

# **The greatest square free factor of a binary recursive sequence**

Tarlok Nath Shorey

### **To cite this version:**

Tarlok Nath Shorey. The greatest square free factor of a binary recursive sequence. Hardy-Ramanujan Journal, 1983, Volume 6 - 1983, pp.23 - 36. 10.46298/hrj.1983.97 . hal-01104239

### **HAL Id: hal-01104239 <https://hal.science/hal-01104239v1>**

Submitted on 16 Jan 2015

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Hardy-Ramanujan Journol  $Vol. 6 (1983) 23 - 36$ 

## THE GREATEST SQUARE FREE FACTOR OF A BINARY RECURSIVE SEQUENCE

By T. N. SHOREY

**§** 1. For any sequence of integers  $u_{\alpha}, u_1, ..., u_m, ...$ satisfying

 $\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{m}} = \mathbf{r} \mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{m-1}} + \mathbf{s} \mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{m-2}} \mathbf{m} = 2, 3, ...$ 

where r and s are rational integers with  $r^2 + 4s \neq 0$ , we have

 $u_m = ad^m + b\beta^m$ , m = 0, 1, 2, ...  $(1)$ 

where L and  $\beta$  are rects of the polynomial  $x^2-r$  X-s and

(2) 
$$
a = \frac{u_0 \beta - u_1}{\beta - d}
$$
,  $b = \frac{u_1 - u_0 d}{\beta - d}$ .

The polynomial  $x^2-rx-s$  is called the polynomial associated to the sequence  $\{u_m\}$ . The sequence  $\{u_m\}$  is said to be a non-degenerate binary recursive sequence if a, b, d,  $\beta$  are non-zero and  $d/\beta$  is not a root of unity. For a rational integer x with  $|\mathbf{E}| > 1$ , denote by  $P(x)$  the greatest prime factor of  $x$  and by  $Q(x)$  the greatest square free factor of  $x$ . If  $p_1$ ,...,  $p_n$  are all the distinct primes dividing  $x$ , then  $Q(x) = p_1 \dots p_r$ . For non-zero rational integers x and y, denote by  $[x, y]$  and  $(x, y)$ , respectively, the least common multiple and the greatest common divisor of x and y. Further we define  $P(1) = P(-1) = 1$  and

$$
P\left(\frac{x}{y}\right) = P\left(\frac{x}{(x, y)}\frac{y}{(x, y)}\right) = P\left(\frac{[x, y]}{(x, y)}\right)
$$

and

$$
\mathfrak{D}\left(\frac{x}{y}\right) = Q\left(\frac{[x, y]}{(x, y)}\right)
$$

Let  $\{u_{n}\}$  be a non-degenerate binary recursive sequence glven by (1). Stewart [4] proved that

Q (u<sub>m</sub>) > C 
$$
\left(\frac{m}{(\log m)^2}\right)^{1/d}, m > C',
$$

where  $d = [0 (d) : 0]$  and  $C > 0$ ,  $C' > 0$  are effectively computable numbers depending only on a and b. Observe that  $d = 1$  or 2. Further, if  $d > | \beta |$ , Stewart [4] proved that for any  $\theta$  with  $0 < \theta < 1$ .

$$
Q(u_{m}) > m^{\theta}, m > C^{\prime\prime},
$$

where  $C' > 0$  is an effectively computable number depending only on  $\Theta$  and the sequence  $\{u_m\}$ . We shall generalise and strengthen this result as follows:

**Theorem 1** 

Let  $\{u_m\}$  be a non-degenerate binary recursive sequence. There exist effectively computable numbers  $C_1 > 0$  and  $C_2 > 0$ depending only on the sequence  $\{ u_n \}$  such that for every  $m > C<sub>1</sub>$ , we have

$$
\log Q(\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{m}}) > C_2 (\log \mathbf{m})^2 (\log \log \mathbf{m})^{-1}.
$$

The improvement depends on utilising the fact that the contribution from small primes in  $u_m$  is small. Stewart [5] proved theorem 1 for the greatest square free factor of the members of Lucas and Lehmer sequences. Further, for Lucas and Lehmer sequences, Stewart [5] proved that for almost all m

$$
\log Q \, (u_m) > (\log m)^{2 + \log 2 - \epsilon}, \epsilon > 0.
$$

Theorem 1 is contained in the following result.

