

On a method of Davenport and Heilbronn I. K Ramachandra

▶ To cite this version:

K Ramachandra. On a method of Davenport and Heilbronn I.. Hardy-Ramanujan Journal, 1998, Volume 21 - 1998, pp.12-26. 10.46298/hrj.1998.136 . hal-01109319

HAL Id: hal-01109319 https://hal.science/hal-01109319v1

Submitted on 26 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.21 (1998) 12-26

On a method of Davenport and Heilbronn, I

by

K. RAMACHANDRA

Dedicated to Professor A. Schinzel on his sixtieth birthday

1. Introduction

This paper arose out of a table of RAJA RAMANNA et al. (see [RR,AS], [RR, BVS] and [RR] papers on nuclear physics) which gave values of the number $\log_{10}\left(\frac{2^n}{n}\right)$ where n is a positive integer. The authors observed that sometimes this is very close to a prime. I first state a result of I.M. VINOGRADOV (see [IMV]) and then a result of S.D. CHOWLA (see [SDC]) and then go on to state the course of developments of a deep method (see [HD,HH]) due to H. DAVENPORT and H. HEILBRONN. One of the corollaries to a deep theorem of I.M. VINOGRADOV runs as follows. Let $\lambda > 0$ be any fixed irrational number. Then as n runs through all positive integers and p through all primes the numbers $\lambda p - n$ are everywhere dense on the real line. (Actually VINOGRADOV proves that the numbers λp are "uniformly distributed modulo 1".) By using a theorem of V. JARNIK and A. WALFISZ [VJ,AW] on the number of lattice points in a five-dimensional ellipsoid, S.D. CHOWLA deduced ingeniously that the set of values of $\sum_{j=1}^{9} \lambda_j x_j^2$ (λ_j fixed non-zero real numbers, not all of the same sign and $\lambda_1 \lambda_2^{-1}$ irrational) as the nine number tuple (x_i) runs independently over all positive integer entries, is dense on the real line. The result of DAVENPORT and HEILBRONN states that here 9 can be reduced to 5. (The latest result in this direction is due to G.A. MARGULIS who by a different method [GAM] showed that the values of any real indefinite quadratic form in 3 variables (which is not a multiple of a form with rational coefficients), as the variables run through all triplets of positive integers, is dense everywhere on the real line.)

Now we come to the method of DAVENPORT and HEILBRONN. Their method was modified by R.P. BAMBAH [RPB] who showed that the values of $\sum_{j=1}^{5} \lambda_j x_j^2$ with the same conditions as before is dense on the real line even when we insist that one of the coordinates say x_5 be the k_0^{th} powers of positive integers ($k_0 \ge 2$ being a fixed integer). The problem of considering prime quintuplets (x_j) was considered by K. RAMACHANDRA [KR₁], and earlier W. SCHWARZ [WS], both of whom considered also the corresponding linear problem $\sum_{j=1}^{3} \lambda_j x_j$ with prime triplets (x_1, x_2, x_3). Also A. BAKER [AB] considered the linear problem by a different method. The result of K. RAMACHANDRA was sharper than those of W. SCHWARZ and A. BAKER, and his method like the method of W. SCHWARZ was an adaptation of the fundamental method of DAVENPORT and HEILBRONN. Next R.C. VAUGHAN [RCV₁], [RCV₂] improved remarkably the result of K. RAMACHANDRA by introducing into the method, expressions involving the zeros of the Riemann zeta-function. (It should be mentioned that much later after R.C. VAUGHAN, S. SRINIVASAN [SS] has also worked out some results by the DAVENPORT-HEILBRONN fundamental method (by using VAUGHAN's ideas)).

In this paper it is our object to raise new questions which arise in connection with our new results which run as follows. (We state a few theorems and make some remarks.)

Theorem 1. Let a > 1, c > 1 be any two fixed real numbers such that $\frac{\log a}{\log c}$ is irrational. Then for any two fixed real numbers b and η , we have the inequality

$$\left|\log_{c}\left(\frac{a^{n}}{n^{b}}\right) - p - \eta\right| < \operatorname{Exp}\left(-(\log(np))^{1/2}\right)$$

for infinitely many pairs (n, p) where n is a positive integer and p is prime.

Remark 1. Let λ be any positive irrational and $\varphi(u)$ $(u \geq 3)$ be any continuously differentiable function for which $\varphi'(u)$ is monotonic and $= O(\frac{1}{u})$. (We can relax this condition to some extent.) Then the numbers $\lambda p - n + \varphi(n)$ are dense (everywhere) on the real line as n runs through all positive integers and p through primes.

