

CAMPANA CONJECTURE FOR COVERINGS OF TORIC SURFACES OVER FUNCTION FIELDS

CARLO GASBARRI, JI GUO, AND JULIE TZU-YUEH WANG

ABSTRACT. We first proved Vojta’s abc conjecture over function fields for Campana points on projective toric surfaces with high multiplicity along the boundary. As a consequence, we show a version of Campana’s conjecture on finite covering of projective toric surfaces over function fields.

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the leading slogans in diophantine geometry over number and function field is *Geometry governs arithmetics*. This slogan, roughly speaking, tells us that one should be able to predict the distribution of rational and algebraic points of a quasiprojective variety using just informations on the geometry of it over the algebraic closure of the field. This slogan is totally successful for one dimensional varieties, where Siegel Theorem on finiteness of integral points over affine curves and Faltings’ Theorem on the finiteness of rational points on curves of genus at least two give a satisfactory answer: one can predict the potential distribution of rational points of a curve just by computing its (logarithmic) Kodaira dimension.

For higher dimensional varieties, the situation seems to be more complicated. The general philosophy should be that if a variety has potentially “a lot” of rational points, then it should be “special” (which, in the one dimensional case means that it should be not of general type).

The notion of special variety is clarified in Campana Theory of varieties and requires the introduction of new geometrical objects which nowadays are called “Campana Orbifolds”.

The theory of Campana Orbifolds is not yet completely developed, but there is a precise definition of orbifold structure, orbifold morphisms and orbifold points. In particular, one can define the notion of Campana orbifold pair of general type, which

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: Primary 11J97; Secondary 14H05 and 11J87.

The second-named author was supported in part by National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 12201643) and Natural Science Foundation of Hunan Province, China (No. 2023JJ40690).

The third-named author was supported in part by Taiwan’s NSTC grant 110-2115-M-001-009-MY3.

allows to define the notion of special varieties. Roughly speaking, one conjectures that orbifolds of general type should have rational points which are never Zariski dense (with some caveat in the function fields case due to the presence of isotrivial varieties) and a variety with potentially dense rational points should not have a morphism to a orbifold of general type.

One of the most fruitful streams of research in Diophantine Geometry is to try to confirm this philosophy on non-trivial classes of varieties and Campana orbifolds. In this article, we verify the philosophy over function fields of characteristic zero for orbifold of general type which are obtained as finite covering of toric surfaces.

Let \mathbf{k} be an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero, C be a smooth projective curve of genus \mathfrak{g} defined over \mathbf{k} , and $K := \mathbf{k}(C)$ be the function field of C . At each point $\mathbf{p} \in C(\mathbf{k})$, we may define a normalized order function $v_{\mathbf{p}} := \text{ord}_{\mathbf{p}} : K \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \cup \{+\infty\}$. Let S be a finite set of points of C . Denote by \mathcal{O}_S and \mathcal{O}_S^* the sets of S -integers and S -units in K respectively.

We now introduce the notion of Campana orbifold and of Campana points:

Definition 1. A smooth Campana orbifold over K is a pair (X, Δ) consisting of a smooth projective variety X and an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor Δ on X , both defined over K , such that

(i) we have

$$\Delta := \Delta_{\epsilon} = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_{\epsilon}} \epsilon_{\alpha} D_{\alpha},$$

where the D_{α} are prime divisors on X , and $\epsilon_{\alpha} \in \{1 - \frac{1}{m} : m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2}\} \cup \{1\}$ for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$.

(ii) the support $\Delta_{\text{red}} = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_{\epsilon}} D_{\alpha}$ is a divisor with normal crossings on X .

The *canonical divisor* of the Campana orbifold (X, Δ) is the \mathbb{Q} -divisor $\mathbf{K}_X + \Delta$ on X , where \mathbf{K}_X is the canonical divisor of X . The Campana orbifold (X, Δ) is said to be *of general type* if $\mathbf{K}_X + \Delta$ is a big divisor on X .

We can now give the definition of *Campana point* of a Campana orbifold.

Definition 2. With the notation introduced above, we say that $\mathcal{R} \subseteq X(K)$ is a set of *Campana (Δ, S) -integral points* if (i) no point $P \in \mathcal{R}$ lies in $\text{Supp}(\Delta)$, and (ii) for each D_{α} there is a Weil function $\{\lambda_{D_{\alpha}, \mathbf{p}}\}_{\mathbf{p} \in C(\mathbf{k})}$, possibly depending on \mathcal{R} , such that the following holds.

(i) for all α with $\epsilon_{\alpha} = 1$ and $\mathbf{p} \notin S$, $\lambda_{D_{\alpha}, \mathbf{p}}(P) = 0$.

(ii) for $\mathbf{p} \notin S$, and all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_\epsilon$ with both $\epsilon_\alpha < 1$ and $\lambda_{D_\alpha, \mathbf{p}}(P) > 0$, we have

$$\lambda_{D_\alpha, \mathbf{p}}(P) \geq \frac{1}{1 - \epsilon_\alpha}.$$

In other words, writing $\epsilon_\alpha = 1 - \frac{1}{m_\alpha}$, we require $\lambda_{D_\alpha, \mathbf{p}}(P) \geq m_\alpha$ whenever $\lambda_{D_\alpha, \mathbf{p}}(P) > 0$.

Campana's conjecture in the function field case can be formulated as follows.

Conjecture 1. *Let (X, Δ) be a smooth Campana orbifold of general type. Let A be a big divisor on X . Then, for any set \mathcal{R} of Campana (Δ, S) -integral points, there exists a proper closed subvariety $Z \subset X$ such that we have $h_A(P) \leq O(1)$ for all $P \in \mathcal{R} \setminus Z$.*

In order to describe the results of this paper we need another definition:

Definition 3. Let ℓ be a positive integer. A Campana orbifold (X, Δ) is said to be of multiplicity at least ℓ , if $\Delta = \sum_i \epsilon_i \Delta_i$ and we have $\frac{1}{1 - \epsilon_i} \geq \ell$.

Following Levin in [14], we say that an ‘‘admissible pair’’ is a couple (X, V) where V is a nonsingular variety embedded in a nonsingular projective variety X , both defined over K , in such a way that $D_0 = X \setminus V$ is a normal crossings divisor. (See [10, Theorem 2].) A Campana orbifold (X, Δ) is said to be associated to the admissible pair (X, V) if D_0 is the support of Δ . We say that an effective reduced divisor D on X is a normal crossings divisor on the admissible pair (X, V) if $D + D_0$ is a normal crossings divisor on X .

Remark. In [8] Section 2.5, it is proven that if X is a smooth toric surface, then (X, \mathbb{G}_m^2) is an admissible pair.

The first theorem proved in this paper is the following:

Theorem 4. *Let X be a nonsingular projective toric surface. Let D be an effective reduced normal crossings divisor on (X, \mathbb{G}_m^2) and A be a big divisor on X . For every $\epsilon > 0$ there is a positive integral number ℓ for which the following holds: For every Campana orbifold (X, Δ) associated to (X, \mathbb{G}_m^2) with multiplicity at least ℓ and any set \mathcal{R} of (Δ, S) -integral points of it, there is a proper closed subset Z of X such that, for all $P \in \mathcal{R} \setminus Z$, either $h_A(P) \leq O(1)$ or*

- (i) $N_{D, S}(P) - N_{D, S}^{(1)}(P) < \epsilon h_A(P)$, and
- (ii) $N_{D, S}^{(1)}(P) \geq h_D(P) - \epsilon h_A(P) - O(1)$.

Here $N_{D, S}^{(1)}$ is the truncated counting function with respect to D and S and h_A is the Weil height function associated with the divisor A (see Section 2.1).

Consequently we can obtain the Campana conjecture for some orbifolds whose orbifold divisor contains properly the boundary of a toric surface.

Theorem 5. *Let X be a nonsingular projective toric surface. Let $D_0 := X \setminus \mathbb{G}_m^2$ and A be an effective divisor on X . Then there exists a positive integer ℓ_0 for which the following holds:*

Given a smooth Campana orbifold (X, Δ) of general type with $\text{Supp}(\Delta) = D_0 + A$ with multiplicity at least ℓ_0 along D_0 and a set $\mathcal{R} \subset X(K)$ of (Δ, S) integral-points, we can find a proper closed set $Z \subset X$ for which if $P \in \mathcal{R}$, either $h_A(P) \leq O(1)$ or $P \in Z$.

Observe that, in the proof we will show that, under the hypothesis of the Theorem, the divisor A is big.

As a consequence, we can obtain the following Theorem which treats the case of an orbifold whose underlying surface is a finite ramified covering of a toric surface:

Theorem 6. *Let X be a nonsingular projective toric surface and $D_0 = X \setminus \mathbb{G}_m^2$. Let Y be a nonsingular projective surface over K with a finite morphism $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$. Let $H := \pi^*(D_0)$ and $R \subset X$ be the ramification divisor of π omitting components from the support of H . Suppose that $A := \pi(R)$ and $A + D_0$ is a SNC divisor on X . Then there exists a positive integer ℓ such that, if (Y, Δ) is a Campana orbifold of general type with $\text{Supp}(\Delta) = \text{Supp}(H)$ and multiplicity at least ℓ and $\mathcal{R} \subset Y(K)$ is a subset of (Δ, S) -integral points, then we can find a proper closed set $Z \subset Y$ for which if $P \in \mathcal{R}$, either $h_R(P) \leq O(1)$ or $P \in Z$.*

Observe that again, we will prove that R is a big divisor on Y .

The proof of Theorem 4 is based on the following main technical theorem.

