



HAL
open science

An Ω -result related to $r_{-4}(n)$.

Sukumar Das Adhikari, R Balasubramanian, A Sankaranarayanan

► **To cite this version:**

Sukumar Das Adhikari, R Balasubramanian, A Sankaranarayanan. An Ω -result related to $r_{-4}(n)$. Hardy-Ramanujan Journal, 1989, Volume 12 - 1989, pp.29 - 30. 10.46298/hrj.1989.113. hal-01104372

HAL Id: hal-01104372

<https://hal.science/hal-01104372v1>

Submitted on 16 Jan 2015

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

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

Hardy-Ramanujan Journal
Vol.12 (1989) 29-30

AN Ω -RESULT RELATED TO $r_4(n)$

SUKUMAR DAS ADHIKARI*, R. BALASUBRAMANIAN*

and

A. SANKARANARAYANAN**

§ 1. INTRODUCTION.

Let

$$g(n) = \sum_{d|n} h(d) \quad (1)$$

where h is a multiplicative function such that $\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} h(d)$ is convergent and $h(d) = O(\frac{1}{d})$. Let

$$M_0(x) = x \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \frac{h(d)}{d}$$

$$M_1(x) = \frac{x^2}{2} \sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \frac{h(d)}{d}$$

$$R_0(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} g(n) - M_0(x)$$

and

$$R_1(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} ng(n) - M_1(x) \quad (2)$$

Let $r_k(n)$ denote the number of representations of the positive integer n as a sum of k squares. If we put $h(d) = \frac{\alpha(d)}{d}$ where

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha(d) &= -3 \text{ if } 4 \mid d \\ &= +1 \text{ if } 4 \nmid d, \text{ then we have} \\ g(n) &= \frac{r_4(n)}{8n}.\end{aligned}$$

(See page 205, Hua [5] for an equivalent expression).

Let $P_k(x)$ be the error term defined by

$$\sum_{n \leq x} r_k(n) = \frac{(\pi x)^{\frac{k}{2}}}{\Gamma(\frac{k+1}{2})} + P_k(x). \quad (3)$$

Szego [7] showed that, if $k \equiv 2, 3, 4 \pmod{8}$, then

$$P_k(x) = \Omega_-((x \log x)^{\frac{k-1}{4}}) \quad (4)$$

and if $k \equiv 6, 7, 8 \pmod{8}$, then

$$P_k(x) = \Omega_+((x \log x)^{\frac{k-1}{4}}) \quad (5)$$

For the particular case $k = 2$, the result had been proved by Hardy [4] and the best Ω_- result to date is due to Hafner [3] which is

$$P_2(x) = \Omega_-((x \log x)^{\frac{1}{4}} (\log \log x)^{\frac{\log 2}{4}} \exp(-B(\log \log \log x)^{\frac{1}{2}})) \quad (6)$$

The best Ω_+ result to date is due to Corradi and Katai [1], namely

$$P_2(x) = \Omega_+(x^{\frac{1}{4}} \exp(c(\log \log x)^{\frac{1}{4}} (\log \log \log x)^{-\frac{3}{4}})) \quad (7)$$

(for eg. see Grosswald page 21, [2]).

Our object of this paper is to consider the case $k = 4$ and we prove the following theorems.

THEOREM 1. *We have*

$$P_4(x) = \Omega_+(x \log \log x).$$

REMARK 1. Our treatment is inspired by a paper of Montgomery [6]. We also observe that an elementary proof of a theorem of Montgomery (Theorem

1 of [6]) follows from our treatment which we state as

THEOREM 2. If $g(n) = \frac{\varphi(n)}{n}$ where $\varphi(n)$ is the Euler's totient function, then we have

$$\frac{R_1(x)}{x} - R_0(x) \ll \exp(-c\sqrt{\log x})$$

for some $c > 0$.

REMARK 2. We feel that the treatment can be applied to some other interesting arithmetic functions. We intend to take them up in a further work.

§ 2. NOTATION.

- 1) $\{x\}$ denotes the fractional part of x .
- 2) $[x]$ denotes the integral part of x
- 3) (a, b) denotes the greatest common divisor of a and b .
- 4) $f(x) = O(g(x))$ or $f(x) \ll g(x)$ denotes that there exists a positive constant A such that $|f(x)| < A g(x)$, where $g(x)$ is real.

§ 3. SOME LEMMAS.

