

ADDITIVE RELATIONS IN IRRATIONAL POWERS

JOSEPH HARRISON

ABSTRACT. We investigate the additive theory of the set

$$S = \{1^c, 2^c, \dots, N^c\},$$

when c is a real number. In the language of additive combinatorics, we determine the asymptotic behaviour of the additive energy of S . When c is rational, this is either known, or follows from existing results, and our contribution is a resolution of the irrational case. We deduce that for all $c \notin \{0, 1, 2\}$, the cardinality of the sumset $S + S$ asymptotically attains its natural upper bound $N(N + 1)/2$, as $N \rightarrow \infty$. We show that there are infinitely many, effectively computable numbers c such that the set $\{p^c : p \text{ prime}\}$ is additively dissociated (actually linearly independent over \mathbb{Q}), and we provide an effective procedure to compute the digits of such c .

1. INTRODUCTION

Our main theorem is the following.

Theorem A. *Let $c \notin \{0, 1, 2\}$ be a real number, let N be a positive integer, and let*

$$S = \{1^c, 2^c, \dots, N^c\}.$$

Then the cardinality of the sumset $S + S$ is asymptotic to $N(N + 1)/2$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$.

It is clear that the conclusion of Theorem A does not hold when $c \in \{0, 1\}$. If $c = 2$, a theorem of Landau [Lan08] implies that $\#(S + S) \ll N^2(\log N)^{-1/2}$. We note that Theorem A improves on [ENR00, Corollary 3.2] for the convex function $f(x) = x^c$ when $A = [N] = \{1, \dots, N\}$.

A standard argument involving the Cauchy–Schwartz inequality, which can be found in [TV10, Lemma 2.9, Corollary 2.10], reduces the proof of Theorem A to an estimate

$$\#\{\mathbf{x} \in [N]^4 : x_1^c + x_2^c = x_3^c + x_4^c\} = 2N^2 + o(N^2)$$

for the so-called additive energy of the set S . When $c \notin \{0, 1, 2\}$ is rational, such an estimate follows from [Sal23] and [CO09]. We explain this in Section 4. The main contribution of this paper handles the irrational exponents.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 03C64, 11B13, 11B30.

Key words and phrases. irrational powers, sumsets, additive energy, Pila–Wilkie Theorem.

Theorem B. *Let N be a positive integer and let c be a real irrational number. There exists a positive integer α such that*

$$\#\{\mathbf{x} \in [N]^4 : x_1^c + x_2^c = x_3^c + x_4^c\} = 2N^2 + O(N(\log N)^\alpha).$$

Moreover, α and the big- O constant are effectively computable, and do not depend on c or N .

A key ingredient in establishing Theorem B is a recent o-minimal point counting theorem [BNZ24]. This result is a development of the celebrated Pila–Wilkie theorem [PW06], and answers a question [PW06, Conjecture 1.11] known as Wilkie’s conjecture. We note that applying [PW06] delivers an error term $O(N^{1+\epsilon})$, which is already sufficient for proving Theorem A.

Another ingredient in our argument is the classical Ax–Schanuel theorem for the exponential function [Ax71]. In Proposition 2.2, we use this theorem to prove a functional transcendence statement for irrational powers that may be considered interesting in its own right.

In [CCH25], a result [RS06, Theorem 2] concerning a Diophantine inequality resembling the additive energy equation in Theorem B is applied to the question of partition regularity of linear relations in the Piatetski–Shapiro sequence $[n^c]$. The question of proving an asymptotic formula like the one appearing in Theorem B was brought to our attention by Sam Chow and Akshat Mudgal.

In Theorem B, we regard the real number c as fixed, and count the number of solutions to a particular instance of the equation

$$(1) \quad x_1^c + x_2^c = x_3^c + x_4^c.$$

We now let c vary, investigating the properties of the set of c for which equation (1) admits non-trivial solutions. Since each $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}^4$ is a solution of at most countably many (in fact finitely many) equations of the form (1), the set of real numbers c so that (1) admits a non-trivial solution is countable, being a union over $\mathbb{Z}_{>0}^4$ of countable (in fact finite) sets.

Let (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4) be a non-trivial solution to (1), and assume without loss of generality that $x_1 \geq x_2$ and $x_1 > x_3 \geq x_4$. Then the inequality

$$x_1^c \leq x_1^c + x_2^c = x_3^c + x_4^c \leq 2x_3^c$$

implies $c \leq (\log 2)N$. Thus if $c > (\log 2)N$, then (1) admits no non-trivial solutions at all.

Let φ be a zero of the polynomial $x^{2n} - x^{n+1} - x^n + 1$, and let $c = \log_2(\varphi)$. Then $(2^{2n}, 1, 2^{n+1}, 2^n)$ is a non-trivial solution to (1). Since $c \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, this construction shows that the set of real numbers c so that (1) admits non-trivial solutions is not discrete, and contains infinitely many irrational members.

We can say more under an additional assumption that the coordinates x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 of a non-trivial solution to (1) are multiplicatively independent. Suppose the numbers

$\log x_1, \dots, \log x_4$ are $\mathbb{Q}(c)$ -linearly independent. This condition is satisfied if c is algebraic by Baker's theorem [Bak66]. If Schanuel's conjecture holds for the numbers $\log x_1, \dots, \log x_4, c \log x_1, \dots, c \log x_4$, then the inequality

$$\text{trdeg}_{\mathbb{Q}}(c, x_1^c, \dots, x_4^c) \geq 4$$

holds. Thus if c is algebraic, Schanuel's conjecture implies that all solutions of (1) are multiplicatively dependent.

A real number c is called exponentially algebraic if it is a coordinate of a smooth solution of a system of polynomial equations in variables y_1, \dots, y_n and their exponentials $\exp(y_1), \dots, \exp(y_n)$. In [BKW10, Theorem 1.1], the authors show that if c is exponentially transcendental, then

$$\text{trdeg}_{\mathbb{Q}(c)}(y_1, \dots, y_n, y_1^c, \dots, y_n^c) \geq n$$

for any $y_1, \dots, y_n \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. In particular, if c is exponentially transcendental then all solutions to (1) are multiplicatively dependent. In [JS11, Section 4], a computable example of an exponentially transcendental number is given. We thank Gareth Jones for these remarks.