Theorem 7. *Let S be a finite subset of $C(\mathbf{k})$. Let $G \in K[x_1, x_2]$ be a non-constant polynomial with no monomials and repeated factors. Assume that $G(0, 0) \neq 0$. Then for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists integers ℓ, m , positive reals c_1 and c_2 , a finite subset $R \subset K^*$ and $|m_1| + |m_2| \leq m$ such that for all $(u_1, u_2) \in \mathcal{O}_S^2$ with $G(u_1, u_2) \neq 0$, $u_1^{m_1} u_2^{m_2} \notin R$ and*

$$(1.1) \quad N_{0,S}^{(1)}(u_i) \leq \frac{1}{\ell} h(u_i),$$

for $i = 1, 2$, we have that either

$$(1.2) \quad \max\{h(u_1), h(u_2)\} \leq c_1 \tilde{h}(G) + c_2 \max\{1, \chi_S(C)\},$$

or

$$N_{0,S}(G(u_1, u_2)) - N_{0,S}^{(1)}(G(u_1, u_2)) \leq \epsilon \max\{h(u_1), h(u_2)\}.$$

Furthermore, if $G \in \mathbf{k}[x_1, x_2]$, then the set R is a subset of \mathbf{k} .

Remark. The integer m and the finite subset $R \subset K^*$ can be effectively determined. Therefore the exceptional set given by a finite union of $[x_1^{m_1} x_2^{m_2} = r]$, $r \in R$, can be determined explicitly.

The case that $(u_1, u_2) \in (\mathcal{O}_S^*)^2$ was treated in [10]. To generalize to the current situation, we need a version of GCD theorem for S -integers and a more precise analysis for the step of reduction to the one variable case. The proof will be given in Section 6 after developing a suitable GCD theorem in Section 5. We also refer to [10] for more introduction and reference on related work. In Section 2, we recall some basic definitions of heights, local Weil functions associated to divisors and the notion of Campana integral points as well as a generation of Brownawell-Masser's S -unit theorem. The proof of Theorem 4 will be given in Section 3. The proofs of Theorem 5 and Theorem 6 will be given in Section 4.

The non orbifold cases of the results of this articles are treated in [5], [6], [17], [4] for surfaces and [10] for higher dimensional cases. Consequently this paper can be seen as a sequel of them.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Notation and heights. Let \mathbf{k} be an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero, C be a smooth projective curve of genus \mathfrak{g} defined over \mathbf{k} , and $K := \mathbf{k}(C)$ be the function field of C . At each point $\mathbf{p} \in C(\mathbf{k})$, we may choose a uniformizer $t_{\mathbf{p}}$ to define a normalized order function $v_{\mathbf{p}} := \text{ord}_{\mathbf{p}} : K \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \cup \{+\infty\}$. Let $S \subset C(\mathbf{k})$ be a finite subset. We denote the ring of S -integers in K and the group of S -units in K respectively by

$$\mathcal{O}_S := \{f \in K \mid v_{\mathbf{p}}(f) \geq 0 \text{ for all } \mathbf{p} \notin S\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{O}_S^* := \{f \in K \mid v_{\mathbf{p}}(f) = 0 \text{ for all } \mathbf{p} \notin S\}.$$

We also denote by

$$\chi_S(C) := 2\mathfrak{g} - 2 + |S|, \quad \text{and} \quad \chi_S^+(C) := \max\{0, \chi_S(C)\}.$$

For simplicity of notation, for $f \in K^*$ and $\mathbf{p} \in C(\mathbf{k})$ we let

$$v_{\mathbf{p}}^0(f) := \max\{0, v_{\mathbf{p}}(f)\}, \quad \text{and} \quad v_{\mathbf{p}}^\infty(f) := -\min\{0, v_{\mathbf{p}}(f)\}$$

i.e. its order of zero and poles at \mathbf{p} respectively. The height of f is defined by

$$h(f) := \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in C(\mathbf{k})} v_{\mathbf{p}}^{\infty}(f).$$

For a finite subset S of $C(\mathbf{k})$, $f \in K^*$ and a positive integer m , we let

$$N_{0,S}(f) = \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in C(\mathbf{k}) \setminus S} v_{\mathbf{p}}^0(f) \quad \text{and} \quad N_{0,S}^{(m)}(f) = \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in C(\mathbf{k}) \setminus S} \min\{m, v_{\mathbf{p}}^0(f)\}$$

be the number of the zero of f outside of S , counting multiplicities and counting multiplicities up to m respectively. We then let

$$N_{\infty,S}(f) = \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in C(\mathbf{k}) \setminus S} v_{\mathbf{p}}^{\infty}(f) \quad \text{and} \quad N_{\infty,S}^{(m)}(f) = \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in C(\mathbf{k}) \setminus S} \min\{m, v_{\mathbf{p}}^{\infty}(f)\}$$

be the number of the poles of f outside of S , counting multiplicities and counting multiplicities up to m respectively.

Let $\mathbf{x} := (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ be a tuple of n variables, and $F = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in I_F} a_{\mathbf{i}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{i}} \in K[\mathbf{x}]$ be a nonzero polynomial, where I_F is the set of those indices $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_n)$ with $a_{\mathbf{i}} \neq 0$; and we put $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{i}} := x_1^{i_1} \cdots x_n^{i_n}$. We define the height $h(F)$ and the relevant height $\tilde{h}(F)$ as follows. Put

$$v_{\mathbf{p}}(F) := \min_{\mathbf{i} \in I_F} \{v_{\mathbf{p}}(a_{\mathbf{i}})\} \quad \text{for } \mathbf{p} \in C(\mathbf{k}),$$

and define

$$h(F) := \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in C(\mathbf{k})} -v_{\mathbf{p}}(F), \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{h}(F) := \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in C(\mathbf{k})} -\min\{0, v_{\mathbf{p}}(F)\}.$$

2.2. Local Weil Functions and Campana integral points.

We recall some facts from [13, Chapter 10] and [12, Section B.8] about local Weil functions associated to divisors. We continue to let K be the function field of a smooth projective curve C over an algebraically closed field \mathbf{k} of characteristic zero. Denote by $M_K := \{v = v_{\mathbf{p}} : \mathbf{p} \in C(\mathbf{k})\}$ the set of valuations on K . We recall that an M_K -constant is a family $\{\gamma_v\}_{v \in M_K}$, where each γ_v is a real number with all but finitely many being zero. Given two families $\{\lambda_{1v}\}$ and $\{\lambda_{2v}\}$ of functions parametrized by M_K , we say $\lambda_{1v} \leq \lambda_{2v}$ holds up to an M_K -constant if there exists an M_K -constant $\{\gamma_v\}$ such that the function $\lambda_{2v} - \lambda_{1v}$ has values at least γ_v everywhere. We say $\lambda_{1v} = \lambda_{2v}$ up to an M_K -constant if $\lambda_{1v} \leq \lambda_{2v}$ and $\lambda_{2v} \leq \lambda_{1v}$ up to M_K -constants. Let X be a projective variety over K . We say that a subset Y of $X(K) \times M_K$ is *affine M_K -bounded* if there is an affine open subset $X_0 \subset X$ over K with a system of affine coordinates x_1, \dots, x_n and an M_K -constant $\{\gamma_v\}_{v \in M_K}$ such that $Y \subset X_0(K) \times M_K$ and

$$\min_{1 \leq i \leq n} v(x_i(P)) \geq \gamma_v, \quad \text{for all } (P, v) \in Y;$$

and we say that the set Y is M_K -bounded if it is a finite union of affine M_K -bounded sets.

The local Weil functions associate to divisors can be defined geometrically. We refer to [18, Section 16] for the following definitions and remarks.

Definition 8. Let X be projective variety defined over K , which is the function field of a smooth projective curve C over an algebraically closed field \mathbf{k} of characteristic zero. A *proper model* of X is a normal variety \mathcal{X} , given with a proper flat morphism $\rho : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow C$ such that the generic fiber is isomorphic to X .

In the above construction, rational points in $X(K)$ correspond bijectively to sections $i : C \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$.

Definition 9. Let X be a projective variety defined over K and $\rho : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow C$ be a proper model of X . Let D be a Cartier divisor on X over K . Then D extends to a Cartier divisor \mathcal{D} on \mathcal{X} . Let $P \in X(K)$ not lying on $\text{Supp}(D)$ and let $i : C \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ be the corresponding section of ρ ; thus the image of i is not contained in \mathcal{D} . Then $i^*\mathcal{D}$ is a Cartier divisor on C . Let $\mathbf{p} \in C$ and $n_{D,\mathbf{p}}$ be the multiplicity of \mathbf{p} in $i^*\mathcal{D}$. The *local Weil function* $\lambda_{D,\mathbf{p}} : X(K) \setminus \text{Supp}(D) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is defined by

$$(2.1) \quad \lambda_{D,\mathbf{p}}(P) := n_{D,\mathbf{p}}.$$

Remark. If another proper model \mathcal{X}' is chosen and let $\lambda'_{D,\mathbf{p}}$ be the associate local Weil function. Then $\lambda_{D,\mathbf{p}} - \lambda'_{D,\mathbf{p}}$ is bounded by a M_K constant. Therefore, we will choose a model that suits best of our purposes.

