

ON MULTIPLICATIVE DEPENDENCE BETWEEN ELEMENTS OF POLYNOMIAL ORBITS

MARLEY YOUNG

ABSTRACT. We classify the pairs of polynomials $f, g \in \mathbb{C}[X]$ having orbits satisfying infinitely many multiplicative dependence relations, extending a result of Ghioca, Tucker and Zieve. Moreover, we show that given f_1, \dots, f_n from a certain class of polynomials with integer coefficients, the vectors of indices (m_1, \dots, m_n) such that $f_1^{m_1}(0), \dots, f_n^{m_n}(0)$ are multiplicatively dependent are sparse. We also classify the pairs $f, g \in \mathbb{Q}[X]$ such that there are infinitely many $(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ satisfying $f(x)^k = g(y)^\ell$ for some (possibly varying) non-zero integers k, ℓ .

1. INTRODUCTION

In complex dynamics, a topic of great importance is the behaviour of complex numbers x as they are iterated under a polynomial $f \in \mathbb{C}[X]$. That is, we are interested in the *orbits* $\mathcal{O}_f(x) := \{x, f(x), f(f(x)), \dots\}$, and how they interact with each other, and the structure of the polynomial f . For example, the orbits of critical points largely determine the features of the global dynamics of the map, see [6, §9]. Points with finite orbit, called *preperiodic points*, also provide a lot of information [6, §3]. On the other hand, less is known about the interaction between orbits of distinct polynomials. However, in [13], Ghioca, Tucker and Zieve prove the following remarkable fact.

Theorem 1.1. [13, Theorem 1.1] *Let $f, g \in \mathbb{C}[X]$ be polynomials which are not linear. If there exist $x, y \in \mathbb{C}$ such that the intersection $\mathcal{O}_f(x) \cap \mathcal{O}_g(y)$ is infinite, then f and g share a common iterate.*

One can interpret Theorem 1.1 as describing when $\mathcal{O}_f(x) \times \mathcal{O}_g(y)$ has infinite intersection with the diagonal $\Delta = \{(z, z) : z \in \mathbb{C}\}$. The conclusion says that this occurs precisely when there exist positive integers n, m such that the line Δ is preserved by the map $(f^n, g^m) : \mathbb{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^2$, where f^n denotes the n -fold composition

$$f^n = \underbrace{f \circ \dots \circ f}_{n \text{ times}}.$$

In fact, this generalises to several polynomials and arbitrary lines, see [13, Theorem 1.3]. This resolves a special case of a version of the so-called *dynamical*

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 37F10, 37P15, 11N25, 11D41.

Mordell-Lang conjecture. Namely, Ghioca and Tucker conjectured the following [12, Conjecture 1.3].

Conjecture 1.2. *Let f_1, \dots, f_k be polynomials in $\mathbb{C}[X]$, and let V be a subvariety of the affine space \mathbb{A}^k which contains no positive dimensional subvariety of \mathbb{A}^k that is periodic under the action of (f_1, \dots, f_k) on \mathbb{A}^k . Then $V(\mathbb{C})$ has finite intersection with each orbit of (f_1, \dots, f_k) on \mathbb{A}^k .*

This conjecture fits into Zhang’s far-reaching system of dynamical conjectures [35], and has more general formulations, see [13, Question 1.6].

In this paper, we prove a generalisation of Theorem 1.1, where we replace the diagonal Δ with a set $\mathcal{M}_{2,1}(\mathbb{C})$ of points in \mathbb{C}^2 whose coordinates satisfy certain multiplicative relations. Instead of f and g necessarily having a common iterate, we will see that in this situation, some \hat{f} and \hat{g} , belonging to explicitly computable families of polynomials forming certain semiconjugacies with f and g respectively, will have a common iterate.

Let n be a positive integer and let $\boldsymbol{\nu} = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_n) \in (\mathbb{C}^\times)^n$. We say that $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ is *multiplicatively dependent* if all its entries are non-zero and there is a non-zero vector $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ for which

$$\boldsymbol{\nu}^{\mathbf{k}} = \nu_1^{k_1} \cdots \nu_n^{k_n} = 1.$$

Otherwise we say that $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ is *multiplicatively independent*. By convention we say that a vector $\boldsymbol{\nu} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ which has at least one zero entry is neither multiplicatively dependent nor independent. For a subset T of \mathbb{C} , we denote by $\mathcal{M}_n(T)$ the set of multiplicatively dependent vectors with coordinates in T .

For $\boldsymbol{\nu} \in (\mathbb{C}^\times)^n$, we define r , the *multiplicative rank* of $\boldsymbol{\nu}$, in the following way. If $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ has a coordinate which is a root of unity, we put $r = 0$; otherwise let r be the largest integer with $1 \leq r \leq n$ for which any r coordinates of $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ form a multiplicatively independent vector. Note that $0 \leq r \leq n - 1$ whenever $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ is multiplicatively dependent. For a subset T of \mathbb{C} , we denote by $\mathcal{M}_{n,r}(T)$ the set of multiplicatively dependent vectors of rank r with coordinates in T , and note that

$$\mathcal{M}_n(T) = \mathcal{M}_{n,0}(T) + \cdots + \mathcal{M}_{n,n-1}(T).$$

In [17], Konyagin, Sha, Shparlinski and Stewart studied the distribution of $\mathcal{M}_n(T)$ when $T \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ is of number theoretic interest. Note that $\mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$ has zero Lebesgue measure, since it is a countable union of hypersurfaces. However, the results of [17] imply that $\mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$ is dense in \mathbb{C}^n . In particular, $\mathcal{M}_{2,1}(\mathbb{C})$ is dense in \mathbb{C}^2 (since $\mathcal{M}_{2,0}(\mathbb{C})$ is clearly nowhere dense). Thus our generalisation of Theorem 1.1 (Theorem 1.3 below) shows that some product of orbits $\mathcal{O}_f(x) \times \mathcal{O}_g(y)$ merely having infinite intersection with a dense subset of \mathbb{C}^2 is enough to have strong implications on the structure of the pair (f, g) .

Moreover, the multiplicative dependence of complex numbers, and in particular of algebraic numbers, has also been studied from various other aspects, and is a subject of independent interest in the contexts of algebraic geometry and

arithmetic dynamics. In [8], Bombieri, Masser and Zannier initiated the study of intersections of algebraic curves with proper algebraic subgroups of the multiplicative group \mathbb{G}_m^n . Since such subgroups of \mathbb{G}_m^n are defined by finite sets of equations of the form $X^{k_1} \cdots X^{k_n} = 1$ (see [7, Corollary 3.2.15]), the paper [8], which leads into the paradigm of “unlikely intersections”, really concerns multiplicative dependence of points on a curve. Further to this, in [24], the authors obtain finiteness results for multiplicatively dependent values of rational functions in the maximal abelian extension of a number field K , and also show that under certain conditions on a rational function $f \in K(X)$, there are only finitely many $\alpha \in K$ such that $(f^n(\alpha), f^m(\alpha))$ is multiplicatively dependent for some distinct $m, n \geq 0$ (these results have since been extended to hold modulo (approximate) finitely generated groups, see [2, 4]). That is, multiplicative relations within orbits of a polynomial or rational function have implications for its structure. Note also that for non-exceptional (semigroups of) polynomials over the cyclotomic closure of a number field, only finitely many orbits contain multiplicative relations of rank 0 (i.e. roots of unity), see [9, 23, 25], following work of Dvornicich and Zannier [10].

