

Number of solutions to $a^x + b^y = c^z$ with $\gcd(a, b) > 1$

Reese Scott
Robert Styer

Keywords: ternary purely exponential Diophantine equation, number of solutions
2020 Subject Class: 11D61

15 August 2024

Abstract

We show that there are at most two solutions in positive integers (x, y, z) to the equation $a^x + b^y = c^z$ for positive integers a, b , and c all greater than one, where at least one of a, b, c is not a power of 2, and $(\{a, b\}, c) \neq (\{3, 5\}, 2)$ (two solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) are considered the same solution if $\{a^{x_1}, b^{y_1}\} = \{a^{x_2}, b^{y_2}\}$). The case in which $\gcd(a, b) = 1$ has been handled in a series of successive results by Scott and Styer, Hu and Le, and Miyazaki and Pink, who showed that there are at most two solutions, excepting $(\{a, b\}, c) = (\{3, 5\}, 2)$, which gives three solutions. So here we treat the case $\gcd(a, b) > 1$, showing that there are at most two solutions in this case if at least one of a, b, c is not a power of 2. This generalizes work of Bennett, who proved the equivalent result (for both $\gcd(a, b) = 1$ and $\gcd(a, b) > 1$) for the case in which one of x or y is a fixed positive integer.

For both $\gcd(a, b) = 1$ and $\gcd(a, b) > 1$, there are an infinite number of cases with exactly two solutions (x, y, z) , which are described in detail in this and a cited previous paper.

In a further result, in which we no longer consider two solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) to be the same solution if $\{a^{x_1}, b^{y_1}\} = \{a^{x_2}, b^{y_2}\}$, we list all cases with more than two solutions.

MSC: 11D61

1 Introduction

For integers a, b , and c all greater than one, we consider $N(a, b, c)$, the number of solutions in positive integers (x, y, z) to the equation

$$a^x + b^y = c^z. \quad (1.1)$$

In this paper, we treat the case in which $\gcd(a, b) > 1$, but first we give a brief history of previous results for the case in which $\gcd(a, b) = 1$.

For (a, b, c) with $\gcd(a, b) = 1$, an effective upper bound for $N(a, b, c)$ was first given by A. O. Gel'fond [3] (Mahler [8] had earlier shown that the number of solutions was finite, using his p -adic analogue of the Diophantine approximation method of Thue-Siegel, but his method is ineffective). Hirata-Kohno [4] used an application of an upper bound on the number of solutions of binary S -unit equations due to F. Beukers and H. P. Schlickewei [2] to obtain $N(a, b, c) \leq 2^{36}$, later improved to $N(a, b, c) \leq 200$ (unpublished). The following more realistic upper bounds for $N(a, b, c)$ when $\gcd(a, b) = 1$ have been obtained in recent years:

- (1) (R. Scott and R. Styer [12]) If $2 \nmid c$ then $N(a, b, c) \leq 2$.
- (2) (Y. Z. Hu and M. H. Le [5]) If $\max\{a, b, c\} > 5 \cdot 10^{27}$, then $N(a, b, c) \leq 3$.
- (3) (Y. Z. Hu and M. H. Le [6]) If $2 \mid c$ and $\max\{a, b, c\} > 10^{62}$, then $N(a, b, c) \leq 2$.
- (4) (T. Miyazaki and I. Pink [10]) If $2 \mid c$ and $\max\{a, b, c\} \leq 10^{62}$, then $N(a, b, c) \leq 2$ except for $N(3, 5, 2) = N(5, 3, 2) = 3$.

Noting that (1), (3), and (4) show that (1.1) has at most two solutions (x, y, z) when $\gcd(a, b) = 1$ except for the case $(\{a, b\}, c) = (\{3, 5\}, 2)$, in what follows we will show that (1.1) has at most two solutions when $\gcd(a, b) > 1$, provided a, b , and c are not all powers of 2 (in this paper, we exclude from consideration the case in which a, b , and c are all powers of 2, noting that if $(a, b, c) = (2^u, 2^v, 2^w)$ where $\gcd(uv, w) = 1$, $\gcd(u, v) = g$, and $\text{lcm}(u, v) = L$, then, for any positive integer t such that $tL \equiv -1 \pmod{w}$, (1.1) has the solution $(x, y, z) = (\frac{tv}{g}, \frac{tu}{g}, \frac{tL+1}{w})$). In counting the number of solutions to (1.1) to determine $N(a, b, c)$ we use the following:

Criterion 1. *Two solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) are considered the same solution if $\{a^{x_1}, b^{y_1}\} = \{a^{x_2}, b^{y_2}\}$.*

When neither a nor b is a perfect power, Criterion 1 simplifies to the following:

Two solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) are considered the same solution if $a = b$ and $\{x_1, y_1\} = \{x_2, y_2\}$.

We know of no results on $N(a, b, c)$ for the case $\gcd(a, b) > 1$ for general a, b, c , except in the special case (known as the Pillai case) in which one of x or y is a fixed positive integer, in which case the proof that there are at most two solutions (y, z) (respectively, (x, z)) is extremely short and straightforward (see [1]).

Before proceeding, we discuss all known cases with $N(a, b, c) > 1$.

Considering (a, b, c) with $\gcd(a, b) = 1$ for which (1.1) has two solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) , we find one infinite family of such $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$ (given by $\{a, b\} = \{2, 2^n - 1\}$, $c = 2^n + 1$, $n > 1$) and several other such $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$, all but one of which are apparently anomalous cases not in an infinite family (the case $\{a, b\} = \{2, 7\}$ with $c = 3$ is a member of the known infinite family). Only one case ($\{a, b\} = \{3, 5\}, c = 2$) gives more than two solutions (x, y, z) . See [12] for a list of the known cases with two solutions to (1.1) when $\gcd(a, b) = 1$.

Considering (a, b, c) with $\gcd(a, b) > 1$ for which (1.1) has two solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) which are distinct under Criterion 1, we find four infinite families of such $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$ and ten anomalous such $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$ which are apparently not in an infinite family. (In counting the anomalous $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$ we assume that none of a, b , or c is a perfect power.) We will show that no (a, b, c) gives more than two solutions (x, y, z) under Criterion 1, except for $(a, b, c) = (2^u, 2^v, 2^w)$ with $\gcd(uv, w) = 1$.

The four infinite families mentioned in the previous paragraph are:

- (i). $(a, b, c) = (2, 2^u(2^{h-1} - 1), 2^u(2^{h-1} + 1))$, $(x_1, y_1, z_1) = (u + 1, 1, 1)$ and $(x_2, y_2, z_2) = (2u + h + 1, 2, 2)$.
- (ii). $(a, b, c) = (2 \cdot 3^t, 3, 3)$, $(x_1, y_1, z_1) = (1, t, t + 1)$ and $(x_2, y_2, z_2) = (3, 3t, 3t + 2)$.
- (iii). $(a, b, c) = (g^j, g^{ju}d, g^{ju}(d+1))$, $(x_1, y_1, z_1) = (u, 1, 1)$ and $(x_2, y_2, z_2) = (ku + \frac{w}{j}, k, k)$ where $2 \nmid g > 1$, $(d + 1)^k - d^k = g^w$, $w > 0$. (Clearly we expect $w = 1$ when $k > 2$, but see, for example, $a = 13$, $b = 91$, $c = 104$, $k = 3$.)
- (iv). $(a, b, c) = (2^i g^j, 2^{iu-1} g^{ju} d, 2^{iu-1} g^{ju} (d + 2))$, $(x_1, y_1, z_1) = (u, 1, 1)$ and $(x_2, y_2, z_2) = (ku + \frac{w}{j}, k, k)$, where $2 \nmid d$, $2 \nmid g > 1$, g^w is the greatest odd divisor of $(d + 2)^k - d^k$, $w > 0$, $2 \mid k$, and $k - v = h - (iw/j)$, where $2^h \parallel 2d + 2$ and $2^v \parallel k$.

Note that the infinite family (i) can be viewed as a subset of the infinite family (iv): take $g = i = j = 1$, which requires $d = 2^{h-1} - 1$ and $k = 2$, which gives $w = h - 1$ (since now w is defined without reference to g), and note that $u_{(iv)} = u_{(i)} + 1$ where $u_{(iv)} = u$ as in (iv) and $u_{(i)} = u$ as in (i). But for the purposes of Theorems 3.1, 3.4, and 4.1, it is clearer to treat (i) as a distinct family. (We take $g > 1$ in (iv) so that (i) is distinct from (iv).)

We give three definitions concerning the infinite families (i), (ii), (iii), (iv).

Definition 1: For a given infinite family, let F be the set of all $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$ such that each of $a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2$ satisfies the restrictions of the given infinite family. (Each member of F is an ordered set of nine fixed positive integers.)

Definition 2: We say that the solution (x, y, z) to (1.1) for the triple (a, b, c) corresponds to the solution (X, Y, Z) to (1.1) for the triple (A, B, C) if $\{a^x, b^y\} = \{A^X, B^Y\}$ and $c^z = C^Z$.

Comment: Note that for any F as in Definition 1, (x_1, y_1, z_1) does not correspond to (x_2, y_2, z_2) .

Definition 3: Let $A, B, C, X_1, Y_1, Z_1, X_2, Y_2, Z_2$ be positive integers such that $A^{X_1} + B^{Y_1} = C^{Z_1}$ and $A^{X_2} + B^{Y_2} = C^{Z_2}$ are distinct solutions to (1.1) for the triple (A, B, C) . We say that $(A, B, C, X_1, Y_1, Z_1, X_2, Y_2, Z_2)$ is in a given infinite family if there exists an $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2) \in F$ such that each of the solutions (X_1, Y_1, Z_1) and (X_2, Y_2, Z_2) to (1.1) for the triple (A, B, C) corresponds to one of the solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) or (x_2, y_2, z_2) to (1.1) for the triple (a, b, c) , and each of the solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) to (1.1) for the triple (a, b, c) corresponds to one of the solutions (X_1, Y_1, Z_1) or (X_2, Y_2, Z_2) to (1.1) for the triple (A, B, C) .

We give an example to show how these three definitions are used. Consider (1.1) with $a = b = 7$ and $c = 98$. We find three solutions:

$$(a, b, c) = (7, 7, 98) : (x_1, y_1, z_1) = (2, 2, 1), (x_2, y_2, z_2) = (6, 7, 3), (x_3, y_3, z_3) = (7, 6, 3). \quad (1.2)$$

Now consider (1.1) with $a = 7, b = 49$, and $c = 98$. We find two solutions:

$$(a, b, c) = (7, 49, 98) : (x_1, y_1, z_1) = (2, 1, 1), (x_2, y_2, z_2) = (7, 3, 3). \quad (1.3)$$

Note that $a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2$ in (1.3) exactly match the values given for $a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2$ in the infinite family (iii) when $g = 7, j = 1, u = 2, d = 1, k = 3$, and $w = 1$, so that $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2) = (7, 49, 98, 2, 1, 1, 7, 3, 3)$ is in F for the infinite family (iii).

On the other hand, $a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2$ as in (1.2) do not match the values given for $a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2$ in the infinite family (iii) for any choice of g, j, u, d, k, w (due both to the choice of b and the order of the (x_2, y_2)), so that $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2) = (7, 7, 98, 2, 2, 1, 6, 7, 3)$ is not in F for the infinite family (iii). However, we still say that $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2) = (7, 7, 98, 2, 2, 1, 6, 7, 3)$ is in the infinite family (iii) since the solutions $(2, 2, 1)$ and $(6, 7, 3)$ for the triple $(a, b, c) = (7, 7, 98)$ correspond respectively to the solutions $(2, 1, 1)$ and $(7, 3, 3)$ for the triple $(a, b, c) = (7, 49, 98)$. The treatment is similar when (x_2, y_2, z_2) in (1.2) is replaced by (x_3, y_3, z_3) in (1.2): $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_3, y_3, z_3) = (7, 7, 98, 2, 2, 1, 7, 6, 3)$ is in the infinite family (iii). On the other hand, using again the notation of (1.2), we see that $(a, b, c, x_2, y_2, z_2, x_3, y_3, z_3) = (7, 7, 98, 6, 7, 3, 7, 6, 3)$ is not in the infinite family (iii).

Noting that we will show $N(a, b, c) \leq 2$ when $\gcd(a, b) > 1$ (except for $(a, b, c) = (2^u, 2^v, 2^w)$), we now consider (a, b, c) with $\gcd(a, b) > 1$ and $N(a, b, c) = 2$ such that there do not exist solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) with $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$ in any of the infinite families (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv).

