stichting
mathematisch
centrum

AFDELING ZUIVERE WISKUNDE ZN 58/74 DECEMBER

J.M. GEIJSEL

TRANSCENDENCE PROPERTIES OF CERTAIN QUANTITIES OVER THE QUOTIENT FIELD $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$

2e boerhaavestraat 49 amsterdam

Printed at the Mathematical Centre, 49, 2e Boerhaavestraat, Amsterdam.

The Mathematical Centre, founded the 11-th of February 1946, is a non-profit institution aiming at the promotion of pure mathematics and its applications. It is sponsored by the Netherlands Government through the Netherlands Organization for the Advancement of Pure Research (Z.W.O), by the Municipality of Amsterdam, by the University of Amsterdam, by the Free University at Amsterdam, and by industries.

AMS(MOS) subject classification scheme (1970): 10F35, 10B40

Transcendence properties of certain quantities over the quotient field of $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$

by

J.M. Geijsel

ABSTRACT

In this report the result of I. Wade:
"the zeros of the Carlitz-ψ-function and the values $\psi(\alpha)$, where $\alpha \neq 0$, α algebraic over $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$, are transcendental over $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$", is generalized to a larger class of functions. The proof uses a combinatorial lemma and Schneider's method.

As a special case we have the result:
"The zeros of the Carlitz-Besselfunctions $J_n(t)$ are transcendental over $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ and at least one of the two values $J_n(\alpha)$, $J_n(x\alpha) - xJ_n(\alpha)$ for $\alpha \neq 0$, α algebraic, is transcendental over $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$."

KEY WORDS & PHRASES: *Transcendency, Carlitzfunctions.*

1. NOTATION AND HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

Let $\mathbb{F}_q$ be a finite field with $q = p^{n_0}$ (p prime) elements. We denote by $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ the ring of polynomials with coefficients in $\mathbb{F}_q$ and by $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$ its quotientfield.

For $0 \neq E \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$ we define the (logarithmic) valuation

$$\mathrm{dg}E = \text{degree of } E$$

and

$$\mathrm{dg}0 = -\infty.$$

For $Q \in \mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$ where $Q = \frac{E}{F}$ with $E,F \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$ and $F \neq 0$ we define

$$\mathrm{dg}Q = \mathrm{dg}E - \mathrm{dg}F.$$

The completion of $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$ with respect to this valuation is denoted by $\mathcal{F}$.

The valuation on $\mathcal{F}$ can be extended to the algebraic closure of $\mathcal{F}$ and the completion of this algebraic closure is denoted by Φ. The valuation of Φ also will be denoted by dg.

1.1. <u>DEFINITION</u>

$$F_0 = 1;\; F_k = \prod_{j=0}^{k-1} (x^{q^k} - x^{q^j}),\; k > 0; \qquad F_k^{-1} = 0,\; k < 0.$$

$$L_0 = 1;\; L_k = \prod_{j=1}^{k} (x^{q^j} - x),\; k > 0.$$

$$\psi(t) := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (-1)^k \frac{t^{q^k}}{F_k}.$$

The function $\psi(t)$ was introduced in a paper of L. CARLITZ [1], where he showed, among other things, the following: The function $\psi(t)$ has zero's in the points $E\xi$, with $E \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$ and where

$$\xi = \lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{(x^q-x)^{\frac{q^k}{q-1}}}{L_k} .$$

These are the only zero's of $\psi(t)$.

Remark that $dg\xi = \frac{q}{q-1}$.

In 1941 L.I. WADE [8] proved the transcendency over $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$ of the quantities

(i) ξ

(ii) $\psi(\alpha)$ for $\alpha \neq 0$, α algebraic over $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$

(iii) $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k \frac{E^{q^k}}{F_k}$ where $c_k \in \mathbb{F}_q$, $c_k \neq 0$ for infinitely many k, and where $E \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$.

In this paper we prove the following results:

(A1) Let $\eta \neq 0$ be a zero of the function

$$f(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k \frac{t^{q^k}}{F_k} ,$$

where $c_k \in \mathbb{F}_q$ and $c_k \neq 0$ for infinitely many k, then η is transcendental over $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$.

(A2) Let $\eta \neq 0$ be a zero of the (Carlitz-Bessel) function

$$J_n(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (-1)^k \frac{t^{q^{n+k}}}{F_{n+k}F_k^{q^n}}, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}$$

then η is transcendental over $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$.

(B) Suppose $\alpha \in \Phi$, $\alpha \neq 0$, α algebraic over $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$ and let

$$f(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k \frac{t^{q^k}}{F_k} ,$$

where $c_k \in \mathbb{F}_q$ and there exists a $c \in \mathbb{F}_q$, $c \neq 0$ such that

$$c_{k+1} = c.c_k, \ k = 0,1,2,\ldots,$$

then $f(\alpha)$ is transcendental over $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$.

(C) Suppose $\alpha \in \Phi$, $\alpha \neq 0$, α algebraic over $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$ and let

$$J_n(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (-1)^k \frac{t^{q^{n+k}}}{F_{n+k}F_k^{q^n}}, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}$$

then at least one of the elements $\{J_n(\alpha), \Delta J_n(\alpha)\}$, where $\Delta J_n(\alpha) = J_n(x\alpha) - xJ_n(\alpha)$, is transcendental over $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$.

The proofs of the results B and C use a refinement of the methods in [9] and in [5] and the results A1 respectively A2. These results will be proved in §4 and §5.

2. THE ZEROS OF $\psi(t)$, $f(t)$ AND $J_n(t)$.

The field Φ is complete with respect to the discrete valuation dg. We use Newton's method to determine the size of the roots of a polynomial over Φ. (See [10]).

Let $g(x) = a_0+a_1t+a_2t^2+\ldots+a_nt^n$ be a polynomial over Φ and assume $a_0, a_n \neq 0$.

In the two dimensional Euclidean space we associate a polygon with the polynomial g as follows:

if $a_i \neq 0$ take the point $(i, -dga_i)$,

if $a_i = 0$ then $dga_i = -\infty$ and no point of the space belongs to a_i.

The lower convex envelope of the set of points $\{(i,-dga_i) \mid i=0,1,\ldots,n\}$ is called the *Newton polygon* of g (with respect to dg).

2.1. <u>LEMMA</u>. *Let* $g(t) = a_0+a_1t+\ldots+a_nt^n$ *with* $a_0, a_n \neq 0$ *be a polynomial over* Φ. *Suppose that* $(r,-dga_r) \leftrightarrow (s,-dga_s)$ *with* $s > r$ *is any segment of the Newton polygon of* g *and its slope is* m. *Then* g *has exactly* s-r *roots* $\beta \in \Phi$ *with* $dg\beta = m$.

Let

$$R_1 := \min_{i>0} \frac{dga_0 - dga_i}{i}$$

$$i_1 := \max\{i \mid \frac{dga_0-dga_i}{i} = R_1\}$$

and inductively if the set $\{i \mid i_{k-1} < i \leq n\}$ *is not empty,*

$$R_k := \min_{i>i_{k-1}} \frac{dga_{i_{k-1}} - dga_i}{i - i_{k-1}},$$

$$i_k := \max \{ i \mid \frac{dga_{i_{k-1}} - dga_i}{i - i_{k-1}} = R_k \}.$$

Then g *has exactly* i_1 *zeros* β *with* $dg\beta = R_1, \ldots, i_k - i_{k-1}$ *zeros* β *with* $dg\beta = R_k$. *Furthermore* $R_1 < R_2 < \ldots < R_k$.

PROOF. We recall the proof of WEISS [10], prop. 3-1-1, in our notation. We may suppose that $a_0 = 1$. Let $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n \in \Phi$ be the zeros of g, ordered in such a way that

$$\begin{aligned} dg\beta_1 &= \ldots = dg\beta_{s_1} = m_1 \\ dg\beta_{s_1+1} &= \ldots = dg\beta_{s_2} = m_2 \\ &\vdots \\ dg\beta_{s_i+1} &= \ldots = dg\beta_n = m_{i+1} \text{ with } m_1 < m_2 < \ldots < m_{i+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the symmetric polynomials in the roots $\beta_1^{-1}, \ldots, \beta_n^{-1}$ of $a_0 t^{-n} + \ldots + a_{n-1} t^{-1} + a_n$ we get:

$$dga_0 = dg1 = 0$$

$$dga_1 = dg \sum_{i=1}^{n} \beta_i^{-1} \le \max_{1 \le i \le n} (-dg\beta_i) = -m_1$$

$$dga_2 = dg \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i \ne j}}^{n} \beta_i^{-1}\beta_j^{-1} \le \max_{\substack{1 \le i,j \le n \\ i \ne j}} (-dg\beta_i\beta_j) = -2m_1$$

$$\vdots$$

$dga_{s_1} = dg \sum_{j_k \ne j_1} \beta_{j_1}^{-1}\beta_{j_2}^{-1} \ldots \beta_{j_{s_1}}^{-1} = -s_1 m_1$, since this elementary symmetric function has exactly one maximal term $\beta_1^{-1}\beta_2^{-1} \ldots \beta_{s_1}^{-1}$.

$$dga_{s_1+1} \le -s_1 m_1 - m_2$$

$$\vdots$$

$$dga_{s_2} = -s_1 m_1 - (s_2 - s_1) m_2,$$

and this process is continued in the obvious way.

Now we can form the Newton polygon of g, which consists of the segments:

$$(0,0) \leftrightarrow (s_1,s_1m_1)$$
$$(s_1,s_1m_1) \leftrightarrow (s_2,s_1m_1+(s_2-s_1)m_2)$$
$$\vdots$$
$$(s_i,s_1m_1+(s_2-s_1)m_2+\ldots+(s_i-s_{i-1})m_i) \leftrightarrow (n,s_1m_1+(s_2-s_1)m_2+\ldots$$
$$\ldots+(n-s_i)m_{i+1}).$$

The slopes of the segments are respectively

$$\frac{s_1m_1-0}{s_1-0} = m_1, \quad \frac{s_1m_1+(s_2-s_1)m_2-s_1m_1}{s_2-s_1} = m_2,\ldots,m_{i+1}.$$

From the inequalities for $dga_0,\ldots,dga_n$ it follows that

$$\frac{dga_0-dga_i}{i} \geq m_1 \text{ for } i = 1,2,\ldots,s_1,$$

$$\frac{dga_0-dga_i}{i} > m_1 \text{ for } i = s_1+1,\ldots,n$$

and

$$\frac{dga_0-dga_{s_1}}{s_1} = m_1.$$

Hence $R_1 = m_1$ and $i_1 = s_1$, which means: g has exactly i_1 roots β with $dg\beta = R_1$.

It also follows from the inequalities above that

$$\frac{dga_{i_1}-dga_i}{i-i_1} = \frac{dga_{s_1}-dga_i}{i-s_1} \geq \min_{1\leq j\leq s_2-s_1} \frac{-s_1m_1+(s_1m_1+jm_2)}{s_1+j-s_1} = m_2$$

$$\text{for } i = s_1+1,\ldots,s_2$$

and

$$\frac{dga_{i_1}-dga_i}{i-i_1} > m_2 \text{ for } i = s_2+1,\ldots,n,$$

while

$$\frac{dga_{i_1}-dga_{s_2}}{s_2-i_1} = m_2.$$

Hence $R_2 = m_2$ and $i_2 = s_2$ which means: g has exactly $i_2 - i_1$ roots β with $dg\beta = R_2$.

The lemma now follows by proceeding in the obvious way.

REMARK. Since we had ordered the zeros in such a way that $m_1 < m_2 < \ldots < m_{i+1}$ we find $R_1 < R_2 < \ldots < R_{i+1}$. □

In his thesis W. SCHÖBE [7], II §3 proved the more general result:

2.2. THEOREM. *The function* $g(t) = a_h t^h + a_{h+1} t^{h+1} + \ldots$ *with* $a_i \in \Phi$, $i = h, h+1, \ldots$; $a_h \neq 0$; $h \geq 0$ *has*

(i) *a zero of order* h *in* $t = 0$.

(ii) $i_1 - h$ *zeros* β *in* Φ *with* $dg\beta = R_1$, *where*

$$R_1 = \min_{i>h} \frac{dga_h - dga_i}{i-h},$$

if this minimum exists,

and

$$i_1 = \max_{i>h}\{i \mid \frac{dga_h - dga_i}{i-h} = R_1\},$$

if this maximum exists.

(iii) $i_k - i_{k-1}$ *zeros* β *in* Φ *with* $dg\beta = R_k$ $(k \geq 2)$ *where,*

$$R_k = \min_{i>i_{k-1}} \frac{dga_{i_{k-1}} - dga_i}{i - i_{k-1}},$$

if this minimum exists

and

$$i_k = \max_{i>i_{k-1}} \{i \mid \frac{dga_{i_{k-1}} - dga_i}{i - i_{k-1}} = R_k\},$$

if this maximum exists.

These are the only zeros of g.

Our proof of theorem 2.2 will be based on several lemmas.

2.3. LEMMA. *Let* g *be defined as in lemma 2.2. Let* $R = -\limsup_{i\to\infty} \frac{dga_i}{i}$ *be the radius of convergence of* g. *If* R_k *as defined in lemma 2.2 exists,* *then* $R_k \le R$.

PROOF. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ be arbitrarily small. Since R is the radius of convergence of g for infinitely many i we have

$$\frac{dga_i}{i} > -R-\varepsilon.$$

From the existence of R_k it follows that for all $i > i_{k-1}$

$$R_k \le \frac{dga_{i_{k-1}} - dga_i}{i-i_{k-1}}.$$

We now have that for infinitely many $i > i_{k-1}$

$$R_k < \frac{dga_{i_{k-1}}}{i-i_{k-1}} + \frac{i(R+\varepsilon)}{i-i_{k-1}}.$$

Since $\lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{dga_{i_{k-1}}}{i-i_{k-1}} = 0$ and $\lim_{i\to\infty} \frac{i(R+\varepsilon)}{i-i_{k-1}} = R + \varepsilon$ we get

$$R_k \le R + \varepsilon.$$

Since ε can be chosen arbitrarily small it follows that

$$R_k \le R. \qquad \square$$

2.4. LEMMA. *Let* g *be defined as in lemma* 2.2. *If* R_k *exists and either* $R_k < R$ *or* $g(t)$ *converges for a certain* t *with* $dgt = R$, *then there exists an index* i_k *such that*

$$\frac{dga_{i_{k-1}} - dga_i}{i-i_{k-1}} > R_k, \quad i > i_k$$

and

$$\frac{dga_{i_{k-1}} - dga_i}{i-i_{k-1}} \le R_k, \quad i_{k-1} < i \le i_k,$$

where

$$\frac{dga_{i_{k-1}}-dga_{i_k}}{i_k-i_{k-1}} = i_k.$$

If k = 1 *we must read* h *instead of* i_{k-1}.

PROOF. Suppose R_1 exists. Since $R_1 \leq R$ according to lemma 2.3 we have: $\forall N \in \mathbb{N}\ \exists i_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$dga_i + idgt < -N,\ i > i_0,$$

for those t with dgt $\leq R_1$ for which g converges. (*)

Now choose N such that

$$dga_h + hR_1 > -N$$

(this is possible since $a_h \neq 0$ and $R_1 \in \mathbb{R}$). Suppose there exists a monotonically increasing sequence $(i_j)_{j=1}^{\infty}$ such that

$$\frac{dga_h-dga_{i_j}}{i_j-h} = R_1 \text{ for } j = 1,2,\ldots \qquad \text{(i.e. } i_1 \text{ does not exist),}$$

then

$$dga_h + hR_1 = dga_{i_j} + i_jR_1 \quad \text{for } j = 1,2,\ldots\ .$$

Hence if $i_j > i_0$ it follows from (*) that if we take a t with dgt $= R_1$ for which g converges then

$$dga_h + hR_1 < -N.$$

This is in contradiction with the choice of N.

For k > 1 the proof is the same. (Note that $a_{i_{k-1}} \neq 0$). □

REMARK.

(i) First we note that if there exists a $t \in \Phi$ with dgt $= R_1$ for which g converges then g converges for every t with dgt $= R_1$.

(ii) If $R_k = R$ and g(t) does not converge for any t with dgt = R then we want to know if $g(t)$ can have any zeros $\neq 0$ with $R_{k-1} < dgt < R_k$. We shall prove that $g(t) \neq 0$ for all $t \neq 0$ with $R_{k-1} < dgt < R_k$.

It is sufficient to consider the case $k = 1$; then $R_1 = R$ and $g(t)$ does not converge for any t with $dgt = R$. Suppose $g(u) = 0$, $u \neq 0$ and $dgu < R$. For all n the polynomial $P_n(t) = a_0+a_1t+\ldots+a_nt^n$ has no zeros β with $dg\beta < R$. Now let N be such that $dga_0 > -N$, then choose n such that $dg(g(t)-P_n(t)) < -N$ for all t with $dgt \leq dgu(<R)$. Then

$$dg(P_n(u)) = dg(g(u)-P_n(u)) < -N. \qquad (*)$$

On the other hand

$$dga_0 \geq dga_i + idgu \text{ for all } i \geq 0$$

and

$$dga_0 > dga_i + idgu \text{ for all } i > 0,$$

therefore

$$dgP_n(u) = \max(dga_i+idgu) = dga_0,$$

which contradicts $(*)$.