In a similar vein, we show that multiplicative relations between orbits of distinct polynomials imply some relationship between the polynomials themselves. For a polynomial $f \in \mathbb{C}[X]$ and a point $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$, denote by f_α the polynomial $f_\alpha(X) = \alpha f(\alpha^{-1}X)$.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $f, g \in \mathbb{C}[X]$ be polynomials which are neither linear nor monomials (i.e. of the form aX^d). Then there exist $x, y \in \mathbb{C}$ such that there are infinitely many pairs $(z, w) \in \mathcal{O}_f(x) \times \mathcal{O}_g(y)$ which are multiplicatively dependent of rank 1 if and only if there exist:*

- integers $s, t \geq 0$,
- coprime integers $k, \ell \geq 1$,
- positive integers $i, j \leq 2$, where we can take $i = 1$ (resp. $j = 1$) unless $\ell = 2$ (resp. $k = 2$),
- $\tilde{f}, \tilde{g} \in \mathbb{C}[X]$, and
- a root of unity ξ ,

such that $f^i(X) = X^s \tilde{f}(X)^\ell$, $g^j(X) = X^t \tilde{g}(X)^k$, and \hat{f} and \hat{g}_ξ share a common iterate, where $\hat{f}(X) = X^s f(X^\ell)$, $\hat{g}(X) = X^t \tilde{g}(X^k)$.

We ignore multiplicatively dependent pairs of rank 0 since infinitely many can always be found. Indeed, let $x \in \mathbb{C}$ be such that $f(x)$ is a root of unity, and suppose y is not preperiodic for g . Then $\{(f(x), g^n(y)) : n \in \mathbb{Z}^+\}$ is an infinite set of multiplicatively dependent points. We can similarly omit the case where f or g is a monomial. Suppose $f(X) = aX^k$, $a \in \mathbb{C}^\times$. If a is a root of unity, let $x \in \mathbb{C}$ be not a root of unity. Then $(f^n(x), x) = (a^{(k^n-1)/(k-1)}x^{k^n}, x)$ is multiplicatively dependent of rank 1 for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$. If a is not a root of unity, let $y \in \mathbb{C}$ be

such that $g(y) = a$. Then $(f^n(a), g(y)) = (a^{k^n+(k^n-1)/(k-1)}, a)$ is multiplicatively dependent of rank 1 for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 makes crucial use of the work of Bilu and Tichy [5] on Diophantine equations in separated variables. Bilu and Tichy completely classify the polynomial pairs $f, g \in \mathbb{Q}[X]$ such that $f(x) = g(y)$ has infinitely many integral solutions (or more generally rational solutions with bounded denominator). As an aside, with an additional argument using bounds on solutions to superelliptic equations given in [1], we are able to characterise the pairs of polynomials $f, g \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ for which $(f(x), g(y))$ is multiplicatively dependent of rank 1 for infinitely many $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $f, g \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ each have at least two distinct roots. Then there are only finitely many $(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ such that $(f(x), g(y))$ is multiplicatively dependent of rank 1 unless for some (k, ℓ) in an explicitly computable (in terms of f and g) finite subset of $\mathbb{Z}^+ \times \mathbb{Z}^+$, we have $f(X)^k = \varphi(f_1(\lambda(X)))$ and $\pm g(X)^\ell = \varphi(g_1(\mu(X)))$, where $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{Q}[X]$ are linear, $\varphi \in \mathbb{Q}[X]$, and (f_1, g_1) is a standard pair (see §3), such that $f_1(x) = g_1(y)$ has infinitely many rational solutions with bounded denominator.*

We give a version of this result over a ring of S -integers in an arbitrary number field in §3. A similar approach is also key to our proof of Theorem 1.3, after we use a specialisation argument to reduce to the case where f, g, x, y are defined over a number field.

An interesting direction for future research would be an extension of Theorem 1.3 to more than two polynomials.

Question 1.5. *Let $f_1, \dots, f_n \in \mathbb{C}[X]$ be polynomials which are not linear or monomials. If there exist $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{C}$ such that there are infinitely many n -tuples $(u_1, \dots, u_n) \in \mathcal{O}_{f_1}(x_1) \times \dots \times \mathcal{O}_{f_n}(x_n)$ which are multiplicatively dependent of rank at least 1, is there some multiplicative relation between some (possibly semiconjugated) iterates of the f_i ?*

This is likely a very difficult question, even in the case $n = 3$. Indeed, we recall the following conjecture of Schinzel and Tijdeman [28], which remains open (though it is known to hold assuming the *abc* conjecture [33]).

Conjecture 1.6. *If a polynomial f with rational coefficients has at least three simple zeros then the equation $y^3 z^2 = f(x)$ has only finitely many solutions in integers x, y, z with $yz \neq 0$.*

The depth of this conjecture is evident as it implies the existence of infinitely many primes p for which $2^{p-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{p^2}$. We would require an even stronger generalisation just to mimic the part of our proof of Theorem 1.3 which uses bounds on solutions to superelliptic equations. Furthermore, another key part of the proof of Theorem 1.1 is a collection of intricate polynomial decomposition

results. The polynomial decomposition work required to tackle Question 1.5 would be even more complicated, unless a totally different approach were discovered.

Hence, for now we consider the following statistical variant. Let K be a field and suppose we have $F = (f_1, \dots, f_n) \in K(X)^n$, $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in K^n$, and $N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, and let $M_{F,\mathbf{x}}(N)$ denote the number of n -tuples of integers $(m_1, \dots, m_n) \in [1, N]^n$ such that $(f_1^{m_1}(x_1), \dots, f_n^{m_n}(x_n))$ is multiplicatively dependent. Given integer polynomials which generate certain kinds of divisibility sequences, we are able to show that the tuples of indices which give a multiplicative dependence relation are at least sparse.

Theorem 1.7. *Let $F = (f_1, \dots, f_n) \in \mathbb{Z}[X]^n$, and $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ such that for each $1 \leq i \leq n$, f_i is not linear nor a monomial, and $\{f_i^m(x_i)\}_{m \geq 1}$ is an unbounded rigid divisibility sequence. Then $M_{F,\mathbf{x}}(N) \ll N^n / \log N$, with the implied constant depending only on F and \mathbf{x} .*

Above, and throughout the paper, the assertion $U \ll V$ is equivalent to $|U| \leq cV$ with some positive constant c . We recall the notion of a rigid divisibility sequence in §5.1, and give examples of classes of polynomials which generate them.

Furthermore, let us note that in the special case $f_1 = \dots = f_n$, $x_1 = \dots = x_n$, we can treat rational functions over a number field or function field (assuming the *abc*-conjecture of Masser-Oesterlé-Szpiro [32], or some conditions on (f, x) in the number field case) and achieve a better bound by using results on primitive prime divisors in dynamical sequences.

Theorem 1.8. *Let K be a number field or characteristic zero function field of transcendence degree 1, let $f \in K(X)$ be a rational function which is not linear or a monomial, and let $x \in K$ be a point which is not preperiodic for f . Let $F = (f, \dots, f) \in K(X)^n$, and let $\mathbf{x} = (x, \dots, x) \in K^n$. If K is a number field, assume that either K satisfies the *abc*-conjecture, or that 0 is periodic for f and f does not vanish to order $\deg f$ at 0. Then $M_{F,\mathbf{x}}(N) = \Theta(N^{n-1})$.*

Here $U = \Theta(V)$ means $U \ll V$ and $V \ll U$. It is clear that $M_{F,\mathbf{x}}(F) \gg N^{n-1}$ in this case, since we can just take $m_i = m_j$ for some $i \neq j$ and let all the other coordinates run freely over $[1, N]$.

This paper is structured as follows: In §2 we present some useful tools and preliminary results, including the polynomial *ABC*-theorem, and bounds on integral solutions to superelliptic equations. In §3, we state Bilu and Tichy's results on Diophantine equations in separated variables and prove a more general form of Theorem 1.4. The proof of Theorem 1.3 is given in §4. Finally, in §5 we give some background on rigid divisibility sequences and primitive prime divisors in arithmetic dynamics, and prove Theorems 1.7 and 1.8.

Acknowledgements. The author is very grateful to Alina Ostafe and Igor Shparlinski for comments on initial drafts of the paper. The latter also gave the suggestion of considering Theorem 1.8.

