

SQUARE-FULL VALUES OF QUADRATIC POLYNOMIALS

WATCHARAKIETE WONGCHAROENBHORN AND YOTSANAN MEEMARK

ABSTRACT. A *square-full* number is a positive integer for which all its prime divisors divide itself at least twice. The counting function of square-full integers of the form $f(n)$ for $n \leq N$ is denoted by $S_f^\blacksquare(N)$. We have known that for a relatively prime pair $(a, b) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ with a linear polynomial $f(x) = ax + b$, its counting function is $\asymp_{a,b} N^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Fix $\varepsilon > 0$, for an admissible quadratic polynomial $f(x)$, we prove that

$$S_f^\blacksquare(N) \ll_{\varepsilon, f} N^{\varpi + \varepsilon}$$

for some absolute constant $\varpi < 1/2$. Under the assumption on the *abc* conjecture, we expect the upper bound to be $O_{\varepsilon, f}(N^\varepsilon)$.

1. INTRODUCTION

A positive integer n is called *square-full* if for every prime p dividing n , then $p^2 | n$. We may put 1 to be a square-full number by this definition. Throughout this work, $f(x)$ is a polynomial with integer coefficients. Let us denote $S_f^\blacksquare(N)$ the number of positive integers $n \leq N$ such that $f(n)$ is square-full. It is known for an identity polynomial $\text{Id}(n) = n$ that

$$S_{\text{Id}}^\blacksquare(N) = \frac{\zeta(3/2)}{\zeta(3)} N^{\frac{1}{2}} + \frac{\zeta(2/3)}{\zeta(2)} N^{\frac{1}{3}} + o(N^{\frac{1}{6}}).$$

This result is due to P. T. Bateman and E. Grosswald [1] for which they improved the pioneer result [6] of P. Erdős and G. Szekeres by producing the term of order $N^{\frac{1}{3}}$ explicitly. They also indicate in the paper that the exponent $1/6$ in the error term cannot be improved without proving some kind of the quasi-Riemann hypothesis. Furthermore, there are studies on $f(n) = an + b$ for $(a, b) \neq (1, 0)$ as well, and the counting function still is of order $N^{\frac{1}{2}}$ up to a constant depending only on a, b . For instance, T. H. Chan [5] provided the asymptotic formula for such a polynomial with $\gcd(a, b) = 1$, and improved the error term for large a .

In 1931, T. Estermann [7] studied the counting function for a quadratic polynomial assuming square-free values. Here, *square-free* integer is similarly defined, for which we replace $p^2 | n$ by $p \nmid n$ in our definition of square-full numbers. Analogous to the square-full notation, we denote $S_f^\square(N)$ by the number of positive integers $n \leq N$ such that $f(n)$ is square-free. Particularly, he proved for $f(x) = x^2 + h$ with a nonzero integer h that

$$S_f^\square(N) = \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{\rho_h(p^2)}{p^2} \right) N + O(N^{\frac{2}{3}} \log N),$$

where $\rho_h(m) := \#\{n \in \mathbb{Z}/m\mathbb{Z} : n^2 + h \equiv 0 \pmod{m}\}$ for all $m \geq 2$. After that, around 80 years later, D. R. Heath-Brown [9] improved in 2012 the error term for $h = 1$ of the above formula to be $O_\varepsilon(N^{\frac{7}{12} + \varepsilon})$ for arbitrarily small ε .

Our interest is to determine the number of square-full numbers of quadratic form, since it seems possible to apply the method of Heath-Brown used in [9]. It turns out

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 11N32; Secondary 11D45.

Key words and phrases. Square-full integers, Quadratic polynomials.

that there might be bias toward it, as suggested by our first main result on special quadratic polynomials.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ and a polynomial $f(x) = x^2 + \alpha^2$, the number of $n \leq N$ for which $f(n)$ is square-full is at most*

$$O_{\varepsilon, \alpha} \left(N^{\varpi + \varepsilon} \right),$$

where $\varpi = \frac{29}{100}$.

Here, we employ the celebrated determinant method introduced by Heath-Brown. His main idea was to use the properties of the sum of two squares and the unique factorization of $\mathbb{Z}[i]$ to extract the equation involving a bi-homogeneous polynomial. Then, he constructed another independent equation with another bi-homogeneous form to help curb the count of solutions.

We also are interested in a more general case of a quadratic polynomial $f(x) = ax^2 + bx + c \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$. It is seen that we may reduce to study its “simple form”, namely, $(gx^2 + h)/k$ where $g, h, k \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $\gcd(g, h, k) = 1$ and $k \neq 0$. This form is obtained by completing the square and changing variables. Then, we call a polynomial $f(x)$ *admissible* if, in its simple form $(gx^2 + h)/k$, we have $h \neq 0$.

To formulate the next result, we define

$$\varpi_0 = \frac{\beta(0)}{6(\log 2 - \beta(0))} \approx 0.1118,$$

where $\beta(0) := \frac{2+\sqrt{3}}{2\sqrt{3}} \log \frac{2+\sqrt{3}}{2\sqrt{3}} - \frac{2-\sqrt{3}}{2\sqrt{3}} \log \frac{2-\sqrt{3}}{2\sqrt{3}}$. We now state our second main theorem, for which we obtain the bound in general to also be strictly less than $\frac{1}{2}$. The main ingredient is the significantly improved bound on counting integral points on Mordell curve by M. Bhagava et al. [2].

Theorem 1.2. *For $\varepsilon > 0$ and an admissible quadratic polynomial $f(x)$, the number of $n \leq N$ for which $f(n)$ is square-full is at most,*

$$O_{\varepsilon, f} \left(N^{\varpi + \varepsilon} \right)$$

where $\varpi = \frac{2(1+8\varpi_0)}{5+24\varpi_0} \approx 0.4931$. Moreover, if Conjecture 2.3 is true, then we can replace ϖ by $\frac{2}{5}$.