Conclusion: If $R_1 = R$ and $g(t)$ does not converge for any t with $dgt = R$ then $g(t)$ has no zeros except possibly 0.

<u>EXAMPLE</u>. $\lambda(t) := \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{t^{q^j}}{L_j}$ is the inverse of $\psi(t)$. (See [1] th. 7.1). Now $R_1 = R = \frac{q}{q-1}$ and i_1 does not exist. Furthermore $\lambda(t)$ does not converge for all t with $dgt = \frac{q}{q-1}$. Hence λ has no zeros β with $dg\beta < \frac{q}{q-1}$ except $\beta = 0$.

2.5. <u>LEMMA</u>. *Suppose* $g(t) = a_0+a_1t+\ldots$ *has radius of convergence* $R > -\infty$ *and suppose* $R_1(g) = R_1$ *exists. If* t_0 *is a zero of* g *with* $dgt_0 = R_1$ *then there exists a* $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ *such that* $h_\kappa(t) = \frac{g(t)}{(t-t_0)^{q^\kappa}}$ *has a zero in* t_0 *for* $\kappa = 0,1,2,\ldots,k-1$ *while* $h_k(t_0) \neq 0$.

<u>PROOF</u>. Choose $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ such that $q^k > i_1$. The function

$$h_k(t) = \frac{g(t)}{(t-t_0)^{q^k}} = b_0 + b_1t + b_2t^2 + \ldots$$

has radius of convergence R. Since $q^k > i_1$ we have

(1) $$dga_\nu + \nu R_1 < dga_0, \text{ for } \nu > i_1.$$

Especially

$$dga_{q^k} + q^k R_1 < dga_0.$$

But

$$a_0 = -b_0 t_0^{q^k},$$

hence

(2) $$dgb_0 = dga_0 - q^k R_1.$$

Furthermore

$$a_{q^k} = b_0 - b_{q^k} t_0^{q^k},$$

and therefore

$$dgb_{q^k} + q^k R_1 \le \max(dga_{q^k}, dgb_0).$$

According to (1) and (2) we get

(3) $$dgb_{q^k} + q^k R_1 = dgb_0.$$

From the definition of $h_k(t)$ it follows that h_k has no zeros in $\{t \mid dgt < R_1\}$. Therefore, if $R_1(h_k)$ does exist then

$$\min_{i>0} \frac{dgb_0 - dgb_i}{i} \ge R_1 = R_1(g).$$

However, since $\dfrac{dgb_0 - dgb_{q^k}}{q^k} = R_1$ we have $R_1(h_k) = R_1$.

Furthermore we have

$$a_{2q^k} = b_{q^k} - b_{2q^k} t_0^{q^k}$$

and therefore

$$dgb_{2q^k} + q^k R_1 \leq \max(dga_{2q^k}, dgb_{q^k})$$

or

$$dgb_{2q^k} + 2q^k R_1 \leq \max(dga_{2q^k} + q^k R_1, dgb_{q^k} + q^k R_1).$$

Using (1), (2) and (3) we find

$$dgb_{2q^k} + 2q^k R_1 = dgb_0.$$

By proceeding in the obvious way we find

$$dgb_{nq^k} + nq^k R_1 = dgb_0 \qquad \text{for } n = 1,2,\dots .$$

Hence $i_1(h_k)$ does not exist, which contradicts lemma 2.4. □

2.6. LEMMA. *If* R_1 *does not exist then* g *converges for* t = 0 *only.*

PROOF. Suppose R_1 does not exist, i.e. there exists a sequence (a_{i_j}) such that

$\forall N \in \mathbb{N}\ \exists j_0 = j_0(N)$ such that for $j > j_0$

$$\frac{dga_0 - dga_{i_j}}{i_j} < -N.$$

Suppose g converges at the point t, then

$\forall N \in \mathbb{N}\ \exists i_0 = i_0(N)$ such that for $i > i_0$

$$dga_i + i\,dgt < -N.$$

Now choose $N \in \mathbb{N}$ then there exists $j^* > j_0, i_0$ such that for $j > j^*$,

$$Ni_j + i_j dgt < dga_{i_j} - dga_0 + i_j dgt < -N - dga_0$$

or

$$dgt < \frac{-N(i_j+1)}{i_j} - dga_0.$$

Hence

$$dgt \le \lim_{j\to\infty} \frac{-N(i_j+1)}{i_j} - dga_0 = -N - dga_0.$$

Since N was chosen arbitrarily it follows that $dgt = -\infty$, which means $t = 0$. □

2.7. LEMMA. *Suppose* R_1 *exists and* $g(t)$ *converges for all* t *with* $dgt = R_1$. *Then* $g(t)$ *has at least one zero* $\neq 0$ *with* $dgt \le R_1$.

PROOF. We may suppose that $h = 0$, then

$$g(t) = a_0 + a_1 t + a_2 t^2 + \dots .$$

Suppose $g(t)$ has no zeros t with $dgt \le R_1$. Then $\exists N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all t with $dgt \le R_1$

$$dg\, g(t) > -N_0 \qquad (*).$$

Since $g(t)$ converges for all t with $dgt \le R_1$ we have

(a) $\forall N \in \mathbb{N}\ \exists i_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $i > i_0(N)$ and $dgt \le R_1$

$$dga_i + idgt < -N$$

(b) according to lemma 2.4 i_1 does exist.

Now choose $N > N_0$ and $n > \max(i_0, i_1)$ then

$$\min_{0<i\le n} \frac{dga_0 - dga_i}{i} = R_1.$$

We write

$$g(t) = a_0 + a_1 t + \dots + a_n t^n + g^*(t).$$

Then

$$dg\, g(t) \le \max(dg(a_0 + a_1 t + \dots + a_n t^n), dg\, g^*(t))$$

and for all t with $dgt \le R_1$

$$\operatorname{dg} g^*(t) \leq \max_{i>n}(\operatorname{dg}a_i + i\operatorname{dg}t) < -N.$$

According to lemma 2.1

$$P_N(t) = a_0 + a_1 t + \ldots + a_n t^n$$

has exactly i_1 zeros β with $\operatorname{dg}\beta = R_1$.

Let β be a zero of $P_N(t)$ with $\operatorname{dg}\beta = R_1$, then

$$\operatorname{dg} g(\beta) = \operatorname{dg} g^*(\beta) < -N < -N_0.$$

This contradicts (*).

Since $g(0) = a_0 \neq 0$ it follows that $g(t)$ has at least one zero $\neq 0$ in $\{t \mid \operatorname{dg}t \leq R_1\}$. □

2.8. <u>LEMMA</u>. *Suppose* R_1 *exists and* $g(t)$ *converges for all* t *with* $\operatorname{dg}t = R_1$. *Then* $g(t)$ *has exactly* i_1-h *zeros* β *with* $\operatorname{dg}\beta = R_1$.

<u>PROOF</u>. Again we may suppose that $h = 0$.

$$g(t) = a_0 + a_1 t + \ldots + a_n t^n + \ldots$$

(i) First we prove that $g(t)$ has at most i_1 different zeros β with $\operatorname{dg}\beta = R_1$. For all t with $\operatorname{dg}t \leq R_1$ we have
$\forall N \in \mathbb{N}\ \exists i_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $i > i_0$

$$\operatorname{dg}a_i + i\operatorname{dg}t < -N.$$

According to lemma 2.4 i_1 does exist.

Choose $n > \max(i_0, i_1)$ and define

$$P_N(t) = a_0 + a_1 t + \ldots + a_n t^n,$$

$$g(t) = P_N(t) + g^*(t).$$

According to lemma 2.1 $P_N(t)$ has exactly i_1 zeros $\beta_{N1}, \ldots, \beta_{Ni_1}$ such that $\operatorname{dg}\beta_{Nj} = R_1$, $j = 1, \ldots, i_1$. Let $\beta_{N1}, \ldots, \beta_{Ni_1^*}$ be all the different ones among them. Note that $1 \leq i_1^* \leq i_1$.

$$P_N(t) = a \prod_{j=1}^{i_1} (t-\beta_{Nj}) \prod_{\nu=i_1+1}^{n} \left(1 - \frac{t}{\beta_{N\nu}}\right),$$

where

$$a = \frac{(-1)^{i_1} a_0}{\prod_{j=1}^{i_1} \beta_{Nj}} .$$

Remark that $dga = dga_0 - i_1R_1$ and that a does not depend on N. Furthermore, $dg\beta_{N\nu} > R_1$ for $\nu = i_1+1,\dots,n$.

For $dgt \le R_1$ we then have:

$$dgP_N(t) = dga + dg \prod_{j=1}^{i_1} (t-\beta_{Nj}) = dga_0 - i_1R_1 + \sum_{j=1}^{i_1} dg(t-\beta_{Nj}),$$

or

$$\sum_{j=1}^{i_1} dg(t-\beta_{Nj}) = dgP_N(t) - dga_0 + i_1R_1. \qquad (*)$$

Suppose g(t) has more than i_1^* different zeros t with $dgt \le R_1$; say $t_1,t_2,\dots,t_m$ are m zeros with $dgt_i = R_1$, where $m > i_1^*$. Then define

$$\lambda := \min_{\substack{i\neq j \\ 1\le i,j\le m}} dg(t_i-t_j).$$

Let

$$U_{\lambda j} = \{t \mid dg(t-t_j) < \lambda\}.$$

Then the sets $U_{\lambda 1},\dots,U_{\lambda m}$ are disjoint.

According to (*) we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^{i_1} dg(t_1-\beta_{Nj}) = dgP_N(t_1) - dga_0 + i_1R_1.$$

Since $g(t_1) = 0$, $dgP_N(t_1) < -N$. Hence there exists at least one $j_1 \in \{1,2,\dots,i_1^*\}$ such that

$$dg(t_1-\beta_{Nj_1}) < \frac{-N-dga_0+i_1R_1}{i_1}$$

and furthermore it follows (for N large enough):

$$dgt_1 = dg\beta_{Nj_1} = R_1.$$

Now let N be such that

$$\frac{-N-dga_0+i_1R_1}{i_1} < \lambda.$$

Then $\beta_{Nj_1} \in U_{\lambda 1}$. Hence for the zero t_1 there is at least one zero β_{Nj_1} in $U_{\lambda 1}$, and analogously for the zeros $t_2,\dots,t_m$ there is at least one zero β_{Nj_m} of $P_N(t)$ in $U_{\lambda 2},\dots$, resp. $U_{\lambda m}$. Since the $U_{\lambda j}$ are disjoint there must be at least m different β_{Nj}, which leads to a contradiction.

Hence g(t) has at most $i_1^* \le i_1$ different zeros t with $dgt = R_1$.

(ii) Finally we must show that g(t) has exactly i_1 zeros t with $dgt = R_1$. It is obvious from lemma 2.5 that if t_0 is a zero of g(t) with $dgt_0 = R_1$ then there exists a $\mu \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$h_i(t) = \frac{g(t)}{(t-t_0)^i}$$

has a zero in $t = t_0$ for $i = 1,\dots,\mu-1$, but $h_\mu(t_0) \neq 0$; the natural number μ is called the multiplicity of the zero t_0.

Let $T = \{\beta_1,\beta_2,\dots,\beta_k\}$ be the set of all zeros of g(t) with $dg\beta_i = R_1$, where

$$\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \dots = \beta_{\mu_1} = t_1$$
$$\beta_{\mu_1+1} = \dots = \beta_{\mu_1+\mu_2} = t_2$$
$$\vdots$$
$$\beta_{\mu_1+\dots+\mu_{m-1}} = \dots = \beta_{\mu_1+\dots+\mu_m} = t_m$$

and μ_i is the multiplicity of t_i (i=1,...,m) and $k = \mu_1+\dots+\mu_m$.

Define

$$h(t) := \frac{g(t)}{(t-\beta_1)(t-\beta_2)\dots(t-\beta_k)} .$$

Since the radius of convergence of $\frac{g(t)}{t-\beta_1} = \frac{g(t)-g(\beta_1)}{t-\beta_1}$ is also R, by repeating this argument we find that h(t) has radius of convergence R.

Define

$$Q(t) := (t-\beta_1)\dots(t-\beta_k).$$

Now we write

$$Q(t) = \sum_{\nu=0}^{k} d_\nu t^\nu$$

and

$$h(t) = \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} b_\nu t^\nu.$$

Since h(t) has no zeros in $\{t \mid \mathrm{dg}t \le R_1\}$ we have according to *(i)*:

(a) $$\mathrm{dg}b_0 > \mathrm{dg}b_i + iR_1 \qquad \text{for } i = 1,2,\dots\ .$$

According to lemma 2.1 we have

$$k = \max\{i \mid \frac{\mathrm{dg}d_0-\mathrm{dg}d_i}{i} = R_1\},$$

hence

(b) $$\mathrm{dg}d_i + R_1 i \le \mathrm{dg}d_0 = \mathrm{dg}d_k + R_1 k, \qquad \text{for } i = 0,1,\dots,k.$$

Now from g(t) = Q(t).h(t) it follows that

$$a_i = \sum_{j=0}^{k} d_j b_{i-j}, \qquad i = 0,1,\dots,$$

and therefore for each t with $\mathrm{dg}t = R_1$ we have:

$$\mathrm{dg}a_i + iR_1 = \mathrm{dg}a_i t^i = \mathrm{dg}(\sum_{j=0}^{k} d_j t^j b_{i-j} t^{i-j}) \le$$

$$\le \max_{0\le j\le k} (\mathrm{dg}d_j t^j + \mathrm{dg}b_{i-j} t^{i-j}).$$

If i > k then the term b_0 does not occur in $\sum_{j=0}^{k} d_j b_{i-j}$ while it actually does if $0 \le i \le k$.

Therefore using (a) and (b) we get if i > k

$$\mathrm{dg}a_i + iR_1 < \mathrm{dg}d_k + kR_1 + \mathrm{dg}b_0$$

and if $0 \le i \le k$

$$dga_i + iR_1 \le dgd_k + kR_1 + dgb_0.$$

Since $d_k = 1$ and $a_0 = b_0\beta_1\ldots\beta_k$ it follows that if $i > k$

$$dga_i + iR_1 < dga_0$$

and if $0 \le i \le k$

$$dga_i + iR_1 \le dga_0.$$

This means that $k = i_1$. □

Now we can prove theorem 2.2.

(i) Is obvious and (ii) follows from lemma 2.8.

(iii) We may again suppose that $h = 0$. We prove (iii) in case $k = 2$; the general case k follows then in the same way inductively from $k - 1$. We use the method of lemma 2.8.

For all t with $dgt \le R_2$ we have

$\forall N \in \mathbb{N}\ \exists i_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for $i > i_0$

$$dga_i + idgt < -N.$$

Choose $n > \max(i_0,i_2)$ and define

$$P_N(t) = a_0 + a_1t + \ldots + a_nt^n$$

and

$$g(t) = P_N(t) + g^*(t).$$

$P_N(t)$ has i_1 zeros $\beta_{N1},\ldots,\beta_{Ni_1}$ such that $dg\beta_{Nj} = R_1$ $(1\le j\le i_1)$ and $i_2 - i_1$ zeros $\beta_{N,i_1+1},\ldots,\beta_{N,i_2}$ such that $dg\beta_{Nj} = R_2$ $(i_1+1\le j\le i_2)$. Now we write

$$P_N(t) = a \prod_{j=1}^{i_1} (t-\beta_{Nj}) \prod_{j=i_1+1}^{i_2} (t-\beta_{Nj}) \prod_{\nu=i_2+1}^{n} (1 - \frac{t}{\beta_{N\nu}}),$$

where

$$a = \frac{(-1)^{i_2} a_0}{\prod_{j=1}^{i_2} \beta_{Nj}}.$$

Note that $dga = dga_0 - i_1R_1 - (i_2-i_1)R_2$, that a does not depend on N and that $dg\beta_{N\nu} > R_2$ for $\nu = i_2+1,\ldots,n$.

For $R_1 < dgt \le R_2$ we have

$$\sum_{j=i_1+1}^{i_2} dg(t-\beta_{Nj}) = dgP_N(t) - dga_0 + i_1R_1 + (i_2-i_1)R_2 - i_1R_2. \qquad (*)$$

Let $P_N(t)$ have ρ different zeros β with $dg\beta = R_2$ $(\rho \le i_2-i_1)$ and let $g(t)$ have the different zeros $t_1,\ldots,t_m$ with $R_1 < dgt_i \le R_2$. Define

$$\lambda = \min_{\substack{i\neq j\\ 1\le i,j\le m}} dg(t_i-t_j)$$

and the disjoint sets

$$U_{\lambda j} = \{t \mid dg(t-t_j) < \lambda\}, \qquad j = 1,\ldots,m.$$

From (*) it follows that for $i = 1,\ldots,m$ there exists at least one $j_i \in \{1,2,\ldots,\rho\}$ such that

$$dg(t_i-\beta_{Nj_i}) < \frac{-N-dga_0+i_1R_1+(i_2-2i_1)R_2}{i_2-i_1}.$$

Now choose N such that

$$\frac{-N-dga_0+i_1R_1+(i_2-2i_1)R_2}{i_2-i_1} < \max(\lambda,R_2)$$

then $\beta_{Nj_i} \in U_{\lambda i}$, $i = 1,\ldots,m$ and $dgt_i = dg\beta_{Nj_i} = R_2$.

From the box principle of DIRICHLET we conclude that $m \le \rho$, which proves that $g(t)$ has $m \le \rho \le i_2-i_1$ different zeros β with $dg\beta = R_2$.