For a finite subset S of $C(\mathbf{k})$, we will denote by

$$m_{D,S}(P) := \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in S} \lambda_{D,\mathbf{p}}(P),$$

$$N_{D,S}(P) := \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in C(\mathbf{k}) \setminus S} \lambda_{D,\mathbf{p}}(P), \quad \text{and} \quad N_{D,S}^{(m)}(P) := \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in C(\mathbf{k}) \setminus S} \min\{m, \lambda_{D,\mathbf{p}}(P)\}$$

where m is a positive integer, and

$$h_D(P) := m_{D,S}(P) + N_{D,S}(P).$$

Finally, we reinterpret the definition of Campana integral points via the geometric model. Let (X, Δ_α) be a Campana orbifold as in Definition 1, where $\Delta := \Delta_\epsilon = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_\epsilon} \epsilon_\alpha D_\alpha$. We can choose a *good integral model away from S* which is a proper model $\rho : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow C$ over \mathcal{O}_S such that \mathcal{X} is regular. We denote by \mathcal{D}_α the Zariski closure of D_α in \mathcal{X} , and we write $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}_\epsilon)$ for the model, where $\mathcal{D}_\epsilon := \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_\epsilon} \mathcal{D}_\alpha$. Then a rational point $P \in X(K)$ extends uniquely to an integral point $\mathcal{P} \in \mathcal{X}(\mathcal{O}_S)$.

Following the convention in [15, Definition 3.4], we define the following.

Definition 10. With the notation introduced above, we say that $P \in X(K)$ is a *Campana (Δ, S) -integral point* with respect to $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}_\epsilon)$ if the following holds:

- (i) for all α with $\epsilon_\alpha = 1$ and $\mathbf{p} \notin S$, $\lambda_{D_\alpha, \mathbf{p}}(P) := n_{D_\alpha, \mathbf{p}} = 0$, i.e. $P \in (X \setminus \cup_{\epsilon_\alpha=1} D_\alpha)(\mathcal{O}_S)$.
- (ii) for $\mathbf{p} \notin S$, and all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}_\epsilon$ with both $\epsilon_\alpha < 1$ and $n_{D_\alpha, \mathbf{p}} > 0$, we have

$$n_{D_\alpha, \mathbf{p}} \geq \frac{1}{1 - \epsilon_\alpha}.$$

Consequently, the collection of Campana (Δ, S) -integral points with respect to $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}_\epsilon)$ is a set of Campana (Δ, S) -integral points as in Definition 2.

Example 1. Let $X = \mathbb{P}^2$, F be a non-constant homogeneous polynomial in $\mathcal{O}_S^*[x_0, x_1, x_2]$ and $D = [F = 0]$. We can take $\mathcal{X} = C \times \mathbb{P}^2$. Let $P = [f_0 : f_1 : f_2] \in \mathbb{P}^2(K)$, i.e. $f_i \in K$. Then

$$\lambda_{D, \mathbf{p}}(P) = v_{\mathbf{p}}(F(f_0, f_1, f_2)) - \min\{v_{\mathbf{p}}(f_0), v_{\mathbf{p}}(f_1), v_{\mathbf{p}}(f_2)\}$$

for $\mathbf{p} \notin S$. Let $\Delta = [x_0 = 0] + \frac{1}{2}[x_1 = 0] + \frac{2}{3}[x_0 + x_1 + x_2 = 0]$. If $P = [f_0 : f_1 : f_2] \in \mathbb{P}^2(K)$ is a Campana (Δ, S) -integral point with respect to $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{D}_\epsilon)$, then $v_{\mathbf{p}}(f_0) = \min\{v_{\mathbf{p}}(f_0), v_{\mathbf{p}}(f_1), v_{\mathbf{p}}(f_2)\}$ for all $\mathbf{p} \notin S$. Therefore, $(\frac{f_1}{f_0}, \frac{f_2}{f_0}) \in \mathcal{O}_S^2$, $v_{\mathbf{p}}(\frac{f_1}{f_0}) \geq 2$, and $v_{\mathbf{p}}(1 + \frac{f_1}{f_0} + \frac{f_2}{f_0}) \geq 3$, for all $\mathbf{p} \notin S$.

2.3. Generalization of unit equations.

We will use the following slightly modified result of Brownawell-Masser [1].

Theorem 11. Let S be a finite subset of $C(\mathbf{k})$. If $f_1, \dots, f_n \in K^*$ and $f_1 + \dots + f_n = 1$, then either some proper subsum of $f_1 + \dots + f_n$ vanishes or

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} h(f_i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n (N_{0,S}^{(n)}(f_i) + N_{\infty,S}^{(n)}(f_i)) + \frac{n(n+1)}{2} \chi_S^+(C).$$

Corollary 12. Let S be a finite subset of $C(\mathbf{k})$. Let F be a non-constant polynomial in $K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ of degree d . Let $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_n) \in (K^*)^n$ such that $F(\mathbf{u}) = 0$. Then there exists a non-trivial n -tuple $(m_1, \dots, m_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ with $\sum_{i=1}^n |m_i| \leq 2d$ such that

$$h(u_1^{m_1} \cdots u_n^{m_n}) \leq c_2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n N_{0,S}^{(1)}(u_i) + \sum_{i=1}^n N_{\infty,S}^{(1)}(u_i) \right) + c_2 \chi_S^+(C) + c_3 h(F),$$

where $c_1 = \binom{n+d}{d} - 1$, $c_2 = \frac{1}{2}c_1(c_1 + 1)$, and $c_3 = 2c_1c_2$.

Proof. Let $F(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in I_F} a_{\mathbf{i}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{i}}$, where $\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$. Since $h(F) = h(\lambda F)$ for $\lambda \in K^*$, we may assume that $a_{\mathbf{i}_0} = 1$ for some \mathbf{i}_0 . As $F(\mathbf{u}) = 0$, there is a (non-trivial) index subset J of $I_F \setminus \{\mathbf{i}_0\}$ such that

$$(2.2) \quad \sum_{\mathbf{j} \in J} a_{\mathbf{j}} \mathbf{u}^{\mathbf{j} - \mathbf{i}_0} = -1$$

with no proper subsum vanishes.

Let $S' = \{\mathbf{p} \in C \setminus S \mid v_{\mathbf{p}}(a_{\mathbf{i}}) \neq 0 \text{ for some } \mathbf{i} \in J, \text{ or } v_{\mathbf{p}}(u_i) \neq 0 \text{ for some } 1 \leq i \leq n\} \cup S$. Then

$$|S'| \leq |S| + \sum_{i=1}^n N_{0,S}^{(1)}(u_i) + \sum_{i=1}^n N_{\infty,S}^{(1)}(u_i) + 2c_1 h(F),$$

where $c_1 = \binom{n+d}{n} - 1$. We now apply Theorem 11 to (2.2) with S' to get

$$\max_{\mathbf{j} \in J} h(\mathbf{u}^{\mathbf{j} - \mathbf{i}_0}) \leq c_2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n N_{0,S}^{(1)}(u_i) + \sum_{i=1}^n N_{\infty,S}^{(1)}(u_i) + \chi_S^+(C) \right) + 2c_1 c_2 h(F)$$

where $c_2 = \frac{1}{2}c_1(c_1 + 1)$. □

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 4

The proof of Theorem 4 is base on Theorem 7 and the following.

Theorem 13. *Let $F \in K[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ be a non-constant polynomial. Assume that $F(0, \dots, 0) \neq 0$. Let Z be the Zariski closed subset of $\mathbb{A}^n(K)$ containing all hypersurfaces defined by all possible subsums (including F) in the expansion of F . Let S be a finite subset of $C(\mathbf{k})$. Then for all $(u_1, \dots, u_n) \in (K^*)^n \setminus Z$, we have*

$$\sum_{\mathbf{p} \in S} v_{\mathbf{p}}^0(F(u_1, \dots, u_n)) \leq \tilde{c}_1 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n N_{0,S}^{(1)}(u_i) + \sum_{i=1}^n N_{\infty,S}^{(1)}(u_i) + \chi_S^+(C) \right) + \tilde{c}_2 h(F),$$

where $d = \deg F$, $\tilde{c}_1 = \frac{1}{2} \binom{n+d}{n} (\binom{n+d}{n} + 1)$ and $\tilde{c}_2 = 2 \left(\binom{n+d}{n} - 1 \right) \tilde{c}_1$.

Proof. Since $F(0, \dots, 0) \neq 0$ and $h(F) = h(\lambda F)$ for $\lambda \in K^*$, we may assume that $F(x_1, \dots, x_n) = 1 + \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in I} a_{\mathbf{i}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{i}}$, where $\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$, $|\mathbf{i}| \leq d$, and $a_{\mathbf{i}} \neq 0$. Then we have

$$(3.1) \quad 1 = F(\mathbf{u}) - \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in I} a_{\mathbf{i}} \mathbf{u}^{\mathbf{i}},$$

where $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_n) \in (K^*)^n \setminus Z$. Therefore, no subsum of $\sum_{\mathbf{i}} a_{\mathbf{i}} \mathbf{u}^{\mathbf{i}}$ vanishes. Let $S' = \{\mathbf{p} \in C \setminus S \mid v_{\mathbf{p}}(a_{\mathbf{i}}) \neq 0 \text{ for some } \mathbf{i} \in I, \text{ or } v_{\mathbf{p}}(u_i) \neq 0 \text{ for some } 1 \leq i \leq n\} \cup S$. Then $F(\mathbf{u}) \in \mathcal{O}_{S'}$ and

$$|S'| \leq |S| + \sum_{i=1}^n N_{0,S}^{(1)}(u_i) + \sum_{i=1}^n N_{\infty,S}^{(1)}(u_i) + 2c_1 h(F),$$

where $c_1 = \binom{n+d}{n} - 1$. We now apply Theorem 11 to (3.1) with S' to get

$$(3.2) \quad h(F(\mathbf{u})) \leq N_{0,S}(F(\mathbf{u})) + \tilde{c}_1 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n N_{0,S}^{(1)}(u_i) + \sum_{i=1}^n N_{\infty,S}^{(1)}(u_i) + \chi_S^+(C) \right) + 2c_1 \tilde{c}_1 h(F)$$

where $\tilde{c}_1 = \frac{1}{2}(c_1 + 1)(c_1 + 2)$. Since $h(F(\mathbf{u})) = \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in C} v_{\mathbf{p}}^0(F(\mathbf{u}))$, the inequality (3.2) implies

$$\sum_{\mathbf{p} \in S} v_{\mathbf{p}}^0(F(\mathbf{u})) \leq \tilde{c}_1 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n N_{0,S}^{(1)}(u_i) + \sum_{i=1}^n N_{\infty,S}^{(1)}(u_i) + \chi_S^+(C) \right) + 2c_1 \tilde{c}_1 h(F).$$

□

We will use the following proposition adapting from [18, Proposition 10.11].