We prove a Diophantine approximation criterion that ensures non-trivial solutions of (1) are multiplicatively dependent. We state our result for an arbitrary integer linear combination of irrational powers.

Theorem C. *Let $A, X > 0$ be real and let s, q be positive integers. There exists a positive valued function $\psi = \psi(A, X, s, q)$ with the following property. If there exist $a, q > 0$ integers with*

$$0 < c - a/q < \psi(A, X, s, q),$$

then for all x_1, \dots, x_s multiplicatively independent integers in $[1, X]$, and all a_1, \dots, a_s integers in $[-A, A]$, the form

$$a_1 x_1^c + \dots + a_s x_s^c$$

does not vanish.

Theorem C is proved in Section 3. Besides the use of an effective linear forms in logarithms result of Fel'dman [Fel70], the proof is elementary.

The function $\psi(A, X, s, q)$ arises from lower bounds for linear forms in logarithms, and so it decreases extremely rapidly. Examining the proof of Theorem C and applying the Borel–Cantelli lemma shows that the set of real numbers c satisfying the Diophantine approximation condition

$$0 < c - a/q < \psi(A, X, s, q)$$

has Lebesgue measure zero. It is easy to see (Lemma 3.2) that uncountably many real numbers c do satisfy this condition. The proof of Lemma 3.2 supplies effectively computable examples of such real numbers c . We therefore have the following.

Theorem D. *There exist infinitely many real numbers c , whose digits can be effectively computed, such that $\{p^c : p \text{ prime}\}$ is linearly independent over \mathbb{Q} .*

We remark that Theorem D trivially implies that there is an effectively computable c such that the set of prime powers p^c is additively dissociated. This is a property of interest in additive combinatorics and the main motivation for proving Theorem D.

Notation. *Throughout this paper, we will use the Bachmann–Landau notation, so we write $f(x) = O_{A,B,\dots}(g(x))$ if f and g are real-valued functions with $|f(x)| \leq c_1 g(x)$ for some constant c_1 depending on A, B, \dots , and for a set of x that will be clear from the context. We also use the Vinogradov notation $f(x) \ll_{A,B,\dots} g(x)$ if $f(x) = O_{A,B,\dots}(g(x))$. We call the constant c_1 the “big- O constant”, even when we use the Vinogradov notation. We stress that the big- O constant dependencies are always as written so, for example, if $f(x) \ll g(x)$ then the big O -constant is absolute.*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS. The author would especially like to thank Harry Schmidt for helpful conversations and guidance, without whom this paper would not exist. Additional thanks are owed to Sam Chow and Akshat Mudgal for introducing us to the problem, to Nathan Lockwood for conversations regarding the construction of non-trivial solutions, and to Gareth Jones for showing us the Schanuel result of Bays–Kirby–Wilkie and for remarks about effectivity in the result of Binyamini–Novikov–Zak. Joseph Harrison is supported by the Warwick Mathematics Institute Centre for Doctoral Training, and gratefully acknowledges the funding from the UK Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (Grant number: EP/W524645/1).

2. PROOF OF THEOREM B

The main term in Theorem B comes from the trivial solutions to the equation

$$(1) \quad x_1^c + x_2^c = x_3^c + x_4^c,$$

namely the solutions with $x_1 \in \{x_3, x_4\}$. Henceforth, we let

$$(2) \quad B(c, N) = \# \left\{ \mathbf{x} \in [N]^4 : \begin{array}{l} x_1^c + x_2^c = x_3^c + x_4^c \\ x_1 \notin \{x_3, x_4\} \end{array} \right\}$$

denote the number of non-trivial solutions.

Throughout we let \mathbb{G}_m denote the split algebraic torus over \mathbb{C} of dimension one. We often work with $\mathbb{G}_m(\mathbb{R}) = \mathbb{R}^*$. A geometrically irreducible algebraic subgroup of \mathbb{G}_m^n is called a subtorus, and a translate of a subtorus by a point of \mathbb{G}_m^n is called a coset. The reader can consult [BG06, Chapter 3] for more information about algebraic tori. In particular, we shall assume that the reader is acquainted with the duality between algebraic subgroups of \mathbb{G}_m^n and subgroups in \mathbb{Z}^n .

The following description of the abelian group $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{AlgGrp}}(\mathbb{G}_m^r, \mathbb{G}_m^s)$ will be crucial for the argument. If $A = (a_{ij})$ is an $r \times s$ matrix with integer entries, we can define

a morphism of algebraic groups

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_A : \mathbb{G}_m^r &\rightarrow \mathbb{G}_m^s \\ (x_1, \dots, x_r) &\mapsto (x_1^{a_{11}} \dots x_r^{a_{r1}}, \dots, x_1^{a_{1s}} \dots x_r^{a_{rs}}). \end{aligned}$$

In [BG06, Proposition 3.2.17], it is proved that the map sending A to φ_A is an isomorphism of the abelian groups $M_{r,s}(\mathbb{Z})$ and $\text{Hom}_{\mathbf{AlgGrp}}(\mathbb{G}_m^r, \mathbb{G}_m^s)$.

The kernel of φ_A is the subgroup associated to the lattice $\Lambda \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^r$ spanned by the columns of A . If $r \leq s$ and the rank of A is r , then the kernel of φ_A is zero-dimensional, and its cardinality is the index of Λ in $\Lambda_{\mathbb{R}} \cap \mathbb{Z}^r$ [BG06, Proposition 3.2.7]. In particular, φ_A is injective if and only if $r \leq s$, A is of rank r and Λ is a primitive lattice.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\varphi_A : \mathbb{G}_m^r \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_m^s$ be the morphism associated to an $r \times s$ matrix A with integer entries. Suppose φ_A is injective. Then*

$$\varphi_A^{-1}(\mathbb{R}_{>0}^s) \cap \mathbb{G}_m^r(\mathbb{R}) \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{>0}^r.$$

Proof. Suppose $\mathbf{g} \in \mathbb{G}_m^r(\mathbb{R})$ and $\varphi_A(\mathbf{g}) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^s$. We can write $\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{s}\mathbf{h}$ where $\mathbf{s} \in \{-1, 1\}^r$ is the signed part of \mathbf{g} and $\mathbf{h} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^r$. Since the coordinate functions of φ_A are monomials, we have $\varphi_A(\mathbf{s}) \in \{-1, 1\}^s$ and $\varphi_A(\mathbf{h}) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^s$. The latter implies that $\varphi_A(\mathbf{s}) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^s$, and so $\varphi_A(\mathbf{s}) = (1, \dots, 1)$ is the identity. Since φ_A is injective, $\mathbf{s} = (1, \dots, 1)$. Thus $\mathbf{g} \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^r$.

