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**Introduction.** Let \(y\) be a differential indeterminate over the rational number field \(R\), that is, we consider the polynomial ring \(R[y_0, y_1, y_2, \ldots]\) in a sequence of (algebraic) indeterminates \(y_0 = y, y_1, y_2, \ldots\) together with the mapping \(a \rightarrow a'\) of \(R[y_0, y_1, y_2, \ldots]\) into itself which has the properties:

1. \((a + b)' = a' + b'\),
2. \((ab)' = a'b + ab'\),
3. \(y_i' = y_{i+1}\); there is one and only one such mapping, and the operation of passing from \(a\) to \(a'\) is called differentiation.

By a differential ideal in \(R[y_0, y_1, y_2, \ldots]\) we mean an ideal in the ring-theoretic sense which has the property that if \(a\) is in the ideal, then also \(a'\) is in the ideal. Notationally, \([y^p]\) stands for the differential ideal generated by \(y^p\), that is, for the ideal generated in the usual ring-theoretic sense by \(y^p, (y^p)', ((y^p)')', \ldots\).

A study of the structure of differential ideals yields many unsolved problems even for the relatively simple ideal \([y^p]\). It is shown from a simple calculation that \(y_1^{2p-1} \equiv 0 y^p\), whence it follows that some power of each \(y_i\) is in \([y^p]\). The following question was singled out for investigation by J. F. Ritt [3]: what is the smallest \(q\) such that \(y_i^q = 0 [y^p]\)? For \(i = 1\), \(q = 2p - 1\) is stated by him without proof to be the answer. In Part I we give a proof of this result, and in Part II we solve the problem for \(i = 2, p \geq 2\). For arbitrary \(i \) we conjecture the answer to be \(q = (i + 1)(p - 1) + 1\).

The following notation and results of H. Levi we use extensively. Let \(P = y_0^{a_0}y_1^{a_1} \cdots y_n^{a_n}\) be a power product (pp.) of degree

\[
d = \sum_{i=0}^{n} \alpha_i
\]

and weight

\[
w = \sum_{i=1}^{n} i\alpha_i.
\]

Write \(d = a(p - 1) + b\) where \(a\) and \(b\) are integers such that \(0 \leq a, 0 < b \leq p - 1\). We let \(f(p, d) = a(a - 1)(p - 1) + 2ab\). It is helpful to note, as Levi has done, that \(f(p, d)\) is the weight of the first \(d\) factors of the formal infinite product \(y_0^{p-1}y_1^{p-1}y_2^{p-1} \cdots\). A sufficient condition for \(P \equiv O[y^p]\) is that the weight be small with respect to the degree. More precisely, we have the following theorem of H. Levi:
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Theorem 0.1. Let $p > 1$ and $P$ be a pp. in the $y_i$ of degree $d$ and weight $w$. Then if $w < f(p, d)$, $P \equiv 0[y^p]$.

Levi's theorem may be restated in terms of the notion of weight sequence introduced by D. G. Mead in [2].

Definition 0.2. If $P = y_{i_1}y_{i_2} \cdots y_{i_n}$, where the $i_j$ are monotonically non-decreasing, then $(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ is called the weight sequence of $P$ and $a_n$ the excess weight of $P$, where

$$a_j = \sum_{k=1}^{j} i_k - f(p, j).$$

There is a one-to-one correspondence between weight sequences and pp. in the $y_i$, therefore a pp. and its associated weight sequence may be used interchangeably. Theorem 0.1 says that if one of the entries in the weight sequence of $P$ is negative, then $P \equiv 0[y^p]$. That this condition is not necessary was shown by Mead in [2].

Another basic result of H. Levi concerns the so-called weak pp.

Definition 0.3. $P = y_0^{a_0}y_1^{a_1} \cdots y_n^{a_n}$ is called a weak pp. if, for $i = 0, \ldots, n - 1$, one has $\alpha_i + \alpha_{i+1} < p$.

Theorem 0.4. No linear combination of weak pp. is in $[y^p]$, unless all the coefficients are zero.

This theorem furnishes us with a starting point for our work. By a sequence of congruence relations we reduce a pp. to a linear combination of weak pp., and then we have only to inspect the coefficients involved to ascertain whether or not $P \equiv 0[y^p]$. In the reduction process used by Levi, if $P$ is not weak, so that it contains a factor $y_i^{\alpha}y_{i+1}^{\alpha'}$, this factor is replaced modulo $[y^p]$ by the other terms in the $[ia + (i+1)(p-a)]$th derivative of $y^n$, that is by

$$- \sum c(\beta) \prod y_j^{\beta_j}$$

where

$$\sum \beta_j = \sigma,$$
$$\sum j\beta_j = ia + (i + 1)(p - a)$$

and

$$c(\beta) = - \frac{i!n(i + 1)!^{p-a} a!(p-a)!}{\prod (j!)^{\beta_j} \prod (\beta_j !)}.$$

This gives rise to a congruence relation $P \equiv - \sum c_i Q_i$ where the $Q_i$ are pp. of the same weight and degree as $P$, but less than $P$ if the pp. in the $y_i$ are
ordered lexicographically. The $Q_i$ may in turn be replaced by linear combinations of $P_{ij}$, each $P_{ij}$ being less than $Q_i$, until $P$ is written congruent to a linear combination of weak $P$. This process usually requires elaborate computations which sometimes may be simplified by the notation of an $M$-congruence [2].

