

## On a transcendence type lemma

The purpose of this note is to prove the following lemma:

**Lemma.** *Let  $K = \mathbb{Q}(x_1, \dots, x_m, y_1, \dots, y_n)$  with*

- (1)  $\{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$  a transcendence basis for  $K$  over  $\mathbb{Q}$ , and
- (2)  $\{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$  a (vector space) basis for  $K$  over  $\mathbb{Q}(x_1, \dots, x_m)$ .

*Then the transcendence type of  $K$  is at least  $m + 1$ .*

The result is ostensibly by the pigeonhole principle, but there is a little more work that that statement suggests. The lemma actually results from the following three lemmata.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $u_{i,j}$  be real numbers for  $1 \leq i \leq \nu$ , and  $1 \leq j \leq \mu$ . Let  $U \in \mathbb{R}$  satisfy*

$$U \geq \max_{1 \leq j \leq \mu} \sum_{i=1}^{\nu} |u_{i,j}|,$$

*and let  $X$  and  $\ell$  be two positive integers such that*

$$\ell^\mu < (X + 1)^\nu.$$

*Then there exist  $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_\nu \in \mathbb{Z}$  not all zero such that*

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq \nu} |\xi_i| \leq X$$

*and*

$$\max_{1 \leq j \leq \mu} \left| \sum_{i=1}^{\nu} u_{i,j} \xi_i \right| \leq \frac{UX}{\ell}.$$

*Proof.* The result is reminiscent of Siegel's lemma, and like that result it uses the pigeonhole principle. Let

$$\mathbb{N}(\nu, X) := \{(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_\nu) \in \mathbb{Z}^\nu \mid 0 \leq \xi_i \leq X \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq \nu\}.$$

Consider the map  $\varphi : \mathbb{N}(\nu, X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^\mu$  that takes  $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_\nu)$  to  $(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\mu)$  where

$$\eta_j = \sum_{i=1}^{\nu} u_{i,j} \xi_i \quad (1 \leq j \leq \mu).$$

For  $1 \leq j \leq \mu$  we denote by  $-V_j$  (and, respectively,  $W_j$ ) the sum of the negative (respectively positive) elements of the set

$$u_{1,j}, u_{2,j}, \dots, u_{\nu,j}.$$

Therefore we have by hypothesis

$$V_j + W_j \leq U \quad \text{for all } 1 \leq j \leq \mu.$$

We may note that if  $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_\nu) \in \mathbb{N}(\nu, X)$  then  $(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\mu) = \varphi(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_\nu)$  is in the set

$$E = \{(\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\mu) \in \mathbb{R}^\mu \mid -V_j X \leq \eta_j \leq W_j X\}.$$

We partition each of the intervals  $[-V_j X, W_j X]$  into  $\ell$  intervals, each of length  $\leq UX/\ell$  (since  $W_j X - (-V_j X) \leq UX$ ). This partitions  $E$  into  $\ell^\mu$  subsets  $E_k$  ( $1 \leq k \leq \ell^\mu$ ).

The set  $\mathbb{N}(\nu, X)$  has  $(1+X)^\nu$  elements, and by hypothesis

$$\ell^\mu < (1+x)^\nu.$$

So by the pigeonhole principle there exist two distinct elements  $\xi^*$  and  $\xi^{**}$  of  $\mathbb{N}(\nu, X)$  whose image under  $\varphi$  belong to the same subset  $E_k$ . We denote by  $\xi$  their difference  $\xi^* - \xi^{**}$ , and by  $\eta$  the value  $\varphi(\xi)$ . We have

$$\xi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_\nu) \neq 0$$

since  $\xi^*$  and  $\xi^{**}$  are distinct, and

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq \nu} |\xi_i| \leq X$$

by definition of  $\mathbb{N}(\nu, X)$ . Setting  $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\mu)$ , we have

$$\max_{1 \leq j \leq \mu} |\eta_j| = \max_{1 \leq j \leq \mu} \left| \sum_{i=1}^{\nu} u_{i,j} \xi_i \right| \leq \frac{UX}{\ell}$$

since  $\varphi$  is a linear map and so  $\varphi(\eta) = \varphi(\xi^* - \xi^{**}) = \varphi(\xi^*) - \varphi(\xi^{**})$ .  $\square$