The ten anomalous cases with $\gcd(a, b) > 1$ mentioned above are as follows:

- $(a, b, c) = (2, 6, 38), (x, y, z) = (1, 2, 1)$ and $(5, 1, 1)$.
- $(a, b, c) = (3, 6, 15), (x, y, z) = (2, 1, 1)$ and $(2, 3, 2)$.
- $(a, b, c) = (6, 15, 231), (x, y, z) = (1, 2, 1)$ and $(3, 1, 1)$.
- $(a, b, c) = (3, 1215, 6), (x, y, z) = (4, 1, 4)$ and $(8, 1, 5)$.
- $(a, b, c) = (3, 6, 7857), (x, y, z) = (4, 5, 1)$ and $(8, 4, 1)$.
- $(a, b, c) = (5, 275, 280), (x, y, z) = (1, 1, 1)$ and $(7, 1, 2)$.
- $(a, b, c) = (5, 280, 78405), (x, y, z) = (1, 2, 1)$ and $(7, 1, 1)$.
- $(a, b, c) = (30, 70, 4930), (x, y, z) = (1, 2, 1)$ and $(5, 2, 2)$.
- $(a, b, c) = (30, 4930, 24304930), (x, y, z) = (1, 2, 1)$ and $(5, 1, 1)$.

$(a, b, c) = (2, 88, 6)$, $(x, y, z) = (7, 1, 3)$ and $(5, 2, 5)$.

Nine of these anomalous cases can be derived from the five cases with $\gcd(a, b) > 1$ listed by Bennett [1] in his list of eleven double solutions for the Pillai case. Four of these five Pillai cases generate two items on our list (since Pillai equations can be rearranged) but one of them does not since one of its two possible arrangements is a member of the infinite family (i). The tenth anomalous solution is derived not from one of the known Pillai cases with $\gcd(a, b) > 1$ but rather from the equations $1 + 2 \cdot 11^2 = 3^5$, $2^4 + 11 = 3^3$.

We have not found any further anomalous double solutions for (a, b, c) with $2 \leq \gcd(a, b) < 1050$, $a/\gcd(a, b) < 1050$, $b/\gcd(a, b) < 10^5$, $a^x < 10^{50}$, $b^y < 10^{50}$. In Section 5 we show that any further anomalous solutions must have $\text{rad}(abc) > 10^7$.

Our main result, Theorem 1.1 which follows, is an immediate consequence of Theorem 4.3 in Section 4. Theorem 4.5 gives additional information on anomalous cases. Theorem 4.7 treats (1.1) without using Criterion 1, listing all cases with more than two solutions (x, y, z) . Theorem 4.8 will give a refined version of Theorem 1.1, made possible by using results on infinite families.

Theorem 1.1. *If a, b, c are positive integers all greater than one with at least one of a, b, c not a power of 2 and with $(\{a, b\}, c) \neq (\{3, 5\}, 2)$, then $N(a, b, c) \leq 2$.*

For the case $\gcd(a, b) = 1$, this result was first stated by Miyazaki and Pink [10], who handled the case $2 \mid c$ with $\max\{a, b, c\} \leq 10^{62}$, which completed the treatment of the case $\gcd(a, b) = 1$ since the case $2 \nmid c$ and the case $\max\{a, b, c\} > 10^{62}$ with $2 \mid c$ had already been handled in [12] and [6], respectively. So to prove Theorem 1.1 it suffices to consider only the case $\gcd(a, b) > 1$. We will need several lemmas and preliminary propositions which follow.

2 Lemmas

For given integers a, b , and c all greater than one with $\gcd(a, b) > 1$, let Q be the set of all primes p such that $p \mid a$, $p \mid b$, and $p \mid c$. For every prime $p \in Q$ let $p^{\alpha_p} \parallel a$, $p^{\beta_p} \parallel b$, $p^{\gamma_p} \parallel c$. Let a_1 be the greatest divisor of a not divisible by any prime in Q , and define b_1 and c_1 similarly for b and c .

Lemma 1. *Let (x, y, z) be a solution to (1.1). Then, for $p \in Q$, two members of the triple $\{\alpha_p x, \beta_p y, \gamma_p z\}$ must be equal and these two members must be less than or equal to the third member.*

We say that a solution to (1.1) is Type A for p (where $p \in Q$) if $\alpha_p x > \beta_p y = \gamma_p z$; we say a solution to (1.1) is Type B for p if $\beta_p y > \alpha_p x = \gamma_p z$; we say a solution to (1.1) is Type C for p if $\gamma_p z > \alpha_p x = \beta_p y$; we say that a solution to (1.1) is Type O for p if $\alpha_p x = \beta_p y = \gamma_p z$.

Lemma 2. *Let p and q be two primes in the set Q such that $\frac{\alpha_p}{\beta_p} > \frac{\alpha_q}{\beta_q}$ and $\frac{\alpha_p}{\gamma_p} > \frac{\alpha_q}{\gamma_q}$. Then (1.1) can have no solutions which are Type B, C, or O for p .*

Proof. If (1.1) has a solution which is Type B, C or O for p then $\alpha_p x \leq \beta_p y$ and $\alpha_p x \leq \gamma_p z$, so that $\alpha_q x < \beta_q y$ and $\alpha_q x < \gamma_q z$, contradicting Lemma 1. \square

Corollary to Lemma 2. *If (1.1) has a solution which is Type A for some prime $p \in Q$, and if this solution is not Type A for some prime $q \in Q$, then (1.1) can have no solutions which are Type B, C, or O for p .*

Proof. If a solution (x, y, z) to (1.1) is Type A for some $p \in Q$, and is not Type A for some prime $q \in Q$, then $\alpha_p x > \beta_p y$, $\alpha_p x > \gamma_p z$, $\alpha_q x \leq \beta_q y$, and $\alpha_q x \leq \gamma_q z$. So $\frac{\alpha_p}{\beta_p} > \frac{\alpha_q}{\beta_q}$ and $\frac{\alpha_p}{\gamma_p} > \frac{\alpha_q}{\gamma_q}$, and the corollary follows from Lemma 2. \square

We will also need several general elementary results, which follow.

Lemma 3. *Let R, S, M , and t_1 be positive integers such that $R > S$, $\gcd(R, S) = 1$, and $M \mid R^{t_1} - (-1)^\epsilon S^{t_1}$ for a fixed choice of $\epsilon \in \{0, 1\}$. Let t_0 be the least positive integer such that $M \mid R^{t_0} - (-1)^\epsilon S^{t_0}$ for this choice of ϵ . Then $t_0 \mid t_1$.*

Proof. For $\epsilon = 0$ this is Lemma 3.1 of [11]. A similar method of proof handles $\epsilon = 1$: take $M > 2$ (since the lemma clearly holds for $M \leq 2$) and let t_0 and t_1 be as in the formulation of the lemma; if we assume $t_0 \nmid t_1$, we can let $t_1 = st_0 + r$ where $2 \nmid s$, $0 < r < 2t_0$, and $r \neq t_0$, so that $R^r \equiv S^r \pmod{M}$; we can let $r = t_0 \pm r_1$ where $0 < r_1 < t_0$; then $R^{r_1} \equiv -S^{r_1} \pmod{M}$, contradicting the definition of t_0 . \square

The following lemma sharpens Lemma 3.2 of [11].

For any integer $m > 1$ we define $P(m)$ to be the set of primes which divide m .

Lemma 4. *If R, S, n_1 , and n_2 are positive integers with $\gcd(R, S) = 1$, $R > S$, $n_1 < n_2$, and each prime dividing $R^{n_2} - S^{n_2}$ also divides $R^{n_1} - S^{n_1}$, then $n_1 = 1$, $n_2 = 2$ and $R + S = 2^h$ for some integer $h > 1$.*

Proof. Let n_0 be the least number such that $\text{rad}(R^{n_2} - S^{n_2}) \mid R^{n_0} - S^{n_0}$. By Lemma 3 we have $n_0 \mid n_2$, so that $R^{n_0} - S^{n_0} \mid R^{n_2} - S^{n_2}$, so that we have $P(R^{n_0} - S^{n_0}) = P(R^{n_2} - S^{n_2})$.

Assume p is an odd prime which divides n_2/n_0 . Then $R^{n_0} - S^{n_0} \mid R^{pn_0} - S^{pn_0} \mid R^{n_2} - S^{n_2}$, so that $P(R^{pn_0} - S^{pn_0}) = P(R^{n_0} - S^{n_0})$. Since $n_0 \mid n_1 < n_2$, n_0 and n_2 are distinct. Consider $R^{pn_0} - S^{pn_0} = ((R^{n_0} - S^{n_0}) + (S^{n_0}))^p - S^{pn_0}$. From the binomial expansion of $((R^{n_0} - S^{n_0}) + (S^{n_0}))^p$ we see that if $p \nmid R^{n_0} - S^{n_0}$ then $(R^{pn_0} - S^{pn_0})/(R^{n_0} - S^{n_0}) > 1$ is prime to $R^{n_0} - S^{n_0}$, and, if $p \mid R^{n_0} - S^{n_0}$ then $(R^{pn_0} - S^{pn_0})/(p(R^{n_0} - S^{n_0})) > 1$ is prime to $R^{n_0} - S^{n_0}$; in either case we have a contradiction to $P(R^{n_0} - S^{n_0}) = P(R^{pn_0} - S^{pn_0})$. So n_2/n_0 is not divisible by any odd prime.

If $4 \mid n_2/n_0$, then $R^{2n_0} + S^{2n_0} \mid R^{n_2} - S^{n_2}$, again giving a contradiction since $R^{2n_0} + S^{2n_0}$ is divisible by an odd prime which is prime to $R^{n_0} - S^{n_0}$. So we must have $n_2 = 2n_0$, so that, since $P(R^{n_0} - S^{n_0}) = P(R^{n_2} - S^{n_2})$, we have $R^{n_0} + S^{n_0} = 2^h$ for some $h > 1$, which requires $n_0 = 1$. Since $1 = n_0 \leq n_1 < n_2 = 2n_0 = 2$, we have $n_1 = n_0$, giving Lemma 4. \square

Lemma 5. *If R, S, n_1 , and n_2 are positive integers with $\gcd(R, S) = 1$, $R > S$, $n_1 < n_2$, and each prime dividing $R^{n_2} + S^{n_2}$ also divides $R^{n_1} + S^{n_1}$, then $(R, S, n_1, n_2) = (2, 1, 1, 3)$.*

Proof. The proof of Lemma 5 follows that of Lemma 4 with n_0 redefined to be the least number such that $\text{rad}(R^{n_2} + S^{n_2}) \mid R^{n_0} + S^{n_0}$: noting that $2 \nmid n_2/n_0$ and considering the binomial expansion of $((R^{n_0} + S^{n_0}) - (S^{n_0}))^p$, we see that the only possibility is $R^{n_0} = 2$, $S^{n_0} = 1$, $n_2 = 3n_0$. So $1 = n_0 \leq n_1 < n_2 = 3$, so that, since $2 \nmid (n_1/n_0)$, we have $n_1 = n_0$. \square

Lemma 6. *Let R, S, n_1 , and n_2 be positive integers with $\gcd(R, S) = 1$ and $n_1 \mid n_2$. Let p be a prime such that $p^{v_1} \parallel R^{n_1} - S^{n_1}$ where $p^{v_1} > 2$. If $p^{v_2} \parallel R^{n_2} - S^{n_2}$, then $p^{v_2 - v_1} \mid \frac{n_2}{n_1}$.*

Proof. Considering the binomial expansion of $((R^{n_1} - S^{n_1}) + S^{n_1})^k$, we see that $k = p$ is the least value of k such that $p^{v_1+1} \mid R^{n_1 k} - S^{n_1 k}$. Also $p^{v_1+1} \parallel R^{n_1 k} - S^{n_1 k}$. By Lemma 3, $p \mid m$ for any m such that $p^{v_1+1} \mid R^{n_1 m} - S^{n_1 m}$. Now consider the binomial expansion of $((R^{n_1 p} - S^{n_1 p}) + S^{n_1 p})^k$ to see that $k = p$ is the least value of k such that $p^{v_1+2} \mid R^{n_1 p k} - S^{n_1 p k}$. Also $p^{v_1+2} \parallel R^{n_1 p k} - S^{n_1 p k}$. By Lemma 3, $p^2 \mid m$ for any m such that $p^{v_1+2} \mid R^{n_1 m} - S^{n_1 m}$. Continuing in this way, we find that $p^d \mid m$ for any m such that $p^{v_1+d} \mid R^{n_1 m} - S^{n_1 m}$, giving the lemma. \square

Lemma 7. *Let n_1 and n_2 be positive integers with $n_1 \mid n_2$, and let $2^v \parallel \frac{n_2}{n_1}$. Let R and S be relatively prime odd positive integers with $R > S$, and let $2^t \parallel R^{n_1} - S^{n_1}$ and $2^u \parallel R^{n_1} + S^{n_1}$, with $h = \max(t, u)$. Then, if $\frac{n_2}{n_1}$ is odd, $2^t \parallel R^{n_2} - S^{n_2}$ and $2^u \parallel R^{n_2} + S^{n_2}$. And, if $\frac{n_2}{n_1}$ is even, $2^{h+v} \parallel R^{n_2} - S^{n_2}$ and $2 \parallel R^{n_2} + S^{n_2}$.*

Proof. If $\frac{n_2}{n_1}$ is odd, then $\frac{R^{n_2} - S^{n_2}}{R^{n_1} - S^{n_1}}$ and $\frac{R^{n_2} + S^{n_2}}{R^{n_1} + S^{n_1}}$ are both odd, so $2^t \parallel R^{n_2} - S^{n_2}$ and $2^u \parallel R^{n_2} + S^{n_2}$. So the lemma holds for $v = 0$.