Actually we prove the following more general theorem and remark about some new questions.

Theorem 2. Let $\lambda_1 > 0$, $\lambda_3 < 0$ be any two constants such that $\lambda_1 \lambda_3^{-1}$ is irrational and let λ_2 be any non-zero real constant. Let $\varphi_1(u)$, $\varphi_2(u)$ and $\varphi_3(u)$ be any three continuously differentiable real valued functions (defined for $u \ge 3$) with the properties: $\varphi'_j(u)$ monotonic and $\sum_{j=1}^3 |\varphi'_j(u)| \le u^{-1}(\log u)^{k_0}$ where k_0 is any fixed positive constant. Then the inequality

$$\left|\sum_{j=1}^{3} \lambda_{j}(p_{j} + \varphi_{j}(p_{j}))\right| < \exp\left(-(\log(p_{1}p_{2}p_{3}))^{1/2}\right)$$

holds for infinitely many triplets (p_1, p_2, p_3) of primes (in fact, even with the restriction $p_1^{-1}p_2 \leq \operatorname{Exp}(-(\log(p_1p_2p_3))^{1/2}).)$

Remark 2. By employing R.C. VAUGHAN's method (which is a sharpening of RA-MACHANDRA's method) we may be able to replace $\exp(-(\log(p_1p_2p_3))^{1/2})$ which occurs in the above theorem by $(p_1p_2p_3)^{-\delta}$ where $\delta > 0$ is an absolute constant.

Remark 3. The precise generalisations of Theorem 2 (with for example $p_j^k + \varphi_j(p_j)$, $k \ge 1$, in place of $p_j + \varphi_j(p_j)$) will form the subject matter of a forthcoming paper.

Remark 4. One of the attractive problems is to consider (with any indefinite quadratic form $f(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ in three variables which is not proportional to a rational form) the problem regarding $f(x_1 + \varphi_1(x_1), x_2 + \varphi_2(x_2), x_3 + \varphi_3(x_3))$ which corresponds to the result of G.A. MARGULIS. Here $\varphi_1(u)$, $\varphi_2(u)$ and $\varphi_3(u)$ are suitable real valued functions.

2. Notation and sketch of the method

We denote by A, B, C quantities greater than 1, which will depend on the variable x $(x \ge 10)$ (but all of them are $\le \exp(100\sqrt{\log x})$). We will choose them later. Very soon we will choose B = A (since $B \ne A$ is not of much use). The letter D will denote the constant $(3\lambda_1 + 2|\lambda_2|)|\lambda_3|^{-1}$. We write $e(u) = e^{2\pi i u}$,

$$\begin{split} S_1 &= \sum_{\substack{x \le p \le 2x \\ 2 \le p \le xC^{-1}}} (\log p) e(B\lambda_1 \alpha(p + \varphi_1(p))) \\ S_2 &= \sum_{\substack{x \le p \le 2x \\ 2 \le p \le xC^{-1}}} (\log p) e(B\lambda_2 \alpha(p + \varphi_2(p))) \\ S_3 &= \sum_{\substack{2 \le p \le Dx \\ 2 \le p \le Dx}} (\log p) e(B\lambda_3 \alpha(p + \varphi_3(p))), \end{split}$$

where α is a real variable.

Then by using

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e(etalpha) \Big(rac{\sin(\pilpha)}{\pilpha}\Big)^2 dlpha = \max(0,1-|eta|) \quad (eta ext{ real}),$$

we see that the quantity J defined by

$$J = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} S_1 S_2 S_3 \Big(\frac{\sin(\pi\alpha)}{\pi\alpha}\Big)^2 d\alpha$$

satisfies

$$J = \sum \sum \sum (\log p_1) (\log p_2) (\log p_3) \max \left(0, 1 - \left| B \sum_{j=1}^3 \lambda_j (p_j + \varphi(p_j)) \right| \right)$$

where the three summations are as in S_1 , S_2 and S_3 respectively. Clearly it suffices to prove $J \neq 0$ (with a suitable B) in order to prove Theorem 2. This is done as follows. First of all we show that the contribution J_1 (to J) from the interval $|\alpha| \leq x^{-1}A$ is the dominant term for J (we may call $|\alpha| \leq x^{-1}A$ as the basic interval). Next we prove that the contribution J_3 (to J) from $|\alpha| \geq B(\log x)^2$ is small (we may call this the supplementary interval). The contribution J_2 (to J) from the remaining interval will have to be shown to be small for a sequence $x = x_{\nu} \to \infty$ (that will be done by using the irrationality of $\lambda_1 \lambda_3^{-1}$, this (remaining) interval may be called the intermediary interval). Though this reminds us of the famous "CIRCLE METHOD", this method is somewhat different and is an ingenious method due to H. DAVENPORT and H. HEILBRONN. We introduce some more notation.

