POWERS FROM PRODUCTS OF CONSECUTIVE TERMS IN ARITHMETIC PROGRESSION

MICHAEL A. BENNETT, KÁLMÁN GYŐRY, AND LAJOS HAJDU

Dedicated to Professor R. Tijdeman on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday

ABSTRACT. We show that if k is a positive integer, then there are, under certain technical hypotheses, only finitely many coprime positive k-term arithmetic progressions whose product is a perfect power. If $4 \leq k \leq 11$, we obtain the more precise conclusion that there are, in fact, no such progressions. Our proofs exploit the modularity of Galois representations corresponding to certain Frey curves, together with a variety of results, classical and modern, on solvability of ternary Diophantine equations. As a straightforward corollary of our work, we sharpen and generalize a theorem of Sander on rational points on superelliptic curves.

1. INTRODUCTION

A celebrated theorem of Erdős and Selfridge [11] states that the product of consecutive positive integers is never a perfect power. A more recent and equally appealing result is one of Darmon and Merel [8] who proved an old conjecture of Dénes to the effect that there do not exist three consecutive nth powers in arithmetic progression, provided $n \geq 3$. One common generalization of these problems is to ask whether it is possible to have a product of consecutive terms in arithmetic progression equal to a perfect power. In general, the answer to this question is in the affirmative as the Diophantine equation

$$n(n+d)\cdots(n+(k-1)d) = y^l, \quad k \geq 3,\ l \geq 2 \tag{1}$$

may have infinitely many solutions in positive integers n, d, k, y and l if either the integers n and d have suitable common factors (as in the example $9 \cdot 18 \cdot 27 \cdot 36 = 54^3$), or $(k, l) = (3, 2)$ and $\gcd(n, d) = 1$ (e.g.

Research supported in part by grants from NSERC (M.B.), the Erwin Schrödinger Institute in Vienna (M.B. and K.G.), the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) (K.G. and L.H.), the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (K.G. and L.H.), by FKFP grant 3272-13/066/2001 (L.H.) and by grants T29330, T42985 (K.G. and L.H.), T38225 (K.G.) and F34981 (L.H.) of the Hungarian National Foundation for Scientific Research.

$1 \cdot 25 \cdot 49 = 35^2$). If, however, we restrict our attention to progressions with

$$\gcd(n, d) = 1, \quad k \geq 3, \quad l \geq 2, \quad (k, l) \neq (3, 2), \tag{2}$$

a number of special finiteness results are available in the literature. Euler showed that then (1) has no solutions if $(k, l) = (3, 3)$ or $(4, 2)$; a like statement was obtained by Obláth [22], [23] in case $(k, l) = (3, 4), (3, 5)$ or $(5, 2)$. It has been conjectured by Erdős (as noted in [34]; see also Darmon and Granville [7]) that (1) (with (2)) has, in fact, no solutions whatsoever. This conjecture has been recently established by Győry [14] for $k = 3$ (and $l \geq 3$ arbitrary) and by Győry, Hajdu and Saradha [15], in case $k = 4$ or 5. In general, however, it appears to be a very hard problem to prove even that the number of solutions to (1), with (2), is finite. As a rough indication of its tractability, this does not seem to be a consequence of the ABC Conjecture of Masser and Oesterlé, unless we further assume that $l \geq 4$; see Theorem 7 of [15]. Further work in this direction, under restrictive hypotheses, includes that of Marszalek [19] (in case d is fixed), Shorey and Tijdeman [34] (if l and the number of prime divisors of d is fixed) and Darmon and Granville [7] (if both k and l are fixed). For a broader sample of the abundant literature in this area, the reader may wish to consult the survey articles of Tijdeman [37] and Shorey [32], [33].

In this paper, we will address the problem of establishing finiteness results for equation (1), under the sole assumption that k is fixed. One of the principal results of this paper is an extension of the aforementioned work of Győry [14] and Győry, Hajdu and Saradha [15] to $k \leq 11$, viz

Theorem 1.1. *The product of k consecutive terms in a coprime positive arithmetic progression with $4 \leq k \leq 11$ can never be a perfect power.*

By coprime progression, we mean one of the form

$$n, n + d, \cdots, n + (k - 1)d$$

with $\gcd(n, d) = 1$. We should emphasize that this does not follow as a mere computational sharpening of the approach utilized in [14] or [15], but instead necessitates the introduction of fundamentally new ideas. Indeed, the principal novelty of this paper is the combination of a new approach for solving ternary Diophantine equations under additional arithmetic assumptions, via Frey curves and modular Galois representations, with classical (and not so classical!) results on lower degree equations representing curves of small (positive) genus. Further, for the

most part, our results do not follow from straightforward application of the modularity of Galois representations attached to Frey curves, but instead require additional understanding of the reduction types of these curves at certain small primes.

Theorem 1.1 is, in fact, an immediate consequence of a more general result. Before we state this, let us introduce some notation. Define, for integer m with $|m| > 1$, $P(m)$ and $\omega(m)$ to be the largest prime dividing m and the number of distinct prime divisors of m, respectively (where we take $P(\pm 1) = 1$, $\omega(\pm 1) = 0$). Further, let us write

$$\Pi\left(i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_t\right) = (n + i_1 d)(n + i_2 d) \cdots (n + i_t d) \tag{3}$$

and

$$\Pi_k = \Pi(0, 1, 2, \ldots, k-1) = n(n+d)(n+2d) \cdots (n+(k-1)d). \tag{4}$$

With these definitions, we have

Theorem 1.2. *Suppose that k and l are integers with $3 \leq k \leq 11$, $l \geq 2$ prime and $(k, l) \neq (3, 2)$, and that n and d are coprime integers with $d > 0$. If, further, b and y are nonzero integers with $P(b) \leq P_{k,l}$ where $P_{k,l}$ is as follows :*

k	$l = 2$	$l = 3$	$l = 5$	$l \geq 7$
3	–	2	2	2
4	2	3	2	2
5	3	3	3	2
6	5	5	5	2
7	5	5	5	3
8	5	5	5	3
9	5	5	5	3
10	5	5	5	3
11	5	5	5	5

then the only solutions to the Diophantine equation

$$\Pi = \Pi_k = by^l \tag{5}$$

are with (n, d, k) in the following list :

$$(-9, 2, 9), (-9, 2, 10), (-9, 5, 4), (-7, 2, 8), (-7, 2, 9), (-6, 1, 6), (-6, 5, 4),$$
$$(-5, 2, 6), (-4, 1, 4), (-4, 3, 3), (-3, 2, 4), (-2, 3, 3), (1, 1, 4), (1, 1, 6).$$

For $k = 3$, this theorem was proved in [14]. Our Theorem 1.2 sharpens and generalizes the corresponding results of [15], which treated the cases $k = 4$ and 5. Note that the upper bound upon $P(b)$ in the above

theorem may be replaced in all cases by the slightly weaker but cleaner bound

$$P(b) < \max\{3, k/2\}. \tag{6}$$

Further, in case $(k,l) = (4,2)$ and $(3,3)$, the result is best possible (in the sense that $P_{k,l}$ cannot be replaced by a larger value). This is almost certainly not the case for other values of (k,l).

It is a routine matter to extend Theorem 1.2 to arbitrary (i.e. not necessarily prime) values of l. For $(k,l) = (3,4)$, equation (5) has no solutions with (6), cf. Theorem 8 of [15]. For all other pairs (k,l) under consideration, Theorem 1.2 yields the following

Corollary 1.3. *Suppose that n, d and k are as in Theorem 1.2, and that $l \geq 2$ is an integer with $(k,l) \neq (3,2)$. If, further, b and y are nonzero integers with (6), then the only solutions to equation (5) are with (n,d,k) in the following list :*

$$(-9,2,9), (-9,2,10), (-9,5,4), (-7,2,8), (-7,2,9),$$
$$(-6,5,4), (-5,2,6), (-4,3,3), (-3,2,4), (-2,3,3).$$

Note that knowing the values of the unknowns on the left hand side of (5), one can easily determine all the solutions (n,d,k,b,y,l) to (5).

In the special case $d = 1$, the set of solutions of equation (5), for $k \geq 2$ fixed, has been described in [13], [16] and [27], under less restrictive assumptions upon b. For further partial results on (5), we refer again to the survey papers [14], [32] [33] and [37].

For fixed values of $k \geq 3$ and $l \geq 2$ with $k + l > 6$, equation (5) has at most finitely many solutions in positive integers (n,d,b,y) with $\gcd(n,d) = 1$ and $P(b) \leq k$; see Theorem 6 of [15].

If we turn our attention to $k > 11$, we may prove a number of results of a similar flavour to Theorem 1.2, only with a corresponding loss of precision. If k is slightly larger than 11, we have

Theorem 1.4. *If $12 \leq k \leq 82$, then there are at most finitely many nonzero integers n, d, l, b and y with $\gcd(n,d) = 1$, $l \geq 2$ and satisfying (5), with (6). Moreover, for all such solutions to (5), we have*

$$\log P(l) < 3^k.$$

For arbitrary values of k, we may deduce finiteness results for equations (1) and (5), only under certain arithmetic assumptions. Write

$$D_k = \prod_{k/2 \leq p < k} p \tag{7}$$

where the product is over prime p. We have

Theorem 1.5. *If $k \geq 4$ is fixed, then the Diophantine equation (5) has at most finitely many solutions in positive integers n, d, b, y and l with*

$$\gcd(n, d) = 1, \;\; y > 1, \;\; l > 1, \;\; P(b) < k/2 \;\; \textit{and} \;\; d \not\equiv 0 \pmod{D_k}.$$

For each such solution, we necessarily have $\log P(l) < 3^k$.

A corollary of this which yields a finiteness result for (1), provided k is suitably large (relative to the number of prime divisors of d), is

Corollary 1.6. *Let D be a positive integer and suppose that k is a fixed integer satisfying*

$$k \geq \begin{cases} 4 & \text{if } D \in \{1, 2\} \\ 6D \log D & \text{if } D \geq 3. \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

Then the Diophantine equation (5) has at most finitely many solutions in positive integers n, d, b, y and l with

$$\gcd(n, d) = 1, \;\; y > 1, \;\; l > 1, \;\; \omega(d) \leq D, \;\; \textit{and} \;\; P(b) < k/2.$$

We remark that a sharp version of this result, in the special case $l = 2$ and $b = D = 1$, was recently obtained by Saradha and Shorey [29].

Finally, we mention an application of Theorem 1.2 to a family of superelliptic equations first studied by Sander [26]. Specifically, let us consider equations of the form

$$x(x + 1) \ldots (x + k - 1) = \pm 2^{\alpha} z^l \tag{9}$$

where x and z are rational numbers with $z \geq 0$, and k, l and α are integers with $k, l \geq 2$ and $-l < \alpha < l$. If $-l < \alpha < 0$, by replacing α and z in (9) with $l + \alpha$ and $z/2$, respectively, we may restrict ourselves to the case where α is nonnegative.

If x and z are further assumed to be integers and $\alpha = 0$, then, by the result of Erdős and Selfridge [11], we have that the only solutions to (9) are with $z = 0$. Since these are also solutions of (9) for each α, we will henceforth refer to them as *trivial*; in what follows, we shall consider only non-trivial solutions. Let us return to the more general situation when $x, z \in \mathbb{Q}$. By putting $x = n/d$ and $z = y/u$ with integers n, d, y, u such that $\gcd(n, d) = \gcd(y, u) = 1$, $d > 0$, $y \geq 0$ and $u > 0$, we see that (9) reduces to equation (5) with $P(b) \leq 2$ and the additional constraint that $u^l = 2^{\gamma} d^k$ for some nonnegative integer γ. An almost immediate corollary of Theorem 1.2 is the following :

Corollary 1.7. *Let $2 \leq k \leq 11$ and $l \geq 2$ with $(k,l) \neq (2,2)$ (and, if $\alpha > 0$, $(k,l) \neq (2,4)$). Then the only non-trivial solutions of (9) with $0 \leq \alpha < l$ are those (x,k) in the following list :*

$$(-9/2,9),(-9/2,10),(-7/2,8),(-7/2,9),(-5/2,6),(-2,2),$$
$$(-3/2,4),(-4/3,3),(-2/3,3),(-1/2,2),(1,2).$$

This result follows easily from Theorem 1.2; the reader is directed to [15] for the necessary arguments. Indeed, in [15], our Corollary 1.7 is established for $l \geq 3$, $k = 3,4$ and, if $\alpha = 0$, $k = 5$. If $2 \leq k \leq 4$, $l > 2$ and $\alpha = 0$, Sander [26] completely solved equation (9) and noted that, for $(k,l) = (2,2)$, there are, in fact, infinitely many solutions. We remark, however, that the solutions listed in Corollary 1.7 for $k = 3$ and 4 are missing from Sander's result. Further, as discussed in [15], the assumption $(k,l) \neq (2,4)$ (if $\alpha > 0$) is necessary, since, in that case, equation (9) has, again, infinitely many solutions.