Q.E.D.

If $X \subseteq \mathbb{G}_m^n(\mathbb{R})$, we let X^{Zar} denote the Zariski closure of X in $\mathbb{G}_m^n(\mathbb{C})$, which is a subscheme of \mathbb{G}_m^n . We will only be taking Zariski closures inside \mathbb{G}_m^n and so this notation should not cause confusion.

Recall that a subset X of \mathbb{R}^n is called semi-algebraic if it is a Boolean combination of sets of the form $\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : f(\mathbf{x}) > 0\}$ or $\{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n : f(\mathbf{x}) = 0\}$, where f is a polynomial with real coefficients. The semi-algebraic sets enjoy the favourable feature of remaining semi-algebraic after coordinate projections, as proved by Tarski and Seidenberg. We say that a semi-algebraic set is irreducible if its Zariski closure is irreducible, and we say that a semi-algebraic set is smooth if it consists of only smooth points of its Zariski closure.

In the proof of Theorem B, we shall be working with the structure \mathbb{R}_{exp} . Let us just say that a structure prescribes a collection of subsets of each Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^n , that are said to be the definable sets in that structure. A subset X of \mathbb{R}^n is definable in \mathbb{R}_{exp} if and only if X can be obtained via Boolean operations, products and coordinate projections of either semi-algebraic sets, or the graph in \mathbb{R}^2 of the real exponential function. A theorem of Wilkie [Wil96] implies that the structure \mathbb{R}_{exp} is o-minimal, i.e., the definable subsets of \mathbb{R} are finite unions of points and intervals. We refer the reader to [Dri98] for more information about semi-algebraic sets and o-minimal structures.

2.1. Functional transcendence. The following proposition is where we need to assume that c is irrational for our argument. The proposition is not true if c is rational. For example, if $c = a/q$ is rational and Z is the algebraic curve $x^a + y^a = 1$, then $f_c(Z)$ lies inside the algebraic curve $x^q + y^q = 1$, which is not a translate of an algebraic subgroup of \mathbb{G}_m^2 .

Proposition 2.2. *Let X be a semi-algebraic set in $\mathbb{R}_{>0}^n$. Moreover, let c be a real irrational number and let f_c denote the map*

$$\begin{aligned} f_c : \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n &\rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}^n \\ (x_1, \dots, x_n) &\mapsto (x_1^c, \dots, x_n^c). \end{aligned}$$

The Zariski closure of $f_c(X)$ in \mathbb{G}_m^n is a finite union of cosets.

Proof. First, we can stratify the semi-algebraic set X into finitely many semi-algebraic subsets that are smooth and connected. If the statement of the lemma holds for each piece, then it holds for X . Thus we can assume that X is smooth and connected. In particular, it is a real-analytic manifold.

The proof is by induction on the dimension n of the ambient \mathbb{G}_m^n . When $n = 1$, the set X consists of a single point, and $f_c(X)$ is contained in a translate of the identity. Assume $n > 1$, and that the result is true when the ambient space has dimension smaller than n .

Let $d = \dim(X)$ and let $\psi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow U \subseteq \exp^{-1}(X)$ be a real-analytic chart of the real logarithm $\exp^{-1}(X)$ of X . Thus there are real-analytic functions $u_1, \dots, u_n : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\psi(y_1, \dots, y_d) = (u_1(y_1, \dots, y_d), \dots, u_n(y_1, \dots, y_d))$$

parameterises the chart U of X . We can regard each u_i as an element of the ring $\mathbb{C}[[y_1, \dots, y_d]]$.

We first apply Ax's theorem [Ax71, Theorem 3] to the functions u_1, \dots, u_n and cu_1, \dots, cu_n . There are two cases to consider. Suppose first that these functions are \mathbb{Q} -linearly independent modulo \mathbb{C} , so that by Ax's theorem the transcendence degree of the $4n$ functions

$$u_1, \dots, u_n, cu_1, \dots, cu_n, \exp(u_1), \dots, \exp(u_n), \exp(cu_1), \dots, \exp(cu_n)$$

is at least

$$2n + \text{rank} \left(\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial y_j} \middle| c \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial y_j} \right)_{\substack{i \in [n] \\ j \in [d]}} = 2n + \text{rank} \left(\frac{\partial u_i}{\partial y_j} \right)_{\substack{i \in [n] \\ j \in [d]}}.$$

Since ψ is a diffeomorphism, this latter expression is equal to $2n + d$. Note that, by construction, the functions $\exp(u_1), \dots, \exp(u_n)$ parameterise the chart $\exp(U)$ of X and the functions $\exp(cu_1), \dots, \exp(cu_n)$ parameterise the chart $f_c(\exp(U))$ of $f_c(X)$. In particular, since $\exp(U)$ is semi-algebraic,

$$\text{trdeg}_{\mathbb{C}}(\exp(u_1), \dots, \exp(u_n)) = \dim(\exp(U)) = \dim(X).$$

The same equalities for $f_c(\exp(U))$ and $f_c(X)^{\text{Zar}}$ shows that

$$\text{trdeg}_{\mathbb{C}}(\exp(u_1), \dots, \exp(u_n), \exp(cu_1), \dots, \exp(cu_n)) \leq d + \dim(f_c(X)^{\text{Zar}}).$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \dim(f_c(X)^{\text{Zar}}) &\geq \text{trdeg}_{\mathbb{C}}(\exp(u_1), \dots, \exp(u_n), \exp(cu_1), \dots, \exp(cu_n)) - d \\ &\geq 2n + d - \text{trdeg}_{\mathbb{C}}(u_1, \dots, u_n) - d \\ &\geq n. \end{aligned}$$

Since \mathbb{G}_m^n is irreducible and $f_c(X)^{\text{Zar}}$ is closed, the Zariski closure of $f_c(X)$ is the coset \mathbb{G}_m^n .