$$I_1 = \int_x^{2x} e(B\lambda_1 \alpha(u + \varphi_1(u))du,$$
$$I_2 = \int_2^{xC^{-1}} e(B\lambda_2 \alpha(u + \varphi_2(u))du,$$
$$I_3 = \int_2^{Dx} e(B\lambda_3 \alpha(u + \varphi_3(u))du,$$

and

$$E_j = S_j - I_j$$
 $(j = 1, 2, 3).$

We assume the prime number theorem in the form $\vartheta(u) - u = O(uE^{-1}(u))$ $(u \ge 3)$, where $E(u) = \operatorname{Exp}((\log u)^{\frac{11}{20}})$, and $\vartheta(u) = \sum_{2 \le p \le u} \log p$. The letters K_1 and K_2 will denote certain positive constants independent of x. The Vinogradov symbols \ll and \gg have the usual meaning.

3. Treatment of the basic interval

Consider the portion J_1 of J, where the integration is restricted by $|\alpha| \leq x^{-1}A$. In J_1 we define J^* to be the same as J_1 but with S_1 , S_2 and S_3 being replaced by I_1 , I_2 and I_3 , respectively. Next we define J^{**} to be the same as J^* with the integration limits $-\infty \leq \alpha \leq \infty$. Our first object is to show that $|J_1 - J^*|$ is small and that $|J^* - J^{**}|$ is also small, but J^{**} is big. This will complete the object of this section namely that J_1 is big. We begin with the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. We have

$$|S_1S_2S_3 - I_1I_2I_3| \le \prod_{j=1}^3 (|I_j| + |E_j|) - \prod_{j=1}^3 |I_j|.$$

Proof. Follows from $S_j = I_j + E_j$

Lemma 3.2. We have

 $|E_1| + |E_3| \ll xE^{-1}(x) + (|B\lambda_1\alpha| + |B\lambda_3\alpha|)x^2E^{-1}(x)$

and

$$|E_2| \ll x C^{-1} E^{-1/2}(x) + |B\lambda_2 \alpha| C^{-2} x^2 E^{-1/2}(x)$$

where the implied constants depend only on λ_1 , λ_2 and λ_3 .

Proof. We have

$$S_{1} = \sum_{\substack{x \le p \le 2x}} (\log p) e(B\lambda_{1}\alpha(p + \varphi_{1}(p)))$$

$$= \int_{x=0}^{2x+0} e(B\lambda_{1}\alpha(u + \varphi_{1}(u)))(d(\vartheta(u) - u) + du)$$

$$= I_{1} + (\vartheta(u) - u)e(B\lambda_{1}\alpha(u + \varphi_{1}(u)))\Big]_{x=0}^{2x+0}$$

$$+ O\Big(\int_{x}^{2x} |B\lambda_{1}\alpha(1 + \varphi_{1}'(u))uE^{-1}(u)e(B\lambda_{1}\alpha(u + \varphi_{1}(u)))|du\Big)$$

Hence

$$|E_1| \ll x E^{-1}(x) + |B\lambda_1 \alpha| x^2 E^{-1}(x).$$

Similarly we can prove estimates for $|E_3|$ and $|E_2|$.

From now on we choose A = B.

Lemma 3.3. For $|\alpha| \leq x^{-1}A$, we have the inequality

$$|E_1| + |E_2| + |E_3| \ll x E^{-1/3}(x).$$

Proof. Follows from the condition A = B imposed already.

Lemma 3.4. We have

$$\int_{|\alpha| \le x^{-1}A} |S_1 S_2 S_3 - I_1 I_2 I_3| d\alpha \ll x^2 (E(x))^{-1/4}.$$

Proof. The proof follows from Lemmas 3.1 and 3.3 (on using the trivial estimates for $|I_1|$, $|I_2|$ and $|I_3|$).

Lemma 3.5. We have

$$|I_1 I_2 I_3| \ll |B\alpha|^{-3}$$

for all real α (where the implied constant depends only on λ_1 , λ_2 and λ_3).

Proof. The integrals I_1 , I_2 , I_3 are of the form

$$igg(e(B\lambda_j lpha(u+arphi_j(u))) du \quad (ext{over suitable limits of integration}) \ = \int rac{B\lambda_j lpha(1+arphi_j'(u))e(B\lambda_j lpha(u+arphi_j(u))) du}{B\lambda_j lpha(1+arphi_j'(u))} = O(|Blpha|^{-1})$$

on using the monotonicity of $\varphi'_j(u)$.

