

BY

K. MAHLER

Reprinted from  
THE JOURNAL OF THE AUSTRALIAN  
MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY

Volume XVI, part 2, p.p. 176–184

1973

Dedicated to the memory of Hanna Neumann

K. MAHLER

(Received 27 April 1972)

Communicated by M. F. Newman

**Abstract**

It is proved that if

$$f = \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} f_h z^h$$

is a formal power series with algebraic  $p$ -adic coefficients which satisfies an algebraic differential equation, then a constant  $\gamma_4 > 0$  and a constant integer  $h_1 \geq 0$  exist such that

$$\text{either } f_h = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad |f_h|_p \geq \exp^{-\gamma_4 h(\log h)^2} \quad \text{for } h \geq h_1.$$

**1**

In his Ph.D. thesis, Jan Popken (1935) proved the following important result.

**THEOREM:** *Let*

$$f = \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} f_h z^h$$

*be a formal power series with real or complex algebraic coefficients which satisfies an algebraic differential equation. Then a positive constant  $c$  exists such that, for all sufficiently large suffixes  $h$ ,*

$$\text{either } f_h = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad |f_h| \geq e^{-ch(\log h)^2}.$$

An analogous theorem for formal power series with  $p$ -adic coefficients will be established in the present paper. Its proof is based on results from two recent papers of mine, [1] and [2].

Popken's theorem can be proved quite similarly, and this proof would be slightly shorter than the original one.

## 2

Denote by  $\Omega$  an arbitrary field of characteristic 0. If the formal power series

$$f = \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} f_h z^h$$

with coefficients  $f_h$  in  $\Omega$  satisfies an algebraic differential equation which has likewise coefficients in  $\Omega$ , then it is known that  $f$  also satisfies such an algebraic differential equation with *rational integral* coefficients (Ritt and Gourin 1927; paper 2). Moreover, it evidently may be assumed that this differential equation does not explicitly involve the indeterminate  $z$  and therefore is of the form

$$(1) \quad F((w)) \equiv F(w, w', \dots, w^{(m)}) \equiv \sum_{(\kappa)} p_{(\kappa)} w^{(\kappa_1)} \dots w^{(\kappa_N)} = 0.$$

Here  $m$  and  $n$  are two fixed positive integers;  $N$  depends on  $(\kappa)$  and assumes only the values  $0, 1, 2, \dots, n$ ;  $(\kappa) = (\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_N)$  runs over finitely many systems of integers where

$$(2) \quad 0 \leq \kappa_1 \leq m, \dots, 0 \leq \kappa_N \leq m; \kappa_1 \leq \kappa_2 \leq \dots \leq \kappa_N;$$

and the coefficients  $p_{(\kappa)}$  are rational integers distinct from 0. There is at most one system  $(\kappa)$  for which  $N = 0$ . This improper system will be denoted by  $(\omega)$ , and to it there corresponds the constant term  $p_{(\omega)}$  on the right-hand side of (1).

## 3

On differentiating the equation (1)  $h$  times and then putting  $w = f$  and  $z = 0$ , we obtain by paper [1] the infinite system of equations

$$(3) \quad \sum_{(\kappa)} \sum_{[\lambda]} p_{(\kappa)} \frac{(\kappa_1 + \lambda_1)!}{\lambda_1!} \dots \frac{(\kappa_N + \lambda_N)!}{\lambda_N!} f_{\kappa_1 + \lambda_1} \dots f_{\kappa_N + \lambda_N} = 0 \quad (h = 1, 2, 3, \dots)$$

for the coefficients  $f_h$  of  $f$ . Here in the second sum  $[\lambda] = [\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_N]$  runs over all systems of  $N$  integers satisfying

$$\lambda_1 \geq 0, \dots, \lambda_N \geq 0, \lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_N = h,$$

$N$  being the same number of terms as in the system  $(\kappa)$ .

