

The generalized Catalan equation in positive characteristic

Peter Koymans
p.h.koymans@math.leidenuniv.nl

May 26, 2021

In this article we will bound m and n for the generalized Catalan equation in characteristic $p > 0$.

Notation

Let $K = \mathbb{F}_p(z_1, \dots, z_r)$ be a finitely generated field over \mathbb{F}_p . Our main result in this article is as follows.

Theorem 1. *Let $a, b \in K^*$ be given. Consider the equation*

$$ax^m + by^n = 1 \tag{1}$$

in $x, y \in K$ and integers $m, n > 1$ coprime with p satisfying

$$(m, n) \notin \{(2, 2), (2, 3), (3, 2), (2, 4), (4, 2), (3, 3)\}. \tag{2}$$

Then there is a finite set $\mathcal{T} \subseteq K^2$ such that for any solution (x, y, m, n) of (1), there is a $(\gamma, \delta) \in \mathcal{T}$ and $t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that

$$ax^m = \gamma^{p^t}, by^n = \delta^{p^t}. \tag{3}$$

Discussion of Theorem 1

In the case $a = b = 1$, a stronger and effective result was proven in [6] based on the work of [1].

Let us now show that the conditions on m and n are necessary. If (2) fails, then (1) defines a curve of genus 0 or 1 over K . It is clear that (3) can fail in this case. It is also essential that m and n are coprime with p . Take for example $a = b = 1$. Then any solution of

$$x + y = 1$$

with $x, y \in K$ and $x, y \notin \overline{\mathbb{F}_p}$ gives infinitely many solutions of the form (3) after applying Frobenius.

The generalized Catalan equation over function fields was already analyzed in [8], where the main theorem claims that the generalized Catalan equation has no solutions for m and n sufficiently large. Unfortunately, it is not hard to produce counterexamples to the main theorem given there. Following the notation in [8], we choose $k = \mathbb{F}_p$, $K = k(u)$, $a = x = u$, $b = y = 1 - u$ and $m = n = p^t - 1$ for $t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Then we have

$$ax^m + by^n = u \cdot u^{p^t-1} + (1-u) \cdot (1-u)^{p^t-1} = 1$$

due to Frobenius, illustrating the need of (3).

Proof of Theorem 1

For our proof we will need a generalization of Mason’s ABC-theorem for function fields in one variable to an arbitrary number of variables. Such a result is given in [2].

Proof. Let (x, y, m, n) be an arbitrary solution. Without loss of generality we may assume that $\{z_1, \dots, z_k\}$ forms a transcendence basis of K/\mathbb{F}_p .

We write $t := r - k$ and rename z_{k+1}, \dots, z_r as y_1, \dots, y_t respectively. Define

$$A_0 := \mathbb{F}_p[z_1, \dots, z_k], \quad K_0 := \mathbb{F}_p(z_1, \dots, z_k).$$

Then

$$A = A_0[y_1, \dots, y_t], \quad K = K_0(y_1, \dots, y_t).$$

Note that A and K are respectively the coordinate ring and the function field of an affine algebraic variety V over \mathbb{F}_p . Then the algebraic closure of \mathbb{F}_p in K is a finite extension of \mathbb{F}_p , say \mathbb{F}_q with $q = p^n$ for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Because \mathbb{F}_q is perfect, it follows that K is separably generated over \mathbb{F}_q , see Theorem 26.2 in [9].

Taking the projective closure of V and normalizing gives a projective variety non-singular in codimension one, still with function field K . Let us call the variety thus obtained W . Our goal will be to introduce a height on K . For later purposes it will be useful to do this in a slightly more general setting. So let X be a projective variety, non-singular in codimension one, defined over a perfect field k . We write L for the function field of X and we assume that k is algebraically closed in L .

