

The *abc* Conjecture: An Introduction

Robert L. Benedetto
Amherst College

September 17, 2018

$$2400 + 1 = 2401$$

Fermat's Last Theorem. (Wiles, 1995)

Theorem

Given $n \geq 3$ integer, there are **no integer solutions** to

$$x^n + y^n = z^n$$

with none of x, y, z equal to zero.

Proof:

A little too long to fit into this talk.

“QED”

Using **Polynomials** instead of **Integers**

Recall: A polynomial $f(t)$ with complex coefficients is a function of the form:

$$f(t) = a_d t^d + a_{d-1} t^{d-1} + \cdots + a_1 t + a_0,$$

where every $a_i \in \mathbb{C}$.

e.g.:

$$\begin{aligned} &5 - \pi t + t^2 \\ &(14 + 2i) + 17t^{11} - (5 - 3i)t^{38} \\ &7 + \sqrt{2}i \\ &0 \end{aligned}$$

Notation:

$$\mathbb{C}[t] = \{\text{polynomials with coefficients in } \mathbb{C}\}.$$

Fermat for Polynomials

Theorem

Let $n \geq 3$ be an integer. There are **no** polynomials $f, g, h \in \mathbb{C}[t]$ such that

$$(f(t))^n + (g(t))^n = (h(t))^n$$

except for the cases that:

- ▶ at least one of f, g, h is the zero polynomial,
or
- ▶ f, g, h are all constant,
or
- ▶ f is a constant times g .

Note: $n = 2$ has **many** solutions. E.g., for any polynomial $f(t)$,

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

Review of Polynomials and Degrees

To say $f = g$ means: for **every** $t_0 \in \mathbb{C}$, $f(t_0) = g(t_0)$.

Equivalently, f and g have exactly the same coefficients.

Writing $f(t) = a_d t^d + \cdots + a_0$ with $a_d \neq 0$, the integer

$$d = d_f = \deg(f)$$

is the **degree** of f .

Note:

- ▶ If $f = a_0$ is a nonzero constant, then $\deg(f) = 0$.
- ▶ If $f = 0$ is the zero polynomial, either we don't talk about its degree, or we say that $\deg(f) = -\infty$.
- ▶ $\deg(f \cdot g) = \deg(f) + \deg(g)$.
- ▶ If f is not a constant, then $\deg(f') = \deg(f) - 1$.

Roots of Polynomials

Any nonzero polynomial

$$f = a_d t^d + \cdots + a_0$$

(with $a_d \neq 0$) has exactly d **roots**

$$\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_d \in \mathbb{C},$$

and in particular,

$$f(t) = a_d \cdot (t - \alpha_1) \cdot (t - \alpha_2) \cdot \cdots \cdot (t - \alpha_d).$$

Furthermore, the above factorization of f is **unique**.

Examples of Roots of Polynomials

Examples.

$$f(t) = t^3 - 3t^2 + 2t = t(t - 1)(t - 2)$$

$$g(t) = t^2 + 4 = (t - 2i)(t + 2i)$$

$$\begin{aligned} h(t) &= 2t^3 - 3t^2 + 1 = 2\left(t + \frac{1}{2}\right)(t - 1)(t - 1) \\ &= 2\left(t + \frac{1}{2}\right)(t - 1)^2 \end{aligned}$$

Counting Roots

Example: Are there numbers $a, b \in \mathbb{C}$ so that

$$(t + 1)^5(t + 2)^4(t^3 + at - 3) = (t - 2)^3(t - 1)^2(t^7 + bt + 6) ?$$

Answer: NO!

We could multiply it out, but here's an easier way:

If the above polynomials were equal, then they would be a single polynomial of degree 12.

This polynomial has as roots **at least** the following:

- ▶ -1 , appearing 5 times,
- ▶ -2 , appearing 4 times,
- ▶ 2 , appearing 3 times
- ▶ 1 , appearing 2 times

That's already $5 + 4 + 3 + 2 = 14$ roots for a degree 12 polynomial, which is impossible.