Let $P = \sum cQ$ be the congruence obtained after one step in Levi's reduction process. Let $P = \prod y_i^{a_i}$ and let $Q = \prod y_i^{b_i}$ be the monomial on the right side of the congruence. Placing $m(P, Q) = (\prod (k!)^{\alpha_k})/\prod (k!)^{\beta_k}$, $m(P, Q)$ is called the first factor of the step from $P$ to $Q$, $M(P, Q) = c/m(P, Q)$ the second. Note that $m(P, Q)$ depends only on $P, Q$, not on the step. After several steps in the reduction, suppose we come to a congruence $P \equiv \sum dR$. Calling a sequence of successive steps a path, there may be several paths in the given reduction leading from $P$ to $R$. The first factor of a path from $P$ to $R$ is defined to be the product of the first factors of the steps; clearly this is $m(P, R)$ and hence the first factor is the same for any path and can be designated without confusion as $m(P, R)$. If, quite generally, $P \equiv \sum dR$, we also write $P \equiv M \sum (d/m(P, R))R$ and call this an $M$-congruence. Because of the independence of the first factor from the path joining $P$ and $R$, the $M$-congruence is what is obtained in the Levi reduction provided the first factors are suppressed at each step of the reduction. As remarked by Mead, in testing $P \equiv O[y_p]$, we may restrict the computations to $M$-congruences.

**Part I.** In this section we show that the smallest $q$ such that $y_1^q \equiv O[y_p]$ is $q = 2p - 1$. This result was known to Ritt and a proof that $y_1^{2p-1} \equiv O[y_p]$ is given in [3].

**Lemma 1.0.** $y_1^{2p-1} \equiv O[y_p]$.

**Proof.** $P = y_1^{2p-1}$ is of degree $2p - 1$ and weight $2p - 1$. We find that $f(p, 2p - 1) = 2p + 2$. Hence, by Theorem 0.1, $P \equiv O[y_p]$.

**Lemma 1.1.** If $P = y_0 y_1 y_2^s$ is of degree $2p - 2$ and has excess weight zero, then $Q = y_0 a_1 + a_2 - 1 - 2a_2$.

**Proof.** Since $P$ has excess weight zero, $w(P) = f(p, 2p - 2) = \alpha_1 + 2\alpha_2$. $w(Q) = \alpha_1 - 1 + 2\alpha_2$. Therefore $w(Q) - f(p, 2p - 2) = -1$, and hence, by Theorem 0.1, $Q \equiv O[y_p]$.

**Lemma 1.2.** Let $P = y_0 \cdots y_{s-1}$, $y_s > 0$, be of degree $2p - 2$ and have excess weight zero. Then if $s > 2$ we have $P \equiv O[y_p]$.

**Proof.** We examine the weight of $Q = y_0 \cdots y_{s-1}$. Since $P$ has excess weight zero, $w(P) = f(p, 2p - 2) = 2p - 2$. Hence $w(Q) = w(P) - s = 2p - 2 - s < 2p - 4 = f(p, 2p - 3)$. By Theorem 0.1, $Q \equiv O[y_p]$, and therefore also $P \equiv O[y_p]$. 
Lemma 1.3. $y_1^{2p-2} \not\equiv O[y^p]$.

**Proof.** We show by induction on $p-k$ that $y_0^k y_1^{2p-2-2k} y_2^k \not\equiv O[y^p]$, $0 \leq k \leq p-1$. For the case $p-k = 1$, $y_0^{-1} y_1^{p-1} y_2^1 \not\equiv O[y^p]$ by Theorem 0.1. We assume the lemma true for values less than $p-k$. By Lemma 1.1, we have $y_0^{k+1} y_1^{2p-3-2k} y_2^k \equiv O[y^p]$, whence $(y_0^{k+1} y_1^{2p-3-2k} y_2^k) \equiv O[y^p]$. Expanding and applying Lemma 1.2, we have

$$
\begin{align*}
&\frac{2p - 2k - 3}{k + 1} \frac{k}{2p - 2 - 2k} \\
&y_0 y_1 y_2 \equiv -\frac{2p - 2k - 3}{k + 1} \frac{k+1}{y_0 y_1 y_2} \quad \text{[y^p].}
\end{align*}
$$

By our induction hypothesis, $y_0^{k+1} y_1^{2p-4-2k} y_2^{k+1} \not\equiv O[y^p]$, and $(2p - 2k - 3)/(k + 1) \not\equiv 0$ since $2p - 2k - 3$ is an odd number. Therefore the induction holds and our lemma follows by taking $k = 0$.

Corollary 1.4. $y_1^{2p-2} \equiv d y_0^{p-1} y_1^{p-2} [y^p]$, $d \not\equiv 0$.

This follows from the proof of the lemma, or from it directly upon observing that there is only one weak pp. of the same degree and weight as $y_0^{-1} y_1^{p-1}$.

