## REPRESENTATIONS OF INTEGERS BY POSITIVE DEFINITE FORMS OVER ARITHMETIC PROGRESSIONS

**BY** 

## CHUNGMING AN AND ALAN H. STEIN

1. In previous works, the authors have analyzed Dirichlet series associated to positive definite integral forms  $F(x)$  and applied the results to obtain asymptotic estimates for  $\sum_{F(y)\leq y} 1$ . In this note, we refine our estimates and analyze the behavior of  $F(\gamma)$  as the components of  $\gamma$  vary over arithmetic progressions.

Let F be a positive definite integral form of degree  $d$  in n variables and let

(1.1) 
$$
\zeta(F,\,\beta,\,s)=\sum_{\gamma\,\in\,\mathbb{Z}^n-\{0\}}F(\gamma)^{-s}e(\langle\beta,\,\gamma\rangle)
$$

where  $s=\sigma+it$ ,  $\beta \in R^n$ ,  $\langle , \rangle$  indicates the standard inner product on  $R^n$ and  $e(a) = \exp(2\pi i a)$ .

In [2] it has been shown that  $\zeta(F, \beta, s)$  can be continued analytically as a meromorphic function of s with only a simple pole at  $s = n/d$  occurring when  $\beta \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ . It was shown [4] that if  $\beta \in \mathbb{Z}^n$  and  $|t| \geq 2$  then

$$
(1.2) \quad \left| \zeta(F,\,\beta,\,\sigma+it) \right| \ll \begin{cases} \frac{|t|^{n-\sigma d}}{(n-\sigma d)(n-1-\sigma d)} & \text{if } \frac{n-1}{d} < \sigma < \frac{n}{d} - \frac{1}{\log|t|} \\ \log|t| & \text{if } \sigma > \frac{n}{d} - \frac{1}{\log|t|} \end{cases}
$$

We shall prove that the restriction on  $\beta$  can be removed.

THEOREM 1. If  $\beta \in R^n$  and  $|t| \geq 2$ , then (1.2) holds. Let  $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n), A = (A_1, \ldots, A_n), B = (B_1, \ldots, B_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ . Let  $\gamma \equiv B \pmod{A}$  mean  $\gamma_i \equiv B_i \pmod{A_i}$  for  $i = 1, \ldots, n$ . Let  $A^* = \prod_{i=1}^n A_i$ ,  $\lambda = \text{Res}_{s=n/d} \zeta(F, 0, s).$ 

We shall use Theorem <sup>1</sup> to prove the following:

THEOREM 2.

(1.3) 
$$
\sum_{\substack{F(y) \le y, \\ y \equiv B \pmod{A}}} 1 = \frac{\lambda}{A^*} \frac{d}{n} y^{n/d} + O(y^{(n-1/2)/d} \log y), \quad y > e^d.
$$

2. Since we know (1.2) holds if  $\beta \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ , we shall assume  $\beta \notin \mathbb{Z}^n$ . Without loss of generality, we assume  $0 < \beta_1 < 1$ .

Received October 26, 1978.

<sup>(</sup>C) 1980 by the Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois Manufactured in the United States of America

If  $x = (x_1, ..., x_n) \in R^n$ , let  $\bar{x} = (x_2, ..., x_n)$ . Let  $K = [[t], ||\gamma|| = \max |\gamma_i|$ and assume  $\sigma > (n-1)/d$ . Since the series representation for  $\zeta(F, \beta, s)$  is valid for  $\sigma > (n-1)/d$  [3], we may write

$$
(2.1) \qquad \zeta(F, \beta, s) = \sum_{0 \leq ||\gamma|| \leq K} F(\gamma)^{-s} e(\langle \beta, \gamma \rangle) + \sum_{||\gamma|| \geq K} F(\gamma)^{-s} e(\langle \beta, \gamma \rangle).
$$

The first term is bounded by  $\sum_{0 \leq ||y|| \leq K} F(y)^{-\sigma}$ . Since

$$
F(\gamma)^{-\sigma} \ll \|\gamma\|^{-\sigma d} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{\|\gamma\| = m} 1 \ll m^{n-1}
$$

we obtain

$$
\sum_{0 < \| \gamma \| < K} F(\gamma)^{-\sigma} \ll \sum_{m < K} m^{-\sigma d + n - 1}
$$

which is bounded by the right hand side of (1.2). So we are left to consider the second term of (2.1). To that end, let  $C_m = e(m\beta_1)/(e(\beta_1)-1)$ . Thus  $e(m\beta_1) = C_{m+1} - C_m$  and  $C_m = O(1)$ . Since

