

On Freiman's Theorem in a function field setting

Mieke Wessel

Abstract

We prove some new instances of a conjecture of Bachoc, Couvreur and Zémor that generalizes Freiman's $3k - 4$ Theorem to a multiplicative version in a function field setting. As a consequence we find that if F is a rational function field over an algebraically closed field K and $S \subset F$ a finite dimensional K -vector space such that $\dim S^2 = 2 \dim S + 1$, then the conjecture holds.

1 Introduction

One of the goals of additive combinatorics is to show that a set $A \subset \mathbb{Z}$ with some form of additive structure has extra structure. For example, A can contain many 3-arithmetic progressions, or most elements in $A + A := \{a_1 + a_2 \mid a_1, a_2 \in A\}$ have many distinct pairs $(a_1, a_2) \in A^2$ representing them. This idea of linking discrete structures to each other is not unique to additive combinatorics and in particular we want to find analogues of theorems in additive combinatorics in the following function field setting.

Let F be a function field over some algebraically closed field of constants K and let S be a finite dimensional K -vector space that is contained in F . If we require S to have some *multiplicative structure*, what does this say about other (structural) properties of S ?

Our current focus will be on generalizing so-called inverse problems in additive combinatorics, which try to find the structure of some finite set $A \subset \mathbb{Z}$ when $|A + A|$ is small. A solution to this problem is given by Freiman's Theorem, which gives bounds for $|A + A|$ such that A is always contained in an r -dimensional arithmetic progression of bounded size. The relatively simple case $r = 1$ is known as Freiman's $3k - 4$ theorem.

Theorem 1.1 (Freiman's $3k - 4$ Theorem [2]). *Let $A \subset \mathbb{Z}$ such that $|A + A| \leq 3|A| - 4$. Then A is contained in an arithmetic progression of length at most $|A + A| - |A| + 1$.*

We are interested in the structure that S can have when the dimension of $S^2 := \{s_1 s_2 \mid s_1, s_2 \in S\}$, the set of products of elements from S , is small. The meaning of small is expressed by the combinatorial genus of S .

Definition 1.2. The *combinatorial genus* of S is defined as

$$\gamma := \dim S^2 - 2 \dim S + 1.$$

In [1] Bachoc, Couvreur and Zémour state a conjecture about how to generalize Freiman's $3k - 4$ Theorem to the function field setting.

Conjecture 1.3. *Let K be an algebraically closed field and let F be an extension field of K . Let S be a K -subspace of finite dimension in F such that $K \subset S$. Suppose the combinatorial genus γ of S is smaller or equal than $\dim S - 3$. Then the genus g of the field $K(S)$ satisfies $g \leq \gamma$ and there exists a Riemann-Roch space $L(D)$ that contains S and such that $\dim L(D) \leq \dim S + \gamma - g$.*

Remark. This is indeed a generalization of Theorem 1.1, take $A \subset \mathbb{Z}$ a finite set and define $S := \{x^a \mid a \in A\}$ for x some element in $F \setminus K$.

In the same paper this conjecture was proven for γ equal to 0 or 1 and when additionally $g = 0$, a possible explicit basis for S was given.

Theorem 1.4 ([1], Theorem 5.3 and Theorem 8.1). *Write n for the dimension of S over K and assume $F = K(S)$ has genus 0.*

- (i) *Suppose $n \geq 3$, and $\gamma = 0$, then we can find $x \in F$ such that $F = K(x)$ and a basis for S is given by*

$$1, x, x^2, \dots, x^n.$$

- (ii) *Suppose $n \geq 4$ and $\gamma = 1$, then we can find $x \in F$ and $\alpha \in K$ such that $F = K(x)$ and the basis of S is given by either*

$$1, x, x^2, \dots, x^{n-2}, (x + \alpha)x^{n-1} \quad \text{or,}$$

$$1, (x + \alpha)x, (x + \alpha)x^2, \dots, (x + \alpha)x^{n-1}.$$

The goal of this article is to show that the conjecture also holds when $g = 0$ and $\gamma = 2$. To prove this we use a similar setup as in [1], where they look at the natural filtration of S with respect to some valuation v of F . In [[1], Theorem 3.1] they first show that $|v(S)| = \dim S$ and then that one can always construct a ‘filtered basis’ of S with respect to v .

Definition 1.5. Let v be a valuation of F . A *filtered basis* of S (with respect to v) is a basis (e_1, e_2, \dots, e_n) such that

$$v(e_1) > v(e_2) > \dots > v(e_n).$$

A *natural filtration* (with respect to v) is the sequence of subspaces S_1, S_2, \dots, S_n such that $S_i := \langle e_1, \dots, e_i \rangle$. This sequence is unique for each valuation and thus independent of the chosen filtered basis.

Remark. By multiplying S with e_1^{-1} we may assume $e_1 = 1$ and thus $v(e_1) = 0$.

After fixing some valuation v we may now define $\gamma_i := \dim S_i^2 - 2 \dim S_i + 1$, the combinatorial genii of the S_i . As we will see in Lemma 2.1 the finite sequence $(\gamma_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ is non-decreasing in i . This makes it possible to use Theorem 1.4 to say something about the basis of S_i when γ_i equals either 0 or 1 and i is not too small. These are the most important ideas used to prove the following main results of this paper.

Theorem 1.6. *Let S be an n -dimensional K -subspace with combinatorial genus $\gamma \leq n - 3$ and suppose that the genus of $F = K(S)$ equals 0. Write $S_1 \subset S_2 \subset \dots \subset S_n$ for the natural filtration of S with respect to some fixed valuation v of F and write γ_i for the combinatorial genus of S_i . Suppose $\{\gamma_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ equals either $\{0, \gamma\}$ or $\{0, 1, \gamma\}$. Then, S is contained in a space $L(D)$ with $\dim(L(D)) \leq n + \gamma$.*

It is immediately clear that this implies the following corollary.

Corollary 1.6.1. *Let S be a K -subspace of dimension $n \geq 5$ and combinatorial genus $\gamma = 2$ such that the genus g of $F = K(S)$ equals 0. Then S is contained in a space $L(D)$ with $\deg(D) \leq n + 1$.*

In Section 2 the steps and tools for the proof of Theorem 1.6 are introduced and the cases where $\{\gamma_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ equals $\{0, \gamma\}$ and $\{0, 1, \gamma\}$ are proven in Sections 3 and 4 respectively.

Finally, in Section 5 we will consider another sequence of γ_i and prove the following theorem.

Theorem 1.7. *Let S, F and $(\gamma_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$ be defined as in Theorem 1.6. Define D_i as the divisor of least degree such that $S_i \subset L(D_i)$ and $\Delta_{\text{Max}} := \max_{2 \leq i \leq n} (\deg(D_i) - \deg(D_{i-1}))$. Suppose that $\gamma_3 = 0$ and $\gamma_{\Delta_{\text{Max}}} = 0$, then $\dim(L(D)) \leq n + \gamma$.*

Notation and conventions

From now on we will assume that $F = K(S)$ and that F has genus 0. This implies that $F = K(x)$ for some $x \in F$ and that all places of F have the form $(x - \alpha)$ for $\alpha \in K$ except for $\frac{1}{x}$, the place at infinity. We will also denote these places by P_α and P_∞ . The places correspond one to one to the valuations of F which we write as v_α and v_∞ , respectively.

With $1 = e_1, \dots, e_n$ we will always denote a filtrated basis of S with respect to v_∞ and $-v_\infty(e_i)$ will also be called the degree of e_i .

We write \mathfrak{p}_i with i an integer for the subset of $K[x]$ consisting of the polynomials in x of degree at most i .

2 Set-up

To prove Theorem 1.6 we will distinguish between quite a few cases. In this section we will outline the steps and some general tools used in the proof.

The most important case distinction that we will make is whether $\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_n\}$ equals $\{0, \gamma\}$ or $\{0, 1, \gamma\}$. The following lemma confirms that for $\gamma = 2$, these are the only possibilities and that the genus of $K(S_i)$ will equal 0 for all S_i in the natural filtration of S .

Lemma 2.1. *Let $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$ and g_i the genus of $K(S_i)$ then, $g_i = 0$ and $\gamma_i \leq \gamma_j$.*

Proof. The first statement follows directly from Lüroth's Theorem[[3], Proposition 3.5.9], since $g_n = g = 0$.

It suffices to prove the second statement for $j = i + 1$. Note that, by the ultrametric property, $v(e_i e_{i-1})$ and $v(e_i^2)$ are not in $v(S_{i-1}^2)$. Hence, $\dim(S_i^2) \geq \dim(S_{i-1}^2) + 2$ and therefore,

$$\gamma_i = \dim S_i^2 - 2 \dim S_i + 1 \geq \dim S_{i-1}^2 + 2 - 2i + 1 = \gamma_{i-1}. \quad \square$$

We define t as the integer between 2 and n such that $\gamma = \gamma_t > \gamma_{t-1}$. In the case that $\{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n\} = \{0, 1, \gamma\}$ we also define t_1 such that $1 = \gamma_{t_1} > \gamma_{t_1-1} = 0$. Note that the dimension of S_t^2 can be at most t bigger than the dimension of S_{t-1}^2 , because $S_t^2 = \langle S_{t-1}^2, e_1 e_t, \dots, e_{t-1} e_t, e_t^2 \rangle$ and therefore $\gamma_t \leq \gamma_{t-1} + t - 2$. This shows that it always holds that $t \geq \gamma - \gamma_{t-1} + 2$.

