X(Z_{\geq q}).$$

This would not, however, make our presentation of the algorithm any simpler, and we do not dwell on it further.

4.3. **Notation.** Given ϵ , we let $\text{Li}_n^\epsilon(a)$ denote an ϵ -approximation of the associated p -adic polylogarithm produced by the algorithm of Besser–de Jeu [BdJ], and similarly for $\zeta^\epsilon(n)$. For the remainder of this section, we write A^G as an abbreviation for $A^G(Z_{>q_M})$.

4.4. **Subalgorithm.** We begin by constructing a subalgorithm which will be applied recursively within the main algorithm. The subalgorithm takes as input an ϵ and an algebra basis

$$\mathcal{B}^G = \{L_{i,j}\}_{i \leq n}$$

for $A^G(Z)$ in half-weights $\leq n$ with $L_{1,j} = \log^u(q_j)$, with $L_{i,1} = \zeta^u(i)$ for i odd ≥ 3 , and with

$$L_{i,j} = \text{Li}_i^u(a_{i,j})$$

for all other i, j , and produces as output for each $a \in X(Z_{>q_M})$, and each $m \leq n$, an expansion of $\text{Li}_m^u(a)$ in the monomial vector-space basis associated to the algebra basis \mathcal{B}^G to precision ϵ . The construction is recursive in m .

4.4.1. In the presence of the given basis, the Hopf-algebra $A^G(Z)$ may be identified as a vector space with a space of vectors with entries in the field \mathbb{Q} of rational numbers equipped with the p -adic absolute value, and the computations that follow are carried out there. As a matter of notation, we let

$$\mathcal{A}_{m,j} = L_{m,j}$$

for $j = 1, \dots, \dim \mathfrak{n}_{-m}^G$, and $\mathcal{A}_{m,j}$ a shuffle monomial in $L_{m',j'}$ with $m' < m$ for $j > \dim \mathfrak{n}_{-m}^G$. For the base case of our recursive construction, we have

$$\text{Li}_1^u(a) = -\log^u(1-a) \in A_1^G \cong \mathbb{Q}^{\{q_1, \dots, q_M\}},$$

which we may expand in the logarithms $\log^u q_j$ by decomposing $1-a$ as a product of primes.

4.4.2. Assume we've expanded the polylogarithmic values $\text{Li}_{<m}^u(a)$ in our algebra basis for $A^G(Z)_{<m}$ up to precision ϵ . Assume m odd (the case m even is simpler). Our polylogarithmic basis for $A_{\leq n}^G$ gives us in particular a polylogarithmic basis for the direct sum of tensor products

$$A_1^G \otimes A_{m-1}^G + A_2^G \otimes A_{m-2}^G + \cdots + A_{m-1}^G \otimes A_1^G,$$

and allows us to identify the latter with a space \mathbb{Q}^N of vectors.

Because of our imperfect approximations, $\Delta' \text{Li}_m^u(a)$ may not quite be in the linear span of the images $\Delta' \mathcal{A}_{m,j}$ of the basis elements $\mathcal{A}_{m,j} \in A_m^G$. We may nevertheless use algorithms from elementary linear algebra to project $\Delta' \text{Li}_m^u(a)$ onto the subspace spanned by the $\Delta' \mathcal{A}_{m,j}$ and to compute the coefficients, which we now denote by

$$\Delta' \text{Li}_m^u(a) = \sum_{j=2}^{\dim A_m^G} c_j \Delta' \mathcal{A}_{m,j}.$$

This gives us all coefficients except c_1 . To determine the latter, we use the period map as follows. Letting $\mathcal{A}_{m,j}^\epsilon$ denote an ϵ -approximation of the p -adic period of $\mathcal{A}_{m,j}$ produced by the algorithm of Besser–de Jeu [BdJ], we set

$$c_1 := \frac{\text{Li}_m^\epsilon(a) - \sum_{j=2}^{\dim A_m^G} c_j \mathcal{A}_{m,j}^\epsilon}{\zeta^\epsilon(m)}.$$

We then have the expansion

$$\text{Li}_m^u(a) \underset{\epsilon}{\sim} \sum c_j \mathcal{A}_{m,j}$$

we hoped for. This completes the construction of the subalgorithm.