2. PRELIMINARIES

We collect here some notions and results which will be useful subsequently.

2.1. The polynomial ABC-theorem. We recall the polynomial *ABC*-theorem (proved first by Stothers [31], then independently by Mason [22] and Silverman [30]).

Lemma 2.1. *Let K be a field and let $A, B, C \in K[X]$ be relatively prime polynomials such that $A + B + C = 0$ and not all of A, B and C have vanishing derivative. Then*

$$\deg \text{rad}(ABC) \geq \max\{\deg A, \deg B, \deg C\} + 1,$$

where, for $f \in K[X]$, $\text{rad } f$ is the product of the distinct monic irreducible factors of f .

2.2. Bounds on solutions to superelliptic equations. Let K be a number field, and let S be a finite set of places of K containing the archimedean ones. Denote by \mathcal{O}_S the ring of S -integers in K . Let

$$f(X) = a_0X^n + a_1X^{n-1} + \cdots + a_n \in \mathfrak{o}_S[X]$$

be a polynomial of degree $n \geq 2$. Let b be a non-zero element of \mathfrak{o}_S , $m \geq 2$ and integer and consider the equation

$$(2.1) \quad f(x) = by^m, \quad x, y \in \mathfrak{o}_S.$$

Assume that in some finite extension of K , $f \in \mathfrak{o}_S[X]$ factorises as

$$f(X) = a_0 \prod_{i=1}^r (X - \alpha_i)^{e_i}$$

with distinct $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r$. Put

$$m_i = \frac{m}{\gcd(m, e_i)}, i = 1, \dots, r,$$

and assume that $m_1 \geq m_2 \geq \cdots \geq m_r$. Improving a classical result of Siegel [29], LeVeque [21] showed that if S consists only of infinite places and $b = 1$ then (2.1) has only finitely many solutions, provided (f, m) satisfies the so-called *LeVeque condition*, where the tuple (m_1, \dots, m_r) is of the form

$$(2.2) \quad m_1 \geq 3, m_2 \geq 2 \quad \text{or} \quad m_1 = m_2 = m_3 = 2.$$

Moreover, in the case $K = \mathbb{Q}$, $\mathfrak{o}_S = \mathbb{Z}$, $b = 1$, Schinzel and Tijdeman [28] treated (2.1) with the exponent m unknown, showing that there are no solutions if m exceeds an effectively computable bound depending only on f . All of these results are based on Baker's theory of linear forms in logarithms of algebraic numbers, and have since been generalised over number fields and (in the case of f having no multiple roots) over finitely generated domains over \mathbb{Z} [3]. We will state below a version from [1] which is useful for our purposes.

For $\alpha \in K$, define the S -norm of α by

$$N_S(\alpha) = \prod_{v \in S} |\alpha|_v,$$

where $|\cdot|_v$ is the normalised absolute valuation of K at the place v . When $\alpha \neq 0$, we denote by $h(\alpha)$ the absolute logarithmic Weil height of α , see [7].

The following is a consequence of [1, Theorems 2.1 and 2.2].

Theorem 2.2. *Suppose (2.1) has a solution (x, y) with $y \notin \mathfrak{o}_S^* \cup \{0\}$. Then*

$$m \ll \log^*(N_S(b)) \log^* \log^* N_S(b),$$

Moreover, if (f, m) satisfies the LeVeque condition (2.2), then all solutions (x, y) of (2.1) satisfy

$$h(x) \ll \begin{cases} N_S(b)^{16r^3} & \text{if } m = 2, \\ N_S(b)^{4m^8r^2} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where $\log^* x = \max(1, \log x)$ and the implied constants depend only on K , S and f .

In order to later apply Theorem 2.2 to polynomial iterates in the proof of Theorem 1.3, we show that given $m \geq 2$, unless a polynomial f is of a special shape, some iterate of f satisfies the LeVeque condition with respect to m .

Lemma 2.3. *Let $f \in \mathfrak{o}_S[X]$ be a polynomial which is not linear nor a monomial, and let $m \geq 2$ be an integer. If f is not of the form $f(X) = X^s p(X)^m$ for some integer $s \geq 0$, and $p \in \overline{K}[X]$, then either $m = 2$ and f^2 is of this form, or (f^j, m) satisfies the LeVeque condition for some $j \leq 6$.*

Example 2.4. *There do exist polynomials f such that f^2 is of the exceptional form. For example, let $f(X) = X^3 - 6iX^2 - 9X + 4i = (X - 4i)(X - i)^2$. Then*

$$f^2(X) = X(X^4 - 9iX^3 - 27X^2 + 30iX + 9)^2.$$

Proof of Lemma 2.3. Suppose f is not of the given form, and that (f, m) does not satisfy the LeVeque condition. Then either

- (i) $f(X) = (X - \beta)^s p(X)^m$ for some $s \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ not divisible by m , $\beta \neq 0 \in \overline{K}$, and $p \in \overline{K}[X]$ with $p(\beta) \neq 0$; or
- (ii) $f(X) = (X - \alpha)^r (X - \beta)^s p(X)^m$ for some $\alpha \neq \beta \in \overline{K}$, $p \in \overline{K}[X]$ with $p(\alpha), p(\beta) \neq 0$, and $r, s \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ with $\gcd(r, m) = \gcd(s, m) = m/2$.

In the first case, we have

$$(2.3) \quad \deg f = s + m \deg p,$$

and

$$(2.4) \quad \deg \operatorname{rad} f = 1 + \deg \operatorname{rad} p \leq 1 + \deg p.$$

By the Lemma 2.1 with $A = -f(X)$, $B = f(X) - \beta$ and $C = \beta$, we have

$$\deg \operatorname{rad}(f(X)(f(X) - \beta)) \geq \deg f + 1,$$

and so by (2.3) and (2.4),

$$(2.5) \quad \begin{aligned} \deg \operatorname{rad}(f(X) - \beta) &\geq s + m \deg p + 1 - (1 + \deg p) \\ &= s + (m - 1) \deg p. \end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$f^2(X) = (f(X) - \beta)^s p(f(X))^m,$$

so if $f(X) - \beta$ has at least two simple roots, we have reduced to the case (ii) (with f^2 in place of f). If $f(X) - \beta$ has $u \leq 1$ simple roots, then by (2.3),

$$\deg \operatorname{rad}(f(X) - \beta) \leq \frac{\deg f + u}{2} \leq \frac{u + s + m \deg p}{2}.$$

This gives a contradiction with (2.5) if either $u = 0$, $s > 1$ or $m > 2$ (in the latter case we also need $\deg p > 0$, but if $\deg p = 0$ then necessarily $s > 1$). If $m = 2$ and $s = 1$, we have $f(X) = (X - \beta)p(X)^2$. Suppose $f(X) - \beta$ has exactly one simple root, say $f(X) - \beta = (X - \gamma)q_1(X)^2$, and similarly that $f(X) - \gamma = (X - \delta)q_2(X)^2$. Note that p and q_1 are coprime unless $\beta = \gamma$, in which case

$$(X - \beta)q_1(X)^2 = f(X) - \beta = (X - \beta)p(X)^2 - \beta,$$

and so

$$(X - \beta)(p(X)^2 - q_1(X)^2) = \beta,$$

which is only possible if $p = q_1$ and $\beta = 0$, a contradiction. Similarly p and q_2 are coprime, and moreover q_1 and q_2 are coprime unless $\gamma = 0$, in which case $f^2(X) = Xq(X)^2$ for some polynomial q . Therefore we see that $p q_1 q_2 \mid f'$, but $\deg(p q_1 q_2) = 3(\deg f - 1)/2 > \deg f'$, a contradiction. Therefore either f^2 or f^3 must satisfy the LeVeque condition with 2 or be of the form (ii).