**Lemma 2.** *Let  $u_0, \dots, u_m \in \mathbb{C}^\times$  and let  $H \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then there exist  $\xi_0, \dots, \xi_m \in \mathbb{Z}$  not all zero such that*

$$\max_{0 \leq i \leq m} |\xi_i| \leq H$$

and

$$|u_0 \xi_0 + \dots + u_m \xi_m| < \sqrt{2}(|u_0| + \dots + |u_m|)H^{-(m-1)/2}.$$

*Proof.* If  $m = 0$  we require

$$|u_0 \xi_0| < \sqrt{2H}|u_0|.$$

Since  $H \geq 1$ ,  $\sqrt{2H} \geq \sqrt{2}$ , so  $\xi_0 = 1$  suffices.

For  $m = 1$  we require

$$|u_0 \xi_0 + u_1 \xi_1| < \sqrt{2}(|u_0| + |u_1|).$$

Without loss of generality assume  $|u_0| \leq |u_1|$ , then take  $\xi_0 = 1$  and  $\xi_1 = 0$ . Then

$$|u_0 \xi_0 + u_1 \xi_1| = |u_0| < \sqrt{2}(|u_0| + |u_1|).$$

And  $H \geq 1$  so  $\max_{0 \leq i \leq 1} |\xi_i| \leq H$ .

For  $m \geq 2$  we apply Lemma 1. For  $0 \leq i \leq m$  define  $u_{i,1}$  and  $u_{i,2}$  by  $u_i = u_{i,1} + u_{i,2}\sqrt{-1}$ . Now let

$$U = \sum_{i=0}^m |u_i|.$$

We have

$$\max_{1 \leq j \leq 2} \sum_{i=0}^m |u_{i,j}| \leq U$$

by the triangle inequality.

Let  $\ell = \lfloor H^{(m+1)/2} + 1 \rfloor$ . So in particular

$$H^{(m+1)/2} < \ell \leq H^{(m+1)/2} + 1.$$

Since for all  $x \geq 0$  and  $n > 2$  we have  $(x^{n/2} + 1)^2 < (x + 1)^n$ , we know that

$$\ell^2 \leq (H^{(m+1)/2} + 1)^2 < (H + 1)^{m+1}.$$

We may now apply Lemma 1, so there exist integers  $\xi_0, \dots, \xi_m$ , not all zero and such that

$$\max_{0 \leq i \leq m} |\xi_i| \leq H$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{1 \leq j \leq 2} \left| \sum_{i=0}^m u_{i,j} \xi_i \right| &\leq \frac{UH}{\ell} \\ &= \frac{(|u_0| + \dots + |u_m|)H}{\lfloor H^{(m+1)/2} + 1 \rfloor} \\ &< \frac{(|u_0| + \dots + |u_m|)H}{H^{(m+1)/2}} \\ &= (|u_0| + \dots + |u_m|)H^{-(m-1)/2}. \end{aligned}$$

And since for  $z \in \mathbb{C}$  we have  $|z| \leq \sqrt{2} \max\{|\Re z|, |\Im z|\}$  the result follows.  $\square$