(More generally, it is known, and easily proved, that there is only one weak pp. of the same degree and weight as $y_0^{-1} y_1^{p-1} \cdots y_2^{p-1}$.)

Theorem 1.5. The smallest $q$ such that $y_1^q \equiv O[y^p]$ is $q = 2p - 1$.

**Proof.** Lemmas 1.0 and 1.3.

Part II. In this section we find that the smallest $q$ such that $y_2^q \equiv O[y^p]$ is $q = 3p - 2$.

Lemma 2.0. $y_2^{3p-2} \equiv O[y^p]$.

**Proof.** $P = y_2^{3p-2}$ has degree $3p - 2$ and weight $6p - 4$. We find that $f(p, 3p - 2) = 6p$. Hence $P \equiv O[y^p]$ by Theorem 0.1.

Lemma 2.1. If $P = y_0^{a_0} y_1^{a_1} y_2^{a_2} y_3^{a_3} y_4^{a_4}$ is of degree $3p-3$ and excess weight zero, then

(a) $Q_0 = y_0 y_1 y_2 y_3 y_4 \equiv O[y^p]$,

(b) $Q_1 = y_0 y_1 y_2 y_3 y_4 \equiv O[y^p]$,

(c) $Q_2 = y_0 y_1 y_2 y_3 y_4 \equiv O[y^p]$,

(d) $Q_3 = y_0 y_1 y_2 y_3 y_4 \equiv O[y^p]$.

**Proof.** (a) $w(Q_0) = (\alpha_1 - 1) + 2\alpha_2 + 3\alpha_3 + 4\alpha_4$. Since $P$ has excess weight zero, $w(P) = f(p, 3p - 3) = \alpha_1 + 2\alpha_2 + 3\alpha_3 + 4\alpha_4$. Therefore $w(Q_0) - f(p, 3p - 3) = -1$ and $Q_0 \equiv O[y^p]$ by Theorem 0.1. The proofs for Parts b, c, and d are similar.

Lemma 2.2. Let $P = y_0^{a_0} y_1^{a_1} y_2^{a_2} y_3^{a_3} y_4^{a_4} \cdots y_s^{a_s}$, $\alpha_s > 0$ be of degree $3p - 3$ and have excess weight zero, then if $s > 4$, $P \equiv O[y^p]$.

**Proof.** Assuming that $\alpha_s > 0$, we compute the weight of $Q = y_0^{a_0} y_1^{a_1} y_2^{a_2} y_3^{a_3} y_4^{a_4} \cdots y_s^{a_s}$
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and excess weight zero, then \( Q \) is of degree \( 3p-3 \) and excess weight zero, so the same remark holds for \( Q \). With this understanding, the mapping \( y_i \to y_{4-i}, \quad 0 \leq i \leq 4 \), not only maps \( P \) into \( Q \), but also maps a valid \( M \)-congruence used in the reduction of \( P \) into a valid \( M \)-congruence for the reduction of \( Q \).

**Theorem 2.5.**

\[
\begin{align*}
(y_1 y_4) (y_1 y_3)^{(p-1)/2} & = O[y^{p+t}], \quad t \geq 0, \quad p \text{ odd, } p > 1. \\
(y_1 y_4)^{t+1} (y_1 y_3)^{(p-2)/2} & = O[y^{p+t}], \quad t \geq 0, \quad p \text{ even, } p > 2.
\end{align*}
\]

**Proof.** For \( p = 2 \), nothing is being asserted. For \( p \) even, \( p > 2 \), write \( p+t = (p-1)+(t+1) \); the theorem for \( p = p \) then follows from the theorem for \( p = p-1 \). So we may assume \( p \) odd, \( p \geq 3 \). We prove the theorem first for \( p = 3 \). For arbitrary \( p \), replacing \( y_3 y_4^{p-3} \) by the other terms in the \((4p-3)\)rd derivative of \( y^p \), we find

\[
\begin{align*}
(1) \quad y_1^2 y_3 y_4^{p-3} & = \left\{ \frac{-9(p-3)!}{4(p-1)!} y_1^{2p-2} y_4^{p-1} - \frac{9(p-3)!}{2(p-2)!} y_1^{2p-3} y_2 y_3 y_4^{p-2} \right\} [y^p].
\end{align*}
\]

By Lemmas 2.1b, 2.2, we have

\[
\begin{align*}
(2) \quad y_1 y_2 y_3 y_4^{p-3} & = \frac{-1}{2p-2} y_1^{2p-2} y_4^{p-1} [y^p].
\end{align*}
\]

Therefore, from (1) and (2) \( y_3^a y_4^b y_2^c y_1^d \equiv O[y^p], \quad p \geq 3 \). Placing \( p-3 = t \), we have \( y_3 y_4^{p-3} \equiv O[y^{3+t}], \) which is the theorem for \( p = 3 \).

Letting \( T \) denote an odd integer such that \( 3 \leq T < p \), we have as our induction hypothesis

\[
\text{I.H.2.5.} \quad (y_1 y_4) (y_1 y_3)^{(T-1)/2} \equiv O[y^{T+t}], \quad t \geq 0.
\]

Before proceeding with the proof of Theorem 2.5, we insert a number of lemmas.