Now we prove that $g(t)$ has exactly i_2-i_1 zeros β with $dg\beta = R_2$. Let $\beta_1,\ldots,\beta_{i_1}$ be the zeros of $g(t)$ with $dg\beta_i = R_1$ $(1\le i\le i_1)$ enumerated according to their multiplicities. Let $\beta_{i_1+1},\ldots,\beta_k$ be the zeros $t_1,\ldots,t_m$ of $g(t)$ enumerated according to their multiplicities where

$$k = \sum_{\nu=1}^{m} \text{multiplicity of } t_\nu.$$

Define

$$h(t) = \frac{g(t)}{\prod_{i=1}^{k} (t-\beta_i)}$$

$$Q(t) = \prod_{i=1}^{k} (t-\beta_i) = \sum_{\nu=0}^{k} d_\nu t^\nu$$

$$h(t) = \sum_{\nu=0}^{\infty} b_\nu t^\nu.$$

$h(t)$ has no zeros in $\{t \mid dgt \le R_2\}$ and therefore

(a) $$dgb_0 > dgb_i + iR_2 \qquad \text{for } i = 1,2,\ldots\ .$$

According to lemma 2.1 we have

$$k = \max_{i>i_1} \{i \mid \frac{dgd_{i_1} - dgd_i}{i-i_1} = R_2\}$$

and

$$i_1 = \max_{i>0} \{i \mid \frac{dgd_0 - dgd_i}{i} = R_1\};$$

hence we get for $i = i_1+1,\ldots,k$

$$dgd_i + iR_2 \le dgd_{i_1} + i_1R_2 = dgd_k + kR_2$$

and for $i = 0,1,\ldots,i_1$ we get

$$\begin{aligned} dgd_i + iR_2 &= dgd_i + iR_1 + i(R_2-R_1) = \\ &\le dgd_0 + i(R_2-R_1) = dgd_{i_1} + iR_2 + (i_1-i)R_1 \\ &< dgd_{i_1} + iR_2 + (i_1-i)R_2 = dgd_k + kR_2. \end{aligned}$$

Now we have proved the relation

(b) $$dgd_i + iR_2 \le dgd_k + kR_2 \qquad \text{for } i = 0,1,\ldots,k.$$

Hence for all t with $dgt = R_2$ we have

$$dga_i + iR_2 \le \max_{0\le j\le k} (dgd_j t^j + dgb_{i-j} t^{i-j}).$$

For $i > k$ we get using (a) and (b) that

$$dga_i + iR_2 < dgd_k + kR_2 + dgb_0.$$

Since $d_k = 1$ and $a_0 = b_0\beta_1\ldots\beta_{i_1}\beta_{i_1+1}\ldots\beta_k$ this means

$$dga_i + iR_2 < kR_2 + dga_0 - i_1R_1 - (k-i_1)R_2$$
$$= kR_2 + dga_{i_1} - (k-i_1)R_2 = dga_{i_1} + i_1R_2.$$

Analogously for $i_1 \le i \le k$ we get using (b) that

$$dga_i + iR_2 \le dga_{i_1} + i_1R_2.$$

From the definition of i_2 it follows now that $k = i_2$, which proves our theorem. □

2.9. SPECIAL CASES

a) The function

$$\psi(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (-1)^k \frac{t^{q^k}}{F_k}$$

converges for all $t \in \Phi$ and $\psi(t)$ has a zero of order 1 in $t = 0$.

$$R_1 = \min_{i>1} \frac{0-dga_i}{i-1} = \min_{i>1} \left(\frac{q}{q-1}, \ldots, \frac{kq^k}{q^k-1}, \ldots\right) = \frac{q}{q-1}.$$

$$i_1 = \max_{i>1} \{i \mid \frac{-dga_i}{i-1} = \frac{q}{q-1}\} = q.$$

Hence $\psi(t)$ has $q-1$ zeros β with $dg\beta = \frac{q}{q-1}$, namely

$$\psi(c\xi) = 0$$

for $c \in \mathbb{F}_q\backslash\{0\}$ and

$$dgc\xi = dg\xi = \frac{q}{q-1} = 1 + \frac{1}{q-1}.$$

For $k \ge 2$ we have

$$R_k = \min_{i>q^{k-1}} \left(\frac{-(k-1)q^{k-1}-dga_i}{i-q^{k-1}}\right) = \frac{-(k-1)q^{k-1}+kq^k}{q^k-q^{k-1}} = k + \frac{1}{q-1}$$

and

$$i_k = q^k .$$

The function $\psi(t)$ has $q^k - q^{k-1}$ zeros β with $dg\beta = k + \frac{1}{q-1}$, namely $\psi(E\xi) = 0$ (see §1) and the number of different polynomials over $\mathbb{F}_q$ of degree $k-1$ is $q^k - q^{k-1}$.

b) In an analogous way it follows that the function

$$f(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k \frac{t^{q^k}}{F_k} \quad \text{with } c_k \in \mathbb{F}_q,\ c_k \neq 0 \text{ for } k = 0,1,\ldots$$

has:

a zero of order 1 in $t = 0$,
$q-1$ zeros β with $dg\beta = \frac{q}{q-1}$,
⋮
$q^k - q^{k-1}$ zeros β with $dg\beta = k + \frac{1}{q-1}$.

c) The function

$$J_n(t) = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} (-1)^r \frac{t^{q^{n+r}}}{F_{n+r} F_r^{q^n}}, \quad n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$$

has a zero of order q^n in $t = 0$ and $q^{n+k+1} - q^{n+k}$ zeros β with $dg\beta = n + 2k + \frac{2q}{q-1}$.

Remark: the function $J_n(t)$ was introduced by L. CARLITZ in 1960; see [2].

3. THE TRANSCENDENCY OF THE ZEROS OF $\psi(t)$, $f(t)$ AND $J_n(t)$

3.1. THEOREM. *Let $\eta \neq 0$ be a zero of the function*

$$f(t) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_j \frac{t^{q^j}}{F_j},$$

with $c_j \in \mathbb{F}_q$ and $c_j \neq 0$ for $j = 0,1,2,\ldots$. Then η is trancendental over $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$.

For the proof of this theorem we use several lemmas.

3.2. LEMMA. *Let* n, $k_1,\dots,k_n$, β *be non-negative integers. If*

$$q^{k_1} + \dots + q^{k_n} \leqq q^{\beta} + q^{\beta-1} + \dots + q^{\beta-n+1}$$

and

$$k_1 \geq k_2 \geq \dots \geq k_n$$

then

$$K' = \frac{F_{\beta}F_{\beta-1}\cdots F_{\beta-n+1}}{F_{k_1}F_{k_2}\cdots F_{k_n}}$$

is a polynomial.

PROOF. See [8], lemma 5.2. □

3.3. LEMMA. *A symmetric polynomial in the roots of a monic polynomial with coefficients in* $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ *is itself an element of* $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$.

PROOF. For instance see [6]. □

3.4. LEMMA. *The equation*

$$q^{k_1} + q^{k_2} + \dots + q^{k_i} = q^{\beta}$$

with β *a non-negative integer, has a solution* $k_1, k_2, \dots, k_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ *with* $k_1 \geq k_2 \geq \dots \geq k_i \geq 0$ *if and only if*

$$i = q^{\mu} + \lambda(q-1),$$

where

$$0 \leq \mu \leq \beta;\ \lambda \in \{0,1,\dots,q^{\mu}-1\}.$$

If $\lambda = 0$ *then the only possible solution is* $k_1 = k_2 = \dots = k_i = \beta - \mu$.
If $\lambda > 0$ *then for every solution* $k_1 = k_2 = \dots = k_{q^{\mu}-1} = \beta - \mu$.

PROOF. Suppose $i = q^{\mu} + \lambda(q-1)$ for a certain $\mu \in \{0,1,\dots,\beta\}$ and $\lambda \in \{0,1,\dots,\min(q^{\mu}-1,\beta-\mu)\}$ and suppose $k_1,\dots,k_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $k_1 \geq \dots \geq k_i \geq 0$, satisfying

$$k_1 = k_2 = \ldots = k_{q^\mu-2} = k_{q^\mu-1} = \beta - \mu$$

$$k_{q^\mu} = k_{q^\mu+1} = \ldots = k_{q^\mu+q-2} = \beta - \mu - 1$$

$$k_{q^\mu+q-1} = \ldots = k_{q^\mu+2(q-1)-1} = \beta - \mu - 2$$

$$\vdots$$

$$k_{q^\mu+(\lambda-1)(q-1)} = \ldots = k_{q^\mu+\lambda(q-1)-1} = \beta - \mu - \lambda$$

$$k_{q^\mu+\lambda(q-1)} = \beta - \mu - \lambda$$

then

$$q^{k_1} + q^{k_2} + \ldots + q^{k_i} = (q^\mu-1)q^{\beta-\mu} + (q-1)q^{\beta-\mu-1} + \ldots$$
$$\ldots + (q-1)q^{\beta-\mu-\lambda+1} + q.q^{\beta-\mu-\lambda} = q^\beta.$$

Now let i be an arbitrary natural number. Then there exist non-negative integers μ and $\lambda \in \{0,1,\ldots,q^\mu-1\}$ such that

(1) $$q^\mu + \lambda(q-1) \leq i < q^\mu + (\lambda+1)(q-1)$$

Furthermore we suppose that there exist a solution $k_1,\ldots,k_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, $k_1 \geq \ldots \geq k_i \geq 0$ of $q^{k_1}+\ldots+q^{k_i} = q^\beta$. Then

$$q^\beta = q^{k_1}+\ldots+q^{k_i} \leq iq^{k_1} < q^{k_1}(q^\mu+(\lambda+1)(q-1)) < q^{k_1+\mu+1},$$

which gives

$$k_1 \geq \beta - \mu.$$

On the other hand it follows from $q^{k_1}+\ldots+q^{k_i} = q^\beta$ that

$$k_1 \leq \beta - 1.$$

Now write $k_1 = \beta - j$ for a certain $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $1 \leq j \leq \mu$. Then

$$q^{k_1}+\ldots+q^{k_i} \leq (q^j-1)q^{\beta-j} + (q-1)q^{\beta-j-1}+\ldots+(q-1)q^{\beta-j-t} +$$
$$+ vq^{\beta-j-t-1},$$

where

$$q^j - 1 + t(q-1) + v = i,$$

$$0 < v \leq q,$$

$$\beta - j - t - 1 \geq 0.$$

If $0 < v < q$, then

$$q^{k_1}+\ldots+q^{k_i} \leq q^\beta - q^{\beta-j-t} + (q-1)q^{\beta-j-t-1} < q^\beta,$$

which contradicts $q^{k_1}+\ldots+q^{k_i} = q^\beta$, and therefore $v = q$. This means

(2) $$i = q^j + (t+1)(q-1).$$

Combining (1) and (2) we find

$$q^\mu + \lambda(q-1) \leq q^j + (t+1)(q-1) < q^\mu + (\lambda+1)(q-1)$$

and hence if $1 \leq j < \mu$:

$$\frac{q^\mu-q^j}{q-1} - 1 \leq t - \lambda < \frac{q^\mu-q^j}{q-1}$$

and if $j = \mu$:

$$\lambda \leq t + 1 < \lambda + 1.$$

Therefore if $j = \mu$ we find $t = \lambda - 1$. If $1 \leq j < \mu$ we remark that $\frac{q^\mu-q^j}{q-1}$ is a positive integer. Since t, λ are (non-negative) integers the only possible value for t is

$$t = \lambda - 1 + \frac{q^\mu-q^j}{q-1}$$

and therefore

$$i = q^j + (\lambda + \frac{q^\mu-q^j}{q-1})(q-1) = q^\mu + \lambda(q-1).$$

Hence a solution of $q^{k_1}+\ldots+q^{k_i} = q^\beta$ with $k_1 \geq \ldots \geq k_i \geq 0$ is only possible if

$$i = q^\mu + \lambda(q-1)$$

for some non-negative integer μ and $\lambda \in \{0,1,\ldots,q^\mu-1\}$. If $k_1 < \beta - \mu$, then

$$q^{k_1}+\dots+q^{k_i} \le iq^{\beta-\mu-1} = (q^\mu+\lambda(q-1))q^{\beta-\mu-1} <$$
$$< (q^\mu+q^\mu(q-1))q^{\beta-\mu-1} = q^\beta,$$

which contradicts $q^{k_1}+\dots+q^{k_i} = q^\beta$. Hence $k_1 = \beta - \mu$. Since we want to have $k_1 \ge 0$ we must have $\mu \le \beta$. Hence a solution of

(3) $$q^{k_1} + q^{k_2} + \dots + q^{k_i} = q^\beta$$

in integers $k_1,\dots,k_i$ with $k_1 \ge k_2 \ge \dots \ge k_i \ge 0$ is possible if and only if

(4) $$i = q^\mu + \lambda(q-1),$$

where $0 \le \mu \le \beta$ and $0 \le \lambda \le q^\mu-1$ are integers.

Let $i_0 \ge 1$ be the smallest index such that

$$k_1 = k_2 = \dots = k_{i_0} = \beta - \mu$$

and

$$k_{i_0+1} \le \beta - \mu - 1.$$

Then

$$q^{k_1} + \dots + q^{k_i} = i_0 q^{\beta-\mu} + q^{k_{i_0+1}} + \dots + q^{k_i}$$

and

(5) $$i_0 q^{\beta-\mu} + (i-i_0) \le q^\beta \le i_0 q^{\beta-\mu} + (i-i_0)q^{\beta-\mu-1}.$$

From the left inequality of (5) it follows that

$$i_0(q^{\beta-\mu}-1) \le q^\beta - q^\mu$$

and therefore

$$i_0 \le q^\mu.$$

If $i_0 < q^\mu - 1$ then $1 \le i_0 \le q^\mu - 2$ and then it follows from the right inequality of (5) that

$$q^\beta \le (q^\mu-2)q^{\beta-\mu} + (q^\mu+\lambda(q-1)-1)q^{\beta-\mu-1} \le$$

$$\le q^\beta - 2q^{\beta-\mu} + (q^\mu-1)q^{\beta-\mu} < q^\beta + q^\beta(1 - \frac{2}{q^\mu}).$$

Since $1 \le i_0 \le q^\mu - 2$ it follows that $\mu \ge 1$ and hence $q^\mu \ge q \ge 2$ which means

$$q^\beta < q^\beta + q^\beta(1 - \frac{2}{q^\mu}) \le q^\beta.$$

Hence from (5) it follows that

$$q^\mu - 1 \le i_0 \le q^\mu.$$

If $\lambda = 0$ then suppose $i_0 = q^\mu - 1$, then

$$q^\beta = q^{k_1}+\dots+q^{k_i} \le (q^\mu-1)q^{\beta-\mu} + (i-i_0)q^{\beta-\mu-1} =$$

$$= q^\beta - q^{\beta-\mu} + q^{\beta-\mu-1} < q^\beta;$$

contradiction. Hence, if $\lambda = 0$ then $i_0 = q^\mu$.

If $1 \le \lambda \le q^\mu - 1$ then suppose $i_0 = q^\mu$, then

$$q^\beta = q^{k_1}+\dots+q^{k_i} \ge q^\mu(q^{\beta-\mu}) + (i-i_0).1 =$$

$$= q^\beta + (q^\mu+\lambda(q-1)-q^\mu) \ge q^\beta + q - 1 > q^\beta;$$

contradiction. Hence, if $\lambda > 0$, then $i_0 = q^\mu - 1$.

This proves our lemma. □

3.5. <u>LEMMA</u>. *The equation*

(1) $$q^{k_1} + q^{k_2} + \dots + q^{k_i} = q^\beta$$

with β *a non-negative integer has a solution* $k_1,k_2,\dots,k_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ *with* $k_1 \ge k_2 \ge \dots \ge k_i \ge 0$ *if and only if*

$$i = q^{\mu_0} + q^{\mu_1} + \dots + q^{\mu_r} - r$$

where $\beta \ge \mu_0 \ge \mu_1 \ge \dots \ge \mu_r \ge 1$ *and* $\mu_0 + \mu_1 + \dots + \mu_r \le \beta$ *if* $r > 0$ *and* $\beta \ge \mu_0 \ge 0$ *if* $r = 0$.

For this i *the only possible solution is given by*

$$\begin{cases} k_1 = k_2 = \dots = k_{q^{\mu_0}-1} & = \beta - \mu_0 \\ k_{q^{\mu_0}} = \dots\dots = k_{q^{\mu_0}+q^{\mu_1}-2} & = \beta - \mu_0 - \mu_1 \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ k_{q^{\mu_0}+q^{\mu_1}+\dots+q^{\mu_{r-1}}-r+1} = \dots = k_{q^{\mu_0}+q^{\mu_1}+\dots+q^{\mu_r}-(r+1)} & = \beta - \mu_0 - \mu_1 - \dots - \mu_r \\ \qquad k_{q^{\mu_0}+q^{\mu_1}+\dots+q^{\mu_r}-r} & = \beta - \mu_0 - \mu_1 - \dots - \mu_r. \end{cases}$$

PROOF. According to lemma 3.4 the equation (1) is solvable if and only if

$$i = q^{\mu} + \lambda(q-1)$$

for a $\mu \in [0,\beta]$ and $0 \le \lambda \le q^{\mu} - 1$.

If $\lambda = 0$ the lemma is proved with $\mu_0 = \mu$ and $r = 0$ by lemma 3.4.