Proposition 14. *Let X be a projective variety over K . Let A and B be two big divisors on X . Then there exists constants c_1 and c_2 and a proper Zariski closed subset Z of X , depending only on A and B , such that*

$$c_1 h_A(P) - O(1) \leq h_B(P) \leq c_2 h_A(P) + O(1)$$

for all $P \in X(K) \setminus Z$, where the implied constant depends only on A , B and the choices of height functions.

We note that the implied constants will be dropped (by increasing c_1 and c_2) when the height functions are fixed.

Proof of Theorem 4. We fix a proper model \mathcal{X} of X so that the local Weil functions of divisors of X are defined as in Definition 9. We recall the following setup of finding a natural finite open covering of X from the proof of [14, Theorem 4.4]. Let Σ be the fan corresponding to the smooth projective toric variety X . Then there is a finite affine covering $\{X_\sigma\}$ of X , where $\sigma \in \Sigma$ is a 2-dimensional smooth cone with an isomorphism $i_\sigma : X_\sigma \rightarrow \mathbb{A}^2$. This isomorphism restricts to an automorphism of \mathbb{G}_m^n , where we identify $\mathbb{G}_m^2 \subset X_\sigma$ naturally as a subset of X and $\mathbb{G}_m^2 \subset \mathbb{A}^2$ in the standard way such that $\mathbb{A}^2 \setminus \mathbb{G}_m^2$ consists of the affine coordinate hyperplanes $\{x_i = 0\}$, $i = 1, 2$. Moreover, by Proposition 14, there exist non-zero constants $b_{\sigma,A}$, $c_{\sigma,A}$ and a proper closed subset $Z_{\sigma,A} \subset X_\sigma$, depending on σ and A such that

$$(3.3) \quad b_{\sigma,A} h_A(P) \leq h(i_\sigma(P)) \leq c_{\sigma,A} h_A(P)$$

for all $P \in X_\sigma(K) \setminus Z_{\sigma,A} \subset X(K)$, where $i_\sigma(P) = (u_1, u_2)$ and $h(i_\sigma(P)) := \max\{h(u_1), h(u_2)\}$. (Note that we are including the coordinate hyperplane of X_σ as a subset of $Z_{\sigma,A}$.) The pullback $(i_\sigma^{-1})^*(D|_{X_\sigma})$ of D to \mathbb{A}^2 is defined by some nonzero polynomial $f_\sigma \in K[x_1, x_2]$, which does not vanish at the origin since D is in general position with the boundary of \mathbb{G}_m^2 in X . We will take f_σ with $f_\sigma(0, 0) = 1$.

Let (X, Δ) be an Campana orbifold associated to (X, \mathbb{G}_m^2) with multiplicity at least ℓ , where ℓ is a sufficiently large integer to be determined later. Let \mathcal{R} be a set of (Δ, S) -integral points. Let $P \in \mathcal{R} \setminus \text{Supp}(D)$. By [13, Chapter 10, Proposition 1.2], for each $\mathbf{q} \notin S$ we find some σ (depend on \mathbf{q}) such that $P \in X_\sigma(K) \setminus Z_{\sigma,A}$ with $v_{\mathbf{q}}(i_\sigma(P)) := \min\{v_{\mathbf{q}}(u_1), v_{\mathbf{q}}(u_2)\} \geq 0$. Then we have

$$(3.4) \quad \lambda_{D,\mathbf{q}}(P) = v_{\mathbf{q}}^0(f_\sigma(i_\sigma(P))) + c_{\sigma,\mathbf{q}},$$

where $0 \leq c_{\sigma,\mathbf{q}} \leq -v_{\mathbf{q}}(f_\sigma)$. We note that $v_{\mathbf{q}}(f_\sigma) \leq 0$ since $f_\sigma(0,0) = 1$. Since there are only finitely many X_σ , we find a finite index set I_P such that for any $\mathbf{p} \notin S$ the equality (3.4) holds for some $\sigma \in I_P$. Let $S_\sigma := \{\mathbf{p} \in C(\mathbf{k}) : v_{\mathbf{p}}(u_1) < 0, \text{ or } v_{\mathbf{p}}(u_2) < 0\} \cup S$. Then $(u_1, u_2) \in \mathcal{O}_{S_\sigma}^2$ and

$$N_{0,S_\sigma}^{(1)}(u_i) \leq \frac{1}{\ell} N_{0,S_\sigma}(u_i) \leq \frac{1}{\ell} h(u_i),$$

since P is a (Δ, S) -integral point with multiplicity at least ℓ . Furthermore,

$$(3.5) \quad N_{D,S}(P) - N_{D,S}^{(1)}(P) \leq \sum_{\sigma \in I_P} N_{0,S_\sigma}(f_\sigma(i_\sigma(P))) - N_{0,S_\sigma}^{(1)}(f_\sigma(i_\sigma(P))) + O(1),$$

by (3.4). Let M be the number of X_σ . Then $|I_P| \leq M$. Finally, we note that $|S_\sigma| \leq |S| + \#\{\mathbf{p} \notin S \mid \min\{v_{\mathbf{p}}(u_1), v_{\mathbf{p}}(u_2)\} < 0\}$. Let \mathcal{B} be the divisor on \mathcal{X} coming from the boundary D_0 and $\iota : C \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$ be the corresponding section of P . Then for $\mathbf{p} \in S_\sigma \setminus S$ we have $\iota(\mathbf{p}) \in \mathcal{B}$, and

$$-\min\{0, v_{\mathbf{p}}(u_1), v_{\mathbf{p}}(u_2)\} = n_{B_\alpha, \mathbf{p}} \geq \ell,$$

where B_α is a component of D_0 . Therefore, we have

$$(3.6) \quad |S_\sigma| \leq |S| + \frac{1}{\ell} h(1, u_1, u_2) \leq |S| + \frac{2}{\ell} \max\{h(u_1), h(u_2)\}.$$

We may now apply Theorem 7 and (3.6) to each f_σ and S_σ . Let $\epsilon > 0$. Then there exist a positive real b_σ and a proper Zariski closed subset $W_\sigma \subset X(K)$ containing $\text{Supp}(D)$ and $Z_{\sigma,A}$ for each $\sigma \in \Sigma$ such that for sufficiently large integer ℓ , either

$$h(i_\sigma(P)) \leq b_\sigma \max\{1, \chi_S(C)\} + \frac{2b_\sigma}{\ell} h(i_\sigma(P))$$

or

$$(3.7) \quad N_{0,S_\sigma}(f_\sigma(i_\sigma(P))) - N_{0,S_\sigma}^{(1)}(f_\sigma(i_\sigma(P))) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{Mc_{\sigma,A}} h(i_\sigma(P))$$

for all $P \in \mathcal{R} \cap X_\sigma(K) \setminus W_\sigma$. Since the number of X_σ is finite, we conclude from (3.3), (3.5) and (3.7) that there exists a positive integer ℓ_0 , a proper Zariski closed subset Z_1 of X such that either $h_A(P) \leq O(1)$ or

$$(3.8) \quad N_{D,S}(P) - N_{D,S}^{(1)}(P) < \epsilon h_A(P)$$

for all $P \in \mathcal{R} \setminus Z_1$ if $\ell > \ell_0$.

Let $\mathbf{q} \in S$. Let $P \in \mathcal{R} \setminus \text{Supp}(D)$. We find some σ (depend on \mathbf{q}) such that $P \in X_\sigma(K) \setminus Z_{\sigma,A}$ and $v_{\mathbf{q}}(i_\sigma(P)) := \min\{v_{\mathbf{q}}(u_1), v_{\mathbf{q}}(u_2)\} \geq 0$. Then (3.4) holds as well. Let $S_{\sigma,\mathbf{q}} := \{\mathbf{p} \in C(\mathbf{k}) : v_{\mathbf{p}}(u_1) < 0 \text{ or } v_{\mathbf{p}}(u_2) < 0\} \cup S$. We apply Theorem 13 respectively to each $S_{\sigma,\mathbf{q}}$ for each $\mathbf{q} \in S$, to find a Zariski closed subset $Z_{\sigma,\mathbf{q}}$ containing $Z_{\sigma,A}$ from (3.3) of X_σ such that

$$(3.9) \quad v_{\mathbf{q}}^0(f_\sigma(i_\sigma(P))) \leq c_1 \left(\sum_{i=1}^2 N_{0,S}^{(1)}(u_i) + \chi_{S_{\sigma,\mathbf{q}}}^+(C) \right) + c_2 h(f_\sigma)$$

for all $P \in \mathcal{R} \cap X_\sigma(K) \setminus Z_{\sigma,A}$. By repeating the previous arguments for the proof of (3.8) and by enlarging ℓ_0 if necessary, we have either $h_A(P) \leq O(1)$, or

$$(3.10) \quad m_{D,S}(P) := \sum_{\mathbf{q} \in S} \lambda_{D,\mathbf{q}}(P) \leq \epsilon h_A(P)$$

for all $P \in \mathcal{R} \setminus Z_2$, where Z_2 is the union of all $Z_{\sigma,\mathbf{q}}$ for $\mathbf{q} \in S$ if $\ell \geq \ell_0$.