**Lemma 2.6.** If \( y_3^a y_4^b y_2^c \) is of degree \( 3p+3t-3 \) and weight \( 6p+6t-6 \), then \( a = 2p+2t-k-2 \) and \( b = p+t-2k-1 \), so that \( y_3^a y_4^b y_2^c = (y_3 y_4)^{p+t-2k-1}(y_2^3)^k \).

**Proof.** We obtain \( a \) and \( b \) by solving simultaneously \( a+3k+b = 3p+3t-3 \) and \( a+9k+4b = 6p+6t-6 \).

**Lemma 2.7.** If \( y_3^a y_4^b y_2^c \) is of degree \( 3p+3t-3 \) and weight \( 6p+6t-6 \), and \( 0 < k < (p-1)/2 \), then \( y_3^a y_4^b y_2^c \equiv O[y^{p+t}] \).

**Proof.** By Lemma 2.6 and I.H.2.5

\[
y_1 y_3 y_4 \equiv O[y^{(2k+1)+(p+t-2k-1)}].
\]
Lemma 2.8.

\[ P = (y_0y_3)^{2,k} (y_1y_4)^{2} (y_1y_3)^{(T-1)/2} \equiv O[y^{T+k+l}] \]

if

\[(T - 1)/2 + \min (k, l) < (p - 1)/2.\]

Proof. By Lemma 2.4, interchanging \(y_0\) and \(y_4\), \(y_1\) and \(y_3\), we see that the lemma is symmetric in \(k\), \(l\); hence we may, and will, assume that \(k \geq l\) and \((T-1)/2 + l < (p-1)/2.\)

To \(P = y_0y_1y_2y_3y_4\), where \(m = (T-1)/2\), we apply Lemmas 2.1d, 2.2 to eliminate the \(y_4\) factor. Applying these lemmas to \(y_0y_1y_2y_4\), (for appropriate \(a, b, c, d, e\)) we can write this pp. congruent to a linear combination of \(y_0y_1y_2y_3y_4, y_0y_1y_2y_3y_4^{-1}, y_0y_1y_2y_3y_4^{+1}y_4^{-1};\) and after repeated applications, the pp. will be congruent to a linear combination of monomials of the form:

\[ a-u \ b+u-v \ c+v-z \ d+w+x \ e-z \]

\[ y_0 \ y_1 \ y_2 \ y_3 \ y_4, \quad u + v + w = x. \]

Taking \(x = e\), \(P\) can be written as congruent to a linear combination of monomials of the form:

\[ k-u \ 2l+3m+u-v \ v-w \ 2k+3m+w+l \]

\[ y_0 \ y_1 \ y_2 \ y_3 \ y_4, \quad u + v + w = l. \]

We propose to show that each of these is congruent to zero, modulo \([y^{T+k+l}]\).

Applying Lemma 2.4, it is sufficient to see that

\[ y_1 \ y_2 \ y_3 \ y_4 \ y_1^{k+3m+u-v} \ y_2^{v-w} \ y_3^{k+3m+w+l} \equiv O[y^{T+k+l}]. \]

We apply Lemmas 2.1b, 2.2 to eliminate the \(y_2\) factor. One application of these lemmas to \(y_0y_3y_1y_4\) replaces the pp. by a linear combination of \(y_1^{a+1}y_2b+c+y-z, y_1^{a+1}y_2b+c+y-z;\) after repeated applications, by a linear combination of pp. of the form

\[ a+x \ b-x-y \ c+y-z \ d+z \]

\[ y_1 \ y_2 \ y_3 \ y_4, \quad x = y + z. \]

Taking \(v-w-x-y=0\), it will be sufficient to show that

\[ y_1^{2k+1+l+3m+v-y} y_2^{2l+3m+u+v+y-z} k-u+v-w-2y \equiv O[y^{T+k+l}]. \]

Recalling that \(l = u+v+w, x = y+z,\) and \(v-w-x-y=0,\) we see that

\[ 2l+3m+u-v+y-z = 3(m+u+w+y), \]

and since \(y=v-w-x \leq v,\) we have

\[ 3(m+u+w+y) \leq 3(m+1) < (3/2)(p-1). \]

By Lemma 2.6, then, it remains to see that
\( \frac{y_1 y_4^{k-u+x}}{(y_1 y_3^3 y_4)} \equiv O[y^{7+k+t}] \),

and this follows from Lemma 2.7. This completes the proof of Lemma 2.8.

Returning to the proof of Theorem 2.5, we distinguish the cases \( p = 4m - 1 \) and \( p = 4m + 1 \). The following lemmas are proved for \( p = 4m - 1 \). The corresponding results are stated for \( p = 4m + 1 \) and are proved in a similar fashion.

