

# On oscillation of the number of primes in an arithmetical progression

By I. KÁTAI in Budapest

1. J. E. LITTLEWOOD [1] proved — in the contrary to an assertion of RIEMANN — that, for a suitable sequence  $x'_1 < x'_2 < \dots$  of integers, the inequality

$$\pi(x'_v) > \text{li } x'_v$$

holds. SKEWES [2] has obtained an upper bound for the first  $x$  for which the difference  $\pi(x) - \text{li } x$  is positive, namely  $\exp \exp \exp \exp (7,705)$ . Later S. KNAPOWSKI [3] — using the ideas of P. TURÁN — gave another proof of this fact. In the last year, S. LEHMAN [4] gave a better upper bound, namely  $1,65 \cdot 10^{1165}$ .

Recently S. KNAPOWSKI and P. TURÁN gave an explicit, localized  $\Omega_{\pm}$  estimation for the difference  $\pi(x, 4, 1) - \frac{1}{2} \text{li } x$ , where, in general,  $\pi(x, k, l)$  denotes the number of primes in the arithmetical progression  $\equiv l \pmod{k}$  not exceeding  $x$ .

The investigation of the oscillation behavior of  $\pi(x, 4, 3) - \frac{1}{2} \text{li } x$  is a simpler case. However, for this we need another method.

In the following,  $c, c_0, c_1, \dots, \delta$  will denote explicitly calculable numerical constants (e. c. n. c.), not the same in every place.  $e_1(x)$  means  $e^x$  and  $e_v(x) = e_1(e_{v-1}(x))$ , further  $\log_1 x = \log x$  and  $\log_v x = \log(\log_{v-1} x)$ . Throughout the paper the letter  $p$  is preserved for primes.

We shall prove the following

Theorem 1. For every  $T > c_0$  we have

$$\max_{T \leq x \leq T^x} \frac{\pi(x, 4, 3) - \frac{1}{2} \text{li } x}{\sqrt{x}/\log x} > \delta, \quad \min_{T \leq x \leq T^x} \frac{\pi(x, 4, 3) - \frac{1}{2} \text{li } x}{\sqrt{x}/\log x} < -\delta,$$

where  $\delta$  and  $c_0$  are e. c. n. positive constants and  $x = (2 + \sqrt{3})^2$ .

In their papers [5], [6] KNAPOWSKI and TURÁN dealt with the oscillation behavior of the functions

$$a(x) = \sum_{p \equiv 1_1 \pmod{8}} \log p \cdot e^{-px} - \sum_{p \equiv 1_2 \pmod{8}} \log p \cdot e^{-px},$$

$$b(x) = \sum_{p \equiv 1_1 \pmod{8}} e^{-px} - \sum_{p \equiv 1_2 \pmod{8}} e^{-px}.$$

In [5] they proved that if  $0 < \delta < c_1$ , then for  $l_1 \not\equiv l_2 \not\equiv 1 \pmod{8}$  we have

$$\max_{\delta \leq x \leq \delta^{1/3}} a(x) > \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta}} e_1 \left( -22 \frac{\log(1/\delta) \cdot \log_3(1/\delta)}{\log_2(1/\delta)} \right),$$

where  $c_1$  is an e. c. n. c. In [6] they proved that for  $l_1, l_2 = 3, 5, 7$  ( $l_1 \neq l_2$ ) we have

$$\max_{\delta \leq x \leq \delta^{1/3}} |b(x)| \cong \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta}} e_1 \left( -23 \frac{\log(1/\delta) \cdot \log_3(1/\delta)}{\log_2(1/\delta)} \right).$$

The authors remarked: "To the more difficult problem of one-sided theorems (for  $b(x)$ ) we hope to return." This problem seems still to be open.

From our Theorem 5 it follows that, for  $0 < y < c$  and for all  $l_1 \not\equiv l_2 \not\equiv 1 \pmod{8}$ , the inequality

$$\max_{y^* \leq x \leq y} b(x) \sqrt{x} \log(1/x) > \delta$$

holds, where  $\kappa = (2 + \sqrt{3})^2$ .

We formulate now some theorems the proofs of which are similar to the proof of Theorem 1.

