

Ph. Barbe
J. Cano
P. Fortuny Ayuso
W.P. McCormick

q -Algebraic Equations

their power series solutions
and the asymptotic behavior of
their coefficients

Acknowledgements

We thank the Departamento de Álgebra, Análisis Matemático, Geometría y Topología of the University of Valladolid for hosting and supporting our collaboration. Besides providing funds for us to meet through the project MTM2013-46337-C2-1-P granted by the Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad of the Spanish Government, our colleagues in Valladolid provided a nurturing environment for our intense working sessions.

Pedro Fortuny Ayuso thanks José Manuel Aroca for introducing him to the topic.

Philippe Barbe thanks Vladimir Georgescu for his unwavering support in the face of adversity.

Contents

1. Introduction
 - 1.1. q -algebraic equations in perspective
 - 1.2. Modern developments in the theory of q -algebraic equations
 - 1.3. Content of this book

- Part I. General theory of q -algebraic equations

2. q -algebraic equations
 - 2.1. Domain of the equations
 - 2.2. q -algebraic equations

3. The Newton-Puiseux construction
 - 3.1. The method of substitution
 - 3.2. The Newton-Puiseux polygon
 - 3.3. Translations of q -operators
 - 3.4. Pivot point
 - 3.5. Partial derivatives of q -operators and multiple roots
 - 3.6. The first ω -terms of a Hahn series
 - 3.7. Finiteness property

4. Solved form and recursion
 - 4.1. Shifting and nonshifting q -factors
 - 4.2. Solved form and recursion
 - 4.3. Some transformations preserving solved forms
 - 4.4. From Hahn series to power series solutions and solved form
 - 4.5. Summability classes of q -algebraic equations

- Part II. Asymptotics for the coefficients of power series solutions of q -algebraic equations in solved form

5. Generic order and degree of the rational function f_n
 - 5.1. Preliminaries
 - 5.2. The generic order of $f_n(q)$

5.3. The generic degree of $f_n(q)$

5.4. Additional results

6. Analytic solutions

6.1. Analytic solutions

6.2. Elementary singularity analysis and the root peeling algorithm

6.3. Asymptotic behavior of f_n

6.4. Transforming linear equations

7. Entire solutions

7.1. A general result

7.2. Linear equations

7.3. Nonlinear equations

8. Divergent solutions

8.1. Main result

8.2. Proof of Theorem 8.1.5

8.3. Proof of Corollary

8.4. On the sharpness of Theorem 8.1.5

Part III. Refinements

9. Translating and simplifying solved forms

9.1. Some notation and basic properties

9.2. Effect of the translation on nonshifting q -operators

9.3. Effect of the translation and simplification on the height, co-height and the crest

9.4. Algorithm

9.5. Effect of the translation and simplification on the depth

9.6. Effect of the translation and simplification on the elevation and edge

10. Miscellanea

1. Leading coefficients

2. A simple confluence result

11. Nongeneric asymptotics for linear equations

11.1. Linear operators and their cokernels

11.2. Long division and auxiliary results

11.3. Change of equation

- 11.4. Characterization of the image and peeling the roots
- 11.5. Formal linear r -factors
- 11.6. Gliding formal r -algebraic equations of Laurent type
- 11.7. Interpretation of the gliding algorithm
- 11.8. Gliding iteratively
- 11.9. Conclusion

Part IV. Applications

12. Algorithms

- 12.1. Notation and assumptions
- 12.2. Newton-Puiseux polygon
 - 12.2.1. Computation of the Newton-Puiseux polygon
 - 12.2.2. Convenience methods
- 12.3. Computation of the initial terms of the solutions
 - 12.3.1. Calculating the exponents
 - 12.3.2. A recursive method using a tree structure
 - 12.3.3. The list of initial expansions
- 12.4. Reduction to solved form
- 12.5. An easy optimization

13. Examples

- 13.1. The colored Jones equation for the figure 8 knot
 - 13.1.1. Case $|q| > 1$
 - 13.1.2. Case $|q| < 1$
- 13.2. First combinatorial example (Drake, 2009)
 - 13.2.1. Case $|q| > 1$
 - 13.2.2. Case $|q| < 1$
- 13.3. Second combinatorial example (Drake, 2009)
- 13.4. Third combinatorial example (Gessel, 1980)
- 13.5. Generating function of bargraphs q -counted by area
- 13.6. The q -Painlevé equation of type 1
 - 13.6.1. Solution starting by $f_1 z$
 - 13.6.2. Solutions with $f_0 \neq 0$
- 13.6. A challenging example
 - 13.6.1. Solution starting with $cz^{-3/2}$
 - 13.6.2. Solution starting with $cz^{1/2}$
 - 13.6.3. Solution starting with cz^2

1. Introduction

A q -algebraic equation is a functional equation given by a complex polynomial of several variables, $P(z, z_0, z_1, \dots, z_k)$, a complex number q , and is of the form

$$P(z, f(z), f(qz), \dots, f(q^k z)) = 0, \quad (1.1)$$

where f is the unknown. Since the coefficients of the polynomial are free parameters, they may in fact depend on q in any fashion that one wishes. These q -algebraic equations occur in various areas, including combinatorics, dynamical systems, knot theory, and mathematical physics.

Some important problems on q -algebraic equations parallel those on differential equations and, loosely speaking, concern the existence, uniqueness, and some form of regularity of the solutions. For those three problems to make sense, one needs to state the domain of the equation, that is, what sort of $f(z)$ are considered. In full generality, all three problems are in terms of formal power series, with possibly non-integer exponents, which may or may not be convergent. In this setting, the regularity problem is to be interpreted as that of the asymptotic behavior of the coefficients of the formal solutions. The purpose of this book is to address these issues.

1. q -algebraic equations in perspective. The origin of the subject in the 17th century seems both analytic and number theoretic. Andrew, Askey and Roy (1999, §10.1) report that Fermat, searching for a closed formula for the integral $\int_0^t x^\lambda dx$ when λ is not an integer, considered the approximation of that integral using a geometric




figure 1.1.1

series, namely, taking q in $(0, 1)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n \geq 0} (q^n t)^\lambda (q^n t - q^{n+1} t) &= t^{\lambda+1} \sum_{n \geq 0} q^{(\lambda+1)n} (1 - q) \\ &= t^{\lambda+1} \frac{1 - q}{1 - q^{\lambda+1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit as q tends to 1 yields $\int_0^t x^\lambda dx = t^{\lambda+1}/(\lambda + 1)$. This lead Thomae (1869) and Jackson (1910) to introduce the q -integral

$$\int_0^t f(x) d_q x = \sum_{n \geq 0} f(tq^n) (tq^n - tq^{n+1}),$$

and consequently, to the development of a discrete form of integral and differential calculus, to which we will come back.

A different source is number theoretic and combinatorial, with the theory of partitions. A partition of an integer n is a nondecreasing tuple (k_1, \dots, k_m) of positive integers such that $k_1 + \dots + k_m = n$. For instance, the partitions of 3 are (3) , $(1, 2)$, and $(1, 1, 1)$. In a different way, a partition of n can be identified with the sequence of nonnegative integers $(n_k)_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that $n = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} n_k k$, the number n_k counting how many times k appears in the partition. Writing $p(n)$ for the number of partitions of n , Euler calculates the generating function of the sequence $(p(n))$, noting that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n \geq 0} p(n) q^n &= \prod_{k \geq 1} (1 + q^k + q^{2k} + q^{3k} + \dots) \\ &= \prod_{k \geq 1} \frac{1}{1 - q^k}. \end{aligned}$$

Writing

$$(z; q)_n = \prod_{0 \leq k < n} (1 - zq^k)$$

with $(z; q)_0 = 1$, defining also

$$(z; q)_\infty = \prod_{k \geq 0} (1 - zq^k),$$

we see that

$$\sum_{n \geq 0} p(n) q^n = \frac{1}{(q; q)_\infty}.$$

In the course of his investigations, Euler discovered the formula

$$\sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{z^n}{(q; q)_n} = \frac{1}{(z; q)_\infty}.$$

Considering the left hand side of this identity, set

$$f(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{z^n}{(q; q)_n}.$$

We see that

$$\begin{aligned} f(qz) &= \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{q^n z^n}{(q; q)_n} \\ &= \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{(q^n - 1)z^n}{(q; q)_n} + \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{z^n}{(q; q)_n} \\ &= -z \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{z^{n-1}}{(q; q)_{n-1}} + f(z) \\ &= (1 - z)f(z). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, f obeys a q -algebraic equation $f(qz) = (1 - z)f(z)$, corresponding to the polynomial $P(z, z_0, z_1) = (1 - z)z_0 - z_1$ in (1.1). From this equation, it is easy to see that if $|q|$ is less than 1, then

$$f(z) = \frac{f(qz)}{1 - z} = \frac{f(q^2z)}{(1 - z)(1 - qz)} = \dots = \frac{f(0)}{(z; q)_\infty} = \frac{1}{(z; q)_\infty},$$

which is Euler's formula.

Euler's line of study led Jackson (1908) to introduce the q -difference operator

$$D_q f(z) = \frac{f(z) - f(qz)}{(1 - q)z},$$

with the heuristic that

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow 1} D_q f(z) = \frac{d}{dz} f(z),$$

so that D_q is a discrete approximation of the differential operator d/dz . Immediately, this opens the door to an interesting q -analogue

of differential equations, and therefore of various special functions, many motivated by applications, not just for the sake of generalization. As an elementary example, a q -analogue of the exponential function $e^{\lambda z}$ may be defined by the identity $D_q f(z) = \lambda f(z)$, which means that f satisfies the q -algebraic equation

$$f(z) - f(qz) - \lambda(1 - q)zf(z) = 0,$$

represented as in (1.1) by the polynomial

$$P(z, z_0, z_1) = z_0 - z_1 - \lambda(1 - q)zz_0.$$

A still different perspective on q -algebraic equations comes from algebra with the study of functions of q -commuting operators, that is, operators x and y such that $yx = qxy$. In that context, one can prove the q -binomial formula

$$(x + y)^n = \sum_{0 \leq k \leq n} \begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix}_q x^{n-k} y^k$$

where

$$\begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix}_q = \frac{(q; q)_n}{(q; q)_k (q; q)_{n-k}}$$

is the q -binomial coefficient, also called the Gauss polynomial. While this formula is reported to have been known in the 19th century, its proof is due to Schützenberger (1953).

The last source of the subject which we mention is combinatorics. It is the main motivation for this book. Many combinatorial structures are defined recursively. As an example, consider the Catalan paths, which are the nondecreasing paths on the lattice \mathbb{N}^2 which join $(0, 0)$ to (n, n) and remain above the diagonal. Let C_n be the number of such paths. By considering the first time k that a Catalan path hits the diagonal, we obtain the recursion

$$\begin{aligned} C_n &= \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} C_{k-1} C_{n-k} \\ &= \sum_{0 \leq k \leq n-1} C_k C_{n-1-k}, \end{aligned}$$




figure 1.1.2

as long as we agree that $C_0 = 1$.

Consider the generating function $C(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} C_n z^n$. The recursion yields

$$\begin{aligned} C(z) &= 1 + z \sum_{\substack{n \geq 1 \\ 0 \leq k \leq n-1}} C_k z^k C_{n-1-k} z^{n-1-k} \\ &= 1 + z \sum_{k, m \geq 0} z^k C_k z^m C_m \\ &= 1 + z C(z)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, C solves the algebraic equation

$$zC(z)^2 - C(z) + 1 = 0. \quad (1.1.1)$$

This is a quadratic equation in C , and we obtain that

$$C(z) = \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 4z}}{2z}.$$

Therefore C_n is the coefficient of z^n in $(1 - \sqrt{1 - 4z})/2z$. As illustrated throughout the book by Flajolet and Sedgewick (2009), this is enough to show that

$$C_n \sim \frac{4^n}{n^{3/2} \sqrt{\pi}} \quad (1.1.2)$$

as n tends to infinity. Relation (1.1.2) allows one to estimate asymptotically the number of Catalan paths from $(0, 0)$ to (n, n) without calculating that number exactly. For this specific example, it is possible to show that C_n is in fact the Catalan number

$$C_n = \frac{1}{n+1} \binom{2n}{n},$$

but this information is not needed to obtain (1.1.2) from (1.1.1), and overall, as explained in Flajolet and Sedgewick (2009), singularity analysis often allows one to obtain the asymptotic behavior of the coefficients of a power series if one knows that this power series satisfies an algebraic equation.

A more involved but related problem gives rise to a q -algebraic equation, namely, that of counting the number of Catalan paths

whose area between the path and the diagonal is given. This problem has been considered first by Carlitz and Riordan (1964) and then by Carlitz (1972). Let $f_{n,\mathcal{A}}$ be the number of Catalan paths joining $(0,0)$ to (n,n) whose area between the path and the diagonal is \mathcal{A} . We introduce the bivariate generating function

$$f(z, q) = q^{1/2} \sum_{n,\mathcal{A}} f_{n,\mathcal{A}} z^n q^{\mathcal{A}}.$$

We may decompose it, defining first

$$f_n(q) = q^{1/2} \sum_{\mathcal{A}} f_{n,\mathcal{A}} q^{\mathcal{A}},$$

so that $f(z, q) = \sum_{n \geq 0} f_n(q) z^n$. Note that the summation in $f_n(q)$ is finite, so that $f_n(q)$ are in fact polynomials in $q^{1/2}$.

Again, by decomposing a path according to its first encounter with the diagonal at (k, k) say, we obtain that

$$f_{n,\mathcal{A}} = \sum_{k,\mathcal{B},\mathcal{C}} f_{k-1,\mathcal{B}} f_{n-k,\mathcal{C}}$$


where the summation is over all k , \mathcal{B} and \mathcal{C} with $\mathcal{B} + k - (1/2) + \mathcal{C} = \mathcal{A}$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} f_n(q) &= \sum_{k,\mathcal{B},\mathcal{C}} f_{k-1,\mathcal{B}} f_{n-k,\mathcal{C}} q^{\mathcal{B}} q^{\mathcal{C}} q^k \\ &= \sum_{k,\mathcal{B},\mathcal{C}} f_{k,\mathcal{B}} f_{n-1-k,\mathcal{C}} q^{\mathcal{B}} q^{\mathcal{C}} q^{k+1/2} q^{1/2} \\ &= \sum_k q^k f_k(q) f_{n-1-k}(q), \end{aligned}$$

as long as we agree that $f_0(q) = 1$.

Therefore, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f(z, q) &= f_0(q) + \sum_{\substack{n \geq 1 \\ 0 \leq k \leq n-1}} (zq)^k f_k(q) f_{n-1-k}(q) z^{n-k} \\ &= 1 + z \sum_{k,m} (zq)^k f_k(q) f_m(q) z^m \\ &= 1 + z f(qz, q) f(z, q). \end{aligned}$$



This equation is a q -algebraic equation, called the q -Catalan equation and the $f_n(q)$ are called the q -Catalan numbers. The second variable, q , is often omitted, and the equation is then written as

$$f(z) = 1 + zf(z)f(qz),$$

corresponding to the polynomial

$$P(z, z_0, z_1) = 1 - z_0 - zz_0z_1$$

in (1.1). This time, singularity analysis, as developed in Flajolet and Sedgewick (2009) does not apply anymore when $|q|$ is greater than 1, because it can be shown that $f(z)$ is a divergent power series. When $|q|$ is less than 1, singularity analysis does apply, but provides the asymptotic behavior of $f_n(q)$ in an implicit way, namely, that generically in q , we have $f_n(q) \sim \zeta^n$ for some ζ defined from f itself.

Part of the theory of q -algebraic equations is also related to complex dynamics. Consider a function φ which is an automorphism of a region \mathcal{R} of the complex plane containing the origin. Define the k -th iterate of φ by $\varphi^{[k]} = \varphi \circ \varphi^{[k-1]}$, $k \geq 1$, with $\varphi^{[0]}$ being the identity and $\varphi^{[-k]}$ being the compositional inverse of $\varphi^{[k]}$. Grévy (1894) started the study of equations of the form

$$P(z, f \circ \varphi^{[0]}(z), f \circ \varphi^{[1]}(z), \dots, f \circ \varphi^{[k]}(z)) = 0. \quad (1.1.3)$$

As indicated by Bézivin (1992b), equation (1.1.3) can be put in the form of (1.1) as follows. Define ψ by the requirement $\psi(0) = 0$, $\psi'(0) = 1$ and

$$\varphi(z) = \psi(q\psi^{[-1]}(z)).$$

Then

$$\varphi^{[j]} = \psi(q^j \psi^{[-1]}(z)),$$

so that (1.1.3) becomes

$$P\left(z, f \circ \psi(q^0 \psi^{[-1]}(z)), f \circ \psi(q^1 \psi^{[-1]}(z)), \dots, f \circ \psi(q^k \psi^{[-1]}(z))\right) = 0.$$

Substituting $\psi(z)$ for z yields

$$P(\psi(z), f \circ \psi(q^0 z), f \circ \psi(q^1 z), \dots, f \circ \psi(q^k z)) = 0,$$

which means that $g = f \circ \psi$ solves an equation quite similar to (1.1). However, the function

$$P(\psi(z), z_0, z_1, \dots, z_k)$$

may not be a polynomial, because of the term $\psi(z)$. But it is a polynomial in z_0, \dots, z_k , whose coefficients are power series in z if $\varphi(z)$ is also a power series in z . We will develop our theory in a slightly more general setting. However, while our results presumably yield some information on (1.1.3), we will not investigate it any further.

We refer to the books by Ernst (2000, 2012) and the survey by Di Vizio, Ramis, Sauloy and Zhang (2003) for further historical information and other areas where q -algebraic equations occur naturally.

2. Modern developments in the theory of q -algebraic equations. While this book proposes a quite extensive theory of the solutions of q -algebraic equations and the asymptotic behavior of their coefficients, it omits important topics which have been extensively studied in recent years. We now recall some of those, without being exhaustive.

Symmetries and classification problems have been extensively studied for linear q -algebraic equations, at least since the work of Birkhoff and Guenther (1941). For the most recent advances, we refer to the works of Ramis, Sauloy and Zhang (2004, 2013), Van der Put and Reversat (2007), Di Vizio and Sauloy (2011) and Di Vizio (2009) for instance, and to the work of Ramis, Sauloy and Zhang (2013) and references therein.

The confluence problem consists in determining the limit of the solutions, possibly rescaled, as q tends to 1. In the setting of linear q -algebraic equations, Di Vizio and Zhang (2009) gave some key results. In this book, we give a couple of very elementary confluence results motivated by the applications in the last chapter.

The asymptotics of the solutions as q tends to 0 or infinity has been studied in the specific context of the q -Lagrange inversion by Barbe and McCormick (2013), leading to unexpected connections between the Taylor formula and renewal theory.

Di Vizio (2002) and André and Di Vizio (2004) cover the case where q is of modulus 1, which gives rise to arithmetic considerations.

The asymptotic behavior of the coefficients of the solutions when q depends on n and tends to 1, that is, of $f_n(q_n)$ with $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} q_n = 1$, is important for some applications in probability and physics. Perhaps Tackacz (1991, 1995) are the first rigorous studies of this topic, in the special case of the q -Catalan equation, and these results are mentioned in some of the surveys in Guttman (2009).

3. Content of this book. This book is inspired by the combinatorial nature of q -algebraic equations. In particular, understanding the asymptotic behavior of the coefficients of the solution yields some information on the combinatorial structure that they count. As illustrated in the surveys edited by Guttman (2009), the asymptotic questions of interest in combinatorics and its applications to physics are difficult and hence, so far, have resisted systematic methods. This book is a modest first step toward addressing these problems, presenting a rather systematic study of q -algebraic equations and the asymptotic behavior of the coefficients of their solutions. As we will illustrate on concrete examples in the last chapter, our results yield quite a good understanding of the solutions and their regularity, as well as useful algorithms and numerical methods for studying the asymptotic behavior of their coefficients.

In order to determine the solutions and the exponents occurring in them, we will use a Newton-Puiseux polygon. As documented in Christensen (1996) and Enriques (1915), this method was originally designed to compute formal power series solutions of algebraic equations. It was also used in the context of differential equations by Briot and Bouquet (1856), Fine (1898, 1890), Ince (1926), Ritt (1936) and Cano (1993). Its use in the q -algebraic setting goes back to the earliest papers in the subject, such as Adams (1931). This technique allows us to show that the set of exponents of any solution of (1.1) is contained in a finitely generated semi-group, which is an analogue of Puiseux's theorem. This mirrors a similar result of Grigoriev and Singer (1991) for differential equations. However, in general, there is no guarantee that a q -algebraic equation has such a solution, unlike algebraic ones.

Building upon the work of van der Hoeven (2001) in the differential equation setting, the Newton-Puiseux construction allows us to show that up to ramifications and a further change of function, we may often assume that the polynomial P in (1.1) is in solved form,

meaning that it has the form

$$c + a_0 z_0 + a_1 z_1 + \cdots + a_k z_k + zQ(z, z_0, z_1, \dots, z_k),$$

where the a_i and c are complex numbers, some nonzero, and Q is a new polynomial. In other words, the coefficient of z^0 in P is an affine function of z_0, z_1, \dots, z_k . This solved form yields a recursion for the coefficients of the solution, albeit a complicated one. Despite this somewhat daunting complexity, this recursion is the key to obtaining asymptotic estimates on the coefficients of the solution.

Maillet's (1903) theorem is a classical result on the growth of the coefficients of a formal solution of a nonlinear differential equation. It states that the formal solution $\varphi(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \varphi_n z^n$ of a differential equation satisfies $|\varphi_n| \leq n!^s R^n$ for some constants s and R . This result was refined by Malgrange (1989) who gave bounds for s . These bounds were recovered by Cano (1993) also for singular solutions.

For linear q -algebraic equations, the first studies of the convergence or divergence of the solutions seem due to Bézivin (1992a, 1992b) and Bézivin and Boutabaa (1992). Simplifying, the analogue of the Maillet theorem then states that if (1.1) has a power series solution $f(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} f_n z^n$ and q is of modulus greater than 1, then $|f_n| \leq |q|^{sn^2} R^n$ for some s and R . For nonlinear equations, Zhang (1998) gives bounds for s which parallel those of Malgrange (1989) for differential equations. In most cases, we will provide more precise estimates of the coefficients in the form of an asymptotic equivalent up to a term of order 1 which can often be evaluated numerically when q is specified. The technique is in essence a refinement of the Laplace method, using that (1.1) expresses a complex recursion on the coefficients f_n of the solution, and analyzing precisely the leading terms in that recursion. This analysis allows us to transform the equation into one of the form

$$\mathcal{C}(z)f(z) = U(f)(z)$$

where \mathcal{C} is a polynomial, or eventually an entire function, and U is an operator which, when acting on f , has the property that the radius of convergence of $U(f)$ is always greater than that of f .

The Newton-Puiseux construction also yields numerical algorithms for computing the solutions. We will describe those algorithms and show their efficiency on specific equations, some particularly complicated, involving hundreds of terms.

As we will see, our sharp estimates on the coefficients of the solutions are generic, meaning that for a specific equation they usually hold for all but some exceptional values of q . For linear equations, we will explore the non-generic cases, giving a very precise refinement of Bézivin's (1992b) results, in particular constructing explicitly the co-kernel associated to the linear operator defining a linear q -algebraic equation, acting on various spaces of formal power series. Various index theorems for these operators follow. The general principle is that regularity of the solution translates into the possibility of obtaining a new equation for a functional of this solution, thus in the possibility of transforming the equation; the key is then to identify classes of equations which are stable under these transformations.

While most of the results are illustrated throughout the text on simple equations, and in particular on the q -Catalan equation or some elementary variants, the last chapter is devoted to examples of q -algebraic equations which arise in combinatorial applications, knot theory, classification of surfaces, and present sometimes some very substantial challenges. As we will see, our theory brings a good understanding of these equations, often delivering sharp estimates on the coefficients of the solutions, but not always. Combined with computer algebra packages and numerical estimates, the theory developed in this book yields valuable insights on the solutions of specific q -algebraic equations when q is given.

Some notations and conventions.

While i denotes an integer everywhere in this book, ι denotes a complex root of -1 , that is, $\iota^2 = -1$.

Throughout the book, if (u_n) and (v_n) are two sequences, with (v_n) having finitely many vanishing terms, we write $u_n \sim cv_n$ as n tends to infinity to signify $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} u_n/v_n = c$. In particular, if $c = 0$, this means $u_n = o(v_n)$ as n tends to infinity.

A basis is often a Schauder basis, meaning a sequence of elements (b_n) in a vector space such that any element f has a unique formal decomposition $f = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} f_n b_n$. In particular, we consider the sequence of powers, (z^n) , to be a basis of the formal power series.

2. q -Algebraic equations

In this chapter we formally define the q -algebraic equations that we will study. We also introduce the terminology and notation that we will use throughout this book.

1. Domain of the equations. Before we define formally the q -algebraic equations that we will study, we need to define some sets of generalized formal power series which we will use both as domain of the equations and to define the equations themselves.

To motivate the use of generalized formal power series, consider first the cusp

$$f(z)^2 - z^3 = 0, \quad (2.1.1)$$

which is an algebraic equation and therefore a q -algebraic one as well. Although (2.1.1) has no formal power series solution, it is reasonable to assert that it has two solutions, namely $f(z) = z^{3/2}$ and $f(z) = -z^{3/2}$. In this example, we see that the mere use of integer exponents of z sets an artificial limit to what one can reasonably understand as a solvable equation, even though the solution may not be sensu stricto a formal power series.

A more elaborate example is the equation

$$f(z) - 2^{\sqrt{3}}f(z/2) = 0,$$

which is a q -algebraic equation as in (1.1) with $q = 1/2$ and

$$P(z, z_0, z_1) = z_0 - 2^{\sqrt{3}}z_1.$$

It is easy to show that this equation has no solution among the power series with rational exponents, but that $f(z) = z^{\sqrt{3}}$ is a solution. Thus, the domain of a q -algebraic equation should include power series with real exponents. This is in contrast with algebraic equations since Puiseux (1850) proved that algebraic equations have power series solutions with only rational exponents.

Finally, q -algebraic equations have other very different properties than their algebraic counterpart, which make them more related to differential equations. For instance, while algebraic equations have

finitely many solutions (Puiseux, 1850), q -algebraic ones may have uncountably many. An example of such q -algebraic equation may be constructed in imitating a differential equation due to Grigoriev and Singer (1991). Introducing the the differential operator $\Delta = x d/dx$ with $\Delta^0 y = xy$, they consider the equation

$$\Delta^0 y \Delta^2 y - (\Delta y)^2 = 0.$$

We consider a q -analogue,

$$f(z)f(q^2z) - f(qz)^2 = 0, \tag{2.1.2}$$

which is obtained by choosing $P(z, z_0, z_1, z_2) = z_0 z_2 - z_1^2$ in (1.1). Equation (2.1.2) has uncountably many solutions, namely all the functions $f(z) = cz^\mu$, $c \in \mathbb{C}$, $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$.

With respect to these differences, q -algebraic equations are rather similar to differential equations where power series with nonrational exponents and uncountably many solutions occur. A different feature of q -algebraic equations though is their dependence on the parameter q , which leads to some interesting questions on the solutions as functions of q .

In view of its scope and applicability, the most useful field of generalized power series with real exponents is the Hahn (1907) field which we now recall.

Definition 2.1.1. *A Hahn series f with complex coefficients and real exponents is a formal sum $f(z) = \sum_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} f_\mu z^\mu$ whose coefficients f_μ are complex numbers and whose support, that is, the set*

$$\{\mu \in \mathbb{R} : f_\mu \neq 0\},$$

is a well ordered set.

The Hahn field $\mathbb{C}[[z^\mathbb{R}]]$ is the field of all Hahn series equipped with the standard extension of the addition and multiplication for power series.

A detailed proof of its ring and field structure can be found in Ribemboin (1992). Hahn series have been extensively used by van der Hoeven (2001) in the context of functional equations. Note that the support of f is the support of the map $\mu \mapsto f_\mu$; if f is a convergent series, this is not the support of the function $z \mapsto f(z)$.

The following notation for the coefficients is classical in combinatorics and will be particularly useful here as well.

Notation 2.1.2. *The coefficient maps are the maps $[z^\mu]$, $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$, defined by*

$$\begin{aligned} [z^\mu] : \mathbb{C}[[z^{\mathbb{R}}]] &\mapsto \mathbb{C} \\ f &\mapsto f_\mu. \end{aligned}$$

The coefficient maps are linear over $\mathbb{C}[[z^{\mathbb{R}}]]$. We also have the tautology $f(z) = \sum_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} ([z^\mu]f)z^\mu$.

Since the support of a Hahn series is a well ordered set, the following definition makes sense.

Definition 2.1.3. *Given a Hahn series f , its order $\text{ord}f$ is the smallest element of its support.*

We write $f(z) = o(z^\nu)$ to signify $\text{ord}f > \nu$.

To rephrase the definition, $\text{ord}f = \min\{\mu : f_\mu \neq 0\}$. In light of the meaning of $f(z) = o(z^\nu)$, this is the usual Landau notation as z tends to 0, but one has to be careful that we are dealing with series which may be divergent, so that $f(z)$ is only a formal object, and in general, $f(z) = o(z^\nu)$ means no more than what is indicated in Definition 2.1.3.

To obtain a useful theory, we need to assume some structure on the support of the Hahn series we will be dealing with.

Definition 2.1.4. *A grid is a subset of the real numbers of the form $\gamma + \Gamma$ where γ is a real number and Γ is a finitely generated additive semigroup of \mathbb{R}^+ .*

We say that a Hahn series is grid-based if its support is in a grid.

We write $\mathbb{C}[[z^{\mathbb{R}}]]_{\text{grid}}$ the set of all grid-based Hahn series.

Note that if we have a Hahn series of the form $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} f_i z^{\mu_i}$, with the μ_i distinct and no f_i vanishing, which is grid-based, then the sequence (μ_i) tends to infinity, because for some γ , the sequence $(\mu_i - \gamma)$ is in a finitely generated semi-group of \mathbb{R}^+ .

Proposition 2.1.5. *The set $\mathbb{C}[[z^{\mathbb{R}}]]_{\text{grid}}$ equipped with the usual sum and product of formal power series is a field over the complex numbers.*

Proof. Following van der Hoeven (2006, section 2.2), $\mathbb{C}[[z^{\mathbb{R}}]]$ is an algebra; sums and products of grid-based series are grid-based. In the same section, he also proves that the formal inverse of a grid-based series is also grid-based, so that $\mathbb{C}[[z^{\mathbb{R}}]]_{\text{grid}}$ is then a field. ■

Puiseux's (1850) theorem asserts that the Hahn series solutions of algebraic equations are grid-based. More precisely, it shows that the exponents involved in the solutions are rational numbers with a common denominator.

While it is desirable to develop a theory of q -algebraic equations using other fields than that of the complex numbers (see Di Vizzio, 2002; André and Di Vizzio, 2004), the assumption that the base field has characteristic 0 is essential for the problems we are dealing with, as the following example shows.

Example. (Ostrowski) Let p be a prime integer. The equation

$$-f(z)^p + zf(z) + z = 0$$

over the field $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ admits as solution the Hahn series $f(z) = \sum_{i \geq 1} z^{\mu_i}$ with

$$\mu_i = \frac{p^i - 1}{p^{i+1} - p^i}.$$

The exponents have no common denominator and $\mu_i < 1/(p-1)$. Therefore, the sequence (μ_i) does not tend to infinity and is not in a grid. Consequently, f is not grid-based and is not of Puiseux type either. ■

2. q -algebraic equations. There are at least three ways to define q -algebraic equations, which differ mostly through the notation used. We will use three different notations, two of them being classical ones, because each has a distinctive advantage.

To introduce these notations, we will need to raise the complex number q to some real number exponent. To do so, once for all in this book, we fix a determination of the logarithm $\log q$ and use it throughout to define $q^\alpha = e^{\alpha \log q}$ for any real number α .

Our primitive object is the q -difference operator. When $|q|$ is greater than 1, this operator is also known as a dilation in the context of wavelets.

Definition 2.2.1. The q -difference operator σ on $\mathbb{C}[[z^{\mathbb{R}}]]$ is the automorphism

$$\sigma\left(\sum_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} f_{\mu} z^{\mu}\right) = \sum_{\mu \in \mathbb{R}} f_{\mu} q^{\mu} z^{\mu}.$$

Formally, $\sigma f(z) = f(qz)$. We define the inverse σ^{-1} and the iterates $\sigma^n = \sigma \sigma^{n-1}$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, so that $\sigma^n \sigma^m = \sigma^{n+m}$. Again, formally $\sigma^n f(z) = f(q^n z)$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, and this makes the following convention convenient.

Convention. Throughout this book, if n is an integer, $f(q^n z)$ means $\sigma^n f(z)$.

We introduce the following definition mostly to record some notation which we will use.

Definition 2.2.2. Let $Y = (Y_0, \dots, Y_n)$ be a tuple of $n+1$ commuting variables. A monomial Y^{λ} is an expression $Y_0^{\lambda_0} Y_1^{\lambda_1} \dots Y_n^{\lambda_n}$ where $\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_n$ are nonnegative integers.

A polynomial with coefficients in a subring \mathcal{R} of $\mathbb{C}[[z^{\mathbb{R}}]]$ and variables Y_0, \dots, Y_n is a sum

$$P(z; Y_0, \dots, Y_n) = \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{N}^{n+1}} P_{\lambda}(z) Y^{\lambda}$$

where the P_{λ} are in \mathcal{R} and only finitely many P_{λ} are not identically equal to 0. We write $\mathcal{R}[Y_0, \dots, Y_n]$ the set of all polynomials in Y_0, \dots, Y_n with coefficients in \mathcal{R} .

Example. The set $\mathbb{C}[[z^{\mathbb{R}}]]_{\text{grid}}[Y_0, \dots, Y_n]$ is the set of all polynomials in Y_0, \dots, Y_n with grid based Hahn series coefficients. This set will be of special importance in the next two chapters. ■

A polynomial in z, Y_0, \dots, Y_n is a polynomial in the sense of Definition 2.2.2, with coefficients in the ring of polynomials in z .

We can now give our first definition of a q -algebraic equation.

Definition 2.2.3. A (polynomial) q -algebraic equation with coefficients in some subring \mathcal{R} of $\mathbb{C}[[z^{\mathbb{R}}]]$ and unknown Hahn series f is a functional equation of the form

$$P(z; \sigma^0 f(z), \sigma f(z), \dots, \sigma^n f(z)) = 0,$$

where P is a polynomial in Y_0, \dots, Y_n with coefficients in \mathcal{R} .

Often, when there is no ambiguity, we will simply say a q -algebraic equation for a polynomial q -algebraic equation.

Multiplying the polynomial P by a series in \mathcal{R} which is not 0 does not change the equation, in the same way that multiplying an algebraic equation by a constant does not change it. However, we will often speak of *the* polynomial associated to an equation, meaning in fact a polynomial in an equivalence class of polynomials defined up to a multiplication by some power series in \mathcal{R} .

Since σ is an automorphism of the Hahn field, $P(z; \sigma^0 f(z), \sigma f(z), \dots, \sigma^n f(z))$ is a Hahn series whenever f is.

Convention 2.2.4. *If $q = 1$, then σ is the identity. In this case, except specified otherwise, we take P to be a polynomial in Y_0 .*

If $q = 0$, then σ^0 may still be defined as the identity, while σ^n is the evaluation at 0 if n is at least 1, and is undefined if n is negative. In this case, we take P to be a polynomial in Y_0 and Y_1 only.

Remark. If $q^k = 1$, then σ^k is the identity and one should identify Y_{ik+j} to Y_j for $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $j = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$. While we will often allow $q = 1$, which corresponds to algebraic curves, we always assume that q is not a nontrivial root of unity. Similarly, other than in some peculiar examples, we do not study the degenerate case $q = 0$.

Sometimes, we implicitly assume that q is not 0 and is not of modulus 1.

Examples. (i) The q -Catalan equation, $f(z) = 1 + zf(z)f(qz)$ is a q -algebraic equation. Indeed, we can rewrite it as

$$1 - \sigma^0 f(z) + z\sigma^0 f(z)\sigma f(z) = 0$$

so that the polynomial P is

$$P(z; Y_0, Y_1) = 1 - Y_0 + zY_0Y_1.$$

But we could as well consider the polynomial with power series coefficients $e^z - e^z Y_0 + ze^z Y_0 Y_1$, that is $e^z P(z; Y_0, Y_1)$, since the exponential $e^z = \sum_{k \geq 0} z^k / k!$ is a Hahn series. We could also consider the

polynomial $P(z; Y_0, Y_1)$ as a polynomial in more variables, including for instance the useless Y_3, Y_4 and Y_5 .

(ii) The equation $f(z) = 1 + ze^z f(q^2 z) f(q^4 z)$ is a q -algebraic equation, since it can be written as

$$\sigma^0 f(z) - 1 - ze^z \sigma^2 f(z) \sigma^4 f(z) = 0.$$

The corresponding polynomial is

$$P(z; Y_0, Y_1, Y_2, Y_3, Y_4) = Y_0 - 1 - \sum_{k \geq 0} \frac{z^{k+1}}{k!} Y_2 Y_4.$$

(iii) A monomial $Y_0^{\lambda_0} Y_1^{\lambda_1} \dots Y_n^{\lambda_n}$ is a polynomial. The corresponding q -algebraic equation is $(\sigma^0 f(z))^{\lambda_0} (\sigma^1 f(z))^{\lambda_1} \dots (\sigma^n f(z))^{\lambda_n} = 0$, that is

$$f(q^0 z)^{\lambda_0} f(q^1 z)^{\lambda_1} \dots f(q^n z)^{\lambda_n} = 0.$$

The solution is of course $f(z) = 0$. ■

From the last example, we see that we can associate to a monomial Y^λ an operator acting on Hahn series. By linearity, such association can be made for polynomials as well, and this is the purpose of the next definition.

Definition 2.2.5. *A monomial Y^λ acts on Hahn series by*

$$Y^\lambda f = (\sigma^0 f)^{\lambda_0} (\sigma^1 f)^{\lambda_1} \dots (\sigma^n f)^{\lambda_n}.$$

A polynomial $P(z; Y_0, \dots, Y_n)$ with coefficients in a subring \mathcal{R} of $\mathbb{C}[[z^{\mathbb{R}}]]$ acts on Hahn series by

$$Pf(z) = \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{N}^{n+1}} P_\lambda(z) Y^\lambda f(z).$$

By construction, $Pf(z) = P(z; \sigma^0 f(z), \dots, \sigma^n f(z))$, so that we can now view polynomials as automorphisms of $\mathbb{C}[[z^{\mathbb{R}}]]$. We can rephrase Definition 2.2.3 as follows.

Definition 2.2.6. *A (polynomial) q -algebraic equation with coefficients in some subring \mathcal{R} of $\mathbb{C}[[z^{\mathbb{R}}]]$ is a functional equation of the*

form $Pf = 0$ where P is a polynomial in some variables Y_0, \dots, Y_n with coefficients in \mathcal{R} , and f is a Hahn series to be determined.

WARNING 2.2.7. When using monomials, one should be very careful with using functions: as a monomial in Y , the function $h(z)$ is constant, and so is $h(z)$ applied to $f(z)$, that is $h(z)f(z)$ is $h(z)$. The usual product $h(z)f(z)$ is then $h(z)Y_0f(z)$. In particular, an expression like $(Y_0 - h(z))f(z)$ means $f(z) - h(z)$. So, a function $h(z)$ acts on monomials in the usual way, multiplying the monomial, and acts on functions in an unusual way by mapping any function to $h(z)$. For this to make sense, the action on monomial takes precedence over that on functions. ■

Sometimes we will not indicate the variable z , writing $Y^\lambda f$ for the Hahn series $Y^\lambda f(z)$, and similarly Pf for $Pf(z)$. So a generic q -algebraic equation is $Pf = 0$ for some polynomial P .

One should be careful that as operator, the variables Y_i obey an unusual convention: for instance Y_i^2 is not a composition as in $Y_1(Y_1f) = Y_2f$ but a product since $Y_1^2f = (Y_1f)^2$.

Examples and counter-examples. (i) Given a sequence (g_n) , the equation

$$1 = \sum_{n \geq 0} g_n f(z) f(qz) \cdots f(q^n z)$$

is a polynomial q -algebraic equation if and only if finitely many g_n are not 0. In this case, the polynomial is $1 - \sum_{0 \leq n \leq N} g_n Y_0 \cdots Y_n$ for some finite N . These equations occur in the context of the q -Lagrange inversion (see Andrews, 1975; Gessel, 1980; Garsia, 1981; Krattenthaler, 1988).

(ii) The equation

$$f(z) = 1 + \sum_{n \geq 0} n! z^n f(z) f(qz)$$

is also a q -algebraic equation, the polynomial being

$$1 + \sum_{n \geq 0} n! z^n Y_0 Y_1 - Y_0.$$

The coefficient of $Y_0 Y_1$ is the divergent power series $\sum_{n \geq 0} n! z^n$.

(iii) Let a, b, c, d be some Hahn series. The equation

$$a(z) + b(z)f(1) + c(z)f(qz) + d(z)f(z) = 0$$

which occurs in the combinatorics of lattice paths (Le Borgne, 2006; proof of Proposition 2), is not a q -algebraic equation in the sense of Definition 2.2.6 because of the term $f(1)$. However, if we were to replace $f(1)$ by some parameter t , we would obtain the q -algebraic equation

$$a(z) + tb(z) + c(z)f(qz) + d(z)f(z) = 0$$

associated to the polynomial $a(z) + tb(z) + c(z)Y_1 + d(z)Y_0$. ■

The notation with the q -difference operator is particularly convenient to express linear q -algebraic equations. Indeed, if now P is a polynomial of two variables (z, σ) , say

$$P(z, \sigma) = \sum_{i, j \in \mathbb{Z}} P_{i, j} z^i \sigma^j$$

with only finitely many $P_{i, j}$ being not 0, then we have

$$P(z, \sigma)f(z) = \sum_{i, j \in \mathbb{Z}} P_{i, j} z^i \sigma^j f(z) = \sum_{i, j \in \mathbb{Z}} P_{i, j} z^i f(q^j z).$$

Definition 2.2.2 is well suited for theoretical purpose, but less so for applications and a caveat is in order. In many applications, the coefficients P_λ depend also on q . So, formally they are functions from \mathbb{C} , where q lives, to a subring of $\mathbb{C}[[z^{\mathbb{R}}]]$. However, the custom is to think of the equation as having q fixed. Thus, the expression

$$f(z) = 1 + qz f(z) f(qz)$$

defines a q -algebraic equation because the coefficient q in front of $zf(z)f(qz)$ is a complex number and therefore a Hahn series in z . A priori, the coefficients $P_\lambda(z)$ may depend on q in a totally arbitrary way. A couple of examples, with a rather smooth dependence in q , are the following.

Examples. (i) The equation

$$f(z) = t + t \left(1 + q \frac{1 - qz}{1 - q}\right) f(qz) + q \frac{1 - qz}{1 - q} f(z) + \left(q \frac{1 - qz}{1 - q}\right)^2 f(qz) f(z)$$

is a q -algebraic equation. This equation occurs in the combinatorics of lattice paths (Le Borgne 2006; Lemma 4).

(ii) The colored Jones polynomial equation for the figure 8 knot is the following (Garoufalidis, 2004). Set

$$\begin{aligned}
C_0(\sigma) &= q\sigma(q^2 + \sigma)(q^5 - \sigma^2)(1 - \sigma) \\
C_1(\sigma) &= -q^2\sigma^{-1}(1 + \sigma)(q^4 - \sigma q^3(2q - 1) - q^3\sigma^2(q^2 - q + 1) \\
&\quad + q^4\sigma^3(q - 2) + \sigma^4 q^4)(q^3 - \sigma^2)(1 - \sigma) \\
C_2(\sigma) &= q^7\sigma^{-1}(1 - \sigma)(1 + \sigma)(1 - q^3\sigma^2)(q\sigma(q - 2) \\
&\quad + \sigma^2(-1 + q - q^2) - \sigma^3(2q - 1) + q\sigma^4) \\
C_3(\sigma) &= -q^{10}\sigma(1 - \sigma)(1 + q^2\sigma)(1 - q^5\sigma^2).
\end{aligned}$$

and set

$$P(z, \sigma) = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 3} z^i C_i(\sigma).$$

This P is not a polynomial, since it involves σ^{-1} ; but $Q(z, \sigma) = P(z, \sigma)\sigma$ is a polynomial and the equation $Pf = 0$ is equivalent to $Qg = 0$ with $g = \sigma^{-1}f$. In the notation of Definition 2.2.5, Q is the rather formidable

$$Q(z; Y_0, Y_1, \dots, Y_8) = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq 8} Q_i(z) Y_i$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_0(z) &= -q^9, \\
Q_1(z) &= q^8((q - 2)z^2 + (2q - 1)z), \\
Q_2(z) &= q^6(-q^4 z^3 + q(-q^2 + q - 1)z^2 + (1 + q^2 + q^4)z + q^2), \\
Q_3(z) &= q^5(q^5(1 - q^7)z^3 + q^2(1 - q^2 + 2q^4 - q^3)z^2 \\
&\quad + (-q^5 + q^3 - 2q + 1)z - q^3 + q), \\
Q_4(z) &= q^3(q^9(q^3 + 1)z^3 + q^4(q^5 - q^4 + q^3 + q^2 + 1)z^2 \\
&\quad + q^2(-q^5 - q^3 - q^2 - 1)z - q^3 - 1), \\
Q_5(z) &= q(q^{14}(q^2 - 1)z^3 + q^6(q^5 - q^3 + 2q - 1)z^2 \\
&\quad + q^4(q^5 - 2q^4 + q - 1)z - 1 + q^2), \\
Q_6(z) &= q(-q^{16}z^3 + q^7(-q^4 - q^2 - 1)z^2 + q^4(q^4 + q^2 + 1)z + 1), \\
Q_7(z) &= q^6(q^4(1 - 2q)z^2 + (-q + 2)z), \\
Q_8(z) &= q^6(q^5 z^2 - z).
\end{aligned}$$

Besides that some complicated equations do occur in some problems, this example makes clear that computer algebra packages are useful when dealing with concrete q -algebraic equations. ■

To motivate our next notation, note that a monomial such as $z^6 Y_0^0 Y_1^4 Y_2^0 Y_3^0 Y_4^5$ acts on a Hahn series f by mapping it to $z^6 (\sigma f(z))^4 (\sigma^4 f(z))^5$ or, equivalently, to $z^6 f(qz)^4 f(q^4 z)^5$. Thus, we can also forget about the variables Y_0, \dots, Y_4 and only keep track of the powers of σ in an expression as $z^6 (\sigma f(z))^4 (\sigma^4 f(z))^5$, or of the powers of q in an expression as $z^6 f(qz)^4 f(q^4 z)^5$, and how many times these powers are involved in an expression. For an algebraic geometer, the polynomials $P(z; Y_0, Y_1)$ and $P(z; Y_2, Y_5)$, taken in isolation, are the same objects because the names of the variables are irrelevant. This is not the case with the notation of Definition 2.2.5 which is similar to some used in differential algebra (Kaplansky, 1957, Kolchin, 1973). In that aspect the following notation retains the minimum information needed to encode the equation and focuses not on monomials but on their operator aspects.

Definition 2.2.8. *A q -factor A is a tuple*

$$A = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{Z}^\ell$$

with $\alpha_1 \leq \alpha_2 \leq \dots \leq \alpha_\ell$. If $\ell = 0$ we simply write $A = (a; \sqcup)$. Such a q -factor acts on Hahn series by

$$Af(z) = z^a f(q^{\alpha_1} z) \cdots f(q^{\alpha_\ell} z).$$

We call ℓ the length of A .

Examples. The q -factor $(2; 1, 1, 3)$ acts on Hahn series by

$$(2; 1, 1, 3)f(z) = z^2 f(qz) f(qz) f(q^3 z) = z^2 f(qz)^2 f(q^3 z).$$

The q -factor $(a; \sqcup)$ acts as a constant operator on Hahn series since $(a; \sqcup)f(z) = z^a$ does not depend on f . In particular, $(0; \sqcup)$ is the constant q -factor which maps any Hahn series f to the constant series $(0; \sqcup)f(z) = 1$. The q -factor $(0; 0)$ is the identity since $(0; 0)f(z) = f(z)$. ■

Convention. *When writing q -factors, a capital letter denotes the q -factor, the corresponding lower case the first component of the q -factor, and the corresponding Greek one the other components. The length ℓ depends on the q -factor.*

For instance, we may write $A = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$ and $B = (b; \beta_1, \dots, \beta_\ell)$ for two q -factors, but the ℓ may not have the same value for both except if specified; often though, we will use $B = (b; \beta_1, \dots, \beta_m)$. If Q is a set of q -factors, an expression such as $\sum_{A \in Q} q^a z^{\alpha_\ell}$ signifies the sum over all A in Q of q to the power the first component of A and z to the power the last component of A .

If we compare Definitions 2.2.8 and 2.2.5, we identify a q -factor A with $z^a Y_{\alpha_1} Y_{\alpha_2} \cdots Y_{\alpha_\ell}$. The only difference — which we will show to be nonsubstantial — is that in Definition 2.2.8 we allowed the α_i to be negative, and that powers are denoted by replication of the components.

Equipped with Definition 2.2.8, Convention 2.2.4 is rephrased as follows.

Convention 2.2.9. *If $q = 1$, we restrict 1-factors to be of the form $(a; \sqcup)$ or $(a; 0, \dots, 0)$.*

Linear combinations of q -factors yields q -operators.

Definition 2.2.10. *Given a formal sum $P = \sum P_A A$ of q -factors, with P_A in \mathbb{C} , we write $A \in P$ if $P_A \neq 0$. A q -operator is a sum of q -factors $P = \sum P_A A$.*

A q -operator is a polynomial q -operator if

- (i) $\{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell) : P_A \neq 0\}$ is a finite set,
- (ii) $\{a : A \in P\}$ is a well ordered set.

Such a q -operator acts on Hahn series by $Pf(z) = \sum_{A \in P} P_A A f(z)$,

A q -algebraic equation is an equation $Pf = 0$ where f is an unknown Hahn series. If P is a polynomial q -operator, we speak of a polynomial q -algebraic equation.

With this definition, it is convenient to agree on the following.

Convention. *A monomial z^a is identified to the q -factor $(a; \sqcup)$.*

Note that we always have $P = \sum_{A \in P} P_A A$ where now all the P_A are not zero.

Before showing that Definitions 2.2.5 and 2.2.8 are equivalent as far as q -algebraic equations are concerned, we consider a couple of examples.

Examples. (i) The left hand side of the q -Catalan equation,

$$1 - f(z) + zf(z)f(qz) = 0,$$

corresponds to the polynomial q -operator

$$(0; \sqcup) - (0; 0) + (1; 0, 1)$$

or, equally,

$$1 - (0; 0) + (1; 0, 1).$$

Be careful that following warning 2.2.7, the 1 in this last expression stands for the q -operator $1f(z) = 1$ for any Hahn series.

(ii) The equation

$$1 - f(z) - zf(z/q)f(qz) = 0 \tag{2.2.1}$$

corresponds to the polynomial q -operator

$$(0; \sqcup) - (0; 0) + (1; -1, 1).$$

It is a q -algebraic equation in the sense of Definition 2.2.10, but not in the sense of Definitions 2.2.3 or 2.2.6, because it involves the term $f(z/q)$, that is, $\sigma^{-1}f(z)$, for which σ is raised to a negative power. However, if we set $g(z) = f(z/q)$, we can rewrite this equation as

$$1 - g(qz) - zg(z)g(q^2z) = 0. \tag{2.2.2}$$

This new equation is a q -algebraic equation in the sense of Definitions 2.2.3, 2.2.6 and 2.2.10. The associated q -operator is

$$(0; \sqcup) - (0; 1) - (1; 0; 2).$$

Clearly, whatever information we obtain on the solution g can be rephrased in terms of f , so that the equations (2.2.1) and (2.2.2) are for all purposes equivalent.

(iii) Let $\theta = \sum_{n \geq 1} \theta_n z^n$ be a formal power series. The functional equation $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} f(q^i z) = \theta(z)$ defines a q -algebraic equation which is not a polynomial q -algebraic equation. The corresponding q -operator is

$$P = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} (0; i) - \sum_{n \geq 1} \theta_n (n; \sqcup).$$

If this equation holds, then, formally,

$$\theta(z) - \theta(qz) = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} f(q^i z) - \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} f(q^{i+1} z).$$

If this is legitimate, the terms in this difference cancel, and $f(z) = \theta(z) - \theta(qz)$ is a solution of the equation.

If $|q| < 1$, we can find a formal power series solution by applying $[z^n]$, obtaining for $n = 0$ the coefficient $f_0 = 0$, and for $n \geq 1$,

$$[z^n] \sum_{i \geq 0} f(q^i z) = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} f_n q^{in} = \frac{f_n}{1 - q^n} = \theta_n.$$

Thus,

$$f(z) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} (1 - q^n) \theta_n z^n = \theta(z) - \theta(qz).$$

When $|q| > 1$, we can still make sense of a solution. Consider the polynomials in q ,

$$f_n(q) = (1 - q^n) \theta_n, \quad n \geq 0.$$

The formal power series in (z, q) ,

$$f(z, q) = \sum_{n \geq 0} (1 - q^n) \theta_n z^n$$

satisfies

$$[q^p z^n] f(q^i z, q) = [q^p] (1 - q^n) q^i \theta_n = \mathbb{1}\{p = i\} \theta_n - \mathbb{1}\{p = i + n\} \theta_n.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} [q^p z^n] \sum_{i \geq 0} f(q^i z) &= \sum_{i \geq 0} \mathbb{1}\{p = i\} \theta_n - \mathbb{1}\{p = i + n\} \theta_n \\ &= \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } p \geq 1, \\ \theta_n & \text{if } p = 0, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

which is $[q^p z^n] \theta(z)$.

(iv) Let now $\theta(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \theta_n z^n$ with $\theta_0 \neq 0$. The functional equation $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} f(q^i z) = \theta(z)$ still defines a q -algebraic equation. It has no solution, for

$$[z^n] \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} f(q^i z) = [z^n] \theta(z)$$

yields, when n is 0, that $\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} f_0 = \theta_0$, which has no solution. \blacksquare

Obviously, rewriting the equation for the Jones polynomial of the figure 8 knot with the notation of Definition 2.2.8 is very painful. So the notation of Definition 2.2.8 is not suitable for writing complicated equations. But we will see that it is particularly well suited for studying general q -algebraic equations. Therefore, when considering specific equations, we will often use two or all three notations introduced so far: using the q -difference operator σ , using polynomials in Y_0, \dots, Y_n , and using the q -factor notation of Definition 2.2.8.

The q -difference operator σ acts on the right of a q -factor $A = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$ by

$$A\sigma^n = (a; \alpha_1 + n, \dots, \alpha_\ell + n)$$

for any n in \mathbb{Z} . Indeed,

$$A\sigma^n f(z) = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell) f(q^n \cdot)(z) = z^a f(q^{\alpha_1} q^n z) \cdots f(q^{\alpha_\ell} q^n z).$$

This right action is extended to q -operators by setting

$$\left(\sum P_A A \right) \sigma = \sum P_A A \sigma.$$

We can now prove that all Definitions 2.2.3, 2.2.6 and 2.2.10 yield the same q -algebraic equations up to a change of unknown $g(z) = f(z/q^\kappa)$, for some positive integer κ , as we transformed (2.2.1) into (2.2.2).

Lemma 2.2.11. (i) *Any polynomial with Hahn series coefficients in the sense of Definition 2.2.5 is a polynomial q -operator.*

(ii) *Up to a change of unknown series of the form $g(z) = f(z/q^\kappa)$ for some positive integer κ , a polynomial q -algebraic equation in the sense of Definition 2.2.6 is a polynomial q -algebraic equation in the sense of Definition 2.2.10, and conversely.*

Proof. (i) We first show that every monomial as in Definition 2.2.5 is a q -factor in the sense of Definition 2.2.8. Consider a tuple $\lambda = (\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_n)$ and let λ_{i_j} , $1 \leq j \leq k$, be the positive entries in λ , with (i_j) increasing. Thus,

$$z^a Y^\lambda = z^a Y_{i_1}^{\lambda_{i_1}} Y_{i_2}^{\lambda_{i_2}} \cdots Y_{i_k}^{\lambda_{i_k}}.$$

To write $z^a Y^\lambda$ as a q -factor, we set

$$\alpha(\lambda) = \underbrace{(i_1, \dots, i_1)}_{\lambda_{i_1}}, \underbrace{(i_2, \dots, i_2)}_{\lambda_{i_2}}, \dots, \underbrace{(i_k, \dots, i_k)}_{\lambda_{i_k}}.$$

This yields the q -factor $(a; \alpha(\lambda))$. We then have

$$z^a Y^\lambda f(z) = (a; \alpha(\lambda)) f(z) \quad (2.2.3)$$

since both sides are equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & z^a f(q^{i_1} z)^{\lambda_1} f(q^{i_2} z)^{\lambda_2} \dots f(q^{i_k} z)^{\lambda_k} \\ &= z^a \underbrace{f(q^{i_1}) \dots f(q^{i_1})}_{\lambda_{i_1}} \underbrace{f(q^{i_2}) \dots f(q^{i_2})}_{\lambda_{i_2}} \dots \underbrace{f(q^{i_k}) \dots f(q^{i_k})}_{\lambda_{i_k}}. \end{aligned}$$

We now show that polynomials as in Definition 2.2.5 are q -operators. Consider such a polynomial P . There exists a finite subset Λ of \mathbb{N}^{n+1} such that

$$P(z; Y) = \sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} P_\lambda(z) Y^\lambda. \quad (2.2.4)$$

Since a finite union of well ordered sets is well ordered there exists a well ordered set Γ and some complex numbers $P_{a,\lambda}$ such that

$$P_\lambda(z) = \sum_{a \in \Gamma} P_{a,\lambda} z^a.$$

In this representation, some of the $P_{a,\lambda}$ may vanish. Consider the formal sum of q -factors

$$Q = \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \Lambda \\ a \in \Gamma}} P_{a,\lambda}(a; \alpha(\lambda)). \quad (2.2.5)$$

Since Λ is finite, $\{\alpha(\lambda) : \lambda \in \Lambda\}$ is a finite set, so that (i) in Definition 2.2.10 holds. Furthermore, (ii) in Definition 2.2.10 holds too because Γ is well ordered. Then, given (2.2.3),

$$P(z, Y) f(z) = \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \Lambda \\ a \in \Gamma}} P_{a,\lambda}(a; \alpha(\lambda)) f(z) = Q f(z),$$

so that P and Q coincide as operators on Hahn series.

(ii) From (i) it is clear that any q -algebraic equation in the sense of Definition 2.2.5 is a q -algebraic equation in the sense of Definition 2.2.10. Conversely, let P be a polynomial q -operator and consider the q -algebraic equation $Pf(z) = 0$. The obstruction to having a q -algebraic equation in the sense of Definition 2.2.6 is that some q -factors in P may have some α_i negative, which correspond to some negative powers of σ , which then cannot be represented by a variable Y_i with i nonnegative — we would need some Y_i with i negative. However, let $\kappa = \min\{\alpha_1 : A \in P\}$ and set $Q = P\sigma^{-\kappa}$ so that

$$Q = \sum_{A \in P} P_A(a; \alpha_1 - \kappa, \dots, \alpha_\ell - \kappa).$$

Note that $\alpha_i - \kappa$ is a nonnegative integer for any A in P and any $1 \leq i \leq \ell$. The equation $Pf = 0$ is equivalent to $Qg = 0$ with $g = \sigma^\kappa f$.

Using requirement (i) in Definition 2.2.10,

$$n = \max\{\alpha_\ell - \kappa : A \in P\}$$

is finite. Set $Y = (Y_0, \dots, Y_n)$. For $j = 0, \dots, n$ and A in P , define

$$\lambda_j(A) = \#\{i : \alpha_i = j + \kappa\}.$$

Then letting $\lambda(A) = (\lambda_0(A), \dots, \lambda_n(A))$,

$$Af(z) = z^a \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} g(q^{\alpha_i - \kappa} z) = z^a Y^{\lambda(A)} g(z).$$

If we set

$$R(z; Y) = \sum_{A \in P} P_A z^a Y^{\lambda(A)},$$

we have $Pf = Rg$. Assumption (i) in Definition 2.2.10 ensures that $\{\lambda(A) : A \in P\}$ is a finite set, so that, with the notation of Definition 2.2.5, only finitely many R_λ are not 0.

Since a subset of a well ordered set is well ordered, the series

$$R_{\tilde{\lambda}}(z) = \sum_{\substack{A \in P \\ \lambda(A) = \tilde{\lambda}}} P_A z^a$$

are all Hahn series. Consequently, R is a polynomial with coefficients in $\mathbb{C}[[z^{\mathbb{R}}]]$ and defines a q -algebraic equation $Rg = 0$ in the sense of Definition 2.2.5 which is equivalent to $Pf = 0$. ■

We end this section with a few more definitions and notations that will be useful when talking about specific features of some q -operators.

Definition 2.2.12. *Let $P = \sum_{A \in P} P_A A$ be a q -operator.*

(i) *The support of P is the set of q -factors $\{A : P_A \neq 0\}$.*

(ii) *The length of P is $\ell(P) = \max_{A \in P} \ell$.*

Example. The q -operator $(0; 0) - (0; \sqcup) - (1; 0, 1)$ corresponding to the q -Catalan equation has support $\{(0; 0), (1; 0, 1), (0; \sqcup)\}$. It has length 2. ■

Notation 2.2.13. (i) *For a q -factor $A = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$, we set $\alpha(A) = \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_\ell$.*

(ii) *If P is a q -operator we set*

$$\bar{a}(P) = \max\{a : A \in P\},$$

$$\bar{\alpha}(P) = \max\{\alpha_\ell : A \in P\},$$

$$\underline{\alpha}(P) = \min\{\alpha_1 : A \in P\}.$$

Following Convention 2.2.9, we see that if $q = 1$, then any 1-factor A of positive length has all its α_i equal to 0. Thus, $\alpha(A) = 0$.

3. The Newton-Puiseux construction

In this chapter, we construct the Newton-Puiseux polygon and establish certain of its properties in order to show that all Hahn series solutions of a polynomial q -algebraic equation whose coefficients are grid-based are also grid-based.

Convention. Throughout this chapter, q -algebraic equation means polynomial q -algebraic equation. Many results extend to more general equations of finite length as long as convergence issues are taken care of.

1. The method of substitution. Consider a (polynomial) q -algebraic equation $Pf = 0$. The method of substitution to calculate a solution consists in writing $f(z) = cz^\mu + g(z)$ with $\text{ord } g > \mu$ and substitute in the equation. This gives a new equation which involves c , μ and g . Considering the term of lowest order in $P(cz^\mu + g(z))$ we seek some conditions or equations which allow us to calculate c and μ ; once c and μ are known, then $P(cz^\mu + g(z))$ gives a new equation with unknown g , and we iterate the procedure.

It is possible that the equation giving c and μ has infinitely many solutions, as (2.1.2). It is also possible that after a certain number of substitutions we find an equation with no solution for the coefficient to be identified, or a condition which cannot be satisfied, in which case what we thought was the beginning of a solution does not lead to a solution at all.

Let us proceed with the method. If we apply a monomial $z^a Y_0^{\lambda_0} \cdots Y_n^{\lambda_n}$ to $cz^\mu + g(z)$ we obtain

$$z^a \prod_{0 \leq k \leq n} (cq^{k\mu} z^\mu + g(q^k z))^{\lambda_k}. \tag{3.1.1}$$

Since g is of order greater than μ , the term of lowest order in z in (3.1.1) is

$$z^a \prod_{0 \leq k \leq n} (cq^{k\mu} z^\mu)^{\lambda_k} = c^{\lambda_0 + \cdots + \lambda_n} q^{\mu(0\lambda_0 + \cdots + n\lambda_n)} z^{a + \mu(\lambda_0 + \cdots + \lambda_n)}.$$

In the q -factor notation,

$$A(cz^\mu + g(z)) = z^a \prod_{0 \leq i \leq \ell} (cq^{\alpha_i \mu} z^\mu + g(q^{\alpha_i} z)),$$

and, writing $\alpha(A)$ for $\alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_\ell$, the term of lowest order is

$$c^\ell q^{\mu \alpha(A)} z^{a + \mu \ell}.$$

Concerning the order of $P(cz^\mu + g(z))$, one should be careful that some cancellations may occur. For instance, if $P(Y_0, Y_1) = qY_0 - Y_1$, then the order of

$$P(cz^\mu + g(z)) = cqz^\mu + qg(z) - cq^\mu z^\mu - g(qz)$$

is μ except when $q = q^\mu$, which occurs for instance when μ is 1. This leads us to introduce the following definition.

Definition 3.1.1. *Let g be a Hahn series of order greater than some μ . The expected order of $P(cz^\mu + g(z))$ is*

$$\min_{A \in P} a + \mu \ell.$$

This definition gives indeed the order of $P(cz^\mu + g(z))$ if no cancellation occurs, because if $g(z) = o(z^\mu)$ then

$$A(cz^\mu + g(z)) = c^\ell q^{\mu \alpha(A)} z^{a + \mu \ell} (1 + o(1)).$$

In light of Definition 3.1.1, we should rephrase the method of substitution, replacing order by expected order.

While this method is simple for identifying a power series solution of an algebraic equation, it is far from being straightforward for finding Hahn series solutions of a q -algebraic equation. The following example will allow us to appreciate the difficulties.

Example. Consider the equation given by the polynomial

$$4Y_1^4 - 9Y_0^2 Y_1 Y_2 + 2Y_0^3 Y_2 - z^3 Y_0^4 Y_5^2 + z \frac{Y_0 Y_2}{q^4} - z^3 \frac{Y_2}{q^4} - z^3 Y_0 + z^5, \quad (3.1.2)$$

or, equivalently in the q -factor notation,

$$4(0; 1, 1, 1, 1) - 9(0; 0, 0, 1, 2) + 2(0; 0, 0, 0, 2) - (3; 0, 0, 0, 0, 5, 5) \\ + q^{-4}(1; 0, 2) - q^{-4}(3; 2) - (3; 0) + (5; \square).$$

When $q = 0$, this q -operator is not defined, but multiplying the corresponding q -algebraic equation by q^4 and then taking $q = 0$, we obtain

$$zf(z)f(0) - z^3f(0) = 0.$$

This equation has infinitely many solutions, namely any Hahn series $f(z)$ for which $f(0) = f_0 = 0$. Thus, in the remainder of this section, whenever we consider equation (3.1.2), we assume that $q \neq 0$.

If we perform the substitution $f(z) = cz^\mu + g(z)$ in the equation given by (3.1.2) and write only the terms of lowest order given by each monomial, we obtain

$$4c^4q^{4\mu}z^{4\mu} - 9c^4q^{3\mu}z^{4\mu} + 2c^4q^{2\mu}z^{4\mu} - c^6q^{10\mu}z^{3+6\mu} + c^2q^{2\mu-4}z^{1+2\mu} - cq^{2\mu-4}z^{3+\mu} - cz^{3+\mu} + z^5. \quad (3.1.3)$$

What are the terms of lowest order in (3.1.3)? Clearly, this depends on μ and we may plot the exponents of z as a function of μ , indicating also in the plot how many times an exponent occurs in (3.1.3). For instance, the exponent $3 + 6\mu$ occurs one time, in the term $-c^6q^{10\mu}z^{3+6\mu}$, and this $3 + 6\mu$ is a linear function of μ , defining a line on the plot.




figure 3.1.1




figure 3.1.2

What are the lowest order monomials in (3.1.3)? For each abscissa μ , the lowest order corresponds to the lowest ordinate among the five lines plotted in figure 3.1.1. According to the value of μ , the lowest order is then the black dashed line in figure 3.1.2, which represents the function

$$\mu \mapsto \min\{3 + 6\mu, 4\mu, 1 + 2\mu, 3 + \mu\}.$$

If the smallest order is obtained for a single monomial, say $c^\ell q^{\mu\alpha(A)} z^{a+\mu\ell}$, then the method of substitution yields that the coefficient of that monomial must be 0, that is $c^\ell q^{\mu\alpha(A)} = 0$ forcing c to be 0. This contradicts that the solution starts with cz^μ for some nonzero c . So, to have a solution starting with cz^μ , it is necessary to have at least two monomials contributing to the terms of lowest order in (3.1.3), which means that this smallest order must occur on the part of the black dashed line in figure 3.1.2 which contains at least two lines — which is why we indicated the multiplicities. Thus, we must have μ in the set

$$(-3/2, 1/2) \cup \{-3/2, 1/2, 2\},$$

the points $-3/2, 1/2$ and 2 referring to situations where at least two lines intersect, and the interval $(-3/2, 1/2)$ referring to situations where one line occurs with multiplicity at least 2.

If $\mu = -3/2$, the order of (3.1.3) is -6 , which is obtained for the exponents 4μ and $3 + 6\mu$, and the coefficient of z^{-6} in (3.1.3) is then

$$\begin{aligned} & 4c^4 q^{-6} - 9c^4 q^{-9/2} + 2c^4 q^{-3} - c^6 q^{-15} \\ & = c^4 (4q^{-6} - 9q^{-9/2} + 2q^{-3} - c^2 q^{-15}). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if our Hahn series solution starts with $cz^{-3/2}$ with $c \neq 0$, the coefficient of the lowest order term in (3.1.3) must vanish, which then requires

$$4q^{-6} - 9q^{-9/2} + 2q^{-3} - c^2 q^{-15} = 0. \quad (3.1.4)$$

If $4q^{-6} - 9q^{-9/2} + 2q^{-3} = 0$, then (3.1.4) has no nonvanishing solution c , and therefore, there is no solution starting by $cz^{-3/2}$ with $c \neq 0$. If $4q^{-6} - 9q^{-9/2} + 2q^{-3} \neq 0$, then we have two possible c which differ by their sign.

Let us now consider the range $\mu \in (-3/2, 1/2)$. In this case, the order of (3.1.3) is 4μ and the coefficient of $z^{4\mu}$ is

$$c^4 (4q^{4\mu} - 9q^{3\mu} + 2q^{2\mu}).$$

Since we assume that q does not vanish, if $4q^{4\mu} - 9q^{3\mu} + 2q^{2\mu} = 0$, that is $q^{2\mu} = 2$ or $q^{2\mu} = 1/4$, we can choose c as we like, and therefore, if we can continue to substitute, we may find infinitely many solutions.

If $\mu = 1/2$, the lowest term in (3.1.3) is given by $z^{4\mu}$ and $z^{1+2\mu}$, that is by z^2 . The coefficient of z^2 is then

$$4c^4q^2 - 9c^4q^{3/2} + 2c^4q + c^2q^{-3} = c^2(c^2(4q^2 - 9q^{3/2} + 2q) + q^{-3}).$$

Again, if $4q^2 - 9q^{3/2} + 2q = 0$, that is $q^{1/2} = 2$ or $q^{1/2} = 1/4$, this coefficient cannot be cancelled, and otherwise, we have two possible choices for c , which differ by a sign.

Finally, if $\mu = 2$, the terms of lowest order in (3.1.3) are given by $z^{1+2\mu}$, $z^{3+\mu}$ and z^5 ; its coefficient is

$$c^2 - 2c + 1 = (c - 1)^2.$$

It has a double solution, $c = 1$. ■

This example illustrates that if we are to use the method of substitution in this naive way, a lot of discussion according to μ and q is needed. Furthermore, as we substitute further, the complexity of the equation grows: one can check using a computer algebra system that if we identify the coefficient of $z^{7/2}$ in the solution $f(z) = z^2 + \rho z^{7/2} + o(z^{7/2})$, the corresponding q -algebraic equation for g has 41 monomials; the next coefficient leads to an equation with 397 monomials! However, out of those 397 monomials, only 8 contribute to identify the coefficient! Clearly, we need a much more efficient way of thinking of the substitution, and, in particular, a way that immediately tells us what are the important monomials to consider. The method of the Newton-Puiseux polygon achieves more than this goal. It will lead us to give in the last chapter of this book a quite detailed study of equation (3.1.2), and, in particular, a detailed description of the asymptotic behavior of its coefficients.

2. The Newton-Puiseux polygon. The Newton-Puiseux construction is a simple yet remarkably powerful graphical tool which is based on the elementary observation that for a q -factor $A = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$,

$$A(cz^\mu) = c^\ell q^{\mu\alpha(A)} z^{a+\mu\ell}, \quad (3.2.1)$$

and therefore the order of $A(cz^\mu)$ is $a + \mu\ell$. Consequently, this order is a linear function in a and ℓ . Thus, if we fix a degree ν and

seek to find in an equation $P(cz^\mu + g(z))$ which q -factors contribute to create a term of degree ν from their action on the term cz^μ , it is precisely the q -factors such that $a + \mu\ell = \nu$. This suggests plotting the points (a, ℓ) and see which ones are on the line $a + \mu\ell = \nu$. For equation (3.1.2), the points (a, ℓ) are in figure 3.2.1 (we indicate their multiplicity).




figure 3.2.1

A line $a + \mu\ell = \nu$ has slope $-1/\mu$, and so it is easier to use the parameter μ , which motivates the following definition.

Definition 3.2.1. *The co-slope of a line $a + \mu\ell = \nu$ is μ . We write L_μ to indicate a line of co-slope μ .*

Perhaps a graphical way to think of the co-slope is that along a line of co-slope μ , if we decrease ℓ by 1, then a increases by μ . Note that the line $a + \mu\ell = \nu$ intersects the a -axis at the abscissa ν , which is the order of $A(cz^\mu)$. Put differently, if we are given a q -factor A and want to determine the order ν of $A(cz^\mu)$, we draw a line of co-slope μ which contains (a, ℓ) and read ν as the intercept of the line with the a -axis.

We can also make a slightly different use of the same idea, namely to read which powers we obtain when we perform a substitution. For instance, if we would like to know the orders of the monomials involved in (3.1.2) when we calculate $P(cz^{-1/2})$, we take lines of co-slope $-1/2$ which go through the points in figure 3.2.1 and read the intersection with the a -axis: namely -2 , which is given by 3 monomials, 0 which is given by 2 monomials, $5/2$ which is given by 2 monomials, and 5 which is given by 1 monomial.




figure 3.2.2




figure 3.2.3

In particular, we see immediately in figure 3.2.2 that the smallest exponent, the order of $P(cz^{-1/2})$, is -2 , and that the monomials contributing to this term are those for which $a = 0$ and $\ell = 4$.

If we make μ to vary in $[-3/2, 1/2]$, the order of $P(cz^\mu)$ is given by the abscissa of a line going through the vertex $(0, 4)$. Varying μ makes the line to pivot around that vertex, sweeping the shaded area in figure 3.2.3, and ν varies between -6 and 2 as can be seen on that figure.

When $\mu < -3/2$, the line giving the smallest exponent pivots around the point $(3, 6)$. If μ varies between $1/2$ and 2 , the line pivots around the point $(1, 2)$. Finally, if μ is greater than 2 , the line pivots around $(5, 0)$. So, as μ varies, the locus of the lines giving the smallest exponents sweeps all the plane except a convex set which is defined as follows.

Definition 3.2.2. *The cloud of points of P is the set*

$$\mathcal{C}(P) = \{ (a, \ell) : A \in P \}.$$

The Newton-Puiseux polygon $\mathcal{N}(P)$ of P is the convex hull of the the set

$$\{ (a + t, \ell) : t \geq 0, A \in P \}.$$

Regarding the definition of the cloud of points of P , recall that a q -factor $(a; \sqcup)$ has $\ell = 0$. Its corresponding point (a, ℓ) is on the a -axis.

If P is reduced to a single q -factor $A = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$ then we make the identification $\mathcal{C}(A) = (a, \ell) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{N}$. With this notation, if $A = (a; \sqcup)$, then $\mathcal{C}(A) = (a, 0)$. Sometimes we will say that a q -factor A is on a line L_μ to signify that $\mathcal{C}(A)$ belongs to L_μ .

In our illustration we often draw points with integer coordinates, as if we were dealing with ordinary power series, but one should keep in mind that when working with general Hahn series, the abscissa may be any real number while the ordinate is always a nonnegative integer.

To draw the Newton-Puiseux polygon of P , we place the points (a, ℓ) corresponding to the q -factors of P ; then we draw right half-lines starting at those points, and take the convex hull. This is illustrated in figure 3.2.4 for equation (3.1.2).




figure 3.2.4




figure 3.2.5

The term of lowest order of $P(cz^\mu)$ can then be determined graphically by sliding a line of co-slope μ until it reaches a vertex on the boundary of the Newton-Puiseux polygon. Whichever vertex lies on that extremal line contributes to the terms of lowest order in $P(cz^\mu)$.

In our example (3.1.2), if we seek the monomials contributing to the lowest order term of $P(cz^{1/2})$, this is all the terms for which (a, ℓ) is $(0, 4)$ or $(1, 2)$, and therefore, this is the part of equation (3.1.2) given by

$$4Y_1^4 - 9Y_0^2Y_1Y_2 + 2Y_0^3Y_2 + z\frac{Y_0Y_2}{q^4},$$

and the order of $P(cz^{1/2})$ is 2 since it is the abscissa at which the supporting line $L_{1/2}$ going through $(0, 4)$ and $(1, 2)$ intersects the a -axis (see figure 3.2.5).

We conclude this section by a definition from convex analysis.

Definition 3.2.3. *A supporting line of $\mathcal{N}(P)$ is a line of finite co-slope which intersects $\mathcal{N}(P)$ on its boundary and such that $\mathcal{N}(P)$ is in a closed half space determined by this line.*

The following notation corresponds to Definition 3.2.3.