Fix a projective embedding of X such that $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}_k^M$ for some positive integer M . Then a prime divisor \mathfrak{p} of X over k is by definition an irreducible subvariety of codimension one. Recall that for a prime divisor \mathfrak{p} the local ring $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a discrete valuation ring, since X is non-singular in codimension one. Following [4] we will define heights on X . To do this, we start by defining a set of normalized discrete valuations

$$M_L := \{\text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} : \mathfrak{p} \text{ prime divisor of } X\},$$

where $\text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is the normalized discrete valuation of L corresponding to $\mathcal{O}_{\mathfrak{p}}$. If $v = \text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}} \in M_L$, we define for convenience $\deg v := \deg \mathfrak{p}$ with $\deg \mathfrak{p}$ being the projective degree in \mathbb{P}_k^M . Then the set M_L satisfies the sum formula for all $x \in L^*$

$$\sum_v v(x) \deg v = 0.$$

If P is a point in $\mathbb{P}^r(L)$ with coordinates $(y_0 : \dots : y_r)$ in L , then its (logarithmic) height is

$$h_L(P) = - \sum_v \min_i \{v(y_i)\} \deg v.$$

Furthermore we define for an element $x \in L$

$$h_L(x) = h_L(1 : x). \tag{4}$$

We will need the following properties of the height.

Lemma 2. *Let $x, y \in L$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. The height defined by (4) has the following properties:*

- (a) $h_L(x) = 0 \Leftrightarrow x \in k$;
- (b) $h_L(x + y) \leq h_L(x) + h_L(y)$;
- (c) $h_L(xy) \leq h_L(x) + h_L(y)$;
- (d) $h_L(x^n) = nh_L(x)$;
- (e) *Suppose that k is a finite field and let $C > 0$ be given. Then there are only finitely many $x \in L^*$ satisfying $h_L(x) \leq C$;*
- (f) $h_L(x) = h_{\bar{k}.L}(x)$.

Proof. Property (a) is Proposition 4 of [3] (p. 157), while properties (b), (c) and (d) are easily verified. Property (e) is proven in [5]. Finally, property (f) can be found after Proposition 3.2 in [4] (p. 63). \square

Let us now dispose with the case $ax^m \in \mathbb{F}_q$. Then

$$2h_K(x) \leq mh_K(x) = h_K(x^m) \leq h_K(ax^m) + h_K(a^{-1}) = h_K(a^{-1}),$$

hence there are only finitely many possibilities for x . Now observe that $ax^m \in \mathbb{F}_q$ implies $by^n \in \mathbb{F}_q$. By the same argument we get finitely many possibilities for y , so we are done in this case.

From now on we will assume $ax^m \notin \mathbb{F}_q$ and hence $by^n \notin \mathbb{F}_q$. Then it follows that

$$h_K(ax^m), h_K(by^n) \neq 0.$$

Write

$$ax^m = \gamma^{p^t}, by^n = \delta^{p^s}$$

for some $t, s \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $\gamma, \delta \notin K^p$. After substitution we get

$$\gamma^{p^t} + \delta^{p^s} = 1.$$

Extracting p -th roots gives $t = s$ and hence

$$\gamma + \delta = 1. \tag{5}$$

Our goal will be to apply the main theorem of [2] to (5). For completeness we repeat it here.

Theorem 3. *Let X be a projective variety over an algebraically closed field k of characteristic $p > 0$, which is non-singular in codimension one. Let $L = k(X)$ be its function field and let M_L be as above. Let L_1, \dots, L_q , $q \geq n + 1$, be linear forms in $n + 1$ variables over k which are in general position. Let $\mathbf{X} = (x_0 : \dots : x_n) \in \mathbb{P}^n(L)$ be such that x_0, \dots, x_n are linearly independent over K^{p^m} for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, for any fixed finite subset S of M_L , the following inequality holds:*

$$\begin{aligned} & (q - n - 1)h(x_0 : \dots : x_n) \\ & \leq \sum_{i=1}^q \sum_{v \notin S} \deg v \min\{np^{m-1}, v(L_i(\mathbf{X})) - \min_{0 \leq j \leq n} \{v(x_j)\}\} \\ & \quad + \frac{n(n+1)}{2} p^{m-1} \left(C_X + \sum_{v \in S} \deg v \right), \end{aligned}$$

where C_X is a constant depending only on X .