**Lemma 2.9a.** Let \( p = 4m - 1 \), then

\[
P = y_1 y_3 y_4 \equiv \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} c_k Q_k[y]^{4m-1+t}
\]

where

\[
Q_k = (y_0 y_3)^{2m-k-1} (y_1 y_4)^{2m-l-k+t} (y_1 y_3)^{2k} y_2
\]

**Lemma 2.9b.** Let \( p = 4m + 1 \), then

\[
P = y_1 y_3 y_4 \equiv \sum_{k=0}^{m} d_k S_k[y]^{4m+1+t}
\]

where

\[
S_0 = (y_0 y_3)^{2m} (y_1 y_4)^{3m+t}
\]

and

\[
S_k = (y_0 y_3)^{2m-k} (y_1 y_4)^{2m+1-k+t} (y_1 y_3)^{2k-1} y_2
\]

for \( k > 0 \).

The exact values of the \( c_k \) and \( d_k \) will be given below.

**Proof** a. Replacing \( y_3^{4m-1} y_4 \) by the other terms in the \((12m+4t-3)\)rd derivative of \( y^{4m-1+t} \), we write \( P \) congruent to a linear combination of pp. of the form:

\[
Q = y_1 \ y_3 \ y_0 \ y_1 \ y_2 \ y_3 \ y_4
\]

with (1) \( i_0 + i_1 + i_2 + i_3 + i_4 = 4m - 1 + t \),
(2) \( i_1 + 2i_2 + 3i_3 + 4i_4 = 12m - 3 + 4t \).
We have \( i_1 + 2i_2 + 3i_3 + 4i_4 = 4(3m - 1 + t) + 1 \), and moreover,
(3) \( i_0 < m \), as \( i_0 \geq m \) implies \( i_1 + i_2 + i_3 + i_4 \leq 3m - 1 + t \), whence \( 3i_1 + 2i_2 + i_3 \leq -1 \), a contradiction. We also note that
(4) \( i_4 > t \).

Using the relations (1) and (2), one verifies that \( Q \) can be written in the form:
We divide the $Q$ into three types: type iii, those for which $2m - 2 - 2i_0 + i_3 = i_2$, types i and ii take up the rest, type i having $i_2 = 0$ and type ii having $i_2 \neq 0$.

For terms of type i we claim
\[(5) \quad i_0 + (2m - 2 - 2i_0 + i_3)/3 \leq 2m - 2.\]

For if not, then $i_0 + i_3 + 3 > 4m - 1$, which with (1) gives $3 - i_1 - i_2 - (4i_1 - t) > 0$, and with (2) gives $9 + 3i_0 - i_1 - 2i_2 - 4(4i_1 - t) > 0$, the first of which yields $i_4 - t = 1$ or 2. If $i_4 - t = 2$, then $i_1 = i_2 = 0$, and the last inequality makes $i_0 = 0$. Thus $i_3 + (i_4 - t) = 4m - 1$ and $3i_3 + 4i_4 - 4t = 12m - 3$, so that $i_4 - t = 0$ contradicting (4). Thus $i_4 - t = 1$. Recalling that $i_2 = 0$, we have $i_1 = 0$ or 1. But there are no terms of the form $y_0^a y_3^b y_4^{i+1}$ or $y_0^a y_1^b y_3^{i+1}$ of the desired degree and weight. Hence (5) is established, and with it, from Lemma 2.8, we conclude that pp. of type i are zero modulo $[y_4^{m-1+t}]$.

We now assert, for all $Q$,
\[(6) \quad 2m - 2 - 2i_0 + i_3 \leq i_2.\]

For if not, then $4i_0 - 2i_3 + 2i_2 + 3 > 4m - 1$. From (1) and (2) we get
\[(7) \quad 4i_0 + 3i_1 + 2i_2 + i_3 = 4m - 1,\]

and with the last inequality, $3 - 3i_1 - 3i_3 > 0$, whence $i_1 = i_3 = 0$. Hence $4i_0 + 2i_2 = 4m - 1$, which is impossible, as an even number cannot be odd.

To take care of the other monomials we insert a lemma:

**Lemma 2.10a.** Let $p = 4m - 1$. If a pp. $Q = (y_0 y_3)^a (y_1 y_3)^b (y_2 y_4)^c y_2^d$ has the same degree and weight as $P$, and if $a \leq m - 1$, $b > d$, and $b + 2c \geq 6m - 3 + 2t$, then $Q \equiv O[y_4^{m-1+t}]$.

**Lemma 2.10b.** Let $p = 4m + 1$. If a pp. $S = (y_0 y_3)^a (y_1 y_3)^b (y_2 y_4)^c y_2^d$ has the same degree and weight as $P$, and if $a \leq m - 1$, $b > d$, and $b + 2c \geq 6m + 2t$, then $S \equiv O[y_4^{m-1+t}]$.

**Proof a.** Applying Lemmas 2.1b, 2.2 to $Q$, we can write $Q$ congruent to a linear combination of pp. of the same form and with smaller $d$, namely,
\[
(y_0 y_3)^{2a-1} (y_1 y_3)^{b+2} (y_2 y_4)^c y_2^{d-1} \\
(y_0 y_3)^2 (y_1 y_3)^{b+1} (y_2 y_4)^c y_2^{d-2} \\
(y_0 y_3)^2 (y_1 y_3)^{b-1} (y_2 y_4)^c y_2^{d-1} .
\]

Thus we may assume $d = 0$. With $d = 0$ and $b \geq 2m - 2$, $Q$ is of type i and hence $Q \equiv O[y_4^{m-1+t}]$. With $d = 0$, if $b < 2m - 2$, then $a + b/3 < m - 1 + (2m - 2)/3 = (5/3)(m - 1) < (p - 1)/2$, so that by Lemma 2.8, $Q \equiv O[y_4^{m-1+t}]$. This completes the proof of Lemma 2.10.