Notation 3.2.4. *We write $L_\mu(P)$ for the line of co-slope μ which touches $\mathcal{N}(P)$ only at its boundary. In particular, if $A = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$ is a q -factor, $L_\mu(A)$ is the line of co-slope μ going through $\mathcal{C}(A) = (a, \ell)$.*

We agree that $L_{-\infty}(P)$ is the horizontal line which touches $\mathcal{N}(P)$ at its points of largest ordinate, while $L_\infty(P)$ is the horizontal line which touches $\mathcal{N}(P)$ at its points of smallest ordinate.

While L_μ is a generic line of co-slope μ , the notation $L_\mu(P)$ refers to the unique line of co-slope μ which touches $\mathcal{N}(P)$ at its boundary. For instance for P as in (3.1.2), figure 3.2.5 shows that $L_{1/2}(P)$ is the line going through the points $(0, 4)$ and $(1, 2)$.

3. Translations of q -operators. When we use the method of substitution, we set $f(z) = cz^\mu + g(z)$ with $g(z) = o(z^\mu)$, and find the proper c and μ . Once c and μ are known, we rewrite the equation $P(cz^\mu + g(z)) = 0$ as a new equation $Qg(z) = 0$ and iterate. The Newton-Puiseux polygon allows us to keep track of the key monomials or q -factors as we do these changes of equation.

To proceed, let us first see what is the effect of the change of function $f(z) = cz^\mu + g(z)$ on a single q -factor. For a q -factor $A = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$, we have

$$Af(z) = z^a \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} f(q^{\alpha_i} z) = z^a \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} (cq^{\alpha_i \mu} z^\mu + g(q^{\alpha_i} z)). \quad (3.3.1)$$

To expand the product, we need the following notation.

Notation 3.3.1. *If k and ℓ are two positive integers, $[k \uparrow \ell]$ is the set of all increasing maps from $\{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ to $\{1, 2, \dots, \ell\}$.*

If $k = 0$, we set $[k \uparrow \ell] = \emptyset$.

With this notation, we think of a map θ in $[k \uparrow \ell]$ as way to expand the last product in (3.3.1) by picking up k of the $g(q^{\alpha_i} z)$ in (3.3.1), so that

$$\begin{aligned} Af(z) = & \sum_{0 \leq k \leq \ell} \sum_{\theta \in [k \uparrow \ell]} g(q^{\alpha_{\theta(1)}} z) \cdots g(q^{\alpha_{\theta(k)}} z) \\ & \times c^{\ell-k} q^{\mu(\alpha(A) - \alpha_{\theta(1)} - \cdots - \alpha_{\theta(k)})} z^{a + \mu(\ell-k)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.3.2)$$

where it is understood that when $k = 0$, the inner summation is $c^\ell q^{\mu\alpha(A)} z^{a + \mu\ell}$, taking an empty product to be 1. As we will see, this formula is useful to analyze the effect of substitutions, but writing a concrete example shows that it is of little value for actual computations.

The right hand side of (3.3.2) is a sum of q -factors which are applied to g . This leads to the following definition.

Definition 3.3.2. *The translation T_{cz^μ} of a q -factor A is the polynomial*

$$T_{cz^\mu} A = \sum_{0 \leq k \leq \ell} c^{\ell-k} \sum_{\theta \in [k \uparrow \ell]} q^{\mu(\alpha(A) - \alpha_{\theta(1)} - \dots - \alpha_{\theta(k)})} (a + \mu(\ell - k); \alpha_{\theta(1)}, \dots, \alpha_{\theta(k)}).$$

The translation T_{cz^μ} is extended to q -operators by linearity, setting $T_{cz^\mu} P = \sum_{A \in P} P_A T_{cz^\mu} A$.

This definition is made so that (3.3.2) can be rewritten as

$$P(cz^\mu + g(z)) = T_{cz^\mu} P(g(z)).$$

In other words, setting $f(z) = cz^\mu + g(z)$ in the equation $Pf = 0$ gives us a new equation $T_{cz^\mu} P g = 0$. In particular, $T_{0z^0} P = T_0 P = P$.

Definition 3.3.2 is easier to express in terms of monomials by

$$T_{cz^\mu}(Y^\lambda) = \prod_{0 \leq j \leq n} (cq^{j\mu} z^\mu + Y_j)^{\lambda_j},$$

but it is harder to write the product in an expanded form. However, note that this formulation in terms of monomials shows that

$$T_{cz^\mu} P(z; Y_0, \dots, Y_n) = P(z; cz^\mu + Y_0, cq^\mu z^\mu + Y_1, \dots, cq^{n\mu} z^\mu + Y_n)$$

and applying a translation amounts to substituting the terms $cq^{i\mu} z^\mu + Y_i$ for the variables Y_i .

Remark. If we start with a general q -operator $P = \sum_{A \in P} P_A A$, its translate $T_{cz^\mu} P$ makes sense as long as for any $b, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_k$,

$$\sum_{\substack{A \in P \\ 0 \leq k \leq \ell \\ \theta \in [k \uparrow \ell]}} P_A c^{\ell-k} q^{\mu(\alpha(A) - \alpha_{\theta(1)} - \dots - \alpha_{\theta(k)})} \mathbb{1}\{a + \mu(\ell - k) = b, \alpha_{\theta(1)} = \beta_1, \dots, \alpha_{\theta(k)} = \beta_k\}$$

is a summable series. ■

From the definition, we see that starting with a q -factor A , the q -operator $T_{cz^\mu} A$ contains only q -factors of the form

$$(a + \mu(\ell - k); \alpha_{\theta(1)}, \dots, \alpha_{\theta(k)}), \quad 0 \leq k \leq \ell, \quad \theta \in [k \uparrow \ell].$$

In particular, considering $k = \ell$, we see that A is in $T_{cz^\mu} A$ with coefficient 1. On the Newton-Puiseux representation (see figure 3.3.1), the point (a, ℓ) is expanded into ℓ points $(a + \mu(\ell - k), k)$, $0 \leq k \leq \ell$. These points are all on a line of co-slope μ passing through (a, ℓ) , that is on $L_\mu(A)$. As k varies between 0 and ℓ these points have integral ordinates which increase by 1 each time k increases by 1. Consequently,




figure 3.3.1

$$\mathcal{C}(T_{cz^\mu} A) \subset L_\mu(A) \tag{3.3.3}$$

and the points in $\mathcal{C}(T_{cz^\mu} A)$ have nonnegative ordinate at most that of $\mathcal{C}(A)$.

It is now quite simple to see which monomials may occur in $T_{cz^\mu} P$: place a line of co-slope μ at every point (a, ℓ) in $\mathcal{C}(P)$, draw all the points on that line whose ordinates are nonnegative integers and at most ℓ . This new set of points is guaranteed to contain $\mathcal{C}(T_{cz^\mu} P)$. Note that the inclusion may be strict, for there may be some cancellations.

Example. To provide an example where a cancellation occurs, consider the substitution of $f(z) = -z + g(z)$ in

$$Pf(z) = f(z) + z + zf(z) + zf(qz) + zf(z)f(qz),$$

which yields

$$\begin{aligned} T_{-z}Pg(z) &= g(z) + zg(z) + zg(qz) - qz^2g(z) - z^2g(qz) \\ &\quad + zg(z)g(qz) - (q+1)z^2 + qz^3. \end{aligned}$$

The cloud of points of P is in figure 3.3.2, while that of $T_{-z}P$ is in figure 3.3.3. Notice that the point $(1, 0)$, which we circled instead of marked by a dot, was cancelled, corresponding to the monomial z .




figure 3.3.2




figure 3.3.3

■

It is convenient to have a notation to collect the terms of P pertaining to a point in the cloud $\mathcal{C}(P)$.

Notation 3.3.3. *Let Q be a point in $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{N}$. The part of P pertaining to Q is*

$$P_Q = \sum_{\substack{A \in P \\ (a, \ell) = Q}} P_A A.$$

While P_A is a complex number, P_Q is a q -operator. One should be careful that $P_{(0;3)}$, having subscript $(0;3)$, where the first entry separated from the other one by a semicolon, refers to the coefficient of the q -factor $(0;3)$. On the other hand, $P_{(0,3)}$, where the subscript is written as an ordered pair, refers to the collected contributions of all q -factors whose point in the cloud is given by $(0,3)$. In particular, since the q -factor $(0;3)$ corresponds to the point $(0,1)$, the q -factor $(0;3)$ can never be in a $P_{(0,3)}$! Luckily, we will only once encounter such a tedious gathering of notation in what follows.

To summarize, we have the following two lemmas.

Lemma 3.3.4. *(i) $\mathcal{C}(T_{cz^\mu} A)$ is contained in the line of co-slope μ passing through the point $\mathcal{C}(A)$ and the points in $\mathcal{C}(T_{cz^\mu} A)$ have integral ordinates at most that of $\mathcal{C}(A)$. In particular, $\mathcal{C}(T_{cz^\mu} P)$ is contained in the lines of co-slope μ passing through the points of $\mathcal{C}(P)$.*

(ii) Let L_μ be a line of co-slope μ passing through a point of $\mathcal{C}(P)$ and let Q be a point of maximal ordinate in $L_\mu \cap \mathcal{C}(P)$. Then $(T_{cz^\mu} P)_Q = P_Q$.

Proof. (i) It follows from the fact that if A is in P , then the monomials in $T_{cz^\mu} A$ have points contained in the line of co-slope μ which passes through the point representing A ; see (3.3.3).

(ii) Let (b, m) be the coordinates of Q and let $\nu = b + \mu m$. This determines L_μ as the line $a + \mu\ell = \nu$. Using Definition 3.3.2,

$$T_{cz^\mu}P = \sum_{A \in P} P_A \sum_{0 \leq k \leq \ell} c^{\ell-k} \sum_{\theta \in [k \uparrow \ell]} q^{\mu(\alpha(A) - \alpha_{\theta(1)} - \dots - \alpha_{\theta(k)})} (a + \mu(\ell - k); \alpha_{\theta(1)}, \dots, \alpha_{\theta(k)}). \quad (3.3.4)$$

From (3.3.4), we see that the q -factors in $T_{cz^\mu}P$ pertaining to the point Q come from some A in P for which

$$(a + \mu(\ell - k), k) = (b, m). \quad (3.3.5)$$

This forces $\ell \geq k = m$ and therefore, considering the abscissa in (3.3.5), $a + \mu(\ell - m) = b$, that is $a + \mu\ell = b + \mu m = \nu$. Thus, $\mathcal{C}(A)$ must be in L_μ as well.

Since Q is of maximal ordinate, we must have $\ell \leq m$. Since (3.3.5) forced $\ell \geq m$, we have $\ell = m$. Then

$$(T_{cz^\mu}P)_Q = \sum_{\substack{A \in P \\ (a, \ell) = (b, m)}} P_A(a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m) = P_Q. \quad \blacksquare$$

We introduce a notation for the highest points in $L_\mu(P) \cap \mathcal{N}(P)$.

Notation 3.3.5. *We write $Q_\mu(P)$ for the point of maximal ordinate in $L_\mu(P) \cap \mathcal{N}(P)$.*

We can then relate the salient features of $\mathcal{N}(T_{cz^\mu}P)$ to those of $\mathcal{N}(P)$.

Lemma 3.3.6. *(i) Let $L_\mu(P)$ be the supporting line of $\mathcal{N}(P)$ of co-slope μ . The polygons $\mathcal{N}(P)$ and $\mathcal{N}(T_{cz^\mu}P)$ are identical above the horizontal line of ordinate that of $Q_\mu(P)$. In particular, $L_\mu(P)$ is a supporting line for $\mathcal{N}(T_{cz^\mu}P)$ and $Q_\mu(P)$ is in $\mathcal{N}(T_{cz^\mu}P)$.*

(ii) For any line of co-slope μ , the point of maximal ordinate in $\mathcal{C}(P) \cap L_\mu$ is in $\mathcal{C}(T_{cz^\mu}P)$.

In assertion (ii), it is possible that L_μ does not intersect $\mathcal{C}(P)$. In this case, assertion (ii) brings no information.

Proof. (i) Let (a, ℓ) be a vertex in $\mathcal{N}(P)$ of ordinate at least that of $Q_\mu(P)$. There exists some q -factor $A = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$ in P . Since

(a, ℓ) is a vertex of $\mathcal{N}(P)$, it is the point in $\mathcal{C}(P)$ of maximal ordinate on a line L_μ passing through (a, ℓ) . Thus, by Lemma 3.3.4.ii this point remains in $\mathcal{N}(T_{cz^\mu}P)$. This shows that the part of $\mathcal{N}(P)$ atop the horizontal line of ordinate that of $Q_\mu(P)$ remains in $\mathcal{N}(T_{cz^\mu}P)$. It is in fact equal because the transformation $T_{cz^\mu}A$ only creates points that have ordinate less than that of $\mathcal{C}(A)$.

It follows that $L_\mu(P)$ is a supporting line of $T_{cz^\mu}P$. Finally, Lemma 3.3.4.ii implies that $Q_\mu(P)$ is in $\mathcal{N}(T_{cz^\mu}P)$.

(ii) This follows from Lemma 3.3.4.ii. Alternatively, consider a point (b, m) in $\mathcal{C}(P) \cap L_\mu$ of maximal ordinate. The monomials of P contributing to this point are

$$\sum_{\substack{A \in P \\ (a, \ell) = (b, m)}} P_A A.$$

Note that if $0 \leq k \leq m - 1$ and if θ is in $[k \uparrow m]$, then a q -factor

$$(a + \mu(m - k); \alpha_{\theta(1)}, \dots, \alpha_{\theta(k)})$$

corresponds to a point $(a + \mu(m - k), k)$ of ordinate less than m . From the definition of T_{cz^μ} we see that

$$T_{cz^\mu} \left(\sum_{(a, \ell) = (b, m)} P_A A \right) = \sum_{(a, \ell) = (b, m)} P_A A + \text{remainder}$$

where all the terms in the remainder term are of ordinates at most $m - 1$. Only the terms $P_A A$ in the first sum correspond to points of ordinate m . Since

$$P = \sum_{(a, \ell) = (b, m)} P_A A + \sum_{(a, \ell) \neq (b, m)} P_A A,$$

there is no cancellation in the sum $\sum_{(a, \ell) = (b, m)} P_A A$. ■

The principle of the method of substitution is to successively cancel the terms of expected lowest order in the equality $Pf = 0$. The following lemma will allow us to identify those terms when we translate the solution — compare with (3.2.1). We make use of Definition 2.1.3 for the meaning of $o(z^\mu)$.

Lemma 3.3.7. *Let μ be a real number and g be a Hahn series. If $g(z) = o(z^\mu)$ then*

$$A(cz^\mu + g(z)) = c^\ell q^{\mu\alpha(A)} z^{a+\mu\ell} + o(z^{a+\mu\ell}).$$

Proof. If $0 \leq k \leq \ell$ and θ is in $[k \uparrow \ell]$, then

$$\text{ord}\left((a + \mu(\ell - k); \alpha_{\theta(1)}, \dots, \alpha_{\theta(k)})g(z)\right) = a + \ell\mu + k(\text{ord}g - \mu). \quad (3.3.6)$$

Since $\text{ord}g > \mu$, (3.3.6) is minimal when k vanishes. Going back to Definition 3.3.2 or to identity (3.3.2), the result follows. \blacksquare

We can now extend the previous lemma to polynomials.

Lemma 3.3.8. *Let μ be a real number and let $L_\mu(P)$ be the supporting line of $\mathcal{N}(P)$ of co-slope μ . Let ν be the abscissa at which $L_\mu(P)$ intersects the a -axis. If g is a Hahn series and $g(z) = o(z^\mu)$ then*

$$T_{cz^\mu}Pg(z) = \sum_{\substack{A \in P \\ (a, \ell) \in L_\mu(P)}} P_A q^{\mu\alpha(A)} c^\ell z^\nu + o(z^\nu). \quad (3.3.7)$$

Proof. Using Lemma 3.3.7, we see that the expected order of $T_{cz^\mu}Pg(z)$ is

$$\nu = \min\{a + \mu\ell : A \in P\}.$$

The line $a + \mu\ell = \nu$ intersects the a -axis when $\ell = 0$, that is at the point of abscissa $a = \nu$. Since ν is minimum, the line $a + \mu\ell = \nu$ is the supporting line $L_\mu(P)$.

Using Lemma 3.3.7,

$$T_{cz^\mu}Pg = \sum_{\substack{A \in P \\ a + \mu\ell = \nu}} P_A q^{\mu\alpha(A)} c^\ell z^\nu + o(z^\nu). \quad \blacksquare$$

Considering the coefficient of z^ν in the right hand side of (3.3.7), we obtain the following definition.

Definition 3.3.9. *Let μ be a real number and let $L_\mu(P)$ be the supporting line of co-slope μ of $\mathcal{N}(P)$. co-slope μ is*

$$\Phi_{P, \mu}(c) = \sum_{\substack{A \in P \\ (a, \ell) \in L_\mu(P)}} P_A q^{\mu\alpha(A)} c^\ell.$$

Thus, $\Phi_{P,\mu}(c)$ is the coefficient of the monomial of smallest expected order in $P(cz^\mu)$, or, equivalently, whenever $g(z) = o(z^\nu)$ and setting $\nu = \min\{a + \mu\ell : A \in P\}$,

$$T_{cz^\mu}Pg(z) = \Phi_{P,\mu}(c)z^\nu + o(z^\nu).$$

By construction, the initial polynomial collects the contributions of each q -factor lying on a supporting line $L_\mu(P)$. For instance, for equation (3.1.2) (see figure 3.2.5), using the Notation 3.3.3,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{(0,4)} + P_{(1,2)} &= 4Y_1^4 - 9Y_0^2Y_1Y_2 + 2Y_0^3Y_2 + z\frac{Y_0Y_2}{q^4} \\ &= 4(0; 1, 1, 1, 1) - 9(0; 0, 0, 1, 2) + 2(0; 0, 0, 0, 2) + \frac{1}{q^4}(1; 0, 2), \end{aligned}$$

so that considering $L_{1/2}(P)$,

$$\Phi_{P,1/2}(c) = 4q^2c^4 - 9q^{3/2}c^4 + 2qc^4 + \frac{c^2}{q^3}.$$

We can decompose the initial polynomial by looking more specifically at the contribution pertaining to each point of $L_\mu(P)$. This gives the following definition whose meaning will be made clear after its statement.

Definition 3.3.10. *Let Q be a point in $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{N}$. The indicial polynomial of P at Q is*

$$\Psi_{P,Q}(t) = \sum_{\substack{A \in P \\ (a,\ell) = Q}} P_A t^{\alpha(A)}.$$

If there is no A in P such that $\mathcal{C}(A) = Q$, we agree that a sum over an empty set is 0, so that $\Psi_{P,Q}(t) = 0$.

When $q = 1$, convention 2.2.9 ensures that $\alpha(A) = 0$ for any q -factor of positive length. In this case, any indicial polynomial is constant. If $Q = (a, \ell)$ is in the cloud of P , then convention 2.2.9 ensures that there is a unique A in P with $\mathcal{C}(A) = Q$, namely $(a; 0, \dots, 0)$, and in that case $\Psi_{P,Q}(t) = P_A$ is constant and does not vanish since A is in P .

Considering the initial polynomial and collecting the terms according to the points of $L_\mu(P) \cap \mathcal{N}(P)$, we obtain

$$\Phi_{P,\mu}(c) = \sum_{(b,m) \in L_\mu(P)} c^m \Psi_{P,(b,m)}(q^\mu).$$

Put differently, if (b, m) is in $L_\mu(P)$, then $\Psi_{P,(b,m)}(q^\mu)$ is the coefficient of c^m in $\Phi_{P,\mu}(c)$.

Note that the indicial polynomial of P at Q depends only on P_Q . In particular, Lemma 3.3.4.ii implies that if L_μ is a line of co-slope μ passing through $\mathcal{C}(P)$ and Q is of maximal ordinate in $L_\mu(P) \cap \mathcal{C}(P)$, then

$$\Psi_{T_{cz^\mu}P,Q} = \Psi_{P,Q}. \quad (3.3.8)$$

Thus, the indicial polynomials at $Q_\mu(P)$ remains constant under the translation T_{cz^μ} .

Remark. For general q -operators, one can define an initial series and some indicial series as long as all the convergence issues are taken care of. ■

We can now express the main conclusion of Lemma 3.3.8 as

$$P(cz^\mu + g(z)) = \Phi_{P,\mu}(c)z^\nu + o(z^\nu) \quad (3.3.9)$$

whenever $g(z) = o(z^\mu)$, and ν is the abscissa at which $L_\mu(P)$ intersects the a -axis. Moreover, if $L_\mu(P)$ meets $\mathcal{N}(P)$ at only one vertex $Q = (a, \ell)$, then $\Phi_{P,\mu}(c) = c^\ell \Psi_{P,Q}(q^\mu)$, so that

$$P(cz^\mu + g(z)) = c^\ell \Psi_{P,Q}(q^\mu)z^\nu + o(z^\nu).$$

This can be rephrased in terms of the method of substitution in the following summary.

Summary 3.3.11. *If we have a solution starting with cz^μ , that is a solution $cz^\mu + g(z)$ with $g(z) = o(z^\mu)$, let ν be the abscissa at which $L_\mu(P)$ intersects the a -axis. Two situations may occur:*

(i) $L_\mu(P)$ meets $\mathcal{N}(P)$ at one vertex Q . In this case, $cz^\mu + g(z)$ being a solution, we have

$$0 = P(cz^\mu + g(z)) = c^\ell \Psi_{P,Q}(q^\mu)z^\nu + o(z^\nu).$$

This implies that q^μ is a root of the indicial polynomial at Q .

(ii) $L_\mu(P)$ meets $\mathcal{N}(P)$ in at least two vertices. In this case

$$0 = P(cz^\mu + g(z)) = \Phi_{P,\mu}(c)z^\nu + o(z^\nu),$$

and c is a root of the initial polynomial.

In other words, we obtained a necessary condition for cz^μ to be the beginning of a solution. We can then iterate, expressing that for a Hahn series to be a solution of a given algebraic equation, its coefficients must be the zeros of some initial polynomials which are recursively defined, and its exponents must be related to the zeros of some recursively defined indicial polynomials.

The setup of this recursion can be done for some particular Hahn series whose support is an increasing sequence — not every Hahn series has such a support — and goes as follows. Let $h(z) = \sum_{i \geq 0} h_i z^{\eta_i}$ be a Hahn series with (η_i) an increasing sequence of real numbers. We can define a sequence of polynomials $(P_{h,i})$ by $P_{h,0} = P$ and for any $i \geq 1$,

$$P_{h,i}k(z) = P(h_0 z^{\eta_0} + h_1 z^{\eta_1} + \cdots + h_{i-1} z^{\eta_{i-1}} + k(z)). \quad (3.3.10)$$

In defining these polynomials, we do not assume that h is a solution of the q -algebraic equation $Pf = 0$. Any h of the given type defines a sequence of polynomials $(P_{h,i})$. The equality

$$P_{h,i+1}k(z) = P_{h,i}(h_i z^{\eta_i} + k(z)) = (T_{h_i z^{\eta_i}} P_{h,i})k(z)$$

gives an inductive way of defining these polynomials and shows that they are obtained by inductively applying some translations. Each polynomial $P_{h,i}$ has its Newton-Puiseux polygon $\mathcal{N}(P_{h,i})$ and we can define the initial polynomial $\Phi_{P_{h,i},\eta_i}$.

Definition 3.3.12. *We say that a Hahn series $h(z) = \sum_{i \geq 0} h_i z^{\eta_i}$, with (η_i) increasing, satisfies the necessary initial conditions if $\Phi_{P_{h,i},\eta_i}(h_i) = 0$, $i \geq 0$.*

The necessary initial conditions express that the sequences (h_i) and (η_i) are those that are calculated recursively by the method of substitution. In particular, if $h(z) = \sum_{i \geq 0} h_i z^{\eta_i}$ satisfies $Ph = 0$,

then it satisfies the necessary initial conditions. In Definition 3.3.12, it is possible that some h_i vanish.

4. Pivot point. As in Definition 3.3.12, let $h(z) = \sum_{i \geq 0} h_i z^{\eta_i}$ be a Hahn series with increasing sequence of exponents, and define recursively the polynomials $P_{h,i}$ as at the end of the previous section. For each i , let $Q_{h,i}$ be the point of highest ordinate in $\mathcal{N}(P_{h,i})$ belonging to the supporting line of co-slope η_i . Since (η_i) is increasing, Lemma 3.3.6.i ensures that the sequence of ordinates of $Q_{h,i}$ is nonincreasing. Therefore, there is an i_0 such that for any $i \geq i_0$ this sequence of ordinates is constant. Lemma 3.3.6.ii ensures that $Q_{h,i}$ is in $\mathcal{N}(P_{h,i+1})$ and Lemma 3.3.6.i ensures that $\mathcal{N}(P_{h,i+1})$ coincides with $\mathcal{N}(P_{h,i})$ above the horizontal line of ordinate that of $Q_{h,i}$; thus, the point $Q_{h,i}$ is constant for any $i \geq i_0$. We can then introduce the following definition.

Definition 3.4.1. *With the above notations, Q_{h,i_0} is called the pivot point of P with respect to h and is written $Q(P, h)$.*

Thus, the pivot point of P with respect to h is such that for i large enough $Q(P, h)$ is in $L_{\eta_i}(P_{h,i}) \cap \mathcal{N}(P_{h,i})$. This means that for i large enough the supporting line $L_{\eta_i}(P_{h,i})$ pivots around $Q(P, h)$. In particular, (3.3.8) implies that the indicial polynomial of $P_{h,i}$ at $Q(P, h)$ remains constant whenever i is at least i_0 , that is, with $P_{h,i+1} = T_{h_i z^{\eta_i}} P_{h,i}$,

$$\Psi_{P_{h,i+1}, Q(P, h)} = \Psi_{P_{h,i}, Q(P, h)} \quad (3.4.1)$$

for any i at least i_0 .

Example. Consider the q -Catalan equation

$$P = 1 - Y_0 + zY_0Y_1.$$

Its Newton-Puiseux polygon is shown in figure 3.4.1.




figure 3.4.1




figure 3.4.2




figure 3.4.3




figure 3.4.4

To see that this equation has a power series solution $f(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} f_n z^n$, note that the equation is in fact

$$f(z) = 1 + z f(z) f(qz).$$

Considering the coefficient of z^n , we obtain $f_0 = 1$ and for any $n \geq 1$,

$$f_n = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n-1} f_i q^{n-1-i} f_{n-1-i}.$$

This defines the sequence (f_n) recursively. To calculate the pivot point of P with respect to f , we first obtain the Newton-Puiseux polygon for $T_{f_0 z^0} P$. Since the exponent of z in $f_0 z^0$ corresponds to a line of co-slope 0, the cloud of points of $T_{f_0 z^0} P$ is contained in the cloud of points obtained from $\mathcal{C}(P)$ by adding points vertically below those of $\mathcal{C}(P)$; however, f_0 is such that the constant of the equation, that is the term of lowest order in $T_{f_0 z^0} P$, vanishes. Thus, the cloud of points is contained in the one indicated in figure 3.4.2 — we put a circle at the point which got cancelled. We can check that there is no further cancellation since

$$\begin{aligned} P(f_0 + g(z)) &= 1 - f_0 - g(z) + z(f_0 + g(z))(f_0 + g(qz)) \\ &= -g(z) + z + z g(z) + z g(qz) + z g(q) g(qz). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$P_{f,1} = T_{f_0 z^0} P = -Y_0 + z + z Y_0 + z Y_1 + z Y_0 Y_1.$$


After our next lemma, we will prove that $(0, 1)$ is the pivot point of P with respect to f , but we can now give the intuition as to why this is indeed the case.

Since f is a solution of the q -Catalan equation, it is in fact obtained by substitution, starting from $f_0 = 1$. Thus, the way to obtain f_n is in fact to cancel the lowest order term in $P_{f,n}(f_n z^n + o(z^n))$. Consequently, f_1 is obtained by canceling $[z]P_1(f_1 z + o(z))$, that is by finding the supporting line $L_1(P_1)$ and removing the point of ordinate 0 on that line — see figure 3.4.3. We find $f_1 = 1$.

Next, we cancel the term $[z^2]P_2(f_2 z^2 + o(z^2))$. To obtain P_2 , we translate the equation given by P_1 , adding points along the lines of co-slope 2, resulting in the cloud of points in figure 3.4.4. Canceling the term $[z^2]P_2$ removes the circled point in figure 3.4.4. As we keep

going, we see that the supporting line $L_n(P_n)$ pivots around $(0, 1)$ and links it to the point $(n, 0)$.

The situation is quite different if we calculate the pivot point of P with respect to the series, say, $h(z) = \sum_{i \geq 0} z^i$. Since $P_{f,0} = P_{h,0} = P$, the cloud of points of $P_{h,0}$ is still that of figure 3.4.1. Since $h_0 = f_0 = 1$, we have $P_{h,1} = P_{f,1}$ so that the cloud of points of $P_{h,1}$ is still given by figure 3.4.2. Since $h_1 = f_1 = 1$, the cloud of points of $P_{h,1}$ is still that of figure 3.4.3. But from now on the supporting line of co-slope n , $n \geq 2$, will go through the fixed point $(2, 0)$ and through $(0, 2/n)$, as indicated for $n = 3$ on figure 3.4.5. ■



This example suggests that the pivot point might indicate if a Hahn series is a solution of the q -algebraic equation or not. The following lemma relates the pivot point to the necessary initial conditions.

Lemma 3.4.2. *Let $h(z) = \sum_{i \geq 0} h_i z^{\eta_i}$ be a Hahn series such that (η_i) is increasing. The following are equivalent*

- (i) *the ordinate of $Q(P, h)$ is at least 1;*
- (ii) *h satisfies the necessary initial conditions for P .*

If $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \eta_i = +\infty$, then both statements are equivalent to

- (iii) *$Ph = 0$.*

Proof. (ii) \Rightarrow (i). Assume that the ordinate of $Q(P, h)$ is 0, that is $Q(P, h) = (a, 0)$ for some a . Then

$$\Psi_{P_i, Q}(t) = \sum_{\substack{B \in P_{h,i} \\ (b,m)=(a,0)}} P_B t^{\alpha(B)} = (P_{h,i})_{(a; \cup)}.$$

Let i be large enough so that $Q_{h,i-1}$ is $Q(P, h)$. Since the ordinate of $Q(P, h)$ is 0, the supporting line $L_{\eta_i}(P_{h,i})$ interstects $\mathcal{N}(P_{h,i})$ at the unique point $Q_{h,i} = Q(P, h)$. Thus, as we have seen in Summary 3.3.11.i, the term of lowest order of $P_{h,i}(h_i z^{\eta_i} + g(z))$ is $\Psi_{P_{h,i}, Q}(q^{\eta_i}) z^a$, that is, $(P_{h,i})_{(a; \cup)} z^a$. Moreover, by Lemma 3.3.4.ii,

$(P_{h,i})_{(a,u)}$ is constant for i large enough. Thus, if i is large enough, $\Psi_{P_{h,i},Q}(t)$ does not depend on i and on t and remains equal to some non-zero $(P_{h,i_0})_{(a,u)}$. Hence, if i is large enough, $\Psi_{P_{h,i},Q}(q^{\eta_i}) \neq 0$, and h does not satisfy the necessary initial conditions.

(i) \Rightarrow (ii). Assume that h does not satisfy the necessary initial conditions. Then $\Phi_{P_{h,i},\eta_i}(h_i) \neq 0$ for some i . For that i , $T_{h_i z^{\eta_i}} P_{h,i}$ introduces a point of ordinate 0 along the supporting line $L_{\eta_i}(P_{h,i})$. The supporting line $L_{\eta_{i+1}}(P_{h,i+1})$ will have only that point, because its co-slope is greater than that of the supporting $L_{\eta_i}(P_{h,i})$, forcing $Q_{h,i+1}$ to be of ordinate 0.

(iii) \Rightarrow (ii). If $Ph = 0$, then Summary 3.3.11 implies that h satisfies the necessary initial conditions. Note that we prove a stronger statement than claimed: showing that implication (iii) \Rightarrow (ii) does not require the assumption that $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \eta_i = +\infty$.

(ii) \Rightarrow (iii). If h satisfies the necessary initial conditions, then (3.3.9) and an induction give, for any Hahn series g such that $g(z) = o(z^{\nu_i})$,

$$P_{h,i}(h_i z^{\eta_i} + g(z)) = o(z^{\nu_i}), \quad (3.4.2)$$

where ν_i is the abscissa at which $L_{\eta_i}(P_{h,i})$ intersects the a -axis. For i large enough, this line passes through the pivot point $Q(P, h)$. Thus, if m is the ordinate of the pivot point and a its abscissa, we have $\nu_i = a + m\eta_i$. Since (η_i) tends to infinity, and assertion (i) ensures that m does not vanish, (ν_i) tends to infinity. Finally, (3.4.2) implies for any i

$$Ph(z) = P_{h,i} \left(h_i z^{\eta_i} + \sum_{j>i} h_j z^{\eta_j} \right) = o(z^{\nu_i})$$

and therefore $\text{ord } Ph = +\infty$, that is $Ph = 0$. ■

We can now conclude our previous example.

Example. (*continued*) Since f is obtained by substitution, it satisfies the necessary initial conditions. Thus, the pivot point $Q(P, f)$ has ordinate at least 1, and consequently, in this example, has ordinate 1. Its abscissa is 0. Since the exponents n are positive, Lemma 3.3.4 implies that $(0, 1)$ remains as we translate the equation further. It is then the pivot point. ■

5. Partial derivatives of q -operators and multiple roots.

Lemma 3.4.2 implies that the ordinate of the pivot point of the

equation with respect to a Hahn series with some special type of support satisfying the necessary initial conditions has ordinate at least 1. When we calculate a solution f by substitution, it is much simpler if the pivot point has ordinate exactly 1. Indeed, if this is so and the pivot point has abscissa a , the part of the $P_{f,i}$ which matters corresponds to the pivot point and the supporting line going through it, and it is then made of q -factors of the form $(a; \alpha)$, of length 1, — which correspond to points of ordinate 1 — and one q -factor of the form $(b; \sqcup)$, of length 0 — which corresponds to a point of ordinate 0. Therefore, the part of the equation that matters takes the form

$$\sum_{(a;\alpha) \in P_{f,i}} P_{(a;\alpha)} z^a f(q^\alpha z) + P_{(b;\sqcup)} z^b,$$

and applying $[z^b]$ we obtain

$$\sum_{(a;\alpha) \in P_{f,i}} P_{(a;\alpha)} q^{\alpha(b-a)} f_{b-a} + P_{(b;\sqcup)} = 0,$$

and we can calculate f_{b-a} easily. In contrast, if the pivot point has ordinate 2, then the part of the equation that matters involves a quadratic term $f(q^\alpha z)f(q^\beta z)$, and the higher the pivot point the more higher order terms are involved, so that the next coefficient of f can be calculated recursively, but in a more complicated fashion. Both for theoretical and practical purposes, and this will become particularly clear later, we see that it is desirable that the pivot point has ordinate 1. Our goal in this section is to show that this can always be obtained after some differentiation of the equation. The following example illustrates the possibility of a pivot point at $(0, 2)$ and the procedure to lower its ordinate.

Example. Consider the equation

$$f(z)f(qz) - e^{qz}f(z) - e^z f(qz) + e^{(q+1)z} = 0.$$

To reveal what this equation is intended for, set $h(z) = e^z$, and keeping the warning 2.2.7 in mind, rewrite the equation as

$$(Y_0 - h(z))(Y_1 - h(qz))f(z) = 0. \quad (3.5.1)$$

It is then obvious that the equation has solution $f(z) = h(z)$, or $f(qz) = h(qz)$, so that the root f is in fact a double root.

In the q -factor notation, the equation corresponds to the q -operator

$$(0; 0, 1) - \sum_{n \geq 0} q^n h_n(n; 0) - \sum_{n \geq 0} h_n(n; 1) + \sum_{n \geq 0} \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n} h_i h_{n-i} q^i(n; \sqcup).$$

The cloud of points for this operator is made of all the points $(n, 0)$ and $(n, 1)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, as well as the point $(0, 2)$, the part of it with $n \leq 5$ is represented in figure 3.5.1




figure 3.5.1

From (3.5.1), it is clear that $f(z) = h(z)$ is the solution of the equation. Let us calculate the sequence of polynomials $P_{h,i}$. Setting $h(z) = \sum_{0 \leq j < N} h_j z^j + z^N k(z)$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} P_{h,N} f(z) &= (f(z) - z^N k(z))(f(qz) - q^N z^N k(qz)) \\ &= q^N z^{2N} k(z)k(qz) - q^N z^N k(qz)f(z) - z^N k(z)f(qz) \\ &\quad + f(z)f(qz). \end{aligned}$$

The corresponding cloud of points is then all the points $(n, 0)$, $n \geq 2N$, which correspond to the power series expansion of the term $z^{2N} k(z)k(qz)$, all the points $(n, 1)$ with $n \geq N$, which correspond to the power series expansion of $-q^N z^N k(qz)f(z) - z^N k(z)f(qz)$, and the point $(0, 2)$ which corresponds to the term $f(z)f(qz)$. Hence $(0, 2)$ is the pivot point of the equation with respect to h . This is represented in figure 3.5.2, along with the supporting lines of co-slope N .




figure 3.5.2

The particularity of this equation is that it has a double root. If we consider the polynomials $\partial P / \partial Y_0 = Y_1 - h(qz)$ or $\partial P / \partial Y_1 = Y_0 - h(z)$, we obtain a new equation which has the same solution $f(z) = h(z)$ as the original one, and now $(0, 1)$ for pivot point. ■

To elaborate on our example, when $q = 1$, generically a translation brings the pivot point to ordinate 1. However, if the power series along which we translate is a root of the polynomial which happens to have multiplicity at least 2, then the pivot point keeps an ordinate greater than 1. In that aspect, for a solution f of a q -algebraic equation, the ordinate of the pivot point $Q(P, f)$ is a q -analogue of the multiplicity of a root. In the usual algebraic setting, that is when q is 1, one may differentiate the polynomial enough times so that the multiple root becomes a single root, and this brings the pivot to ordinate 1. We will show that the same procedure can be used in the q -setting, exactly as we did in the example above.

To explain this, the following definition expresses in q -factor notation the differentiation of monomials,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial Y_k} z^a Y_0^{\lambda_0} \dots Y_n^{\lambda_n} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \lambda_k = 0, \\ \lambda_k z^a Y_0^{\lambda_0} \dots Y_k^{\lambda_k-1} \dots Y_n^{\lambda_n} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Definition 3.5.1. *Let $A = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$ be a q -factor. Let α be a nonnegative integer. Let*

$$\lambda_\alpha(A) = \#\{i : \alpha_i = \alpha\}.$$

If $\lambda_\alpha(A)$ is positive, let $A_{\setminus\alpha}$ be the q -factor obtained from A by removing one of the components α_i equal to α . The derivative of A with respect to α is the q -operator

$$\partial_\alpha A = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \alpha \notin \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell\} \\ \lambda_\alpha(A) A_{\setminus\alpha} & \text{if } \alpha \in \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell\}. \end{cases}$$

This derivation is extended to polynomials by linearity. It is also extended by induction to derivatives of higher order, so that $\partial_{\beta_1} \dots \partial_{\beta_k} A$ is defined.

Example. (i) If $A = (7; 1, 5, 5, 5, 5, 8)$ then $\partial_5 A = 4(7; 1, 5, 5, 5, 8)$ and $\partial_8 A = (7; 1, 5, 5, 5, 5)$.

(ii) Since the empty set contains no element, $\partial_\alpha(a; \square) = 0$ for any q -factor of length 0. ■

It is clear from the interpretation in terms of monomials that the derivatives commute.

Geometrically, a q -factor A in P is represented by the point (a, ℓ) in $\mathcal{C}(P)$. If γ is one of the α_i , then $\partial_\gamma A$ is represented by $(a, \ell - 1)$; thus, it is the point obtained by translating the point (a, ℓ) one unit down. If γ is not one of the α_i , then $\partial_\gamma A$ vanishes. This does not mean that the point $(a, \ell - 1)$ is not in $\partial_\gamma P$ for there could be other q -factors of length ℓ in P which contribute to the point $(a, \ell - 1)$ after the differentiation. Therefore, $\mathcal{C}(\partial_\gamma P)$ is included in the translation one unit down of $\mathcal{C}(P)$, keeping only the points of nonnegative ordinate; and the inclusion may be strict.

Since we will need to use both translations and derivatives, the following commutativity property will be useful.

Lemma 3.5.2. *Derivatives commute with translations.*

Proof. We need to show that for any α and any cz^μ , we have

$$\partial_\alpha T_{cz^\mu} = T_{cz^\mu} \partial_\alpha.$$

It suffices to prove this identity on q -factors because translations and derivatives are linear. This is one instance where writing q -operators with the variables Y_0, \dots, Y_n makes a proof considerably easier. Consider a q -factor $A = z^a Y_0^{\lambda_0} \dots Y_n^{\lambda_n}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} T_{cz^\mu} A f(z) &= z^a \prod_{0 \leq i \leq n} \left(Y_i(cz^\mu + f(z)) \right)^{\lambda_i} \\ &= z^a \prod_{0 \leq i \leq n} (cq^{\mu_i} z^\mu + f(q^i z))^{\lambda_i} \\ &= z^a \prod_{0 \leq i \leq n} (cq^{\mu_i} z^\mu + Y_i)^{\lambda_i} f(z), \end{aligned}$$

where the product $\prod_{0 \leq i \leq n} (cq^{\mu_i} z^\mu + Y_i)^{\lambda_i}$ is the operator obtained by expanding this product as a polynomial in Y_0, \dots, Y_n and then thinking of the monomials in Y_i as operators. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_k T_{cz^\mu} A &= \frac{\partial}{\partial Y_k} \left(z^a \prod_{0 \leq i \leq n} (cq^{\mu_i} z^\mu + Y_i)^{\lambda_i} \right) \\ &= z^a \lambda_k (cq^{\mu_k} + Y_k)^{\lambda_k - 1} \prod_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq n \\ i \neq k}} (cq^{\mu_i} z^\mu + Y_i)^{\lambda_i}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5.2)$$

Since

$$\partial_k A = z^a \lambda_k Y_k^{\lambda_k - 1} \prod_{\substack{0 \leq i \leq n \\ i \neq k}} Y_i^{\lambda_i},$$

we see that (3.5.2) is $T_{cz^\mu} \partial_k A$. \blacksquare

The following lemma will be instrumental to relate the pivot point of P to that of some of its derivatives.

Lemma 3.5.3. *Let $\mathcal{N}(P)$ be the Newton-Puiseux polygon of P . Let $L_\mu(P)$ be its supporting line of co-slope μ and let $A = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$ be a monomial in P such that $\mathcal{C}(A)$ is the point of greatest ordinate in $L_\mu(P) \cap \mathcal{N}(P)$. Let $(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n)$ be a subtuple of $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$. Then the point of largest ordinate of $L_\mu(\partial_{\gamma_1} \cdots \partial_{\gamma_n} P)$ is $(a; \ell - n)$.*

Proof. The proof is by induction on n . For $n = 1$, write γ instead of γ_1 , so that we need to consider $\partial_\gamma P$. Since γ is one of the $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell$, the q -factor $\partial_\gamma A$ is not 0 and therefore is in $\partial_\gamma P$. Consider the line of co-slope μ passing through $\mathcal{C}(\partial_\gamma A)$, that is, $L_\mu(\partial_\gamma A)$.

To show that $\mathcal{C}(\partial_\gamma A)$, that is, $(a, \ell - 1)$, is of maximal ordinate on $L_\mu(\partial_\gamma P) \cap \mathcal{N}(\partial_\gamma P)$, we argue by contradiction. Thus, assume that $\mathcal{C}(\partial_\gamma A)$ is not of maximal ordinate in $L_\mu(\partial_\gamma P) \cap \mathcal{N}(\partial_\gamma P)$. Then, either

- (i) $L_\mu(\partial_\gamma A)$ is not a supporting line of $\mathcal{N}(\partial_\gamma P)$, or
- (ii) $L_\mu(\partial_\gamma A)$ is a supporting line of $\mathcal{N}(\partial_\gamma P)$ but $\mathcal{C}(\partial_\gamma A)$ is not of maximal ordinate in $L_\mu(\partial_\gamma A) \cap \mathcal{N}(\partial_\gamma P)$.

Let $\nu = a + \mu\ell$. In particular, $a + \mu(\ell - 1) = \nu - \mu$. By definition of the supporting line $L_\mu(P)$ to which $\mathcal{C}(A)$ belongs,

$$\nu = \min\{b + \mu m : (b; \beta_1, \dots, \beta_m) \in P\}. \quad (3.5.3)$$

Case (i) means that $\mathcal{C}(\partial_\gamma P)$ has a point $(b, m - 1)$ such that $b + \mu(m - 1) < a + \mu(\ell - 1)$, and therefore

$$b + \mu m < a + \mu\ell = \nu. \quad (3.5.4)$$

But $(b, m - 1) = \mathcal{C}(\partial_\gamma B)$ for some q -factor B of P . Then (3.5.4) contradicts (3.5.3), and therefore, case (i) cannot occur.

In case (ii), the line $L_\mu(\partial_\gamma A)$ intersects the a -axis at the abscissa $a + \mu(\ell - 1) = \nu - \mu$. Let then $(b, m - 1)$ be a point of maximal

ordinate in $L_\mu(\partial_\gamma A) \cap \mathcal{N}(\partial_\gamma P)$. Since this point is on $L_\mu(\partial_\gamma A)$, we have $b + \mu(m - 1) = \nu - \mu$, and therefore,

$$b + \mu m = \nu. \quad (3.5.5)$$

Moreover, since $(b, m - 1)$ is of maximal ordinate in $L_\mu(\partial_\gamma A) \cap \mathcal{N}(\partial_\gamma P)$ while $\mathcal{C}(\partial_\gamma A)$ is not, we also have $m > \ell$. Since it is of maximal ordinate, the point $(b, m - 1)$ is in $\mathcal{C}(\partial_\gamma P)$ and thus is some $\mathcal{C}(\partial_\gamma B)$ for some B in P . Thus (3.5.5) shows that B is on $L_\mu(A) = L_\mu(P)$ and therefore on $L_\mu(P) \cap \mathcal{N}(P)$. This contradicts that A is of maximal ordinate. Therefore case (ii) cannot occur and $\partial_\gamma A$ is indeed of maximal ordinate in $L_\mu(\partial_\gamma P) \cap \mathcal{N}(\partial_\gamma P)$.

For higher order derivatives, we then proceed by induction, considering $\partial_{\gamma_1}(\partial_{\gamma_2} P)$ and so on. \blacksquare

The following examples illustrate that in Lemma 3.5.3 the condition that $(\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n)$ is a subtuple of $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$ is essential for the result to hold, as well as that $\mathcal{C}(A)$ is of maximal ordinate in $L_\mu(P) \cap \mathcal{N}(P)$.

Examples. (i) Consider

$$\begin{aligned} P &= Y_0^2 + Y_1^6 + z^3 Y_1^2 + z^4 Y_1 + z^2 \\ &= (0; 0, 0) + (0; 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1) + (3; 1, 1) + (4; 1) + (2; \sqcup). \end{aligned}$$

The cloud of points of P is in figure 3.5.3.




figure 3.5.3




figure 3.5.4

The line $L_1(P)$ passes through $(0, 2)$ and $(2, 0)$, corresponding to Y_0^2 and z^2 .

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_1 P &= 6Y_1^5 + 2z^3 Y_1 + z^4 \\ &= 6(0; 1, 1, 1, 1, 1) + 2(3; 1) + (4; \sqcup), \end{aligned}$$

the supporting line $L_1(\partial_1 P)$ passes through $(3, 1)$ and $(4, 0)$. This line is above $L_1(P)$, as shown in figure 3.5.4.

(ii) Consider

$$P = Y_0^3 + zY_1^2 + z^2Y_2 + z^3,$$

and the supporting line $L_1(P)$. Figures 3.5.5–3.5.8 illustrate Lemma 3.5.3 on $\partial_0 P$ and show why the assumptions of Lemma 3.5.3 are important when taking derivatives.




figure 3.5.5

figure 3.5.6

figure 3.5.7

figure 3.5.8

■

We now relate the pivot point of P with respect to a Hahn series h to that of the pivot point of some well chosen partial derivatives of P with respect to the same Hahn series h .

Proposition 3.5.4. *Let $h(z) = \sum_{i \geq 1} h_i z^{\eta_i}$ be a Hahn series with (η_i) increasing. Let $Q(P, h) = (a, \ell)$ be the pivot point of P with respect to h . Assume that ℓ is positive and that $Q(P, h)$ is reached at step N . Let $A = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$ be a q -factor in $P_{h, N}$ with $\mathcal{C}(A) = Q(P, h)$. Then, for any subtuple $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_m)$ of $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$, the pivot point of $\partial_{\beta_1} \dots \partial_{\beta_m} P$ with respect to h is $(a; \ell - m)$ and it is reached at step N .*

Proof. Let i be at least N . Since $Q(P, h)$ is of maximal ordinate on the supporting line $L_{\mu_N}(P_{h, N})$, Lemma 3.3.4.ii ensures that A will remain in each $P_{h, i}$. By definition of the pivot point, $\mathcal{C}(A) = Q(P, h)$ is of maximal ordinate in $L_{\mu_i}(P_{h, i}) \cap \mathcal{N}(P_{h, i})$.

By Lemma 3.5.3, the point of largest ordinate in

$$L_{\mu_i}(\partial_{\beta_1} \dots \partial_{\beta_m} P_{h, i}) \cap \mathcal{N}(\partial_{\beta_1} \dots \partial_{\beta_m} P_{h, i})$$

is then $(a, \ell - m)$. Since the translations and the differentiations commute,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\beta_1} \dots \partial_{\beta_m} P_{h, i} &= \partial_{\beta_1} \dots \partial_{\beta_m} T_{h_{i-1}z^{\eta_{i-1}}} T_{h_{i-2}z^{\eta_{i-2}}} \dots T_{h_0z^{\eta_0}} P \\ &= T_{h_{i-1}z^{\eta_{i-1}}} T_{h_{i-2}z^{\eta_{i-2}}} \dots T_{h_0z^{\eta_0}} \partial_{\beta_1} \dots \partial_{\beta_m} P \\ &= (\partial_{\beta_1} \dots \partial_{\beta_m} P)_{h, i}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $\partial_{\beta_1} \cdots \partial_{\beta_m}(P_{h,i})$ and $(\partial_{\beta_1} \cdots \partial_{\beta_m} P)_{h,i}$ coincide and have the same cloud of points. Hence, the points of largest ordinate in

$$L_{\eta_i}((\partial_{\beta_1} \cdots \partial_{\beta_m} P)_{h,i}) \cap \mathcal{N}((\partial_{\beta_1} \cdots \partial_{\beta_m} P)_{h,i})$$

is $(a, \ell - m)$. Consequently, $(a, \ell - m)$ is the pivot point of $\partial_{\beta_1} \cdots \partial_{\beta_m} P$ with respect to h and it is reached at step N . ■

To conclude this section, we do not know if the equations with pivot point at height 2 have a special structure. The change of variable $Y_i \leftarrow Y_i - f(q^i z)$ yields a pivot point at height at least 2. In general, we do not know how to decompose an equation with pivot point at height at least 2 in terms of simpler equations, beyond using Proposition 3.5.4. However, Proposition 3.5.4 seems sufficient when dealing with concrete equations.

6. The first ω terms of a Hahn series. In our general setup, we are dealing with Hahn series solutions with no condition on their support beyond being well ordered. We may encounter series whose exponents are not an increasing sequence, such as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n \geq 1} z^{(1-1/n)\mathbb{1}_{2\mathbb{N}+1}(n) + (43-1/n)\mathbb{1}_{2\mathbb{N}}(n)} \\ = \sum_{n \geq 0} z^{1-1/(2n+1)} + \sum_{n \geq 1} z^{43-1/(2n)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6.1)$$

It is therefore possible that the support has one or several accumulation points. However, since the support of a Hahn series is well ordered, the following definition makes sense.

Definition 3.6.1. *Let f be a Hahn series and let S be its support. Let ω be the cardinality of S . We define the sequence $(\mu_i)_{0 \leq i < \omega}$ inductively by $\mu_0 = \min S$ and $\mu_i = \min(S \setminus \{\mu_0, \dots, \mu_{i-1}\})$*

The first ω terms of f is the Hahn series $\sum_{0 \leq i < \omega} ([z^{\mu_i}]f(z))z^{\mu_i}$.

Thus, in example (3.6.1), we have $\omega = +\infty$ and $\mu_i = 1 - 1/(2i + 1)$. The first ω terms of that series are

$$\sum_{n \geq 1} z^{1-1/n} \mathbb{1}_{2\mathbb{N}+1}(n) = \sum_{n \geq 0} z^{1-1/(2n+1)}.$$

If S is finite, then f coincides with its first ω terms. More generally, if S has no (finite) accumulation point, then f coincides with its first ω terms.

7. Finiteness property. So far we have considered two types of operations on q -algebraic equations: the translations T_{cz^μ} and the derivations ∂_α . Starting with a q -algebraic equation $Pf = 0$ with P having grid-based Hahn series coefficients, that is, $P \in \mathbb{C}[[z^{\mathbb{R}}]]_{\text{grid}}[Y_0, \dots, Y_n]$, we need to show that $T_{cz^\mu}P$ and $\partial_\alpha P$ are also polynomials in Y_0, \dots, Y_n whose coefficients are also grid-based. This is the purpose of the next lemma. However, we need to introduce a notation first.

Notation 3.7.1. *Let Γ_1 and Γ_2 be two finitely generated additive semigroups of the additive semigroup \mathbb{R}^+ . We write $\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2$ for the additive semigroup of \mathbb{R}^+ generated by the union of the generators of Γ_1 and Γ_2 .*

We have the following stability of grid-based q -operators under translations and differentiation.

Lemma 3.7.2. *Let P be in $\mathbb{C}[[z^{\mathbb{R}}]]_{\text{grid}}[Y_0, \dots, Y_n]$. Then*

- (i) $T_{cz^\mu}P \in \mathbb{C}[[z^{\mathbb{R}}]]_{\text{grid}}[Y_0, \dots, Y_n]$ and
- (ii) $\partial_\alpha P \in \mathbb{C}[[z^{\mathbb{R}}]]_{\text{grid}}[Y_0, \dots, Y_n]$.

Proof. (i) The assumption that the coefficients of P are grid-based with grid, say, $\gamma + \Gamma$, means that for any q -factor $A = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$ in P , the component a is in $\gamma + \Gamma$. From Definition 3.3.2, all the q -factors $B = (b; \beta_1, \dots, \beta_m)$ in $T_{cz^\mu}A$ have b of the form $a + \mu(\ell - k)$ for some $0 \leq k \leq \ell$. If μ is positive, such a b belongs to the grid $\gamma + (\Gamma + \mu\mathbb{N})$. If μ is negative, such a b belongs to the grid $\gamma + \mu\ell(P) + (\Gamma + |\mu|\mathbb{N})$. This implies that $T_{cz^\mu}P$ is grid-based.
(ii) Note that $\partial_\alpha A$ is either 0 or some $\lambda_\alpha(A)A_{\setminus\alpha}$. ■

By induction, using a circle to indicate the composition of translations, we obtain that for any nonnegative integer n ,

$$\left(\bigcirc_{0 \leq i \leq n} T_{f_i z^{\mu_i}} \right) P \in \mathbb{C}[[z^{\mathbb{R}}]]_{\text{grid}}[Y_0, \dots, Y_n],$$

with grid

$$\gamma' + (\Gamma + |\mu_0|\mathbb{N} + \cdots + |\mu_n|\mathbb{N})$$

for some real number γ' .

We will also need the following lemma.

Lemma 3.7.3. *Let Ψ be a polynomial. Given $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, the set*

$$\{\gamma \in \mathbb{R} : \gamma > \alpha, \Psi(q^\gamma) = 0\}$$

is

- (i) finite if $|q| \neq 1$,
- (ii) in a grid if $|q| = 1$ and $q \neq 1$.

Proof. (i) is clear. To prove (ii), if $|q| = 1$ and $\Psi(q^\gamma) = 0$, then q^γ is of modulus 1 and is a root r of Ψ . In particular, r is of modulus 1. Writing $q = e^{2i\pi\theta}$ and $r = e^{2i\pi\rho}$, we have $\gamma\theta = \rho + \mathbb{Z}$ and, since γ is at greater than α , it is in a grid included in $\rho/\theta + (1/\theta)\mathbb{Z}$. ■

Remark. This lemma fails if Ψ is a series instead of a polynomial, which prevents the next theorem to be true in general for q -operators which are not polynomials, even if all the convergence issues are taken care of.

We can now prove our main result for this chapter. Recall that if $q = 1$, only the variable Y_0 is used since σ is the identity.

Theorem 3.7.4. (i) *Let P be a polynomial in (Y_0, \dots, Y_n) with grid-based coefficients. Then any solution of $Pf = 0$ is grid-based.*
(ii) *Moreover, if $|q| \neq 1$ and the pivot point $Q(P, f)$ is reached at step 0 and is $(0, 1)$, and $\Psi(q^\eta) \neq 0$ for any $\eta \geq \text{ord} f$, then a grid for the coefficients of P is also a grid for the coefficients of f .*

As we will see in the proof, we can always transform an equation which satisfies the assumption in the first assertion of the theorem, into one that satisfies the assumptions in the second assertion.

Proof. Let f be a Hahn series such that $Pf = 0$. Let $\underline{f}(z) = \sum_{0 \leq i < \omega} f_i z^{\mu_i}$ be its first ω terms. If ω is finite, then f is grid based.

Assume from now on that ω is infinite. Let \bar{f} be such that $f = \underline{f} + \bar{f}$. Recall the polynomials $P_{f,i}$ introduced in (3.3.10) by recursively translating the equation along the power series f . It follows from (3.3.10) that

$$Pf(z) = P_{f,n} \left(\sum_{i>n} f_i z^{\mu_i} + \bar{f} \right). \quad (3.7.1)$$

Lemma 3.7.2 ensures that $P_{f,n}$ is grid-based. Therefore, taking n large enough, substituting $P_{f,n}$ for P , Definition 3.4.1 and the discussion that precedes it allow us to assume that the pivot point $Q(P, f)$ is reached at step 0.

If the pivot point has ordinate at least 2, we apply Proposition 3.5.4, differentiating P in order to bring down the pivot point so that its ordinate is 1 and is still reached at step 0. Lemma 3.7.2.ii ensures that the equation is still grid-based.

If the pivot point has a negative abscissa, say $-a^*$, then f also solves $(z^{a^*} P)f = 0$. Substituting $z^{a^*} P$ for P translates $\mathcal{C}(P)$ by a^* units to the right, so that the new equation has pivot point $(0, 1)$, which is still reached at step 0, and the polynomial $z^{a^*} P$ is still grid-based. Therefore, we can assume that $Q(P, f) = (0, 1)$.

Now, (3.3.8) ensures that the indicial polynomial at $Q(P, f)$ is unchanged when we translate the equation along the solution.

To summarize, we can assume that the pivot point $Q(P, f)$ is reached at step 0 and is $(0, 1)$, and that the indicial polynomial is a fixed polynomial Ψ .

Recall (3.7.1). Summary 3.3.11 and Definition 3.4.1 of the pivot point ensure that $L_{\mu_n}(P_{f,n})$ meets $\mathcal{C}(P_{f,n})$ at the vertex $Q(P_{f,n}, f) = Q(P, f)$. It may also meet $\mathcal{C}(P_{f,n})$ at some other points. In the latter case, this other point is unique; indeed, since $Q(P, f) = (0, 1)$, the only other point of nonnegative integral ordinate which can be in $L_{\mu_n}(P_{f,n}) \cap \mathcal{C}(P_{f,n})$ is at ordinate 0, that is, on the a -axis. Since $L_{\mu_n}(P_{f,n})$ has co-slope μ_n and passes through $Q(P, f) = (0, 1)$, it intersects the a -axis at $(\mu_n, 0)$. So we are in one of the following situations:

1) if $L_{\mu_n}(P_{f,n})$ meets $\mathcal{C}(P_{f,n})$ only at $Q(P, f)$, then Summary 3.3.11.i asserts that q^{μ_n} is one of the roots of the indicial polynomial Ψ . If $|q| \neq 1$, there are finitely many possible μ_n such that this occur. If $|q| = 1$ and $q \neq 1$, then Lemma 3.7.3 ensures that μ_n is in a grid.

2) If $L_{\mu_n}(P_{f,n})$ meets $\mathcal{C}(P_{f,n})$ at Q and $(\mu_n, 0)$, this means that $(\mu_n, 0)$ is also in $\mathcal{C}(P_{f,n})$. Thus z^{μ_n} is a monomial in P , and since P is grid-based with grid $\gamma + \Gamma$ then μ_n is in the grid $\gamma + \Gamma$.

In both cases, (μ_n) is in a grid and the solution is grid-based. Since (μ_n) is in a grid, (μ_n) tends to infinity and $\bar{f} = 0$, and $f(z) = \sum_{0 \leq i < \omega} f_i z^{\mu_i}$ solves $Pf = 0$.

To prove the second assertion, $\mu_0 = \text{ord} f$ is such that $\Psi(q^\eta) \neq 0$ for any $\eta \geq \mu_0$, and, in particular, $\Psi(q^{\mu_n}) \neq 0$ for any nonnegative n . Therefore, we can never be in situation 1 above. Since we are then in situation 2, each μ_n is in the same grid as the coefficients of P . ■

4. Solved form and recursion

Our goal in this chapter is to show that a large class of q -algebraic equations can be transformed so that their solution is a power series whose coefficients can be recovered by a possibly complicated yet tractable and useful recursion.

The underlying reasoning is simple to explain on the q -Catalan equation $f(z) = 1 + zf(z)f(qz)$. Applying $[z^n]$ to both sides of this identity, we obtain the recursion

$$f_n = \mathbb{1}\{n = 0\} + \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n-1} f_{n-1-i} q^i f_i,$$

with in particular $f_0 = 1$. This allows us to calculate the f_n recursively and to study the coefficients f_n . For instance, if q is a real number greater than 1, the recursion shows that all f_n are at least 1 and that $f_n \geq q^{n-1} f_{n-1}$ — this term is obtained for $i = n-1$ in the recursion. In particular, this shows that f_n grows at least like $q^{n(n-1)/2}$.

Our goal in this chapter is to show that for a vast class of equations one can obtain such a recursive formula for the coefficients of a series which may not be the solution of the equation but from which the solution of the equation can be calculated very easily. In further chapters, this will allow us to obtain asymptotic estimates on the coefficients of the solution, in fact very much as we just did for the q -Catalan equation, but in a much more precise way.

1. Shifting and nonshifting q -factors. Consider a q -factor A with first component a a nonnegative integer, and a power series f . The coefficient of z^n in Af is

$$\begin{aligned} [z^n]Af(z) &= [z^n]z^a \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} f(q^{\alpha_i} z) \\ &= [z^{n-a}] \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \sum_{n_i \geq 0} f_{n_i} q^{\alpha_i n_i} z^{n_i} \\ &= \sum_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n-a} q^{\alpha_1 n_1 + \dots + \alpha_\ell n_\ell} f_{n_1} \dots f_{n_\ell}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.1.1)$$

In (4.1.1) as well as in all that follows, $\sum_{n_1+\dots+n_\ell=n-a}$ means sum over all nonnegative integers n_1, \dots, n_ℓ which add to $n - a$; if $n - a$ is negative, no such integers exists and the sum is 0.

We see that if $a \geq 1$, the sum (4.1.1) involves only coefficients f_{n_i} with $n_i \leq n - 1$. In this case, evaluating $[z^n]Af(z)$ requires only the knowledge of the f_i for $0 \leq i \leq n - 1$ but not that of f_n . This motivates the following definition.

Definition 4.1.1. A q -factor $A = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$ with nonnegative integer a is

- (i) *shifting* if $a \geq 1$ and $\ell \geq 1$;
- (ii) *nonshifting* if $a = 0$ and $\ell \geq 1$;
- (iii) *constant* if $\ell = 0$.

The reason for the terminology constant in Definition 4.1.1.iii is that if A is a q -factor with length 0, then $Af(z) = z^a$ does not depend on f . Thus, as operator, such a q -factor is indeed constant. Note that a q -factor A with a in \mathbb{N} is either shifting, nonshifting or constant, and that those three types are exclusive. We can then decompose some q -operators according to the type of the q -factors, leading to the following definition.

Definition 4.1.2. Let P be a q -operator with power series coefficients.

The *shifting part* of P is $P_+ = \sum_{\substack{A \in P \\ a \geq 1; \ell \geq 1}} P_A A$.

The *nonshifting part* of P is $P_0 = \sum_{\substack{A \in P \\ a=0; \ell \geq 1}} P_A A$.

The *constant part* of P is $P_\sqcup = \sum_{\substack{A \in P \\ \ell=0}} P_A A$.

Clearly $P = P_0 + P_+ + P_\sqcup$. If we write P as a polynomial $P(z; Y_0, \dots, Y_n)$, then $P_\sqcup f(z) = P(z; 0, \dots, 0)$ does not depend on f . To fix the notation, since

$$P_\sqcup = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} P_{(n; \sqcup)}(n; \sqcup),$$

we have

$$P_{\sqcup}(z) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} P_{(n; \sqcup)} z^n = P(z; 0, \dots, 0).$$

2. Solved form and recursion. Equipped with Definitions 4.1.1 and 4.1.2, we can define what a solved form is.

Definition 4.2.1. *A q -operator is in solved form if the following two conditions are satisfied:*

- (i) *all its q -factors have $a \in \mathbb{N}$;*
- (ii) *its nonshifting part is a linear operator which is not 0.*

The second condition in Definition 4.2.1 means that any nonshifting q -factor A in P has length 1. This implies that the cloud of points of the nonshifting part of P is the unique point $(0, 1)$. A q -operator in solved form can be written as

$$P = \sum_{A \in P_0} P_A(0; \alpha_1) + P_+ + P_{\sqcup},$$

or, equivalently,

$$Pf(z) = \sum_{A \in P_0} P_A f(q^{\alpha_1 z}) + \sum_{A \in P_+} P_A A f(z) + P_{\sqcup}(z).$$

Applying $[z^n]$ and using (4.1.1), we obtain that $Pf = 0$ is equivalent to

$$\left(\sum_{A \in P_0} P_A q^{\alpha_1 n} \right) f_n + \sum_{A \in P_+} P_A \sum_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a} q^{\alpha_1 n_1 + \dots + \alpha_\ell n_\ell} f_{n_1} \cdots f_{n_\ell} + P_{(n; \sqcup)} = 0 \quad (4.2.1)$$

for all nonnegative integer n . In particular for $n = 0$, we obtain $\sum_{A \in P_0} P_A f_0 + P_{(0; \sqcup)} = 0$.

Equation (4.2.1) is a linear equation in f_n . If $\sum_{A \in P_0} P_A q^{\alpha_1 n} \neq 0$, we can calculate f_n recursively from the previous f_i , $0 \leq i \leq n - 1$. This explains why the equation is said to be in solved form. In particular, since we can calculate the f_n recursively, the solution of a q -algebraic equation in solved form is a power series. In practice, the computation may be delicate if the equation has q -factors of large length.

Note also that in Definition 2.2.10 of q -operators, a general q -operator may not be a polynomial. In particular, a q -operator in solved form may not be a polynomial. The point of this distinction is that while we will show that any polynomial q -algebraic equation with rational exponents having a common denominator can be transformed in a solved form, we will be able to develop a theory for the solutions of equations in solved form which does not require the q -operator to be polynomial.

The recursion (4.2.1) motivates us to introduce the following definition.

Definition 4.2.2. *Let q be a fixed complex number. A q -operator P in solved form satisfies the uniqueness condition if for any nonnegative integer n ,*

$$\sum_{A \in P_0} P_A q^{\alpha_1 n} \neq 0.$$

In particular, for $n = 0$, the uniqueness condition assumes that the series $\sum_{A \in P_0} P_A$ is summable. This condition is not restrictive since (4.2.1) makes sense for $n = 0$ only if the P_A are summable. Put differently, if $\sum_{A \in P_0} P_A$ is divergent, then the equation has no solution. That can also be seen on the identity

$$[z^0]Pf = \sum_{A \in P_0} P_A f_0 + P_{(0; \mathbb{L})}.$$

If P is in solved form, its cloud of points has the following structure: it has one point at $(0, 1)$, the pivot point with respect to a solution of the equation; it may have a point at $(0, 0)$, the constant term of $P(z; Y_0, \dots, Y_n)$; and all its other points have integral abscissa at least 1. In particular $(0, 1)$ is the pivot point with respect to any solution supported on in the nonnegative half-line, and it is reached at step 0. The corresponding indicial polynomial at $(0, 1)$ is $\Psi(t) = \sum_{A \in P_0} P_A t^{\alpha_1}$ so that the uniqueness condition of Definition 4.2.2 implies that when solving iteratively for f_n , we are always in the situation of Summary 3.3.11.ii.

Thinking now of P as a polynomial $P(z; Y_0, \dots, Y_n)$, it is in solved form if $[z^0]P$ is a nonconstant affine function of Y_0, \dots, Y_n .

An equation in solved form may still have multiple solutions.

Example. The q -Catalan equation

$$f(z) = 1 + zf(z)f(qz)$$

is in solved form. It has a power series solution $f(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} f_n z^n$ with (f_n) defined recursively by

$$f_n = \mathbb{1}\{n = 0\} + \sum_{0 \leq k \leq n-1} q^k f_k f_{n-1-k}.$$

It also has a solution $g(z) = qz^{-1} + h(z)$ where h satisfies

$$1 + qh(qz) + zh(z)h(qz) = 0.$$

We may take h to be a power series, obtaining a second solution to the equation. ■

We make the following convention.

Convention. *Whenever an equation is in solved form, we consider only the power series solutions.*

3. Some transformations preserving solved forms. In the subsequent chapters, we will need to consider equations in solved forms with some additional features. The goal of this section is to introduce some operations on solved forms which we will use to show that the required additional features can always be assumed.

Consider recursion (4.2.1). If $|q| > 1$, then $\sum_{A \in P_0} P_A q^{\alpha_1 n}$ is of order $O(q^{\bar{\alpha}(P_0)n})$, while if $|q| < 1$, it is of order $O(q^{\underline{\alpha}(P_0)n})$. To analyze the asymptotic behavior of f_n , it will be desirable to set one of these orders to be 1 at will. For polynomial q -operators, this is achieved by applying some power of the q -difference operator to bring $\underline{\alpha}(P_0)$ or $\bar{\alpha}(P_0)$ to 0. The following result implies that solved forms are preserved under these transformations.

Proposition 4.3.1. *If P is in solved form, so are $\sigma^k \circ P$ and $P \circ \sigma^k$ for any k in \mathbb{Z} . Moreover, for any s in $\{0, +, \square\}$ and any k in \mathbb{Z} , we have $(\sigma^k P)_s = \sigma^k P_s$ and $(P \sigma^k)_s = P_s \sigma^k$.*

Proof. It follows from the identities

$$\begin{aligned} A\sigma^k f &= Af(q^k \cdot) \\ &= (a; \alpha_1 + k, \dots, \alpha_\ell + k)f. \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma^k Af &= q^{ka} Af(q^k \cdot) \\ &= q^{ka}(a; \alpha_1 + k, \dots, \alpha_\ell + k). \quad \blacksquare\end{aligned}$$

As a consequence of Proposition 4.3.1, $\bar{\alpha}((P \circ \sigma^k)_0) = \bar{\alpha}(P_0) + k$ and $\underline{\alpha}((P \circ \sigma^k)_0) = \underline{\alpha}(P_0) + k$. Therefore, when dealing with a polynomial q -algebraic equation in solved form, we can always assume that either $\bar{\alpha}(P_0)$ or $\underline{\alpha}(P_0)$ vanish if we need it. In both cases, this implies that $(0; 0)$ is in P_0 and therefore that $P_{(0;0)}$ does not vanish.

Definition 4.3.2. *The simplification by z operator S_z is defined on q -factors by*

$$S_z A = \begin{cases} q^{\alpha(A)}(a + \ell - 1; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell) & \text{if } A \neq (0; \sqcup); \\ 0 & \text{if } A = (0; \sqcup). \end{cases}$$

It is extended linearly to q -operators.

The reason for the name of this operator is indicated in the following result which shows that S_z indeed represent a simplification by z after a change of unknown power series.

Proposition 4.3.3. *If P is a q -operator such that $P_{(0; \sqcup)} = 0$, then for any power series g ,*

$$P(zg(z))/z = (S_z P)g(z).$$

Proof. For a q -factor $A = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$,

$$\begin{aligned}A(zg(z)) &= z^a \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} q^{\alpha_i} zg(q^{\alpha_i} z) \\ &= q^{\alpha(A)}(a + \ell; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)g(z). \quad (4.3.1)\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, if g is a power series with a constant term, $A(zg(z))$ is of order 0 in z if and only if $a + \ell = 0$, that is, $A = (0; \sqcup)$. Since $P_{(0; \sqcup)} = 0$, the power series $P(zg(z))$ is then in the ideal generated by z .

Furthermore, (4.3.1) shows that if A is not $(0; \sqcup)$, then $A(zg(z))/z$ is $S_z Ag(z)$, and the result follows by linearity. ■

We can provide another transformation which preserves solved form. Its motivation is to consider an equation $Pf = 0$ in solved form; we then may solve for f_0 , write $f(z) = f_0 + zg(z)$ and derive a new equation for g , namely $P(f_0 + zg(z)) = 0$. We may simplify this equation by z , obtaining $P(f_0 + zg(z))/z = 0$. Our next result asserts that this equation for g is still in solved form. Recall that for any complex number c , the translation $T_c = T_{cz^0}$ acts as $T_c Pf = P(c+f)$.

Proposition 4.3.4. *Let P be a q -operator in solved form and let c be a complex number such that $[z^0]Pc = 0$. Then $S_z T_c P$ is in solved form.*

Proof. Since P is in solved form, any nonshifting q -factor in P is linear. Thus, if A is in P_0 , we have $a = 0$ and $\ell = 1$ so that

$$A(c + zg(z)) = c + q^{\alpha_1} zg(q^{\alpha_1} z).$$

If A is shifting, then for some q -operator $R_{A,c}$, we have

$$A(c + zg(z)) = z^a c^\ell + z^{a+1} R_{A,c} g(z).$$

Therefore, there exists a q -operator $R_{P,c}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} P(c + zg(z)) &= \sum_{A \in P_0} P_A c + \sum_{A \in P_0} P_A q^{\alpha_1} zg(q^{\alpha_1} z) + \sum_{\substack{A \in P_+ \\ a=1}} P_A z c^\ell \\ &\quad + P_{(0; \sqcup)} + z P_{(1; \sqcup)} + z^2 R_{P,c} g(z). \end{aligned}$$

The equality $[z^0]Pc = 0$ is equivalent to $\sum_{A \in P_0} P_A c + P_{(0; \sqcup)} = 0$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} P(c + zg(z)) &= \sum_{A \in P_0} P_A q^{\alpha_1} zg(q^{\alpha_1} z) + \sum_{\substack{A \in P_+ \\ a=1}} P_A z c^\ell \\ &\quad + z P_{(1; \sqcup)} + z^2 R_{P,c} g(z). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{z} P(c + zg(z)) &= \sum_{A \in P_0} P_A q^{\alpha_1} (0; \alpha_1) g(z) + \sum_{\substack{A \in P_+ \\ a=1}} P_A c^\ell \\ &\quad + P_{(1; \sqcup)} + z R_{P,c} g(z) \end{aligned}$$

The nonshifting part of this operator is linear, and it does not vanish because P is in solved form and the $(0, \alpha_1)$, $A \in P_0$, are all distinct. Therefore, $S_z T_c P$ is in solved form. \blacksquare

Sometimes, we will find convenient to substitute $1/q$ for q , as for instance when we impose a condition such as $|q| > 1$. In terms of operations on q -algebraic equations, this replacement is achieved with the following definition.

Definition 4.3.5. *If $A = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$ its reflection is $RA = (a; -\alpha_\ell, \dots, -\alpha_1)$.*

The reflection operator R is extended to q -operators by linearity.

Subscripting q -factors by q , we have

$$\begin{aligned} A_q f(z) &= z^a \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} f(z/q^{-\alpha_i}) \\ &= (RA)_{1/q} f(z). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for a q -operator P , we have $P_q = (RP)_{1/q}$. Clearly R is involutive.

The following lemma is easy to prove and is stated for further references.

Lemma 4.3.6. *We have*

- (i) $(RP)_s = RP_s$ for any s in $\{0, +, \sqcup\}$;
- (ii) P is in solved form if and only if RP is;
- (iii) $\overline{\alpha}(P) = -\underline{\alpha}(RP)$ and $\underline{\alpha}(P) = -\overline{\alpha}(RP)$.

The last operation which we introduce is the multiplication of the argument by some real number.

Definition 4.3.7. *Let λ be a real number. The multiplication M_λ by λ is defined on a q -factor $A = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$ by $M_\lambda A = \lambda^a A$. It is extended linearly to q -operators.*

Assume that f solves a q -algebraic equation $Pf = 0$. Set $g(z) = f(\lambda z)$. We then have, as formal power series in λz ,

$$0 = (Pf)(\lambda z) = \sum_{A \in P} P_A \lambda^a z^a \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} f(q^{\alpha_i} \lambda z). \quad (4.3.2)$$

Thus, the right hand side of (4.3.2) is $(M_\lambda P)g(z)$. Consequently, g solves $(M_\lambda P)g = 0$. The following is then immediate.