Suppose $v = 1$. Then $n_2 = 2mn_1$ for some odd m . $2^{h+1} = 2^{t+u} \parallel (R^{mn_1} - S^{mn_1})(R^{mn_1} + S^{mn_1}) = R^{n_2} - S^{n_2}$ and (by consideration modulo 4) $2 \parallel R^{n_2} + S^{n_2}$. So the lemma holds for $v = 1$.

The lemma follows by induction on v . □

We will also need two lemmas concerning the infinite families (i), (ii), (iii), (iv) in the Introduction.

Lemma 8. *We cannot have $d = 1$ in (iv).*

Proof. We consider the restrictions on the variables in (iv). If $d = 1$, then $h = 2$, which requires $k - v = 1$, giving $k = 2$. But then $(d + 2)^k - d^k = 3^2 - 1 = 8$ has no odd divisor, contradicting $g > 1$ and $w > 0$. □

Lemma 9. *If, for some (a, b, c) with $\gcd(a, b) > 1$, we have $N(a, b, c) = 2$, and (1.1) has two solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) with $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$ in a given infinite family, then any solution (x, y, z) to (1.1) for this (a, b, c) must correspond to one of the two solutions given by a member of F for this infinite family.*

Proof. Notice first that in each of the infinite families (i), (ii), (iii), and (iv) the two solutions given do not correspond to one another. So, using the notation of the statement of the lemma, by Definition 3 we see that the solution (x_1, y_1, z_1) does not correspond to the solution (x_2, y_2, z_2) . Since $N(a, b, c) = 2$ we can apply Criterion 1 to see that any solution to (1.1) for this (a, b, c) must correspond to one of the solutions $(x_1, y_1, z_1), (x_2, y_2, z_2)$. By Definition 3, we obtain the lemma. □

3 Preliminary Propositions

In this section and in the following section, we treat a, b, c with $\gcd(a, b) > 1$, and define $Q, \alpha_p, \beta_p, \gamma_p, a_1, b_1, c_1$ as in the first paragraph of Section 2.

Proposition 3.1. *If, for some a, b, c , (1.1) has two solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) both of which are Type A for every prime in some subset Q_0 of Q and neither of which is Type A for any prime not in Q_0 , then $N(a, b, c) = 2$, and $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$ is in the infinite family (i) in the Introduction.*

This statement holds if we replace “Type A” by “Type B”.

Proof. By the symmetry of a and b it suffices to prove the first paragraph of the Proposition. Let $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$ and Q_0 be as in the first paragraph of the statement of the Proposition, and choose a prime $p \in Q_0$. Let

$$\frac{\beta_p}{\gamma_p} = \frac{t}{s}, \gcd(s, t) = 1. \tag{3.1}$$

Then by Lemma 1 we must have integers n_1 and n_2 , $n_1 < n_2$, such that

$$y_i = n_i s, z_i = n_i t, i \in \{1, 2\}. \tag{3.2}$$

Let B be the set of all primes $q \in Q$ such that $\frac{\beta_q}{\gamma_q} > \frac{t}{s}$. Then the solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) are Type B for every prime in B .

Let C be the set of all primes $q \in Q$ such that $\frac{\beta_q}{\gamma_q} < \frac{t}{s}$. Then the solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) are Type C for every prime in C .

Let A be the set of all primes $q \in Q$ for which $\frac{\beta_q}{\gamma_q} = \frac{t}{s}$. Then the solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) are either Type A or Type O for every prime in A .

Now we observe that any solution to (1.1) which is Type A for p can be written as follows, noting that for some n , $y = ns$ and $z = nt$ (using Lemma 1 as in (3.2)):

$$a_1^x \prod_{q \in Q} q^{\alpha_q x} + b_1^{ns} \prod_{q \in Q} q^{\beta_q ns} = c_1^{nt} \prod_{q \in Q} q^{\gamma_q nt}. \quad (3.3)$$

The greatest number dividing all terms in (3.3) is

$$D = \prod_{q \in Q} (q^{\min(s\beta_q, t\gamma_q)})^n. \quad (3.4)$$

Dividing both sides of (3.3) by D and rearranging terms, we see that any solution of Type A for p to (1.1) is equivalent to:

$$(c_1^t \prod_{q \in C} q^{\gamma_q t - \beta_q s})^n - (b_1^s \prod_{q \in B} q^{\beta_q s - \gamma_q t})^n = a_1^x \prod_{q \in A} q^{\alpha_q x - \gamma_q nt}. \quad (3.5)$$

Note that all variables in (3.5) other than n itself are completely determined by (a, b, c, p) except for x , which is determined by n . We define a function $f(n)$:

$$f(n) = (c_1^t \prod_{q \in C} q^{\gamma_q t - \beta_q s})^n - (b_1^s \prod_{q \in B} q^{\beta_q s - \gamma_q t})^n.$$

When $f(n)$ corresponds to a solution to (1.1) as in (3.5), we have

$$f(n) = a_1^x \prod_{q \in A} q^{\alpha_q x - \gamma_q nt}.$$

We consider $f(n_1)$ and $f(n_2)$: by the definition of Q_0 and the definition of Type A, we see that $\alpha_q x_1 - \gamma_q n_1 t$ and $\alpha_q x_2 - \gamma_q n_2 t$ are both positive for every prime $q \in Q_0$, and $\alpha_q x_1 - \gamma_q n_1 t$ and $\alpha_q x_2 - \gamma_q n_2 t$ are both zero for every prime q not in Q_0 , so that $P(f(n_1)) = P(f(n_2))$, where, for any integer $m > 1$, $P(m)$ is the set of primes which divide m .

Now we find that proving Proposition 3.1 is equivalent to proving the following Observation:

Observation 3.1. *If (1.1) has two solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) both of Type A for some prime $p \in Q$ with $P(f(n_1)) = P(f(n_2))$, then $N(a, b, c) = 2$, and $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$ is in the infinite family (i) in the Introduction.*

This statement holds if we replace ‘‘Type A’’ by ‘‘Type B’’.

Proof of Observation 3.1. By the symmetry of a and b it suffices to prove the first paragraph of the Observation. Assume (1.1) has two solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) both of Type A for some prime $p \in Q$ with $P(f(n_1)) = P(f(n_2))$ and write

$$R = c_1^t \prod_{q \in C} q^{\gamma_q t - \beta_q s}, S = b_1^s \prod_{q \in B} q^{\beta_q s - \gamma_q t}.$$

By (3.5), we can assume $R > S$. We have

$$R^n - S^n = f(n).$$

Now we can apply Lemma 4 to $f(n_1)$ and $f(n_2)$ to obtain

$$R + S = 2^h, h \geq 2; n_1 = 1, n_2 = 2; f(n_1) = 2j, 2 \nmid j; f(n_2) = 2^{h+1}j. \quad (3.6)$$

Combining (3.6) with the right side of (3.5), we see that a_1 can have no odd divisors ($x_1 \neq x_2$ since $n_1 \neq n_2$ and $Df(n) = c^{tn} - b^{sn} = a^x$ increases with n).

Let $T = Q \cup \{2\}$. For every $q \in T$, let $W_q = \frac{w_2}{w_1}$ where $q^{w_1} \parallel Df(n_1) = a^{x_1}$ and $q^{w_2} \parallel Df(n_2) = a^{x_2}$. We must have $W_q = \frac{x_2}{x_1}$ for every $q \in T$. For any odd $q \in A$, let $q^d \parallel j$. Then $W_q = \frac{n_2 t \gamma_q + d}{n_1 t \gamma_q + d} = \frac{2t\gamma_q + d}{t\gamma_q + d} \leq 2$. For any odd $q \in B$, $W_q = \frac{n_2 t \gamma_q}{n_1 t \gamma_q} = 2$. For any odd $q \in C$, $W_q = \frac{n_2 s \beta_q}{n_1 s \beta_q} = 2$. If $2 \in A$, then $W_2 = \frac{n_2 t \gamma_2 + h + 1}{n_1 t \gamma_2 + 1} > 2$. If $2 \mid a_1$, then $W_2 = h + 1 > 2$. Since we must have either $2 \in A$ or $2 \mid a_1$, we see, from the results on W_q , that B and C are empty and $A = \{2\}$ since, by hypothesis, A is not empty.

So we must have $p = 2$, $a_1 = 1$, $R = c_1^t$, and $S = b_1^s$. Since $n_1 = j = 1$, from (3.6) we obtain $c_1^t - b_1^s = 2$ and $c_1^t + b_1^s = 2^h$, so that $b_1^s = 2^{h-1} - 1$ and $c_1^t = 2^{h-1} + 1$. If $h > 2$, it is a familiar elementary result that we must have $t = s = 1$ except when $h = 4$, $c_1 = 3$, $t = 2$. If $h = 2$ then $b_1 = 1$ and we have the special case $(a_1, b_1, c_1) = (1, 1, 3)$, $Q = \{2\}$.

So we must have one of the following:

$$(a_1, b_1, c_1) = (1, 2^{h-1} - 1, 2^{h-1} + 1), Q = \{2\}, h > 2, \quad (3.7)$$

$$(a_1, b_1, c_1) = (1, 7, 3), Q = \{2\}, \quad (3.8)$$

$$(a_1, b_1, c_1) = (1, 1, 3), Q = \{2\}. \quad (3.9)$$

These three cases are the only possibilities when (1.1) has two solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) both of Type A for some prime in Q with $P(f(n_1)) = P(f(n_2))$. We first show that for each of these three cases there is no third solution to (1.1).

We first treat (3.7). Writing β for β_2 and γ for γ_2 , we have $\beta = \gamma$ since $s = t = 1$. For this case, (1.1) has two solutions (x, y, z) for (a, b, c) as follows:

$$(a, b, c) = (2, 2^\beta(2^{h-1} - 1), 2^\beta(2^{h-1} + 1)), (x_1, y_1, z_1) = (\beta + 1, 1, 1), (x_2, y_2, z_2) = (2\beta + h + 1, 2, 2). \quad (3.10)$$

The two solutions given in (3.10) are the solutions with $n_1 = 1$ and $n_2 = 2$ as in (3.6), and we can apply Lemma 4 to see that they must be the only solutions which are Type A for 2, since, if there exists a third such solution for some n_3 , then $P(R^{n_3} - S^{n_3}) = P(R^{n_2} - S^{n_2}) = P(R^{n_1} - S^{n_1})$. We need to show that the two solutions in (3.10) are also the only two solutions to (1.1) even if we consider Types B, C, and O. (Note that if $\beta + 1$ and $2\beta + h + 1$ have a common factor k , we can replace $a = 2$ by $a = 2^k$, but any solution to (1.1) with $a = 2^k$ will also occur as a solution for $a = 2$ as in (3.10), so it suffices to consider (a, b, c) as in (3.10).)

Since a_1, b_1, c_1 are all odd, there can be no solutions of Type O for 2. We need to show there are no solutions of Type B or C for 2.

For a solution of Type B for 2 we must have

$$2^{z\beta} + 2^{y\beta} b_1^y = 2^{z\beta} (b_1 + 2)^z$$

so that

$$2^{(y-z)\beta} b_1^y = (b_1 + 2)^z - 1, y > z, (y - z)\beta \geq h - 1. \quad (3.11)$$

From (3.11) we have

$$(h - 1) \log(2) + z \log(b_1) < z \log(b_1 + 2) = z \log(b_1(1 + \frac{2}{b_1})) < z \log(b_1) + \frac{2z}{b_1}. \quad (3.12)$$

By Lemma 4, z is the only value of u such that $\text{rad}((b_1 + 2)^u - 1) = \text{rad}(2b_1)$, so that z must be the least value of u such that $b_1 \mid (b_1 + 2)^u - 1$, so that $z \leq \phi(b_1) \leq b_1 - 1$. So now (3.12) gives

$$(h - 1) \log(2) < \frac{2(b_1 - 1)}{b_1} < 2$$

which requires $h = 3$ (since we have excluded $h = 2$ from consideration in (3.7)).