Now suppose $\lambda \neq 0$. Define

$$\mu_0 = \mu.$$

Then from lemma 3.4 it follows that

$$q^{k_1} + \dots + q^{k_i} = q^{\beta}$$

where

$$k_1 = \dots = k_{q^{\mu_0}-1} = \beta - \mu_0.$$

Hence

$$q^{k_{q^{\mu_0}}} + \dots + q^{k_i} = q^{\beta-\mu_0}. \tag{2}$$

According to lemma 3.4 equation (2) is solvable if and only if

$$i - q^{\mu_0} + 1 = q^{\mu_1} + \lambda_1(q-1)$$

for a $\mu_1 \in \{0,1,\dots,\beta-\mu_0\}$ and $\lambda_1 \in \{0,1,\dots,q^{\mu_1}-1\}$, which means since $i = q^{\mu_0} + \lambda(q-1)$ that

$$\lambda = \frac{q^{\mu_1}-1}{q-1} + \lambda_1.$$

If $\mu_1 = 0$, then $\lambda = \lambda_1 \le q^{\mu_1} - 1 = 0$, in contradiction with our assumption that $\lambda \neq 0$. Hence $\mu_1 \ge 1$.

If $\lambda_1 = 0$ then the process is ended and

$$i = q^{\mu_0} + q^{\mu_1} - 1,$$

where $1 \le \mu_1$ and since μ_1 is a non-negative integer for which

$$q^{\mu_1} = 1 + \lambda(q-1) < 1 + q^{\mu_0}(q-1) \le q^{\mu_0+1}$$

it follows that $\mu_1 \le \mu_0$. Furthermore

$$k_1 = \ldots = k_{q^{\mu_0}-1} = \beta - \mu_0$$

and

$$k_{q^{\mu_0}} = \ldots = k_{q^{\mu_0}+q^{\mu_1}-1} = \beta - \mu_0 - \mu_1.$$

If $\lambda_1 \neq 0$ we proceed in an analogous way.

Since $\mu_{j+1} \le \beta - \mu_0 - \mu_1 - \ldots - \mu_j$ and $0 \le \lambda_{j+1} \le q^{\mu_{j+1}} - 1$ this process must end after a finite number of steps. □

3.6. LEMMA. *Let* $k_1 \ge \ldots \ge k_n \ge 0$ *be integers such that*

$$q^\nu < q^{k_1} + q^{k_2} + \ldots + q^{k_n} < q^{\nu+1},$$

then there exists an integer i *with* $1 \le i < n$ *such that*

$$q^{k_1} + q^{k_2} + \ldots + q^{k_i} = q^\nu.$$

PROOF. See WADE [8], lemma 5.10. □

Now we are able to prove theorem 3.1.

PROOF.

$$f(t) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_j \frac{t^{q^j}}{F_j}$$

with $c_j \in \mathbb{F}_q$, $c_j \neq 0$ for $j = 0,1,2,\ldots$.

Let $\eta \neq 0$ be a zero of $f(t)$. According to Corollary 2.9

$$\mathrm{dg}\eta = \frac{q}{q-1} + \lambda,$$

where λ is some non-negative integer.

Suppose η is algebraic. Then there exists an $e \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\eta^{q^e} = \alpha$ is separable. Let m be the degree of the minimal-polynomial for α.

$$P(t) = t^m + \frac{A_{m-1}}{B_{m-1}} t^{m-1} + \ldots + \frac{A_0}{B_0} \quad \text{with } A_i, B_i \in \mathbb{F}_q[x].$$

$$P(\alpha) = 0.$$

Since α is separable, $\mathrm{dg}\alpha = \dfrac{\mathrm{dg}A_0 - \mathrm{dg}B_0}{m}$, which will be denoted by $\dfrac{a_0}{m}$. Hence $a_0 = mq^e(\frac{q}{q-1} + \lambda)$. Let $\alpha_1 = \alpha, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_m$ be the algebraic conjugated elements of α; then $\mathrm{dg}\alpha_i = \frac{a_0}{m}$ for $i = 1,\ldots,m$. There exists a unique $s \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$q^{s-1} < m \leq q^s.$$

Now multiply $P(t)$ with the factor $(t-x^{\lambda q^e})^{q^s-m}$, then

$$Q(t) = P(t)(t-x^{\lambda q^e})^{q^s-m}$$

is a polynomial over $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$ of degree $n = q^s$ whose roots are

$$\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_m;\ \alpha_{m+1} = \ldots = \alpha_n = x^{\lambda q^e}.$$

Furthermore

$$Q(t) = t^n + \frac{E_{n-1}}{D_{n-1}} t^{n-1} + \ldots + \frac{E_0}{D_0},$$

where

$$\mathrm{dg}\frac{E_0}{D_0} = \mathrm{dg}(\alpha_1 \cdot\ldots\cdot \alpha_n) = \mathrm{dg}(\alpha_1 \cdot\ldots\cdot \alpha_m) + (n-m)\lambda q^e =$$

$$= mq^e(\frac{q}{q-1} + \lambda) + (n-m)\lambda q^e = mq^e \cdot \frac{q}{q-1} + n\lambda q^e.$$

Note that $\mathrm{dg}(\alpha_1 \cdot\ldots\cdot \alpha_n) = mq^e \cdot \frac{q}{q-1} + n\lambda q^e$.

Let β be a natural number, which will be fixed later. Denote by

$$D := D_0 D_1 \cdots D_{n-1}$$

and by

$$K_\beta := F_\beta F_{\beta-1} \cdots F_{\beta-n+1}.$$

Remark that $D\alpha_i$ is an algebraic integer.

Since $f(\eta) = 0$ we have

$$0 = f^{q^e}(\eta) = \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k \frac{\eta^{q^k}}{F_k}\right)^{q^e} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k \frac{\eta^{q^{k+e}}}{F_k^{q^e}} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k \frac{\alpha^{q^k}}{F_k^{q^e}},$$

and therefore

$$0 = \prod_{i=1}^{n} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{c_k}{F_k^{q^e}} \alpha_i^{q^k}\right) =$$

$$= \sum_{k_1 \geq \ldots \geq k_n \geq 0} \frac{c_{k_1} \cdots c_{k_n}}{F_{k_1}^{q^e} \cdots F_{k_n}^{q^e}} \sum_{(i_1,\ldots,i_n)} \alpha_{i_1}^{q^{k_1}} \alpha_{i_2}^{q^{k_2}} \cdots \alpha_{i_n}^{q^{k_n}},$$

where the sum is taken over all terms $\alpha_{i_1}^{q^{k_1}} \alpha_{i_2}^{q^{k_2}} \cdots \alpha_{i_n}^{q^{k_n}}$ which are different. Now the following product

$$0 = K_\beta^{q^e} D^{q^{\beta+1}} \prod_{i=1}^{n} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{c_k}{F_k^{q^e}} \alpha_i^{q_k}\right)$$

can be written as

$$K_\beta^{q^e} D^{q^{\beta+1}} \sum_{\nu=s}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{k_1 \geq \ldots \geq k_n \geq 0 \\ q^\nu \leq q^{k_1} + \ldots + q^{k_n} < q^{\nu+1}}} \frac{c_{k_1} \cdots c_{k_n}}{F_{k_1}^{q^e} \cdots F_{k_n}^{q^e}} \sum_{(i_1,\ldots,i_n)} \alpha_{i_1}^{q^{k_1}} \alpha_{i_2}^{q^{k_2}} \cdots \alpha_{i_n}^{q^{k_n}} = 0.$$

We split this sum into two parts

$$I + Q = 0,$$

where I is the sum over the terms with $\nu = s,\ldots,\beta$ and Q is the sum over the other terms. Since

$$\sum_{(i_1,\ldots,i_n)} (D\alpha_{i_1})^{q^{k_1}} (D\alpha_{i_2})^{q^{k_2}} \ldots (D\alpha_{i_n})^{q^{k_n}}$$

is a symmetric polynomial in the roots of a monic polynomial with coefficients in $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ the sum itself is an element of $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ according to lemma 3.3. Furthermore from lemma 3.2 it follows that

$$\frac{K_\beta^{q^e}}{F_{k_1}^{q^e}\ldots F_{k_n}^{q^e}} = \left(\frac{F_\beta F_{\beta-1}\ldots F_{\beta-n+1}}{F_{k_1}F_{k_2}\ldots F_{k_n}}\right)^{q^e}$$

is an element of $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ for all terms of I, since the maximal term $q^{k_1}+\ldots+q^{k_n}$ with $k_1 \geq k_2 \geq \ldots \geq k_n$ such that $q^{k_1}+\ldots+q^{k_n} < q^{\beta+1}$ is the term with $k_1 = \beta$, $k_2 = \beta - 1,\ldots,k_n = \beta - n + 1$. Hence $I \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$, which means either $\mathrm{dg}I \geq 0$ or $I = 0$.

Our aim is to show that for β chosen large enough $\mathrm{dg}Q < 0$. Then it follows from $I + Q = 0$ that $I = 0$ and $Q = 0$. Furthermore we shall prove that $\mathrm{dg}Q > -\infty$, hence $Q \neq 0$. This will give the desired contradiction.

The proof that $\mathrm{dg}Q < 0$ will be split in several parts. Every term of Q has the form

$$(1) \qquad K_\beta^{q^e} D^{q^{\beta+1}} \frac{c_{k_1}\ldots c_{k_n}}{F_{k_1}^{q^e}\ldots F_{k_n}^{q^e}} \sum_{(i_1,\ldots,i_n)} \alpha_{i_1}^{q^{k_1}} \ldots \alpha_{i_n}^{q^{k_n}},$$

with $k_1 \geq \ldots \geq k_n \geq 0$, $q^\nu \leq q^{k_1}+\ldots+q^{k_n} < q^{\nu+1}$ and $\nu \geq \beta + 1$.

According to lemma 3.4, since $n = q^s$, there exists exactly one solution $k_1 \geq \ldots \geq k_n \geq 0$ of $q^{k_1}+\ldots+q^{k_n} = q^\nu$ and this solution is given by $k_1 = \ldots = k_n = \nu - s$. Let N_ν denote the term of Q where

$$q^{k_1}+\ldots+q^{k_n} = q^\nu \qquad (\nu = \beta+1,\ldots)$$

We shall prove

(i) If β is chosen sufficiently large then

$$\mathrm{dg}N_{\nu+j} - \mathrm{dg}N_\nu < 0 \qquad \text{for } j = 1,2,\ldots .$$

Hence for β chosen sufficiently large we have

$$dgN_\nu - dgN_{\beta+1} < 0 \qquad \text{for } \nu = \beta+2,\ldots .$$

(ii) Let N be a term of Q with

$$q^\nu < q^{k_1}+\ldots+q^{k_n} < q^{\nu+1} \qquad (\nu = \beta+1,\ldots),$$

then

$$dgN - dgN_\nu < 0$$

if β is chosen large enough. And for all $N \neq N_{\beta+1}$ in Q we have

$$dgN - dgN_{\beta+1} < 0.$$

Proof of (i): Since $k_1 = \ldots = k_n = \nu - s$ we have

$$N_\nu = K_\beta^{q^e} D^{q^{\beta+1}} \left(\frac{c_{\nu-s}}{F_{\nu-s}^{q^e}}\right)^n \left(\sum_{(i_1,\ldots,i_n)} \alpha_{i_1}\alpha_{i_2}\ldots\alpha_{i_n}\right)^{q^{\nu-s}}$$

$$= K_\beta^{q^e} D^{q^{\beta+1}} \left(\frac{c_{\nu-s}}{F_{\nu-s}^{q^e}}\right)^n (\alpha_1\ldots\alpha_n)^{q^{\nu-s}}.$$

Hence since $c_{\nu-s} \neq 0$ we have $N_\nu \neq 0$ and

$$dgN_\nu = q^e dgK_\beta + q^{\beta+1}dgD - nq^e(\nu-s)q^{\nu-s} + q^{\nu-s}dg(\alpha_1\ldots\alpha_n),$$

which yields

$$(2) \qquad dgN_\nu = q^e dgK_\beta + q^{\beta+1}dgD - (\nu-s)q^{\nu+e} + q^{\nu+e}\left(\frac{m}{n}\cdot\frac{q}{q-1} + \lambda\right)$$

For $\nu = \beta + 1$ we get

$$dgN_{\beta+1} = q^e(\beta q^\beta+\ldots+(\beta-n+1)q^{\beta-n+1}) + q^{\beta+1}dgD - (\beta+1-s)q^{\beta+e+1} +$$
$$+ q^{\beta+1+e}\left(\frac{m}{n}\cdot\frac{q}{q-1} + \lambda\right)$$
$$\leq \beta q^e(q^\beta+\ldots+q^{\beta-n+1}) + q^{\beta+1+e}\left(-\beta - 1 + s + \frac{dgD}{q^e} + \frac{m}{n}\cdot\frac{q}{q-1} + \lambda\right)$$
$$= q^{\beta+e-n+1}\left[\beta(q^{n-1}+\ldots+q+1) + q^n\left(-\beta - 1 + s + \frac{dgD}{q^e} + \frac{m}{n}\cdot\frac{q}{q-1} + \lambda\right)\right].$$

Since

$$-q^{n} + q^{n-1} + \ldots + q + 1 < 0$$

and since

$$q^{n}(-1 + s + \frac{dgD}{q^{e}} + \frac{m}{n} \cdot \frac{q}{q-1} + \lambda)$$

is a constant which does not depend on β, there exists a $\beta_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

(3) $\qquad dgN_{\beta+1} < 0 \quad$ for all $\beta > \beta_1$.

Furthermore we have for $j \geq 1$

$$dgN_{\nu+j} - dgN_{\nu} = -(\nu+j-s)q^{\nu+j+e} + q^{\nu+j+e}(\frac{m}{n} \cdot \frac{q}{q-1} + \lambda) +$$

$$+ (\nu-s)q^{\nu+e} - q^{\nu+e}(\frac{m}{n} \cdot \frac{q}{q-1} + \lambda) =$$

$$= -jq^{\nu+j+e} + (\nu - s - \frac{m}{n} \cdot \frac{q}{q-1} - \lambda)(q^{\nu+e} - q^{\nu+j+e}).$$

Since

$$\nu - s - \frac{m}{n} \cdot \frac{q}{q-1} - \lambda \geq \beta + 1 - s - \frac{m}{m} \cdot \frac{q}{q-1} - \lambda > 0 \quad \text{for } \beta > \beta_2$$

we have

(4) $\qquad dgN_{\nu+j} - dgN_{\nu} < 0 \quad$ for $j \geq 1$ and $\beta > \beta_2$.

Hence from (3) and (4) we conclude (i).

<u>Proof</u> of (ii): N is a term such that $q^{\nu} < q^{k_1}+\ldots+q^{k_n} < q^{\nu+1}$. According to lemma 3.6 there exists an $i \in \{1,2,\ldots,n-1\}$ such that

$$q^{k_1} + \ldots + q^{k_i} = q^{\nu}.$$

According to lemma 3.5 this is only possible if

$$i = q^{\mu} \quad \text{and then} \quad k_1 = \ldots = k_i = \nu - \mu$$

or

$$i = q^{\mu_0} + q^{\mu_1} + \ldots + q^{\mu_r} - r$$

with

$$\mu_0 \geq \mu_1 \geq \dots \geq \mu_r \geq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mu_0 + \mu_1 + \dots + \mu_r \leq \nu.$$

(iia) First we consider the case that

$$i = q^{\mu} \quad \text{and} \quad k_1 = \dots = k_i = \nu - \mu.$$

Then

$$N = K_{\beta}^{q^e} D^{q^{\beta+1}} \left(\frac{c_{\nu-\mu}}{F_{\nu-\mu}^{q^e}} \right)^i \frac{c_{k_{i+1}} \dots c_{k_n}}{F_{k_{i+1}}^{q^e} \dots F_{k_n}^{q^e}} \sum_{(j_1,\dots,j_n)} (\alpha_{j_1} \dots \alpha_{j_i})^{q^{\nu-\mu}} \alpha_{j_{i+1}}^{q^{k_{i+1}}} \dots \alpha_{j_n}^{q^{k_n}},$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{dg}N \leq\ & q^e \mathrm{dg}K_{\beta} + q^{\beta+1}\mathrm{dg}D - iq^e(\nu-\mu)q^{\nu-\mu} + \\ & - k_{i+1}q^{k_{i+1}+e} - \dots - k_n q^{k_n+e} + q^{\nu-\mu}.i.q^e\left(\frac{q}{q-1} + \lambda\right) + \\ & + \left(q^{k_{i+1}} + \dots + q^{k_n}\right).q^e\left(\frac{q}{q-1} + \lambda\right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $N_{\nu} \neq 0$ using (2) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{dg}N - \mathrm{dg}N_{\nu} \leq\ & -(\nu-\mu)q^{\nu+e} + q^{k_{i+1}+e}\left(\frac{q}{q-1} + \lambda - k_{i+1}\right) + \dots \\ & \dots + q^{k_n+e}\left(\frac{q}{q-1} + \lambda - k_n\right) + q^{\nu+e}\left(\frac{q}{q-1} + \lambda\right) + (\nu-s)q^{\nu+e} + \\ & - q^{\nu+e}\left(\frac{m}{n} . \frac{q}{q-1} + \lambda\right) \leq (\mu-s)q^{\nu+e} + q^{\nu+e} . \frac{q}{q-1}\left(1 - \frac{m}{n}\right) + \\ & + (n-i) \max_{i+1 \leq j \leq n} q^{k_j+e}\left(\frac{q}{q-1} + \lambda - k_j\right). \end{aligned}$$