Lemma 4.3.8. *If P is in solved form, so is $M_\lambda P$ and $(M_\lambda P)_s = M_\lambda P_s$ for any s in $\{0, +, \square\}$.*

4. From Hahn series to power series solutions and solved form. Our goal in this section is to show that most q -algebraic equations, and certainly all which occur in combinatorics, can be put in solved form, using some simple changes of functions and argument. Recall that a ramification is a change of variables which substitutes z for some $z^{1/p}$ where p is a positive integer.

Theorem 4.4.1. *Let P be a polynomial q -operator with Hahn series coefficients having rational exponents with a common denominator. The q -algebraic equation defined by P can be put in solved form by using translations, derivatives, ramifications, and simplifications.*

The proof of Theorem 4.4.1 is constructive and is useful to analyze concrete equations. To illustrate the procedure, we will run it on the following example which is simple enough so that the calculations can be done by hand.

Example. Consider the equation given by the polynomial

$$P = Y_0 Y_1^2 Y_2 - Y_1 + qz^{1/2} + z^{4/3}. \quad (4.4.1)$$

The cloud of points $\mathcal{C}(P)$ is on figure 4.4.1. ■

In general, let P be a polynomial belonging to $\mathbb{C}[[z^{\mathbb{R}}]]_{\text{grid}}[Y_0, \dots, Y_n]$. If f satisfies $Pf = 0$, then Theorem 3.7.4 implies that f is grid based. Therefore, there exists an ω in $\mathbb{N}^* \cup \{+\infty\}$ and an increasing sequence $(\mu_i)_{0 \leq i < \omega}$ such that $f(z) = \sum_{0 \leq i < \omega} f_i z^{\mu_i}$.

If the support of f is finite, the solution is, in theory, explicit, since we can calculate all the exponents μ_i and the coefficients f_i recursively. In practice, this is doable by hand for simple equations and if ω does not exceed perhaps 4 or 5, or if some specific feature of the equation yields a simple recursion for




figure 4.4.1

the f_i and μ_i . This is also doable for larger ω , say a few hundreds, and if the f_i are reasonably simple functions of q , using a computer algebra software. While these important and nontrivial numerical considerations will be addressed in Chapter 12, we disregard them now and concentrate on the theory, considering that if the support is finite, then f is in fact known. Hence, in what follows, we assume that

the support of f is infinite,

in which case ω is $+\infty$, and $\lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \mu_i = +\infty$.

Recall that in theory, we can compute all the μ_i and f_i for any i less than some finite N . Recall that we assume that

$$|q| \neq 1. \tag{4.4.2}$$

The proof of Theorem 4.4.1 will be broken in several steps.

Step 1. Translating the equation. The proof of Theorem 3.7.4 shows that for N large enough, the equation $P_{f,N}g = 0$ has pivot point Q reached at step 0 and, taking N large enough, using (4.4.2) and (3.4.1), we also have $\Psi_{P,Q}(q^n) \neq 0$ for any $n \geq N$. The way to obtain $P_{f,N}$ is by recursively calculating the powers μ_i and the coefficients f_i , until we reach the pivot point in the Newton-Puiseux polygon for $P_{f,i}$ and we check that, in the case $|q| < 1$, the initial polynomial $\Psi_{P,Q}$ has no root of modulus at most $|q|^N$, and in the case $|q| > 1$, has no root of modulus at least $|q|^N$. In this recursion, there may not be a unique μ_i and f_i , but once we choose them among all the possible ones, this may determine the beginning of a solution. So, in practice, if one is interested in all the solutions of an equation, one should keep track of them as one calculates the μ_i and f_i recursively.

Example. (*continued*) We see in figure 4.4.1 that the Newton-Puiseux polygon $\mathcal{N}(P)$ has the ℓ -axis as supporting line of co-slope 0, which passes through two vertices, namely $(0, 1)$ and $(0, 4)$. We then seek a solution starting with a constant term, corresponding to the exponent $\mu_0 = 0$ given by the co-slope 0. To identify this term, Summary 3.3.11.ii asserts that we only need to look at the contribution of the monomials in P to the points $(0, 1)$ and $(0, 4)$ of $\mathcal{C}(P)$, namely to $Y_0Y_1^2Y_2 - Y_1$. To calculate the initial polynomial $\Phi_{P,0}(c)$, we have

$$(Y_0Y_1^2Y_2 - Y_1)(cz^0) = c^4 - c = c(c^3 - 1).$$

Thus, f_0 must satisfy $f_0(f_0^3 - 1) = 0$, that is f_0 is one of $0, 1, e^{2i\pi/3}$ or $e^{4i\pi/3}$.

Say we are interested in the solution starting with $f_0 = 1$. We translate the equation, calculating $P_{f,1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} T_{1z^0}P &= (1 + Y_0)(1 + Y_1)^2(1 + Y_2) - (1 + Y_1) + qz^{1/2} + z^{4/3} \\ &= Y_0 + Y_1 + Y_2 + 2Y_0Y_1 + Y_0Y_2 + 2Y_1Y_2 + Y_1^2 + Y_0Y_1^2 + Y_1^2Y_2 \\ &\quad + 2Y_0Y_1Y_2 + Y_0Y_1^2Y_2 + qz^{1/2} + z^{4/3}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.4.3)$$

The cloud of points of $P_{f,1}$ is the following.

We can seek a solution with next term $z^{1/2}$, which corresponds to the supporting line of co-slope $1/2$, indicated in figure 4.4.2. If we do so, we reached the pivot point $(0, 1)$.

For some specific values of q , we may have solutions for which the next term is not $z^{1/2}$ but, instead, some power of z between 0 and $1/2$. Indeed, the contribution to the point $(0, 1)$ is $Y_0 + Y_1 + Y_2$. The corresponding indicial polynomial is




figure 4.4.2

$$\Psi_{P_{f,1},(0,1)}(t) = 1 + t + t^2.$$

This polynomial vanishes on the set $\{-e^{i\pi/3}, -e^{-i\pi/3}\}$. Therefore, if there is a μ between 0 and $1/2$ such that q^μ is either $-e^{i\pi/3}$ or $-e^{-i\pi/3}$, then we may take this μ for the next power of z involved. Then Summary 3.3.11.i implies that $[z^\mu]f$ can be chosen as any number one would like, meaning that we have infinitely many solutions, differing by the term $[z^\mu]f$ and possibly other coefficients. However, if we assume (4.4.2), there is no μ such that q^μ is either $-e^{i\pi/3}$ or $-e^{-i\pi/3}$. Thus, under (4.4.2), our next power of z in f must be $1/2$, and, since $\Psi(q^\eta) \neq 0$ for any positive η , we are in position to use Theorem 3.7.4.ii.

We also could have started the solution corresponding to the supporting line passing through $(0, 1)$ and $(1/2, 0)$ in figure 4.4.1. This solution is $f(z) = qz^{1/2} + \dots$. The pivot point $(0, 1)$ is reached immediately as seen in figure 4.4.1 and using Lemma 3.3.4.i inductively. ■

As indicated after Lemma 3.7.2, the polynomial $P_{f,N}$ is grid based with grid $\gamma' + (\Gamma + |\mu_0|\mathbb{N} + |\mu_1|\mathbb{N} + \dots + |\mu_N|\mathbb{N})$.

To go further, assume that

γ' , the generators of Γ and the $(\mu_i)_{0 \leq i \leq N}$ are rational numbers.

Let p be their common denominator. Then the semi-group $\Gamma + |\mu_0|\mathbb{N} + |\mu_1|\mathbb{N} + \cdots + |\mu_N|\mathbb{N}$ is in $(1/p)\mathbb{N}$. Thus, from now on, we may assume that for some integer γ ,

P is grid based with grid $(\gamma/p) + (1/p)\mathbb{N}$, the pivot point is reached at step 0, and $\Psi(q^n) \neq 0$ for any positive n . (4.4.4)

Theorem 3.7.4.ii implies that the solution of $Pf = 0$ is then grid-based with grid $(\gamma/p) + (1/p)\mathbb{N}$.

Example. (*continued*) Equation (4.4.3) has grid based coefficients with grid $(1/6)\mathbb{N}$. The pivot point is reached at step 0, and $\Psi(q^n) \neq 0$ for any positive n . Therefore, the solution is grid-based with grid $(1/6)\mathbb{N}$. ■

Step 2. Bringing the pivot point to (0, 1). If the ordinate of the pivot point is greater than 1, let $A = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$ be a q -factor in P such that $\mathcal{C}(A)$ is the pivot point. Proposition 3.5.4 implies that whenever $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{\ell-1})$ is a subtuple of $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$ then $\partial_{\beta_1} \partial_{\beta_2} \cdots \partial_{\beta_{\ell-1}} P$ has pivot point of ordinate 1, and it is reached at step 0. Let κ be the abscissa of the pivot point. The equation $\partial_{\beta_1} \cdots \partial_{\beta_{\ell-1}} Pf = 0$ is equivalent to $z^{-\kappa} \partial_{\beta_1} \cdots \partial_{\beta_{\ell-1}} Pf(z) = 0$. The q -operator $z^{-\kappa} \partial_{\beta_1} \cdots \partial_{\beta_{\ell-1}} P$ has cloud of points that of $\partial_{\beta_1} \cdots \partial_{\beta_{\ell-1}} P$ translated $-\kappa$ units to the left, and therefore it has pivot point with abscissa 0. Thus we may as well assume that

the pivot point is $(0, 1)$. (4.4.5)

Example. (*continued*) Since the pivot point is $(0, 1)$, we have nothing to do in this step.

Step 3. Changing variable to have a formal meromorphic solution. Since the solution of $Pf = 0$ is now grid based with grid $(\gamma/p) + (1/p)\mathbb{N}$, it is of the form $f(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} f_n z^{\mu_n/p}$ where each μ_n is in $\gamma + \mathbb{N}$. Consider the formal power series

$$g(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} f_n z^{\mu_n}.$$

As an identity between formal power series, $g(z) = f(z^p)$. Paralleling the theory of algebraic curves, we may think of $(z, f(z))$ as a curve solution of $Pf = 0$, we see that $(z^p, g(z))$ is a parametrization of the geometric locus of this curve. One should be careful though that f and g may be divergent, so that the word ‘curve’ here may not be what one would usually consider to be a curve. Let ξ be a p -th root of 1. Then, formally, $g(\xi z^{1/p}) = f(z)$. Thus, each $f_\xi(z) = g(\xi z^{1/p})$ is a solution of $Pf = 0$. If g is a convergent power series, these f_ξ are parametrizations of the solution curve.

Instead of solving $Pf = 0$ one could instead solve for g from which the f_ξ can be easily deduced. To determine the corresponding equation in g , set

$$r = q^{1/p}.$$

Since we will be using q -factors as well as r -factors, we will subscript q -factors by q and r -factors by r . Hence $A_q f(z) = z^a \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} f(q^{\alpha_i} z)$ while $A_r f(z) = z^a \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} f(r^{\alpha_i} z)$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} (A_q f)(z^p) &= z^{pa} \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} f(q^{\alpha_i} z^p) \\ &= z^{pa} \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} g((q^{1/p})^{\alpha_i} z) \\ &= (pa; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)_r g(z). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, defining the r -operator

$$R = \sum_{A \in P} P_A(pa; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)_r$$

the unknown g satisfies $Rg = 0$. For this new equation, the pivot point remains at $(0, 1)$, and is still reached at step 0. From Definition 3.3.10, the new indicial polynomial is the same as that for the original equation. Thus, up to translating the equation a few more times, we may assume that $\Psi_{R,(0,1)}(r^n) \neq 0$ for any positive n . Thus, from now on, substituting q for r and P for Q , we may assume that


$$\{a : A \in P\} \subset \gamma + \mathbb{N} \text{ for some } \gamma \in \mathbb{Z}. \quad (4.4.6)$$

The solution of the new equation is a formal power series whose support may include a finite number of negative integers, so it is a formal meromorphic series.

Example. (*continued*) The polynomial (4.4.3) is grid based with grid $(1/6)\mathbb{N}$. Thus, we consider $P(z^6; Y_0, Y_1, Y_2)$ and set $r = q^{1/6}$. The new polynomial is

$$Y_0 + Y_1 + Y_2 + 2Y_0Y_1 + Y_0Y_2 + 2Y_1Y_2 + Y_1 + Y_0Y_1^2 + Y_1^2Y_2 + 2Y_0Y_1Y_2 + Y_0Y_1^2Y_2 + r^6z^3 + z^8, \quad (4.4.7)$$

with now Y_i being an r -factor. Since $|q| \neq 1$, we have $|r| \neq 1$ and r^n is not a root of the indicial polynomial for any $n \geq 0$. The corresponding cloud of points is indicated in figure 4.4.3. ■



Step 4. Translating to have a power series solution. A formal meromorphic power series is of the form

$$f(z) = \sum_{n \geq -N} f_n z^n$$

for some nonnegative integer N . If $Pf = 0$, then

$$T_{f_N z^{-N}} T_{f_{N-1} z^{-N+1}} \cdots T_{f_{-1} z^{-1}} P g = 0$$

has solution the power series

$$g(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} f_n z^n.$$

The equation for g still satisfies assumptions (4.4.2), (4.4.4)–(4.4.6).

Because all the exponents of g are nonnegative and the pivot point of the equation is $(0, 1)$, the supporting line of co-slope 0, which corresponds to the lowest exponent of z possibly present in g , is the l -axis. Therefore, for this equation we have

$$a \in \mathbb{N} \text{ for any } A \text{ in } P. \quad (4.4.8)$$

The cloud of points of this new equation is then contained in the quadrant $a \geq 0$ and $l \geq 0$ and this cloud of points contains the pivot point $(0, 1)$.

Example. (*continued*) We may skip step 4 since the equation has a power series solution already.

Step 5. Translate one last time and simplify by z . Consider the equation $Pf = 0$ with now (4.4.2), (4.4.4)–(4.4.6) and (4.4.8) satisfied. It is possible that other points than $(0,0)$ and $(0,1)$ remain on the ℓ -axis, and we would like to remove them. The solution is a formal power series $f(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} f_n z^n$. Define g by $f(z) = f_0 + zg(z)$, that is $g(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} f_{n+1} z^n$. We have $T_{f_0 z^0} P(zg(z)) = 0$.

Since we made the translation $T_{f_0 z^0}$, the q -factor $(0; \sqcup)$ is not in the support of q -operator $T_{f_0 z^0} P$; indeed, in doing the translation, we cancelled the point $(0,0)$ which may have been in $\mathcal{C}(P)$. Thus, all the q -factors of length 0 in $T_{f_0 z^0} P$ have $a \geq 1$.

To describe the cloud of points of the q -operator Q defined by $Qg = T_{f_0 z^0}(zg(z))$, consider a q -factor $A = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$ in $T_{f_0 z^0} P$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} A(zg(z)) &= z^a \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} q^{\alpha_i} zg(q^{\alpha_i} z) \\ &= q^{\alpha(A)}(a + \ell; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)g(z). \end{aligned}$$

If $\mathcal{C}(A)$ is on the ℓ -axis, then ℓ is at least 1 because $(0; \sqcup)$ is not in the support of $T_{f_0 z^0} P$. Thus, any point of $\mathcal{C}(Q)$ on the a -axis has abscissa at least 1. This means that the corresponding monomial is in the ideal generated by z .

If $\mathcal{C}(A)$ is at ordinate 1, then $a + \ell$ is $a + 1$, so that the abscissa of that point is at least 1. Moreover, the point $(1, 1)$ is in $\mathcal{C}(Q)$ because $(0, 1)$ is the pivot point for P .

Finally, if $\mathcal{C}(A)$ is of ordinate at least 2, then $a + \ell$ is at least $a + 2$. Consequently, the corresponding monomials are in the ideal generated by z^2 .

Therefore, we see that all the points in $\mathcal{C}(Q)$ have abscissa at least 1, and that the only points of abscissa 1 are $(1, 1)$ and possibly $(1, 0)$. Consequently, Q has the form

$$Q = Q_{(1; \sqcup)}z + \sum_{n \geq 0} Q_{(1; n)}(1; n) + z^2 S$$

for some q -operator S . Therefore, the series $Qg(z)$ is in the ideal generated by z . We divide the equation $Qg(z) = 0$ by z , and obtain an equation $Rg = 0$ with R being

$$Q_{(1; \sqcup)} + \sum_{n \geq 0} Q_{(1; n)}(0; n) + zS.$$

Doing some rewriting, R is of the form,

$$R_{(0;u)} + \sum_{n \geq 0} R_{(0;n)}(0; n) + zS \quad (4.4.9)$$

for some q -operator S .

In conclusion, we have shown that any q -algebraic equation with rational exponent having the same common denominator can be brought in the form (4.4.9), that is in solved form. This proves Theorem 4.4.1.

Example. (*continued*) Considering figure 4.4.3, equation (4.4.7) is not in solved form since the nonshifting part is not linear; for instance (4.4.7) contains Y_0Y_2 . Let c be a complex number different from 0 and such that $[z^0]Pc = 0$, that is c solves

$$3c + 6c^2 + 4c^3 + c^4 = 0.$$

That is, c is one of

$$-1, \quad \frac{-3 + i\sqrt{3}}{2}, \quad -\frac{3 + i\sqrt{3}}{2}.$$

We consider a solution $f(z) = -1 + zg(z)$. To calculate $P(-1 + zg(z))$ note that

$$Y_i(c + zg(z)) = c + r^i zg(q^i z) = c + r^i z Y_i g(z).$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(z; Y_0, \dots, Y_n)(-1 + zg(z)) \\ = P(z; -1 + zY_0, -1 + rzY_1, \dots, -1 + r^n zY_n)g(z). \end{aligned}$$

We divide this operator by z to obtained the solved form

$$-rY_1 + r^4 z^3 Y_0 Y_1^2 Y_2 + r^6 z^2 + z^7.$$

If we consider instead $c = (-3 + i\sqrt{3})/2$, then we obtain the solved form

$$\begin{aligned} Y_0 + qY_1 + q^2 Y_2 - (1 + i\sqrt{3})qzY_0Y_1 - \frac{1 + i\sqrt{3}}{2}q^2 zY_0Y_2 \\ - \frac{1 + i\sqrt{3}}{2}q^2 zY_1^2 - \frac{1 - i\sqrt{3}}{2}q^4 Z^2 Y_1^2 Y_2 - (1 + i\sqrt{3})q^3 zY_1Y_2 \\ + q^4 z^3 Y_0 Y_1^2 Y_2 - \frac{1 - i\sqrt{3}}{2}q^2 z^2 Y_0 Y_1^2 - (1 - i\sqrt{3})q^3 z^2 Y_0 Y_1 Y_2 \\ + qz^2 + z^7. \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

As one sees in this last example, solved forms may involve many terms, and we will see some examples for which starting with an equation with less than 10 terms, its solved form involves several hundreds of terms, so that efficient algorithms and computer algebra software will be needed to manipulate them. However, very few features of these solved forms will be needed to obtain remarkably sharp estimates on the coefficients of the solution of the original q -algebraic equation.

5. Summability classes of q -algebraic equations. In the previous chapters, we worked with great generality, considering q -algebraic equations with Hahn power series coefficients. But we showed that a large class of equations can be put in solved form, that is, in particular, as polynomials in Y_0, \dots, Y_n with power series coefficients. In order to obtain results on the regularity of the solutions, and also because this corresponds to the vast majority of equations occurring in applications, we will need to impose some summability conditions on the coefficients. In this section we gather the definitions of various sets of power series, most of which we recall mainly to set the notation. This section is mostly for later reference in this book.

Notation 4.5.1. $\mathbb{C}[[z]]$ is the ring of formal power series in z with complex coefficients.

So, $\mathbb{C}[[z]]$ is the ring of formal sums $f(z) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} f_n z^n$ with complex coefficients f_n . Most of the time, we will write $\sum_{n \geq 0} f_n z^n$, the usage of n will signify that the sum is over all nonnegative integers.

A power series is said to be convergent if its radius of convergence is positive, possibly infinite.

Notation 4.5.2. $\mathbb{C}\{z\}$ is the ring of convergent power series.

Following Bézivin (1992), Ramis (1992) and others, we introduce the q -Borel transforms.

Definition 4.5.3. Let q be a complex number.

(i) If f is a formal power series, its q -Borel transform of order s is the formal power series

$$\mathcal{B}_{q,s}f(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} q^{-sn^2/2} f_n z^n .$$

(ii) We say that a formal power series has q -Gevrey order s if its q -Borel transform of order s is a convergent power series.

(iii) A formal power series has exact q -Gevrey order s if it has q -Gevrey order s and no q -Gevrey order less than s .

(iv) We write $\mathbb{C}[[z]]_{q,s}$ the vector space of all formal power series of q -Gevrey order s .

(v) We say that a power series has full q -Gevrey order s if its q -Borel transform of order s converges on the entire complex plane.

Put differently, a formal power series f is of q -Gevrey order s if the power series $\sum_{n \geq 0} q^{-sn^2/2} f_n z^n$ has a positive radius of convergence. If $|q| > 1$ and s is positive, the positivity of the radius of convergence limits the growth of the coefficients f_n . If $|q| < 1$ and s is positive, the finiteness of the radius of convergence limits the decay of the coefficients f_n .

As a consequence of these definitions and Definitions 2.2.3, 2.2.6 and 2.2.10, we will speak of a q -operator and of a q -algebraic equation with formal power series coefficients, with convergent power series coefficients, with q -Gevrey coefficients of order s , and so on. Since this is defined on q -operators viewed as polynomials, it is convenient to have an analogous definition for q -operators viewed as formal sums of q -factors. This leads to our next proposition.

Proposition 4.5.4. *Consider the conditions*

- (i) any q -factor A in P has $a \in \mathbb{N}$;
- (ii) $\sum_{A \in P} P_A z^a$ is convergent in a neighborhood of 0;
- (iii) $\sum_{A \in P} P_A q^{-sa^2/2} z^a$ is convergent in a neighborhood of 0.
- (iv) $\sum_{A \in P} P_A q^{-sa^2/2} z^a$ is convergent on the whole complex plane.

If P is a polynomial q -operator, then we have the following equivalences:

- 1) P has formal power series coefficients if and only if (i) holds.
- 2) P has convergent power series coefficients if and only if (i) and (ii) hold.
- 3) P has q -Gevrey coefficients of order s if and only if (i) and (iii) hold.

4) P has q -Gevrey coefficients of full order s if and only if (i) and (iv) hold.

Proof. Comparing (2.2.4) and (2.2.5), we have, with the same notation used in the proof of Lemma 2.2.11,

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} P_\lambda(z) Y^\lambda = \sum_{\substack{\lambda \in \Lambda \\ a \in \Gamma}} P_{a,\lambda}(a; \alpha(\lambda)). \quad (4.5.1)$$

The first equivalence comes from this identity and that both sides of the equivalence are equivalent to taking $\Gamma = \mathbb{N}$.

To prove the second equivalence, we may assume that $\Gamma = \mathbb{N}$. Identity (4.5.1) gives the identity of formal power series

$$P_\lambda(z) = \sum_{a \in \mathbb{N}} P_{a,\lambda} z^a.$$

Therefore, if each P_λ is a convergent power series, so are each $\sum_{a \in \mathbb{N}} P_{a,\lambda} z^a$. Consequently, since Λ is a finite set,

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \sum_{a \in \mathbb{N}} P_{a,\lambda} z^a = \sum_{A \in P} P_A z^a$$

is also convergent. The converse is then clear.

Finally, the assertion that each P_λ is q -Gevrey of order s is equivalent to

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} P_{n,\lambda} q^{-sn^2/2} z^n = \sum_{\substack{A \in P \\ A=(a;\alpha(\lambda))}} P_A q^{-sa^2/2} z^a$$

being a convergent power series. Since Λ is a finite set, this is equivalent to

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \Lambda} \sum_{\substack{A \in P \\ A=(a;\alpha(\lambda))}} P_A q^{-sa^2/2} z^a = \sum_{A \in P} P_A q^{-sa^2/2} z^a$$

being a convergent power series. ■

In light of Proposition 4.5.4, the next definition makes sense.

Definition 4.5.5. *Let P be a q -operator. We say that*

(i) P is analytic if for any A in P its first component a is a natural integer and $\sum_{A \in P} P_A z^a$ is convergent in a neighborhood of the origin;

(ii) P is of q -Gevrey order s if any A in P has a natural integer first component a and

$$\sum_{A \in P} P_A q^{-sa^2/2} z^a \quad (4.5.2)$$

is convergent near the origin;

(iii) P is of full q -Gevrey order s if the power series (4.5.2) is convergent in the whole complex plane.

5. Generic order and degree of the rational functions f_n

A q -algebraic equation in solved form yields the basic recursion (4.2.1) which we rewrite here for convenience,

$$\left(\sum_{A \in P_0} P_A q^{\alpha_1 n} \right) f_n + \sum_{A \in P_+} P_A \sum_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a} q^{\alpha_1 n_1 + \dots + \alpha_\ell n_\ell} f_{n_1} \dots f_{n_\ell} + P_{(n; \cup)} = 0. \quad (5.1)$$

If we assume the uniqueness condition

$$\sum_{A \in P_0} P_A q^{\alpha_1 n} \neq 0 \quad \text{for any } n \geq 0,$$

it is straightforward to see by induction that f_n is a rational function in q and the P_A . In this chapter we obtain some estimates on the degree and order of this rational function of q , when the P_A are free parameters. However, to do so, some care is needed in defining degrees and orders, which is the motivation for the first section. The second and third sections give our estimates on these orders and degrees. In subsequent chapters, these orders and degrees will play a role when studying the asymptotic behavior of the (f_n) as n tends to infinity.

1. Preliminaries. As an example, consider the q -algebraic equation

$$f(z) = 1 + rzf(qz)$$

where r is a parameter. Applying $[z^n]$ to both sides of the equation,

$$f_n = \mathbb{1}\{n = 0\} + rq^{n-1} f_{n-1}.$$

By induction, the unique power series solution of the equation is defined by $f_0 = 1$ and $f_n = r^n q^{\binom{n}{2}}$. So f_n is a polynomial in q whose degree and order are both $\binom{n}{2}$. However, if $r = e^a$ say, then f_n is

no longer a polynomial or even a rational function in q . Similarly, if $r = q^p$, then $f_n = q^{np + \binom{n}{2}}$ is a polynomial in q of degree $np + \binom{n}{2}$. However, if $r = 0$ then $f_n = 0$ for any positive n and is then of order $-\infty$ and degree 0.

In the remainder of this chapter, we will always consider the coefficients P_A as free parameters, not depending on q . This allows us to talk of the degree and the order of f_n , viewing f_n as a rational function of q .

The generic order and degree of f_n are defined as follow, and the motivation for this definition will be explained after its statement.

Definition 5.1.1. *Let $Pf = 0$ be a q -algebraic equation in solved form and satisfying the uniqueness condition.*

(i) *Assume that $\underline{\alpha}(P_0) = 0$. The generic order ω_n of $f_n(q)$ is the sequence defined by $\omega_n = 0$ if n is negative, and, for any nonnegative n , by $\omega_n = 0$ if $P_{(n; \mathfrak{u})} \neq 0$, and*

$$\omega_n = \min_{A \in P_+} \min_{\substack{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a \\ a \leq n}} \alpha_1 n_1 + \dots + \alpha_\ell n_\ell + \omega_{n_1} + \dots + \omega_{n_\ell},$$

otherwise, with $\min \emptyset = 0$.

(ii) *Assume that $\bar{\alpha}(P_0) = 0$. The generic degree δ_n of f_n is the sequence defined by $\delta_n = 0$ if n is negative and for any nonnegative n ,*

$$\delta_n = \max_{\substack{A \in P_+ \\ a \leq n; \alpha_\ell \geq 0}} \max_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a} \alpha_1 n_1 + \dots + \alpha_\ell n_\ell + \delta_{n_1} + \dots + \delta_{n_\ell},$$

with $\max \emptyset = 0$.

In particular, $\omega_0 = 0$ and $\delta_0 = 0$ since every shifting q -factor A has a positive a . To explain Definition 5.1.1, going back to (5.1), we obtain

$$\sum_{A \in P_0} P_A q^{\alpha_1 n} f_n = - \sum_{A \in P_+} \sum_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a} q^{\alpha_1 n_1 + \dots + \alpha_\ell n_\ell} f_{n_1} \cdots f_{n_\ell} - P_{(n; \mathfrak{u})}. \quad (5.1.1)$$

As we have seen after Proposition 4.3.1, if P is a polynomial, we may assume that $\bar{\alpha}(P_0) = 0$. In this case, the degree in q of the left hand

side of (5.1.1) is $\deg_q f_n$. That of the right hand side is impossible to determine in general, because one may have cancellations of the highest order terms. However, if there are no cancellations, which is the generic situation, the degree of the right hand side is

$$\max_{A \in P_+} \max_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a} \alpha_1 n_1 + \dots + \alpha_\ell n_\ell + \deg_q f_{n_1} + \dots + \deg_q f_{n_\ell}.$$

Thus, equating the degree of the left hand side of (5.1.1) to the putative degree of its right hand side, we almost obtained the recursion defining the generic degree. In the generic degree though, we only take the maximum over the shifting q -factors for which α_ℓ is nonnegative. As we will see, this ensures that (δ_n) is nondecreasing and convex, which is a convenient property.

Similarly, assume that $\underline{\alpha}(P_0) = 0$. The order of the left hand side of (5.1.1) is $\text{ord}_q f_n$. If there is no cancellation of the lower order terms and if $P_{(n, \cup)} \neq 0$, the right hand side of (5.1.1) has order

$$\min_{A \in P_+} \min_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a} \alpha_1 n_1 + \dots + \alpha_\ell n_\ell + \text{ord}_q f_{n_1} + \dots + \text{ord}_q f_{n_\ell}.$$

This yields a recursion on $\text{ord}_q f_n$ which is the one for the generic order.

Consider (5.1.1), and assume that all the P_A , $A \in P_+$, are negative real numbers, and that $P_{(0;0)}$ is a positive real number. If $\underline{\alpha}(P_0) = 0$, the order of f_n is ω_n , while if $\bar{\alpha}(P_0) = 0$, the degree of f_n is δ_n . Thus, there are situations where the generic order and degree are the actual order and degree of f_n as a rational function in q .

There are q -algebraic equations for which ω_n and δ_n may not be the actual order and degree of f_n . These equations are not generic, either because there are some cancellations in the recursion for f_n , or because the coefficients P_A depend on q or because of some specific feature of the P_A . The latter situation is illustrated by the equation $f(z) = 1 + z^2 f(qz)$ for which $f_{2n+1} = 0$ has order 0 and degree 0, while $f_{2n} = q^{n(n-1)}$. For this equation, the recursion for generic order is

$$\omega_n = (n - 2)_+ + \omega_{n-2}.$$

This yields $\omega_{2n} = n(n - 1)$, which is indeed the order of $f_n(q)$ and $\omega_{2n+1} = n^2$ which is not the order of $f_{2n+1}(q)$ viewed as a polynomial in q . The discrepancy on the odd coefficients comes from the fact that the solution of the equation is a power series in z^2 .

To better capture the actual order of (f_n) , one could consider $(\tilde{\omega}_n)$ defined by $\tilde{\omega}_0 = 0$ and

$$\tilde{\omega}_n = \min_{\substack{A \in \mathcal{P}_+ \\ a \leq n}} \min_{\substack{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a \\ f_{n_1} \dots f_{n_\ell} \neq 0}} \alpha_1 n_1 + \dots + \alpha_\ell n_\ell + \tilde{\omega}_1 + \dots + \tilde{\omega}_\ell.$$

Unfortunately this recursion seems quite intractable since it involves the condition that f_{n_i} does not vanish.

Despite these limitations, we will see in subsequent chapters that the generic order has bearing on the asymptotic behavior of the coefficients f_n as n tends to infinity.

Using a different approach, Di Vizio (2008) obtains an asymptotic upper bound for the degree of f_n and an asymptotic lower bound for the order of f_n . Our results are not totally comparable for they are sharper in some cases and equivalent in others, while Di Vizio's result may be more general than ours.

Through the reflection introduced in Definition 4.3.5, we can relate the order and degree as follows. Set $r = 1/q$ and let $f(z; q)$ be a solution of $P_q f = 0$ while $g(z; r)$ is a solution of $(RP)_r g(z; r) = 0$. We have

$$(RP)_r g(z; r) = P_{1/r} g(z; r) = P_q g(z; 1/q).$$

Thus, $g(z; 1/q) = f(z; q)$. Consequently,

$$\deg_q f_n(q) = \deg_q g_n(1/q) = \text{ord}_r g_n(r)$$

and

$$\text{ord}_q f_n(q) = \text{ord}_q g_n(1/q) = \deg_r g_n(r).$$

To some extent, these relations can be rephrased on the generic order and degree, and we will use this fact to obtain further results in section 4.

Remark. It seems worth pointing out a connection between the sequences (δ_n) and (ω_n) and the analysis of divide and conquer algorithms (see e.g. Akra and Bazzi, 1988; Drmota and Szpankowski, 2013). Let C_n be the complexity of an algorithm applied to a problem of size n . The divide and conquer strategy consists in dividing the problem into ℓ sub-problems of sizes n_1, \dots, n_ℓ which add to n . There is a cost u_n associated to this decomposition, so that the complexity satisfies the recursion $C_n = u_n + C_{n_1} + \dots + C_{n_\ell}$.

If the cost is linear in the size of the sub-problems, the sequence (C_n) satisfies the recursion

$$C_n = \alpha_1 n_1 + \cdots + \alpha_\ell n_\ell + C_{n_1} + \cdots + C_{n_\ell},$$

with $n_1 + \cdots + n_\ell = n$. Thus, ω_n is very similar to a best case scenario in a divide and conquer algorithm when we have the choice between different partitioning schemes, while δ_n is similar to a worst case scenario, the partitioning scheme being represented by the q -factors A in P_+ .

It is remarkably easy to guess some simple and yet reasonably accurate estimates on the growth of ω_n and δ_n , and the arguments we are about to show in this remark, while not rigourous, can be made so. However, we do not delve into the matter since we will obtain much better results by refining those arguments.

Considering the generic order, taking $n_1 = n_2 = \cdots = n_\ell = n/\ell$, ignoring that fractions may not be integers and that $n - a$ is not quite n , we expect

$$\omega_n \leq \frac{\alpha(A)}{\ell} n + \ell \omega_{n/\ell}.$$

Thus, if p is loosely defined by $\ell^p \approx n$, we should have, by induction

$$\omega_n \leq \frac{\alpha(A)}{\ell} \underbrace{(n + n + \cdots + n)}_p \approx \frac{\alpha(A)}{\ell \log \ell} n \log n.$$

As we will see, the order of magnitude $n \log n$ is correct. But we could certainly partition in a more optimal way, by not taking all the n_i equal, so that the constant $\alpha(A)/\ell \log \ell$ could be improved. In connection with the divide and conquer strategy, this $n \log n$ rate is that of the best case for the quick sort algorithm.

Concerning the generic degree, for any fixed q -factor A in P_+ , we have

$$\delta_n \geq \alpha_\ell (n - a) + \delta_{n-a}.$$

Therefore, writing $n = ap + r$ the Euclidean division of n by a , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_n &\geq \alpha_\ell (n - a) + \alpha_\ell (n - 2a) + \cdots + \alpha_\ell (n - pa) + \delta_{n-pa} \\ &\geq \alpha_\ell \left(pn - a \frac{p(p+1)}{2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since p is about n/a for n large, we obtain

$$\delta_n \geq \frac{\alpha_\ell}{2a} n^2.$$

Optimizing over the choice of A , it follows that the generic degree has a growth at least quadratic,

$$\delta_n \geq \max\{\alpha_\ell/2a : A \in P_+\} n^2.$$

We will show that this is sharp as far as the coefficient of n^2 is concerned. ■

2. The generic order of $f_n(q)$. Because we consider the generic order, we assume throughout this section that P is in solved form, satisfies the uniqueness condition, and that $\underline{\alpha}(P_0) = 0$. Our first proposition shows that for the generic order to be nontrivial, the shifting and constant parts of P must be finitely supported.

Proposition 5.2.1. *If the support of $P_+ + P_\cup$ is infinite, then the generic order of f_n is 0 for infinitely many n .*

Proof. If $\{a : A \in P_+\}$ is a finite set, then Definition 2.2.10.i implies that $\{A : A \in P_+\}$ is a finite set. Thus, if the support of P_+ is infinite, the set $\{a : A \in P_+\}$ is infinite. Let A be in P_+ . Definition 5.1.1.i implies that ω_a vanishes since the recursion defining the nonnegative sequence (ω_n) yields $\omega_a \leq \omega_0 = 0$.

If the support of P_\cup is infinite, then $P_{(n;\cup)} \neq 0$ for infinitely many n and $\omega_n = 0$ infinitely often. ■

Given Proposition 5.2.1, we will then be concerned with q -operators such that

$$P_+ + P_\cup \text{ has a finite support.} \quad (5.2.1)$$

Assumption (5.2.1) holds if P is a polynomial in z, Y_0, \dots, Y_n .

To settle the behavior of the generic order in another simple case, it is convenient to introduce the following definition.

Definition 5.2.2. *The elevation of a shifting q -factor A is $E(A) = \alpha_1/a$. The elevation of P is $E(P) = \inf_{A \in P_+} E(A)$.*

Our next result asserts that without elevation, the order cannot raise much!

Proposition 5.2.3. *Assume that (5.2.1) holds. The sequence (ω_n) is bounded if and only if $E(P) = 0$.*

Proof. Assume that $E(P) = 0$ and (5.2.1) holds. Let A be a q -factor in P_+ with elevation 0. Then $\alpha_1 = 0$, and taking $n_1 = n - a$ in the recursion defining ω_n ,

$$\omega_n \leq \alpha_1(n - a) + \omega_{n-a} = \omega_{n-a}.$$

Thus, writing $n = ak + p$ with $0 \leq p < a$, we have $\omega_n \leq \omega_p$. Consequently, ω_n is at most $\max\{\omega_p : p \leq \max_{A \in P_+} a\}$.

Conversely, assume that (ω_n) is a bounded sequence and recall notation 2.2.13. Since (5.2.1) holds, let n be greater than $\bar{a}(P_+)$. Let A be in P_+ . If $n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a$ then, since $\alpha_1 \leq \dots \leq \alpha_\ell$,

$$\alpha_1 n_1 + \dots + \alpha_\ell n_\ell + \omega_{n_1} + \dots + \omega_{n_\ell} \geq \alpha_1(n_1 + \dots + n_\ell) = \alpha_1(n - a).$$

Therefore, $\omega_n \geq \min_{A \in P_+} \alpha_1(n - a)$. Thus, if (ω_n) is bounded from above and P_+ has a finite support, then the sequence $(\alpha_1 n)$ is bounded for at least one A in P_+ . Then $\alpha_1 \leq 0$ and the elevation is nonpositive.

If the elevation of P is negative, then $\alpha_1 < 0$ for some A in P_+ . For that q -factor,

$$\omega_n \leq \alpha_1(n - a) + \omega_{n-a}.$$

Thus, by induction, $\omega_n \leq \alpha_1(n - a)$ and $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega_n = -\infty$, contradicting that (ω_n) is bounded. Thus, if (ω_n) is bounded, the elevation of P vanishes. ■

Example. The q -Catalan equation

$$f(z) = 1 + zf(z)f(qz)$$

has finite support and is in solved form. Its elevation is 0 and is achieved for the q -factor $(1; 0, 1)$. Proposition 5.2.3 asserts that the generic order of $f_n(q)$ is bounded as a function of n . Considering the recursion defining ω_n , we can check by induction that $\omega_n = 0$

for any integer n , taking the tuple (n_1, n_2) to be $(n - 1, 0)$ in the minimization defining ω_n .

Applying $[z^n]$ to the q -Catalan equation yields the recursion

$$f_n = \mathbb{1}\{n = 0\} + \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n-1} q^i f_i f_{n-1-i}.$$

Each coefficient f_n is a polynomial in q , say $f_n(q)$. We then have

$$f_n(0) = \mathbb{1}\{n = 0\} + f_0(0)f_{n-1}(0).$$

Since $f_0 = 1$, we have $f_n(0) = f_{n-1}(0) = 1$ for any nonnegative n . The order of $f_n(q)$ is 0 and coincides with the generic order.

It is informative to consider a variation of the q -Catalan equation, namely,

$$g(z) = q^\lambda + q^\mu z g(z) g(qz),$$

where now the coefficients depend on q . Clearly, the q -Catalan equation is obtained for $\lambda = \mu = 0$. The generic order of g_n is the same as that of f_n , namely, 0. However, g_n obeys the recursion

$$g_n = q^\lambda \mathbb{1}\{n = 0\} + \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n-1} q^{i+\mu} g_i g_{n-1-i}.$$

Therefore, $\text{ord}_q g_0 = \lambda$ and for any n positive,

$$\text{ord}_q g_n = \min_{0 \leq i \leq n-1} (i + \mu + \text{ord}_q g_i + \text{ord}_q g_{n-1-i}).$$

One can check that this recursion defines the sequence

$$\text{ord}_q g_n = (\mu + \lambda)n + \lambda.$$

We see that the order of $g_n(q)$ is much greater than its generic order, and grows linearly in n as long as $\lambda + \mu$ does not vanish. \blacksquare

Our next result provides an estimate for the generic order of f_n for linear q -algebraic equations. As we will see later, this generic order grows much faster than if the equation is nonlinear.

Theorem 5.2.4. *Assume that P is a linear q -operator and that (5.2.1) holds; then $\omega_n = n^2 E(P)/2 + O(n)$ as n tends to infinity.*

The conclusion of Theorem 5.2.4 is valid if the elevation of P vanishes, but less precise than Proposition 5.2.3.

Before proving Theorem 5.2.4, we note that the elevation of P can be read from a Newton-like diagram as follows. Consider the points (a, α_1) . Since P is linear, the assumption $\underline{\alpha}(P_0)$ vanishes asserts that we have one point at $(0, 0)$ and that all the other points on the α_1 -axis have positive ordinate. Thus, the cloud of points (a, α_1) looks like that on figure 5.2.1, with all the points above the line $\alpha_1 = E(P)a$.




figure 5.2.1

Proof. The proof of Theorem 5.2.4 has two parts: one to prove an upper bound on ω_n , the other one to prove a matching lower bound. *Upper bound.* Let $A = (a; \alpha_1)$ be in P_+ with elevation that of P . We write $n = ak + p$ with $0 \leq p < a$. For that a we have

$$\omega_n \leq \alpha_1(n - a) + \omega_{n-a},$$

and, by induction,

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_n &\leq \alpha_1((n - a) + (n - 2a) + \cdots + (n - ka)) + \omega_p \\ &= \alpha_1 kn - \alpha_1 a \frac{k(k+1)}{2} + \omega_p. \end{aligned}$$

Since $k = (n - p)/a$, we obtain

$$\omega_n \leq \frac{\alpha_1}{2a} n^2 + O(n) = \frac{E(A)}{2} n^2 + O(n).$$

Since the elevation of A is that of P , we obtain $\omega_n \leq n^2 E(P)/2 + O(n)$.

Lower bound. It suffices to show that for some positive c , we have $\omega_i \geq (E(P)i^2/2) - ci$ for all i nonnegative. Assume that this is the case for any i less than n . Since P is linear, any q -factor in P_+ has length 1, and thus, ω_n is at least

$$\begin{aligned} &\min_{A \in P_+} \alpha_1(n - a) + \frac{E(P)}{2}(n - a)^2 - c(n - a) \\ &= \frac{E(P)}{2} n^2 - cn + \min_{A \in P_+} \left(n(\alpha_1 - aE(P)) - \alpha_1 a + \frac{E(P)}{2} a^2 + ca \right). \end{aligned}$$

Given how the elevation is defined, $\alpha_1 - aE(P) \geq 0$ for any A in P_+ . Consequently,

$$\omega_n \geq \frac{E(P)}{2}n^2 - cn + \min_{A \in P_+} \left(-\alpha_1 a + \frac{E(P)}{2}a^2 + ca \right).$$

If c is large enough then the minimum above is positive and $\omega_n \geq (E(P)/2)n^2 - cn$. \blacksquare

To study the generic order ω_n of f_n for nonlinear equations, we need to introduce further definitions. Given a q -factor of positive length, $A = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$, we consider the Laplace transform \mathcal{L}_A of the measure that puts mass 1 on each α_i ,

$$\mathcal{L}_A(s) = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} e^{-s\alpha_i}.$$

If α_1 is nonnegative, this function is nonincreasing in s . We can then define the following quantities.

Definition 5.2.5. *Let $A = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$ be a q -factor of positive length and such that α_1 is nonnegative. Its depth is*

$$D(A) = \inf \{ 1/s : s > 0; \mathcal{L}_A(s) > 1 \}$$

with $\inf \emptyset = +\infty$. Its co-depth is $d(A) = a/(\ell - 1)$.

Note that the co-depth is defined for all q -factors but the nonshifting linear ones, which have the form $(0; \alpha_1)$. The co-depth is infinite if and only if the q -factor is shifting and linear. It is 0 if and only if the q -factor is nonshifting and nonlinear.

Consider a q -factor $A = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$. If $\alpha_1 = 0$, the inequality $\mathcal{L}_A(s) \geq e^{-\alpha_1 s}$ yields $\mathcal{L}_A(s) \geq 1$ for any nonnegative s . Thus $D(A) = 0$.

If now α_1 is positive and $\ell = 1$, then $\mathcal{L}_A(s) < 1$ for any positive s . In this case, $D(A) = +\infty$.

Finally, if α_1 is positive and ℓ is at least 2, then $\mathcal{L}_A(s)$ is a decreasing and continuous function, with $\mathcal{L}_A(0) = \ell$ and $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}_A(s) = 0$. Therefore, $D(A)$ is positive and finite and $\mathcal{L}_A(1/D(A)) = 1$.

Consequently, $D(A)$ is positive and finite only for q -factors of length at least 2 and with a positive α_1 , and in this case $\mathcal{L}_A(1/D(A)) = 1$.

Definition 5.2.5 extends to q -operators in the following way.

Definition 5.2.6. *Let P be a q -operator in solved form and such that $\underline{\alpha}(P_0) = 0 \leq \underline{\alpha}(P_+)$. Its depth is*

$$D(P) = \inf\{D(A) : A \in P_+\}$$

and its co-depth is

$$d(P) = \sup\{d(A) : A \in P_+, D(A) = D(P)\}.$$

Note that the depth and co-depth of a q -operator P depend only on its shifting part once we know that $\underline{\alpha}(P_0) = 0 \leq \underline{\alpha}(P_+)$.

Our next result shows the relevance of the depth in the asymptotic behavior of the generic order of f_n .

Theorem 5.2.7. *Assume that $\underline{\alpha}(P_0) = 0 \leq \underline{\alpha}(P_+)$ and (5.2.1) holds. As n tends to infinity,*

$$\omega_n = D(P)n \log n + O(n).$$

Formally, Theorem 5.2.7 is not precise in two cases: if $D(P) = +\infty$, it asserts that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \omega_n/n \log n = +\infty$, and if $D(P) = 0$, it asserts that $\omega_n = o(n \log n)$ as n tends to infinity. Let us now examine these two cases.

For $D(P)$ to be infinite, we must have $D(A) = +\infty$ for any shifting q -factor A in P , and therefore $\mathcal{L}_A(s) \leq 1$ for all these q -factors and any nonnegative s . This implies that all the shifting q -factors are linear; since P is in solved form, it is then a linear q -operator. Under assumption (5.2.1), Theorem 5.2.4 provides that (ω_n) grows like n^2 as long as the elevation of P is positive, while Proposition 5.2.3 shows that (ω_n) remains bounded if the elevation of P vanishes.

For $D(P)$ to be 0, the operator P must have a shifting q -factor A for which $\mathcal{L}_A(s) > 1$ for any s positive. In particular, $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{L}_A(s) \geq 1$, and, consequently, this q -factor must have $\alpha_1 = 0$. Its elevation is then 0. Proposition 5.2.3 implies that (ω_n) is then bounded.

From this discussion we conclude that Proposition 5.2.3 and Theorems 5.2.4 and 5.2.7 completely describe the asymptotic behavior

of the generic order, except when $\underline{\alpha}(P_0) = 0 > \underline{\alpha}(P_+)$. This last case will be covered in the next two sections.

Proof of Theorem 5.2.7. The proof of Theorem 5.2.7 is rather long and will be broken into various lemmas which make up the remainder of this section. The discussion following the statement of Theorem 5.2.7 shows that we may assume that $D(P)$ is positive and finite.

Let $\log_+ x$ be $\max(\log x, 0)$. We define the function

$$u(x) = D(P)(x + d(P)) \log_+ x.$$

If x is an integer n , we write u_n instead of $u(x)$. In order to avoid too many parentheses, we also write D_P for $D(P)$ and d_P for $d(P)$, so that $u_n = D_P(n + d_P) \log_+ n$.

For A in P_+ and x_1, \dots, x_ℓ nonnegative real numbers, we set

$$\Omega_A(x_1, \dots, x_\ell) = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \alpha_i x_i + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} u(x_i) - u\left(a + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} x_i\right). \quad (5.2.2)$$

The bulk of the proof is to find the minimum of $\Omega_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell)$ when $n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a$ so that we can compare ω_n with u_n . The main difficulty is that Ω_A is not a convex function, but if one were to remove the term $D_P d_P \log_+ x$ from $u(x)$ then it would be. Instead of minimizing Ω_A one would then minimize the simpler convex function

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \alpha_i x_i + D_P \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} x_i \log x_i$$

over $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} x_i = n - a$, and a calculation of the Lagrangian shows that the minimum is achieved at (x_1^*, \dots, x_ℓ^*) with

$$x_i^* = (n - a) \frac{e^{-\alpha_i/D_P}}{\mathcal{L}_A(1/D_P)}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq \ell. \quad (5.2.3)$$

This is why the Laplace transforms \mathcal{L}_A arise in our problem. By construction, the x_i^* add to $n - a$; they are also positive. The tuple (x_1^*, \dots, x_ℓ^*) depends on n and A but the notation does not keep track of these dependencies. However it should be clear from the context for which n and which q -factor we consider this tuple. We now evaluate $\Omega_A(x_1^*, \dots, x_\ell^*)$ before showing that this is indeed the

near minimum of $\Omega_A(x_1, \dots, x_\ell)$ when the x_i are nonnegative and add to $n - a$.

Lemma 5.2.8. *Let A be in P_+ and let (x_1^*, \dots, x_ℓ^*) the tuple associated with A as in (5.2.3). Then $\Omega_A(x_1^*, \dots, x_\ell^*)$ is*

$$\begin{cases} -D_P a - d_P \alpha(A) + O(1/n) & \text{if } D(A) = D_P \text{ and } d(A) = d_P, \\ -D_P a - d_P \alpha(A) + D_P(d_P(\ell - 1) - a) \log n + O(1/n) & \text{if } D(A) = D_P \text{ and } d(A) < d_P, \\ -D_P n \log \mathcal{L}_A(1/D_P) + D_P(d_P(\ell - 1) - a) \log n + O(1) & \text{if } D_A \neq D_P, \end{cases}$$

as n tends to infinity.

Proof. Throughout the proof, we consider n large enough so that $\min_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} x_i^* \geq 1$. Then $\log_+ x_i^* = \log x_i^*$. Considering the definition of \mathcal{L}_A and that of the x_i^* , we have

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \alpha_i x_i^* = -(n - a) \frac{\mathcal{L}'_A}{\mathcal{L}_A}(1/D_P). \quad (5.2.4)$$

Furthermore, $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} u(x_i^*) - u(n - a)$ is the sum of

$$D_P \left(\sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} x_i^* \log x_i^* - (n - a) \log(n - a) \right) \quad (5.2.5)$$

and

$$D_P d_P \left(\sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \log x_i^* - \log(n - a) \right). \quad (5.2.6)$$

The first sum, (5.2.5), is

$$\begin{aligned} & D_P \left((n - a) \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \frac{e^{-\alpha_i/D_P}}{\mathcal{L}_A(1/D_P)} \left(\log(n - a) - \frac{\alpha_i}{D_P} - \log \mathcal{L}_A(1/D_P) \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - (n - a) \log(n - a) \right) \\ & = (n - a) \frac{\mathcal{L}'_A}{\mathcal{L}_A}(1/D_P) - D_P(n - a) \log \mathcal{L}_A(1/D_P). \end{aligned}$$

The second sum, (5.2.6), is

$$\begin{aligned} & D_P d_P \left(\sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \log(n - a) - \frac{\alpha_i}{D_P} - \log \mathcal{L}_A(1/D_P) \right) - D_P d_P \log(n - a) \\ & = D_P d_P(\ell - 1) \log(n - a) - d_P \alpha(A) - D_P d_P \ell \log \mathcal{L}_A(1/D_P). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} u(n-a) - u(n) &= D_P(n-a) \log(n-a) - D_P n \log n \\ &\quad + D_P d_P \log(n-a) - D_P d_P \log n \\ &= -D_P a \log n - D_P a + O(1/n) \end{aligned} \quad (5.2.7)$$

Adding (5.2.4) with the expression we found for (5.2.5) and (5.2.6) as well as with (5.2.7), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_A(x_1^*, \dots, x_\ell^*) &= -D_P(n-a) \log \mathcal{L}_A(1/D_P) + D_P(d_P(\ell-1) - a) \log n \\ &\quad - d_P \alpha(A) - D_P d_P \ell \log \mathcal{L}_A(1/D_P) - D_P a + O(1/n). \end{aligned}$$

The result follows since $\mathcal{L}_A(1/D_P) = 1$ when $D(A) = D_P$. \blacksquare

Our next lemma is a representation of $\Omega_A(x_1, \dots, x_\ell)$ near (x_1^*, \dots, x_ℓ^*) .

Lemma 5.2.9. *There exists a positive c such that if n is large enough, $x_1 + \dots + x_\ell = n - a$, all the x_i are nonnegative, and*

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \frac{(x_i - x_i^*)^2}{x_i^*} \leq \epsilon n^{1/3}, \quad (5.2.8)$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \Omega_A(x_1, \dots, x_\ell) - \Omega_A(x_1^*, \dots, x_\ell^*) - \frac{D_P}{2} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \frac{(x_i - x_i^*)^2}{x_i^*} \right. \\ \left. - D_P d_P \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \frac{x_i - x_i^*}{x_i^*} \right| \leq \frac{c \epsilon^{1/2}}{n^{1/3}} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \frac{(x_i - x_i^*)^2}{x_i^*}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By definition of Ω_A , since both the x_i and the x_i^* add to $n - a$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_A(x_1, \dots, x_\ell) - \Omega_A(x_1^*, \dots, x_\ell^*) \\ = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \alpha_i(x_i - x_i^*) + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} u(x_i) - u(x_i^*). \end{aligned} \quad (5.2.9)$$

Taylor's formula ensures that for some θ_i between x_i and x_i^* ,

$$\begin{aligned} x_i \log x_i - x_i^* \log x_i^* \\ = (x_i - x_i^*)(1 + \log x_i^*) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{(x_i - x_i^*)^2}{x_i^*} - \frac{1}{6} \frac{(x_i - x_i^*)^3}{\theta_i^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.2.10)$$

Recall that the x_i^* add to $n - a$. Since the x_i also add to $n - a$, we have $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} x_i - x_i^* = 0$ and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} (x_i - x_i^*)(1 + \log x_i^*) \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} (x_i - x_i^*) \left(1 + \log(n - a) - \frac{\alpha_i}{D_P} - \log \mathcal{L}_A(1/D_P) \right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{D_P} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} (x_i - x_i^*) \alpha_i. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \alpha_i (x_i - x_i^*) + D_P \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} x_i \log x_i - x_i^* \log x_i^* \\ &= \frac{D_P}{2} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \frac{(x_i - x_i^*)^2}{x_i^*} - \frac{D_P}{6} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \frac{(x_i - x_i^*)^3}{\theta_i^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.2.11)$$

If (5.2.8) holds, then $(x_i - x_i^*)^2 \leq \epsilon x_i^* n^{1/3}$, so that

$$\frac{|x_i - x_i^*|}{x_i^*} \leq \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{x_i^*}} n^{1/6} \leq \sqrt{\epsilon \frac{\mathcal{L}_A(1/D_P)}{e^{-\alpha_i/D_P}} \frac{n}{n-a}} n^{-1/3}.$$

Hence, since (5.2.1) holds, there exists a positive c such that if n is large enough,

$$\frac{|x_i - x_i^*|}{x_i^*} \leq c \epsilon^{1/2} n^{-1/3}$$

uniformly in $1 \leq i \leq \ell$, uniformly in A in P_+ and in the x_i in the range defined by (5.2.8). In particular, uniformly in that range $x_i \sim x_i^*$ as n tends to infinity, which implies $x_i \sim x_i^* \sim \theta_i$ as n tends to infinity. Therefore, for any n large enough,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \frac{(x_i - x_i^*)^3}{\theta_i^2} \right| &\leq \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \frac{(x_i - x_i^*)^2}{x_i^*} \frac{|x_i - x_i^*|}{x_i^*} \left(\frac{x_i^*}{\theta_i} \right)^2 \\ &\leq c \epsilon^{1/2} n^{-1/3} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \frac{(x_i - x_i^*)^2}{x_i^*}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.2.12)$$

Next, for another θ_i between x_i and x_i^* , Taylor's formula gives

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} (\log x_i - \log x_i^*) = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \frac{x_i - x_i^*}{x_i^*} - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \frac{(x_i - x_i^*)^2}{\theta_i^2}. \quad (5.2.13)$$

Moreover, since $x_i \sim x_i^*$ in the range determined by (5.2.8), and since $x_i^* \sim \theta_i$ is of order n as n tends to infinity, we also have

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \frac{(x_i - x_i^*)^2}{\theta_i^2} \leq \frac{c}{n} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \frac{(x_i - x_i^*)^2}{x_i^*}. \quad (5.2.14)$$

The result follows from (5.2.9), (5.2.11)–(5.2.14). \blacksquare

We now show that outside the range described by (5.2.8), the function $\Omega_A(x_1, \dots, x_\ell)$ is much larger than $\Omega_A(x_1^*, \dots, x_\ell^*)$.

Lemma 5.2.10. *Let ϵ be a positive real number. There exists a positive c such that if $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} x_i = n - a$ and all the x_i are nonnegative and*

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \frac{(x_i - x_i^*)^2}{x_i^*} \geq \epsilon n^{1/3}, \quad (5.2.15)$$

then, for any n large enough, $\Omega_A(x_1, \dots, x_\ell) \geq \Omega_A(x_1^, \dots, x_\ell^*) + c\epsilon n^{1/3}$.*

Proof. In (5.2.10), use a second order Taylor formula instead of a third order one. Then (5.2.11) becomes, for some θ_i between x_i and x_i^* ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \alpha_i (x_i - x_i^*) + D_P \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} x_i \log x_i - x_i^* \log x_i^* \\ = \frac{D_P}{2} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \frac{(x_i - x_i^*)^2}{x_i^*} \frac{x_i^*}{\theta_i}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.2.16)$$

Recall that we consider only nonnegative x_i . If $x_i \leq x_i^*$ then $x_i^*/\theta_i \geq 1$. If $x_i \geq x_i^*$, then $x_i \leq n - a$ since the x_i add to $n - a$. In both cases, since α_ℓ is the largest of the α_i , $1 \leq i \leq \ell$,

$$\frac{x_i^*}{\theta_i} \geq \frac{x_i^*}{n - a} = \frac{e^{-\alpha_i/D_P}}{\mathcal{L}_A(1/D_P)} \geq \frac{e^{-\alpha_\ell/D_P}}{\mathcal{L}_A(1/D_P)}.$$

Therefore, if (5.2.15) holds and n is large enough, the right hand side of (5.2.16), and so the left hand side of (5.2.16) as well, is at least

$$\frac{D_P}{2} \frac{e^{-\alpha_\ell/D_P}}{\mathcal{L}_A(1/D_P)} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \frac{(x_i - x_i^*)^2}{x_i^*} \geq \frac{D_P}{2} \frac{e^{-\alpha_\ell/D_P}}{\mathcal{L}_A(1/D_P)} \epsilon n^{1/3}.$$

We also have $\log x_i^* \leq \log n$. Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_A(x_1, \dots, x_\ell) - \Omega_A(x_1^*, \dots, x_\ell^*) \\ \geq \frac{D_P}{2} \frac{e^{-\alpha_\ell/D_P}}{\mathcal{L}_A(1/D_P)} \epsilon n^{1/3} - 2\ell D_P d_P \log n \end{aligned}$$

and the result follows for any n large enough. \blacksquare

Combining Lemmas 5.2.9 and 5.2.10 allows us to find an approximate minimum for Ω_A .

Lemma 5.2.11. *We have*

$$\min_{x_1 + \dots + x_\ell = n - a} \Omega_A(x_1, \dots, x_\ell) = \Omega_A(x_1^*, \dots, x_\ell^*) + o(1).$$

Proof. Given Lemma 5.2.9, consider the function

$$\tilde{\Omega}_A(x_1, \dots, x_\ell) = \frac{D_P}{2} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \frac{(x_i - x_i^*)^2}{x_i^*} + D_P d_P \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \frac{x_i - x_i^*}{x_i^*}.$$

Writing the Lagrangian with multiplier λD_P , we find that $\tilde{\Omega}(x_1, \dots, x_\ell)$ is minimum over $x_1 + \dots + x_\ell = n - a$ when

$$\frac{x_i - x_i^*}{x_i^*} + \frac{d_P}{x_i^*} - \lambda = 0,$$

that is when x_i is $\tilde{x}_i = (1 + \lambda)x_i^* - d_P$ where λ ensures that $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \tilde{x}_i = n - a$. Thus, $\lambda = \ell d_P / (n - a)$ and

$$\tilde{x}_i - x_i^* = \lambda x_i^* - d_P = O(1).$$

For these values \tilde{x}_i we have $\tilde{\Omega}_A(\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_\ell) = O(1/n)$ as n tends to infinity. Then, Lemma 5.2.9 ensures that in the range of (5.2.8),

$$\Omega_A(x_1, \dots, x_\ell) \geq \Omega_A(x_1^*, \dots, x_\ell^*) + \tilde{\Omega}_A(\tilde{x}_1, \dots, \tilde{x}_\ell) - c\epsilon.$$

We conclude with Lemma 5.2.10, and the fact that ϵ is arbitrary. \blacksquare

Our next lemma gives half of Theorem 5.2.7.

Lemma 5.2.12. *There exists a positive c such that $\omega_n \geq u_n - cn$ for any positive n .*

Proof. Using Lemma 5.2.8, let n_0 be large enough so that for any n at least n_0 ,

(i) if $D(A) = D_P$ and $d(A) = d_P$ then

$$\Omega_A(x_1^*, \dots, x_\ell^*) \geq -D_P a - d_P \alpha(A) - 1; \quad (5.2.17)$$

(ii) if $D(A) = D_P$ and $d(A) < d_P$ then

$$\Omega_A(x_1^*, \dots, x_\ell^*) \geq -D_P a - d_P \alpha(A) - 1 + D_P(d_P(\ell - 1) - a) \log n; \quad (5.2.18)$$

(iii) if $D(A) \neq D_P$ then

$$\Omega_A(x_1^*, \dots, x_\ell^*) \geq -D_P n \log \mathcal{L}_A(1/D_P) + D(d_P(\ell - 1) - a) \log n - \log n. \quad (5.2.19)$$

Given how $d(P)$ is defined, in case (ii) we have $\Omega_A(x_1^*, \dots, x_\ell^*) \geq -D_P a - d_P \alpha(A)$ provided n is large enough; this inequality also holds in case (iii) since, given how $D(P)$ is defined, $D(A) \neq D_P$ implies $\mathcal{L}_A(1/D_P) < 1$. Hence, provided n is large enough,

$$\Omega_A(x_1^*, \dots, x_\ell^*) \geq -D_P a - d_P \alpha(A) - 1$$

for any A in P_+ . Then, using Lemma 5.2.11, we can take n_0 large enough so that

$$\min_{x_1 + \dots + x_\ell = n - a} \Omega_A(x_1, \dots, x_\ell) \geq -D_P a - d_P \alpha(A) - 2 \quad (5.2.20)$$

for any n at least n_0 and any A in P_+ .

Let c be large enough so that $\omega_n \geq u_n - cn$ for any n at most n_0 . Let n be greater than n_0 and assume that we proved that $\omega_i \geq u_i - ci$ for any i less than n . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_n &\geq \min_{A \in P_+} \min_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a} \alpha_1 n_1 + \dots + \alpha_\ell n_\ell + u_{n_1} + \dots + u_{n_\ell} \\ &\quad - cn_1 - \dots - cn_\ell \\ &= \min_{A \in P_+} \min_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a} \Omega_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell) + u_n - c(n - a). \end{aligned}$$

Using (5.2.20), we obtain, provided n is large enough,

$$\omega_n \geq \min_{A \in P_+} (u_n - cn - D_P a - d_P \alpha(A) - 2 + ca).$$

Thus, if we chose c larger than $\max_{A \in P_+} D_P a - d_P \alpha(A) - 2$, we also have ca greater than this maximum because for a shifting q -factor a is at least 1. We then have $\omega_n \geq u_n - cn$. \blacksquare

Finally, we prove a matching upper bound so that Theorem 5.2.7 will follow from our next lemma and Lemma 5.2.12.

Lemma 5.2.13. *There exists a positive c such that $\omega_n \leq u_n + cn$ for any nonnegative n .*

Proof. Let A be in P_+ such that $D(A) = D_P$ and $d(A) = d_P$. Let n_1, \dots, n_ℓ be such that $|n_i - x_i^*| \leq 1$ for any $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ and $n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a$. To show that such n_i exist, we pick n_i to be either $\lfloor x_i^* \rfloor$ or $\lceil x_i^* \rceil$ in a way that the n_i add to $n - a$; that such a choice exists comes from the inequality

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \lfloor x_i^* \rfloor \leq \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} x_i^* = n - a \leq \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \lceil x_i^* \rceil.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_n &\leq \alpha_1 n_1 + \dots + \alpha_\ell n_\ell + u_{n_1} + \dots + u_{n_\ell} \\ &= \Omega_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell) + u_n. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5.2.9 ensures that for our choice of the n_i

$$\Omega_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell) \leq \Omega_A(x_1^*, \dots, x_\ell^*) + 1 \quad (5.2.21)$$

for any n larger than some n_0 . Moreover, since $D(A) = D_P$ and $d(A) = d_P$, Lemma 5.2.8 shows that $\Omega_A(x_1^*, \dots, x_\ell^*) = O(1)$ as n tends to infinity. Take c to be large enough so that firstly, $\omega_n \leq u_n + cn$ for any n at most n_0 , and, secondly, c is larger than $\Omega_A(x_1^*, \dots, x_\ell^*) + 1$ for any n .

Let n be greater than n_0 . Assume that we have $\omega_m \leq u_m + cm$ for any m less than n . Let n_1, \dots, n_ℓ be such that $|n_i - x_i^*| \leq 1$ for any $1 \leq i \leq \ell$ and $n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_n &\leq \alpha_1 n_1 + \dots + \alpha_\ell n_\ell + u_{n_1} + \dots + u_{n_\ell} + c(n - a) \\ &\leq \Omega_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell) + u_n + c(n - a). \end{aligned}$$

Using (5.2.21) and that A is shifting, we obtain

$$\omega_n \leq \Omega_A(x_1^*, \dots, x_\ell^*) + u_n + 1 + c(n - 1).$$

Given how c is chosen, this implies that $\omega_n \leq u_n + cn$, concluding the proof of Lemma 5.2.13, as well as that of Theorem 5.2.7. ■

3. The generic degree of f_n . Recall how the generic degree δ_n of f_n as a rational function is defined in Definition 5.1.1. In particular, in order to speak of the generic degree, we assume throughout this section that P is in solved form, satisfies the uniqueness condition and that $\bar{\alpha}(P_0) = 0$. To study its asymptotic behavior, we need some definitions which parallel those we used for studying the order. The following definition parallels Definition 5.2.5.

Definition 5.3.1. *The height of a q -factor $A = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$ is*

$$H(A) = \frac{\alpha_\ell}{a}.$$

Its co-height is $h(A) = a$.

One should be careful not to confuse the height of A with its elevation introduced in Definition 5.2.2. Definition 5.3.1 extends to q -operators in a way paralleling how Definition 5.2.6 extends Definition 5.2.5.

Definition 5.3.2. *Let P be a q -operator with $P_+ \neq 0$. The height of P is*

$$H(P) = \sup\{H(A) : A \in P_+\}$$

and its co-height is

$$h(P) = \min\{h(A) : A \in P_+, H(A) = H(P)\}.$$

As for the depth and co-depth, the height and co-height depend only on the shifting part of the q -operator. The following result shows the relevance of the height and co-height in describing the generic degree of f_n .

Theorem 5.3.3. *Assume that P is in solved form and that $H(P) \geq 0$. As n tends to infinity,*

$$\delta_n = \frac{H(P)}{2}n(n - h(P)) + O(1).$$

Theorem 5.3.3 asserts that up to a bounded quantity, the generic degree of the rational function $f_n(q)$ is the quadratic sequence

$$\frac{H(P)}{2} n^2 - \frac{H(P)}{2} h(P) n.$$

It is interesting to note that Theorem 5.3.3 is sharper than Theorem 5.2.7; we do not know if it is possible to improve Theorem 5.2.7.

The height, co-height and the product $H(P)h(P)$ also have an interpretation on a Newton-like diagram. Consider the points (a, α_ℓ) . The assumption $\bar{\alpha}(P_0) = 0$ asserts that there is one point at $(0, 0)$ and that all the other points on the α_ℓ -axis have negative ordinate. The cloud of points (a, α_ℓ) then looks like that on figure 5.3.1.




figure 5.3.1

Di Vizio (2008) provides a similar result for general q -algebraic equations, that is, not assuming being in solved form, however, with an accuracy $O(n)$.

Example. Consider the q -Catalan equation

$$f(z) = 1 + zf(z)f(qz).$$

The corresponding q -operator is $P = (0; 0) - (1; 0, 1) - (0; \sqcup)$. Its height is 1 and is achieved for the q -factor $(1; 0, 1)$. Theorem 5.3.3 asserts that the generic degree of f_n is $n(n-1)/2 + O(1)$. The recursion for the coefficients f_n ,

$$f_n = \mathbb{1}\{n = 0\} + \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n-1} q^i f_i f_{n-1-i}$$

shows that f_n is a polynomial in q and that $\deg_q f_0 = 0$ while for any n positive,

$$\deg_q f_n = \max_{0 \leq i \leq n-1} (i + \deg_q f_i + \deg_q f_{n-1-i}).$$

One can check that $\deg_q f_n = n(n-1)/2$ indeed satisfies that recursion.

Like for the generic order, it is instructive to consider the slightly more general equation

$$f(z) = q^\lambda + q^\mu z f(z) f(qz).$$

It leads to the recursion

$$f_n = q^\lambda \mathbb{1}\{n=0\} + \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n-1} q^{i+\mu} f_i f_{n-1-i},$$

and therefore

$$\deg_q f_n = \lambda \mathbb{1}\{n=0\} + \max_{0 \leq i \leq n-1} (i + \mu + \deg_q f_i + \deg_q f_{n-1-i}).$$

One can check that this recursion is satisfied by the sequence

$$\deg_q f_n = \frac{n(n-1)}{2} + (\lambda + \mu)n + \lambda.$$

The effect of λ and μ is then visible in the terms of order n and smaller. In particular, the first coefficient, $f_0 = q^\lambda$ has an impact on the entire sequence ($\deg_q f_n$). Nevertheless, we still have $\deg_q f_n(q) = n^2/2 + O(n)$ as n tends to infinity. For this example, the generic degree is the same as for the q -Catalan equation, and therefore, $\deg_q f_n = \delta_n + (\lambda + \mu)n + O(1)$ as n tends to infinity. ■

Proof of Theorem 5.3.3. If $H(P) = 0$, then any shifting q -factor in P_+ has $\alpha_\ell \leq 0$. Then $\delta_n = 0$ for any n and is indeed $O(1)$ as n tends to infinity. Thus, we assume from now on that $H(P)$ is positive. In particular, there is a shifting q -factor in P_+ with α_ℓ positive.

The proof of Theorem 5.3.3 requires several lemmas. Recall that a sequence (v_n) is convex if the sequence $(v_{n+1} - v_n)$ is nondecreasing.

Lemma 5.3.4. *The sequence (δ_n) is convex.*

Proof. The proof requires two steps.

Step 1. (δ_n) is nondecreasing. The proof is by induction. Set $\underline{a} = \min_{A \in P_+} a$. If $n < \underline{a}$, then $\delta_n = 0$ by our convention regarding $\max \emptyset$. If $n = \underline{a}$, then

$$\delta_n = \max_{\substack{A \in P_+ \\ a=n; \alpha_\ell \geq 0}} \max_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = 0} (\alpha_1 n_1 + \dots + \alpha_\ell n_\ell + \delta_{n_1} + \dots + \delta_{n_\ell}).$$

The maximum is achieved only when $n_1 = \dots = n_\ell = 0$ and this gives $\delta_n = 0$.

Assume now that we proved that $(\delta_i)_{0 \leq i \leq n}$ is nondecreasing for some n at least \underline{a} . Then, for some A in P_+ with $\alpha_\ell \geq 0$ and some $n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a$, we have

$$\delta_n = \alpha_1 n_1 + \dots + \alpha_\ell n_\ell + \delta_{n_1} + \dots + \delta_{n_\ell}. \quad (5.3.1)$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_{n+1} &\geq \alpha_1 n_1 + \dots + \alpha_{\ell-1} n_{\ell-1} + \alpha_\ell (n_\ell + 1) \\ &\quad + \delta_{n_1} + \dots + \delta_{n_{\ell-1}} + \delta_{n_\ell+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.3.2)$$

This lower bound is at least $\delta_n + \alpha_\ell + \delta_{n_\ell+1} - \delta_{n_\ell}$ which is at least δ_n using the induction hypothesis. Thus, $\delta_{n+1} \geq \delta_n$.

Step 2. (δ_n) is convex. Again, the proof is by induction. Since $\delta_i = 0$ for any $0 \leq i \leq \underline{a}$, the sequence $(\delta_{i+1} - \delta_i)_{0 \leq i \leq \underline{a}}$ is nondecreasing. Assume that $(\delta_{i+1} - \delta_i)_{0 \leq i \leq n}$ is nondecreasing for some n at least \underline{a} . Let A in P_+ and $n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a$ such that (5.3.1) holds. Then (5.3.2) holds, and

$$\delta_{n+1} - \delta_n \geq \alpha_\ell + \delta_{n_\ell+1} - \delta_{n_\ell}. \quad (5.3.3)$$

Moreover, δ_{n-1} is at least

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1 n_1 + \dots + \alpha_{\ell-1} n_{\ell-1} + \alpha_\ell (n_\ell - 1) + \delta_{n_1} + \dots + \delta_{n_{\ell-1}} + \delta_{n_\ell-1} \\ = \delta_n - \alpha_\ell + \delta_{n_\ell-1} - \delta_{n_\ell}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, using the induction hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_n - \delta_{n-1} &\leq \alpha_\ell + \delta_{n_\ell} - \delta_{n_\ell-1} \\ &\leq \alpha_\ell + \delta_{n_\ell+1} - \delta_{n_\ell}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.3.4)$$

Combining (5.3.3) and (5.3.4) we obtain $\delta_{n+1} - \delta_n \geq \delta_n - \delta_{n-1}$, and this proves that the sequence (δ_n) is convex. \blacksquare

Our next lemma is valid for any convex sequence, not only for the sequence (δ_n) , but we will need it here only for that specific sequence.

Lemma 5.3.5. *Let A be a q -factor. Set $s(A) = \#\{i : \alpha_i = \alpha_\ell\}$. Then*

$$\max_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a} (\alpha_1 n_1 + \dots + \alpha_\ell n_\ell + \delta_{n_1} + \dots + \delta_{n_\ell})$$

is achieved exactly at all of the $s(A)$ tuples (n_1, \dots, n_ℓ) such that $n_i = n - a$ for some i such that $\alpha_i = \alpha_\ell$, and all the other n_j are 0.

Proof. Consider the expression to maximize,

$$\alpha_1 n_1 + \dots + \alpha_\ell n_\ell + \delta_{n_1} + \dots + \delta_{n_\ell}. \quad (5.3.5)$$

If we specify n_1, \dots, n_ℓ up to a permutation, this expression is maximal when $n_1 \leq \dots \leq n_\ell$ since $\alpha_1 \leq \dots \leq \alpha_\ell$. Thus, to maximize it, we can concentrate only on the tuples (n_1, \dots, n_ℓ) which are nondecreasing, which we do from now on.

Let $1 \leq i < j \leq \ell$. For $n_i \geq 1$, if we substitute $n_i - 1$ for n_i and $n_j + 1$ for n_j in such a tuple, and that this substitution keeps the tuple ordered, then (5.3.5) is increased by

$$-\alpha_i + \alpha_j - (\delta_{n_i} - \delta_{n_i-1}) + (\delta_{n_j+1} - \delta_{n_j});$$

this increase is indeed positive since the α_k are nondecreasing and (δ_n) is convex. Therefore, the maximum of (5.3.5) is attained when $n_\ell = n - a$ and all the other n_i vanish. The result follows since any tuple of the form $(0, \dots, 0, n - a, 0, \dots, 0)$, where the nonzero entry is one of the last $s(A)$ positions, gives exactly the same result for $\alpha_1 n_1 + \dots + \alpha_\ell n_\ell + \delta_{n_1} + \dots + \delta_{n_\ell}$, namely $\alpha_\ell(n - a) + \delta_{n-a}$. ■

Combining Lemmas 5.3.4 and 5.3.5, we obtain that

$$\delta_n = \max_{\substack{A \in P_+ \\ a \leq n; \alpha_\ell \geq 0}} \alpha_\ell(n - a) + \delta_{n-a}. \quad (5.3.6)$$

Consider the sequence (v_n) defined by

$$v_n = \frac{H(P)}{2} n(n - h(P))$$

so that Theorem 5.3.3 asserts that $\delta_n = v_n + O(1)$. To compare δ_n and v_n , we will need three more lemmas. In what follows, we write H_P for $H(P)$ and h_P for $h(P)$.