Roots and Derivatives

Suppose $f \in \mathbb{C}[t]$ and α is a root of f , appearing with multiplicity $r \geq 1$; that is,

$$f(t) = (t - \alpha)^r g(t)$$

for some polynomial $g(t)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} f'(t) &= r(t - \alpha)^{r-1}g(t) + (t - \alpha)^r g'(t) \\ &= (t - \alpha)^{r-1} \underbrace{[rg(t) + (t - \alpha)g'(t)]}_{\text{some polynomial}}. \end{aligned}$$

That means the polynomial f' has α as a root with multiplicity (at least) $r - 1$.

The Radical of a Polynomial

Definition

Given a polynomial

$$f(t) = A(t - \alpha_1)^{r_1}(t - \alpha_2)^{r_2} \cdots (t - \alpha_k)^{r_k},$$

with $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ distinct, the **radical** of f is the polynomial

$$\text{rad}(f) = (t - \alpha_1)(t - \alpha_2) \cdots (t - \alpha_k).$$

Note:

1. If f is not constant, then $1 \leq \deg(\text{rad}(f)) \leq \deg(f)$.
2. The number of **distinct** roots of f is $k = \deg(\text{rad}(f))$.
3. $r_1 + r_2 + \cdots + r_k = \deg(f)$.

abc for Polynomials

Theorem (Stothers, Mason, early 1980s)

Let $a(t)$, $b(t)$, $c(t)$ be nonzero polynomials, not all constant, such that

1. $a + b = c$, and
2. a and b have no common roots.

Then

$$\max\{\deg(a), \deg(b), \deg(c)\} \leq -1 + \deg(\text{rad}(abc)).$$

That is:

The largest degree of a , b , and c is **strictly less than** the **total** number of **distinct** roots of a , b , and c .

Example 1

$$\underbrace{t^3(5t+2)}_{a(t)} + \underbrace{(3t+1)^3(t+1)}_{b(t)} = \underbrace{(2t+1)^3(4t+1)}_{c(t)}$$

$$\max\{\deg a, \deg b, \deg c\} = 4$$

$$\text{rad}(abc) = t(t+1)(2t+1)(3t+1)(4t+1)(5t+2),$$

so $\deg(\text{rad}(abc)) = 6$, and $4 \leq (-1) + 6$.

Example 2

$$\underbrace{t^{1821} - 1}_{a(t)} + \underbrace{1}_{b(t)} = \underbrace{t^{1821}}_{c(t)}$$

$$\max\{\deg a, \deg b, \deg c\} = \deg a = \deg c = 1821$$

$$\text{rad}(abc) = t(t^{1821} - 1),$$

so $\deg(\text{rad}(abc)) = 1822$, and $1821 \leq (-1) + 1822$.

Example 3

$$\underbrace{(t^{1821} + 1)}_{a(t)} + \underbrace{(-t^{1821} + 1)}_{b(t)} = \underbrace{2}_{c(t)}$$

$$\max\{\deg a, \deg b, \deg c\} = \deg a = \deg b = 1821$$

$$\text{rad}(abc) = t^{3642} - 1,$$

so $\deg(\text{rad}(abc)) = 3642$, and $1821 \leq (-1) + 3642$.

Proving abc for Polynomials: Setup

Without loss: The largest degree is $\deg(a) = \deg(b) = d \geq 1$.

Let $d_c = \deg(c)$. Then $0 \leq d_c \leq d$.

Factor the polynomials as:

$$a(t) = A(t - \alpha_1)^{q_1}(t - \alpha_2)^{q_2} \cdots (t - \alpha_k)^{q_k}$$

$$b(t) = B(t - \beta_1)^{r_1}(t - \beta_2)^{r_2} \cdots (t - \beta_\ell)^{r_\ell}$$

$$c(t) = C(t - \gamma_1)^{s_1}(t - \gamma_2)^{s_2} \cdots (t - \gamma_m)^{s_m}$$

By hypothesis, note that:

- ▶ $q_1 + \cdots + q_k = r_1 + \cdots + r_\ell = d$,
- ▶ $s_1 + \cdots + s_m = d_c$,
- ▶ $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_\ell, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_m$ are all distinct.

Let $N = k + \ell + m = \deg(\text{rad}(abc))$.

Our goal is to show: $d \leq N - 1$.