The proof when $t < \gamma + 3$ is slightly more involved than when $t \geq \gamma + 3$, but the general structure will be the same. We define $r := \max(t, \gamma + 3)$, where for a first read-through one may assume $r = t$. After fixing the set of values that the γ_i can take and the values for t and t_1 , we will continue with the following steps.

Steps:

1. Determine the possible degrees of e_1, e_2, \dots, e_r .
2. Look at the degrees of $\{e_i e_j \mid 1 \leq i \leq j \leq r\}$ and try to determine which elements s_1, \dots, s_k are ‘needed’ from $e_t S_r \cup e_{t+1} S_r \cup \dots \cup e_r S_r$ such that $S_r^2 = \langle S_{t-1}^2, s_1, \dots, s_k \rangle$. The ones not ‘needed’, imply a relation between the $e_i e_j$.
3. Use the found relations to check if elements can and/or must have poles outside of infinity.
4. By similar techniques as for e_r , figure out the possible values of n and poles of e_{r+1}, \dots, e_n . This will lead to the smallest divisor D such that $S \subset L(D)$.

2.1 Tools for Step 1

Note that Freiman’s $3k - 4$ Theorem can be applied to the set $\deg(S)$ of degrees of S , because $\deg(S) + \deg(S) \subset \deg(S^2)$ and $|\deg(S^2)| = \dim(S^2)$. This means that this set must be an arithmetic progression missing at most γ elements. The same then holds for $\deg(S_t)$, because it is a subset. If we know the greatest common divisor of $\deg(S_t)$, this idea will give us an upper bound for the degree of e_t .

When $t \geq \gamma_{t-1} + 4$, the most important tool to find the degrees of e_1, \dots, e_{t-1} is Theorem 1.4. However, a priori we only know the degrees in $K(S_{t-1}) \subset F$. The next lemma, which is a straightforward generalization of Lemma 7.11 in [1], can help us check whether $F = K(S_{t-1})$.

Lemma 2.2. *Define $\delta := \max_{1 \leq i \leq n-1} (\gamma_{i+1} - \gamma_i)$. Then $F = K(S) = K(S_{\delta+2})$.*

Proof. The codimension of S_i^2 in $S_i S_{i+1}$ equals $\gamma_{i+1} - \gamma_i + 1 \leq \delta + 1$. Since for $i \geq \delta + 2$ we know that $\dim S_i \geq \delta + 2$ the intersection $S_i^2 \cap S_i e_{i+1}$ is non-empty. Therefore e_{i+1} must be in $K(S_i)$ and $F = K(S_n) = \dots = K(S_{\delta+2})$. \square

Corollary 2.2.1. *For any $t \in \mathbb{N}$ it holds that $F = K(S_t)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.2 it suffices to prove that $t \geq \delta + 2$. Let j be such that $\delta = \gamma_j - \gamma_{j-1} = \dim S_j^2 - \dim S_{j-1}^2 - 2$. Note that $S_j^2 = \langle S_{j-1}^2, e_1 e_j, e_2 e_j, \dots, e_j^2 \rangle$ and thus,

$$\delta = \dim S_j^2 - \dim S_{j-1}^2 - 2 \leq j - 2 \leq t - 2,$$

where the second inequality holds because t is the largest index for which $\gamma_t - \gamma_{t-1}$ is non-zero. \square

When $F \neq K(S_{t-1})$, it might occur that $\gcd(\deg(S_{t-1})) \neq 1$. The following lemma together with the previous corollary show that without loss of generality we may assume that $\gcd(\deg(S_t)) = 1$.

Lemma 2.3. *Suppose $F = K(S_i)$, then for all but finitely many valuations v_α with $\alpha \in K \cup \{\infty\}$ it holds that there are $s_1, s_2 \in S_i$, depending on α , such that $v_\alpha(s_1) - v_\alpha(s_2) = 1$. In particular this implies $\gcd(v_\alpha(S_{\delta+2})) = 1$.*

Proof. Consider two elements s_1 and s_2 of S_i that have different degree. By multiplying by a suitable rational function h we may assume $f := hs_1$ and $g := hs_2$ to be coprime polynomials of different degrees. Let α be any element of F such that it is neither a zero of f nor of g , then we can find a unique $a_\alpha \in K$ such that $(f + a_\alpha g)(\alpha) = 0$. Note that $a_\alpha \neq 0$ and $v_\alpha(f) = 0$. We claim that for all but finitely many α it also holds that $v_\alpha(f + a_\alpha g) = 1$. This would prove that the elements s_1 and $s_1 + a_\alpha s_2$ of S_i have an α -valuation of difference one.

We prove the claim by contradiction. Recall that if $(f + a_\alpha g)(\alpha) = 0$ and $v_\alpha(f + a_\alpha g) \neq 1$, we know $(f' + a_\alpha g')(\alpha) = 0$. Hence, assuming the claim not to hold, we find for infinitely many α that

$$a_\alpha(fg' - f'g)(\alpha) = 0.$$

Since we know for all α that $a_\alpha \neq 0$, this would imply that $fg' = f'g$. However, because $\deg(f) > \deg(f')$, this contradicts the coprimality of f and g . The claim and therefore the lemma now follow. \square

These ideas should give all the possibilities for $\deg(S_t)$ when $t \geq \gamma_{t-1} + 4$. If t does not meet this bound we will use the first part of Lemma 2.9 below to reduce the options for possible degrees of $S_{\gamma+3}$.

2.2 Tools for step 2 and 3

The goal of step 2 is to find relations between the $e_i e_j$ such that these can be used in step 3 to find the poles of e_1, \dots, e_r outside of infinity. Here Theorem 1.4 is also of big help, for example, if $\gamma_i = 0$ for some $i \geq 2$ we know that $e_i = e_2^{i-1}$. Hence, it is most of all important to find a relation that expresses e_t in the other basis elements. When $t \geq \gamma + 3$ we know such a relation must exist, because the co-dimension of S_{t-1}^2 in S_t^2 is at most $\gamma + 2$ and there are t elements of the form $e_1 e_t, \dots, e_t e_t$. When $t < \gamma + 3$, we might need to look at a basis for S_{t+1}^2 or for S_{t+2}^2 , for which Lemma 2.9 below will also be needed.

We first introduce the following definitions to be able to better compare bases of several spaces.

Definition 2.4. For $k, l \geq 1$, we define $E_{k,l} := \{e_i e_j \mid 1 \leq i \leq k, 1 \leq j \leq l\}$ and $E_k := E_{k,k}$.

Definition 2.5. Let $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ and $S' \subset S_i S_j$ some K -vector subspace. Define S'' such that $S_i S_j = S' \oplus S''$. We say that k elements from $T \subset E_{i,j}$ are needed for $S_i S_j$ compared to S' , if every basis of S'' that is a subset of $E_{i,j}$, contains exactly k elements from T . If T equals the singleton $\{s\}$ and $k = 1$, we also say that s is needed. Furthermore, when saying something is needed for the basis of S_i^2 without further specifying S' , we always mean compared to S_{i-1}^2 .

For example, for the basis of S_t^2 exactly $\gamma - \gamma_{t-1} + 2$ elements from E_t are needed. When we know which $\gamma - \gamma_{t-1} + 2$ elements are needed, we also know which ones are not (necessarily) needed, giving us a relation between the $e_i e_j$ in E_t . To find out which elements are needed we can use a degree table of S_t^2 (see Table 1 for an example) and ideas similar to the following proposition.

Proposition 2.6.

- (i) Let $1 \leq i \leq t$ and suppose $\deg(e_i e_t) > \max(\deg(S_{t-1})^2)$, then $e_i e_t$ is needed for the basis of S_t^2 .
- (ii) When $e_i e_t$ is not necessarily needed for the basis of S_t^2 , there must either be an element $f_1 \in E_{t-1}$ such that $\deg(e_i e_t) = \deg(f_1)$ or two distinct elements $f_1 \in E_{t-1}$ and $f_2 \in E_t$ such that $\deg(f_1) = \deg(f_2) > \deg(e_i e_t)$.