Lemma 5.3.6. *For any q -operator P in solved form for which H_P is achieved,*

$$\inf\{H_P a - \alpha_\ell : A \in P_+ \setminus \{P\}; H(A) < H_P\} > 0. \quad (5.3.7)$$

Proof. Since H_P is achieved, it is equal to some a/α_ℓ for some A in P_+ . If (5.3.7) does not hold, then we can find a sequence of q -factors $B_n = (b_n, \beta_{n,1}, \dots, \beta_{n,m_n})$ in P_+ such that the sequence $u_n = H_P b_n - \beta_{n,m_n}$ is a sequence of positive numbers and tends to 0. We then have

$$au_n = \alpha_\ell b_n - a\beta_{n,m_n}.$$

Since the right hand side of this identity is an integer, so is the left hand side. Therefore, since a is positive and u_n tends to 0, we must have $u_n = 0$ for any n large enough. This contradicts that that u_n is positive. \blacksquare

Lemma 5.3.7. *Let*

$$f(A, n) = (n - a)(aH_P - \alpha_\ell) + \frac{H_P}{2}a(a - h_P)$$

and let η be the infimum involved in Lemma 5.3.6. For any integer n at least a ,

(i) if A is in P_+ and $H(A) = H_P$, then $f(A, n) = H_P a(a - h_P)/2 \geq 0$;

(ii) if A is in P_+ and $H(A) < H_P$, then

$$f(A, n) \geq n\eta - \frac{(2\eta + h_P H_P)^2}{8}.$$

Proof. (i) If $H(A) = H_P$, then $aH_P - \alpha_\ell = 0$.

(ii) Let A be in P_+ with $H(A) < H_P$, and assume that $n - a \geq 0$. Then $aH_P - \alpha_\ell \geq \eta$. Consequently, setting

$$g(a) = (n - a)\eta + \frac{H_P}{2}a(a - h_P),$$

we have $f(A, n) \geq g(a)$. Considering its derivative, g has a minimum at $a^* = (2\eta + h_P H_P)/2H_P$, and this minimum is

$$\begin{aligned} g(a^*) &= n\eta - \frac{(2\eta + h_P H_P)\eta}{2H_P} + \frac{2\eta + h_P H_P}{2} \frac{2\eta - h_P H_P}{2H_P} \\ &= n\eta - \frac{(2\eta + h_P H_P)^2}{8}, \end{aligned}$$

which yields the result. ■

Recall that $v_n = H_P n(n - h_P)/2$.

Lemma 5.3.8. *For any n large enough,*

$$v_n = \max_{\substack{A \in P_+ \\ \alpha_\ell \geq 0}} \alpha_\ell(n - a) + v_{n-a}.$$

Proof. Let A be in P_+ with α_ℓ nonnegative. With the notation $f(A, n)$ as in Lemma 5.3.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_\ell(n - a) + v_{n-a} &= \alpha_\ell(n - a) + \frac{H_P}{2}(n - a)(n - a - h_P) \\ &= v_n - f(A, n). \end{aligned} \tag{5.3.8}$$

If A is in P_+ and $H(A) = H_P$, then Lemma 5.3.7 implies that (5.3.8) is at most v_n and is v_n if $a = h_P$.

If A is in P_+ and $H(A) < H_P$, Lemma 5.3.7.ii and the positivity of η imply $f(A, n) \geq 0$ whenever n is large enough, so that (5.3.8) is at most v_n . ■

We can now complete the proof of Theorem 5.3.3 with the following upper and lower bounds.

Lemma 5.3.9. *For any $n \geq 0$, the inequality $v_n \leq \delta_n$ holds. Furthermore, there exists a c such that for any n large enough,*

$$v_n \leq \delta_n \leq v_n + c.$$

Proof. If $n \leq h_P$, then v_n is nonpositive; thus, $v_n \leq \delta_n$. Assume that we proved $v_i \leq \delta_i$ for any $i < n$ and some $n \geq h_P$. Let A be such that $H(A) = H_P$ and a is minimal. Thus, $a = h_P$ and $\alpha_\ell = aH_P$. For such an A , (5.3.8) is v_n . Using the induction hypothesis,

$$\delta_n \geq \alpha_\ell(n - a) + \delta_{n-a} \geq \alpha_\ell(n - a) + v_{n-a} = v_n.$$

To prove the upper bound, Lemmas 5.3.4 and 5.3.5 imply, as indicated in (5.3.6), that for $n \geq \min_{A \in P_+} a$,

$$\delta_n = \max_{\substack{A \in P_+ \\ \alpha_\ell \geq 0}} \alpha_\ell(n - a) + \delta_{n-a}.$$

Then, for n large enough, say some N , Lemma 5.3.8 yields

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_n - v_n &= \max_{\substack{A \in P_+ \\ \alpha_\ell \geq 0}} (\alpha_\ell(n-a) + \delta_{n-a}) - \max_{\substack{A \in P_+ \\ \alpha_\ell \geq 0}} (\alpha_\ell(n-a) + v_{n-a}) \\ &\leq \max_{\substack{A \in P_+ \\ \alpha_\ell \geq 0}} (\delta_{n-a} - v_{n-a}). \end{aligned}$$

Since shifting q -factors have a positive a , this implies

$$\delta_n - v_n \leq \max_{i \leq n-1} (\delta_i - v_i).$$

Therefore, by induction, $\delta_n - v_n \leq \max_{i \leq N} \delta_i - v_i$. ■

4. Additional results. The results on generic orders and degrees established so far do not exhaust all the possible cases. For instance, Theorem 5.2.7 does not give an estimate of the generic order if $\bar{\alpha}(P_+) < \underline{\alpha}(P_0)$. The goal of this section is to show that by using the reflection operator, the results obtained so far provide a good description of the generic orders and degrees.

We will need to compare the generic order sequence (δ_n) to the sequence $(\tilde{\delta}_n)$ defined by $\tilde{\delta}_n = 0$ if $n \leq 0$ and

$$\tilde{\delta}_n = \max_{\substack{A \in P_+ \\ a \leq n}} \max_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n-a} \alpha_1 n_1 + \dots + \alpha_\ell n_\ell + \tilde{\delta}_{n_1} + \dots + \tilde{\delta}_{n_\ell}. \quad (5.4.1)$$

The difference between (δ_n) and $(\tilde{\delta}_n)$ is that in the definition of δ_n we restrict the outer maximization to those q -factors in P_+ with $\alpha_\ell \geq 0$.

Note that the inner maximisation in the definition of $\tilde{\delta}_n$ is not over a larger set than that in δ_n , and therefore we may have $\tilde{\delta}_n < \delta_n$ for some n as the following example shows.

Example. If the support of P_+ is $\{(1; -2), (10; 4)\}$, then $\tilde{\delta}_0 = \tilde{\delta}_1 = 0$ and

$$\tilde{\delta}_2 = \max_{n_1=1} \alpha_1 n_1 + \tilde{\delta}_{n_1} = -2.$$

However, $\delta_0 = \delta_1 = \delta_2 = 0$. ■

As this example shows, the sequence $(\tilde{\delta}_n)$ is not convex since $\tilde{\delta}_2 - \tilde{\delta}_1 = -2 < \tilde{\delta}_1 - \tilde{\delta}_0 = 0$. Nevertheless we may compare (δ_n) and $(\tilde{\delta}_n)$ as follows.

Lemma 5.4.1. *Let P be a q -operator in solved form with a shifting part. If $H(P)$ is positive, then $\delta_n - \tilde{\delta}_n = O(n)$ as n tends to infinity.*

Proof. Theorem 5.3.3 ensures that for any c large enough,

$$|\delta_n - nH(P)(n - h(P))| \leq c$$

for any n nonnegative. Let $B = (b; \beta_1, \dots, \beta_m)$ be in P_+ and such that $H(B) = H(P)$ and $b = h(P)$. Since $H(P)$ is positive, so is β_m . Let n be at least b and assume that we proved that $\tilde{\delta}_m \geq \delta_m - cm$ for any $m < n$; this assumption certainly holds for $n = b + 1$ provided we choose c large enough.

Then, since $n \geq b$,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\delta}_n &\geq \max_{\substack{A \in P_+ \\ a \leq n}} \max_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a} \alpha_1 n_1 + \dots + \alpha_\ell n_\ell + \delta_{n_1} + \dots + \delta_{n_\ell} \\ &\qquad\qquad\qquad - c(n - a) \\ &\geq \max_{\substack{A \in P_+ \\ a \leq n; \alpha_\ell \geq 0}} \max_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a} \alpha_1 n_1 + \dots + \alpha_\ell n_\ell + \delta_{n_1} + \dots + \delta_{n_\ell} \\ &\qquad\qquad\qquad - c(n - a) \\ &\geq \delta_n - cn \end{aligned}$$

because $n - a \leq n$ for any A in P_+ .

Next, if we proved that $\tilde{\delta}_m \leq \delta_m + cm$ for any $m < n$, which is certainly the case if c is large enough and $n = 1$, then

$$\tilde{\delta}_n \leq \max_{\substack{A \in P_+ \\ a \leq n}} \max_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a} \alpha_1 n_1 + \dots + \alpha_\ell n_\ell + \delta_{n_1} + \dots + \delta_{n_\ell} + c(n - a).$$

Using Lemma 5.3.5 we obtain

$$\tilde{\delta}_n \leq \max_{\substack{A \in P_+ \\ a \leq n}} \alpha_\ell(n - a) + \delta_{n-a} + c(n - 1).$$

Setting

$$\theta_n = \max_{\substack{A \in P \\ a \leq n; \alpha_\ell \leq 0}} \alpha_\ell(n - a) + \delta_{n-a},$$

and using (5.3.6), we obtain

$$\tilde{\delta}_n \leq (\delta_n \vee \theta_n) + c(n - 1).$$

But since (δ_n) is nondecreasing,

$$\theta_n \leq \max_{\substack{A \in P_+ \\ a \leq n; \alpha_\ell \leq 0}} \delta_{n-a} \leq \delta_{n-1} \leq \delta_n.$$

Therefore, $\tilde{\delta}_n \leq \delta_n + cn$. \blacksquare

The following lemma allows us to swap results on (ω_n) and $(\tilde{\delta}_n)$. This is why the sequence $(\tilde{\delta}_n)$ was introduced. Write $(\omega_n(P))$ and $(\delta_n(P))$ for the generic order and degrees associated to a q -algebraic equation P . Similarly, $(\tilde{\delta}_n(P))$ is defined in (5.4.1) and associated to P . Recall that the reflection was introduced in Definition 4.3.5.

Lemma 5.4.2. *We have the identity of sequences $(-\omega_n(P)) = (\tilde{\delta}_n(RP))$.*

Proof. The identity follows from the fact that $-\omega_n(P)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{A \in P_+} \max_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n-a} \left((-\alpha_1)n_1 + \dots + (-\alpha_\ell)n_\ell \right) + (-\omega_{n_1}) + \dots + (-\omega_{n_\ell}) \\ &= \max_{A \in RP_+} \max_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n-a} \alpha_1 n_1 + \dots + \alpha_\ell n_\ell + (-\omega_{n_1}) + \dots + (-\omega_{n_\ell}). \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

Equipped with Lemmas 5.4.1 and 5.4.2, we can obtain further results in some cases not covered in the previous sections. The following provides an example and is by no means exhaustive.

Theorem 5.4.3. *Assume that $\bar{\alpha}(P_+) < \underline{\alpha}(P_0) = 0$. Then, as n tends to infinity,*

$$(i) \ \omega_n(P) = \frac{E(P)}{2}n^2 + O(n);$$

$$(ii) \ \delta_n(P) = \sup\{D(A) : A \in P_+\}n \log n + O(n).$$

Proof. (i) Given Lemma 4.3.6, the inequality $\bar{\alpha}(P_+) < \underline{\alpha}(P_0) = 0$ is equivalent to

$$-\underline{\alpha}(RP_+) < -\bar{\alpha}(RP_0) = 0.$$

Therefore,

$$\bar{\alpha}(RP_+) > \bar{\alpha}(RP_0) = 0.$$

Then $\omega_n(P) = -\tilde{\delta}_n(RP)$. Using Theorem 5.3.3,

$$\delta_n(RP) = H(RP)n^2/2 + O(n),$$

and using Lemma 5.4.2, we obtain

$$\omega_n(P) = -H(RP)n^2/2 + O(n).$$

But

$$\begin{aligned} H(RP) &= \max_{A \in RP_+} \alpha_\ell/a \\ &= \max_{A \in P_+} -\alpha_1/a \\ &= -\min_{A \in P_+} \alpha_1/a = -E(P). \end{aligned}$$

The result follows.

(ii) We have $\tilde{\delta}_n(P) = -\omega_n(RP)$. Using Theorem 5.2.7 and Lemma 5.4.1, we obtain $\delta_n(P) = -D(RP)n \log n + O(n)$. Since $\underline{\alpha}(RP_+) > 0$, the discussion following Definition 5.2.5 shows that $D(A) > 0$ for any A in RP_+ . We have

$$D(RP) = \inf\{D(RA) : A \in P_+\}.$$

But if $D(A)$ is finite, the identity $\mathcal{L}_{RA}(s) = \mathcal{L}_A(-s)$ yields $D(RA) = -D(A)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} D(RP) &= \inf\{-D(A) : A \in P_+\} \\ &= -\sup\{D(A) : A \in P_+\}. \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

6. Analytic solutions

In this chapter, we consider a q -algebraic equation in solved form, such that

$$0 = \overline{\alpha}(P_0) = \overline{\alpha}(P_+) \quad \text{and} \quad |q| > 1.$$

Using a reflection and Lemma 4.3.6, this is equivalent to

$$0 = \underline{\alpha}(P_0) = \underline{\alpha}(P_+) \quad \text{and} \quad |q| < 1. \quad (6.1)$$

As indicated after Proposition 4.3.1, for a polynomial q -algebraic equation in solved form, there is no loss of generality in prescribing a value for $\overline{\alpha}(P_0)$ or $\underline{\alpha}(P_0)$.

Our goal is to show that under (6.1) and some other conditions which are satisfied on most equations arising in applications, the solutions of the equations are analytic in a neighborhood of the origin. Unfortunately, obtaining a good result on the asymptotic behavior of the coefficients f_n under (6.1) is related to longstanding problems in the asymptotic analysis of generating functions. As a consequence, not all of our results will have the same effectiveness.

1. Analytic solutions. In this section we prove the following result which holds under a condition slightly weaker than (6.1). This additional generality will be useful in the next chapter when we consider equations for which $0 = \underline{\alpha}(P_0) < \underline{\alpha}(P_+)$ and $|q| < 1$.

Theorem 6.1.1. *Let $Pf = 0$ be a q -algebraic equation of finite length, in solved form and satisfying the uniqueness condition. If P is analytic and $0 = \underline{\alpha}(P_0) \leq \underline{\alpha}(P_+)$ and $|q| < 1$, then f is analytic in a neighborhood of the origin.*

Proof. The proof has two steps and uses the so-called technique of majoring series.

Step 1. Defining a majoring series. Let $K_n = |P_{(n;u)}|$ and set

$$K(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} K_n z^n.$$

The radius of convergence of $K(z)$ is that of $P_{\cup}(z)$. Consider the nonnegative sequence (h_n) defined recursively by

$$h_n = \sum_{A \in P_+} |P_A| \sum_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n-a} h_{n_1} \cdots h_{n_\ell} + K_n. \quad (6.1.1)$$

Recall that a sum over $n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a$ is to be read as 0 if $n - a$ is negative. This recursion asserts that the formal power series $h(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} h_n z^n$ satisfies the equation

$$h(z) = \sum_{A \in P_+} |P_A| z^a h(z)^\ell + K(z). \quad (6.1.2)$$

Since P is analytic, the power series $\sum_{A \in P_+} |P_A| z^a$ is analytic in a neighborhood of the origin. Therefore, for any k in $\{0, 1, \dots, \ell(P)\}$, the power series $\sum_{A \in P_+; \ell=k} |P_A| z^a$ is analytic. By the Puiseux theorem, the solution h of (6.1.2) is determined by (6.1.1) and is analytic in a neighborhood of the origin and has a positive radius of convergence.

Step 2. Showing that f is analytic. Let us now show that there exist some positive c and C such that $|f_n| \leq C c^n h_n$, an inequality which then implies that f is analytic at the origin since h is. We take

$$C = 1 \vee \sup_{n \geq 0} \frac{1}{\left| \sum_{A \in P_0} P_A q^{\alpha_1 n} \right|}.$$

This C is well defined because under (6.1) one of the α_1 for some A in P_0 is 0 and the uniqueness condition holds.

Let L be the length of P . Since L is finite, $c = C^L$ is finite. Note that $h_0 = K_0 = |P_{(0; \cup)}|$ while

$$\left| \sum_{A \in P_0} P_A \right| |f_0| = |P_{(0; \cup)}|.$$

In particular, $|f_0| \leq C h_0$.

Let n be at least 1. Assume that the induction hypothesis $|f_m| \leq C c^m h_m$ holds for any $m < n$. Recall that f_n is defined through recursion (4.2.1). Since $|q| < 1$ and $\underline{q}(P_+)$ is nonnegative, $|q|^{\alpha_1 n_1 + \dots + n_\ell \alpha_\ell} \leq 1$ for any A in P_+ and any tuple (n_1, \dots, n_ℓ) of nonnegative integers. Consequently, (4.2.1) and the induction hypothesis imply

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{A \in P_0} P_A q^{\alpha_1 n} \right| |f_n| \\ & \leq C^L \sum_{A \in P_+} |P_A| c^{n-a} \sum_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n-a} h_{n_1} \cdots h_{n_\ell} + K_n. \end{aligned} \quad (6.1.3)$$

Since C and c are at least 1 and a is at least 1 for any shifting q -factor A , the right hand side of (6.1.3) is at most

$$C^L c^{n-1} \left(\sum_{A \in P_+} |P_A| \sum_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n-a} h_{n_1} \cdots h_{n_\ell} + K_n \right) = C^L c^{n-1} h_n . \quad (6.1.4)$$

Given how c is chosen, this proves that $|f_n| \leq C c^n h_n$. ■

Example. Whenever $|q|$ is less than 1, the q -Catalan equation $f(z) = 1 + z f(z) f(qz)$ satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 6.1.1. Therefore, its power series solution is analytic in a neighborhood of the origin. ■

2. Elementary singularity analysis and the root peeling algorithm. Our goal in this section is to introduce the basic results of singularity analysis to study the asymptotic behavior of the coefficients of the power series solutions of q -algebraic equations in solved form. The subject of singularity analysis is explained in the book by Flajolet and Sedgewick (2009).

Consider a univariate polynomial \mathcal{C} which does not vanish at the origin and two analytic functions f and U related by the identity

$$\mathcal{C}f = U . \quad (6.2.1)$$

In a neighborhood of 0, we have $f = U/\mathcal{C}$. Add the extra assumption that U has a radius of convergence greater than that of f . The relation $f = U/\mathcal{C}$ then forces f to have singularities at the roots of \mathcal{C} of smallest modulus. If all these singularities are removable, we can extend f beyond. To describe this situation accurately, let $\rho_1, \rho_2, \dots, \rho_k$ be the distinct roots of \mathcal{C} , with respective multiplicities $\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_k$, and label the roots such that $|\rho_1| \leq |\rho_2| \leq \dots \leq |\rho_k|$. Identity (6.2.1) and the assumption that the radius of convergence of U is greater than that of f imply that the radius of convergence of f is at least $|\rho_1|$.

In order not to disrupt the flow of the discussion, we now prove the following technical lemma.

Lemma 6.2.1. *Let ζ_j , $1 \leq j \leq p$, be p distinct complex numbers on the unit circle. If*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq p} c_j \zeta_j^n = 0$$

then all the c_i are 0.

Proof. Let c_1, \dots, c_p be some complex numbers and assume that the sequence

$$u_n = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq p} c_j \zeta_j^n \quad (6.2.2)$$

converges to 0. Let B be the backward operator defined by $Bu_n = u_{n-1}$. If (u_n) tends to 0, so does $(\zeta_p Bu_n)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - \zeta_p B)u_n &= \sum_{1 \leq j \leq p} c_j \zeta_j^n - \sum_{1 \leq j \leq p} c_j \zeta_p \zeta_j^{n-1} \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq j \leq p-1} c_j (\zeta_j - \zeta_p) \zeta_j^{n-1} \end{aligned}$$

Setting $c'_j = c_j (\zeta_j - \zeta_p)$, $1 \leq j \leq p-1$, we obtain that if (u_n) converges to 0 so does

$$u'_n = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq p-1} c'_j \zeta_j^n.$$

By induction, applying the composition $(1 - \zeta_2 B)(1 - \zeta_3 B) \cdots (1 - \zeta_p B)$ to (6.2.2), we obtain that the sequence of constant modulus

$$c_1 (\zeta_1 - \zeta_2) (\zeta_1 - \zeta_3) \cdots (\zeta_1 - \zeta_p) \zeta_1^{n-p+1}$$

tends to 0. Hence, the sequence is constant and equal to 0. Since the ζ_i are distinct and ζ_1 is of modulus 1, this implies that $c_1 = 0$.

We then have $u_n = \sum_{2 \leq j \leq p} c_j \zeta_j^n$. By the same argument, $c_2 = 0$, and by induction, all the c_i are 0. \blacksquare

To describe the process of singularity analysis, we need to order the roots of \mathcal{C} in a way that will reflect their contribution to the asymptotic behavior of f_n . For this, we recall that the falling factorial $(n)_j$ is defined by

$$(n)_j = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } j = 0, \\ n(n-1) \cdots (n-j+1) & \text{if } j \geq 1. \end{cases}$$

For any nonnegative integer j we then have

$$\frac{1}{(1-z)^j} = \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{(n+j-1)_{j-1}}{(j-1)!} z^n.$$

In particular, since $(n + j - 1)_{j-1} \sim n^{j-1}$ as n tends to infinity,

$$[z^n] \frac{1}{(1 - z/\rho)^j} \sim \frac{n^{j-1}}{\rho^n (j-1)!}$$

as n tends to infinity.

Since \mathcal{C} does not vanish at the origin, (6.2.1) allows us to assume that $\mathcal{C}(0) = 1$, which we do from now on. We then write the decomposition of $1/\mathcal{C}(z)$ into partial fractions, namely, for some complex numbers $\lambda_{i,j}$,

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{C}(z)} = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq \mu_i} \frac{\lambda_{i,j}}{(1 - z/\rho_i)^j},$$

so that

$$f(z) = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq \mu_i} \lambda_{i,j} \frac{U(z)}{(1 - z/\rho_i)^j}. \quad (6.2.3)$$

The principle of singularity analysis (see Flajolet and Sedgewick, 2009, Chapter IV or even Theorems IV.9 and IV.10) is that starting with (6.2.3), the Cauchy formula implies that as long as U is analytic in a neighborhood of a root ρ_i , a term $U(z)/(1 - z/\rho_i)^j$ contributes to the asymptotic behavior of f_n by

$$U(\rho_i)[z^n] \frac{1}{(1 - z/\rho_i)^j} \sim U(\rho_i) \frac{n^{j-1}}{\rho_i^n (j-1)!} \quad (6.2.4)$$

as n tends to infinity. To retain only the leading contribution and encode the importance of a term $1/(1 - z/\rho)^j$ in the asymptotic behavior of f_n , we consider the following equivalence relation on pairs (ρ, j) by

$$(\rho, j) \bowtie (\sigma, k) \text{ if } |\rho| = |\sigma| \text{ and } j = k.$$

On the quotient set we define a total ordering by

$$(\rho, j) \triangleleft (\sigma, k) \text{ if } \left[\begin{array}{l} |\rho| < |\sigma|, \\ \text{or} \\ |\rho| = |\sigma| \text{ and } j > k, \end{array} \right.$$

where the straight bracket indicates an ‘or’.

For instance, figure 6.2.1 shows some roots ρ in the complex plane with their multiplicities μ , that is, some pairs (ρ_i, μ_i) . The equivalence classes are

$$\{(\rho_1, 3), (\rho_2, 3)\} \triangleleft \{(\rho_3, 1)\} \triangleleft \{(\rho_4, 1)\} \triangleleft \{(\rho_6, 2)\} \triangleleft \{(\rho_7, 1)\}.$$

The ordering of the equivalence classes of roots represents the ordering by the asymptotic behavior of the right hand side of (6.2.4) when $j = \mu_i$ and ρ_i varies among the roots.

Assume that the roots and their multiplicities are labeled so that

$$\{(\rho_i, \mu_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq p\}$$




figure 6.2.1

is the smallest equivalence class.

Then all the μ_i , $1 \leq i \leq p$, are equal and all the $|\rho_i|$, $1 \leq i \leq p$, are equal as well. Theorem IV.10 in Flajolet and Sedgewick (2009) implies that if $\mathcal{C}f = U$ then

$$\begin{aligned} [z^n]f &\sim \sum_{1 \leq i \leq p} \lambda_{i, \mu_1} U(\rho_i) \frac{n^{\mu_1 - 1}}{\rho_i^n (\mu_1 - 1)!} \\ &\sim \frac{n^{\mu_1 - 1}}{|\rho_1|^n (\mu_1 - 1)!} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq p} \lambda_{i, \mu_1} U(\rho_i) \left(\frac{|\rho_i|}{\rho_i}\right)^n. \end{aligned} \quad (6.2.5)$$

Note that

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq p} \lambda_{i, \mu_1} U(\rho_i) \left(\frac{|\rho_i|}{\rho_i}\right)^n, \quad n \geq 0 \quad (6.2.6)$$

is a bounded sequence. The asymptotic equivalent for f_n in (6.2.5) is not sharp if and only if (6.2.6) converges to 0 as n tends to infinity.

Before seeing the implication of such a convergence to 0, let us first consider what it means that a root ρ_i of U , $1 \leq i \leq p$, does not contribute to the asymptotic behavior of f_n . Given how the λ_{i, μ_i} are defined, none can be 0. Thus for ρ_i to bring no contribution in (6.2.6), Lemma 6.2.1 with ζ_i being $|\rho_i|/\rho_i$ asserts that we must have $U(\rho_i) = 0$. The vanishing of all the $U(\rho_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq p$, implies that $U(z)$ is a multiple of each $(1 - z/\rho_i)$, $1 \leq i \leq p$.

Assume that $U(\rho_i) = 0$, $1 \leq i \leq p$, so that no ρ_i brings any contribution in (6.2.6). Set $v_i(z) = U(z)/(1 - z/\rho_i)$. Since $U(\rho_i) = 0$, the function v_i can be defined at ρ_i by

$$v_i(\rho_i) = \lim_{z \rightarrow \rho_i} -\rho_i \frac{U(z) - U(\rho_i)}{z - \rho_i} = -\rho_i U'(\rho_i).$$

Identity (6.2.3) may be rewritten as

$$f(z) = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq p} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq \mu_i} \lambda_{i,j} \frac{v_i(z)}{(1 - z/\rho_i)^{j-1}} + \sum_{p+1 \leq i \leq k} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq \mu_i} \lambda_{i,j} \frac{U(z)}{(1 - z/\rho_i)^j}.$$

The right hand side has now singularities corresponding to the points $(\rho_i, \mu_i - 1)$, $1 \leq i \leq p$, and (ρ_i, μ_i) with $p + 1 \leq i \leq k$.

This is of the same form as (6.2.3), and the similar arguments apply.

We see that for each root ρ with multiplicity μ , the vanishing of $U(\rho_i), U'(\rho_i), \dots, U^{(\mu_i-1)}(\rho_i)$ indicates that the terms $1/(1 - z/\rho_i)^j$, $1 \leq j \leq \mu_i$, do not contribute to the asymptotic behavior of f_n .

There are exactly

$$\mu_1 + \dots + \mu_k = \deg \mathcal{C}$$

such vanishing conditions. We will elaborate on this idea in Chapter 11 when we study nongeneric asymptotics of linear equations, each condition characterizing the image of a specific subspace of power series for the operator associated to the equation.

Example. Given a complex number λ , consider the equation

$$(1 - z)f(z) = (1 - \lambda z)f(qz)$$

with $|q|$ less than 1. The solution is determined up to a multiplicative constant, and is unique once we decide that $f(0) = 1$. From the previous discussion or directly from the identity

$$f(z) = \frac{1 - \lambda z}{1 - z} f(qz)$$

we conclude that $f_n \sim (1 - \lambda)f(q)$ as n tends to infinity, and therefore

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n = (1 - \lambda)f(q). \quad (6.2.7)$$

Thus, we determined the asymptotic behavior of f_n , but up to the unknown multiplicative factor $f(q)$.

In this example, it is known (Andrews, Askey, Roy, 1999, proof of Theorem 10.2.1) that

$$f(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{(\lambda, q)_n}{(q, q)_n} z^n, \quad (6.2.8)$$

so that in fact $f_n = (\lambda, q)_n / (q, q)_n$ and therefore

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n = \frac{(\lambda, q)_\infty}{(q, q)_\infty} \quad (6.2.9)$$

as n tends to infinity.

Comparing (6.2.7) and (6.2.9) and using expression (6.2.8) to express $f(q)$, we obtain

$$(1 - \lambda) \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{(\lambda, q)_n}{(q, q)_n} q^n = \frac{(\lambda, q)_\infty}{(q, q)_\infty}.$$

Consequently, we have

$$\sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{(\lambda, q)_n}{(q, q)_n} q^n = \frac{(\lambda q, q)_\infty}{(q, q)_\infty}.$$

This identity is a special case of the q -binomial theorem. ■

3. Asymptotic behavior of f_n . In order to understand the nature of the result we can achieve, let us first consider a simple example.

Example. Consider the q -Catalan equation $f(z) = 1 + zf(z)f(qz)$. We assume that $|q| < 1$ so that (6.1) holds. Theorem 6.1.1 implies that the solution is analytic in a neighborhood of the origin. We may rewrite the equation as

$$f(z) = \frac{1}{1 - zf(qz)}. \quad (6.3.1)$$

If there exists a ζ of minimal modulus such that $\zeta f(q\zeta) = 1$, then identity (6.3.1) shows that f has a singularity at ζ . To prove that ζ exists, we rewrite the q -Catalan equation as

$$f(z)(1 - zf(qz)) = 1 \quad (6.3.2)$$

Assume that ζ does not exist. Then $1 - zf(qz)$ never vanishes and (6.3.2) implies that f is in fact entire. Identity (6.3.1) implies that $f(z)$ does not take the value 0 on any open set not containing 0. Then (6.3.1) shows that f cannot take the value 1 as well. This contradicts the great Picard Theorem (see for instance Berenstein, Gray, 1991); therefore, ζ exists.

We rewrite the q -Catalan equation as

$$1 = (1 - zf(qz))f(z) = (\zeta f(q\zeta) - zf(qz))f(z).$$

Since f is analytic at $q\zeta$, we have

$$\zeta f(q\zeta) - zf(qz) = (\zeta - z)(f(q\zeta) + q\zeta f'(q\zeta)) + O(\zeta - z)^2.$$

Consequently, provided $f(q\zeta) + q\zeta f'(q\zeta)$ does not vanish, the function $(\zeta - z)f(z)$ can be extended analytically in a neighborhood of ζ and its value at ζ is $1/(f(q\zeta) + q\zeta f'(q\zeta))$. If this function can be extended analytically on a disk of radius greater than $|\zeta|$, Theorem IV.10 (or Corollary VI.1 and arguing as in their Example VI.2) in Flajolet and Sedgewick (2009) yields

$$\begin{aligned} [z^n]f &\sim \frac{1}{f(q\zeta) + q\zeta f'(q\zeta)} [z^n] \frac{1}{\zeta - z} \\ &\sim \frac{1}{\zeta^{n+1}(f(q\zeta) + q\zeta f'(q\zeta))} \end{aligned} \quad (6.3.3)$$

as n tends to infinity.

To show that $g(z) = (\zeta - z)f(z)$ is analytic on a larger disk than f , we substitute in the q -Catalan equation, obtaining

$$g(z)(\zeta - qz - zg(qz)) = (\zeta - z)(\zeta - qz). \quad (6.3.4)$$

This is a new q -algebraic equation of the form $Qg = 0$ with

$$Q(z; Y_0, Y_1) = \zeta Y_0 - qzY_0 - zY_0Y_1 - \zeta^2 + z\zeta(1 + q) - qz^2.$$

This equation is still in solved form with a unique nonshifting q -factor, $Y_0 = (0; 0)$ and its shifting q -factors are $zY_0 = (1; 0)$ and $zY_0Y_1 = (1; 0, 1)$. Therefore, we have $0 = \underline{\alpha}(Q_0) = \underline{\alpha}(Q_+)$ and by Theorem 6.1.1, the solution g is analytic in a neighborhood of 0,

as it must be. Identity (6.3.4) ensures that g is analytic as long as $\zeta - qz - zg(qz)$ does not vanish. But

$$\zeta - qz - zg(qz) = (\zeta - qz)(1 - zf(qz)).$$

Thus, this term vanishes when $z = \zeta$ and $z = \zeta/q$. However, the right hand side of (6.3.4) also vanishes when $z = \zeta$. We rewrite (6.3.4) as

$$g(z) \frac{1 - zf(qz)}{\zeta - z} = 1.$$

The function $(1 - zf(qz))/(\zeta - z)$ has a removable singularity at ζ and its value at ζ is $f(q\zeta) + q\zeta f'(q\zeta)$. If this value is not 0, the function g has no singularity in a neighborhood of ζ and therefore is analytic on a larger disk than f .

The limitation of this result is that ζ is not explicit and is defined in terms of the unknown f , and that it assumes that ζ is unique and that it also assumes that $f(q\zeta) + q\zeta f'(q\zeta) \neq 0$, which may or may not be the case. We do not know how to overcome this difficulty. However, if q is real and in the interval $(0, 1)$, then the q -Catalan recursion

$$f_n = \mathbb{1}\{n = 0\} + \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n-1} q^i f_i f_{n-1-i},$$

obtained by applying $[z^n]$ to the q -Catalan equation, shows that f has positive coefficients. This implies that ζ is unique, positive, and that $f(q\zeta) + q\zeta f'(q\zeta)$ does not vanish, establishing (6.3.3) in this context.

If q is given, knowing (6.3.3) allows one to calculate an approximated equivalent of f_n as follows. One may calculate an approximation of f by computing the first f_n , and then evaluate ζ . One may also calculate some f_n , plot the points $(n, \log f_n)$, and fit a straight line on a range where n is large enough. The slope of the line is then an approximation of $\log \zeta$ while the intercept is an approximation of $-\log(f(q\zeta) + q\zeta f'(q\zeta))$. This approach will be illustrated in chapter 13. ■

The general principle underlying our example is known, and while it leads to an algorithm for determining the asymptotic behavior of f_n on concrete equations when q is specified, it seems difficult to state a useful theorem. Therefore, we will follow the presentation in section

VII.7.1 and VII.7.2 of Flajolet and Sedgewick (2009), adapting it to our specific problem.

Starting with the polynomial $P(z; Y)$ and assuming that the equation $P(z, Y)f = 0$ has a power series solution, we rewrite $P(z, Y)$ as a polynomial in Y_0 as follows. Let \widehat{Y}_0 be (Y_1, Y_2, \dots) . We write $P(z; Y)$ as

$$P(z; Y) = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq m} P_i(z; \widehat{Y}_0) Y_0^i.$$

Let f be the power series solution of $Pf = 0$ and set $c_i(z) = P_i(z; \widehat{Y}_0)f(z)$. The identity $Pf = 0$ implies

$$\sum_{0 \leq i \leq m} P_i(z; \widehat{Y}_0)f(z)Y_0^i f(z) = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq m} c_i(z)f(z)^i = 0.$$

Therefore, f solves an algebraic equation

$$\sum_{0 \leq i \leq m} c_i(z)g(z)^i = 0 \tag{6.3.5}$$

with unknown g . Note that each $c_i(z)$ involves only $f(q^j z)$ with $j \geq 1$. If f is analytic in a disk of radius ρ , as for instance under the conditions of Theorem 6.1.1, each c_i is analytic in a larger disk of radius at least $\rho/|q|$. Thus, we may think of f as a solution of an algebraic equation with analytic coefficients. Equation (6.3.5) has m solutions counted with multiplicity, at least one coinciding with f . This leads to the following result which restricts the type of singularity an analytic solution may have.

Proposition 6.3.1. *Let $P(z; Y)f$ be a polynomial q -algebraic equation with $|q| < 1$, whose solution f is analytic with a finite radius of convergence. Then the singularities of f on the boundary of its disk of convergence are either poles, ramifications, or ramified poles, and there is a finite number of them.*

Proof. Let ρ be the radius of convergence of f . Equation (6.3.5) has coefficients which are analytic on the larger disk

$$D_{\rho/|q|} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < \rho/|q|\}.$$

Therefore (6.3.5) defines an analytic curve C in the set $X = D_{\rho/|q|} \times \mathbb{P}_C^1$. The graph of f on $D_{\rho/|q|}$,

$$\{ (z, f(z)) : z \in D_{\rho/|q|} \}$$

is contained in an irreducible component \overline{C} of the analytic curve C . Let $\pi : X \rightarrow D_{\rho/|q|}$ be the projection on the first coordinate. By the Puiseux theorem, the restriction of π to \overline{C} defines a finite ramified covering of $D_{\rho/|q|}$, so that any non-removable singularity of f can only be a pole or a ramification or a ramified pole.

As we mentioned, C is an analytic curve. Moreover, the restriction of π to C is an analytic map from C onto the large disk $D_{\rho/|q|}$ with compact fibers. The singular values of an analytic map between curves are discrete and ∂D_ρ being compact, there can be only a finite number of them. ■

In particular, under the conditions of Proposition 6.3.1, the singularities of an analytic solution are never essential.

To further study the behavior of an analytic solution near its singularities, we consider the discriminant of equation (6.3.5) viewed as an algebraic equation in g , that is, the $(2m - 1) \times (2m - 1)$ determinant

$$R(z) = \det \begin{pmatrix} c_0 & & & c_1 & & & \\ c_1 & c_0 & 0 & 2c_2 & c_1 & 0 & \\ \vdots & & \ddots & \vdots & & \ddots & \\ c_{m-2} & & & c_0 & & & c_1 \\ c_{m-1} & & & mc_m & & & \\ c_m & & & \vdots & mc_m & & \vdots \\ & \ddots & & & & \ddots & \\ \underbrace{0 \quad \quad \quad c_m}_{m-1} & & & \underbrace{0 \quad \quad \quad mc_m}_m & & & \end{pmatrix}.$$

The exceptional set of the equation is

$$\Theta(P) = \{ z : R(z) = 0 \}.$$

Lemma VII.4 in Flajolet and Sedgewick (2009) shows that any solution $g(z)$ of equation (6.3.5) can be analytically continued along any path starting at the origin which does not meet any point of the exceptional set $\Theta(P)$. Consequently, the exceptional set must contain a point on the boundary of the disk of convergence of f .

Example. (i) Consider the q -Catalan equation, which in the form (6.3.5) corresponds to the polynomial $1 + (zf(qz) - 1)Y_0$. The discriminant of this polynomial is $zf(qz) - 1$. The exceptional set is

$$\Theta(P) = \{z : zf(qz) = 1\}.$$

(ii) Consider the equation

$$f(z) = 1 + zf^2(z)f(qz).$$

We rewrite it as a polynomial in Y_0 as

$$1 - Y_0 + zf(qz)Y_0^2 = 0.$$

The discriminant is

$$R(z) = \det \begin{vmatrix} zf(qz) & 2zf(qz) & 0 \\ -1 & -1 & 2zf(qz) \\ 1 & 0 & -1 \end{vmatrix} = zf(qz)(4zf(qz) - 1).$$

The exceptional set is

$$\Theta(P) = \{z : zf(qz) = 0\} \cup \{z : 4zf(qz) = 1\}. \quad \blacksquare$$

Set

$$Q(z, Y_0) = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq m} P_i(z, \hat{Y}_0) f(z) Y_0^i$$

so that f solves $Q(z, f(z)) = 0$. For each z , the power series f is then the solution of the algebraic equation $Q(z, y) = 0$. Since the discriminant $R(z)$ involves only $f(q^j z)$ with $j \geq 1$ and not $f(z)$ and since (6.1) holds, the discriminant is analytic on a disk of radius $\rho/|q|$. If $\Theta(P)$ has a cluster point in the interior of that disk, then the discriminant being analytic, it vanishes on the whole disk. However, if the discriminant of a polynomial vanishes, then

one root has multiplicity at least 2. This root may or may not be the solution $f(z)$. If it is, then f solves the equation of lower degree

$$\frac{\partial Q}{\partial Y_0}(z; Y_0)f(z) = 0;$$

if it is not, then we can only say that there exists a polynomial $\overline{Q}(z, y)$ of lower degree in y than $Q(z, y)$ such that $\overline{Q}(z, f(z)) = 0$.

Assume now that $\Theta(P)$ has no cluster point. If ζ is a singularity of f in $\Theta(P)$, we set $h(z) = f(\zeta - z)$ so that h has a singularity at 0. Given (6.3.5), the function h satisfies

$$\sum_{0 \leq i \leq m} c_i(\zeta - z)h(z)^i = 0. \quad (6.3.6)$$

Since this is an algebraic equation whose coefficients are analytic in a neighborhood of the origin, any solution h is a Puiseux series. Write γ_i for the order in z of $c_i(\zeta - z)$. We draw the Newton-Puiseux polygon associated to the cloud of points (γ_i, i) , $0 \leq i \leq m$, as for instance in figure 6.3.1.




figure 6.3.1

If the order of h is η , that is $h(z) = h_0z^\eta + o(z^\eta)$ with h_0 not vanishing, then the terms of lowest order in the left hand side of (6.3.6) have order $\nu = \min_{0 \leq i \leq m} \gamma_i + i\eta$. Therefore, η must be such that the equality $\gamma_j + j\eta = \nu$ holds for at least two values of j in $0, \dots, m$. In other words, η is the largest co-slope of the supporting line of the Newton-Puiseux polygon of the points (γ_i, i) .

If η is negative, then h has a branch pole, while if η is positive, h may have a branch.

In any case, we have $f(z) \sim h_0(\zeta - z)^\eta$. This contributes to the asymptotic of f_n by a term $cn^{\eta-1}\zeta^{-n}$.

In both cases we need to check that the choice of the solution h in (6.3.6) coincides with f in a neighborhood of 0. Moreover, if f has several singularities of the same modulus, all need to be considered in order to determine the ones that dominate in the asymptotic behavior of f_n . In general we do not know how to make this process of analyzing singularities more explicit. In particular, identifying the singularities of f seems to be a very difficult problem. In Chapter

13 we will study some examples which provide some ideas on the type of result that one can expect to be able to achieve on particular equations.

4. Transforming linear equations. In this section, we show how to transform a linear equation with a possibly divergent solution into one of the form (6.2.1) with an analytic solution. The technique and result will be generalized to the nonlinear setting in Chapter 8, but the simplicity of the linear case makes it worth explaining here.

Consider a linear q -operator P , necessarily in solved form, with $0 = \bar{\alpha}(P_0) < \bar{\alpha}(P_+)$ and assume that $|q| > 1$. Assume also that the uniqueness condition holds. As in Chapter 5, it will be convenient to write H_P for the height $H(P)$ and h_P for the co-height $h(P)$. For simplicity, assume that P has finite support.

Given a power series θ , consider the equation $Pf = \theta$. Apply $[z^n]$ to the identity $Pf = \theta$ to obtain the basic recursion

$$\sum_{A \in P} P_A q^{\alpha(n-a)} f_{n-a} = \theta_n. \quad (6.4.1)$$

Set $f_n = q^{H_P n(n-h_P)/2} g_n$ so that $g(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} g_n z^n$ is the q -Borel transform of order H_P of f at $z/q^{H_P h_P/2}$. Substituting in (6.4.1) and multiplying by $q^{-H_P n(n-h_P)/2}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{A \in P} P_A q^{\alpha(n-a) + H_P(n-a)(n-a-h_P)/2 - H_P n(n-h_P)/2} g_{n-a} \\ = q^{-H_P n(n-h_P)/2} \theta_n. \end{aligned}$$

Simplifying the exponent of q , we have

$$\sum_{A \in P} P_A q^{-H_P a(a-h_P)/2} q^{-(aH_P - \alpha)(n-a)} g_{n-a} = q^{-H_P n(n-h_P)/2} \theta_n.$$

Multiplying by z^n and summing over n yields

$$\sum_{A \in P} P_A q^{-H_P a(a-h_P)/2} z^a g\left(\frac{z}{q^{aH_P - \alpha}}\right) = \mathcal{B}_{q, H_P} \theta\left(\frac{z}{q^{H_P h_P/2}}\right). \quad (6.4.2)$$

This is a $1/q$ -algebraic equation with unknown function g , associated to the $1/q$ -operator

$$\sum_{A \in P} P_A q^{-H_P a(a-h_P)/2} (a; aH_P - \alpha)_{1/q} - \mathcal{B}_{q, H_P} \theta\left(\frac{z}{q^{H_P h_P/2}}\right).$$

This new equation satisfies condition (6.1), with q in (6.1) being $1/q$ here. Thus, applying Theorem 6.1.1 to this new equation, g is analytic in a neighborhood of 0.

In (6.4.2), all the exponents $aH_P - \alpha$ of $1/q$ in the argument of g , are nonnegative. We isolate the exponents which are 0, defining the q -operator

$$\widehat{P} = \sum_{\substack{A \in P \\ aH_P = \alpha}} P_A q^{-H_P a(a-h_P)/2} (a; 0)_q.$$

Introducing the polynomial

$$\mathcal{C}(z) = \sum_{\substack{A \in P \\ aH(P) = \alpha}} P_A q^{-H_P a(a-h_P)/2} z^a,$$

we see that $\widehat{P}g(z) = \mathcal{C}(z)g(z)$. Since $0 = \bar{\alpha}(P_0)$, we have $\mathcal{C}(0) = P_{(0;0)} \neq 0$. In particular, the roots of \mathcal{C} are not 0. Setting

$$U(z) = \mathcal{B}_{q, H_P} \theta\left(\frac{z}{q^{H_P h_P/2}}\right) - \sum_{A \in P \setminus \widehat{P}} P_A q^{-H_P a(a-h_P)/2} z^a g\left(\frac{z}{q^{aH_P - \alpha}}\right), \quad (6.4.3)$$

the power series g satisfies the equation

$$\mathcal{C}(z)g(z) = U(z). \quad (6.4.4)$$

Since the exponents of $1/q$ in (6.4.3) are all positive, since $|q|$ is greater than 1, and since P has finite support, the function U is guaranteed to have a radius of convergence greater than that of g .

We can then apply the singularity analysis described in section 6.2. In particular, if \mathcal{C} has a unique root ρ of smallest modulus and multiplicity μ , then $g_n \sim U(\rho)n^{\mu-1}/\rho^n$ as n tends to infinity. Given the relation between f and g , we deduce that

$$f_n \sim U(\rho) \frac{n^{\mu-1}}{\rho^n} q^{H_P n(n-h_P)/2}$$

as n tends to infinity. This provides the asymptotic behavior of f_n , though the constant $U(\rho)$ is not explicit. As before, if $U(\rho) = 0$, this asymptotic is not sharp and asserts only that

$$f_n = o\left(\frac{n^{\mu-1}}{\rho^n} q^{H_P n(n-h_P)/2}\right)$$

as n tends to infinity.

In Chapter 8 we will do the same analysis for nonlinear equations. As we have seen in section 6.2, it is possible that the function U vanishes at all the roots of \mathcal{C} , in which case, the root peeling algorithm fails to yield the asymptotic behavior of the coefficients of the solution, but only provides that the solution is entire. For linear equations, we will determine the asymptotic behavior of the coefficients of the solution in Chapter 11 in the nongeneric cases.

7. Entire solutions

In this chapter, we consider a q -algebraic equation in solved form, satisfying the uniqueness condition, and such that

$$0 = \underline{\alpha}(P_0) < \underline{\alpha}(P_+) \quad \text{and} \quad |q| < 1. \quad (7.1)$$

Using Lemma 4.3.6, this is equivalent to

$$\bar{\alpha}(P_+) < \bar{\alpha}(P_0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad |q| > 1.$$

Our goal is to show that the power series solution converges on the disk where $P_{\sqcup}(z)$ does and to give an estimate on the coefficients of the solution. When studying the generic order in Chapter 5, we saw that linear and nonlinear equations have a different behavior. We will find the same distinction when studying the asymptotic behavior of the coefficients of the power series solution.

1. A general result. Let P be a q -operator of finite length, in solved form, and satisfying the uniqueness condition. If (7.1) holds, so do the assumptions of Theorem 6.1.1, and, therefore, the solution of $Pf = 0$ is analytic. In this section we show that (7.1) implies that the solution of the equation has radius of convergence at least that of $\sum_{A \in P} P_A z^a$. In particular, if the support of P is finite, or more generally if $P(z; Y_0, \dots, Y_n)$ is a polynomial in Y_0, \dots, Y_n with entire coefficients, the solution is an entire series. With further assumptions, we will obtain more precise information on the coefficients of the solution in the next section.

We first settle the case $q = 0$. In this case, the equation is

$$P_{(0;0)}f(z) + \sum_{\substack{A \in P \\ A \neq (0;0)}} P_A z^a f(0)^\ell = 0.$$

This allows us to calculate explicitly $f(z)$, the constant term solving the algebraic equation

$$\sum_{A \in P_0} P_A f(0)^\ell + P_{\sqcup}(0) = 0.$$

Thus, from now on, we may assume that $|q|$ is positive, and less than 1 under (7.1).

Theorem 7.1.1. *Let $Pf = 0$ be a q -algebraic equation of finite length, in solved form, and satisfying the uniqueness condition. Assume that (7.1) holds and $q \neq 0$. The radius of convergence of f is at least that of $\sum_{A \in P} P_A z^a$.*

If P is a polynomial in z, Y_0, \dots, Y_n , its support as q -operator is finite, and $P(z)$ is entire. Theorem 7.1.1 implies that the solution of $Pf = 0$ is an entire function.

Proof. Let R be the radius of convergence of f . Since (7.1) implies (6.1), Theorem 6.1.1 implies that R is positive. For any nonnegative real number x , set

$$f^*(x) = \sup\{|f(z)| : |z| \leq x\}.$$

The function f^* is well defined for any $0 \leq x < R$. We rewrite the equation $Pf = 0$ as

$$\begin{aligned} P_{(0;0)}f(z) &= - \sum_{\substack{A \in P \\ A \neq (0;0)}} P_A A f(z) \\ &= - \sum_{\substack{A \in P_0 + P_+ \\ A \neq (0;0)}} P_A z^a \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} f(q^{\alpha_i} z) + P_{\cup}(z). \end{aligned} \quad (7.1.1)$$

Let x be a positive real number less than R and let z be a complex number of modulus at most x . If A is in $P_0 + P_+$ and $A \neq (0;0)$, then (7.1) and P being in solved form imply $\alpha_1 \geq 1$. Thus, for such A we have

$$\left| \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} f(q^{\alpha_i} z) \right| \leq f^*(|q|x)^\ell.$$

Consequently, (7.1.1) yields

$$|P_{(0;0)}f(z)| \leq \sum_{\substack{A \in P \\ A \neq (0;0)}} |P_A| r^a f^*(|q|x)^\ell.$$

Taking the supremum of the left hand side of this inequality over $|z| \leq x$ we obtain

$$|P_{(0;0)}f^*(x) \leq \sum_{\substack{A \in P \\ A \neq (0;0)}} |P_A| x^a \max_{0 \leq \ell \leq \ell(P)} f^*(|q|x)^\ell.$$

Since f^* is well defined for $x < R$, the above inequality implies that f^* remains finite as long as $\sum_{A \in P} |P_A| x^a$ is. But this last series is finite whenever x is less than the radius of convergence of $\sum_{A \in P} P_A z^a$. ■

2. Linear equations. Paralleling the results of section 5.2, we consider a linear equation in solved form, such that (7.1) holds. The elevation of a q -factor $E(A) = \alpha_1/a$ and of a q -operator, $E(P) = \inf_{A \in P_+} E(A)$ have been introduced in Definition 5.2.2. Isolating the q -factors of minimal elevation, we introduce the following definition.

Definition 7.2.1. *Let P be a q -operator in solved form and assume that (7.1) holds.*

(i) *The edge of P is the q -operator*

$$P^\dagger = \sum_{\substack{A \in P \\ \alpha_1 = E(P)a}} P_A A.$$

(ii) *The edge series associated to P is*

$$\mathcal{E}_{P,q}(z) = \sum_{A \in P^\dagger} P_A q^{-E(P)a^2/2} z^a.$$

If P^\dagger has a finite support, we call $\mathcal{E}_{P,q}$ the edge polynomial.

(iii) *The edge q -Borel transform of a power series f is*

$$\mathcal{B}_{P,q}^\dagger f(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} q^{-E(P)n^2/2} f_n z^n.$$

Let P be a q -operator satisfying the assumptions of Definition 7.2.1. It is in solved form, hence any q -factor $A = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$ in P has a nonnegative integer a , and α_1 is also nonnegative. Given how the elevation of P is defined, this implies $\alpha_1 \geq aE(P)$ for any q -factor A of positive length in P . This inequality is an equality for all the q -factors in P^\dagger . Since P is in solved form, P_0 is linear, containing then only q -factor of the forme $(a; \alpha_1)$, and since (7.1) holds, one of these factors is $(0; 0)$. Clearly $(0; 0)$ is in P^\dagger , showing that the edge always contains $(0; 0)$ and does not vanish.

Our next result shows that for linear equations, if $Pf = 0$, then $\mathcal{B}_{P,q}^\dagger f$ has a positive radius of convergence which is at least the smallest modulus of all the zeroes of the edge series.

Theorem 7.2.2. *Let $Pf = 0$ be a linear q -algebraic equation in solved form, with $E(P)$ achieved for some q -factor in P . Assume that (7.1) and the uniqueness condition hold and that $|q| \neq 0$.*

(i) *If P has q -Gevrey order $E(P)$, then f has q -Gevrey order $E(P)$.*

(ii) *If P is of full q -Gevrey order $E(P)$ then there exists an analytic function U and a positive Θ such that the radius of convergence of U is at least $1/|q|^\Theta$ that of $\mathcal{B}_{P,q}^\dagger f$, and $\mathcal{E}_{P,q}\mathcal{B}_{P,q}^\dagger f = U$.*

Theorem 7.2.2.ii and the results of section 6.2 show that if $\mathcal{E}_{P,f}$ has a unique root ζ of smallest modulus and that this root has multiplicity μ , then

$$[z^n]\mathcal{B}_{P,q}^\dagger f \sim c \frac{n^\mu}{\zeta^n}$$

as n tends to infinity. Since $[z^n]\mathcal{B}_{P,q}^\dagger f = q^{-E(P)n^2/2}f_n$, this leads to

$$f_n \sim c q^{E(P)n^2/2} \frac{n^\mu}{\zeta^n}$$

as n tends to infinity. If the root ζ is not unique or has multiplicity greater than 1, then the method of section 6.2 applies and provides the asymptotic behavior of f_n generically, up to a multiplicative constant. We will expand on this theme in the next chapter on divergent solutions, and the discussion in Chapter 8, which seems more relevant to applications, could be carried in the setting of the current chapter.

Example. Consider the function

$$f(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} (-1)^n q^{n(n-1)/2} z^n.$$

It satisfies the equation $zf(qz) = 1 - f(z)$ which is associated to the q -operator

$$P = -1 + (0; 0) + (1; 1).$$

This q -operator has elevation 1 which is achieved for the q -factor (1; 1). The edge polynomial is

$$\mathcal{E}_{P,q}(z) = 1 + q^{-1/2}z.$$

Theorem 7.2.2 asserts that $(1+q^{-1/2}z)\mathcal{B}_{P,q}^\dagger f(z)$ is holomorphic in the disk centered at the origin and of radius $|q|^{-1/2-\Theta}$ for some positive Θ . Therefore, for some complex number c ,

$$[z^n]\mathcal{B}_{P,q}^\dagger f(z) \sim c[z^n]\frac{1}{1+q^{-1/2}z} \sim c(-1)^n q^{n/2}$$

as n tends to infinity. This yields $f_n \sim c(-1)^n q^{n(n-1)/2}$, which is correct up to the multiplicative constant c . ■

Proof of Theorem 7.2.2. We apply the same technique as in section 6.4. Since all the q -factors of P are linear, recursion (4.2.1) takes the form

$$\sum_{A \in P_0} P_A q^{\alpha_1 n} f_n + \sum_{\substack{A \in P_+ \\ a \leq n}} P_A q^{\alpha_1(n-a)} f_{n-a} + P_{(n; \cup)} = 0. \quad (7.2.1)$$

In what follows, we write E_P for $E(P)$. We make the change of sequence $f_n = q^{E_P n^2/2} g_n$, so that

$$g(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} g_n z^n = \mathcal{B}_{P,q}^\dagger f(z).$$

Set $K_n = |q|^{-E_P n^2/2} |P_{(n; \cup)}|$ and $K(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} K_n z^n$. Since

$$\alpha_1(n-a) + \frac{E_P}{2}(n-a)^2 - \frac{E_P}{2}n^2 = \left(\alpha_1 - aE_P\right)(n-a) - \frac{E_P}{2}a^2,$$

we rewrite (7.2.1) as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{A \in P_0} P_A q^{\alpha_1 n} g_n + \sum_{\substack{A \in P_+ \\ a \leq n}} P_A q^{-E_P a^2/2} q^{(\alpha_1 - aE_P)(n-a)} g_{n-a} \\ + q^{-E_P n^2/2} P_{(n; \cup)} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (7.2.2)$$

Proof of (i). We use the technique of the majoring series. Since we assumed that P is of q -Gevrey order $E(P)$, the series $K(z)$ converges in a neighborhood of the origin.

Consider the sequence (h_n) of nonnegative numbers defined by

$$h_n = \sum_{\substack{A \in P_+ \\ a \leq n}} |P_A| |q|^{-E_P a^2/2} h_{n-a} + K_n.$$

Multiplying this identity by z^n and summing over n , the formal power series $h(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} h_n z^n$ satisfies the identity

$$h(z) = \sum_{A \in P_+} |P_A| |q|^{-E_P a^2/2} z^a h(z) + K(z). \quad (7.2.3)$$

Since P has q -Gevrey order $E(P)$, the power series

$$\sum_{A \in P_+} |P_A| |q|^{-E_P a^2/2} z^a$$

has a positive radius of convergence. Consequently, (7.2.3) yields

$$h(z) = \frac{K(z)}{1 - \sum_{A \in P_+} |P_A| |q|^{-E_P a^2/2} z^a}.$$

Since any A in P_+ has $a \geq 1$, the denominator is $1 + O(z)$ as z tends to 0 and the power series h is convergent in a neighborhood of the origin.

Let

$$c = 1 \vee \sup_{n \geq 0} \frac{1}{|\sum_{A \in P_0} P_A q^{\alpha_1 n}|}.$$

We now show that $|g_n| \leq c^{n+1} h_n$ for any nonnegative integer n , an inequality which implies that g has a positive radius of convergence.

Using (7.2.2), we have $|\sum_{A \in P_0} P_A |g_0| = K_0$, while (7.2.3) yields $h_0 = |K_0|$, so that $|g_0| \leq c h_0$. Let n be at least 1 and consider the induction hypothesis that $|g_m| \leq c^{m+1} h_m$ for any m less than n . From (7.2.2) we deduce

$$\left| \sum_{A \in P_0} P_A q^{\alpha_1 n} g_n \right| |g_n| \leq \sum_{\substack{A \in P_+ \\ a \leq n}} |P_A| |q|^{-E_P a^2/2} c^{n-a+1} h_{n-a} + |K_n|.$$

Since c is at least 1, this upper bound is at most

$$c^n \left(\sum_{A \in P_0} |P_A| |q|^{-E_P a^2/2} h_{n-a} + |K_n| \right) = c^n h_n.$$

Thus, $|g_n| \leq c^{n+1} h_n$. This implies that g is a convergent power series, which is the first assertion of Theorem 7.2.2.

Proof of (ii). We will need the following gap on the elevation.

Lemma 7.2.3. $\inf_{A \in P_+ \setminus P^\dagger} (\alpha_1 - aE_P) > 0.$

Proof. Let $B = (b; \beta_1, \dots, \beta_m)$ be in P_+ and such that $E(B) = E(P)$. Assume that $\inf_{A \in P_+ \setminus P^\dagger} (\alpha_1 - aE_P) = 0$. Then we can find a sequence $A_n = (a_n; \alpha_{n,1}, \dots, \alpha_{n,\ell_n})$ in $P_+ \setminus P^\dagger$ such that $u_n = \alpha_{n,1} - a_n E_P$ tends to 0 as n tends to infinity. Since $E_P = \beta_1/b$, we have $bu_n = b\alpha_{n,1} - a_n \beta_1$. The left hand side of this equality tends to 0 as n tends to infinity, while the right hand side is an integer. Therefore, $bu_n = 0$ for any n large enough. This implies $\alpha_{n,1} = a_n E_P$ and contradicts the assumption that A_n is not in the edge of P . ■

Continuing the proof of Theorem 7.2.2, we multiply (7.2.2) by z^n and sum over n to obtain that g satisfies the equation

$$\sum_{A \in P_0} P_A g(q^{\alpha_1} z) + \sum_{A \in P_+} P_A q^{-E_P a^2/2} z^a g(q^{\alpha_1 - aE_P} z) + \mathcal{B}_{P,q}^\dagger P_u(z) = 0. \quad (7.2.4)$$

In particular, setting

$$U(z) = - \sum_{A \in (P_0 + P_+) \setminus P^\dagger} P_A q^{-E_P a^2/2} z^a g(q^{\alpha_1 - aE_P} z) - \mathcal{B}_{P,q}^\dagger P_u(z),$$

identity (7.2.4) asserts that $\mathcal{E}_P(z)g(z) = U(z)$.

Let ρ be the radius of convergence of g . The first assertion of the theorem implies that ρ is positive. Using Lemma 7.2.3, the number

$$\Theta = \inf\{ \alpha_1 - aE_P : A \in (P_0 + P_+) \setminus P^\dagger \}$$

is positive — this number should be read $+\infty$ if $P_0 + P_+ = P^\dagger$. Furthermore, if $|z| < \rho|q|^{-\Theta}$, then

$$\sup\{ |q^{\alpha_1 - aE_P} z| : A \in (P_0 + P_+) \setminus P^\dagger \} < \rho.$$

Therefore, since P has full q -Gevrey order E_P , the power series U converges on the larger disk of radius $\rho|q|^{-\Theta}$. This concludes the proof of Theorem 7.2.2. ■

One may wonder what happens if the q -Gevrey order of P is less than $E(P)$. The following result provides a possible answer. Recall that the q -Borel transform of order s was introduced in Definition 4.5.3.

Theorem 7.2.4. *Let $Pf = 0$ be a linear q -algebraic equation satisfying (7.1) and the uniqueness condition. Assume that P has q -Gevrey order s less than $E(P)$. Let $R_{P,q}$ be the radius of convergence of $\mathcal{B}_{q,s}P$. There exists a positive Θ such that*

$$P_{(0;0)}\mathcal{B}_{q,s}f + f_0\mathcal{B}_{q,s}(P_0 + P_+ - P_{(0;0)}(0;0)) + \mathcal{B}_{q,s}P_{\cup}$$

has radius of convergence at least $R_{P,q}/|q|^{E(P)-s}$.

Note that in Theorem 7.2.4, it is possible for s to be nonpositive. As we will see in the example following its proof, Theorem 7.2.4 may provide surprisingly precise asymptotics on the coefficients of f .

Proof. Set $f_n = q^{sn^2/2}g_n$. Since

$$\alpha_1(n-a) + \frac{s}{2}(n-a)^2 - \frac{s}{2}n^2 = (\alpha_1 - as)(n-a) - \frac{s}{2}a^2,$$

we rewrite (4.2.1) as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{A \in P_0} P_A q^{\alpha_1 n} g_n + \sum_{A \in P_+} P_A q^{-sa^2/2} q^{(\alpha_1 - as)(n-a)} g_{n-a} \\ + q^{-sn^2/2} P_{(n;\cup)} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (7.2.5)$$

Consider the formal power series $h(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} h_n z^n$ defined by

$$h_n = \sum_{A \in P_+} |P_A| |q|^{-sa^2/2} h_{n-a} + |q|^{-sn^2/2} |P_{(n;\cup)}|.$$

Multiplying this identity by z^n and summing over n , the formal power series h satisfies the equation

$$h(z) = \sum_{A \in P_+} |P_A| |q|^{-sa^2/2} z^a h(z) + \sum_{n \geq 0} |q|^{-sn^2/2} |P_{(n;\cup)}| z^n.$$

Therefore,

$$h(z) = \frac{\sum_{n \geq 0} |q|^{-sn^2/2} |P_{(n;\cup)}| z^n}{1 - \sum_{A \in P_+} |P_A| |q|^{-sa^2/2} z^a}.$$

Since P is of q -Gevrey order s , the function h is then well defined in a neighborhood of the origin.

Set

$$c = 1 \vee \sup_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{|\sum_{A \in P_0} P_A q^{\alpha_1 n}|}.$$

This number is well defined because the uniqueness condition holds. Using Lemma 7.2.3, it is easy to see by induction that $|g_n| \leq c^{n+1}h_n$ for any nonnegative n . Consequently, the power series g converges in a neighborhood of the origin.

Multiplying (7.2.5) by z^n and summing over n , the function g obeys the equation

$$\sum_{A \in P_0} P_A g(q^{\alpha_1} z) + \sum_{A \in P_+} P_A q^{-sa^2/2} z^a g(q^{\alpha_1 - as} z) + \mathcal{B}_{q,s} P_{\square}(z) = 0.$$

Therefore,

$$P_{(0;0)} g(z) = - \sum_{\substack{A \in P_0 + P_+ \\ A \neq (0;0)}} P_A q^{-sa^2/2} z^a g(q^{\alpha_1 - as} z) - \mathcal{B}_{q,s} P_{\square}(z). \quad (7.2.6)$$

Set $g(z) = g_0 + zk(z)$. The power series k has the same radius of convergence as g . We rewrite (7.2.6) as

$$\begin{aligned} P_{(0;0)} g(z) + \sum_{\substack{A \in P_0 + P_+ \\ A \neq (0;0)}} P_A q^{-sa^2/2} z^a g_0 + \mathcal{B}_{q,s} P_{\square}(z) \\ = - \sum_{\substack{A \in P_0 + P_+ \\ A \neq (0;0)}} P_A q^{-sa^2/2} z^a (g(q^{\alpha_1 - as} z) - g_0) \\ = -z \sum_{\substack{A \in P_0 + P_+ \\ A \neq (0;0)}} P_A q^{-sa^2/2} q^{\alpha_1 - as} z^a k(q^{\alpha_1 - as} z). \end{aligned} \quad (7.2.7)$$

Since s is less than $E(P)$, Lemma 7.2.3 yields for any $A \in P_+$,

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1 - as &= \alpha_1 - aE(P) + (E(P) - s)a \\ &\geq (E(P) - s)a. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, (7.2.7) is well defined for any z of modulus less than $R_{P,q}/|q|^{E(P)-s}$. \blacksquare

Example. Consider the equation

$$f(z) = 1 + \sum_{k \geq 1} z^k f(q^k z)$$

with $|q| < 1$. This corresponds to the q -operator

$$P = -(0; 0) + 1 + \sum_{k \geq 1} (k; k).$$

The elevation of the q -factor $(k; k)$ is 1, and 1 is the elevation of P . However P is not of q -Gevrey order 1 since $\sum_{k \geq 1} q^{-k^2/2} z^k$ is divergent. Instead, P is of q -Gevrey order 0, and its corresponding q -Borel transform is

$$\mathcal{B}_{q,0}P(z) = \sum_{k \geq 1} z^k = \frac{1}{1-z}.$$

Its radius of convergence is 1. Theorem 7.2.4 asserts that the function

$$-f(z) + f_0 \sum_{k \geq 1} z^k + 1$$

has radius of convergence $1/|q|^\ominus$. Since $f_0 = 1$, this means that the function $f(z) - 1/(1-z)$ is holomorphic on the disk centered at 0 of radius $1/|q|^\ominus$, a radius which is larger than 1. This implies $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} f_n = 1$. \blacksquare

3. Nonlinear equations. For nonlinear equations, a new asymptotic behavior of f_n occurs. However, while it is possible to sharpen Theorem 7.1.1, our result is not as precise as Theorem 7.2.2. Since our equation is in solved form, its nonshifting part is a linear operator. Then, the only possibility for the equation to be nonlinear is that some shifting q -factors are nonlinear, that is $\max_{A \in P_+} \ell \geq 2$. To state our result, we will use the depth and co-depth, introduced in Definition 5.2.5 and 5.2.6. As in Chapter 5, we write \log_+ for $\max(\log, 0)$. Recall that the support of a q -operator is the set of q -factors A for which P_A does not vanish, as indicated in Definition 2.2.12.

Theorem 7.3.1. *Let $Pf = 0$ be a q -algebraic equation in solved form, satisfying the uniqueness condition and (7.1), nonlinear, and such that P has finite support. The power series*

$$\sum_{n \geq 0} q^{-D(P)(n+d(P)) \log_+ n} f_n z^n \tag{7.3.1}$$

has a positive radius of convergence.

As we indicated after Definition 5.2.5, the nonlinearity of P is equivalent to the finiteness of the depth and co-depth, so that the exponents of q in (7.3.1) are finite.

The meaning of Theorem 7.3.1 is that f_n decays at least like $q^{D(P)n \log n + O(n)}$ as n tends to infinity. In particular f has infinite radius of convergence and is an entire function. Thus, Theorem 7.3.1 sharpens the remark following Theorem 7.1.1. This is not as precise as other results that we may obtain as a consequence of the results of Chapter 6. However, Theorem 5.2.7 suggests that it is generically sharp and the following example provides an instance where the radius of convergence of (7.3.1) is finite, showing that, without further assumptions, Theorem 7.3.1 is sharp.

Example. Consider the variant of the q -Catalan equation,

$$f(z) = 1 + zf^2(qz).$$

Applying $[z^n]$, we obtain that the coefficients f_n of f satisfy the recursion

$$f_n = \mathbb{1}\{n = 0\} + q^{n-1} \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n-1} f_i f_{n-1-i}. \quad (7.3.2)$$

By induction, f_n is a polynomial in q with nonnegative integer coefficients. In particular, $[q^{\text{ord}_q f_n}] f_n \geq 1$ and therefore $f_n \geq q^{\text{ord}_q f_n}$. Given (7.3.2), the order of f_n satisfies the recursion $\text{ord}_q f_0 = 0$ and

$$\text{ord}_q f_n = n - 1 + \min_{0 \leq i \leq n-1} (\text{ord}_q f_i + \text{ord}_q f_{n-1-i}).$$

Therefore, this order coincides with the generic order of the equation given in Definition 5.1.1. Theorem 5.2.7 then implies

$$\text{ord}_q f_n = D(P)n \log n + O(n).$$

Therefore,

$$f_n(q) \geq q^{\text{ord}_q f_n} \geq q^{D(P)n \log n + O(n)}.$$

Consequently, the power series $\sum_{n \geq 0} q^{-D(P)n \log n} f_n z^n$ has a finite radius of convergence.

In this example, it is possible to calculate $D(P)$ explicitly. Indeed, the only shifting q -factor is $A = (1; 1, 1)$ and has the corresponding Laplace transform $\mathcal{L}_A(s) = 2e^{-s}$. The equation $\mathcal{L}_A(s) = 1$ has solution $s = \log 2$. Consequently, $D(P) = 1/\log 2$. By Theorem 7.3.1 we have $f_n \sim q^{(1/\log 2)n \log n + O(n)}$. Even for this specific example, we do not know how to obtain a more precise estimate on f_n .

Proof of Theorem 7.3.1. Recall the function Ω_A introduced in (5.2.2), whose definition on tuples (x_1, \dots, x_ℓ) such that $x_1 + \dots + x_\ell = n - a$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_A(x_1, \dots, x_\ell) = & \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \alpha_i x_i + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} D(P)(x_i + d(P)) \log_+ x_i \\ & - D(P)(n + d(P)) \log_+ n. \end{aligned}$$

Let $K(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} K_n z^n$ be the power series defined by $K_n = q^{-D(P)(n+d(P)) \log_+ n} P_{(n; \mathfrak{u})}$. This power series is in fact a polynomial since P has a finite support.

In (4.2.1) we make the change of sequence

$$f_n = q^{D(P)(n+d(P)) \log_+ n} g_n$$

to obtain the recursion

$$\sum_{A \in P_0} P_A q^{\alpha_1 n} g_n + \sum_{A \in P_+} \sum_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a} q^{\Omega_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell)} g_{n_1} \cdots g_{n_\ell} + K_n = 0. \quad (7.3.3)$$

Since P has finite support, Lemmas 5.2.8 and 5.2.11 imply that there exists a positive c such that for any nonnegative integer n and any A in P_+ ,

$$\min_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a} \Omega_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell) \geq -c.$$

Thus, (7.3.3) yields

$$\left| \sum_{A \in P_0} P_A q^{\alpha_1 n} \right| |g_n| \leq \sum_{A \in P_+} |q|^{-c} \sum_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a} |g_{n_1}| \cdots |g_{n_\ell}| + |K_n| \quad (7.3.4).$$

Let $h(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} h_n z^n$ be the power series defined by

$$h_n = \sum_{A \in P_+} |q|^{-c} \sum_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a} h_{n_1} \cdots h_{n_\ell} + |K_n|. \quad (7.3.5)$$

Set $\tilde{K}(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} |K_n| z^n$. Since P has a finite support, \tilde{K} is a polynomial and converges on the whole complex plane. Multiplying both sides of (7.3.5) by z^n and summing over n , we obtain that h_n solves

$$h(z) = \sum_{A \in P_+} |q|^{-c} z^a h(z)^\ell + \tilde{K}(z).$$

By Puiseux's theorem, h has a positive radius of convergence. Let C be a positive real number at least 1, such that $|g_0| \leq Ch_0$. Let $\eta = \min_{n \geq 0} |\sum_{A \in P_0} PAq^{\alpha_1 n}|$. Since P is in solved form and satisfies the uniqueness condition and (7.1), η is a positive real number. Let L be $\max_{A \in P_+} \ell$ and let R be greater than $1 \vee (C^{L-1}/\eta)$. Assume that we proved $|g_i| \leq CR^i h_i$ for any $i < n$; which is the case for $n = 1$. Then (7.3.4) yields

$$\eta |g_n| \leq \sum_{A \in P_+} |q|^{-c} C^\ell R^{n-a} \sum_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n-a} h_{n_1} \cdots h_{n_\ell} + |K_n|.$$

Since C and R are greater than 1 and a is a positive integer for any A in P_+ , we obtain, using (7.3.5),

$$\begin{aligned} \eta |g_n| &\leq C^L R^{n-1} \left(\sum_{A \in P_+} |q|^{-c} \sum_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n-a} h_{n_1} \cdots h_{n_\ell} + |K_n| \right) \\ &\leq C^L R^{n-1} h_n. \end{aligned}$$

Since $R \geq C^{L-1}/\eta$, this gives $|g_n| \leq CR^n h_n$. Since h has a positive radius of convergence, so does $g(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} g_n z^n$. This proves Theorem 7.3.1. \blacksquare

8. Divergent solutions

In this chapter, we consider a q -algebraic equation in solved form, satisfying the uniqueness condition, and such that

$$0 = \bar{\alpha}(P_0) < \bar{\alpha}(P_+) \quad \text{and} \quad |q| > 1. \quad (8.1)$$

Equivalently, using Lemma 4.3.6, this covers equations for which

$$0 = \underline{\alpha}(P_+) < \underline{\alpha}(P_0) \quad \text{and} \quad |q| < 1.$$

Proposition 4.3.1 show that there is no loss of generality in assuming that $\bar{\alpha}(P_0) = 0$. Assumption (8.1) does not preclude some of the α_i from being negative.

Our goal is to show that, generically, the power series solution of the equation is a divergent series and to provide a sharp asymptotic estimate on its n -th coefficient as n tends to infinity.

In Definitions 5.3.1 and 5.3.2, we introduced the height and co-height of a q -operator, and we related them to the generic degree in Theorem 5.3.3. In particular, Theorem 5.3.3 implies that the leading term of $f_n(q)$ should be of degree about $H(P)n(n-h(P))/2$. Under (8.1), q is of modulus greater than 1. This suggests that f_n may grow like $q^{H(P)n(n-h(P))/2}$ times something of smaller magnitude depending on P , and that the q -factors of maximal height of P could play a role in the asymptotic behavior of f_n .

1. Main result. Isolating the q -factors of maximal height in a q -operator, we define a new q -operator as follows.

Definition 8.1.1. *Let P be a q -operator such that (8.1) holds. The crest of P is the q -operator*

$$\hat{P} = \sum_{\substack{A \in P \\ \alpha_\ell = H(P)a}} P_A A.$$

Given how the height and the crest of P are defined, $aH(P) - \alpha_\ell$ is 0 if and only if A is in the crest of P , and, otherwise, $aH(P) - \alpha_\ell$ is positive. The crest \widehat{P} is obtained from P by keeping the shifting q -factors of maximal height together with the nonshifting q -factor for which a and α_ℓ vanishes. Put differently, the crest of P is

$$\widehat{P} = P_{(0;0)}(0;0) + \sum_{\substack{A \in P_+ \\ H(A)=H(P)}} P_A A.$$

Given how the height of a q -operator is defined, it is possible that no q -factor in P has height $H(P)$. For this reason, we will assume without further notice in this chapter that

Assumption 8.1.2. *The height $H(P)$ is achieved for some q -factor A in P .*

Example. Consider the equation

$$f(z) = 2 + 5zf(z)f(qz)^2 + 3z^2f(qz)f(q^2z)^3. \quad (8.1.1)$$

The corresponding q -operator is

$$P = (0;0) - 2(0;\sqcup) - 5(1;0,1,1) - 3(2;1,2,2,2).$$

In this operator, the two q -factors $(1;0,1,1)$ and $(2;1,2,2,2)$ have the largest height, 1. The crest of P is

$$\widehat{P} = (0;0) - 5(1;0,1,1) - 3(2;1,2,2,2). \quad (8.1.2)$$

Equivalently,

$$\widehat{P} = Y_0 - 5zY_0Y_1^2 - 3z^2Y_1Y_2^3.$$

The co-height of the operator is $h(P) = 1$ and is achieved for the q -factor $(1;0,1,1)$. \blacksquare

To relate the crest of P to the asymptotic behavior of the coefficients f_n of the solution, we need a series and a transform which we define now.