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $x_1, \dots, x_q \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $N_1, \dots, N_q, H \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then there exists a nonzero polynomial  $P \in \mathbb{Z}[X_1, \dots, X_q]$  with  $\deg_{X_h} P \leq N_h$  for  $1 \leq h \leq q$  and height  $\leq H$  such that*

$$|P(x_1, \dots, x_q)| \leq \sqrt{2} H^{1-M/2} \exp(c(N_1 + \dots + N_q))$$

where

$$M = \prod_{k=1}^q (1 + N_k)$$

and

$$c = 1 + \log \max(1, |x_1|, \dots, |x_q|).$$

*Proof.* Let  $P \in \mathbb{Z}[X_1, \dots, X_q]$  satisfy the hypotheses of the lemma, so  $P(x_1, \dots, x_q)$  is a sum of monomials in  $x_1, \dots, x_q$  with degree  $\leq N_h$  in  $x_h$ . This gives at most  $(1 + N_1)(1 + N_2) \cdots (1 + N_q) = M$  terms in total. Denote the  $M$  monomials by  $m_1, \dots, m_M$ .

By Lemma 2 we can find integers  $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_M$  not all zero such that if  $P$  has coefficients  $\xi_i$  then

$$|P(x_1, \dots, x_q)| < \sqrt{2} \rho H^{-(M-2)/2}$$

where

$$\rho = \sum_{i=1}^M |m_i(x_1, \dots, x_q)|.$$

Using the fact that  $e^t > 1 + e^t$  for all  $t > 0$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} M &= \prod_{k=1}^q (1 + N_k) \\ &< \prod_{k=1}^q e^{N_k} \\ &= \exp(N_1 + \dots + N_q). \end{aligned}$$

We now estimate  $\rho$  as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= \sum_{i=1}^M |m_i(x_1, \dots, x_q)| \\ &\leq M \max\{1, |x_1|\}^{N_1} \dots \max\{1, |x_q|\}^{N_q} \\ &< \exp(N_1 + \dots + N_q) \max\{1, |x_1|, \dots, |x_q|\}^{N_1 + \dots + N_q} \\ &= \exp((N_1 + \dots + N_q)(1 + \log \max\{1, |x_1|, \dots, |x_q|\})). \end{aligned}$$

□

We can now prove the original lemma, which is restated below to include the definition of transcendence type.

**Lemma.** *Let  $x_1, \dots, x_m \in \mathbb{C}$  be a transcendence basis for  $K \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ . Suppose that for every  $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}(x_1, \dots, x_m)$  we have*

$$-(\text{size } \alpha)^\tau \ll \log |\alpha|.$$

*Then  $\tau \geq m + 1$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $N, H \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then by Lemma 3 there exists a nonzero polynomial  $P \in \mathbb{Z}[X_1, \dots, X_m]$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \deg_{X_i} P &\leq N, \\ \text{ht } P &\leq H, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$|P(x_1, \dots, x_m)| \leq \sqrt{2} H^{1-M/2} e^{cmN}$$

where

$$M = \prod_{k=1}^m (1 + N) < e^{mN}, \quad c = 1 + \log \max\{1, |x_1|, \dots, |x_m|\}.$$

Consider  $\alpha = P(x_1, \dots, x_m) \in \mathbb{Q}(x_1, \dots, x_m)$ . Let  $mN \geq \log H$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \deg \alpha &\leq mN \\ \text{ht } \alpha &\leq H \\ \text{size } \alpha &= \max\{\deg \alpha, \log \text{ht } \alpha\} \leq mN. \end{aligned}$$

So:

$$-(\text{size } \alpha)^\tau \geq -(mN)^\tau.$$

Moreover,

$$|\alpha| \leq \sqrt{2}H^{1-M/2}e^{cmN},$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} \log |\alpha| &\leq \log \sqrt{2} + (1 - M/2) \log H + cmN \\ &= \log \sqrt{2} + \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}(1 + N)^m\right) \log H + cmN. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we must have

$$-(mN)^\tau \ll \log \sqrt{2} + \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}(1 + N)^m\right) \log H + cmN,$$

i.e.

$$N^\tau \gg N^m \log H.$$

Taking  $N = m^{-1} \lceil \log H \rceil$  gives the result.  $\square$