Lemma 3.6. We have

$$\int_{|\alpha| \ge x^{-1}A} |I_1 I_2 I_3| d\alpha \ll A^{-5} x^2.$$

Proof. LHS is

$$\ll \int_{|lpha| \ge x^{-1}A} |B lpha|^{-3} d lpha \ll B^{-3} (x^{-1}A)^{-2} = A^{-5} x^2$$

Lemma 3.7. We have

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} I_1 I_2 I_3 \Big(rac{\sin(\pilpha)}{\pilpha}\Big)^2 dlpha \gg x^2 A^{-1} C^{-1},$$

where the implied constant depends only on λ_1 , λ_2 and λ_3 .

Proof. LHS is the same as

$$\int_{x}^{2x} \int_{2}^{xC^{-1}} \int_{2}^{Dx} \max \Big(0, 1 - \Big| B \sum_{j=1}^{3} \lambda_j (u_j + arphi_j (u_j)) \Big| \Big) du_1 du_2 du_3.$$

Let u_1 and u_2 run freely over their ranges. For every pair (u_1, u_2) the integrand is $\geq \frac{1}{2}$ provided

$$B\lambda_3(u_3+arphi_3(u_3))|$$

(as a function of u_3) varies over an interval of length $\frac{1}{2}$. For this u_3 has to be in an interval of length $\gg B^{-1} = A^{-1}$. This proves Lemma 3.7.

Collecting we have the following main lemma of this section.

Lemma 3.8. We have

$$J_{1} = \int_{|\alpha| \le x^{-1}A} S_{1} S_{2} S_{3} \left(\frac{\sin(\pi\alpha)}{\pi\alpha}\right)^{2} d\alpha$$

$$\ge x^{2} A^{-1} C^{-1} (K_{1} - K_{2} A^{-4} C - K_{2} A C (E(x))^{-1/4}).$$

)

4. Treatment of supplementary interval

Denote by J_3 the portion $|\alpha|$ exceeding a positive quantity (see Lemma 4.2) of the integral

$$\int S_1 S_2 S_3 \Big(\frac{\sin(\pi\alpha)}{\pi\alpha}\Big)^2 d\alpha.$$

We will show that J_3 is small.

Lemma 4.1. Let $y \ge 0$. Then $S_2 \ll xC^{-1}$ and

$$\int_{y \le \alpha \le y+1} |S_1 S_3| d\alpha \ll x \log x.$$

Proof. The first assertion is trivial. Next we have $|S_1S_3| \leq |S_1|^2 + |S_3|^2$ and

$$\begin{split} \int_{y \le |\alpha| \le y+1} \Big| \sum_{x \le p \le 2x} (\log p) e(B\lambda_1 \alpha (p + \varphi_1(p))) \Big|^2 d\alpha \\ \le \sum_{p} (1 + O(1)) (\log p)^2 \ll x \log x. \end{split}$$

Here we have used a famous theorem due to H.L. MONTGOMERY and R.C. VAUGHAN (see for instance $[KR_2]$). We may prove what is required for our purposes by simpler arguments but it is convenient to use this.

Similarly

$$\int_{y \le |\alpha| \le y+1} \Big| \sum_{2 \le p \le Dx} (\log p) e(B\lambda_3 \alpha (p + \varphi_3(p))) \Big|^2 d\alpha \ll x \log x.$$

Lemma 4.2. For all $y \ge 0$ we have

$$\int_{|\alpha| \ge y} |S_1 S_2 S_3| \Big(\frac{\sin(\pi \alpha)}{\pi \alpha}\Big)^2 d\alpha \ll \frac{x^2 (\log x) C^{-1}}{y+1}$$

and choosing $y = A(\log x)^2$, we have

$$\int_{|\alpha| \ge A(\log x)^2} |S_1 S_2 S_3| \Big(\frac{\sin(\pi \alpha)}{\pi \alpha}\Big)^2 d\alpha \ll A^{-1} C^{-1} x^2 (\log x)^{-1}.$$

Proof. The proof follows from Lemma 4.1.

We show that the integral



over this interval is small compared with $A^{-1}C^{-1}x^2$ (for a sequence $x = x_{\nu} \to \infty$). Let $M = \max_{\alpha \in I} \min_{j=1,3} |S_j|$. Then



(where $(\alpha)_1$ denotes those $\alpha \in I$ for which $M = |S_1|$ and $(\alpha)_3$ denotes those $\alpha \in I$ for which $M = |S_3|$)



We adopt a similar procedure at some places below. Finally we let $x = x_{\nu} \to \infty$ ($\nu = 1, 2, 3...$).