Let  $N_k(l)$  denote the number of solutions of the congruence  $x^2 \equiv l \pmod{k}$ . For the moduli  $k$  in

(A)  $3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 19, 24,$

the position of the zeros of  $L(s, \chi)$  for all  $\chi \pmod{k}$  is known in the neighbourhood of the real line. Especially, it was proved by HASELGROVE, that the  $L(s, \chi)$  are non-vanishing on the real line in the critical strip.

Theorem 2. For  $k$  in (A) and for all of those pairs  $l_1, l_2$  for which  $N_k(l_1) = N_k(l_2)$ ,  $l_1 \not\equiv l_2 \pmod{k}$ , we have

$$\max_{T \leq x \leq T^*} \frac{\pi(x, k, l_1) - \pi(x, k, l_2)}{\sqrt{x}/\log x} > \delta, \quad \min_{T \leq x \leq T^*} \frac{\pi(x, k, l_1) - \pi(x, k, l_2)}{\sqrt{x}/\log x} < -\delta,$$

if  $T > c$ , where  $\kappa = (2 + \sqrt{3})^2$ ,  $c$  and  $\delta$  are e. c. n. positive constants.

Theorem 3. For all  $k$  in (A) and for all  $l$  for which  $N_k(l) = 0$ , we have the inequalities

$$\max_{T \leq x \leq T^*} \frac{\pi(x, k, l) - \frac{\text{li } x}{\varphi(k)}}{\sqrt{x}/\log x} > \delta, \quad \min_{T \leq x \leq T^*} \frac{\pi(x, k, l) - \frac{\text{li } x}{\varphi(k)}}{\sqrt{x}/\log x} < -\delta,$$

whenever  $T > c$ , where  $\delta$  and  $c$  are e. c. positive numerical constants.

Let

$$\sigma(x, k, l) = \sum_{p \equiv l \pmod{k}} e^{-p/x}, \quad s(x) = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\log n} e^{-n/x}.$$

The following assertions hold.

**Theorem 4.** For every  $k$  in (A) and for all  $l$  for which  $N_k(l) = 0$ , we have

$$\max_{T \leq x \leq T^x} \frac{\sigma(x, k, l) - \frac{s(x)}{\varphi(k)}}{\sqrt{x}/\log x} > \delta, \quad \min_{T \leq x \leq T^x} \frac{\sigma(x, k, l) - \frac{s(x)}{\varphi(k)}}{\sqrt{x}/\log x} < -\delta$$

if  $T > c$ , where  $x = (2 + \sqrt{3})^2$ , further  $c$  and  $\delta$  are e. c. positive numerical constants.

**Theorem 5.** For every  $k$  in (A) and all  $l_1, l_2$  for which  $N_k(l_1) = N_k(l_2)$ ,  $l_1 \not\equiv l_2 \pmod{k}$ , we have

$$\max_{T \leq x \leq T^x} \frac{\sigma(x, k, l_1) - \sigma(x, k, l_2)}{\sqrt{x}/\log x} > \delta,$$

if  $T > c$ , where  $x = (2 + \sqrt{3})^2$ , further  $c$  and  $\delta$  are positive e. c. n. c.

The method of the proofs of our Theorems is the same as was elaborated for the omega-estimation of  $M(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n)$  in my dissertation [7] and in the paper [8]. However, we use here an idea of RODOSKY in a deeper form [9].

## 2. Some lemmas.

**Lemma 1.** If

$$F(w) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{n^w}$$

is absolutely convergent for  $\sigma \geq \sigma_0$ , then

$$(2.1) \quad \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n e_1 \left( -\frac{\log^2 n}{4u} \right) = \frac{i\sqrt{u}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{(\sigma_0)} F(w) e_1(w^2 u) dw.$$

For the proof see [9].

**Lemma 2.** [9] For  $0 < \alpha \leq 1$  and  $u \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$(2.2) \quad \frac{1}{2u} \int_1^{\infty} x^{2-1} \log x \cdot e_1 \left( -\frac{\log^2 x}{4u} \right) dx = 2\sqrt{\pi u} e_1(\alpha^2 u) + O(1).$$

Lemma 3. [9] Let  $u \geq 1$  and  $y, z$  be defined by

$$(2.3)-(2.4) \quad \log y = 2u \left(1 - \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\right), \quad \log z = 2u \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\right).$$