We now suppose that the functions $u_1, \dots, u_n, cu_1, \dots, cu_n$ are \mathbb{Q} -linearly dependent modulo \mathbb{C} in Ax's theorem. By clearing denominators and using the fact that the functions are real-valued, we can assume they are \mathbb{Z} -linearly dependent modulo \mathbb{R} . Let $r_1, \dots, r_n, s_1, \dots, s_n$ be integers, not all of which are zero, with

$$(r_1 + cs_1)u_1 + \dots + (r_n + cs_n)u_n \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Note that $r_i + cs_i = 0$ if and only if $r_i = s_i = 0$ because c is irrational. In particular, not all of the coefficients $r_i + cs_i$ can vanish, and so we have $\text{trdeg}_{\mathbb{C}}(u_1, \dots, u_n) < n$. We can now obtain more information by applying Ax's theorem to the functions u_1, \dots, u_n . The \mathbb{Q} -linearly independent modulo \mathbb{C} case of the theorem implies $\text{trdeg}_{\mathbb{C}}(u_1, \dots, u_n) \geq n$, contrary to what has just been demonstrated. Therefore the functions u_1, \dots, u_n are \mathbb{Q} -linearly dependent modulo \mathbb{C} ; without loss of generality \mathbb{Z} -linearly dependent modulo \mathbb{R} . If $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ and λ is real with

$$a_1 u_1 + \dots + a_n u_n = \lambda,$$

then we can divide λ by $\gcd(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ to assume that \mathbf{a} is a primitive vector. Exponentiating, it follows that $\exp(U)$ is contained in a coset $\mathbf{g}T$, where \mathbf{g} can be taken to be $(\exp(\lambda/a_1), 1, \dots, 1)$ and T is the $(n-1)$ -dimensional subtorus corresponding to the rank one primitive lattice generated by \mathbf{a} . (See [BG06, Section 3.2.6].) Since X is irreducible, the Zariski closure of $\exp(U)$ contains X , and is contained in $\mathbf{g}T$.

The conclusion of the lemma can be seen to hold for X if and only if it holds for $\mathbf{g}^{-1}X$. Thus we can replace the coset $\mathbf{g}T$ with the torus T . Choose an $n \times (n-1)$ full rank matrix A with integer entries so that the associated morphism of algebraic groups $\varphi_A : \mathbb{G}_m^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{G}_m^n$ is an isomorphism onto T .

To apply the inductive hypothesis to $\varphi_A^{-1}(X)$ lying inside $\mathbb{G}_m^{n-1}(\mathbb{R})$, we need to show that the hypotheses of the proposition are satisfied for $\varphi_A^{-1}(X)$. By Lemma 2.1 we have $\varphi_A^{-1}(X) \subseteq \mathbb{R}_{>0}^{n-1}$. Moreover, $\varphi_A^{-1}(X)$ is semi-algebraic since φ_A is a morphism and connected since φ_A is an injective open map.

By the inductive hypothesis, the Zariski closure of $f_c(\varphi_A^{-1}(X))$ in \mathbb{G}_m^{n-1} is a finite union of cosets. Now we have

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi_A(f_c(\varphi_A^{-1}(X)))^{\text{Zar}} &= \varphi_A(f_c(\varphi_A^{-1}(X)))^{\text{Zar}} \\ &= \varphi_A(\varphi_A^{-1}(f_c(X)))^{\text{Zar}} \\ &= f_c(X)^{\text{Zar}},\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the fact that f_c commutes with any morphism of algebraic groups φ_A . Since φ_A sends cosets to cosets [BG06, Proposition 3.2.18], the Zariski closure of $f_c(X)$ is a finite union of cosets.

Q.E.D.

2.2. O-minimal point counting. We now describe heights and the o-minimal point counting results that will be used in the proof of Theorem B. If a rational number can be written as a/q where a and $q > 0$ are coprime integers, then we define the height $H(a/q) = \max(|a|, q)$. The height of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Q}^n$ is $H(\mathbf{x}) = \max_i \{H(x_i)\}$. If X is a subset of \mathbb{R}^n and $T > 0$, we let

$$X(\mathbb{Q}, T) = \{\mathbf{x} \in X \cap \mathbb{Q}^n : H(\mathbf{x}) \leq T\}.$$

We also define the algebraic part of X

$$X^{\text{alg}} = \bigcup_{\substack{Z \subseteq X \\ Z \text{ semi-algebraic} \\ \dim(Z) > 0}} Z$$

and the transcendental part $X^{\text{trans}} = X \setminus X^{\text{alg}}$. Thus the points of X^{alg} are exactly the points of X that lie on semi-algebraic curves.

Theorem 2.3. [PW06, Theorem 1.8] *Let X be a subset of \mathbb{R}^n definable in an o-minimal structure. Then*

$$\#X^{\text{trans}}(\mathbb{Q}, N) \ll_{\varepsilon} N^{\varepsilon}$$

for every $\varepsilon > 0$.

The estimate provided by the Pila–Wilkie theorem is already good enough to prove $B(c, N) \ll_{\varepsilon} N^{1+\varepsilon}$ together with Lemma 2.5, however we will be able to prove $B(c, N) \ll N(\log N)^{\alpha}$ for some $\alpha > 0$ using the following theorem, which was already conjectured in [PW06, Conjecture 1.11]. Here we use the version of the theorem for definable families, which allows us to achieve uniformity in the exponent c .

Theorem 2.4. [BNZ24, Equation (6)] *Let $X \rightarrow \Lambda$ be an \mathbb{R}_{exp} -definable family. There exists an effectively computable $\alpha > 0$ such that for any $\lambda \in \Lambda$*

$$\#X_{\lambda}^{\text{trans}}(\mathbb{Q}, T) \ll_X (\log T)^{\alpha}.$$

In particular, the big-O constant depends on the definable family, but not on the parameter λ .