For the case $h = 3$, (3.11) becomes

$$2^{(y-z)\beta} 3^y = 5^z - 1$$

which, by Lemma 4, has as its only solution $z = 2$, giving $y = 1$, contradicting $y > z$. So (3.7) does not allow a solution of Type B for 2.

And a solution of Type C for 2 requires

$$2^{y\beta} + 2^{y\beta} b_1^y = 2^{z\beta} (b_1 + 2)^z$$

so that

$$1 + b_1^y = 2^{(z-y)\beta} (b_1 + 2)^z$$

which is impossible since $z > y$.

Thus there is no third solution to (1.1) for the case (3.7).

Now we treat (3.8) for which a solution which is Type A for 2 requires, for some $v \in \mathbb{Z}^+$,

$$2^v + 7^y = 3^z. \quad (3.13)$$

Consideration modulo 7 requires $2 \mid z$ in (3.13), so, if we assume there are no solutions of Type B, Type C, or Type O for 2, we can take $(a_1, b_1, c_1) = (1, 7, 9)$ and use (3.7) and (3.10) to obtain the two solutions with $n_1 = 1$ and $n_2 = 2$ respectively, which we have shown are the only solutions which are Type A for 2.

We need to show there are not solutions of Type B, Type C, or Type O for 2.

A solution of Type O for 2 for the case (3.8) is impossible since $a_1 = 1$, $b_1 = 7$, and $c_1 = 3$ are all odd.

A solution which is Type B for 2 for the case (3.8) requires, for some $v \in \mathbb{Z}^+$,

$$1 + 2^v 7^y = 3^z \quad (3.14)$$

which requires $\text{rad}(3^z - 1) = 14$. But $7 \mid 3^z - 1$ requires $13 \mid 3^z - 1$, a contradiction which shows that there can be no solution of Type B for 2.

A solution of Type C for 2 for the case (3.8) requires, for some $v \in \mathbb{Z}^+$,

$$1 + 7^y = 2^v 3^z \quad (3.15)$$

which is impossible modulo 3.

So there is no third solution to (1.1) for the case (3.8).

Now we treat the case (3.9), letting $\alpha = \alpha_2$, $\beta = \beta_2$, and $\gamma = \gamma_2$. In this case we have, for any solution (x, y, z) ,

$$2^{\alpha x} + 2^{\beta y} = 2^{\gamma z} 3^z. \quad (3.16)$$

Solutions of Type C for 2 and Type O for 2 are clearly impossible in (3.16).

For a solution which is Type A for 2, (3.16) becomes

$$2^{\alpha x} + 2^{\gamma z} = 2^{\gamma z} 3^z \quad (3.17)$$

so that for a given value of z there is at most one solution of Type A for 2.

Similarly, a solution of Type B for 2 requires

$$2^{\gamma z} + 2^{\beta y} = 2^{\gamma z} 3^z, \quad (3.18)$$

so that for a given value of z there is at most one solution of Type B for 2.

Suppose that for a given choice of z we have both a solution which is Type A for 2 and a solution which is Type B for 2: letting (x_a, y_a, z_a) be the solution which is Type A for 2 in (3.17) and letting (x_b, y_b, z_b) be the solution which is Type B for 2 in (3.18), we have $\alpha x_a = \beta y_b$, and we see that $a^{x_a} = b^{y_b}$ and $a^{x_b} = b^{y_a}$. Using Criterion 1 we see that (x_a, y_a, z_a) and (x_b, y_b, z_b) are to be considered the same solution. So it suffices to show that there are only two values of z which are possible in solutions to (1.1) which are Type A for 2.

From (3.17) we see that any solution which is Type A for 2 must give

$$3^z - 1 = 2^{\alpha x - \gamma z},$$

which requires either $z = 1$ or $z = 2$ by Lemma 4. Thus (under Criterion 1) we see that (3.9) has no third solution.

It remains to show that $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$ is in the infinite family (i) in the Introduction. We have shown that if (1.1) has two solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) both of Type A for some prime in Q with $P(f(n_1)) = P(f(n_2))$, then one of (3.7), (3.8), or (3.9) must hold. And we have shown that when (3.7) holds we have (3.10) which is the infinite family (i) in the Introduction. Also we have shown that, when (3.8) holds, (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) must correspond to solutions in which $(1, 7, 3)$ is replaced by $(1, 7, 9)$, so again we have (3.7) giving (3.10) which is the infinite family (i). Finally, if (3.9) holds, we have shown that we have two solutions $(x_1, y_1, 1)$ and $(x_2, y_2, 2)$ both of which are Type A for 2, so that $\beta_2 y_1 = \gamma_2$ and $\beta_2 y_2 = 2\gamma_2$. Letting $u = \beta_2 y_1$, we see that (3.9) gives (i) with $h = 2$. This completes the proof of Observation 3.1. \square

This completes the proof of Proposition 3.1 (by the symmetry of a and b). \square

Corollary to Proposition 3.1. *If (1.1) has two solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) both of which are Type A for some prime in Q and if further (1.1) has no solutions of Type O for any prime in Q , then $N(a, b, c) = 2$, and $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$ is in the infinite family (i) in the Introduction.*

This statement holds if we replace "Type A" by "Type B".

Proof. By the symmetry of a and b it suffices to prove the first paragraph of the Corollary. Choose a prime $p \in Q$ such that (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) are both Type A for p , and let s and t be as in (3.1) and (3.2). We have (3.5) with the sets A , B , and C derived from (3.1) and (3.2). Since for the case under consideration no solutions of Type O are possible for any prime in Q , we see that (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) are both Type A for every prime in A , so, for every prime $q \in A$, we have

$$\alpha_q x_1 - \gamma_q n_1 t > 0, \alpha_q x_2 - \gamma_q n_2 t > 0$$

so that, using (3.5) and recalling the definition of $f(n)$, we have $P(f(n_1)) = P(f(n_2))$, so we can apply Observation 3.1 to obtain the corollary. \square

Proposition 3.2. *Assume (1.1) has a solution which is Type C for some prime $p \in Q$. Then (1.1) can have no solution which is Type A, B, or O for p .*

Proof. Let p be any prime in Q . For brevity, write α for α_p , β for β_p , γ for γ_p . Let (x_c, y_c, z_c) be a solution to (1.1) which is Type C for p and let (x_d, y_d, z_d) be a solution to (1.1) which is Type A, B, or O for p . By Lemma 1 $\alpha x_d \geq \gamma z_d$ and $\alpha x_c < \gamma z_c$ so that

$$\frac{x_c}{z_c} < \frac{x_d}{z_d}. \quad (3.19)$$

Similarly

$$\frac{y_c}{z_c} < \frac{y_d}{z_d}. \quad (3.20)$$

Now let $a_p = a/p^\alpha$, $b_p = b/p^\beta$ and let $c_p = c/p^\gamma$. $a^{x_d} < c^{z_d}$ so $p^{\alpha x_d} a_p^{x_d} < p^{\gamma z_d} c_p^{z_d}$, so that $p^{\alpha x_d - \gamma z_d} a_p^{x_d} < c_p^{z_d}$, so that

$$x_d \log(a_p) < z_d \log(c_p). \quad (3.21)$$

Similarly,

$$y_d \log(b_p) < z_d \log(c_p). \quad (3.22)$$

Now suppose $a^{x_c} \geq b^{y_c}$. Then $2a^{x_c} \geq c^{z_c}$, so that $2a_p^{x_c} \geq p^{\gamma z_c - \alpha x_c} c_p^{z_c} \geq 2c_p^{z_c}$, so that

$$x_c \log(a_p) \geq z_c \log(c_p). \quad (3.23)$$

Since (3.21) requires $c_p > 1$, (3.23) gives $a_p > 1$. So (3.23) in combination with (3.21) gives

$$\frac{x_c}{z_c} > \frac{x_d}{z_d}, \quad (3.24)$$

contradicting (3.19). So we must have $b^{y_c} > a^{x_c}$, so that $2b^{y_c} > c^{z_c}$, and, recalling (3.22), the same argument which handles the case $a^{x_c} > b^{y_c}$ yields

$$\frac{y_c}{z_c} > \frac{y_d}{z_d}, \quad (3.25)$$

contradicting (3.20). So the existence of a solution of Type C for p makes solutions of Type A, B, or O for p impossible. \square

Proposition 3.3. *For a given $p \in Q$, there is at most one solution of Type O for p .*

Proof. Let r , s , and t be positive integers with $\gcd(r, s, t) = 1$ such that

$$r\alpha_p = s\beta_p = t\gamma_p, p \in Q.$$

By Lemma 1 any solution (x, y, z) which is Type O for p must have

$$x = nr, y = ns, z = nt.$$

By Fermat's Last Theorem [13], $n \leq 2$. So if there are two solutions which are Type O for p , then $a^r + b^s = c^t$ and $a^{2r} + b^{2s} = c^{2t}$, which is impossible since $c^{2t} = (a^r + b^s)^2 > a^{2r} + b^{2s} = c^{2t}$ \square

Let S_c be the set of all triples (a, b, c) such that $\gcd(a, b) > 1$, $N(a, b, c) > 1$, a, b , and c are not all powers of 2, and there exists a solution to (1.1) which is Type C for some prime in Q .

Proposition 3.4. *For $(a, b, c) \in S_c$, (1.1) has exactly two solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) , and $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$ is in the infinite family (ii).*

Proof. After Proposition 3.2, it suffices to show that if (1.1) has two solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) both of which are Type C for some prime in Q , then these two solutions are the only solutions to (1.1), and $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$ is in the infinite family (ii).

Assume (1.1) has two solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) both of which are Type C for a given $p \in Q$. Let

$$\frac{\alpha_p}{\beta_p} = \frac{s}{r}, \gcd(r, s) = 1. \quad (3.26)$$

Then by Lemma 1 we must have integers n_1 and n_2 , $n_1 < n_2$, such that

$$x_i = n_i r, y_i = n_i s, i \in \{1, 2\}. \quad (3.27)$$

Let A be the set of all primes $q \in Q$ such that $\frac{\alpha_q}{\beta_q} > \frac{s}{r}$. Then the solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) are Type A for every prime in A .

Let B be the set of all primes $q \in Q$ such that $\frac{\alpha_q}{\beta_q} < \frac{s}{r}$. Then the solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) are Type B for every prime in B .

Now consider $q \in Q$ for which $\frac{\alpha_q}{\beta_q} = \frac{s}{r}$. Then, by Propositions 3.2 and 3.3, the solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) are both Type C for q . Let C be the set of all primes $q \in Q$ for which $\frac{\alpha_q}{\beta_q} = \frac{s}{r}$.

Now we observe that any solution to (1.1) which is Type C for p can be written as follows, noting that for some n , $x = nr$ and $y = ns$:

$$a_1^{nr} \prod_{q \in Q} q^{\alpha_q nr} + b_1^{ns} \prod_{q \in Q} q^{\beta_q ns} = c_1^z \prod_{q \in Q} q^{\gamma_q z}. \quad (3.28)$$

The greatest number dividing all terms in (3.28) is

$$D = \prod_{q \in Q} (q^{\min(r\alpha_q, s\beta_q)})^n. \quad (3.29)$$

Dividing both sides of (3.28) by D , we see that any solution of Type C for p to (1.1) is equivalent to:

$$(a_1^r \prod_{q \in A} q^{\alpha_q r - \beta_q s})^n + (b_1^s \prod_{q \in B} q^{\beta_q s - \alpha_q r})^n = c_1^z \prod_{q \in C} q^{\gamma_q z - \alpha_q nr}. \quad (3.30)$$

Note that all variables in (3.30) other than n itself are completely determined by (a, b, c, p) except for z , which is determined by n . We define a function $f(n)$:

$$f(n) = (a_1^r \prod_{q \in A} q^{\alpha_q r - \beta_q s})^n + (b_1^s \prod_{q \in B} q^{\beta_q s - \alpha_q r})^n.$$

When $f(n)$ corresponds to a solution to (1.1),

$$f(n) = c_1^z \prod_{q \in C} q^{\gamma_q z - \alpha_q nr}.$$

Let

$$R = a_1^r \prod_{q \in A} q^{\alpha_q r - \beta_q s}, S = b_1^s \prod_{q \in B} q^{\beta_q s - \alpha_q r} \quad (3.31)$$

and assume first we do not have the special case $R = S$. Since $\gcd(R, S) = 1$, by the symmetry of a and b we can take $R > S$. We have

$$f(n) = R^n + S^n.$$

Letting n_1 and n_2 be as in (3.27), we have $P(f(n_1)) = P(f(n_2))$ where, for any integer $m > 1$, $P(m)$ is the set of primes which divide m . Now we can apply Lemma 5 to $f(n_1)$ and $f(n_2)$ to obtain

$$R = 2, S = 1, n_1 = 1, n_2 = 3; f(n_1) = 3, f(n_2) = 9. \quad (3.32)$$

Recall that by Proposition 3.2 we need only consider solutions of Type C for p , so that using (3.30), (3.31), and (3.32), we see that we can apply Lemma 5 to show that (1.1) has exactly two solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) when $R > S$. It remains to show that $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$ is in the infinite family (ii).