As was proved in detail in paper [1], it can be deduced from (3) that there exist

- (a) a polynomial  $A(h) \not\equiv 0$  in  $h$  with rational integral coefficients;
- (b) a polynomial  $\phi_h(f_0, f_1, \dots, f_{h-1})$  in  $f_0, f_1, \dots, f_{h-1}$ , likewise with rational integral coefficients; and
- (c) a positive integral constant  $h_0$ ,

such that

$$(4) \quad A(h) \neq 0 \text{ and } A(h)f_h = \phi_h(f_0, f_1, \dots, f_{h-1}) \quad \text{for } h \geq h_0.$$

Here, by paper [1], the polynomial  $\phi_h$  has the explicit form

$$(5) \quad \phi_h(f_0, f_1, \dots, f_{h-1}) = \sum_{\{v\} \in S_h} P_{\{v\}, h} f_{v_1} \cdots f_{v_N},$$

where now  $N$  assumes at most the values  $1, 2, \dots, n$ ; where  $S_h$  is a certain finite set of systems  $\{v\} = \{v_1, \dots, v_N\}$  of integers satisfying

$$(6) \quad 0 \leq v_1 \leq h-1, \dots, 0 \leq v_N \leq h-1, v_1 + \dots + v_N \leq h + c_1,$$

$c_1$  being a positive constant independent of  $h$  and  $\{v\}$ ; and where the coefficients  $P_{\{v\}, h}$  are rational integers which may depend on  $h$  and  $\{v\}$ .

It is obvious that the relations (4) remain valid if  $h_0$  is increased. Let therefore, without loss of generality,  $h_0$  be so large that

$$(7) \quad h_0 \geq c_1 + 2.$$

#### 4

From now on assume that the coefficients  $f_h$  of  $f$  are algebraic over the rational field  $\mathcal{Q}$ . Then, by the second relations (4), the infinite extension field

$$K = \mathcal{Q}(f_0, f_1, f_2, \dots)$$

of  $\mathcal{Q}$  is identical with the finite algebraic extension

$$K = \mathcal{Q}(f_0, f_1, \dots, f_{h_0-1})$$

of  $\mathcal{Q}$  and so is an algebraic number field of finite degree,  $D$  say, over  $\mathcal{Q}$ .

This number field  $K$  can then in  $D$  distinct ways be imbedded in the complex field  $\mathcal{C}$ , so generating the  $D$  conjugate real or complex algebraic number fields

$$K^{(1)}, \dots, K^{(D)} \quad \text{say.}$$

If  $a$  is any element of the abstract algebraic field  $K$ , denote by  $a^{(j)}$ , where  $j=1, 2, \dots, D$ , the image of  $a$  in  $K^{(j)}$ . As is usual, we put

$$|\overline{a}| = \max(|a^{(1)}|, \dots, |a^{(D)}|).$$

#### 5

By hypothesis,  $f$  satisfies the algebraic differential equation (1), and this equation has rational coefficients. It follows then that the  $D$  power series

$$f^{(j)} = \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} f_h^{(j)} z^h \quad (j = 1, 2, \dots, D)$$

conjugate to  $f$  over  $K$  also satisfy the same differential equation (1).

Hence, by the main theorem of my paper [1], there exist for each  $j$  a pair of positive constants  $\gamma_1^{(j)}$  and  $\gamma_2^{(j)}$  such that

$$|f_h^{(j)}| \leq \gamma_1^{(j)}(h!)^{\gamma_2^{(j)}} \quad \left[ \begin{array}{l} j = 1, 2, \dots, D \\ h = 0, 1, 2, \dots \end{array} \right].$$

Therefore, on putting

$$\gamma_1 = \max_{j=1, 2, \dots, D} \gamma_1^{(j)} \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma_2 = \max_{j=1, 2, \dots, D} \gamma_2^{(j)},$$

our hypothesis implies the infinite sequence of inequalities

$$(8) \quad \overline{|f_h|} \leq \gamma_1 (h!)^{\gamma_2} \quad (h = 0, 1, 2, \dots).$$

## 6

In addition to this inequality for  $\overline{|f_h|}$ , we require an upper estimate for the denominators,  $d_h$  say, of the coefficients  $f_h$ . Here  $d_h$  is a positive rational integer, by preference as small as possible, such that the product

$$(9) \quad g_h = d_h f_h \quad (h = 0, 1, 2, \dots)$$

is an algebraic integer in  $K$ .

An upper bound for such denominators  $d_h$  can be obtained by the following considerations which go back to Popken's thesis.