2.3. Proof of Theorem B. We consider the \mathbb{R}_{exp} -definable set

$$X = \{(c, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_{>0}^4 : x_1^c + x_2^c = x_3^c + x_4^c\},$$

which becomes a definable family when equipped with the projection $X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ onto the first coordinate. We also define

$$X^{\text{nt}} = \{(c, \mathbf{x}) \in X : x_1 \in \{x_3, x_4\}\},$$

the \mathbb{R}_{exp} -definable subset of X containing only the non-trivial solutions of (1). Here it is clear that these sets are definable in \mathbb{R}_{exp} , because $x^c = \exp(c \log x)$.

In this situation, one has the crude bound

$$B(c, N) \ll \#X_c^{\text{nt}}(\mathbb{Q}, N),$$

and a naive approach to proving Theorem B would involve showing that X^{nt} and X^{trans} coincide, and then using Theorem 2.4.

Unfortunately, this simply does not work because $X^{\text{alg}} = X$ in this case. To circumvent this issue, we consider the dehomogenised families

$$Y = \{(c, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_{>0}^3 : 1 + x_1^c = x_2^c + x_3^c\},$$

$$Y^{\text{nt}} = \{(c, \mathbf{x}) \in Y : x_1 \notin \{x_2, x_3\}\},$$

which are still definable in \mathbb{R}_{exp} . We think of Y as a slice of X under the projection onto the first coordinate. The issue is essentially that some points of X lie on semi-algebraic curves that are horizontal with respect to the projection. Such semi-algebraic curves intersect the dehomogenised slice Y in a zero-dimensional semi-algebraic set, which does not contribute to the algebraic part of Y .

It now follows that

$$(3) \quad B(c, N) \ll \#X_c^{\text{nt}}(\mathbb{Q}, N) \ll N \#Y_c^{\text{nt}}(\mathbb{Q}, N),$$

and we must show that $Y^{\text{nt}} = Y^{\text{trans}}$ in order to prove Theorem B.

Lemma 2.5. *It holds that $Y^{\text{nt}} = Y^{\text{trans}}$, i.e.,*

$$Y^{\text{alg}} = \{(c, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}_{>0}^3 : x_1 \in \{x_2, x_3\}\}.$$

Proof. Let Z be a connected, semi-algebraic curve in Y . By Proposition 2.2, the Zariski closure W of $f_c(Z)$ in \mathbb{G}_m^3 is a translate of an algebraic subgroup. On the other hand, it is contained in the hyperplane H defined by $1 + x_1 = x_2 + x_3$. Since this hyperplane is not a translate of an algebraic subgroup, W must be a curve. By [BG06, Proposition 3.2.17], we can choose an isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{G}_m &\rightarrow W \\ z &\mapsto (\alpha_1 z^{a_1}, \alpha_2 z^{a_2}, \alpha_3 z^{a_3}), \end{aligned}$$

where $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}^3$ and $(a_1, a_2, a_3) \in \mathbb{Z}^3$. The image lies in H , and so we have the equation

$$1 + \alpha_1 z^{a_1} = \alpha_2 z^{a_2} + \alpha_3 z^{a_3}$$

for all $z \in \mathbb{R}^\times$. Now $a_2 = 0$ or $a_3 = 0$ (we cannot just have $a_1 = 0$, because then $\alpha_1 = -1$). If $a_2 = 0$, then we must have $a_1 = a_3$. Then $\alpha_2 = 1$ and $\alpha_1 = \alpha_3$. It follows that W is the line $x_1 = x_3$ and $x_2 = 1$. Hence Z is contained in this line too. Taking $a_3 = 0$ leads to the other option $x_1 = x_2$ and $x_3 = 1$.

Q.E.D.

Lemma 2.5 and Theorem 2.4 can now be combined to show

$$B(c, N) \ll N \# Y_c^{\text{trans}}(\mathbb{Q}, N) \ll N(\log N)^\alpha.$$

Since the set Y is existentially definable, the big-O constant in [BNZ24] is effective. We thank Gareth Jones for this observation. This concludes the proof of Theorem B.

3. PROOF OF THEOREM C AND D

Theorem 3.1. *Let $A, X > 0$ be real and let s, q be positive integers. There exists an effectively computable positive valued function $\psi(A, X, s, q)$ with the following property. If there exist $a, q > 0$ integers with*

$$0 < c - a/q < \psi(A, X, s, q),$$

then for all x_1, \dots, x_s multiplicatively independent integers in $[1, X]$, and all a_1, \dots, a_s integers in $[-A, A]$, the form

$$a_1 x_1^c + \dots + a_s x_s^c$$

does not vanish.

Proof. Let $\varepsilon = c - a/q$. We need to show that if ε is small enough compared to A, X, s and q , then the form

$$F = a_1 x_1^c + \dots + a_s x_s^c$$

does not vanish.

Let $R(x, \varepsilon)$ denote the remainder term in

$$x^\varepsilon = 1 + \varepsilon \log x + R(x, \varepsilon),$$

which satisfies the estimate $R(x, \varepsilon) \ll_X \varepsilon^2$ for $x \in [1, X]$. Writing $x_i^c = x_i^{a/q} x_i^\varepsilon$ and expanding each term x_i^ε around zero gives

$$\begin{aligned} F &= \sum_{i=1}^s a_i x_i^{a/q} (1 + \varepsilon \log x_i + R(x_i, \varepsilon)) \\ &= \alpha + \varepsilon \Lambda + \sum_{i=1}^s a_i x_i^{a/q} R(x_i, \varepsilon), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\alpha = \sum_{i=1}^s a_i x_i^{a/q}, \quad \Lambda = \sum_{i=1}^s a_i x_i^{a/q} \log x_i.$$

The idea of the proof is the following. If α does not vanish, then, being an algebraic integer with bounded conjugates, we can write down a lower bound for $|\alpha|$. At the same time, we can make ε small enough that the lower bound on $|\alpha|$ is much larger than the other terms contributing to F . On the other hand, if α vanishes then a positive lower bound on Λ can be used since the remainder term has order ε^2 . In any case, we will need to use the estimate

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^s a_i x_i^{a/q} R(x_i, \varepsilon) \right| \ll_{A, X, s} \varepsilon^2.$$

Case α is nonzero. Using the reverse triangle inequality and the estimate $|\Lambda| \ll_{A, X, s} 1$ we have

$$|F| \geq |\alpha| + O_{A, X, s}(\varepsilon).$$

By the triangle inequality, the conjugates of α lie in the disc of radius AXs , and since α is an algebraic integer of degree at most q^s we have

$$1 \leq |\alpha| (AXs)^{q^s-1}.$$

In particular $|\alpha|$ is bounded below by a positive constant depending on A, X, s, q . Hence, taking ε small in terms of A, X, s, q , we find that F is non-zero.