The structure of this paper is as follows. In the second section, we will indicate how the problem of solving equation (5) may be translated to a question of determining solutions to ternary Diophantine equations. In Sections 3–6, we prove Theorem 1.2 for, respectively, prime $l \geq 7$, $l = 2$, $l = 3$ and $l = 5$. In most cases, for $l = 2$ or 3, the problem may be reduced to one of finding the torsion points on certain rank 0 elliptic curves $E/\mathbb{Q}$ (though the arguments are somewhat different for the two values of l; if $l = 3$, for instance, we will rely heavily on work of Selmer [31]). In the special case $l = 2$, $k = 6$ and $b = 5$ in Theorem 1.2, this approach proves inadequate to deduce the desired result. We instead turn to recent explicit Chabauty techniques due to Bruin and Flynn [4]. If $l = 5$, we depend on either classical results of Dirichlet, Lebesgue, Maillet (cf. [10]), Dénes [9] and Győry [12] on generalized Fermat equations of the shape $X^l + Y^l = CZ^l$, or recent work of Kraus [17]. For $l \geq 7$, we apply recent results of the first author and Chris Skinner [1], together with some refinements of these techniques; our proofs are based upon Frey curves and the theory of Galois representations and modular forms. Section 7 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.5. Finally, we conclude the paper by considering values of k with $12 \leq k \leq 82$.

2. The transition to ternary equations

For virtually every argument in this paper, we will rely heavily on the fact that a "nontrivial" solution to (5) implies a number of similar solutions to related ternary Diophantine equations which we may, if all goes well, be able to treat with the various tools at our disposal. The

only situation where we will not follow this approach is in Section 4 (i.e. when $l = 2$). From equation (5) and the fact that $\gcd(n, d) = 1$, we may write

$$n + id = b_i y_i^l \text{ for } 0 \leq i \leq k-1, \tag{10}$$

where b_i and y_i are integers with $P(b_i) < k$. We note that, in terms of b_i, such a representation is not necessarily unique. We will thus assume, unless otherwise stated, that each b_i is lth power free and, if l is odd, positive.

Let us first observe that any three of the linear forms $n + id$, $0 \leq i \leq k-1$, are linearly dependent. In particular, given distinct integers $0 \leq q, r, s \leq k-1$, we may find relatively prime non-zero integers λ_q, λ_r, λ_s, for which

$$\lambda_q(n + qd) + \lambda_r(n + rd) = \lambda_s(n + sd). \tag{11}$$

It follows from (10) that, writing $A = \lambda_q b_q$, $B = \lambda_r b_r$, $C = \lambda_s b_s$, $(u, v, z) = (y_q, y_r, y_s)$, we have

$$Au^l + Bv^l = Cz^l, \tag{12}$$

where $P(ABC) < k$. This is a ternary Diophantine equation of signature (l, l, l). In case $l = 3, 5$ and, sometimes, $l \geq 7$, we will prove Theorem 1.2 through analysis of such equations. In the sequel, we will employ the shorthand $[q, r, s]$ to refer to an identity of the form (11) (and hence a corresponding equation (12)) – for given distinct integers q, r and s, coprime nonzero integers λ_q, λ_r and λ_s satisfying (11) are unique up to sign.

A second approach to deriving ternary equations from a solution to (5) proves to be particularly useful for larger values of (prime) l. If p, q, r and s are integers with

$$0 \leq p < q \leq r < s \leq k-1 \text{ and } p + s = q + r,$$

then we may observe that

$$(n + qd)(n + rd) - (n + pd)(n + sd) = (qr - ps)d^2 \neq 0. \tag{13}$$

It follows that identity (13) implies (nontrivial) solutions to Diophantine equations of the form

$$Au^l + Bv^l = Cz^2 \tag{14}$$

with $P(AB) < k$, for each quadruple $\{p, q, r, s\}$. This is a ternary Diophantine equation of signature $(l, l, 2)$. Henceforth, we will use the shorthand $\{p, q, r, s\}$ to refer to an identity of the form (13).

Our arguments will rely upon the fact that a triple $[q, r, s]$ or quadruple $\{p, q, r, s\}$ can always be chosen such that the resulting equation

(12) or (14) is one that we may treat with techniques from the theory of Galois representations and modular forms, or, perhaps, with a more classical approach. In essence, once we have established certain results on the equations (12) and (14), as we shall see, this can be regarded as a purely combinatorial problem.

3. Proof of Theorem 1.2 in case $l \geq 7$

We will primarily treat equation (5) with prime exponent $l \geq 7$ by reducing the problem to one of determining the solvability of equations of the shape (14). For a more detailed discussion of these matters, the reader is directed to [1], [8], [18] and [21]. We begin by cataloguing the required results on such ternary equations :

Proposition 3.1. *Let $l \geq 7$ be prime, α, β be nonnegative integers, and let A and B be coprime nonzero integers. Then the following Diophantine equations have no solutions in nonzero coprime integers (x, y, z) with $xy \neq \pm 1$:*

$$x^l + 2^\alpha y^l = 3^\beta z^2, \ \alpha \neq 1 \tag{15}$$

$$x^l + 2^\alpha y^l = z^2 \text{ with } p \mid xy \text{ for } p \in \{3, 5, 7\} \tag{16}$$

$$x^l + 2^\alpha y^l = 3z^2 \text{ with } p \mid xy \text{ for } p \in \{5, 7\} \tag{17}$$

$$x^l + y^l = Dz^2, \ D \in \{2, 6\} \tag{18}$$

$$x^l + 3^\alpha y^l = 2z^2 \text{ with } p \mid xy \text{ for } p \in \{5, 7\}, \ l \geq 11 \tag{19}$$

$$x^l + 5^\alpha y^l = 2z^2 \text{ with } l \geq 11 \text{ if } \alpha > 0 \tag{20}$$

$$Ax^l + By^l = z^2, \ AB = 2^\alpha p^\beta, \ \alpha \geq 6, \ p \in \{3, 5, 13\} \tag{21}$$

$$Ax^l + By^l = z^2, \ AB = 2^\alpha p^\beta, \ \alpha \neq 1, \ p \in \{11, 19\} \tag{22}$$

$$Ax^l + By^l = z^2, \ P(AB) \leq 3, \text{ with } p \mid xy \text{ for } p \in \{5, 7\} \tag{23}$$

$$Ax^l + By^l = z^2, \ P(AB) \leq 5, \text{ with } 7 \mid xy \text{ and } l \geq 11. \tag{24}$$

In each instance where we reference a prime p, we further suppose that the exponent $l > p$.

Proof. We begin by noting that the stated results for equations (15), (18), (20) and (21) are, essentially, available in Bennett and Skinner [1]. The cases of equation (21) with $p = 3$ or 5, and $\beta \geq 1$, while not all explicitly treated in [1], follow immediately from the arguments of that paper, upon noting that the modular curves $X_0(N)$ have genus 0 for all N dividing 6 or 10.

For the remaining equations, we will begin by employing the approach of [1]. Specifically, to a putative nontrivial solution of one of

the preceding equations, we associate a Frey curve $E/\mathbb{Q}$ (see [1] for details), with corresponding mod l Galois representation

$$\rho_l^E : \mathrm{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}/\mathbb{Q}) \to \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{F}_l)$$

on the l-torsion $E[l]$ of E. Via Lemmata 3.2 and 3.3 of [1], this representation arises from a cuspidal newform f of weight 2 and trivial Nebentypus character. The level N of this newform may be shown to satisfy

$$N \in \{20, 24, 30, 40, 96, 120, 128, 160, 384, 480, 640, 768, 1152, 1920\}$$

(for example, a nontrivial solution to (16) with $\alpha = 1$ and x, y odd necessarily leads to a newform of level 128; for details, the reader is directed to Lemma 3.2 of [1]). The assumption that $p \mid xy$ for $p \in \{3, 5, 7\}$ implies, if p is coprime to lN, that

$$\text{trace } \rho_l^E\,(\mathrm{Frob}_p) = \pm(p+1).$$

It follows, if f has Fourier coefficents a_n in a number field K_f, that

$$\mathrm{Norm}_{K_f/\mathbb{Q}}\,(a_p \pm (p+1)) \equiv 0 \pmod{l}. \tag{25}$$

Using William Stein's "Modular Forms Database" [35], we find a_p, $p \in \{3, 5, 7\}$, for each newform at the levels N of interest, provided p is coprime to N. In most cases the corresponding Fourier coefficients are even integers: from the Weil bounds, $a_3 \in \{0, \pm 2\}$ (if $3 \nmid N$), $a_5 \in \{0, \pm 2, \pm 4\}$ (if 5 is coprime to N) and $a_7 \in \{0, \pm 2, \pm 4\}$ (if 7 fails to divide N). Congruence (25) thus implies a contradiction for these forms. The only forms f encountered with $K_f \neq \mathbb{Q}$ are (in Stein's notation) form 3 at level 160, forms 9–12 at level 640, forms 9–12 at level 768 and forms 25–28 at level 1920. In the case of form 3, $N = 160$, we find that $a_7 = \pm 2\sqrt{2}$ and so $2\sqrt{2} \equiv \pm 8 \pmod{\mathcal{P}}$ for some prime $\mathcal{P}$ lying over l. It follows that $l \mid 56$ and so $l = 7$. Similarly, form 9 at level 672 has $a_7 = -\vartheta - 2$ where $\vartheta^2 + 2\vartheta - 4 = 0$. From $a_7 \equiv \pm 8 \pmod{\mathcal{P}}$ we thus have $\vartheta \equiv 6 \pmod{\mathcal{P}}$ (whereby $l = 11$) or $\vartheta \equiv -10 \pmod{\mathcal{P}}$ (whence $l = 19$). On the other hand, $a_3 = \vartheta$ and hence, from the Weil bounds, $\vartheta \equiv 0, \pm 2, \pm 4 \pmod{\mathcal{P}}$, a contradiction in each case. Arguing in a like fashion for the remaining forms completes the proof. □

We will also have use of a result on equations of signature (l, l, l). Specifically, we require

Proposition 3.2. *Let $l \geq 3$ and $\alpha \geq 0$ be integers. Then the Diophantine equation*

$$X^l + Y^l = 2^\alpha Z^l \tag{26}$$

has no solutions in coprime nonzero integers X, Y and Z with $XYZ \neq \pm 1$.

Proof. This is essentially due to Wiles [38] (in case $l \mid \alpha$), Darmon and Merel [8] (if $\alpha \equiv 1 \pmod{l}$) and Ribet [24] (in the remaining cases for $l \geq 5$ prime); see also Győry [14]. □

Let us begin the proof of Theorem 1.2. For the remainder of this section, we will suppose that there exists a solution to equation (5) in nonzero integers n, d, k, y, l and b with n and $d > 0$ coprime, $3 \leq k \leq 11$, and $l \geq 7$ prime. We suppose further that b satisfies (6). We treat each value $3 \leq k \leq 11$ in turn.

3.1. **The case k=3.** If $k = 3$, the identity $\{0, 1, 1, 2\}$ yields solutions to an equation of the shape (15) with $\beta = 0$ and $\alpha = 0$ (if Π is odd) or $\alpha \geq 2$ (if Π is even). By Proposition 3.1, after a modicum of work, we obtain the solutions $(n, d, k) = (-4, 3, 3)$ and $(-2, 3, 3)$ listed in the statement of Theorem 1.2.

3.2. **The case k=4.** If n is coprime to 3, we may use the same identity as for $k = 3$ to deduce that there is no solution to (5). If $3 \mid n$, then $\{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ gives an equation of type (18) with $D = 2$ (if Π is odd), and one of the form (16) with $p = 3$ (if Π is even). In either case, we infer from Proposition 3.1 that equation (5) has no solution.

3.3. **The case k=5.** Considering the product of the first or the last four terms of Π, according as $3 \mid n$, or not, we may reduce this to the preceding case and reach the desired conclusion.

3.4. **The case k=6.** If $k = 6$ and 5 fails to divide n, then we may apply what we have for the case $k = 4$ to the product of the first, middle or last four terms of Π, to obtain that there is no solution to (5). Similarly, if $3 \nmid n(n + 5d)$, the middle four terms lead to a contradiction. Thus we may suppose that $5 \mid n$, and, by symmetry, that also $3 \mid n$. Considering the identity $\{0, 1, 4, 5\}$ (if Π is odd) or $\{0, 2, 3, 5\}$ (if Π is even), we obtain an equation of the shape (23) with $p = 5$. We can thus apply Proposition 3.1 to conclude that (5) has no solution with $k = 6$ and $l \geq 7$ prime.

3.5. **The case k=7.** Next, let $k = 7$. If $5 \nmid n(n + d)$, then we may apply $\{1, 2, 4, 5\}$ (if $3 \mid n$) or $\{0, 3, 3, 6\}$ (if $3 \nmid n$). These lead to equations of type (15). Next, suppose that $5 \mid n(n + d)$; by symmetry, we may assume $5 \mid n$. Suppose first that $6 \mid \Pi$, and consider the identity $\{0, 2, 3, 5\}$. If $3 \mid n + d$, we are led to an equation of the shape (16) or

(17), with $p = 5$. On the other hand, if $3 \mid n(n + 2d)$, then the same identity induces an equation of the form (23), again with $p = 5$.

Assume now that $6 \nmid \Pi$, and consider $\{0, 1, 4, 5\}$. If $\gcd(\Pi, 6) = 3$, this identity gives equation (23) with $p = 5$. If, however, $\gcd(\Pi, 6) = 2$, then the same identity leads either to (16) with $p = 5$ or to (18), with $D = 2$. Finally, if $\gcd(\Pi, 6) = 1$, then again employing the identity $\{0, 1, 4, 5\}$, we find a solution to (15) with $\alpha = \beta = 0$. In all cases, we conclude from Proposition 3.1 that (5) has no solution, in the situation under consideration.