Continuing the proof of Lemma 2.9, Lemma 2.10 shows that all $Q$ of type
ii are zero. Thus we are left with terms of type iii. Terms of type iii are of the form:

\[
\begin{align*}
(y_0 y_y)^{2m-k-1} & \quad (y_1 y_y)^{2m-1-k-l+t} & (y_1 y_y)^{2k+l} & \quad y_2^{2k+1} \\
(y_0 y_y)^{2m-k-l+t} & \quad (y_1 y_y)^{2m-1-k-1+l} & (y_1 y_y)^{2k+1} & \quad y_2^{2k+1} \\
(y_0 y_y)^{2m-k-1} & \quad (y_1 y_y)^{2m-1-k-1+l} & (y_1 y_y)^{2k+1} & \quad y_2^{2k+1} \\
& \quad y_1^{m-3+2t} & y_2^{m-2} & y_0^{m-k-l+l+t_i}
\end{align*}
\]

\[= y_1^{m-3+2t} y_2^{m-2} y_0^{m-k-l+l+t_i},\]

where \(0 \leq k \leq m-1, \ l \geq 0.\) One observes that \(l \leq 1\) since the term is divisible by \(y_1^{m-3+2t}.\) By the formula given in the introduction we note that the coefficient for \(l = 0\) is

\[
\frac{3!^{m-1}4^{m-1}!(4m - 1)!l!}{2^{2k+4}3!^{m-1-k+i}(2k)!(3m - 1 - k + l)!(m - k - 1)!},
\]

and the coefficient for \(l = 1\) is

\[
\frac{3!^{m-1}4^{m-1}!(4m - 1)!l!}{2^{2k+1}3!^{m-2-k+i}(2k + 1)!(3m - 2 - k + l)!(m - k - 1)!}.
\]

Suppose \(l = 1.\) An application of Lemmas 2.1b, 2.2 to such a term yields it to be congruent to a linear combination of three pp.:

\[
\begin{align*}
(y_0 y_y)^{2m-k-2} & \quad (y_1 y_y)^{2m-2-k+l} & (y_1 y_y)^{2k+1} & \quad y_2^{2k} \\
(y_0 y_y)^{2m-k-1} & \quad (y_1 y_y)^{2m-2-k+l} & (y_1 y_y)^{2k+2} & \quad y_2^{2k-1} \\
(y_0 y_y)^{2m-k-l} & \quad (y_1 y_y)^{2m-1-k+l} & (y_1 y_y)^{2k} & \quad y_2^{2k} \\
& \quad y_1^{m-3+2t} & y_2^{m-2} & y_0^{m-k-l+t_i}
\end{align*}
\]

where the coefficient of the last term, \(Q_k,\) is

\[
-\frac{2m - 1}{6m - 2 + 2t}.
\]

The first two pp. are zero by Lemma 2.10. Thus we have \(P = \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} c_k Q_k\) as stated.

**Remark.** By the last paragraph we see that

\[
c_k = -\frac{3!^{m-1}4^{m-1}!(4m - 1)!l!}{2^{2k+4}3!^{m-1-k+i}(2k)!(3m - 1 - k + l)!(m - k - 1)!},
\]

\[
+\frac{(2m - 1)}{(6m - 2 + 2t)} \frac{3!^{m-1}4^{m-1}!(4m - 1)!l!}{2^{2k+1}3!^{m-2-k+i}(2k + 1)!(3m - 2 - k + l)!(m - k - 1)!}.
\]

Similarly one finds

\[
d_0 = -\frac{3!^{m+1}4^{m+1}!(4m + 1)!l!}{3!^{m+1}4^{m+1}!(3m + t)!m!},
\]
A PROPERTY OF THE DIFFERENTIAL IDEAL \([y^n]\)

\[ d_k = \frac{3!4m+14!'((4m + 1)!)(t)!}{2^{2k-14^{3m+k+1+t}(2k - 1)!((3m - k + 1 + t)!(m - k)!}} + \frac{(2m)}{(6m + 1 + 2t)} \frac{3!4m+14!'(4m + 1)!}{2^{2k}3!4^{3m-k+1+t}(2k)!(3m - k + t)!(m - k)!} \]

when \( k > 0. \)

**Lemma 2.11a.** Let \( p = 4m - 1, \) then for \( 0 \leq k \leq m - 1, \)

\[ Q_k = \frac{(2m - 2)!(6m - 2 + 2t)!}{(2m - 2k - 2)!(6m - 2 + 2k + 2t)!} \times y_0 y_1 y_2 \]

**Lemma 2.11b.** Let \( p = 4m + 1, \) then for \( 1 \leq k \leq m, \)

\[ S_k = (-1)^{2k-1} \frac{(2m - 1)!(6m + 1 + 2t)!}{(2m - 2k)!(6m + 2k + 2t)!} \times y_0 y_1 y_3 y_4 \]