Case α is zero. In this case we have

$$|F| \geq \varepsilon(|\Lambda| - O_{A, X, s}(\varepsilon)).$$

By [Fel70, Theorem 1], we have $|\Lambda| \gg_{A, X, s, q} 1$. Thus we can again make sure F does not vanish by taking ε small in terms of A, X, s, q .

Finally, choose $\psi(A, X, s, q)$ small enough so that if $\varepsilon < \psi$, then F does not vanish in either case.

Q.E.D.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\psi(A, X, s, q)$ be a decreasing function of q . There exist uncountably many real numbers c with the following property. For each triple of positive integers A, X, s , there are coprime integers a and $q > 0$ with*

$$\left| c - \frac{a}{q} \right| < \psi(A, X, s, q).$$

Proof. For a positive integer N , let $f_N(q)$ be the minimum of $\psi(A, X, s, q)$ taken over $A, X, s \leq N$. Thus if there are a and $q > 0$ with

$$\left| c - \frac{a}{q} \right| < f_N(q)$$

for all N , then the same is true of $\psi(A, X, s, q)$.

Let (d_n) be an increasing sequence of positive integers with at least $d_n \gg n$, and let

$$c = \sum_{n \geq 1} 2^{-d_n} = \frac{a}{q} + \sum_{n > N} 2^{-d_n}$$

with a and q coprime. Then $q = 2^{d_N}$. We therefore require that

$$\left| c - \frac{a}{q} \right| = \sum_{n > N} 2^{-d_n} \leq \sum_{n \geq d_{N+1}} 2^{-n} \geq 2^{1-d_{N+1}}$$

is smaller than $f_N(q)$. To achieve this, define the sequence (d_n) by

$$2^{d_{n+1}} \geq \frac{2}{f_n(2^{d_n})} + e_n$$

for each $n \geq 1$, and for some sequence (e_n) of positive integers. Since there are uncountably many such sequences (e_n) , this proves the lemma.

Q.E.D.

For each positive integer k , let c_k be defined, as in the proof of Lemma 3.2, by choosing d_{n+1} to the smallest positive integer with

$$2^{d_{n+1}} \geq \frac{2}{f_n(2^{d_n})} + k.$$

Then the real numbers c_k are effectively computable. Indeed, since $f_n(q)$ is an effectively computable function, the proof of Lemma 3.2 provides an algorithm to compute the digits of c_k . By varying k , one obtains infinitely many effectively computable examples. This proves Theorem D.

4. RATIONAL CASE

In this section, we consider the equation

$$(1) \quad x_1^c + x_2^c = x_3^c + x_4^c,$$

but with c a rational number, instead of an irrational number, which was already considered in Theorem B. In particular, we would like to show that the quantity $B(c, N)$, as defined in (2), is $o(N^2)$. Together with Theorem B, this finishes the proof of the sumset corollary stated in the introduction.

When c is a positive integer, these questions have received plenty of attention over the years. When $c = 2$, the non-trivial solutions overwhelm the trivial ones $B(2, N) \gg N^2(\log N)^{1/2}$ [Lan08]. Hooley addressed the case $c = 3$ in [Hoo63, Hoo80] and arbitrary positive integral c in [Hoo64, Hoo81]—the third article states the famous conjecture that $B(c, N) = 0$ for integers $c \geq 5$. Greaves [Gre66] obtained an improvement for $c = 4$ and Skinner–Wooley [SW95] obtained an improvement for $c \geq 5$ using the Bombieri–Pila determinant method. The further improvements of Heath-Brown [HB02] and Browning [Bro02] for $c \geq 6$ also use the determinant method, together with geometric insights that allow for clever choices of plane sections. Recently, Salberger [Sal23, Corollary 0.7] has shown that

$$(4) \quad B(c, N) \ll_c N^{3/\sqrt{c}}(\log N)^4 + 1$$

for $c \geq 2$. When $c = -d$ is a negative integer, the equation (1) is equivalent to the equation

$$(5) \quad (x_2x_3x_4)^d + (x_1x_3x_4)^d = (x_1x_2x_4)^d + (x_1x_2x_3)^d,$$

and applying [Sal23, Theorem 0.5] to the projective surface in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{Q}}^3$ of degree $3d$ defined by (5) shows that

$$(6) \quad B(c, N) \ll_d N^{\sqrt{3/|c|}} (\log N)^4 + N$$

when c is a negative integer.

The results of the last paragraph can be explained in terms of the Diophantine geometry of the surface $X_c \subseteq \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{Q}}^3$ defined by (1). The surface X_3 is rational over \mathbb{Q} , and so there are many nontrivial rational points. In particular, they are Zariski dense in X_3 . The surface X_4 is K3 and admits an elliptic fibration with generic fibre having Mordell–Weil rank one. The rational points of X_4 are again Zariski dense (even dense in the real topology) [SD68]. Finally, the surfaces X_c for $c \geq 5$ are of general type, and the conjecture that X_c contains no nontrivial rational points can be regarded as a manifestation of the Bombieri–Lang conjecture, wherein the rational points of X_c are not Zariski dense, in contrast to the cases $c \in \{3, 4\}$.