Proof. Let $s_1, \dots, s_k \in E_t$ such that $S_t^2 = \langle S_{t-1}^2, s_1, \dots, s_k \rangle$ and k is minimal. Then we should be able to find $a_0, \dots, a_k \in K$ and $s_0 \in S_{t-1}^2$ such that $e_i e_t = \sum_{j=0}^k a_j s_j$. Clearly, the degree of $e_i e_t$ should be equal to the degree of the right hand side. Hence, either $\deg(e_i e_t) = \deg(s_j)$ for some $0 \leq j \leq k$, or $\deg(e_i e_t) < \deg(s_{j_1}) = \deg(s_{j_2})$ for some $0 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq k$. In the second case we must have that $j_1 = 0$, because the degree of $e_{j_1} e_t$ is never equal to the degree of $e_{j_2} e_t$ if $j_1 \neq j_2$. This proves both parts of the proposition. \square

Example. Using the degree table shown in Table 1 it follows from (i) that $e_4 e_5$ and e_5^2 are needed for the basis of S_5^2 and from (ii) that $e_3 e_5$ is also needed. Assuming that exactly three elements from $\{e_i e_5 \mid 1 \leq i \leq 5\}$ are needed, we could now conclude that $e_2 e_5$ and $e_1 e_5$ must be in S_4^2 . Hence, $e_2 e_5 = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq 4} a_{i,j} e_i e_j$ for some $a_{i,j} \in K$, which is a non-trivial relation between the e_i 's.

	e_1	e_2	e_3	e_4	e_5
e_1	0	1	2	4	5
e_2	-	2	3	5	6
e_3	-	-	4	6	7
e_4	-	-	-	8	9
e_5	-	-	-	-	10

Table 1: The degree table of S_5^2 when the degrees in S_5 equal 0, 1, 2, 4, 5. In each cell the degree of the product $e_i e_j$ is written.

To conclude something about the poles of e_t it is useful to know the exact structure of S_{t-1}^2 . The following can be derived from Theorem 1.4.

Lemma 2.7.

- (i) When $\gamma = 0$ and $n \geq 3$ we have $S_i = \mathfrak{p}_{i-1}$ and $S_i^2 = \mathfrak{p}_{2i-2}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$.
- (ii) When $\gamma = 1$ and $n \geq 4$ the case $t_1 = t - 1$ gives, $S^2 = \mathfrak{p}_{2n}$ and $S = \mathfrak{p}_{n-2} \oplus Ke_n$. (All S_i with $i < n$, have $\gamma_i = 0$ and thus fall in the previous case.)
- (iii) When $\gamma = 1$ and $n \geq 4$ the case $t_1 = 3$ gives, $S_i = K \oplus e_2 \mathfrak{p}_{i-2}$ and $S_i^2 = K \oplus e_2 \mathfrak{p}_{2i-2}$ for all $3 \leq i \leq n$ and $\frac{e_i}{e_{i-1}} \in K[x]$ for all $2 \leq i \leq n$.

Furthermore, we will make use of the following lemma.

Lemma 2.8. The number of poles of $e \in F$ counted with multiplicity equals $[F : K(e)]$.

Proof. Let $x \in F$ such that $F = K(x)$, then $e = \frac{f(x)}{g(x)}$ with $f(x), g(x) \in K[x]$ coprime. This gives us the algebraic relation $f(x) - g(x)e = 0$. The polynomial $f(x) - g(x)e$ is irreducible

in $K[e][x]$, and therefore, by Gauss's Lemma, also in $K(e)[x]$. Hence,

$$[F : K(e)] = \max(\deg(g(x), \deg(f(x))) = \text{number of poles of } e \text{ with multiplicity.} \quad \square$$

2.3 Tools for Step 4

When we know all the poles occurring at e_1, \dots, e_r we know exactly what the divisor D_i of least degree such that $S_i \subset L(D_i)$ looks like for $1 \leq i \leq r$. However, it is possible that $n > r$. The following lemma helps us determine D_{i+1} when γ_{i+1} stays equal to γ_i .

Lemma 2.9. *Suppose $\gamma_{i+1} = \gamma_i$ then,*

- (i) *if $i \geq 2$ we have $D_{i+1} - D_i = D_i - D_{i-1}$.*
- (ii) *if $i \geq 3$ and $\alpha \in K \cup \{\infty\}$ such that $v_\alpha(D_{i-1}) = 0$ we have $v_\alpha(D_i) = 0$.*

Proof. We start by proving the first statement. Note that the co-dimension of $S_{i-1}S_i$ inside S_i^2 is 1, since e_i^2 is the only element of E_i not in $S_{i-1}S_i$. Because $\gamma_{i+1} = \gamma_i$, we also know that the co-dimension of S_i^2 inside S_iS_{i+1} equals one. Hence, we find a co-dimension diagram as shown in Figure 1, where the number on an arrow from some space A to some space B indicates the co-dimension of A in B .

$$\begin{array}{ccc} S_i^2 & \xrightarrow{1} & S_iS_{i+1} \\ \uparrow 1 & & \uparrow 1 \\ S_{i-1}S_i & \xrightarrow{1} & S_{i-1}S_{i+1} \end{array}$$

Figure 1: The co-dimensions are all equal to 1.

This implies that

$$S_iS_{i+1} = \langle S_{i-1}S_{i+1}, e_i e_{i+1}, e_i^2 \rangle = \langle S_i^2, e_i e_{i+1} \rangle,$$

and thus $e_i^2 \in S_{i-1}S_{i+1}$. We find that $S_i^2 \subset S_{i-1}S_{i+1}$ and since they have the same dimension it must hold that $S_i^2 = S_{i-1}S_{i+1}$.

For any $\alpha \in K \cup \{\infty\}$ it now holds that $\min v_\alpha(S_i^2) = \min v_\alpha(S_{i-1}S_{i+1})$ and thus,

$$\min v_\alpha(S_{i+1}) - \min v_\alpha(S_i) = \min v_\alpha(S_i) - \min v_\alpha(S_{i-1}).$$

Recalling that $v_\alpha(D_j) = -\min v_\alpha(S_j)$ for any $1 \leq j \leq n$, we can conclude the first statement.

Suppose $v_\alpha(D_i) = s > 0$ then, by the first statement, e_{i+1} has $2s$ poles at α , which is more than any element in $S_{i-1}S_i$ has. We know e_{i+1} cannot be needed for the basis of S_{i+1}^2 , since $e_i e_{i+1}$ and e_{i+1}^2 are already needed. This implies that $\deg(e_{i+1}) = \deg(e_i^2)$, which contradicts that $\deg(e_{i+1}) - \deg(e_i) = \deg(e_i) - \deg(e_{i-1})$. \square

Remark. The first part of Lemma 2.9 can be seen as a generalization of Lemma 7.10 in [1].

3 From 0 to γ

In this section we will prove Theorem 1.6 when $\{\gamma_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\} = \{0, \gamma\}$, or in other words, the sequence γ_i jumps directly from 0 to γ . We also assume that $\gamma \geq 2$, which we may do because the conjecture is already proved for $\gamma = 1$. As mentioned before, we know that $t \geq \gamma - \gamma_{t-1} + 2 = \gamma + 2$ and we will consider the cases I. $t \geq \gamma + 3$ and II. $t = \gamma + 2$ separately.

I. The case $t \geq \gamma + 3$

The first step is to determine all the possible degrees of e_1, \dots, e_t , which is done by the following proposition.

Proposition 3.1. *The degree of e_i for $1 \leq i \leq t - 1$ is equal to $i - 1$ and the degree of e_t is equal to $t - 2 + \Delta$ for some integer $\Delta \in [1, \gamma + 1]$.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.2 we know that $F = K(S_{\gamma+2}) = K(S_{t-1})$. Hence, the degree of e_i for $i \leq t - 1$ is determined by its degree in $K(S_{t-1})$. Since we are given that $\gamma_{t-1} = 0$ and $t - 1 \geq 3$, we can use Theorem 1.4 to conclude $S_{t-1} \subset L((t - 2)P_\infty)$ and therefore $\deg(e_i) = i - 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq t - 1$. The second statement now follows directly from Freiman's $3k - 4$ Theorem. \square

Next we want to find relations between the basis elements of S_t to be able to determine their poles. These two steps both occur in the proof of the next proposition.

Proposition 3.2. *The divisor D_t takes the form $(t - 2 + \Delta)P_\infty + P_{\alpha_1} + \dots + P_{\alpha_k}$ with $k = \gamma - \Delta + 1$ and $\alpha_i \in K$ not necessarily distinct.*

Proof. There are exactly $\gamma + 2$ elements needed from $\{e_i e_t \mid 1 \leq i \leq t\}$ for the basis of S_t^2 . By Proposition 2.6(i) we know that $e_i e_t$ is always needed for $i \leq t - 1 - \Delta$, giving us $\Delta + 1$ elements. Furthermore, there must be at least one element that is not needed. We define k to be the smallest positive integer such that $e_{k+1} e_t$ is an element of

$$\langle S_{t-1}^2, e_1 e_t, \dots, e_k e_t \rangle, \quad (1)$$

then $k + 1 < t$. This implies that there exists $a_1, \dots, a_{k+1} \in K$ such that

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} a_i e_i \right) e_t \in S_{t-1}^2 = \mathfrak{p}_{2t-4}.$$

Since e_i has exactly degree $i - 1$, we find that e_t can have at most k poles outside of infinity. Furthermore, because k is defined as the smallest integer for which such a relation holds, we find that e_t must have exactly k of such poles. This implies that any element $e_i e_t$ of degree smaller or equal to $2t - 4$ must be in (1) hence, whenever $i \leq t - 1 - \Delta$. Hence, we get k basis elements for small i and $\Delta + 1$ for big i and find $\Delta + k + 1 = \gamma + 2$ or, equivalently, $k = \gamma - \Delta + 1$. This shows that $D_t = (t - 2 + \Delta)P_\infty + P_{\alpha_1} + \dots + P_{\alpha_k}$. \square

In the last step we find that n must always equal t and may conclude that the conjecture does indeed hold in this case.