3.6. **A diversion.** In case $k \geq 8$, in a number of instances, Proposition 3.1 enables us to prove our statement only for $l \geq 11$ prime. We are thus forced to deal with the exponent $l = 7$ separately. As we shall observe, in each case where we encounter difficulties for $l = 7$, there are precisely two distinct factors in Π which are divisible by 7. By our assumptions, we have that $7 \mid \nu_7(\Pi)$ where, here and henceforth, we write $\nu_p(m)$ for the largest integer t such that p^t divides a nonzero integer m. It follows that one of these two factors is necessarily divisible by 7^2. We will use the following argument to finish the proof in this case.

Choose three factors $n+qd$, $n+rd$ and $n+sd$ of Π, such that one of them, $n+qd$ say, is divisible by 7^2, but 7 fails to divide $(n+rd)(n+sd)$. The identity $[q, r, s]$ thus yields

$$\lambda_r b_r y_r^7 \equiv \lambda_s b_s y_s^7 \pmod{7^2},$$

whence, upon taking sixth powers, it follows that

$$u^6 \equiv v^6 \pmod{7^2}, \tag{27}$$

where $u = \lambda_r b_r$ and $v = \lambda_s b_s$. If we choose $n + qd$, $n + rd$ and $n + sd$ appropriately, then we can use the fact that, for $a \equiv uv^{-1} \pmod{7^2}$,

$$a^6 \equiv 1 \pmod{7^2} \Longleftrightarrow a \equiv \pm 1, \pm 18, \pm 19 \pmod{7^2} \tag{28}$$

to obtain a contradiction, thereby verifying that (5) has no solution in the case in question.

3.7. **The case k=8.** Let us return to our proof. Suppose $k = 8$. If $7 \nmid n$, then we may reduce to the preceding case by considering the first or last seven terms of Π. Suppose, then, that $7 \mid n$. Notice that if $\gcd(\Pi, 15) = 1$, then we may apply our results with $k = 6$ to the middle six terms of Π to conclude that (5) has no solution. If $5 \nmid \Pi$, it therefore follows that $3 \mid \Pi$. If $3 \mid n$ or $3 \mid n + d$, using $\{1, 2, 4, 5\}$ or $\{2, 3, 5, 6\}$ respectively, we are led to an equation of the shape (15) with $\beta = 1$, contradicting Proposition 3.1. If $3 \mid n + 2d$, then the identity

$\{0, 1, 6, 7\}$ gives rise to an equation of the form (18) with $D = 6$, if Π is odd, and of the form

$$x^l + 2^\alpha y^l = 3z^2, \tag{29}$$

if Π is even. We may apply Proposition 3.1 again, unless $\alpha = 1$, i.e. unless $\nu_2(n + id) = 2$ for one of $i = 0, 1, 6, 7$. If this last condition occurs, it follows that $\nu_2(n + jd) \geq 3$ for one of $j = 2, 3, 4, 5$. For this j, the identity $\{j - 1, j, j, j + 1\}$ leads to an equation of the form (21) with $p = 3$. By Proposition 3.1, we infer that (5) has no solution in this case.

We may thus suppose that $5 \mid \Pi$. If $3 \nmid \Pi$, then we may apply our results obtained for $k = 3$ to $\Pi(i, i + 1, i + 2)$ with an appropriate $i = 1, 3$ or 4 to conclude that there is no solution in this case. We may therefore assume that $15 \mid \Pi$. Further, if $5 \mid (n + 3d)(n + 4d)$, we can argue as previously to obtain a contradiction. Hence we may suppose that $5 \mid n(n + d)(n + 2d)$. Assume first that $5 \mid n + d$. If Π is odd, then the identity $\{1, 2, 5, 6\}$ leads to (23) with $p = 5$ and so, via Proposition 3.1, a contradiction. If Π is even, then we consider the identity $\{1, 3, 4, 6\}$. If $3 \mid n + 2d$, we are led to an equation of the form (17) with $p = 5$. On the other hand, if $3 \mid n(n + d)$, then we find a nontrivial solution to (23) with $p = 5$. In either case, we contradict Proposition 3.1.

To complete the proof of Theorem 1.2, in case $k = 8$, we may thus, by symmetry, suppose that $5 \mid n$. We divide our proof into two parts. First suppose that $l \geq 11$ prime.

We begin with the case where $3 \mid n$. Necessarily one of $n, n + 3d$ or $n+6d$ is divisible by 9. If $9 \mid n$, then $\{1, 3, 4, 6\}$ gives rise to an equation of the form (18) with $D = 2$, at least provided Π is odd. When Π is even, the identity $\{0, 2, 5, 7\}$ yields (24) and hence a contradiction. If $9 \mid n + 3d$, $\{0, 1, 6, 7\}$ leads to (20), if Π is odd. If Π is even, from the same identity we have (24). By Proposition 3.1, in each case, we conclude that there is no solution to (5). Finally, if $9 \mid n+6d$, then the identity $\{0, 3, 4, 7\}$ provides either (20) or (24). In both cases, we have a contradiction, at least for $l \geq 11$ prime.

We argue in a similar fashion if $3 \mid n + d$ or $3 \mid n + 2d$. In the first of these cases, one of the identities $\{0, 3, 4, 7\}$, $\{0, 1, 6, 7\}$, $\{1, 3, 4, 6\}$ or $\{0, 2, 5, 7\}$, necessarily implies solutions to either (20) or (24). In the second, either $\{1, 3, 4, 6\}$ yields a solution to (18) with $D = 6$, or $\{0, 2, 5, 7\}$ provides one to equation (24). By Proposition 3.1, we thus derive a contradiction, in all cases, for $l \geq 11$ prime.

Now suppose that $l = 7$. We use the argument outlined in subsection 3.6; i.e. we appeal to identities of the form (11), corresponding to triples $[q, r, s]$.

Assume first that, together with $5 \mid n$, we have $3 \mid n$. Since, necessarily, either n or $n + 7d$ is divisible by 7^2, we distinguish two cases. Suppose first that $7^2 \mid n$, and consider the identity $[0, 2, 4]$. This implies a congruence of the form

$$\left(2^{\nu_2(b_2)+1}\right)^6 \equiv \left(2^{\nu_2(b_4)}\right)^6 \pmod{7^2},$$

whereby, from (28), $(\nu_2(b_2), \nu_2(b_4)) = (0, 1)$ or $(1, 2)$. From the identity $\{1, 2, 2, 3\}$, if $\nu_2(n + 2d) \geq 3$, we derive a nontrivial solution to (21) with $p = 3$, contrary to Proposition 3.1. We conclude, then, that $\nu_2(n + 2d) = 1$ (and hence $\nu_2(n + 6d) = 1$). It thus follows, from $[0, 3, 6]$, that

$$\left(3^{\nu_3(b_3)}\right)^6 \equiv \left(3^{\nu_3(b_6)}\right)^6 \pmod{7^2}$$

and so $\nu_3(b_3) = \nu_3(b_6) = 1$. The identity $[3, 4, 6]$ thus leads to a nontrivial solution to equation (26), with $n = 7$ and $\alpha = 1$, contradicting Proposition 3.2.

We next suppose that $7^2 \mid n + 7d$. If $2 \not| \Pi$, then $[1, 4, 7]$ immediately contradicts (28). If $2 \mid n$, arguing as previously, we find, from $[1, 3, 7]$, that $\nu_3(b_3) = 4$ and hence $[2, 3, 7]$ implies that $\nu_2(b_2) = 6$. If, however, $2 \mid n + d$, $[4, 6, 7]$ gives that $\nu_3(b_6) = 6$ whence, from $[3, 6, 7]$, $\nu_2(b_3) = 6$. In either case, $[3, 4, 7]$ now contradicts (28).

Assume next that $3 \mid n + d$. Suppose first that $7^2 \mid n$. The identity $[0, 2, 6]$ implies that

$$\left(3 \cdot 2^{\nu_2(b_2)}\right)^6 \equiv \left(2^{\nu_2(b_6)}\right)^6 \pmod{7^2}$$

and so

$$\nu_2(b_6) - \nu_2(b_2) \in \{-4, 3\}. \tag{30}$$

On the other hand, $[0, 3, 6]$ implies that $\nu_2(b_6) = 1$, contradicting (30) (since we have $\min\{\nu_2(n + 2d), \nu_2(n + 6d)\} \leq 2$).

Next, let $7^2 \mid n + 7d$. In this case, the identity $[2, 6, 7]$ plays the role of $[0, 2, 6]$ in the previous situation. We have that

$$\nu_2(b_2) - \nu_2(b_6) \in \{-4, 3\}$$

and hence, since $[3, 6, 7]$ implies that $\nu_2(b_6) = 5$, again a contradiction.

Finally, suppose that $3 \mid n + 2d$. As the situation with Π odd was covered previously for $l = 7$, we need distinguish only two cases. If $2 \mid n$, then $[0, 1, 3]$ (if $7^2 \mid n$) or $[1, 3, 7]$ (if $7^2 \mid n + 7d$) each contradict (28). If, however, $2 \mid n + d$, the identities $[0, 4, 6]$ and $[4, 6, 7]$ play a

like role. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2 for $k = 8$ and $l \geq 7$ prime.

3.8. **The case k=9.** Next, consider $k = 9$. Symmetry allows us to assume that $7 \mid n$, otherwise we can reduce to the preceding situation. We may also assume that $5 \mid n+3d$, or, by applying our results with $k = 8$ to the first eight terms of Π, again obtain a contradiction. If 3 fails to divide the product Π, then we may use what we have proved already for $k = 3$, via consideration of $\Pi(4, 5, 6)$, to deduce a contradiction. If $3 \mid n$, then $\{1, 2, 4, 5\}$ yields (15) with $\beta = 1$. Similarly, if $3 \mid n + d$, $\{3, 5, 6, 8\}$ provides (18) with $D = 6$, if Π is odd, and (17) with $p = 5$, if Π is even. Using Proposition 3.1, we obtain contradictions in either case. If $3 \mid n+2d$, then the identity $\{0, 1, 6, 7\}$ gives rise to an equation of the shape (18) with $D = 6$, if Π is odd, while $\{3, 5, 6, 8\}$ leads to an equation of the form (23) with $p = 5$, if Π is even. Applying Proposition 3.1 thus completes the proof of Theorem 1.2, in case $k = 9$ and $l \geq 7$ prime.

3.9. **The case k=10.** When $k = 10$, we reduce to the preceding case unless either $7 \mid n$, $5 \mid n+9d$, or $5 \mid n$, $7 \mid n+9d$. By symmetry, we may suppose that the first of these occurs. Then, if $3 \nmid \Pi$, we may apply our result with $k = 3$ for $\Pi(1, 2, 3)$ to obtain a contradiction. In case $3 \mid n(n+d)$, $\{2, 5, 5, 8\}$ yields (15) with $\beta = 0$, providing a contradiction by Proposition 3.1. We thus suppose that $3 \mid n + 2d$. To complete the proof of Theorem 1.2 in this case, we will utilize Proposition 3.2. Necessarily, precisely one of $n + 2d$, $n + 5d$ or $n + 8d$ is divisible by 9. If $9 \mid n + 2d$, the identity $[5, 6, 8]$ implies a nontrivial solution to (26), contradicting Proposition 3.2. Similarly, if $9 \mid n + 5d$ or $9 \mid n + 8d$, application of $[2, 3, 8]$ or $[2, 3, 5]$, respectively, leads to a contradiction. We conclude, then, that equation (5) has no solution, with $k = 10$ and, again, prime $l \geq 7$.

3.10. **The case k=11.** Finally, let $k = 11$. If $5 \nmid \Pi$, then we may apply the results from the preceding case to the first or last ten terms of Π, to obtain a contradiction. If $5 \mid \Pi$, we will, as when $k = 10$, repeatedly appeal to Proposition 3.2 to complete the proof. In what follows, we will assume, via symmetry, that either $7 \nmid \Pi$ or $7 \mid (n + 4d)(n + 5d)(n + 6d)$, or that $7 \mid n(n + d)$. The last case is the only one in which $7 \mid b_i$ for some $0 \leq i \leq 10$.

Let us begin by supposing that $5 \mid n$. From the identity $\{3, 6, 6, 9\}$, we deduce a solution to (15) unless $3 \mid n$. If $3 \mid n$, then 9 divides exactly one of $n, n + 3d$ or $n + 6d$. If $9 \mid n$, then $[3, 4, 6]$ thus implies a (nontrivial) solution to (26), contrary to Proposition 3.2. Similarly,

$[6,7,9]$ (if $7 \mid n+d$) and $[6,8,9]$ (in the remaining cases) lead to the same conclusion if $9 \mid n+3d$. Finally, if $9 \mid n+6d$, we may apply $[3,7,9]$ (if $7 \mid n+d$) and $[1,3,9]$ (in the remaining cases) to reach a contradiction.

In case $5 \mid n+id$ for $i = 1, 2$ or 4, we argue similarly. In the first of these cases, either $\{4,7,7,10\}$ (if $7 \mid n+d$) or $\{2,5,5,8\}$ (otherwise) implies that $3 \mid n+d$ (respectively, $3 \mid n+2d$). The identities $[4,5,7]$, $[7,9,10]$ and $[2,4,10]$ (respectively, $[2,3,5]$, $[5,7,8]$ and $[2,4,8]$) thus combine to contradict Proposition 3.2. If $5 \mid n+2d$, $\{3,6,6,9\}$ leads to the conclusion that $3 \mid n$, whereby $[3,4,6]$, $[3,5,9]$ and either $[0,4,6]$ (if $7 \mid n+d$) or $[6,8,9]$ (in all other cases) provide the desired conclusion. If $5 \mid n+4d$, we combine the identities $\{2,5,5,8\}$, $[2,3,5]$, $[5,6,8]$ and $[2,8,10]$ (if $7 \mid n$), or $\{0,3,3,6\}$, $[0,2,3]$, $[3,5,6]$ and $[0,2,6]$ (in all other cases) to obtain a contradiction.