Definition 8.1.3. *(i) The scope of a q -factor $A = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$ is the number of maximal α_i ,*

$$s(A) = \#\{i : \alpha_i = \alpha_\ell\}.$$

(ii) If P is a q -operator, its associated crest series is

$$\mathcal{C}_{P,q,t}(z) = \sum_{A \in \widehat{P}} P_{As}(A) q^{-H(P)a(a-h(P))/2} t^{\ell-1} z^a .$$

If the support of \widehat{P} is finite, we call $\mathcal{C}_{P,q,t}(z)$ the crest polynomial.

Though it was not introduced formally, the scope was used in Lemma 5.3.5.

If P has q -Gevrey order $H(P)$, then the crest series is convergent in a neighborhood of the origin. If P has full q -Gevrey order $H(P)$ then the crest series is convergent on the whole complex plane.

Example. The crest polynomial associated to (8.1.1) is

$$\mathcal{C}_{P,q,t}(z) = 1 - 10t^2z - 9q^{-1}t^3z^2 . \quad \blacksquare$$

If A is in the crest of P and is shifting, its height is that of P , so that $H(P)a(a-h(P)) = \alpha_\ell(a-h(P))$ is an integer. Also, ℓ is at least 1. Therefore, $\mathcal{C}_{P,q,t}(z)$ is a series in $(z, q^{-1/2}, t)$, provided we ignore a possible dependence on q in the coefficient P_A .

Finally we introduce a q -Borel transform on power series which is taylored to our specific problem.

Definition 8.1.4. Let P be a q -operator in solved form. The crest q -Borel transform of a formal power series $f(z)$ is the formal power series

$$\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q}f(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} q^{-H(P)n(n-h(P))/2} f_n z^n .$$

In the notation $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q}$, the hat refers to the crest.

We see that the crest series is the crest q -Borel transform of $\sum_{A \in \widehat{P}} P_{As}(A) t^{\ell-1} z^a$.

If the crest is a linear q -operator, then the crest series has the simpler form

$$\mathcal{C}_{P,q,t}(z) = \sum_{A \in \widehat{P}} P_A q^{-H(P)a(a-h(P))/2} z^a .$$

It is the crest q -Borel transform of $\sum_{A \in \widehat{P}} P_A z^a$.

The series $\mathcal{C}_{P,q,t}(z) - P_{(0;0)}$ is in the ideal generated by z . However, it is possible that this series is identically 0 due to some cancellations.

Consequently, a crest series may be constant, in which case it is equal to $P_{(0;0)}$. If this is the case, we consider that it has a root at infinity for the following result to hold without further discussion. Note that $P_{(0;0)}$ cannot vanish under (8.1), since $\bar{\alpha}(P_0) = 0$. Therefore, the crest series cannot be identically equal to 0.

If the crest is linear, no cancellations can occur in the crest series for the following reason: if $A = (a; \alpha_1)$ and $B = (b; \beta_1)$ are in the crest, then $H(P) = \alpha_1/a = \beta_1/b$ and for their contribution to the crest series to cancel, we must have $a = b$, which then forces $\alpha_1 = \beta_1$, and therefore $A = B$. Consequently, if the crest is linear, the crest series cannot be trivial.

The main result of this chapter is the following, and its implications will be discussed afterwards. Its proof is in the next section. We make use of Definitions 2.2.12 and 4.5.5.

Theorem 8.1.5. *Let P be a q -operator of finite length and in solved form, satisfying the uniqueness condition, and such that (8.1) holds. Let f be a power series such that $Pf = 0$, with, as usual, $f_0 = [z^0]f$.*

- (i) *If P has q -Gevrey order $H(P)$ then f has q -Gevrey order $H(P)$.*
- (ii) *Assume that P has full q -Gevrey order $H(P)$ and that $H(P)$ is achieved. Let R_{P,q,f_0} be the smallest modulus of the zeros of the crest series \mathcal{C}_{P,q,f_0} . There exists some positive Θ such that $\mathcal{C}_{P,q,f_0} \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q} f$ is a holomorphic function that has no singularities other than removable ones in the disk centered at 0 and of radius $q^\Theta R_{P,q,f_0}$.*

Our proof shows that Θ in statement (ii) of Theorem 8.1.5 may be taken to be the smallest of $H(P)$, the gap $\sup_{A \in P \setminus \widehat{P}} (Ha - \alpha_\ell)$ and 1.

A careful examination of the proof shows that the power series $(\mathcal{C}_{P,q,f_0} \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q} f)(z)$ is almost a linear combination of tangled products in the sense of Garsia (1981) of q -Borel transforms of f . However, since there is no simple way to calculate this q -Borel transform, such expression does not seem useful to estimate $[z^n]f$.

The strength of Theorem 8.1.5 comes from the singularity analysis and the root peeling algorithm developed in section 6.2. Set

$$U_{P,q,f_0} = \mathcal{C}_{P,q,f_0} \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q} f.$$

Theorem 8.1.5 asserts that U_{P,q,f_0} has no singularity of modulus less than $q^\ominus R_{P,q,f_0}$. Therefore, we can use the singularity analysis described in section 6.2 to evaluate the coefficient

$$q^{-H(P)n(n-h(P))/2} f_n = [z^n] \frac{U_{P,q,f_0}(z)}{C_{P,q,f_0}(z)}. \quad (8.1.3)$$

In particular, this has the following implication.

Corollary 8.1.6. *Assume that the hypotheses for statements (i) and (ii) of Theorem 8.1.5 hold. Assume also that*

$$\{-P_A : A \in P \setminus P_0\} \quad \text{and} \quad \left\{ \sum_{A \in P_0} P_A q^{\alpha_1^n} : n \in \mathbb{N} \right\}$$

are two sets of positive real numbers, that q is a real number greater than 1 and that $\gcd\{a : A \in \hat{P} \setminus P_0\} = 1$. Then

- (i) *all the f_n are nonnegative;*
- (ii) *R_{P,q,f_0} is the unique root of smallest modulus of the crest series C_{P,q,f_0} and has multiplicity 1;*
- (iii) *there exists a positive real number c_{P,q,f_0} such that*

$$f_n \sim c_{P,q,f_0} \frac{q^{H(P)n(n-h(P))/2}}{R_{P,q,f_0}^n}$$

as n tends to infinity.

We will prove Corollary 8.1.6 in the third section of this chapter.

Example. For equation (8.1.1), $f_0 = 2$. The crest polynomial, with $f_0 = 2$, is

$$C_{P,q,2}(z) = 1 - 40z - 72q^{-1}z^2.$$

When q is positive, it has a positive root,

$$\frac{-10 + \sqrt{100 + 18/q}}{36} q.$$

Corollary 8.1.6 implies that there exists a positive real number c_q such that

$$f_n \sim c_q q^{n(n-1)/2} \left(\frac{-10 + \sqrt{100 + 18/q}}{36} q \right)^n.$$

If q is not positive, this asymptotic equivalence may not hold. For instance, if $q = -18/100$, the crest polynomial has a double root, $1/20$. Then, Theorem 8.1.5 and the singularity analysis of section 6.2 imply

$$f_n \sim c_{-18/100} n \left(\frac{200}{3\sqrt{2}} \right)^n \left(\frac{9}{50} \right)^{n^2/2}.$$

Note the multiplicative term n in this expression. However, we have no guarantee that $c_{9/50}$ does not vanish. Numerical calculations strongly suggest that it does not. ■

Recall, from Definition 4.5.3, that since we consider $|q| > 1$, if f has q -Gevrey order s , it also has q -Gevrey order any number greater than s . It is then of interest to find the smallest q -Gevrey order of a divergent power series. Theorem 8.1.5.i gives an upper bound for the smallest q -Gevrey order of the solution of $Pf = 0$. Combined with Corollary 8.1.6, we readily obtain the following consequence.

Corollary 8.1.7. *Under the assumptions of Corollary 8.1.6, $H(P)$ is the smallest q -Gevrey order of the power series solution.*

Proof. It follows from the positivity of c_{P,q,f_0} in Corollary 8.1.6. ■

Remark. Translating an equation as we did in Chapter 3 may change its height and co-height. We will see in Chapter 9 that for Theorem 8.1.5 and Corollary 8.1.7 to deliver a sharp result, we should translate and simplify an equation until its crest is linear. As we will see in that chapter, this has to do with the fact that a crest series may be constant and that the first statement of Theorem 8.1.5 gives only a lower bound on the radius of convergence of $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q}f$. ■

The following corollary to Theorem 8.1.5 covers important applications and shows that some oscillatory behavior may occur and gives a sharp bound on the periodicity.

Corollary 8.1.8. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 8.1.5, if the crest \widehat{P} has a unique shifting element A which has scope 1, then there exist complex numbers c_0, \dots, c_{a-1} such that, as n tends to infinity,*

$$[z^n]f \sim q^{H(P)n(n-h(P))/2} \left(\frac{-PA}{P_{(0;0)}} \right)^{n/h(P)} c_m$$

where m is the remainder in the Euclidean division algorithm of n by a .

In the statement of Corollary 8.1.8, $P_A/P_{(0;0)}$ may not be a positive real number. Thus, to take the fractional power $n/h(P)$ of this number requires one to choose a branch cut in the complex plane. The fractional power is then defined up to some $e^{2i\pi kn/h(P)}$ for some $0 \leq k < h(P)$. Since $h(P) = a$, this indeterminacy may be absorbed in the constants c_m .

As far as the oscillatory behavior of $[z^n]f$ is concerned, Corollary 8.1.8 shows that it may be decomposed into two parts: write $-P_A/P_{(0;0)}$ as $\rho e^{2i\pi\theta}$ with ρ nonnegative and θ in $[0, 1)$. Corollary 8.1.8 asserts that

$$[z^n]f \sim q^{H(P)n(n-h(P))/2} \rho^{n/h(P)} e^{2i\pi\theta n/h(P)} c_m$$

as n tends to infinity. If θ is irrational, the sequence $(e^{2i\pi\theta n/h(P)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is dense in the unit circle, making $[z^n]f$ have seemingly little regularity. If θ is rational, say $\theta = h(P)p'/p$ with p' and p mutually prime positive integers, the sequence $(e^{2i\pi\theta n/h(P)})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ has periodicity p . Thus, the sequence $(e^{2i\pi n\theta/h(P)} c_m)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ has periodicity the least common multiple of p and a . The last example of Chapter 12 will illustrate this phenomenon with $p = 4$ and $a = 17$, leading to a periodicity of 68. However, because $(c_m)_{0 \leq m < a}$ may have a periodicity a divisor of a , it is possible that the sequence $(e^{2i\pi n\theta/h(P)} c_m)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ has a period smaller than that least common multiple of p and a .

Since (8.1) holds, recursion (4.2.1) implies that there exist some polynomials Q_n and R_n with $R_n(0) = P_{(0;0)}$ such that $f_n(q) = Q_n(q)/R_n(1/q)$. Expanding $1/R_n(1/q)$ as a power series in $1/q$, we obtain that $f_n(q)$ is a Laurent series in q which has a term of highest degree equal to the term of highest degree of $Q_n(q)/R_n(0)$. The degree in q of this term is related to the generic degree δ_n of f_n , as defined in Chapter 5. Corollary 8.1.8 shows that this leading term drives the asymptotic behavior of f_n as n tends to infinity. The leading terms will be described more precisely in section 10.1.

Proof of Corollary 8.1.8. Since the crest has a unique shifting element A and (8.1) holds, the height of P is α_ℓ/a and its co-height is a . Since $\bar{\alpha}(P_0) = 0$, the crest contains exactly the elements $(0; 0)$ and A . Since the lemma assumes that the only shifting element in

the crest has scope 1, the crest polynomial does not depend on t , and

$$\mathcal{C}_{P,q,f_0}(z) = P_{(0;0)} + P_A z^a.$$

Write $-P_{(0;0)}/P_A = \rho e^{i\theta}$ with $0 \leq \theta < 2\pi$ and ρ positive. Set $\zeta_k = \rho^{1/a} e^{i(\theta+2k\pi)/a}$, $0 \leq k < a$, so that the ζ_k are the roots of \mathcal{C}_{P,q,f_0} . These roots have modulus $|P_{(0;0)}/P_A|^{1/a}$. By (8.1.3), Theorem 8.1.5 yields

$$[z^n]f = \frac{q^{H(P)n(n-h(P))/2}}{P_{(0;0)}} [z^n] \frac{U_{P,q,f_0}(z)}{\prod_{0 \leq k < a} (1 - z/\zeta_k)}.$$

But

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{\prod_{0 \leq k < a} (1 - z/\zeta_k)} &= \sum_{0 \leq k < a} \frac{1}{1 - z/\zeta_k} \prod_{\substack{0 \leq j < a \\ j \neq k}} \frac{1}{1 - \zeta_k/\zeta_j} \\ &= \sum_{0 \leq k < a} \frac{1}{1 - z/\zeta_k} \prod_{\substack{0 \leq j < a \\ j \neq k}} \frac{1}{1 - e^{2i(k-j)\pi/a}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$[z^n]f \sim \frac{q^{H(P)n(n-h(P))/2}}{P_{(0;0)}} \sum_{0 \leq k < a} \frac{U_{P,q,f_0}(\zeta_k)}{\prod_{\substack{0 \leq j < a \\ j \neq k}} (1 - e^{2i(k-j)\pi/a})} \zeta_k^{-n}.$$

Note that $(\zeta_k/\zeta_0)^{-n}$ depends only on the remainder m in the Euclidean division algorithm of n by a . We then set

$$c_m = \frac{1}{P_{(0;0)}} \sum_{0 \leq k < a} \frac{U_{P,q,f_0}(\zeta_k)}{\prod_{\substack{0 \leq j < a \\ j \neq k}} (1 - e^{2i(k-j)\pi/a})} \left(\frac{\zeta_0}{\zeta_k}\right)^n. \quad \blacksquare$$

Example. Consider the equation

$$f(z) = 1 + zf(z)f(qz) + \iota z^3 f(q^5 z).$$

The associated operator is

$$(0; 0) - (1; 0, 1) - \iota(3; 5) - (0; \sqcup).$$

Its heigh is $5/3$, which is achieved for $(3; 5)$. The crest, $(0; 0) - \iota(3; 5)$ has a unique shifting q -factor. Applying Corollary 8.1.8

$$[z^n]f \sim q^{5n(n-3)/6} \iota^{n/3} c_m$$

as n tends to infinity, where the c_0 , c_1 and c_2 are some constants and m is the remainder of the Euclidean division of n by 3. We may rewrite this asymptotic equivalence as

$$[z^n]f \sim q^{5n(n-3)/6} e^{in\pi/6} c_m,$$

possibly after multiplying the previous c_m by some fixed complex numbers. The sequence c_m has periodicity 3, while $e^{in\pi/6}$ has periodicity 12, so that $q^{-5n(n-3)/6} f_n$ has an asymptotic periodicity of 12. \blacksquare

One may wonder if the conclusions of Theorem 8.1.5 hold under weaker assumptions. We will show in section 8.4 that these assumptions cannot be improved in a fundamental way.

2. Proof of Theorem 8.1.5. In the proof, we write H_P for $H(P)$ and h_P for $h(P)$, as we did in the proof of Theorem 5.3.3. We set

$$g_n = q^{-H_P n(n-h_P)/2} f_n.$$

The power series $g(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} g_n z^n$ is the crest q -Borel transform $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q} f(z)$.

Since we are dealing with power series, it is understood that both f_n and g_n are 0 whenever n is a negative integer.

For a q -factor $A = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$, define, for $n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell) = & - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \alpha_i n_i - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} H_P n_i (n_i - h_P) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} H_P n (n - h_P), \end{aligned}$$

so that (4.2.1) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{A \in P_0} P_A q^{\alpha_1 n} g_n + \sum_{A \in P_+} P_A \sum_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a} q^{-\Delta_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell)} g_{n_1} \cdots g_{n_\ell} \\ + q^{-H_P n(n-h_P)/2} P_{(n; \emptyset)} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (8.2.1)$$

The role of $\Delta_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell)$ is similar to that of $\Omega_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell)$ in our study of the generic order in section 5.2. Since q is of modulus greater than 1, the idea of the proof is inspired by the Laplace method (see e.g. Olver, 1997, for the Laplace method): we want to

isolate in (8.2.1) the contributions for which $\Delta_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell)$ is small; the fact that identity (8.2.1) holds then gives a functional equation for g , relating the contributions with small $\Delta_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell)$ to those with large ones. The contributions with a small $\Delta_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell)$ correspond to the product $\mathcal{C}_{P,q,f_0}g$. If g has a positive radius of convergence, the domain in which the functional equation holds can be extended beyond the disk of convergence of g , yielding in effect an analytic continuation of $\mathcal{C}_{P,q,f_0}g$, from which one can show the result. The proof has then two steps, one consisting in showing that g has a positive radius of convergence, the other one consisting in providing a representation for g through the functional equation that it obeys.

Because the proof relies on isolating the largest terms in (8.2.1) and $|q|$ is greater than 1 under (8.1), we need to understand when $\Delta_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell)$ is small. This function is concave in n_1, \dots, n_ℓ . Its minimum occurs on the boundary of the domain $n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a$ — recall that the n_i are always assumed to be nonnegative. Consequently, differential calculus is not particularly useful to understand these minimums. Instead, we will use arguments similar to those we used in the proof of Lemma 5.3.5. However, since we need rather precise information on Δ_A , we need to make these arguments more explicit. For this, it is convenient to use the sequence

$$v_n = H_P n(n - h_P)/2$$

introduced in section 5.3, so that if $n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a$,

$$\Delta_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell) = v_n - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} v_{n_i} - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \alpha_i n_i.$$

Step 1. Proving that g has a positive radius of convergence. Our first lemma is stated for convenience.

Lemma 8.2.1. *The sequence (v_n) is strictly convex.*

Proof. It is clear that $v_{n+1} - v_n = (2n + 1 - h_P)H_P/2$ is increasing in n . ■

The following definition is stated to set the notation and recall some known terminology (see MacDonal, 1995, §I.1 for raising operators).

Definition 8.2.2. Given two positive integers $i < j$, the following operators act on tuples of length at least j :

- (i) the transposition $\tau_{i,j}$ permutes the i -th and j -th entries;
- (ii) the raising operator $R_{i,j}$ decreases the i -th entry by 1 and increases the j -th entry by 1.

For instance $R_{3,5}(0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) = (0, 1, 1, 3, 5, 5)$. Note that transpositions and raising operators leave invariant the sum of the entries of a tuple.

Lemma 8.2.3. Let $A = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$ be a q -factor and let $1 \leq i < j \leq \ell$ be some integers. Then

$$\Delta_A \circ \tau_{i,j}(n_1, \dots, n_\ell) = \Delta_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell) + (\alpha_j - \alpha_i)(n_j - n_i)$$

and,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_A \circ R_{i,j}(n_1, \dots, n_\ell) &= \Delta_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell) + v_{n_i} - v_{n_i-1} \\ &\quad - (v_{n_j+1} - v_{n_j}) + \alpha_i - \alpha_j. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Both assertions follow from some elementary calculations. ■

Our next lemma gives the minimum of Δ_A over the range of interest in (8.2.1).

Lemma 8.2.4. For any A in P_+ and any $n \geq a$,

$$\min_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a} \Delta_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell) = H_P a(a - h_P)/2.$$

Proof. Consider a tuple (n_1, \dots, n_ℓ) whose entries sum to $n - a$. If $i < j$ and $n_i > n_j$, we apply a transposition $\tau_{i,j}$ so that Lemma 8.2.3 yields

$$\Delta_A \circ \tau_{i,j}(n_1, \dots, n_\ell) \leq \Delta_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell).$$

Thus, if we are given (n_1, \dots, n_ℓ) up to a permutation, the smallest value of $\Delta_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell)$ is achieved when $n_1 \leq \dots \leq n_\ell$.

Consider such an ordered tuple. If $n_i > 1$ and $i < j \leq \ell$, Lemma 8.2.1 yields

$$v_{n_i} - v_{n_i-1} - (v_{n_j+1} - v_{n_j}) \leq 0,$$

and, since $\alpha_i \leq \alpha_j$, we also have $\alpha_i - \alpha_j \leq 0$. Therefore, Lemma 8.2.3 yields

$$\Delta_A \circ R_{i,j}(n_1, \dots, n_\ell) \leq \Delta_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell).$$

To prove the lemma, we start with an arbitrary tuple (n_1, \dots, n_ℓ) . We order it using transpositions, and apply several raising operators $R_{i,j}$, $i < j$, to bring it to the form $(0, \dots, 0, n - a)$. Each time, Δ_A either decreases or remains the same.

A simple calculation yields

$$\Delta_A(0, \dots, 0, n - a) = (n - a)(H_P a - \alpha_\ell) + H_P a(a - h_P)/2. \quad (8.2.2)$$

If A is in P_+ then the definition of $H(P)$ yields $H_P a - \alpha_\ell \geq 0$. Therefore, the minimum value in (8.2.2) is achieved when $n = a$ and it is $H_P a(a - h_P)/2$. \blacksquare

We can now complete the first step of the proof of Theorem 8.1.5. In particular, since $g = \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q,f_0} f$, the following lemma implies the first assertion of Theorem 8.1.5.

Lemma 8.2.5. *The power series g has a positive radius of convergence.*

Proof. We set $K_n = |q|^{-H_P n(n-h_P)/2} |P_{(n; \cup)}|$, and define $K(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} K_n z^n$. Consider the power series $h(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} h_n z^n$ defined by the recursion $h_n = 0$ if n is negative, and for any nonnegative n ,

$$h_n = \sum_{A \in P_+} |P_A| |q|^{-H_P a(a-h_P)/2} \sum_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a} h_{n_1} \cdots h_{n_\ell} + K_n. \quad (8.2.3)$$

Clearly, the h_n are nonnegative real numbers. Multiplying both sides of (8.2.3) by z^n and summing over n , we obtain the following identity for the formal power series h ,

$$h(z) = \sum_{A \in P_+} |P_A| |q|^{-H_P a(a-h_P)/2} z^a h(z)^\ell + K(z). \quad (8.2.4)$$

We now show that (8.2.4) is an algebraic equation in h . Since P has finite length, $L = \max_{A \in P} \ell$ is finite. If $0 \leq i \leq L$, the coefficient of $h(z)^i$ in the right hand side of (8.2.4) is

$$\sum_{\substack{A \in P_+ \\ \ell = i}} |P_A| |q|^{-H_P a(a-h_P)/2} z^a. \quad (8.2.5)$$

Since we assume that P has q -Gevrey order H_P , the power series in (8.2.5) has a positive radius of convergence. Therefore, in (8.2.4), the power series h solves an algebraic equation with convergent power series coefficients. By Puiseux's theorem, $h(z)$ is a convergent power series.

To conclude the proof, we show that for some positive C and c the inequality $|g_n| \leq Cc^n h_n$ holds for all n . We will take

$$C = 1 \vee \sup_{n \geq 0} \frac{1}{\left| \sum_{A \in P_0} P_A q^{\alpha_1 n} \right|}$$

and $c = C^L$. Since P satisfies the uniqueness condition, C and c are well defined positive numbers. Given (8.2.1) and (8.2.3), we have

$$\left| \sum_{A \in P_0} P_A q^{\alpha_1 n} \right| |g_0| \leq h_0.$$

Consequently, $|g_0| \leq Ch_0$. Assume that we proved $|g_i| \leq Cc^i h_i$ for any $0 \leq i < n$. Then (8.2.1) and Lemma 8.2.4 imply

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{A \in P_0} P_A q^{\alpha_1 n} g_n \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{A \in P_+} |P_A| |q|^{-H_P a(a-h_P)/2} \sum_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n-a} |g_{n_1}| \cdots |g_{n_\ell}| + K_n. \end{aligned}$$

Using the induction hypothesis, the right hand side is at most

$$\sum_{A \in P_+} |P_A| |q|^{-H_P a(a-h_P)/2} C^\ell c^{n-a} \sum_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n-a} h_{n_1} \cdots h_{n_\ell} + K_n. \quad (8.2.6)$$

Since C and c are greater than 1 and a is at least 1 for any A in P_+ , (8.2.6) is at most

$$\begin{aligned} & C^L c^{n-1} \left(\sum_{A \in P_+} |P_A| |q|^{-H_P a(a-h_P)/2} \sum_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n-a} h_{n_1} \cdots h_{n_\ell} + K_n \right) \\ & = C^L c^{n-1} h_n. \end{aligned}$$

Given how C and c are chosen, we obtain $|g_n| \leq Cc^n h_n$. Since h is a convergent power series, so is g . \blacksquare

Step 2. Representing g . Now that we know that g has a positive radius of convergence, and proved assertion the first assertion of

Theorem 8.1.5, our goal, to show the second assertion, is to isolate the leading terms in (8.2.1), and to provide an expression for g which involves the crest series. For this, we need more information on the q -factors A and the tuples (n_1, \dots, n_ℓ) guaranteeing that $\Delta_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell)$ remains bounded with n , and when it is unbounded we need to get an estimate of the rate at which it diverges. This is the purpose of the next lemma.

In what follows, $\Delta_A(0, \dots, n-a, \dots, 0)_i$ signifies $\Delta_A(0, \dots, 0, n-a, 0, \dots, 0)$ where $n-a$ is in the i -th component.

Lemma 8.2.6. *There exists some positive Θ such that:*

(i) if $A \in \widehat{P}$ and $\alpha_i = \alpha_\ell$, then, for any $n \geq a$,

$$\Delta_A(0, \dots, n-a, \dots, 0)_i = \frac{H_P}{2}a(a-h_P);$$

(ii) if $A \in \widehat{P}$ and $\alpha_i \neq \alpha_\ell$, then for any $n \geq a$,

$$\Delta_A(0, \dots, n-a, \dots, 0)_i \geq (n-a)\Theta + \frac{H_P}{2}a(a-h_P);$$

(iii) if $A \in P_+ \cap \widehat{P}$, then, for any $n \geq a+2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\substack{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n-a \\ \#\{i: n_i > 0\} \geq 2}} \Delta_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell) &\geq (n-a)\Theta + \frac{H_P}{2}a(a-h_P) \\ &\quad - H_P(1+h_P); \end{aligned}$$

(iv) if $A \in P_+ \setminus \widehat{P}$, then, for any $n \geq a$,

$$\min_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n-a} \Delta_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell) \geq (n-a)\Theta + \frac{H_P}{2}a(a-h_P).$$

Remark. In assertion (iii), if $n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n-a$ and at least two of the n_i are positive, then $n_1 + \dots + n_\ell \geq 2$ and therefore, $n \geq a+2$. This is why the condition $n \geq a+2$ is imposed in this statement.

We can take Θ to be the minimum of the following Θ_i which we will use in the proof,

$$\begin{aligned} \Theta_1 &= \min\{\alpha_\ell - \alpha_i : A \in P_+ \cap \widehat{P}, \alpha_i \neq \alpha_\ell\}, \\ \Theta_2 &= H_P, \\ \Theta_3 &= \inf\{H_P a - \alpha_\ell : A \in P_+ \setminus \widehat{P}\}, \\ \Theta_4 &= \min\{-\alpha_1 : A \in P_0 \setminus \widehat{P}\} = \min\{-\alpha_1 : A \in P_0, \alpha_1 < 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since we assume in Theorem 8.1.5.ii that $H(P)$ is achieved, Lemma 5.3.6 implies that Θ_3 is positive. Also, Θ_1 and Θ_4 are at least 1 since the α_i are integers; and Θ_2 is positive because $\underline{\alpha}(P_+)$ is positive under (8.1).

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_A(0, \dots, n-a, \dots, 0)_i &= v_n - v_{n-a} - \alpha_i(n-a) \\
&= \frac{H_P}{2}(n^2 - (n-a)^2) - \frac{H_P}{2}h(n - (n-a)) - \alpha_i(n-a) \\
&= (n-a)(H_P a - \alpha_i) + \frac{H_P}{2}a(a - h_P). \tag{8.2.7}
\end{aligned}$$

(i) If A is in \widehat{P} then $H_P a - \alpha_\ell = 0$. Thus, if $\alpha_i = \alpha_\ell$, then $2H_P a = \alpha_i$, so that (8.2.7) is $H_P a(a - h_P)/2$.

(ii) Note that if A is in $P_0 \cap \widehat{P}$, then $\ell = 1$ because P is solved form. If A is in $P_+ \cap \widehat{P}$ and $\alpha_i \neq \alpha_\ell$, then $H_P a = \alpha_\ell$ and (8.2.7) is

$$(n-a)(\alpha_\ell - \alpha_i) + \frac{H_P}{2}a(a - h_P).$$

This is at least $(n-a)\Theta_1 + H_P a(a - h_P)/2$.

(iii) Consider a tuple (n_1, \dots, n_ℓ) with at least two positive components and $n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a$. We argue as in the proof of Lemma 8.2.4. If (n_1, \dots, n_ℓ) is given up to a permutation, the smallest values of $\Delta_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell)$ is achieved when $n_1 \leq \dots \leq n_\ell$. Then, using raising operators, we see that the minimum over all tuples (n_1, \dots, n_ℓ) which add to $n - a$ and with at least two positive entries is achieved at the tuple $(0, \dots, 0, 1, n - a - 1)$. The value of Δ_A on this tuple is

$$\begin{aligned}
v_n - v_{n-a-1} - v_1 - \alpha_{\ell-1} - \alpha_\ell(n-a-1) \\
= v_n - v_{n-a} - \alpha_\ell(n-a) + v_{n-a} - v_{n-a-1} - v_1 + \alpha_\ell - \alpha_{\ell-1}. \tag{8.2.8}
\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$v_{n-a} - v_{n-a-1} = (n-a)H_P - \frac{H_P}{2} - h_P \frac{H_P}{2},$$

we use (8.2.7) to evaluate $v_n - v_{n-a} - \alpha_\ell(n-a)$ and obtain that (8.2.8) is at least

$$(n-a)(H_P a - \alpha_\ell) + \frac{H_P}{2}a(a - h_P) + (n-a)H_P - H_P(1 + h_P).$$

Since A is in \widehat{P} we have $H_P a - \alpha_\ell = 0$ and the result follows.

(iv) As we argued in the proof of Lemma 8.2.4, if $n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a$, then

$$\Delta_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell) \geq \Delta_A(0, \dots, 0, n - a).$$

Using (8.2.7), the minimum value is at least

$$(n - a)\Theta_3 + \frac{H_P}{2}a(a - h_P). \quad \blacksquare$$

To conclude the proof of Theorem 8.1.5, note first that since the equation is in solved form, if A is in P_0 , then $\ell = 1$ and $a = 0$, so that $\Delta_A(n - a) = -\alpha_1 n$. Consequently, we can rewrite (8.2.1) as

$$\sum_{A \in P_0 + P_+} P_A \sum_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a} q^{-\Delta_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell)} g_{n_1} \cdots g_{n_\ell} + q^{-H_P n(n - h_P)} P_{(n; \mathbb{u})} = 0. \quad (8.2.9)$$

We decompose the sum in this identity as follows. We isolate the q -factors A in the crest, and for those, we isolate the tuples (n_1, \dots, n_ℓ) which add to $n - a$ and for which only one component does not vanish, and for this component, say the i -th, $\alpha_i = \alpha_\ell$; that is, we isolate

$$V_{0,n} = \sum_{A \in \widehat{P}} P_A \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq \ell \\ \alpha_i = \alpha_\ell}} q^{-\Delta_A(0, \dots, n - a, \dots, 0)_i} g_{n - a} g_0^{\ell - 1}.$$

We do this because given that $s(A)$ counts the number of α_i equal to α_ℓ , Lemma 8.2.6.i yields

$$V_{0,n} = \sum_{A \in \widehat{P}} P_A s(A) q^{-H_P a(a - h_P)/2} g_{n - a} g_0^{\ell - 1},$$

and, as it will be clear below, these are the only terms in (8.2.9) where the exponent of q does not depend on $n - a$. This corresponds to the largest terms in (8.2.1) that we mentioned in the discussion following (8.2.1).

What do we need to add to $V_{0,n}$ to recover the left hand side of (8.2.9)? Firstly, we need to add the contribution of the q -factors in the crest and the tuples (n_1, \dots, n_ℓ) with only one nonvanishing entry, say the i -th, but with now $\alpha_i \neq \alpha_\ell$. This contribution is

$$V_{1,n} = \sum_{A \in \widehat{P}} P_A \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq \ell \\ \alpha_i \neq \alpha_\ell}} q^{-\Delta_A(0, \dots, n - a, \dots, 0)_i} g_{n - a} g_0^{\ell - 1}.$$

The next contributions are

$$V_{2,n} = \sum_{A \in P_+ \cap \widehat{P}} P_A \sum_{\substack{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n-a \\ \#\{i: n_i > 0\} \geq 2}} q^{-\Delta_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell)} g_{n_1} \cdots g_{n_\ell},$$

$$V_{3,n} = \sum_{A \in P_+ \setminus \widehat{P}} P_A \sum_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n-a} q^{-\Delta_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell)} g_{n_1} \cdots g_{n_\ell},$$

as well as

$$V_{4,n} = \sum_{A \in P_0 \setminus \widehat{P}} P_A q^{\alpha_1 n} g_n$$

and

$$V_{5,n} = q^{-nH_P(n-h_P)/2} P_{(n; \cup)}.$$

We set

$$U_n = -(V_{1,n} + V_{2,n} + V_{3,n} + V_{4,n} + V_{5,n}),$$

so that (8.2.9) is $V_{0,n} = U_n$. We multiply this identity by z^n and sum over n . We write $V_i(z)$ for $\sum_{n \geq 0} V_{i,n} z^n$, for $i = 0, 1, \dots, 5$. The part from $V_{0,n}$ gives the power series

$$\begin{aligned} V_0(z) &= \sum_{A \in \widehat{P}} P_A s(A) q^{-H_P a(a-h_P)/2} g_0^{\ell-1} \sum_{n \geq 0} z^n g_{n-a} \\ &= \sum_{A \in \widehat{P}} P_A s(A) q^{-H_P a(a-h_P)/2} g_0^{\ell-1} z^a g(z) \\ &= \mathcal{C}_{P,q,g_0}(z) g(z). \end{aligned}$$

Note that $g_0 = f_0$ so that we could have written \mathcal{C}_{P,q,f_0} instead of \mathcal{C}_{P,q,g_0} .

Thus writing $U(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} U_n z^n$, the identity $V_{0,n} = U_n$ asserts that $\mathcal{C}_{P,q,f_0} g = U$, which is the desired representation for g .

Now we show that the radius of convergence of U is at least a multiple greater than 1 that of g , namely at least $|q|^\ominus$ times that of g . For this, set

$$\tilde{g}(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} |g_n| |z|^n.$$

The function $\tilde{g}(z)$ is real valued despite being of a complex variable. As a power series in $|z|$, it converges for any $|z|$ less than the radius of convergence of g ; hence, $\tilde{g}(z)$ is well defined for any z inside the open disk of convergence of g , and it is infinite outside the closed

disk of convergence of g . Lemma 8.2.5 implies that the radius of this disk is some positive real number ρ .

In $V_{1,n}$, Lemma 8.2.6.ii ensures that the exponent of q , that is, $\Delta_A(0, \dots, n-a, \dots, 0)_i$, is at least $(n-a)\Theta_1 + H_P a(a-h_P)/2$. Since there are $\ell - s(A)$ indices i such that $\alpha_i \neq \alpha_\ell$, we obtain

$$|V_{1,n}| \leq \sum_{A \in \widehat{P}} |P_A| |q|^{-H_P a(a-h_P)/2} (\ell - s(A)) |g_0|^{\ell-1} |g_{n-a}| |q|^{-(n-a)\Theta}.$$

Consequently, since $V_1(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} V_{1,n} z^n$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |V_1(z)| &\leq \sum_{A \in \widehat{P}} |P_A| |q|^{-H_P a(a-h_P)/2} \ell |g_0|^{\ell-1} \sum_{n \geq 0} |z|^n |g_{n-a}| |q|^{-(n-a)\Theta} \\ &\leq L \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq L} |g_0|^{\ell-1} \sum_{A \in \widehat{P}} |P_A| |q|^{-H_P a(a-h_P)/2} |z|^a \tilde{g}(z/q^\Theta). \end{aligned}$$

Since P is of full q -Gevrey order $H(P)$, the power series

$$\sum_{A \in P} |P_A| |q|^{-H_P a(a-h_P)/2} |z|^a$$

has infinite radius of convergence, and the radius of convergence of $V_1(z)$ is at least that of $\tilde{g}(z/q^\Theta)$, that is $|q|^\Theta \rho$.

In $V_{2,n}$, Lemma 8.2.6.iii ensures that the exponent $\Delta_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell)$ is at least

$$(n-a)\Theta_2 + \frac{H_P}{2} a(a-h_P) - H_P(1+h_P).$$

We obtain that $|V_{2,n}|$ is at most

$$\begin{aligned} |q|^{H_P(1+h_P)} \sum_{A \in P_+ \cap \widehat{P}} |P_A| |q|^{-H_P a(a-h_P)/2} |q|^{-(n-a)\Theta} \\ \sum_{\substack{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n-a \\ \#\{i: n_i > 0\} \geq 2}} |g_{n_1}| \cdots |g_{n_\ell}|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $|V_2(z)|$ is at most

$$\begin{aligned} |q|^{H_P(1+h_P)} \sum_{A \in P_+ \cap \widehat{P}} |P_A| |q|^{-H_P a(a-h_P)/2} \\ \sum_{n \geq 0} \sum_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n-a} |q|^{-(n-a)\Theta} |z|^n |g_{n_1}| \cdots |g_{n_\ell}|. \end{aligned}$$

In this expression, the second line, with the double sum, is

$$\begin{aligned} |z|^a \sum_{n \geq 0} \sum_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n-a} (|z|^{n_1} q^{-\Theta n_1} |g_{n_1}|) \dots (|z|^{n_\ell} |q|^{-\Theta n_\ell} |g_{n_\ell}|) \\ = |z|^a \tilde{g}(z/q^{\Theta_2})^\ell, \end{aligned}$$

so that $|V_2(z)|$ is at most

$$|q|^{H_P(1+h(P))} \sum_{A \in P_+ \cap \widehat{P}} |P_A| |q|^{-H_P a(a-h_P)/2} |z|^a \max_{0 \leq \ell \leq L} \tilde{g}(z/q^\Theta)^\ell.$$

In particular, since P is of full q -Gevrey order $H(P)$, the radius of convergence of $V_2(z)$ is at least that of $\tilde{g}(z/q^\Theta)$, that is $|q|^\Theta \rho$.

Next, we have similarly, using Lemma 8.2.6.iv, that $|V_{3,n}|$ is at most

$$\sum_{A \in P_+ \setminus \widehat{P}} |P_A| |q|^{-H_P a(a-h_P)/2} \sum_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n-a} |q|^{-\Theta_3(n-a)} |g_{n_1}| \dots |g_{n_\ell}|.$$

This implies

$$|V_3(z)| \leq \sum_{A \in P_+ \setminus \widehat{P}} |P_A| |q|^{-H_P a(a-h_P)/2} |z|^a \tilde{g}(z/q^\Theta)^\ell.$$

Thus,

$$|V_3(z)| \leq \sum_{A \in P_+ \setminus \widehat{P}} |P_A| |q|^{-H_P a(a-h_P)/2} |z|^a \max_{0 \leq \ell \leq L} \tilde{g}(z/q^\Theta)^\ell,$$

and $V_3(z)$ converges on the disk centered at 0 and of radius $|q|^\Theta \rho$.

Next, if A is in $P_0 \setminus \widehat{P}$, then (8.1) ensures that $\alpha_1 \leq -1$. Moreover, since A is nonshifting, $a = 0$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} |V_4(z)| &\leq \sum_{A \in P_0 \setminus \widehat{P}} |P_A| \tilde{g}(z/q^{\Theta_4}) \\ &\leq \sum_{A \in P_0 \setminus \widehat{P}} |P_A| |q|^{-H_P a(a-h_P)/2} \tilde{g}(z/q^\Theta). \end{aligned}$$

Again, this implies that the radius of convergence of $V_4(z)$ is at least $|q|^\Theta \rho$.

Finally,

$$|V_5(z)| \leq \sum_{n \geq 0} |P_{(n;u)}| |q|^{-H_P n(n-h_P)/2} |z|^{\tilde{n}}.$$

Since P is of full q -Gevrey order $H(P)$, the power series $V_5(z)$ converges in the whole complex plane.

Putting all these bounds together, we obtain that for some positive number $c_{P,q}$

$$|U(z)| \leq c_{P,q} \sum_{A \in P} |P_A| |q|^{-H_P a(a-h_P)/2} |z|^a \max_{0 \leq \ell \leq L} \tilde{g}(z/q^\Theta)^\ell.$$

It follows that the radius of convergence of U is at least $|q|^\Theta \rho$.

Since P has full q -Gevrey order $H(P)$, the crest series \mathcal{C}_{P,q,f_0} is defined on the whole complex plane. Since U is defined on the disk of radius $|q|^\Theta \rho$, the identity $\mathcal{C}_{P,q,f_0} g = U$ implies that the power series $\mathcal{C}_{P,q,f_0} g$ is holomorphic on the disk centered at 0 and of radius $|q|^\Theta \rho$. Thus, as long as \mathcal{C}_{P,q,f_0} does not vanish, we are guaranteed that the power series g is well defined and coincides with $U/\mathcal{C}_{P,q,f_0}$. Therefore $\rho \geq R_{P,q,f_0}$. Once we hit a zero of smallest modulus R_{P,q,f_0} of \mathcal{C}_{P,q,f_0} , then U is still defined on a larger disk of radius $|q|^\Theta R_{P,q,f_0}$. Consequently, the identities $\mathcal{C}_{P,q,f_0} g = U$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q} f = g$ imply assertion (ii) of Theorem 8.1.5. \blacksquare

Remark. The proof suggests that in greater generality than asserted in Theorem 8.1.5, if P has q -Gevrey order $H(P)$, the radius of convergence of the solution f is the minimum of the radius of convergence of $\sum_{A \in P} P_A q^{-H(P)a(a-h(P))/2} z^a$ and the smallest modulus of the zeros of the crest series. The proof also suggests that if P is not of q -Gevrey order $H(P)$, then the q -Gevrey order of f is that of P .

Remark. Referring to the second assertion of Theorem 8.1.5, we claim that generically, the radius of convergence of $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q} f(z)$ is R_{P,q,f_0} . Indeed, with the notation of the proof of Theorem 8.1.5, we consider the identity $\mathcal{C}_{P,q,f_0} \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q} f = U$. Theorem 8.1.5.i asserts that the radius of convergence of $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q} f$ is at least R_{P,q,f_0} . Let ζ be a zero of \mathcal{C}_{P,q,f_0} of modulus R_{P,q,f_0} . If the radius of convergence of $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q} f$ is greater than R_{P,q,f_0} , then the identity $\mathcal{C}_{P,q,f_0} \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q} f = U$ implies $U(\zeta) = 0$. The power series U involves the original P_A , the

parameter q , and the power series g , which itself is a function of the P_A and q . And this complicated function of P_A and q is not identical to 0 because of Corollary 8.1.6.iii. Therefore, the equation $U(\zeta) = 0$ sets a constraint on the coefficients P_A and q . In that sense, Theorem 8.1.5.ii is the generic case.

3. Proof of Corollary 8.1.6. (i) follows from (5.1).

(ii) Since P is in solved form, P_0 is linear. Hence any q -factor in P_0 is of the form $(0; \alpha_1)$, and in that last case, (8.1) ensures that $\alpha_1 < 0$ for all q -factors of P_0 but $(0; 0)$. Thus, since $|q| > 1$,

$$P_{(0;0)} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{A \in P_0} P_A q^{\alpha_1 n}. \quad (8.3.1)$$

Since our equation is in solved form, $P_{(0;0)}$ does not vanish, and under the assumptions of the corollary, (8.3.1) shows that $P_{(0;0)}$ is positive. To prove the second assertion of the corollary, we use a convexity argument which is sometimes used in renewal theory. The crest series has the form

$$\mathcal{C}_{P,q,f_0}(z) = P_{(0;0)} + \sum_{A \in \widehat{P} \setminus P_{(0;0)}} P_A s(A) q^{-H(P)a(a-h(P))/2} f_0^{\ell-1} z^a.$$

Set $c_A = -P_A s(A) q^{-H(P)a(a-h(P))/2} f_0^{\ell-1} / P_{(0;0)}$. We rewrite the equation $\mathcal{C}_{P,q,f_0}(z) = 0$ as

$$\sum_{A \in \widehat{P} \setminus P_0} c_A z^a = 1 \quad (8.3.2)$$

and the coefficients c_A are all positive under the assumptions of Corollary 8.1.6. Recall that q is assumed to be a positive real number in this corollary. Since P is of full q -Gevrey order $H(P)$, equation (8.3.2) has a unique positive solution ρ . Consider the probability measure

$$\mu = \sum_{A \in \widehat{P} \setminus P_0} c_A \rho^a \delta_a.$$

If (8.3.2) has another solution $\rho\zeta$ which is complex and of modulus at most ρ , so that ζ has modulus at most 1, then (8.3.2) implies $\sum_{A \in \widehat{P} \setminus P_0} c_A \rho^a \zeta^a = 1$, that is

$$1 = \int \zeta^a d\mu(a).$$

But

$$\int \zeta^a \, d\mu(a) \leq \int |\zeta|^a \, d\mu(a) = 1,$$

with equality if and only if $\zeta^a = 1$ for any a in the support of μ . Since we can find finitely many a , $A \in \widehat{P} \setminus P_0$, whose greatest common divisor is 1, this implies that $\zeta = 1$ and that ρ is the solution of (8.3.2) with smallest modulus. Therefore $\rho = R_{P,q,f_0}$.

(iii) The coefficients of the derivative $\mathcal{C}'_{P,q,f_0}(z)$ are all some

$$aP_A s(A) q^{-H(P)a(a-h(P))/2} f_0^{\ell-1}, \quad A \in \widehat{P} \setminus P_0.$$

Therefore, under the assumptions of Corollary 8.1.6, they are all of the same sign. Since P is of full q -Gevrey order $H(P)$, this implies that $\mathcal{C}'_{P,q,f_0}(R_{P,q,f_0})$ is well defined and does not vanish. Theorem 8.1.5 and Theorem IV.10 in Flajolet and Sedgewick (2009) imply that with $U = \mathcal{C}_{P,q,f_0} \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q} f$, and

$$c_{P,q,f_0} = \frac{-U(R_{P,q,f_0})}{R_{P,q,f_0} \mathcal{C}'_{P,q,f_0}(R_{P,q,f_0})},$$

we have

$$[z^n] \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q} f(z) \sim c_{P,q,f_0} / R_{P,q,f_0}^n$$

as n tends to infinity. Since $[z^n] \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q} f(z) = q^{-H(P)n(n-h_P)/2} f_n$, this proves Corollary 8.1.6.iii. \blacksquare

4. On the sharpness of Theorem 8.1.5. To conclude this chapter, the following two examples show that the conditions in Theorem 8.1.5 cannot be relaxed in a fundamental way while keeping the conclusion.

Examples. (i) Let H be a positive rational number and consider the q -algebraic equation

$$f(z) = 1 + \sum_{k \geq 1} q^{\lambda k^2} z^k f(2q^{Hk} z).$$

This equation has height H , which is obtained for all the q -factors $(k; Hk)$. Substituting $q^{1/H}$ for q and $H\lambda$ for λ , there is no loss of generality in considering the simpler equation

$$f(z) = 1 + \sum_{k \geq 1} q^{\lambda k^2} z^k f(q^k z). \quad (8.4.1)$$

This new equation has height 1 and is in solved form. The associated q -operator is

$$P = (0; 0) - \sum_{k \geq 1} q^{\lambda k^2} (k; k) - (0; \sqcup).$$

Its co-height is 1, and its crest is

$$\widehat{P} = (0; 0) - \sum_{k \geq 1} q^{\lambda k^2} (k; k).$$

The crest series is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{P,q,1}(z) &= 1 - \sum_{k \geq 1} q^{\lambda k^2} q^{-k(k-1)/2} z^k \\ &= 1 - \sum_{k \geq 1} q^{k^2(\lambda-1/2)} (q^{1/2} z)^k. \end{aligned}$$

If $\lambda < 1/2$, the assumptions of Theorem 8.1.5 are satisfied. In particular, if q is a real number greater than 1, the crest series has a unique root R_q of smaller modulus, which is a positive real number, and we obtain $f_n \sim cq^{n(n-1)/2}/R_q^n$ as n tends to infinity.

If $\lambda = 1/2$, the crest series is

$$\mathcal{C}_{P,q,1}(z) = 1 - \frac{q^{1/2} z}{1 - q^{1/2} z} = \frac{1 - 2q^{1/2} z}{1 - q^{1/2} z}.$$

It has a unique root $R_q = 1/(2q^{1/2})$. The assumption of Theorem 8.1.5.i still holds, so that f has q -Gevrey order 1. However, the assumptions of Theorem 8.1.5.ii do not hold since P is not of full q -Gevrey order 1.

We now calculate f_n explicitly. Applying $[z^n]$ to (8.4.1) yields the recursion

$$f_n = \mathbb{1}\{n = 0\} + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} q^{\lambda k^2 + k(n-k)} f_{n-k}. \quad (8.4.2)$$

Specializing this identity for $\lambda = 1/2$ and setting $f_n = q^{n^2/2} g_n$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} g_n &= \mathbb{1}\{n = 0\} + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} q^{k^2/2 + k(n-k) + (n-k)^2/2 - n^2/2} g_{n-k} \\ &= \mathbb{1}\{n = 0\} + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} g_{n-k} \\ &= \mathbb{1}\{n = 0\} + \sum_{0 \leq k \leq n-1} g_k. \end{aligned}$$

In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} g_{n+1} &= \mathbb{1}\{n=0\} + \sum_{0 \leq k \leq n-1} g_k + g_n \\ &= 2g_n, \end{aligned}$$

and, therefore, since $g_0 = 1$, we obtain $g_n = 2^n$. It follows that $f_n = q^{n^2/2} 2^n$. Consequently,

$$\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q} f(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} q^{n^2/2} 2^n z^n = \frac{1}{1 - 2q^{1/2}z},$$

and

$$\mathcal{C}_{P,q,1}(z) \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q} f(z) = \frac{1}{1 - q^{1/2}z}.$$

We see that $\mathcal{C} \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q} f$ has no singularity on the open disk centered at 0 and of radius $2R_q$ and has a singularity at $2R_q$. While the conclusion of Theorem 8.1.5.ii remains true if $|q|$ is small enough so that $|q|^\Theta \leq 2$, it becomes false if $|q|$ is too large, showing that the assumptions cannot be removed in general while keeping the conclusion.

Consider now $\lambda > 1/2$ so that the q -Gevrey order of P is greater than its height. We set $f_n = q^{\lambda n^2} g_n$ and rewrite (8.4.2) as

$$g_n = \mathbb{1}\{n=0\} + g_0 + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n-1} q^{-(2\lambda-1)k(n-k)} g_{n-k}. \quad (8.4.3)$$

We will now show that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_n = g_0 = 1$. We first show that (g_n) is a bounded sequence. For this purpose, let N be such that for any n at least N ,

$$2 \sum_{k \geq 1} |q|^{-(2\lambda-1)kn/2} \leq 1/2,$$

and let C be greater than both 2 and $\max_{0 \leq i \leq N} |g_i|$. Let n be greater than N and assume that we proved $|g_i| \leq C$ for any $0 \leq i < n$, an assumption which is clearly true if $n = N + 1$. Since $g_0 = 1$, (8.4.3) yields

$$\begin{aligned} |g_n| &\leq 1 + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n-1} |q|^{-(2\lambda-1)k(n-k)} C \\ &\leq 1 + 2C \sum_{k \geq 1} |q|^{-(2\lambda-1)kn/2} \\ &\leq 1 + C/2. \end{aligned}$$

Since C is at least 2, we obtain $|g_n| \leq C$. Therefore, (g_n) is a bounded sequence. We then have

$$\sum_{1 \leq k \leq n-1} |q|^{-(2\lambda-1)k(n-k)} |g_{n-k}| \leq Cn|q|^{-(2\lambda-1)(n-1)},$$

and therefore, considering (8.4.3), $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_n = g_0 = 1$ as announced. This implies that $f_n \sim q^{\lambda n^2}$ as n tends to infinity. Therefore, f is of q -Gevrey order 2λ and no less, the radius of convergence of $\sum_{n \geq 0} q^{-\lambda n^2} f_n z^n$ being exactly 1. In particular, f is not of q -Gevrey order the height of P , so that the conclusion of Theorem 8.1.5.i fails, as well as its assumption.

(ii) We now provide an example of a q -algebraic equation whose solution has no q -Gevrey order at all, namely

$$f(z) = 1 + \sum_{k \geq 1} q^{k^\theta} z^k f(q^k z),$$

with θ a real number greater than 2. Applying $[z^n]$, we obtain

$$f_n = \mathbb{1}\{n = 0\} + \sum_{k \geq 1} q^{k^\theta + k(n-k)} f_{n-k}.$$

Set $f_n = q^{n^\theta} g_n$ and

$$\Delta_n(k) = k^\theta + (n-k)^\theta - n^\theta + k(n-k)$$

to obtain

$$g_n = \mathbb{1}\{n = 0\} + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n} q^{\Delta_n(k)} g_{n-k}. \quad (8.4.4)$$

Since

$$\Delta'_n(k) = \theta k^{\theta-1} - \theta(n-k)^{\theta-1} + n - 2k,$$

we have $\Delta'_n(n/2) = 0$. Furthermore, in the range $0 \leq k \leq n$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta''_n(k) &= \theta(\theta-1)k^{\theta-2} + \theta(\theta-1)(n-k)^{\theta-2} - 2 \\ &\geq \theta(\theta-1)\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^{\theta-2} - 2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for n larger than some N , the function Δ''_n is positive, so that Δ_n is convex, decreasing on $(0, n/2)$ and increasing on $(n/2, n)$. Since

$$\Delta_n(1) = (n-1)^\theta - n^\theta + n \sim -\theta n^{\theta-1}$$

as n tends to infinity, and $\Delta_n(n) = 0$, we obtain that, provided N is chosen large enough, $\Delta_n(k)$ is negative on $1 \leq k \leq n-1$, and equal to 0 at n . Furthermore,

$$\Delta_n(n-1) = \Delta_n(1) \sim -\theta n^{\theta-1}$$

as n tends to infinity. Consequently, provided N is chosen large enough, we may assume that

$$\Delta_n(k) \leq -2n^{\theta-1}$$

for any $1 \leq k \leq n-1$.

If needed, we increase N so that $(n-1)|q|^{-2n^{\theta-1}} \leq 1/2$ for any n at least N .

Now, take C greater than 2 and large enough so that $|g_i| \leq C$ for any $0 \leq i \leq N$. To build an induction to prove that (g_n) is bounded, assume that for some n at least N we have $|g_i| \leq C$ for any $i < n$. Then (8.4.4) yields

$$\begin{aligned} |g_n| &\leq 1 + \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n-1} |q|^{-2n^{\theta-1}} C \\ &\leq 1 + C(n-1)|q|^{-2n^{\theta-1}} \\ &\leq 1 + C/2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, since C is at least 2, we obtain $|g_n| \leq C$. It follows that (g_n) is a bounded sequence. Using (8.4.4), for any n at least N we have,

$$\begin{aligned} |g_n - g_0| &\leq \sum_{1 \leq k \leq n-1} |q|^{-2n^{\theta-1}} C \\ &\leq n|q|^{-2n^{\theta-1}} C, \end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g_n = g_0 = 1.$$

This implies $f_n \sim q^{n^\theta}$ as n tends to infinity. Since θ is greater than 2, the sequence (f_n) has no q -Gevrey order. \blacksquare

9. Translating and simplifying q -algebraic equations

The purpose of this chapter is to address the following problem: consider a q -algebraic equation $Pf = 0$ in solved form, having a power series solution. Setting $f(z) = f_0 + zg(z)$ and identifying the constant coefficient f_0 , the equation $Pf = 0$ is transformed into a new equation $Qg = 0$. The results of Chapters 6, 7 and 8 yield some estimates on the coefficients of f and g . However, these estimates are in terms of height, co-height, crest series, elevation, edge series, etc., and they are up to multiplicative constants which may be 0. It is then conceivable that the estimates calculated for f are more or less precise than those calculated for g . So the question arises as how much should one transform an equation in order to get the most accurate estimates on the coefficients of the solution. The broad answer is that for an equation in solved form, for the estimates given in Chapters 6, 7 and 8 to be as accurate as possible,

- if (8.1) holds, we should translate and simplify until the crest is linear;
- if (6.1) or (7.1) hold, then translating and simplifying is not needed.

Hence, despite its seemingly technical nature, this chapter has some very practical consequences and this will be made explicit in chapter 13 devoted to examples.

1. Some notation and basic properties. Since we will be dealing with the nonshifting, shifting and constant parts of q -operators, the following notation will be useful. Recall that $\mathbb{C}[[z]]$ is the vector space of formal power series in z . It coincides with the space spanned by the formal sum of constant q -factors.

Notation 9.1.1. *We write*

- (i) \mathfrak{Q} *the vector space of q -operators;*

(ii) \mathfrak{D}_0 the subspace spanned by the formal sums of nonshifting q -factors and $\mathbb{C}[[z]]$;

(iii) \mathfrak{D}_+ the subspace spanned by formal sums of shifting q -factors and $\mathbb{C}[[z]]$;

(iv) $\mathfrak{D}_{\text{linear}}$ the subspace spanned by the formal sums of linear q -factors.

Following Definition 3.3.2, recall that the translation T_c by a complex number c is defined by $(T_c A)f = A(c + f)$ and is extended linearly to \mathfrak{D} . Translations act as the identity on $\mathbb{C}[[z]]$ when $\mathbb{C}[[z]]$ is viewed as a space of q -operator, since these q -operators are constant.

Proposition 9.1.2. *The subspaces $\mathbb{C}[[z]]$, $\mathfrak{D}_0/\mathbb{C}[[z]]$ as well as $\mathfrak{D}_+/\mathbb{C}[[z]]$ are invariant under any translation T_c .*

Proof. If $A = (a, \sqcup)$ is in $\mathbb{C}[[z]]$ then $T_c A = (a; \sqcup)$. Thus $\mathbb{C}[[z]]$ is indeed invariant under T_c . We can then consider the action of T_c on the quotient spaces $\mathfrak{D}_0/\mathbb{C}[[z]]$ and $\mathfrak{D}_+/\mathbb{C}[[z]]$.

If $A = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$ is a q -factor, then the q -factors in $T_c A$ which are not in $\mathbb{C}[[z]]$ are of the form $(a; \alpha_{\theta(1)}, \dots, \alpha_{\theta(\ell)})$ for some increasing θ in some $[k \uparrow \ell]$. They are all shifting if A is shifting, and all nonshifting if A is nonshifting. ■

The simplification by z is introduced in Definition 4.3.2 and its effect is described in Proposition 4.3.3.

Proposition 9.1.3. *The subspaces $\mathbb{C}[[z]]$, \mathfrak{D}_+ and $\mathfrak{D}_{\text{linear}}$ are invariant under S_z .*

Proof. If A is a q -factor of the form $(a; \sqcup)$, then $S_z A = 0$ if $a = 0$ and $S_z A = (a - 1; \sqcup)$ if $a \geq 1$. This shows that $\mathbb{C}[[z]]$ is stable under S_z .

If A is in \mathfrak{D}_+ and is not constant, then $A = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$ with $a \geq 1$ and $\ell \geq 1$. Then $S_z A = q^{\alpha(A)}(a + \ell - 1; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$ is again shifting.

If A is linear, then $A = (a; \alpha_1)$ and $S_z A = q^{\alpha_1} A$. ■

The proof of Proposition 9.1.3 shows that the linear q -factors are eigenvectors of the simplification by z .

2. Effect of translations on nonshifting q -operators. Because we will mostly translate an equation $Pf = 0$ by T_{f_0} in order to cancel the constant term, we will often have a simplification following a translation. So, we will usually consider the effect of a translation through the composition $S_z T_{f_0}$. The following proposition tells us how the nonshifting part of $S_z T_{f_0} P$ is obtained from that of P .

Proposition 9.2.1. *Assume that P is in solved form. If f is a power series such that $[z^0]Pf = 0$, then the nonshifting part of $S_z T_{f_0} P$ is given by the linear q -operator*

$$\sum_{A \in P_0} P_A f_0^{\ell-1} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq \ell} (0; \alpha_j).$$

Proof. Consider a q -factor A . We have

$$T_c A = \sum_{0 \leq k \leq \ell} c^{\ell-k} \sum_{\theta \in [k \uparrow \ell]} (a; \alpha_{\theta(1)}, \dots, \alpha_{\theta(k)}).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} S_z(T_c A - c^\ell) &= \sum_{1 \leq k \leq \ell} c^{\ell-k} \sum_{\theta \in [k \uparrow \ell]} q^{\alpha_{\theta(1)} + \dots + \alpha_{\theta(k)}} (a+k-1; \alpha_{\theta(1)}, \dots, \alpha_{\theta(k)}). \end{aligned}$$

The q -factor $(a+k-1; \alpha_{\theta(1)}, \dots, \alpha_{\theta(k)})$ is nonshifting if and only if $a+k=1$; since $1 \leq k \leq \ell$ and P is in solved form, this implies $k=1$ and $a=0$, in which case $(a+k-1; \alpha_{\theta(1)}, \dots, \alpha_{\theta(k)}) = (0; \alpha_{\theta(1)})$ is linear. The nonshifting part of $S_z(T_c A - c^\ell)$ is $c^{\ell-1} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq \ell} (0; \alpha_j)$ and the result is obtained by linearity. ■

Proposition 9.2.1 leaves open the possibility that the nonshifting part of $S_z T_{f_0} P$ vanishes. However, if this is the case, this may have a strong implication. Indeed, this nonshifting part can be written as

$$\sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}} (0; \alpha) \sum_{A \in P_0} P_A f_0^{\ell-1} \#\{j : \alpha_j = \alpha\}.$$

Thus, it vanishes if and only if

$$\sum_{A \in P_0} P_A f_0^{\ell-1} \#\{j : \alpha_j = \alpha\} = 0 \quad \text{for any } \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

That may be as many polynomials as the numbers of distinct α_i in P_0 which must vanish all at once!

Next we show that if the nonshifting q -factors of P are linear, then this nonshifting part is preserved under $S_z T_{f_0}$.

Proposition 9.2.2. *Assume that P_0 is in solved form and linear. If f is a power series such that $[z^0]Pf = 0$, then the nonshifting part of $S_z T_{f_0} P$ is P_0 .*

Proof. Propositions 9.1.2 and 9.1.3 or Proposition 9.2.1 ensure that all the q -factors in $(S_z T_c P)_0$ come from P_0 . If A is linear and nonshifting, then $T_c A = c + A$ and $S_z(T_c A - c) = A$. Consequently, the nonshifting part of P is stable under $S_z T_{f_0}$. ■

Proposition 9.2.3. *If P_0 is linear, then*

$$(i) \bar{\alpha}((T_c P)_0) = \bar{\alpha}(P_0) \text{ and } \underline{\alpha}((T_c P)_0) = \underline{\alpha}(P_0);$$

$$(ii) \bar{\alpha}((S_z P)_0) = \bar{\alpha}(P_0) \text{ and } \underline{\alpha}((S_z P)_0) = \underline{\alpha}(P_0).$$

Proof. (i) Since T_c preserves \mathfrak{Q}_+ , the nonshifting part of $T_c P$ comes from that of P . By assumption, P_0 is linear. But if Q is a linear q -operator, $T_c Q = c + Q$ and consequently $\bar{\alpha}(T_c Q) = \bar{\alpha}(Q)$ and $\underline{\alpha}(T_c Q) = \underline{\alpha}(Q)$. The result follows since T_c does not introduce any cancellation among the q -factors in P_0 .

(ii) The same argument applies with S_z substituted for T_c . ■

3. Effect of translations and simplification on the height, co-height and the crest. Our first result relates the height, co-height and the crest of $T_c P$ to those of P .

Proposition 9.3.1. *The following holds:*

$$(i) H(T_c P) = H(P).$$

$$(ii) h(\widehat{T_c P}) \geq h(\widehat{P}).$$

(iii) *The crest of $T_c P$ is*

$$\widehat{T_c P} = \sum_{A \in \widehat{P}} P_A \sum_{1 \leq k \leq \ell} c^{\ell-k} \sum_{\theta \in [k \uparrow \ell]} (a; \alpha_{\theta(1)}, \dots, \alpha_{\theta(k)}) \mathbb{1}\{\alpha_{\theta(k)} = \alpha_\ell\}.$$

Proof. (i) If θ is in $[k \uparrow \ell]$ and $\alpha_1 \leq \dots \leq \alpha_\ell$, then $\alpha_{\theta(k)} \leq \alpha_\ell$. Thus, for any A in P , the height of $T_c A$ is at most that of A . Consequently, $H(T_c P) \leq H(P)$.

To prove that $H(T_c P) \geq H(P)$, let $A = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$ be in \widehat{P} such that, firstly, $\alpha(A)$ is maximal, and, secondly, among those, ℓ is maximal. If A belongs to $T_c P$, then $H(T_c P) \geq H(A) = H(P)$ and therefore $H(P) = H(T_c P)$.

To prove that A is in $T_c P$, note that A is in $T_c A$ and that $T_c A - A$ involves only q -factors different from A . Seeking a contradiction, assume that A is not in $T_c P$. This means that it is cancelled by some $T_c B$ for some B in P , with then $B \neq A$. Write $B = (b; \beta_1, \dots, \beta_m)$. Since A is cancelled by a q -factor in $T_c B$, we must have $(a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell) = (b; \beta_{\theta(1)}, \dots, \beta_{\theta(\ell)})$ for some θ in $[\ell \uparrow m]$. In particular, $m \geq \ell$, and $a = b$, and

$$\alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_\ell = \beta_{\theta(1)} + \dots + \beta_{\theta(\ell)} \leq \beta_1 + \dots + \beta_m.$$

Since $a = b$ and $\alpha_\ell = \beta_{\theta(\ell)} \leq \beta_m$, the height of B is at least that of A . Thus, since A is of maximal height, so is B , which means $B \in \widehat{P}$. Since $\alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_\ell$ is maximal, this also forces

$$\beta_1 + \dots + \beta_m \leq \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_\ell = \beta_{\theta(1)} + \dots + \beta_{\theta(\ell)}.$$

Consequently, $\beta_{\theta(1)} + \dots + \beta_{\theta(\ell)} = \beta_1 + \dots + \beta_m$. In particular, $\{\beta_{\theta(i)} : 1 \leq i \leq \ell\}$ contains all the β_i which do not vanish. Thus, since $m \geq \ell$, B is of the form $(a; 0, \dots, 0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$. Since ℓ is maximal, B is in fact $(a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$ and coincides with A , which is a contradiction, and establishes that A is in $\widehat{T_c P}$.

(ii) Let $B = (b; \beta_1, \dots, \beta_m)$ be in $\widehat{T_c P}$. It is of the form $(a; \alpha_{\theta(1)}, \dots, \alpha_{\theta(m)})$ for some $A = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$ in P and some θ in $[m \uparrow \ell]$. Necessarily, a equals b . Given assertion (i), we have

$$\frac{\alpha_{\theta(m)}}{a} = \frac{\beta_m}{a} = H(T_c P) = H(P) \geq H(A) = \frac{\alpha_\ell}{a}.$$

Since θ is increasing, this forces $\alpha_{\theta(m)} = \alpha_\ell$ and $H(A) = H(P)$. Hence, A is in \widehat{P} . This means $B \in T_c A$ for some A in \widehat{P} , and, therefore,

$$h(\widehat{T_c P}) = \min\{h(B) : B \in \widehat{T_c P}\} \geq \min\{h(A) : A \in \widehat{P}\} = h(\widehat{P}).$$

(iii) The proof of assertion (ii) shows that any B in the crest of $T_c P$ is in some $T_c A$ for some A in the crest of P . Moreover, since

$T_c A - A$ involves q -factors different from A and whose heights are at most that of A , we have $H(T_c A) = H(A)$. Therefore,

$$\widehat{T_c P} = \sum_{A \in \widehat{P}} P_A \widehat{T_c A}$$

which is the result provided we can show that the right-hand side is not 0. This is indeed not 0 since we have seen in the proof of assertion (i) that the A in \widehat{P} such that $\alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_\ell$ is maximal and ℓ is maximal remain in $\widehat{T_c P}$ \blacksquare

Given Proposition 9.3.1, the crest polynomial of $T_c P$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{\widehat{T_c P}, q, t}(z) &= (\widehat{T_c P})_{(0;0)} + \sum_{A \in \widehat{P}} P_A \sum_{1 \leq k \leq \ell} c^{\ell-k} \\ &\quad \sum_{\theta \in [k \uparrow \ell]} q^{-H(\widehat{P})a(a-h(\widehat{T_c P}))/2} z^a t^{k-1} \mathbb{1}\{\alpha_{\theta(k)} = \alpha_\ell\}. \end{aligned}$$

We then establish the analogue of Proposition 9.3.1 for the simplification by z . If P is in solved form and $\bar{\alpha}(P_0) = 0$, then \widehat{P} contains the linear q -factor $(0;0)$. Thus, the crest has always a trivial part. The nontrivial part is in the shifting part of the crest, $(\widehat{P})_+$. Note that if $H(P)$ is positive, then Definition 5.3.2 implies that $\bar{\alpha}(P) \geq \bar{\alpha}(P_+) > 0$.

Proposition 9.3.2. *Assume that $H(P)$ is nonnegative and that $\bar{\alpha}(P)$ is finite.*

- (i) *The linear q -factors are the only q -factors A such that $S_z A \in \mathbb{C}A$.*
- (ii) *If $(\widehat{P})_+$ contains only nonlinear q -factors, then*

$$H(S_z P) \leq H(P) \left(1 - \frac{H(P)}{\bar{\alpha}(P) + H(P)}\right).$$

- (iii) *If $(\widehat{P})_+$ contains a linear q -factor, then $\widehat{S_z P}$ is a linear q -operator; furthermore, $H(S_z P) = H(P)$ and $h(\widehat{S_z P}) \geq h(\widehat{P})$. The crest of $S_z P$ is then given by*

$$\widehat{S_z P} = \sum_{A \in \widehat{P} \cap \mathfrak{Q}_{\text{linear}}} P_A q^{\alpha_1} A$$

and it does not vanish.

Proof. (i) If $(a + \ell - 1; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell) = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$, then $\ell = 1$. In this case $S_z A = q^{\alpha_1} A$ is in $\mathbb{C}A$.

(ii) If $H(A)$ is nonpositive, then so is $H(S_z A)$. Assume that $H(A)$ is positive and that A is nonlinear, that is, ℓ is at least 2. Let ρ_A be in $(0, 1]$ such that $H(A) = \rho_A H(P)$. We then have

$$a = \frac{\alpha_\ell}{H(A)} = \frac{\alpha_\ell}{\rho_A H(P)}.$$

Consequently,

$$H(S_z A) = \frac{\alpha_\ell}{a + \ell - 1} \leq \frac{\alpha_\ell}{a + 1} = \frac{\rho_A \alpha_\ell}{\alpha_\ell + \rho_A H(P)} H(P).$$

This upper bound is maximal when $\rho_A = 1$ and the maximum value is at most

$$\frac{\alpha_\ell}{\alpha_\ell + H(P)} H(P) = \left(1 - \frac{H(P)}{\alpha_\ell + H(P)}\right) H(P).$$

The result follows since $\alpha_\ell \leq \alpha(P)$.

(iii) Assume that $(\widehat{P})_+$ contains a linear q -factor $A = (a; \alpha_1)$, and a nonlinear one, $B = (b; \beta_1, \dots, \beta_m)$ — in particular m is at least 2. Since both A and B are in the crest, $H(A) = H(B)$. Since B is nonlinear and A is linear, $H(S_z B) < H(B) = H(A) = H(S_z A)$. Thus, $S_z B$ is not in the crest of $S_z P$.

If now $B = (b; \beta_1, \dots, \beta_m)$ is in P but not in the crest \widehat{P} , then $\beta_m/b < H(P)$. Then

$$H(S_z B) = \frac{\beta_m}{b + m - 1} \leq H(B) < H(P) = H(A)$$

and $S_z B$ is not in $\widehat{S_z P}$. Therefore,

$$\widehat{S_z P} = \sum_{\substack{A \in \widehat{P} \\ A \text{ linear}}} P_A q^{\alpha_1} A$$

and this sum does not vanish since all the A 's are distinct and the P_A do not vanish. \blacksquare

To conclude this section, Proposition 9.3.1 asserts that translations preserve the height and do not decrease the co-height, while

Proposition 9.3.2 asserts that simplification decreases the height as long as the crest has a nonlinear factor, that as soon as a linear factor occurs in the crest, simplification makes the crest linear, and from then on, the height remains constant under simplification. Thus, this indicates that we should translate and simplify until the crest becomes linear, and then the height will not decrease any further. The next section expands on this idea and makes it more precise.

4. Algorithm. Assume that $|q| > 1$. Given a q -algebraic equation $Pf = 0$ which may not be in solved form but whose solution is a power series, we transform it as follows.

```

until  $P_0$  is linear do
  solve for  $f_0$  in  $P(0, f_0, \dots, f_0) = 0$ 
   $P \leftarrow S_z T_{f_0} P$ 
end until

```

If this loop ends we then need to normalize the equation so that $\bar{\alpha}(P_0) = 0$. This is done as follows.

$$P \leftarrow \sigma^{-\bar{\alpha}(P_0)} P$$

At this point we have $\bar{\alpha}(P_0) = 0$. Since all the nonshifting q -factors are linear, we have $P_{(0;0)} \neq 0$, or, put differently, the monomial Y_0 appears in P . If $\bar{\alpha}(P_+) \leq 0$ then Theorem 6.1.1 ensures that the solution is convergent.

Assume that $\bar{\alpha}(P_+) > 0$. Then $H(P)$ is positive and we do the following.

```

 $H_{new} \leftarrow H(P)$ 
until  $\hat{P}$  is linear do
   $H_{old} \leftarrow H_{new}$ 
  solve for  $f_0$  in  $P(0, f_0, \dots, f_0) = 0$ 
   $P \leftarrow S_z T_{f_0} P$ 
   $H_{new} \leftarrow H(P)$ 
end until

```

Let $P_{[0]}$ be the q -operator at the beginning of this loop — we put the subscript 0 inside brackets to avoid any confusion with a nonshifting part; in particular P_0 is the nonshifting part of P . Let

$f(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} f_n z^n$ be the solution of $Pf = 0$, and set

$$\theta = 1 - \frac{H(P_{[0]})}{\bar{\alpha}(P_0) + H(P_{[0]})}.$$

Note that θ is in $(0, 1)$. The algorithm constructs the sequence of operators $P_{[i+1]} = S_z T_{f_i} P_{[i]}$, $0 \leq i \leq N$, and the solution of $P_{[i]}g = 0$ is $g(z) = \sum_{n \geq i} f_n z^n$. The algorithm stops if $P_{[N]}$ has only linear shifting factors and $H(P_{[N]}) = H(P_{[N-1]})$.

To analyze this algorithm with respect to Theorem 8.1.5, we consider the i -th step; it constructs $P_{[i+1]} = S_z T_{f_i} P_{[i]}$. Proposition 9.3.1.i ensures that $H(T_{f_i} P_{[i]}) = H(P_{[i]})$. If $\widehat{T_{f_i} P_{[i]}}$ contains only nonlinear q -factors, then Proposition 9.3.2.ii implies that $H(S_z T_{f_i} P_{[i]}) < \theta H(P_{[i]})$. Thus, as long as the shifting part of the crest $(\widehat{P})_+$ contains only nonlinear q -factors, the height decreases. If $(\widehat{T_{f_i} P_i})_+$ contains a linear q -factor, then Proposition 9.3.2.iii ensures that $S_z \widehat{T_{f_i} P_i}$ contains only linear q -factors, and that $H(S_z T_{f_i} P_i) = H(P_i)$. We reached the end of the loop.

So, either the height keeps decreasing, or it will stabilize as soon as the crest of P contains a linear q -factor. Writing $P_{[i],0}$ for the nonshifting part of $P_{[i]}$, Proposition 9.2.3 ensures that $\bar{\alpha}(P_{[i],0})$ remains equal to 0 through the **until** loop.