Moreover, we note that the problem of counting square-full values of a quadratic polynomial $f(x)$ is related to counting pairs of quasi-consecutive square-full numbers, since n^2 itself is square-full and we can reduce to study its simple form. Indeed, if we fix a polynomial $f(x) = x(x+1)$, then counting pairs of consecutive square-full integers not exceeding N is the same as determining $S_f^{\blacksquare}(N)$. T. Reuss [12] studied this problem, as well as some related problems on k -free numbers. Our result for special $f(x)$ is the same as his average result, which also shows that the number of such pairs of integers up to N is $O_{\varepsilon}(N^{\frac{29}{100} + \varepsilon})$. Furthermore, as we mentioned, the result of Reuss implies similar bound for a reducible polynomial $f(x) = x(x+h)$ for a nonzero integer h . Recently, T. Browning and I. Shparlinski [3] have proved that almost all polynomials of arbitrary degree $k \geq 2$, in the sense of naive height, take infinitely many square-free values. We give the final remark that almost all quadratic polynomials, in this sense, have small bounds for their square-full counting formulae (see Remark 4.3).

2. PRELIMINARIES AND LEMMAS

We show that although it seems difficult to find a positive integer n so that $n^2 + 4$ is square-full, indeed there are infinitely many n that can do so. We may let $n = 2d$ be an even number so that $n^2 + 4 = 4(d^2 + 1)$ and we see that there are infinitely many solutions $(d, k) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ such that

$$4(d^2 + 1) = 8k^2 \iff d^2 - 2k^2 = -1,$$

which is a negative Pell's equation with $(1, 1)$ as a based solution, and $8k^2$ is always square-full. We shall note also that for a polynomial $f(x)$ of degree at least three, it seems impossible that $f(n)$ will assume infinite values of square-full integers. This is thanks to the work of A. Granville [8] as a consequence of the *abc* conjecture. Our example $f(x) = x^2 + 4$ shows that the number of $n \leq N$ for which $f(n)$ is square-full is $\gg \log N$. We may ask as mentioned by Granville on counting consecutive square-full numbers that

$$S_f^\blacksquare(N) \sim c_f \log N,$$

for some constant c_f . In particular, this might hold for any admissible quadratic polynomial $f(x)$ with no fixed prime p such that $p \mid f(n)$ for all sufficiently large n . The constant c_f is allowed to depend on the coefficients of $f(x)$. In Remark 2.7, we shall see that assuming the *abc* conjecture, the left-hand side is bounded by $C_{\varepsilon, f} N^\varepsilon$ for some constant $C_{\varepsilon, f} > 0$. This result is, perhaps, far from being optimal. Whence, it is interesting if its asymptotic behavior does exist.

For a fixed polynomial $f(x)$, it is more convenient to focus on the expression

$$(2.1) \quad S_f^\blacksquare(2N) - S_f^\blacksquare(N) = \sum_{\substack{N < n \leq 2N \\ e^2 d^3 = f(n)}} \mu^2(d),$$

and finding the upper bound for it implies that we obtain the bound for $S_f^\blacksquare(N)$ itself by a dyadic sum, up to logarithmic factors. We see that by defining $\mathcal{M}(E, D) := \#\{(e, d, n) \in \mathbb{N}^3 : N < n \leq 2N, E < e \leq 2E, D < d \leq 2D, e^2 d^3 = f(n)\}$, the right-handed side of Equation 2.1 is at most

$$\ll \sum_{E \gg L} \max_{D \asymp \left(\frac{N}{E}\right)^{\frac{2}{3}}} \mathcal{M}(E, D) + \sum_{E \ll L} \max_{D \asymp \left(\frac{N}{E}\right)^{\frac{2}{3}}} \mathcal{M}(E, D),$$

where the sums are dyadic sums over E and L is some parameter. Whence, the problem is reduced to obtain the bound for $\mathcal{M}(E, D)$ in the whole range. In his paper, Estermann showed that the contribution to $\mathcal{M}(E, D)$ for fixed $D < d \leq 2D$ is $O(\log N)$ so we have $\mathcal{M}(E, D) \ll D \log N$.

It seems difficult to extend Heath-Brown's determinant method to a polynomial $f(x) = x^2 + h$ for a non-perfect square $h \neq 0$. Hence, for general quadratic polynomials, we employ the bound on counting integral points on an elliptic curve, which involved the size of its discriminant. The following lemma tells us that we may focus on Mordell equations.

Lemma 2.1. *Let \mathcal{E} be an elliptic curve over \mathbb{Q} with $\mathcal{E} : gy^2 = ke^2x^3 - h$ for fixed nonzero integers g, h, k . Suppose further that e is square-free relatively prime to $6gkh$. Then, the discriminant Δ of the Weierstrass equation $\mathcal{E}' : y^2 = x^3 - e^4g^3k^2h$ corresponding to it, and its minimal discriminant $\Delta_{\mathcal{E}}$ satisfy*

$$|\Delta_{\mathcal{E}}| \asymp_{g, h, k} |\Delta|,$$

where the implied constant is dependent only on g, h, k .