Let $c = a/q$ be an arbitrary rational number not in $\{0, 1, 2\}$. The strategy to estimate $B(a/q, N)$ in this case employs a result of Carr–O’Sullivan [CO09, Theorem 1.1] about linear independence of a/q -powers to reduce to the problem of estimating $B(a, M)$ for various $M \leq N^{1/q}$. This is the content of Proposition 4.2. The problem of estimating $B(a, M)$ can be handled using, for example, Salberger’s results [Sal23, Theorem 0.5, Corollary 0.7], which we have mentioned already. This results in the following estimates for $B(a/q, N)$. In fact, for $c \in \{1/2, 1/3\}$ we obtain asymptotic formulae.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $N \geq 2$ be an irrational number.*

(1) *We have the asymptotic formulae*

$$\begin{aligned} B(1/2, N) &= \zeta(3/2)N^{3/2} + O(N \log N), \\ B(1/3, N) &= N(\log N) + O(N). \end{aligned}$$

(2) *For $q > 3$ we have $B(1/q, N) \ll N$, and for $q > 2$ we have*

$$B(2/q, N) \ll \frac{N(\log N)^3}{q^2}.$$

(3) *For a rational number a/q in lowest terms, and with $a < 0$ or $a > 2$, we have*

$$B(a/q, N) \ll_a \frac{N(\log N)^4}{q^3}.$$

We now prove some auxiliary results that are required to establish Theorem 4.1.

Proposition 4.2. *Let a and $q > 0$ be coprime integers, and let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4)$ be a non-trivial solution to (1) with $c = a/q$. Then we can write $x_i = a_i^q b$ for*

$i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, where $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4)$ is a non-trivial solution to (1) with $c = a$, and b is a positive integer. In particular, for N a positive integer we have

$$B(a/q, N) = \sum_{b \leq N} B(a, (N/b)^{1/q}).$$

Proof. Suppose \mathbf{x} is a non-trivial solution to (1) and let $x_i = a_i^q b_i$ where $a_i, b_i \in [N]$ and the b_i are q -th power free. Consider the set $A = \{b_1^{a/q}, b_2^{a/q}, b_3^{a/q}, b_4^{a/q}\}$ inside $L = \mathbb{Q}(b_1^{1/q}, b_2^{1/q}, b_3^{1/q}, b_4^{1/q})$. If $z, w \in \{b_1, \dots, b_4\}$ and $z^{a/q}$ and $w^{a/q}$ are \mathbb{Q} -linearly dependent, then let s and t be coprime integers with $sz^{a/q} = tw^{a/q}$. If p is a prime dividing s , then

$$qv_p(s) + av_p(z) = av_p(w)$$

so that $a \mid v_p(s)$. Therefore $s = u^a$ for some integer u , and similarly $t = v^a$. We now have

$$z = \left(\frac{v}{u}\right)^q w,$$

so $z = w$, since z and w are q -th power free. In the notation of [CO09], this means that $A \in \theta(\mathbb{Q}, L)$, and so A is \mathbb{Q} -linearly independent by Theorem 1.1 in *loc. cit.*. Substituting the expressions for the x_i into (1) yields

$$a_1^a b_1^{a/q} + a_2^a b_2^{a/q} = a_3^a b_3^{a/q} + a_4^a b_4^{a/q}.$$

Since the a_i are nonzero, we know that b_1 must be equal to at least one of b_2, b_3 or b_4 . If it is equal to b_2 , but not b_3 or b_4 , then $a_1 = a_2 = 0$, and so b_1 must be equal to at least one of b_3 and b_4 . If it is only equal to say b_3 , then $a_1 = a_3$, so $a_2 = a_4$ and we have a trivial solution. Therefore $b_1 = b_2 = b_3 = b_4$. In particular, every nontrivial solution takes the form

$$x_i = a_i^q b$$

for some $a_i \in [N^{1/q}]$ and $b \in [N]$, such that \mathbf{a} is a nontrivial solution to

$$a_1^a + a_2^a = a_3^a + a_4^a.$$

It follows that

$$B(a/q, N) = \sum_{b \leq N} B(a, (N/b)^{1/q}).$$

Q.E.D.

The following lemma can be proved using partial summation [Apo98, Theorem 3.2], but we state it here for convenience.

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\alpha > 0$ and let N be a positive integer. Then*

$$\sum_{b \leq N} \left(\frac{N}{b}\right)^\alpha = \begin{cases} N(\log N) + O(N) & \alpha = 1, \\ \frac{N}{1-\alpha} + \zeta(\alpha)N^\alpha + O(1) & \alpha \neq 1, \end{cases}$$

where the big- O constant does not depend on α .

The following upper bound for $B(2, N)$ will be useful in the proof of Theorem 4.1.

Lemma 4.4. *For $N \geq 2$ we have $B(2, N) \ll N^2(\log N)^3$.*

Proof. We thank Akshat Mudgal for showing us this argument. For $n \leq 2N^2$ let

$$r(n) = \#\{(x, y) \in [N]^2 : n = x^2 - y^2\}.$$

If $n = x^2 - y^2$ then $x - y$ divides n . If $d = x - y$ then we can recover x , and therefore y , from d because of the relation $2x = d + n/d$. Thus $r(n) \leq \sigma_0(n)$, where σ_0 is the divisor counting function. Then

$$B(2, N) \leq \sum_{n \leq 2N^2} r(n)^2 \leq \sum_{n \leq 2N^2} \sigma_0(n)^2 \ll N^2(\log N)^3,$$

where the second moment estimate for the divisor function can be found in [LT17].