Lemma 5.1. Let $Q \ge 1$ and β be any real numbers. Then there exist integers a, q with (a,q) = 1, $1 \le q \le Q$ and $|\beta - \frac{a}{q}| \le (qQ)^{-1}$. Hence we have

 $egin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|c|c|} \lambda_1 Blpha - rac{a_1}{q_1} &\leq (q_1Q)^{-1}, & 1 \leq q_1 \leq Q, & (a_1,q_1) = 1, \ \lambda_3 Blpha - rac{a_3}{q_3} &\leq (q_3Q)^{-1}, & 1 \leq q_3 \leq Q, & (a_3,q_3) = 1, \end{array}$

and

$$\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_3} - \frac{a_0}{q_0} \Big| \le (q_0 Q_0)^{-1} (\le q_0^{-2}), \qquad (a_0, q_0) = 1,$$

where $a_1, a_3, q_1, q_3, Q, Q_0$ are integers and Q and Q_0 are at our choice.

Proof. The first assertion is well-known and follows by a simple application of the Dirichlet box principle. The rest of the assertions are special corollaries. \Box

Hereafter we impose x and Q_0 to be large enough and $\lambda_1 \lambda_3^{-1}$ irrational and so q_0 can be assumed to run through a sequence which tends to infinity.

Lemma 5.2. If Q_0 is large enough then $a_0 \neq 0$. If $a_1 = 0$ then for such α (note that $I: A(\log x)^2 \geq \alpha \geq x^{-1}A$ and also $|B\alpha| \ll Q^{-1}$)

$$|S_1| \ll (B\alpha)^{-1} + xE^{-1}(x) + |B\alpha|x^2E^{-1}(x).$$

If $a_3 = 0$ then for such α we have

$$|S_3| \ll |B\alpha|^{-1} + xE^{-1}(x) + |B\alpha|x^2E^{-1}(x).$$

Proof. Similar to the proofs of Lemmas 3.2 and 3.5.

Let $(\alpha)_{0,1}$ be the set of those $\alpha \in I$ for which $a_1 = 0$ and $(\alpha)_{0,3}$ the set of those $\alpha \in I$ for which $a_3 = 0$. Then

$$\begin{split} &\int_{(\alpha)_{0,1}} |S_1 S_2 S_3| \Big(\frac{\sin(\pi\alpha)}{\pi\alpha}\Big)^2 d\alpha \\ &\ll \int \Big\{ A^{-1} B^{-1} x + x E^{-1}(x) + \frac{x^2}{Q} E^{-1}(x) \Big\} |S_2 S_3| \Big(\frac{\sin(\pi\alpha)}{\pi\alpha}\Big)^2 d\alpha \\ &\ll A^{-2} C^{-1/2} x^2 \log x + C^{-1/2} x^2 E^{-1}(x) \log x \\ &\quad + \frac{x^2}{Q} E^{-1}(x) \int_{\alpha > x^{-1} A} |S_2 S_3| \frac{d\alpha}{\alpha^2 + 1} \\ &\ll A^{-2} C^{-1/2} x^2 \log x + C^{-1/2} x^2 E^{-1}(x) \log x + \frac{x^3}{Q} E^{-1}(x) C^{-1/2} \log x. \end{split}$$

We can get the same bound for

$$\int_{(\alpha)_{0,3}} |S_1 S_2 S_3| \Big(\frac{\sin(\pi\alpha)}{\pi\alpha}\Big)^2 d\alpha$$

by proceeding in a similar way.

Collecting we have the following lemma.

Lemma 5.3. Contribution to the integral over the intermediary interval from those α for which $a_1 = 0$ or $a_3 = 0$ is

$$\ll A^{-2}C^{-1/2}x^2\log x + C^{-1/2}x^2E^{-1}(x)\Big(1+\frac{x}{Q}\Big)x^2\log x.$$

From now on we consider the contribution form those α for which both $a_1 \neq 0$ and $a_3 \neq 0$.