**Proof a.** Let

\[ Q_{k,j} = \begin{pmatrix} m-k-1 & 6m+2j+2t & 2k-j & 2m-2j & 3m-1-k+t+j \\ m-k-1 & 6m+2j+2t & 2k-j & 2m-2j & 3m-1-k+t+j \end{pmatrix} \]

\[ = \begin{pmatrix} y_0 y_3 & y_1 & y_2 & y_3 & y_4 \\ y_0 y_3 & y_1 & y_2 & y_3 & y_4 \end{pmatrix} \]

We will prove that

\[ Q_{k,j} = \frac{-(2m - 2 - j)}{6m - 1 + 2t + j} Q_{k,j+1}[y^{4m-1+t}], \]

\( 0 \leq j < 2k. \) By Lemmas 2.1b, 2.2 we may write \( Q_{k,j} \) congruent to a linear combination of three monomials:

\[ \begin{pmatrix} y_0 y_3 & (y_0 y_4) & y_1 y_3 & y_2 \\ y_0 y_3 & y_1 y_4 & (y_1 y_3) & y_2 \\ y_0 y_3 & y_1 y_4 & (y_1 y_3) & y_2 \end{pmatrix} \]

The first two pp. are zero modulo \([y^{4m-1+t}]\) by Lemma 2.10, and the third pp. is \( Q_{k,j+1}. \) Taking into account the coefficients, we have
Lemma 2.12a. Let $p = 4m - 1$, then for $1 \leq k \leq m$, $k \leq j \leq m,$

\[y_0, y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4\]

\[\equiv \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{i-k} \frac{(2j - 2k)!(4m + k - 2 + t - j)!(4m - 2 + t)!}{2^{i-k}(j - k)!(4m - 2 + t)!}
\times y_0, y_1, y_2, y_4, [y_{4m-1+t}].\]

Lemma 2.12b. Let $p = 4m + 1$, then for $0 \leq k \leq m$, $k \leq j \leq m,$

\[y_0, y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4\]

\[\equiv \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{i-k} \frac{(2j - 2k)!(4m + t + k - j)!(4m + t)!}{2^{i-k}(j - k)!(4m + t)!}
\times y_0, y_1, y_2, y_4, [y_{4m+1+t}].\]

Proof. Let

\[Q_j = y_0, y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4, [y_{4m-1+i}].\]

We will show

\[Q_j \equiv \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{i-k} \frac{2j - 2k - 1}{4m + k + t - 1 - j} Q_{j-1}[y_{4m-1+i}].\]

Let $Q_i \leftrightarrow \overline{Q}_j$ under the mapping $y_i \leftrightarrow y_{4-i}$, $0 \leq i \leq 4$. By an application of Lemmas 2.1a, 2.2 to

\[\overline{Q}_j = y_0, y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4, \]

we see that $\overline{Q}_j$ is congruent to a linear combination of the following three pp.:

\[4m+1+k+t+j \quad 2j-2k+2m-1 \quad 6m+4+2k+2t \quad m-k \]

\[y_0, y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4, \]

\[4m-1+k+t+j \quad 2j-2k+1 \quad 6m-3+2k+2t \quad m-k \]

\[y_0, y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4, \]

\[4m-1+k+t+j \quad 2j-2k+1 \quad 6m-5+2k+2t \quad m-k+1 \]

\[y_0, y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4, \]

Of these three terms, the first is $\overline{Q}_{j-1}$. By Lemma 2.4, the second two are in $[y^p]$ if the following are:
and this is so since
\[ w(y_0, y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4) < f(4m - 1 + t, 7m - 3 + k + 2t) = 6m - 2 + 2k + 2t, \]
and
\[ w(y_0, y_1, y_2, y_3, y_4) < f(4m - 1 + t, 7m - 4 + k + 2t) = 6m - 4 + 2k + 2t. \]

Taking into account the coefficients, we have
\[ \overline{Q}_j = -\frac{2j - 2k - 1}{4m - 1 + k + t - j} \overline{Q}_{j-1}[y^{4m-1+t}]. \]

Hence we have:
\[ \overline{Q}_j \equiv \overline{M} - \frac{2j - 2k - 1}{4m - 1 + k + t - j} \frac{1}{m(\overline{Q}_j, \overline{Q}_{j-1})} \overline{Q}_{j-1}[y^{4m-1+t}], \]
\[ Q_j \equiv \overline{M} - \frac{2j - 2j - 1}{4m - 1 + k + t - j} \frac{1}{m(\overline{Q}_j, \overline{Q}_{j-1})} Q_{j-1}[y^{4m-1+t}], \]
(by Lemma 2.4), and
\[ Q_j \equiv -\frac{2j - 2j - 1}{4m - 1 + k + t - j} \frac{m(Q_j, Q_{j-1})}{m(\overline{Q}_j, \overline{Q}_{j-1})} Q_{j-1}[y^{4m-1+t}]. \]

We also have
\[ \frac{m(Q_j, Q_{j-1})}{m(\overline{Q}_j, \overline{Q}_{j-1})} = \frac{3}{2} \]
and our lemma follows.