It remains, then, to deal with the possibility that $5 \mid n+3d$. In this situation, we require a somewhat more involved argument. If n is not divisible by 7, then $\{4,7,7,10\}$, together with Proposition 3.1, implies that $3 \mid n+d$, whereby one of $[4,6,7]$, $[7,9,10]$ or $[2,4,10]$ contradicts Proposition 3.2. We may thus suppose that $7 \mid n$. In this case, $\{1,2,4,5\}$ yields a solution to (15) unless $3 \mid (n+d)(n+2d)$. If $3 \mid n+2d$, $\{0,1,6,7\}$ implies a solution to either (15) or (18) (with $D = 6$), unless

$$\max\{\nu_2(n+id) : i = 0,1,6,7\} = 2. \tag{31}$$

In the latter case, from $\{0,1,6,7\}$, we have a solution to (17) (with $p = 7$) and hence may conclude further that $l = 7$. If $7^2 \mid n$, the identity $[0,1,9]$ implies that

$$\left(9 \cdot 2^{\nu_2(b_1)}\right)^6 \equiv \left(2^{\nu_2(b_9)}\right)^6 \pmod{7^2},$$

contrary to (31). If $7^2 \mid n+7d$, then, from $[1,7,9]$,

$$\left(3 \cdot 2^{\nu_2(b_9)}\right)^6 \equiv \left(2^{\nu_2(b_1)}\right)^6 \pmod{7^2},$$

again contradicting (31).

Finally, if $3 \mid n+d$, from $\{2,5,6,9\}$, we deduce solutions to either (15) or (18) (with $D = 6$), unless

$$\max\{\nu_2(n+id) : i = 2,5,6,9\} = 3. \tag{32}$$

In this case, $\{0,1,6,7\}$ implies solutions to equation (24) and so, via Proposition 3.1, we may assume further that $l = 7$. If $7^2 \mid n$, $[0,2,6]$ gives

$$\left(3 \cdot 2^{\nu_2(b_2)}\right)^6 \equiv \left(2^{\nu_2(b_6)}\right)^6 \pmod{7^2},$$

contradicting (32). If $7^2 \mid n + 7d$, $[2, 6, 7]$ yields

$$\left(5 \cdot 2^{\nu_2(b_6)}\right)^6 \equiv \left(2^{\nu_2(b_2)}\right)^6 \pmod{7^2},$$

again contrary to (32). This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2, in case $l \geq 7$ is prime.

4. Proof of Theorem 1.2 in case $l = 2$

Having disposed of the possibility of equation (5) having solutions with l divisible by a large prime, we are now left with the task of dealing with the primes $l = 2, 3$ and 5. In this section, we treat the first of these cases. For $l = 2$ and fixed $k \geq 4$, a solution to (5) corresponds to a rational point on one of finitely many hyperelliptic curves. Our argument will essentially rely upon the fact that, with the given restrictions on b, the curves in question may often be shown to cover elliptic curves of rank 0 over $\mathbb{Q}$.

4.1. **The case k=4.** In case $k = 4$, we actually deduce a stronger result, which will prove useful for larger values of k :

Lemma 4.1. *The only solutions in coprime nonzero integers n and d, with $d > 0$, and nonzero integer y, to the Diophantine equations*

$$\Pi(0, 1, 2, 3) = by^2, \quad b \in \{\pm 1, \pm 2, \pm 3, 5, -6, 15, -30\} \tag{33}$$

$$\Pi(0, 1, 2, 4) = by^2, \quad b \in \{-1, \pm 2, \pm 3, 5, 6, \pm 10, -15, -30\} \tag{34}$$

$$\Pi(0, 1, 3, 4) = by^2, \quad b \in \{\pm 1, \pm 2, \pm 3, -5, 6, -15, 30\} \tag{35}$$

$$\Pi(0, 1, 2, 5) = by^2, \quad b \in \{-1, \pm 2, 3, \pm 5, 6, \pm 10, \pm 15\} \tag{36}$$

correspond to the identities

$$(-3) \cdot (-1) \cdot 1 \cdot 3 = 3^2 \quad \textit{and} \quad (-2) \cdot (-1) \cdot 1 \cdot 2 = 2^2.$$

We remark that, by symmetry, results for $\Pi(0, 1, 2, 4)$ and $\Pi(0, 1, 2, 5)$ lead to like statements for $\Pi(0, 2, 3, 4)$ and $\Pi(0, 3, 4, 5)$, respectively. Further, we may translate a claim for $\Pi(0, p, q, r)$ to one for $\Pi(i, p + i, q + i, r + i)$, for any $i \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Proof. Via the change of variables

$$X = pqb\left(\frac{rd + n}{n}\right), \quad Y = \frac{pqryb^2}{n^2},$$

if p, q and r are integers with

$$0 < p < q < r,$$

solutions in nonzero integers n, d, y to

$$\Pi(0, p, q, r) = by^2 \tag{37}$$

correspond to rational points (X, Y) on the elliptic curve

$$E \ : \ Y^2 = X(X + p(r-q)b)(X + q(r-p)b).$$

The lemma follows from the observation that, for the choices of p, q, r and b described above, the curves $E = E(p, q, r, b)$ have rank 0 over $\mathbb{Q}$ (together with a routine calculation to ensure that the torsion points yield only the stated solutions to (37)). For the given triples (p, q, r) and all other values of b dividing 30, the curves E have positive rank (and hence the equations (37) have, for these p, q, r and b, infinitely many solutions in nonzero coprime integers n and d). To verify these facts requires a routine computation in, say, **mwrank** (though **Magma** or other symbolic computation packages would be equally suitable). By way of example, if $(p, q, r) = (1, 2, 3)$, the elliptic curves corresponding to (37) are birational to the following curves (where we adopt the notation of Cremona [6]) :

b	Cremona	b	Cremona	b	Cremona	b	Cremona
1	$24A$	3	$144B$	6	$576I$	15	$3600K$
-1	$48A$	-3	$72A$	-6	$576D$	-15	$1800S$
2	$192C$	5	$600D$	10	$4800C$	30	$14400SSSS$
-2	$192D$	-5	$1200A$	-10	$4800BBB$	-30	$14400X$

If $b \in \{\pm 1, \pm 2, \pm 3, 5, -6, 15, -30\}$, then it is readily checked that the corresponding curves have rank 0. In all cases, except for $b = 1$, we have $E(\mathbb{Q})_{\text{tors}}$ isomorphic to $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$, where the torsion points map back to only the trivial solutions to (37), with $n/d = 0, -p, -q, -r$ and $y = 0$. If $b = 1$, then there are additional torsion points given by $(X, Y) = (-2, \pm 2)$ and $(2, \pm 6)$. The latter of these corresponds to a solution to (37) with $d = 0$, while the former yields $(n, d) = (-3, 2)$.

For the remaining triples (p, q, r), we argue similarly. In all cases, for the stated values of b, we find rank 0 curves with

$$E(\mathbb{Q})_{\text{tors}} \simeq \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z},$$

unless $(p, q, r, b) = (1, 3, 4, 1)$, in which case

$$E(\mathbb{Q}) \simeq \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}.$$

The additional torsion points, on this model of Cremona's 48A, correspond to, again, a trivial solution to (5), and to the case $(n, d) = (-2, 1)$. □

4.2. **The case k=5.** Next, let $k = 5$. By the above results for equation (33), if we write $S(m)$ for the square-free integer of maximum modulus dividing m, it follows, recalling (10), that

$$S(b_0b_1b_2b_3) = S(b_1b_2b_3b_4) = 6.$$

Multiplying these two terms together, we conclude that $S(b_0b_4) = 1$ and so, since $d > 0$ implies that the sequence $\mathrm{sign}(b_i)$ is nondecreasing in i, necessarily the b_i are all of the same sign. On the other hand, Lemma 4.1, as applied to (35), leads to the conclusion that $S(b_0b_1b_3b_4) = -6$, a contradiction.

4.3. **The case k=6.** The great majority of our work, if $l = 2$, is devoted to the situation when $k = 6$. The easy part of this case is the following

Lemma 4.2. *The Diophantine equation*

$$\Pi(0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5) = by^2, \quad b \in \{1, \pm 2, \pm 3, -5, -6, \pm 10, 15, 30\} \tag{38}$$

has no solutions in coprime nonzero integers n and d, with $d > 0$ and nonzero integer y.

Proof. Writing

$$Y = \frac{b^2y}{d^3} \text{ and } X = \frac{bn(n + 5d)}{d^2},$$

we have that the hyperelliptic curves defined by (38) cover elliptic curves $E/\mathbb{Q}$ of the form

$$E \ : \ Y^2 = X(X + 4b)(X + 6b).$$

For the values of b under consideration, these curves have rank 0 over $\mathbb{Q}$ and

$$E(\mathbb{Q})_{\mathrm{tors}} \simeq \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z},$$

where, again, these torsion points correspond precisely to the trivial solutions to (38). □

To complete the proof of Theorem 1.2 in case $k = 6$ and $l = 2$, it remains to deal with the values

$$b \in \{-30, -15, -1, 5, 6\}.$$

As it transpires, in all cases except for $b = 5$, we may apply Lemma 4.1 to show that the hyperelliptic curve defined by $\Pi_6 = by^2$ covers a rank 0 elliptic curve over $\mathbb{Q}$. We will thus, for the time being, suppose that $b \neq 5$.

If $b = 6$, then we necessarily have that 5 does not divide $b_1b_2b_3b_4$ and so, applying Lemma 4.1, $S(b_1b_2b_3b_4) = 6$. Since $\Pi_6 = 6y^2$, it follows

that $S(b_0b_5) = 1$ and hence that one of $S(b_0b_1b_2b_5)$ or $S(b_0b_3b_4b_5)$ is 3 or 6. This, however, contradicts our results on equation (36).

Let us next suppose that $b \in \{-30, -15, -1\}$. If 5 fails to divide any of the b_i, then applying our results on equation (33), we have that

$$S(b_ib_{i+1}b_{i+2}b_{i+3}) = 6,$$

for $i = 0, 1$ and 2. This implies that $S(b_0b_4) = S(b_1b_5) = 1$ and so $b > 0$, a contradiction. We thus have that $5 \mid b_i$ for some $0 \leq i \leq 4$. In case $b = -1$, it follows that $5 \mid b_0$ and $5 \mid b_5$, whereby, from Lemma 4.1, either $(n, d) = (-5, 2)$ or $S(b_1b_2b_3b_4) = 6$. In the latter case, since $b < 0$, we may assume that either $n < 0$ and $n + d > 0$, or $n + 2d < 0$ and $n + 3d > 0$. In both cases, we have that $b_0b_1b_2b_4$ is negative and divisible by 5, and so, by Lemma 4.1 as applied to (34), we have $S(b_0b_1b_2b_4) = -5$ which yields $S(b_0b_3) = -30$, whence $3 \mid b_3$ and $3 \nmid b_0$. It follows that $3 \mid b$, contradicting $b = -1$.

Next assume that $b \in \{-15, -30\}$. By symmetry, we may suppose that $5 \mid b_0b_1b_2$ (and consequently, $5 \nmid b_3b_4b_5$). We start with the case where $5 \mid b_0$. By Lemma 4.1 (equation (36)),

$$S(b_0b_1b_2b_5) = \pm 30 \quad \text{and} \quad S(b_0b_3b_4b_5) = \pm 30.$$

Thus $S(b_1b_2b_3b_4) = \pm 1$ which, by Lemma 4.1, gives a contradiction. If $5 \mid b_1$ then Lemma 4.1 leads to the conclusion that $S(b_2b_3b_4b_5) = 6$, whence, from the fact that $b < 0$, $n < 0$ and $n + d > 0$. From (34), we thus have $S(b_0b_2b_3b_4) = -6$, $S(b_0b_1b_2b_4) = -5$ and so $S(b_0b_5) = -1$, whereby $b_0 = -1$, $b_5 = 1$. From Lemma 4.1, as applied to (33), we thus have $b = -30$, $S(b_1b_2b_3b_4) = 30$. It follows, then, that $b_1 = 5$ and so $S(b_2b_4) = 1$ and $b_3 = 6$, whence

$$S(b_0b_1b_2b_3) = -30,$$

contradicting Lemma 4.1. If $5 \mid b_2$ then by Lemma 4.1, as applied to (35), $S(b_0b_1b_3b_4) = -6$. As $n+5d > 0$, we have $n+2d > 0$. Hence $n < 0$ and $n+d > 0$. By Lemma 4.1, we have $S(b_0b_1b_2b_4) = S(b_0b_2b_3b_4) = -5$. Thus $3 \nmid b_0b_1b_3b_4$, which contradicts $S(b_0b_1b_3b_4) = -6$.

Finally, let $b = 5$. In this case, the equation $\Pi_6 = by^2$ defines a hyperelliptic curve of genus 2, which fails to cover a rank 0 elliptic curve over $\mathbb{Q}$. Further, since the Jacobian of this curve has Mordell-Weil rank 2, traditional Chabauty methods do not suffice to find the rational points in question. To deal with this situation, we will apply recent techniques of Bruin and Flynn [4] (cf. [2] and [3]). For our purposes, it will be preferable to consider the isomorphic curve

$$C \ : \ Y^2 = (X - 60)(X - 30)(X + 20)(X + 30)(X + 60).$$

To see how this is obtained from a solution to $\Pi_6 = 5y^2$, write $x = n/d$ and $t = 5y/d^3$, so that, after homogenizing,

$$t^2z^4 = 5x^6 + 75x^5z + 425x^4z^2 + 1125x^3z^3 + 1370x^2z^4 + 600xz^5.$$

The change of variables

$$x = -2X + 60Z, \;\; t = -60Y, \;\; z = X$$

thus leads to

$$\begin{aligned} Y^2Z^3 &= X^5 + 20X^4Z - 4500X^3Z^2 - 90000X^2Z^3 \\ &\quad +3240000XZ^4 + 64800000Z^5 \end{aligned}$$

or, dehomogenizing, the curve C.