LEMMA 3.1. We have

$$R_G(x) = -x \sum_{d>x} \frac{h(d)}{d} - \sum_{d \leq x} h(d) \left\{ \frac{x}{d} \right\}$$

PROOF. We have,

$$\begin{aligned} R_0(x) &= \sum_{n \leq x} g(n) - M_0(x) \\ &= \sum_{n \leq x} \sum_{d|n} h(d) - M_0(x) \\ &= \sum_{d \leq x} h(d) \left(\frac{x}{d} - \left\{ \frac{x}{d} \right\} \right) - M_0(x) \\ &= -x \sum_{d>x} \frac{h(d)}{d} - \sum_{d \leq x} h(d) \left\{ \frac{x}{d} \right\} \\ &\quad \text{(by the definition of } M_0(x)) \end{aligned}$$

which proves the lemma.

LEMMA 3.2. *If $b, r (> 0)$ are integers such that $(b, r) = 1$ and β is a real number, then we have*

$$\sum_{n=1}^r \left\{ \frac{bn}{r} + \beta \right\} = \frac{r-1}{2} + \{r\beta\} \quad (3.2.1)$$

PROOF. We note that both sides are periodic in β with period $\frac{1}{r}$. So we assume that $0 \leq \beta < \frac{1}{r}$. We can also assume that $b = 1$. If $\beta = 0$, then the left hand side of (3.2.1) = $\sum_{n=1}^{r-1} \frac{n}{r} = \frac{r-1}{2}$. If $0 < \beta < \frac{1}{r}$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^r \left\{ \frac{n}{r} + \beta \right\} &= \frac{1}{r} \cdot \frac{r(r-1)}{2} + r\beta \\ &= \frac{r-1}{2} + \{r\beta\} \end{aligned}$$

which proves the lemma.

LEMMA 3.3. *With notation as in Lemma 3.2, for any integer N , we have*

$$\sum_{n=1}^N \left\{ \frac{nb}{r} + \beta \right\} = \frac{N}{r} \{r\beta\} + \frac{N}{2} \left(\frac{r-1}{r} \right) + O(r).$$

PROOF. We have $N = Qr + R$ for some $0 \leq R < r$. Therefore from Lemma 3.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^N \left\{ \frac{nb}{r} + \beta \right\} &= Q \{r\beta\} + Q \left(\frac{r-1}{2} \right) + \sum_{n=1}^R \left\{ \frac{nb}{r} + \beta \right\} \\ &= \frac{N}{r} \{r\beta\} + \frac{N(r-1)}{2r} + O(r). \end{aligned}$$

which proves the lemma.

LEMMA 3.4. *We have*

$$\frac{R_1(x)}{x} - R_0(x) = \frac{x}{2} \sum_{d>x} \frac{h(d)}{d} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{d \leq x} h(d) - \frac{1}{2x} \sum_{d \leq x} h(d) \cdot d \left(\left\{ \frac{x}{d} \right\} - \left\{ \frac{x}{d} \right\}^2 \right).$$

PROOF. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
R_1(x) &= \sum_{n \leq x} ng(n) - M_1(x) \\
&= \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ d_1 d_2 \leq x}} h(d_1) \cdot d_1 d_2 - M_1(x) \\
&= \sum_{d_1 \leq x} d_1 h(d_1) \cdot \sum_{d_2 \leq \lfloor \frac{x}{d_1} \rfloor} d_2 - M_1(x) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{d_1 \leq x} h(d_1) \cdot d_1 \left(\frac{x}{d_1} - \left\{ \frac{x}{d_1} \right\} \right) \left(\frac{x}{d_1} + 1 - \left\{ \frac{x}{d_1} \right\} \right) - M_1(x) \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{d \leq x} h(d) \cdot d \left(\frac{x^2}{d^2} + \frac{x}{d} - 2 \frac{x}{d} \left\{ \frac{x}{d} \right\} - \left\{ \frac{x}{d} \right\} + \left\{ \frac{x}{d} \right\}^2 \right) - M_1(x) \\
&= -\frac{x^2}{2} \sum_{\substack{d > x \\ d \leq x}} \frac{h(d)}{d} + \frac{x}{2} \sum_{\substack{d \leq x \\ d \leq x}} h(d) - x \sum_{\substack{d \leq x \\ d \leq x}} h(d) \left\{ \frac{x}{d} \right\} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{d \leq x} h(d) \cdot d \left\{ \frac{x}{d} \right\} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{d \leq x} h(d) d \left\{ \frac{x}{d} \right\}^2.
\end{aligned}$$

From Lemma 3.1, we have

$$-\sum_{d \leq x} h(d) \left\{ \frac{x}{d} \right\} = R_0(x) + x \sum_{d > x} \frac{h(d)}{d}$$

and so we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{R_1(x)}{x} - R_0(x) &= \frac{x}{2} \sum_{d > x} \frac{h(d)}{d} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{d \leq x} h(d) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2x} \sum_{d \leq x} h(d) d \left(\left\{ \frac{x}{d} \right\} - \left\{ \frac{x}{d} \right\}^2 \right)
\end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof.