The following inequalities hold:

$$(2.5) \quad \frac{1}{2u} \int_1^y x^{-1/2} \log x \cdot e_1 \left( -\frac{\log^2 x}{4u} \right) dx < ce_1 \left( \frac{u}{4} \right),$$

$$(2.6) \quad \frac{1}{2u} \int_z^\infty x^{-1/2} \log x \cdot e_1 \left( -\frac{\log^2 x}{4u} \right) dx < ce_1 \left( \frac{u}{4} \right).$$

Lemma 4. Let

$$(2.7) \quad R(u) = \frac{i\sqrt{u}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{(2)} \log \left( w - \frac{1}{2} \right) e_1(w^2 u) dv.$$

Then

$$|R(u)| > \frac{c}{\sqrt{u}} e_1(u/4), \quad \text{if } u > c_1.$$

Proof. Using the well-known formula

$$\log s = \int_0^\infty \frac{e^{-v} - e^{-sv}}{v} dv \quad (\operatorname{Re} s > 0)$$

due to EULER, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} R(u) &= \frac{i\sqrt{u}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{(2)} \int_0^\infty \frac{e_1(-v) - e_1(-(w - \frac{1}{2})v)}{v} dv e_1(w^2 u) dv = \\ &= \pi \int_0^\infty \left[ -e_1(-v) + e_1 \left( -\frac{v^2}{4u} + \frac{v}{2} \right) \right] \frac{dv}{v}. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\left| \int_0^1 \left[ e_1 \left( -\frac{v}{4u} + \frac{v}{2} \right) - e_1(-v) \right] \frac{dv}{v} \right| < c \quad \text{and} \quad \int_1^\infty e_1(-v) \frac{dv}{v} < c,$$

the inequality

$$R_1(u) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_1^\infty e_1 \left( -\frac{v^2}{4u} + \frac{v}{2} \right) \frac{dv}{v} = R(u) + O(1)$$

holds. Substituting  $e_1(v) = x$  we obtain

$$R_1(u) = \int_e^\infty e_1 \left( -\frac{\log^2 x}{4u} \right) \frac{x^{-1/2}}{\log x} dx,$$

thus

$$\begin{aligned} R_1(u) &\cong 2u(\log z)^{-2} \frac{1}{2u} \int_y^z e_1 \left( -\frac{\log^2 x}{4u} \right) \log x \cdot x^{-1/2} dx \cong \\ &\cong cu(\log z)^{-2} \sqrt{u} e_1(u/4) \cong ce_1(u/4) \cdot u^{-1/2}, \quad c > 0. \end{aligned}$$

(See Lemmas 2, 3 and (2. 4).) Hence the assertion follows.

From Lemma 4 one can deduce the following

Lemma 5. *Let*

$$(2.8) \quad J(u) = \frac{i\sqrt{u}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{(2)} \log(w - \frac{1}{2}) \Gamma(w) e_1(w^2 u) dw.$$

Then

$$|J(u)| > ce_2(u/4)u^{-1/2}, \quad c > 0.$$

Proof. Let  $L$  denote the broken line with vertices  $1 - i\infty, 1 - i \cdot 2, 1/4 - i \cdot 2, 1/4 + i \cdot 2, 1 + i \cdot 2, 1 + i \cdot \infty$ . Let  $\Gamma(\omega) = \Gamma(\frac{1}{2}) + \varphi(\omega)$ . So the inequalities

$$(2.9) \quad |\varphi(\omega)| \leq c|\omega - 1/2|, \quad |\log(w - \frac{1}{2})\varphi(w)| < c|w - \frac{1}{2}|^{3/4}$$

hold on the line  $L$ . Let now

$$J(u) = \frac{i\sqrt{u}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{(2)} \log(w - \frac{1}{2}) e_1(w^2 u) dw + \frac{i\sqrt{u}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_L \varphi(w) e_1(w^2 u) \log(w - \frac{1}{2}) dw.$$

From (2.9) it follows that the absolute value of second integral is majorized by  $ce_1(u/4)u^{-1}$ . For the first integral we use Lemma 4, and we obtain the assertion stated in Lemma 5.