(2.3) 
$$
e(\langle \beta, \gamma \rangle) = e(\langle \overline{\beta}, \overline{\gamma} \rangle)(C_{\gamma_1+1} - C_{\gamma_1})
$$

we can rewrite the second term of  $(2.1)$  as

$$
(2.4) \quad \sum_{\max (\|\overline{\gamma}\|,|m|)\geq K} e(\langle \overline{\beta}, \overline{\gamma} \rangle) C_{m+1} (F(m, \overline{\gamma})^{-s} - F(m+1, \overline{\gamma})^{-s}) + \sum_{0 \leq \|\gamma\| \leq K} e(\langle \overline{\beta}, \overline{\gamma} \rangle) (C_{-K+1} F(-K+1, \overline{\gamma})^{-s} - C_{K-1} F(K-1, \overline{\gamma})^{-s}).
$$

The second term of (2.4) is clearly  $\ll |t|^{n-1-\sigma d}$ , so we need concentrate only on the first term, which is bounded by

(2.5) 
$$
S = \sum_{\max (\|\bar{\gamma}\|, |\mathbf{m}|) \geq K} |F(m, \bar{\gamma})^{-s} - F(m+1, \bar{\gamma})^{-s}|.
$$

Furthermore,

$$
(2.6) \qquad F(m,\bar{\gamma})^{-s}-F(m+1,\bar{\gamma})^{-s}=s\int_m^{m+1}F(u,\bar{\gamma})^{-s-1}\frac{\partial}{\partial u}F(u,\bar{\gamma})\ du.
$$

Since

$$
|F(u, \bar{\gamma})^{-s-1}| \ll ||(u, \gamma)||^{(-\sigma-1)d}
$$
 and  $\frac{\partial}{\partial u}F(u, \bar{\gamma}) \ll ||(u, \bar{\gamma})||^{d-1}$ ,

we obtain

$$
(2.7) \tF(m, \bar{\gamma})^{-s} - F(m+1, \bar{\gamma})^{-s} \ll |t| \int_{m}^{m+1} \|(u, \bar{\gamma})\|^{-\sigma d-1} du.
$$

The integral is certainly  $\ll ||(m, \overline{\gamma})||^{-\sigma d-1}$  yielding

(2.8) 
$$
S \ll |t| \sum_{\|y\| \geq K} \|y\|^{-\sigma d - 1} \ll |t| \sum_{m > K} m^{n - \sigma d - 2}.
$$

Since  $K \approx |t|$ , the right hand side of (2.8) is  $\ll$  the right hand side of (1.2), completing the proof of Theorem 1.

3. Let  $A, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}^n$  be fixed. We use the following lemma to prove Theorem 2.

LEMMA.

$$
(3.1) \sum_{\substack{F(y) \le y, \\ y \equiv B \pmod{A}}} \left(1 - \frac{F(y)}{y}\right) = \frac{\lambda y^{n/d}}{\frac{n}{d} \left(\frac{n}{d} + 1\right) A^*} + O(y^{(n-1)/d} \log^2 y), \quad y > e^d.
$$

*Proof.* Let  $\sum'$  represent a sum over all  $\alpha \in Q^n$  where  $\alpha_i = p_i/A_i$ ,  $p_i \in Z$  and  $0 \leq p_i < A_i$ . Let

(3.2) 
$$
\zeta_{B/A}(F, s) = \sum' e(-\langle \alpha, B \rangle) \zeta(F, \alpha, s).
$$

We easily conclude from our knowledge of  $\zeta(F, \alpha, s)$  that  $\zeta_{B/A}(F, s)$  is meromorphic with only a simple pole of residue  $\lambda$  at  $s = n/d$  and that, for  $\sigma > (n-1)/d, |t| \geq 2,$ 

$$
(3.3) \qquad \zeta_{B/A}(F,s) \ll \begin{cases} \frac{|t|^{n-\sigma d}}{(n-\sigma d)(n-1-\sigma d)} & \text{if } \sigma \leq \frac{n}{d} - \frac{1}{\log |t|} \\ \log |t| & \text{if } \sigma \geq \frac{n}{d} - \frac{1}{\log |t|} \end{cases}
$$