In the case (ii), we have

$$(2.6) \quad \deg f = r + s + m \deg p,$$

and

$$(2.7) \quad \deg \operatorname{rad} f = 2 + \deg \operatorname{rad} p \leq 2 + \deg p.$$

By Lemma 2.1 with $A = -f(X)$, $B = f(X) - \alpha$ and $C = \alpha$, we have

$$\deg \operatorname{rad}(f(X)(f(X) - \alpha)) \geq \deg f + 1,$$

and so by (2.6) and (2.7)

$$(2.8) \quad \begin{aligned} \deg \operatorname{rad}(f(X) - \alpha) &\geq r + s + m \deg p + 1 - (2 + \deg p) \\ &= r + s + (m - 1) \deg p - 1. \end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$(2.9) \quad f^2(X) = (f(X) - \alpha)^r (f(X) - \beta)^s p(f(X))^m,$$

so if $f(X) - \alpha$ and $f(X) - \beta$ have between them at least 3 distinct simple roots, then clearly (f^2, m) satisfies the LeVeque condition. If $f(X) - \alpha$ has $u \leq 2$ simple roots, then

$$\deg \text{rad}(f(X) - \alpha) \leq \frac{\deg f + u}{2},$$

and so by (2.6),

$$\deg \text{rad}(f(X) - \alpha) \leq \frac{u + r + s + m \deg p}{2}.$$

Since $r, s \geq m/2$, this gives a contradiction with (2.8) if $m > 2$ or $u = 0$. That is, if $m > 2$ we are done. Otherwise, when $m = 2$, $f(X) - \alpha$ and similarly $f(X) - \beta$ each have at least one simple root (distinct from each other and from the roots of f). If $\alpha = 0$, then

$$f^2(X) = X^{r^2}(X - \beta)^{rs}(f(X) - \beta)^s p(X)^4 p(f(X))^2,$$

and so $(f^2, 2)$ satisfies the LeVeque condition, noting that r and s are both odd. Similarly this holds if $\beta = 0$, so assume $\alpha, \beta \neq 0$. If $f(X) - \alpha = (X - \gamma)q_1(X)^2$ and $f(X) - \beta = (X - \delta)q_2(X)^2$, then p, q_1 and q_2 are pairwise coprime, so $p q_1 q_2 \mid f'$. This is again a contradiction, since $\deg(p q_1 q_2) \geq 1 + 2(\deg f - 1)/2 > \deg f'$. Thus $f(X) - \alpha$ or $f(X) - \beta$ must have another root of odd multiplicity, and so referring to (2.9), we conclude once more that $(f^2, 2)$ must satisfy the LeVeque condition. \square

3. DIOPHANTINE EQUATIONS WITH SEPARATED VARIABLES

In describing all $f, g \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ for which $f(x) = g(y)$ has infinitely many integer solutions, Bilu and Tichy [5] list the following exceptional classes, which they call *standard pairs*. Here a, b are non-zero elements of some field, m and n are positive integers, and p is a non-zero polynomial (which may be constant):

- $(X^m, aX^r p(X)^m)$ or switched i.e. $(aX^r p(X)^m, X^m)$, where we have $0 \leq r \leq m$, $\gcd(r, m) = 1$ and $r + \deg p > 0$.
- $(X^2, (aX^2 + b)p(X)^2)$ (or switched).
- $(D_m(X, a^n), D_n(X, a^m))$, where $\gcd(m, n) = 1$. Here $D_m(X, a)$ denotes the m th Dickson polynomial, defined by

$$D_m(z + a/z, a) = z^m + (a/z)^m.$$

- $(a^{-m/2} D_m(X, a), -b^{n/2} D_n(X, b))$, where $\gcd(m, n) = 2$.
- $((aX^2 - 1)^3, 3X^4 - 4X^3)$ (or switched).

Moreover, to deal with the general case of S -integers over a number field K , they introduce a *specific pair* over K , namely

$$(D_m(X, a^{n/d}), -D_n(X \cos(\pi/d), a^{m/d}))$$

(or switched), where $d = \gcd(m, n) \geq 3$ and $a, \cos(2\pi/d) \in K$. For $F \in K[X, Y]$ and a subring R of K , say that $F(x, y) = 0$ has *infinitely many solutions with*

bounded R -denominator if there exists a non-zero $D \in R$ such that $F(x, y) = 0$ has infinitely many solutions $(x, y) \in K \times K$ with $Dx, Dy \in R$. Then we have the following [5, Theorem 10.5].

Theorem 3.1 (Bilu, Tichy). *Let K be a number field, S a finite set of places of K containing all archimedean places, and $f, g \in K[x]$. Then the following are equivalent:*

- (a) *The equation $f(x) = g(y)$ has infinitely many solutions with a bounded \mathfrak{o}_S -denominator.*
- (b) *We have $f = \varphi \circ f_1 \circ \lambda$ and $g = \varphi \circ g_1 \circ \mu$, where $\lambda, \mu \in K[X]$ are linear polynomials, $\varphi \in K[X]$, and (f_1, g_1) is a standard or specific pair over K such that the equation $f_1(x) = g_1(y)$ has infinitely many solutions with bounded \mathfrak{o}_S -denominator.*

If K is totally real and S is the set of archimedean places (in particular, if $K = \mathbb{Q}$ and $\mathfrak{o}_S = \mathbb{Z}$), then the specific pair may be omitted in (b).

Given polynomials $f, g \in \mathfrak{o}_S[X]$ which are neither linear nor monomials, define

$$\mathcal{E}(f) := \{1\} \cup \{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 2} : (f, \ell) \text{ fails the LeVeque condition}\},$$

and note that the set

$$\mathcal{E}(f, g) := \{(k, \ell) \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \times \mathbb{Z}^+ : k \in \mathcal{E}(g), \ell \in \mathcal{E}(f) \text{ and } \gcd(k, \ell) = 1\}$$

is finite. We have the following result, of which Theorem 1.4 is a special case.

Theorem 3.2. *Let K be a number field, S a finite set of places containing all the archimedean ones, and suppose $f, g \in \mathfrak{o}_S[X]$ have at least two distinct roots. Then there are only finitely many $(x, y) \in \mathfrak{o}_S^2$ such that either $f(x) = g(y)$ or $(f(x), g(y))$ is multiplicatively dependent of rank 1 unless for some $(k, \ell) \in \mathcal{E}(f, g)$, we have $f(X)^k = \varphi(f_1(\lambda(X)))$ and $\zeta g^\ell = \varphi(g_1(\mu(X)))$, where ζ is a root of unity contained in K , $\lambda, \mu \in K[X]$ are linear, $\varphi \in K[X]$, and (f_1, g_1) is a standard or specific pair over K , such that $f_1(x) = g_1(y)$ has infinitely many solutions with a bounded \mathfrak{o}_S denominator. If K is totally real and S is the set of archimedean places (in particular, if $K = \mathbb{Q}$ and $\mathfrak{o}_S = \mathbb{Z}$), then the specific pair may be omitted.*