3. Let us now introduce the following notations:

$$(3.1)-(3.2) \quad f(s) = \sum_{p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}} p^{-s}; \quad g(s) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=2}^\infty \frac{(\log n)^{-1}}{n^s};$$

$$(3.3) \quad F(s) = f(s) - g(s) = \sum_{n=2}^\infty \frac{a_n}{n^s},$$

where the coefficients  $a_n$  of  $F(s)$  are defined by

$$(3.4) \quad a_n = \begin{cases} 1 - \frac{1}{2}(\log n)^{-1}, & \text{if } n = p \equiv -1 \pmod{4}, \quad p \text{ prime,} \\ -\frac{1}{2}(\log n)^{-1} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let  $\zeta(s)$  be the Riemann zeta-function and let

$$L(s, \gamma) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n}{(2n+1)^s}.$$

We have evidently that

$$(3.5) \quad f(s) = \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{\zeta(s)}{L(s, \gamma)} + h(s),$$

where  $h(s)$  is a function represented by an absolutely convergent Dirichlet series in the halfplane  $\operatorname{Re} s > 1/3$  and hence regular.

Further we have  $\frac{dg(s)}{ds} = -\zeta(s)$  and so  $\frac{d}{ds}(g(s) + \log(s-1)) = -\zeta(s) + \frac{1}{s-1}$ .

Since the right hand side is an integral function, so is  $g(s) + \log(s-1)$  regular on the whole plane. Hence it follows that  $F(s)$  is regular at the point  $s=1$ . Further it is known that in the domain  $0 < \sigma < 1, 0 \leq t \leq 10, 24$  the function  $L(s, \gamma)$  has a unique simple zero, namely at the point

$$(3.6) \quad \rho = \frac{1}{2} + i \cdot 6,02\dots = \frac{1}{2} + i \cdot \gamma.$$

In this domain  $\zeta(s)$  is non-vanishing.

Let now

$$(3.7) \quad I(\tau) = \frac{i\sqrt{u}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{(2)} \Gamma(w+i\tau) e_1(w^2 u) dw,$$

where  $\tau$  is a real number.

We shall now give an upper estimation for (3.7) in the special cases  $\tau=0$  and  $\tau=\gamma$ .

Let  $\Gamma$  denote the broken line with vertices  $1, 5-i\cdot\infty; 1,5-4i; 0,4-4i; 0,4+4i; 1,5+4i; 1,5+i\cdot\infty$ . For the estimation of  $I(0)$  we transform the integration line in (3.7) to  $\Gamma$  and we obtain

$$(3.8) \quad |I(0)| < ce_1(0,16 \cdot u).$$

Choose now  $\tau=\gamma$ . Then the function  $F(w+i\gamma)$  has a logarithmic singularity at the point  $w=1/2$  and

$$F(w+i\gamma) = -\log(w-\frac{1}{2}) + F_1(w),$$

where  $F_1(w)$  is a regular function on the broken line  $\Gamma$  and on the right hand side of  $\Gamma$ . So we have

$$I(\gamma) = \frac{i\sqrt{u}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{\Gamma} F_1(w) e_1(w^2 u) dw - \frac{i\sqrt{u}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{(2)} \log\left(w-\frac{1}{2}\right) e_1(w^2 u) dw = P(u) - R(u).$$

For  $P(u)$  we have the estimation  $|P(u)| < ce_1(0, 16u)$ . From Lemma 4

$$|R(u)| > \frac{ce_1(u/4)}{\sqrt{u}}$$

follows. So we have

$$(3.9) \quad |I(y)| > \frac{ce_1(u/4)}{\sqrt{u}}$$

4. Let now

$$(4.1) \quad A(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} a_n,$$

where the  $a_n$  are defined by (3.4). It is evident, that

$$(4.2) \quad \pi(x, 4, 3) - \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{li} x = A(x) + O(1).$$

From Lemma 1 it follows that the  $I(\tau)$  in (3.7) can be represented as

$$I(\tau) = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} a_n e_1 \left( -\frac{\log^2 n}{4u} - i\tau \log n \right).$$

By partial integration follows:

$$(4.3) \quad I(\tau) = \int_1^{\infty} A(x) x^{-1} \left( \frac{\log x}{2u} + i\tau \right) e_1 \left( -\frac{\log^2 x}{4u} - i\tau \log x \right) dx.$$