If  $\sigma > n/d$  we can write

(3.4) 
$$
\zeta_{B/A}(F, s) = \sum' e(-\langle \alpha, B \rangle) \sum_{\|\gamma\| \neq 0} e(\langle \alpha, \gamma \rangle) F(\gamma)^{-s}.
$$

Since the series representation for  $\zeta(F, \alpha, s)$  converges absolutely if  $\sigma > n/d$ , we can interchange summations, obtaining

(3.5) 
$$
\zeta_{B/A}(F, s) = \sum_{\|\gamma\| \neq 0} F(\gamma)^{-s} \sum' e(\langle \alpha, \gamma - B \rangle).
$$

If  $\gamma - B \equiv 0 \pmod{A}$  then it is clear that  $\sum' e(\langle \alpha, \gamma - B \rangle) = A^*$ . Suppose  $\gamma - B \not\equiv 0 \pmod{A}$ . We may assume, without loss of generality, that  $\gamma_1 - B_1 \neq 0$  (mod  $A_1$ ). We can then factor out

$$
\sum_{\rho_1=0}^{A_1-1} e\left(\frac{\gamma_1-B_1}{A_1}\rho_1\right)=0.
$$

We thus obtain

(3.6) 
$$
\zeta_{B/A}(F, s) = A^* \sum_{0 \neq \gamma \equiv B \pmod{A}} F(\gamma)^{-s} \text{ if } \sigma > n/d.
$$

Consider

(3.7) 
$$
I = \frac{1}{2\Pi i} \int_{\rho - iy}^{\rho + iy} \frac{\zeta_{B/A}(F, s)y^s}{s(s+1)} ds \text{ where } \beta = \frac{n}{d} + \frac{1}{\log y}.
$$

Using (3.6) we obtain

(3.8) 
$$
I = A^* \sum_{\mathbf{0} \neq \gamma \equiv B \pmod{A}} \frac{1}{2 \Pi i} \int_{\beta - iy}^{\beta + iy} \frac{(y/F(\gamma))^s}{s(s+1)} ds.
$$

Since

$$
\frac{1}{2\Pi i} \int_{\beta - iy}^{\beta + iy} \frac{z^s}{s(s+1)} ds = \begin{cases} O(z^{\beta / y}) & \text{if } z \le 1 \\ 1 - 1/z + O(z^{\beta} / y) & \text{if } z \ge 1 \end{cases}
$$

(cf.  $[5]$ ), we obtain

$$
(3.9) \qquad I = A^* \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{d} \neq \gamma \equiv B(\text{mod }A), \\ F(\gamma) \leq y}} \left(1 - \frac{F(\gamma)}{y}\right) + O\left(\sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{d} \neq \gamma \equiv B(\text{mod }A)}} y^{\beta - 1} / F(\gamma)^{\beta}\right).
$$

The error term is

$$
\begin{aligned}\n&\leq y^{n/d} \sum_{\gamma \neq 0} F(\gamma)^{-\beta} \\
&\leq y^{n/d-1} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} m^{-\beta d + n - 1} \\
&\leq \frac{y^{n/d-1}}{n - \beta d} \\
&\leq y^{n/d-1} \log y\n\end{aligned}
$$

yielding

(3.10) 
$$
I = A \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{0} \neq y \equiv B(\text{mod } A) \\ F(y) \leq y}} \left(1 - \frac{F(y)}{y}\right) + O(y^{n/d - 1} \log y).
$$

We now estimate I via contour integration. Let  $\beta' = (n - 1)/d + 1/\log y$ , C<sub>1</sub> be the straight line contour from  $\beta + iy$  to  $\beta' + iy$ ,  $C_2$  be the straight line contour from  $\beta' + iy$  to  $\beta' - iy$  and  $C_3$  be the straight line contour from  $\beta' - iy$ to  $\beta - iy$ . Let  $C_0$  be  $C_1 + C_2 + C_3$  + the straight line contour from  $\beta - iy$  to  $\beta$  + iy. Let

(3.11) 
$$
I_j = \frac{1}{2\Pi i} \int_{C_j} \frac{\zeta_{B/A}(F, s) y^s}{s(s+1)} ds \text{ for } j = 0, 1, 2, 3.
$$

Then  $I = I_0 - (I_1 + I_2 + I_3)$ . Since the only singularity of  $[\zeta_{B/A}(F, s)y^{s}]/[s(s + 1)]$  inside  $C_0$  comes from the pole of  $\zeta_{B/A}(F, s)$  at  $s = n/d$ , we obtain