Lemma 5.4. We have

$$\frac{a_0}{q_0} - \frac{a_1 q_3}{a_3 q_1} = O(q_0^{-2} + Q^{-1} | a_3 | q_3^{-1} (q_1^{-1} + q_3^{-1})).$$

Proof. We have

$$\left|\frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_3}\lambda_3 Blpha - \frac{a_1}{q_1}\right| \le (q_1Q)^{-1}.$$

Here the LHS is

$$\Big|\Big(\frac{\alpha_0}{q_0}+O(q_0^{-2})\Big)\Big(\frac{a_3}{q_3}+O(q_3^{-1}Q^{-1})\Big)-\frac{a_1}{q_1}\Big|.$$

This gives

$$\frac{a_0a_3}{q_0q_3} + O(|a_3|q_3^{-1}q_0^{-2}) + O(q_3^{-1}Q^{-1}) - \frac{a_1}{q_1} = O(q_1^{-1}Q^{-1}),$$

i.e.

$$\frac{a_0}{q_0} - \frac{a_1 q_3}{a_3 q_1} = O(q_0^{-2} + Q^{-1} | a_3 | q_3^{-1} (q_1^{-1} + q_3^{-1})).$$

Lemma 5.5 We have $a_3 = O(A^2 q_3 (\log x)^2)$.

Proof. Follows from the inequality defining a_3 and q_3 .

Lemma 5.6. Let q_1 and q_3 be both $\leq q_0^t$ where t > 0 is such that

$$A^2(\log x)^2 q_0^{2t} = o(q_0). \tag{1}$$

Then

$$q_0^{-1+2t} A^2 (\log x)^2 + Q^{-1} q_0^{1+t} A^4 (\log x)^4 \gg 1.$$
(2)

Proof. Otherwise

$$\frac{a_0}{q_0} - \frac{a_1 q_3}{a_3 q_1} = 0$$

and hence q_0 divides a_3q_1 and so $q_0 \le |a_3|q_1$ which is not possible by hypothesis (we have used Lemma 5.5).

Lemma 5.7. If t(>0) is such that (1) holds and

$$q_0^{-1+2t} A^2 (\log x)^2 + Q^{-1} q_0^{1+t} A^4 (\log x)^4 = o(1),$$
(3)

then we have

either
$$q_1 \ge q_0^t$$
 or $q_3 \ge q_0^t$. (4)

Proof. The proof follows from Lemma 5.6.

Lemma 5.8. For j = 1, 3 we have

$$S_{j} = \sum_{p} (\log p) e(\lambda_{j} B \alpha (p + \varphi_{j}(p))) = S_{j}^{*} + O(Q^{-1} q_{j}^{-1} x^{2}),$$
(5)

where

$$S_j^* = \sum_p (\log p) e\Big(\frac{a_j}{q_j}(p + \varphi_j(p))\Big),\tag{6}$$

the summation over p each time being as in S_j .

Proof. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} e(\lambda_j B\alpha(p + \varphi_j(p))) &- e(a_j q_j^{-1}(p + \varphi_j(p))) \\ &= O(|\lambda_j B\alpha - a_j q_j^{-1}|(p + \varphi_j(p))) = O(Q^{-1} q_j^{-1} p). \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$|S_j - S_j^*| \le \sum_p p(\log p)Q^{-1}q_j^{-1} = O(Q^{-1}q_j^{-1}x^2)$$

This proves the lemma (since $\varphi_j(p) = \int_3^p \varphi_j'(u) du + O(1) = O((\log p)^{k_0+1})).$

We now proceed to estimate S_j^* . We have

$$S_j^* = \int_2^{D_j x} e\Big(\frac{a_j}{q_j} \varphi_j(u)\Big) d\Big(\sum_{2 \le p \le u} (\log p) e\Big(\frac{a_j}{q_j} p\Big)\Big)$$

(where D_1 and D_3 are positive constants depending only on $\lambda_1, \, \lambda_2$ and λ_3)

$$= e\left(\frac{a_{j}}{q_{j}}\varphi_{j}(u)\right) \sum_{2 \leq p \leq u} (\log p) e\left(\frac{a_{j}}{q_{j}}p\right) \Big|_{u=2-0}^{D_{j}x+0} \\ - \int_{2}^{D_{j}x} \left(\sum_{2 \leq p \leq u} (\log p) e\left(\frac{a_{j}}{q_{j}}p\right)\right) \frac{a_{j}}{q_{j}}\varphi_{j}'(u) e\left(\frac{a_{j}}{q_{j}}\varphi_{j}(u)\right) du \\ = O(1) + O\left(\Big|\sum_{2 \leq p \leq D_{j}x+0} (\log p) e\left(\frac{a_{j}}{q_{j}}p\right)\Big|\right) \\ + O\left(\int_{2}^{D_{j}x} \Big|\frac{a_{j}}{q_{j}}\sum_{2 \leq p \leq u} (\log p) e\left(\frac{a_{j}}{q_{j}}p\right)\Big| (\log x)^{k_{0}}u^{-1}du\right) \\ = O(1) + O\left(\Big|S\left(\frac{a_{j}}{q_{j}}, D_{j}x\right)\Big|\right) \\ + O\left(\Big|\frac{a_{j}}{q_{j}}\Big| (\log x)^{k_{0}}\int_{2}^{D_{j}x} \Big|S\left(\frac{a_{j}}{q_{j}}, u\right)\Big|u^{-1}du\right)$$
(7)