Consider the function $g\colon \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$g(x) = q^{x+e}\left(\frac{q}{q-1} + \lambda - x\right).$$

Then for $x \geq -\frac{1}{\ln q} + \frac{q}{q-1} + \lambda$ the function $g(x)$ is monotonically decreasing, hence

$$\max_{i+1\le j\le n} q^{k_j+e}\left(\frac{q}{q-1}+\lambda-k_j\right) \leqq \frac{1}{\ln q}\cdot q^{\frac{q}{q-1}+\lambda-\frac{1}{\ln q}+e} .$$

The constant $a_1 = \frac{1}{\ln q}\cdot q^{\frac{q}{q-1}+\lambda-\frac{1}{\ln q}+e} > 0$ does not depend on the choice of $k_{j+1},\dots,k_n$. Furthermore, since $q^{s-1} < m \le q^s = n$ we have

$$\frac{q}{q-1}\left(1-\frac{m}{n}\right) \le \frac{q}{q-1}\left(1-\frac{1}{n}-\frac{1}{q}\right) = 1-\frac{q}{n(q-1)} < 1.$$

Now we have

$$\mathrm{dg}N - \mathrm{dg}N_\nu \leqq (\mu-s)q^{\nu+e} + q^{\nu+e}\left(1-\frac{q}{n(q-1)}\right) + na_1.$$

Since $i \in \{1,\dots,n-1\}$ and $i = q^\mu$ and $n = q^s$ we have $\mu - s \le -1$. Therefore we have

$$\mathrm{dg}N - \mathrm{dg}N_\nu \leqq -q^{\nu+e} + q^{\nu+e}\left(1-\frac{q}{n(q-1)}\right) + na_1 < 0$$

for $\beta > \beta_3$. Using (i) we get for β sufficiently large

(5) $$\mathrm{dg}N - \mathrm{dg}N_{\beta+1} < 0.$$

(iib) Now we consider the case that N is a term such that $q^\nu < q^{k_1}+\dots+q^{k_n} < q^{\nu+1}$ and $q^{k_1}+\dots+q^{k_i} = q^\nu$ where $i = q^{\mu_0}+q^{\mu_1}+\dots+q^{\mu_r} - r$ with $\mu_0 \ge \mu_1 \ge \dots \ge \mu_r \ge 1$ and $\mu_0+\dots+\mu_r \le \nu$. Then according to lemma 3.5 we have

$$N = K_\beta^{q^e} D^{q^{\beta+1}} \sum_{k_1\ge\dots\ge k_n\ge 0} \frac{c_{k_1}\cdots c_{k_n}}{F_{k_1}^{q^e}\cdots F_{k_n}^{q^e}} \sum_{(j_1,\dots,j_n)} \alpha_{j_1}^{q^{k_1}}\alpha_{j_2}^{q^{k_2}}\cdots\alpha_{j_n}^{q^{k_n}},$$

where

$$\begin{cases} k_1 = \dots = k_{q^{\mu_0}-1} & = \nu - \mu_0 \\ k_{q^{\mu_0}} = \dots = k_{q^{\mu_0}+q^{\mu_1}-2} & = \nu - \mu_0 - \mu_1 \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ k_{q^{\mu_0}+q^{\mu_1}+\dots+q^{\mu_{r-1}}-r+1} = \dots = k_{q^{\mu_0}+q^{\mu_1}+\dots+q^{\mu_r}-(r+1)} & = \nu - \mu_0 - \dots - \mu_r \\ k_{q^{\mu_0}+q^{\mu_1}+\dots+q^{\mu_r}-r} & = \nu - \mu_0 - \mu_1 - \dots - \mu_r \end{cases}$$

and therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} dgN \le{} & q^e dgK_\beta + q^{\beta+1}dgD - (\nu-\mu_0)q^{\nu-\mu_0+e}(q^{\mu_0}-1) + \\ & -(\nu-\mu_0-\mu_1)q^{\nu-\mu_0-\mu_1+e}(q^{\mu_1}-1) - \dots - (\nu-\mu_0-\dots-\mu_r)q^{\nu-\mu_0-\dots-\mu_r+e}(q^{\mu_r}-1) + \\ & -(\nu-\mu_0-\dots-\mu_r)q^{\nu-\mu_0-\dots-\mu_r+e} + \\ & + \{(q^{\mu_0}-1)q^{\nu-\mu_0}+(q^{\mu_1}-1)q^{\nu-\mu_0-\mu_1}+\dots+(q^{\mu_r}-1)q^{\nu-\mu_0-\dots-\mu_r}+q^{\nu-\mu_0-\dots-\mu_r}\}\max_j dg\alpha_j + \\ & -q^e(k_{i+1}q^{k_{i+1}}+\dots+k_n q^{k_n}) + (q^{k_{i+1}}+\dots+q^{k_n})\max_j dg\alpha_j = \\ ={} & q^e dgK_\beta + q^{\beta+1}dgD - (\nu-\mu_0)q^{\nu+e} + q^\nu \max_j dg\alpha_j + \\ & + q^{k_{i+1}}(\max_j dg\alpha_j - k_{i+1}q^e) + \dots + q^{k_n}(\max_j dg\alpha_j - k_n q^e) \\ \le{} & q^e dgK_\beta + q^{\beta+1}dgD - (\nu-\mu_0)q^{\nu+e} + q^{\nu+e}(\tfrac{q}{q-1} + \lambda) + \\ & (n-i)q^e \max_{i+1\le j\le n} (\tfrac{q}{q-1} + \lambda - k_j)q^{k_j} . \end{aligned}$$

Since $N_\nu \neq 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} dgN - dgN_\nu \le{} & (\mu_0-s)q^{\nu+e} + q^{\nu+e}\frac{q}{q-1}(1-\frac{m}{n}) + \\ & + (n-i)q^e \max_{i+1\le j\le n}(\frac{q}{q-1} + \lambda - k_j)q^{k_j}. \end{aligned}$$

Using (iia) we get

$$dgN - dgN_\nu \le (\mu_0 - s)q^{\nu+e} + q^{\nu+e}\left(1 - \frac{q}{n(q-1)}\right) + na_1.$$

Since $\mu_1 \ge \mu_2 \ge \ldots \ge \mu_r \ge 1$ we have

$$q^{\mu_0} = i + r - (q^{\mu_1} + q^{\mu_2} + \ldots + q^{\mu_r}) \le i \le n - 1 = q^s - 1$$

and therefore $\mu_0 \le s - 1$. Hence we conclude for this N:

(6) $\qquad dgN - dgN_{\beta+1} < 0 \qquad$ for β sufficiently large.

Combining (5) and (6) we have proved (ii).

Now choose $\beta > \max(\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3)$ then for all terms N of Q we have

$$dgN < dgN_{\beta+1} \qquad \text{if } N \neq N_{\beta+1}.$$

Since $dgN_{\beta+1} < 0$ we conclude $I = 0$ and $Q = 0$. But since

$$dgQ = dgN_{\beta+1} = q^{\beta+e-n+1}[-\beta q^n + \beta q^{n-1} + (\beta-1)q^{n-2} + \ldots + (\beta-n+1) + q^n(-1 + s + \frac{dgD}{q^e} + \frac{m}{n} \cdot \frac{q}{q-1} + \lambda)]$$

we have $Q \neq 0$. Hence we have the desired contradiction which proves the transcendency of η. □

3.7. THEOREM. *Let $\eta \neq 0$ be a zero of the function*

$$J_n(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (-1)^k \frac{t^{q^{n+k}}}{F_k^{q^n} F_{n+k}} \qquad (n \in \mathbb{N}),$$

then η is transcendental over $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$.

PROOF. We follow the proof of theorem 3.1. According to Corollary 2.9

$$dg\eta = n + \frac{2q}{q-1} + \lambda$$

for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$.

Suppose η is algebraic and η^{q^e} is separable. Let m be the degree of the minimalpolynomial P for $\alpha = \eta^{q^e}$. Let $\alpha_1 = \alpha, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_m$ be the conjugated elements of α. There exists a unique s such that

$$q^{s-1} < m \le q^s.$$

Let

$$Q(t) := P(t)(t - x^{q^e(n+\lambda+2)})^{q^s-m}$$

then $Q(t)$ is a polynomial over $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$ of degree $N = q^s$, with roots $\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_m;\ \alpha_{m+1} = \dots = \alpha_N = x^{q^e(n+\lambda+2)}$. The natural number β will be chosen later. Let D be a denominator for the coefficients of Q, then $D\alpha_i$ is an algebraic integer. Denote by

$$K_\beta := F_\beta F_{\beta-1}\dots F_{\beta-N+1}.$$

Now

$$0 = J_n^{q^e}(\eta) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (-1)^k \frac{\alpha^{q^{k+n}}}{F_k^{q^{n+e}} F_{n+k}^{q^e}}$$

and therefore

$$0 = D^{q^{\beta+n+1}} K_\beta^{q^{n+e}} K_{\beta+n}^{q^e} \sum_{\nu=s}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{k_1\ge\dots\ge k_N\ge 0 \\ q^\nu \le q^{k_1}+\dots+q^{k_N} < q^{\nu+1}}} \frac{(-1)^{k_1+\dots+k_N} \sum_{(i_1,\dots,i_N)} \alpha_{i_1}^{q^{k_1}}\dots\alpha_{i_N}^{q^{k_N}}}{F_{k_1}^{q^{n+e}}\dots F_{k_N}^{q^{n+e}} F_{k_1+n}^{q^e}\dots F_{k_N+n}^{q^e}}.$$

We split this sum into two parts: $I + Q = 0$, where I denotes the sum over the terms with $\nu = s,\dots,\beta$. Then I is a polynomial.

Let N_ν be the term of Q with $q^{k_1}+\dots+q^{k_N} = q^\nu$, hence $k_1 = \dots = k_N = \nu - s$. Then

$$N_\nu = D^{q^{\beta+1}} K_\beta^{q^{n+e}} K_{\beta+n}^{q^e} \left(\frac{(-1)^{\nu-s}}{F_{\nu-s}^{q^{n+e}} F_{n+\nu-s}^{q^e}}\right)^N (\alpha_1\dots\alpha_N)^{q^{\nu+n-s}}$$

and

$$\text{(1)} \qquad dgN_\nu = q^{\beta+1}dgD + q^{n+e}dgK_\beta + q^e dgK_{\beta+n} + \\ -q^{n+\nu+e}[2(\nu-s) - \frac{m}{N}\cdot\frac{2}{q-1} - \lambda - 2].$$

Especially:

$$dgN_{\beta+1} = q^{\beta+n+e+1-N}[-2\beta q^{N}+(2\beta+n)q^{N-1}+(2\beta+n-2)q^{N-2}+\dots$$

$$\dots+(2\beta+n-2N+2)+q^{N}(\frac{dgD}{q^{e}} + 2s + \frac{m}{N} \cdot \frac{2}{q-1} + \lambda)]$$

$$\leq q^{\beta+n+e+1-N}[2\beta(-q^{N}+q^{N-1}+\dots+q+1)+q^{N}(\frac{dgD}{q^{e}} + 2s + \frac{m}{N} \cdot \frac{2}{q-1} + \lambda)].$$

Hence for β sufficiently large

(2) $$dgN_{\beta+1} < 0.$$

Furthermore for β large enough and all $\nu \geq \beta + 1$ we have

(3) $$dgN_{\nu+1} - dgN_{\nu} < (q^{n+\nu+e}-q^{n+\nu+1+e})[2(\nu-s-1) - \frac{m}{N} \cdot \frac{2}{q-1} - \lambda] < 0.$$

If N is a term such that $q^{\nu} < q^{k_1}+\dots+q^{k_N} < q^{\nu+1}$ and $i = q^{\mu}$, $k_1 = \dots = k_i = \nu - \mu$ and $q^{\nu} = q^{k_1}+\dots+q^{k_i}$, then using (1) we get

$$dgN - dgN_{\nu} \leq 2q^{n+\nu+e}\{(\mu-s) + \frac{1}{q-1}(1 - \frac{m}{N})\} +$$

$$+ n \max_{i+1\leq j\leq N} q^{k_j+n+e}(\frac{2q}{q-1} + \lambda - 2k_j).$$

This maximum is less that a constant which does not depend on ν, hence for β sufficiently large

(4) $$dgN - dgN_{\nu} < 0.$$

If N is a term such that $q^{\nu} < q^{k_1}+\dots+q^{k_N} < q^{\nu+1}$ and $i = q^{\mu_0} + q^{\mu_1}+\dots+q^{\mu_r} - r$ with $\mu_0 \geq \mu_1 \geq \dots \geq \mu_r \geq 1$ then (using lemma 3.5) we get

(5) $$dgN - dgN_{\nu} \leq 2q^{n+\nu+e}\{(\mu_0-s) + \frac{1}{q-1}(1 - \frac{m}{N})\} +$$

$$+ n \max_{i+1\leq j\leq N} q^{k_j+n+e}(\frac{2q}{q-1} + \lambda - 2k_j) < 0$$

Hence if we choose β large enough then from (1),...,(5) we get $-\infty < dgQ = dgN_{\beta+1} < 0$, which gives a contradiction to $I + Q = 0$ and $I \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$. □

REMARK. Theorem 3.7 is our result A2 of §1. A special case of result A1 was proved in theorem 3.1 and A1 will be proved in the following theorem.

3.8. THEOREM. *Suppose* $\eta \neq 0$ *is a zero of the function*

$$f(t) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k \frac{t^{q^k}}{F_k}$$

with $c_k \in \mathbb{F}_q$, $c_k \neq 0$ *for infinitely many* k. *Then* η *is transcendental over* $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$.

PROOF. The function f(t) can be written also in the form

$$f(t) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_{v_j} \frac{t^{q^{v_j}}}{F_{v_j}}$$

with

$$c_{v_j} \in \mathbb{F}_q, \; c_{v_j} \neq 0 \qquad \text{for } j = 0,1,\ldots .$$

Let $\eta \neq 0$ be a zero of f, then from theorem 2.2 it follows that

$$\mathrm{dg}\eta = v_\kappa + \frac{(v_\kappa - v_{\kappa-1})q^{v_{\kappa-1}}}{q^{v_\kappa} - q^{v_{\kappa-1}}},$$

where $v_\kappa > v_{\kappa-1}$ are non-negative integers determined by the coefficients of f: $c_{v_{\kappa-1}} \neq 0$, $c_{v_{\kappa-1}+1} = \ldots = c_{v_\kappa - 1} = 0$, $c_{v_\kappa} \neq 0$. Remark that $\mathrm{dg}\eta > 0$.

Suppose η is algebraic, then $\alpha = \eta^{q^e}$ is separable with minimal-polynomial P(t) of degree m. Let s be determined by $q^{s-1} < m \leq q^s$ and define $\lambda =: [\mathrm{dg}\eta]$, where $[\mathrm{dg}\eta]$ denotes the entier of the positive number $\mathrm{dg}\eta$. Let

$$Q(t) = P(t)(t - x^{\lambda q^e})^{n-m},$$

where $n = q^s$. Then Q(t) has the roots $\alpha_1 = \alpha, \alpha_2, \ldots, \alpha_m$; $\alpha_{m+1} = \ldots = \alpha_n = x^{\lambda q^e}$.

Define D and K_β as in the proof of theorem 3.1. Then $f^{q^e}(\eta) = 0$ and therefore

$$0 = K_\beta^{q^e} D^{q^{\beta+1}} \prod_{i=1}^{n} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{c_k}{F_k^{q^e}} \alpha_i^{q^k} \right) =$$

$$= K_\beta^{q^e} D^{q^{\beta+1}} \sum_{\nu=s}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{k_1 \geq \ldots \geq k_n \geq 0 \\ q^\nu \leq q^{k_1}+\ldots+q^{k_n} < q^{\nu+1}}} \frac{c_{k_1} \ldots c_{k_n}}{F_{k_1}^{q^e} \ldots F_{k_n}^{q^e}} \sum_{(i_1,\ldots,i_n)} \alpha_{i_1}^{q^{k_1}} \ldots \alpha_{i_n}^{q^{k_n}},$$

which sum is split into two parts I + Q = 0, where I is the sum over the terms with $\nu = s, s+1, \ldots, \beta$. Then $I \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$ which means either $dgI \geq 0$ or I = 0. Every term of Q has the form

$$K_\beta^{q^e} D^{q^{\beta+1}} \frac{c_{k_1} \ldots c_{k_n}}{F_{k_1}^{q^e} \ldots F_{k_n}^{q^e}} \sum_{(i_1,\ldots,i_n)} \alpha_{i_1}^{q^{k_1}} \ldots \alpha_{i_n}^{q^{k_n}}$$

with

$$k_1 \geq \ldots \geq k_n \geq 0,\ q^\nu \leq q^{k_1}+\ldots+q^{k_n} < q^{\nu+1},\ \nu \geq \beta + 1.$$

Let N_ν denote the term of Q where $q^{k_1}+\ldots+q^{k_n} = q^\nu$ $(\nu \geq \beta+1)$. We shall prove:

(i) If β is chosen sufficiently large and such that $c_{\beta-s} \neq 0$ then $dgN_{\beta+1} < 0$ and $N_{\beta+1} \neq 0$. Furthermore if $N_\nu \neq 0$ then for β sufficiently large

$$dgN_{\nu+j} - dgN_\nu < 0 \qquad \text{for } j = 1,2,\ldots .$$

Hence for all $\nu > \beta + 1$ we have

$$dgN_\nu < dgN_{\beta+1}.$$

(ii) If N is a term of Q with $q^\nu < q^{k_1}+\ldots+q^{k_n} < q^{\nu+1}$ $(\nu \geq \beta+1)$ and $N_\nu \neq 0$, then if β is chosen large enough we have

$$dgN - dgN_\nu < 0.$$

Hence for all terms N of Q, $N \neq N_{\beta+1}$ we have

$$dgN < dgN_{\beta+1},$$

which means

$$dgQ = dgN_{\beta+1} < 0.$$

Then it follows that

$$I = 0 \text{ and } Q = 0.$$

On the other hand since $N_{\beta+1} \neq 0$ and $dgQ = dgN_{\beta+1}$ we have $Q \neq 0$. Contradiction!