The algorithm does not terminate only if the crest $\widehat{T_{f_i} P}$ never contains a linear q -factor. In this case, Proposition 9.3.1 and 9.3.2 imply that

$$H(P_{[i+1]}) \leq \frac{H(P_{[i]})\bar{\alpha}(P_{[i]})}{\bar{\alpha}(P_{[i]}) + H(P_{[i]})}.$$

Recall that we assume $\bar{\alpha}(P) > 0$. Since $\bar{\alpha}(P_{[i]}) \leq \bar{\alpha}(P)$ because no variable Y_i is introduced by either T_c or S_z , we have

$$H(P_{[i+1]}) \leq \frac{H(P_{[i]})\bar{\alpha}(P)}{\bar{\alpha}(P) + H(P_{[i]})}$$

The sequence $H(P_{[i]})$, $i \geq 0$, is decreasing and it has a limit L . This limit satisfies

$$0 \leq L \leq \frac{L\bar{\alpha}(P)}{\bar{\alpha}(P) + L}.$$

This forces L to be 0.

In other words, either the algorithm terminates with a linear crest, or the crest keeps having nonlinear q -factors and the height of the equation keeps decreasing and tends to 0.

While we will see many examples where the algorithm terminates with a linear crest, the following one illustrates that it is not always the case.

Example. Consider the q -operator

$$Qg(z) = g(z) - zg(qz)^2.$$

The equation $Qg = 0$ has a unique power series solution, $g(z) = 0$. Define the q -operator

$$\begin{aligned} Pg(z) &= (1-z)(1-qz)^2 Q\left(g(z) - \frac{1}{1-z}\right) \\ &= (1-qz)^2((1-z)g(z) - 1) - z(1-z)((1-qz)g(qz) - 1)^2. \end{aligned}$$

By construction, the equation $Pf = 0$ has a power series solution,

$$f(z) = \frac{1}{1-z} = \sum_{n \geq 0} z^n.$$

We will now prove by induction that, with the notation used in the analysis of the algorithm,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{[n]}g(z) &= (1-qz)^2((1-z)g(z) - 1) \\ &\quad - z^{n+1}(1-z)q^{2n}((1-qz)g(qz) - 1)^2. \end{aligned}$$

This relation holds for $n = 0$. Assume that it holds for any n less than some positive N . Since $f_N = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P_{[N]}g(z) &= S_z T_1 P_{[N-1]}g(z) \\ &= z^{-1} P_{[N-1]}(1 + zg(z)) \\ &= z^{-1}(1-qz)^2(-z + (1-z)zg(z)) \\ &\quad - z^{N-1}(1-z)q^{2(N-1)}(-qz + (1-qz)qzg(qz))^2 \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{[N]}g(z) &= (1-qz)^2((1-z)g(z) - 1) \\ &\quad - z^{N+1}(1-z)q^{2N}((1-qz)g(q) - 1)^2, \end{aligned}$$

which is the desired formula.

The crest of $P_{[n]}$ is

$$\widehat{P}_{[n]}g(z) = -z^{n+1}q^{2n}(g(qz)^2 - 2g(qz)).$$

It is not linear, and has height $H(P_{[n]}) = 1/(n+1)$. \blacksquare

It is clear that as long as the height decreases, Theorem 8.1.5 yields better and better q -Gevrey bounds. Assume that the algorithm reaches a point where the crest contains at least one linear q -factor, and possibly some nonlinear ones. Let us call P the q -operator obtained at this step. The algorithm applies one more transformation, and yields a new q -operator $Q = S_z T_{f_0} P$. Since P and Q have the same height but possibly different crests, Theorem 8.1.5 might yield different results when applied to P or to Q . We will now show that this is not the case.

Proposition 9.3.1.iii yields that $\widehat{T}_{f_0} P$ is

$$\sum_{A \in \widehat{P}} P_A \sum_{1 \leq k \leq \ell} f_0^{\ell-k} \sum_{\theta \in [k \uparrow \ell]} (a; \alpha_{\theta(1)}, \dots, \alpha_{\theta(k)}) \mathbb{1}\{\alpha_{\theta(k)} = \alpha_\ell\}.$$

The linear part is

$$\sum_{A \in \widehat{P}} P_A f_0^{\ell-1} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq \ell} (a; \alpha_j) \mathbb{1}\{\alpha_j = \alpha_\ell\} = \sum_{A \in \widehat{P}} P_A f_0^{\ell-1} s(A)(a; \alpha_\ell).$$

If it vanishes then $\widehat{T}_{f_0} P$ has in fact no linear terms and Proposition 9.3.2.ii implies that $H(S_z T_{f_0} P) < H(T_{f_0} P)$. Thus, $H(Q) < H(P)$ and we would have not stopped the algorithm. Hence, if we stopped the algorithm, the linear part of $\widehat{T}_{f_0} P$ does not vanish. Then Proposition 9.3.2.iii yields

$$\widehat{Q} = S_z \widehat{T}_{f_0} P = \sum_{A \in \widehat{P}} P_A f_0^{\ell-1} s(A) q^{\alpha_\ell} (a; \alpha_\ell).$$

Since $H(Q) = H(P)$ and $\alpha_\ell = aH(P)$ whenever A is in \widehat{P} , the crest polynomial for Q is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{\widehat{Q}, q, t}(z) &= \sum_{A \in \widehat{P}} P_A f_0^{\ell-1} s(A) q^{-H(P)a(a-h(\widehat{Q}))/2} q^{aH(P)} z^a \\ &= \sum_{A \in \widehat{P}} P_A f_0^{\ell-1} s(A) q^{-H(P)a(a-h(\widehat{P}))/2} q^{aH(P)(2-h(\widehat{P})+h(\widehat{Q}))/2} z^a \\ &= \mathcal{C}_{\widehat{P}, q, f_0}(q^{H(P)(2-h(\widehat{P})+h(\widehat{Q}))/2} z). \end{aligned} \tag{9.4.1}$$

Since $f(z) = f_0 + zg(z)$ we have $f_n = g_{n-1}$ for any $n \geq 1$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q}f(z) &= \sum_{n \geq 0} q^{-H(P)n(n-h(\widehat{P}))/2} f_n z^n \\ &= f_0 + \sum_{n \geq 1} q^{-H(P)n(n-h(\widehat{P}))/2} g_{n-1} z^n \\ &= f_0 + z \sum_{n \geq 0} q^{-H(P)(n+1)(n+1-h(\widehat{P}))/2} g_n z^n.\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$(n+1)(n+1-h(\widehat{P})) = n(n-h(\widehat{Q})) + n(2+h(\widehat{Q})-h(\widehat{P})) + 1-h(\widehat{P}).$$

Consequently,

$$\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q}f(z) = f_0 + zq^{H(P)(h(\widehat{P})-1)/2} \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{Q,q}g(zq^{-H(P)(2+h(\widehat{Q})-h(\widehat{P}))/2}). \quad (9.4.2)$$

In particular, combining (9.4.1) and (9.4.2),

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{C}_{\widehat{P},q,f_0}(z) \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q}f(z) &= \mathcal{C}_{\widehat{Q},q,g_0}(q^{-H(P)(2-h(\widehat{P})+h(\widehat{Q}))/2} z) \\ &\times \left(f_0 + zq^{H(P)(h(\widehat{P})-1)/2} \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{Q,q}g(zq^{-H(P)(2+h(\widehat{Q})-h(\widehat{P}))/2}) \right).\end{aligned} \quad (9.4.3)$$

Let R_P be the smallest modulus of the zeros of \mathcal{C}_{P,q,f_0} and let R_Q be the smallest modulus of the zeros of \mathcal{C}_{Q,q,g_0} . Theorem 8.1.5 asserts that $\mathcal{C}_{P,q,f_0}(z) \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q}f(z)$ has radius of convergence greater than R_P . Given (9.4.3), this is equivalent to $\mathcal{C}_{Q,q,g_0}(z) \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{Q,q}g(z)$ having radius of convergence greater than $q^{-H(P)(2-h(\widehat{P})+h(\widehat{Q}))/2} R_P$; but this is exactly R_Q because of (9.4.1). Thus there is no improvement in what Theorem 8.1.5 provides.

Once the algorithm stops, the crest is linear. We then show that the estimate given in Theorem 8.1.5 does not change if one transforms the equation further. Indeed, we can assume that P has a linear crest. Then Proposition 9.3.1.iii yields

$$\widehat{T}_{f_0} P = \sum_{A \in \widehat{P}} P_A(a; \alpha_1) = \widehat{P},$$

and Proposition 9.3.2.iii yields

$$\widehat{Q} = S_z \widehat{T}_{f_0} P = \sum_{A \in \widehat{P}} P_A q^{\alpha_1} A.$$

In particular, $h(\widehat{P}) = h(\widehat{Q})$. Again, if A is in \widehat{P} and is linear, then $\alpha_1 = H(P)a = H(Q)a$. We then have for any t and s ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{Q,q,t}(z) &= \sum_{A \in \widehat{P}} P_A q^{-H(Q)a(a-h(\widehat{Q}))/2} (q^{H(Q)}z)^a \\ &= \mathcal{C}_{P,q,s}(q^{H(Q)}z). \end{aligned}$$

Since $H(P) = H(Q)$ and $h(\widehat{P}) = h(\widehat{Q})$ we also have, as in (9.4.2),

$$\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q}f(z) = f_0 + q^{H(P)(h(\widehat{P})-1)/2} \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{Q,q}g(z^{-H(P)}).$$

The same argument as before shows that there is no improvement in the estimate given by Theorem 8.1.5 in doing the change of function $f(z) = f_0 + zg(z)$.

In conclusion, as we stated in the introduction of this chapter, if (8.1) holds we should translate and simplify the equation until the crest is linear for Theorem 8.1.5 to provide the sharpest estimate.

Examples. (i) The q -Catalan equation

$$f(z) = 1 + zf(z)f(qz)$$

has a nonlinear crest. Set $f(z) = 1 + zg(z)$ to transform the equation as

$$g(z) = 1 + zg(z) + qzg(qz) + qz^2g(z)g(qz).$$

The crest of this new equation is $(0;0) - q(1;1)$ and is linear. It has the same height, co-height and scope as the original equation. Therefore, we could apply Theorem 8.1.5 directly on the original equation.

(ii) Consider the equation

$$f(z) = 1 - 2zf(qz) + zf(qz)^2.$$

The corresponding q -operator, $(0;0) + 2(1;1) - (1;1,1) - (0;\sqcup)$ has height 1, which is achieved for the q -factors $(1;1)$ and $(1;1,1)$. We set $f(z) = 1 + zg(z)$ to obtain the new equation $S_z T_1 P g = 0$, which is, explicitly,

$$g(z) = -1 + q^2 z^2 g(qz)^2.$$

It has height $1/2$, which is less than the original 1 , obtained for the q -factor $(2; 1, 1)$. The crest is still nonlinear. We set $g(z) = -1 + zh(z)$ and obtain a new equation

$$h(z) = q^2 z - 2q^3 z^2 h(qz) + q^4 z^3 h(qz)^2.$$

This equation has height $1/2$, reached on the linear q -factor $(2; 1)$.

If $|q| > 1$, we can apply Theorem 8.1.5. The crest polynomial is $\mathcal{C}_{P,q}(z) = 1 + 2q^3 z^2$ and we have, using Corollary 8.1.8,

$$h_n \sim q^{n(n-2)/4} (-2q^3)^{n/2} c_m$$

as n tends to infinity, with m the remainder of the Euclidan division of n by 3 . Thus, up to possibly c_m by a root of -1 ,

$$h_n \sim q^{(n+4)n/4} 2^{n/2} i^n c_m$$

Since $f(z) = 1 + z + z^2 h(z)$, it follows that $f_n = h_{n-2}$, and, consequently, up to redefining the c_m ,

$$f_n \sim q^{(n+2)(n-2)/4} 2^{n/2} i^n c_m$$

as n tends to infinity. ■

5. Effect of translations and simplification on the depth.

The following proposition shows that translations by a constant and the simplification by z leave the depth invariant, while the co-depth is invariant under translations by a constant and is increased by 1 by the simplification by z .

Proposition 9.5.1. *Let P be a q -operator in solved form. The following identities hold:*

(i) $D(T_c P) = D(P)$ and $d(T_c P) = d(P)$;

(ii) $D(S_z P) = D(P)$ and $d(S_z P) = d(P) + 1$.

Before we prove this proposition, we examine its consequences in relation with Theorem 7.3.1. Consider the q -algebraic equation $Pf = 0$ where P satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 7.3.1. Set $f(z) = f_0 + zg(z)$ and $Q = S_z T_{f_0} P$, so that $Qg = 0$. The new

equation $Qg = 0$ satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 7.3.1. Thus, Theorem 7.3.1 implies that both

$$\tilde{f}(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} q^{-D(P)(n+d(P)) \log_+ n} f_n z^n$$

and

$$\tilde{g}(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} q^{-D(Q)(n+d(Q)) \log_+ n} g_n z^n$$

have a positive radius of convergence. Since $g_n = f_{n+1}$, we have

$$\tilde{g}(z) = \sum_{n \geq 1} q^{-D(Q)(n-1+d(Q)) \log_+(n-1)} f_n z^{n-1}.$$

Proposition 9.5.1 implies that $D(Q) = D(P)$ and $d(Q) = d(P)$. Thus,

$$D(Q)((n-1) \log(n-1) - n \log n) = -D(P)(1 + \log n) + o(1)$$

as n tends to infinity and

$$D(Q)d(Q) \log(n-1) = D(P)d(P) \log n = o(1)$$

as n tends to infinity. Consequently, the radius of convergence of \tilde{g} equals that of \tilde{f} . Hence, as far as what Theorem 7.3.1 asserts on the asymptotic behavior of f_n , there is no improvement in going from P to Q . Therefore, once the equation is in solved form and we can apply Theorem 7.3.1, there is no point in translating and simplifying the equation further with the change of unknown $f(z) = f_0 + zg(z)$.

Proof of Proposition 9.5.1 We will use the following lemma which relies on specializing the expansion in Definition 3.3.2 as

$$T_c A = A + \sum_{0 \leq k \leq \ell-1} c^{\ell-k} \sum_{\theta \in [k \uparrow \ell]} (a; \alpha_{\theta(1)}, \dots, \alpha_{\theta(k)}). \quad (9.5.1)$$

Lemma 9.5.2. *If B is in $T_c A - A$ then $D(B) > D(A)$. Thus, $D(T_c A) = D(A)$ and $d(T_c A) = d(A)$.*

Proof. Let B be in $T_c A - A$. Given (9.5.1) we have $B = (a; \alpha_{\theta(1)}, \dots, \alpha_{\theta(k)})$ for some $0 \leq k \leq \ell - 1$ and some θ in $[k \uparrow \ell]$. For any positive s ,

$$\mathcal{L}_B(s) = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq k} e^{-s\alpha_{\theta(j)}} < \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} e^{-s\alpha_i} = \mathcal{L}_A(s).$$

This implies $\mathcal{L}_B(1/D(A)) < 1$, and therefore $D(B) > D(A)$.

Since A is in T_cA , we then have $D(T_cA) = D(A)$ and $d(T_cA) = d(A)$. \blacksquare

We now continue the proof of Proposition 9.5.1.

(i) Let B be in P and such that $D(B) = D(P)$. Since B is in T_cB , if B is not in T_cP that means that B is in some T_cA for some A in P and $A \neq B$ so that a cancellation of B occurs. Lemma 9.5.2 implies that $D(B) > D(A)$, which contradicts that $D(B)$ is $D(P)$. Therefore, B is in T_cP and $D(T_cP) \leq D(B)$.

Since Lemma 9.5.2 ensures that $D(T_cP) \geq D(P)$, we obtain that $D(T_cP) = D(P)$.

We just proved that

$$\{ B \in P : D(B) = D(P) \} = \{ B \in T_cP : D(B) = D(T_cP) \}.$$

Thus, $d(T_cP) = d(P)$.

(ii) Since $S_zA = (a + \ell - 1; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$, we have $\mathcal{L}_{S_zA} = \mathcal{L}_A$ and therefore $D(S_zA) = D(A)$ and $d(S_zA) = d(A) + 1$. The result follows. \blacksquare

6. Effect of translations and simplification on the elevation and edge. In the context of Chapter 7.2, we need to study how the elevation, edge and edge series are transformed by $S_zT_{f_0}$. Consider an affine q -algebraic equation in solved form given by

$$P = \sum_{A \in P \setminus P_\sqcup} P_A(a; \alpha_1) + P_\sqcup.$$

We have

$$T_c(a; \alpha_1) = c(a; \sqcup) + (a; \alpha_1)$$

and

$$T_c(a; \sqcup) = (a; \sqcup).$$

Thus,

$$T_cP = c \sum_{A \in P \setminus P_\sqcup} P_A(a; \sqcup) + P,$$

and if $[z^0]Pf = 0$, then

$$S_zT_{f_0}P = f_0 \sum_{\substack{A \in P \setminus P_\sqcup \\ a \neq 0}} P_A(a-1; \sqcup) + \sum_{\substack{A \in P \\ \ell=1}} P_A q^{\alpha_1} A + \sum_{\substack{A \in P_\sqcup \\ a \neq (0; \sqcup)}} P_A(a-1; \sqcup).$$

Thus, $E(P) = E(S_z T_{f_0} P)$.

If $f(z) = f_0 + zg(z)$, we have $f_{n+1} = g_n$ and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}_{S_z T_{f_0} P, q}^\dagger g(z) &= \sum_{n \geq 1} q^{-E(P)(n-1)^2/2} f_n z^{n-1} \\ &= \frac{q^{-E(P)/2}}{z} (\mathcal{B}_{P, q}^\dagger f(q^{E(P)} z) - 1). \end{aligned}$$

The same argument used as in section 9.4 shows that there is no gain in applying Theorem 7.2.2 to $S_z T_{f_0} P$ instead of P . Therefore, in the setup of section 7.2, there is no point in transforming the equation by making the change of unknown $f(z) = f_0 + zg(z)$.

10. Miscellanea

As its names indicates, the purpose of this chapter is to collect some additional results. In the first section we show that for divergent solutions whose coefficients are polynomials in q , the asymptotic behavior of these coefficients as n tends to infinity is driven by their terms of highest degree and that these terms are related by a recursion involving the crest polynomial.

In the second section, we show some simple confluence results, namely that under some suitable assumptions, the convergent solution of a q -algebraic equation in solved form, or the crest q -Borel transform of the solution if that solution is divergent, converge to the solution of the limiting algebraic equation as q tends to 1.

1. Leading coefficients. Now that we established in sections 9.3 and 9.4 how we can linearize the crest except perhaps for some exceptional equations, we will address the following question which underlines the results of Chapters 5 and 8: we have seen in Theorem 5.3.3 that the generic degree of $f_n(q)$ is given by $H(P)n(n-h(P))/2$, and in Theorem 8.1.5 that when the assumptions of this theorem apply, $q^{-H(P)n(n-h(P))/2}f_n(q)$ remains of order 1 as n tends to infinity, suggesting that the leading terms of $f_n(q)$ drive its asymptotic behavior as n tends to infinity. Our goal in this section is to show that these leading terms have a particularly simple behavior which indeed explains the asymptotics of $f_n(q)$ as n tends to infinity in the context of Theorem 8.1.5. More precisely, we will show that when $\bar{\alpha}(P_0) < \bar{\alpha}(P_+)$ and n is large enough, the top coefficients of $f_n(q)$ obey a linear recursion driven by the crest series, and therefore can be represented as linear combinations of algebraic/geometric series built from the roots of the crest series. One interesting aspect of this result is that it shows that in some cases it is better to keep a nonlinear crest and not to attempt to linearize it, mostly because the generic degree neglects the fact that the coefficients P_A may depend on q .

To proceed, we first recall some known facts on sequences defined by a linear recursion. We agree that any sequence $(u_n)_{n \geq 0}$ is extended to a sequence $u = (u_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ by setting $u_n = 0$ if n is negative.

On sequences, we define the backward shift B by $(Bu)_n = u_{n-1}$. By induction, the powers B^k , $k \geq 1$, are defined, and we set B^0 to be the identity.

Let C be an arbitrary polynomial which does not vanish at 0. Then $1/C(z)$ is a power series. Substituting B^k for z^k in that power series, we define $1/C(B)$. If (u_n) is a sequence, then $t_n = (1/C(B))u_n$ is well defined and vanishes on the negative integers. Furthermore, $C(B)t_n = u_n$. This last identity shows that (t_n) obeys a linear recursion, writing C_i for the coefficient of z^i in $C(z)$,

$$C_0 t_n = u_n - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \deg C} C_i t_{n-i}.$$

Such a sequence can be described differently. Up to multiplying t_n by $C(0)$ we may assume that $C(0)$ is 1. Let ρ_i , $1 \leq i \leq k$, be the distinct roots of C , with μ_i the multiplicity of ρ_i . As in section 6.2, we write the partial fractions expansion of $1/C(z)$, asserting that there exist some $\lambda_{i,j}$ such that

$$\frac{1}{C(z)} = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq \mu_i} \frac{\lambda_{i,j}}{(1 - z/\rho_i)^j}.$$

Expanding $1/(1 - z/\rho_i)^j$, this implies that the relation $C(B)t_n = u_n$ forces

$$t_n = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} \sum_{1 \leq j \leq \mu_i} \lambda_{i,j} \sum_{m \geq 0} \frac{(m+j-1)_{j-1}}{(j-1)!} \frac{u_{n-m}}{\rho_i^m}. \quad (10.1.1)$$

in particular, if we know that $C(B)t_n = 0$ for n large enough, that is $u_n = 0$ for n larger than some N then (10.1.1) implies

$$\begin{aligned} t_n &= \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} \sum_{0 \leq j < \mu_i} \lambda_{i,j} \sum_{n-N \leq m \leq n} \frac{(m+j-1)_{j-1}}{(j-1)!} \frac{u_{n-m}}{\rho_i^m} \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} \sum_{0 \leq j < \mu_i} \lambda_{i,j} \sum_{0 \leq m \leq N} \frac{(n-m+j-1)_{j-1}}{(j-1)!} \frac{u_m}{\rho_i^n} \rho_i^m. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we may express t_n as a linear combination of the more elementary sequences $(n-m+j-1)_{j-1}/\rho_i^n$, or even simpler ones, n^p/ρ_i^n for $0 \leq p \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \mu_i$.

We are now ready to describe the top coefficients of $f_n(q)$. Recall that once $\bar{\alpha}(P_0) < \bar{\alpha}(P_+)$, there is no loss of generality in assuming

that $\bar{\alpha}(P_0) = 0$, and following the results of sections 9.3 and 9.4, we may also assume that the crest is linear.

Theorem 10.1.1. *Let P be in solved form, satisfying the uniqueness condition, and such that $0 = \bar{\alpha}(P_0) < \bar{\alpha}(P_+)$. Assume furthermore that $\bar{\alpha}(P)$ is finite and that the coefficients of P do not depend on q . Then for any fixed integer k in \mathbb{Z} , there exists N_k such that for any n at least N_k ,*

$$[q^k]\mathcal{C}_{P,q,f_0}(B)[z^n]\widehat{B}_{P,q}f(z) = 0.$$

The meaning of the conclusion is the following. By definition of the crest q -Borel transform,

$$[z^n]\widehat{B}_{P,q,f_0}f(z) = q^{-H(P)n(n-h(P))/2}f_n(q).$$

Since $[q^k]$ and B commute here, the conclusion of Theorem 10.1.1 asserts that

$$\mathcal{C}_{P,q,f_0}(B)[q^k](q^{-H(P)n(n-h(P))/2}f_n(q)) = 0,$$

that is

$$\mathcal{C}_{P,q,f_0}(B)[q^{H(P)n(n-h(P))/2+k}]f_n(q) = 0. \quad (10.1.2)$$

Also, if the crest polynomial has a unique root ρ of multiplicity μ , then Theorem 10.1.1 implies that for any k in \mathbb{Z} there exists $u_{m,k}$ such that, provided n is large enough,

$$\begin{aligned} & [q^{H(P)n(n-h(P))/2+k}]f_n(q) \\ &= \sum_{0 \leq j \leq \mu} \lambda_{1,j} \sum_{0 \leq m \leq N} \frac{(n+m+j-1)_{j-1}}{(j-1)!} \frac{u_{m,k}}{\rho^n} \rho^m. \end{aligned}$$

Arranging the terms, this means that there is a polynomial $\Pi_{\mu,k}(n)$ in n , of degree μ , such that for any n large enough,

$$[q^{H(P)n(n-h(P))/2+k}]f_n(q) = \frac{\Pi_{\mu,k}(n)}{\rho^n}.$$

Since Theorem 5.3.3 asserts that the generic degree of $f_n(q)$ is $H(P)n(n-h(P))/2 + O(1)$, identity (10.1.2) shows that the top

coefficients of $f_n(q)$ obey a linear recursion, and can therefore be represented as linear combinations of terms n^i/ρ_j^n , $1 \leq i \leq \mu_j$, built from the crest polynomial. In particular, their order of magnitude is that of n^{μ_1}/ρ_1^n where ρ_1 is a root of smallest modulus of the crest polynomial of maximal multiplicity μ_1 . Coupled with Theorem 8.1.5, this shows that when $|q|$ is greater than 1, the asymptotic behavior of $f_n(q)$ is in fact driven by its terms of largest degree in q .

In some sense, Theorem 10.1.1 systematizes the empirical observation made by Drake (2009) for some specific equations that the top coefficients of $f_n(q)$ seem to remain constant for n large enough.

The following elementary example illustrates this point and more generally, our discussion.

Example. Consider the q -Catalan equation

$$f(z) = 1 + zf(z)f(qz). \quad (10.1.3)$$

It is in solved form, satisfies the uniqueness condition, and for this equation $0 = \bar{\alpha}(P_0) < \bar{\alpha}(P_+) = 1$. We have $f_0 = 1$ and the crest polynomial is $1 - z$. It has a unique root, 1. Theorem 10.1.1 asserts that for any fixed k and any n large enough,

$$(1 - B)[q^{n(n-1)/2+k}]f_n(q) = 0. \quad (10.1.4)$$

Thus, if we write $f_n(q) = \sum_{0 \leq j \leq \delta_n} f_{n,i}q^i$, we have for any k in \mathbb{Z} and any n large enough,

$$f_{n,n(n-1)/2+k} = f_{n-1,(n-1)(n-2)/2+k}. \quad (10.1.5)$$

This can be seen directly, in particular when k vanishes. Indeed, applying $[z^n]$ to (10.1.3), we obtain

$$f_n(q) = \mathbb{1}\{n = 0\} + \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n-1} q^i f_i(q) f_{n-1-i}(q).$$

Therefore,

$$\deg_q f_n(q) = \max_{0 \leq i \leq n-1} (i + \deg_q f_i(q) + \deg_q f_{n-1-i}(q)), \quad (10.1.6)$$

with $\deg_q f_0(q) = 0$. The sequence $n(n-1)/2$ is 0 when $n = 0$ and obeys the same recursion as $\deg_q f_n(q)$. Therefore, $\deg_q f_n(q) =$

$n(n-1)/2$. This implies that the maximum in (10.1.6) is achieved only when $i = n-1$. Thus, $[q^{n(n-1)/2}]q^i f_i f_{n-1-i} = 0$ if $i \leq n-2$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} [q^{n(n-1)/2}]f_n &= [q^{n(n-1)/2}]q^{n-1}f_{n-1}f_0 \\ &= [q^{n(n-1)/2-(n-1)}]f_{n-1} \\ &= [q^{(n-1)(n-2)/2}]f_{n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

This is what (10.1.4) asserts when k is 0, meaning that the top coefficient of $f_n(q)$ is constant whenever n is large enough.

It is instructive to see what happens if we linearize the crest. We translate and simplify the equation, in effect setting $f(z) = 1 + zg(z)$, to obtain

$$g(z) = 1 + zg(z) + qzg(qz) + qz^2g(z)g(qz).$$

This equation has a linear crest, $(0; 0) - q(1; 1)$, but the coefficients of the associated q -operator depend on q . To satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 10.1.1, we may embed the equation into a parametric family, say

$$g(z) = 1 + zg(z) + rzg(qz) + rz^2g(z)g(qz). \quad (10.1.7)$$

The coefficients of g are now some polynomials in r and q , say $g_n(r, q)$. This equation has height $1/2$ and co-height 1. The crest polynomial is $1 - rz$. It has a unique root, $1/r$. For this new equation, Theorem 10.1.1 asserts that if n is at least some N , then

$$(1 - rB)[q^{n(n-1)/2+k}]g_n(r, q) = 0. \quad (10.1.8)$$

Thus, if we write $g_n(q) = \sum_{0 \leq j \leq \delta_n} g_{n,i}(r)q^i$, we have for any integer k and any n large enough,

$$g_{n,n(n-1)/2+k}(r) = r g_{n-1,(n-1)(n-2)/2+k}(r). \quad (10.1.9)$$

Since $f(z) = 1 + zg(z)$, we have $g_n(q, q) = f_{n+1}(q)$, so that the sequence $f_n(q)$ is related to the sequence $g_n(r, q)$ on the diagonal $r = q$. It is unclear if some useful information on $f_n(q)$ can then be recovered from that we have on $g_n(r, q)$. ■

Proof of Theorem 10.1.1. As in section 8.2, let

$$v_n = H(P)n(n - h(P))/2.$$

For a q -factor $A = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$ and any nonnegative integers n_1, \dots, n_ℓ with $n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a$, set, as in section 8.2,

$$\Delta_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell) = v_n - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} v_{n_i} - \sum_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} \alpha_i n_i.$$

Defining g_n by $f_n(q) = q^{v_n} g_n(1/q)$, we rewrite (8.2.1) as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{A \in P_0} P_A q^{\alpha_1 n} g_n(1/q) + \sum_{A \in P_+} P_A \sum_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n - a} q^{-\Delta_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell)} \\ & \times g_{n_1}(1/q) \cdots g_{n_\ell}(1/q) + q^{-v_n} P_{(n; \emptyset)} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (10.1.10)$$

Note that since the coefficients of P do not depend on q , Theorem 5.3.3 implies $\delta_n = v_n + O(1)$ as n tends to infinity. Consequently,

$$\max_{n \geq 0} \deg_q g_n(1/q) < \infty. \quad (10.1.11)$$

Lemma 8.2.6 implies that for any of the cases (ii), (iii) and (iv) of that lemma, there exists some positive Θ such that

$$\Delta_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell) \geq (n - a)\Theta + H(P)a(a - h(P))/2. \quad (10.1.12)$$

In particular, since Θ is positive and $\bar{a}(P)$ is finite, since (10.1.11) holds, for n large enough

$$[q^k] q^{-\Delta_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell)} g_{n_1}(1/q) \cdots g_{n_\ell}(1/q) = 0.$$

Thus, applying $[q^k]$ to (10.1.10), we obtain for n large enough,

$$P_{(0;0)}[q^k] g_n(1/q) + \sum_{A \in \widehat{P}_+} P_A [q^k] (q^{H(P)a(a-h(P))/2} g_{n-a}(1/q)) = 0,$$

that is

$$[q^k] P_{(0;0)} g_n(1/q) + [q^k] \sum_{A \in \widehat{P}_+} P_A q^{H(P)a(a-h(P))/2} B^a g_n(1/q) = 0,$$

or, equivalently,

$$[q^k] \mathcal{C}_{P,q}(B) g_n(1/q) = 0.$$

This is the result since the series $\sum_{n \geq 0} g_n z^n$ is $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q} f(z)$. ■

The proof of Theorem 10.1.1 shows that it is possible to refine the result, showing that it holds as long as $k \leq \epsilon n$ for some positive ϵ which depends on Θ in (10.1.12).

2. A simple confluence result. Consider a polynomial q -algebraic equation in solved form, $P_q f(z) = 0$. The solution f is a power series in z which depends also on q , and can be written, as in Chapter 5,

$$f(z; q) = \sum_{n \geq 0} f_n(q) z^n.$$

The confluence problem is to assess the continuity of f with respect to q . A considerable variety of situations may occur, as we will show with some examples. Our goal in this section is not to develop an extensive theory, but, on the contrary, to prove two specific and simple results, with the precise aim of enlightening the numerical calculations which we will carry out in Chapter 13.

We will be only interested in results as q tends to 1. Since we need to distinguish according to the position of $|q|$ with respect to 1, we write $\lim_{q \rightarrow 1-}$ for $\lim_{\substack{q \rightarrow 1 \\ |q| < 1}}$ and $\lim_{q \rightarrow 1+}$ for $\lim_{\substack{q \rightarrow 1 \\ |q| > 1}}$.

Examples. (i) Consider the equation

$$f(z) = 1 + (1 - q)z f(qz).$$

Applying $[z^n]$, we obtain the recursion

$$f_n = \mathbb{1}\{n = 0\} + (1 - q)q^{n-1} f_{n-1}.$$

Therefore, $f_n = (1 - q)^n q^{n(n-1)/2}$ and

$$f(z; q) = \sum_{n \geq 0} q^{n(n-1)/2} ((1 - q)z)^n.$$

Thus, $f(z; q)$ is a function for $|q| < 1$, which is defined on the complex plane. We have $\lim_{q \rightarrow 1} f_n(q) = \mathbb{1}\{n = 0\} = f_n(1)$. Consequently,

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow 1-} f(z; q) = 1 = f(z; 1)$$

and this convergence holds locally uniformly on \mathbb{C} .

If $|q| > 1$, then $f(z; q)$ is a divergent series, but

$$\mathcal{B}_{q, 1/2} f(z; q) = \sum_{n \geq 0} ((1 - q)z)^n = \frac{1}{1 - (1 - q)z}.$$

This q -Borel transform is defined on the disk

$$\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1/|1 - q|\},$$

and

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow 1^+} \mathcal{B}_{q,1/2} f(z; q) = f(z; 1),$$

and this convergence is locally uniform.

(ii) Consider the equation

$$(1 - q)f(z) = 1 + zf(z) - zf(qz).$$

When q is 1, this equation gives the formal identity $0 = 1$, and, therefore, has no solution. But $f(z; q) = 1/(1 - q)$ is a solution of the equation. Clearly, this solution has no limit as q tends to 1.

However, if one is interested in describing the behavior of $f(z; q)$ for q near 1, one could consider $g(z; q) = (1 - q)f(z; q)$, which satisfies the equation

$$g(z) = 1 + z \frac{g(z) - g(qz)}{1 - q}$$

and assert that $\lim_{q \rightarrow 1} g(z; q) = 1$.

(iii) Consider the equation

$$f(z) - f(qz) = (1 - q)zf(z).$$

Applying $[z^n]$ yields

$$(1 - q^n)f_n = (1 - q)f_{n-1},$$

and, therefore,

$$f_n = \prod_{1 \leq k \leq n} \frac{1 - q}{1 - q^k} f_0,$$

with f_0 a free parameter. This yields

$$f(z; q) = f_0 + f_0 \sum_{n \geq 1} \prod_{1 \leq k \leq n} \frac{1 - q}{1 - q^k} z^n.$$

We have $\lim_{q \rightarrow 1} f_n(q) = f_0/n!$. To study the convergence of $f(z; q)$ as q tends to 1– say, we restrict ourselves to q being real, namely q in $(0, 1)$. Then

$$0 \leq \frac{1 - q}{1 - q^n} \leq 1,$$

so that

$$\left| f(z; q) - f_0 - f_0 \sum_{1 \leq n \leq N} \prod_{1 \leq k \leq n} \frac{1-q}{1-q^k} z^n \right| \leq |f_0| \sum_{n > N} |z|^n.$$

Therefore, for any z of modulus less than 1, for any positive ϵ , provided N is large enough,

$$\limsup_{\substack{q \rightarrow 1^- \\ q \in (0,1)}} \left| f(z; q) - f_0 - \sum_{1 \leq n \leq N} \prod_{1 \leq k \leq n} \frac{1-q}{1-q^k} z^n \right| \leq \epsilon$$

and, consequently,

$$\lim_{\substack{q \rightarrow 1^- \\ q \in (0,1)}} f(z; q) = f_0 e^z,$$

and this convergence is locally uniform in the disk $\{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\}$.

Formally, the limiting equation for $q = 1$ reads $0 = 0$, and any power series is a solution. However, upon rewriting the equation as

$$\frac{f(z) - f(qz)}{1-q} = z f(z)$$

and assuming that f is differentiable, taking the limit as q tends to 1 yields the differential equation $z f'(z) = z f(z)$, to which $f_0 e^z$ are the only solutions. In that sense, $f(z; q)$ converges to the limiting solution as q tends to 1-. ■

For linear equations, the confluence problem with differential equations as limit has been studied, among others, by Sauloy (2000), Dreyfus (2015), Le Stum and Quirós (2015), and by André and Di Vizzio (2004) in the p -adic setting. Our purpose being quite specific, we will instead consider the much simpler confluence with an algebraic equation as a limit.

Formally, the confluence problem is somewhat complicated to state in full generality, because a q -operator is a formal weighted sum of q -factors, so that both the coefficients and the q -factors may depend on q . So, for the purpose of this section, we consider q -operators of the form

$$P_q = \sum_{A \in \mathcal{P}} P_A(q)(a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)_q, \quad (10.2.1)$$

the important point being here that the summation is over a fixed set P , which does not depend on q , and with the assumption that

$$P_A(q) \neq 0 \text{ for any } A \text{ in } P \text{ and any } q \text{ in a punctured neighborhood of } 1. \quad (10.2.2)$$

So the support of P_q is P when $q \neq 1$, but may be smaller when $q = 1$, as for example in $P_q = (1 - q)(0; 0)$.

Our first result deals with the convergence of the coefficients of the solution as q tends to 1.

Proposition 10.2.1. *Let P_q be a q -operator as in (10.2.1), satisfying (10.2.2), in solved form, satisfying the uniqueness condition for any q in a neighborhood of 1, with finite support, such that $\lim_{q \rightarrow 1} P_A(q) = P_A(1)$ for any A in P , and $\lim_{q \rightarrow 1} \sum_{A \in P} P_A(q) \neq 0$. Then*

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow 1} f_n(q) = f_n(1).$$

Proof. Consider the basic recursion (4.2.1). The result follows by induction on n . ■

We now strengthen this result by showing that not only do the coefficients converge but, when $f(z; q)$ is analytic, this solution converges, and when $f(z; q)$ is divergent, its crest q -Borel transform converges.

Theorem 10.2.2. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 10.2.1,*

(i) *if $0 = \underline{\alpha}(P_0) \leq \underline{\alpha}(P_+)$ then $\lim_{q \rightarrow 1^-} f(z; q) = f(z; 1)$ locally uniformly in a disk centered at 0;*

(ii) *if $0 = \overline{\alpha}(P_0) < \overline{\alpha}(P_+)$, then $\lim_{q \rightarrow 1^+} \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q} f(z; q) = f(z; 1)$ locally uniformly in a disk centered at 0.*

Proof. For any A in P , set $Q_A = 1 + |P_A(1)|$. Since P has a finite support, $|P_A(q)| \leq Q_A$ for any q in some neighborhood \mathcal{U} of 1 in the unit disk $\{q \in \mathbb{C} : |q| \leq 1\}$.

(i) Since we are interested in a limit as q tends to 1 with the modulus of q being less than 1, we choose \mathcal{U} in the unit disk centered at 0 and small enough so that

$$\lambda = \min_{q \in \mathcal{U}} \left| \sum_{A \in P_0} P_A(q) \right| \wedge 1$$

does not vanish, which is possible under the assumptions of Proposition 10.2.1.

Using Puiseux's theorem, define $h(z)$ as the power series solution of

$$\lambda h(z) = \sum_{A \in P_+} Q_A z^a h(z)^\ell + \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} Q_{(n; \mathcal{U})} z^n.$$

The coefficients $h_n = [z^n]h$ satisfy the recursion

$$\lambda h_n = \sum_{A \in P_+} Q_A \sum_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n-a} h_{n_1} \cdots h_{n_\ell} + Q_{(n; \mathcal{U})}.$$

The power series h is analytic in a neighborhood of the origin. Given the basic recursion (4.2.1), for any q in \mathcal{U} we have

$$\lambda h_0 = Q_{(0; \mathcal{U})} \geq |P_{(0; \mathcal{U})}| = |f_0(q)|.$$

In particular, since λ is at most 1, we have $|f_0(q)| \leq h_0$ for any q in \mathcal{U} . Assume that we have proved that for any q in \mathcal{U} and any $0 \leq i < n$ the inequality $f_i(q) \leq h_i$ holds. Since any q in \mathcal{U} is of modulus less than 1 and since $\underline{\alpha}(P_+)$ is nonnegative, the basic recursion (4.2.1) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{A \in P_0} P_A q^{\alpha_1 n} f_n(q) \right| &\leq \sum_{A \in P_+} Q_A \sum_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n-a} h_{n_1} \cdots h_{n_\ell} + Q_{(n; \mathcal{U})} \\ &= \lambda h_n. \end{aligned}$$

Given how λ is defined, this implies $|f_n(q)| \leq h_n$, and this now holds for any nonnegative integer n .

If z is in the disk of convergence of h and q is in \mathcal{U} , then

$$\left| f(z; q) - \sum_{0 \leq n < N} f_n(q) z^n \right| \leq \sum_{n \geq N} |z|^n h_n.$$

Since Proposition 10.2.1 implies $\lim_{q \rightarrow 1^-} f_n(q) = f_n(1)$, it follows that

$$\limsup_{q \rightarrow 1^-} \left| f(z; q) - \sum_{0 \leq n < N} f_n(1) z^n \right| \leq \sum_{n \geq N} |z|^n h_n.$$

This implies that $\lim_{q \rightarrow 1^-} f(z; q) = f(z; 1)$ and that $f(z; 1)$ is well defined. Moreover, by Puiseux's theorem, $f(z; 1)$ is analytic in a neighborhood of 0.

(ii) We now take \mathcal{U} contained in the annulus defined by $1 \leq |q| \leq 2$. As in the proof of Theorem 8.1.5, let $H_P = H(P)$ and $h_P = h(P)$. Define the power series $g(z; p) = \sum_{n \geq 0} g_n(q) z^n$ by $g_n(q) = q^{-H_P n(n-h_P)/2} f_n$ so that $g(z; q) = \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q} f(z)$. Similarly to what we did to prove Theorem 8.1.5, define the power series $h(z)$ by

$$h(z) = \sum_{A \in P_+} Q_A z^a h(z)^\ell + Q_{\mathfrak{u}}(z).$$

By Puiseux's theorem, h is holomorphic in a neighborhood of the origin. Set

$$C = 1 \vee \sup_{q \in \mathcal{U}} \sup_{n \geq 0} \frac{1}{\left| \sum_{A \in P_0} P_A(q) q^{\alpha_1 n} \right|}.$$

Given $L = \max_{A \in P} \ell$, define also $c = C^L 2^{H_P h_P^2}$. Clearly, for any q in \mathcal{U} , the inequality $|g_0(q)| \leq h_0$ holds. Assume that we have proved $|g_i(q)| \leq C c^i h_i$ for any $0 \leq i < n$. Then, (8.2.1) and Lemma 8.2.4 imply that $|\sum_{A \in P_0} P_A q^{\alpha_1 n} g_n(q)|$ is at most

$$c^{n-1} C^L \sum_{A \in P_+} |Q_A| |q|^{-H_P a(a-h_P)/2} \sum_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n-a} h_{n_1} \cdots h_{n_\ell} + |q|^{-H_P n(n-h_P)/2} Q_{(n; \mathfrak{u})}.$$

Since $|q|$ is at most 2 in \mathcal{U} , we have $|q|^{-H_P n(n-h_P)/2} \leq 2^{H_P h_P^2/2}$ because $n(n-h_P) \geq -h_P^2/4$. Therefore, $|g_n(q)|$ is at most

$$c^{n-1} C^{L+1} 2^{H_P h_P^2} \left(\sum_{A \in P_+} |Q_A| \sum_{n_1 + \dots + n_\ell = n-a} h_{n_1} \cdots h_{n_\ell} + Q_{(n; \mathfrak{u})} \right) \leq C c^n h_n.$$

Thus, if z is such that cz is in the disk of convergence of h , we have

$$\left| \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q} f(z; q) - \sum_{0 \leq i < N} g_i(q) z^i \right| \leq C \sum_{n \geq N} |cz|^n h_n.$$

Since Proposition 10.2.1 yields $\lim_{q \rightarrow 1+} g_i(q) = f_i(1)$, we proved that $\lim_{q \rightarrow 1+} \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q} f(z; q) = f(z; 1)$. \blacksquare

11. Nongeneric asymptotics for linear equations

The theory developed so far provides the asymptotic behavior of the sequence of coefficients (f_n) as n tends to infinity, up to some multiplicative terms which remain of order 1. As indicated, generically, these multiplicative terms are not 0. However, there might be exceptional values of q or, when they are parameters, of the coefficients of the equations, for which those multiplicative terms vanish, so that our estimates are not sharp. The purpose of this chapter is to understand when this occurs, give criteria which ensure that it does not, and when it does, obtain sharp estimates. We will explain the technique to address this issue only on linear q -algebraic equations. Some of the arguments extend to nonlinear equations, but we do not know how to deal with nonlinear equations in general.

The theory which we will develop is strongly related to Bézivin's (1992) study of the index of linear q -operators acting on q -Gevrey spaces. Bézivin (1992) showed that this index is related to the Newton polygon associated to the points (a, α) , $A \in P$. The index of a linear operator in various spaces of power series, and in particular its cokernel, inform us on the q -Gevrey order of the solution. Thus, what follows may be seen as an explicit and very refined form of some of Bézivin's results. Our results hinge on two simple techniques which are summarized in two algorithms: the root peeling algorithm, which was introduced in Chapter 6, and the gliding algorithm, which consists in rewriting the equation once we know that some functions belong to an ideal generated by some polynomial. These two techniques are explained in sections 3, 4 and 6. Section 1 recalls the notion of cokernel, while in section 2 we establish some technical lemmas needed in the other sections. In section 5 we introduce a new class of functional equations which is related to q -algebraic equations; this class is needed to describe some new equations that the solution of a q -algebraic equation obeys when the asymptotic behavior of its coefficients is not the generic one. Sections 7 and 8 are devoted to the gliding algorithm, explaining why this algorithm allows us to find the

asymptotic behavior of the coefficients of the solution in nongeneric cases. Section 9 contains an elementary example.

1. Linear operators and their cokernels. Recall that $\mathbb{C}[[z]]$ is the vector space of formal power series. It is an infinite dimensional vector space with basis $(z^n)_{n \geq 0}$. The dual basis consists of the evaluations $([z^n])_{n \geq 0}$, and we write $\mathbb{C}[[z]]^*$ for the algebraic dual of $\mathbb{C}[[z]]$.

Consider a linear q -operator P in solved form, mapping a subspace E of $\mathbb{C}[[z]]$ into a subspace F of $\mathbb{C}[[z]]$. For instance, E and F might be two spaces of power series with a given q -Gevrey orders. The image of E by P is written PE .

The cokernel $\text{coker} P$ of P mapping E into F is the quotient space F/PE , and the index of P is the difference $\dim \ker P|_E - \dim \text{coker} P|_{E,F}$ when at least one of these dimensions is finite. If P satisfies the uniqueness condition, it is injective, its kernel is trivial, and its index is $-\dim \text{coker} P$.

Since PE is a subspace of $\mathbb{C}[[z]]$, the set of linear forms

$$(PE)^\perp = \{ L \in \mathbb{C}[[z]]^* : \forall \theta \in PE, L\theta = 0 \}$$

is a subspace of $\mathbb{C}[[z]]^*$. Two formal power series θ and ϕ are in the same equivalence class in $\text{coker} P$ if and only if $L(\theta - \phi) = 0$ for any L in $(PE)^\perp$. Put differently, $\bigcap_{L \in (PE)^\perp} \ker L$ characterizes the equivalence classes forming the cokernel of P acting on E , and the cokernel can be identified with all the linear relations that a formal power series must satisfy in order to be in the image PE .

To make the connection between cokernels and nongenericity in the asymptotic behavior of the coefficients f_n , we follow the ideas developed by Bézivin (1992), following earlier work by Malgrange (1974) and Ramis (1978, 1984) for differential operators. Intuitively, we consider a linear q -algebraic equation $Pf = \theta$. For concreteness of the discussion, assume in this introduction that θ is analytic, that $|q| > 1$ and that $0 = \bar{\alpha}(P_0) < \bar{\alpha}(P_+)$ as in (8.1). Theorem 8.1.5 ensures that the solution of $Pf = \theta$ is generically of q -Gevrey order $H(P)$ where $H(P)$ is, as in Chapters 5 and 8, the height of the equation. What are the exceptional cases in which this solution is of lower q -Gevrey order, say s ? For this we need θ to be in the image of $\mathbb{C}[[z]]_{q,s}$, that is, to satisfy some linear relations given by the linear forms in $(PC[[z]]_{q,s})^\perp$. We will see that it is possible to describe these linear forms, that is, the cokernel of P acting on the q -Gevrey

spaces of order at most $H(P)$. Our description will involve the crest polynomial. Furthermore, following Bézivin, we will see that there are specific values of s such that if f is of q -Gevrey order s then θ satisfies some linear restrictions which involve the roots of some crest-like polynomials. This will give an explicit version of some of Bézivin's results. Finally, we will be able to describe the asymptotic behavior of the coefficients of the solutions, even in the degenerate cases.

In order to provide the intuition for the next sections and perhaps enlighten the previous discussion, the following example may be useful.

Example. Consider the linear equation

$$f(z) - zf(qz) = \theta(z), \quad (11.1.1)$$

and assume that $|q| > 1$. Applying $[z^n]$ to this identity yields the recursion

$$f_n = q^{n-1}f_{n-1} + \theta_n. \quad (11.1.2)$$

By induction on n , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f_n &= \theta_n + q^{n-1}\theta_{n-1} + q^{(n-1)+(n-2)}\theta_{n-2} + \dots \\ &\quad + q^{(n-1)+(n-2)+\dots+0}\theta_0 \\ &= q^{\binom{n}{2}} \sum_{0 \leq k \leq n} q^{-\binom{k}{2}} \theta_k. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, if θ is analytic, or, more generally, of full q -Gevrey order 1, and $|q| > 1$, the asymptotic equivalence

$$f_n \sim q^{\binom{n}{2}} \sum_{k \geq 0} q^{-\binom{k}{2}} \theta_k \quad (11.1.3)$$

holds as n tends to infinity. In particular, f is of q -Gevrey order 1. The right hand side of (11.1.3) is of the form $cq^{\binom{n}{2}}$ as given by Theorem 8.1.5, and f is of q -Gevrey order 1.

Conversely, consider a formal power series f with q -Gevrey order 1. Then $f_n = q^{\binom{n}{2}}g_n$ with $\sum g_n z^n$ analytic. In particular, for some positive c and M , we have $|g_n| \leq cM^n$ for every n . If θ is defined by (11.1.1), then (11.1.2) holds, and

$$\theta_n = q^{\binom{n}{2}}(g_n - g_{n-1}).$$

Consequently, θ is of q -Gevrey order 1. This shows that the q -operator $(0; 0) - (1; 1)$ is an automorphism of $\mathbb{C}[[z]]_{q,1}$.

The asymptotic equivalence (11.1.3) is not sharp if and only if the constant vanishes, that is, if and only if

$$\sum_{k \geq 0} q^{-\binom{k}{2}} \theta_k = 0. \quad (11.1.4)$$

This linear constraint on θ is not generic in q and is not generic in θ as well, meaning that the asymptotic equivalence $f_n \sim cq^{\binom{n}{2}}$ is generic. We may introduce the linear form

$$L = \sum_{k \geq 0} q^{-\binom{k}{2}} [z^k]$$

defined on the space $\mathbb{C}[[z]]_{q,1}$ of formal power series of q -Gevrey order 1 whose q -Borel transform is convergent at 1, and rewrite (11.1.4) as $L\theta = 0$. This constraint is necessary for the solution to be of full q -Gevrey order 1 and the kernel of L may be identified with the cokernel of P restricted to the space of power series of full q -Gevrey order 1.

Consider now a specific subspace of $\mathbb{C}[[z]]_{q,1}$, namely the space $\mathbb{C}\{z\}$ of analytic functions. It is clear from (11.1.1) that P maps $\mathbb{C}\{z\}$ into $\mathbb{C}\{z\}$, but (11.1.3) shows that $PC\{z\}$ is a proper subspace of $\mathbb{C}\{z\}$. A priori, $PC\{z\}$ is a subspace of $\ker L \cap \mathbb{C}\{z\}$. We will now show that $PC\{z\}$ is in fact $\ker L \cap \mathbb{C}\{z\}$.

Assume now that θ is analytic. We will see that while the equation $Pf = \theta$ has an a priori divergent power series solutions of q -Gevrey order 1, the constraint $L\theta = 0$ forces the solution to be far better behaved, and in particular, analytic.

Indeed, θ is of full q -Gevrey order 1 and $L\theta = 0$, then (11.1.4) holds and

$$\sum_{0 \leq k \leq n} q^{-\binom{k}{2}} \theta_k = - \sum_{k > n} q^{-\binom{k}{2}} \theta_k. \quad (11.1.5)$$

The explicit form for f_n becomes

$$\begin{aligned} f_n &= -q^{\binom{n}{2}} \sum_{k > n} q^{-\binom{k}{2}} \theta_k \\ &= -q^{\binom{n}{2}} \sum_{k \geq 0} q^{-\binom{n+1+k}{2}} \theta_{n+1+k} \\ &= - \sum_{k \geq 0} q^{-\binom{k+1}{2}} q^{-n(k+1)} \theta_{n+1+k}. \end{aligned} \quad (11.1.6)$$

Since $\theta(z)$ is analytic, there exist some positive real numbers c and M such that $|\theta_n| \leq cM^n$ for any nonnegative integer n . Then, since $|q| > 1$,

$$|f_n| \leq cM^{n+1} \sum_{k \geq 0} |q|^{-\binom{k+1}{2}} M^k.$$

It follows that f is analytic with radius of convergence at least $1/M$.

This shows that the image of the analytic functions through the q -operator $P = (0; 0) - (1; 1)$ coincides with the space of analytic functions θ such that $L\theta = 0$. In particular, the index of the operator P as automorphism on the space of analytic functions is -1 .

To close this example, note that the solution of (11.1.1) is quite explicit, namely

$$f(z) = \sum_{k \geq 0} q^{\binom{k}{2}} z^k \theta(q^k z).$$

Thus, we showed that if θ is analytic, then the power series $\sum_{k \geq 0} q^{\binom{k}{2}} z^k \theta(q^k z)$ is analytic if and only if $\sum_{k \geq 0} q^{-\binom{k}{2}} \theta_k = 0$. ■

In the next sections, we will do what we did in this example with greater generality and precision. The main obstacle is to understand where the identity $L\theta = 0$ comes from, and how one can write an identity like (11.1.5) abstractly, proceed with the substitution in f_n , and iterate this process recursively as the solution becomes more and more regular. As we will see, this is related to the Euclidean division algorithm of the powers z^n by the crest polynomial associated to the equation.

2. Euclidean division and some auxiliary results. In order not to break the flow of the main arguments, we gather in this section some technical results which will be useful. We consider a polynomial \mathcal{C} of degree γ such that $\mathcal{C}(0) \neq 0$. Write

$$z^k = \mathcal{C}(z)Q_{k-\gamma}(z) + R_k(z) \tag{11.2.1}$$

for the Euclidean division of z^k by \mathcal{C} . Thus, $Q_{k-\gamma}$ and R_k are both polynomials. If $0 \leq k < \gamma$, then $Q_{k-\gamma} = 0$. The degree of $Q_{k-\gamma}$ is $(k - \gamma) \vee 0$, and the degree of R_k is at most $\gamma - 1$. We write

$$R_k(z) = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq \gamma-1} R_{k,i} z^i.$$

We will use the following lemma.

Lemma 11.2.1. *Given the polynomial \mathcal{C} of degree γ , with largest root modulus $\bar{\rho}$, there exists a constant c such that for any nonnegative n ,*

$$\max_{0 \leq i < \gamma} |R_{n,i}| \leq cn^{\gamma-1} \bar{\rho}^n.$$

Proof. For any nonnegative integers n and k , we consider the falling factorial

$$(n)_k = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k = 0, \\ n(n-1) \cdots (n-k+1) & \text{if } k > 0. \end{cases} \quad (11.2.2)$$

This notation is introduced so that

$$\frac{d^k}{dz^k} z^n = (n)_k z^{n-k}.$$

Using Leibnitz's formula, identity (11.2.1) yields for any nonnegative k less than μ ,

$$\frac{d^k}{dz^k} z^n = (n)_k z^{n-k} = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq k} \binom{k}{i} \mathcal{C}^{(i)}(z) Q_n^{(k-i)}(z) + R_n^{(k)}(z). \quad (11.2.3)$$

Let ρ be a root of \mathcal{C} , of multiplicity μ . Substituting ρ for z in (11.2.3) and taking into account that $\mathcal{C}^{(k)}(\rho) = 0$ for any $0 \leq k < \mu$, we obtain

$$(n)_k \rho^{n-k} = R_n^{(k)}(\rho), \quad 0 \leq k < \mu. \quad (11.2.4)$$

Thus, R_n is a polynomial of degree at most $\gamma - 1$ which interpolates the function $z^n - \mathcal{C}(z)Q_{n-\gamma}(z)$ and its derivatives, with prescribed values on the roots of \mathcal{C} . It follows from Spitzbart (1960, Theorem 1) that for some polynomials $A_{\rho,k}(z)$,

$$R_n(z) = \sum_{\rho: \mathcal{C}(\rho)=0} \sum_{0 \leq k < \mu} A_{\rho,k}(z) (n)_k \rho^{n-k}.$$

Note that the polynomials $A_{\rho,i}$ depend on the roots of \mathcal{C} and their multiplicities, but do not depend on n . Consequently, for any $0 \leq i < \gamma$,

$$\begin{aligned} [z^i]R_n(z) &\leq \sum_{\rho: \mathcal{C}(\rho)=0} \sum_{0 \leq k < \mu} (n)_k |\rho|^{n-k} |[z^i]A_{\rho,k}| \\ &\leq c \max_{\substack{\rho: \mathcal{C}(\rho)=0 \\ 0 \leq k < \mu}} (n)_k |\rho|^{n-k} \\ &\leq cn^{\gamma-1} \bar{\rho}^n. \quad \blacksquare \end{aligned}$$

The coefficients of the polynomials Q_k can be defined recursively, and satisfy the following useful identity.

Lemma 11.2.2. *For any nonnegative integers k and n ,*

$$[z^n]Q_k(z) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } n > k, \\ Q_{k-n}(0) & \text{if } n \leq k. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Since Q_k is of degree k , we have $[z^n]Q_k = 0$ if n is greater than k .

Given how Q_n and R_n are defined, the identity $z^{k+\gamma} = z z^{k+\gamma-1}$ implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}(z)Q_k(z) + R_{k+\gamma}(z) &= \mathcal{C}(z) \left(zQ_{k-1}(z) + \frac{R_{k+\gamma-1, \gamma-1}}{\mathcal{C}_\gamma} \right) \\ &\quad + zR_{k-1+\gamma}(z) - \frac{R_{k-\gamma-1, \gamma-1}}{\mathcal{C}_\gamma} \mathcal{C}(z). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$Q_k(z) = zQ_{k-1}(z) + \frac{R_{k+\gamma-1, \gamma-1}}{\mathcal{C}_\gamma}.$$

If n is at most k and is positive, this identity yields

$$[z^n]Q_k = [z^{n-1}]Q_{k-1}.$$

By induction, since $n \leq k$, we obtain

$$[z^n]Q_k = [z^0]Q_{k-n} = Q_{k-n}(0). \quad \blacksquare$$

The coefficient $[z^0]Q_n = Q_n(0)$ will play a special role, and the following estimate will be particularly useful.

Lemma 11.2.3. *Given the polynomial \mathcal{C} such that $\mathcal{C}(0) \neq 0$, there exist some constants c and R such that for any nonnegative n ,*

$$|Q_n(0)| \leq cR^n.$$

In fact, we may take R any number larger than the largest root modulus $\bar{\rho}$ of \mathcal{C} .

Proof. Identity (11.2.1) implies $\mathcal{C}_0 Q_{k-\gamma}(0) + R_{k,0} = 0$. Thus,

$$|Q_{k-\gamma}(0)| = |R_{k,0}/\mathcal{C}_0|$$

and the result follows from Lemma 11.2.1. ■

3. Change of equation. Consider again the equation

$$\mathcal{C}g = U, \tag{11.3.1}$$

with $\mathcal{C}(0) \neq 0$. Let $(\rho_j)_{1 \leq j \leq k}$ be the roots of \mathcal{C} . In section 6.2, we saw how some linear constraints on U , of the form $U^{(i)}(\rho_j) = 0$, change the asymptotic behavior of the sequence (g_n) . Assume that U is such that g is entire. Then U belongs to the ideal generated by \mathcal{C} . We now show that this forces g to satisfy a new equation.

We use the notation introduced in (11.2.1), namely writing

$$z^k = \mathcal{C}(z)Q_{k-\gamma}(z) + R_k(z) \tag{11.3.2}$$

for the long division of z^k by $\mathcal{C}(z)$.

Theorem 11.3.1. *Consider an equation $\mathcal{C}g = U$ where \mathcal{C} is a polynomial of degree γ which does not vanish at the origin. Assume that g is entire. Then U is a power series $\sum U_n z^n$ and for any nonnegative integer n ,*

$$g_n = \sum_{k \geq 0} U_{n+\gamma+k} Q_k(0). \tag{11.3.3}$$

Considering the assumptions of Theorem 11.3.1 and having in mind the root peeling algorithm, considering also how g is defined in (11.3.1), we see that for g to be entire, all the roots of \mathcal{C} must also be roots of U , with multiplicities in U at least as large as in \mathcal{C} ; thus U satisfies the greatest number of linear relations that \mathcal{C} induces in the root peeling algorithm.

By multiplying (11.3.3) by z^n and summing over n , Theorem 11.3.1 asserts that, as a formal power series, g satisfies the equation

$$g(z) = \sum_{n,k \geq 0} U_{n+\gamma+k} Q_k(0) z^n.$$

This is the analogue of identity (11.1.6).

Proof. Since g is entire so is U . We rewrite $\mathcal{C}g = U$ as

$$\mathcal{C}(z)g(z) = \sum_{k \geq 0} U_k z^k. \quad (11.3.4)$$

Since U is entire, the sequence (U_n) converges to 0 faster than any algebraic rate. Therefore, Lemmas 11.2.1–11.2.3 imply that both $\sum_{k \geq 0} U_k R_k(z)$ and $\sum_{k \geq 0} U_k Q_{k-\gamma}(z)$ are entire functions. Thus, using (11.3.2) to substitute for z^k in (11.3.4),

$$\mathcal{C}(z)g(z) = \mathcal{C}(z) \sum_{k \geq 0} U_k Q_{k-\gamma}(z) + \sum_{k \geq 0} U_k R_k(z). \quad (11.3.5)$$

Since all the R_k are polynomials of degree $\gamma - 1$, the series $\sum_{k \geq 0} U_k R_k(z)$ is a polynomial of degree $\gamma - 1$. Thus for g to be entire, that is, for the right hand side of (11.3.5) to be divisible by \mathcal{C} , we must have

$$\sum_{k \geq 0} U_k R_k = 0.$$

This expresses in a more condensed way the condition of section 6.2 that U belongs to some cokernel. When this is the case, we obtain a new identity from (11.3.5), namely

$$g(z) = \sum_{k \geq 0} U_k Q_{k-\gamma}(z) = \sum_{k \geq 0} U_{k+\gamma} Q_k(z).$$

In particular, applying $[z^n]$ to this new identity and using Lemma 11.2.2, we obtain

$$g_n = \sum_{k \geq 0} U_{k+\gamma} Q_{k-n}(0) = \sum_{k \geq 0} U_{n+\gamma+k} Q_k(0). \quad \blacksquare$$

4. Characterization of the image and peeling the roots. The purpose of this section is to show how the root peeling algorithm yields a rather explicit construction of the cokernel of the operator P which is only implicit in Bézivin's (1992) results.

As in Section 6.4, consider a linear q -operator P , with $|q| > 1$ and $0 = \bar{\alpha}(P_0) < \bar{\alpha}(P_+)$, and a q -algebraic equation $Pf = \theta$, where, a priori, f is in $\mathbb{C}[[z]]$. Define $g = \widehat{B}_{P,q}f$ and

$$U(z) = \widehat{B}_{P,q}\theta(z) - \sum_{A \in P \setminus \widehat{P}} P_A q^{-H_P a(a-h_P)} z^a g\left(\frac{z}{q^{2aH_P - \alpha}}\right). \quad (11.4.1)$$

Assume that θ is of full q -Gevrey order $H(P)$, so that the crest Borel transform $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q}\theta$ is entire. In section 6.4, we transformed the original equation into (6.4.2), which can be rewritten as $\mathcal{C}g = U$, with

$$\mathcal{C}(z) = \sum_{A \in \widehat{P}} P_A q^{-H_P a(a-h_P)} z^a$$

the crest polynomial and U as in (11.4.1). It is guaranteed that U has a radius of convergence greater than that of g . The importance of the roots of \mathcal{C} and their multiplicities has been stressed in section 6.2.

As in section 6.2, assume that the roots of \mathcal{C} and their multiplicities are labeled so that

$$\{(\rho_i, \mu_i) : 1 \leq i \leq p\}$$

is the smallest equivalence class; in particular, $\mu_1 = \dots = \mu_p$.

Then all the μ_i , $1 \leq i \leq p$, are equal and all the $|\rho_i|$, $1 \leq i \leq p$, are equal as well. As we have seen in section 6.2, Theorem IV.10 in Flajolet and Sedgewick (2009) implies that




figure 11.4.1

$$\begin{aligned} [z^n]g_n &\sim \sum_{1 \leq i \leq p} \lambda_{i, \mu_i} U(\rho_i) \frac{n^{\mu_i-1}}{\rho_i^n (\mu_i-1)!} \\ &\sim \frac{n^{\mu_1-1}}{|\rho_1|^n (\mu_1-1)!} \sum_{1 \leq i \leq p} \lambda_{i, \mu_i} U(\rho_i) \left(\frac{|\rho_i|}{\rho_i}\right)^n. \end{aligned} \quad (11.4.2)$$

Note that

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq p} \lambda_{i, \mu_i} U(\rho_i) \left(\frac{|\rho_i|}{\rho_i}\right)^n, \quad n \geq 0 \quad (11.4.3)$$

is a bounded sequence. The asymptotic equivalent for g_n in (11.4.2) is not sharp if and only if the sequence (11.4.3) tends to 0.

Following the root peeling algorithm, a root ρ_i , $1 \leq i \leq p$, does not contribute to the asymptotic behavior of g_n if and only if $U(\rho_i) = 0$, that is,

$$\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q}\theta(\rho_i) - \sum_{A \in P \setminus \widehat{P}} P_A q^{-H_P a(a-h_P)/2} \rho_i^a g\left(\frac{\rho_i}{q^{aH_P-\alpha}}\right) = 0. \quad (11.4.4)$$

It is possible to express this identity directly on the solution of the equation; indeed, let δ_x be the Dirac mass or the evaluation at x , that is, for any function f defined at x , we have $\delta_x f = f(x)$. Since $Pf = \theta$, identity (11.4.4) can be rewritten as

$$\left(\delta_{\rho_i} \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q} P - \sum_{A \in P \setminus \widehat{P}} P_A q^{-H_P a(a-h_P)/2} \rho_i^a \delta_{\rho_i/q^{aH_P-\alpha}} \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q} \right) f = 0.$$

This condition cannot be proved or disproved numerically since it involves the complete sequence of coefficients (f_n) and the often inaccessible roots of \mathcal{C} . However, in applications, we can rely on numerical methods not as proof but as supporting evidence that the condition may or may not be satisfied.

Consider now P as acting on its domain in $\mathbb{C}[[z]]$. Since P is linear and satisfies the uniqueness condition, it has an inverse P^{-1} on its image which is also linear. Thus, (11.4.4) may be rewritten as

$$\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q} \theta(\rho_i) - \sum_{A \in P \setminus \widehat{P}} P_A q^{-H_P a(a-h_P)/2} \rho_i^a \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q} P^{-1} \theta \left(\frac{\rho_i}{q^{aH_P-\alpha}} \right) = 0. \quad (11.4.5)$$

Define the linear form

$$L_{\rho_i,0} = \delta_{\rho_i} \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q} - \sum_{A \in P \setminus \widehat{P}} P_A q^{-H_P a(a-h_P)/2} \rho_i^a \delta_{\rho_i/q^{2aH_P-\alpha}} \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q} P^{-1}.$$

Then (11.4.4) is simply $L_{\rho_i,0} \theta = 0$. Therefore, $L_{\rho_i,0}$ is a linear form and the belonging of θ to its kernel indicates that the root ρ_i of the crest polynomial does not contribute with its full multiplicity to the asymptotic behavior of g_n .

Given a positive real number ρ and an integer μ , we consider the vector space

$$\mathbb{C}[[z]]_{q,H(P),\rho,\mu} = \left\{ f \in \mathbb{C}[[z]] : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} q^{-n^2 H(P)/2} \frac{\rho^n}{n^{\mu-1}} f_n = 0 \right\}.$$

This is a subspace of $\mathbb{C}[[z]]_{q,H(P)}$.

Proposition 11.4.1. *Let q be a complex number of modulus greater than 1. Let P be a linear q -operator satisfying the uniqueness condition and such that $0 = \overline{\alpha}(P_0) < \overline{\alpha}(P_+)$ and $\overline{a}(P)$ is finite. Let ρ be a nonzero complex number.*

(i) If $\sum_{A \in P} |P_A q^{H(P)/2} a^2 \rho^a| < \infty$, then for any positive μ the operator P is an injective endomorphism of $\mathbb{C}[[z]]_{q, H(P), \rho, \mu}$.

(ii) If P is of full $1/q$ -Gevrey order $H(P)$, then it is an injective endomorphism on the space of power series of full q -Gevrey order $H(P)$.

Proof. The uniqueness condition implies that P is injective. Since P is linear, all its q -factor have the form $(a; \alpha)$.

(i) Let f be an element of $\mathbb{C}[[z]]_{q, H(P), \rho, \mu}$. Let ϵ be a positive real number and let N be large enough so that for any n at least $N - \bar{a}(P)$,

$$|f_n| \leq \epsilon \frac{n^{\mu-1}}{\rho^n} |q|^{H(P)n^2/2}.$$

If n is at least $N \vee 2\bar{a}(P)$, then $|[z^n]Pf|$ is at most

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{A \in P} |P_A q^{\alpha(n-a)} f_{n-a}| \\ & \leq \epsilon \sum_{A \in P} \left| P_A q^{\alpha(n-a) + H(P)(n-a)^2/2} \frac{(n-a)^{\mu-1}}{\rho^{n-a}} \right| \\ & \leq \epsilon n^{\mu-1} \frac{|q|^{H(P)n^2/2}}{|\rho|^n} \sum_{A \in P} \left| P_A q^{n(\alpha - aH(P)) + H(P)a^2/2} \rho^a \left(1 - \frac{a}{n}\right)^{\mu-1} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

In the range n at least $2\bar{a}(P)$, the sequence $(1 - a/n)^{\mu-1}$ is bounded. Moreover, $|\rho|^a$ is at most $1 \vee |\rho|^{\bar{a}(P)}$. Since $\alpha - aH(P)$ is non positive whenever A is in P , we obtain that $|[z^n]Pf|$ is at most $\epsilon c n^{\mu-1} q^{H(P)n^2/2} / \rho^n$. This proves that Pf is in $\mathbb{C}[[z]]_{q, H(P), \rho, \mu}$.

(ii) If f is of full q -Gevrey order $H(P)$, then for any positive r there exists N such that for any n at least N ,

$$|f_n| \leq r^n |q|^{H(P)n^2/2}.$$

If n is at least $N + \bar{a}(P)$, we then have

$$\begin{aligned} |[z^n]Pf| & \leq \sum_{A \in P} |P_A q^{\alpha(n-a)} f_{n-a}| \\ & \leq r^n q^{H(P)n^2/2} \sum_{A \in P} |P_A q^{n(\alpha - aH(P))} q^{H(P)a^2/2} r^{-a}| \\ & \leq c r^n q^{H(P)n^2/2}. \end{aligned}$$

Since r is arbitrary, this shows that Pf is of full q -Gevrey order $H(P)$. \blacksquare

The discussion preceding (11.4.5), and in particular (11.4.2), show that if Pf satisfies $L_{\rho_i,0}Pf = 0$ for any $1 \leq i \leq p$, then f belongs to the space in $\mathbb{C}[[z]]_{q,H(P),|\rho_1 q^{h(P)H(P)/2}|,\mu_1}$.

Conversely, take a power series θ in $\mathbb{C}[[z]]_{q,H(P),|\rho_1 q^{h(P)H(P)}|,\mu_1}$ and such that $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q}\theta$ converges on the disk of radius $|\rho_1|$. Theorem 8.1.5 ensures that $Pf = \theta$ has a solution f for which (11.4.2) holds with $g = \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q}f$. Moreover, if $L_{\rho_i,0}\theta = 0$, $1 \leq i \leq p$, then (11.4.3) tends to 0 as well, which implies that f is in $\mathbb{C}[[z]]_{q,H(P),\rho_1,\mu_1}$. This does not prove that the cokernel of P is given by the p equations $L_{\rho_i,0}\theta = 0$, for we assume that $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q}\theta$ converges on the disk of radius $|\rho_1|$. Without this assumption, we could conclude that $-p$ is the index of P on $\mathbb{C}[[z]]_{q,H(P),|\rho_1 q^{h(P)H(P)/2}|,\mu_1}$, but as it is, this index remains elusive.

Similarly to what we did in section 6.2, for each root ρ_i with multiplicity μ_i , we may associate μ_i linear forms $L_{\rho_i,j}$, $0 \leq j < \mu_i$, such that

$$L_{\rho_i,j}\theta = U^{(j)}(\rho_i).$$

These forms have the rather explicit expression

$$\begin{aligned} L_{\rho_i,j} &= \frac{d^j}{dz^j} \Big|_{z=\rho_i} \delta_z \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q} \\ &\quad - \sum_{A \in P \setminus \widehat{P}} P_A q^{-H_P a(a-h_P)/2} \frac{d^j}{dz^j} \Big|_{z=\rho_i} \delta_{z/q^{\alpha - \alpha H_P}} \widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q} P^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

The vanishing of $L_{\rho_i,0}, L_{\rho_i,1}, \dots, L_{\rho_i,\mu_i}$ indicates that the terms $1/(1 - z/\rho_i)^j$, $1 \leq j \leq \mu_i$, do not contribute to the asymptotic behavior of g_n .

Thus, we see that the q -Gevrey order of f is indeed $H(P)$ and not more, that is $f \in \mathbb{C}[[z]]_{q,H(P)} \setminus \mathbb{C}[[z]]_{q,(H(P))}$, as long as at least one of these linear forms $L_{\rho_i,j}$, $0 \leq j < \mu_i$, $1 \leq i \leq k$, does not vanish on θ . There are exactly

$$\mu_1 + \dots + \mu_k = \deg \mathcal{C}$$

such forms. In particular, the dimension of the cokernel of P viewed as an endomorphism on the space of power series of full q -Gevrey

order $H(P)$, is the degree of the crest polynomial. Under the uniqueness condition, the kernel of P is trivial and has dimension 0. Therefore, we have the following index theorem.

Theorem 11.4.2. *Let q be of modulus greater than 1. Let P be a linear q -algebraic operator satisfying the uniqueness condition, with $0 = \overline{\alpha}(P_0) < \underline{\alpha}(P_+)$. The index of P as an endomorphism of the space of power series of full q -Gevrey order $H(P)$ is the opposite of the degree of the crest polynomial.*

Therefore, the degree γ of the crest polynomial is the dimension of the cokernel of P when acting on the space of power series of full q -Gevrey order $H(P)$, and, as P is injective, its index is then $-\gamma$. A similar argument shows that the index is 0 when P is considered as an endomorphism of $\mathbb{C}[[z]]_{s,q}$ for $0 \leq s \leq H(P)$.

While this formalism and our discussion are somewhat lengthy, they can be explained very simply and with more details on figure 11.4.1, which is the purpose of the following example.

Example. Assume that $|q| > 1$. Consider an equation whose crest polynomial has roots (ρ_i, μ_i) , $1 \leq i \leq 7$, as on figure 11.4.1. In particular, no root vanishes. We set $\zeta_i = |\rho_i|/\rho_i$. We write c_i for some complex numbers which may change values from one occurrence to the next.

The top contribution to the asymptotic behavior of g_n comes from the roots $(\rho_1, 3)$ and $(\rho_3, 3)$ since they are the smallest roots in modulus, with the largest multiplicities. Thus, generically,

$$g_n \sim \frac{n^2}{|\rho_1|^n} (c_1 \zeta_1^n + c_2 \zeta_2^n) \quad (11.4.6)$$

as n tends to infinity. This asymptotic is not sharp, meaning $c_1 = c_2 = 0$, if and only if $L_{\rho_1,0}\theta = L_{\rho_2,0}\theta = 0$, that is if

$$\theta \in \ker L_{\rho_1,0} \cap \ker L_{\rho_2,0}. \quad (11.4.7)$$

Put differently, condition (11.4.7) characterizes that θ is in the image of the space

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{C}[[z]]_{q,H(P),q^{-H(P)h(P)/2}\rho_{1,3}} \\ & = \left\{ f \in \mathbb{C}[[z]] : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} q^{H(P)n(n-h(P))/2} \frac{|\rho_1|^n}{n^2} f_n = 0 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

If (11.4.7) holds, we need to consider figure 11.4.2.

We then obtain the new asymptotic

$$g_n \sim \frac{n}{|\rho_1|^n} (c_1 \zeta_1^n + c_2 \zeta_2^n).$$

Compared to (11.4.6), the power of n dropped, and as mentioned earlier, the constants c_1 and c_2 may be different than those in (11.4.6).