4.5. Basis algorithm for Z tapered. We now construct the main algorithm of this section. We assume for a recursive construction that we have an algebra basis in half-weights $< m \leq n$, as well as unipotent polylogarithms

$$L_1 = \text{Li}_m^u(a_{m,1}), \dots, L_r = \text{Li}_m^u(a_{m,r})$$

which are linearly independent modulo the space D_n^G of decomposables. We choose arbitrarily a point $a \in X(Z)$ and an $\epsilon \in p^{-\mathbb{N}}$. We use the subalgorithm of segment 4.4 above to expand Δ' of the decomposables in weight m , the $\Delta' L_i$, as well as our new candidate $\Delta' L = \Delta' \text{Li}_m^u(a)$ with precision ϵ in our polylogarithmic basis for the space

$$\bigoplus_{i+j=m, i,j \geq 1} A_i^G \otimes A_j^G$$

and check the result for ϵ -linear independence (ignoring L_1 if m is odd). If the result is negative, we change a and decrease ϵ and repeat.⁹ If the result is positive, we set $a_{m,r+1}$ equal to a and continue the process until $r = \dim \mathfrak{n}_m^G$. This completes the construction.

⁹If the integral depth-one conjecture is false for m and Z , then this process may not halt.

Proposition 4.6. Assume the integral depth-1 conjecture (2.3.6) holds for q_M in half weights $\leq n$. Then the algorithm of segment 4.5 halts.

5. CHANGE OF BASIS

5.1. Given our polylogarithmic algebra-basis

$$\mathcal{B}_{\leq n}^G = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathcal{B}_i^G$$

for $A_{\leq n}^G(Z_{> q_M})$, there exists an algebra basis $\mathcal{B}_{\leq n} = \bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathcal{B}_i$ for $A_{\leq n}(Z_{> q_M})$ which extends $\mathcal{B}_{\leq n}^G$ (c.f. remark 3.3 above). In detail, let $\mathcal{P}_{\geq n}^G \subset \mathcal{B}_{\geq n}^G$ denote the subset obtained by removing the extension classes (i.e. the logarithms and zeta elements). In half weight 1 we set

$$\mathcal{P}_1 = \mathcal{P}_1^G = \emptyset.$$

In half-weight $i \geq 2$ we extend the set \mathcal{P}_i^G (by choosing arbitrary linearly independent elements of $A_i \subset A$, regarded as an abstract shuffle algebra) to a linearly independent subset \mathcal{P}_i of A_i which spans a linear complement to the subspace

$$E_i \oplus D_i \subset A_i$$

spanned by extensions and decomposables. Setting

$$\mathcal{E}_i := \begin{cases} \{\log^u q_1, \dots, \log^u q_M\} & i = 1 \\ \zeta^u(i) & i > 1 \text{ odd} \\ \emptyset & i > 1 \text{ even,} \end{cases} \quad \mathcal{E}_{\leq n} := \bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathcal{E}_i, \quad \mathcal{P}_{\leq n} := \bigcup_{i=1}^n \mathcal{P}_i,$$

and

$$\mathcal{B}_{\leq n} := \mathcal{E}_{\leq n} \cup \mathcal{P}_{\leq n},$$

we have according to proposition 3.2.2 of [DC], $A_{\leq n}(Z_{> q_M}) = \mathbb{Q}[\mathcal{B}_{\leq n}]$.¹⁰

5.2. For r odd ≥ 3 , we let σ_r be dual to $\zeta^u(r)$ relative to the vector-space basis of shuffle monomials in the algebra basis $\mathcal{B}_{\leq n}$. If w is a word in the generators τ_q, σ_r , and \mathcal{A} is an element of the vector-space basis for A^G generated by the polylogarithmic algebra basis, then the value

$$\langle \mathcal{A}, w \rangle \in \mathbb{Q}$$

is independent of the choice of basis for A beyond the polylogarithmic basis constructed for A^G .

We now construct an algorithm which takes as input a polylogarithmic basis, a word w in the generators τ_q, σ_r , an element \mathcal{A} of the vector space basis generated by the algebra basis, and an ϵ , and computes $\langle \mathcal{A}, w \rangle$ to

¹⁰ The resulting algebra basis $\mathcal{B}_{\leq n}$ is a mixture of concrete polylogarithmic elements of A^G which we have constructed algorithmically on the one hand, with abstract elements of A on the other hand, whose construction does not intervene in the algorithm. If we were to separate our construction of the algorithm from our verification that its output has the desired meaning, then these last elements would serve as a mere book-keeping device in the construction.

precision ϵ . The construction is a dévissage in three steps. An example is worked out for instance in §7.6.3 of [DCW2] as well as in [CDC].