24

Theorem 2

Let  $\{ u_n \}$  be a non-degenerate binary recursive sequence. *There exist effectively computable numbers*  $C_8 > 0$  *and*  $C_4 > 0$ *depending only on the sequence*  $\{ u_n \}$  *such that for every pair*  $m, n$  *with*  $m > n$ ,  $m > C_3$  *and*  $u_n \neq 0$ , *we have* 

$$
\log Q (\ln \Delta_{m, n}) > C_4 (\log m)^2 (\log \log m)^{-1}
$$

*where* 

$$
\Delta'_{m, n} = [u_m, u_n] / (u_m, u_n).
$$

For a non-degenerate binary recursive sequence  $\{u_m\}$ , observe that the equation  $\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{m}} = 0$  implies that m is bounded by an effectively computable number depending only on the sequence  ${u_{m}}$ . We apply theorem 2 with the least integer **n** (**n** is either 0 or 1) such that  $u_n \neq 0$  to obtain theorem 1. For estimates on P  $(u_m)$  and P  $({\Delta'}_{m, n})$ , we refer to Stewart [4] and the author [3]. See also the next theorem.

Let {  $\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{m}}$  } and {  $\mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{m}}$  } be non-degenerate binary recursive sequences whose associated polynomials are identically equal. Denote by  $J$  and  $\beta$  the roots of their asscciated polynomial. Then the sequence  $\{u_m\}$  is given by (1) and (2). Further for  $m = 0, 1, 2, ...,$  we have

$$
\mathbf{v_m} = \mathbf{a_1} \mathbf{d^m} + \mathbf{b_1} \mathbf{\beta^m}
$$

where

 $\alpha$  , and  $\alpha$  , and  $\alpha$ 

$$
a_1 = \frac{v_0 \beta - v_1}{\beta - d} \cdot b_1 = \frac{v_1 - v_0 d}{\beta - d}.
$$

For m and n with  $u_m v_n \neq 0$ , put

$$
\Delta_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{n}} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{m}}, \mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{n}} \end{bmatrix} / (\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{m}}, \mathbf{v}_{\mathbf{n}}).
$$

Then theorem 2 is a particular case of the following result. Theorem 3

*Let*  $A > 0$  *and*  $0 < K < (d+1)^{-1}$  *where*  $d = [Q(d) : Q]$ *There exist effectively computable numbers*  $C_5 > 0$  and  $C_6 > 0$ *depending only on* A, K, the sequences  $\{u_m\}$  and  $\{v_m\}$  such *that for every pair* m, n *with*  $m > n$ ,  $m > C_5$ ,  $v_n \neq 0$  *and* 

$$
(3) \qquad \frac{a d^m}{a_1 d^n} \neq \frac{b \beta^m}{b_1 \beta^n}.
$$

*either* 

$$
\log P \left( A_{m, n} \right) > \left( \log m \right)^A
$$

*or* 

$$
\sum_{\substack{p \mid \Delta_{m, n} \\ p > m}} 1 > C_6 \frac{\log m}{\log \log m}
$$

*where* p *runs through primes* 

For the proof of theorem  $2$ , we may assume log P  $(\Delta'_{\mathbf{D}, \mathbf{b}})$  <  $(l \circ g \mathbf{m})^2$ . Theo we apply theorem 3 with  ${u_{m}} = {v_{m}}$ , A = 2 and K =  $\frac{1}{4}$  Observe that (3) is satisfied, s<sub>ince</sub>  $J\beta$  is not a root of unity. Now the assertion of theorem 2 follows immediately.

Tbe proof of theorem 3 depends on the theory of linear forms in logarithms. Let  $d_1$ ,...,  $d_n$  be non-zero algebraic numb:rs Let K b: their splitting field over Q.Put  $D = [K:Q]$ 

We denote by  $A_1$  ....,  $A_n$  upper bounds for the heights of  $d_1, \ldots, d_n$  respectively, where we assume that  $A_i > 3$ for  $1 \leq j \leq n$ . Write

$$
\Omega' = \frac{\ln 2}{\ln 1} \log A_j, \Omega = \Omega' \log A_n.
$$

The proof of theorem 3 depends on the following theorem of Baker [1] on linear forms in logarithms.

Theorem A.