Proposition 3.3. *We have $n = t$ and thus $S \subset L(D)$ with $\deg D = n + \gamma - 1$.*

Proof. We prove this by contradiction, so assume $n > t$ then we must have the basis element e_{t+1} and $\gamma_{t+1} = \gamma_t$. By Lemma 2.9 we find that k must equal 0 and that e_{t+1} is of degree $t - 2 + 2\Delta = t + 2\gamma$. This contradicts Freiman's $3k - 4$ Theorem whenever $\gamma \geq 2$. \square

II. The case $t = \gamma + 2$

We may immediately consider the space $S_{t+1} = S_{\gamma+3}$, since we know $n \geq \gamma + 3$. The first step is determining the degrees of e_1, \dots, e_{t+1} .

Proposition 3.4. *The set of degrees of $S_{\gamma+3}$ equals either $\{0, 1, 2, \dots, \gamma + 2\}$ or $\{0, 2, 4, \dots, 2\gamma, 2\gamma + 1, 2\gamma + 2\}$.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.9 we may define positive integers d and k such that the degree of e_i is $(i - 1)d$ when $i \leq \gamma + 1$ and $\gamma d + (i - \gamma - 1)k$ when $i = \gamma + 2, \gamma + 3$. By Lemma 2.3 we find that either d or k has to equal 1. This gives us the degree table as shown in Table (2).

	e_1	e_2	e_3	\dots	e_{t-1}	e_t	e_{t+1}
e_1	0	d	$2d$	\dots	γd	$\gamma d + k$	$\gamma d + 2k$
e_2	-	$2d$	$3d$	\dots	$(\gamma + 1)d$	$(\gamma + 1)d + k$	$(\gamma + 1)d + 2k$
e_3	-	-	$4d$	\dots	$(\gamma + 2)d$	$(\gamma + 2)d + k$	$(\gamma + 2)d + 2k$
\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\ddots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots
e_{t-2}	-	-	-	\dots	$(2\gamma - 1)d$	$(2\gamma - 1)d + k$	$(2\gamma - 1)d + 2k$
e_{t-1}	-	-	-	\dots	$2\gamma d$	$2\gamma d + k$	$2\gamma d + 2k$
e_t	-	-	-	\dots	-	$2\gamma d + 2k$	$2\gamma d + 3k$
e_{t+1}	-	-	-	\dots	-	-	$2\gamma d + 4k$

Table 2: The degree table of S_{t+1}^2 . In each cell the degree of the product $e_i e_j$ is written.

Because $\gamma_t = \gamma_{t+1}$ we know that exactly two elements of E_{t+1} are needed for the basis of S_{t+1}^2 , namely $e_t e_{t+1}$ and e_{t+1}^2 . In particular this implies that $e_{t-2} e_{t+1}$ should be in the space S_t^2 . By Proposition 2.6(ii) either two elements in E_t have an equal degree greater than $\deg(e_{t-2} e_{t+1})$ or $\deg(e_{t-2} e_{t+1})$ is in $\deg(S_t^2)$. The first option cannot happen because $2\gamma d, 2\gamma d + k$ and $2\gamma d + 2k$ are all distinct. We find that one of the following two equations must hold

$$(2\gamma - 1)d + 2k = 2\gamma d \quad \text{or} \quad (2\gamma - 1)d + 2k = 2\gamma d + k.$$

We conclude that (d, k) is equal to either $(2, 1)$ or $(1, 1)$. The lemma now follows. \square

We will now distinguish between the two possible sets of degrees that $S_{\gamma+3}$ can have and determine the possible poles for both cases.

Proposition 3.5. *Suppose the set of degrees of $S_{\gamma+3}$ equals $\{0, 2, 4, \dots, 2\gamma, 2\gamma + 1, 2\gamma + 2\}$. Then $S \subset L((n + \gamma - 1)P_\infty)$.*

Proof. The fact that $\gamma_{t-1} = 0$ and the degree table of S_t^2 (Table 2 with $d = 2$ and $k = 1$), will help us to find relations between the e_i . Note that we can find a basis for S_{t+1}^2 consisting of elements in E_{t+1} such that all degrees are distinct and therefore $e_{t+1} \in \langle S_2 S_{t-1}, e_t \rangle$ and

$e_{t-1}e_{t+1} \in S_t^2$. By also possibly translating e_{t+1} with other basis elements e_i we find the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned} e_i &= e_2e_{i-1} = e_2^{i-1} \quad \text{for all } 3 \leq i \leq t-1 \\ e_{t+1} &= e_2e_{t-1} = e_2^{t-1} \\ e_{t-1}e_{t+1} &= e_2^{2t-3} = e_t^2 + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq t-1 \\ i \leq j \leq t}} a_{i,j}e_ie_j, \end{aligned}$$

for some $a_{i,j} \in K$. The first relation implies that $F = K(e_2, e_t)$ and the third that both $[F : K(e_2)] \leq 2$ and $[F : K(e_t)] \leq 2\gamma + 1$. From Lemma 2.8 we may conclude that e_2 and e_t do not have any poles outside of infinity and therefore none of the e_i with $i \leq t+1 = \gamma+3$ do. The result now follows by Lemma 2.9(i). \square

Proposition 3.6. *Suppose the set of degrees of $S_{\gamma+3}$ equals $\{0, 1, 2, \dots, \gamma+2\}$. Then, $S \subset L((n-1)P_\infty + \gamma P_\alpha)$ for some $\alpha \in K$.*

Proof. As in the previous proof, but now filling in $d = 1$ and $k = 1$ in the degree table, we find the following relations

$$\begin{aligned} e_i &= e_2e_{i-1} = e_2^{i-1} \quad \text{for all } 3 \leq i \leq t-1 \\ e_{t-2}e_{t+1} &= e_{t-1}e_t + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq j \leq t \\ i+j \leq 2t-2}} a_{i,j}e_ie_j \\ e_{t-1}e_{t+1} &= e_t^2 + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq t-1 \\ i \leq j \leq t}} b_{i,j}e_ie_j, \end{aligned}$$

for some $a_{i,j}, b_{i,j} \in K$. The first equation implies that $F = K(e_2, e_t)$. When we multiply the second equation by e_2 , its left side is equal to the left side of the third equation. Therefore, the right sides must also be equal, which gives us an equation in only e_2 and e_t ; we find $[F : K(e_2)] \leq 2$ and $[F : K(e_t)] \leq 2\gamma + 1$.

Suppose that e_2 does not have any poles outside of infinity, then by Lemma 2.9 neither does e_t . However, then S_{t+1} consists exactly of all the polynomials of degree less or equal to $\gamma+2$ and hence, $\gamma_{t+1} = 0$. We may conclude that e_2 has exactly one pole outside of infinity, at α .

This shows that e_{t-1} must have exactly γ poles outside of infinity, all at α . By possibly translating e_t by a multiple of e_{t-1} , we also find that e_t has γ poles at α . Since e_t can have at most $2\gamma + 1$ poles these must be the $\gamma + 1$ poles at infinity and the γ poles at α . Hence, $D_{\gamma+2} - D_{\gamma+1} = P_\infty$ and the statement now follows from Lemma 2.9. \square

4 From 0 to 1 to γ

In this section we will prove Theorem 1.6 for the second case, when $\{\gamma_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\} = \{0, 1, \gamma\}$. We know that $t \geq \gamma + 1$ and, by Theorem 1.4, that whenever $t \geq 5$ the only options for t_1 are 3 and $t-1$. It therefore suffices to consider the following four cases: I. $t \geq \gamma + 3$ and $t_1 = t-1$, II. $t \geq \gamma + 3$ and $t_1 = 3$, III. $t \in \{\gamma + 1, \gamma + 2\}$ and $t \geq 5$ and IV. $t = 4$.

The next proposition determines the degrees of e_{t-1} and e_t in the first three cases, but does not necessarily hold in the fourth.

Proposition 4.1. *Suppose $t \geq \max(\gamma + 1, 5)$, then the degree of e_{t-1} equals $t - 1$ and the degree of e_t equals $t - 1 + \Delta$ for some $\Delta \in [1, \gamma]$.*

Proof. Since, $t - 1 \geq 4$ we know from Theorem 1.4 that $\deg(\{e_1, \dots, e_{t-1}\})$ equals either $\{0, d, 2d, \dots, (t-3)d, (t-1)d\}$ or $\{0, 2d, 3d, \dots, (t-1)d\}$ for some positive integer d . Hence, the degrees form an arithmetic progression of step 1 missing $(t-1)(d-1) + 1$ elements. Using that $t - 1 \geq \gamma$, Freiman's $3k - 4$ Theorem now implies that $d = 1$, which proves the first two statements. The third also follows from Freiman's $3k - 4$ Theorem, since $1 + (\Delta - 1)$ must not exceed γ . \square

Note that, given t_1 , we have also found the degrees of e_1, \dots, e_{t-2} .