Proof. Suppose $(x, y) \in \mathfrak{o}_S^2$ is such that $f(x) = g(y)$ or $(f(x), g(y))$ is multiplicatively dependent of rank 1. Then we must have

$$(3.1) \quad f(x)^{k'} = g(y)^{\ell'}$$

for some $k', \ell' \neq 0$. Recall that by assumption, both f and g have at least 2 distinct roots. Hence, for example by [19, Proposition 1.5], there are only finitely many pairs $(x, y) \in \mathfrak{o}_S^2$ such that $f(x)$ and $g(y)$ are both S -units. Excluding these, we may assume, without loss of generality, that there is some $v \notin S$ such that $|f(x)|_v < 1$. Thus, if k', ℓ' have different signs in (3.1), then

$$1 \geq |g(y)|_v = |f(x)|_v^{k'/\ell'} > 1,$$

a contradiction. Therefore, we may assume $k', \ell' > 0$. We have

$$f(x)^k = \zeta g(y)^\ell$$

where $k = k' / \gcd(k', \ell')$ and $\ell = \ell' / \gcd(k', \ell')$ are coprime, and ζ is a root of unity contained in K . If $(k, \ell) \notin \mathcal{E}(f, g)$, assume without loss of generality that $k > 1$ and (g, k) satisfies the LeVeque condition. Take $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $ak + b\ell = 1$. Then

$$(3.2) \quad g(y) = g(y)^{ak+b\ell} = (\zeta^{-b} g(y)^a f(x)^b)^k.$$

Clearly $z := \zeta^{-b} g(y)^a f(x)^b \in K$, and in fact $z \in \mathfrak{o}_S$, since for $v \notin S$, $|z|_v = |g(y)|_v^{1/k} \leq 1$. Thus by Theorem 2.2, we have $h(y), k \ll 1$, with the implied constants depending only on K, S and g . So by Northcott's theorem, there are only finitely many possible choices for y . If additionally $\ell > 1$ and (f, ℓ) satisfies the LeVeque condition, we similarly obtain that there are only finitely many possibilities for x . Otherwise, we have $\ell \in \mathcal{E}(f)$ and so $\ell \ll 1$ (depending only on f). Therefore $f(x)^k = \zeta g(y)^\ell$, with $k, \ell \ll 1$ and ζ, y belonging to finite sets, and so again there are only finitely many possibilities for x .

We conclude that there are infinitely many $(x, y) \in \mathfrak{o}_S^2$ such that $(f(x), g(y))$ is multiplicatively dependent of rank 1 if and only if there are infinitely many solutions $x, y \in \mathfrak{o}_S$ to $f(x)^k = \zeta g(y)^\ell$ for some $(k, \ell) \in \mathcal{E}(f, g)$ and some root of unity $\zeta \in K$. The result follows by Theorem 3.1. \square

4. MULTIPLICATIVE DEPENDENCE IN ORBITS

4.1. Specialisation. To prove Theorem 1.3, we can restrict our attention to the finitely generated (over \mathbb{Q}) subfield K of \mathbb{C} generated by the roots and coefficients of f and g together with the points x and y . We are thus able to reduce to the case where K is a number field by inductively making appropriate specialisations of the transcendental generators of K . This allows us to use the tools from §2.2. For a polynomial f defined over a field K , and a homomorphism φ whose domain is a subring of K containing the coefficients of f , let f^φ denote the polynomial obtained by applying φ to the coefficients of f .

Proposition 4.1. *Let K be a finitely generated field over \mathbb{Q} , suppose $f, g \in K[X]$ are not linear and split into linear factors over K , and let $x, y \in K$. Let E be a subfield of K such that $\text{trdeg}(K/E) = 1$ and E/\mathbb{Q} is finitely generated. Then there exists a subring R of K , a finite extension E' of E and a homomorphism $\varphi: R \rightarrow E'$ such that*

- (1) R contains x, y and every coefficient and root of f and g , the leading and lowest order coefficients of f and g have non-zero image under φ , and distinct roots of f and g have pairwise distinct images under φ ;
- (2) $\varphi(x)$ is not preperiodic for f^φ ;
- (3) If $k, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $(f(X), g(X))$ is not of the form $(X^s \tilde{f}(X)^\ell, X^t \tilde{g}(X)^k)$ for some $s, t \geq 0$ and polynomials \tilde{f}, \tilde{g} , then neither is $(f^\varphi(X), g^\varphi(X))$.

To prove this, we recall the usual setup for specialisation, following the exposition in [12, §6]. We may assume (replacing it with a finite extension if necessary) that E is algebraically closed in K . Let C be a smooth projective curve over E whose function field is K , and let $\pi : \mathbb{P}_C^1 \rightarrow C$ be the natural fibration. Any $z \in \mathbb{P}_K^1$ gives rise to a section $Z : C \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ of π , and for $\varphi \in C(\overline{E})$, we let $z_\varphi := Z(\varphi)$, and let $E(\alpha)$ be the residue field of K at the valuation corresponding to φ . Let R be the valuation ring for this valuation, $E' = E(\alpha)$, and define the homomorphism $R \rightarrow E'$ by $z \mapsto z_\varphi$. The polynomial $f \in K[X]$ extends to a rational map (of E -varieties) from \mathbb{P}_C^1 to itself, whose generic fibre is f , and whose fibre above any $\varphi \in C$ is f^φ . Note that f^φ is a morphism of degree $\deg(f)$ from the fibre $(\mathbb{P}_C^1)_\varphi = \mathbb{P}_{E(\varphi)}^1$ to itself whenever the coefficients of f have no poles or zeros at φ ; hence it is a morphism on $\mathbb{P}_{E(\varphi)}^1$ of degree $\deg(f)$ at all but finitely many φ .

Let h_C be the logarithmic Weil height on C associated to a fixed degree-one ample divisor. We have the following.

Proposition 4.2. [12, Proposition 6.2] *Let $z \in \mathbb{P}_K^1$. There exists $c > 0$ such that, for $\varphi \in C(\overline{E})$ with $h_C(\varphi) > c$, the point z_φ is not preperiodic for f^φ .*

Proof of Proposition 4.1. Let $\psi : C \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_E^1$ be any non-constant rational function. By [20, Prop. 4.1.7], there are positive constants A and B such that for all $P \in \mathbb{P}^1(\overline{E})$, the preimage $\varphi = \psi^{-1}(P)$ satisfies $h_C(\varphi) \geq Ah(P) + B$. Since there are infinitely many $P \in \mathbb{P}^1(E)$ such that $h(P) > (c - B)/A$, we obtain infinitely many $\varphi \in C(\overline{E})$ such that $h_C(\varphi) > c$. Proposition 4.2 thus implies that there are infinitely many φ satisfying (2), and all but finitely many of these satisfy (1) as well. Finally, it is clear that a specialisation φ satisfying (1) also satisfies (3), since by construction all the multiplicities of the roots of f and g are preserved. \square

4.2. Proof of Theorem 1.3. We are now ready to prove the following result, which together with Theorem 1.1 will imply Theorem 1.3.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $f, g \in \mathbb{C}[X]$ be polynomials which are not linear or monomials, and let $x, y \in \mathbb{C}$. Then*

- (a) *There are only finitely many pairs $(z, w) \in \mathcal{O}_f(x) \times \mathcal{O}_g(y)$ such that $z^k = w^\ell$ with k, ℓ non-zero integers of different signs.*
- (b) *If $(z, w) \in \mathcal{O}_f(x) \times \mathcal{O}_g(y)$ is such that $z^k = \zeta w^\ell$ with $k, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ coprime and ζ a root of unity, then $k, \ell \ll 1$, with the implied constants depending only on f, g, x, y .*
- (c) *Let $k, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ be relatively prime. Suppose that $(f(X), g(X))$ is not of the form $(X^s \tilde{f}(X)^\ell, X^t \tilde{g}(X)^k)$ for some $s, t \geq 0$ and $\tilde{f}, \tilde{g} \in \mathbb{C}[X]$, and additionally that $(f^2(X), g(X))$ is not of this form if $k = 2$, and that $(f(X), g^2(X))$ is not of this form if $\ell = 2$. Then there are only finitely many pairs $(z, w) \in \mathcal{O}_f(x) \times \mathcal{O}_g(y)$ such that $z^k = w^\ell$.*

Proof. Write $f(X) = a_s X^s + \cdots + a_0$ and $g(X) = b_t X^t + \cdots + b_0$. Let

$$K = \mathbb{Q}(x, y, a_0, \dots, a_s, b_0, \dots, b_t, f^{-1}(0), g^{-1}(0), f^{-2}(0), g^{-2}(0)).$$

We proceed by induction on $\text{trdeg}(K/\mathbb{Q})$. For the base case, where K is a number field, let

$$S = M_K^\infty \cup \left\{ v \in M_K^0 : \min_{0 \leq i \leq s, 0 \leq j \leq t} \{v(a_i), v(b_j), v(x), v(y)\} < 0 \right\}.$$

Then for all $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, $f^n(x), g^m(y) \in \mathfrak{o}_S$. By [19, Proposition 1.6], both $\mathcal{O}_f(x) \cap \mathfrak{o}_S^*$ and $\mathcal{O}_g(y) \cap \mathfrak{o}_S^*$ are finite. Thus, if $\mathcal{O}_f(x) \times \mathcal{O}_g(y)$ is infinite, and $(z, w) \in \mathcal{O}_f(x) \times \mathcal{O}_g(y)$ is such that $z^k = w^\ell$ with k, ℓ integers of different signs, then upon omitting finitely many possibilities we may assume that $|z|_v < 1$ for some $v \in S$, and hence

$$1 \geq |w|_v = |z|_v^{k/\ell} > 1,$$

a contradiction. This gives (a) in this case.