where

$$S\left(\frac{a_j}{q_j}, u\right) = \sum_{2 \le p \le u} (\log p) e\left(\frac{a_j}{q_j}p\right).$$
(8)

Lemma 5.9. We have (for $2 \le u \le x$, j = 1, 3)

$$S\left(\frac{a_j}{q_j}, u\right) = O\left(\left((q_j x)^{1/2} + x^{5/7} q_j^{3/14} + x q_j^{-1/2})(\log x)^{17}\right),\tag{9}$$

and so since $|a_j q_j^{-1}| \ll A^2 (\log x)^2$,

$$S_{j} = S_{j}^{*} + O(x^{2}(q_{j}Q)^{-1})$$

= $O\left(x^{2}(q_{j}Q)^{-1} + A^{2}(\log x)^{k_{0}+20}((q_{j}x)^{1/2} + q_{j}^{3/14}x^{5/7} + q_{j}^{-1/2}x)\right).$ (10)

Proof. The equation (9) is precisely Theorem 16.1 (on p. 141) of H.L. MONTGOMERY (see [HLM]). \Box

Collecting we have

Lemma 5.10. Let

$$A^{2}q_{0}^{2t}(\log x)^{2} = o(q_{0}) \operatorname{and}(q_{0}^{-1+2t} + Q^{-1}q_{0}^{1+t}A^{2})A^{2}(\log x)^{4} = o(1).$$
(11)

Then choosing that j for which $q_j \ge q_0^t$, we have

$$S_j = O\Big(x^2 (q_0^t Q)^{-1} + ((Qx)^{1/2} + Q^{3/14} x^{5/7} + q_0^{-t/2} x) A^2 (\log x)^{k_0 + 20}\Big).$$
(12)

We have still to choose x in terms of q_0 and relate Q to q_0 . In this direction we have the following lemma.

Lemma 5.11. Let $1 \le A \le \exp(100\sqrt{\log x})$, $1 \le C \le \exp(100\sqrt{\log x})$, $t = \frac{1}{16}$, $x = q_0^2$, $Q \ge q_0^{2-(1/100)}$. Then the conditions (11) are all satisfied and we have

$$\begin{split} \int_{(\mathfrak{a})_1} |S_1 S_2 S_3| \Big(\frac{\sin(\pi\alpha)}{\pi\alpha}\Big)^2 d\alpha &+ \int_{(\alpha)_3} |S_1 S_2 S_3| \Big(\frac{\sin(\pi\alpha)}{\pi\alpha}\Big)^2 d\alpha \\ &\ll \Big\{ \Big(\frac{x}{Qq_0^t}\Big) + \Big(\Big(\frac{Q}{x}\Big)^{1/2} + \Big(\frac{Q^3}{x^4}\Big)^{1/14} + q_0^{-t/2}\Big) A^2 (\log x)^{k_0+20} \Big\} x^2 C^{-1/2} \log x \\ &\ll x^2 C^{-1/2} \Big\{ \frac{q_0^{2-t}}{Q} + \Big(\Big(\frac{Q}{q_0^2}\Big)^{1/2} + \Big(\frac{Q}{x}\Big)^{3/14} x^{-1/14} + q_0^{-t/2}\Big) A^2 (\log x)^{k_0+21} \Big\} (\log x). \end{split}$$

Here $(\alpha)_1$ and $(\alpha)_3$ denote respectively those α for which $q_1 \ge q_0^t$ and those for which $q_3 \ge q_0^t$.

6. Conclusion

Thus collecting Lemmas 3.8, 4.2, 5.3 and 5.11 we have the following theorem.