5.2.1. If $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}'\mathcal{A}''$ is a product of two or more algebra-basis elements, we use the relationship

$$\langle \mathcal{A}'\mathcal{A}'', w \rangle = \langle \mathcal{A}' \otimes \mathcal{A}'', \mu(w) \rangle$$

between the shuffle product on A and the coproduct μ on its completed universal enveloping algebra \mathcal{U} repeatedly to reduce to the case that $\mathcal{A} = L$ is itself an algebra-basis element.

5.2.2. The values $\langle L, w \rangle$ for L a logarithm, an n -logarithm, or a zeta value obey the following rules. We have

$$\langle \log^u a, \tau_q \rangle = v_q(a)$$

(the q -adic valuation of a) and all other values $\langle \log^u a, w \rangle$ vanish. We have

$$\langle \text{Li}_1^u a, \tau_q \rangle = \langle -\log^u(1-a), \tau_q \rangle = -v_q(1-a).$$

By proposition 3.8, we have

$$\langle \text{Li}_n^u a, \tau_1 \cdots \tau_n \rangle = \langle \text{Li}_1^u a, \tau_1 \rangle \langle \log^u a, \tau_2 \rangle \cdots \langle \log^u a, \tau_n \rangle,$$

and

$$\langle \text{Li}_n^u a, \sigma_r \tau_1 \cdots \tau_s \rangle = \langle \text{Li}_r^u a, \sigma_r \rangle \langle \log^u a, \tau_1 \rangle \cdots \langle \log^u a, \tau_s \rangle$$

($r + s = n$), and all other values $\langle \text{Li}_n^u a, w \rangle$ vanish. Finally, by definition

$$\langle \zeta^u(n), \sigma_n \rangle = 1$$

and all other values $\langle \zeta^u(n), w \rangle$ vanish. Using these formulas, we reduce to the computation of the values $\langle \text{Li}_r^u(a), \sigma_r \rangle$, noting, however, that $\text{Li}_r^u(a)$ may not be an algebra basis element.

5.2.3. We use the method of §4.4 to expand $\text{Li}_r^u(a)$ in our polylogarithmic basis in half-weight r to precision ϵ . We have thus reduced to the case that $\mathcal{A} = L$ is again an algebra-basis element, while $w = \sigma_r$ is a one-letter word. Finally, by our very definition of σ_r , we have

$$\langle L, \sigma_r \rangle = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } L = \zeta^u(r), \text{ and} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

This completes the construction of the algorithm.

5.3. Given $w \in \mathcal{U}_{-k}$ a word in the generators τ_p, σ_r (with $k \leq n$), we let $f_w \in A_k$ denote the dual element relative to the basis consisting of such words. In terms of the resulting shuffle basis, the above computations can be rewritten as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \log^u q &= f_{\tau_q}, \\ \zeta^u(n) &= f_{\sigma_n}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Li}_i^u(a) &= \sum \langle \text{Li}_r^u a, \sigma_r \rangle v_{q_1}(a) \cdots v_{q_s}(a) f_{\sigma\tau_{q_1} \cdots \tau_{q_s}} + \sum v_{q_0}(a) \cdots v_{q_i}(a) f_{\tau_{q_0} \cdots \tau_{q_i}} \\ (a = a_{i,j}, r + s = i). \end{aligned}$$

6. BASIS FOR $Z \subset \text{Spec } \mathbb{Z}$ ARBITRARY

6.1. We now consider $Z \subset Z_{>q_M}$ arbitrary. At this point we have a polylogarithmic basis $\{\mathcal{A}_{i,j}\}$ for $A^G(Z_{>q_M})$, a shuffle basis $\{f_w\}$ for all of $A(Z_{>q_M})$, and a matrix M expanding the former in the latter to precision ϵ , which we think of as the matrix associated to the inclusion