LEMMA 3.5. *If there exists a function $G(x)$ such that $G(x)$ and $\frac{x}{G(x)}$ are increasing functions of x , then we have*

$$R_0(x) = -\sum_{d \leq y} h(d) \left\{ \frac{x}{d} \right\} + O(1) \text{ for } y \geq \frac{x}{G(x)}.$$

PROOF. Since $\sum_{d > y} h(d) \left\{ \frac{x}{d} \right\} = O(1)$ for $y \geq \frac{x}{G(x)}$, the lemma follows from Lemma 3.1.

LEMMA 3.6. *For integers $q \approx G(N)$ with $G(N)$ as in Lemma 3.5,*

$\beta = q$ and $y = \frac{(N+1)q}{G(N)}$, we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^N R_0(nq + \beta) = N \sum_{\substack{e \leq y \\ p|e \Rightarrow p|q}} h(e) \frac{(e, q)}{e} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \left\{ \frac{\beta}{(e, q)} \right\} \right) \sum_{\substack{f \leq \frac{y}{e} \\ (f, q) = 1}} \frac{h(f)}{f} + O(N)$$

PROOF. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n=1}^N R_0(nq + \beta) \\ &= - \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{d \leq y} h(d) \left\{ \frac{nq + \beta}{d} \right\} + O(N) \\ & \quad (\text{Since } y = \frac{(N+1)q}{G(N)} > \frac{nq + \beta}{G(nq)}) \\ &= - \sum_{d \leq y} h(d) \sum_{n=1}^N \left\{ \frac{nq + \beta}{d} \right\} + O(N) \\ &= - \sum_{d \leq y} h(d) \cdot \sum_{n=1}^N \left\{ \frac{q/(d, q)}{d/(d, q)} \cdot n + \beta \right\} + O(N) \\ &= - \sum_{d \leq y} h(d) \left(\frac{N}{d} (d, q) \left\{ \frac{\beta}{(d, q)} \right\} + \frac{N(d, q)}{d} \left(\frac{d}{2(d, q)} - 1 \right) + O\left(\frac{d}{(d, q)} \right) \right) + O(N) \\ & \quad (\text{by Lemma 3.3}) \\ &= - \sum_{d \leq y} h(d) \frac{N(d, q)}{d} \left(\left\{ \frac{\beta}{(d, q)} \right\} - \frac{1}{2} \right) + O(N) \\ &= -N \sum_{\substack{e \leq y \\ p|e \Rightarrow p|q}} h(e) \frac{(e, q)}{e} \left(\left\{ \frac{\beta}{(e, q)} \right\} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \sum_{\substack{f \leq \frac{y}{e} \\ (f, q) = 1}} \frac{h(f)}{f} + O(N) \\ & \quad (\text{by writing } d = ef \text{ where } p|e \Rightarrow p|q \text{ and } (f, q) = 1) \end{aligned}$$

which proves the lemma.

LEMMA 3.7. We have

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \frac{\alpha(n)}{n} = 2 \log 2 + O\left(\frac{1}{x}\right)$$

where $\alpha(n)$ is as defined in § 1.

PROOF. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n \leq x} \frac{\alpha(n)}{n} &= - \sum_{4n \leq x} \frac{3}{4n} + \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ 4n \leq x}} \frac{1}{n} - \sum_{4n \leq x} \frac{1}{4n} \\ &= \sum_{n \leq x} \frac{1}{n} - \sum_{n \leq [\frac{x}{4}]} \frac{1}{n} \\ &= 2 \log 2 + O\left(\frac{1}{x}\right) \end{aligned}$$

which proves the lemma.

LEMMA 3.8. If $h(n) = \frac{\alpha(n)}{n}$ and so $g(n) = \frac{\tau_4(n)}{8n}$, then we have

$$\frac{R_1(x)}{x} - R_0(x) = O(1).$$

PROOF. Since $\sum_{d=1}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha(d)}{d}$ is convergent and $|\sum_{d \leq x} \alpha(d)| \leq 3$ for all x , the lemma follows from Lemmas 3.4 and 3.7.