Proof. See Theorem in [2]. □

Note that Theorem 3 requires that the ground field k is algebraically closed. But a constant field extension does not change the height by Lemma 2(f). Hence we can keep working with our field K instead of $\overline{\mathbb{F}_p} \cdot K$. Define the following three linear forms in two variables X, Y

$$\begin{aligned} L_1 &= X \\ L_2 &= Y \\ L_3 &= X + Y. \end{aligned}$$

We apply Theorem 3 with our W , the above L_1, L_2, L_3 and $\mathbf{X} = (\gamma : \delta) \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)$. We claim that γ and δ are linearly independent over K^p . Suppose that there are $e, f \in K^p$ such that

$$e\gamma + f\delta = 0.$$

Together with $\gamma + \delta = 1$ we find that

$$0 = e\gamma + f\delta = e(1 - \delta) + f\delta = e + (f - e)\delta.$$

If $e \neq f$, then this would imply that $\delta \in K^p$, contrary to our assumptions. Hence $e = f$, but then we find

$$0 = e\gamma + f\delta = e$$

and we conclude that $e = f = 0$ as desired.

We still have to choose the subset S of M_K to which we apply Theorem 3. First we need to make some preparations. From now on v will be used to denote an element of M_K . Define

$$\begin{aligned} N_0 &:= \{v : v(a) \neq 0 \vee v(b) \neq 0\} \\ N_1 &:= \{v : v(a) = 0, v(b) = 0, v(\gamma) > 0\} \\ N_2 &:= \{v : v(a) = 0, v(b) = 0, v(\delta) > 0\} \\ N_3 &:= \{v : v(a) = v(b) = 0, v(\gamma) = v(\delta) < 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

It is clear that N_0, N_1, N_2 and N_3 are finite disjoint sets. Before we proceed, we make a simple but important observation in the form of a lemma.

Lemma 4. *Let (γ, δ) be a solution of (5). If $v(\gamma) < 0$ or $v(\delta) < 0$, then*

$$v(\gamma) = v(\delta) < 0.$$

Proof. Obvious. □

Recall that

$$h_K(\gamma) = \sum_v \max(0, v(\gamma)) \deg v = \sum_v -\min(0, v(\gamma)) \deg v$$

and

$$h_K(\delta) = \sum_v \max(0, v(\delta)) \deg v = \sum_v -\min(0, v(\delta)) \deg v.$$

Lemma 4 tells us that

$$\sum_v -\min(0, v(\gamma)) \deg v = \sum_v -\min(0, v(\delta)) \deg v,$$

hence

$$h_K(\gamma) = h_K(\delta) = \sum_v \max(0, v(\gamma)) \deg v = \sum_v -\min(0, v(\gamma)) \deg v \quad (6)$$

$$= \sum_v \max(0, v(\delta)) \deg v = \sum_v -\min(0, v(\delta)) \deg v. \quad (7)$$

We will use these different expressions for the height throughout. Let us now derive elegant upper bounds for N_1 , N_2 and N_3 . Again we will phrase it as a lemma.

Lemma 5. *Let (γ, δ) be a solution of (5). Then*

$$h_K(\gamma) = h_K(\delta) \geq m \sum_{v \in N_1} \deg v,$$

$$h_K(\gamma) = h_K(\delta) \geq n \sum_{v \in N_2} \deg v,$$

$$h_K(\gamma) = h_K(\delta) \geq \text{lcm}(m, n) \sum_{v \in N_3} \deg v.$$

Proof. We know that

$$h_K(\gamma) = h_K(\delta) = \sum_v \max(0, v(\gamma)) \deg v \geq \sum_{v \in N_1} \max(0, v(\gamma)) \deg v.$$

Now let $v \in N_1$. This means that $v(a) = v(b) = 0$ and $v(\gamma) > 0$. Then $ax^m = \gamma^{p^t}$ implies

$$v(a) + mv(x) = p^t v(\gamma)$$

and hence $mv(x) = p^t v(\gamma)$. But m and p are coprime by assumption, so we obtain $m \mid v(\gamma)$. Because $v(\gamma) > 0$, this gives $v(\gamma) \geq m$ and we conclude that

$$h_K(\gamma) = h_K(\delta) \geq m \sum_{v \in N_1} \deg v.$$

Using

$$h_K(\gamma) = h_K(\delta) = \sum_v \max(0, v(\delta)) \deg v \geq \sum_{v \in N_2} \max(0, v(\delta)) \deg v,$$

we find in a similar way that

$$h_K(\gamma) = h_K(\delta) \geq n \sum_{v \in N_2} \deg v.$$

It remains to be proven that

$$h_K(\gamma) = h_K(\delta) \geq \text{lcm}(m, n) \sum_{v \in N_3} \deg v.$$

Now we use

$$\begin{aligned} h_K(\gamma) = h_K(\delta) &= \sum_v -\min(0, v(\gamma)) \deg v = \sum_v -\min(0, v(\delta)) \deg v \\ &\geq \sum_{v \in N_3} -\min(0, v(\gamma)) \deg v = \sum_{v \in N_3} -\min(0, v(\delta)) \deg v. \end{aligned}$$