Proof of (i): The only possible solution for $k_1,\dots,k_n$ in N_ν is $k_1 = \dots = k_n = \nu - s$ and

$$N_\nu = K_\beta^{q^e} D^{q^{\beta+1}} \left(\frac{c_{\nu-s}}{F_{\nu-s}^{q^e}}\right)^n (\alpha_1\dots\alpha_n)^{q^{\nu-s}}.$$

Hence if $c_{\nu-s} \neq 0$ we have $N_\nu \neq 0$ and

$$dgN_\nu = q^e dgK_\beta + q^{\beta+1}dgD - nq^e(\nu-s)q^{\nu-s} +$$
$$+ q^e(mq^e dg\eta + (n-m)q^e[dg\eta]) \qquad (*)$$

For $\nu = \beta + 1$ and $c_{\beta+1-s} \neq 0$ we get:

$$dgN_{\beta+1} \leq q^{\beta+e-n+1}\left[\beta(q^{n-1}+\dots+q+1) + q^n(-\beta-1+s+\frac{dgD}{q^e} + \frac{m}{n}dg\eta + \frac{n-m}{n}[dg\eta])\right]$$

which is < 0 for all $\beta > \beta_1$ for which $c_{\beta+1-s} \neq 0$. Analogously for $j \geq 1$ and $c_{\nu-s} \neq 0$, $c_{\nu+j-s} \neq 0$ we find

$$dgN_{\nu+j} - dgN_\nu < 0,$$

which proves (i).

Proof of (ii): Now $q^\nu < q^{k_1}+\dots+q^{k_n} < q^{\nu+1}$ and therefore $q^\nu = q^{k_1}+\dots+q^{k_i}$ for a certain i, $1 \leq i < n$. We distinguish the two cases

(a) $i = q^\mu$ and $k_1 = \dots = k_i = \nu - \mu$

(b) $i = q^{\mu_0} + q^{\mu_1}+\dots+q^{\mu_r} - r$ with $\mu_0 \geq \dots \geq \mu_r \geq 1$ and $\mu_0+\dots+\mu_r \leq \nu$.

(iia) Now

$$N = K_\beta^{q^e} D^{q^{\beta+1}} \left(\frac{c_{\nu-\mu}}{F_{\nu-\mu}^{q^e}}\right)^i \frac{c_{k_{i+1}}\dots c_{k_n}}{F_{k_{i+1}}^{q^e}\dots F_{k_n}^{q^e}} \sum_{(j_1,\dots,j_n)} (\alpha_{j_1}\dots\alpha_{j_i})^{q^{\nu-\mu}} \alpha_{j_{i+1}}^{q^{k_{i+1}}}\dots\alpha_{j_n}^{q^{k_n}},$$

which gives

$$dgN \le q^e dgK_\beta + q^{\beta+1} dgD - q^{\nu+e}(\nu-\mu) - k_{i+1} q^{k_{i+1}+e} - \ldots - k_n q^{k_n+e} +$$
$$+ q^e dg\eta (q^\nu + q^{k_{i+1}} + \ldots + q^{k_n}).$$

Suppose $N_\nu \neq 0$, then from (*) it follows that

$$dgN - dgN_\nu \le (\mu-s)q^{\nu+e} + q^{\nu+e}(dg\eta - [dg\eta])(1 - \tfrac{m}{n}) +$$
$$+ (n-i) \max_{i+1\le j\le n} q^{k_j+e}(dg\eta - k_j).$$

Since $\max_{x\ge 0} q^{x+e}(-x + dg\eta)$ does not depend on the choice of $k_{i+1},\ldots,k_n$ we conclude $dgN - dgN_\nu < 0$ for β large enough and $N_\nu \neq 0$.

(iib) Now

$$N = K_\beta^{q^e} D^{q^{\beta+1}} \sum_{k_1\ge\ldots\ge k_n\ge 0} \frac{c_{k_1}\cdots c_{k_n}}{F_{k_1}^{q^e}\cdots F_{k_n}^{q^e}} \sum_{(j_1,\ldots,j_n)} \alpha_{j_1}^{q^{k_1}} \cdots \alpha_{j_n}^{q^{k_n}},$$

where

$$\begin{cases} k_1 = \ldots = k_{q^{\mu_0}-1} & = \nu - \mu_0 \\ k_{q^{\mu_0}} = \ldots = k_{q^{\mu_0}+q^{\mu_1}-2} & = \nu - \mu_0 - \mu_1 \\ \vdots & \\ k_{q^{\mu_0}+\ldots+q^{\mu_{r-1}}-r+1} = \ldots = k_{q^{\mu_0}+\ldots+q^{\mu_r}-(r+1)} & = \nu - \mu_0 - \mu_1 - \ldots - \mu_r \\ k_{q^{\mu_0}+\ldots+q^{\mu_r}-r} & = \nu - \mu_0 - \ldots - \mu_r, \end{cases}$$

and therefore

$$dgN \le q^e dgK_\beta + q^{\beta+1} dgD - (\nu-\mu_0)q^{\nu+e} + q^{\nu+e} dg\eta +$$
$$+ (n-i) \max_{i+1\le j\le n} q^{k_j+e}(dg\eta - k_j).$$

Suppose $N_\nu \neq 0$ then

$$dgN - dgN_\nu \leq (\mu_0 - s)q^{\nu+e} + q^{\nu+e}(dg\eta - [dg\eta])(1 - \frac{m}{n}) +$$
$$+ (n-i) \max_{i+1\leq j\leq n} q^{k_j+e}(dg\eta - k_j) < 0$$

if β is large enough.

From (i) and (ii) it follows that if $N \neq N_{\beta+1}$ then

$$dgN - dgN_{\beta+1} < 0.$$

We have proved now the contradiction $I = Q = 0$ and $dgQ = dgN_{\beta+1}$ $(N_{\beta+1} \neq 0)$, and therefore our assumption "η is algebraic" is false. □

4. THE TRANSCENDENCY OF $\psi(\alpha)$ FOR ALGEBRAIC $\alpha \neq 0$

The function $f\colon \Phi \to \Phi$ given by the power series

$$f(t) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i t^i$$

with $a_i \in \Phi$, which converges for all t with $dgt < R$ is called *linear* if

$$\begin{cases} f(t+u) = f(t) + f(u) \\ f(ct) = cf(t), \end{cases}$$

for all $t,u \in \Phi$ with $dgt < R$, $dgu < R$ and all $c \in \mathbb{F}_q$.

For linear functions we define for all t for which the involving series converge the *operators* Δ^r $(r=1,2,\ldots)$ by

$$\Delta f(t) = f(xt) - xf(t)$$
$$\Delta^r f(t) = \Delta^{r-1} f(xt) - x^{q^{r-1}} \Delta^{r-1} f(t), \quad r \geq 2.$$

For purpose of notation: $\Delta^\circ f(t) = f(t)$.

A power series $f\colon \Phi \to \Phi$ is called *entire* if f converges for all $t \in \Phi$.

For entire linear functions f we have an *"expansion formula"* (see L. CARLITZ [1]), namely:
for every $M \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$ we have

$$f(Mt) = \sum_{\nu=0}^{dgM} \frac{\psi_\nu(M)}{F_\nu} \Delta^\nu f(t),$$

where F_ν is defined in def. 1.1 and

$$\psi_\nu(t) = \prod_{\substack{dgE<\nu \\ E\in \mathbb{F}_q[x]}} (t - E).$$

4.1. <u>LEMMA</u>. *Let* K *be a separable finite algebraic extension of* $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$ *of degree* h. *Let* $r,s \in \mathbb{N}$ *with* $0 < r < s$. *Then the system of linear equations*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{s} \alpha_{ki} X_i = 0 \qquad (k=1,\ldots,r),$$

where α_{ki} *are algebraic integers in* K *and*

$$a = \max_{k,i}(dg\alpha_{ki},0)$$

has a non-trivial solution $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^{s}$ *with* $X_i \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$, *such that*

$$dgX_i < \frac{cs+ar}{s-r} \qquad (i=1,\ldots,s),$$

where c *is a positive constant only depending on the field* K.

<u>PROOF</u>. See [5], lemma 1. □

4.2. <u>LEMMA</u>. *Let*

$$\psi_\mu(t) := \prod_{\substack{E \\ dgE<\mu}} (t - E)$$

where $E \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$. *Then*

$$dg\, \frac{\psi_\mu(A)}{F_\mu} < q^{m-1}$$

for all $A \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$ *with* $dgA < m$ *and all* $\mu \in \{0,1,\ldots,m-1\}$.

<u>PROOF</u>. We may suppose that $dgA \geq \mu$, then

$$dg\, \frac{\psi_\mu(A)}{F_\mu} = \sum_{dgE<\mu} dg(A-E) - \mu q^\mu = (dgA-\mu)q^\mu.$$

Consider the function $f\colon \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$f(y) = (dgA-y)q^y.$$

Then

$$f'(y) = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad y = dgA - \frac{1}{\ln q}.$$

Hence

$$f(y) \le \frac{1}{\ln q} q^{dgA - \frac{1}{\ln q}} \quad \text{for all } y \ge 0.$$

For $q \ge 3$ we have

$$f(y) \le q^{dgA-1} \qquad \text{for all } y \ge 0.$$

Hence

$$(dgA-\mu)q^{\mu} \le q^{dgA-1} < q^{m-1}, \quad \mu \in \{0,1,\dots,m-1\}.$$

For $q = 2$ we have $\ln 2 > \frac{1}{2}$ and therefore

$$f(y) < 2.q^{dgA-2} = 2^{dgA-1} < 2^{m-1} \quad \text{for all } \mu.$$

Hence for all $\mu \le dgA$ we have

$$dg \frac{\psi_{\mu}(A)}{F_{\mu}} < q^{m-1}.$$

For $\mu > dgA$ we have $\psi_{\mu}(A) = 0$. □

4.3. <u>THEOREM</u>. *Let* $\alpha \in \Phi$, $\alpha \neq 0$ *and* $\alpha^{-1}\xi \notin \mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$. *Then* $\psi(\alpha)$ *is transcendental over* $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$.

<u>REMARK</u>. From this theorem it follows that $\psi(\alpha)$ is transcendental for algebraic $\alpha \neq 0$, which was already proved by L.I. WADE [8]. Now we give a different proof, which is a refinement of the methods used in [9], [4] and [5].

<u>PROOF</u>. Let $\alpha \in \Phi$, $\alpha \neq 0$ and $\alpha^{-1}\xi \notin \mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$. We may suppose that $dg\alpha > \frac{q}{q-1}$; for if $dg\alpha \le \frac{q}{q-1}$ then there exists $E \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$ such that $dg(E\alpha) > \frac{q}{q-1}$ and $(E\alpha)^{-1}\xi \notin \mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$, hence if we have proved the theorem for α with $dg\alpha > \frac{q}{q-1}$ then $\psi(E\alpha)$ is transcendental. Using the expansionformula we get

$$\psi(E\alpha) = \sum_{\mu=0}^{dgE} (-1)^{\mu} \frac{\psi_{\mu}(E)}{F_{\mu}} \psi^{q^{\mu}}(\alpha)$$

and from the assumption $\psi(\alpha)$ algebraic we conclude $\psi(E\alpha)$ algebraic. Hence from now on $dg\alpha > \frac{q}{q-1}$.

Suppose $\psi(\alpha)$ is algebraic. Then there exists an $e \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\psi^{q^e}(\alpha)$ is separable. Let $K = \mathbb{F}_q\{x\}(\psi^{q^e}(\alpha))$ and $h = [K: \mathbb{F}_q\{x\}]$. Define $d^*t = \max(dgt, 0)$. Define the function

$$L(t) := \sum_{i=0}^{q^k-1} \sum_{j=0}^{q^l-1} X_{ij}(d^*t)^j \psi^{iq^e}(\alpha t),$$

where k and l are positive integers which will be chosen later and the polynomials $X_{ij} \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$ are to be defined by the following system of at most q^m equations in the q^{k+l} variables X_{ij}:

$$L(A) = 0 \quad \text{for } A \in \mathbb{F}_q[x],\ dgA < m.$$

The coefficients of X_{ij} in these equations are algebraic in K, since

$$0 = L(A) = \sum_{i=0}^{q^k-1} \sum_{j=0}^{q^l-1} X_{ij}(d^*A)^j \left\{ \sum_{\mu=0}^{m} (-1)^{\mu} \frac{\psi_{\mu}(A)}{F_{\mu}} \psi^{q^{\mu}}(\alpha) \right\}^{iq^e}.$$

In fact the coefficients of X_{ij} are polynomials in $\psi^{q^e}(\alpha)$ of degree $\le q^{k+m}$ with coefficients in $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$. Let $\Gamma \in \mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$ be such that $\Gamma\psi^{q^e}(\alpha)$ is an algebraic integer of K. Let $c_1 = dg\Gamma$. Then $F_m^{q^{k+e}}\Gamma^{q^{k+m}}L(A) = 0$, $A \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$, $dgA < m$ is a system of at most q^m linear equations in the X_{ij} with algebraic integers as coefficients; we write this system in the form

$$\sum_{i=0}^{q^k-1} \sum_{j=0}^{q^l-1} D_{ij}X_{ij} = 0.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} dgD_{ij} &\le q^{k+e}.mq^m + c_1q^{k+m} + q^l m + q^{k+e}.q^{m-1} + q^{k+m+e}\max(0, dg\psi_{\mu}(\alpha)) \\ &\le (m+c_2)q^{k+m+e} + mq^l, \end{aligned}$$

where c_2 is a positive real constant. Now put $k < \frac{1}{2}l$ and $m = k+l-1$, then

$$dgD_{ij} \le (2m+c_3)q^{2l+e}$$

with $c_3 > 0$. We use lemma 4.1 with $r = q^m$, $s = q^{k+l}$, $a = \max d^*D_{ij}$, then we conclude that there exist

$$X_{ij} \in \mathbb{F}_q[x],\ i = 0,\dots,q^k-1;\ j = 0,\dots,q^l-1,$$

not all zero, such that

$$(1) \qquad dgX_{ij} \le \frac{cq^{k+1} + (2m+c_3)q^{2l+e}.q^m}{q^{k+1} - q^m} = (2m+c_4)q^{2l+e},$$

where $c_4 > 0$.

Define

$$\mathcal{B}(\mu) := \{A + \alpha^{-1}\xi B \mid dgB < dgA < \mu;\ A,B \in \mathbb{F}_q[x] \text{ not both zero}\},$$

where

$$\xi = \lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{(x^q-x)^{\frac{q^k}{q-1}}}{L_k}$$

and therefore $\psi(B\xi) = 0$ for all $B \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$. Hence for all $t \in \mathcal{B}(\mu)$ we have:

$$L(t) = L(A + \alpha^{-1}\xi B) =$$

$$= \sum_{i=0}^{q^k-1} \sum_{j=0}^{q^l-1} X_{ij}(d^*(A+\alpha^{-1}\xi B))^j\ \psi^{iq^e}(\alpha A + B\xi)$$

$$= \sum_{i=0}^{q^k-1} \sum_{j=0}^{q^l-1} X_{ij}(d^*(A+\alpha^{-1}\xi B))^j\ \psi^{iq^e}(\alpha A).$$

Since $dg\alpha > \frac{q}{q-1}$ and $dg\xi = \frac{q}{q-1}$ we have

$$dg(A+\alpha^{-1}\xi B) = \max(dgA, dg\alpha^{-1}\xi B) = dgA,$$

hence

$$(2) \qquad L(A+\alpha^{-1}\xi B) = \sum_{i=0}^{q^k-1} \sum_{j=0}^{q^l-1} X_{ij}(d^*A)^j\ \psi^{iq^e}(\alpha A).$$

This means for all $t \in \mathcal{B}(m)$ we have (since $dgA < m$):

$$(3) \qquad L(t) = L(A+\alpha^{-1}\xi B) = L(A) = 0.$$

The number of polynomials B with $dgB < dgA$ and $dgA = \nu$ is q^ν. Since

$\alpha^{-1}\xi \notin \mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$ we have

$$A_1 + \alpha^{-1}\xi B_1 = A_2 + \alpha^{-1}\xi B_2 \iff A_1 = A_2 \text{ and } B_1 = B_2.$$

Hence the number of different elements $A + \alpha^{-1}\xi B$ with $dgB < dgA$ and $dgA = \nu$ is $q^\nu(q^{\nu+1}-q^\nu)$, and therefore the number of elements of $\mathcal{B}(\mu)$ is

$$\sum_{\nu=0}^{\mu-1} q^\nu(q^{\nu+1}-q^\nu) = \frac{q^{2\mu}-1}{q+1} .$$

If we denote the number of elements of $B(\mu)$ by $N\mathcal{B}(\mu)$, then for $\mu > 1$ we have

(4) $$q^{2\mu-2} < N\mathcal{B}(\mu) < q^{2\mu-1}.$$

Now let $\mu \geq m$. Define

(5) $$\eta := \mu - k + 1$$

then $\eta \geq 1$ and $\eta \geq 2k$.