Letting g_1 be the greatest common divisor of a^{x_1} , b^{y_1} , and c^{z_1} and letting g_2 be the greatest common divisor of a^{x_2} , b^{y_2} , and c^{z_2} , we have from (3.30), (3.31), and (3.32)

$$\frac{a^{x_1}}{g_1} + \frac{b^{y_1}}{g_1} = R + S = 2 + 1 = 3 = \frac{c^{z_1}}{g_1}, \frac{a^{x_2}}{g_2} + \frac{b^{y_2}}{g_2} = R^3 + S^3 = 2^3 + 1 = 3^2 = \frac{c^{z_2}}{g_2}. \quad (3.33)$$

Since we are assuming there is at least one prime $p \in Q$ for which the solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) are Type C for p , from (3.32) we see that $C = \{3\}$ and $c_1 = 1$. Also from (3.32) we have $b_1 = 1$ with B empty.

Assume $A = \{2\}$. Then $a_1 = b_1 = c_1 = 1$, $Q = \{2, 3\}$, and, by (3.33), both solutions are Type A for 2 and neither solution is Type O for either prime in Q . By the Corollary to Proposition 3.1, we must have $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$ in the infinite family (i) in the Introduction. But then $Q = \{2\}$, contradicting $Q = \{2, 3\}$. (Note that $Q = \{2\}$ would require C empty and $c_1 = 3$, giving (3.9)). So $A \neq \{2\}$.

So, by (3.31) and (3.32), we must have $a_1^r = 2$ with A empty and $Q = \{3\}$. Thus we have $a_1 = 2$, $b_1 = 1$, $c_1 = 1$. So we have

$$a = 2 \cdot 3^{\alpha_3}, b = 3^{\beta_3}, c = 3^{\gamma_3}.$$

If $\beta_3 \gamma_3 > 1$, then each of the two solutions to (1.1) must correspond to one of two solutions for the case $\beta_3 \gamma_3 = 1$, so by Definitions 2 and 3 we can take

$$a = 2 \cdot 3^{\alpha_3}, b = 3, c = 3.$$

We see that, since $a_1^r = 2$, we must have $r = n_1 = x_1 = 1$ and $x_2 = 3$, so that, since (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) are both Type C for 3, we must have (using the notation of (3.33)) $g_1 = 3^{\alpha_3}$ and $g_2 = 3^{3\alpha_3}$, so that $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$ is in the infinite family (ii) with $t = \alpha_3$. Recall also we have shown there is no third solution. This proves Proposition 3.4 for the case $R > S$.

If $R = S$, then, since $\gcd(R, S) = 1$, we have $R = S = 1$, so that $a_1 = b_1 = 1$ and A and B are empty, so that $f(n) = 2$ for every n . Since we are assuming C has at least one element, we have $c_1 = 1$ and $C = \{2\}$. So in this case all of a , b , and c must be powers of 2, which has been excluded. This completes the proof of Proposition 3.4. \square

Proposition 3.5. *Suppose for some (a, b, c) we have a subset Q_1 of Q such that, for any primes q_1 and q_2 in Q_1 ,*

$$\frac{\alpha_{q_1}}{\alpha_{q_2}} = \frac{\beta_{q_1}}{\beta_{q_2}} = \frac{\gamma_{q_1}}{\gamma_{q_2}}. \quad (3.34)$$

Let Q_2 be the set of all primes in Q which are not in Q_1 . Then we can take

$$a = a_1 g^{\alpha_g} \prod_{q \in Q_2} q^{\alpha_q}, b = b_1 g^{\beta_g} \prod_{q \in Q_2} q^{\beta_q}, c = c_1 g^{\gamma_g} \prod_{q \in Q_2} q^{\gamma_q} \quad (3.35)$$

where α_g, β_g , and γ_g are positive integers and g is a positive integer divisible by every prime in Q_1 and by no other prime.

Proof. We use the notation indicating proportions in which (3.34) would be written as follows:

$$\alpha_{q_1} : \alpha_{q_2} = \beta_{q_1} : \beta_{q_2} = \gamma_{q_1} : \gamma_{q_2}.$$

Assume Q_1 contains n primes. Then we can find a set of n positive integers t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n with no common divisor such that

$$\alpha_{q_1} : \alpha_{q_2} : \dots : \alpha_{q_n} = \beta_{q_1} : \beta_{q_2} : \dots : \beta_{q_n} = \gamma_{q_1} : \gamma_{q_2} : \dots : \gamma_{q_n} = t_1 : t_2 : \dots : t_n$$

and let

$$\alpha_{q_i} = ht_i, \beta_{q_i} = jt_i, \gamma_{q_i} = mt_i, 1 \leq i \leq n, \quad (3.36)$$

for some positive integers h, j , and m .

So we can take $g = q_1^{t_1} q_2^{t_2} \dots q_n^{t_n}$, $\alpha_g = h$, $\beta_g = j$, and $\gamma_g = m$. \square

Since any solution to (1.1) of a given Type for some $q_1 \in Q_1$ is of the same Type for any $q_2 \in Q_1$, Proposition 3.5 allows us to refer to solutions of Type A for g , Type B for g , etc., even when g is composite. We say that a solution is of a given Type for g when this solution is of that same Type for every prime dividing g , where the set of n primes dividing g satisfies (3.36).

4 Proof of Theorem 1.1

Let S_o be the set of all triples (a, b, c) such that $\gcd(a, b) > 1$, $N(a, b, c) > 1$, and there exists a solution to (1.1) which is Type O for some prime in Q .

Proposition 4.1. *For $(a, b, c) \in S_o$ we have $N(a, b, c) = 2$, and (1.1) has two solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) with $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$ in one of the infinite families (iii) or (iv).*

Proof. Choose $(a, b, c) \in S_o$ and let (x_1, y_1, z_1) be a solution which is Type O for p where $p \in Q$. Let (x_2, y_2, z_2) be a second solution to (1.1). By Propositions 3.2 and 3.3 (x_2, y_2, z_2) must be either Type A or Type B for p . By the symmetry of a and b we can assume (x_2, y_2, z_2) is Type A for p . By the Corollary to Lemma 2, (x_2, y_2, z_2) must be Type A for every prime in Q .

Let

$$\frac{\beta_p}{\gamma_p} = \frac{t}{s}, \gcd(s, t) = 1.$$

We can take

$$y_1 = n_1 s, z_1 = n_1 t, y_2 = n_2 s, z_2 = n_2 t, n_1 > 0, n_2 > 0.$$

Since, for every prime $q \in Q$, $y_2 \beta_q = z_2 \gamma_q$, we see that $\frac{\beta_q}{\gamma_q} = \frac{t}{s}$, and thus (x_1, y_1, z_1) must be either Type O or Type A for every prime in Q .

Let G be the set of all primes in Q for which (x_1, y_1, z_1) is Type O and let H be the set of all primes in Q for which (x_1, y_1, z_1) is Type A. For every prime $q \in G$, $\alpha_q x_1 = \beta_q y_1 = \gamma_q z_1$, so that for any two primes q_1 and q_2 in G we have

$$\frac{\alpha_{q_1}}{\alpha_{q_2}} = \frac{\beta_{q_1}}{\beta_{q_2}} = \frac{\gamma_{q_1}}{\gamma_{q_2}}$$

so that we can apply Proposition 3.5 to see that we can write

$$a = a_1 g^{\alpha_g} \prod_{q \in H} q^{\alpha_q}, b = b_1 g^{\beta_g} \prod_{q \in H} q^{\beta_q}, c = c_1 g^{\gamma_g} \prod_{q \in H} q^{\gamma_q} \quad (4.1)$$

for some positive integers $g, \alpha_g, \beta_g, \gamma_g$.

From the solution (x_1, y_1, z_1) we derive

$$c_1^{n_1 t} - b_1^{n_1 s} = a_1^{x_1} \prod_{q \in H} q^{\alpha_q x_1 - n_1 t \gamma_q}, x_1 = \frac{n_1 t \gamma_g}{\alpha_g} \quad (4.2)$$

From the solution (x_2, y_2, z_2) we derive

$$c_1^{n_2 t} - b_1^{n_2 s} = a_1^{x_2} g^{\alpha_g x_2 - n_2 t \gamma_g} \prod_{q \in H} q^{\alpha_q x_2 - n_2 t \gamma_q}, x_2 > \frac{n_2 t \gamma_g}{\alpha_g}. \quad (4.3)$$

From the expressions for x_1 and x_2 in (4.2) and (4.3) we derive

$$\frac{x_2}{x_1} > \frac{n_2}{n_1}. \quad (4.4)$$

Let $R = c_1^t, S = b_1^s$, so that $R > S$. Let

$$f(n) = c_1^{tn} - b_1^{sn} = R^n - S^n.$$

Let U be the product of all primes in H , let r be any prime dividing $a_1 U$ (if such r exists), and let $r^{v_1} \parallel f(n_1)$ and $r^{v_2} \parallel f(n_2)$. Recalling (4.2) and (4.3) we see that, if $r \mid a_1$, then $\frac{v_2}{v_1} = \frac{x_2}{x_1} > \frac{n_2}{n_1}$ by (4.4). If $r \in H$ then by (4.2), (4.3), and (4.4)

$$\frac{v_2}{v_1} = \frac{\alpha_r x_2 - n_2 t \gamma_r}{\alpha_r x_1 - n_1 t \gamma_r} = \frac{\alpha_r \frac{x_2}{x_1} x_1 - \frac{n_2}{n_1} n_1 t \gamma_r}{\alpha_r x_1 - n_1 t \gamma_r} > \frac{n_2}{n_1}.$$

So in either case, we have

$$\frac{v_2}{v_1} > \frac{n_2}{n_1}. \quad (4.5)$$

Let n_0 be the least value of n such that $\text{rad}(a_1 U) \mid f(n)$. By Lemma 3

$$n_0 \mid n_1, n_0 \mid n_2 \quad (4.6)$$

so that $f(n_0) \mid f(n_1)$, so that $f(n_0)$ can be divisible by no primes which do not divide $a_1 U$, so that

$$P(f(n_0)) = P(f(n_1)) = P(a_1 U)$$

where, for any integer $m > 1$, $P(m)$ is the set of primes dividing m . Assume there do not exist distinct positive integers m_1 and m_2 such that $P(f(m_1)) = P(f(m_2))$. Then n_1 must be the only value of n such that $P(f(n)) = P(a_1U)$, so that $n_0 = n_1$, and, by (4.6), $n_1 \mid n_2$.

Now assume we have m_1 and m_2 such that $P(R^{m_1} - S^{m_1}) = P(R^{m_2} - S^{m_2})$. Let h be an integer such that $2^h \parallel R + S$. By Lemma 4, $\{m_1, m_2\} = \{1, 2\}$, $R - S \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$, and $R + S = 2^h$ with $h \geq 2$. If $n_1 \notin \{1, 2\}$, then the above argument still applies to show $n_1 \mid n_2$. If $n_1 = 1$, then again we have $n_1 \mid n_2$.

So we consider $n_1 = 2$ with $P(f(1)) = P(f(2))$: Let $2^{v_1} \parallel f(n_1) = f(2) = (R - S)(R + S)$ so that by Lemma 4, $v_1 = h + 1$. By (4.2), $\gcd(f(n_1), g) = 1$, so, since $P(f(1)) = P(f(2))$ and $g \mid f(n_2)$, we must have $n_2 > n_1$, so that, letting $2^{v_2} \parallel f(n_2)$, by (4.5) we have $v_2 > v_1 = h + 1 > 2$. Since $n_1 = 2$ is the least value of n such that $2^2 \mid f(n)$, by Lemma 3 we have $n_1 \mid n_2$.