Since $h_D(P) = m_{D,S}(P) + N_{D,S}(P)$, we can derive from (3.10) that

$$N_{D,S}(P) \geq h_D(P) - \epsilon h_A(P)$$

for all $P \in \mathcal{R} \setminus Z_2$. Then we have either $h_A(P) \leq O(1)$ or

$$(3.11) \quad N_{D,S}^{(1)}(P) \geq h_D(P) - 2\epsilon h_A(P) - O(1),$$

for all $P \in P \in \mathcal{R} \setminus \{Z_1 \cup Z_2\}$. Finally, we note that the situation that $h_A(P) \leq O(1)$ can be included in (3.11) by enlarging the implied constant. \square

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 5 AND THEOREM 6

Proof of Theorem 5. Since a canonical divisor \mathbf{K}_X can naturally be taken to be $-D_0$ (see [7, Theorem 8.2.3]), and $\mathbf{K}_X + \Delta \leq \mathbf{K}_X + D_0 + A$, the assumption that $\mathbf{K}_X + \Delta$ is big implies that A is also big.

Since \mathcal{R} is a set of (Δ, S) integral-points with multiplicity at least ℓ_0 along D_0 , we may apply Theorem 4. Let $\epsilon = \frac{1}{3}$. Then there exists a proper Zariski closed subset Z of X and a positive integer ℓ_0 such that

$$(4.1) \quad N_{A,S}^{(1)}(P) \geq (1 - \epsilon) \cdot h_A(P) - O(1)$$

holds for all $P \in \mathcal{R} \setminus Z$ if $\ell \geq \ell_0$. On the other hand, it follows from Definition 2 that

$$(4.2) \quad N_{A,S}^{(1)}(P) \leq \frac{1}{2} N_{A,S}(P) \leq \frac{1}{2} h_A(P).$$

Combining (4.2) and (4.1), we have $h_A(P) \leq O(1)$ for all $P \in \mathcal{R} \setminus Z$ if $\ell \geq \ell_0$. \square

Proof of Theorem 6. Let $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$ be a finite morphism. Let D be the support of H . Following the arguments from [6, Lemma 1], we have $K_Y \sim \pi^*(K_X) + \text{Ram}$, where Ram is the ramification divisor of π . Furthermore, $\text{Ram} = R + R_D$, where

R_D is the contribution coming from the support contained in D , i.e. $H = D + R_D$. Since a canonical divisor \mathbf{K}_X can naturally be taken as $-D_0$, we obtain

$$(4.3) \quad R \sim D + \mathbf{K}_Y \geq \Delta + \mathbf{K}_Y.$$

Since (Y, Δ) is of general type, $\mathbf{K}_Y + \Delta$ is big and hence R is big as well.

Let R_0 be an irreducible component of R , which we may assume to be defined over K . (See the proof of [10, Theorem 3].) Without loss of generality, we let $R_0 = R$. Otherwise, we simply repeat the following steps for each irreducible component. Let $A = \pi(R)$, which is a normal crossings divisor on (X, \mathbb{G}_m^2) by assumption. Since π^*A has multiplicity at least 2 along R , we have

$$2\lambda_{R, \mathbf{q}}(P) \leq \lambda_{\pi^*A, \mathbf{q}}(P) = \lambda_{A, \mathbf{q}}(\pi(P))$$

for all $\mathbf{q} \in C$ if $P \in Y(K) \setminus R$. Hence,

$$(4.4) \quad N_{R, S}(P) \leq N_{A, S}(\pi(P)) - N_{A, S}^{(1)}(\pi(P)),$$

if $P \in Y(K) \setminus R$.

Since (Y, Δ) is a Campana orbifold of general type with $\text{Supp}(\Delta) = \text{Supp}(H)$ and multiplicity at least ℓ and $\mathcal{R} \subset Y(K)$ is a subset of (Δ, S) -integral points, it is clear from Definition 9 that $\pi(\mathcal{R}) \subset X(K)$ is a subset of (Δ', S) -integral points, where $\Delta' = \pi(\Delta)$ (as \mathbb{Q} divisors).

Let $\epsilon = \frac{1}{3}$. We now apply Theorem 4 to the right hand side of (4.4) and use Proposition 14 and the functorial property of local Weil functions to find a sufficiently large integer ℓ_0 and a proper closed subset Z of Y such that either $h_R(P) \leq O(1)$ or

$$(4.5) \quad N_{R, S}(P) \leq \epsilon h_R(P), \quad \text{and}$$

$$(4.6) \quad N_{A, S}^{(1)}(\pi(P)) \geq h_A(\pi(P)) - \epsilon h_R(P) - O(1)$$

for all $P \in \mathcal{R} \setminus Z$ if $\ell \geq \ell_0$. On the other hand, by the functorial property, $R \leq \pi^*(A)$ (as divisors) implies that

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{aligned} m_{R, S}(P) &= m_{A, S}(\pi(P)) + O(1) \\ &= h_A(\pi(P)) - N_{A, S}(\pi(P)) + O(1) \\ &\leq \epsilon h_R(P) + O(1). \quad (\text{by (4.6)}) \end{aligned}$$

Together with (4.5) and that $\epsilon = \frac{1}{3}$, we have $h_R(P) \leq O(1)$ if $P \notin \text{Supp}(\pi^*(A)) \cup \pi^{-1}(Z)$. \square

5. GCD THEOREMS

In this section, we develop a gcd theorem for two coprime polynomials evaluating at arguments with large zeros. For $f, g \in K$, we define

$$N_{S, \text{gcd}}(f, g) := \sum_{p \in C \setminus S} \min\{v_p^0(f), v_p^0(g)\}; \quad \text{and}$$

$$h_{\text{gcd}}(f, g) := \sum_{p \in C} \min\{v_p^0(f), v_p^0(g)\}.$$

Theorem 15. *Let $F_1, F_2 \in K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be a coprime pair of nonconstant polynomials. Assume that $F_1(0, \dots, 0) \neq 0$. Let S be a finite subset of $C(\mathbf{k})$. For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exist an integer m , positive reals c_1, c_2 , and a sufficiently large integer ℓ all depending only on ϵ and the degree of F_i , $i = 1, 2$, such that for all n -tuple $(g_1, \dots, g_n) \in (K^*)^n$ with*

$$(5.1) \quad N_{0, S}^{(1)}(g_i) + N_{\infty, S}^{(1)}(g_i) \leq \frac{1}{\ell} h(g_i),$$

for each $1 \leq i \leq n$, one of the following holds:

- (i) $\max\{h(g_1), \dots, h(g_n)\} \leq c_1 \max\{0, 2\mathbf{g} - 2 + |S|\} + c_2(\tilde{h}(F_1) + \tilde{h}(F_2))$,
- (ii) $h_{\text{gcd}}(F_1(\mathbf{g}), F_2(\mathbf{g})) \leq \epsilon \max\{h(g_1), \dots, h(g_n)\}$, or
- (iii) $h(g_1^{m_1} \cdots g_n^{m_n}) \leq \epsilon \max\{h(g_1), \dots, h(g_n)\}$ holds for a non-trivial n -tuple of integers (m_1, \dots, m_n) with $\sum |m_i| \leq 2m$.

Remark. *Let $g \neq 0 \in \mathcal{O}_S$. Suppose that $v_p(g) \geq \ell$ whenever $v_p(g) > 0$ for all $p \notin S$. Then (5.1) holds as $N_{0, S}^{(1)}(g) + N_{\infty, S}^{(1)}(g) \leq \frac{1}{\ell} N_{0, S}(g) \leq \frac{1}{\ell} h(g)$.*

5.1. Key Theorems.

For any finite-dimensional vector subspace $V \subset K$ over \mathbf{k} and any positive integer r , we denote by $V(r)$ the vector space over \mathbf{k} spanned by the set of all products of r (non-necessarily distinct) elements from V . Then $\dim V(r+1) \geq \dim V(r)$ for each r and $\liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \dim V(r+1)/\dim V(r) = 1$. Applying this inequality with V replaced by $V(e)$, we see that for each $e \in \mathbb{N}$

$$(5.2) \quad \liminf_{r \rightarrow \infty} \dim V(er + e)/\dim V(er) = 1.$$

Definition 16. Let $E \subset K$ be a vector space over \mathbf{k} . We say that $y_1, \dots, y_m \in K$ are linearly nondegenerate over E if whenever we have a linear combination $\sum_{i=1}^m a_i y_i = 0$ with $a_i \in E$, then $a_i = 0$ for each i ; otherwise we say that they are linearly degenerate over E . Similarly, a point $\mathbf{x} = [x_0 : x_1 : \cdots : x_n] \in \mathbb{P}^n(K)$, with each $x_i \in K$, is said to be linearly degenerate (resp. linearly nondegenerate) over E if x_0, \dots, x_n is linearly degenerate (resp. nondegenerate) over E .

Recall the following technical theorem from [9].