Suppose $L(t) = 0$ for all $t \in \mathcal{B}(\mu)$. Let $D \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$, $dgD = \mu$, then $D \in \mathcal{B}(\mu+1)$. The function

$$L(t) \Big/ \prod_{\mathcal{B}(\mu)} (t-A-\alpha^{-1}\xi B)$$

is an entire function, hence according to the maximum-modulus-principle (see [3]) we have

$$dg \frac{L(D)}{\prod_{\mathcal{B}(\mu)} (D-A-\alpha^{-1}\xi B)} \leq \max_{dgt=2\mu} dg\left(\frac{L(t)}{\prod_{\mathcal{B}(\mu)} (t-A-\alpha^{-1}\xi B)}\right) .$$

Since $\mu = dgD > \max(dgA, dg\alpha^{-1}\xi B)$ we have

$$dg \prod_{\mathcal{B}(\mu)} (D-A-\alpha^{-1}\xi B) = \mu . N\mathcal{B}(\mu)$$

and

$$\underset{dgt=2\mu}{dg} \prod_{\mathcal{B}(\mu)} (t-A-\alpha^{-1}\xi B) = 2\mu\, N\mathcal{B}(\mu).$$

Hence using (4) we have

$$dgL(D) \le \max_{dgt=2\mu} dgL(t) - \mu N\mathcal{B}(\mu) < \max_{dgt=2\mu} dgL(t) - \mu q^{2\mu-2}.$$

From the definition of L(t) we get by using (1) and (5):

(6) $$\max_{dgt=2\mu} dgL(t) \le \max_{i,j} dgX_{ij} + 2\mu q^{l} + q^{k+e} \max_{dgt=2\mu} (dg\psi(\alpha t),0)$$

$$\le (2m+c_4)q^{2l+e} + 2\mu q^{l} + c_5 q^{k+e+2\mu}$$

$$\le 4\mu q^{2\eta+e} + c_6 q^{2\eta+e+3k-2}.$$

Hence

$$dgL(D) \le q^{2\eta+e}(4\mu + c_6 q^{3k-2} - \mu q^{2k-3-e}).$$

L(D) is algebraic and $F_\mu^{q^{k+e}} \Gamma^{q^{\mu+k+e}} L(D)$ is an algebraic integer, hence

$$(N(F_\mu^{q^{k+e}} \Gamma^{q^{\mu+k+e}} L(D)) \in \mathbb{F}_q[x],$$

where $N(\beta) = \beta_1,\dots,\beta_h$ where $\beta_1,\dots,\beta_h$ are the conjugated elements of β in K if β is algebraic in K. Therefore

$$dg(N(F_\mu^{q^{k+e}} \Gamma^{q^{\mu+k+e}} L(D)) = h[\mu q^{k+e+\mu} + c_1 q^{\mu+k+e} + dgL(D)] =$$

$$\le h[\mu q^{2\eta+e} + c_1 q^{2\eta+e} + dgL(D)] \le hq^{2\eta+e}[\mu(5-q^{2k-3-e}) + c_7 q^{3k-2}].$$

Now first choose $k > k_0$ such that

$$5 - q^{2k-3-e} < 0$$

and then $l > l_0$ such that

$$l(5-q^{2k-3-e}) + c_7 q^{3k-2} < 0$$

then we must conclude

$$L(D) = 0.$$

According to (2) we now have for all $t \in \mathcal{B}(\mu+1)$:

(7) $$L(D+\alpha^{-1}\xi B) = L(D) = 0.$$

Combining (3) and (7) we have

$$L(t) = 0 \text{ for all } t \in B(\mu),\ \mu = 1,2,\dots .$$

We already have remarked that all these zeros of L(t) are different.

Now k and l are fixed under the above conditions. Since L is entire and not a polynomial we have (see [5]):

$$L(t) = \gamma_0 t \prod_{\eta \in \mathcal{B}(\nu)} \left(1 - \frac{t}{\eta}\right)^{\mu(\eta)} \prod_{\substack{\eta \notin \mathcal{B}(\nu) \\ \eta \neq 0 \\ \eta \text{ zero of } L}} \left(1 - \frac{t}{\eta}\right)^{\mu(\eta)}$$

with $\gamma_0 \in \Phi$, where $\mu(\eta)$ = multiplicity of the zero η and $\mu(\eta) \geq 1$. Furthermore

$$\max_{dgt=2\nu} dg \prod_{\substack{\eta \notin \mathcal{B}(\nu) \\ \eta \neq 0 \\ \eta \text{ zero of } L(t)}} \left(1 - \frac{t}{\eta}\right) \geq 0$$

and

$$\prod_{\eta \in \mathcal{B}(\nu)} \left(1 - \frac{t}{\eta}\right) = \frac{\prod_{\mathcal{B}(\nu)} (A+\alpha^{-1}\xi B - t)}{\prod_{\mathcal{B}(\nu)} (A+\alpha^{-1}\xi B)} .$$

From these formulae we get:

$$\max_{dgt=2\nu} dgL(t) \geq dg\gamma_0 + 2\nu + 2\nu N\mathcal{B}(\nu) - \sum_{\mathcal{B}(\nu)} dg(A+\alpha^{-1}\xi B)$$

$$\geq dg\gamma_0 + 2\nu + 2\nu N\mathcal{B}(\nu) - \nu N\mathcal{B}(\nu) \geq c_8 + 2\nu + \nu q^{2\nu-2}$$

where c_8 is a constant only depending on L(t). On the other hand from (6) we have

$$\max_{dgt=2\nu} dgL(t) \leq (2m+c_4)q^{2l+e} + c_5 q^{k+e+2\nu} + 2\nu q^{l},$$

where m, k and l are now fixed constants. Hence both inequalities for $\max_{dgt=2\nu} dgL(t)$ are contradictory for ν large enough, which proves our theorem. □

4.4. <u>LEMMA</u>. *If* $\alpha^{-1}\xi \in \mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$ *then* $\psi(\alpha)$ *is algebraic over* $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$.

PROOF. If $\alpha^{-1}\xi \in \mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$ then $\alpha = \frac{E}{F}.\xi$ with $E,F \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$ and $(E,F) = 1$. [$(E,F) = 1$ means: E and F have no common factor.] If $\frac{E}{F} \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$ then $\psi(\alpha) = 0$ (Cor. 2.9). Let $\frac{E}{F} \notin \mathbb{F}_q[x]$. Consider $\alpha_1 = \xi F^{-1}$. Then

$$0 = \psi(F.\alpha_1) = \sum_{\mu=0}^{dgF} (-1)^{\mu} \frac{\psi_{\mu}(F)}{F_{\mu}} .\psi^{q^{\mu}}(\alpha_1);$$

hence $\psi(\alpha_1)$ is a zero of an algebraic equation with coefficients in $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$ and therefore $\psi(\alpha_1)$ is algebraic. Now

$$\psi(\alpha) = \psi(E\alpha_1) = \sum_{\mu=0}^{dgE} (-1)^{\mu} \frac{\psi_{\mu}(E)}{F_{\mu}} \psi^{q^{\mu}}(\alpha)$$

is a rational combination of algebraic elements; hence $\psi(\alpha)$ is algebraic over $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$. □

Now we have proved the following theorem.

4.5. THEOREM. *If* $\alpha \in \Phi$, $\alpha \neq 0$ *then* $\psi(\alpha)$ *is transcendental over* $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$ *if and only if* $\alpha^{-1}\xi \in \mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$.

4.6. COROLLARY. *If* $\alpha \in \Phi$, $\alpha \neq 0$ *and* α *is algebraic, then* $\psi(\alpha)$ *is transcendental over* $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$.

PROOF. Since ξ is transcendental over $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$ (theorem 3.1) $\alpha^{-1}\xi$ is transcendental over $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$ and therefore $\alpha^{-1}\xi \notin \mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$, hence $\psi(\alpha)$ is transcendental over $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$. □

4.7. COROLLARY. *Let* $\lambda(t): \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{t^{q^j}}{L_j}$ *be defined for* $\{t \in \Phi \mid dgt < \frac{q}{q-1}\}$. *If* $\alpha \in \Phi$, $\alpha \neq 0$, $dg\alpha < \frac{q}{q-1}$ *and* α *is algebraic, then* $\lambda(\alpha)$ *is transcendental over* $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$.

PROOF. Since λ is the inverse function of ψ (see CARLITZ [1]) we have

$$\psi(\lambda(\alpha)) = \alpha.$$

Since $\alpha \neq 0$ and since λ has no zeros for $dgt < \frac{q}{q-1}$ we have $\lambda(\alpha) \neq 0$. Suppose $\lambda(\alpha)$ is algebraic, then according to cor. 4.6 $\psi(\lambda(\alpha))$ is transcendental over $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$. This contradicts our assumption that α is algebraic. □

4.8. THEOREM. *Suppose* $\alpha \in \Phi$, $\alpha \neq 0$ *and* α *is algebraic over* $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$. *Define*

$$f(t) := \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_j \frac{t^{q^j}}{F_j},$$

where $c_j \in \mathbb{F}_q$ *and* $\exists c \in \mathbb{F}_q$, $c \neq 0$ *such that* $c_{j+1} = c.c_j$, $j = 0,1,2,\ldots$.
Then $f(\alpha)$ *is transcendental over* $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$.

PROOF. Suppose $f(\alpha)$ is algebraic and let $f^{q^e}(\alpha)$ be separable. Let $\Gamma \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$ be such that $\Gamma f^{q^e}(\alpha)$ is an algebraic integer. $K = \mathbb{F}_q\{x\}(f^{q^e}(\alpha))$ and $[K: \mathbb{F}_q\{x\}] = h$. As in theorem 4.3 we define

$$L(t) := \sum_{i=0}^{q^k-1} \sum_{j=0}^{q^l-1} X_{ij}(d^*t)^j f^{iq^e}(\alpha t),$$

where k and l $\in \mathbb{N}$, $k < \frac{1}{2}l$ will be chosen later and $X_{ij} \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$ are defined by the following system of equations

$$L(A) = 0 \quad \text{for } A \in \mathbb{F}_q[x],\ dgA < m,$$

where $m = k + l - 1$. By the same arguments as used in theorem 4.3 we find: the X_{ij} are not all zero and

$$dgX_{ij} \leq (2m + c_4)q^{2l+e}$$

where c_4 is a positive real constant which does not depend on m, l and k.

There exists a minimal $m_0 \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ such that

$$dg\alpha > \frac{1}{q-1} - m_0.$$

Now we want k and l to be such that $m > m_0$.

Define

$$\mathcal{B}(\mu) = \left\{ A + \alpha^{-1}\beta \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{l} A \in \mathbb{F}_q[x],\ \beta \text{ a zero of } f(t),\ A \text{ and } B \text{ not} \\ \text{both zero; } dgA < \mu,\ dg\beta < dgA + \frac{1}{q-1} - m_0. \end{array} \right\}$$

For all $t \in \mathcal{B}(\mu)$ we have

$$L(t) = L(A+\alpha^{-1}\beta) = \sum_{i=0}^{q^k-1} \sum_{j=0}^{q^l-1} X_{ij}(d^*(A+\alpha^{-1}\beta))^j f^{iq^e}(\alpha A+\beta) =$$

$$= \sum_{i=0}^{q^k-1} \sum_{j=0}^{q^l-1} X_{ij}(d^*(A+\alpha^{-1}\beta))^j f^{iq^e}(\alpha A).$$

Since $dg\beta < dgA + \frac{1}{q-1} - m_0$ we have $d^*(A+\alpha^{-1}\beta) = dgA$. Therefore for all

$t \in \mathcal{B}(\mu)$ we have:

$$L(t) = \sum_{i=0}^{q^k-1} \sum_{j=0}^{q^1-1} x_{ij} (d^*A)^j f^{iq^e}(\alpha A).$$

Hence

$$L(t) = 0, \forall t \in \mathcal{B}(m).$$

According to cor. 2.9 the number of zeros β of $f(t)$ with $dg\beta = \frac{1}{q-1} + k$ is $q^k - q^{k-1}$, $k = 1,2,\ldots$; hence the number of zeros β of $f(t)$ with $dg\beta < dgA + \frac{1}{q-1} - m_0$ with $dgA = \nu \geq m_0$ is $q^{\nu-m_0}$. The number of polynomials A with $dgA = \nu$ is $q^{\nu+1} - q^{\nu}$. Since $f(t)$ is linear all zeros of $f(t)$ are different, for if $f(\beta) = 0$ and $dg\beta = \frac{1}{q-1} + k$, then $c\beta + \beta_1$ where $f(\beta_1) = 0$ and $dg\beta_1 < \frac{1}{q-1} + k$ and $c \in \mathbb{F}_q$, $c \neq 0$ is also a zero of f and $dg(c\beta+\beta_1) = \frac{1}{q-1} + k$. Since $c \neq 0$ and $\beta_1 \neq 0$ we have $c\beta + \beta_1 \neq \beta$. The number of different zeros $c\beta + \beta_1$ with $dg\beta = \frac{1}{q-1} + k$, $c \in \mathbb{F}_q$, $c \neq 0$ and $dg\beta_1 < \frac{1}{q-1} + k$ is $q^k - q^{k-1}$. Hence all zeros of $f(t)$ are different.

Since α is algebraic and according to theorem 3.1 a zero $\beta \neq 0$ of $f(t)$ is transcendental, we have $\alpha^{-1}\beta$ is transcendental for every zero $\beta \neq 0$ of $f(t)$. Suppose

$$A_1 + \alpha^{-1}\beta_1 = A_2 + \alpha^{-1}\beta_2,$$

then

$$A_1 - A_2 = \alpha^{-1}(\beta_2-\beta_1).$$

Since $\beta_2 - \beta_1$ is a zero of $f(t)$ it follows that $\alpha^{-1}(\beta_2-\beta_1)$ is transcendental unless $\beta_1 = \beta_2$. Hence $A_1 = A_2$ and $\beta_1 = \beta_2$. This means that all elements $A + \alpha^{-1}\beta$ of $\mathcal{B}(\mu)$ are different. Therefore the number of elements of $\mathcal{B}(\mu)$ is

$$\sum_{\nu=m_0}^{\mu-1} q^{\nu-m_0}(q^{\nu+1}-q^{\nu}) + q^{m_0} - 1 = \frac{q^{2\mu-m_0}+q^{m_0+1}}{q+1} - 1.$$

If we denote the number of elements of $\mathcal{B}(\mu)$ by $N\mathcal{B}(\mu)$ then for $\mu > m_0$ we have

$$q^{2\mu-m_0-2} < N\mathcal{B}(\mu) < q^{2\mu-1}.$$

Now we proceed in the same way as in theorem 4.3, which leads to the choice of k such that $q^{2k-3-m_0-e} > 5$ and then l such that $l(5-q^{2k-3-m_0-3}) + c_7 q^{3k-2} < 0$ where c_7 is the same constant as in theorem 4.3. With this choice of k and l we conclude that $L(t) = 0$ for all $t \in \mathcal{B}(\mu)$, $\mu = 1,2,\ldots$.

This gives us a productrepresentation for L(t) from which it follows that

$$\max_{dgt=2\nu} dgL(t) \geq c_8 + 2\nu + \nu q^{2\nu-m_0-2},$$

and on the other hand from the definition of L(t) we get

$$\max_{dgt=2\nu} dgL(t) \leq (2m+c_4)q^{2l+e} + c_5 q^{k+e+2\nu} + 2\nu q^{l},$$

which gives for ν large enough the desired contradiction. Hence our assumption that $f(\alpha)$ is algebraic is false. □

<u>REMARK</u>. In the proof of theorem 4.8 we use the expansionformula for f(t) to determine the X_{ij}, namely since $c_{j+1} = c.c_j$ we get

$$f(\alpha A) = \sum_{\mu=0}^{dgA} \frac{\psi_\mu(A)}{F_\mu} \Delta^\mu f(\alpha) = \sum_{\mu=0}^{dgA} \frac{\psi_\mu(A)}{F_\mu} c^\mu f^{q^\mu}(\alpha)$$

from which it follows that the system of linear equations

$$L(A) = 0, \qquad A \in \mathbb{F}_q[x],\ dgA < m$$

in the X_{ij} has algebraic coefficients. Hence it does not seem possible to generalize theorem 4.8 to all functions of the form

$$g(t) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} c_j \frac{t^{q^j}}{F_j},\ c_j \in \mathbb{F}_q,\ c_j \neq 0 \text{ for infinitely many } j,$$

without a different method.