$$A^G(Z_{>q_M}) \subset A(Z_{>q_M})$$

relative to the polylogarithmic basis on the source and the shuffle basis on the target. Relative to the shuffle basis, $A(Z) \subset A(Z_{>q_M})$ is the hyperplane spanned by f_w with w not involving the generators τ_q for primes $q \in Z$. Pulling back via M , we obtain a system of linear equations. We may then construct a basis for the space of solutions by basic methods of linear algebra. The result is an algebra basis

$$\mathcal{B}^G = \{L_{i,j}\}_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq n \\ 1 \leq j \leq d_i}}$$

of $A^G(Z)$ in half-weights $\leq n$ such that

$$L_{1,1} = \log^u q_1, \dots, L_{1,M} = \log^u q_M$$

is the family of unipotent motivic logarithms of the primes $\notin Z$

7. GEOMETRIC ALGORITHM

The geometric algorithm takes place in a purely abstract setting, which we set up from scratch in order to emphasize this point.

7.1. Let $\pi^a(Z)$ denote the free pronipotent group on sets of generators

$$\Sigma_{-1} = \{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_M\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma_{-3} = \{\sigma_3\}, \quad \Sigma_{-5} = \{\sigma_5\} \dots$$

with $m = n$ if n is odd, and $m = n - 1$ if n is even, and M equal to the number of primes excluded from Z . Let $A(Z)^a$ denote the associated graded Hopf algebra

$$A(Z)^a = \mathcal{O}(\pi^a(Z)),$$

a polynomial \mathbb{Q} -algebra on the set of Lyndon words for an ordering of the generators. As a corollary of proposition 3.8, we obtain a map of finite type polynomial algebras over \mathbb{Q} which represents the universal evaluation map

$$\pi_1^{\text{un}}(Z) \times Z^1(\pi_1^{\text{un}}(Z), \pi^{\text{PL}}(X))^{\mathbb{G}_m} \rightarrow \pi_1^{\text{un}}(Z) \times \pi^{\text{PL}}(X)$$

in restricted weights:

$$\mathbb{Q}[\{f_\lambda\}_\lambda, \{\Phi_\Lambda^\rho\}_{\text{wt}(\rho)=\text{wt}(\Lambda)}] \leftarrow \mathbb{Q}[\{f_\lambda\}_\lambda, \log^{\text{u}}, \text{Li}_1^{\text{u}}, \text{Li}_2^{\text{u}}, \dots, \text{Li}_n^{\text{u}}],$$

(where λ ranges over Lyndon words in the generators τ, σ of $\pi^a(Z)$, Λ ranges over the set of polylogarithmic words in e_0, e_1 of weight $\leq n$, and ρ ranges over the set of generators τ, σ of $\pi^a(Z)$) given by

$$\sum_{\tau \in \Sigma_{-1}} f_\tau \Phi_0^\tau \leftarrow \log^{\text{u}}$$

and

$$\sum_{\substack{\tau_1, \dots, \tau_r \in \Sigma_{-1} \\ \sigma \in \Sigma_{-s} \\ r+s=n \\ 1 \leq s \leq n}} f_{\tau_1 \dots \tau_r \sigma} \Phi_0^{\tau_1} \cdots \Phi_0^{\tau_r} \underbrace{\Phi_0^\sigma \dots 01}_s \leftarrow \text{Li}_n^{\text{u}};$$

see [CDC]. So a set of generators for its kernel may be constructed by standard methods of elimination theory. This completes our construction of the geometric algorithm.

7.2. Remark. If \mathcal{C} is the universal cocycle

$$\pi_1^{\text{un}}(Z) \times Z^1(\pi_1^{\text{un}}(Z), \pi^{\text{PL}}(X))^{\mathbb{G}_m} \rightarrow \pi^{\text{PL}}(X) \times Z^1(\pi_1^{\text{un}}(Z), \pi^{\text{PL}}(X))^{\mathbb{G}_m},$$

then

$$\underbrace{\Phi_0^\rho \dots 01}_n(\mathcal{C}) = \langle \text{Li}_n^{\text{u}}(\mathcal{C}), \rho \rangle$$

(this equality takes place inside the coordinate ring of Z^1 , or, in terms of our shuffle basis, inside $\mathbb{Q}[\{\Phi_\Lambda^\rho\}]$). In other words, Φ_Λ^ρ corresponds to the function on cocycles $\langle \text{Li}_n^{\text{u}}(?), \rho \rangle$.