Theorem 17 ([9, Theorem 26]). *Let $F_1, F_2 \in K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be coprime polynomials of the same degree $d > 0$. Assume that one of the coefficients in the expansion of F_i is 1 for each $i \in \{1, 2\}$. For every positive integer $m \geq 2d$, we let $M := M_m := 2\binom{m+n-d}{n} - \binom{m+n-2d}{n}$ and $M' := M'_m := \binom{m+n}{n} - M$. For every positive integer r , we denote by $V_{F_1, F_2}(r)$ the vector space over \mathbf{k} spanned by $\prod_{\alpha} \alpha^{n_{\alpha}}$, where α runs over all non-zero coefficients of F_1 and F_2 , $n_{\alpha} \geq 0$ and $\sum n_{\alpha} = r$; we also put $d_r := \dim_{\mathbf{k}} V_{F_1, F_2}(r)$. Then M'_m has order $O(m^{n-2})$; moreover, if for some $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_n) \in (\mathcal{O}_S^*)^n$ those $\mathbf{g}^{\mathbf{i}}$ with $\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ and $|\mathbf{i}| \leq m$ are linearly nondegenerate over $V_{F_1, F_2}(Mr + 1)$ for some positive integer $m \geq 2d$, then we have the following estimate*

$$\begin{aligned} & MN_{S, \text{gcd}}(F_1(\mathbf{g}), F_2(\mathbf{g})) \\ & \leq \left(M' + \frac{d_{Mr}}{d_{M(r-1)}} M - M \right) mn \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{h(g_i)\} + cM(h(F_1) + h(F_2)) + c' M \chi_S^0(C) \end{aligned}$$

where $c := \frac{d_{Mr}}{d_{M(r-1)}}(1 + M(r + 1))$ and $c' := \frac{d_{Mr}^2 M}{2d_{M(r-1)}}$.

Proof of Theorem 15. We can assume that F_1 and F_2 have the same degree d and $F_1(0, \dots, 0) = 1$ by the same arguments in the proof of Theorem 8 in [9]. Let $\epsilon > 0$ be given. We first consider when $n \geq 2$. We first choose m sufficiently large so that $m \geq 2d$ and

$$(5.3) \quad \frac{M' mn}{M} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{4},$$

where $M := M_m := 2\binom{m+n-d}{n} - \binom{m+n-2d}{n}$ and $M' := M'_m := \binom{m+n}{n} - M$; this is possible because $M_m = \frac{m^n}{n!} + O(m^{n-1})$ and $M' = O(m^{n-2})$. By (5.2) we may then choose a sufficiently large integer $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$(5.4) \quad \frac{w}{u} - 1 \leq \frac{\epsilon}{4mn},$$

where $w := \dim_{\mathbf{k}} V_{F_1, F_2}(Mr)$ and $u := \dim_{\mathbf{k}} V_{F_1, F_2}(Mr - M)$ (as in Theorem 17).

We first consider when those $\mathbf{g}^{\mathbf{i}}$ with $\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{n+1}$ and $|\mathbf{i}| = m$ are linearly degenerate over $V_{F_1, F_2}(Mr + 1)$, i.e. there is a non-trivial relation

$$(5.5) \quad \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in I} \alpha_{\mathbf{i}} \mathbf{g}^{\mathbf{i}} = 0,$$

where the sum runs over those $\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{n+1}$ $|\mathbf{i}| = m$, and $\alpha_{\mathbf{i}} \in V_{F_1, F_2}(Mr + 1)$ such that $\alpha_{\mathbf{i}} \neq 0$ for each \mathbf{i} . By Corollary 12 and (5.1), there exists a non-trivial n -tuple $(m_1, \dots, m_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ with $\sum_{i=1}^n |m_i| \leq 2m$ such that

$$(5.6) \quad h(g_1^{m_1} \cdots g_n^{m_n}) \leq \frac{n\tilde{c}_2}{\ell} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{h(g_i)\} + \tilde{c}_2 \chi_S^+(C) + \tilde{c}_3(h(F_1) + h(F_2)),$$

where $\tilde{c}_1 = \binom{n+m}{m} - 1$, $\tilde{c}_2 = \frac{1}{2}\tilde{c}_1(\tilde{c}_1 + 1)$, $\tilde{c}_3 = 2(Mr + 1)\tilde{c}_1\tilde{c}_2$, and ℓ is to be determined later.

We now consider when those $\mathbf{g}^{\mathbf{i}}$ with $\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ and $|\mathbf{i}| = m$ are linearly nondegenerate over $V_{F,G}(Mr + 1)$. Let

$$(5.7) \quad \tilde{S} = \{\mathbf{p} \in C \setminus S \mid v_{\mathbf{p}}(g_i) \neq 0 \text{ for some } 1 \leq i \leq n\} \cup S.$$

Then

$$|\tilde{S}| \leq \sum_{i=1}^n (N_{0,S}^{(1)}(g_i) + N_{\infty,S}^{(1)}(g_i)) + |S| \leq \frac{n}{\ell} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{h(g_i)\} + |S|,$$

and $g_i \in \mathcal{O}_{\tilde{S}}^*$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$. Applying Theorem 17 with (5.3) and (5.4), we have

$$(5.8) \quad N_{\tilde{S},\text{gcd}}(F(\mathbf{g}), G(\mathbf{g})) \leq \left(\frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{n\tilde{c}_5}{\ell}\right) \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{h(g_i)\} + \tilde{c}_4(h(F_1) + h(F_2)) + \tilde{c}_5\chi_S^+(C),$$

where \tilde{c}_4 and \tilde{c}_5 are positive reals depending only on m , thus only on ϵ and d .

We now choose

$$(5.9) \quad \ell = 8n\epsilon^{-1} \cdot \max\{\tilde{c}_2, \tilde{c}_5\}$$

and assume that

$$(5.10) \quad \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{h(g_i)\} \geq \frac{8}{\epsilon} (\max\{\tilde{c}_3, \tilde{c}_4\}(h(F_1) + h(F_2)) + \max\{\tilde{c}_2, \tilde{c}_5\}\chi_S^+(C)).$$

Then (5.6) becomes

$$h(g_1^{m_1} \cdots g_n^{m_n}) \leq \epsilon \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{h(g_i)\},$$

and (5.8) yields

$$(5.11) \quad N_{\tilde{S},\text{gcd}}(F_1(\mathbf{g}), F_2(\mathbf{g})) \leq \frac{3\epsilon}{4} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{h(g_i)\}.$$

We now show (5.11) for $n = 1$ and $g = g_1$. Since F_1 and F_2 are coprime in $K[x]$, the theorem of resultant implies there exist polynomials P_1, P_2 of bounded degree with coefficients in the \mathbb{Z} -module generated by the coefficients of F_1 and F_2 such that $F_1P_1 + F_2P_2 = \alpha$, where α is the resultant of F_1 and F_2 . Then we have

$$\min\{v_{\mathbf{p}}^0(F_1(g)), v_{\mathbf{p}}^0(F_2(g))\} + \min\{-v_{\mathbf{p}}^\infty(P_1(g)), -v_{\mathbf{p}}^\infty(P_2(g))\} \leq v_{\mathbf{p}}^0(\alpha),$$

for each $\mathbf{p} \in C \setminus \tilde{S}$. Moreover,

$$\sum_{\mathbf{p} \in C \setminus \tilde{S}} v_{\mathbf{p}}^\infty(P_i(g)) \leq \sum_{\mathbf{p} \in C \setminus \tilde{S}} -\min\{0, v_{\mathbf{p}}(P_i)\} \leq \tilde{h}(P_i)$$

for $i = 1, 2$ since $v_{\mathbf{p}}(g) = 0$ for $\mathbf{p} \notin \tilde{S}$. Therefore,

$$N_{\tilde{S},\text{gcd}}(F_1(g), F_2(g)) \leq h(\alpha) + \tilde{h}(P_1) + \tilde{h}(P_2).$$

By the construction of resultant (See [16, Proposition 2.13].), the right hand side is bounded by a (computable) constant multiple of $h(F_1) + h(F_2)$. We can deduce (5.11) similarly, by enlarging the right hand side of (5.10) if necessary.

We now estimate the part for \tilde{S} for all $n \geq 1$. Since $F_1(0, \dots, 0) = 1$, we may express F_1 as the following

$$F_1 = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^t a_{i_j} \cdot \mathbf{x}^{i_j},$$

where $a_{i_j} \neq 0$, $1 \leq j \leq r$. Since $m \geq 2d$ and those $\mathbf{g}^{\mathbf{i}}$ with $\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ and $|\mathbf{i}| = m$ are linearly nondegenerate over $V_{F,G}(Mr+1)$, it is clear that no proper subsum of $1 + \sum_{j=1}^r a_{i_j} \cdot \mathbf{g}^{i_j}$ vanishes. Then by Theorem 13 with \tilde{S} and (5.1), we have

$$\sum_{\mathbf{p} \in \tilde{S}} v_{\mathbf{p}}^0(F_1(\mathbf{g})) \leq \frac{n\tilde{c}_6}{\ell} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{h(g_i)\} + \tilde{c}_6 \chi_S^+(C) + \tilde{c}_7 h(F_1),$$

where $\tilde{c}_6 = \frac{1}{2}(c_1+1)(c_1+2) \leq \tilde{c}_2$ and $\tilde{c}_7 = c_1(c_1+1)(c_1+2) \leq \tilde{c}_3$ as $c_1 = \binom{n+d}{n} - 1$. Then by our choice of ℓ in (5.9) and the height assumption (5.10), it yields

$$\sum_{\mathbf{p} \in \tilde{S}} v_{\mathbf{p}}^0(F_1(\mathbf{g})) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{4} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{h(g_i)\}.$$

Together with (5.11), we have

$$h_{\text{gcd}}(F_1(\mathbf{g}), F_2(\mathbf{g})) \leq \epsilon \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \{h(g_i)\}.$$

□

6. PROOF OF THEOREM 7

6.1. Main Lemmas. We recall some definitions and results from [9]. Let $t \in K \setminus \mathbf{k}$, which will be fixed later. The mapping $g \rightarrow \frac{dg}{dt}$ on $\mathbf{k}(t)$, the formal differentiation on $\mathbf{k}(t)$ with respect to t , extends uniquely to a global derivation on K as K is a finite separable extension of $\mathbf{k}(t)$. Furthermore, since an element in K can be written as a Laurent series in $t_{\mathbf{p}}$, the local derivative of $\eta \in K$ with respect to $t_{\mathbf{p}}$, denoted by $d_{\mathbf{p}}\eta := \frac{d\eta}{dt_{\mathbf{p}}}$, is given by the formal differentiation on $\mathbf{k}((t_{\mathbf{p}}))$ with respect to $t_{\mathbf{p}}$. The chain rule says

$$(6.1) \quad \eta' := \frac{d\eta}{dt} = d_{\mathbf{p}}\eta \cdot (d_{\mathbf{p}}t)^{-1}.$$

The following results are consequences of the Riemann-Roch Theorem. We refer to [2, Corollary 7] for a proof.