Proof of Fermat for Polynomials

Suppose $n \geq 3$ and $f^n + g^n = h^n$, where

- ▶ f, g, h are nonzero, and
- ▶ f is not a constant multiple of g .

If f and g have a common root $a \in \mathbb{C}$, then so does h ; so divide both sides by $(t - a)^n$.

Repeat until f and g have no common roots.

Rearrange so that $\deg f = d \geq \deg(g), \deg(h)$. By *abc* Theorem,

$$\underbrace{\deg(f^n)}_{nd} \leq -1 + \underbrace{(\#\text{distinct roots of } f^n g^n h^n)}_{\leq \deg(fgh) \leq 3d}.$$

So $nd \leq 3d - 1$, i.e., $(n - 3)d \leq -1$. Contradiction! QED

Back to Integers

Given a positive integer $n \geq 1$, what's the analogue of the “degree” of n ?

Idea:

$$2548 = 2 \cdot 10^3 + 5 \cdot 10^2 + 4 \cdot 10 + 8$$

$$\text{vs. } 2 \cdot t^3 + 5 \cdot t^2 + 4 \cdot t + 8$$

So “degree” is roughly analogous to “number of digits”, which means (roughly) $\log |n|$.

Another parallel:

$$\deg(fg) = \deg(f) + \deg(g)$$

$$\log |mn| = \log |m| + \log |n|$$

What about the **radical** of an integer?

Polynomials have factorizations

$$f(t) = A(t - \alpha_1)^{r_1}(t - \alpha_2)^{r_2} \cdots (t - \alpha_k)^{r_k},$$

and the radical of f is

$$\text{rad}(f) = (t - \alpha_1)(t - \alpha_2) \cdots (t - \alpha_k).$$

Similarly, integers have **prime** factorizations

$$n = \pm p_1^{r_1} p_2^{r_2} \cdots p_k^{r_k}, \quad \text{so}$$

Definition

Let $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ be a nonzero integer $n = \pm p_1^{r_1} p_2^{r_2} \cdots p_k^{r_k}$.

The **radical** of n is $\text{rad}(n) = p_1 p_2 \cdots p_k$.

An Analogous Conjecture for Integers

Conjecture

There is a constant $C \in \mathbb{R}$ with the following property: For all positive integers $a, b, c \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying:

1. $a + b = c$, and
2. a and b have no common prime factors,

we have

$$\underbrace{\max\{\log a, \log b, \log c\}}_{\log c} \leq C + \log(\text{rad}(abc)).$$

[**Recall:** If $abc = p_1^{r_1} p_2^{r_2} \cdots p_k^{r_k}$, then $\text{rad}(abc) = p_1 p_2 \cdots p_k$.]

But: this conjecture is **FALSE!!!!**

Preparations for a Counterexample

Lemma

For any integer $j \geq 1$, $3^{(2^j)} - 1$ is divisible by 2^{j+2} .

Proof of Lemma: By induction on j :

For $j = 1$, $3^2 - 1 = 8$ is divisible by $2^{1+2} = 8$.

If the statement is true for some $j \geq 1$, then

$$3^{2^{j+1}} - 1 = \underbrace{(3^{2^j} - 1)}_{\text{divisible by } 2^{j+2}} \cdot \underbrace{(3^{2^j} + 1)}_{\text{divisible by } 2}.$$

Thus, $3^{2^{j+1}}$ is divisible by 2^{j+3} .

QED Lemma

A Counterexample to the Conjecture

For each $j \geq 1$, write $\underbrace{2^{j+2}n_j}_{a_j} + \underbrace{1}_{b_j} = \underbrace{3^{2^j}}_{c_j}$, for some $n_j \in \mathbb{N}$.

Note (for later) that $n_j < 3^{2^j}/2^{j+2}$. **We compute:**

$$\log \max\{a_j, b_j, c_j\} = \log(3^{2^j}) = 2^j \log 3, \quad \text{and}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \log \text{rad}(a_j b_j c_j) &\leq \log(2 \cdot 3 \cdot n_j) = \log 6 + \log(n_j) \\ &\leq \log 6 + \log(3^{2^j}) - \log(2^{j+2}) \\ &= \log 6 + 2^j \log 3 - (j+2) \log 2. \end{aligned}$$

So if the conjecture were true, we would have

$$2^j \log 3 \leq C + \log 6 + 2^j \log 3 - (j+2) \log 2,$$

i.e., $(j+2) \log 2 \leq C + \log 6$ for **all** $j \geq 1$, which is impossible.