8. LOCI ALGORITHM

In terms of the basis algorithms, the change of basis algorithm, and the geometric algorithm, our *loci algorithm* is similar to the algorithm of [DC, §4.2]; we repeat the construction, making adjustments as needed.

8.1. The loci algorithm takes as input an open subscheme $Z \subset \text{Spec } \mathbb{Z}$, a closed point $p \in Z$, a natural number n and an $\epsilon \in p^{\mathbb{Z}}$. As output, it returns

8.2. In the next steps, which incorporate our polylogarithmic basis, we complete the portion of our algorithm which we refer to as the *loci algorithm*. The coefficients of the generators produced by the geometric algorithm will necessarily be within ϵ of the image of our ϵ -approximation of the map

$$A^G(Z) \rightarrow A(Z);$$

by the methods of elementary linear algebra we may project the coefficients onto its image and expand the corresponding points of A^G in our polylogarithmic basis. We then replace all unipotent motivic polylogarithms by their p -adic periods and replace the algebraic functions \log^u , Li_i^u on $\pi^{\text{PL}}(X)$ by the corresponding Coleman functions on $X(\mathbb{Z}_p)$. We then symmetrize with respect to the S_3 action as indicated in segment 2.4.2. We apply the algorithm of Besser–de Jeu [BdJ] to obtain local power series expansions.

9. POINT COUNTING ALGORITHM

9.1. Our *root criterion algorithm* from [DC, §5] combines standard methods of Newton polygons together with a growth estimate obtained by Besser–de Jeu [BdJ] to decide whether the number of zeroes of a p -adic power series in a given ball is zero or one, given a sufficiently close approximation. We do not repeat it here.

9.2. Our *point-counting algorithm* from [DC, §7] remains unchanged; we nevertheless do repeat it for the reader’s convenience, while avoiding the double tildes of loc. cit. as indicated in remark 2.3.11. This algorithm takes as input an open subscheme Z of $\text{Spec } \mathbb{Z}$ and proceeds by running two processes simultaneously. One process is simply a naive search for points of $X(Z)$. This produces a gradually increasing subset $X(Z)_n \subset X(Z)$.

For the other process, we set q equal to the largest prime $\notin Z$ and we let p be the next prime. This process computes the loci $X(\mathbb{Z}_p)_n$ to given precision. It then verifies if it is possible, with the given level of precision, to declare an equality

$$X(Z)_n = X(\mathbb{Z}_p)_n.$$

9.3. More precisely, our algorithm searches through the set of triples (n, N, ϵ) , $n, N \in \mathbb{N}$, ϵ in a countable subset of $\mathbb{R}_{>0}$ with accumulation point 0. After each attempt, we increase n and N and decrease ϵ . To each such triple, our algorithm assigns a set $X(Z)_n$ of points of $X(Z)$ and a boolean. The boolean output will be constructed in segments 9.4–9.7. If the boolean output is *True*, then we output $X(Z)_n$. If the boolean output is *False*, then we continue the search. To produce the set $X(Z)_n$, we simply search for points up to a suitable high-bound depending on n which goes to infinity with n . The remainder of the construction concerns the boolean output.

9.4. We partition $X(\mathbb{Z}_p)$ into ϵ -balls, decreasing ϵ as needed to ensure that each ball contains at most one element of the set $X(Z)_n$ (our, potentially incomplete, list of integral points). We run our loci algorithm to produce a family $\{F_i\}_i$ of polylogarithmic functions on $X(\mathbb{Z}_p)$.

9.5. We now focus our attention on an ϵ -ball B containing a rational representative $y \in B$. Using *Lip service* [BdJ], we expand each polylogarithmic function F_i to arithmetic precision ϵ and geometric precision e^{-N} about y . In a technical step explained in the proof of theorem 7.2.1 of [DC], we must check that all nonzero coefficients are larger than ϵ , returning *False* if not.

9.6. Let b be the number of points (0 or 1) in $X(Z)_n \cap B$. We run the root-criterion algorithm on the ball B , on the precision-levels N and ϵ , and on each of the functions F_i , to verify if B contains no more than b roots.