Proposition 18. *For each point $\mathbf{q} \in C(\mathbf{k})$, we can find some $t \in K \setminus \mathbf{k}$ satisfying the following conditions: t has exactly one pole at \mathbf{q} ; $h(t) \leq \mathbf{g} + 1$; and $\sum_{\mathbf{p} \in C(\mathbf{k})} v_{\mathbf{p}}^0(d_{\mathbf{p}}t) \leq 3\mathbf{g}$.*

The following is a reformulation of [9, Lemma 16 (b)].

Lemma 19. *Let S be a finite subset of C . Let $\eta_0, \dots, \eta_n \in K^*$. Then*

$$h\left(1, \frac{\eta'_1}{\eta_1}, \dots, \frac{\eta'_\ell}{\eta_\ell}\right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n (N_{0,S}^{(1)}(\eta_i) + N_{\infty,S}^{(1)}(\eta_i)) + |S| + 3\mathbf{g}.$$

From now on, we will fix a t satisfying the conditions in Proposition 18 and use the notation $\eta' := \frac{d\eta}{dt}$ for $\eta \in K$. For the convenience of discussion, we will use the following convention. Let $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_n) \in (K^*)^n$. We denote by $\mathbf{x} := (x_1, \dots, x_n)$, $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{i}} := x_1^{i_1} \cdots x_n^{i_n}$, $\mathbf{u}^{\mathbf{i}} := u_1^{i_1} \cdots u_n^{i_n} \in K^*$ and $|\mathbf{i}| := \sum_{j=1}^n |i_j|$. For a polynomial $F(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{i}} a_{\mathbf{i}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{i}} \in K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, we denote by I_F the set of exponents \mathbf{i} such that $a_{\mathbf{i}} \neq 0$ in the expression of F , and define

$$(6.2) \quad D_{\mathbf{u}}(F)(\mathbf{x}) := \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in I_F} \frac{(a_{\mathbf{i}} \mathbf{u}^{\mathbf{i}})'}{\mathbf{u}^{\mathbf{i}}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{i}} = \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in I_F} (a'_{\mathbf{i}} + a_{\mathbf{i}} \sum_{j=1}^n i_j \frac{u'_j}{u_j}) \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{i}}$$

Clearly, we have

$$(6.3) \quad F(\mathbf{u})' = D_{\mathbf{u}}(F)(\mathbf{u}),$$

and the following product rule:

$$(6.4) \quad D_{\mathbf{u}}(FG) = D_{\mathbf{u}}(F)G + FD_{\mathbf{u}}(G)$$

for each $F, G \in K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$.

The following proposition follows from the proof of [9, Proposition 17] and Lemma 19.

Proposition 20. *Let F be a nonconstant polynomial in $K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and S be a finite subset of C . Then for all $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_n) \in (K^*)^n$, we have*

$$\tilde{h}(D_{\mathbf{u}}(F)) \leq c_1 \tilde{h}(F) + 3 \max\{1, \chi_S(C)\} + \sum_{j=1}^n (N_{0,S}^{(1)}(u_j) + N_{\infty,S}^{(1)}(u_j)),$$

where $c = 2^{\binom{n+\deg F}{n}} + 1$.

The following lemma can be deduced from [9, Lemma 19] with $\mathbf{e} = (1, \dots, 1)$.

Lemma 21. *Let $F \in K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be a non-constant polynomial in $K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ with no monomials and repeated factors. Let $\mathbf{u} \in (K^*)^n$. Then F and $D_{\mathbf{u}}(F)$ are coprime in $K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ unless there exists a nontrivial tuple of integers (m_1, \dots, m_n) with $|m_1| + \dots + |m_n| \leq 2 \deg F$ such that $h(u_1^{m_1} \cdots u_n^{m_n}) \leq h(F)$.*

Proposition 22. *Let $G \in K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be a non-constant polynomial in $K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ with no monomials and repeated factors and assume that $G(0, \dots, 0) \neq 0$. For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exist an integer m , positive reals c_i , $1 \leq i \leq 2$, and a sufficiently large integer ℓ all depending only on ϵ and degree of G , such that for all $\mathbf{u} = (u_1, \dots, u_n) \in (K^*)^n$ satisfying*

$$N_{0,S}^{(1)}(u_i) + N_{\infty,S}^{(1)}(u_i) \leq \frac{1}{\ell} \max\{h(u_1), \dots, h(u_n)\}$$

for each $1 \leq i \leq n$, one of the following holds.

- (i) $\max\{h(u_1), \dots, h(u_n)\} \leq c_1 \max\{0, 2\mathbf{g} - 2 + |S|\} + c_2 h(G)$,
- (ii) there exists a non-trivial n -tuple of integers (m_1, \dots, m_n) with $\sum |m_i| \leq 2m$, such that $h(u_1^{m_1} \cdots u_n^{m_n}) \leq \epsilon \max\{h(u_1), \dots, h(u_n)\}$, or
- (iii) $N_{0,S}(G(\mathbf{u})) - N_{0,S}^{(1)}(G(\mathbf{u})) \leq \epsilon \max\{h(u_1), \dots, h(u_n)\}$.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{p} \in C(\mathbf{k})$ and let $t_{\mathbf{p}}$ be a local parameter at \mathbf{p} . Then we have

$$D_{\mathbf{u}}(G)(\mathbf{u}) = G(\mathbf{u})' = \frac{d}{dt_{\mathbf{p}}}(G(\mathbf{u})) \cdot \left(\frac{dt}{dt_{\mathbf{p}}}\right)^{-1}.$$

If $v_{\mathbf{p}}(G(\mathbf{u})) \geq 2$, then

$$v_{\mathbf{p}}(D_{\mathbf{u}}(G)(\mathbf{u})) + v_{\mathbf{p}}\left(\frac{dt}{dt_{\mathbf{p}}}\right) = v_{\mathbf{p}}\left(\frac{d}{dt_{\mathbf{p}}}(G(\mathbf{u}))\right) = v_{\mathbf{p}}(G(\mathbf{u})) - 1.$$

Hence,

$$v_{\mathbf{p}}^0(G(\mathbf{u})) - \min\{1, v_{\mathbf{p}}^0(G(\mathbf{u}))\} \leq \min\{v_{\mathbf{p}}^0(D_{\mathbf{u}}(G)(\mathbf{u})), v_{\mathbf{p}}^0(G(\mathbf{u}))\} + v_{\mathbf{p}}^0\left(\frac{dt}{dt_{\mathbf{p}}}\right).$$

Together with Proposition 18 we have

$$N_{0,S}(G(\mathbf{u})) - N_{0,S}^{(1)}(G(\mathbf{u})) \leq h_{\gcd}(G(\mathbf{u}), D_{\mathbf{u}}(G)(\mathbf{u})) + 3\mathbf{g}.$$

By Lemma 21 with suitable choice of c_1 and c_2 for assumption (ii), we have either (ii) holds or G and $D_{\mathbf{u}}(G)$ are coprime in $K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Then the assertion is a consequence of Theorem 15 and Proposition 20. \square

Proof of Theorem 7. Applying Proposition 22 for $n = 2$, it suffices to consider when

$$(6.5) \quad \max\{h(u_1), h(u_2)\} \geq c_1 h(G) + c_2 \max\{1, 2\mathbf{g} - 2 + |S|\},$$

and

$$(6.6) \quad h(u_1^{n_1} u_2^{n_2}) \leq \epsilon \max\{h(u_1), h(u_2)\}$$

holds for a non-trivial 2-tuple of integers (n_1, n_2) with $|n_1| + |n_2| \leq 2m$. We may assume that n_1 and n_2 are coprime and let $u_1^{n_1} u_2^{n_2} = \lambda$. Then there exist integers a and b such that $n_1 a + n_2 b = 1$. Since $h(\lambda) = h(\lambda^{-1})$, we may exchange the sign of n_1 and n_2 simultaneously. Moreover, we can also rearrange the index of u_1 and u_2 . Therefore, we may assume that $n_2 \geq n_1$ and $n_2 > 0$. For the choice of a and

b , we note that if $n_1 = 0$, then $n_2 = 1$ and we can simply take $a = 0$ and $b = 1$. If $n_1 \neq 0$, then we may assume that $0 < b \leq |n_1|$ since $n_1(a + kn_2) + n_2(b - kn_1) = 1$ for any integer k . Then we have $|a| < n_2$. Let $\beta = u_1^b u_2^{-a}$. Then we may write

$$u_1 = \lambda^a \beta^{n_2} \quad \text{and} \quad u_2 = \lambda^b \beta^{-n_1}.$$

As we have set $n_2 > 0$, it suffices to consider $n_1 \geq 0$ and $n_1 < 0$ respectively. From the definition of height function and the assumption, we have

$$(6.7) \quad \max\{h(u_1), h(u_2)\} \leq \max\{|n_1|, |n_2|\}h(\beta) + (|n_1| + |n_2|)h(\lambda)$$