LEMMA 3.9. If $h(n) = \frac{\alpha(n)}{n}$ and so $g(n) = \frac{\tau_4(n)}{n}$, then we have

$$R_0(x) = - \sum_{d \leq y} \frac{\alpha(d)}{d} \left\{ \frac{x}{d} \right\} + O(1)$$

uniformly for $x \geq 2, y \geq \sqrt{x}$.

PROOF. From Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_0(x) &= -x \sum_{d > x} \frac{\alpha(d)}{d^2} - \sum_{d \leq x} \frac{\alpha(d)}{d} \left\{ \frac{x}{d} \right\} \\ &= - \sum_{d \leq x} \frac{\alpha(d)}{d} \left\{ \frac{x}{d} \right\} + O(1) \\ &\quad \left(\text{Since } \sum_{d > x} \frac{\alpha(d)}{d^2} = O\left(\frac{1}{x}\right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

So it is enough to show that

$$\sum_{y \leq d \leq x} \frac{\alpha(d)}{d} \left\{ \frac{x}{d} \right\} = O(1) \text{ for } \sqrt{x} \leq y \leq x.$$

We choose k such that $1 \leq k \leq \frac{x}{y}$ and in $\frac{x}{k+1} < d \leq \frac{x}{k}$, the function $\left\{ \frac{x}{d} \right\}$ is monotone. Therefore we have

$$\sum_{\frac{x}{k+1} < d \leq \frac{x}{k}} \frac{\alpha(d)}{d} \left\{ \frac{x}{d} \right\} = O\left(\frac{k}{x}\right) \text{ (by Lemma 3.7)}$$

Now summing up for k in $1 \leq k \leq \frac{x}{y}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{y \leq d \leq x} \frac{\alpha(d)}{d} \left\{ \frac{x}{d} \right\} &= O\left(\frac{1}{x} \sum_{1 \leq k \leq \frac{x}{y}} k\right) \\ &= O\left(\frac{1}{x} \cdot \frac{x^2}{y^2}\right) \\ &= O(1) \text{ (since } y \geq \sqrt{x}\text{)} \end{aligned}$$

which proves the lemma.

§ 4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.

We take $h(n) = \frac{\alpha(n)}{n}$. Therefore from Lemma 3.6 and 3.9 we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^N R_0(nq + \beta) = N \sum_{\substack{e \leq y \\ p|e \Rightarrow p|q}} \frac{\alpha(e)}{e} \frac{(e, q)}{e} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \left\{ \frac{\beta}{(e, q)} \right\}\right) \sum_{\substack{f \leq y/e \\ (f, q)=1}} \frac{\alpha(f)}{f^2} + O(N) \quad (4.1)$$

for $q \simeq \sqrt{N}$, $\beta \leq q$ and $y = \frac{(N+1)q}{\sqrt{N}} (= O(N))$. Since

$$\sum_{f \geq \frac{1}{e}} \frac{\alpha(f)}{f^2} = O\left(\sum_{f \geq \frac{1}{e}} \frac{1}{f^2}\right) = O\left(\frac{e}{y}\right),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} &N \sum_{e \leq y} \frac{\alpha(e)}{e} \frac{(e, q)}{e} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \left\{ \frac{\beta}{(e, q)} \right\}\right) \sum_{f \geq \frac{1}{e}} \frac{\alpha(f)}{f^2} \\ &\ll N \sum_{e \leq y} \frac{|\alpha(e)|}{e} \frac{(e, q)}{e} \left| \frac{e}{y} \right| \\ &\ll \frac{N}{y} \sum_{e \leq y} \frac{(e, q)}{e} \\ &= O(N). \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

Therefore from (4.1) and (4.2) we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^N R_0(nq + \beta) = N \left(\prod_{p|q} \left(1 + \frac{\alpha(p)}{p^2} + \frac{\alpha(p^2)}{p^4} + \dots\right) \right) \sum_{\substack{e \leq y \\ p|e \Rightarrow p|q}} \frac{\alpha(e)}{e} (e, q) \left(\frac{1}{2} - \left\{ \frac{\beta}{(e, q)} \right\}\right) + O(N) \quad (4.3)$$

Now, we assume $q = \prod_{p \leq z} p$, $\beta = \prod_{2 < p \leq z} p = \frac{q}{2}$ where $z = \left[\frac{1}{2} \log N\right]$. Hence

$q \simeq \sqrt{N}$. From (4.3), we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^N R_0(nq + \beta) = N \left(\prod_{p|q} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^2}\right)^{-1} \right) \zeta(2) \sum_{\substack{e \leq y \\ p|e \Rightarrow p|q}} \frac{\alpha(e)}{e^2} (e, q) \left(\frac{1}{2} - \left\{ \frac{\beta}{(e, q)} \right\}\right) + O(N). \quad (4.4)$$