Proof. We may transform our elliptic curve via $(x, y) \mapsto (x/(gke^2), y/(g^2ke^2))$ to the Weierstrass equation $\mathcal{E}' : y^2 = x^3 - e^4g^3k^2h$. Using Proposition VII.2.1.3(d) in [13] we obtain that the minimal Weierstrass equation comes from the change of coordinates

$$x = u^2x' + r \text{ and } y = u^3y' + u^2sx' + t,$$

for some $u, r, s, t \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then, using similar argument and notation, we obtain $u^6 \mid 864g^3k^2he^4$. For u to be large it must be that $u^6 \mid e^4$ as e is relatively prime to $6gkh$. Since, e is square-free, we have $u = 1$. Thus, the minimal discriminant

$$|\Delta_{\mathcal{E}}| = |u^{-12}\Delta| \asymp |\Delta|$$

as desired because $u \ll_{k,g,h} 1$. \square

Then, we state the current best known upper bound for the number of integral points on Elliptic curves [2].

Theorem 2.2. *Let \mathcal{E} be an elliptic curve over \mathbb{Q} defined by a Weierstrass equation with integer coefficients and discriminant Δ . Then the number of integer points on $\mathcal{E}(\mathbb{Q})$ is at most,*

$$O_{\varepsilon}(|\Delta|^{\varpi_0 + \varepsilon}).$$

For a special non-singular elliptic curve $\mathcal{E} : y^2 = x^3 + a$, the discriminant Δ is of order a^2 . Whence, the number of integral points on $\mathcal{E}(\mathbb{Q})$ is at most $O_{\varepsilon}(a^{2\varpi_0 + 2\varepsilon})$, by this theorem. We shall focus on this particular curve as mentioned. It has been conjectured that this could be improved to be almost uniform bound, that is, ϖ_0 should be replaced by zero. The conjecture is stated explicitly as follows.

Conjecture 2.3. *For a fixed integer $a \neq 0$ and $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\#\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : y^2 = x^3 + a\} \ll_{\varepsilon} |a|^{\varepsilon}.$$

Remark 2.4. It is possible to prove the weak version of the conjecture for special a elementarily. The weak version means that for each $\varepsilon > 0$ and a fixed integer $a \neq 0, 1$, we have that

$$\#\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 : |x|, |y| \leq B, y^2 = x^3 + a\} \ll_{\varepsilon} (B|a|)^{\varepsilon}.$$

For any a , this weak version can be proved by using Heath-Brown's result as was mentioned in [10] for which he proved for bivariate forms. We shall homogenize this Mordell curve and employ his result to obtain what we desire. Note that he assumed the Birch-Swinnerton-Dyer conjecture and the Riemann hypothesis for L -functions of elliptic curves. Also this version, and hence invoking two such conjectures, suffices to prove our second assertion in Theorem 1.2. This is because we may take $B = N$ in the above weak version, and use the bound as in the proof below.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. As in (2.1), we consider the simple form of $f(x)$, say $(gx^2 + h)/k$ with $h \neq 0$. Then, we find an upper bound for $\mathcal{M}(E, D)$ for which $E \ll L$ to be

$$\mathcal{M}(E, D) \ll E \#\{(d, n) : E < e \leq 2E, gn^2 = ke^2d^3 - h\} \ll E^{1+8\varpi_0 + \varepsilon},$$

by Lemma 2.1 and Theorem 2.2 for the last inequality. Since there exists a prime e in $(E, 2E]$ which is square-free, the minimal discriminant is of order e^8 for any large enough prime e . Thus, we obtain the total bound to be $\ll_{\eta} N^{\eta}(\sum_{E \gg L} D + \sum_{E \ll L} L^{1+8\varpi_0}) \ll N^{\varpi_0 + \eta}$, where $\varpi = \frac{2(1+8\varpi_0)}{5+24\varpi_0}$ for the optimal choice $L = N^{\frac{2}{5+24\varpi_0}}$. The second assertion can be done similarly by replacing ϖ_0 by 0. The theorem follows as desired. \square

Remark 2.5. In the above proof, we split up naively for the dyadic sum over E and Lemma 2.1 tells us that for large prime e we cannot save any power to cover all the bound depending on the discriminant in that range. Indeed, since positive proportion of integers are square-free, it seems difficult to reduce the bound by simply rearranging terms. Another approach appealing to Heath-Brown's [10] or Salberger's mechanism (as was mentioned in [4]) seems unfortunate to tackle this problem with our naive method. We estimate the number of points (d, n) that satisfies

$$q(d) - p(n) - h := ke^2d^3 - gn^2 - h = 0,$$

where $h, k \neq 0$, $p(x)$ is a polynomial of degree 2 and $q(x)$ is a polynomial of degree 3. Then, we proceed as in Reuss's work [12] and obtain via using theorem 15 of [10] that the points (d, n) satisfying the above lie on at most $N^\eta \sqrt{D}$ auxiliary curves. Thus, using Bézout's theorem, the number of points under consideration is $\ll_\eta N^\eta \sqrt{D}$. Upon invoking Estermann's bound in the first sum we obtain the upper bound to be $\ll_\eta N^\eta \left(\sum_{E \gg N^\psi} D + \sum_{E \ll N^\psi} \max_{\psi \leq \frac{1}{4}} E \sqrt{D} \right) \ll N^{\frac{1}{2} + \eta}$, where we use the optimal $\psi = \frac{1}{4}$. This is however weaker than what we expected in Theorem 1.2.

For our first main theorem, we proceed in parallel to Heath-Brown's work [9] on square-free values of $n^2 + 1$, by reducing the bound of $\mathcal{M}(E, D)$ of the second sum that we showed in general case to be $N^\eta \sqrt{M} \min(\sqrt{E}, \sqrt{D})$, with new parameter M . Before we prove Theorem 1.1, we may state the infamous *abc* conjecture which provides us an almost bound result. As a convention, for a positive integer n , we denote $\text{rad}(n) = \prod_{p|n} p$.