There exist effectively computable absolute constants  $C_{\tau} > 0$  and  $C_{\rho} > 0$  such that the inequalities

$$
0 < | d_1^{b_1} \dots d_n^{b_n} - 1 | < C_8^n
$$
\n
$$
\exp \left( - \left( C_7 n D \right)^{C_8} \Omega \log \Omega' \log B \right)
$$

have no solution in rational integers  $b_1, ..., b_n$  with absolute values at most  $B$  ( $> 2$ ).

We shall also need a p-adic analogue, due to van der Poorten [2], of theorem A.

#### Theorem B.

Let  $\wp$  be a prime ideal of K lying above a rational prime p. There exist effectively computable absolute constants  $C_0 > 0$ and  $C_{10} > 0$  such that the inequalities

$$
\infty > \text{ord}_{\text{so}}(\mathbf{d}_1^{b_1} \dots \mathbf{d}_n^{b_n} - 1) >
$$
  

$$
(C_9 \text{ nD})^{C_1 0^n} \frac{p^D}{\log p} \Omega (\log B)^2
$$

have no solution in rational integers  $b_1, ..., b_n$  with absolute values at most  $B(> 2)$ .

 $\ddot{\phantom{1}}$ 

§ 2. Proof of theorem 3.

Let A > 0 and 0 < K < (d+1)<sup>-1</sup>. Put  
(4) 
$$
\tau = K (d+1)
$$
.

Observe that  $0 < \tau < 1$ . Let  $\{u_{-}\}\$  and  $\{v_{m}\}\$  be as in

theroem 3. There is no loss of generality in assuming that  $|d| \ge |\beta|$ . Then, since  $d/\beta$  is not a root of unity, we find that  $|d| > 1$ . For algebraic integer  $\pi \in Q(d)$ , denote by [a] the ideal generated by  $\pi$  in the ring of integers of  $Q(d)$ . There exists a positive rational integer k such that

$$
([a^2], [B^2]) = [k].
$$

Put  $d_1 = d^2/k$  and  $\beta_1 = \beta^2/k$ . Then the ideals  $[d_1]$  and  $\left[\beta_{1}\right]$  are relatively coprime. For  $m = 0,1,2,...$ , notice that

$$
U_{m} = k^{-m} u_{2m} = ad_{1}^{m} + b\beta_{1}^{m},
$$
  
\n
$$
U'_{m} = k^{-m} u_{2m+1} = add_{1}^{m} + b\beta \beta_{1}^{m},
$$
  
\n
$$
V_{m} = k^{-m} v_{2m} = a_{1} d_{1}^{m} + b_{1} \beta_{1}^{m},
$$
  
\n
$$
V'_{m} = k^{-m} v_{2m+1} = a_{1} d d_{1}^{m} + b_{1} \beta \beta_{1}^{m}.
$$

Observe that the sequences  $\{U_m\}$ ,  $\{V_m\}$ ,  $\{V_m\}$  and  $\{V_m\}$  are non-degenerate binary recursive sequences. By proving the theorem separately for sequences  $\{U_m\}$  and  $\{V_m\}$ ,  $\{U_m\}$  and  $\{V'_m\}$ ,  $\{U'_m\}$  and  $\{V_m\}$ ,  $\{U'_m\}$ and  $\{V_m\}$ , there is no loss of generality in assuming that  $([d], [\beta]) = [1].$ 

Denote by  $c_1, c_2, \ldots$  effectively computable positive numbers depending only on A, K, the sequences  $\{u_m\}$  and

$$
^{~28}
$$

 $\{v_m\}$ . We may assume that  $m > c_1$  with  $c_1$  sufficiently large. Then, since  $\{u_m\}$  is non-degenerate, we see that  $u_m \neq 0$ , Let  $0 < n < m$  satisfy  $v_n \neq 0$  and suppose that (3) Is valid. We suppose

(5) 
$$
\log P(\Delta_{m,n}) < (\log m)^A
$$
.

Let  $\pi_1, ..., \pi_s$  be all the rational primes satisfying  $\pi_1 \Delta_{m,n}$ and  $\pi_1 > m$ <sup>K</sup> for  $1 < l < s$ . Let  $0 < s < 1$ . We suppose that

(6) 
$$
s < + \varepsilon
$$
 (log m) (log log m)  $^{-1}$ .

We shall arrive at a contradiction for a suitable choice of  $\epsilon$ depending only on A, K the sequences  $\{u_m\}$  and  $\{v_m\}$ .