So we can assume

$$n_1 \mid n_2. \quad (4.7)$$

Now we can apply Lemma 6: letting r be any prime dividing a_1U , and letting $r^{v_1} \parallel f(n_1)$ and $r^{v_2} \parallel f(n_2)$, we see that, if $r^{v_1} > 2$,

$$r^{v_2 - v_1} \mid \frac{n_2}{n_1}$$

so that

$$\frac{n_2}{n_1} \geq r^{v_2 - v_1} \geq r^{\frac{v_2}{v_1} - 1} > r^{\frac{n_2}{n_1} - 1} \quad (4.8)$$

which is impossible. So we must have $r^{v_1} \leq 2$. Since r can be any prime dividing a_1U we see that H contains no odd primes and $a_1 \leq 2$, giving only three possible cases:

Case 1: $a_1 = 1$, $H = \{2\}$, $f(n_1) = 2$.

Case 2: $a_1 = 2$, H is empty, $f(n_1) = 2$.

Case 3: $a_1 = 1$, H is empty, $f(n_1) = 1$.

For all three cases, $n_1 = 1$.

For Case 1, we have

$$a = 2^{\alpha_2} g^{\alpha_g}, b = 2^{\beta_2} g^{\beta_g} b_1, c = 2^{\gamma_2} g^{\gamma_g} c_1. \quad (4.9)$$

Let

$$d = b_1^{y_1}, b_0 = b^{y_1}, c_0 = c^{z_1}.$$

Since $c_1^{z_1} - b_1^{y_1} = c_1^{n_1 t} - b_1^{n_1 s} = c_1^t - b_1^s = f(n_1) = 2$ we have

$$c_1^{z_1} = d + 2. \quad (4.10)$$

So we have

$$b_0 = 2^{\beta_2 y_1} g^{\beta_g y_1} d, c_0 = 2^{\gamma_2 z_1} g^{\gamma_g z_1} (d + 2). \quad (4.11)$$

Since the solution (x_1, y_1, z_1) is Type O for g , we have $\beta_g y_1 = \gamma_g z_1 = \alpha_g x_1$; also since (x_1, y_1, z_1) is Type A for 2 and $f(n_1) = 2$, we have $\beta_2 y_1 = \gamma_2 z_1 = \alpha_2 x_1 - 1$ by (4.2). So from (4.11) we have

$$b_0 = 2^{\alpha_2 x_1 - 1} g^{\alpha_g x_1} d, c_0 = 2^{\alpha_2 x_1 - 1} g^{\alpha_g x_1} (d + 2). \quad (4.12)$$

Let $k = n_2$, and note that, since $n_1 = 1$,

$$k = \frac{n_2 s}{s} = \frac{y_2}{y_1}, k = \frac{n_2 t}{t} = \frac{z_2}{z_1}.$$

The solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) for the triple (a, b, c) as in (4.9) correspond to the solutions $(x_1, 1, 1)$ and (x_2, k, k) for the triple (a, b_0, c_0) .

Since $g^{\alpha_g x_2} \parallel a^{x_2} = c_0^k - b_0^k$, from (4.12) we find that $\alpha_g x_2 = k\alpha_g x_1 + w_g$ where $g^{w_g} \parallel (d+2)^k - d^k$ (such $w_g > 0$ must exist since (x_2, y_2, z_2) is Type A for g ; note that g^{w_g} is the greatest odd divisor of $(d+2)^k - d^k$ and α_g must divide w_g). So

$$x_2 = kx_1 + \frac{w_g}{\alpha_g}. \quad (4.13)$$

Since $2^{\alpha_2 x_2} \parallel a^{x_2} = c_0^k - b_0^k$, from (4.12) we find that $\alpha_2 x_2 = k\alpha_2 x_1 - k + w_2$ where $2^{w_2} \parallel (d+2)^k - d^k$. But also by (4.13) $\alpha_2 x_2 = k\alpha_2 x_1 + \frac{\alpha_2 w_g}{\alpha_g}$, so that $w_2 = k + \frac{\alpha_2 w_g}{\alpha_g} > 1$, so that Lemma 7 gives

$$2 \mid k.$$

So now we can use Lemma 7 to see that we must have $k + \frac{\alpha_2 w_g}{\alpha_g} = w_2 = h + v$ where $2^v \parallel k$ and $2^h \parallel 2d + 2$. So we have

$$k - v = h - \frac{\alpha_2 w_g}{\alpha_g}.$$

Now from (4.12) and (4.13) we see that $(a, b_0, c_0, x_1, 1, 1, kx_1 + (w_g/\alpha_g), k, k)$ (and therefore also $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$) is in the infinite family (iv) in the Introduction when $i = \alpha_2$, $j = \alpha_g$, $u = x_1$, $w = w_g$, and $iu > 1$.

Note that $d = b_1^{y_1}$ in the member of the infinite family (iv) derived from the solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) . By Lemma 8, $b_1 \neq 1$.

Now suppose there is a third solution other than (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) for the triple (a, b, c) . By Propositions 3.2 and 3.3 this third solution (x_3, y_3, z_3) must be either Type A for g or Type B for g . If this third solution is Type A for g , then, since $\frac{\beta_g}{\gamma_g} = \frac{t}{s}$, we have $y_3 = n_3 s$ and $z_3 = n_3 t$ for some integer n_3 , and we see that we must have $P(f(n_3)) = P(f(n_2))$, so that we can apply Observation 3.1 to see that $(a, b, c, x_2, y_2, z_2, x_3, y_3, z_3)$ is in the infinite family (i), so that a is a power of 2, contradicting $2 \nmid g > 1$.

So (x_3, y_3, z_3) must be Type B for g . In the part of this proof preceding (4.9) we showed that when (x_2, y_2, z_2) is Type A for g we must have Case 1, Case 2, or Case 3; using the same argument under the assumption that (x_3, y_3, z_3) is Type B for g , we can show that, noting that now we can assume $2 \nmid b_1$, we must have $b_1 = 1$. But we have shown that $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$ is in the infinite family (iv) with $d = b_1^{y_1} \neq 1$ by Lemma 8, giving a contradiction.

Thus we see that if we have Case 1, then there are exactly two solutions (x, y, z) and these two solutions are given by the infinite family (iv) with $iu > 1$.

For Case 2, we have

$$a = 2g^{\alpha_g}, b = g^{\beta_g} b_1, c = g^{\gamma_g} c_1. \quad (4.14)$$

Again letting $d = b_1^{y_1}$, $b_0 = b^{y_1}$, $c_0 = c^{z_1}$, we have (4.10).

$$b_0 = g^{\beta_g y_1} d, c_0 = g^{\gamma_g z_1} (d + 2). \quad (4.15)$$

Note that Case 2 requires $x_1 = 1$ (by (4.2) and the definition of Case 2). Since the solution (x_1, y_1, z_1) is Type O for g , we have $\beta_g y_1 = \gamma_g z_1 = \alpha_g$. So we have

$$b_0 = g^{\alpha_g} d, c_0 = g^{\alpha_g} (d + 2). \quad (4.16)$$

Letting $k = n_2 = \frac{n_2}{n_1} = \frac{y_2}{y_1} = \frac{z_2}{z_1}$, we see that the solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) for the triple (a, b, c) as in (4.14) correspond to the solutions $(1, 1, 1)$ and (x_2, k, k) for the triple (a, b_0, c_0) . We find that

$\alpha_g x_2 = k\alpha_g + w_g$ where $g^{w_g} \parallel (d+2)^k - d^k$ as in Case 1. So

$$x_2 = k + \frac{w_g}{\alpha_g}. \quad (4.17)$$

Now $2^{x_2} \parallel a^{x_2} = c^{z_2} - b^{y_2} = c_0^k - b_0^k$, so that by Lemma 7 we must have $x_2 = h + v$ where $2^h \parallel 2d + 2$ and $2^v \parallel k$. Combining this with (4.17) we obtain

$$k - v = h - \frac{w_g}{\alpha_g}.$$

Now we see that $(a, b_0, c_0, 1, 1, 1, k + (w_g/\alpha_g), k, k)$ (and therefore also $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$) is in the infinite family (iv) in the Introduction when $i = 1$, $j = \alpha_g$, $u = 1$, and $w = w_g$.

There can be no third solution by the same argument used to show there is no third solution for Case 1.

Thus we see that if we have Case 2, then there are exactly two solutions (x, y, z) and these two solutions are given by the infinite family (iv) with $iu = 1$.

For Case 3 we have

$$a = g^{\alpha_g}, b = g^{\beta_g} b_1, c = g^{\gamma_g} c_1. \quad (4.18)$$

Again letting $d = b_1^{y_1}$, $b_0 = b^{y_1}$, $c_0 = c^{z_1}$, we have

$$c_1^{z_1} - b_1^{y_1} = c_1^{n_1 t} - b_1^{n_1 s} = f(n_1) = 1. \quad (4.19)$$

So we have

$$b_0 = g^{\beta_g y_1} d, c_0 = g^{\gamma_g z_1} (d + 1). \quad (4.20)$$

Since the solution (x_1, y_1, z_1) is Type O for g , we have $\beta_g y_1 = \gamma_g z_1 = \alpha_g x_1$. So we have

$$b_0 = g^{\alpha_g x_1} d, c_0 = g^{\alpha_g x_1} (d + 1). \quad (4.21)$$

Again letting $k = n_2$, we find that the solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) for the triple (a, b, c) as in (4.18) correspond to the solutions $(x_1, 1, 1)$ and (x_2, k, k) for the triple (a, b_0, c_0) . We find that $\alpha_g x_2 = k\alpha_g x_1 + w_g$ where $g^{w_g} = (d+1)^k - d^k$. So

$$x_2 = kx_1 + \frac{w_g}{\alpha_g}. \quad (4.22)$$

Now we see that $(a, b_0, c_0, x_1, 1, 1, kx_1 + (w_g/\alpha_g), k, k)$ (and therefore also $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$) is in the infinite family (iii) in the Introduction, with $a = g^j$, $j = \alpha_g$, $u = x_1$, and $w = w_g$. (Note that $2 \nmid g$ since $\gcd(g, d(d+1)) = 1$.)

There can be no third solution which is Type A, C, or O for g by the same argument used for Cases 1 and 2. And the argument used in the first part of this proof to show that we must have Case 1, 2, or 3 can be used to show that, if there exists a solution (x_3, y_3, z_3) which is Type B for g , then $b_1 \leq 2$. If $b_1 = 2$, then, since $a_1 = 1$, we can reverse the roles of a and b in the argument used for Case 2 to see that $(b, a, c, y_1, x_1, z_1, y_2, x_2, z_2)$ is in the infinite family (iv) with $d = 1$, contradicting Lemma 8.

So if there is a third solution we must have $a_1 = b_1 = 1$.

By Propositions 3.2 and 3.3 we can have no third solution which is Type C or O for g .

From the solution (x_1, y_1, z_1) which is Type O for g we derive $c_1 = 2$.

From the solution (x_2, y_2, z_2) , which is Type A for g , we derive

$$g^{\alpha_g x_2 - \gamma_g z_2} + 1 = 2^{z_2} \quad (4.23)$$

It is a familiar elementary result that (4.23) requires $\alpha_g x_2 - \gamma_g z_2 = 1$ and that there are no values of z possible in a solution which is Type A for g other than z_2 .

If there is a third solution (x_3, y_3, z_3) which is Type B for g , then

$$1 + g^{\beta_g y_3 - \gamma_g z_3} = 2^{z_3}. \quad (4.24)$$

We have $\beta_g y_3 - \gamma_g z_3 = 1$ so that $z_2 = z_3$ is the only possible choice for z in any solution to (1.1) other than (x_1, y_1, z_1) .

Multiplying both sides of (4.23) and (4.24) by $g^{\gamma_g z_2}$ we find that we can apply Criterion 1 to see that (x_2, y_2, z_2) is considered the same as (x_3, y_3, z_3) . (For the case $a_1 = b_1 = 1$ we have (iii) with $g = 2^k - 1$, $w = j = d = 1$.)

Thus we see that if we have Case 3, then $N(a, b, c) = 2$ and $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$ is in the infinite family (iii).

Thus we find that in all three cases $N(a, b, c) = 2$ with $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$ in either the infinite family (iii) or the infinite family (iv).

This completes the proof of Proposition 4.1. \square

Let S_{aa} be the set of all triples (a, b, c) such that $\gcd(a, b) > 1$ and (1.1) has two solutions both of which are Type A for some prime in Q .