Proposition 4.3. *The only rational solutions (X, Y) to the equation*

$$Y^2 = (X - 60)(X - 30)(X + 20)(X + 30)(X + 60)$$

are with

$$X \in \{-60, -30, -20, -15, 20, 30, 60\}.$$

Proof. The authors are grateful to Professor Nils Bruin for the following argument. Begin by observing that a rational point on C gives rise to a rational solution to the system of equations

$$\begin{aligned} X - 60 &= \delta_1 Y_1^2 \\ X - 30 &= \delta_2 Y_2^2 \\ X + 20 &= \delta_3 Y_3^2 \\ X + 30 &= \delta_4 Y_4^2 \\ X + 60 &= \delta_5 Y_5^2, \end{aligned}$$

for some 5-tuple $(\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_5) \in \mathbb{Q}^*/\mathbb{Q}^{*2}$. In fact, since the roots of the linear factors are all distinct modulo a prime p outside the set $\{2, 3, 5\}$, it can easily be shown that these $\{\delta_i\}$ can be taken to be $\{2, 3, 5\}$-units. A straightforward 2-descent on $\mathrm{Jac}_C(\mathbb{Q})$ (see e.g. [5], [36]) shows that the $\{\delta_i\}$ lie in a group isomorphic to $(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^6$, generated by

$$\begin{aligned} &< -3, -5, 5, 15, 5 >, < 3, 1, -1, -15, 5 >, < 2, 5, 1, 5, 2 >, \\ &< 3, 6, 1, 15, 30 >, < 15, 15, 10, 3, 30 >, < 3, 1, 5, 30, 2 > . \end{aligned}$$

This group corresponds to the 2-Selmer group of the Jacobian of our curve. Since the torsion part of the Mordell-Weil group of $\mathrm{Jac}_C(\mathbb{Q})$ is generated by

$$\{[(60, 0) - \infty], [(30, 0) - \infty], [(-20, 0) - \infty], [(-30, 0) - \infty]\},$$

this implies, upon noting the (independent) divisors $[(-15, 3375) - \infty]$ and $[(20, 8000) - \infty]$, of infinite order, that the rank of $\mathrm{Jac}_C(\mathbb{Q})$ is 2. As mentioned earlier, this fact ensures that a direct application of

traditional Chabauty methods is not a viable option. To proceed, we will consider covers of C, as in [2], [3].

Note that if the system above has a solution, then this gives rise to a solution to, say,

$$(X-60)(X-30)(X+20) = \delta_1\delta_2\delta_3(Y_1Y_2Y_3)^2.$$

Since this equation describes a genus 1 curve and there are obvious rational points on it, it models an elliptic curve, the Mordell-Weil rank of which we may bound via 2-descent. If this rank turns out to be zero, then we automatically find only a finite number of candidate solutions to our original system.

Applying this argument with all choices of 3 or 4 equations from the above system enables us to greatly reduce the possibilities for the 5-tuples $\{\delta_i\}$. We readily verify that, for the choices of $\{\delta_i\}$ which lead to coverings of rank 0 elliptic curves over $\mathbb{Q}$, the corresponding torsion points produce no points on C other than those with $Y = 0$. Carrying out this procedure for all 64 potential $\{\delta_i\}$, there remain only 2 possible 5-tuples that lead, in all cases, to elliptic curves of positive rank :

$$(-3,-5,5,15,5),\ (-10,-10,10,2,5).$$

They correspond to the solutions $(X,Y) = (-15, 3375)$ and $(X,Y) = (20, 8000)$, respectively. This is to be expected : these are non-trivial solutions and, on each of the covered genus 1 curves, they have no particular reason to map to a torsion point. Indeed, in each case, they correspond to points of infinite order.

Note also that the original equation has an extra automorphism given by $(X,Y) \mapsto (6-X,Y)$ and that these two rational points are interchanged under this automorphism. Therefore, if we show that the values $(X,Y) = (-15, \pm 3375)$ are the only solutions corresponding to the 5-tuple $(-3,-5,5,15,5)$, then we may reach a similar conclusion, via symmetry, for $(X,Y) = (20, \pm 8000)$ and $(-10,-10,10,2,5)$. We will therefore specialize the δ_i to $(-3,-5,5,15,5)$.

From consideration of the system of equations

$$\begin{aligned} -3X+180 &= Z_1^2 \\ -5X+150 &= Z_2^2 \\ 5X+100 &= Z_3^2 \\ 15X+450 &= Z_4^2 \\ 5X+300 &= Z_5^2, \end{aligned}$$

let us therefore adopt the strategy suggested in [4] and analyze the fibre product of the following two covers of the X-line :

$$(-5X+150)(5X+100)(15X+450) = (Z_1Z_2Z_3)^2 \tag{39}$$

and

$$5X + 300 = Z_5^2.$$

This gives us a $V4$-extension of the X-line. The fibre-product D is a new curve of genus 2 with Jacobian isogenous to the product of the elliptic curve (39) and the quadratic subcover

$$(-5X + 150)(5X + 100)(15X + 450)(5X + 300) = (Z_1Z_2Z_3Z_5)^2$$

(each of these genus 1 curves has rank 1). Substituting

$$X = \left(Z_5^2 - 300\right)/5$$

into (39), we obtain a curve isomorphic to

$$D \ : \ -(u^2 - 2)(9u^2 - 8)(3u^2 - 2) = v^2.$$

Arguing as previously, a rational point (u, v) on this curve gives rise to a solution of the system of equations

$$\begin{aligned} 3u^2 - 2 &= v_1^2 \\ 9u^2 - 8 &= v_2^2 \\ u^2 - 2 &= -v_3^2. \end{aligned}$$

Again, we might, via products of pairs of these equations, be led to consider elliptic covers E over $\mathbb{Q}$. The presence of the points $(\pm 1, \pm 1)$ on each of these curves, however, suggests that they will have positive rank and, indeed, it is easy to verify that they do. On the other hand, by factoring the above equations, we may obtain elliptic curves over a suitable ground field extension. This is a useful observation at this stage because, in such a situation, a rank 1 curve may still permit a successful Chabauty-argument.

Let us choose α with $\alpha^2 = 2$ and set $K = \mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$. Consider the equations

$$Q(u) = (u - \alpha)(3u + 2\alpha)$$

and

$$R(u) = -9u^4 - 3\alpha u^3 + 18u^2 + 2\alpha u - 8.$$

Since $\mathrm{Norm}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(Q) = (u^2-2)(9u^2-8)$, if, for $u \in \mathbb{Q}$, there are $v_1, v_2, \delta \in K^*$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} Q(u) &= \delta v_1^2 \\ R(u) &= \delta v_2^2, \end{aligned}$$

we must have that $-\mathrm{Norm}_{K/\mathbb{Q}}(\delta)$ is a square in $\mathbb{Q}$. Furthermore, it is clear that δ can be taken to be a square-free $\{2, 3, 5\}$-unit in K^* (or perhaps, to be more precise, we should say a $\{\alpha, 3, 5\}$-unit).

Applying local arguments, restricting u to values in $\mathbb{Q}_p$ and seeing if there are $v_1, v_2 \in K \otimes \mathbb{Q}_p$ satisfying the equations above, we find that, in fact, we can restrict attention to either $\delta = -\alpha - 1$ or $\delta = \alpha + 1$.

These are readily seen to correspond to the points $(1, \pm 1)$ and $(-1, \pm 1)$, respectively. Again, the automorphism $(u, v) \mapsto (-u, v)$ interchanges these points. It thus suffices, by symmetry, to consider only the case where $\delta = \alpha + 1$.

We find, after a little work, that the curve defined by the equation $R(u) = (\alpha + 1)v_2^2$ is isomorphic to

$$E \quad : \quad y^2 = x^3 + 18(1 - \alpha)x^2 + 4(3 - 2\alpha)x.$$

In these coordinates,

$$u = \frac{(2\alpha - 3)x + (-2\alpha - 2)y - 4\alpha - 19}{7x + (2\alpha + 2)y + (-15\alpha - 36)/2}.$$

The group $E(K) = \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ is generated (up to a finite index, prime to $2 \cdot 41$) by $g = (4\alpha + 6, 10\alpha + 10)$ and $T = (0, 0)$. A standard Chabauty-argument using the prime 41 shows that 0 and $-2g$ are the only two points in $E(K)$ that yield a rational value for u, namely -1. Tracing this backwards, we find that this corresponds to the point $(X, Y) = (-15, \pm 3375)$, as claimed. This completes the proof of Proposition 4.3. □

With this proposition in place, it is a simple matter to check that the equation $\Pi_6 = 5y^2$ has only the nontrivial solutions $n \in \{-1, 6\}$ and $d = 1$, concluding the proof of Theorem 1.2 for $(k, l) = (6, 2)$.

4.4. **The cases k = 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11.** To treat the cases $7 \leq k \leq 11$, it is enough to observe that either there exists an i with $0 \leq i \leq k - 8$ for which $7 \mid n + id$ (so that 7 divides precisely two terms of the product Π), or that no such i exists (whence, 2 divides $\nu_7(n + jd)$ for $0 \leq j \leq k - 1$). In the former case, we may apply our result for $k = 6$ to the product $\Pi(i + 1, i + 2, \ldots, i + 6)$ to reach the desired conclusion. In the latter, considering $\Pi(0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5)$ suffices. In particular, we find only the solutions corresponding to $(n, d) = (-7, 2)$ (with $k = 8$ or 9) and to $(n, d) = (-9, 2)$ (with $k = 9$ or 10). This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2, in case $l = 2$.

5. Proof of Theorem 1.2 in case $l = 3$

If $l = 3$, our arguments will depend upon choosing integers q, r and s such that the identity (11) leads to a Diophantine equation of the shape (12) which may be treated via traditional approaches (local or otherwise). The key result we will need on such equations is the following

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose that A, B are coprime positive integers with $A \leq B$ and that α, β are integers with $0 \leq \alpha, \beta \leq 2$. Then, if the Diophantine equation*

$$AX^3 + BY^3 = Z^3, \quad AB = 2^\alpha 3^\beta \tag{40}$$

has solutions in coprime nonzero integers X, Y and Z, for which $XYZ \neq \pm 1$, it follows that

$$(A, B) \in \{(2,3), (3,4), (1,6), (1,9), (1,12)\}.$$

Proof. If $A = 1$, solutions to equation (40) correspond to rational points on elliptic curves of the shape

$$y^2 = x^3 - 432B^2,$$

while $(A, B) = (2, 3)$ and $(3, 4)$ lead to

$$y^2 = x^3 - 343 \quad \text{and} \quad y^2 = x^3 - 972,$$

respectively. In case $A = 1$ and $B \in \{1, 2, 3, 18, 36\}$, these have rank 0 over $\mathbb{Q}$ (see e.g. Selmer [31]) and hence the result obtains (after tracing back torsion points). The equations

$$2X^3 + 9Y^3 = Z^3 \quad \text{and} \quad 4X^3 + 9Y^3 = Z^3$$

have no solutions in coprime nonzero integers, modulo 9. For the remaining pairs (A, B), the corresponding elliptic curves $E/\mathbb{Q}$ have positive rank (and hence the related equations (40) have, in each case, infinitely many nontrivial solutions). □

For $3 \leq k \leq 5$ and $l = 3$, we note that Theorem 1.2 appears to be a consequence of Theorems 8 and 9 of [15]. Unfortunately, the proofs of these theorems require modification as they depend upon an incorrect result (Lemma 6 of [15]).

5.1. **The case k=3.** Let us begin by supposing that $k = 3$. In this case, the identity $[0, 1, 2]$ immediately implies an equation of the shape

$$X^3 + 2^t Y^3 = Z^3$$

for some nonnegative integer t, and hence, from Lemma 5.1, that $XYZ = \pm 1$. Tracing these values backwards leads to the solutions

$$(n, d) = (-4, 3), (-2, 3)$$

to equation (5).

5.2. **The case k=4.** Similarly, if $k = 4$ and $3 \not| \Pi$, $[0, 1, 2]$ ensures that (5) has no solutions. By symmetry, we assume, then, that $k = 4$ and $3 \mid n(n + d)$. If $\nu_3(n) = 1$, then either $[0, 1, 2]$ or $[0, 2, 3]$ leads to ternary equations to which we may apply Lemma 5.1. A little work leads to the solutions

$$(n, d) = (-6, 5), (-3, 2)$$

to (5). If, however, $\nu_3(n + 3d) = 1$, $[1, 2, 3]$ and $[0, 1, 3]$ yield the additional solution $(n, d) = (-9, 5)$. Supposing next that $3 \mid n + d$ and applying the identity $[0, 2, 3]$, we conclude from Lemma 5.1 that either $(n, d) = (-4, 1)$ (which, via symmetry, implies the corresponding solution $(n, d) = (1, 1)$ with $3 \mid n+2d$), or that $\nu_2(n+2d) \equiv 2 \pmod 3$. In this latter case, $[0, 1, 3]$ implies, with Lemma 5.1, that there are no further solutions to (5).