Let further  $I(\tau, 1, y)$ ,  $I(\tau, y, z)$ ,  $I(\tau, z, \infty)$  denote the integral on the right hand side extended for the intervals  $[1, y]$ ,  $[y, z]$ ,  $[z, \infty]$ , respectively. Let the values  $y, z$  be choosen as in (2.3), (2.4). Using the trivial estimation  $|A(x)| < cx(\log x)^{-1}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} |I(\tau, 1, y)| &< c \int_2^y (\log x)^{-1} \left[ \frac{\log x}{2u} + |\tau| \right] e_1 \left( -\frac{\log^2 x}{4u} \right) dx \cong \\ &\cong c(1 + |\tau|) \int_2^y \frac{1}{\log x} e_1 \left( -\frac{\log^2 x}{4u} \right) dx = c(1 + |\tau|) \int_{\log 2}^{\log y} t^{-1} e_1 \left( t - \frac{t^2}{4u} \right) dt \end{aligned}$$

and by partial integration,

$$\int_2^y \frac{1}{\log x} e_1 \left( -\frac{\log^2 x}{4u} \right) dx < cu^{-1} e_1(u/4).$$

Hence

$$(4.3) \quad |I(\tau, 1, y)| < c(1 + |\tau|) u^{-1} e_1(u/4)$$

follows. Using similar computations we obtain

$$(4.4) \quad |I(\tau, z, \infty)| < c(1 + |\tau|)u^{-1}e_1(u/4).$$

Let now assume that for a fixed positive  $\delta$  one of the inequalities

$$(4.5) \quad \max_{y \leq x \leq z} \left( A(x) - \delta \frac{x^{1/2}}{\log x} \right) \equiv 0,$$

$$(4.6) \quad \min_{y \leq x \leq z} \left( A(x) + \delta \frac{x^{1/2}}{\log x} \right) \equiv 0$$

holds. Using this assumption we obtain such an inequality for  $I(y)$  and  $I(0)$  which contradicts (3. 8), (3. 9).

Indeed, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |I(\tau, y, z)| \equiv & \left| \int_y^z \frac{A(x) \pm \delta \frac{x^{1/2}}{\log x}}{x} \left| \frac{\log x}{2u} + i\tau \right| e_1 \left( -\frac{\log^2 x}{2u} \right) dx \right| + \\ & + \delta \int_y^z \frac{x^{-1/2}}{\log x} \left| \frac{\log x}{2u} + i\tau \right| e_1 \left( -\frac{\log^2 x}{4u} \right) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Using the inequality

$$\left| \frac{\log x}{2u} + i\tau \right| < c(1 + |\tau|) \frac{\log x}{2u}$$

and our assumption, i.e. that one of the functions

$$A(x) \pm \delta \frac{x^{1/2}}{\log x}$$

has constant sign on the interval  $[y, z]$ , we have

$$|I(\tau, y, z)| \equiv c(1 + |\tau|)I(0, y, z) + c\delta(1 + |\tau|) \int_y^z \frac{x^{-1/2}}{\log x} e_1 \left( -\frac{\log^2 x}{4u} \right) dx.$$

For the integral on the right hand side we have

$$\int_y^z \frac{x^{-1/2}}{\log x} e_1 \left( -\frac{\log^2 x}{4u} \right) dx < \frac{c}{u} \int_1^\infty x^{-1/2} e_1 \left( -\frac{\log^2 x}{4u} \right) dx < \frac{c}{\sqrt{u}} e_1(u/4)$$

by Lemma 2. Hence

$$|I(\tau, y, z)| < c(1 + |\tau|)|I(0, y, z)| + c\delta(1 + |\tau|)e_1(u/4)u^{-1}$$



and by (4. 3), (4. 4)

$$(4.7) \quad |I(\tau)| < c(1 + |\tau|) \left\{ |I(0)| + \delta \frac{e_1(u/4)}{\sqrt{u}} + \frac{e_1(u/4)}{u} \right\}.$$

Let now  $\tau = \gamma$ . Taking into account the inequalities (3. 8), (3. 9) we get

$$c_1 u^{-1/2} e_1(u/4) < c_2 e_1(0, 16u) + \delta c_2 u^{-1/2} e_1(u/4) + c_3 u^{-1} e_1(u/4),$$

where  $c_1 > 0$ . This is impossible if  $\delta < c_1/c_2$  and  $u$  is sufficiently large. Hence it follows that the inequalities cannot hold, i.e. we have

$$\max_{y \leq x \leq z} \frac{A(x) \log x}{\sqrt{x}} > \delta, \quad \min_{y \leq x \leq z} \frac{A(x) \log x}{\sqrt{x}} < -\delta,$$

if  $u > c$ .