Lemma 2.13a. Let \( p = 4m - 1 \), then for \( 1 \leq k \leq m \),
\[ y_0, y_1, y_2, y_4 = (-1)^{m-k} \frac{(m - k)!}{(8m - 5 + 2t)(8m - 7 + 2t) \cdots (6m - 3 + 2k + 2t)} y_1 y_4^{8m-4t+2t} [y^{4m-1+t}]. \]

Lemma 2.13b. Let \( p = 4m + 1 \), then for \( 0 \leq k \leq m \),
Proof a. By Lemmas 1.1, 1.2 we have
\[
\frac{(m-k)!}{(8m-1+2t)(8m-3+2t) \cdots (6m+1+2k+2t)} \times y_1 y_4 [y^{4m-1+t}].
\]
A second application of Lemmas 1.1, 1.2 gives
\[
\frac{(8m-5+2t)(8m-7+2t) \cdots (8m-3+2t-2j)}{1} \times y_1 y_4 [y^{4m-1+t}].
\]
Repeated applications of Lemmas 1.1, 1.2 gives
\[
\frac{(8m-4+2t)(8m-6+2t) \cdots (8m-3+2t-2j)}{j!} \times y_1 y_4 [y^{4m-1+t}].
\]
Taking \(j = m-k\) and multiplying by \(y_i^{4m-2+t}\) we have our lemma.

**Lemma 2.14a.** Let \(p = 4m-1\), then for \(0 \leq k \leq m-1\),
\[
Q_k = \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{m-k-1} \left(\frac{2m-2}{(6m+2t)}\right)! \times \frac{8m-4+2t}{(8m-4+2t)!} \times y_1 y_4 [y^{4m-1+t}].
\]

**Lemma 2.14b.** Let \(p = 4m+1\), then
\[
S_0 = \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{m} \frac{(2m)!}{(8m+2t)!} \times \frac{8m+2t}{y_1 y_4 [y^{4m-1+t}]}.
\]
\[
S_k = -\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{m-k} \frac{(2m-1)!}{(8m+2t)!} \times \frac{8m+2t}{y_1 y_4 [y^{4m-1+t}]}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq m.
\]

Proof a. Lemmas 2.11, 2.12 with \(j = m\), and 2.13.
Continuing with the proof of Theorem 2.5, we have by Lemma 2.14, if \(p = 4m-1\),
\[
P = \frac{6m-3+2t}{y_1 y_3 y_4}
\]
\[
= \text{Constant} \times \sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{2^{2j-2}(6m^2 - 8mj + 3j - 1 + (2m-2j)t)}{(2j-1)!(m-j)!(3m-j+t)!}
\]
\[
\times \frac{8m-4+2t}{y_1 y_4 [y^{4m-1+t}]};
\]
or if \( p = 4m + 1 \),

\[
P = y_1^{6m+1+2t} y_4^{6m+t} y_5^{6m + t} y_6^{4m+1+3t} = c \sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{2^{2i+2}(6m^2 - 8mj - 2ji + 2mt + 2m - j)}{(m - j)!(2j)!(3m - j + i + 1)!} y_1^{6m+2t} y_4^{4m+t} y_5^{4m+1+i} y_6^{4m+1+3t}.
\]

Theorem 2.5 will follow from Lemma 2.15.

**Lemma 2.15a.** For \( p = 4m - 1 \),

\[
\sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{2^{2i-2}(6m^2 - 8mj + 3j - 1 + 2mt - 2jt)}{(2j - 1)! (m - j)!(3m - j + i)!} = 0.
\]

**Lemma 2.15b.** For \( p = 4m + 1 \),

\[
\sum_{j=0}^{m} \frac{2^{2i+2}(6m^2 - 8mj - 2ji + 2mt + 2m - j)}{(m - j)!(2j)!(3m - j + i + 1)!} = 0.
\]

**Proof a.**

\[
\sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{2^{2i-2}(6m^2 - 8mj + 3j - 1 + (2m - 2j)t)}{(2j - 1)! (m - j)!(3m - j + i)!} = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{2^{2i-1}(3m - j + i)(m - j)}{(2j - 1)! (m - j)!(3m - j + i)!} - \sum_{j=0}^{m-1} \frac{2^{2i}(2j + 1)(j)}{(2j + 1)! (m - j - 1)!(3m - j - 1 + i)!} = 0.
\]

**Theorem 2.16.** The smallest \( q \) such that \( y_2^{q-2} = O[y^p] \) is \( q = 3p - 2 \).

**Proof.** By Lemma 2.0, \( y_2^{3p-2} = O[y^p] \). By Theorems 2.3, 2.5 \( y_2^{3p-3} = cy_1^{2p-2}y_4^{-1}[y^p] \), \( c \neq 0 \). By Corollary 1.4, \( y_2^{3p-2} = dy_1^{p-1}y_2^{p-1}[y^p] \), \( d \neq 0 \). Hence \( y_2^{3p-3} = cd[y_1^{p-1}y_2^{p-1}y_4^{-1}][y^p] \), \( cd \neq 0 \) whence \( y_2^{3p-3} \neq O[y^p] \) by Theorem 0.4.
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