5.3. **The case k=5.** If $k = 5$, dividing Π by one of n or $n + 4d$ necessarily reduces the problem to the case $k = 4$. A short calculation shows that no new solutions to (5) accrue. We may thus suppose that $k \geq 6$. For these values, we will have to argue somewhat more carefully.

5.4. **The case k=6.** Let $k = 6$. If $5 \not| (n + 2d)(n + 3d)$, then we may apply our result for $k = 4$ to $\Pi(i, i+1, i+2, i+3)$ for one of $i = 0, 1$ or 2, to conclude that the only solutions to (5), in this case, are given by

$$(n, d) = (-5, 2), (-6, 1) \text{ and } (1, 1).$$

By symmetry, we may suppose that $5 \mid n + 2d$. Further, if $3 \not| \Pi$, we may apply our prior result for $k = 3$ to $\Pi(3, 4, 5)$ to reach the desired conclusion. We may thus assume that $3 \mid \Pi$. There are three cases to consider, according as to whether $3 \mid n$, $3 \mid n + d$ or $3 \mid n + 2d$.

If $3 \mid n$, then identity $[1, 4, 5]$ leads to an equation of the form (40) with $(A, B) \in \{(1, 6), (1, 9), (1, 12)\}$ only if $8 \mid n + 5d$. In this case, $[0, 1, 3]$ implies an equation of the form

$$2X^3 + 3^t Y^3 = Z^3 \tag{41}$$

and hence a contradiction. Similarly, if $3 \mid n + 2d$, $[0, 1, 3]$, together with Lemma 5.1, leads to the conclusion that $\nu_2(n + d) \equiv 2 \pmod 3$, whereby, from $[0, 1, 4]$, we obtain a nontrivial solution to equation (41) with $t = 1$, again contradicting Lemma 5.1.

The final case to consider (when $k = 6$) is with $3 \mid n + d$. We will split this into two subcases, according as to whether $\nu_3(n + d) = 1$ or $\nu_3(n+4d) = 1$. In the first of these, $[1, 3, 5]$ and Lemma 5.1 imply that $3 \mid \nu_2(n + d)$ (and that $2 \mid n + d$). The identity $[0, 1, 3]$ thus leads to

$$X^3 + 36\, Y^3 = Z^3,$$

contradicting Lemma 5.1. If $\nu_3(n+4d)=1$, from [3, 4, 5] and Lemma 5.1, we reach the desired conclusion if $2 \mid n+d$ or if 3 fails to divide $\nu_2(n+4d)$. Otherwise, [1, 3, 4] leads to an equation of the form (41) which, with Lemma 5.1, completes the proof, in case $l=3, k=6$.

5.5. **The cases k = 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11.** For the cases $7 \le k \le 11$, we argue exactly as when $l=2$; in all situations, consideration of one of $\Pi(i+1, i+2, \ldots, i+6)$ suffices to reduce the problem to the previously treated $k=6$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2 when $l=3$.

6. Proof of Theorem 1.2 in case $l = 5$

We begin this section by proving a pair of results on ternary Diophantine equations of signature $(5, 5, 5)$. The first follows from a variety of classical arguments. The second is a consequence of work of a much more recent vintage, due to Kraus [17].

Proposition 6.1. *Let C be a positive integer with $P(C) \le 5$. If the Diophantine equation*

$$X^5 + Y^5 = CZ^5 \tag{42}$$

has solutions in nonzero coprime integers X, Y and Z, then $C = 2$ and $X = Y = \pm 1$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may suppose $C = 2^\alpha 3^\beta 5^\gamma$ with $0 \le \alpha, \beta, \gamma \le 4$. By old results of Dirichlet, Lebesgue (see e.g. [10], p. 735, item 20 and p. 738, item 37), and P. Dénes (c.f. [9]), for (42) to have a solution in coprime nonzero integers with $XYZ \ne \pm 1$, we require $C > 2$ and

$$C^4 \equiv 1 \pmod{5^2}.$$

This implies that $\gamma = 0$ and

$$(\alpha, \beta) \in \{(1,2), (2,4), (3,1), (4,3)\}.$$

From the fact that both 2 and 3 are primitive roots modulo 5, and the exponent 5 is a regular prime, a classical result of E. Maillet (see e.g. [10], p. 759, item 167) leads to the conclusion that $5 \not| Z$. Since, for each remaining value of C, we have

$$C^4 \not\equiv 2^4 \pmod{5^2},$$

Theorem 1 of Győry [12] thus implies that

$$r^4 \equiv 1 \pmod{5^2},$$

for every divisor r of C. The parity of the remaining C (whereby we are free to choose $r = 2$ above) provides an immediate contradiction and hence the desired result. □

Proposition 6.2. *Let A and B be coprime positive integers with $AB = 2^\alpha 3^\beta$ for nonnegative integers α and β with $\alpha \geq 4$. Then the Diophantine equation*

$$AX^5 + BY^5 = Z^5 \tag{43}$$

has no solutions in coprime nonzero integers X, Y and Z.

Proof. This is a result of Kraus [17] and is essentially a consequence of the fact that there are no weight 2, level N cuspidal newforms of trivial character, for N dividing 6. □

We suppose throughout this section that $l = 5$. In what follows, our arguments will typically rely upon the fact that a careful choice of identity $[q, r, s]$ leads to an equation of the form (42). In other cases, such identities imply equations which may be proven insoluble modulo 11 or 25. We shall employ the trivial observation that, for $k \leq 11$, at most one factor of Π_k is divisible by 11.

6.1. **The case k=3.** From the identity $[0, 1, 2]$, we deduce a solution in nonzero integers to equation (42), with $P(C) \leq 2$ (and hence $C = 2$). A short calculation leads to the conclusion that $(n, d) = (-2, 3)$ or $(-4, 3)$.

6.2. **The case k=4.** The following lemma is a more precise version of Theorem 1.2 in case $k = 4$. It will prove useful in analyzing larger values of k.

Lemma 6.3. *Suppose that there exist nonzero integers n, d, y and b with b, d positive and* $\gcd(n, d) = 1$*, satisfying*

$$\Pi_4 = by^5 \ \text{ with } \ P(b) \leq 3. \tag{44}$$

Then either $(n, d) = (-3, 2)$ or, up to symmetry,

$$(b_0, b_1, b_2, b_3) = (4, 3, 2, 1) \text{ or } (9, 4, 1, 6). \tag{45}$$

It is likely that $(n, d) = (-9, 5), (-6, 5), (-4, 1), (-3, 2)$ and $(1, 1)$ are the only solutions of (44).

Proof. Let us suppose we have a solution to (44) in nonzero integers n, d, y and b, with $b, d > 0$ and $\gcd(n, d) = 1$. If 3 fails to divide the product $b_i b_{i+1} b_{i+2}$ for either $i = 0$ or $i = 1$, we may reduce immediately to the case $k = 3$. We may thus assume, via symmetry, that either $3 \mid b_0$ and $3 \mid b_3$, or that $3 \mid b_1$. In the first case, if $\nu_3(b_0 b_3) = 2$, the identity $[0, 1, 3]$ implies a nontrivial solution to an equation of the form $X^5 + Y^5 = 2^\alpha Z^5$ and hence, after a little work, a contradiction via Proposition 6.1. We may thus suppose, again by symmetry, that $9 \mid b_0$.

Further, unless $2 \mid n+d$, we may apply the same identity $[0,1,3]$ to deduce a nontrivial solution to

$$X^5 + Y^5 = 2^\alpha 3^\beta Z^5, \tag{46}$$

contrary to Proposition 6.1. Combining the identities $[0,1,2]$ and $[0,2,3]$ with Proposition 6.2, we may assume that $\nu_2((n+d)(n+3d)) = 3$. If $\nu_2(n+d) = 1$, $[1,2,3]$ leads to a solution to (46) with $\alpha = \beta = 1$. If, on the other hand, $\nu_2(n+3d) = 1$, from the fact that

$$t^5 \equiv 0, \pm 1 \pmod{11}, \text{ for } t \in \mathbb{Z},$$

the identity $[1,2,3]$ implies that $\Pi(1,2,3)$ is not divisible by 11. It follows from $[0,1,3]$ that $\nu_3(n) = 2$ (whereby (b_0,b_1,b_2,b_3) is just $(9,4,1,6)$).

If, however, $3 \mid b_1$, $[0,1,2]$ and Proposition 6.1 imply that we may suppose $2 \mid n$, whereby, again combining $[1,2,3]$, $[0,1,3]$ and Proposition 6.2, we may assume that $\nu_2(n(n+2d)) = 3$. In case $\nu_2(n) = 1$, $[0,2,3]$ leads to a solution to (46) with $\beta = 1$, a contradiction. If $\nu_2(n) = 2$, the same identity $[0,2,3]$ implies that 11 fails to divide $n+2d$ and so, modulo 11, from $[0,1,2]$, we are able to conclude that $\nu_3(b_1) = 1$, whence

$$(b_0,b_1,b_2,b_3) = (4,3,2,1).$$

□

6.3. **The case k=5.** Let $k = 5$ and suppose that we have a nontrivial solution to (5). Then applying Lemma 6.3 to $\Pi(0,1,2,3)$ and $\Pi(1,2,3,4)$, it follows that either $n+id = -3$, $d = 2$ for $i = 0$ or 1 (which fails to yield a solution to (5)) or that both 4-tuples (b_0,b_1,b_2,b_3) and (b_1,b_2,b_3,b_4) are in the set :

$$\{(1,2,3,4),(4,3,2,1),(6,1,4,9),(9,4,1,6)\}.$$

Since this is readily seen to be impossible, we conclude that equation (5) has no solutions in this case.

6.4. **The case k=6.** As in case $l = 2$ or 3, most of our work in proving Theorem 1.2 is concentrated, if $l = 5$, in treating $k = 6$. Let us suppose we have a nontrivial solution to (5) with $P(b) \le 5$. If 5 fails to divide the product $b_0b_1b_2b_3b_4b_5$, then, omitting the factor $n+5d$ in Π_6, we reduce to the case $k = 5$ and hence find no new solutions.

By symmetry, it suffices to deal with the cases when $5 \mid n$, $5 \mid n+d$ or $5 \mid n+2d$. We consider them in turn.

6.4.1. $5 \mid n$. First assume that $5 \mid n$ and hence also $5 \mid n + 5d$. Then, applying Lemma 6.3 to $\Pi(1, 2, 3, 4)$, we infer that either $n + d = -3$, $d = 2$ (which gives the solution $(n, d) = (-5, 2)$), or we have, again up to symmetry,

$$(b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4) = (4, 3, 2, 1) \text{ or } (9, 4, 1, 6).$$

Consider the identity

$$3(n + d)(n + 4d) - 2(n + 2d)(n + 3d) = n(n + 5d). \tag{47}$$

If $(b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4) = (4, 3, 2, 1)$, (47) implies a nontrivial solution to (42), contradicting Proposition 6.1. If, however, $(b_1, b_2, b_3, b_4) = (9, 4, 1, 6)$, (47) leads to an equation of the form

$$3^4X^5 + 2^2Y^5 = 5^tZ^5$$

where $t \geq 2$ and $5 \nmid XY$. Working modulo 25 and taking 4th powers, we deduce the congruence

$$3^{16} \equiv 2^8 \pmod{5^2},$$

and hence a contradiction.

6.4.2. $5 \mid n + d$. Consider now the case when $5 \mid n + d$. We apply Lemma 6.3 to $\Pi(2, 3, 4, 5)$. It is clear that $n + 2d = -3$, $d = 2$ does not provide a further solution to (5). We thus have

$$(b_2, b_3, b_4, b_5) \in \{(4, 3, 2, 1), (1, 2, 3, 4), (9, 4, 1, 6), (6, 1, 4, 9)\}.$$

In the first of these cases, necessarily $b_0 = 2 \cdot 3^t$ for a nonnegative integer t. From the identity $[2, 3, 4]$, we find that

$$2y_2^5 + y_4^5 = 3y_3^5$$

and hence 11 fails to divide $y_2y_3y_4$. Similarly, $[1, 3, 4]$ yields the conclusion that y_1 is coprime to 11, whereby, from $[1, 2, 3]$ and its companion equation

$$5^{\nu_5(b_1)}y_1^5 + 3y_3^5 = 8y_2^5,$$

we may conclude not only that $\nu_5(b_1) = 1$ (so that $b_1 = 5$), but also

$$y_2^5 \equiv y_3^5 \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{11}.$$

Applying $[0, 2, 3]$, then, we obtain a solution to the equation

$$3^{\nu_3(b_0)-1}y_0^5 + y_3^5 = 2y_2^5, \tag{48}$$

and find, working modulo 11, that necessarily $\nu_3(b_0) = 1$. Applying Proposition 6.1 to (48), we have that $XYZ = \pm 1$. From this, we obtain the solution $(n, d) = (-6, 1)$ to (5) (together with the symmetrical solution $(1, 1)$).

If we have (b_2, b_3, b_4, b_5) equal to either $(1, 2, 3, 4)$ or $(9, 4, 1, 6)$, then the identities $[0, 1, 2]$ and $[0, 2, 4]$, respectively, lead to nontrivial solutions to (42), contradicting Proposition 6.1. Finally, if $(b_2, b_3, b_4, b_5) = (6, 1, 4, 9)$, then $[0, 1, 5]$ implies that

$$2^{\nu_2(b_0)+2} y_0^5 \equiv 9 y_5^5 \pmod{25}$$

and so, taking 4th powers, we conclude that $\nu_2(b_0) = 2$. This, together with $[0, 2, 4]$, contradicts Proposition 6.1.