Taking into account that

$$A(x) = \pi(x, 4, 3) - \frac{1}{2} \text{li } x + O(1),$$

and that  $z = y^x$  Theorem 1 follows.

5. In this section we give a sketch of Theorem 5 in the special case  $k = 8$ . We shall use the following generalization of Lemma 1.

Lemma 6. *Let*

$$(5.1) \quad h(s) = \int_1^\infty x^{-s} dA(x)$$

*absolutely and uniformly convergent in the halfplane  $\sigma > \sigma_1 (> 0)$ . Then*

$$(5.2) \quad \int_1^\infty e_1 \left( -\frac{\log^2 x}{4u} \right) dA(x) = \frac{i\sqrt{u}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{(\sigma)} h(w) e_1(w^2 u) dw.$$

The proof of this Lemma is very similar to that of Lemma 1 and so can be omitted.

Let  $l_1, l_2$  be two different among the numbers 3, 5, 7, further let  $\varepsilon_p$  be defined by the relation

$$(5.3) \quad \varepsilon_p = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } p \equiv l_1 \pmod{8}, \\ -1, & \text{if } p \equiv l_2 \pmod{8}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and let

$$(5.4) - (5.5) \quad g(s) = \sum_p \frac{\varepsilon_p}{p^s}, \quad s(x) = \sigma(x, 8, l_1) - \sigma(x, 8, l_2) = \sum_p \varepsilon_p e^{-p/x}.$$

Using a well-known relation we have

$$(5.6) \quad \Gamma(s)g(s) = \int_0^{\infty} y^{s-1} \sum_p \varepsilon_p e^{-py} dy = \int_0^{\infty} \frac{s(x)}{x^{s+1}} dx = \int_0^1 + \int_1^{\infty} = l(s) + h(s).$$

Here the function  $l(s)$  is regular in the halfplane  $\operatorname{Re} s = \sigma > 0$  and  $|l(s)| < c$  if  $\sigma \geq 1/10$ , because  $|s(x)| < c$  in the interval  $0 \leq x \leq 1$ . Using now Lemma 6 with

$$(5.7) \quad dA(x) = \frac{s(x)}{x^{1+it}} dx, \quad h(s) = \int_1^{\infty} \frac{s(x)}{x^{s+1}} dx,$$

we obtain

$$(5.8) \quad \int_1^{\infty} e_1 \left( -\frac{\log^2 x}{4u} - it \log x \right) s(x) \frac{dx}{x} = \frac{i\sqrt{u}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{(2)} h(w+it) e_1(w^2 u) dw.$$

Let us now introduce the following notations:

$$(5.9) \quad I(\tau, a, b) = \int_a^b e_1 \left( -\frac{\log^2 x}{4u} - it \log x \right) s(x) \frac{dx}{x},$$

$$(5.10) \quad K(\tau) = \frac{i\sqrt{u}}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{(2)} h(w+i\tau) e_1(w^2 u) dw.$$

In the proof an essential role is played by some numerical data due to P. C. HASELGROVE (see S. KNAPOWSKI and P. TURÁN [5], p. 254). Let

$$L(s, \chi_1) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left\{ \frac{1}{(8n+1)^s} + \frac{1}{(8n+3)^s} - \frac{1}{(8n+5)^s} - \frac{1}{(8n+7)^s} \right\},$$

$$L(s, \chi_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left\{ \frac{1}{(4n+1)^s} - \frac{1}{(4n+3)^s} \right\},$$

$$L(s, \chi_3) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left\{ \frac{1}{(8n+1)^s} - \frac{1}{(8n+3)^s} - \frac{1}{(8n+5)^s} + \frac{1}{(8n+7)^s} \right\}.$$

Then in the domain

$$0 < \sigma < 1, |t| \leq 12$$

the zeros of  $L(s, \chi_1)$  are

$$\frac{1}{2} \pm i \cdot 4,899\dots, \quad \frac{1}{2} \pm i \cdot 7,628\dots, \quad \frac{1}{2} \pm i \cdot 10,806\dots$$

those of  $L(s, \chi_2)$

$$\frac{1}{2} \pm 2 \cdot 6,020\dots, \quad \frac{1}{2} \pm 2 \cdot 10,243\dots,$$

and those of  $L(s, \chi_3)$

$$\frac{1}{2} \pm i \cdot 3,576\dots, \frac{1}{2} \pm i \cdot 7,434\dots, \frac{1}{2} \pm i \cdot 9,503\dots$$

In particular, they are simple and different from each other.