I. The case $t \geq \gamma + 3$ and $t_1 = t - 1$

Since $t - 1 \geq 4$ we already know all the poles for e_1, \dots, e_{t-1} and in the next proposition the poles at e_t are determined.

Proposition 4.2. *Let k equal $\gamma - \max(\Delta, 2)$ and $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k \in K$, not necessarily distinct. The divisor D_t takes the form*

$$(t - 1 + \Delta)P_\infty + P_{\alpha_1} + \dots + P_{\alpha_k}.$$

Proof. Exactly $\gamma + 1$ elements of $\{e_i e_t \mid 1 \leq i \leq t\}$ are needed for the basis of S_t^2 . Consider the degree table of S_t^2 , shown in Table 3 and recall Proposition 2.6. Since the degree of $e_i e_t$ exceeds $2t - 2$, the maximal degree of S_{t-1}^2 , for all $i \geq t - \max(\Delta, 2) + 1$, these elements must all be needed for the basis of S_t^2 , giving $\max(\Delta, 2)$ needed basis elements. Furthermore, because E_{t-1} does not contain any elements of degree $2t - 3$ and exactly one of degree $2t - 2$, at least one of the elements $e_{t-\Delta} e_t$ and $e_{t-\Delta-1} e_t$ are needed.

Define k to be the smallest integer such that $e_{k+1} e_t$ is an element of

$$\langle S_{t-1}^2, e_1 e_t, \dots, e_k e_t \rangle.$$

Since there are at least two elements of the form $e_i e_t$ that are not needed for the basis of S_t^2 , we know that $k + 1 < t - \Delta - 1$ and therefore, $\deg(e_{k+1} e_t) < \deg(e_{t-1}^2)$. In particular this implies that $e_{k+1} e_t$ is an element of $\langle S_{t-2} S_{t-1}, e_1 e_t, \dots, e_k e_t \rangle$. Recall that $S_{t-2} S_{t-1} = \mathfrak{p}_{2t-4}$, hence there must exist a relation

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} a_i e_i \right) e_t \in \mathfrak{p}_{2t-4},$$

for some $a_i \in K$. As in the proof of Proposition 3.2 we can conclude that e_t has exactly k poles outside of infinity and that any $e_i e_t$ with degree less or equal to $2t - 4$, can also be described by such a relation. By a similar argument we find that $e_{t-\Delta} e_t$ cannot be needed. Hence, $k + \max(\Delta, 2) + 1 = \gamma + 1$. This proves the proposition. \square

Proposition 4.3. *Suppose either $\gamma > 2$ or $\Delta > 1$ then, $n = t$ and thus, $S \subset L(D)$ with $\deg D = n + \gamma - 1$. When $\Delta = 1$ and $\gamma = 2$ it holds that $n \geq t$ and $S \subset L(nP_\infty)$.*

	e_1	e_2	e_3	\dots	e_{t-2}	e_{t-1}	e_t	e_{t+1}
e_1	0	1	2	\dots	$t-3$	$t-1$	$t-1+\Delta$	$t-1+2\Delta$
e_2	-	2	3	\dots	$t-2$	t	$t+\Delta$	$t+2\Delta$
e_3	-	-	4	\dots	$t-1$	$t+1$	$t+1+\Delta$	$t+1+2\Delta$
\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\ddots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots
e_{t-2}	-	-	-	\dots	$2t-6$	$2t-4$	$2t-4+\Delta$	$2t-4+2\Delta$
e_{t-1}	-	-	-	\dots	-	$2t-2$	$2t-2+\Delta$	$2t-2+2\Delta$
e_t	-	-	-	\dots	-	-	$2t-2+2\Delta$	$2t-2+3\Delta$
e_{t+1}	-	-	-	\dots	-	-	-	$2t-2+4\Delta$

Table 3: The degree table of S_{t+1}^2 when $t_1 = t - 1$. In each cell the degree of the product $e_i e_j$ is written.

Proof. With some minor adjustments, the first statement can be proved in the same way as Proposition 3.3. When $\gamma = 2$ and $\Delta = 1$ it follows from Lemma 2.9. \square

II. The case $t \geq \gamma + 3$ and $t_1 = 3$

As in the previous case, we already know the poles for e_1, \dots, e_{t-1} and we start with determining the poles of e_t . In this proof we really need some of the exact structure of S_{t-1}^2 that comes from the explicit basis given in Theorem 1.4.

Proposition 4.4. *The divisor D_t takes the form*

$$(t-1+\Delta)P_\infty + P_{\alpha_1} + \dots + P_{\alpha_k},$$

for k equal to either $\gamma - \Delta$ or $\gamma - \Delta - 1$ and $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k \in K$ not necessarily distinct.

Proof. By Proposition 2.6(i) we find that all $e_i e_t$ with $i \geq t - \Delta$ are needed for the basis of S_t^2 , this gives us $\Delta + 1$ basis elements. Since at least two elements of $\{e_i e_t \mid 1 \leq i \leq t\}$ are not needed we know that for some $a_i \in K$ we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{t-\Delta-2} a_i e_i e_t \in S_{t-1}^2 \subset \mathfrak{p}_{2t-2},$$

and therefore e_t has at most $\deg(e_{t-\Delta-2}) = t - \Delta - 2$ poles outside of infinity.

Define k to be the exact number of poles that e_t has outside of infinity, then for all $k + 2 \leq i \leq t - \Delta - 1$ we can construct a polynomial of the form $A_i := \frac{1}{e_2}(e_i + \sum_{j=2}^{k+1} a_{j,t} e_j)$ with $a_{j,t} \in K$ while fixing k of its zeroes. Taking the zeroes of A_i equal to the poles of e_t we find that $e_2 A_i e_t \in e_2 \mathfrak{p}_{2t-4}$ and thus

$$e_i e_t \in \langle S_{t-1}^2, e_1 e_t, \dots, e_{k+1} e_t \rangle,$$

for all $i \leq t - \Delta - 1$. Hence the basis of S_t^2 needs at most $k + \Delta + 2$ elements from $\{e_i e_t \mid 1 \leq i \leq t\}$ for its basis and $k \geq \gamma - \Delta - 1$. Furthermore,

$$e_i e_t \notin \langle S_{t-1}^2, e_1 e_t, \dots, e_{i-1} e_t \rangle,$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq k-1$, because then there would exist a polynomial h of degree smaller or equal to $k-1$ such that he_t would not have any poles outside of infinity. This shows that S_t^2 needs at least $k+\Delta$ elements from $\{e_i e_t\}$ for its basis and therefore $k \leq \gamma - \Delta + 1$.

To prove the proposition it now suffices to show that $k \neq \gamma - \Delta + 1$. We will prove this by contradiction, so assume e_t has exactly $\gamma - \Delta + 1$ poles outside of infinity. By our two earlier observations we see that $\langle S_{t-1}^2, e_1 e_t, \dots, e_{k-1} e_t, e_{t-\Delta} e_t, \dots, e_t^2 \rangle = S_t^2$. In particular, this implies that

$$e_k e_t, e_{k+1} e_t \in \langle S_{t-1}^2, e_1 e_t, \dots, e_{k-1} e_t \rangle. \quad (2)$$

Thus, we can construct polynomials $A_i := e_i + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} a_{i,j} e_j$ for $i = k, k+1$ and $a_{i,j} \in K$ such that $A_k e_t, A_{k+1} e_t \in S_{t-1}^2 = K \oplus e_2 \mathfrak{p}_{2t-4}$. This means that we can write $A_{k+1} e_t = e_2 f + a$ and $A_k e_t = e_2 g + b$ for some polynomials $f, g \in K[x]$ and $a, b \in K$. Multiplying the second equation by $\frac{A_{k+1}}{A_k}$ we find that

$$e_2 \left(f - \frac{A_{k+1}}{A_k} g \right) = \frac{A_{k+1}}{A_k} b - a.$$

The degree of $\frac{A_{k+1}}{A_k}$ equals 1 and hence, by comparing degrees, we derive that $a = b = 0$. We can now rewrite our earlier equation to $\frac{A_k}{e_2} e_t = g$. However, this implies that e_t has at most $k-2$ poles outside of infinity, which contradicts our assumptions. \square

Proposition 4.5. *Suppose either $\gamma > 2$ or $\Delta > 1$ then, $n = t$ and thus, $S \subset L(D)$ with $\deg D \in \{n + \gamma - 1, n + \gamma - 2\}$. When $\gamma = 2$ and $\Delta = 1$ it holds that $n \geq t$ and $S \subset L(nP_\infty)$.*

Proof. When $n > t$ we know from Lemma 2.9 that $k = 0$ and thus $\Delta = \gamma$ or $\Delta = \gamma - 1$. In the first case the degree of e_{t+1} equals $t - 1 + 2\gamma$, which contradicts Freiman's $3k - 4$ Theorem for $\gamma \geq 2$. In the second case the degree becomes $t - 3 + 2\gamma$, which only contradicts Freiman's $3k - 4$ Theorem for $\gamma \geq 4$. This proves the proposition for all cases except $\gamma = 3$ and $\Delta = 2$. However, in that case it is easy to check $e_{t-2} e_{t+1} \notin S_t^2$ and thus $\gamma_{t+1} > \gamma_t$, also a contradiction. \square

III. The case $t \in \{\gamma + 1, \gamma + 2\}$ and $t \geq 5$

For this case the structure of the proof will be quite different from the other cases, as we will actually show that it can never hold. We will consider the options $F = K(e_2, e_3)$ and $F \neq K(e_2, e_3)$ separately in the next two propositions. In both proofs we will still roughly follow steps 2 and 3, in the sense that we try to find relations between the e_i for $1 \leq i \leq \gamma + 3$, which will give us information about which poles they should have. However, we will see that this then implies that $\gamma_{\gamma+3} > \gamma_t = \gamma$, which is not possible.