Conjecture 2.6 (*abc* conjecture). *For any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ if $a + b = c$ for pairwise coprime positive integers a, b, c , then for some constant K_ε*

$$c < K_\varepsilon \cdot \text{rad}(abc)^{1+\varepsilon}.$$

Remark 2.7. Under the *abc* conjecture, any admissible quadratic polynomial $f(x)$, satisfies $S_f^\blacksquare(N) \ll_{\varepsilon, f} N^\varepsilon$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Assume that the *abc* conjecture holds. We may focus on $f(x) = ax^2 + b$ with $\text{gcd}(a, b) = 1$, by its simple form and splitting into finite cases of counting the tuple (n, e, d) from $ce^2d^3 = an^2 + b$ with fixed integers a, b, c such that $b \neq 0$. Then, we determine the condition on d that satisfies the equation $ce^2d^3 = an^2 + b$ since we want to bound, as in (2.1),

$$S_f^\blacksquare(2N) - S_f^\blacksquare(N) \ll_\eta \sum_d \#\{(e, n) \in \mathbb{N} : N < n \leq 2N, ce^2d^3 = an^2 + b\}.$$

We can further assume that $\text{gcd}(b, n) = 1$. For $b > 0$, there exists an absolute constant C_ε such that $ce^2d^3 \leq C_\varepsilon \text{rad}((an^2)(ce^2d^3)b)^{1+\varepsilon}$. Hence, we have $e^{1-\varepsilon}d^{2-\varepsilon} \ll_\varepsilon n^{1+\varepsilon}$, and since $e^2d^3 \asymp_{a,b,c} n^2$, we obtain that $d \ll N^\eta$ for arbitrarily small $\eta > 0$. Then, the Estermann's bound and the number of possibilities of d imply the claim. For $b < 0$, the argument is similar. Since some $f(x)$ produces infinitely many square-full numbers, this claim is best possible. The *abc* conjecture also implies that the number of pairs of consecutive square-full numbers up to N is at most $O_\varepsilon(N^\varepsilon)$. Here, we are to count solutions for $N < a^2b^3 = a_1^2b_1^3 + 1 \leq 2N$. By the *abc* conjecture, we have that $a^{1-\varepsilon}b^{2-\varepsilon} \leq C_\varepsilon a_1^{1+\varepsilon} b_1^{1+\varepsilon}$. Thus, we have

$$a^{-2\varepsilon} b^{1-2\varepsilon} \leq 2^{1+2\varepsilon} C_\varepsilon^2 \cdot \frac{N^{2\varepsilon}}{b_1^{1-2\varepsilon}},$$

and the right-hand side is less than 1 if N is large in term of ε for $b_1 \geq N^{6\varepsilon}$, which is impossible. Therefore, we have similar situation with fixed $c = 1, a < N^{6\varepsilon}$ in the above calculation, and hence the claim. Furthermore, Conjecture 2.3 (or the Birch-Swinnerton-Dyer conjecture with the Riemann hypothesis for elliptic curves) can be used to imply

$$S_f^\blacksquare(N) \ll_\varepsilon N^{\frac{2}{5} + \varepsilon} \|f\|^\varepsilon,$$

where $\|f\|$ denotes the maximum modulus of coefficients of f . This is an almost uniform result; however, we are unable to prove analogous to this assuming *abc* conjecture to be almost uniform bound.

Back to the proof of Theorem 1.1, we proceed as in Heath-Brown [9] and Reuss [12]. Fix $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\eta > 0$, we determine the solutions (e, d, n) to the equation $e^2 d^3 = n^2 + \alpha^2$. We have that $e = x_1^2 + x_2^2$ and $d = y_1^2 + y_2^2$ by the sum of two squares argument since we may assume that $\gcd(n, \alpha) = 1$. This can be done by splitting the equation into about $O_\alpha(1)$ cases each of which corresponds to counting solutions with $\gcd(n, \alpha) = 1$. With the unique factorization property of $\mathbb{Z}[i]$ we have that $(x_1 + ix_2)^2(y_1 + iy_2)^3 = n + \alpha i$ and that after taking the imaginary part, we obtain that

$$(2.2) \quad (x_1^2 - x_2^2)(3y_1^2 y_2 - y_2^3) + 2x_1 x_2 (y_1^3 - 3y_1 y_2^2) = \alpha.$$

We shall assume that $|x_1| \leq |x_2|$ and x_1, x_2 have the same signs. For if $|x_1| \geq |x_2|$ we may change the role of them and change the sign of y_2 . If x_1, x_2 have different signs, we can change the signs of y_1 and x_2 . Now, we claim that

$$\max(|3y_1^2 y_2 - y_2^3|, |y_1^3 - 3y_1 y_2^2|) \gg D^{\frac{3}{2}}.$$

The proof will assume $|y_1| \leq |y_2|$; however, since they are symmetry the other case can be done in a similar way. For the case $|y_2| \cdot |3y_1^2 - y_2^2| \geq |y_1| \cdot |y_1^2 - 3y_2^2|$, we first suppose that $y_2^2 < 3y_1^2$. Then we have $|y_2|(3y_1^2 - y_2^2) \geq |y_1||y_1^2 - 3y_2^2| \geq |y_1|(3y_2^2 - y_1^2)$. Since d is square-free we see that $|y_1| \neq |y_2|$, for otherwise $d = 2y_1^2$ is not square-free and $d \gg D$ is large for $N \gg_\eta 1$, then $3t^2 - 1 \geq t(3 - t^2)$ for $1 \geq t := |y_1/y_2|$. Thus, we have $0 \leq t^3 + 3t^2 - 3t - 1 \leq 3t^2 - 3t = 3t(t - 1)$ and $t = 1$ so $|y_1| = |y_2|$, which is not possible. Therefore, $y_2^2 \geq 3y_1^2$ and with the same set-up we obtain that $0 \leq t^3 - 3t^2 - 3t + 1 = (t - 1)^3 - 6t + 2 \leq 2 - 6t$ and $|y_1| \leq \frac{1}{3}|y_2|$. The maximum in this case is $\gg |y_2|(y_2^2 - 3y_1^2) \gg D^{3/2}$. Similarly, for the case $|y_2||3y_1^2 - y_2^2| < |y_1||y_1^2 - 3y_2^2|$, with the same notation we have either