Suppose $k, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ are coprime, and that $(z, w) = (f^n(x), g^m(y))$ satisfies $z^k = \zeta w^\ell$ for a root of unity ζ . By the same argument which follows (3.2), we have $z = \alpha^\ell$ and $w = \beta^k$ for some $\alpha, \beta \in \mathfrak{o}_S$. Then the first conclusion of Theorem 2.2 gives $k, \ell \ll 1$ as required for (b). Moreover, if $\ell > 1$, and $f(X)$ (also $f^2(X)$ if $\ell = 2$) is not of the form $X^s \tilde{f}(X)^\ell$ for some $s \geq 0$ and $\tilde{f} \in \overline{K}[X]$, then by Lemma 2.3, (f^j, ℓ) satisfies the LeVeque condition for some $j \leq 6$. Thus, by the second part of Theorem 2.2, we have $h(f^{n-j}(x)) \ll 1$. In particular either x is preperiodic for f or $n \ll 1$. Moreover, noting that $h(g^m(y)) = kh(f^n(x))/\ell$, we see also that either y is preperiodic for g or $m \ll 1$. The same conclusion holds (swapping f and g) if $k > 1$. This proves (c), completing the base case.

For the inductive step, let E be a subfield of K with $\text{trdeg}(K/E) = 1$, and E/\mathbb{Q} finitely generated. First suppose that there are infinitely many pairs $(z, w) \in \mathcal{O}_f(x) \times \mathcal{O}_g(y)$ such that $z^k = w^\ell$ with k, ℓ non-zero integers of different signs. Without loss of generality assume that x is not preperiodic for f . Let R, E' and $\varphi : R \rightarrow E'$ be as in Proposition 4.1. Properties (1) and (2) imply that there are infinitely many pairs $(z, w) \in \mathcal{O}_{f^\varphi}(\varphi(x)) \times \mathcal{O}_{g^\varphi}(\varphi(y))$ such that $z^k = w^\ell$ with k, ℓ non-zero integers of different signs. Thus, by the induction hypothesis, f^φ or g^φ is linear or a monomial, contradicting (1). This proves (a).

For (b), suppose there is a sequence $\{(z_j, w_j)\}_{j=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{O}_f(x) \times \mathcal{O}_g(y)$, roots of unity ζ_j and coprime $k_j, \ell_j \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ with $\max(k_j, \ell_j) \rightarrow \infty$ as $j \rightarrow \infty$, such that $z_j^{k_j} = \zeta_j w_j^{\ell_j}$. The same argument as above implies the existence of such a sequence in $\mathcal{O}_{f^\varphi}(\varphi(x)) \times \mathcal{O}_{g^\varphi}(\varphi(y))$, again contradicting the induction hypothesis. An analogous argument also proves (c) in light of property (3) (changing R, E' and φ to respect the pairs (f^2, g) or (f, g^2) when necessary), completing the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Suppose, as in the statement of the theorem, that we have $f^i(X) = X^s \tilde{f}(X)^\ell$, $g^j(X) = X^t \tilde{g}(X)^k$, and that \hat{f} and \hat{g}_ξ share a common iterate,

say $\hat{f}^n = \hat{g}_\xi^m$, where $\hat{f}(X) = X^s \tilde{f}(X^\ell)$, $\hat{g}(X) = X^t \tilde{g}(X^k)$. Then for any $N \in \mathbb{Z}^+$

$$(4.1) \quad f^{iN}(X^\ell) = \hat{f}^N(X)^\ell, \quad g^{jN}(X^k) = \hat{g}^N(X)^k.$$

Let $x \in \mathbb{C}$ be non-preperiodic for f , and let y be an ℓ -th root of x . Then for any $r \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, using (4.1) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} f^{inr}(x)^k &= f^{inr}(y^\ell)^k = \hat{f}^{nr}(y)^{k\ell} \\ &= \hat{g}_\xi^{mr}(y)^{k\ell} = \xi^{k\ell} \hat{g}^{mr}(\xi^{-1}y)^{k\ell} \\ &= \xi^{k\ell} g^{jmr}(\xi^{-k}y^k)^\ell, \end{aligned}$$

and so we have infinitely many pairs $(f^{inr}(x), g^{jmr}(\xi^{-k}y^k))$, $r \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, which are multiplicatively dependent of rank 1.

For the converse, write $f(X) = a_s X^s + \cdots + a_0$, $g(X) = b_t X^t + \cdots + b_0$, and let $K = \mathbb{Q}(x, y, a_0, \dots, a_s, b_0, \dots, b_t)$. Suppose $(z, w) = (f^n(x), g^m(y)) \in \mathcal{O}_f(x) \times \mathcal{O}_g(y)$ is multiplicatively dependent of rank 1. Then $z^{k'} = w^{\ell'}$ for some non-zero integers k', ℓ' . By Proposition 4.3 (a), we may assume without loss of generality that $k', \ell' > 0$. Then $z^k = \zeta w^\ell$, where $k = k'/\gcd(k', \ell)$, $\ell = \ell'/\gcd(k', \ell')$ are coprime, and ζ is one of finitely many roots of unity contained in K . By Proposition 4.3 (b), we have $k, \ell \ll 1$. Hence, if there are infinitely many pairs $(z, w) \in \mathcal{O}_f(x) \times \mathcal{O}_g(y)$ which are multiplicatively dependent of rank 1, then infinitely many of them satisfy $z^k = \zeta w^\ell$ for some fixed coprime $k, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and root of unity $\zeta \in K$. By Proposition 4.3 (c), this cannot be the case unless $(f(X), g_\zeta(X))$ is of the form $(X^s \tilde{f}(X)^\ell, X^t \tilde{g}(X)^k)$ for some $s, t \geq 0$ and $\tilde{f}, \tilde{g} \in \mathbb{C}[X]$. In this scenario, we have the semiconjugacies $f(X^\ell) = \hat{f}(X)^\ell$ and $g_\zeta(X^k) = \hat{g}(X)^k$, where $\hat{f}(X) = X^s \tilde{f}(X^\ell)$ and $\hat{g}(X) = X^t \tilde{g}(X^k)$. Then $f^n(X^\ell) = \hat{f}^n(X)^\ell$, $g_\zeta^m(X^k) = \hat{g}^m(X)^k$, and we can write $z^k = \zeta w^\ell$ as

$$\hat{f}^n(\hat{x})^{k\ell} = \hat{g}^m(\hat{y})^{k\ell},$$

where $\hat{x}^\ell = x$ and $\hat{y}^k = \zeta y$. We conclude that

$$\hat{f}^n(\hat{x}) = \hat{g}_\xi^m(\xi \hat{y}),$$

where ξ is another root of unity. The result then follows from Theorem 1.1. \square

5. SPARSENESS OF MULTIPLICATIVELY DEPENDENT ITERATES

5.1. Rigid divisibility sequences. Recall that a sequence $(a_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ of integers is a *divisibility sequence* if whenever $m \mid n$, we have $a_m \mid a_n$. We say that a divisibility sequence $(a_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ is a *rigid divisibility sequence* if additionally, for every prime p , there is an exponent s_p such that for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, either $p \nmid a_n$ or $p^{s_p} \parallel a_n$. Rigid divisibility sequences generated by polynomial iteration have been studied in the context of the density of prime divisors [16] as well as the existence of primitive prime divisors (see §§5.2) in arithmetic dynamics. It turns out such sequences also provide examples where it is not too difficult to show that the sets $M_{F,\mathbf{x}}(N)$,

defined before the statement of Theorem 1.7, are sparse. We have the following examples [26, Propositions 3.2 and 3.5] (see also [27, Theorems 1 and 3]).