Proposition 4.6. *There exists no S for which $F = K(e_2, e_3)$.*

Proof. First we restrict the possible values that Δ can take now that we know $n \geq t + 1$. Consider the element $e_{t-2} e_{t+1}$, which has degree $2t - 3 + 2\Delta$ or $2t - 4 + 2\Delta$, when t_1 equals 3 or $t - 1$ respectively. Because $e_t e_{t+1}$ and e_{t+1}^2 are always the two elements needed for the basis of S_{t+1}^2 , the element $e_{t-2} e_{t+1}$ must be in S_t^2 . We find that $\deg(e_{t-2} e_{t+1}) \leq \deg(e_{t-1} e_t) = 2t - 2 + \Delta$. Hence Δ must equal either 1 or 2, where the second can only occur when $t_1 = t - 1$.

Now assume that $F = K(e_2, e_3)$, all poles in S_{t-1} may be assumed to be at infinity because, $t - 1 \geq 4 = \gamma_{t-1} + 3$. Since $n > t$, Lemma 2.9(ii) now implies that also all poles in S are at infinity.

Recall that exactly $\gamma + 1$ elements of $\{e_i e_t \mid 1 \leq i \leq t\}$ are needed for the basis of S_t^2 or in other words, at most one is not needed. In particular this means that either $e_1 e_t$ or $e_2 e_t$ is needed. When $t_1 = t - 1$ we know that $S_{t-1}^2 = \mathfrak{p}_{2t-4}$, hence an element with no poles outside of infinity can only be needed for the basis of S_t^2 if its degree is bigger than $2t - 4$. This would imply that $\deg(e_2 e_t) = t + \Delta > 2t - 4$, impossible when $\Delta = 1, 2$ and $t \geq 5$. When $t_1 = 3$, the degree of $e_i e_t$ might be included in $\deg(S_{t-1}^2)$ but still $e_i e_t \notin S_{t-1}^2$, when $1 \in \deg(\langle S_{t-1}^2, e_i e_t \rangle)$. However, this can only happen once and thus two of $\deg(e_1 e_t)$, $\deg(e_2 e_t)$ and $\deg(e_3 e_t)$ must not be in $\deg(S_{t-1}^2)$. This also gives a contradiction for $\Delta = 1$ and $t \geq 5$. We conclude that $F \neq K(e_2, e_3)$, as wished. \square

Proposition 4.7. *There exists no S for which $F \neq K(e_2, e_3)$.*

Proof. First we show that $F \neq K(e_2, e_3)$ can only happen if $t = \gamma + 1$. By Lemma 2.2 it holds that $F = K(e_2, e_3, e_{\gamma+1})$, thus Proposition 4.6 implies that $e_{\gamma+1} \notin K(e_2, e_3)$. When $t = \gamma + 2$ we have $\gamma_{\gamma+1} = 1$ and therefore $F(S_{\gamma+1}) = F(S_3) = F(e_2, e_3)$, a contradiction. From now on we assume $t = \gamma + 1$.

Let $y \in F$ such that $K(e_2, e_3) = K(y)$ and for $1 \leq i \leq t - 1$ we can write e_i as a polynomial in y . From our previous observation we know that $e_t \notin K(y)$ and $F = K(y, e_t)$.

When $t_1 = t - 1$, following the same argument as in the proof of Proposition 4.6, we know Δ equals either 1 or 2. However, when $\Delta = 2$ we find that $e_{t-3} e_{t+1}$ is needed for the basis of S_{t+1}^2 by Proposition 2.6(ii), contradicting $\gamma_{t+1} = \gamma_t$. We conclude that $\Delta = 1$ and using Table 3 we can find the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned} e_{t-2} e_{t+1} &= e_{t-1}^2 + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq t-2 \\ i \leq j \leq t}} a_{i,j} e_i e_j, \\ e_{t-3} e_{t+1} &= e_{t-2} e_t + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq j \leq t \\ i+j \leq 2t-3}} b_{i,j} e_i e_j, \end{aligned}$$

for $a_{i,j}, b_{i,j} \in K$. We know that $e_{t-2} = y e_{t-3}$, thus when multiplying the second relation with y the left hand side is the same as in the first relation. From this we find $[F : K(y)] = 1$, a contradiction.

When $t_1 = 3$ we know that $\Delta = 1$ and find the following relations using Table 4,

$$\begin{aligned} e_{t-1} e_{t+1} &= e_t^2 + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq t-1 \\ i \leq j \leq t}} a_{i,j} e_i e_j, \\ e_{t-2} e_{t+1} &= e_{t-1} e_t + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq j \leq t \\ i+j \leq 2t-2}} b_{i,j} e_i e_j, \end{aligned}$$

for some $a_{i,j}, b_{i,j} \in K$. We also know from Theorem 1.4 that $f := \frac{e_{t-1}}{e_{t-2}}$ is a polynomial of degree 1 in y . Multiplying the second relation with f and comparing its right hand side with the right hand side of the first relation we find $[F : K(y)] \leq 2$ and $[F : K(e_t)] \leq 2\gamma + 1$.

	e_1	e_2	e_3	e_4	\dots	e_{t-2}	e_{t-1}	e_t	e_{t+1}
e_1	0	2	3	4	\dots	$t-2$	$t-1$	t	$t+1$
e_2	-	4	5	6	\dots	t	$t+1$	$t+2$	$t+3$
e_3	-	-	6	7	\dots	$t+1$	$t+2$	$t+3$	$t+4$
e_4	-	-	-	8	\dots	$t+2$	$t+3$	$t+4$	$t+5$
\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\ddots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots
e_{t-2}	-	-	-	-	\dots	$2t-4$	$2t-3$	$2t-2$	$2t-1$
e_{t-1}	-	-	-	-	\dots	-	$2t-2$	$2t-1$	$2t$
e_t	-	-	-	-	\dots	-	-	$2t$	$2t+1$
e_{t+1}	-	-	-	-	\dots	-	-	-	$2t+2$

Table 4: The degree table of S_{t+1}^2 when $t_1 = 3$. In each cell the degree of the product $e_i e_j$ is written. The bold numbers correspond to a possible basis for S_t^2 .

Since $F \neq K(y)$, this implies that y must have exactly one pole outside of infinity, at α , and therefore e_i has i poles at α for all $2 \leq i \leq t-1$. By possibly translating e_t with e_{t-1} , we find that e_t also has at least γ poles at α . Since it already has $\gamma+1$ poles at infinity, these $2\gamma+1$ have to be all the poles of e_t . By Lemma 2.9 we find that $v_\alpha(e_{t+1}) > -\gamma$, we will show that this contradicts the fact that $e_{t+1} \in S_t^2$.

Define $T := \{(j-1, j) \mid 2 \leq j \leq t\} \cup \{(j, j), (j, t) \mid 1 \leq j \leq t\} \cup \{(1, 3)\}$ then, $\{e_i e_j \mid (i, j) \in T\}$ is a basis of S_t^2 , these are marked as bold numbers in Table 4. Therefore there are $c_{i,j} \in K$ such that

$$e_{t+1} = \sum_{(i,j) \in T} c_{i,j} e_i e_j.$$

Consider the elements $e_i e_j$ of maximal degree for which $c_{i,j} \neq 0$, there are either one or two of such elements. There is one element if and only if $\deg(e_i e_j) = t+1 = \gamma+2$, which is only possible if $i, j \neq t$. Hence, $v_\alpha(e_i e_j) = -(\gamma+2)$ and all other elements for which $c_{i,j} \neq 0$, will have even less poles at α . By the ultrametric property we find, $v_\alpha(e_{t+1}) = -(\gamma+2)$, a contradiction. In case that there are two elements of maximal degree with $c_{i,j}, c_{i',j'} \neq 0$, we know that this degree must be strictly bigger than $t+1$. One of them will be of the form $j = t$ and thus have $\gamma+i$ poles at α , the other will have $i', j' \neq t$ and therefore the number of poles at α will equal its degree $i' + j' = i + t + 1 = i + \gamma + 2$. By the ultrametric property we find that $v_\alpha(e_{t+1}) = -(i' + j') < -(\gamma+2)$. We conclude that it is impossible for e_{t+1} to have at most γ poles at α , proving that no S exists. \square

IV. The case $t = 4$

When $t = 4$ the dimension of S_t^2 is at most 10 and therefore $\gamma = 2$ or $\gamma = 3$.