$$t(3 - t^2) > 3t^2 - 1 \text{ or } t(3 - t^2) > 1 - 3t^2,$$

and the second inequality is impossible since it is equivalent to $(t + 1)(t^2 - 4t + 1) < 0$. The first corresponds to $(t - 1)(t^2 + 4t + 1) < 0$ which is always true and which corresponds to $t^2 < 3 \implies y_2^2 < 3y_1^2$. Again, we obtain the maximum of the two terms $\gg D^{3/2}$.

Upon taking $q_1(y_1, y_2)$ to be the largest of the two, which has the property that its absolute value is $\gg D^{3/2}$, and taking z_1, z_2 appropriately to be polynomials in x_1, x_2 , we obtain

$$q_1(y_1, y_2)z_1 + q_2(y_1, y_2)z_2 = \alpha.$$

Then, by the triangle inequality, we have that

$$D^{\frac{3}{2}}|z_1| \ll |q_1(y_1, y_2)||z_1| \leq \alpha + |q_2(y_1, y_2)||z_2| \ll D^{\frac{3}{2}}|z_2|.$$

Thus, $|z_1| \ll |z_2|$ and $|z_2| \gg \max(|z_1|, |z_2|) \gg E$. Hence,

$$(2.3) \quad t = -\frac{q_2(s, 1)}{q_1(s, 1)} + O(E^{-1}D^{-\frac{3}{2}}) = -\frac{q_2(s, 1)}{q_1(s, 1)} + O(N^{-1}) =: \phi(s) + O(N^{-1}),$$

where $s = y_1/y_2$ and $t = z_1/z_2$ if $|y_1| \leq |y_2|$ and $s = y_2/y_1$ in the separate case, which can be handled in a similar way, so $s, t \ll 1$. Therefore, the problem reduces to count points (s, t) that lie close to the curve $t = \phi(s)$. We will impose $w = x_1/x_2$ which is positive since the x_1, x_2 have the same signs and $w \ll 1$.

3. THE DETERMINANT METHOD

In this section, we want to construct another equation on bi-homogeneous form of the same variables as in (2.3). The satisfactory bound is plausible since we have the existing bound for counting points on $G(x_1, x_2; y_1, y_2) = 0$, for an absolutely irreducible bi-homogeneous polynomial $G(x_1, x_2; y_1, y_2) \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2]$.

Our plan is as follows. We proceed to choose a parameter $M \in [D, N]$ with $D = N^{\frac{8}{9}}$, and split the intervals of possible values of s into $O(M)$ intervals of the form $I =]s_0, s_0 + M^{-1}]$. By Taylor's theorem, if we write $s \in I$ by $s = s_0 + u$ with $u = O(M^{-1})$, then $\phi(s) = \phi(s_0) + P(u) + O(N^{-1})$ where $P(u)$ is a polynomial in u with no constant coefficient and all coefficients of size $O(1)$. Thus, $|P(u)| \ll M^{-1}$. Write $\tau(w) := t = \phi(s) + O(N^{-1})$ where $0 < w = x_1/x_2 \ll 1$. If $\tau(w) = (w^2 - 1)/2w$ then we obtain

$$\frac{w^2 - 1}{2w} = \phi(s_0) + P(u) + O(N^{-1}).$$

Since $w > 0$ and $P(u)$ is small, we have that

$$w = \phi(s_0) + P(u) + \sqrt{(\phi(s_0) + P(u))^2 + 1 + O(N^{-1})}.$$

By Taylor's theorem, $\sqrt{s + c} = \sqrt{c} + (2\sqrt{c})^{-1}s + O(s^2)$ for s around zero and $c \geq 1$ is a constant. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} w &= \phi(s_0) + P(u) + \sqrt{1 + (\phi(s_0) + P(u))^2} + \frac{O(N^{-1})}{2\sqrt{1 + (\phi(s_0) + P(u))^2}} \\ &= c_{s_0} + Q(u) + O(N^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the Taylor's theorem for the non-error terms. Similarly, if $\tau(w) = 2w/(w^2 - 1)$, we obtain

$$w = \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 + (\phi(s_0) + P(u) + O(N^{-1}))^2}}{\phi(s_0) + P(u)} \ll 1,$$

and as $P(u)$ is small, $|\phi(s_0)| \gg 1$. By Taylor's theorem on $\sqrt{1 + (c + s)^2}$ for s around zero and $c \geq 1$ is a constant, we have

$$\begin{aligned} w &= \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 + (\phi(s_0) + P(u))^2}}{\phi(s_0) + P(u)} + \frac{O(N^{-1})}{\sqrt{1 + (\phi(s_0) + P(u))^2}} \\ &= c_{s_0} + Q(u) + O(N^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

by the fact that $|\phi(s_0)| \gg 1$, and we have used the Taylor's theorem for the first term on $1 + \sqrt{1 + (\phi(s_0) + s)^2}$ for s around zero. Therefore, in either case, w can be represented by a polynomial $Q(u)$ of order $\ll M^{-1}$ with error $O(N^{-1})$.