By (4), (5), and (9),  $g_h$  can be written in the explicit form

$$(10) \quad g_h = \sum_{\{v\} \in S_h} P_{\{v\}, h} \frac{d_h}{A(h)d_{v_1} \cdots d_{v_n}} g_{v_1} \cdots g_{v_n} \quad \text{for } h \geq h_0.$$

Here, for the first  $h_0$  denominators

$$d_0, d_1, \dots, d_{h_0-1},$$

choose the smallest positive rational integers for which the products

$$g_0, g_1, \dots, g_{h_0-1}$$

as defined in (9) are algebraic integers in  $k$ , and then, for each larger suffix

$$h \geq h_0$$

define  $d_h$  recursively as the smallest positive rational integer such that

$$(11) \quad A(h)d_{v_1} \cdots d_{v_n} \text{ is a divisor of } d_h \text{ for all systems } \{v\} \in S_h.$$

By complete induction on  $h$  it is then immediately obvious from (10) that also all the products  $g_h$  with  $h \geq h_0$  become algebraic integers in  $K$ .

## 7

It is now convenient to split every system  $\{v\}$  in  $S_h$  into two subsystems

$$\{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_X\} \text{ and } \{\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_Y\}$$

where the  $\xi$ 's are those  $v$ 's which are  $\leq h_0 - 1$ , while the  $\zeta$ 's are the  $v$ 's which are  $\geq h_0$ . For reasons which will soon become clear, we further put

$$\eta_1 = \zeta_1 - (h_0 - 1), \eta_2 = \zeta_2 - (h_0 - 1), \dots, \eta_Y = \zeta_Y - (h_0 - 1),$$

so that  $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_Y$  are *positive* integers. With the  $\xi$ 's and  $\eta$ 's so defined, the system  $\{v\}$  will from now on be written as

$$\{v\} = \{\xi | \eta\} = \{\xi_1, \dots, \xi_X | \eta_1, \dots, \eta_Y\}.$$

Here the numbers  $X$  and  $Y$  are such that

$$0 \leq X \leq N \leq n, \quad 0 \leq Y \leq N \leq n, \quad 1 \leq X + Y = N \leq n.$$

We further put

$$d(k) = d_{k+h_0-1} \quad (k = 1, 2, 3, \dots)$$

and define  $S(k)$  as the set of all subsystems  $\{\eta\}$  to which there exists at least one system

$$\{v\} \text{ in } S_{k+h_0-1} \text{ such that } \{v\} = \{\xi | \eta\}.$$

## 8

If  $\{v\} = \{\xi | \eta\}$  lies in  $S_{k+h_0-1}$ , both the factors  $d_{\xi_i}$  and the number  $X$  of these factors in the product

$$d_{\xi_1} \cdots d_{\xi_X}$$

are bounded. Hence there exists a positive integral constant  $d^*$  such that

$$(12) \quad d_{\xi_1} \cdots d_{\xi_X} \text{ is a divisor of } d^* \text{ whenever } \{\xi | \eta\} \in S_{k+h_0-1} \text{ and } k \geq 1.$$

Let us then replace  $A(h)$  by the new polynomial

$$(13) \quad a(k) = A(k + h_0 - 1)d^*$$

in  $k$ . Also  $a(k)$  has rational integral coefficients, and the first formula (4) implies that

$$(14) \quad a(k) \neq 0 \text{ for } k = 1, 2, 3, \dots$$

In the new notation, the conditions (11) for  $d_h$  are equivalent to the conditions for  $d(k)$ , as follows,

$A(k + h_0 - 1)d_{\xi_1} \cdots d_{\xi_x} d(\eta_1) \cdots d(\eta_Y)$  divides  $d(k)$  for all  $\{\xi \mid \eta\} \in S_{k+h_0-1}$

and all  $k \geq 1$ .

Further these new conditions are certainly satisfied if

(15)  $a(k)d(\eta_1) \cdots d(\eta_Y)$  is a divisor of  $d(k)$  for all  $\{\eta\} \in S(k)$  and all  $k \geq 1$ ,

as will from now be assumed.

We had seen that

(6)  $0 \leq v_1 \leq h - 1, \dots, 0 \leq v_N \leq h - 1, v_1 + \dots + v_N \leq h + c_1$  if  $\{v\} \in S_h$ .

By the decomposition of  $\{v\}$ , this implies in particular that

$0 \leq \zeta_1 \leq k + h_0 - 2, \dots, 0 \leq \zeta_Y \leq k + h_0 - 2, \zeta_1 + \dots + \zeta_Y \leq k + h_0 + c_1 - 1$   
if  $\{v\} \in S_{k+h_0-1}$ ,

and hence that

$1 \leq \eta_1 \leq k - 1, \dots, 1 \leq \eta_Y \leq k - 1, \eta_1 + \dots + \eta_Y \leq k + h_0 + c_1 - 1 - Y(h_0 - 1)$   
if  $\{\eta\} \in S(k)$ .