Proposition 5.1. *Suppose $f \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ is a monic polynomial with linear coefficient 0. Then $\{f^n(0)\}_{n \geq 1}$ is a rigid divisibility sequence.*

Proposition 5.2. *Suppose $f \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ is monic, and that $\{f^n(0)\}_{n \geq 1}$ is a rigid divisibility sequence. If $r \in \mathbb{Z}$ is a root of f , and $g(X) := f(X + r) - r$, then $\{g^n(0)\}_{n \geq 1}$ is a rigid divisibility sequence.*

We note that the largest square-free factor of a polynomial value generally grows with the input.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $f \in \mathbb{Z}[X]$ be such that $(f, 2)$ satisfies the LeVeque condition. Then for $x \in \mathbb{Z}$, the largest square-free factor $Q^+(f(x))$ of $f(x)$ satisfies*

$$\log Q^+(f(x)) \gg \log \log |x|,$$

where the implied constant depends only on f .

Proof. Let $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ and write

$$f(x) = \pm p_1^{2a_1} \cdots p_k^{2a_k} q_1^{2b_1+1} \cdots q_\ell^{2b_\ell+1}$$

for distinct primes $p_1, \dots, p_k, q_1, \dots, q_\ell$ and integers $a_1, \dots, a_k \geq 1, b_1, \dots, b_\ell \geq 0$. Then

$$f(x) = \pm p_1^2 \cdots p_k^2 q_1 \cdots q_\ell y^2, \quad y \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Note that $Q^+(f(x)) = p_1 \cdots p_k q_1 \cdots q_\ell$, so applying Theorem 2.2 with $S = \{\infty\}$ and $b = \pm p_1^2 \cdots p_k^2 q_1 \cdots q_\ell$, we have $N_S(b) = |b| \leq Q^+(f(x))^2$, and so

$$\log |x| \ll Q^+(f(x))^{32r^3}.$$

The result follows upon taking logarithms. \square

We are now able to prove Theorem 1.7.

Proof of Theorem 1.7. Suppose $(m_1, \dots, m_n) \in M_{F, \mathbf{x}}(N)$ with $m_i \geq N^{1/2} + 2$ for each i . Then

$$f_1^{m_1}(x_1)^{k_1} \cdots f_n^{m_n}(x_n)^{k_n} = 1$$

for some $k_1, \dots, k_n \in \mathbb{Z}$, not all 0. Discard the $O(N^{n-1})$ choices of (m_1, \dots, m_n) for which the multiplicative dependence relation above is of rank 0, and suppose i is such that $k_i \neq 0$. Then each prime $p \mid f_i^{m_i}(x_i)$ divides some other $f_j^{m_j}(x_j)$. Let Q denote the largest square-free factor of $f_i^{m_i}(x_i)$. Then $Q \geq Q^+(g(f_i^{m_i-2}(x_i)))$, where $g = \text{rad}(f_i^2)$ is the product of the distinct irreducible factors (over \mathbb{Z}) of f_i^2 . Since f_i is not linear or a monomial, f_i^2 has at least 3 distinct roots (for example by [34, Lemma 3.2]). Thus $(g, 2)$ satisfies the LeVeque condition, and so by Lemma 5.3,

$$(5.1) \quad \log Q \gg \log \log |f_i^{m_i-2}(x_i)| \gg N^{1/2}.$$

For each $j \neq i$, let Q_j be the largest factor of Q dividing $f_j^{m_j}(x_j)$. Then there is some j with $Q_j \geq Q^{1/n}$. For such a j , and each prime p dividing Q_j , let $s_{j,p}$ be the least integer such that $p \mid f_j^{s_{j,p}}(x_j)$. Then, by the properties of a rigid divisibility sequence, m_j must be a multiple of $s_j := \text{lcm}_{p \mid Q_j} s_{j,p}$. But $Q_j \mid f_j^{s_j}(x_j)$, so

$$Q^{1/n} \ll |f_j^{s_j}(x_j)| \ll e^{d_j^{s_j}}.$$

Hence (5.1) gives

$$s_j \gg \log \log Q \gg \log N,$$

and so there are at most $O(N/\log N)$ possibilities for m_j . The result follows from letting the other m_ℓ run freely over $[N^{1/2} + 2, N]$, and noting that there are only $O(N^{n-1/2})$ vectors $(m_1, \dots, m_n) \in [1, N]^n$ with some $m_\ell < N^{1/2} + 2$. \square

5.2. Primitive prime divisors in dynamical sequences. Let K be a number field or function field, let $f \in K(X)$ be a rational function of degree $d > 1$, and let $x \in K$. Let \mathfrak{p} be a finite prime of K and denote by $v_{\mathfrak{p}}$ the valuation on K associated to \mathfrak{p} . For $m \geq 1$, we say that a prime \mathfrak{p} of K is a *primitive prime divisor* of $f^m(x)$ if \mathfrak{p} divides $f^m(x)$ i.e. $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(f^m(x)) > 0$, but $v_{\mathfrak{p}}(f^k(x)) \leq 0$ for all $k < m$. It is often the case that for all but finitely many m , $f^m(x)$ has a primitive prime divisor. Indeed, as noted above this was one of the motivations for studying polynomials which generate rigid divisibility sequences [26]. More recently, many authors have considered the problem in other cases [11, 14, 18, 15]. We will make use of an amalgamation of these results. We say that a number field K *satisfies the abc-conjecture* if for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a constant $C_{K,\varepsilon} > 0$ such that for all $a, b, c \in K^\times$ satisfying $a + b = c$, we have $h(a, b, c) < (1 + \varepsilon)\text{rad}(a, b, c) + C_{K,\varepsilon}$ (see [14, Conjecture 3.1] for the precise definitions of the height and radical used here).

Theorem 5.4. *Let K be a number field or characteristic zero function field of transcendence degree 1, let $f \in K(X)$ be a rational function of degree $d > 1$ which is not a monomial, and let $x \in K$ be a point which is not preperiodic for f . If K is a number field, assume that either K satisfies the abc-conjecture, or that 0 is periodic for f and f does not vanish to order d at 0. Then for all but finitely many positive integers m , there is a prime \mathfrak{p} of K such that \mathfrak{p} is a primitive prime divisor of $f^m(x)$.*

Proof. This follows from [14, Theorem 1.1] and [15, Theorem 7]. \square

We conclude by proving Theorem 1.8.