This asymptotic is not sharp if and only if the new conditions $L_{\rho_1,1}\theta = L_{\rho_2,1}\theta = 0$ are imposed additionally to the previous ones, that is if

$$\theta \in \ker L_{\rho_1,0} \cap \ker L_{\rho_2,0} \cap \ker L_{\rho_1,1} \cap \ker L_{\rho_2,1}. \quad (11.4.8)$$

If (11.4.8) holds, the picture to consider is figure 11.4.3.

Now the asymptotic behavior of g_n is given by

$$g_n \sim \frac{1}{|\rho_1|^n} (c_1 \zeta_1^n + c_2 \zeta_2^n + c_3 \zeta_3^n)$$

as n tends to infinity. Note that the exponent of n dropped once more.

This asymptotic equivalence is not sharp if and only if we impose further condition, namely $L_{\rho_1,2}\theta = L_{\rho_2,2}\theta = L_{\rho_3,0}\theta = 0$, or equivalently,

$$\begin{aligned} \theta \in \ker L_{\rho_1,0} \cap \ker L_{\rho_2,0} \cap \ker L_{\rho_1,1} \cap \ker L_{\rho_2,1} \\ \cap \ker L_{\rho_1,2} \cap \ker L_{\rho_2,2} \cap \ker L_{\rho_3,0}. \end{aligned} \quad (11.4.9)$$

If (11.4.9) holds, we need to consider figure 11.4.4.

The asymptotic behavior of g_n is now $g_n \sim c/|\rho_4|^n$ as n tends to infinity. Note that the geometric rate changed compared to the one we obtained from the previous pictures.




figure 11.4.2




figure 11.4.3




figure 11.4.4




figure 11.4.5

This new asymptotic estimate is not sharp if and only if the condition $L_{\rho_4,0}\theta = 0$ is further imposed, that is

$$\theta \in \ker L_{\rho_1,0} \cap \ker L_{\rho_2,0} \cap \ker L_{\rho_1,1} \cap \ker L_{\rho_2,1} \\ \cap \ker L_{\rho_1,2} \cap \ker L_{\rho_2,2} \cap \ker L_{\rho_3,0} \cap \ker L_{\rho_4,0} .$$

The new picture is as follows.

As more roots and their multiplicities are peeled off, eventually none are left, meaning that g is entire, or, equivalently, that f has full q -Gevrey order $2H(P)$. ■

Considering the equation $Pf = \theta$, we will see that if θ is such that f is of full q -Gevrey order $2H(P)$, then θ is such that we can peel off all the roots of the crest polynomial. Then the q -Gevrey order of f drops and f satisfies a new equation. This new equation gives rise to a new crest-like polynomial. If θ satisfies additional constraints given by peeling the roots of this crest-like polynomial, then the q -Gevrey order of the solution f will drop further. We will iterate as much as θ allows us to. The Newton polygon of the points (a, α) will allow us to keep track of the q -Gevrey order. If θ satisfies enough constraints that we can iterate this procedure as many times as the number of edges on the Newton polygon, the solution of the corresponding equation is an analytic function. The procedure can then be iterated further: if the function is not only analytic but entire, it may have negative q -Gevrey order. However, the process of transforming the

equation leads to new functional equations for the q -Borel transform of the solution, and these functional equations are not q -algebraic. Thus we need to introduce a different yet related class of functional equations, which is the purpose of the next section.

5. Formal linear r -factors. An r -factor $(a; \alpha)$ acts on a Hahn series $f(z)$ by $(a; \alpha)f(z) = z^a f(r^\alpha z)$. If a is a negative real number, even a negative integer, the r -factor $(a; \alpha)$ does not define an endomorphism of the space of formal power series; for instance $(-2; 0)z = z^{-1}$ is not a formal power series. However, if f is a Hahn series and a is positive,

$$[z^n]((-a; \alpha)f(z)) = [z^{n+a}]f(r^\alpha z) = r^{\alpha(n+a)}f_{n+a}. \quad (11.5.1)$$

This identity may be specialized formally to power series, as long as a is an integer, be it positive or negative. If f is a power series and a is a positive integer, multiplying the right hand side of (11.5.1) by z^n and summing over n nonnegative yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n \geq 0} [z^n]((-a; \alpha)f(z))z^n \\ &= \sum_{n \geq 0} r^{\alpha(n+a)} f_{n+a} z^n \\ &= \sum_{n \geq a} r^{\alpha n} f_n z^{n-a} \\ &= \frac{1}{z^a} (f(z) - (f_0 + f_1 r^\alpha z + \cdots + f_{n-1} r^{\alpha(n-1)} z^{n-1})). \end{aligned} \quad (11.5.2)$$

This is not the action of the r -factor $(-a; \alpha)$ on f . However, we will need this operation to study nongeneric asymptotics, and it is best to think of this operation as acting on sequences of coefficients as in (11.5.1). Since we will deal with power series, we identify a formal power series $f(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} f_n z^n$ with the sequence $f = (f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$ supported by \mathbb{N} . Thus, for a formal power series, $f_n = 0$ if n is negative. The set of formal power series or sequences is a linear vector space when equipped with the componentwise multiplication by a complex number, $cf = (cf_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$, and the componentwise addition $f + g = (f_n + g_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$.

Definition 11.5.1. *A formal linear r -factor is a pair $[a; \alpha]$, $a \in \mathbb{Z}$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$, which acts on formal power series $f = (f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}$*

as

$$([a; \alpha]f)_n = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } n < 0, \\ r^{\alpha(n-a)} f_{n-a} & \text{if } n \geq 0. \end{cases}$$

Sometimes we write $[a; \alpha]_r$ to specify r .

We see that if a is positive, $[a; \alpha]f(z)$ is (11.5.2) and $[a; \alpha]_r f = (a; \alpha)_r f$. A formal linear r -factor is a linear morphism on the space of formal power series. Note that the formal linear r -factors are indicated with square brackets as in $[a; \alpha]$, while the linear r -factors are indicated by parentheses, as in $(a; \alpha)$. A formal linear r -factor $[a; \alpha]_r$ is the linear r -factor $(a; \alpha)_r$ if and only if a is nonnegative.

We now define operators which are the analogue of q -operators, but using formal linear r -factors.

Definition 11.5.2. A formal linear r -operator is a formal sum

$$\sum_{\substack{a \in \mathbb{Z} \\ \alpha \in \mathbb{R}}} P_{[a; \alpha]} [a; \alpha]$$

of distinct formal linear r -factors, where the set of nonzero $P_{[a; \alpha]}$ is at most countable.

Most of the notation we introduced for q -operators can be extended verbatim to formal r -operators. In particular, $[a; \alpha] \in P$ means that $P_{[a; \alpha]}$ does not vanish,

$$\underline{\alpha}(P) = \inf \{ \alpha : [a; \alpha] \in P \}$$

and so on. We set

$$\bar{a}(P) = \sup \{ a : A \in P \}.$$

Definition 11.5.3. A formal linear r -algebraic equation of Laurent type is given by

- (i) a polynomial \mathcal{E} with $\mathcal{E}(0) \neq 0$,
- (ii) a formal linear r -operator P with $\underline{\alpha}(P)$ positive and $\bar{a}(P)$ finite, all the α being rational with a common denominator, and satisfying the summability condition that for any positive λ ,

$$\sum_{A \in P} |P_A| |r|^{-\alpha a} \lambda^a < \infty, \quad (11.5.3)$$

(iii) an entire function θ ,

and has the form $\mathcal{E}f = \theta - Pf$, where f is an unknown formal power series.

Condition (11.5.3) asserts that $\sum_{A \in P} |P_A| |r|^{-\alpha a} z^{-a}$ converges in the complex plane punctured at the origin.

Since $\bar{a}(P)$ is assumed to be finite, condition (11.5.3) involves finitely many negative powers of λ , and possibly infinitely many positive powers of λ . Thus, this defines a formal Laurent series in λ , hence the reference to Laurent in Definition 11.5.3. Still considering the summability condition (11.5.3), since $\bar{a}(P)$ is finite, then for a positive, the condition constraints the summability of the $P_{[a; \alpha]}$ over α . But one should keep in mind that we allow a to be negative, and one should actually think the summability condition as a constraint on the summability of the $P_{[a; \alpha]}$ over negative a .

By not requiring $\underline{a}(P)$ to be positive, we could combine the term $\mathcal{E}(z)f(z)$ and $Pf(z)$ into a single formal r -operator. However, we will see that Definition 11.5.3 is well suited for our purpose.

As we will see in the next section, formal r -algebraic equations of Laurent type have a stability property under the change of equation described in Theorem 11.3.1, which is the key to an induction process.

As before, writing $P = \sum_{A \in P} P_A [a; \alpha]$, we have $\mathcal{E}f = \theta - Pf$ if and only if for any nonnegative integer n ,

$$[z^n] \mathcal{E}f(z) = \theta_n - \sum_{A \in P} P_A r^{\alpha(n-a)} f_{n-a},$$

and $[z^n] \mathcal{E}f(z) = 0$ if n is negative. Thus a formal r -algebraic equation of Laurent type is nothing but a special type of linear relation between the coefficients f_n and θ_n .

Example. A simple example of a formal r -algebraic equation of Laurent type is

$$\sum_{a \geq 0} r^{\alpha(n+a)} f_{n+a} = \theta_n,$$

which can also be written as $\sum_{a \leq 0} [a; \alpha] f = \theta$, or, in a more complicated fashion,

$$\sum_{a \geq 0} z^{-a} \left(f(r^\alpha z) - \sum_{0 \leq n \leq a} f_n r^{\alpha n} z^n \right) = \theta(z).$$

This is not a r -algebraic equation, again, because this expresses f_n in terms of f_m for $m > n$. In particular, we can no longer calculate the f_n inductively. ■

Our next proposition shows that when $|r|$ is less than 1, if a formal linear r -operator with $\underline{\alpha}(P)$ positive satisfies the summability condition (11.5.3), then it is a contraction on the holomorphic functions in the sense that it increases the radius of convergence.

Proposition 11.5.4. *Assume that $|r| < 1$. Let P be a formal linear r -operator with $\underline{\alpha}(P)$ positive and satisfying the summability condition (11.5.3). If f is a holomorphic function with radius of convergence at least some ρ , then Pf is holomorphic with radius of convergence at least $\rho/|r|^{\underline{\alpha}(P)}$. In particular, if f is entire, so is Pf .*

Proof. Let f be a holomorphic function and let ρ be its radius of convergence. Let ζ be a positive real number less than ρ . Since $\sum_{n \geq 0} |f_n| \zeta^n$ converges, there exists a constant c such that $|f_n| \leq c/\zeta^n$ for any nonnegative n . Since

$$[z^n]Pf(z) = \sum_{A \in P} P_A r^{\alpha(n-a)} f_{n-a},$$

we have

$$|[z^n]Pf(z)| \leq c \sum_{A \in P} |P_A| |r|^{-\alpha a} \zeta^a \left(\frac{|r|^\alpha}{\zeta} \right)^n.$$

Using the summability condition (11.5.3) and that $|r|$ is less than 1, this is at most $c(|r|^{\underline{\alpha}(P)}/\zeta)^n$. Since ζ can be chosen arbitrary close to ρ , the radius of convergence of $Pf(z)$ is at least $\rho/|r|^{\underline{\alpha}(P)}$. ■

Some important features of formal linear r -algebraic equations of Laurent type can be represented graphically on a Newton like diagram. We indicate the points of coordinates (a, α) by dots, and we add crosses corresponding to the polynomial \mathcal{E} , with the convention that a monomial z^a in that polynomial acting on f as $z^a f(z)$ is placed at $(a, 0)$. For instance we may have the following cloud of points for P .




figure 11.5.1

The following definition will be useful.

Definition 11.5.5. Let (\mathcal{E}, P, θ) be a formal linear r -algebraic equation of Laurent type. Let γ be the degree of \mathcal{E} . The slope of (\mathcal{E}, P, θ) is

$$s_{\mathcal{E}, P} = \min \left\{ \frac{\alpha}{a - \gamma} : A \in P, a > \gamma \right\},$$

with $\min \emptyset = +\infty$.

Since any formal linear r -algebraic equation of Laurent type has $\underline{\alpha}(P)$ positive and $\bar{\alpha}(P)$ finite, the slope is positive. To determine $s_{\mathcal{E}, P}$, we look at the points to the right of the line $a = \gamma$ and minimize $\alpha/(a - \gamma)$ for those points. Thus, $s_{\mathcal{E}, P}$ is the smallest positive slope connecting the point $(\gamma, 0)$ to (a, α) for a greater than γ . This is the smallest positive slope of the convex hull of the cloud of points, which is indicated on figure 12.5.2.




figure 11.5.2

For what follows it is worth noting that if (\mathcal{E}, P, θ) is a formal linear r -algebraic equation of Laurent type and k is a nonnegative integer, then $\alpha + s_{\mathcal{E}, P}(k + \gamma - a)$ is nonnegative for any A in P ; indeed, $s_{\mathcal{E}, P}$ is positive since $\underline{\alpha}(P)$ is, and, if a is at most γ then $\gamma - a$ is nonnegative and so is $\alpha + s_{\mathcal{E}, P}(\gamma - a)$, while, if a is greater than γ , then $s_{\mathcal{E}, P}$ is at most $\alpha/(a - \gamma)$ which guarantees that $\alpha + s_{\mathcal{E}, P}(\gamma - a)$ is nonnegative.

6. Gliding formal r -algebraic equations of Laurent type.

From now on, r is a complex number of modulus less than 1. We now describe a fairly complicated transformation of formal r -algebraic equations of Laurent type. This transformation is quite mysterious at first sight, but, as we will see later, it will correspond to transforming a q -algebraic equation along the edges of a Newton polygon and substituting an unknown power series by one of its q -Borel transforms, following the equation as the solution becomes more and more regular. This complicated operation will be defined through the following algorithm.

Procedure GLIDING ALGORITHM

Require A formal r -algebraic equation of Laurent type (\mathcal{E}, P, θ) .

★ Start GLIDING ALGORITHM

$\gamma \leftarrow \deg \mathcal{E}$.

Define Q_n and R_n by $z^n = \mathcal{E}(z)Q_{n-\gamma}(z) + R_n(z)$.

$$s \leftarrow \min \left\{ \frac{\alpha}{a - \gamma} : A \in P, a > \gamma \right\}$$

$$\mathcal{F}(z) \leftarrow 1 + \mathcal{E}_\gamma^{-1} \sum_{\substack{A \in P \\ \alpha = (a - \gamma)s}} P_A r^{-s(\gamma - a)^2/2} z^{a - \gamma},$$

$$Q \leftarrow \sum_{\substack{A \in P \\ k \geq 0 \\ \alpha + s(k + \gamma - a) > 0}} P_A r^{-s(k + \gamma - a)^2/2} Q_k(0) [a - \gamma - k; \alpha + s(k + \gamma - a)]$$

$$\phi(z) \leftarrow \sum_{\substack{k \geq 0 \\ n \geq 0}} r^{-sn^2/2} \theta_{n + \gamma + k} Q_k(0) z^n.$$

return (\mathcal{F}, Q, ϕ) .

Given a formal r -algebraic equation of Laurent type (\mathcal{E}, P, θ) , we now explain how to construct the cloud of points (a, α) of the output (\mathcal{F}, Q, ϕ) of the gliding algorithm.




figure 11.6.1

To construct the points pertaining to the formal linear r -factors $[a - \gamma - k; \alpha + s(k + \gamma - a)]$, we first consider k to be 0 and construct the points $(a - \gamma, \alpha - s(a - \gamma))$. They are obtained from the points (a, α) by moving the origin to the point $(\gamma, 0)$ and substituting the vertical distance to the supporting line of slope s for the ordinate. But we need to remove the points pertaining to \mathcal{E} and add the point $(0, 0)$ corresponding to the constant coefficient 1 of \mathcal{F} . Thus if (\mathcal{E}, P, θ) has the cloud of point in figure 11.5.1, we obtain the cloud of points in figure 11.6.1.




figure 11.6.2

Then we mark with a cross the points pertaining to \mathcal{F} , that is those which are on the a -axis, and add the points corresponding to

$[a - \gamma - k, \alpha - s(a - \gamma) + sk]$, $k > 0$. Those are obtained by drawing half lines of slope $-s$ going to the left of each point with positive ordinate, and marking the points of integer abscissa on these lines. This gives figure 11.6.2.

As we see in figure 11.6.2, this has the same structure as the picture we started with, namely a finite number of points on the a -axis, all the other points having positive ordinates which are of the form $n + sm$, and hence, ordinate which are rational numbers with a common denominator, and the largest abscissa is finite. All what we did is to glide the points and add a lot more points which will turn out not so important. As the following result shows, the fact that the final picture shares the salient features of the original one is not a coincidence, for the gliding algorithm preserves formal linear r -algebraic equations of Laurent type.

Proposition 11.6.1. *Assume that $|r|$ is less than 1. If (\mathcal{E}, P, θ) is a formal linear r -algebraic equation of Laurent type and θ is of full r -Gevrey order $s_{\mathcal{E}, P}$, then (\mathcal{F}, Q, ϕ) obtained from the gliding algorithm is also a formal r -algebraic equation of Laurent type.*

Proof. We need to show that the requirements of Definition 11.5.3 are satisfied for (\mathcal{F}, Q, ϕ) . Set $s = s_{\mathcal{E}, P}$. Note that s is at least $\underline{\alpha}(P)/\bar{\alpha}(P)$ and is positive. Given how the slope $s_{\mathcal{E}, P}$ is defined, we have $(a - \gamma)s \leq \alpha$ for any A in P with a greater than γ . Since s is positive, the inequality $(a - \gamma)s \leq \alpha$ then holds for any A in P , even if a is not greater than γ . Since $a - \gamma$ is an integer, $\mathcal{F}(z)$ is a power series. Since $\bar{\alpha}(P)$ is finite, the equality $\alpha = 2(a - \gamma)s$ can hold only for finitely many A in P . Thus, \mathcal{F} is a polynomial in z .

Since s and $\underline{\alpha}(P)$ are positive, we see that if A is in P and $\alpha = (a - \gamma)s$, then $a - \gamma$ is positive. Consequently, $\mathcal{F}(0) = 1$ and \mathcal{F} does not vanish at 0.

Clearly Q is a formal linear r -operator. It has the form $Q = \sum_{B \in Q} Q_B B$ where each $B = [b; \beta]$ is some $[a - \gamma - k; \alpha + s(k + \gamma - a)]$ with A in P and $k \geq 0$ and $\alpha + s(k + \gamma - a)$ positive, that is, β positive. It is clear that $\underline{\alpha}(Q)$ is nonnegative. To show that $\underline{\alpha}(Q)$ is positive, assume that it is not. Then we can find some sequence A_n in P and some nonnegative k_n such that $u_n = \alpha_n + s(k_n + \gamma - a_n)$ is positive for each n but converges to 0 as n tends to infinity. The u_n are rational numbers with a common denominator δ . By construction,

$s = \beta/(b - \gamma)$ for some B in P . Thus,

$$u_n(b - \gamma) = (b - \gamma)\alpha_n + \beta(k_n + \gamma - a_n).$$

Since (\mathcal{E}, P, θ) is a formal linear r -algebraic equation of Laurent type, the α_n can be reduced to the same denominator, say $\alpha_n = m_n/N$ for m_n and N integers. Therefore,

$$u_n N(b - \gamma) = (b - \gamma)m_n + \beta N(k_n + \gamma - a_n).$$

Since (u_n) tends to 0, the sequence of integers $(b - \gamma)m_n + \beta N(k_n - \gamma - a_n)$ converges to 0 and is constant equal to 0 for any n large enough. This implies that $u_n = 0$ for any n large enough, which contradicts that u_n is positive. Thus $\underline{\alpha}(Q)$ is positive.

To prove that $\bar{\alpha}(Q)$ is finite, we use that $\bar{\alpha}(P)$ is finite and the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\alpha}(Q) &= \max\{a - \gamma - k : a \in P, k \geq 0, \alpha + s(a - \gamma + k) > 0\} \\ &\leq \max\{a - \gamma : A \in P\} \\ &\leq \bar{\alpha}(P) - \gamma. \end{aligned}$$

We then need to show that the summability condition (11.5.3) is preserved by the gliding algorithm. Let λ be a positive real number. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{B \in Q} |Q_B| |r|^{-\beta b} \lambda^b &\leq \sum_{\substack{A \in P \\ k \geq 0 \\ \alpha + s(k + \gamma - a) \geq 0}} |P_A| |r|^{-s(k + \gamma - a)^2/2} |Q_k(0)| \\ &\quad |r|^{-(\alpha + s(k + \gamma - a))(a - \gamma - k)} \lambda^{a - \gamma - k}. \end{aligned} \quad (11.6.1)$$

Let R be as in Lemma 11.2.3, with \mathcal{E} substituted for \mathcal{C} in that lemma. Since the modulus of r is less than 1, we can find a positive M such that $|r|^M R/\lambda < 1$.

If $k + \gamma - a$ is at least $2M/s$, then

$$\frac{s}{2}(k + \gamma - a)^2 + \alpha(k + \gamma - a) \geq (M + \alpha)(k + \gamma - a)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |r|^{(s/2)(k + \gamma - a)^2 + \alpha(k + \gamma - a)} R^k \lambda^{a - \gamma - k} &\leq \left(\frac{|r|^{M + \alpha} R}{\lambda}\right)^k |r|^{-\alpha a} \left(\frac{\lambda}{|r|^M}\right)^a \frac{|r|^{M\gamma}}{\lambda^\gamma} |r|^{\alpha\gamma}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $|r|^{\alpha\gamma} < 1$, referring to (11.6.1), we have that the summation in (11.6.1) over $A \in P, k \geq 0, \alpha + 2s(k + \gamma - 1) > 0$, and $k + \gamma - a \geq 2M/s$, is at most

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{A \in P \\ k \geq 0}} |P_A| \left(\frac{|r|^M R}{\lambda} \right)^k |r|^{-\alpha a} \left(\frac{\lambda}{|r|^M} \right)^a \frac{|r|^{M\gamma}}{\lambda^\gamma} \\ \leq c \frac{|r|^{M\gamma}}{\lambda^\gamma} \sum_{A \in P} |P_A| |r|^{-\alpha a} \left(\frac{\lambda}{|r|^M} \right)^a. \end{aligned}$$

This bound is finite under (11.5.3).

Next, if $k + \gamma - a$ is less than $2M/s$, then $k + \gamma \leq (2M/s) + \bar{a}(P)$ and that part of (11.6.1) is at most

$$c \sum_{\substack{A \in P \\ k + \gamma \leq (2M/s) + \bar{a}(P)}} |P_A| |r|^{-\alpha a} \lambda^a \leq c \sum_{A \in P} |P_A| |r|^{-\alpha a} \lambda^a < \infty.$$

This shows that Q satisfies the summability condition (11.5.3).

We finally show that ϕ is entire. Since θ is of full r -Gevrey order s , we have for any ϵ positive

$$\sum_{k \geq 0} |\theta_k| r^{-sk^2/2} / \epsilon^k < \infty.$$

Thus, for any positive ϵ , there exists some c such that $|\theta_k| \leq c\epsilon^k r^{sk^2/2}$. Then, using Lemma 11.2.3, $[[z^n]\phi]$ is at most

$$|r|^{-sn^2/2} \sum_{k \geq 0} |\theta_{n+k+\gamma}| |Q_k(0)| \leq c\epsilon^n \sum_{k \geq 0} |r|^{s((n+k+\gamma)^2 - n^2)/2} (\epsilon R)^k. \quad (11.6.2)$$

The exponent of $|r|$ is

$$s(k + \gamma)(2n + k + \gamma) \geq s(k + \gamma)^2 \geq sk^2.$$

Thus, (11.6.2) is at most $c\epsilon^n$. Since ϵ is arbitrary, ϕ is entire. \blacksquare

Definition 11.6.2. We say that we glide (\mathcal{E}, P, θ) to (\mathcal{F}, Q, ϕ) if (\mathcal{F}, Q, ϕ) is obtained from (\mathcal{E}, P, θ) by the gliding algorithm. We then write $(\mathcal{F}, Q, \phi) = \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{E}, P, \theta)$.

Note that whenever we write $(\mathcal{F}, Q, \phi) = \mathcal{G}(\mathcal{E}, P, \theta)$, this means that \mathcal{E} is a polynomial which does not vanish at 0, and then, according to Proposition 11.6.1, so is \mathcal{F} .

7. Interpretation of the gliding algorithm. We can now give an interpretation of the gliding algorithm through the following result.

Proposition 11.7.1. *Assume that $|r|$ is less than 1. Let (\mathcal{E}, P, θ) be a formal linear r -algebraic equation of Laurent type with θ of full r -Gevrey order $s_{\mathcal{E}, P}$. Assume that its solution f is entire. Then $\mathcal{B}_{r, s_{\mathcal{E}, P}} f$ is holomorphic and solves $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{E}, P, \theta)$.*

In other words, if θ is in $\mathbb{C}[[z]]_{r, (s_P, \mathcal{E})}$ and (\mathcal{E}, P, θ) has an entire solution, this solution has r -Gevrey order $s_{\mathcal{E}, P}$ and the glided equation $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{E}, P, \theta)$ is that for the appropriate r -Borel transform of f . This is the abstract form of obtaining (11.1.6) from (11.1.1) under (11.1.4).

Proof. If f is entire, Proposition 11.5.4 implies that Pf is entire. Since f solves (\mathcal{E}, P, θ) , we also have

$$\mathcal{E}f = \theta - Pf.$$

Since $|r| < 1$ and θ is of full r -Gevrey order $s_{\mathcal{E}, P}$, the power series θ is entire. Therefore, as a difference of entire series, $\mathcal{E}f$ is entire. We are in position to apply Theorem 11.3.1, with $U = \theta - Pf$. We have

$$[z^n]U = \theta_n - \sum_{A \in P} P_A r^{\alpha(n-a)} f_{n-a}.$$

Thus, (11.3.3) implies

$$f_n = \sum_{k \geq 0} \theta_{n+\gamma+k} Q_k(0) - \sum_{\substack{A \in P \\ k \geq 0}} P_A r^{\alpha(n-a+\gamma+k)} Q_k(0) f_{n-a+\gamma+k}. \quad (11.7.1)$$

Set $g = \mathcal{B}_{r, s_{\mathcal{E}, P}} f$, so that $f_n = r^{sn^2/2} g_n$. We then rewrite (11.7.1) as

$$g_n = r^{-sn^2/2} \sum_{k \geq 0} \theta_{n+\gamma+k} Q_k(0) - \sum_{\substack{A \in P \\ k \geq 0}} P_A r^{\alpha(n-a+\gamma+k) + s((n-a+\gamma+k)^2 - n^2)/2} Q_k(0) g_{n-a+\gamma+k}. \quad (11.7.2)$$

With the notation of the gliding algorithm, we have

$$r^{-sn^2/2} \sum_{k \geq 0} \theta_{n+\gamma+k} Q_k(0) = [z^n] \phi(z).$$

In the last sum of (11.7.2), the exponent of r is

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha(n - a + \gamma + k) + \frac{s}{2}(2n - a + \gamma + k)(-a + \gamma + k) \\ &= (\alpha + s(k + \gamma - a))(n + k + \gamma - a) - \frac{s}{2}(k + \gamma - a)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (11.7.3)$$

Since $\underline{\alpha}(P)$ is positive and $\bar{a}(P)$ is finite, we see on (11.7.2) that, when n is at least $\bar{a}(P)$, the exponent of r is increasing in k when n is at least $\bar{a}(P)$. This exponent is minimal when k vanishes, then equal to, reading now (11.7.3),

$$(\alpha + s(\gamma - a))(n + \gamma - a) - \frac{s}{2}(\gamma - a)^2.$$

In (11.7.2), we isolate the terms for which k vanishes and $\alpha + s(\gamma - a) = 0$. Those terms contribute as the opposite of

$$\sum_{\substack{A \in P \\ \alpha = s(a - \gamma)}} P_A r^{-s(\gamma - a)^2/2} Q_0(0) g_{n - a + \gamma}.$$

Multiplying by z^n and summing over n yields, with \mathcal{F} as in the gliding algorithm, and upon noting that by definition of Q_0 we have $Q_0(0) = 1/\mathcal{E}_\gamma$,

$$\sum_{\substack{A \in P \\ \alpha = s(a - \gamma)}} P_A r^{-s(\gamma - a)^2/2} Q_0(0) z^{a - \gamma} g(z) = (\mathcal{F}(z) - 1)g(z).$$

Next, the contribution in (11.7.2) of A in P and $k \geq 0$ such that $\alpha + s(k + \gamma - a)$ is positive is, using (11.7.3), multiplying by z^n and summing over n ,

$$\sum_{\substack{A \in P \\ \alpha + s(k + \gamma - a) > 0}} P_A r^{-s(k + \gamma - a)^2/2} Q_k(0) [a - \gamma - k; \alpha + 2s(k + \gamma - a)] g(z),$$

that is, with Q as in the gliding algorithm, $Qg(z)$. Thus, $\mathcal{B}_{r, s_{\mathcal{E}}, P} f$ solves $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{E}, P, \theta)$. \blacksquare

8. Gliding iteratively. Consider a formal linear r -algebraic equation of Laurent type given by (\mathcal{E}, P, θ) , with $|r|$ less than 1, and θ of full r -Gevrey order $s_{\mathcal{E}, P}$. In particular, θ is entire since $|r|$

is less than 1. Assume that this equation has a holomorphic solution f . Then

$$\mathcal{E}f = \theta - Pf. \quad (11.8.1)$$

This equality is of the form $\mathcal{E}f = U$. Proposition 11.5.4 and θ being entire ensure that the radius of convergence of U exceeds that of f . Consequently, a priori, f has radius of convergence the modulus of the smallest root of \mathcal{E} and the asymptotic behavior of f_n is given by singularity analysis. If this is not the case, we can apply the root peeling algorithm to determine the exact asymptotic behavior of (f_n) .

Eventually, f might be entire. In this case, Proposition 11.7.1 implies that $\mathcal{B}_{r,s_{\mathcal{E}},P}f$ is holomorphic and solves $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{E}, P, \theta)$. Thus, up to changing the notation, we get also an equation of the form (11.8.1) after gliding.

Therefore, we see that to determine the asymptotic behavior of (f_n) , it suffices to apply the root peeling algorithm, and if the function θ satisfies enough linear constraints of the form (11.4.5), we can glide the equation, and iterate.

9. Conclusion. The procedures described in the previous sections, namely the root peeling algorithm and the iteration of the gliding algorithm can be read directly and efficiently on the Newton polygon associated with the points (a, α) , as we will now explain. We will distinguish linear r -algebraic equations with $|r| < 1$ and convergent solution, and linear q -algebraic equations with $|q| > 1$ and divergent solutions.

Linear r -algebraic equations with $|r| < 1$ and convergent solutions. We consider an equation of the form

$$\mathcal{E}(z)f(z) = \theta(z) + Pf(z)$$

with now P an r -operator with $\underline{\alpha}(P) > 0$, with \mathcal{E} a polynomial not vanishing at 0, and θ entire. Its cloud of points (a, α) has for instance a structure comparable to that in figure 11.9.1.

The points indicated with a cross pertain to the polynomial \mathcal{E} , while those with a dot pertain to P . To each of these points (a, α) we attach the number $P_{[a;\alpha]}$, and we will speak of the weight of the point (a, α) when referring to $P_{[a;\alpha]}$. Each point $(a, 0)$ with a cross has a weight which corresponds to the coefficient \mathcal{E}_a , while

each point (a, α) with a dot has a weight $P_{(a;\alpha)}$ which corresponds to the coefficient of the r -factor $(a; \alpha)$ in P .




figure 11.9.1




figure 11.9.2

As we go along the algorithm we will see that the relevant picture

is figure 11.9.2.

We start with the equation $\mathcal{E}f = \theta - Pf$. The equation determines the generic asymptotic behavior of f_n , simply by applying Theorem 7.2.2. If θ satisfies enough linear constraints as described in the root peeling algorithm, the asymptotic behavior of f_n is not the generic one. We proceed with the root peeling algorithm, as much as we can. Once all the roots are peeled off, then either θ has q -Gevrey order at most $s_{\mathcal{E},P}$, in which case f has the same order, or we can glide the equation because θ has full q -Gevrey order $s_{\mathcal{E},P}$. In this later case, to determine the asymptotic behavior of f_n , we only need the edges of the polygon indicated on figure 11.9.2. In the gliding algorithm, each point on the edge of the Newton polygon on figure 11.9.2 corresponds to $k = 0$. On the edge, the gliding algorithm multiplies the weight to the right of the vertical line $a = \gamma_1$ by $r^{-s_1(\gamma_1 - a)^2/2}/\mathcal{E}_{\gamma_1}$. The new polynomial $\mathcal{E}^{(1)}$ is obtained by considering only the points which are on the edge of slope $s_1/2$.

If θ allows it, as we glide further, we move along the edges, multiplying whatever is to the right of the line $a = \gamma_i$ by $r^{-s_i(\gamma_1 + \dots + \gamma_i - a)^2/2}/\mathcal{E}_{\gamma_i}^{(i)}$. The polynomials $\mathcal{E}^{(i)}$ are then read directly from the points with their weights.

Example. Consider the equation

$$(1 - z)f(z) = \theta(z) + z^2f(rz) + z^3f(r^4z), \quad (11.9.1)$$

and assume that θ is entire. The cloud of points is in figure 11.9.3.

The equation has the form $(1 - z)f(z) = U(z)$ where the radius of convergence of U is greater than that of f . Thus, the singularity analysis of section 6.2 implies that generically $f_n \sim U(1)$ as n tends to infinity. This is not sharp if $U(1) = 0$, meaning

$$\theta(1) + f(r) + f(r^4) = 0. \quad (11.9.2)$$

It is unclear how one can check this condition besides by some numerical computations or careful considerations of the f_n as a polynomials in r .




figure 11.9.3

If $\theta(1) + f(r) + f(r^4) = 0$ and θ is of full r -Gevrey order 1, then we glide the equation (otherwise, we cannot). The relevant part of the equation is read on figure 11.9.4, given that we have in this example $r^{-s_1(\gamma_1-a)^2/2}/\mathcal{E}_{\gamma_1} = -r^{(1-a)^2}$.

So the part of the new equation driving the asymptotic behavior of f_n is

$$(-1 - z)f(z) = \tilde{\theta}(z) - r^{-4}z^2f(r^2z).$$

For this equation, $f_n^{(1)} \sim -U^{(1)}(-1)$, which means that $f_n \sim cr^{n^2/2}$, so that f is not only entire but has $1/r$ -Gevrey order 1.




figure 11.9.4

Linear q -algebraic equations with $|q| > 1$ and divergent solution.

Consider a q -algebraic equation $Pf = \theta$ with $|q| > 1$ and $0 = \underline{\alpha}(P_0) < \underline{\alpha}(P_+)$, having a cloud of points like the one in figure [linEqFgJ], where we labeled the edges of the Newton polygon with numbers 0, 1, 2 and 3 in boxes for a reason which will be apparent later.

The height of the equation, $H(P)$, is $\max\{a/\alpha : A \in P\}$, which in figure 11.9.5, is the slope of the segment between the points (0, 0) and (2, 3). As we have seen in section 6.4, setting $g = \hat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q}f$, we obtain a new equation for g ,




figure 11.9.5

$$\sum_{A \in P} P_A q^{-H_P a(a-h_P)/2} (a; aH_P - \alpha)_{1/q} g = \tilde{\theta}$$

with $\tilde{\theta}(z) = \mathcal{B}_{q,H_P} \theta(z/q^{H_P h_P/2})$. Setting $r = 1/q$, this equation for g has a cloud of points derived from that of P by substituting a point $(a, aH_P - \alpha)$ for a point (a, α) . The number $aH_P - \alpha$ is the vertical gap between the point (a, α) and the line $\alpha = aH_P$. For the points in figure 11.9.5, we obtain the cloud in figure 11.9.6.

Because all the slopes of the Newton polygon are multiples of $1/2$, we are then back in the previous situation, having an $r^{1/2}$ -algebraic equation with an analytic solution, which is also a formal $r^{1/2}$ -algebraic equation of Laurent type. We write $(\mathcal{E}^{(0)}, Q^{(0)}, \tilde{\theta}^{(0)})$ for this equation.




figure 11.9.6

The slope s_1 is

$$\min \left\{ \frac{aH_P - \alpha}{a - \gamma} : A \in P, a > \gamma \right\}.$$

If $\tilde{\theta}^{(0)}$ has full $r^{1/2}$ -Gevrey order s_1 , then its $r^{1/2}$ -Borel transform of order s_1 is analytic. Therefore, the q -Borel transform of order $2(H_P - s_1)$ of f is analytic. But $2(H_P - s_1)$ is twice the slope of the second segment in the convex hull in figure 11.9.5.

Referring to the root peeling algorithm, we see that as θ satisfies more and more constraints, the solution f of the equation becomes more and more regular, and its q -Gevrey order takes values among the slopes of the sides of the convex hull of the cloud of points associated to P as in figure 11.9.5.

Further information can be obtained from the Newton polygon. Referring to figures 11.9.5 and 11.9.6, we label the edges of the polygons, the edge labeled '0' starting at $(0, 0)$, and increasing the label by 1 as we move to the next edge on the right. The horizontal projection of the k -th edge on figures 11.9.5 and 11.9.6 have the same lengths; for those specific figures, the projection of edge '0' has length 2, that of edge '1' has length 1, that of edge '2' has length 4, and that of edge '3' has length 4 as well.

Write $(\mathcal{E}^{(j)}, Q^{(j)}, \tilde{\theta}^{(j)})$ for the glided equation $\mathcal{G}^j(\mathcal{E}^{(0)}, Q^{(0)}, \tilde{\theta}^{(0)})$. Then the degree of $\mathcal{E}^{(j)}$ is the length of the projection of the j -th edge on the horizontal axis. Following the root peeling algorithm, this is also the number of linear constraints that $\tilde{\theta}^{(j)}$ must satisfy for the solution of $\mathcal{G}^j(\mathcal{E}^{(0)}, Q^{(0)}, \tilde{\theta}^{(0)})$ to have a nongeneric r -Gevrey order.

Therefore, the edges of the Newton polygon on figure 11.9.5 have the following interpretation: generically, the equation has a solution of q -Gevrey order $H(P)$, here $3/2$. The length of the horizontal projection of the corresponding edge of the polygon, that is, edge labeled '0', is opposite of the index of P on the space of power series of full q -Gevrey order $3/2$, and is also the number of constraints that θ must satisfy for the solution to be of lower q -Gevrey order. If θ is such that the solution is of full q -Gevrey order $3/2$, then this solution must be of q -Gevrey order 1, which is the slope of the next edge of the polygon.

12. Algorithms

The purpose of this chapter is to gather several algorithms which allow one to implement the results obtained so far. These algorithms will be used in our next chapter when we study particular equations.

This chapter is as self-contained as possible, in the sense that the implementation of these algorithms does not require a deep understanding of the previous chapters. It is aimed at readers with primary interest in applications.

We use the term algorithm in a loose way, because the main methods we show depend on operations which are known to be non-algorithmic, such as, for example, finding roots of polynomials or deciding whether a number is zero.

In applications, q may be either a generic variable, or can be specified as a given value. Overall, if all the coefficients and parameters of a q -algebraic equation are specific numbers, then all polynomials involved in finding the solution, such as the indicial and initial polynomials, are explicit. Their roots can be found numerically. When q or other quantities in the equation are generic parameters, our key algorithms are subject to the ability to solve for zeros of polynomials whose coefficients may be parameters with unspecified values. In this case, as we will see in our last chapter devoted to examples, the main use of the algorithms is then not to automate the process of studying q -algebraic equations, but to provide a clear path on how to study these equations, this study requiring often a combination of hand calculation and the use of a computer algebra package.

1. Notation and assumptions. All the procedures described below are given a name typeset in small capitals, and, whenever they are used, a notation like $\text{ALGO}(a, b)$ means that procedure ALGO is called with parameters a and b . The required parameters for each procedure are stated in the corresponding **Require** section. Although this is remarked whenever necessary, there are places where a method is called which has not been defined. This implies that that method is assumed to be part of the symbolic algebra system

or that its implementation is rather straightforward. For example, $\text{ROOTS}(P)$ refers to a procedure which should return the roots of a polynomial P .

It is convenient to have a hash table which associates to each point in the cloud, the list of monomials in P corresponding to that point. This makes the coding and computations easier, albeit at a price in memory use. We assume that this hash table is defined, and will call it $\text{HASH}(P, p)$, where p is a point. Thus, $\text{HASH}(P, p)$ is the list of monomials of P whose corresponding point is p . It is an empty list if no monomial corresponds to p , and, more generally, it represents what we would write P_p with notation 3.3.3.

We distinguish between lists and tuples, using brackets for lists and parentheses for tuples. If L is a list, then **push-into**(L, c) adds the elements c to the end of list L .

For convenience, we use the following notation: if p is a point in the plane, $X(p)$ and $Y(p)$ are its abscissa and ordinate.

2. Newton-Puiseux polygon. Given a polynomial P in $\mathbb{C}[[z^{\mathbb{R}}]][Y_0, \dots, Y_n]$, or more precisely, a q -operator with finite support, we want to generate a data structure describing the Newton-Puiseux polygon corresponding to P . For this we need the cloud of points, though only the leftmost points at each height are needed to describe the Newton-Puiseux polygon. The polygon is completely described by its vertices, but it is convenient to add the list of co-slopes of each side.

2.1. Computation of the Newton-Puiseux polygon. In order to compute the actual vertices of the Newton-Puiseux polygon, we proceed geometrically as follows. First of all, we compute the list of leftmost vertices at each height and order them according to increasing ordinate, obtaining a list $[p_1, \dots, p_n]$. If there is only one, this means that all the points in the cloud have the same ordinate and the polygon is just the half line starting at p_1 and going to the right. Procedure **NEWTON-PUISEUX-POLYGON** returns a pair made of two lists: the first list, *vertices*, contains the vertices of the Newton-Puiseux polygon, the second one, *coslopes*, contains the co-slopes of the sides. This procedure uses another one, $\text{COSLOPE}(p_1, p_2)$, which returns the co-slope of the line passing through p_1 and p_2 , that is, when p_1 and p_2 do not have the same ordinates, $(X(p_2) - X(p_1)) / (Y(p_1) - Y(p_2))$.

Procedure NEWTON-PUISEUX-POLYGON. Computation of the Newton-Puiseux polygon (vertices and co-slopes).

Require a list $[p_1, \dots, p_n]$ of points in the plane ordered by strictly increasing ordinate (no two points with same ordinate).

★ Start NEWTON-PUISEUX-POLYGON

```

 $v \leftarrow p_1$ 
 $vertices \leftarrow [v]; coslopes \leftarrow []$ 
 $\mu = -\infty$  ( $\mu$  will be the last computed co-slope)
while  $v \neq p_n$  do
   $j \leftarrow \min\{i : Y(p_i) > Y(v)\}$ 
  while  $j \leq n$  do
     $\lambda \leftarrow \text{COSLOPE}(v, p_j)$ 
    if  $\lambda \geq \mu$  then (note  $\geq$ , not  $>$ )
       $\mu \leftarrow \lambda; nextv \leftarrow p_j$ 
    end if
     $j \leftarrow j + 1$ 
  end while
  push-into( $vertices, nextv$ )
  push-into( $coslopes, \mu$ )
   $v \leftarrow nextv$ 
end while
return ( $vertices, coslopes$ )

```

2.2. Convenience methods. The following easy-to-implement methods will be useful.

Points at a co-slope. Recall that $L_\mu(P)$ is the leftmost line of co-slope μ meeting the Newton-Puiseux polygon in a nonempty set. Given a co-slope μ , the points which are part of L_μ can be computed using minima as procedure POINTS-AT-COSLOPE describes. We use this because procedure NEWTON-PUISEUX-POLYGON only returns the vertices, and therefore, if an edge of the polygon contains more than two points, some of those points will not be included.

Procedure POINTS-AT-COSLOPE. Points of the cloud on L_μ .

Require the list of points in the cloud, $cloud = [p_1, \dots, p_n]$, and a co-slope μ .

★ Start POINTS-AT-COSLOPE

```

 $output \leftarrow []$ 

```

```

 $\nu \leftarrow \min\{X(p) + \mu Y(p) : p \in \text{cloud}\}$ 
for  $p$  in  $\text{cloud}$  do
  if  $X(p) + \mu Y(p) = \nu$  then
    push-into( $\text{output}, p$ )
  end if
end for
return  $\text{output}$ 

```

Indicial polynomial of a point. Recall that for a point p in the cloud of P , the indicial polynomial of P at p is

$$\Psi_{P,p}(t) = \sum_{\substack{A \in P \\ (a,\ell)=p}} P_A t^{\alpha(A)}.$$

Procedure INDICIAL-POLYNOMIAL shows how to compute $\Psi_{P,p}(t)$. Assume that P is a polynomial in z and Y_0, \dots, Y_n . We compute the coefficient of a monomial of $\Psi_{P,p}(t)$ by substituting z by 1 and all the Y_i , $1 \leq i \leq n$, by t . We assume that the procedure SUBSTITUTE(L, E) allows us to make the substitution indicated by the list L in the expression E . For instance SUBSTITUTE($[z = 1, Y_0 = t], z^3 Y_0^4 Y_1$) would return $t^4 Y_1$.

Procedure INDICIAL-POLYNOMIAL. The indicial polynomial for P at a point p .

Require a q -operator P and a point p .

★ Start INDICIAL-POLYNOMIAL

```

 $\Psi(t) \leftarrow 0$ 
for  $A$  in HASH( $P, p$ ) do
   $\Psi(t) \leftarrow \Psi(t) + \text{SUBSTITUTE}([z = 1; Y_i = t; 0 \leq i \leq n], A)$ 
end for
return  $\Psi$ 

```

Initial polynomial for a given co-slope. Computing the initial polynomial for a given co-slope is just a matter of computing the indicial polynomials and multiplying their evaluations at q^μ by the appropriate power of the variable c , and summing. We assume that the procedure CLOUD(P) returns the list of points in the cloud of P . We assume that given a list of points, *listOfPoints*, the procedure

LEFTMOST-POINT returns a list containing for each ordinate the leftmost point in the list *listOfPoint*. The list returned is assumed to be ordered by increasing ordinates.

Procedure INITIAL-POLYNOMIAL. Compute the initial polynomial of a q -operator P for a co-slope μ .

Require a q -operator P and a co-slope μ .

★ Start INITIAL-POLYNOMIAL

$\Phi(c) \leftarrow 0$

$temporary \leftarrow \text{NEWTON-PUISEUX-POLYGON}(\text{LEFTMOST-POINTS}(\text{CLOUD}(P)))$

$points \leftarrow \text{POINTS-AT-COSLOPE}(temporary, \mu)$

for p **in** $points$ **do**

$m = Y(p)$

$\Phi(c) \leftarrow \Phi(c) + c^m \text{INDICIAL-POLYNOMIAL}(P, p)(q^\mu)$

end for

return $\Phi(c)$

Translation T_{cz^μ} . Translating and shifting are probably the most used operations when trying to study solutions of q -algebraic equations. One only needs to take care of the adequate exponents of q , as shown in the following procedure TRANSLATION.

Procedure TRANSLATION. Translate a q -operator by cz^μ .

Require a q -operator P , a complex number c , and a co-slope μ .

★ Start TRANSLATION

$Q \leftarrow P$

$\bar{\alpha} \leftarrow \max\{\alpha_\ell : A \in P\}$

$Q \leftarrow \text{SUBSTITUTE}([Y_i = Y_i + cq^{i\mu}z^\mu; 0 \leq i \leq \bar{\alpha}], Q)$

return Q

Simplification by z . Simplifying by z is simple as translating, as procedure SIMPLIFY shows.

Procedure SIMPLIFY. Simplify a q -operator by z .

Require a q -operator P and a complex number c .

★ Start SIMPLIFY

$Q \leftarrow P$

```

 $\bar{\alpha} \leftarrow \max\{\alpha_\ell : A \in P\}$ 
 $Q \leftarrow \text{SUBSTITUTE}([Y_i = c + zY_i; 0 \leq i \leq \bar{\alpha}], Q)$ 
return  $Q/z$ 

```

Note that procedure SIMPLIFY may return something which has a nonzero denominator in z if $P_{(0;u)}$ does not vanish (see Propostion 4.3.3).

Test for solved form. One usually wants to check whether a q -algebraic equation is in solved form or not. This is what procedure IS-IN-SOLVED-FORM does. It assumes that there exist four procedures,

- Z-EXPONENT, which returns the exponent of z in a monomial $z^a Y^\lambda$;
- Y-EXPONENT, which, given a monomial $z^a Y^\lambda$, returns the tuple of exponents $(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_n)$, where λ_i is the exponent of Y_i ;
- NOT-INTEGER, which decides whether a number is an integer or not;
- MONOMIALS, which returns the list of monomials of a q -operator passed as argument.

Since deciding if a q -algebraic equation is in solved form or not requires to assess if the nonshifting q -factors are linear, we will make use of the following procedure which decides if a q -operator has at least one non-shifting term.

Procedure HAS-A-NONSHIFTING-PART. Decide if a q -operator has a non-shifting part.

Require a q -opeartor P .

```

★ Start HAS-A-NONSHIFTING-PART
for  $A$  in MONOMIALS( $P$ ) do
   $a \leftarrow$  Z-EXPONENT( $A$ )
   $\lambda \leftarrow$  Y-EXPONENT( $A$ )
  if  $(a = 0) \wedge (\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} \lambda_i \neq 0)$  then
    return true
  end if
end for
return false

```

We can then write a procedure to decide if an equation is in solved form or not.

Procedure IS-IN-SOLVED-FORM. Decide whether an equation is in solved form or not.

Require a q -operator P .

★ Start IS-IN-SOLVED-FORM

```

if HAS-A-NON-SHIFTING-PART( $P$ ) then
  for  $A$  in MONOMIALS( $P$ ) do
     $a \leftarrow$  Z-EXPONENT( $A$ )
    if ( $a < 0$ )  $\vee$  NOT-INTEGER( $a$ ) then
      return false
    end if
     $(\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_n) \leftarrow$  Y-EXPONENT( $A$ )
    if ( $a = 0$ )  $\wedge$  ( $\sum_i \lambda_i > 1$ ) then
      return false
    end if
  end for
  return true      (Only reached when true)
else      (P has only shifting terms)
  return false
end if

```

3. Computation of the initial terms of the solutions. All the previous procedures are relevant for the following one which we improperly call the “computation of solutions” of q -algebraic equations using the Newton-Puiseux procedure. As a matter of fact, the most we can do is to find a number of possible initial expansions of possible solutions, given a q -operator P . In general we cannot always guarantee that what has been found is the beginning of a solution.

3.1. Calculating the exponents. The initial terms of a solution are monomials in z . To determine their exponents, we need to find the possible co-slopes corresponding to vertices of the Newton-Puiseux polygon. These are related to the co-slopes of the supporting lines of the Newton-Puiseux polygon and the roots of the indicial polynomials of the vertices. In order to decide whether these roots are relevant or not, we need to assess what co-slopes appear both before and after a specific vertex of the polygon. Our next procedure, NEXT-COSLOPES, could well be called ‘next exponent of z ’; it takes a q -operator P and returns the list of the possible exponents for the first terms of the solution. In some instances we may want to

restrict the output to exponents above some given threshold μ_{min} ; for instance, when solving the q -Catalan equation, one may be interested only in power series solutions, restricting the exponents to be at least 0. An additional flag, *flagEqual*, allows us to select the exponents which are greater than or equal to μ_{min} , or only those which are greater than μ_{min} .

This procedure assumes that we have

- a method NONZERO-ROOTS which, for a polynomial, returns a list of all its nonzero complex roots;
- a method IS-REAL which decides whether its parameter is a real number or not, that is if it has no imaginary part;
- the ability to compare two real values.

Though these three items are not realistic in general, current symbolic algebra systems are capable enough to deal with most of the practical examples, and this will be illustrated in the next chapter.

As indicated in the introduction to this chapter, the value of q is implicit everywhere in procedure RECURSIVE-SOLVE. One may wish to add a parameter to this function in order to substitute this parameter for q whenever the latter appears.

The procedure NEWTON-PUISEUX-POLYGON defined earlier returns a pair of lists. We agree that the second list in that pair can be accessed as NEWTON-PUISEUX-POLYGON() [2].

The procedure NEXT-COSLOPES uses a procedure VERTICES-BELOW-LOWEST-POINT-IN(P , *listOfPoints*) which returns the vertices of the Newton-Puiseux polygon of P which are below the lowest point in the list of points *listOfPoints*.

In the procedure NEXT-COSLOPES, we calculate some indicial polynomials, from which we calculate the roots. It is possible for an indicial polynomial to be 0, as in equation (2.1.2). In this case, the polynomial has infinitely many roots, and the algorithm fails, printing that infinitely many exponents are possible.

Procedure NEXT-COSLOPES.

Require a q -operator P , a minimum coslope μ_{min} which is a lower bound for the co-slopes to be computed, a binary flag *flagEqual*, asserting if we allow for equality to μ_{min} .

★ Start NEXT-COSLOPES

```

borderP ← LEFTMOST-POINTS(CLOUD(P))
coslopesNPP ← NEWTON-PUISEUX-POLYGON(borderP)[2]
listOfMu ← [ ] (to become a list of coslopes)
for  $\mu$  in coslopesNPP do
  if  $(\mu > \mu_{min}) \vee (flagEqual \wedge (\mu = \mu_{min}))$  then
    push-into(listOfMu,  $\mu$ )
  end if
end for
points ← POINTS-AT-COSLOPE(P,  $\mu_{min}$ )
push-into(points, VERTICES-BELOW-LOWEST-POINT-IN(P,
                                                                    points))

for  $p$  in points do
   $\Psi$  ← INDICIAL-POLYNOMIAL(P,  $p$ )
  if  $\Psi = 0$  then
    print(“ $\psi = 0$ : infinitely many exponents are possible”)
    rootsOfPsi ←  $\infty$ 
    return None
  else
    rootsOfPsi ← NONZERO-ROOTS( $\Psi$ )
  end if
  for  $r$  in rootsOfPsi do (does  $r$  provide a valid coslope?)
     $\lambda$  ←  $\log_q(r)$ 
    if IS-REAL( $\lambda$ ) then
       $\lambda_-$  ←  $\max\{\nu \in coslopesNPP : \nu \leq \lambda\}$  (coslope before  $\lambda$ )
       $\lambda_+$  ←  $\min\{\nu \in coslopesNPP : \nu \geq \lambda\}$  (coslope after  $\lambda$ )
      if  $((\lambda_- < \lambda) \vee (flagEqual \wedge (\lambda_- = \lambda))) \wedge (\lambda_+ > \lambda)$  then
        push-into(listOfMu,  $\lambda$ )
      end if
    end if
  end for
end for (listOfMu lists all the possible next coslopes)
return listOfMu

```

3.2. A recursive method using a tree structure. Recall that a q -algebraic equation may have several solutions which start with the same few monomials. This leads us to think of the solutions as a tree. For instance, if we have two solutions, say $f_1(z) = 1 + z + z^2 + z^3 \dots$ and $f_2(z) = 1 + z + 2z^2 + 3z^3 + \dots$, we can organize the first few terms of these solutions as a tree as in figure 12.3.1.

This leads us to define a Newton-Puiseux object as a recursive structure, that is, as a tree with a finite number of branches at each node, each branch representing the next term in a solution and carrying the equation as it is being translated and simplified along the solution.




figure 12.3.1

The procedure RECURSIVE-SOLVE takes for argument a Newton-Puiseux object, which is a recursive object composed of a list $[\mu, Q, M, \mathcal{L}]$ where:

- the number μ represents the last exponent which was added to the “solution” under consideration. This is $-\infty$ at the beginning;
- Q is the equation at the present stage, that is, after performing all the substitutions which have led to this point;
- M is the last monomial added, which will be of the form cz^μ ;
- \mathcal{L} is a list of Newton-Puiseux objects, one for each possible coslope and each possible root of the corresponding indicial and initial polynomials.

As an example, if up to this point two solutions have been found, one of the form

$$3 + 2z^{1/2} + 7z^{2/3} - 3z^2,$$

and one of the form

$$2 - 2z^{1/2},$$

we would have the recursive list-type object

```
[0, Q0, 3,
 [
 [1/2, Q1, 2z^(2/3),
 [
 [ 2/3, Q3, 7z^(2/3),
 [
 [2, Q4, -3z^2, [[]]]]],
 [1/2, Q5, -2z^(1/2), [[]]]] .
```

Note that \mathcal{L} starts as an empty list. The value returned by procedure RECURSIVE-SOLVE is a Newton-Puiseux object.

One of the inputs is a non-negative integer k , the number of terms of each solution still to be computed, which is then the depth of the tree. This value is what guarantees that the recursion is finite, as it is decreased with each call.

In order to call Procedure RECURSIVE-SOLVE, one has to build an initial Newton-Puiseux object. This can be easily done with just the list $[\mu, P, 0, []]$, where μ is the minimum desired starting coslope, or exponent, so that $\mu = -\infty$ gives all the possible trees.

Procedure RECURSIVE-SOLVE. Recursive call to find “solutions.”

Require a Newton-Puiseux object \mathcal{N} , a number of terms to be computed k , a binary flag *flagEqual* to be passed to NEXT-COSLOPE

★ Start RECURSIVE-SOLVE

```

 $[\mu, Q, M, \mathcal{L}] \leftarrow \mathcal{N}$ 
if  $k = 0$  then      (end of recursion)
    return  $\mathcal{N}$ 
end if
 $listOfMu \leftarrow \text{NEXT-COSLOPES}(P, \mu, \text{flagEqual})$ 
if ( $listOfMu = [ ]$ )  $\wedge$  ( $Q(z, 0) \neq 0$ ) then
     $M = \text{not\_available}$ ;  $\mu \leftarrow \text{not\_available}$       (this branch does not lead to a solution)

    return  $[\mu, Q, M, \mathcal{L}]$ 
else
    for  $\mu$  in  $listOfMu$  do
         $\Phi \leftarrow \text{INITIAL-POLYNOMIAL}(P, \mu)$ 
         $rootsOfPhi \leftarrow \text{NONZERO-ROOTS}(\Phi)$ 
        for  $r$  in  $rootsOfPhi$  do
             $Q \leftarrow \text{TRANSLATION}(P, r, \mu)$ 
             $\mathcal{N}' \leftarrow [\mu, Q, rz^\mu, [ ]]$ 
             $\text{PUSH-INTO}(\mathcal{L}, \text{RECURSIVE-SOLVE}(\mathcal{N}', k - 1, \text{false}))$ 
        end for
    end for
end if

```

The purpose of flag *flagEqual* in the procedure RECURSIVE-SOLVE is to allow for a call with a starting coslope different from $-\infty$ in order to get the solutions starting at least with that exponent.

We could also add a flag *flagPowerSeries* to discard solutions with non-integer or negative exponents and keep only power series solutions. This flag should be passed recursively with the same

value. If it is added, then any call to procedure RECURSIVE-SOLVE with initial $\mu = 0$ and *flagPowerSeries* = **true**, would only provide ‘solutions’ which have non-negative integer exponents, that is, which correspond to true formal power series. We will use this technique to transform an equation into solved form.

3.3. The list of initial expansions. From the Newton-Puiseux object returned by procedure RECURSIVE-SOLVE, one usually wants to extract the list of initial terms of solutions which have been computed. This requires traversing the tree structure and adding the corresponding monomials at each point. This is what procedure INITIAL-EXPANSIONS does.

Procedure INITIAL-EXPANSIONS. Expand into sums the monomials from the tree structure returned by RECURSIVE-SOLVE

Require a Newton Polygon object \mathcal{N} as, for example, returned by RECURSIVE-SOLVE, a list \mathcal{S} which contains the different expansions and is empty in the first call, and a value $s(t)$ which represents the sum of the terms in the present branch (0 for the initial call).

```

* Start INITIAL-EXPANSIONS
   $[\nu, P, M, \mathcal{L}] \leftarrow \mathcal{N}$       (Values of the node)
   $s(t) \leftarrow s(t) + M$ 
  if  $\mathcal{L} = \emptyset$  then
    push-into( $\mathcal{S}, s(t)$ )
    return  $\mathcal{S}$ 
  end if
  for  $\mathcal{N}'$  in  $\mathcal{L}$  do
     $\mathcal{S} \leftarrow$  INITIAL-EXPANSIONS( $\mathcal{N}', \mathcal{S}, s(t)$ )
  end for
  return  $\mathcal{S}$ 

```

4. Reduction to ikeysolved form. As we saw in Chapter 4, there is no guarantee that an equation can be reduced to solved form in a finite number of steps. However, one is usually interested in trying or at least knowing if one can get to solved form in some finite number of steps. However, in the end, the effort to reduce to solved form amounts to solving the equation with non-negative integer exponents, so that our procedure TO-SOLVED-FORM is almost a simple wrapper around the procedure RECURSIVE-SOLVE. It returns a pair of lists: the first list contains the beginning of the solutions bringing the equation to a solved form; the second list

contains the corresponding solved form derived from these initial terms.

One should be aware that for some equations one needs to ramify z in order to be able to bring them to solved form; in this case, the following procedure cannot be applied directly. We will see such an example in the next chapter.

We use a procedure $\text{COEFF}(Q(t), t, n)$ which returns the coefficient of t^n in the polynomial $Q(t)$, as well as $\text{DEG}(Q(t))$ which returns the degree of the polynomial $Q(t)$.

We assume that we implemented the procedure $\text{RECURSIVE-SOLVE-INTEG}$ which is the procedure RECURSIVE-SOLVE but allowing only for power series solutions, as described at the end of subsection 3.2.

Procedure TO-SOLVED-FORM. Bring an equation to its solved form and returns all the paths leading to solved forms and the transformed equations.

Require a q -operator P and a finite number k indicating the maximum number of simplifications to make.

★ Start TO-SOLVED-FORM

```

solutions ← [ ]; equations ← [ ]
 $\mathcal{T} = [0, P, 0, [ ]]$  (first 0 for solutions with no poles)
 $\mathcal{N} \leftarrow \text{RECURSIVE-SOLVE-INTEG}(\mathcal{T}, k)$ 
 $\mathcal{S} \leftarrow \text{INITIAL-EXPANSIONS}(\mathcal{N})$ 
i ← 0
for s in  $\mathcal{S}$  do
  if s is not marked not_available then
     $P' \leftarrow P$ 
    for  $j = 0$  to  $\text{DEG}(s(t))$  do
       $P' \leftarrow \text{SIMPLIFY}(\text{TRANSLATE}(P', \text{COEFF}(s(t), t, j), 1))$ 
    end for
    if  $\text{IN-SOLVED-FORM}(P')$  then
      push-into(solutions, s(t)); push-into(equations,  $P'$ )
    end if
  end if
end for
return (solution, equations)

```

5. An easy optimization. Procedure $\text{INITIAL-EXPANSIONS}$ tries to find all possible initial solutions up to a specific number of terms.

If one fixes a positive number ν and wishes to compute the possible initial expansions, say $s(z)$, such that $Ps(z) = o(z^\nu)$, an easy and often useful optimization is possible. Let μ be any co-slope and $A = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$ be a q -factor. The point corresponding to A in the cloud is (a, ℓ) . The line of co-slope μ passing through $(\nu, 0)$ is the set of points (b, m) such that $b + \mu m = \nu$. If $a + \mu\ell > \nu$, then the monomial A has no influence in the terms of degree less than ν of any solution, so that it can be subtracted from P for the purpose of finding a solution up to $o(z^\nu)$.

As an illustration, the points at the top of the dashed line on the figure 12.5.1 may be removed from P .

This idea may be implemented in the procedure RECURSIVE-SOLVE, before the last call to **push-into** which contains the recursive call to RECURSIVE-SOLVE. One might include before that line the following code. It assumes that a procedure SUM-TERMS is passed a list and sums all the terms in this list.

```

for  $p$  in CLOUD( $Q$ ) do
  if  $X(Q) + \mu Y(Q) > \nu$  then
     $Q \leftarrow Q - \text{SUM-TERMS}(\text{HASH}(Q, p))$ 
  end if
end for

```

With this optimization, the procedure RECURSIVE-SOLVE needs a new input parameter, namely the maximum order ν , which should then be passed in the recursive calls.




figure 12.5.1

13. Examples

In this chapter, we study various q -algebraic equations which appear in the literature, illustrating the theory developed in the previous chapters. Each example seeks to illustrate different aspects and the examples are loosely ordered in increasing difficulty.

1. The colored Jones equation for the figure 8 knot. The purpose of this example is to analyse a q -algebraic equation which is naturally written as a polynomial in the q -difference operator σ . Its solution is a divergent series both when $|q| < 1$ and $|q| > 1$, which coefficients are known explicitly, allowing us to check the accuracy of our results.

Following Garoufalidis (2004), the colored Jones polynomials for the figure 8 knot are

$$J_n(q) = \sum_{0 \leq k \leq n-1} q^{nk} \left(\frac{1}{q^{n+1}}; \frac{1}{q} \right)_k \left(\frac{1}{q^{n-1}}; q \right)_k$$

with $J_0(q) = 1$. Recall the operator $\sigma f(z) = f(qz)$. Garoufalidis (2004) showed that the generating function $J(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} J_n z^n$ satisfies the q -algebraic equation

$$C_0 J(z) + z C_1 J(z) + z^2 C_2 J(z) + z^3 C_3 J(z) = 0,$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} C_0 &= q\sigma(q^2 + \sigma)(q^5 - \sigma^2)(1 - \sigma) \\ C_1 &= -q^2\sigma^{-1}(1 + \sigma)(q^4 - \sigma q^3(2q - 1) - q^3\sigma^2(q^2 - q + 1) \\ &\quad + q^4\sigma^3(q - 2) + \sigma^4 q^4)(q^3 - \sigma^2)(1 - \sigma) \\ C_2 &= q^7\sigma^{-1}(1 - \sigma)(1 + \sigma)(1 - q^3\sigma^2)(q\sigma(q - 2) + \sigma^2(-1 + q - q^2) \\ &\quad - \sigma^3(2q - 1) + q\sigma^4) \\ C_3 &= -q^{10}\sigma(1 - \sigma)(1 + q^2\sigma)(1 - q^5\sigma^2). \end{aligned}$$

Note that in the C_i , the constant terms correspond to the operators that multiply a power series f by that constant term, that is, if c is a complex number occurring in a C_i , then c means $c\sigma^0$.

Let P the q -operator corresponding to this equation. Since the equation is expressed as a polynomial in σ , the equation $Pf = 0$ is linear in the unknown power series f . In particular, it is in solved form. The nonshifting part of the operator is given by C_0 , while the shifting part corresponds to $zC_1 + z^2C_2 + z^3C_3$.

In particular, we have

$$\bar{\alpha}(P_0) = \deg_{\sigma} C_0 = 5$$

while

$$\underline{\alpha}(P_0) = \text{ord}_{\sigma} C_0 = 1.$$

The shifting part of the operator is given by $zC_1 + z^2C_2 + z^3C_3$. We have

$$\bar{\alpha}(P_+) = \max_{i=1,2,3} \deg_{\sigma} C_i = \max(7, 7, 5) = 7$$

and

$$\underline{\alpha}(P_+) = \min_{i=1,2,3} \text{ord}_{\sigma} C_i = \min(-1, 0, 1) = -1.$$

We will need to discuss cases according to the position of q with respect to 1.

1.1. Case $|q| > 1$. Since $\bar{\alpha}(P_0) < \bar{\alpha}(P_+)$ and $|q| > 1$, the relevant results are those of Chapter 8.

In order to fulfill assumption (8.1), we consider $f(z) = \sigma^5 J(z)$ as our new function. It solves the q -algebraic equation

$$(D_0 + zD_1 + z^2D_2 + z^3D_3)f(z) = 0$$

with $D_i = C_i \sigma^{-5}$. The D_i are Laurent polynomials. This equation corresponds to a new q -operator Q , which has now $\bar{\alpha}(Q_0) = 0$. It involves many q -factors, all of the form $(a; \alpha_1)$ for $a = 0, 1, 2, 3$, the q -factors $(a; \alpha_1)$ coming from D_a . Thus, $\max_{a=i} \alpha_{\ell}$ is $\deg_{\sigma} D_i$. For this equation, the following table then shows how to calculate efficiently the quantities needed to apply the results of Chapter 8.

$i =$	0	1	2	3
leading term of C_i	$q\sigma^5$	$-q^6\sigma^7$	$q^{11}\sigma^7$	$-q^{17}\sigma^5$
leading term of D_i	q	$-q^6\sigma^2$	$q^{11}\sigma^2$	$-q^{17}$
corresponding $Q_A A$	$q(0; 0)$	$-q^6(1; 2)$	$q^{11}(2; 2)$	$-q^{17}(3; 0)$
$H(A)$	–	2	1	0
r_A	q	$-q^6$	q^{11}	$-q^{17}$

From this table, we read that the height of the set of q -factors involved in the equation for f is 1 and the co-height is 2. The crest is

$$\widehat{P} = q(0; 0) - q^6(1; 2).$$

Corollary 8.1.8 yields

$$[z^n]f(z) \sim cq^{n(n-1)}q^{5n}$$

as n tends to infinity. Since $f_n = q^{5n}J_n$, we conclude that

$$J_n \sim cq^{n(n-1)} \quad (13.1.1)$$

as n tends to infinity.

Since the assumptions of Corollary 8.1.6 do not hold in this example, it is possible that c is 0. This example is instructive since the asymptotic behavior of J_n can be obtained directly from its expression. Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} J_n &= \sum_{0 \leq k \leq n-1} q^{nk} \frac{1 - 1/q^n}{(1 - 1/q^{n-k}) \cdots (1 - 1/q^{n+k})} \\ &= \sum_{0 \leq j \leq n-1} q^{n(n-1-j)} \frac{1 - 1/q^n}{(1 - 1/q^{j+1}) \cdots (1 - 1/q^{2n-1-j})}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, isolating the term for which $j = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} J_n &= q^{n(n-1)} \frac{1 - 1/q^n}{(1/q; 1/q)_{2n-1}} \\ &\quad + q^{n(n-1)}(1 - 1/q^n) \sum_{1 \leq j \leq n-1} \frac{q^{-nj}}{(1/q^{j+1}; 1/q)_{2(n-j)-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $|q| > 1$, we have $0 \leq 1 - 1/|q^j| \leq |1 - 1/q^j|$ for any nonnegative integer j , and therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{1 \leq j \leq n} \frac{q^{-nj}}{(1/q^{j+1}; 1/q)_{2(n-j)-1}} \right| &\leq \sum_{1 \leq j \leq n} \frac{|q|^{-nj}}{(1/|q|; 1/|q|)_\infty} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(1/|q|; 1/|q|)_\infty} \frac{|q|^{-n}}{1 - |q|^{-n}}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$J_n \sim \frac{q^{n(n-1)}}{(1/q; 1/q)_\infty}$$

as n tends to infinity. We see that (13.1.1) is in fact sharp.

1.2. Case $|q| < 1$. Since $|q| < 1$ and $\underline{\alpha}(P_+) < \underline{\alpha}(P_0)$, the relevant results are again those of Chapter 8. It is then convenient to apply a reflection, setting $r = 1/q$, so that we will be dealing with an r -algebraic equation with $|r| > 1$.

Recall that the q -difference operator σ_q acts on power series by $\sigma_q f(z) = f(qz)$. In particular, since $r = 1/q$, we have $\sigma_q = \sigma_r^{-1}$. Consequently, writing $C_i(\sigma_q, q)$ for what we wrote so far as C_i , and writing τ for σ_q^{-1} , we define

$$D_i(\tau, r) = C_i(1/\tau, 1/r), \quad i = 0, 1, 2, 3.$$

Setting

$$Q_r = D_0(\tau, r)\tau + zD_1(\tau, r)\tau + z^2D_2(\tau, r)\tau + D_3(\tau, r)\tau,$$

we have $P_q = Q_r\tau^{-1}$. The multiplication by τ is introduced so that, as we will see, $\deg_\tau D_0(\tau, r) = 0$.

The nonshifting part of Q_r is given by $D_0(\tau, r)\tau$. Thus $\bar{\alpha}((Q_r)_0)$ is the degree in τ of $D_0(\tau, r)\tau$. Since

$$D_0(\tau, r) = \frac{1}{r} \left(\frac{1}{r^2} + \frac{1}{\tau} \right) \left(\frac{1}{r^5} - \frac{1}{\tau^2} \right) \left(1 - \frac{1}{\tau} \right),$$

the term of highest degree in τ is $1/r^8$. Thus, $\bar{\alpha}(Q_{r,0}) = 0$, as it should be, given that we calculated $\underline{\alpha}(P_{q,0}) = 1$.

We have, as Puiseux series τ

$$\begin{aligned} D_1(r, \tau) &= -r^{-2}\tau^2 r^{-4}r^{-3} + O(\tau^3) = -r^{-9}\tau^2 + O(\tau^3), \\ D_2(r, \tau) &= O(\tau), \\ D_3(r, \tau) &= O(1). \end{aligned}$$

Thus the crest of Q_r is

$$\widehat{Q}_r = r^{-8}(0; 0) - r^{-9}(1; 2).$$

This crest is linear, with height 2 and co-height 1. Therefore, Corollary 8.1.8 implies that the solution of $Qf = 0$ satisfies, as n tends to infinity,

$$f_n \sim cr^{n(n-1)} \left(\frac{1}{r} \right)^n.$$

Since $PJ = Q\tau^{-1}J$, we have $f = \tau^{-1}J$, and therefore, $f_n = r^{-n}J_n$. Consequently,

$$J_n(q) \sim cq^{-n(n-1)} \quad (13.1.1)$$

as n tends to infinity.

This asymptotic equivalent can be confirmed and even precised by a direct consideration of $J_n(q)$. Indeed we rewrite

$$J_n(q) = \sum_{0 \leq k \leq n-1} \frac{q^{nk}}{q^{(n+1)+\dots+(n+k)+(n-1)+\dots+(n-k)}} \\ (q^{n+1} - 1)(q^{n+2} - 1) \dots (q^{n+k} - 1)(q^{n-1} - 1) \dots (q^{n-k} - 1),$$

Since

$$(n - k) + \dots + (n + k) = (2k + 1)n,$$

we obtain

$$J_n(q) = q^{-n(n-1)} \sum_{0 \leq k \leq n-1} q^{kn} \frac{(1 - q^{1+k}) \dots (1 - q^{2n-1-k})}{q^n - 1}.$$

As n tends to infinity, each q^{kn} tends to 0 except when $k = 0$, and when $k = 0$, the product $(1 - q^{1-k}) \dots (1 - q^{2n-1-k})$ converges to $(q; q)_\infty$ as n tends to infinity. This implies

$$J_n(q) \sim q^{-n(n-1)}(q; q)_\infty$$

as n tends to infinity, and confirms (13.1.1).

2. First combinatorial example (Drake, 2009). This example provides us with an equation for which the solution is convergent when $|q| < 1$ and divergent when $|q| > 1$. It is also an example where our result can be proved to be sharp when q is a positive real number. This is quite typical of the q -algebraic equations arising in combinatorics. For this example, the asymptotic behavior of the coefficients is known from some combinatorial arguments, and as in the previous example, this will illustrate how sharp our general results are.

Motivated by combinatorics of lattice paths, Drake (2009) considers a set of positive integers S_0 and the equation

$$f(z) = 1 + qzf(z)f(q^2z) + \sum_{j \in S_0} q^{j(j-1)} z^j f(z)f(q^2z) \dots f(q^{2(j-1)}z). \quad (13.2.1)$$

Though Drake (2009) allows for S_0 to be infinite, we restrict S_0 to be finite here so that the corresponding q -operator has finite length. In our notation, Drake's set S is $S_0 \cup \{0\}$.

Equation (13.2.1) is in solved form. It corresponds to the q -operator

$$P = 1 - (0; 0) + q(1; 0, 2) + \sum_{j \in S_0} q^{j(j-1)}(j; 1, 2, \dots, 2(j-1)).$$

The nonshifting part is $P_0 = (0; 0)$ and the shifting part is

$$P_+ = q(1; 0, 2) + \sum_{j \in S_0} q^{j(j-1)}(j; 1, 2, \dots, 2(j-1)).$$

In particular, we have

$$\underline{\alpha}(P_0) = \bar{\alpha}(P_0) = 0$$

and $\underline{\alpha}(P_+) = 0$, as well as

$$\bar{\alpha}(P_+) = 2 \vee \max_{j \in S_0} 2(j-1).$$

Therefore, when $|q| > 1$, the relevant results are those of Chapter 8, while when $|q| < 1$ they are those of Chapter 6.

2.1. Case $|q| > 1$. The height of the q -factor $(1; 0, 2)$ is 1, while that of $(j; 0, 2, \dots, 2(j-1))$ is $(j-1)/j$, which is less than 1. Thus, the height of P is 1; its co-height is 1; and its crest is

$$\widehat{P} = -(0; 0) + q(1; 0, 2).$$

This crest has a unique shifting q -factor. Corollary 8.1.8 yields, for some complex number c_q ,

$$[z^n]f \sim q^{n(n-1)}c_qq^n = c_qq^{n^2}$$

as n tends to infinity. It is possible for c_q to vanish. However, when q is real and positive, Corollary 8.1.6 shows that c_q does not vanish. Therefore, this estimate is sharp in this case.