Suppose there are J solutions to 2.3 in the interval I . Then, upon introducing new parameters K, L that will be dependent merely on η , we construct a $J \times H$ matrix

$$\mathfrak{M} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & s_1 & w_1 & \cdots & s_1^k w_1^\ell & \cdots & s_1^K w_1^L \\ 1 & s_2 & w_2 & \cdots & s_2^k w_2^\ell & \cdots & s_2^K w_2^L \\ \vdots & & & \vdots & & & \vdots \\ 1 & s_J & w_J & \cdots & s_J^k w_J^\ell & \cdots & s_J^K w_J^L \end{pmatrix},$$

where $H = (K + 1)(L + 1)$. We obtain a nonzero vector \mathbf{c} such that

$$\mathfrak{M}\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{0},$$

if we have $\text{rank}(\mathfrak{M}) < H$. With this nonzero vector \mathbf{c} , we can consider the polynomial $C_I(s, w) = \sum_{h=1}^H c_h m_h(s, w)$, where we label $m_h(s, w)$ to be each monomial $s^k w^\ell$ appearing in each row of \mathfrak{M} for $k \leq K$ and $\ell \leq L$ so that $C_I(s_j, w_j) = 0$ for all $j \leq J$. Also, by reducing matrix \mathfrak{M} into row-reduced echelon form, we have that $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{Q}^H$ has rational entries and we may clear the denominator of C_I , which is \ll some fixed power of N , so that its coefficients are integral of size $\ll N^{\kappa(K,L)}$. The fact that $\text{rank}(\mathfrak{M})$ is strictly less than H follows from

$$\left(\prod_{j \leq H} y_{2,j}^K x_{2,j}^L \right) \Delta \in \mathbb{Z},$$

where Δ is the subdeterminant of the first $H \times H$ matrix, and we assume that $J \geq H$. Thus, we will choose M appropriately so that $\Delta = 0$ for which it suffices to prove that $\Delta \ll_{K,L} D^{-\frac{KH}{2}} E^{-\frac{LH}{2}}$, and we obtain the desired inequality.

Following the proof of Heath-Brown, for $V \asymp N$ in the Taylor's expansion $w = c_{s_0} + P(u) + v$ with $v \ll V^{-1}$ and note that $u \ll M^{-1}$. We now order the values of $M^{-k} V^{-\ell}$, $k \leq K$, $\ell \leq L$, decreasingly as $1 = M_0, M_1, \dots$. Lemma 3 of Heath-Brown [11] gives

$$\Delta \ll_H \prod_{h \leq H} M_h.$$

Let us denote $M_H = W^{-1}$. Then $M^{-k} V^{-\ell} \geq M_H$ if and only if

$$k \log M + \ell \log V \leq \log W.$$

The number of pairs k, ℓ satisfying the above is

$$\frac{\log^2 W}{2 \log M \log V} + O\left(\frac{\log W}{\log N}\right) + O(1),$$

which equals to H . Thus, we have that

$$\log W = \sqrt{2H \log M \log V} + O(\log N).$$

Moreover, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \log \prod_{h \leq H} M_h &= \sum_{\substack{k, \ell \\ k \log M + \ell \log V \leq \log W}} -(k \log M + \ell \log V) \\ &= -\frac{\log^3 W}{3 \log M \log V} + O\left(\frac{\log^2 W}{\log N}\right) \\ &= -H^{\frac{3}{2}} \cdot \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{3} \sqrt{\log M \log V} + O(H \log N), \end{aligned}$$

by replacing the term of $\log W$ above. Whence, we acquire

$$\log |\Delta| \leq O_H(1) - H^{\frac{3}{2}} \cdot \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{3} \sqrt{\log M \log V} + O(H \log N).$$

Thus, $\Delta = 0$ if we have that

$$\frac{K}{2} \log D + \frac{L}{2} \log E \leq (KL)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{3} \sqrt{\log M \log V} + O_{K,L}(1) + O(\log N),$$

or, for taking $K = \lceil L \log E / \log D \rceil$ that

$$L \log E \leq L \cdot \frac{2\sqrt{2}}{3} \sqrt{\log M \log V} \sqrt{\frac{\log E}{\log D}} + O_L(1) + O(\log N).$$

For small fixed $\delta > 0$ if

$$\frac{2\sqrt{2}}{3} \sqrt{\log M \log V} \sqrt{\frac{\log E}{\log D}} \geq (1 + \delta) \log E,$$

and $L, N \gg_\delta 1$, we will obtain the desired inequality. Since $V \gg N$, we summarize and acquire the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\eta > 0$ be given and $M \in [D, N]$ satisfies*

$$\log M \geq \frac{9}{8}(1 + \eta) \frac{\log E \log D}{\log N}.$$

Then, for any interval $I = [s_0, s_0 + M^{-1}]$, there exists $0 \neq C_I(s, t)$ of integral coefficients such that all solutions satisfy

$$C_I(y_1/y_2, x_1/x_2) = 0,$$

with $y_1/y_2 \in I$. Moreover, $\deg(C_I) = O_\eta(1)$ and its coefficients size $O_\eta(N^\kappa)$ for some $\kappa = \kappa(\eta)$.

With this polynomial C_I in the previous lemma, as in [9] we may assume without loss of generality that C_I is absolutely irreducible. Hence, we can apply the existing bound on counting solutions noted at the beginning of this section.