L.I. WADE proved in [8] that for $E \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$, g(E) is transcendental over $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$ as a consequence of his theorem 3.2:

"If $B_0, B_1, \ldots$ satisfy the conditions

(i) $B_k \in \mathbb{F}_q[x]$

(ii) $B_k \neq 0$ for infinitely many k

(iii) $dgB_k \leq (q-1)(k-1)q^{k-1} - b_k q^k$ for all sufficiently large k, where $b_k \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$

then $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{B_k}{F_k}$ is transcendental over $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$".

In a forthcoming paper we shall discuss a more general result of this type.

5. TRANSCENDENCE PROPERTIES OF BESSELFUNCTIONS IN ALGEBRAIC NONZERO POINTS

In [2] L. CARLITZ introduced the following function:

$$J_n(t) = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} (-1)^r \frac{t^{q^{n+r}}}{F_{n+r}F_r^{q^n}}, \quad n \in \mathbb{Z},$$

where $(F_{-n})^{-1} := 0$ for $n = 1,2,\ldots$. For these functions, which we shall call the Carlitz-Bessel-functions, he proved among other things the following relations for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$:

$$J_{-n}(t) = (-1)^n\{J_n(t)\}^{q^{-n}}$$

$$\Delta^r J_n(t) = J_{n-r}^{q^r}(t), \qquad r = 0,1,2,\ldots$$

$$J_{n+1}(t) - (x^{q^n}-x)J_n(t) + J_{n-1}^q(t) = 0.$$

Using these relations we proved in [4], lemma 3.1 the following lemma:

5.1. <u>LEMMA</u>. $J_{2n}(t)$ *and* $J_{2n+1}(t)$ *are linear polynomials in* $J_0(t)$ *and* $\Delta J_0(t)$ *of degree* q^n *with coefficients in* $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$ *of degree* $< q^{2n}$ *respectively* $< q^{2n+1}$.

5.2. <u>LEMMA</u>. *Let* $n \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, *then* $J_n(t)$ *has a zero of order* q^n *in* $t = 0$ *and has* $q^{k+1} - q^k$ *different zeros* β *with* $\mathrm{dg}\beta = n + 2k + \frac{2q}{q-1}$. *Each of these zeros* β *has order* q^n.

<u>PROOF</u>. According to cor. 2.9 $J_n(t)$ has a zero of order q^n in $t = 0$ and has $q^{n+k+1} - q^{n+k}$ zeros β with

$$\mathrm{dg}\beta = n + 2(k+1) + \frac{2}{q-1}, \qquad k = 0,1,\ldots$$

and $J_n(t)$ does not have any other zeros.

Let β be a zero of $J_n(t)$ with $dg\beta = n + 2(k+1) + \frac{2}{q-1}$ then the elements $c\beta + \beta^*$ with $c \in \mathbb{F}_q$, $c \neq 0$ and β^* a zero of $J_n(t)$ with $dg\beta^* < dg\beta$ are all different. If $k = 0$ the number of different elements $c\beta + \beta^*$ is $q-1$. From this it follows inductively for arbitrary $k > 0$ that the number of different elements $c\beta + \beta^*$ is $q^{k+1} - q^k$. Hence the number of different zeros β with $dg\beta = n + 2(k+1) + \frac{2}{q-1}$ is $q^{k+1} - q^k$.

Since $J_{-n}(t) = (-1)^n\{J_n(t)\}^{q^{-n}}$ it follows that if β is a zero of $J_n(t)$ then $J_{-n}(\beta) = 0$. Hence

$$J_n(t) = (-1)^n\{J_{-n}(t)\}^{q^n}$$

and therefore β is a zero of $J_n(t)$ with multiplicity $\geq q^n$. Since the total number of zeros β with $dg\beta = n + 2k + \frac{2q}{q-1}$ is $q^{n+k+1} - q^{n+k}$ the zero β has multiplicity exactly q^n. □

5.3. <u>THEOREM</u>. *If* $\alpha \in \Phi$, $\alpha \neq 0$ *and* α *algebraic over* $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$ *then* $J_n(\alpha)$ *and* $\Delta J_n(\alpha)$ *cannot be both algebraic over* $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$.

<u>PROOF</u>. It is sufficient to consider only the case $n \geq 0$; for if $n < 0$ then from the assumption $J_n(\alpha)$ and $\Delta J_n(\alpha)$ are both algebraic it follows that since

$$J_{-n}(\alpha) = (-1)^n\{J_n(\alpha)\}^{q^{-n}},$$

$J_{-n}(\alpha)$ is algebraic and since

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta J_{-n}(\alpha) &= J_{-n}(x\alpha) - xJ_{-n}(\alpha) = \\ &= (-1)^n\{\Delta J_n(\alpha)\}^{q^{-n}} + (-1)^n(x^{q^{-n}} - x)\{J_n(\alpha)\}^{q^{-n}},\end{aligned}$$

also $\Delta J_{-n}(\alpha)$ is algebraic. Hence we suppose from now on $n \geq 0$.

Suppose $J_n(\alpha)$ and $\Delta J_n(\alpha)$ are both algebraic. Then $\exists e \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $J_n^{q^e}(\alpha)$ and $(\Delta J_n(\alpha))^{q^e}$ are separable and they generate a normal algebraic extension K of $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$ of degree h.

Let $\Gamma \in \mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$ be such that $\Gamma J_n^{q^e}(\alpha)$ and $\Gamma(\Delta J_n(\alpha))^{q^e}$ are algebraic integers in K. Define

$$L(t) := \sum_{i=0}^{q^k-1} \sum_{j=o}^{q^l-1} X_{ij}(d^*t)^j J_n^{iq^e}(\alpha t),$$

where k and $l \in \mathbb{N}$ are to be chosen later such that $k < \frac{1}{2}$ and the X_{ij} are to be determined by the following system of equations

$$L(A) = 0 \qquad \text{for } A \in \mathbb{F}_q[x],\ dgA < m,$$

where $m := k + 1 - 1$. This means

$$\sum_{i=0}^{q^k-1} \sum_{j=0}^{q^1-1} X_{ij} (d^*A)^j \left(\sum_{\mu=0}^{dgA} \frac{\psi_\mu(A)}{F_\mu} \Delta^\mu J_n(\alpha) \right)^{iq^e} = 0, \quad dgA < m.$$

Using the relations for $J_n(t)$ this system can be written as

$$\sum_{i=0}^{q^k-1} \sum_{j=0}^{q^1-1} X_{ij} (d^*A)^j \left(\sum_{\mu=0}^{dgA} \frac{\psi_\mu(A)}{F_\mu} J_{n-\mu}^{q^\mu}(\alpha) \right)^{iq^e} = 0, \quad dgA < m,$$

or

$$\sum_{i=0}^{q^k-1} \sum_{j=0}^{q^1-1} X_{ij} (d^*A)^j \left(\sum_{\mu=0}^{n} \frac{\psi_\mu(A)}{F_\mu} J_{n-\mu}^{q^\mu}(\alpha) + \sum_{\mu=n+1}^{dgA} (-1)^\mu \frac{\psi_\mu(A)}{F_\mu} J_{\mu-n}(\alpha) \right)^{iq^e} = 0,\ dgA < m.$$

It now follows from this and lemma 5.1 that the coefficients of X_{ij} in this system of equations are polynomials in $J_0^{q^e}(\alpha)$ and $(\Delta J_0(\alpha))^{q^e}$ of degree $\leq q^{[\frac{m+n}{2}]+1}(q^k-1)$ with coefficients in $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$. Hence if $m > 2n$ and since $m = k + 1 - 1$ using lemma 5.1 we have:

$$F_m^{q^{k+e}} \Gamma^{q^{21}} L(A) = \sum_{i=0}^{q^k-1} \sum_{j=0}^{q^1-1} D_{ij} X_{ij} = 0, \quad dgA < m,$$

is a system of at most q^m linear equations in the X_{ij} with algebraic integers as coefficients, where

$$dgD_{ij} \leqq mq^{k+m+e} + c_0 q^{21} + q^{k+e}(q^{m-1} + q^{m-n} + c_1 q^{1+[\frac{m+n}{2}]})$$

with $c_0 = dg\Gamma$ and $c_1 = \max(dgJ_0(\alpha), dg\Delta J_0(\alpha), 0)$, hence

$$dgD_{ij} \leq q^{21+e}(2m + c_2)$$

where $c_2 > 0$. Using lemma 4.1 we conclude that there exist

$$X_{ij} \in \mathbb{F}_q[x],\ i = 0,1,\ldots,q^k-1;\ j = 0,1,\ldots,q^1-1,$$

not all zero such that

$$\mathrm{dg}X_{ij} \le \frac{cq^{k+1}+(2m+c_2)q^{2l+e}\cdot q^m}{q^{k+1}-q^m} = (2m+c_3)q^{2l+e},$$

with $c_3 > 0$.

Let $m_0 \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ be minimal such that

$$\mathrm{dg}\alpha > n + \frac{2}{q-1} - m_0.$$

We later choose k such that $k > m_0$. Define

$$\mathcal{B}(\mu) := \left\{ A + \alpha^{-1}\beta \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{l} A \in \mathbb{F}_q[x],\ \beta \text{ a zero of } J_n(t),\ A \text{ and } \beta \text{ not} \\ \text{both } 0;\ \mathrm{dg}A < \mu,\ \mathrm{dg}\beta < \mathrm{dg}A + n + \frac{2}{q-1} - m_0 \end{array} \right\}.$$

For all $t \in \mathcal{B}(\mu)$ we have

$$L(t) = L(A+\alpha^{-1}\beta) = \sum_{i=0}^{q^k-1} \sum_{j=0}^{q^l-1} X_{ij}\,(d^*(A+\alpha^{-1}\beta))^j\, J_0^{iq^e}(\alpha A+\beta).$$

Now we have

$$J_0(\alpha A+\beta) = J_0(\alpha A)$$

and since

$$\mathrm{dg}\alpha^{-1}\beta < -\mathrm{dg}\alpha + \mathrm{dg}A + n + \frac{2}{q-1} - m_0 < \mathrm{dg}A,$$

$$d^*(A+\alpha^{-1}\beta) = d^*(A),$$

hence

$$L(A+\alpha^{-1}\beta) = L(A)$$

which gives

$$L(t) = 0 \quad \text{for } t \in \mathcal{B}(m).$$

According to lemma 5.2 $J_n(t)$ has a zero of order q^n in $t = 0$ and $J_n(t)$ has $q^{k+1} - q^k$ different zeros β with

$$\mathrm{dg}\beta = n + 2(k+1) + \frac{2}{q-1}$$

each of order q^n, $k = 1,2,\ldots$. Since $\alpha \ne 0$ is algebraic and the zeros $\beta \ne 0$ of $J_n(t)$ are transcendental (th. 3.7), the number of different elements $A + \alpha^{-1}\beta$ of $\mathcal{B}(\mu)$ with $\mathrm{dg}A = \nu \ge m_0$ is

$$q^{\nu-m_0}(q^{\nu+1}-q^{\nu}).$$

Therefore the total number of elements of $\mathcal{B}(\mu)$ is

$$N\mathcal{B}(\mu) = \sum_{\nu=m_0}^{\mu-1} q^{\nu-m_0}(q^{\nu+1}-q^{\nu}) + q^{m_0} - 1$$

which gives for $\mu \geq m$:

$$q^{2\mu-2} < N\mathcal{B}(\mu) < q^{2\mu-1}.$$

Define $\eta := \mu - k + 1$ and suppose $L(t) = 0$ for $t \in \mathcal{B}(\mu)$. The function

$$L(t) \Big/ \prod_{\mathcal{B}(\mu)} (t-A-\alpha^{-1}\beta)$$

is an entire function and according to the maximum modulus principle we have

$$\mathrm{dg}L(D) \leqq \sum_{\mathcal{B}(\mu)} \mathrm{dg}(D-A-\alpha^{-1}\beta) + \max_{\mathrm{dg}t=2\mu} \mathrm{dg}\left(\frac{L(t)}{\prod_{\mathcal{B}(\mu)} (t-A-\alpha^{-1}\beta)}\right)$$

$$\leqq \max_{\mathrm{dg}t=2\mu} \mathrm{dg}L(t) - \mu N\mathcal{B}(\mu).$$

Furthermore

$$\max_{\mathrm{dg}t=2\mu} \mathrm{dg}L(t) \leqq \max_{i,j} \mathrm{dg}X_{ij} + 2\mu q^{l} + q^{k+e} \max_{\mathrm{dg}t=2\mu} (\mathrm{dg}J_n(\alpha t),0).$$

Since

$$J_n(\alpha t) = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} (-1)^r \frac{(\alpha t)^{q^{n+r}}}{F_{n+r}F_r^{q^n}},$$

we have

$$\max_{\mathrm{dg}t=2\mu} \mathrm{dg}J_n(\alpha t) \leqq \max_{r\geq 0} q^{n+r}(\mathrm{dg}\alpha+2\mu-n-2r) \leqq$$

$$\leqq q^{n+\mu-[\frac{m_0}{2}]}(1 + \frac{2}{q-1}) = c_4 q^{\mu+n}$$

where $c_4 > 0$ only depends on α. Hence

$$dgL(D) \leqq (2m+c_3)q^{2l+e} + 2\mu q^{l} + c_4q^{k+e+\mu+n} - q^{2\mu-2}$$

$$\leqq q^{2\eta+e}(4\mu+c_5q^{2k-1+n}-\mu q^{2k-3-e}).$$

Since L(D) is algebraic it follows from the definition of L and lemma 5.1 that

$$F_\mu^{q^{k+e}} \Gamma^{q^{2\eta}} L(D)$$

is an algebraic integer G, and

$$N(G) \leqq h[q^{k+e+\mu}\mu+c_0q^{2\eta}+q^{2\eta+e}(4\mu+c_5q^{2k-1+n}-\mu q^{2k-3-e})]$$

$$\leqq hq^{2\eta+e}[\mu(5-q^{2k-3-e})+c_6q^{2k-1+n}]$$

with $c_6 > 0$. Now choose k such that $5 - q^{2k-3-e} < 0$ and $k > m_0$ and then l such that $l(5-q^{2k-3-e}) + c_6q^{2k-1+n} < 0$ then $L(D) = 0$.

Now the integers k, l and m are fixed. We have $L(t) = 0$ for all $t \in B(\mu)$, $\mu \geq m$.

Since L(t) is an entire function we have

$$L(t) = \gamma_0 t^{q^n} \prod_{\eta\in\mathcal{B}(\nu)} (1 - \frac{t}{\eta})^{\mu(\eta)} \prod_{\substack{\eta\notin\mathcal{B}(\nu)\\ \eta\neq 0\\ \eta \text{ zero of } L(t)}} (1 - \frac{t}{\eta})^{\mu(\eta)},$$

with $\gamma_0 \in \Phi$, where $\mu(\eta) \geq 1$ is the multiplicity of the zero η of L(t).

Let ν_0 be the minimum of the degrees of the zeros $\neq 0$ of L(t), then

$$\max_{dgt=2\nu} \prod_{\substack{\eta\notin\mathcal{B}(\nu)\\ \eta\neq 0}} (1 - \frac{t}{\eta})^{\mu(\eta)} \geq \max_{dgt=\frac{\nu_0}{2}} \prod_{\substack{\eta\notin\mathcal{B}(\nu)\\ \eta\neq 0}} (1 - \frac{t}{\eta})^{\mu(\eta)} = 0.$$

Therefore

$$\max_{dgt=2\nu} dgL(t) \geq dg\gamma_0 + 2\nu q^n + 2\nu N\mathcal{B}(\nu) - \sum_{\mathcal{B}(\nu)} dg(A+\alpha^{-1}\beta)$$

$$\geq dg\gamma_0 + 2\nu q^n + \nu N\mathcal{B}(\nu) \geq c_7 + 2\nu q^n + \nu q^{2\nu-2}.$$

On the other hand

$$\max_{dgt=2\nu} dgL(t) \leq (2m+c_3)q^{2l+e} + 2\nu q^{l} + c_4q^{k+e+n+\nu}$$

and both inequalities are contradictory for ν sufficiently large. Hence at least one of the elements $J_n(\alpha)$, $\Delta J_n(\alpha)$ is transcendental over $\mathbb{F}_q\{x\}$. □

REFERENCES

[1] CARLITZ, L., *On certain functions connected with polynomials in a Galoisfield*, Duke Math. J. 1 (1935), 137-168.

[2] CARLITZ, L., *Some special functions over* GF(q,x), Duke Math. J. 27 (1960), 139-158.

[3] GEIJSEL, J.M., *Speciale funckties over lichamen van karakteristiek* p, Math. Centre Report ZN 35/70, A'dam, 1970.

[4] GEIJSEL, J.M., *Transcendence properties of the Carlitz-Bessel-functions*, Math. Centre Report ZW 2/71, A'dam, 1971.

[5] GEIJSEL, J.M., *Schneider's method in fields of characteristic* $p \neq 0$, Math. Centre Report ZW 17/73, A'dam, 1973.

[6] PERRON, O., *Algebra 1*, Göschen, Berlin, 1927.

[7] SCHÖBE, W., *Beiträge zur Funktionentheorie in nichtarchimedisch bewerteten Körpern*, Thesis, Helios, Münster, 1930.

[8] WADE, L.I., *Certain quantities transcendental over* $GF(p^n,x)$, Duke Math. J. 8 (1941), 701-720.

[9] WADE, L.I., *Trancendence properties of the Carlitz ψ-functions*, Duke Math. J. 13 (1946), 79-85.

[10] WEISS, E., *Algebraic number theory*, McGraw Hill, New York, 1963.