Drake's combinatorial argument, while less general than ours, is more specific for that equation. Indeed, equation (5) in Drake (2009) is our equation (13.2.1), so that his $\tilde{r}_n^{(S)}(q)$ is our f_n and his

$r_n^{(S)}(1/q)$ is our $q^{-n^2} f_n$. The constant c is then given in Drake's (2009) Theorem 1 and is

$$c_q = \prod_{i \geq 1} \frac{1}{1 - q^{-2i}} \left(1 + \sum_{j \in S_0} q^{-j(2i-1)} \right).$$

2.2. Case $|q| < 1$. To apply the technique described in Chapter 6, we factor $f(z)$ in (13.2.1). Namely, writing

$$g(z) = 1 - qzf(q^2z) - \sum_{j \in S_0} q^{j(j-1)} z^j f(q^2z) \cdots f(q^{2(j-1)}z),$$

we rewrite (13.2.1) as

$$f(z)g(z) = 1. \quad (13.2.1)$$

Let ζ be a complex number of minimal modulus such that $g(\zeta) = 0$, that is

$$q\zeta f(q^2\zeta) + \sum_{j \in S_0} q^{j(j-1)} \zeta^j f(q^2\zeta) \cdots f(q^{2(j-1)}\zeta) = 1.$$

If q is real and positive, then each f_n is a power series in q with positive coefficients. The same argument as for proving Corollary 8.1.6 shows that ζ is real and positive and is unique.

We then have, provided $g'(\zeta) \neq 0$,

$$f(z) = \frac{1}{g(z) - g(\zeta)} \sim \frac{1}{(z - \zeta)g'(\zeta)}$$

as z tends to ζ . Therefore, if $(z - \zeta)f(z)$ is analytic in a disk of radius larger than $|\zeta|$ and if ζ is unique, then

$$[z^n]f \sim [z^n] \frac{1}{(z - \zeta)g'(\zeta)} = -\frac{1}{\zeta^{n+1}g'(\zeta)}$$

as n tends to infinity.

Assume now that q is in $(0, 1)$. Since (13.2.1) yields

$$\begin{aligned} f_n &= \mathbb{1}\{n = 0\} + q \sum_{n_1 + n_2 = n-1} q^{2n_2} f_{n_1} f_{n_2} \\ &+ \sum_{j \in S_0} q^{j(j-1)} \sum_{n_1 + \cdots + n_{j-1} = n-j} q^{2n_2 + 4n_3 + \cdots + 2(j-1)n_{j-1}} f_{n_1} \cdots f_{n_{j-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

all the f_i are positive. It follows from Pringsheim's theorem that ζ is a positive real number and then that $f'(\zeta)$ is positive. Let $h(z) = (z - \zeta)f(z)$. Substituting in (13.2.1) and using that $g(\zeta) = 0$, we obtain

$$h(z) = \frac{z - \zeta}{g(z) - g(\zeta)}.$$

Since $g'(\zeta) \neq 0$, the function h has a removable singularity at ζ because both $g(z)$ and $1/(z - \zeta)$ are defined on a larger disk punctured at ζ .

This proves that when q is real and between 0 and 1, then $f_n \sim c/\zeta^n$ as n tends to infinity.

3. Second combinatorial example (Drake, 2009). This example provides a first instance where the coefficients of the solution, when the solution is divergent, have an oscillatory behavior.

Drake (2009, display (12)) considers also the example

$$f(z) = 1 + zf(z) + qz^2f(z)f(qz). \quad (13.3.1)$$

He shows that when $|q| > 1$, there exist positive constants \tilde{c}_0 and \tilde{c}_1 , such that

$$f_{2m} \sim q^{m^2} \tilde{c}_0 \quad \text{and} \quad f_{2m+1} \sim q^{m^2+m} \tilde{c}_1 \quad (13.3.2)$$

as m tends to infinity. Note that if $n = 2m$, then $m^2 = n^2/4$, while if $n = 2m + 1$, then $m^2 + m = (n^2/4) - 1/4$. Thus, setting $c_0 = \tilde{c}_0$ and $c_1 = q^{-1/4} \tilde{c}_1$, (13.3.2) can be rewritten as

$$f_n \sim q^{n^2/4} c_m \quad (13.3.3)$$

as n tends to infinity, with m being 0 if n is even and m being 1 if n is odd.

The q -operator corresponding to equation (13.3.1) is

$$P = 1 - (0; 0) + (1; 0) + q(2; 0, 1).$$

It is in solved form, with $\underline{\alpha}(P_0) = \bar{\alpha}(P_0) = 0$ and $\underline{\alpha}(P_+) = 0$ and $\bar{\alpha}(P_+) = 1$. To study the solution, we need to distinguish according to the position of $|q|$ with respect to 1.

Case $|q| > 1$. The height of P is $1/2$ and its co-height is 2. The crest is

$$\hat{P} = -(0; 0) + q(2; 0, 1).$$

This crest contains a unique shifting q -factor, $(2; 0, 1)$, and the corresponding coefficient $P_{(2;0,1)}$ is q . Corollary 8.1.8 implies that there exist c_0 and c_1 such that

$$[z^n]f(z) \sim q^{(1/4)n(n-2)}q^{n/2}c_m = q^{n^2/4}c_m$$

where m is the remainder of the division of n by 2. Therefore, we recovered (13.3.3), however with the possibility that c_0 or c_1 may vanish. To see that they do not vanish in general, we can either use the proof of Corollary 8.1.8, or make a direct calculation. Indeed, since all the coefficients involved in equation (13.3.1) are positive, the proof of Corollary 8.1.6 shows that the function U_{q,f_0} in (8.1.3) has nonnegative coefficients. The crest polynomial is

$$C_q(z) = 1 - qz^2$$

and has roots $1/\sqrt{q}$ and $-1/\sqrt{q}$. We then have, writing U for U_{q,f_0} in (8.1.3),

$$[z^n]\frac{U(z\sqrt{q})}{1 - qz^2} = \frac{1}{2}[z^n]\left(\frac{U(z\sqrt{q})}{1 - \sqrt{q}z} + \frac{U(z\sqrt{q})}{1 + \sqrt{q}z}\right).$$

Using singularity analysis, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} [z^n]\frac{U(z\sqrt{q})}{1 - qz^2} &\sim \frac{1}{2}(U(1)q^{n/2} + U(-1)(-1)^nq^{n/2}) \\ &\sim q^{n/2}\frac{1}{2}(U(1) + (-1)^nU(-1)). \end{aligned}$$

So we have $c_0 = (U_q(1) + U_q(-1))/2$ and $c_1 = (U_q(1) - U_q(-1))/2$. Thus c_0 is the sum of all coefficients of even order of U_q while c_1 is the sum of all coefficients of odd order. Since U_q has nonnegative coefficients, $U_q(1) - U_q(-1)$ does not vanish, and we have indeed $f_n \sim q^{n^2/4}c_m$ with c_0 and c_1 not being 0.

In this example, there is no improvement in linearizing the crest as described in Chapter 11.

The combinatorial argument in Drake (2009) provides an explicit value for c_0 and c_1 . Indeed, his $\tilde{m}_n^{(1)}(q)$ is our f_n , so that his $m_{2n}^{(1)}(1/q)$ is our $q^{-n^2}f_{2n}$ and his $m_{2n+1}^{(1)}(1/q)$ is our $q^{-(n^2+n)}f_{2n+1}$. Since we have $q^{-n^2}f_{2n} \sim \tilde{c}_0$ and

$$q^{-(n^2+n)}f_{2n+1} = q^{1/4}q^{-(2n+1)^2/4}f_{2n+1} \sim \tilde{c}_1,$$

as n tends to infinity, it follows from Drake's (2005) Theorem 5 that c_0 is his $\Phi_2(1/q)$ and c_1 his $q^{-1/4}\Psi_2(1/q)$, that is, with $r = 1/q$,

$$c_0 = \frac{1}{(r; r)_\infty (r^2; r^{12})_\infty (r^9; r^{12})_\infty (r^{10}; r^{12})_\infty}$$

and

$$c_1 = \frac{q^{-1/4}}{(r; r^2)_\infty (r^4; r^{12})_\infty (r^6; r^{12})_\infty (r^8; r^{12})_\infty (r^{12}; r^{12})_\infty}.$$

Case $|q| < 1$. Set $g(z) = 1 - z - qz^2f(qz)$, so that (13.3.1) is $f(z)g(z) = 1$. Let ζ be a complex number of smallest modulus such that $g(\zeta) = 0$. We have

$$g'(\zeta) = -1 - 2q\zeta f(q\zeta) - q^2\zeta^2 f(q\zeta).$$

If ζ is unique and $g'(\zeta) \neq 0$, then

$$f(z) \sim \frac{1}{(z - \zeta)g'(\zeta)}$$

as z tends to ζ .

As in the previous example, if q is real and between 0 and 1, all the f_n are nonnegative, $g'(\zeta)$ is positive and ζ is unique. In this case, we have

$$f_n \sim \frac{1}{\zeta^{n+1}g'(\zeta)}$$

as n tends to infinity.

4. Third combinatorial example (Gessel, 1980). This example deals with a q -algebraic equation with a parameter. It is very similar to the previous one.

Gessel (1980) considers particular q -algebraic equations motivated by the q -Lagrange inversion. For instance, he studied the equation (Gessel, 1980, equation (10.16))

$$f(z) = 1 + q(1 + s)zf(z) + q^3sz^2f(z)f(qz). \quad (13.4.1)$$

The corresponding q -operator is

$$P = 1 - (0; 0) + q(1 + s)(1; 0) + q^3s(2; 0, 1).$$

It is in solved form and

$$\underline{\alpha}(P_0) = \overline{\alpha}(P_0) = 0$$

while

$$\underline{\alpha}(P_+) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\alpha}(P_+) = 1.$$

We then need to distinguish according to whether $|q|$ is smaller or greater than 1.

Case $|q| > 1$. We apply the results of Chapter 8. The height of the equation is $1/2$ and its co-height is 2. The crest is

$$\widehat{P} = -(0; 0) + q^3 s(2; 0, 1).$$

Corollary 8.1.8 yields

$$[z^n]f \sim q^{(1/4)n(n-2)} q^{3n/2} s^{n/2} c_m(s) \sim q^{(n^2/4)+n} s^{n/2} c_m(s)$$

with m being 0 or 1 according to the parity of n . Again, as in the previous example, the coefficients $c_0(s)$ and $c_1(s)$ do not vanish when the coefficients in equation (13.4.1) are positive, that is when q and s are positive.

Case $|q| < 1$. We rewrite the equation as

$$f(z)(1 - q(1 + s)z - q^3 s z^2 f(qz)) = 1.$$

As before, this leads to the asymptotic behavior

$$f_n \sim \frac{c}{\zeta^n}$$

as n tends to infinity, where ζ is the root of smallest modulus of the equation

$$q(1 + s)z + q^3 s z^2 f(qz) = 1.$$

5. Generating function of bargraphs q -counted by area. This example is somewhat a mirror of our first example: its purpose is to provide an equation where the solution is convergent both for $|q| < 1$ and $|q| > 1$. It is also an example where a change of function $f(z) = g(-z)$ is needed to obtain a rigorous estimate on f_n from our results.

Motivated by applications in statistical physics, Prellberg and Brak (1995) considered the generating function of so-called bar-graphs q -counted by area, and they showed that it is a solution of the q -algebraic equation

$$f(z) = sf(qz) + qsz + qzf(z) + qszf(qz) + qzf(qz)f(z).$$

The corresponding q -operator is

$$P = qs(1; \sqcup) + (qz - 1)(0; 0) + s(0; 1) + qs(1; 1) + q(1; 0, 1).$$

It is in solved form. Since $\underline{\alpha}(P_0) = \underline{\alpha}(P_+) = 0$, the solution is convergent whenever $|q| < 1$. Since $\bar{\alpha}(P_0) = \bar{\alpha}(P_+) = 1$, the solution is convergent whenever $|q| > 1$.

Case $|q| < 1$. We write the equation as

$$f(z)(1 - qz - qzf(qz)) = sf(qz) + qsz + qszf(qz).$$

Again, setting ζ_s to be the root of smallest modulus of

$$qz + qzf(qz) = 1$$

we obtain $f_n \sim c/\zeta_s^n$ as n tends to infinity provided ζ is unique and the proper derivative does not vanish. As before, the structure of the equation is such that the coefficients f_n are positive when q and s are real numbers between 0 and 1, because applying $[z^n]$ yields the induction

$$(1 - sq^n)f_n = qs\mathbb{1}\{n = 1\} + qf_{n-1} + q^n sf_{n-1} + q \sum_{n_1+n_2=n-1} q^{n_1} f_{n_1} f_{n_2}.$$

Case $|q| > 1$. We substitute z/q for z in the equation, obtaining

$$f(z/q) = sf(z) + sz + zf(z/q) + szf(z) + zf(z)f(z/q). \quad (13.5.1)$$

We rewrite this equation as

$$f(z)(s + sz + zf(z/q)) = (1 - z)f(z/q) - sz.$$

Again, we expect an asymptotic equivalence of the form $f_n \sim c/\zeta_s^n$ for some ζ_s . However, this time the coefficients f_n are not guaranteed

to be positive when q is real. However, we have the following argument.

Assume that q is positive and that s is greater than 1. Set $g(z) = f(-z)$. Then (13.5.1) is

$$sg(z) - g(z/q) = sz + szg(z) + zg(z/q) + zg(z)g(z/q).$$

Applying $[z^n]$, we obtain the recursion

$$(s - q^{-n})g_n = s\mathbb{1}\{n = 1\} + (s + q^{-(n-1)})g_{n-1} + \sum_{n_1+n_2=n-1} q^{-n_2}g_{n_1}g_{n_2}.$$

Since s is greater than 1, this implies that g_n is positive. Therefore, we have now $g_n \sim c/\rho_s^n$ for some positive ρ and some nonnegative c . This yields $f_n \sim (-1)^n c/\rho_s^n$ where now ρ_s is some positive real number which solves $s - sz - zf(-z/q) = 0$.

6. The q -Painlevé equation of type 1. This example deals with an equation which is not in solved form and has multiple solutions. It is also an example where the theory does not lead to a definitive result but provides a conjecture which is supported by numerical computations.

Motivated by dynamical systems, Ramani and Grammaticos (1996) introduced a q -version of the Painlevé equation of the first type, which amounts to

$$\omega(qz)\omega\left(\frac{z}{q}\right) = \frac{1}{\omega(z)} - \frac{1}{z\omega^2(z)}. \quad (13.6.1)$$

This equation was further considered in the context of classification of rational surfaces by Sakai (2012) and from a different perspective by Nishioka (2010) and Joshi (2012).

Equation (13.6.1) is invariant by a substitution of $1/q$ for q . Therefore, we may assume that either $|q| > 1$ or $|q| < 1$ as we see fit. It also is easy to see that $\omega(z)$ is a power series in $1/z$. Thus, setting $f(z) = \omega(1/z)$, we rewrite the equation as

$$f(z) = f(z/q)f(z)^2f(qz) + z. \quad (13.6.2)$$

This is a q -algebraic equation. It corresponds to the polynomial

$$Y_0 - Y_{-1}Y_0^2Y_1 - z.$$

The corresponding cloud of points is shown in figure 13.6.1

From Summary 3.3.11, we obtain that (13.6.2) may have a solution starting by a constant term, say f_0 , which does not vanish, or a solution starting with $f_0 = 0$ and then a term $f_1 z$ with $f_1 \neq 0$. We will study both possibilities.




figure 13.6.1

6.1. Solution starting by $f_1 z$. Since (13.6.2) is not in solved form, we apply the algorithm described in chapter 4.3 to bring it into that form. Since we treat the case $f_0 = 0$ first, we translate the equation with T_0 and then simplify it with S_z . Here this amounts to setting $f(z) = zg(z)$ in (13.6.2), obtaining, after simplification by z ,

$$g(z) = z^3 g(z/q) g(z)^2 g(qz) + 1. \quad (13.6.1.1)$$

The only nonshifting q -factor in this equation corresponds to the linear term $g(z)$. Thus, the equation is in solved form. It is also clear that $g(z)$ is in fact a power series in z^3 . Thus, writing $g(z) = h(z^3)$ and substituting z for z^3 , we obtain the equation

$$h(z) = zh(z/q^3)h(z)^2h(q^3z) + 1.$$

Setting $r = q^3$, this equation corresponds to the r -operator

$$Q_r = (0; 0)_r - (1; -1, 0, 0, 1)_r - (0; \sqcup).$$

We assume without any loss of generality that $|q|$ is greater than 1, and therefore that $|r|$ is greater than 1.

We then have

$$0 = \bar{\alpha}(Q_{r,0}) < \bar{\alpha}(Q_{r,+}) = 1.$$

We apply the results of Chapter 8. The height of the unique shifting r -factor $(1; -1, 0, 0, 1)$ is 1 and the crest has a unique shifting element which has scope 1. Therefore, Corollary 8.1.8 yields that for some complex number c_r ,

$$h_n \sim c_r r^{n(n-1)/2} \quad (13.6.1.2)$$


as n tends to infinity. Moreover, Corollary 8.1.6 ensures that c_r is positive when r is a positive number. Thus, the asymptotic equivalent in (13.6.1.2) is sharp when r is positive real.

Going back to the sequence (f_n) , we obtain that $f_{3n+1} = h_n$, and therefore

$$f_n \sim c_q q^{(n-1)(n-4)/6} \quad \text{if } n \in 3\mathbb{N} + 1$$


and $f_n = 0$ if $n \notin 3\mathbb{N} + 1$.

The following plot shows $h_n/r^{n(n-1)/2}$ for various values of r and shows that (13.6.1.2) is very accurate. The reason is that the results of Chapter 8 and singularity analysis imply that the convergence of $h_n/r^{n(n-1)/2}$ to the limiting constant is geometric.




$$r = 2 \quad q = 1.259 \dots$$

figure 13.6.1.1



$$r = 1.5 \quad q = 1.144 \dots$$

figure 13.6.1.2



$$r = 1.1 \quad q = 1.032 \dots$$

figure 13.6.1.3

It seems from these numerical calculations that the limit of $h_n/r^{n(n-1)/2}$, as a function of q , is decreasing. However, figures 13.6.1.1–13.6.1.3 suggest that as q gets closer to 1 the geometric rate is getting closer to 1, slowing down the convergence. This is to be expected from the results of section 10.2 because the crest Borel transform of the solution converges to the solution for $q = 1$.

6.2. Solutions starting with $f_0 \neq 0$. Consider $z = 0$ in (13.6.2). Since $f_0 \neq 0$, we obtain $f_0^3 = 1$. Let ζ be either $e^{2i\pi/3}$ or $e^{4i\pi/3}$. We may have three solutions to the equation, one, f , starting with 1, one starting with ζ and one starting with ζ^2 .

These three solutions may be studied all at once with the following remark. Multiplying equation (13.6.2) by ζ and substituting $\zeta^2 z$ for z yields,

$$\zeta f(\zeta^2 z) = \zeta f(\zeta^2 z/q) f(\zeta^2 z)^2 f(\zeta^2 qz) + z.$$

Thus, $f_{[\zeta]}(z) = \zeta f(\zeta^2 z)$ solves the equation

$$f_{[\zeta]}(z) = f_{[\zeta]}(z/q) f_{[\zeta]}(z)^2 f_{[\zeta]}(qz) + z$$

which is (13.6.2). Therefore, the solution of $f_{[\zeta]}$ of (13.6.2) starting with ζ is obtained from the solution f starting by 1 by the relation $f_{[\zeta]}(z) = \zeta f(\zeta^2 z)$. Consequently, it suffices to study the solution f starting with $f_0 = 1$.

Since (13.6.2) is not in solved form, we apply the algorithm described in Chapter 4.3. We translate the equation with $T_{f_0} = T_1$ and simplify by z . This means that we set $f(z) = 1 + zg(z)$ in (13.6.2), we obtain a new equation $\tilde{Q}g = 0$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Q} &= \frac{1}{q}(0; -1) + (0; 0) + q(0; 1) \\ &\quad + (1; 0, 0) + \frac{2}{q}(1; -1, 0) + 2q(1; 0, 1) + (1; -1, 1) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{q}(2; -1, 0, 0) + q(2; 0, 0, 1) + 2(2; -1, 0, 1) \\ &\quad + (3; -1, 0, 0, 1) + (0; \square) \end{aligned}$$

This q -operator is in solved form and the uniqueness condition is $q^{-n-1} + 1 + q^{n+1} \neq 0$ for any $n \geq 0$. Multiplying it by q^n and substituting n for $n + 1$, gives the nicer condition

$$1 + q^n + q^{2n} \neq 0 \quad \text{for any } n \geq 1.$$

This is a quadratic equation in q^n , whose solutions are $e^{2i\pi/3}$ and $e^{4i\pi/3}$. Note that if $n = 2p$ then $e^{4i\pi/3n} = e^{2i\pi/p}$; therefore the uniqueness condition is

$$q \notin \{ e^{4i\pi/3n} : n \geq 1 \}.$$

We may assume that $|q|$ is less than 1. Since $\underline{\alpha}(\tilde{Q}_0) = \underline{\alpha}(\tilde{Q}_+)$, the relevant theory for the equation $\tilde{Q}g = 0$ is in Chapter 6. Since $\underline{\alpha}(Q_0) = -1$, it is convenient to use Proposition 4.3.1 and study $\sigma\tilde{Q}$. If A is a q -factor, then

$$\sigma A = q^a(a; \alpha_1 + 1, \dots, \alpha_\ell + 1).$$

Therefore, we may study $Q = q\sigma\tilde{Q}$, that is,

$$\begin{aligned} Q = & (0; 0) + q(0; 1) + q^2(0; 2) \\ & + q^2(1; 1, 1) + 2q(1; 0, 1) + 2q^3(1; 1, 2) + q^2(1; 0, 2) \\ & + q^2(2; 0, 1, 1) + q^4(2; 1, 1, 2) + 2q^3(2; 0, 1, 2) + q^4(3; 0, 1, 1, 2) \\ & + q(0; \square). \end{aligned}$$

It is now convenient to switch to the polynomial notation, rewriting

$$\begin{aligned} Q = & Y_0 + qY_1 + q^2Y_2 + q^2zY_1^2 + 2qzY_0Y_1 + 2q^3zY_1Y_2 + q^2zY_0Y_2 \\ & + q^2z^2Y_0Y_1^2 + q^4z^2Y_1^2Y_2 + 2q^3z^2Y_0Y_1Y_2 + q^4z^3Y_0Y_1^2Y_2 + q. \end{aligned}$$

The polynomial Q can be written as

$$Q = Y_0R + S \tag{13.6.2.1}$$

with

$$R = (1 + qzY_1)^2(1 + q^2zY_2)$$

and

$$S = q(1 + Y_1 + qY_2 + qzY_1^2 + 2q^2zY_1Y_2 + q^3z^2Y_1^2Y_2).$$

The polynomials R and S are related by the identity

$$R - zS = 1 + qzY_1 - qz. \tag{13.6.2.2}$$

Identifying Y_i with $g(q^i z)$, the equation $Qg = 0$ and (13.6.2.1) yield that $Y_0 g = -(S/R)g$. Given (13.6.2.2), this means

$$\begin{aligned} Y_0 g &= -\frac{S}{R}g = \frac{-R + 1 + qzY_1 - qz}{zR}g \\ &= -\left(\frac{qzY_1 + q^2zY_2 + q^3z^2Y_1Y_2}{(1 + qzY_1)(1 + q^2zY_2)} + \frac{q}{(1 + qzY_1)^2(1 + q^2zY_2)}\right)g. \end{aligned}$$

In other words,

$$\begin{aligned} g(z) &= -q \frac{zg(qz) + qzg(q^2z) + q^2z^2g(qz)g(q^2z)}{(1 + qzg(qz))(1 + q^2zg(q^2z))} \\ &\quad - \frac{q}{(1 + qzg(qz))^2(1 + q^2zg(q^2z))}. \end{aligned} \quad (13.6.2.3)$$

Let ζ be a complex number of minimal modulus such that $q\zeta g(q\zeta) = -1$. The function $1 + q^2zg(q^2z)$ has no zero of modulus less than $|\zeta|/|q|$ because this function coincides with $\sigma(1 + qzg(qz))$. From (13.6.2.3) we then see that g is well defined as long as $|z| < |\zeta|$. We also have

$$\begin{aligned} (z - \zeta)^2 g(z) &= -\frac{(z - \zeta)^2}{z} + \frac{z - \zeta}{1 + qzg(qz)} \frac{z - \zeta}{q + q^2z} \\ &\quad - \left(\frac{\zeta - z}{1 + qzg(qz)}\right)^2 \frac{q}{1 + q^2zg(q^2z)}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that because $1 = -q\zeta g(q\zeta)$,

$$\frac{1 + qzg(qz)}{z - \zeta} = q \frac{zg(qz) - \zeta g(q\zeta)}{z - \zeta} \sim q(g(q\zeta) + q\zeta g'(q\zeta))$$

as z tends to ζ . It follows that if $g(q\zeta) + q\zeta g'(q\zeta) \neq 0$, the function $(z - \zeta)^2 g(z)$ has a removable singularity at ζ and is analytic in a larger disk of radius at least $|r|/|q|$. Furthermore, we have


$$g(z) \sim \frac{1}{\zeta^2 q(g(q\zeta) + q\zeta g'(q\zeta))} \frac{1}{(1 - z/\zeta)^2}$$

as z tends to ζ . Therefore, we should expect

$$g_n \sim \frac{n}{\zeta^{n+2} q(g(q\zeta) + q\zeta g'(q\zeta))} \quad (13.6.2.4)$$

as n tends to infinity. This is not a rigorously established result since it relies on the unproven assumptions that the equation $qzg(qz) = -1$ has a unique solution of smallest modulus ζ , and that $g(q\zeta) + q\zeta g'(q\zeta) \neq 0$. It is believable that this holds generically but that it may not hold for some specific values of q .


The heuristic equivalence (13.6.2.4) is supported by numerical computations. Figure 13.6.2.1 shows for different values of q between 0 and 1 the values of $\log g_n - \log n$, which for n large should be about $-(n+2)\log \zeta + c$, and therefore close to a linear function of n .



(after $q = 0.9$, increments of 0.01 until $q = 0.99$ then $q = 1$)

figure 13.6.2.1

Figure 13.6.2.2 shows g_{n+1}/g_n which is about ζ , the radius of convergence of g .



(after $q = 0.9$, increments of 0.01 until $q = 0.99$ then $q = 1$)

figure 13.6.2.2

As q tends to 1, Proposition 10.2.1 shows that $g_n(q)$ tends to $g_n(1)$ and Theorem 10.2.2 that $g(z; q)$ converges to $g(z; 1)$. For $q = 1$, considering the operator Q , the function $g(z; 1)$ solves

$$3g + 1 + 6zg^2 + 4z^2g^3 + z^3g^4 = 0.$$

The discriminant of this polynomial in g is

$$z^6(256z^3 - 27).$$

As we have seen in Chapter 6, the radius of convergence of $g(z; 1)$ coincides with a zero of the discriminant. Given that g satisfies an algebraic equation, Puiseux's theorem ensures that this radius of convergence is positive. Therefore, this radius of convergence is the smallest modulus of the roots of $256z^3 - 27 = 0$. This is $4\sqrt[3]{4}/3$ and this explains the horizontal asymptote in figure 13.6.2.2.

The numerical calculations are fast enough that we can study ζ as a function of q for $-1 < q < 1$. Figure 13.6.3 illustrates what is easily achievable. The radius of convergence was computed for

q varying from 0.01 to 1 by increments of 0.01 and the points are linked by straight line segments.




figure 13.6.2.3

While this curve is very close to that of $(4\sqrt[3]{4}/3)q^2$, it is far enough to differ!

7. A challenging example. This example is far more involved than all the others that we have seen so far and it combines all the difficulties: the equation is not in solved form, has several solutions which are not power series of z , asymptotic periodicity of the coefficients of period 68 for some divergent solutions, required use of a computer algebra system to deal with equations of several hundred terms, and failure of some of the methods to give a definitive result. In short, a fair reward to a reader who read everything so far, which shows clearly the power and limitations of our results. Since this equation leads to a rather involved discussion, we will summarize each step with some result stated in italics.

Throughout this example, we will use fractional powers of q . Recall that it was agreed in section 1.2 that q^α is defined as $e^{\alpha \log q}$

once a determination of $\log q$ has been chosen. Consequently, the solutions to the equation will depend on the choice of the logarithm even though we do not make this to appear explicitly. In particular, if we say that an equation has two solutions, this means two solutions for a generic determination of $\log q$. For specific determinations, the number may vary. When changing this determination, more solutions may occur.

We consider the q -algebraic equation (Cano and Fortuny-Ayuso, 2012) given by the polynomial

$$4Y_1^4 - 9Y_0^2Y_1Y_2 + 2Y_0^3Y_2 + \frac{z}{q^4}Y_0Y_2 - z^3Y_0^4Y_5^2 - \frac{z^3}{q^4}Y_2 - z^3Y_0 + z^5. \quad (13.7.1)$$

As it is written, this equation assumes that q is not 0. Multiplying the equation by q^4 , we can give it some meaning when $q = 0$, namely $zY_0Y_2 - z^3Y_2$. When q vanishes, for $Y_i f(z)$ to make sense, the Hahn series f must have nonnegative exponents, and then $Y_i f(z) = [z^0]f$ if $i \neq 0$. Thus the equation is $zf(z)[z^0]f - z^3[z^0]f = 0$, that is, either $[z^0]f = 0$ or $f(z) = z^2$. But this second solution, $f(z) = z^2$ satisfies $[z^0]f = 0$. Thus, if $q = 0$, any Hahn series with $[z^0]f = 0$ is a solution of the equation, and we have uncountably many solutions.

Result. *If $q = 0$ any Hahn series f with positive support is a solution.*

From now on, we assume that q is not 0.

Equation (13.7.1) is not in solved form since the nonshifting part, $4Y_1^4 - 9Y_0^2Y_1Y_2 + 2Y_0^3Y_2$, is not linear in the Y_i . To bring it into solved form, we use the procedures described in Chapters 3 and 4.

The cloud of points and the Newton-Puiseux polygon for this equation are in figure 13.7.1.

The polygon has three extremal supporting lines. The first one goes through the points (3, 6) and (0, 4); it has co-slope $-3/2$. The second one goes through the points (0, 4) and (1, 2) and has co-slope $1/2$. The third one goes through (1, 2) and (5, 0), and has co-slope 2. This means that we may have solutions starting by either $cz^{-3/2}$, $cz^{1/2}$ or cz^2 .




figure 13.7.1

We may also have other solutions corresponding to vertices of the Newton-Puiseux polygon, which come from the indicial polynomial, as indicated in Summary 3.3.11. However, this occurs only for specific values of q which are not generic. For instance, the indicial polynomial at the point $(0, 4)$ is

$$\Psi_{P,(0,4)}(c) = q^2(4q - 1)(q - 2)c^4.$$

It vanishes for all c if q is either $1/4$ or 2 , in which case we may or may not have a solution starting by cz^μ for any c and any μ in $(-3/2, 1/2)$. While our technique still allows to study these exceptional cases, doing so would result in this example being unreasonably lengthy while seemingly not bringing additional understanding. As a consequence, we choose to study only the generic cases, not considering the values of q for which an indicial polynomial may vanish.

7.1. Solutions starting with $cz^{-3/2}$. To study the possible solutions starting by $cz^{-3/2}$, the contribution of P to the points $(3, 6)$ and $(0, 4)$ is,

$$\begin{aligned} &P_{(0,4)} + P_{(3,6)} \\ &= 4Y_1^4 - 9Y_0^2Y_1Y_2 + 2Y_0^3Y_2 - z^3Y_0^4Y_5^2 \\ &= 4(0; 1, 1, 1, 1) - 9(0; 0, 0, 1, 2) + 2(0; 0, 0, 0, 2) - (3; 0, 0, 0, 0, 5, 5). \end{aligned}$$

To identify c , the initial polynomial $\Phi_{P,-3/2}$ introduced in Definition 3.3.9 is given by

$$\Phi_{P,-3/2}(c) = 4c^4q^{-6} - 9c^4q^{-9/2} + 2c^4q^{-3} - c^6q^{-15}.$$

This polynomial vanishes when $c = 0$ or $c^2 = 4q^9 - 9q^{21/2} + 2q^{12}$, that is,

$$c^2 = q^9(2q^{3/2} - 1)(q^{3/2} - 4). \quad (13.7.1.1)$$

This defines a c different from 0 and up to a sign, provided $q^{3/2}$ is not $1/2$ or 4 .

We assume that $q^{3/2}$ is not $1/2$ or 4 , so that we may have two solutions starting with $cz^{-3/2}$ for some $c \neq 0$ which satisfies (13.7.1.1), these solutions differing by the sign of c .

We then translate the equation using $T_{cz^{-3/2}}$. The translation leads to a long expression which we write out completely for two reasons: firstly, to make clear that without a computer algebra

package, one should not try to undertake the study of a q -algebraic equation that is not immediately amenable to rendering in solved form; secondly, to show that a useful theory should be able to apply on very complicated equations. With this caveat, $T_{cz^{-3/2}}P$ is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{zY_0Y_2}{q^4} + c\frac{Y_2}{q^4z^{1/2}} - 9Y_0^2Y_1Y_2 \\ & - z^3Y_0^4Y_5^2 - \frac{z^3Y_2}{q^4} + 2Y_0^3Y_2 - z^3Y_0 + 4Y_1^4 + z^5 + c\frac{Y_0}{q^7z^{1/2}} \\ & - 18c\frac{Y_0Y_1Y_2}{z^{3/2}} + 24c^2\frac{Y_1^2}{q^3z^3} - 6c^4\frac{Y_0^2}{q^{15}z^3} - c^2\frac{Y_0^4}{q^{15}} + 6c^2\frac{Y_0^2}{q^3z^3} - c^4\frac{Y_5^2}{z^3} \\ & - 4c^5\frac{Y_0}{q^{15}z^{9/2}} - 4c^3\frac{Y_0^3}{q^{15}z^{3/2}} - 9c^3\frac{Y_1}{q^3z^{9/2}} - 9c^2\frac{Y_0^2}{q^{9/2}z^3} + 2c^3\frac{Y_2}{z^{9/2}} \\ & + 6c^3\frac{Y_0}{q^3z^{9/2}} + 2c\frac{Y_0^3}{q^3z^{3/2}} - 2c^5\frac{Y_5}{q^{15/2}z^{9/2}} + 16c^3\frac{Y_1}{q^{9/2}z^{9/2}} + 16c\frac{Y_1^3}{q^{3/2}z^{3/2}} \\ & - 9c^3\frac{Y_2}{q^{3/2}z^{9/2}} - 18c^3\frac{Y_0}{q^{9/2}z^{9/2}} - 2c\frac{Y_0^4Y_5z^{3/2}}{q^{15/2}} - 12c^3\frac{Y_0^2Y_5}{q^{15/2}z^{3/2}} \\ & - 9c\frac{Y_0^2Y_2}{q^{3/2}z^{3/2}} - 4cY_0^3Y_5^2z^{3/2} - 8c^2\frac{Y_0^3Y_5}{q^{15/2}} - 4c^3\frac{Y_0Y_5^2}{z^{3/2}} - 8c^4\frac{Y_0Y_5}{q^{15/2}z^3} \\ & + 6c\frac{Y_0^2Y_2}{z^{3/2}} - 9c^2\frac{Y_1Y_2}{z^3} - 18c^2\frac{Y_0Y_1}{q^3z^3} + 6c^2\frac{Y_0Y_2}{z^3} - 6c^2Y_0^2Y_5^2 - 18c^2\frac{Y_0Y_2}{q^{3/2}z^3} \\ & + \frac{c^2}{q^7z^2} - c\frac{z^{3/2}}{q^7} - cz^{3/2} - 9c\frac{Y_0^2Y_1}{q^3z^{3/2}}. \end{aligned}$$

The cloud of points and the Newton-Puiseux polygon for this new q -operator are given in the figure 13.7.1.1.

Note, that we marked the points associated to each monomial listed in $T_{cz^{-3/2}}P$, not checking that for our specific value of c no cancellation occurs. This checking is not needed for each point because we see that the next supporting line is that pertaining to $(-9/2, 1)$ and $(-2, 0)$, so that at, this step, we only need to check that these two points remain. We have

$$[z^{-9/2}Y_1]T_{cz^{-3/2}}P = \frac{c^3}{q^{9/2}}(16 - 9q^{3/2}).$$




figure 13.7.1.1

Thus, since c does not vanish, we are guaranteed that the point $(-9/2, 1)$ remains whenever $q \neq (16/9)^{2/3}$, which we assume from now on. The point $(-2, 0)$ comes from the unique term $c^2/(q^7 z^2)$ and remains since c does not vanish.




figure 13.7.1.2

The co-slope of the supporting line going through the points $(-9/2, 1)$ and $(-2, 0)$ is $5/2$. We also see that the pivot point has been reached. We bring it to $(0, 1)$ by multiplying the equation by $z^{9/2}$, that is, by considering $z^{9/2}T_{cz^{-3/2}}P$. The new cloud of points is in figure 13.7.1.2.

We see that all the points in the cloud, and in particular those on the a -axis, have either integers or half-integer abscissa, with some being half-integers. Therefore, the power series solution is in fact a power series in $z^{1/2}$.

Referring to the notation introduced in Chapter 2, we write $f(z) = \sum_{\mu} f_{\mu} z^{\mu}$. That f is a power series in $z^{1/2}$ means that the support of f is in the half-integers. Writing then $f(z) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} f_{n/2} z^{n/2}$, we define the sequence (g_n) by $g_n = f_{n/2}$, $n \geq 0$. Formally

$$g(z) = \sum_{n \geq 0} g_n z^n = \sum_{n \geq 0} f_{n/2} z^n = f(z^2).$$

Thus, introducing g amounts to introducing a formal ramification. Set $r = q^{1/2}$. For a q -factor $A_q = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\ell})_q$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (A_q f)(z^2) &= z^{2a} \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} f(q^{\alpha_i} z^2) \\ &= z^{2a} \prod_{1 \leq i \leq \ell} g(r^{\alpha_i} z) \\ &= (2a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{\ell})_r g(z). \end{aligned} \quad (13.7.1.2)$$

We then define the r -operator Q by the requirement that if f solves $T_{cz^{-3/2}}Pf = 0$ then g solves $Qg = 0$. Given (13.7.1.2), we obtain Q from $T_{cz^{-3/2}}P$ by substituting z^2 for z and r^2 for q . As indicated in section 2.2, we assume throughout that we choose a determination of $\log q$ and define q^α by $q^\alpha = e^{\alpha \log q}$. Thus, we may set $r = q^{1/2}$. Different choice of $\log q$ yields different signs of r , so that what seems to be one solution may in fact be several solutions, encoded by the choice of $\log q$.

The new r -operator, Q , has the following cloud of points and Newton-Puiseux polygon.




figure 13.7.1.3

The nonshifting part is proportional to

$$9r^{24}Y_1 - 16r^{21}Y_1 + 2c^2r^{15}Y_5 + 9r^{27}Y_2 - 6r^{24}Y_0 - 2r^{30}Y_2 + 18r^{21}Y_0 + 4c^2Y_0. \quad (13.7.1.3)$$

The uniqueness condition is then that for any nonnegative n ,

$$9r^{24+n} - 16r^{21+n} + 2c^2r^{15+5n} + 9r^{27+2n} - 6cr^{24} - 2r^{30+2n} + 18r^{21} + 4c^2 \neq 0. \quad (13.7.1.4)$$

The nonshifting part of the operator, (13.7.1.3), is linear. Therefore, the equation is in solved form. Since this operator involves Y_0 and Y_5 , we have

$$\underline{\alpha}(Q_0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\alpha}(Q_0) = 5.$$

For this operator we also have

$$\underline{\alpha}(Q_+) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\alpha}(Q_+) = 5.$$

Since $\underline{\alpha}(Q_0) = \underline{\alpha}(Q_+)$ and $\bar{\alpha}(Q_0) = \bar{\alpha}(Q_+)$, Theorem 6.1.1 implies that the solution is analytic, regardless of the position of $|q|$ with

respect to 1. Nevertheless, if we are to study the asymptotic behavior of the coefficients of the solution, we still need to discuss according to the position of $|q|$ with respect to 1, because that position dictates which parts of the equation matter.

Case $|q| < 1$. Following Chapter 6, we should think of the equation as a polynomial in Y_0 . This polynomial has degree 4 in Y_0 . To locate its singularities, we need to calculate its discriminant and see when it vanishes. The discriminant can be computed by a software, and has several thousand monomials! It is intractable and we are not able to say anything more.

Case $|q| > 1$. We should now consider Q as a polynomial in Y_5 . It is a polynomial of degree 2. Its discriminant is the product of a very manageable power of

$$c + z^3 Y_0$$

with the terrible

$$\begin{aligned} & -18cr^{30}z^9Y_0Y_1Y_2 + c^6 + 6cr^{30}z^9Y_0^2Y_2 - 18c^2r^{27}z^6Y_0Y_2 \\ & - 18c^2r^{24}z^6Y_0Y_1 - 9cr^{27}z^9Y_0^2Y_2 + cr^{16}z^{11}Y_0 - 9r^{30}z^{12}Y_0^2Y_1Y_2 \\ & + 6c^2r^{30}z^6Y_0Y_2 - 9cr^{24}z^9Y_0^2Y_1 - 9c^3r^{24}z^3Y_1 + 2c^3r^{30}z^3Y_2 \\ & - 9c^2r^{30}z^6Y_1Y_2 - 9c^3r^{27}z^3Y_2 + 2r^{30}z^{12}Y_0^3Y_2 + 6r^{24}c^3z^3Y_0 \\ & + r^{22}z^{14}Y_0Y_2 + cr^{22}z^{11}Y_2 + 6c^2r^{24}z^6Y_0^2 + 16c^3r^{21}z^3Y_1 \\ & - 18c^3r^{21}z^3Y_0 + 16cr^{27}z^9Y_1^3 + 2cr^{24}z^9Y_0^3 + 24c^2r^{24}z^6Y_1^2 \\ & + r^{30}z^{22} - 9c^2r^{21}z^6Y_0^2 - r^{22}z^{18}Y_2 + c^2r^{16}z^8 + 4r^{30}z^{12}Y_1^4 \\ & - r^{30}z^{18}Y_0 - cr^{30}z^{15} - cr^{16}z^{15}. \end{aligned}$$

The problem is that we have no idea which of these two terms has a smallest root.

In conclusion, as far as a solution starting with $cz^{-3/2}$ is concerned we have the following;

Result. *If q is of modulus greater than 1, is not $1/\sqrt[3]{4}$ or $2\sqrt[2]{2}$, and if the uniqueness conditions (13.7.1.4) are satisfied, there are two solutions $f(z)$ starting with $cz^{-3/2}$, and $z^3f(z^2)$ is analytic in a neighborhood of the origin.*

Keep in mind that this result is conditional to the determination of $\log q$. In particular, changing this determination may induce a different pair of solutions.

7.2. Solutions starting with $cz^{1/2}$. The contribution of P to the points $(0, 4)$ and $(1, 2)$ of its cloud of points $\mathcal{C}(P)$ in figure 13.7.1 is

$$2Y_0^3Y_2 - 9Y_0^2Y_1Y_2 + 4Y_1^4 + \frac{zY_0Y_2}{q^4}.$$

The corresponding initial polynomial is

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_{P,1/2}(c) &= c^4(2q - 9q^{3/2} + 4q^2) + c^2/q^3 \\ &= c^2\left(c^2q(q^{1/2} - 2)(4q^{1/2} - 1) + \frac{1}{q^3}\right).\end{aligned}$$

If $q^{1/2}$ is either $1/4$ or 2 , the initial polynomial cannot vanish except when c does. The equation has no solution starting by $cz^{1/2}$ with $c \neq 0$.

From now on, we assume that $q^{1/2}$ is neither $1/4$ nor 2 . Then we may have two solutions $f(z) = cz^{1/2} + \dots$ which differ by the sign of c , with

$$c = \pm \frac{i}{q^2 \sqrt{(q^{1/2} - 2)(4q^{1/2} - 1)}}. \quad (13.7.2.1)$$

Following the algorithm described in Chapters 3 and 4, we consider $T_{cz^{1/2}}P$. The corresponding cloud of points and Newton-Puiseux polygon are in figure 13.7.2.1.

The next co-slope is given by the points $(3/2, 1)$ and $(7/2, 0)$ and is 2 . However, this is correct as long as no cancellation occurs which could remove these points, that is, for instance, as long as

$$[z^{3/2}Y_0]T_{cz^{1/2}}P = \frac{c}{q^3}(1 + 6c^2q^4(1 - 3q^{1/2})) \neq 0.$$

For this condition to hold, it suffices that

$$(q^{1/2} - 2)(4q^{1/2} - 1) \neq 6(1 - 3q^{1/2}),$$

which we assume from now on. Similarly, we have

$$[z^{7/2}]T_{cz^{1/2}}P = -c(1 + q^{-3}),$$




figure 13.7.2.1

and this coefficient does not vanish as long as $q \notin \{-1, e^{-i\pi/3}, e^{i\pi/3}\}$.

With these assumptions, we reached the pivot point $(3/2, 1)$ and from now on, translation will give a point on the a -axis with either integer or half-integer coordinate. So we should make a change of variable, writing the solution $f(z)$ as $cz^{1/2} + z^2g(\sqrt{z})$. With this change of unknown, the pivot point is at $(0, 1)$; hence we write the equation as an equation Qg with $f(z) = cz^{1/2} + z^2g(\sqrt{z})$. As indicated after (13.7.1.2), this amounts to first substituting $q^{2i}z^2Y_i$ for Y_i , then substituting z^2 for z and r^2 for q . After a simplification of the equation by z^7 , the new cloud of points and Newton-Puiseux polygon are in figure 13.7.2.2.




figure 13.7.2.2

The nonshifting part of this operator Q is

$$Q_0 = -18c^3r^3Y_0 + 6c^3r^2Y_0 + \frac{c}{r^6}Y_0 + 16c^3r^7Y_1 \\ - 9c^3r^6Y_1 - 9c^3r^9Y_2 + 2c^3r^8Y_2 + cY_2$$

This is a linear operator. The equation is in solved form.

We have

$$\underline{\alpha}(Q_0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\alpha}(Q_0) = 2$$

since Y_0 and Y_2 are the variables of respectively smallest and largest index in Q_0 . The shifting part has 35 terms, involving all the variables Y_0, \dots, Y_5 . Therefore, we have

$$\underline{\alpha}(Q_+) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\alpha}(Q_+) = 5.$$

We then need to discuss according to $|q| < 1$ or $|q| > 1$.

Case $|q| < 1$. Since $\underline{\alpha}(Q_0) = \underline{\alpha}(Q_+)$, Theorem 6.1.1 implies that the solution is analytic. The polynomial Q is of degree 4 in Y_0 , with coefficients made of 16, 12, 9, 5 and 3 monomials. The discriminant

has over 6 000 monomials, and is far beyond what our theory can grasp. Again, the theory fails to bring anything beyond the existence and analyticity of the solution.

Result. *If $|q| < 1$ the equation has a two solutions $f(z) = cz^{1/2} + z^2g(\sqrt{z})$ where g is analytic, and these solutions differ by the sign of c .*

Case $|q| > 1$. Since $\bar{\alpha}(Q_0) < \bar{\alpha}(Q_+)$, the results of Chapter 8 suggest that the solution is a divergent series. To apply those results, we need to bring $\bar{\alpha}(Q_0)$ down to 0. This can be done either by setting $g(z) = h(z/r^2)$, which amounts to considering $(Q\sigma_r^{-2})g$, or by seeing g as solving $(Qg)(z/r^2) = 0$, which amounts to considering $(\sigma_r^{-2}Q)g$. Here we do the latter and set $R = \sigma_r^{-2}Q$. We write R as a polynomial in $Y_{-2}, Y_{-1}, \dots, Y_3$. This polynomial is obtained from Q by substituting Y_{i-2} for Y_i , $i = 0, \dots, 5$, and z/r^2 for z in Q . Thus, R is a polynomial in z, Y_{-2}, \dots, Y_3 . Its nonshifting part is

$$R_0 = -\frac{c}{r^6}(6c^2r^8Y_{-2} - 18c^2r^9Y_{-2} + Y_{-2} - 9c^2r^{12}Y_{-1} + 16c^2r^{13}Y_{-1} + r^6Y_0 + 2c^2r^{14}Y_0 - 9c^2r^{15}Y_0).$$

To apply the results of Chapter 8, we need to calculate the height and co-height of R_+ as well as the corresponding crest polynomial.

Since R has no term in Y_1 or Y_2 , the only q -factors which can have positive height are those containing Y_3 . The height is maximal if the power of z is minimal. Thus we may isolate that part of R by considering $R(z; Y_{-2}, \dots, Y_2, Y_3) - R(z; Y_{-2}, \dots, Y_2, 0)$, and divide 3 by twice the order in z of this part. This gives 3/16 and the only q -factor in R having this height is $-2r^9c^5z^8Y_3$. Consequently, the crest is linear and, following the results of sections 9.1–9.4, we do not need to translate the equation any further for the results of Chapter 8 to deliver the sharpest estimate that they can.

Since the coefficient of $(0; 0) = z^0Y_0$ in R is $c + 2c^3r^8 - 9c^3r^9$, the crest polynomial is

$$c + 2c^3r^8 - 9c^3r^9 - 2r^9c^5z^8.$$

It vanishes when z equals

$$R_{c,q} = \left(\frac{1 + 2c^2r^8 - 9c^2r^9}{2c^4r^9} \right)^{1/8}.$$

Note that this $R_{c,q}$ can never be 0 because the uniqueness condition ensures that the numerator does not vanish. Corollary 8.1.8 implies that there exists some c_0, \dots, c_7 such that

$$g_n \sim r^{3n(n-8)/16} \left(\frac{-2c^4 r^9}{1 + 2c^2 r^8 - 9c^2 r^9} \right)^{n/8} c_m$$

as n tends to infinity, with m being the remainder in the Euclidean division algorithm of n by 8. Since $f(z) = cz^{1/2} + z^2 g(z^{1/2})$, we have $f_{n/2} = g_{n-4}$, that is, up to changing the meaning of the c_m ,

$$f_{n/2} \sim r^{3n(n-16)/16} \left(\frac{-2c^4 r^9}{1 + 2c^2 r^8 - 9c^2 r^9} \right)^{n/8} c_m.$$

We can then replace c by its value obtained in (13.7.2.1).

In this example, we see that our results provide a sharp estimate, with the caveat though that some or all the c_m might be 0. To summarize this case, we have the following result.

Result. *If $|q| > 1$, the equation has two solutions $f(z) = \sum_{n \geq 1} f_{n/2} z^{n/2}$ with $f_{1/2} = c$, those solutions differing by the sign of c , and, as n tends to infinity, $f_{n/2}$ is asymptotically equivalent to*

$$q^{n(3n-62)/32} \left(\frac{-2}{(q^{1/2} - 2)^2 (4q^{1/2} - 1)^2 (1 + 2c^2 q^4 - 9c^2 q^{9/2})} \right)^{n/8} c_m,$$

where c_0, \dots, c_7 are some complex numbers and m is the remainder of the Euclidean division of n by 8.

We will not illustrate this result by some numerical considerations because our next case follows a similar pattern but with a slightly more involved result, which we will then illustrate by some numerical calculations.

7.3. Solutions starting with cz^2 . If we seek a solution starting by cz^2 , we need to look at the contribution to the points (1, 2), (3, 1) and (5, 0). We have

$$P_{(1,2)} + P_{(3,1)} + P_{(5,0)} = \frac{z}{q^4} Y_0 Y_2 - z^3 Y_0 - \frac{z^3}{q^4} Y_2 + z^5.$$

The corresponding initial polynomial is

$$\Phi_{P,2}(c) = (c - 1)^2.$$

It has a unique root, 1. Thus our solution starts as $f(z) = z^2 + \dots$.




figure 13.7.3.1

We then translate the equation, setting $P_1 = T_{z^2}P$. The new cloud of points and Newton-Puiseux polygon in figure 13.7.3.1

We have not reached the pivot point since we now need to consider the supporting line going through $(1, 2)$ and $(8, 0)$. It has co-slope $7/2$. The contribution to the points $(1, 2)$ and $(8, 0)$ in P_1 is

$$P_{1,(1,2)} + P_{1,(8,0)} = \frac{z}{q^4} Y_0 Y_2 + 4q^8 z^8 - 9q^6 z^8 + 2q^4 z^8.$$

The corresponding initial polynomial is

$$q^3(c^2 + 4q^5 - 9q^3 + 2q).$$

Therefore, the next term of the solution is $cz^{7/2}$ with

$$c^2 = -q(4q^4 - 9q^2 + 2).$$

Thus, we have two possible solutions, differing by the sign of c .




figure 13.7.3.2

We then translate the equation, evaluating $P_2 = T_{cz^{7/2}}P_1$. The new equation has close to 200 terms and its cloud of point is in figure 13.7.3.2.

We have now reached the pivot point, which is $(9/2, 1)$, and the points have either integer or half-integer abscissa. Therefore, the solution is a power series in $z^{1/2}$. The next co-slope is 5, which is obtained with the points $(9/2, 1)$ and $(19/2, 0)$. Therefore, in the equation $P_2f = 0$, we make the change of function $f(z) = z^5g(z^{1/2})$. As we saw before, this amounts to first substituting $q^{5i}z^5Y_i$ for Y_i , then substituting z^2 for z and $r = q^{1/2}$ for q . In the new equation, a term z^{19} may be factored. So, in effect, the equation $P_2f = 0$ is transformed into $z^{19}Qg = 0$. The cloud of points and the Newton-Puiseux polygon for Q are in figure 13.7.3.




figure 13.7.3.3

After simplification, the polynomial Q contains about 200 monomials. The nonshifting factors are given by the polynomial

$$Q_0 = r^6c(r^6Y_2 + Y_0).$$

Thus, $\bar{\alpha}(Q_0) = 2$. The shifting r -factors are contained in a polynomial Q_+ for which $\bar{\alpha}(Q_+) = 5$. To check the uniqueness condition of Definition 4.2.2, a computation with **Maple** shows that $Q(0, Y_0, \dots, Y_5)$ is proportional to

$$Y_0 + r^6Y_2 + r^2(6 - 18r^4 + 2r^6 - 9r^7 - 9r^{10} + 16r^{11}).$$

Thus, the uniqueness condition is that

$$r^{6+2n} + 1 + 6r^2 - 18r^6 + 2r^8 - 9r^9 - 9r^{12} + 16r^{13} \neq 0$$

for all n . For a given n , this condition fails for at most $(6 + 2n) \vee 13$ values of r . Therefore, this condition fails for at most countably many r . In particular, if $r = 2$, this condition becomes

$$64 \cdot 4^n + 88985 \neq 0$$

which is of course verified.

Having checked the condition, assume from now on that $|q| > 1$. We need to transform the equation to one for which $\bar{\alpha}(Q_0)$ vanishes so that we can apply Theorem 8.1.5. This is done by considering $\sigma^{-2}Q$, which amounts to substituting Y_{i-2} for Y_i and z/r^2 for z in Q . The new equation contains the variables $Y_{-2}, Y_{-1}, \dots, Y_3$ and no other Y_i . Therefore, the terms of positive height are obtained through the variable Y_3 . Since Q is a polynomial of degree 2 in Y_3 , the height of Q is the largest of $3/(2\text{ord}_z([Y_3^2]Q))$ and $3/(2\text{ord}_z([Y_3]Q))$. We compute

$$\text{ord}_z([Y_3^2]Q) = 23$$

and

$$\text{ord}_z([Y_3]Q) = 17.$$

Therefore, the height of Q is $3/(2 \times 17) = 3/34$, and its co-height is 17. The height is achieved at the unique monomial $-2r^{36}z^{17}Y_3$. The crest is then

$$cr^{12}Y_0 - 2r^{36}z^{17}Y_3.$$

In particular, the crest is linear and has a unique shifting r -factor, $-2r^{36}z^{17}Y_3$. We then apply Corollary 8.1.8 to obtain

$$g_n \sim c_{r,m} r^{3n(n-17)/34} \left(-\frac{2r^{36}}{cr^{12}} \right)^{n/17}$$

as n tends to infinity. Given our change of function, we have for any n at least 10,

$$f_{n/2} = g_{n-10}.$$

After some elementary calculations we then obtain the following estimate.

Proposition 13.7.3.1. *For all but countably many values of q of modulus greater than 1, (13.7.1) has two solutions $f(z) = \sum_{n \geq 4} f_{n/2} z^{n/2}$ such that*

$$f(z) = z^2 + \rho z^{7/2} + o(z^{7/2})$$

and $\rho^2 = -q(q^2 - 2)(2q - 1)(2q + 1)$, those two solutions differing by the sign of ρ , and

$$f_{n/2} \sim c_{q,m} q^{(3n^2 - 63n)/68} \left(\frac{2}{\rho} \right)^{n/17}.$$

for $m = n \pmod{17}$ and $0 \leq m < 17$.

In particular, Proposition 13.7.3.1 implies that f_n has 4-Gevrey order $3/34$, as indicated by Cano and Fortuny Ayuso (2012).

Our analysis shows that the conclusion of Proposition 13.7.3.1 is valid for the specific value $q = 4$. When $q = 4$ we have $\rho^2 = -42^2 \times 2$. So, we may take $\rho = -42i\sqrt{2}$, which leads to

$$f_{n/2} \sim c_m i^{n/17} \frac{2^{(3n^2-64n)/34}}{21^{n/17}} \quad (13.7.3.1)$$

as n tends to infinity. Since $i^{(n+17)/17} = i i^{n/17}$, we may rewrite (13.7.3.1) as

$$f_{n/2} \sim \tilde{c}_m \frac{2^{(3n^2-64n)/34}}{21^{n/17}}$$

with now $m = n \pmod{17}$ and the additional constraint that $\tilde{c}_{m+17} = i\tilde{c}_m$ for $0 \leq m < 17$. Using a computer algebra package, we computed exactly the first 390 coefficients of the solution. An inspection of the coefficients reveals that $f_{n/2}$ is real if n is even and purely imaginary if n is odd, and that the sign of $f_{n/2}$ is the opposite of that of $f_{(n+34)/2}$, confirming the relation $\tilde{c}_{m+17} = i\tilde{c}_m$. The following plot shows $\log |f_n 21^{n/17} / 2^{(3n^2-64n)/34}|$, which should be about $\log |\tilde{c}_m|$, and, therefore, given that $\tilde{c}_{m+17} = i\tilde{c}_m$, should have asymptotic periodicity 17.



This plots confirms our result, and could be used to evaluate the coefficients c_m numerically. After Theorem 8.1.5, we made the

remark that we can provide an estimate for Θ . The positivity of Θ implies that the convergence of

$$\left(\frac{-\rho}{2}\right)^{n/17} q^{-(3n^2-63n)/68} f_{n/2} - \tilde{c}_m$$

to 0 is exponentially fast. This is confirmed by the plot which exhibits a complete stability for n greater than about 70. While this plot supports that some \tilde{c}_m do not vanish, it is unclear if those of magnitude less than 10^{-10} say are zero or not.

References

- C.R. Adams (1929). On the linear ordinary q -difference equations, *Ann. Math.*, 30, 195–205.
- C.R. Adams (1931). Linear q -difference equations, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 37, 361–400.
- M. Akra, L. Bazzi (1988). On the solution of linear recurrence equations, *Comput. Optim. Appl.*, 10, 195–210.
- Y. André, L. Di Vizzio (2004). q -difference equations and p -adic local monodromy, *Asterisque*. 296, 55–111.
- G.E. Andrews, R. Askey, R. Roy (1999). *Special Functions*, Cambridge.
- Ph. Barbe, W.P. McCormick (2013). Some Tauberian theory for the q -Lagrange inversion, [arXiv:1312.6899](https://arxiv.org/abs/1312.6899).
- J.-P. Bézivin (1992a). Convergence des solutions formelles de certaines équations fonctionnelles, *Aequationes Math.*, 44, 84–99.
- J.-P. Bézivin (1992b). Sur les équations fonctionnelles aux q -différences, *Aequationes Math.*, 43, 159–176.
- J.-P. Bézivin, A. Boutabaa (1992). Sur les équations fonctionnelles p -adiques aux q -différences, *Collect. Math.*, 43, 125–140.
- G.D. Birkhoff (1913). The generalized Riemann problem for linear differential equations and the allied problems for linear difference and q -difference equations, *Proc. Amer. Acad.*, 49, 521–568.
- G.D. Birkoff, P.E. Guenther (1941). Note on a canonical form for the linear q -difference system, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*, 27, 218–222.
- C.A. Briot and J.C. Bouquet (1856). Propriétés des fonctions définies par des équations différentielles, *Journal de l'École Polytechnique*, 36, 133–198.
- J. Cano (1993). An extension of the Newton-Puiseux polygon construction to give solutions of Pfaffian forms, *Ann. Inst. Fourier*, 43, 125–142.
- J. Cano (1993). On the series defined by differential equations, with an extension of the Puiseux Polygon construction to these equations, *Analysis*, 13, 103–117.
- J. Cano, P. Fortuny Ayuso (2012). Power series solutions of non-linear q -difference equations and the Newton-Puiseux polygon,

arxiv:1209.0295.

- L. Carlitz (1972). Sequences, paths, ballot numbers, *Fibonacci Quart.*, 10, 531–549.
- L. Carlitz, J. Riordan (1964). Two element lattice permutation numbers and their q -generalization, *Duke J. Math.*, 31, 371–388.
- R.D. Carmichael (1912). The general theory of linear q -difference equations, *Amer. J. Math.*, 34, 147–168.
- D. Cox, J. Little, D. O’Shea (2007). *Ideals, Varieties, and Algorithms* (3rd ed.), Springer.
- C. Christensen (1996). Newton’s method for resolving affected equations, *College Mathematics Journal* 27, 330–340.
- L. Di Vizio (2002). Arithmetic theory of q -difference equations: the q analogue of Grothendieck-Katz’s conjecture on p -curvature, *Invent. Math.*, 150, 517–578.
- L. Di Vizio (2008). An ultrametric version of the Maillet-Malgrange theorem for nonlinear q -difference equations, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 136, 2803–2814.
- L. Di Vizio (2009). Local analytic classification of q -difference equations with $|q| = 1$, *J. Noncommut. Geom.*, 3, 125–149.
- L. Di Vizio, J.-P. Ramis, J. Sauloy, C. Zhang (2003). Équations aux q -différences, *Gaz. Math.*, 96, 20–49.
- L. Di Vizio, J. Sauloy (2011). Outils pour la classification locale des équations aux q -différences linéaires complexes, in *Arithmetic and Galois theories of differential equations*, L. Di Vizio, T. Rivoal eds., SMF.
- L. Di Vizio, C. Zhang (2009). On q -summation and confluence, *Ann. Inst. Fourier*, 59, 347–392
- B. Drake (2009). Limit of areas under lattice paths, *Discrete Math.*, 309, 3936–3953.
- T. Dreyfus (2015). Confluence of meromorphic solutions of q -difference equations, arXiv:1307.7085.
- M. Drmota, W. Szpankowski (2013). A master theorem for discrete divide and conquer sequences, *J. ACM*, 60, art. 16.
- F. Enriques (1915). Lezioni sulla teoria geometrica delle equazioni e delle funzioni algebriche, *Libro quarto. Zanichelli*, Bologna.
- Th. Ernst (2000). The history of q -calculus and a new method, thesis
- Th. Ernst (2012). *A Comprehensive Treatment of q -Calculus*, Birkhäuser.
- H.B. Fine (1898). On the functions defined by differential equations, with an extension of the Puiseux polygon construction to these

- equations, *Amer. Jour. of Math.*, 11, 317–328.
- H.B. Fine (1890), Singular solutions of ordinary differential equations, *Amer. Jour. of Math.*, 12, 295–322.
- Ph. Flajolet, R. Sedgewick (2009). *Analytic Combinatorics*, Cambridge.
- J. Förlinger, J. Hofbauer (1985). q -Catalan numbers, *J. Comb. Th.*, A, 248–264.
- S. Garoufalidis (2004). On the characteristic and deformation varieties of a knot, *Proceedings of the Casson Fest, Geometry and Topology Monographs*, 7, 291–310.
- A.M. Garsia (1981). A q -analogue of the Lagrange inversion formula, *Houston J. Math.*, 7, 205–237.
- A.M. Garsia, M. Haiman (1996). A remarkable q, r -Catalan sequence and q -Lagrange inversion, *J. Algebraic Combin.*, 5, 191–244.
- I. Gessel (1980). A noncommutative generalization and q -analog of the Lagrange inversion formula, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 257, 455–482.
- A. Grévy (1894). Etude sur les equations fonctionnelles, *Ann. Sci. ENS*, 3 sér., 11, 249–323.
- D.Y. Grigoriev, M.F. Singer (1991). Solving ordinary differential equations in terms of series with real exponents, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 327, 329–351.
- A.J. Guttman (2009). *Polygons, Polyominoes and Polycubes*, Springer.
- E.L. Ince (1926). *Ordinary Differential Equations*, Dover.
- F.H. Jackson (1908), On q -functions and a certain difference operator, *Trans. Roy. Soc. Edin.*, 46, 253–281.
- F.H. Jackson (1910). On q -definite integral, *Quart. J. Pure Appl. Math.*, 41, 93–203.
- N. Joshi (2012). Quicksilver solutions of a q -difference first Painlevé equation, [arXiv:1306.5045](https://arxiv.org/abs/1306.5045).
- I. Kaplansky (1957). *An Introduction to Differential Algebra*, Hermann.
- E.R. Kolchin (1948). Algebraic matrix groups and the Picard-Vessiot theory of homogeneous linear ordinary differential equations, *Ann. of Math.*, 49, 1–42.
- E.R. Kolchin (1973). *Differential Algebra and Algebraic Groups*, Academic Press.
- Y. Le Borgne (2006). Counting upper interactions in Dyck paths, *Sem. Lothar. Combin.*. 54, article B54f.

- B. Le Stum, A. Quirós (2015). Formal confluence of quantum differential operators, arXiv:1505.07258.
- X. Li, C. Zhang (2011). Existence of analytic solutions to analytic nonlinear q -difference equations, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.*, 375, 412–417.
- E. Maillet (1903). Sur les séries divergentes et les équations différentielles, *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér.*, 487–518, 20.
- B. Malgrange (1974). Sur les points singuliers des équations différentielles, *Enseign. Math.*, 20, 147–176.
- B. Malgrange (1989). Sur le théorème de Maillet, *Asymptot. Anal.*, 2, 1–4.
- I.G. MacDonald (1995). *Symmetric Functions and Hall Polynomials*, Oxford University Press.
- S. Nishioka (2010). Transcendence of solutions of q -Painlevé equation of type $A_7^{(2)}$, *Aequationes Mathematicae*, 79, 1–12.
- F.W.J. Olver (1997). *Asymptotic and Special Functions*, A.K. Peters.
- T. Prellberg, R. Brak (1995). Critical exponents from non-linear functional equations for partially directed cluster models, *J. Stat. Phys.*, 78, 701–730.
- V.A. Puiseux (1850). Recherches sur les fonctions algébriques, *J. Math. Pures Appl.* 15, 365–480.
- A. Ramani, B. Grammaticos (1996). Discrete Painlevé equation: coalescence, limits and degeneratics, *Phys. A*, 228, 160–171.
- J.-P. Ramis (1978). Dévissage Gevrey, *Astérisque*, 59–60, 607–612.
- J.-P. Ramis (1984). *Théorèmes d'indices Gevrey pour les équations différentielles ordinaires*, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 296.
- J.-P. Ramis (1992). About the growth of entire functions solutions of linear algebraic q -difference equations, *Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse*, 6 (1), 53–94.
- J.-P. Ramis, J. Sauloy, C. Zhang (2004). La variété des classes analytiques d'équations aux q -différences dans une classe formelle, *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 338, 277–280.
- J.-P. Ramis, J. Sauloy, C. Zhang (2013). *Local Analytic Classification of q -Difference Equations*, *Asterisque*, 349.
- P. Ribenboim (1992). Noetherian rings of generalized power series, *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 79, 293–312.
- J.F. Ritt (1936). On the singular solutions of algebraic differential equations, *Ann. of Math.*, 37, 552–617.

- H. Sakai (2001). Rational surfaces associated with affine root systems and geometry of the Painlevé equations, *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 220, 165–229.
- J. Sauloy (2000). Systèmes aux q -différences singuliers réguliers: classification, matrice de connexion et monodromie, *Ann. Inst. Fourier*, 50, 1021–1071.
- J. Sauloy (2003). Galois theory of Fuchsian q -difference equations, *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup.*, 36, 925–968.
- M.-P. Schützenberger (1953). Une interprétation de certaines solutions de l'équation fonctionnelle $F(x + y) = F(x)F(y)$, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, 236, 362–353.
- A. Spitzbart (1960). A generalization of Hermite's interpolation formula, *Amer. Math. Month.*, 67, 42–46.
- L. Takacs (1991). A Bernoulli excursion and its various applications, *Adv. Appl. Prob.*, 23, 557–585.
- L. Takacs (1995). Limit distributions for the Bernoulli meander, *J. Appl. Prob.*, 32, 375–395.
- J. Thomae (1869). Beiträge zur Theorie der durch die Heinesche Reihe ..., *J. Reine Ang. Math.*, 70, 258–281.
- W.J. Trjitzinsky (1938). Theory of non-linear q -difference systems, *Ann. Math. Pura Appl.*, 17, 59–106.
- J. van der Hoeven (2001). Operators on generalized power series, *Illinois J. Math.*, 45, 1161–1190.
- J. van der Hoeven (2005). *Transseries and Real Differential Algebra*, Springer.
- M. van der Put, M. Reversat (2007). Galois theory of q -difference equations, *Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math.*, 16, 665–718.
- C. Zhang (1998). Sur un théorème de Maillet-Malgrange pour les équations q -différentielles, *Asymptot. Anal.*, 17, 309–314.
- C. Zhang (2002). A discrete summation for linear q -difference equations with analytic coefficients: general theory and examples, in Braaksma et al. ed., *Differential Equations and the Stokes Phenomenon, Proceedings of the conference, Groningen, Netherlands, May 28–30, 2001*, World Scientific.

Index of notation

\triangleleft , 119 \bowtie , 119 $\alpha(A)$, 30 $\bar{\alpha}$, 176 $\bar{\alpha}(P)$, 30 $\underline{\alpha}$, 176 $\underline{\alpha}(P)$, 30, 220 γ , 207 $\Delta_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell)$, 155 $\Delta_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell)$, 156 $\Delta_A(n_1, \dots, n_\ell)$, 196 δ_n , 86, 104, 106, 113 $\tilde{\delta}_n$, 111 $\delta_n(P)$, 113 $\tilde{\delta}_n(P)$, 113 Θ_1 , 160 Θ , 150 Θ , 160 Θ_2 , 160 Θ_3 , 160 Θ_4 , 160 $\Theta(P)$, 126 $\lambda_\alpha(A)$, 55 ν , 45 $\bar{\rho}$, 208 σ , 17 $\tau_{i,j}$, 157 $\Psi_{P,Q}$, 46 $\Omega_A(x_1, \dots, x_\ell)$, 96 ω_n , 86, 92, 95, 113 $\omega_n(P)$, 113 $\tilde{\omega}_n$, 88	$A = (a; \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell)$, 23, 24 $Af(z)$, 23 $A \setminus \alpha$, 55 $(a; \sqcup)$, 23, 24 $\bar{a}(P)$, 220 $\bar{a}(P)$, 30 B , 118 $B_{P,q}f(z)$, 193 $\mathcal{B}_{q,s}f$, 81 $\mathcal{B}_{r,s\varepsilon,P}f$, 229 $\mathcal{B}_{P,q}^\dagger f(z)$, 135 $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q}$, 149 $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}_{P,q}f$, 200 $(b; \beta_1, \dots, \beta_\ell)$, 24 C_0 , 251 C_1 , 251 C_2 , 251 C_3 , 251 \mathcal{C} , 207 $\mathcal{C}(A)$, 37 $\mathcal{C}(P)$, 37 $\mathcal{C}(z)$, 207 \mathcal{C}_{P,q,f_0} , 193 $\mathcal{C}_{P,q,t}(z)$, 149 $\mathbb{C}\{z\}$, 81 $\mathbb{C}[[z^{\mathbb{R}}]]$, 14 $\mathbb{C}[[z^{\mathbb{R}}]]_{\text{grid}}$, 15 $\mathbb{C}[[z^{\mathbb{R}}]]_{\text{grid}}[Y_0, \dots, Y_n]$, 17 $\mathbb{C}[[z]]$, 81 $\mathbb{C}[[z]]_{q,H(P),\rho,\mu}$, 213 $\mathbb{C}[[z]]_{q,s}$, 82 $\text{coker } P$, 204 $D(A)$, 94 $D(P)$, 95, 96, 142, 186
---	---

D_i , 254
 D_q , 3
 $d(A)$, 94
 $d(P)$, 95, 96, 186
 ∂_α , 55
 $E(A)$, 90
 $E(P)$, 90
 \mathcal{E} , 220
 $\mathcal{E}_{P,q}(z)$, 135
 (\mathcal{E}, P, θ) , 223, 224, 228
 (\mathcal{F}, Q, ϕ) , 224, 228
 f_μ , 14
 $f_n(q)$, 197, 200
 \mathcal{G} , 228, 229
 g_n , 129, 144, 155
 H , 176
 H , 178
 $H(A)$, 104
 $H(P)$, 104, 108, 216
 h , 176
 $h(A)$, 104
 $h(P)$, 104, 108
 $J_n(q)$, 251
 $L_{-\infty}(P)$, 38
 $L_\infty(P)$, 38
 L_μ , 36
 $L_\mu(A)$, 38
 $L_\mu(P)$, 38
 $L_{\rho_i,0}$, 213
 $L_{\rho_i,j}$, 215
 \mathcal{L}_A , 94
 $\ell(P)$, 30
 \log_+ , 96
 M_λ , 72
 $\mathcal{N}(P)$, 37
 $\text{ord}f$, 15
 \widehat{P} , 147
 $[a; \alpha]$, 219
 $[k \uparrow \ell]$, 39
 $(n)_j$, 118, 208
 P_0 , 66
 P_+ , 66
 P^\dagger , 135
 $(PE)^\perp$, 204
 $Pf(z)$, 19
 $P_{h,i}$, 48
 P_Q , 42
 P_\square , 66
 $P = \sum P_A A$, 24
 $Q_{h,i}$, 49
 $Q_{k-\gamma}$, 207
 $Q_\mu(P)$, 43
 $Q(P, h)$, 49
 \mathfrak{Q}_0 , 174
 \mathfrak{Q} , 173
 \mathfrak{Q}_+ , 174
 \mathfrak{Q}_{linear} , 174
 $\mathcal{R}[Y_0, \dots, Y_n]$, 17
 R , 72
 R_k , 207
 $R_{i,j}$, 157
 $R(z)$, 126
 S_z , 70
 $s(A)$, 107, 148
 $s_{\mathcal{E}}, P$, 223
 T_{cz^μ} , 40
 $u(x)$, 96
 $V_{0,n}$, 162
 $V_0(z)$, 163
 $V_{1,n}$, 162
 $V_1(z)$, 164
 $V_{2,n}$, 163
 $V_{3,n}$, 163
 $V_{4,n}$, 163
 $V_{5,n}$, 163
 $V_i(z)$, 163
 v_n , 108, 156, 195
 x_i^* , 96

Y^λ , 17
 \widehat{Y}_0 , 125

$[z^\mu]$, 15
 $(z; q)_n$, 2

Index

- analytic q -operator, 84
- backward operator, 118
- bargraphs, 261
- basic recursion, 85
- Catalan number, 5
- Catalan paths, 4
- cloud of points, 37
- co-depth, 94, 95
- coefficient maps, 15
- co-height, 104, 176
- cokernel, 204
- colored Jones equation, 251
- confluence, 197
- constant (q -operator), 66
- constant part, 66
- co-slope, 36, 239, 244
- crest, 147, 176, 178
- crest polynomial, 149, 191, 216
- crest q -Borel transform, 149
- crest series, 149
- depth, 94, 95, 186
- derivative, 55
- edge, 135, 188
- edge q -Borel transform, 135
- edge series, 135
- elevation, 90, 188
- exact q -Gevrey order, 82
- exceptional set, 126
- expected order, 32
- falling factorial, 118, 208
- first ω terms, 60
- formal linear r -algebraic equation of Laurent type, 220
- formal linear r -factor, 219
- formal linear r -operator, 220
- formal r -algebraic equations of Laurent type, 224
- full q -Gevrey order, 82, 84, 216
- generic degree, 86, 104
- generic order, 86, 90
- glide, gliding, 224, 228, 230
- gliding algorithm, 226
- grid, 15
- grid-based, 15
- Hahn field, 14
- Hahn series, 14
- height, 104, 176
- index, 204, 216
- indicial polynomial, 46, 240
- initial expansions, 248
- initial polynomial, 240
- Jones polynomial, 22, 251
- Laplace transform, 94
- lattice paths, 255
- length, 30
- linear q -factors, 174
- method of substitution, 31
- monomial, 17, 19
- multiplication, 72
- necessary initial conditions, 48
- Newton-Puiseux polygon, 35, 37, 238
- nonshifting, 66, 174, 175, 242
- nonshifting part, 66, 175, 176
- order, 15
- partial derivatives, 52
- part of P pertaining to Q , 42
- peeling the roots, 211
- pivot point, 49
- polynomial, 19

(polynomial) q -algebraic equation, 17
 q -Painlevé equation of type 1, 263
 q -algebraic equation, 1, 24
 q -Borel transform, 81
 q -Catalan equation, 7, 18, 25, 49, 65, 69, 91, 105, 122, 127, 185, 194
 q -difference operator, 3, 17
 q -factor, 23
 q -Gevrey order, 82, 84
 q -Lagrange inversion, 260
 q -operator, 24, 173
 raising, 157
 reflection, 72
 r -factor, 219
 root peeling, 117, 210, 212
 scope, 148
 shifting, 66, 174
 shifting part, 66
 simplification, 176, 186, 188, 241
 simplification by z , 70
 singularity analysis, 117
 slope, 223
 solved form, 67, 73, 242
 support, 14, 30
 supporting line, 38
 translation, 39, 40, 39, 175, 176, 186, 188, 241
 transposition, 157
 uniqueness condition, 68, 85