Proposition 4.2. *For $(a, b, c) \in S_{aa}$ we have $N(a, b, c) = 2$, and (1.1) has two solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) with $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$ in either the infinite family (i) or the infinite family (iv).*

Proof. Let J be the set of all $(a, b, c) \in S_{aa}$ such that there exists a solution which is Type O for some prime in Q , and let K be the set of all $(a, b, c) \in S_{aa}$ such that there are no solutions which are Type O for any prime in Q .

If $(a, b, c) \in J$, then, by Proposition 4.1, $N(a, b, c) = 2$ and the equation (1.1) has two solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) with $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$ in one of the infinite families (iii) or (iv). Assume $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$ is in the infinite family (iii). Any solution to (1.1) for this a, b, c must correspond to one of the two solutions given by a member of F for the infinite family (iii) (by Lemma 9), and any solution of Type A for any prime must correspond to the solution in F given by $(ku + \frac{w}{j}, k, k)$ in (iii), so that only one (x, y, z) is possible for a solution which is Type A for a given p , so that $(a, b, c) \notin S_{aa}$. Thus $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$ must be in the infinite family (iv). (Although not needed for our purpose, it is easily seen that we must have (iv) with $iu > 1$ in order to have $2 \in Q$ so that the two solutions in (iv) are both Type A for 2.)

Now suppose $(a, b, c) \in K$. By the Corollary to Proposition 3.1, $N(a, b, c) = 2$ and (1.1) has two solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) with $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$ in the infinite family (i).

So, since $S_{aa} = J \cup K$, Proposition 4.2 follows. \square

Let S_{bb} be the set of all triples (a, b, c) such that $\gcd(a, b) > 1$ and (1.1) has two solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) both of which are Type B for some prime in Q . By the symmetry of a and b , Proposition 4.2 holds with S_{bb} replacing S_{aa} .

Theorem 4.3. *Let $S_i = S_c \cup S_o \cup S_{aa} \cup S_{bb}$. If (a, b, c) in S_i , then $N(a, b, c) = 2$, and (1.1) has two solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) with $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$ in one of the infinite families (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv).*

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of Propositions 3.4, 4.1, and 4.2. \square

Theorem 1.1 follows directly from Theorem 4.3:

Proof of Theorem 1.1. For (a, b, c) such that $\gcd(a, b) > 1$ and $(a, b, c) \notin S_i$, (1.1) has no solutions of Type C or O for any prime in Q , and at most one solution of Type A and at most one solution of Type B for any prime in Q . So $N(a, b, c) \leq 2$ for this (a, b, c) . Now Theorem 1.1 is an immediate consequence of Theorem 4.3. \square

Comment 4.4 Notice that proving Theorem 1.1 does not require using the statement concerning infinite families in Theorem 4.3 or the similar statements in Propositions 3.1, 3.4, 4.1, and 4.2; only the result $N(a, b, c) = 2$ is needed. Also, the use of infinite families is not needed for proving $N(a, b, c) = 2$ in Propositions 3.1, 3.4, 4.1, and 4.2 except to handle two special cases in the proof of Proposition 4.1, where the infinite family (iv) is used. Our primary purpose in considering infinite families is to obtain results concerning anomalous solutions (as in Theorem 4.5 below) and to obtain results on cases allowing more than two solutions (x, y, z) to (1.1) when Criterion 1 is not used (as in Theorems 4.7 and 4.8). The proof of Theorem 4.5 will use the statement concerning infinite families in Theorem 4.3. The solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) in the statement concerning infinite families in Theorem 4.3 (and in the similar statements in Propositions 3.1, 3.4, 4.1, and 4.2) will be shown (by Theorem 4.7) to be the only solutions (x, y, z) to (1.1) for the (a, b, c) in question even when Criterion 1 is not used, except for a few specifically designated cases allowing more than two solutions (x, y, z) . For cases allowing more than two solutions, if $a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2$ are as in the statement of Theorem 4.3, then $(a, b, c, x_3, y_3, z_3, x_4, y_4, z_4)$ is in the same infinite family as $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$ for any pair of solutions (x_3, y_3, z_3) and (x_4, y_4, z_4) (not necessarily distinct from (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2)) which do not correspond to each other (this follows directly from Lemma 9).

Theorem 4.5. *If, for some (a, b, c) with $\gcd(a, b) > 1$, (1.1) has two solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) which do not correspond to each other and $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$ is not in any of the infinite families (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv), then*

$$a = g^{\alpha_g} a_1, b = g^{\beta_g} b_1, c = g^{\gamma_g} c_1 \quad (4.25)$$

for some positive integers $g, \alpha_g, \beta_g, \gamma_g, a_1, b_1, c_1$ with $\gcd(g, a_1 b_1 c_1) = 1$ and $\gcd(a_1, b_1) = 1$, and one of the two solutions is Type A for g and the other solution is Type B for g , with no further solutions (x, y, z) .

Proof. Assume that, for some (a, b, c) with $\gcd(a, b) > 1$, (1.1) has two solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) which do not correspond to each other and $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$ is not in any of the infinite families (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv). By Theorem 1.1 any further solution (x, y, z) must correspond to one of (x_1, y_1, z_1) , (x_2, y_2, z_2) , so that no two solutions for this (a, b, c) can correspond to the two solutions in a member of F for any infinite family (recall the Comment following Definition 2 in the Introduction), so that $(a, b, c) \notin S_i$ (by Theorem 4.3). So, recalling the proof of Theorem 1.1 (immediately following Theorem 4.3), we see that (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) are the only solutions (x, y, z) to (1.1) and, for any prime in Q , one of (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) is Type A and the other is Type B. (Note that neither (x_1, y_1, z_1) nor (x_2, y_2, z_2) corresponds to a distinct third solution (x_3, y_3, z_3) since $(a, b, c) \notin S_{aa} \cup S_{bb}$).

Suppose one of these solutions, say (x_1, y_1, z_1) , is of Type A for some prime $p \in Q$ and of Type B for some prime $q \in Q$. Then, by the Corollary to Lemma 2, (x_2, y_2, z_2) must also be Type A for p , contradicting the previous paragraph (which showed that (x_2, y_2, z_2) must be Type B for p). So we see that one of the solutions, say (x_1, y_1, z_1) , must be Type A for every prime in Q and the other solution (x_2, y_2, z_2) must be Type B for every prime in Q . Let q_1 and q_2 be any two primes in Q . Then $\beta_{q_1} y_1 = \gamma_{q_1} z_1$, $\beta_{q_2} y_1 = \gamma_{q_2} z_1$, $\alpha_{q_1} x_2 = \gamma_{q_1} z_2$, $\alpha_{q_2} x_2 = \gamma_{q_2} z_2$, from which we derive (3.34), so that we can use Proposition 3.5 to obtain (4.25). The solution (x_1, y_1, z_1) is Type A for g , and the solution (x_2, y_2, z_2) is Type B for g . \square

Theorem 4.5 will be used to establish a method for searching for anomalous solutions in Section 5 which follows.

Let I be the set of all (a, b, c) with $\gcd(a, b) > 1$ such that (1.1) has two solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) with $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$ in one of the four infinite families in the Introduction.

(Although not needed for what follows, we note that $I = S_i \cup T$ where T is the set of all triples (a, b, c) satisfying either $(\{a, b, \}c) = (\{2, 4\}, 2^{2t+1} \cdot 3)$ or $(\{4, 8\}, 2^{6t+3} \cdot 3)$, where $t \geq 0$. Since we will not be using this result, we do not give its proof, which uses the method of the proof of Theorem 4.7 below. Any $(a, b, c) \in T$ gives exactly two solutions (x, y, z) to (1.1), one of which is Type A for 2 and the other of which is Type B for 2.)

Observation 4.6. *The use of Criterion 1 to determine $N(a, b, c) = 2$ is needed only when (a, b, c) gives two solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) to (1.1) with $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$ in either the infinite family (i) with $h = 2$ or the infinite family (iii) with $g = 2^k - 1$, $d = w = j = 1$.*

Proof. Criterion 1 is relevant only when $a_1 = b_1 = 1$. Assume (a, b, c) satisfies $\gcd(a, b) > 1$, $N(a, b, c) = 2$, and $a_1 = b_1 = 1$.

If $(a, b, c) \notin I$, then (a, b, c) satisfies the conditions of the statement of Theorem 4.5, so, by Theorem 4.5, (a, b, c) has exactly two solutions (x, y, z) , neither of which corresponds to a further distinct solution (x, y, z) . So Criterion 1 does not apply here.

If $(a, b, c) \in I$, then, since $a_1 = b_1 = 1$, it suffices to determine when any of the infinite families (i), (ii), (iii), (iv) allows $a_1 = b_1 = 1$. In the infinite family (ii), we have $a_1 = 2$, so we can eliminate (ii) from consideration. In the infinite family (iv), we cannot have $b_1 = d = 1$ by Lemma 8, so we can eliminate (iv) from consideration. In the infinite family (i), $b_1 = 1$ holds only if $h = 2$. Finally, in the infinite family (iii), $b_1 = 1$ requires $d = 1$, so that, since $g^w = (d + 1)^k - d^k = 2^k - 1$, we have $g = 2^k - 1$ and $w = 1$, so that, since $x_2 = ku + (w/j)$, we must have $j = 1$. \square

Using Observation 4.6 we can consider (1.1) without using Criterion 1 and determine all cases for which (1.1) has more than two solutions (x, y, z) .

Theorem 4.7. *Let (a, b, c) be a triple giving more than two solutions (x, y, z) to (1.1).*

If $\gcd(a, b) = 1$, then $(\{a, b\}, c) = (\{3, 5\}, 2)$, which has three solutions: $3+5 = 2^3$, $3^3+5 = 2^5$, $3+5^3 = 2^7$.

If $\gcd(a, b) > 1$, then we must have one of the following:

1.) $(a, b, c) = (2, 2, 2^\gamma 3)$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, which has four solutions (x, y, z) : $(\gamma+1, \gamma, 1)$, $(\gamma, \gamma+1, 1)$, $(2\gamma+3, 2\gamma, 2)$, $(2\gamma, 2\gamma+3, 2)$.

2.) $(a, b, c) = (2, 8, 2^{3t} 3)$, $t \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, which has three solutions (x, y, z) : $(3t+1, t, 1)$, $(6t+3, 2t, 2)$, $(6t, 2t+1, 2)$

or

$(a, b, c) = (8, 2, 2^{3t} 3)$, $t \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, which has three solutions (x, y, z) : $(t, 3t+1, 1)$, $(2t, 6t+3, 2)$, $(2t+1, 6t, 2)$.

3.) $(a, b, c) = (2^k - 1, 2^k - 1, 2(2^k - 1)^\gamma)$, $k, \gamma \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, which has three solutions (x, y, z) : $(\gamma, \gamma, 1)$, $(k\gamma+1, k\gamma, k)$, $(k\gamma, k\gamma+1, k)$.

4.) $(a, b, c) = (2^u, 2^v, 2^w)$, $u, v, w \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $\gcd(uv, w) = 1$, which has an infinite number of solutions $(x, y, z) = (\frac{tv}{g}, \frac{tu}{g}, \frac{tL+1}{w})$ where $\gcd(u, v) = g$, $\text{lcm}(u, v) = L$, and t is a positive integer such that $tL \equiv -1 \pmod{w}$.

Proof. If $\gcd(a, b) = 1$, then the result that $(\{a, b\}, c) = (\{3, 5\}, 2)$ is given by [10], and the result that there are exactly three solutions in this case is given by [10] as well as earlier papers cited in [10].

Now assume (a, b, c) with $\gcd(a, b) > 1$ gives more than two solutions (x, y, z) to (1.1). If (a, b, c) are all powers of 2, then we have 4.); assume a, b , and c are not all powers of 2, so that we are eliminating 4.) from

consideration. Since any solution to (1.1) has at most one solution distinct from it which corresponds to it, we must have $N(a, b, c) > 1$. By Theorem 1.1, $N(a, b, c) = 2$.

By Observation 4.6, we must have one of the following two cases.

Case 1: (a, b, c) gives two solutions $(x_1, y_1, z_1), (x_2, y_2, z_2)$ to (1.1) such that $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$ is in the infinite family (i) with $h = 2$, and there is at least one further solution (x_3, y_3, z_3) where the solution (x_3, y_3, z_3) corresponds to one of (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) (recall the proof of Lemma 9).