4. COUNTING SOLUTIONS AND FINISHING THE PROOF

In the previous section, we construct an auxiliary equation involving bi-homogeneous polynomial C_I in each fixed interval I . It can be proven that we may restrict to C_I that is absolutely irreducible, say $F(y_1, y_2; z_1, z_2) = 0$ to be again bi-homogeneous. In this section, we will count the solutions to 2.3 based on changing of bases. We now have in the interval $I = (s_0, s_0 + M^{-1}]$ that

$$s_0 < s = \frac{y_1}{y_2} \leq s_0 + M^{-1}.$$

It follows that $|y_1 - s_0 y_2| \leq D^{1/2} M^{-1}$ because $|y_2| \leq D^{1/2}$. We proceed by letting

$$\Lambda = \left\{ (D^{-1/2} M(y_1 - s_0 y_2), D^{-1/2} y_2) : (y_1, y_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \right\}.$$

Then Λ is a lattice of determinant $D^{-1} M$. We are interested in points $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \in \Lambda$ falling in the square

$$S = \{(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) : \max(|\alpha_1|, |\alpha_2|) \leq 1\}.$$

Let $\mathbf{g}^{(1)}$ be the shortest non-zero vector in the lattice and $\mathbf{g}^{(2)}$ be the shortest vector not parallel to $\mathbf{g}^{(1)}$. The two vectors form a basis for Λ and moreover $\lambda_1 \mathbf{g}^{(1)} + \lambda_2 \mathbf{g}^{(2)} \in S$ only when $|\lambda_1| \ll |\mathbf{g}^{(1)}|^{-1} =: L_1$ and $|\lambda_2| \ll |\mathbf{g}^{(2)}|^{-1} =: L_2$. Thus, we have $L_1 \gg L_2$ and $(L_1 L_2)^{-1} = |\mathbf{g}^{(1)}| |\mathbf{g}^{(2)}| \ll \det(\Lambda) = D^{-1} M \implies L_1 L_2 \gg D M^{-1}$. Hence, we may replace (y_1, y_2) by (λ_1, λ_2) . We may argue in exactly the same way to change x_1, x_2 by τ_1, τ_2 . Now, we have the equations

$$(4.1) \quad G_0(\lambda_1, \lambda_2; \tau_1, \tau_2) = \alpha$$

$$(4.2) \quad G_1(\lambda_1, \lambda_2; \tau_1, \tau_2) = 0$$

which are bi-homogeneous of degree $(3; 2)$ and $(a; b)$ respectively. When $a, b \geq 2$ we can get a satisfactory bound from the following lemma due to Heath-Brown [9].

Lemma 4.1. *Let $G(x_1, x_2; y_1, y_2)$ be an absolutely irreducible bi-homogeneous polynomial with integer coefficients of degree $(a; b)$ with $a, b \geq 1$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be given. Then for $X \geq 1$ there exist $O_{a,b,\varepsilon}(X^{\frac{2}{b} + \varepsilon} \|G\|^\varepsilon)$ points $(a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2) \in \mathbb{Z}^4$ satisfying the conditions*

$$\begin{aligned} \gcd(a_1, a_2) &= \gcd(b_1, b_2) = 1, \\ G(a_1, a_2; b_1, b_2) &= 0 \text{ and } \max\{a_1, a_2\} \leq X. \end{aligned}$$

We see that it suffices to assume $\gcd(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = \gcd(\tau_1, \tau_2) = 1$ since we fixed α and there are $O_\alpha(1)$ possibilities to determine, by the divisor argument. When $b \geq 2$, we set $X = L_1$ and the Equation 4.2 implies $\|G\| \ll N^\eta$ and Lemma 4.1 tells us that the number of solutions is $O_\eta(L_1^{1+\eta}N^\eta)$. Each of these solutions produce at most one solution in Equation 4.1. Then, upon considering the case $b = 0, 1$ with T_1 as in the work of Heath-Brown, we obtain the following lemma.

Lemma 4.2. *For $\eta > 0$, in an interval I , $\mathcal{M}(E, D)$ contributes $O_\eta(N^\eta \min(L_1^{1+\eta}, T_1^{1+\eta}))$.*

Now, we finish the proof of Theorem 1.1. After fixing a parameter M as in Lemma 3.1 we now count possible intervals by fixing $L \ll N$ and consider each $L < L_1 \leq 2L$. Then we sum the total contribution dyadically on L by applying Lemma 4.2. If (y_1, y_2) corresponds to $\mathbf{g}^{(1)}$, then $L_1(y_1 - s_0 y_2) \ll M^{-1}\sqrt{D}$ and $L_1 y_2 \ll \sqrt{D}$. Suppose that for some fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, $L_1 \gg D^{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}$ we have that $y_2 = 0$ and $y_1 = 0$ as well, which is not possible. Whence, $L_1 \ll_\varepsilon D^{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon}$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$. Then, we take $s_0 = y_3 M^{-1}$ in $I =]s_0, s_0 + M^{-1}]$ and we see that $y_3 \ll M$ since $s_0 \ll 1$. Therefore, the number of intervals for which $L < L_1 \leq 2L$ is at most the number of triples $(y_1, y_2, y_3) \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ with $\gcd(y_1, y_2) = 1$ for which

$$y_2 y_3 = M y_1 + O(L^{-1}\sqrt{D}), y_2 \ll L^{-1}\sqrt{D}, \text{ and } y_3 \ll M.$$

Recall that $L_1 \gg L_2$ and $L_1 L_2 \gg DM^{-1}$, so $L \gg D^{\frac{1}{2}}M^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. For each value of y_1 , there are $O_\eta(N^\eta L^{-1}\sqrt{D})$ pairs of (y_2, y_3) . Hence, for which L_1 is of order L there are $O_\eta(N^\eta L^{-2}D)$ intervals since $y_1 \ll L^{-1}\sqrt{D}$. We find that $\mathcal{M}(E, D) \ll_\eta N^{2\eta} L^{-2} D \cdot L^{1+\eta} \ll N^{3\eta} \sqrt{DM}$. Analogously, we obtain $\mathcal{M}(E, D) \ll N^{3\eta} \sqrt{EM}$. Therefore, we conclude that

$$\mathcal{M}(E, D) \ll N^{3\eta} \sqrt{M} \min(\sqrt{E}, \sqrt{D}).$$

Next, we let $E = N^\psi$. Then $D = N^{\frac{2}{3}(1-\psi)}$ and M as in Lemma 3.1 must be $N^{\frac{3}{4}\psi(1-\psi)}$. Observe that, for the dyadic sums, we have that

$$\frac{1}{N^\eta} \left(\sum_{E \ll N^\psi} \sqrt{M} \min(\sqrt{E}, \sqrt{D}) + \sum_{E \gg N^\psi} D \right) \ll_\eta N^\varpi + N^{\frac{2}{27}},$$

where $\varpi = \frac{29}{100}$ for the optimal choice $\psi = \frac{8}{9}$. The upper bound for the second sum is obtained via the Estermann's bound. This completes the proof.