Lemma 4.8.

- (i) When $\gamma = 2$ the set of degrees of S_5 equals $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$, $\{0, 1, 3, 4, 5\}$, $\{0, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ or $\{0, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$.
- (ii) When $\gamma = 3$ the set of degrees of S_6 equals $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$, $\{0, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$, $\{0, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7\}$, $\{0, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8\}$, $\{0, 1, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$ or $\{0, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7\}$

Proof. We only give the proof for $\gamma = 2$, the case $\gamma = 3$ is very similar. Define $d := \deg(e_2)$, $k := \deg(e_3) - \deg(e_2)$ and $\ell := \deg(e_4) - \deg(e_3)$, by Lemma 2.9(i) we know that $\deg(e_5) = d + k + 2\ell$. Freiman's $3k - 4$ Theorem then implies that $d + k + 2\ell \leq 6$, which gives us finitely many options for (d, k, ℓ) . For each of these options one may look at the degree table of S_5^2 , if there are at least 12 distinct values in this table this would imply $\gamma > 2$, which leaves us with the four cases mentioned in the lemma. \square

We will give the explicit calculation for the case $\{0, 1, 3, 4, 5\}$ and then only state the results for the other cases. The degree table of S_5^2 is shown in Table 5, where the bold numbers point out a basis of S_5^2 and the non-bold ones are dependent on them.

	e_1	e_2	e_3	e_4	e_5
e_1	0	1	3	4	5
e_2	-	2	4	5	6
e_3	-	-	6	7	8
e_4	-	-	-	8	9
e_5	-	-	-	-	10

Table 5: The degree table of S_5^2 when the degrees in S_5 equal 0, 1, 3, 4, 5.

From this we can find that (after possibly translating the basis elements by multiples of each other) there must exist $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_8 \in K$ such that the following relations hold:

$$\begin{aligned} e_4 &= e_2e_3 + a_1e_2^2, \\ e_5 &= e_2e_4 + a_2e_2^2, \\ e_2e_5 &= e_3^2 + a_3e_2e_4 + a_4e_2e_3 + a_5e_2^2 + a_6e_3 + a_7e_2 + a_8. \end{aligned}$$

By substituting e_4 and e_5 in the last equation we find a relation between e_2 and e_3 of degree at most 4 in e_2 and degree at most 2 in e_3 . Recall that $F = K(x) = K(e_2.e_3)$, we can now conclude that $[F : K(e_2)] \leq 2$ and $[F : K(e_3)] \leq 4$. This implies that e_2 has at most 2 poles and e_3 at most 4, hence they both have at most 1 pole outside of infinity.

Assume that e_3 has a pole outside of infinity at α and e_2 does not. Then, by our first two relations, both e_4 and e_5 have exactly one pole at α . However, our third relation would then imply that e_2e_5 has two poles at α , which is a contradiction. We conclude, if e_3 has a pole outside of infinity, e_2 should have the same pole.

If e_2 does not have any poles outside of infinity then neither do e_4 and e_5 , because $e_4 \in S_3^2$ and $e_5 \in S_4^2$. Here we find $S_5 \subset L(5P_\infty)$.

If e_2 does have a pole at $\alpha \neq \infty$, then e_4 has either 0, 1 or 2 poles there. However, if e_4 would have 2 poles at α , then e_5 would have 3 and thus e_2e_5 has 4, this cannot be true by the third relation, since the right hand side can have at most 3. Here we find $S_5 \subset L(5P_\infty + P_\alpha)$.

In both situations the basis can be continued. Using Lemma 2.9 we find that either $S \subset L(nP_\infty)$ or $S \subset L(nP_\infty + P_\alpha)$.

Lemma 4.9. *Let $\gamma = 2$,*

- (i) *when $\deg(S_5) = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$ we find $S \subset L((n-1)P_\infty + P_\alpha)$ for $\alpha \in K$ or $S \subset L((n-1)P_\infty + P_{\alpha_1} + P_{\alpha_2})$ where $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in K$ might be equal.*

- (ii) when $\deg(S_5) = \{0, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ we find $S \subset L(nP_\infty)$ or $S \subset L(nP_\infty + P_\alpha)$ for some $\alpha \in K$.
- (iii) when $\deg(S_5) = \{0, 1, 3, 4, 5\}$ we find $S \subset L(nP_\infty)$ or $S \subset L(nP_\infty + P_\alpha)$ for some $\alpha \in K$.
- (iv) when $\deg(S_5) = \{0, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$ we find $S \subset L((n+1)P_\infty)$.

Lemma 4.10. When $\gamma = 3$ we have $F = K(e_2, e_3)$.

Proof. We already know that $F = K(e_2, e_2, e_4)$, so it suffices to show that $e_4 \in K(e_2, e_3)$. By looking at the degree table of S_5^2 for any of the possible sets in Lemma 4.8(ii) we find that $e_5, e_2e_5 \in S_3S_4$ and $e_2e_5 \notin S_3^2$. Therefore we have relations of the following form

$$e_5 = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq 3 \\ i \leq j \leq 4}} a_{i,j} e_i e_j,$$

$$e_2 e_5 = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq 3 \\ i \leq j \leq 4}} b_{i,j} e_i e_j,$$

for some $a_{i,j}, b_{i,j} \in K$. Substituting the first equation in the second we find a relation between e_2, e_3 and e_4 , that is linear in e_4 , showing that indeed $e_4 \in K(e_2, e_3)$. \square

Lemma 4.11. Let $\gamma = 3$,

- (i) when $\deg(S_6) = \{0, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8\}$ we find $S \subset L((n+2)P_\infty)$.
- (ii) when $\deg(S_6) = \{0, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7\}$ and $\{0, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7\}$ we find $S \subset L((n+1)P_\infty)$ or $S \subset L((n+1)P_\infty + P_\alpha)$ for some $\alpha \in K$.
- (iii) when $\deg(S_6) = \{0, 1, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$ and $\{0, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$ we find $S \subset L(nP_\infty + P_\alpha)$ for some $\alpha \in K$ or $S \subset L(nP_\infty + P_{\alpha_1} + P_{\alpha_2})$ where $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in K$ might be equal.
- (iv) when $\deg(S_6) = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ we find $S \subset L((n-1)P_\infty + P_{\alpha_1} + P_{\alpha_2})$ or $S \subset L((n-1)P_\infty + P_{\alpha_1} + P_{\alpha_2} + P_{\alpha_3})$, where $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 \in K$ might be equal.

Proof. We can prove (i)-(iii) using Lemma 4.10 and the same ideas as shown above for $\gamma = 2$. In the following we prove the case $\deg(S_6) = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$.

In Table 6 the degree table of S_6^2 is shown. The bold numbers in the table represent a possible basis of S_6^2 in E_6 . We find that e_5 equals $ae_3^2 + (1-a)e_2e_4 + \sum_{\substack{1 \leq i, j \leq 4 \\ 2 \leq i+j \leq 5}} a_{i,j} e_i e_j$ for some $a, a_{i,j} \in K$. We will distinguish between the cases $a \neq 0$ and $a = 0$.

In both cases, by analyzing the relations between the e_i , we find that either the lemma holds and $n+1 \leq \deg(D) \leq n+2$ or the divisors D_i take one of the following two forms:

$$\begin{aligned} D_1 = 0 & & D_i = (i-1)P_\infty + (i-1)P_\alpha & & \text{for all } 2 \leq i \leq n, \\ D_1 = 0 & & D_i = (i-1)P_\infty + (i-1)P_\alpha + P_\beta & & \text{for all } 2 \leq i \leq n. \end{aligned}$$

We will prove by contradiction that these two sets of divisors cannot occur.