We note that, if $2 \mid e$, then $\frac{1}{2} - \{\frac{\beta}{(e,q)}\} = 0$. If $2 \nmid e$, then $\alpha(e) = 1$ and $\frac{1}{2} - \{\frac{\beta}{(e,q)}\} = \frac{1}{2}$. Therefore we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{e \leq y \\ p|e \Rightarrow p|q}} \frac{\alpha(e)}{e^2} (e, q) \left(\frac{1}{2} - \left\{ \frac{\beta}{(e, q)} \right\} \right) &\geq \sum_{\substack{e \leq y \\ p|e \Rightarrow p|q, 2 \nmid e}} \frac{1}{e^2} (e, q) \cdot \frac{1}{2} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\substack{e|q \\ 2 \nmid e}} \frac{1}{e} \\ &\approx \log z \\ &\approx \log \log N \quad (4.5) \end{aligned}$$

From (4.4) and (4.5), we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^N R_0(nq + \beta) \geq N \zeta(2) \cdot \frac{1}{2} \log \log N + O(N)$$

which implies

$$R_0(x) = \Omega_+(\log \log x)$$

and hence from Lemma 3.8, we have

$$R_1(x) = \Omega_+(x \log \log x)$$

which completes the proof of Theorem 1.

§ 5. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.

We take $h(n) = \frac{\mu(n)}{n}$. From Lemma 3.4, we have

$$\frac{R_1(x)}{x} - R_0(x) = \frac{x}{2} \sum_{d > x} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{d \leq x} \frac{\mu(d)}{d} - \frac{1}{2x} \sum_{d \leq x} \mu(d) \left(\left\{ \frac{x}{d} \right\} - \left\{ \frac{x}{d} \right\}^2 \right)$$

We consider the sum $\sum_{d \leq x} \mu(d) \left\{ \frac{x}{d} \right\}$. For the range $d \leq x e^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}$, we use trivial estimate and get

$$\sum_{d \leq x e^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}} \mu(d) \left\{ \frac{x}{d} \right\} \ll x e^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}$$

For $x \geq d \geq xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}$, we notice that $\{\frac{x}{d}\}$ is monotonic in $\frac{x}{k+1} < d \leq \frac{x}{k}$ for any k such that $1 \leq k \leq e^{c\sqrt{\log x}}$. Therefore we get

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\frac{x}{k+1} < d \leq \frac{x}{k}} \mu(d)\{\frac{x}{d}\} &\ll \frac{x}{k} \exp(-c\sqrt{\log \frac{x}{k}}) \\ &\ll \frac{x}{k} \exp(-c_1\sqrt{\log x}) \end{aligned}$$

Now summing up over all k 's in $1 \leq k \leq \exp(c\sqrt{\log x})$, we get

$$\sum_{x \exp(-c\sqrt{\log x}) \leq d \leq x} \mu(d)\{\frac{x}{d}\} \ll \exp(-c_2\sqrt{\log x}).$$

The sum $\sum_{d \leq x} \mu(d)\{\frac{x}{d}\}^2$ can be treated similarly. Other sums are easy to deal with. Hence the Theorem 2 follows.

REFERENCES

1. K. CORRADI and I. KATAI, *A comment on K.S. Gangadharan's paper entitled "Two classical lattice point problems"*, Magyar Tud. Akad. Mat. Fiz. Oszt. Közl. 17 (1967) 89-97.
2. EMIL GROSSWALD, *Representations of integers as sums of squares*, Springer-Verlag, 1985.
3. J. HAFNER, *New Ω -theorems for two classical lattice point problems*. Invent. Math. 63 (1981) 11-20.
4. G.H. HARDY, *On Dirichlet's divisor problem*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (2) 15(1916) 1-25.
5. L.K. HUA, *Introduction to Number Theory*, Springer-Verlag, 1982.
6. H.L. MONTGOMERY, *Fluctuations in the mean of Euler's phi function*, Proc. Indian Acad. Sci (Math. Sci.) 97 (1987) 239-245.
7. G. SZEGÖ, *Beitrage zur Theorie der Laguerreshhen polynome, II. Zahlentheoretische Anwendungen*, Math. Z. 25 (1926) 388-404.

ADDRESS OF THE AUTHORS

* PROFESSOR R. BALASUBRAMANIAN AND MR. S.D. ADHIKARI

THE INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES,
MADRAS - 600113
INDIA

** MR. A. SANKARANARAYANAN
SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS
TATA INSTITUTE OF FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH
BOMBAY 400 005
INDIA