Remark 4.3. The *abc* conjecture implies $S_f^\blacksquare(N) \ll_\varepsilon N^\varepsilon$; however, we hope for the asymptotic relation, which is much smaller than that. It is possible to see the behavior on average quadratic polynomials, so we determine square-full values of random polynomials. Here, we consider ordering polynomials via naive height similar to the work of Browning and Shparlinski [3]. For positive integers H and $k \geq 2$, we write $\mathbf{a} = (a_0, a_1, \dots, a_k) \in \mathbb{Z}^{k+1}$ and denote

$$\mathcal{F}_k(H) := \{a_0 + a_1 X + \dots + a_k X^k \in \mathbb{Z}[X] : \mathbf{a} \in \mathcal{B}_k(H)\},$$

where $\mathcal{B}_k(H) := \{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}^{k+1} : |a_i| \leq H, \text{ for all } i = 0, 1, \dots, k\}$. Here, we focus only on $k = 2$. Then, we have by a naive bound

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}_2(H)} S_f^\blacksquare(N) &\ll \sum_{d \ll N^{\frac{2}{3}}} \# \left\{ (e, d, n, \mathbf{a}) : n \leq N, \frac{a_0 + a_1 n + a_2 n^2}{d^3} = e^2 \right\} \\ &\ll \sum_{d \ll N^{\frac{2}{3}}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{H}{d^3}} + 1 \right) H^2 N \ll H^{\frac{5}{2}} N + H^2 N^{\frac{5}{3}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we obtain for small $\varepsilon > 0$ that whenever $N^{2+\varepsilon} \leq H \leq N^A$ for some constant A ,

$$\frac{1}{\#\mathcal{F}_2(H)} \sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}_2(H)} S_f^\blacksquare(N) \ll_\varepsilon \frac{1}{N^{\frac{\varepsilon}{2}}}.$$

This means that almost all quadratic polynomials have pretty small bound for their counting formulae. Also, it is possible to obtain a similar result for square-free values of quadratic forms. If we change the notation for $\mathcal{B}_k(H)$ above by imposing in addition the condition $\gcd(a_0, a_1, \dots, a_k) = 1$, then by letting $f_0(n) = n^2 + 1$, we may replace the result from [3] by

$$\frac{1}{\#\mathcal{F}_2(H)} \sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}_2(H)} |S_f^\square(N) - c_f S_{f_0}^\square(N)| \ll N^{1-\delta},$$

where c_f is the ratio between the coefficients in the asymptotic relations corresponding to f and to f_0 . Now we let $1 - \delta = \frac{26 + \sqrt{433}}{81} - \varepsilon$ with appropriate smaller range of H to obtain the best known bound for almost all quadratic polynomials in $\mathcal{F}_2(H)$.

REFERENCES

- [1] P. T. Bateman and E. Grosswald, On a theorem of Erdős and Szekeres, *Illinois J. Math.* **2** (1958) 88–98.
- [2] M. Bhargava and A. Shankar, et al., Bounds on 2-torsion in class groups of number fields and integral points on elliptic curves, *J. Am. Math. Soc.* **33** (2017) 1087–1099.
- [3] T. Browning and I. Shparlinski, Square-free values of random polynomials, *Arxiv.* (2023).
- [4] T. Browning, Power-free values of polynomials, *Arch. Math.* **96** (2011) 139–150.
- [5] T. H. Chan, Squarefull numbers in arithmetic progression II, *J. Number Theory* **152** (2015) 90–104.
- [6] P. Erdős and G. Szekeres, Über die Anzahl der Abelschen Gruppen gegebener Ordnung und über ein verwandtes zahlentheoretisches Problem (German), *Acta Sci. Math. (Szeged)* **7** (1934–1935) 95–102.
- [7] T. Estermann, Einige Sätze über quadratfreie Zahlen (German), *Math. Ann.* **105** (1931) 653–662.
- [8] A. Granville, ABC allows us to count squarefrees, *Int. Math. Res.* **19** (1998) 991–1009.
- [9] D. R. Heath-Brown, Square-free values of $n^2 + 1$, *Acta Arith.* **155** (2012) 1–13.
- [10] D. R. Heath-Brown, *Counting Rational Points on Algebraic Varieties*, Springer-Verlag, 2006.
- [11] D. R. Heath-Brown, Sums and differences of three k -th powers, *J. Number Theory* **129** (2009) 1579–1594.
- [12] T. Reuss, Pairs of k -free numbers, consecutive square-full numbers, *Arxiv.* (2014).
- [13] J. H. Silverman, *The Arithmetic of Elliptic Curves, 2nd Ed.*, Springer, 2009.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCE, FACULTY OF SCIENCE, CHULALONGKORN UNIVERSITY, BANGKOK, THAILAND 10330

Email address: w.wongcharoenbhorn@gmail.com

Email address: yotsanan.m@chula.ac.th