6.4.3. $5 \mid n + 2d$. Finally, consider the case where $5 \mid b_2$. In light of the identity $\{0, 1, 3, 4\}$ and Proposition 3.1, we may suppose that $3 \mid n(n + d)$. First, assume that $3 \mid n$. The identity $[1, 3, 5]$ implies a nontrivial solution to (42) unless $4 \mid n + d$. Under this assumption, $[0, 3, 4]$ and Proposition 6.1 yield the conclusion that $\nu_3(n) \geq 2$, whence $\nu_3(n + 3d) = 1$ (and so $b_3 = 6$). From $[2, 3, 4]$, we deduce that

$$5^{\nu_5(b_2)} y_2^5 + y_4^5 = 12 y_3^5,$$

whereby, upon consideration modulo 5^2, $\nu_5(n+2d) = 1$. Analyzing the same equation, modulo 11, implies that $11 \mid y_2$. It follows, then, from the identity $[0, 2, 4]$, that

$$3^{\nu_3(b_0)} y_0^5 + y_4^5 = 10 y_2^5.$$

Modulo 11, we therefore have that $\nu_3(b_0) = 0$ and hence contradict Proposition 6.1.

The last case to consider in this subsection is when $5 \mid b_2$ and $3 \mid n+d$. From $[3, 4, 5]$ and Proposition 6.1, we may assume that $2 \mid n+d$, whence, applying a like argument with $[0, 1, 3]$, we necessarily have $\nu_2(n+d) = 1$. Identity $[0, 1, 4]$, again with Proposition 6.1, gives $\nu_3(n + 4d) \geq 2$ (so that $\nu_3(n + d) = 1$ and $b_1 = 6$). Applying $[0, 1, 2]$ thus leads to the equation

$$y_0^5 + 5^{\nu_5(b_2)} y_2^5 = 12 y_1^5.$$

Modulo 5^2 and 11, we again find that $\nu_5(b_2) = 1$ and that $11 \mid y_2$. To conclude, then, we apply the identity $[0, 2, 4]$ which yields

$$y_0^5 + 3^{\nu_3(b_4)} y_4^5 = 10 y_2^5.$$

This implies, modulo 11, that $\nu_3(b_4) = 0$ and so, via Proposition 6.1, a contradiction.

6.5. **The cases k = 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11.** Again, we argue as for $l = 2$ or 3, applying our results for $k = 6$ to one of $\Pi(i, i+1, \cdots, i+5)$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2.

7. Proofs of Theorem 1.5 and Corollary 1.6

Having dispatched Theorem 1.2, we will now present the proof of Theorem 1.5. the reason we proceed in this order is that the techniques introduced in this section will prove useful in the subsequent treatment of Theorem 1.4.

Proof of Theorem 1.5. If $k \leq 11$, Theorem 1.5 is an immediate consequence of Theorem 1.2 (without any conditions upon d). We thus assume that $k \geq 12$ and that $l \geq 2$ is prime. For the $\pi(k)$ prime values of $l \leq k$, we may apply Theorem 6 of [15] (a slight generalization of Corollary 2.1 of [7], itself a nice application of Falting's Theorem) to conclude that (5) has finitely many solutions as claimed. We may thus suppose that $l > k$.

Since $d \not\equiv 0 \pmod{D_k}$ (recall definition (7)), there exists a prime in the interval $[k/2, k)$ which is coprime to d and hence divides y. Define p to be the largest such prime. From (5), since $\gcd(n, d) = 1$ and $P(b) < k/2$, it follows that either

(i) $p \mid n + id$ for precisely one i with $1 \leq i \leq k-2$, or

(ii) $p \mid n+id$ and $p \mid n+(i+p)d$, for some i with $0 \leq i \leq k-1-p$.

In case (i), the identity $\{i-1, i, i, i+1\}$ leads to a ternary equation of the form (14) where $C = 1$ and A, B, u and v are nonzero integers with $P(AB) < p$ and $p \mid uv$. Corresponding to this equation, as in the proof of Proposition 3.1, we may consider a Frey elliptic curve $E/\mathbb{Q}$, with corresponding mod l Galois representation ρ_l^E. Again, this arises from a cuspidal newform f of weight 2, trivial Nebentypus character and level N. Here, from Lemma 3.2 of [1], N divides

$$N_1 = 64 \cdot \prod_{q<p} q,$$

where the product is over prime q. Since $p \mid uv$ and p is coprime to lN, our Frey curve E has multiplicative reduction at p and so we may conclude, as in the proof of Proposition 3.1, that

$$\mathrm{Norm}_{K_f/\mathbb{Q}}\,(a_p \pm (p+1)) \equiv 0 \pmod{l},$$

where K_f is the field of definition for the Fourier coefficients a_n of f. By the Weil bounds for a_p, we have

$$l \leq (p + 1 + 2\sqrt{p})^{g_0^+(N)} \tag{49}$$

where $g_0^+(N)$ denotes the dimension of the space of weight 2, level N cuspidal newforms of trivial character (as a $\mathbb{C}$-vector space).

Similarly, in case (ii), we have the identity $\{i, i+j, i+p-j, i+p\}$, where we are free to choose any j with $1 \leq j \leq (p-1)/2$. If $n(n+d)$ is odd, $p = 7$ and $k = 12$ or 13, we will take $j = 3$ whereby the above identity leads to a ternary equation of the shape (14) with coprime A, B, C satisfying $ABC \equiv 1 \pmod 2$, $P(AB) < 7$, $C \in \{1, 3\}$ and $7 \mid uv$. Otherwise, we take $j = 2$ (if $n(n+d)$ is even) or $j = 4$ (if $n(n+d)$ is odd). These choices lead to equations (14) with $P(AB) < p$, $p - j$ is divisible by C, $\gcd(AB, C) = 1$ and $p \mid uv$. Since $l > k$, in each case we may argue as previously to deduce the existence of a cuspidal newform f of weight 2, trivial Nebentypus character and level N dividing either 1440 or

$$N_2 = 64 \cdot \prod_{q_1 < p} q_1 \cdot \prod_{q_2 \mid p-j} q_2$$

where again the products are over q_i prime. Arguing as before, we once more obtain inequality (49).

From Martin [20], we have, for any N, that

$$g_0^+(N) \leq \frac{N+1}{12}$$

and, via Schoenfeld [30],

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \log p < 1.000081x,$$

valid for all $x > 0$. It follows, by routine computation, that

$$g_0^+(N) < e^{1.05p}$$

and hence, from (49), that

$$\log l < 3^p < 3^k.$$

Since k is fixed, this leaves us with finitely many pairs (k, l) to consider. Again, via Theorem 6 of [15], we may conclude that, for each pair $(k, l) \neq (3, 2)$, equation (5) has at most finitely many coprime solutions with (6). This therefore completes the proof of Theorem 1.5. □

Proof of Corollary 1.6. To deduce Corollary 1.6, suppose now that $d \equiv 0 \pmod{D_k}$ (and, again, that $l > k$). Since it is easy to show that the left hand side of (5) is divisible by every prime $q \leq k$ coprime to d, it follows, writing

$$P_k = \pi(k-1) - \pi\left(\frac{k-1}{2}\right),$$

that

$$P_k \leq \omega(d) \leq D. \tag{50}$$

By the Prime Number Theorem, P_k is asymptotically $\frac{k}{2\log k}$, as $k \to \infty$. Applying Chebyshev-type estimates for $\pi(x)$, say those of Rosser and Schoenfeld [25], we may show that

$$P_k \geq \frac{k}{3\log k}, \quad \text{if } \ k \geq 18.$$

From our lower bound (8) for k, we therefore have

$$P_k \geq \frac{2D\log D}{\log(6D\log D)} > D,$$

for $k \geq 18$, contradicting (50). For $12 \leq k \leq 17$ and (via inequality (8)) $D \in \{1, 2\}$, we check to see if inequality (50) is satisfied, obtaining a contradiction in all cases except when $D = 2$ and $k = 12, 13, 15, 16$ or 17. For each of these, $P_k = 2$ and so the fact that y fails to have a prime divisor p with $k/2 \leq p < k$ implies

$$d = \begin{cases} 7^\alpha 11^\beta & \text{if } k = 12, 13 \\ 11^\alpha 13^\beta & \text{if } k = 15, 16, 17, \end{cases}$$

where α and β are positive integers. Theorem 2 of Saradha and Shorey [28], however, shows that d necessarily has a prime divisor congruent to 1 (mod l). It follows that $l \in \{2, 3, 5\}$, contradicting $l > k$. This completes the proof of Corollary 1.6. □

8. Finiteness results for $12 \leq k \leq 82$

In this section, we will present the proof of Theorem 1.4. We begin by noting that, if P and Q are consecutive primes and if we know that equation (5) has finitely many solutions with $k = 2P + 1$ and (6), then a like result immediately obtains for

$$k = 2P + 2, 2P + 3, \ldots, 2Q.$$

Indeed, for one of these values of k, if Π_k is divisible by a prime in the interval $[Q, k]$, then Theorem 1.5 implies the desired result. We may thus suppose, if $p \mid \Pi_k$, that either $p > k$ or $p \leq P$. It follows that we can write

$$\Pi(0, 1, \cdots, 2P + 1) = BY^l$$

for nonzero integers B and Y with $P(B) \leq P$, whereby the result follows, as claimed, from the case $k = 2P + 1$. To prove Theorem 1.4, we may, in light of Theorem 1.2, restrict attention to

$$k \in \{15, 23, 27, 35, 39, 47, 59, 63, 75\},$$

where we further suppose that Π_k is coprime to D_k. Now, for each prime $3 \le p \le P$, there are $p+1$ possibilities : either $p \mid n+sd$ for some $0 \le s \le p-1$, or p fails to divide Π (i.e. $p \mid d$). Analyzing these

$$N(P) = \prod_{3 \le p \le P} (p+1) \tag{51}$$

cases, for each k under consideration (actually, symmetry allows us to reduce this number somewhat), we note that if we can find integers $i \ge 0$ and $j \ge 1$ such that

$$\gcd\left(\Pi(i, 3j+i, 6j+i), \prod_{3 \le p \le P} p\right) \in \{1, 11, 19\}, \tag{52}$$

then $\{i, 3j+i, 3j+i, 6j+i\}$ leads to an equation of the form (22). We obtain a like conclusion if there exist $i \ge 0$, $j \ge 1$ for which

$$\gcd\left(\Pi(i, j+i, 9j+i, 10j+i), \prod_{3 \le p \le P} p\right) \in \{1, 11, 19\} \tag{53}$$

(where we employ the identity $\{i, j+i, 9j+i, 10j+i\}$).

8.1. **The case $k = 15$.** For $k = 15$ (i.e. if $P = 7$), a short search indicates that we can find i and j for which (52) or (53) holds, unless $p \mid n + i_p d$ for $p \in \{3, 5, 7\}$ where i_p are as follows :

case	(i_3, i_5, i_7)	case	(i_3, i_5, i_7)	case	(i_3, i_5, i_7)
(i)	$(2, 4, 6)$	(v)	$(0, 3, 4)$	(ix)	$(2, 4, 0)$
(ii)	$(1, 3, 5)$	(vi)	$(2, 2, 3)$	(x)	$(1, 3, 6)$
(iii)	$(0, 2, 4)$	(vii)	$(1, 1, 2)$	(xi)	$(1, 1, 1)$
(iv)	$(2, 1, 3)$	$(viii)$	$(0, 0, 1)$	(xii)	$(0, 0, 0)$

By symmetry, we may suppose that we are in one of the cases (i), (ii), (iii), (iv), (ix) or (x). In case (i), $\{1, 3, 10, 12\}$ implies an equation of the form (18) with $D = 2$, if Π is odd, and (15) with $\beta = 0$, if Π is even, unless, in this latter case, we have

$$\max\{\nu_2(n + id) : i = 1, 3, 10, 12\} = 2. \tag{54}$$

It follows, in this situation, that $\{2, 3, 11, 12\}$ leads to equation (15) with $\alpha \ge 2$, unless $9 \mid n + 2d$. If we assume, then, that $9 \mid n + 2d$, $\{5, 7, 8, 10\}$ implies an equation of the form (15) with $\beta = 0$, unless

$$\max\{\nu_2(n + id) : i = 5, 7, 8, 10\} = 2. \tag{55}$$

Combining (54) and (55), we may thus assume $\nu_2(n+10d) = 2$, whereby $\{5, 8, 9, 12\}$ leads to an equation of the form (20), completing the proof, in case (i).

In cases (ii), (ix) and (x), we argue in an identical fashion as for case (i), only with the identities

$$\{1, 3, 10, 12\},\ \{2, 3, 11, 12\},\ \{5, 7, 8, 10\} \text{ and } \{5, 8, 9, 12\}$$

replaced by

$$\{0, 2, 9, 11\},\ \{1, 2, 10, 11\},\ \{4, 6, 7, 9\},\ \{4, 7, 8, 11\}, \text{ in case (ii)},$$

$$\{1, 3, 10, 12\},\ \{2, 3, 11, 12\},\ \{3, 5, 6, 8\},\ \{1, 4, 5, 8\}, \text{ in case (ix)}$$

and

$$\{0, 2, 9, 11\},\ \{1, 2, 10, 11\},\ \{2, 4, 5, 7\},\ \{0, 3, 4, 7\}, \text{ in case (x)}.$$

In case (iii) (respectively case (iv)), the identity $\{1, 5, 10, 14\}$ (respectively $\{0, 4, 9, 13\}$) leads to the conclusion that

$$\max\{\nu_2(n + id) : i = 1, 5, 10, 14\} = 3$$

whence $\{8, 9, 9, 10\}$, $\{2, 5, 5, 8\}$, $\{7, 10, 10, 13\}$ and $\{3, 6, 6, 9\}$ (respectively $\{7, 8, 8, 9\}$, $\{1, 4, 4, 7\}$, $\{6, 9, 9, 12\}$ and $\{2, 5, 5, 8\}$) lead to equations of the shape (21) with $p \in \{3, 5\}$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.4, if $k = 15$ (i.e. for $k \leq 22$).