If  $Y \geq 2$ , it follows then, by (7), that

(16)  $1 \leq \eta_1 \leq k - 1, \dots, 1 \leq \eta_Y \leq k - 1, \eta_1 + \dots + \eta_Y \leq k - 1$  if  $\{\eta\} \in S(k)$ .

These inequalities evidently remain valid also if  $Y = 1$ ; and they are without content if  $Y = 0$ , a case which may be excluded.

## 9

As usual, denote by  $[x]$  the integral part of the positive number  $x$ . Further put

(17) 
$$d[k] = \prod_{j=1}^k |a(j)|^{\left[ \frac{(n-1)k+1}{(n-1)j+1} \right]} \quad (k = 1, 2, 3, \dots),$$

so that

$$d(1) = |a(1)|.$$

We assert that the denominator  $d(k) = d_{k+h_0-1}$  of  $f_{k+h_0-1}$  may for all  $k \geq 1$  be chosen as the integer

(18) 
$$d(k) = d[k] \quad (k = 1, 2, 3, \dots),$$

but we do not assert that this is always the smallest possible choice of  $d(k)$ .

The assertion (18) is by (15) and (16) certainly true for  $k = 1$  because  $S(1)$  is the empty set and we may therefore take  $d(1) = |a(1)|$ . Assume next that (18)

has already been established for all values of  $k$  less than some integer  $k^*$ . We shall now show that then (18) is valid also for  $k = k^*$  and so is always true.

To carry out this proof, it suffices by (17) to prove that

$$(19) \quad \left[ \frac{(n-1)\eta_1 + 1}{(n-1)j + 1} \right] + \cdots + \left[ \frac{(n-1)\eta_Y + 1}{(n-1)j + 1} \right] \leq \left[ \frac{(n-1)k + 1}{(n-1)j + 1} \right]$$

for all integers  $j \geq 1$ , for all integers  $k = 1, 2, \dots, k^*$ , and for all systems  $\{\eta\}$  in  $S(k)$ . But for such values of the parameters,

$$\begin{aligned} \{(n-1)\eta_1 + 1\} + \cdots + \{(n-1)\eta_Y + 1\} Y &= \\ &= (n-1)(\eta_1 + \cdots + \eta_Y) + Y \leq (n-1)(k-1) + Y \leq (n-1)k + 1 \end{aligned}$$

because

$$Y \leq n = (n-1) + 1,$$

and so the assertion (19) follows at once.

## 10

This proof has established that we may choose

$$(20) \quad d_{k+h_0-1} = d(k) = \prod_{j=1}^k |a(j)|^{\left[ \frac{(n-1)k+1}{(n-1)j+1} \right]}$$

as an admissible denominator of the coefficients  $f_{k+h_0-1}$  if  $k \geq 1$ . We next determine an upper estimate for this product.

There evidently exist positive constants  $c_2, c_3, c_4$ , and  $c_5$  independent of  $j$  and  $k$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} |a(j)| &\leq c_2 j^{c_3} \quad (j = 1, 2, 3, \dots); \\ \frac{(n-1)k+1}{(n-1)j+1} &\leq \frac{k}{j} \quad \text{if } 1 \leq j \leq k \text{ and } k \geq 1; \end{aligned}$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^k \frac{1}{j} \leq c_4 + \log k; \quad \sum_{j=1}^k \frac{\log j}{j} \leq c_5 + (\log k)^2.$$

It thus follows from (20) that

$$1 \leq d_{k+h_0-1} \leq \prod_{j=1}^k (c_2 j^{c_3})^{k/j} \leq c_2^{k(c_4 + \log k)} \cdot e^{c_3 k \{c_5 + (\log k)^2\}}.$$

On replacing here  $k + h_0 - 1$  again by  $h$ , we arrive then at the result that

*There exists to the series  $f$  a positive constant  $\gamma_3$  and a positive integer  $h_1$  such that the denominator  $d_h$  of  $f_h$  satisfies the inequality*



$$(21) \quad 1 \leq d_h \leq e^{\gamma_3 h (\log h)^2} \quad \text{for all suffixes } h \geq h_1.$$

This result certainly holds if all the coefficients  $f_h$  of  $f$  lie in the formal algebraic number field  $K$  of degree  $D$  over  $\mathcal{Q}$ . It still remains valid if we imbed  $K$  in any one of the  $D$  possible ways in the complex number field  $\mathbf{C}$ , or if we imbed  $K$  for any prime  $p$  in some finite algebraic extension of the  $p$ -adic field  $\mathcal{Q}_p$ .