We write

(7) 
$$
B_1 = \frac{u_m}{(u_m, v_n)}, B_2 = \frac{v_n}{(u_m, v_n)},
$$
  
 $\Lambda = (u_m, v_n).$ 

**Then** 

(8) 
$$
\frac{u_m}{v_n} = \frac{B_1}{B_2}
$$
 and  $(B_1, B_2) = 1$ .

Further

 $\Delta_{\mathbf{m},\mathbf{n}} = \pm \mathbf{B}_1 \mathbf{B}_2.$  $(9)$ 

For a prime p dividing  $B_1$ , we see from (7) that

$$
\mathrm{ord}_{p}\left(B_{1}\right)<\mathrm{ord}_{p}\left(\mathbf{u}_{\mathrm{m}}\right).
$$

Let  $\emptyset$  be a prime ideal in the ring of integers of Q (d) dividing  $p$ . Then, since the ideals  $[d]$  and  $[\beta]$  are relatively prime, either  $\wp$  does not divide [d] or  $\wp$  does not divide [ $\beta$ ]. For simplicity assume that  $\wp$  does not divide [d]. Then, by  $(1)$ , we have

$$
\operatorname{ord}_{p}(u_{m}) < \operatorname{ord}_{\widehat{\mathcal{S}}}(u_{m})
$$
\n
$$
\leq c_{2} + \operatorname{ord}_{\widehat{\mathcal{S}}}\left( -\frac{b}{a} \left( \frac{\beta}{d} \right)^{m} - 1 \right).
$$
\nNow we apply theorem B with  $n = 2$ ,  $D = d$ ,  $d_{1} = -b/a$ ,

\n
$$
d_{2} = \beta/d, b_{1} = 1 \text{ and } b_{2} = m \text{ to conclude that}
$$

$$
\operatorname{ord}_{\wp}\left(-\frac{\mathfrak{b}}{\mathfrak{a}}\left(\frac{\beta}{\mathfrak{a}}\right)^{m}-1\right)
$$
  
<  $\leq$  c<sub>3</sub> p<sup>d</sup>  $(\log p)^{-1} (\log m)^{+2}$ .

Therefore

 $d_2 =$ 

ord<sub>p</sub>  $(B_1) < c_4 p^d$  (log p)<sup>-1</sup> (log m)<sup>2</sup>.

This inequality follows similarly when  $\wp$  does not divide [ $\beta$ ]. Consequently, by (4),

$$
\sum_{\substack{p \mid B_1 \ p \le m}} \text{ord}_p(b_1) \log p < c_4 m^{\tau} (\log m)^2.
$$

Similarly

$$
\sum_{\substack{p \mid B_{\mathbf{2}} \\ p \le m}} \operatorname{ord}_p (B_2) \log p < c_5 m^{\tau} (\log m)^2.
$$

Consequently, by (9), we may write

(10) 
$$
B_1 = B_3 \pi_1^{\pi_1} \dots \pi_s^{\pi_s}, B_2 = B_4 \pi_1^{\frac{y_1}{y_1}} \dots \pi_s^{\frac{y_s}{y_s}}
$$

where  $x_1, ..., x_s, y_1, ..., y_s$  are non-negative integers and  $B_3$ ,  $B_4 \, \epsilon \, Z$  with

 $\log \max ( |B_3|, |B_4| ) < c_6 m^{\tau} (\log m)^2.$  $(11)$ 

Further we see from (7) that  $\log \max (\frac{1}{2} B_1 + \frac{1}{2} B_2) < c_n m$ which, together with (10), implies that  $\max(x_1, ..., x_s, y_1, ..., y_s) < c_g$ m  $(12)$ with  $c_0 > 1$ . We have  $u_m$   $a_1^{-1}$  ad<sup>m-n</sup>  $v_n$  $(13)$  $= -b_1 \beta^0 (a_1^{-1} a_1^{m-n} - b_1^{-1} b_1 \beta^{m-n})$ and, by  $(7)$  and  $(1)$ ,  $\Lambda B_1$  – ad<sup>m</sup> = b  $\beta^m$  $(14)$ In view of (3), we see that  $u_m - a_1^{-1}$  ad<sup>m-n</sup>  $v_n \neq 0$ .  $(15)$ Put  $T = a_1^{-1} a d^{m-n} v_n u_m^{-1} - 1$  $T_1 = a^{-1} d^{-m} \Lambda B_1 - 1$ By  $(15)$  and  $(14)$ , notice that  $TT_1 \neq 0$ . Further it follows from (8) and (10) that  $T_1 = a_1^{-1} d^{-m} \pi_1^{k_1} \cdots \pi_8^{k_8} (B_3 \Lambda) - 1$ and  $T = \frac{a}{a_1} d^{m-n} \pi_1^{z_1} \dots \pi_s^{z_s} \frac{B_4}{B_2} - 1$ where  $z_i = y_i - x_i$  for  $1 \le i \le s$  Now we split the proof of theorem 3 in two cases.  $|\mathcal{A}| > |\beta|$ . Dividing both the sides of (13) by  $Case I.$  $u_m$ , we have