Now take $v \in N_3$. Then $v(\gamma) = v(\delta) < 0$. In the same way as before, we can show that $m \mid v(\gamma)$ and $n \mid v(\delta)$. But $v(\gamma) = v(\delta) < 0$ by Lemma 4, so we find that

$$h_K(\gamma) = h_K(\delta) \geq \text{lcm}(m, n) \sum_{v \in N_3} \deg v$$

as desired. \square

Define

$$S := N_0 \cup N_1 \cup N_2 \cup N_3.$$

Suppose that $v \notin S$. We claim that

$$v(\gamma) = v(\delta) = 0.$$

But $v \notin S$ implies $v \notin N_0$, so certainly $v(a) = v(b) = 0$. Furthermore, we have that $v \notin N_1$ and $v \notin N_2$, which means that $v(\gamma) \leq 0$ and $v(\delta) \leq 0$. If $v(\gamma) < 0$ or $v(\delta) < 0$, then Lemma 4 gives $v \in N_3$, contradicting our assumption $v \notin S$. Hence $v(\gamma) = v(\delta) = 0$ as desired.

From our claim it follows that we have for $v \notin S$ and $i = 1, 2, 3$

$$v(L_i(\gamma, \delta)) = \min(v(\gamma), v(\delta)).$$

Theorem 3 tells us that

$$h_K(\gamma : \delta) \leq C_W + \sum_{v \in S} \deg v,$$

where C_W is a constant depending on W only. By Lemma 5 we find that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{v \in S} \deg v &= \sum_{v \in N_0} \deg v + \sum_{v \in N_1} \deg v + \sum_{v \in N_2} \deg v + \sum_{v \in N_3} \deg v \\ &\leq C_{a,b} + \left(\frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{\text{lcm}(m, n)} \right) h_K(\gamma), \end{aligned}$$

where $C_{a,b}$ is a constant depending on a and b only. Now (2) implies

$$\frac{1}{m} + \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{\text{lcm}(m, n)} < 0.9,$$

hence

$$h_K(\gamma : \delta) \leq 10(C_W + C_{a,b}).$$

But $\gamma + \delta = 1$ gives

$$h_K(\gamma) = h_K(\delta) = h_K(\gamma : \delta).$$

The theorem now follows from Lemma 2(e). \square

Discussion of Theorem 1

The conclusion of Theorem 1 tells us that there is a finite set $\mathcal{T} \subseteq K^2$ such that for any solution (x, y, m, n) of (1), there is a $(\gamma, \delta) \in \mathcal{T}$ and $t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ such that

$$ax^m = \gamma^{p^t}, by^n = \delta^{p^t}.$$

Since \mathcal{T} is finite, we may assume that γ and δ are fixed in the above two equations. The resulting equation is studied in [7].

References

- [1] B. Brindza, *The Catalan equation over finitely generated integral domains*, Publ. Math. Debrecen 42 (1993), 193-198.
- [2] L.-C. Hsia, J.T.-Y. Wang, *The ABC theorem for higher-dimensional function fields*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 356 (2004), 2871-2887.
- [3] S. Lang, *Introduction to Algebraic Geometry*, Addison-Wesley, Redwood City, CA, 1973.
- [4] S. Lang, *Fundamentals of Diophantine Geometry*, Springer, Berlin, 1983.
- [5] D.W. Masser, *Mixing and Linear Equations over Groups in positive characteristic*, Isreal Journal of Mathematics 142 (2004), 189-204.
- [6] P. Koymans, *The Catalan equation*, <http://pub.math.leidenuniv.nl/~koymansph/MasterThesis.pdf>
- [7] P. Koymans, *Power Equation*, <http://pub.math.leidenuniv.nl/~koymansph/PowerEquation.pdf>
- [8] J.H. Silverman, *The Catalan equation over function fields*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 273 (1982), 201-205.
- [9] H. Matsumura, *Commutative ring theory*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1986.