The *abc* Conjecture

Conjecture (David Masser and Joseph Oesterlé, 1985.)

For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a constant $C_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$ with the following property.

For all positive integers $a, b, c \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying

- 1. $a + b = c$, and*
- 2. a and b have no common prime factors,*

we have

$$\log c \leq C_\varepsilon + (1 + \varepsilon) \log(\text{rad}(abc)).$$

abc ratios

Given a, b, c as in the conjecture, let

$$R(a, b, c) = \frac{\log c}{\log \text{rad}(abc)},$$

called the “*abc* ratio” or the “quality” of the triple (a, b, c) .

Idea: Intuitively, the *abc* conjecture says $R(a, b, c)$ cannot be much bigger than 1.

More precisely, it says that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there are only **finitely many** triples (a, b, c) for which $R(a, b, c) > 1 + \varepsilon$.

Examples of abc ratios

“Most” of the time, $R(a, b, c)$ is a lot smaller than 1:

- $18384 + 73295 = 91679$ is $2^4 \cdot 3 \cdot 383 + 5 \cdot 107 \cdot 137 = 7^2 \cdot 1871$, so

$$R = \frac{\log(91679)}{\log(2 \cdot 3 \cdot 5 \cdot 7 \cdot 107 \cdot 137 \cdot 383 \cdot 1871)} = 0.40201\dots$$

- $5^{12} + 3^{16} = 287187346 = 2 \cdot 137 \cdot 1048129$ has

$$R = \frac{\log(287187346)}{\log(2 \cdot 3 \cdot 5 \cdot 137 \cdot 1048129)} = 0.877926\dots$$

- But $1 + 2400 = 2401$ is $1 + 2^5 \cdot 3 \cdot 5^2 = 7^4$, so

$$R = \frac{\log(2401)}{\log(2 \cdot 3 \cdot 5 \cdot 7)} = 1.455673\dots,$$

which is number 37 on the all-time worst (best?) list of known (a, b, c) -triples.

Top ten worst known (a, b, c) -triples:

a	b	c	R
2	$3^{10} \cdot 109$	23^5	1.62991...
11^2	$3^2 \cdot 5^6 \cdot 7^3$	$2^{21} \cdot 23$	1.62599...
$19 \cdot 1307$	$7 \cdot 29^2 \cdot 31^8$	$2^8 \cdot 3^{22} \cdot 5^4$	1.62349...
283	$5^{11} \cdot 13^2$	$2^8 \cdot 3^8 \cdot 17^3$	1.58075...
1	$2 \cdot 3^7$	$5^4 \cdot 7$	1.56788...
7^3	3^{10}	$2^{11} \cdot 29$	1.54707...
$7^2 \cdot 41^2 \cdot 311^3$	$11^{16} \cdot 13^2 \cdot 79$	$2 \cdot 3^3 \cdot 5^{23} \cdot 953$	1.54443...
5^3	$2^9 \cdot 3^{17} \cdot 13^2$	$11^5 \cdot 17 \cdot 31^3 \cdot 137$	1.53671...
$13 \cdot 19^6$	$2^{30} \cdot 5$	$3^{13} \cdot 11^2 \cdot 31$	1.52699...
$3^{18} \cdot 23 \cdot 2269$	$17^3 \cdot 29 \cdot 31^8$	$2^{10} \cdot 5^2 \cdot 7^{15}$	1.52216...

For more information

For a list of all 240 known (a, b, c) triples with $R > 1.4$, see Bart de Smit's list at

<http://www.math.leidenuniv.nl/~desmit/abc/index.php?set=2>

(or search for `desmit abc`)

For more on the *abc* conjecture, see Abderrahmane Nitaj's page at:

<http://www.math.unicaen.fr/~nitaj/abc.html>

(or search for `nitaj abc`)