Proof of Theorem 1.8. By Theorem 5.4, there exists a constant $B > 0$, depending only on f and x , such that $f^m(x)$ has a primitive prime divisor for all $m > B$. Suppose $(m_1, \dots, m_n) \in M_{F,x}(N)$ is such that $m_i > B$ and $f^{m_i}(x)$ is not a root of unity for each i , and $m_i \neq m_j$ for all $i \neq j$. Then

$$f^{m_1}(x)^{k_1} \dots f^{m_n}(x)^{k_n} = 1$$

for some $k_1, \dots, k_n \in \mathbb{Z}$, not all 0. By construction, the multiplicative relation above is not of rank 0. Hence, taking the largest m_i such that $k_i \neq 0$, each prime \mathfrak{p} dividing $f^{m_i}(x)$ must divide some $f^{m_j}(x)$ with $j \neq i$. This is a contradiction since $f^{m_i}(x)$ has a primitive prime divisor. Since there are $O(N^{n-1})$ choices of (m_1, \dots, m_n) with either $m_i \leq B$ for some i , $f^{m_i}(x)$ a root of unity for some i , or $m_i = m_j$ for some $i \neq j$, the result follows. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Bérczes, Y. Bugeaud, J.-H. Evertse, K. Györy, J. Mello, A. Ostafe and M. Sha, ‘Explicit bounds for the solutions of superelliptic equations over number fields’, *preprint*, arXiv:2310.09704v1. (pp. 4, 6, and 7)
- [2] A. Bérczes, Y. Bugeaud, J.-H. Evertse, K. Györy, J. Mello, A. Ostafe and M. Sha, ‘Multiplicative dependence of rational values modulo approximate finitely generated groups’, *preprint*, arXiv:2107.05371v3. (p. 3)
- [3] A. Bérczes, J.-H. Evertse and K. Györy, ‘Effective results for Diophantine equations over finitely generated domains’, *Acta Arith.*, **163** (2014), 71-100. (p. 6)
- [4] A. Bérczes, A. Ostafe, I. E. Shparlinski and J. H. Silverman, ‘Multiplicative dependence among iterated values of rational functions modulo finitely generated groups’, *Int. Math. Res. Notices*, **2021** (2021), no. 12, 9045-9082. (p. 3)
- [5] Y. F. Bilu and R. F. Tichy, ‘The Diophantine equation $f(x) = g(y)$ ’, *Acta Arith.* **95** (2000), 261-268. (pp. 4, 9, and 10)
- [6] P. Blanchard, ‘Complex analytic dynamics of the Riemann sphere’, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **11** (1984), 85-141. (p. 1)
- [7] E. Bombieri and W. Gubler, ‘Heights in Diophantine geometry’ *Cambridge Univ. Press*, Cambridge, 2006. (pp. 3 and 7)
- [8] E. Bombieri, D. Masser and U. Zannier, ‘Intersecting a curve with algebraic subgroups of multiplicative groups’, *Int. Math. Res. Notices*, **20** (1999), 1119-1140. (p. 3)
- [9] E. Chen, ‘Avoiding algebraic integers of bounded house in orbits of rational functions over cyclotomic closures’, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **46** (2018), 4189-4198. (p. 3)
- [10] R. Dvornicich and U. Zannier, ‘Cyclotomic diophantine problems (Hilbert irreducibility and invariant sets for polynomial maps)’, *Duke Math J.*, **139** (2007), 527-554. (p. 3)
- [11] D. Ghioca and K. D. Nguyen, ‘Squarefree doubly primitive divisors in dynamical sequences’, *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **164** (2018), 551-572. (p. 16)
- [12] D. Ghioca, T. J. Tucker and M. E. Zieve, ‘Intersections of polynomial orbits and a dynamical Mordell-Lang conjecture’ *Invent. Math.* **171** (2008), 463-483. (pp. 2 and 12)
- [13] D. Ghioca, T. J. Tucker and M. E. Zieve, ‘Linear relations between polynomial orbits’, *Duke Math. J.* **161** (2012), 1379-1410. (pp. 1 and 2)
- [14] C. Gratton, K. Nguyen and T. J. Tucker, ‘ ABC implies primitive prime divisors in arithmetic dynamics’, *Bull. London Math. Soc.* **45** (2013), 1194-1208. (p. 16)
- [15] P. Ingram and J. H. Silverman, ‘Primitive divisors in arithmetic dynamics’, *Math. Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* **146** (2009), 289-302. (p. 16)
- [16] R. Jones, ‘The density of prime divisors in the arithmetic dynamics of quadratic polynomials’, *J. London Math. Soc.*, **78** (2008), no. 2, 523-544. (p. 14)
- [17] S. Konyagin, M. Sha, I. Shparlinski and C. L. Stewart, ‘On the distribution of multiplicatively dependent vectors’, *Math. Res. Letters*, **30** (2023), no. 2, 509-540. (p. 2)
- [18] H. Krieger, ‘Primitive prime divisors in the critical orbit of $z^d + c$ ’, *Int. Math. Res. Notices*, **2013** (2013), no. 23, 5498-5525. (p. 16)

- [19] H. Krieger, A. Levin, Z. Scherr, T. J. Tucker, Y. Yasufuku and M. E. Zieve, ‘Uniform boundedness of S -units in arithmetic dynamics’, *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* **274** (2015), no. 1, 97-105. (pp. [10](#) and [13](#))
- [20] S. Lang, *Fundamentals of Diophantine geometry*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1983. (p. [12](#))
- [21] W. LeVeque, ‘On the equation $y^m = f(x)$ ’, *Acta Arith.*, **9** (1964), 209-219. (p. [6](#))
- [22] R.C. Mason, ‘Diophantine equations over function fields’, *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*, **96** (1984), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. (p. [6](#))
- [23] A. Ostafe, ‘On roots of unity in orbits of rational functions’, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **145** (2017) 1927-1936. (p. [3](#))
- [24] A. Ostafe, M. Sha, I. E. Shparlinski and U. Zannier, ‘On Multiplicative dependence of values of rational functions and a generalisation of the Northcott theorem’, *Michigan Math. J.* **68** (2019), no. 2, 385-407. (p. [3](#))
- [25] A. Ostafe and M. Young, ‘On algebraic integers of bounded house and preperiodicity in polynomial semigroup dynamics’, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **373** (2020), 2191-2206. (p. [3](#))
- [26] B. Rice, ‘Primitive prime divisors in polynomial arithmetic dynamics’, *Integers* **7** (2007), A26, 16 pp. (electronic). (pp. [15](#) and [16](#))
- [27] B. Rice, ‘Rigid divisibility sequences generated by polynomial iteration’, *HMC Senior Theses*, **212** (2008), https://scholarship.claremont.edu/hmc_theses/212/. (p. [15](#))
- [28] A. Schinzel and R. Tijdeman, ‘On the equation $y^m = P(x)$ ’, *Acta Arith.*, **31** (1976), 199-204. (pp. [4](#) and [6](#))
- [29] C. L. Siegel, ‘The integer solutions of the equation $y^2 = ax^n + bx^{n-1} + \dots + k$ ’, *J. London Math. Soc.*, **1** (1926), 66-68. (p. [6](#))
- [30] J.H. Silverman, ‘The S -unit equation over function fields’, *Proc. Camb. Philos. Soc.*, **95** (1984), 3-4. (p. [6](#))
- [31] W.W. Stothers, ‘Polynomial identities and Hauptmoduln’, *Q. J. Math. Oxf.*, **32** (1981), No. 3, 349-370. (p. [6](#))
- [32] P. Vojta, ‘Diophantine approximation and value distribution theory’, *Lecture notes in Mathematics* 1239, Springer, Berlin, 1987. (p. [5](#))
- [33] P. G. Walsh, ‘On a conjecture of Schinzel and Tijdeman’, *Number Theory in Progress*, edited by Kálmán Györy, Henryk Iwaniec and Jerzy Urbanowicz, Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter, 1999, 577-582. (p. [4](#))
- [34] M. Young, ‘On multiplicative independence of rational function iterates’, *Monatsh. Math.*, **192** (2020), 225-247. (p. [15](#))
- [35] S. Zhang, ‘Distributions in algebraic dynamics’, A tribute to Professor S.-S Chern, *Survey in Differential Geometry* **10** (2006), 381-430. (p. [2](#))

CENTRO DI RICERCA MATEMATICA ENNIO DE GIORGI, SCUOLA NORMALE SUPERIORE,
PISA, 56126, ITALY

E-mail address: `marley.young@sns.it`