8.2. **The cases $k \in \{23, 27, 35, 39\}$.** A (reasonably) short calculation reveals that for each of the $N(P)$ possibilities with $P \in \{11, 13, 17\}$, we can always find i and j satisfying (52) or (53). If $P = 19$ (so that $k = 39$), then we are left with, up to symmetry, the following cases to consider (where, as previously, $p \mid n + i_p d$) :

case	i_3	i_5	i_7	i_{11}	i_{13}	i_{17}	i_{19}
(i)	1	0	3	6	1	9	6
(ii)	1	0	4	1	8	9	17
(iii)	0	4	3	0	7	8	16
(iv)	2	3	2	10	6	7	15

In the first of these $\{8, 11, 33, 36\}$ leads immediately to an equation of the shape (15) with $\beta = 1$. In the remaining three,

$$\{2 - i, 6 - i, 29 - i, 33 - i\}$$

(for $i = 0, 1$ or 2, respectively) implies a solution to equation (15) with $(\alpha, \beta) = (0, 1)$, if Π is odd. If, however, Π is even, the identity

$$\{28 - i, 29 - i, 37 - i, 38 - i\}$$

leads to equation (15) with $\alpha \geq 2$ and $\beta = 1$, unless $9 \mid n + (28 - i)d$. In this case, the identity

$$\{13 - i, 14 - i, 16 - i, 17 - i\}$$

thus leads to equation (22) with $p = 19$. This completes the proof for $k = 39$ (and hence for $k \leq 46$).

8.3. **The cases $k \in \{47, 59, 63, 75\}$.** We verify via Maple that, for each of the $N(P)$ possibilities with $P \in \{23, 29\}$, we can always find i and j satisfying (52) or (53). For $P = 31$ (i.e. $k = 63$), there are again some possibilities that elude our sieve (the computation is now becoming rather more substantial). These 28 cases correspond, after symmetry, to $p \mid n + i_p d$ for i_p as follows :

case	i_3	i_5	i_7	i_{11}	i_{13}	i_{17}	i_{19}	i_{23}	i_{29}	i_{31}
(i)	0	3	5	1	7	1	18	2	14	10
(ii)	2	2	4	0	6	0	17	1	13	9
(iii)	0	3	5	1	7	15	18	14	16	10
(iv)	2	2	4	0	6	14	17	13	15	9
(v)	1	1	3	8	5	15	11	4	8	23
(vi)	0	0	2	7	4	14	9	3	7	22
(vii)	2	4	1	6	3	13	8	2	6	21
$(viii)$	1	1	3	8	5	15	8	4	1	23
(ix)	0	3	5	10	7	14	13	6	10	25
(x)	2	2	4	9	6	13	12	5	9	24
(xi)	0	0	2	3	4	14	9	3	7	22
(xii)	2	4	1	2	3	13	8	2	6	21
$(xiii)$	0	3	5	10	7	14	10	6	3	25
(xiv)	2	2	4	9	6	13	9	5	2	24

Our arguments will prove similar in each case. From an initial identity of the form $\{p, q, r, s\}$, we will conclude that $8 \mid n + id$ for some i congruent, modulo 8, to $p + 4$, $q + 4$, $r + 4$ or $s + 4$. For each of these possibilities, one of a collection of 4 (or 2) secondary identities of the shape $\{p_1, q_1, q_1, r_1\}$ then implies a nontrivial solution to an equation of the form (21), contradicting Proposition 3.1. For example, in case (i), $\{31, 32, 49, 50\}$ implies the desired conclusion unless

$$\max\{\nu_2(n + id) : i = 31, 32, 49, 50\} = 2.$$

This hypothesis ensures that $8 \mid n + id$ for one of $i = 3, 4, 5, 6$ which, with the identities $\{6, 11, 11, 16\}$, $\{11, 20, 20, 29\}$, $\{4, 13, 13, 22\}$ and $\{29, 30, 30, 31\}$, contradicts Proposition 3.1. For the remaining cases, we choose our identities as follows :

case	initial identity	$8 \mid n + id$
(i)	$\{31, 32, 49, 50\}$	$i = 3, 4, 5, 6$
(iii)	$\{2, 4, 29, 31\}$	$i = 0, 2, 3, 5$
$(v), (viii)$	$\{12, 14, 60, 62\}$	$i = 4, 6$
$(ix), (xiii)$	$\{16, 17, 34, 35\}$	$i = 4, 5, 6, 7$
(xi)	$\{11, 13, 59, 61\}$	$i = 3, 5$

and

case	secondary identities
(i)	$\{6, 11, 11, 16\}, \{11, 20, 20, 29\}, \{4, 13, 13, 22\}, \{29, 30, 30, 31\}$
(iii)	$\{21, 24, 24, 27\}, \{27, 42, 42, 57\}, \{2, 11, 11, 20\}, \{4, 13, 13, 22\}$
$(v), (viii)$	$\{13, 28, 28, 43\}, \{9, 22, 22, 35\}$
$(ix), (xiii)$	$\{1, 4, 4, 7\}, \{16, 37, 37, 58\}, \{17, 22, 22, 27\}, \{2, 23, 23, 44\}$
(xi)	$\{6, 19, 19, 32\}, \{8, 13, 13, 18\}$

In case (ii), (iv), (vi), (vii), (x), (xii) and (xiv), we argue as for (i), (iii), (v), (ix) and (xi), only with $\{p, q, r, s\}$ replaced, in each case, by $\{p - i, q - i, r - i, s - i\}$ for $i = 1$ or $i = 2$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.4, for $63 \leq k \leq 74$.

To finish the proof of Theorem 1.4, it remains to handle the case $k = 75$. In this situation, after lengthy calculations (carried out in Maple on a Beowulf cluster at Simon Fraser University), we conclude that there always exist i and j satisfying either (52) or (53). The code utilized in this computation is available from the authors on request.

9. Concluding remarks

Presumably, the cases $2 \leq l \leq 5$ in Theorem 1.2 may be sharpened with a more careful combinatorial analysis, at least if $(k, l) \neq (4, 2)$ or $(3, 3)$. As far as we can tell, the statement, for large prime values of l, essentially reflects the limitations of our method. An extension of Theorem 1.2 to larger values of k would be a reasonably routine matter if one had available a full set of Galois conjugacy classes of weight 2 cuspidal newforms at larger levels than currently present in [35]. Proving an analog of Theorem 1.4 for larger k is also certainly possible via the techniques described herein; to some degree, at this stage, the problem is primarily a matter of combinatorics.

10. Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to Professor Á. Pintér for his valuable remarks, to Dr. R. Ferguson for his assistance in carrying out the various computations described herein, and to Professor N. Bruin both for

making available his recent preprints and for his patience in explaining recent developments in the method of Coleman-Chabauty to the first author, in particular, with regards to Proposition 4.3.

References

[1] M.A. Bennett and C. Skinner, Ternary Diophantine equations via Galois representations and modular forms, *Canad. J. Math.*, 56 (2004), no. 1, 23–54.
[2] N. Bruin, Chabauty methods and covering techniques applied to generalised Fermat equations, CWI Tract 133, 77 pages, 2002
[3] N. Bruin, Chabauty methods using elliptic curves, *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 562 (2003), 27–49.
[4] N. Bruin and E. V. Flynn, Towers of 2-covers of hyperelliptic curves, Preprint PIMS-01-12, 2001.
[5] J.W.S. Cassels, The Mordell-Weil group of curves of genus 2, Arithmetic and geometry, Vol. I 27–60, Progr. Math. 35, Birkhauser, Boston, Mass. 1983.
[6] J. Cremona, *Algorithms for Modular Elliptic Curves*, Cambridge University Press, 1992.
[7] H. Darmon and A. Granville, On the equations $z^m = F(x, y)$ and $Ax^p + By^q = Cz^r$, *Bull. L.M.S.* 27 (1995), 513–543.
[8] H. Darmon and L. Merel, Winding quotients and some variants of Fermat's Last Theorem *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 490 (1997), 81–100.
[9] P. Dénes, Über die diophantische Gleichung $x^l + y^l = cz^l$, *Acta Math.* 88 (1952), 241–251.
[10] L. E. Dickson, History of the theory of numbers. Vol. II: Diophantine analysis Chelsea Publishing Co., New York 1966.
[11] P. Erdős and J.L. Selfridge, The product of consecutive integers is never a power, *Illinois J. Math.* 19 (1975), 292–301.
[12] K. Győry, Über die diophantische Gleichung $x^p + y^p = cz^p$, *Publ. Math. Debrecen* 13 (1966), 301–305.
[13] K. Győry, On the diophantine equation $n(n + 1) \dots (n + k - 1) = bx^l$, *Acta Arith.* 83 (1998), 87–92.
[14] K. Győry, Power values of products of consecutive integers and binomial coefficients, *Number Theory and Its Applications*, Kluwer Acad. Publ. 1999, 145–156.
[15] K. Győry, L. Hajdu and N. Saradha, On the Diophantine equation $n(n + d) \dots (n + (k - 1)d) = by^l$, *Canad. Math. Bull.* 47 (2004), no. 3, 373–388.
[16] G. Hanrot, N. Saradha and T.N. Shorey, Almost perfect powers in consecutive integers, *Acta Arith.* 99 (2001), 13–25.
[17] A. Kraus, Majorations effectives pour l'équation de Fermat généralisée, *Canad. J. Math.* 49 (1997), no. 6, 1139–1161.
[18] A. Kraus, On the equation $x^p + y^q = z^r$: a survey, *Ramanujan J.* 3 (1999), no. 3, 315–333.
[19] R. Marszalek, On the product of consecutive terms of an arithmetic progression, *Monatsh. Math.* 100 (1985), 215–222.
[20] G. Martin, Dimensions of spaces of cuspforms and newforms on $\Gamma_0(N)$ and $\Gamma_1(N)$, submitted for publication.
[21] L. Merel, Arithmetic of elliptic curves and Diophantine equations, *J. Théor. Nombres Bordeaux* 11 (1999), 173–200.

[22] R. Obláth, Über das Produkt fünf aufeinander folgender Zahlen in einer arithmetischen Reiche, *Publ. Math. Debrecen* 1 (1950), 222–226.
[23] R. Obláth, Eine Bemerkung über Produkte aufeinander folgender Zahlen, *J. Indian Math. Soc.* 15 (1951), 135–139.
[24] K. Ribet, On the equation $a^p + 2^\alpha b^p + c^p = 0$, *Acta Arith.* 79 (1997), 7–16.
[25] J.B. Rosser and L. Schoenfeld, Approximate formulas for some functions of prime numbers, *Illinois J. Math.* 6 (1962), 64–94.
[26] J.W. Sander, Rational points on a class of superelliptic curves, *J. London Math. Soc.* 59 (1999), 422–434.
[27] N. Saradha, On perfect powers in products with terms from arithmetic progressions, *Acta Arith.* 82 (1997), 147–172.
[28] N. Saradha and T.N. Shorey, Almost perfect powers in arithmetic progression, *Acta Arith.* 99 (2001), 363–388.
[29] N. Saradha and T.N. Shorey, Almost squares in arithmetic progression, *Compositio Math.* 138 (2003), no. 1, 73–111.
[30] L. Schoenfeld, Sharper bounds for the Chebyshev functions $\theta(x)$ and $\psi(x)$ II, *Math. Comp.* 30 (1976), 337–360.
[31] E. Selmer, The diophantine equation $ax^3+by^3+cz^3 = 0$, *Acta Math.* 85 (1951), 205–362.
[32] T.N. Shorey, Powers in arithmetic progression, in A Panorama in Number Theory (G. Wüstholz, ed.), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2002, 325–336.
[33] T.N. Shorey, Powers in arithmetic progression (II), in New Aspects of Analytic Number Theory, Kyoto 2002, 202–214.
[34] T.N. Shorey and R. Tijdeman, Perfect powers in products of terms in an arithmetic progression, *Compositio Math.* 75 (1990), 307–344.
[35] W. Stein, The Modular forms database, Current web address (2003) : http://modular.fas.harvard.edu/Tables/.
[36] M. Stoll, Implementing 2-descent for Jacobians of hyperelliptic curves, *Acta Arith.* 98 (2001), 245–277.
[37] R. Tijdeman, Diophantine equations and diophantine approximations, in Number Theory and Applications, Kluwer Acad. Press, 1989, 215–243.
[38] A. Wiles, Modular elliptic curves and Fermat's Last Theorem, *Ann. Math* 141 (1995), 443–551.

Department of Mathematics, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C., V6T 1Z2 Canada
E-mail address: bennett@math.ubc.ca

Number Theory Research Group of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Institute of Mathematics, University of Debrecen, P.O. Box 12, 4010 Debrecen, Hungary
E-mail address: gyory@math.klte.hu

Institute of Mathematics, University of Debrecen, P.O. Box 12, 4010 Debrecen, Hungary
E-mail address: hajdul@math.klte.hu