For this case, we have $(a, b, c) = (2^\alpha, 2^\beta, 2^\gamma \cdot 3)$ since, by Definition 3, the solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) must correspond to the two solutions given by some member of F for the infinite family (i) (note that this requires $\min(z_1, z_2) = 1$). Letting m be this member of F we have $m = (2, 2^u, 2^u \cdot 3, u + 1, 1, 1, 2u + 3, 2, 2)$ for some fixed positive integer u . By Definition 3, $\gamma = \gamma \min(z_1, z_2) = u \min(1, 2) = u$, so that

$$m = (2, 2^\gamma, 2^\gamma \cdot 3, \gamma + 1, 1, 1, 2\gamma + 3, 2, 2).$$

Let (x_1, y_1, z_1) be the solution to (1.1) which corresponds to the solution $(\gamma + 1, 1, 1)$ in m , and let (x_2, y_2, z_2) be the solution in m which corresponds to the solution $(2\gamma + 3, 2, 2)$. Then we have

$$\{\alpha x_1, \beta y_1\} = \{\gamma + 1, \gamma\} \tag{4.26}$$

and

$$\{\alpha x_2, \beta y_2\} = \{2\gamma + 3, 2\gamma\}. \tag{4.27}$$

Let (x_3, y_3, z_3) be a further solution. If (x_3, y_3, z_3) corresponds to (x_1, y_1, z_1) , then, if $\alpha x_1 = \gamma + 1$ (respectively, γ), we must have $\alpha x_3 = \gamma$ (respectively, $\gamma + 1$). By (4.26) we see that this requires $\alpha \mid \gamma + 1$, $\alpha \mid \gamma$, $\beta \mid \gamma + 1$, $\beta \mid \gamma$, so that $\alpha = \beta = 1$.

If (x_3, y_3, z_3) corresponds to (x_2, y_2, z_2) , then by (4.27) we must have $\alpha \mid 2\gamma + 3$, $\alpha \mid 2\gamma$, $\beta \mid 2\gamma + 3$, $\beta \mid 2\gamma$. This requires $\alpha \in \{1, 3\}$, $\beta \in \{1, 3\}$. so we have $(\alpha, \beta) = (1, 1), (1, 3)$, or $(3, 1)$, noting that $(\alpha, \beta) = (3, 3)$ is impossible by (4.26).

If $\alpha = \beta = 1$ we have 1.) in the formulation of Theorem 4.7. If $(\alpha, \beta) = (1, 3)$ or $(3, 1)$, we have 2.) in the formulation of Theorem 4.7 (note that in this case we must have $3 \mid \gamma$).

Case 2: (a, b, c) gives two solutions $(x_1, y_1, z_1), (x_2, y_2, z_2)$ to (1.1) such that $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$ is in the infinite family (iii) with $g = 2^k - 1$, $d = w = j = 1$, and there is at least one further solution (x_3, y_3, z_3) where the solution (x_3, y_3, z_3) corresponds to one of (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) .

For this case we have $(a, b, c) = ((2^k - 1)^\alpha, (2^k - 1)^\beta, 2(2^k - 1)^\gamma)$ since, by Definition 3, the solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) must correspond to the two solutions given by some member of F for the infinite family (iii) (note that this requires $\min(z_1, z_2) = 1$). Letting m be this member of F and proceeding as in Case 1, we see that we must have

$$m = (2^k - 1, (2^k - 1)^\gamma, 2(2^k - 1)^\gamma, \gamma, 1, 1, k\gamma + 1, k, k)$$

for some positive integer k .

Let (x_1, y_1, z_1) be the solution to (1.1) which corresponds to the solution $(\gamma, 1, 1)$ in m , and let (x_2, y_2, z_2) be the solution to (1.1) which corresponds to the solution $(k\gamma + 1, k, k)$.

Let (x_3, y_3, z_3) be a further solution. If (x_3, y_3, z_3) corresponds to (x_1, y_1, z_1) , then both (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_3, y_3, z_3) are Type O for $g = 2^k - 1$, so that $\alpha x_1 = \beta y_1 = \alpha x_3 = \beta y_3$ so that $y_1/x_1 = y_3/x_3$. Since $z_3 = z_1$, this requires $x_1 = x_3$, $y_1 = y_3$, so that (x_3, y_3, z_3) is not a distinct solution.

If (x_3, y_3, z_3) corresponds to (x_2, y_2, z_2) , then we can proceed as in Case 1 to see that $\alpha \mid k\gamma + 1$, $\alpha \mid k\gamma$, $\beta \mid k\gamma + 1$, $\beta \mid k\gamma$, so that $\alpha = \beta = 1$, which gives 3.) in the formulation of Theorem 4.7. \square

From Theorem 4.7 we can immediately obtain a revised version of Theorem 1.1 in which Criterion 1 is replaced by a more specific restriction:

Theorem 4.8. *For given integers a, b, c all greater than one, (1.1) has at most two solutions in positive integers (x, y, z) (where two solutions $(x_1, y_1, z_1), (x_2, y_2, z_2)$ are considered the same solution if $a = b$ and $\{x_1, y_1\} = \{x_2, y_2\}$), except for the following three cases:*

- 1.) $\{a, b\} = \{3, 5\}, c = 2$ which gives the three solutions in Theorem 4.7.
- 2.) $\{a, b\} = \{2, 8\}, c = 2^{3t}3$, which gives the three solutions in 2.) of Theorem 4.7.
- 3.) $\{a, b\} = \{2^u, 2^v\}, c = 2^w$, where $\gcd(uv, w) = 1$, which gives the infinite number of solutions in 4.) of Theorem 4.7.

5 Cases with exactly two solutions

By Theorem 1.1 we have $N(a, b, c) \leq 2$ for all (a, b, c) except $(\{a, b\}, c) = (\{3, 5\}, 2)$ or $(\{2^u, 2^v\}, 2^w)$ for positive integers u, v, w with $\gcd(uv, w) = 1$. Let S_j be the set of all triples (a, b, c) such that $\gcd(a, b) > 1$, $N(a, b, c) = 2$, and there do not exist solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) with $(a, b, c, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2)$ in any of the infinite families (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv). By Theorem 4.5, for any $(a, b, c) \in S_j$ there are exactly two solutions (x, y, z) one of which is Type A for g , the other of which is Type B for g , and neither of which has a solution corresponding to it (here g is as in Theorem 4.5). In this section we consider whether there exist any $(a, b, c) \in S_j$ which are not listed among the ten anomalous cases given in the Introduction.

By Theorem 4.5, we can assume that for any $(a, b, c) \in S_j$, we have a solution (x_1, y_1, z_1) which is Type A for g and a solution (x_2, y_2, z_2) which is Type B for g , where g is as in Theorem 4.5. Using the notation of Theorem 4.5 (taking $a_1 \leq b_1$ and, for brevity, writing α for α_g, β for β_g , and γ for γ_g), from the solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) we derive two equations with relatively prime terms:

$$g^{\alpha x_1 - \gamma z_1} a_1^{x_1} + b_1^{y_1} = c_1^{z_1} \quad (5.1)$$

and

$$a_1^{x_2} + g^{\beta y_2 - \gamma z_2} b_1^{y_2} = c_1^{z_2}. \quad (5.2)$$

For any $(a, b, c) \in S_j$, the two solutions (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) must be derived from equations with relatively prime terms as in (5.1) and (5.2). So, in searching for hitherto unknown anomalous solutions we can begin by examining pairs of equations of the form

$$g^{w_1} a_1^{x_1} + b_1^{y_1} = c_1^{z_1} \quad (5.3)$$

and

$$a_1^{x_2} + g^{w_2} b_1^{y_2} = c_1^{z_2} \quad (5.4)$$

where g, a_1, b_1 , and c_1 are pairwise relatively prime. For any pair of equations with relatively prime terms which can be represented as in (5.3) and (5.4), we consider whether there exist α, β , and γ which produce an $(a, b, c) \in S_j$. To do this we construct systems of linear equations in which the unknowns are α, β , and γ :

$$y_1 \beta = z_1 \gamma, \quad (5.5)$$

$$y_2 \beta - w_2 = z_2 \gamma, \quad (5.6)$$

$$x_1\alpha - w_1 = z_1\gamma, \tag{5.7}$$

$$x_2\alpha = z_2\gamma. \tag{5.8}$$

If $1 < a_1 < b_1$, we have a system of four equations which must have a solution in three positive integer variables α, β, γ in order to produce an $(a, b, c) \in S_j$.

If $1 = a_1 < b_1$, then it suffices to obtain a solution in positive integers β and γ for the system of two equations (5.5) and (5.6) in order to produce an $(a, b, c) \in S_j$, since then we can take $\alpha = 1$ and let

$$x_1 = z_1\gamma + w_1 \tag{5.9}$$

and

$$x_2 = z_2\gamma. \tag{5.10}$$

If $1 = a_1 = b_1$, then we have

$$g^{w_1} + 1 = c_1^{z_1} \tag{5.11}$$

and

$$1 + g^{w_2} = c_1^{z_2}. \tag{5.12}$$

(5.12) can also be considered a solution of Type A for g , so that $(a, b, c) \in S_{aa} \subset S_i$, contradicting the definition of S_j . (Although not needed for our purposes, we note that, if $z_1 \neq z_2$, then (5.11) and (5.12) must be $2 + 1 = 3$ and $2^3 + 1 = 3^2$.)

In conducting a search for possible further anomalous solutions not already known, we can begin by considering ternary equations with relatively prime terms. A remarkably comprehensive list of such equations was constructed by Matschke [9] based on work of Känel and Matschke [7]. This list gives all cases of $A + B = C$ with $\gcd(A, B) = 1$ and $\text{rad}(ABC) < 10^7$. From this list we find pairs of equations satisfying (5.3) and (5.4) and determine whether a triple of positive integers (α, β, γ) satisfies (5.5) through (5.8). We thus show that there are no (a, b, c) with $\gcd(a, b) > 1$, $N(a, b, c) = 2$, and $\text{rad}(abc) < 10^7$ other than those already known and listed among the anomalous cases and infinite families in the Introduction.

One can calculate that (5.3) and (5.4) have no further solutions for $a_1 \leq 100$, $g \leq 100$, $b_1 \leq 10000$, and the exponents $w_1, x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, w_2, y_2, z_2$ each less than or equal to 10.

These results complement the bounds given in the Introduction found by an independent computer search.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to Takafumi Miyazaki for many helpful suggestions and corrections. This work used the Augie High Performance Computing cluster, funded by award NSF 2018933, at Villanova University.

References

- [1] M. Bennett, On some exponential equations of S. S. Pillai, *Canadian J Math.*, **53** (2001), 897–922.
- [2] F. Beukers and H.P. Schlickewei, The equation $x + y = 1$ in finitely generated groups, *Acta Arith.*, **78** (1996), 189–199.

- [3] A. O. Gel'fond, Sur la divisibilité de la différence des puissance de deux nombres entiers par une puissance d'un idéal premier, *Mat. Sb.*, **7** (49) (1940), 7–25.
- [4] N. Hirata-Kohno, S-unit equations and integer solutions to exponential Diophantine equations, in *Analytic Number Theory and surrounding Areas 2006*, Kyoto RIMS Kokyuroku, 2006, 92–97.
- [5] Y.-Z. Hu and M.-H. Le, An upper bound for the number of solutions of ternary purely exponential diophantine equations, *J. Number Theory*, **183** (2018), 62–73.
- [6] Y.-Z. Hu and M.-H. Le, An upper bound for the number of solutions of ternary purely exponential diophantine equations II, *Publ. Math. Debrecen* **95** (2019), 335–354.
- [7] R. von Känel and B. Matschke, Solving S-unit, Mordell, Thue, Thue-Mahler and generalized Ramanujan-Nagell equations via Shimura-Taniyama conjecture, *Mem. Amer. Math. Soc.* **286** (2023), no.1419, vi+142 pp.
- [8] K. Mahler, Zur Approximation algebraischer Zahlen I: Über den grössten Primteiler binärer Formen, *Math. Ann.*, **107** (1933), 691–730.
- [9] B. Matschke, Data attached to the paper ‘Solving S-unit, Mordell, Thue, Thue-Mahler and generalized Ramanujan-Nagell equations via Shimura-Taniyama conjecture’ <https://www.math.u-bordeaux.fr/~bmatschke/data/>
- [10] T. Miyazaki and I. Pink, Number of solutions to a special type of unit equation in two variables, 2020, to appear in *Amer. J. Math.*
- [11] R. Scott and R. Styer. Bennett’s Pillai theorem with fractional bases and negative exponents allowed. *Journal de théorie des nombres de Bordeaux*, **27** no. 1 (2015), 289–307.
- [12] R. Scott and R. Styer, Number of solutions to $a^x + b^y = c^z$, *Publ. Math. Debrecen* **88** (2016), 131–138.
- [13] A. Wiles. Modular elliptic curves and Fermat’s last theorem. *Ann.of Math.*,**141**. (1995) 443–551.