Let

$$(6.8) \quad \Lambda = X^{n_1} Y^{n_2} \quad \text{and} \quad T = X^b Y^{-a}$$

be two variables. Then

$$X = \Lambda^a T^{n_2} \quad \text{and} \quad Y = \Lambda^b T^{-n_1}.$$

Let $B_\Lambda(T) \in K[\Lambda, \Lambda^{-1}][T]$ be the polynomial such that $B_\Lambda(0) \neq 0$ and

$$(6.9) \quad G(X, Y) = G(\Lambda^a T^{n_2}, \Lambda^b T^{-n_1}) = T^{M_1} B_\Lambda(T)$$

for some integers M_1 . Let $B(\Lambda, T) \in K[\Lambda, T]$ be the polynomial such that $B(0, T) \neq 0$ and

$$(6.10) \quad B(\Lambda, T) = \Lambda^{M_2} B_\Lambda(T)$$

for some integer M_2 . Since $B(\Lambda, 0) \in \mathbb{C}[\Lambda]$ is not identically zero, there are at most finitely many

$$(6.11) \quad \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_s \in K \text{ such that } B(\gamma_i, 0) = 0 \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq s.$$

We note that $B(\Lambda, T)$ cannot be constant as G has no monomial factors. Furthermore, as G is square free and the linear transformation

$$\begin{pmatrix} n_1 & b \\ n_2 & -a \end{pmatrix} : \mathbb{Z}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^2$$

defining (6.8) is bijective, it follows that that $B(\Lambda, T) \in K[\Lambda, T]$ is square free. Hence, the resultant $\text{res}(B_\Lambda, B'_\Lambda)$ of B_Λ and B'_Λ is a Laurent polynomial in $K[\Lambda, \Lambda^{-1}]$, not identically zero. Let

$$(6.12) \quad \alpha_i, 1 \leq i \leq t, \text{ be all the zeros of the resultant } \text{res}(B_\Lambda, B'_\Lambda).$$

It is clear that $\alpha_i \in \overline{K}$. Let $B(T) := B_\lambda(T) \in K[T]$, the specialization of $B_\Lambda(T)$ at $\Lambda = \lambda$. From now on, we assume that $\lambda \neq \alpha_i$ for any $1 \leq i \leq t$, $\lambda \neq \gamma_j$ for any $1 \leq j \leq s$, and furthermore λ is not a zero of the coefficient of the leading

term of $B_\Lambda(T)$. Therefore, $B(0) \neq 0$, $B(T)$ has no multiple factors in $K[\overline{T}]$, and $\deg B(T) = \deg B_\Lambda(T)$. We also have

$$(6.13) \quad G(u_1, u_2) = \beta^{M_1} B(\beta).$$

In what follows, we will show

$$(6.14) \quad v_{\mathbf{p}}^0(G(u_1, u_2)) \leq v_{\mathbf{p}}^0(B(\beta))$$

for $\mathbf{p} \notin S$. Since we always choose $n_2 > 0$, we separate the discussion into two cases. For the case that $n_1 \leq 0$, the assertion clearly holds since $M_1 = 0$, i.e. $G(u_1, u_2) = B(\beta)$. If $n_1 > 0$, then $a \leq 0$ as we set $b > 0$. Consequently, $\beta = u_1^b u_2^{-a} \in \mathcal{O}_S$. It is clear that (6.14) holds if $M_1 \leq 0$, which we will show. We now consider the expansion of $G(\Lambda^a T^{n_2}, \Lambda^b T^{-n_1})$ with $n_1 > 0$. Let $G(X, Y) = 1 + \sum a_{(i_1, i_2)} X^{i_1} Y^{i_2}$. Then the constant term of $G(\Lambda^a T^{n_2}, \Lambda^b T^{-n_1})$ is

$$P_0(\Lambda) = 1 + \sum a_{(i_1, i_2)} \Lambda^{ai_1 + bi_2},$$

where the sum is taking over all $(i_1, i_2) \neq (0, 0)$ such that $i_1 n_2 = i_2 n_1$, which implies that $ai_1 + bi_2 \neq 0$ and are distinct for different pairs of integers. Therefore, $P_0(\Lambda)$ is not zero. This implies that $M_1 \leq 0$. Then by (6.14), we have

$$(6.15) \quad N_{0,S}(G(u_1, u_2)) - N_{0,S}^{(1)}(G(u_1, u_2)) \leq N_{0,S}(B(\beta)) - N_{0,S}^{(1)}(B(\beta)).$$

To apply Proposition 22, we first note that by (6.6), and (6.7), there exist computable positive constants \tilde{c}_i , $1 \leq i \leq 2$ depending on ϵ and degree of G such that $h(B) \leq \tilde{c}_1 h(G)$,

$$(6.16) \quad h(\beta) \geq \tilde{c}_2 \max\{h(u_1), h(u_2)\},$$

and hence (6.5) yields

$$(6.17) \quad h(\beta) \geq \tilde{c}_1^{-1} \tilde{c}_2 c_1 h(B) + \tilde{c}_2 c_2 \max\{1, 2g - 2 + |S|\}.$$

Furthermore,

$$(6.18) \quad N_{0,S}^{(1)}(\beta) + N_{\infty,S}^{(1)}(\beta) \leq \sum_{i=1}^2 (N_{0,S}^{(1)}(u_i) + N_{\infty,S}^{(1)}(u_i)) \leq \frac{2}{\ell} \max\{h(u_1), h(u_2)\} \leq \frac{1}{\ell'} h(\beta),$$

where ℓ' is an integer bigger than $\ell \tilde{c}_2 / 2$. Since we may increase the size of ℓ , c_1 and c_2 whenever necessary, by applying Proposition 22 with $\epsilon' < \min\{1, \tilde{c}_2^{-1} \epsilon\}$ we have either

$$(6.19) \quad N_{0,S}(B(\beta)) - N_{0,S}^{(1)}(B(\beta)) \leq \epsilon' h(\beta) \leq \epsilon \max\{h(u_1), h(u_2)\},$$

or $h(\beta^b) \leq \epsilon' h(\beta)$, which can be ruled out as β is not constant and $\epsilon' < 1$. Together with (6.15), we have

$$N_{0,S}(G(u_1, u_2)) - N_{0,S}^{(1)}(G(u_1, u_2)) \leq \epsilon \max\{h(u_1), h(u_2)\}.$$

□

REFERENCES

- [1] W. D. BROWNAWELL AND D. W. MASSER, *Vanishing sums in function fields*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc. **100** (1986), no. 3, 427–434.
- [2] T. T. H. AN, H.-L. HUANG AND J. T.-Y. WANG, *Generalized Būchi’s problem for algebraic functions and meromorphic functions*, Math. Z. **273** (2013), no. 1-2, 95–122.
- [3] F. CAMPANA, *Orbifolds, special varieties and classification theory*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **54** (2004), 499–630.
- [4] L. CAPUANO AND A. TURCHET, *Lang-Vojta conjecture over function fields for surfaces dominating \mathbb{G}_m^2* , Eur. J. Math. **8** (2022), no. 2, 573–610.
- [5] P. CORVAJA AND U. ZANNIER, *Some cases of Vojta’s conjecture on integral points over function fields*, J. Algebraic Geom. **17** (2008), no. 2, 295–333.
- [6] P. CORVAJA AND U. ZANNIER, *Algebraic hyperbolicity of ramified covers of \mathbb{G}_m^2 (and integral points on affine subsets of \mathbb{P}^2)*, J. Differential Geom. **93** (2013), no. 3, 355–377.
- [7] D. A. COX, J. B. LITTLE, AND H. K. SCHENCK, *Toric Varieties*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 124. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2011.
- [8] W. FULTON *Introduction to Toric Varieties*, Ann. of Math. Stud., 131, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993, xii+157 pp.
- [9] J. GUO, C.-L. SUN AND J. T.-Y. WANG *On Pisot’s d -th root conjecture for function fields and related GCD estimates*, J. of Number Theory, **231** (2022), 401–432.
- [10] J. GUO, K. D. NGUYEN, C.-L. SUN AND J. T.-Y. WANG *Vojta’s abc Conjecture for algebraic tori and applications over function fields*, arXiv:2106.15881v3.
- [11] J. GUO AND J. T.-Y. WANG *A complex case of Vojta’s general abc conjecture and cases of Campana’s orbifold conjecture*, arXiv:2209.11434.
- [12] M. HINDRY AND J. H. SILVERMAN, *Diophantine Geometry. An Introduction.*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 201. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000.
- [13] S. LANG, *Fundamentals of Diophantine Geometry*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1983.
- [14] A. LEVIN, *Greatest common divisors and Vojta’s conjecture for blowups of algebraic tori*, Invent. Math. **215** (2019), no. 2, 493–533.
- [15] M. PIEROPAN, A. SMEETS, S. TANIMOTO AND A. VÁRILLY-ÁLVARADO, *Campana points of bounded height on vector group compactifications*, Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. **123** (2021), no. 3, 57–101.
- [16] J. H. SILVERMAN, *The Arithmetic of Dynamical Systems*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 241. Springer, New York, 2007.
- [17] A. TURCHET, *Fibered threefolds and Lang-Vojta’s conjecture for function fields*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **369** (2017), no. 12, 8537–8558.
- [18] P. VOJTA, *Diophantine Approximation and Nevanlinna Theory, Arithmetic Geometry*, 111–224, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **2009**, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2011.

IRMA, UMR 7501, 7 RUE RENÁ©-DESCARTES, 67084 STRASBOURG, FRANCE
 Email address: gasbarri@math.unistra.fr

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, CENTRAL SOUTH UNIVERSITY, CHANGSHA 410075, CHINA
 Email address: 221250@csu.edu.cn

INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, ACADEMIA SINICA, 6F, ASTRONOMY-MATHEMATICS BUILDING, NO. 1, SEC. 4, ROOSEVELT ROAD, TAIPEI 10617, TAIWAN
 Email address: jwang@math.sinica.edu.tw