Theorem 3. Let $x = q_0^2$, $1 \le A \le \exp(100\sqrt{\log x})$, $1 \le C \le \exp(100\sqrt{\log x})$, $t = \frac{1}{16}$, $Q \ge q_0^{2-(1/100)}$. Then we have

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} S_1 S_2 S_3 \Big(rac{\sin(\pilpha)}{\pilpha}\Big)^2 dlpha \geq x^2 A^{-1} C^{-1} \Lambda$$

where

$$\begin{split} \Lambda &= K_1 - K_2 A^{-4} C - K_2 (\log x)^{-1} - K_2 A C(E(x))^{-1/4} \\ &- K_2 A^{-1} C^{1/2} (\log x) - K_2 A C^{1/2} \Big(1 + \frac{q_0^2}{Q} \Big) (E(x))^{-1} \log x \\ &- K_2 A^3 C^{1/2} \Big\{ \frac{q_0^{2-t}}{Q} + \Big(\frac{Q}{q_0^2} \Big)^{1/2} + \Big(\frac{Q}{q_0^2} \Big)^{3/14} q_0^{-1/7} + q_0^{-t/2} \Big\} (\log x)^{k_0 + 22} \end{split}$$

where $K_1 > 0$ and $K_2 > 0$ are constants depending only on λ_1 , λ_2 and λ_3 .

Remark. The choice $A = C = \text{Exp}(10\sqrt{\log x})$ and $Q = q_0^2(E(x))^{-1}$ proves Theorem 2.

Acknowledgement

I am very much thankful to Professor R.J. HANS-GILL for kindly helping me with the reference list. Next, I wish to thank Dr. S. SRINIVASAN and Dr. K. SRINIVAS for two of the references. Finally, I am thankful to Professor RAJA RAMANNA for drawing my attention to the observation mentioned in the beginning of this paper.

References

- [AB] Baker, A., On some Diophantine inequalities involving primes. J.Reine Angew. Math. 228 (1967), 166–181.
- [RPB] Bambah, R.P., Four squares and a kth power. Quart. J. Math.5 (1954), 191-202.
- [SDC] Chowla, S.D., A theorem on irrational indefinite quadratic forms. J.London Math. Soc. 9 (1934), 162–163.
- [HD,HH] Davenport, H., Heilbronn, H., On indefinite quadratic forms in five variables. J. London Math. Soc. 21 (1946), 185–193.
- [VJ,AW] Jarnik, V., Walfisz, A., Über Gitterpunkte in mehrdimensionalen Ellipsoiden. Math. Zeitschrift 32 (1930), 152–160.
- [GAM] Margulis, G.A., Indefinite quadratic forms and unipotent flows on homogeneous spaces. C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris. Ser. I Math. 304 (1987), no. 10, 249–253.
- [HLM] Montgomery, H.L., Topics in multiplicative number theory. Springer, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York 1971.
- [KR₁] Ramachandra, K., On the sums $\sum_{j=1}^{k} \lambda_j f_j(p_j)$. J. Reine Angew.Math. 262/263 (1973), 158-165.
- [KR₂] Some remarks on a theorem of Montgomery and Vaughan. J. Number Theory 11 (1980), 465–471.
- [RR] Raja Ramanna, Flavours of Fundamental Particles and Prime Numbers, Current Science, Vol. 75 No.3 (1998), 183-186.
- [RR.AS] Ramanna, R., Sharma, A., The systematics of fundamental particles and unstable nuclear systems using the concept of continuity and discreteness, Current Science, Vol.73 No. 12 (1997), 1083-1097.
- [RR, BVS] Raja Ramanna and B.V.Sreekantan, On the correlations of masses and lifetimes of radionuclides and fundamental particles, Mod. Phy. Letters, (1995), A 10, 741-753.
- [WS] Schwarz, W., Über die Lösbarkeit gewisser Ungleichungen durch Primzahlen.
 J. Reine Angew. Math. 212 (1963), 150–157.
- [SS] Srinivasan, S., A Diophantine inequality with prime variables. Bull.Australian Math. Soc. 38 (1988), 57–66.

- [RCV₁] Vaughan, R.C., Diophantine approximation by prime numbers, I.Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) 28 (1974), 373-384.
- [RCV₂] Diophantine approximation by prime numbers, II. Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) 28 (1974), 385-401.
- [IMV] Vinogradov, I.M., The method of trigonometrical sums in the theory of numbers. Translated by A. Davenport and K.F. Roth. Interscience, London 1954.

Author's addresses

K. Ramachandra Hon. Vis. Professor Nat. Inst. of Adv. Studies I. I. Sc. Campus Bangalore-560012 India

K. Ramachandra Retd. Professor TIFR Centre P.O.Box 1234 I. I. Sc. Campus Bangalore-560012 India

e-mail: kram@math.tifrbng.res.in

Manuscript completed on24th May, 1997. Received: 29th January, 1998 Accepted: 1st May, 1998.