## 11

We apply the last remark to the case when all the coefficients  $f_h$  are algebraic  $p$ -adic numbers.

Denote by

$$u_h(x) = x^\Delta + u_{h1}x^{\Delta-1} + \cdots + u_{h\Delta} \quad (h = 0, 1, 2, \dots)$$

the irreducible polynomial with rational coefficients for which

$$u_h(f_h) = 0 \quad (h = 0, 1, 2, \dots);$$

here  $\Delta$  may depend on  $h$ . The further polynomial defined by

$$U_h(x) = \prod_{j=1}^D (x - f_h^{(j)}) = x^D + U_{h1}x^{D-1} + \cdots + U_{hD} \quad (h = 0, 1, 2, \dots)$$

is then a positive integral power of  $u_h(x)$ , and therefore also

$$U_h(f_h) = 0 \quad (h = 0, 1, 2, \dots).$$

Denote again by  $d_h$  the denominator of  $f_h$  and then put

$$V_h(x) = d_h^D \cdot U_h(x/d_h) \quad (h = 0, 1, 2, \dots).$$

Then  $V_h(x)$  has the explicit form

$$V_h(x) = x^D + V_{h1}x^{D-1} + \cdots + V_{hD}$$

with rational *integral* coefficients. All the zeros of  $V_h(x)$  are therefore *algebraic integers*, and hence *the algebraic integer  $d_h f_h$  is a divisor of  $V_{hD}$* .

Here

$$V_{hD} = (-1)^D \prod_{j=1}^D (d_h f_h^{(j)}),$$

whence, by (8) and (21),

$$|V_{hD}| \leq \left( e^{\gamma_3 h (\log h)^2} \cdot \gamma_1 (h!)^{\gamma_2} \right)^D \quad \text{for } h \geq h_1.$$

This estimate implies that there exists a positive constant  $\gamma_4$  independent of  $h$  such that

$$(22) \quad |V_{hD}| \leq e^{\gamma_4 h (\log h)^2} \quad \text{for } h \geq h_1.$$

## 12

Assume finally that both  $h \geq h_1$  and

$$f_h \neq 0.$$

Then also

$$f_h^{(j)} \neq 0 \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \dots, D,$$

hence

$$V_{hD} \neq 0,$$

whence, by (22),

$$(23) \quad |V_{hD}|_p \geq e^{-\gamma_4 h (\log h)^2} \quad \text{for } h \geq h_1.$$

The algebraic integer  $d_h f_h$  is also a  $p$ -adic integer, and it is a divisor of  $V_{hD} \neq 0$ . This implies that

$$(24) \quad |d_h f_h|_p \geq |V_{hD}|_p.$$

Further  $d_h$  is a positive rational integer and therefore satisfies

$$(25) \quad |d_h|_p \leq 1.$$

On combining these three inequalities (23), (24), and (25), we arrive then finally at the following analogue of Popken's theorem.

**THEOREM.** *Let  $p$  be a fixed prime, and let*

$$f = \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} f_h z^h$$

*be a formal power series with  $p$ -adic algebraic coefficients which satisfies an algebraic differential equation. Then a positive constant  $\gamma_4$  and a positive integer  $h_1$  exist such that*

$$\text{either } f_h = 0 \text{ or } |f_h|_p \geq e^{-\gamma_4 h (\log h)^2} \quad \text{for } h \geq h_1.$$

It would have great interest to decide whether this estimate is best possible; but I rather doubt it.

## References

- [1] K. Mahler, *Atti della Accad. Naz. Lincei Rend. Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Natur.*, 50 (1971) 36–49.
- [2] K. Mahler, *Atti della Accad. Naz. Lincei Rend. Cl. Sci. Fis. Mat. Natur.*, 50 (1971) 174–184.
- [3] J. Popken, Ph. D. Thesis, N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgeversmaatschappij (1935).
- [4] J. F. Ritt and E. Gourie, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 33 (1927), 182–184.

Department of Mathematics  
 Institute of Advanced Studies  
 Australian National University  
 Canberra