(16) 
$$
0 < |T| < c_9^{-n}, c_9 > 1
$$
.  
\nWe apply theorem<sub>1</sub>with  
\n $n = s+3 < \mathbb{E} (\log m) (\log \log m)^{-1} + 3 \text{ by } (6),$   
\n $D = d < 2$ ,  $\log A_1 = \log A_2 = c_{10}, \log A_3 = ... =$   
\n $\log A_{n-1} = (\log m)^A$  by (5),  $\log A_n = c_6 m^T (\log m)^2$  by (11)  
\nand B =  $c_8 m$  by (12) to conclude that  
\n(17)  $|T| > \exp (-m^{T+c} 11^{\epsilon} (\log m)^5)$ .  
\nWe shall choose  $\epsilon$  to satisfy  
\n(18)  $\epsilon < (1-\tau)/2$   $c_{11}$ .  
\nPut  
\n $\tau_1 = (1 + \tau)/2$ .  
\nThen, since  $0 < \tau < 1$ , we find that  $\tau < \tau_1 < 1$ .  
\nCombining (16), (17) and (18), we have  
\n $n < c_{12} m^T (\log m)^5$ .  
\nThen  
\n(19)  $\log |\bigwedge t| < \log |\nu_n| < c_{13} m^T$  ( $\log m$ )<sup>5</sup>.  
\nDividing both the sides of (14) by a  $\mathbb{L}^m$ , we have  
\n(20)  $0 < |\Upsilon_1| < c_{14}^{-m}$ ,  $c_{14} > 1$ .  
\nWe apply theorem A with  $n = s + 3 < \epsilon$  (log m) ( $\log \log m$ )<sup>-1</sup>  
\n+ 3 by (6),  $D = d < 2$ ,  $\log A_1 = \log A_2 = c_{15}$ ,  
\n $\log A_3 = ... = \log A_{n-1} = (\log m)^{\Delta}$  by (5),  $\log A_n = 2c_{13} m^T$   
\n $(\log m)^5$  by (19), (11) and B =  $c_3 m$  by (12) to conclude that

(21) 
$$
|\mathbf{T}_1| > \exp(-\mathbf{m}^{\tau_1 + \mathbf{c}_{16}} \mathbf{E}_{(\log m)^8}).
$$

Let

$$
\epsilon = \min \left( \frac{1-\tau}{2c_{11}}, \frac{1-\tau_1}{2c_{16}}, \frac{1}{2} \right)
$$

Then (18) is satisfied. Put

$$
\tau_2 = (1 + \tau_1) / 2.
$$

Observe that  $\tau_1 < \tau_2 < 1$ . Now we combine (20) and (21) to conclude that

$$
m < c_{17} m^{T} \left(\log m\right)^8
$$

which, slace  $\tau_{2}$  < 1, implies that m < c<sub>12</sub>. But this is not possible if  $c_1 > c_{18}$ .

#### Case II

 $|d| = |\beta|$ . Let  $\tau_1$  and  $\tau_2$  be defined as in case I. Observe that  $\beta$  is not a unit, since  $\alpha/\beta$  is not a root of unity. Therefore there exists a prime ideal  $\wp$  in the ring of integers of Q (d) such that  $\emptyset$  / [ $\beta$ ]. Further, since the ideals [d] and [ $\beta$ ] are relatively coprime, observe that  $\wp$  does not divide [ $\mathcal{A}$ ]. Consequently ord  $_{\wp}$  (u<sub>m</sub>) < c<sub>19</sub>. Now, by counting the power of prime ideal  $\wp$  on both the sides in (13), we have

$$
n < c_{20} + \text{ord}_{\mathbb{S}^1} (u_{\mathbf{m}}) + \text{ord}_{\mathbb{S}^1} (T) < c_{21} + \text{ord}_{\mathbb{S}^1} (T).
$$