We shall use that for the function  $g(s)$  in (5. 4)

$$(5.11) \quad g(s) = \frac{-1}{4} \sum_{x \pmod{8}} (\bar{\chi}(l_1) - \bar{\chi}(l_2)) \log L(s, \chi) + u(s),$$

where the function  $u(s)$  has an absolutely convergent Dirichlet series representation in the halfplane  $\sigma > \frac{1}{3}$ , because 3, 5, 7 are quadratic non-residues mod 8. So we have

$$(5.12) \quad h(s) = -\frac{\Gamma(s)}{4} \sum_{x \pmod{8}} (\bar{\chi}(l_1) - \bar{\chi}(l_2)) \log L(s, \chi) + v(s),$$

where  $v(s)$  is a regular and bounded function in the strip  $\frac{1}{3} < \sigma < 10$ . Transforming the integration line in (5.10) to the broken line  $\Gamma$  (see (3.8)) we have

$$(5.13) \quad |K(0)| < ce_1(0, 16u).$$

Choose  $\tau = \gamma$  where  $\frac{1}{2} + i\gamma$  is the first singularity of  $g(s)$  in the upper halfplane ( $\text{Im } s > 0$ ). Using Lemma 5 instead of Lemma 4 we have

$$(5.14) \quad |K(\gamma)| \geq cu^{-1/2}e_1(u/4), \quad c > 0.$$

Let now  $y, z$  be chosen as in (2. 3), (2. 4) and assume that one of the inequalities

$$(5.15)-(5.16) \quad \max_{y \leq x \leq z} \left( s(x) - \delta \frac{\sqrt{x}}{\log x} \right) \leq 0, \quad \min_{y \leq x \leq z} \left( s(x) + \delta \frac{\sqrt{x}}{\log x} \right) \geq 0$$

be satisfied with a positive  $\delta$ . Using a similar argument as in the section 4, we can deduce from this assumption the inequality

$$(5.17) \quad |I(\tau, 1, \infty)| < c(1 + |\tau|)\{|I(0, 1, \infty)| + \delta u^{-1/2}e_1(u/4) + u^{-1}e_1(u/4)\}.$$

Taking into account that  $I(\tau, 1, \infty) = K(\tau)$  and choosing  $\tau = \gamma$ , the inequality (5.17) contradicts the inequalities (5.13), (5.14) for a sufficiently small positive  $\delta$  and for  $u > c$ . So the inequalities (5.15)—(5.16) for this  $\delta$  cannot hold and hence the assertion follows.

## References

- [1] J. E. LITTLEWOOD, Sur la distribution des nombres premiers, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris*, **158** (1914), 1869—1872.
- [2] S. SKEWES, On the difference  $\pi(x) - \text{li } x$ . II, *Proc. London Math. Soc.*, (3) **5** (1955), 48—70.
- [3] S. KNAPOWSKI, On sign changes in the remainder term in the prime-number formula, *J. London Math. Soc.*, **36** (1961), 451—460.
- [4] R. S. LEHMAN, On the difference  $\pi(x) - \text{li } x$ , *Acta Arithm.*, **11** (1966), 397—410.
- [5] S. KNAPOWSKI and P. TURÁN, Comparative prime-number theory. VIII. Chebyshev's problem for  $k=8$ , *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hung.*, **14** (1963), 251—268.
- [6] S. KNAPOWSKI and P. TURÁN, On an assertion of Čebyšev, *J. Analyse Math.*, **14** (1965), 267—274.
- [7] I. KÁTAI, Investigations in the comparative prime-number theory, Thesis (Budapest, 1965, in Hungarian).
- [8] I. KÁTAI, On comparative prime-number theory, *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hung.* (to appear, in Russian).
- [9] K. A. RODOSKY, On regularity of distribution of prime numbers, *Uspehi Mat. Nauk*, **17** (1962), 189—191 (in Russian).
- [10] K. PRACHAR, *Primzahlverteilung* (Berlin, 1957).

(Received May 2, 1967)