First assume $a \neq 0$, then we can replace e_3^2 in the basis by e_5 . Since the dimension of $S' := \langle S_2S_4, e_5 \rangle$ is 8 and the maximal degree occurring is 4, we know that there must exist

	e_1	e_2	e_3	e_4	e_5	e_6
e_1	0	1	2	3	4	5
e_2	-	2	3	4	5	6
e_3	-	-	4	5	6	7
e_4	-	-	-	6	7	8
e_5	-	-	-	-	8	9
e_6	-	-	-	-	-	10

Table 6: The degree table of S_6^2 when the degrees in S_6 equal 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. The bold numbers represent a possible basis of S_6^2 .

some element $C \in S'$ such that $\deg(C) \leq -3$. This also means that C has 3 poles, of which at most 2 can be at β and therefore $-v_\alpha(C) \geq 1$. We can write C in the basis of S' and find

$$C = c_{1,1} + c_{1,2}e_2 + c_{1,3}e_3 + c_{1,4}e_4 + c_{1,5}e_5 + c_{2,2}e_2^2 + c_{2,3}e_2e_3 + c_{2,4}e_2e_4,$$

for some $c_{i,j} \in K$. Furthermore, by possibly translating e_6 and e_5 with multiples of other basis elements, we find $e_6 = e_2e_5$. Therefore,

$$Ce_5 = c_{1,1}e_5 + c_{1,2}e_2e_5 + c_{1,3}e_3e_5 + c_{1,4}e_4e_5 + c_{1,5}e_5^2 + c_{2,2}e_2e_6 + c_{2,3}e_3e_6 + c_{2,4}e_4e_6.$$

Hence, we have found an element in S_6^2 of degree at most 1 with at least 5 poles at α . This is impossible.

Next, assume $a = 0$ and $e_3^2 \in S_2S_6$. We can replace e_3^2 and e_3e_4 in the basis of S_6^2 by e_6 and e_2e_5 and we can choose a basis of S such that $e_5 = e_2e_4$. The space $S'' := \langle S_2S_3, e_4 \rangle$ has dimension 6 and maximal degree 3. Thus, S'' contains an element B such that $\deg(B) \leq -2$ and $-v_\alpha(B) \geq 0$. We can write Be_4 as follows

$$Be_4 = b_{1,1}e_4 + b_{1,2}e_2e_4 + b_{1,3}e_3e_4 + b_{1,4}e_4^2 + b_{2,2}e_2e_5 + b_{2,3}e_3e_5,$$

with $b_{i,j} \in K$. Using the relations between the $e_i e_j$ we can also find $b'_{i,j} \in K$ such that

$$Be_4 = b'_{1,4}e_4 + b'_{2,4}e_2e_4 + b'_{1,6}e_6 + b'_{2,6}e_2e_6 + b'_{2,5}e_2e_5 + b'_{2,6}e_2e_6.$$

Multiplying this equation by e_4 again we find

$$Be_4^2 = b'_{1,4}e_4^2 + b'_{2,4}e_4e_5 + b'_{1,6}e_4e_6 + b'_{2,6}e_5e_6 + b'_{2,5}e_5^2 + b'_{2,6}e_5e_6.$$

Hence, we have found an element in S_6^2 of degree at most 4 with at least 6 poles at α , which is impossible.

Finally, assume $a = 0$ and $e_3^2 \notin S_2S_6$. Using a relation for e_5 and e_2e_5 we can find a relation $fe_3 = g$ with $f, g \in K[e_2, e_4]$. Also looking at relations for e_6 and e_2e_6 we find $[F : K(e_4)] \leq 5$. This is a contradiction since e_4 has at least 6 poles according to our current divisors.

We conclude that it must always hold that $\deg(D) \in \{n+1, n+2\}$, confirming the lemma for this case. \square

5 Proof of Theorem 1.7

Define t to be such that $\gamma_t > \gamma_{t-1} = 0$, then by the assumption we know that $t > \Delta_{\text{Max}}$ and $t > 3$. Furthermore, by Theorem 1.4, we find that $e_1 = 1, e_2 = x, \dots, e_{t-1} = x^{t-2}$ for some $x \in F$ such that $F = K(x)$. To give the proof we will need something slightly stronger than a filtered basis with respect to v_∞ , which exists by the following lemma.

Lemma 5.1. *Let K be an algebraically closed field and $S \subset K(x)$ an n -dimensional K -vector field such that $\min(\deg(S)) = 0$. Then it is possible to give a basis $\{e_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ for S that is filtered at v_∞ such that for any $\alpha \in K$ with $m_\alpha := \min(v_\alpha(S)) < 0$ we have*

$$v_\alpha(e_1) \geq v_\alpha(e_2) \geq \dots \geq v_\alpha(e_n) = m_\alpha.$$

Proof. Define $A := \{\alpha \in K \mid m_\alpha < 0\}$, then A must be finite because the elements in the basis can only have a finite number of poles. There is some $i \geq 2$ such that for every $\alpha \in A$ we have $v_\alpha(e_1) \geq \dots \geq v_\alpha(e_{i-1})$. We may replace e_i by $e_i + ae_{i-1}$ with $a \in K$ and we will still have a filtered basis by the ultrametric property. For every α there is at most one $a_\alpha \in K$ such that $e_i + a_\alpha e_{i-1}$ has higher valuation in v_α than e_{i-1} has. Take $a \in K$ such that $a \neq a_\alpha$ for all $\alpha \in A$ and replace e_i by $e_i + ae_{i-1}$. Then we have $v_\alpha(e_1) \geq \dots \geq v_\alpha(e_i)$ for all $\alpha \in A$. Repeating this process until $i = n$ gives a basis that meets the properties of the lemma. \square

Definition 5.2. We call a basis meeting the criteria of Lemma 5.1 a *super filtered basis* of S with respect to v_∞ .

From now on we assume $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ to be a super filtered basis of S . We want to show that the dimension of S_i^2 grows roughly like the number of poles that e_i has. Define M_i as $\sum_{\alpha \in K} \max(-v_\alpha(e_i), 0)$, so it equals the number of poles with multiplicity that e_i has outside of infinity. Note that because the basis is super filtered, we have $M_1 \leq M_2 \leq \dots \leq M_n$ and $M_i + \deg(e_i) = \deg(D_i)$. Also let $\Delta_i := \deg(e_i) - \deg(e_{i-1})$ and $\mu_i := M_i - M_{i-1}$ for all $2 \leq i \leq n$, then we know that $t > \Delta_i + \mu_i$ for all such i .

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\gamma_{t-1} = 0$ and suppose that $t > \mu_j + \Delta_j$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$. Then, for any $t-1 \leq i \leq n$ we have $T_i := L((t-2)P_\infty + D_i) \subset S_i^2$.*

Proof. We will show this using induction. Note that $S_{t-1}^2 = \mathfrak{p}_{2t-4} = T_{t-1}$ so it holds for the base case. We assume $i \geq t$ and $T_{i-1} \subset S_{i-1}^2$ and we will now prove $T_i \subset S_i^2$.

Consider the elements $\{e_1 e_i, \dots, e_{\mu_i} e_i\} = \{e_i, x e_i, \dots, x^{\mu_i-1} e_i\}$, these elements all have the same M_i poles and degree at most

$$\mu_i - 1 + \deg(e_i) \leq t - 2 + \deg(e_{i-1}).$$

By taking linear combinations of these elements we may create μ_i distinct elements s_1, \dots, s_{μ_i} with $M_{i-1} + 1, \dots, M_{i-1} + \mu_i - 1$ and M_i poles, respectively. Furthermore, we may choose exactly which poles these elements lose in comparison to e_i and can therefore assure that s_1 has all poles that e_{i-1} has and one extra and that s_j for each $j \geq 2$ has the poles s_{j-1} has and one extra. From this we may conclude that

$$\langle T_{i-1}, s_1, \dots, s_{\mu_i} \rangle = L((t-2)P_\infty + D_i - \Delta_i P_\infty) \subset S_i^2.$$

Next we consider the elements $\{e_{t-\Delta_i} e_i, \dots, e_{t-1} e_i\}$ which have degrees $t-1 + \deg(e_{i-1}), t + \deg(e_{i-1}), \dots, t-2 + \deg(e_i)$, respectively. Hence, we find that all these elements are needed

for a basis of S_i^2 compared to $\langle T_{i-1}, s_1, \dots, s_{\mu_i} \rangle$. Noting furthermore that their poles outside of infinity are exactly the M_i poles of e_i outside of infinity, we may conclude that $T_i \subset S_i^2$, which by the principal of induction proves the lemma. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.7. Using Lemma 5.3 we have that $T_n = L((t-2)P_\infty + D) \subset S^2$. Now we consider the elements $\{e_t e_n, \dots, e_n^2\}$. They all have distinct degrees that are at least $t-2 + \deg(e_n) + 1$ and are thus needed for a basis of S^2 compared to T_n . Hence we find that

$$\dim S^2 \geq \dim T_n + n - t + 1 = \deg(D) + n.$$

Rearranging everything we get

$$\dim(D) \leq \dim(S^2) - n + 1 = n + \gamma,$$

which proves the conjecture for this specific case. \square

References

- [1] Christine Bachoc, Alain Couvreur, and Gilles Zémor. “Towards a function field version of Freiman’s Theorem”. In: *Algebraic Combinatorics* 1.4 (2018), 501–521.
- [2] G.A. Freiman. *Foundations of a Structural Theory of Set Addition*. Translations of mathematical monographs. American Mathematical Society, 1973.
- [3] Henning Stichtenoth. *Algebraic Function Fields and Codes*. second ed. Vol. 254. Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Berlin: Springer-Verlag, 2009.

Mathematical Institute, Bunsenstrasse 3-5, 37073 Göttingen, Germany
mieke.wessel@mathematik.uni-goettingen.de