Q.E.D.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Suppose first that $a = 1$. Then Proposition 4.2 yields

$$\begin{aligned} B(1/q, N) &= \sum_{b \leq N} \left[\left(\frac{N}{b} \right)^{1/q} \right]^3 \\ &= \sum_{b \leq N} \left(\left(\frac{N}{b} \right)^{1/q} + O(1) \right)^3 \\ &= \sum_{b \leq N} \left(\frac{N}{b} \right)^{3/q} + O\left(\sum_{b \leq N} \left(\frac{N}{b} \right)^{2/q} \right), \end{aligned}$$

and two applications of Lemma 4.3 give

$$\begin{aligned} B(1/2, N) &= \zeta(3/2)N^{3/2} + O(N \log N) \quad (q = 2), \\ B(1/3, N) &= N \log N + O(N) \quad (q = 3), \\ B(1/q, N) &\ll qN \quad (q > 3). \end{aligned}$$

When $a = 2$, we use the upper bound in Lemma 4.4 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} B(2/q, N) &\ll \frac{(\log N)^3}{q^3} \sum_{b \leq N} \left(\frac{N}{b} \right)^{2/q} \\ &\ll \frac{(\log N)^3}{q^3} \left(\frac{N}{1 - 2/q} + \zeta(2/q)N^{2/q} + 1 \right) \\ &\ll \frac{N(\log N)^3}{q^2}. \end{aligned}$$

When $a > 2$, we use [Sal23, Corollary 0.7] to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
B(a/q, N) &\ll_a \frac{(\log N)^4}{q^4} \sum_{b \leq N} \left(\frac{N}{b}\right)^{3a^{-1/2}q^{-1}} \\
&\ll_a \frac{(\log N)^4}{q^4} \left(\frac{N}{1 - 3a^{-1/2}q^{-1}} + \zeta(3a^{-1/2}q^{-1}) N^{3a^{-1/2}q^{-1}} + 1 \right) \\
&\ll_a \frac{N(\log N)^4}{q^3}.
\end{aligned}$$

When $a = -d$ is negative,

$$\begin{aligned}
B(a/q, N) &\ll_a \sum_{b \leq N} B(-d, (N/b)^{1/q}) \\
&\ll_a \frac{(\log N)^4}{q^4} \sum_{b \leq N} \left(\frac{N}{b}\right)^{\sqrt{3}a^{-1/2}q^{-1}} \\
&\ll_a \frac{(\log N)^4}{q^4} \frac{N}{1 - \sqrt{3}q^{-1}} \\
&\ll_a \frac{N(\log N)^4}{q^3}.
\end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of Theorem 4.1.

Q.E.D.

REFERENCES

- [Apo98] T. M. Apostol. *Introduction to analytic number theory*. Undergraduate Texts Math. New York, NY: Springer, corrected 5th printing edition, 1998.
- [Ax71] J. Ax. On Schanuel's conjectures. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 93:252–268, 1971.
- [Bak66] A. Baker. Linear forms in the logarithms of algebraic numbers. *Mathematika*, 13:204–216, 1966.
- [BG06] E. Bombieri and W. Gubler. *Heights in Diophantine geometry*, volume 4 of *New Mathematical Monographs*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006.
- [BKW10] Martin Bays, Jonathan Kirby, and A. J. Wilkie. A Schanuel property for exponentially transcendental powers. *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 42(5):917–922, 2010.
- [BNZ24] G. Binyamini, D. Novikov, and B. Zak. Wilkie's conjecture for Pfaffian structures. *Ann. Math. (2)*, 199(2):795–821, 2024.
- [Bro02] T. D. Browning. Equal sums of two k th powers. *J. Number Theory*, 96(2):293–318, 2002.
- [CCH25] J. Chapman, S. Chow, and P. Holdridge. Additive Ramsey theory over Piatetski-Shapiro numbers, 2025.
- [CO09] R. Carr and C. O'Sullivan. On the linear independence of roots. *Int. J. Number Theory*, 5(1):161–171, 2009.
- [Dri98] L. P. D. van den Dries. *Tame Topology and O-minimal Structures*. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- [ENR00] György Elekes, Melvyn B. Nathanson, and Imre Z. Ruzsa. Convexity and sumsets. *J. Number Theory*, 83(2):194–201, 2000.
- [Fel70] N. I. Feldman. An improvement of the estimate of a linear form in the logarithms of algebraic numbers. *Math. USSR, Sb.*, 6:393–406, 1970.
- [Gre66] G. Greaves. On the representation of a number as a sum of two fourth powers. *Math. Z.*, 94:223–234, 1966.
- [HB02] D. R. Heath-Brown. The density of rational points on curves and surfaces. (With an appendix by J.-L. Colliot-Thélène). *Ann. Math. (2)*, 155(2):553–598, 2002.
- [Hoo63] C. Hooley. On the representations of a number as the sum of two cubes. *Math. Z.*, 82:259–266, 1963.
- [Hoo64] C. Hooley. On the representation of a number as the sum of two h -th powers. *Math. Z.*, 84:126–136, 1964.
- [Hoo80] C. Hooley. On the numbers that are representable as the sum of two cubes. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 314:146–173, 1980.
- [Hoo81] C. Hooley. On another sieve method and the numbers that are a sum of two h -th powers. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)*, 43:73–109, 1981.
- [JS11] Gareth Jones and Tamara Servi. On the decidability of the real field with a generic power function. *J. Symb. Log.*, 76(4):1418–1428, 2011.
- [Lan08] E. Landau. On the partition of positive integers in four classes according to the minimal number of squares needed to their additive composition. *Arch. der Math. u. Phys. (3)*, 13:305–312, 1908.
- [LT17] F. Luca and L. Tóth. The r th moment of the divisor function: an elementary approach, 2017.
- [PW06] J. Pila and A. J. Wilkie. The rational points of a definable set. *Duke Math. J.*, 133(3):591–616, 2006.
- [RS06] O. Robert and P. Sargos. Three-dimensional exponential sums with monomials. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 591:1–20, 2006.
- [Sal23] P. Salberger. Counting rational points on projective varieties. *Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. (3)*, 126(4):1092–1133, 2023.

- [SD68] H. P. F. Swinnerton-Dyer. $A^4 + B^4 = C^4 + D^4$ revisited. *J. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 43:149–151, 1968.
- [SW95] C. M. Skinner and T. D. Wooley. Sums of two k th powers. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 462:57–68, 1995.
- [TV10] T. Tao and V. H. Vu. *Additive combinatorics*, volume 105 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, paperback edition, 2010.
- [Wil96] A. J. Wilkie. Model completeness results for expansions of the ordered field of real numbers by restricted Pfaffian functions and the exponential function. *J. Am. Math. Soc.*, 9(4):1051–1094, 1996.

WARWICK MATHEMATICS INSTITUTE, COVENTRY, UK

Email address: `joseph.s.harrison@warwick.ac.uk`