9.7. We repeat steps 9.5-9.6 in each ball. This completes the construction of the algorithm.

REFERENCES

- [BDCKW] J. Balakrishnan, I. Dan-Cohen, M. Kim, and S. Wewers. A non-abelian conjecture of Birch and Swinnerton-Dyer type for hyperbolic curves. Preprint. arXiv:1209.0640v1.
- [BdJ] Amnon Besser and Rob de Jeu. $\text{Li}^{(p)}$ -service? An algorithm for computing p -adic polylogarithms. *Math. Comp.*, 77(262):1105–1134, 2008.
- [Bor1] Armand Borel. Sur la cohomologie des espaces fibrés principaux et des espaces homogènes de groupes de Lie compacts. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 57:115–207, 1953.
- [Bor2] Armand Borel. Cohomologie de SL_n et valeurs de fonctions zeta aux points entiers. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4)*, 4(4):613–636, 1977.
- [Bro1] Francis Brown. Integral points on curves, the unit equation, and motivic periods. arXiv:1704.00555v1.
- [Bro2] Francis Brown. Mixed Tate motives over \mathbb{Z} . *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 175(2):949–976, 2012.
- [BW] A. Baker and G. Wüstholz. *Logarithmic forms and Diophantine geometry*, volume 9 of *New Mathematical Monographs*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007.
- [CDC] David Corwin and Ishai Dan-Cohen. The Goncharov quotient in computational chabauty-kim theory I. In preparation.
- [DC] Ishai Dan-Cohen. Mixed Tate motives and the unit equation II. arXiv:1510.01362v3.
- [DCS] Ishai Dan-Cohen and Tomer Schlank. Rational motivic path spaces and Kim’s relative unipotent section conjecture. arXiv:1703.10776.
- [DCW1] Ishai Dan-Cohen and Stefan Wewers. Explicit Chabauty-Kim theory for the thrice punctured line in depth two. *Proceedings of the London Math Society*. To appear. arXiv:1209.0276v1.

- [DCW2] Ishai Dan-Cohen and Stefan Wewers. Mixed Tate motives and the unit equation. *International Math Research Notices*. To appear. arXiv:1311.7008.
- [Del] Pierre Deligne. Le groupe fondamental de la droite projective moins trois points. In *Galois groups over \mathbf{Q} (Berkeley, CA, 1987)*, volume 16 of *Math. Sci. Res. Inst. Publ.*, pages 79–297. Springer, New York, 1989.
- [DG] P. Deligne and A. B. Goncharov. Groupes fondamentaux motiviques de Tate mixte. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 38(1):1–56, 2005.
- [dW] B. M. M. de Weger. *Algorithms for Diophantine equations*, volume 65 of *CWI Tract*. Stichting Mathematisch Centrum, Centrum voor Wiskunde en Informatica, Amsterdam, 1989.
- [EG] Jan-Hendrik Evertse and Kálmán Györy. *Unit equations in Diophantine number theory*, volume 146 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2015.
- [Gon1] Alexander B. Goncharov. Polylogarithms and motivic Galois groups. In *Motives (Seattle, WA, 1991)*, volume 55 of *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, pages 43–96. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1994.
- [Gon2] Alexander B. Goncharov. Galois symmetries of fundamental groupoids and noncommutative geometry. *Duke Math. J.*, 128(2):209–284, 2005.
- [Kim1] Minhyong Kim. The motivic fundamental group of $\mathbb{P}^1 \setminus \{0, 1, \infty\}$ and the theorem of Siegel. *Invent. Math.*, 161(3):629–656, 2005.
- [Kim2] Minhyong Kim. Tangential localization for Selmer varieties. *Duke Math. J.*, 161(2):173–199, 2012.
- [Lev] Marc Levine. Tate motives and the fundamental group. In *Cycles, motives and Shimura varieties*, Tata Inst. Fund. Res. Stud. Math., pages 265–392. Tata Inst. Fund. Res., Mumbai, 2010.
- [vKM] Rafael von Känel and Benjamin Matschke. Solving S-unit, Mordell, Thue, Thue–Mahler and generalized Ramanujan–Nagell equations via Shimura–Taniyama conjecture. arXiv:1605.06079.

DAVID CORWIN
 DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
 970 EVANS HALL #3840
 UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
 BERKELEY, CA 94720-3840
 Email Address: corwind@alum.mit.edu

ISHAI DAN-COHEN
 DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
 BEN-GURION UNIVERSITY OF THE NEGEV
 BE'ER SHEVA, ISRAEL
 Email address: ishaidc@gmail.com