We apply theorem B with  $p < c_{22}$  and the same parameters as in case I for obtaining a lower bound for  $\vert \mathbf{r} \vert$  by theorem A. We obtain

$$
\operatorname{ord}_{\varnothing}(\mathbf{T}) < \mathbf{m} \qquad \qquad \frac{\tau + \mathbf{c}_{23} \varepsilon}{\left(\log m\right)^5}.
$$

We shall choose  $\varepsilon$  to satisfy (22)  $\epsilon < \frac{1-\tau}{2 c_{23}}$ .

**Then** 

ž,

$$
n < c_{24} \text{ m}^{T_1} (\log \text{m})^5
$$

which implies tbat

$$
\log | \wedge | < c_{25} \, \mathrm{m}^{\mathrm{T}_1} \, (\log \, \mathrm{m})^5.
$$

Counting the power of p lms ideal  $\wp$  on both the sides In (14), we obtain

$$
\mathbf{m} \leq \mathbf{c}_{26} + \operatorname{ord}_{\wp}(\mathbf{T}_1).
$$

 $1$  (log m)<sup>5</sup> We apply theorem B with  $p < c_{22}$ ,  $\log A_{n} = c_{25}$  m  $\log (log m)$ and tbe same parameters as in case I for obtaining a lower bound for  $|\mathbf{T}_1|$  by theorem A We obtain

$$
\operatorname{ord}_{\S^0}(T_1) < m^{T_1 + 0} 27^{\sum_{i=1}^{m} (\log m)^8}.
$$
\nLet

\n
$$
\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1 - \tau}{2 c_{23}}, \frac{1 - \tau}{2 c_{27}}, \frac{1}{2}
$$

Then (22) is satisfied. We obtain

$$
m < c_{28} \; m^{T_{2}} \left(\log\; m\right)^{8}.
$$

Consequently  $m < c_{q_0}$  which is not possible if  $c_1 > c_{q_0}$ . This completes the proof of theorem 3.

**Remarks** 

(i) Let  $\{u_{m}\}\$ be a non-degenerate blaary recursive sequence. For every pair m, n with  $m > n$ ,  $u_m u_n \neq 0$  and  $Q(u_m) = Q(u_n)$ , we have

$$
m - n > c_{30} (\log m)^{2} (\log \log m)^{-1}
$$

where  $c_{q_0} > 0$  is an e'fectively computable number depending only on the sequence  $\{u_{m}\}$ . This follows immediately from theorem 1 and the relation (13) with  $a_1 = a$ ,  $b_1 = b$ .

(ii) Let  $P \ge 2$  and denote by S the set of all non-zero integers composed of primes not exceeding P. We can apply the argument of proof of theorem I to prove that for every

$$
x \in S, y \in S \text{ with } (x, y) = 1, |x| > |y| \text{ and } \log |x| > e^{\mathfrak{S}},
$$

$$
\log Q(x + y) > c_{31} (\log \log |x|)^{2} (\log \log \log |x|)^{-1}
$$

where  $c_{31} > 0$  is an effectively computable number depending only on P.

### **References**

- 1. **A.** Baker, *The theory of linear forms In logarithms,*  **Transcendence theory:** Advances and applications, A. Baker and D.W, Masser ed., Academic Prrss, London and Nrw Yo•k 1977.
- 2. A. J. van der Poorten, *Lintar forms* in *logarithms in the p-adic case,* franscendencc theory : Advances and appllcations, A. Baker and Masser ed., Academic Press, London and New York 1977.
- 3. T.N. Shorey, *Linear forms in members of a binary recursive sequence*, Acta. Arith. (to appear).
- 4. C.L. Stewart, On *divisors of terms of Linear recursive' sequences,* Jour. reioe anaew Math 333 (1982), 12-31.
- 5. C.L. Stewarr, On *divisors of Fermat, Fibonacci, Lucas and*  Lchmer numbers *III*, Jour, London Math. Soc. (to appear).

*School of Mathemaiics Tata Institute of Fundamental Research Homi Bhabha Road Bombay 400 005 India.*