(3.12) 
$$
I = \frac{\lambda y^{n/d}}{\frac{n}{d}(\frac{n}{d} + 1)} - (I_1 + I_2 + I_3).
$$

Along C<sub>1</sub>, (3.3) implies that  $\zeta_{B/A}(F, s)y^s = O(y^{1 + (n-1)/d} \log y)$ . Since

$$
\frac{1}{s(s+1)} = O\left(\frac{1}{y^2}\right)
$$

along  $C_1$ , we obtain

(3.13) 
$$
I_1 = O(y^{(n-1)/d} \log y/y).
$$

The same estimate clearly holds for  $I_3$ . To estimate  $I_2$ , we first observe that

$$
I_2 = \int_{C_2, |t| \geq 2} \frac{\zeta_{B/A}(F, s) y^s}{s(s+1)} ds + O(y^{(n-1)/d})
$$

We again use (3.3) to estimate  $\zeta_{B/A}(F, s) = O(|t| \log y)$  if  $seC_2$ ,  $|t| \geq 2$ , obtaining

$$
(3.14) \tI_2 \ll y^{(n-1)/d} \log y \int_{C_2, |t| \geq 2} \frac{|t|}{|t|^2} dt + O(y^{(n-1)/d}),
$$

so that

(3.15) 
$$
I_2 = O(y^{(n-1)/d} \log^2 y).
$$

We combine  $(3.12)$ ,  $(3.13)$ , and  $(3.15)$  to obtain

(3.16) 
$$
I = \frac{\lambda y^{n/d}}{\frac{n}{d}(\frac{n}{d} + 1)} + O(y^{(n-1)/d} \log^2 y).
$$

Combining (3.10) and (3.16) completes the proof of the lemma.

4. Let  $a_k$  represent the number of solutions to  $F(\gamma) = k$  for which  $\gamma \equiv B \pmod{A}$ . Then we may write

(4.1) 
$$
\sum_{\substack{F(y) \leq y, \\ y \equiv B \pmod{A}}} \left(1 - \frac{F(y)}{y}\right) = \sum_{k \leq y} a_k \left(1 - \frac{k}{y}\right).
$$

Combining  $(3.1)$ ,  $(4.1)$  and multiplying by y yields

(4.2) 
$$
\sum_{k \leq y} a_k (y-k) = \frac{\lambda y^{1+n/d}}{A^* \frac{n}{d} \left( \frac{n}{d} + 1 \right)} + O(y^{1+(n-1)/d} \log^2 y).
$$

If we let  $A(z) = \sum_{k \leq z} a_k$  and assume y is an integer, then (4.2) becomes

(4.3) 
$$
\sum_{k \leq y} A(k) = \frac{\lambda y^{1+n/d}}{A^* \frac{n}{d} (\frac{n}{d} + 1)} + O(y^{1+(n-1)/d} \log^2 y).
$$

It is clear that (4.3) must also hold if  $y$  is not an integer. Now let

 $\alpha = 1 - y^{-1/2d} \log y$ .

Then

$$
(4.4) \quad \sum_{\substack{xy \le k < y}} A(k) = \frac{\lambda}{A^* \frac{n}{d} \left(1 + \frac{n}{d}\right)} y^{1 + n/d} (1 - \alpha^{1 + n/d}) + O(y^{1 + (n - 1)/d} \log^2 y)
$$
\n
$$
\le (1 - \alpha) y A(y).
$$

Since  $1 - \alpha^{1 + n/d} = (1 + n/d)(1 - \alpha) + O((1 - \alpha)^2)$ , if we divide by  $1 - \alpha$  we obtain

(4.5) 
$$
A(y) \geq \frac{\lambda}{A^*} \frac{d}{n} y^{n/d} + O(y^{n/d}(1-\alpha)) + \frac{O(y^{(n-1)/d} \log^2 y)}{1-\alpha}
$$

With our choice for  $\alpha$ , (4.5) becomes

(4.6) 
$$
A(y) \geq \frac{\lambda}{A^*} \frac{d}{n} y^{n/d} + O(y^{(n-1/2)/d} \log y).
$$

Letting  $\beta = 1 + y^{-1/2d} \log y$  and considering  $\sum_{y \le k < \beta y} A(k)$  we obtain

(4.7) 
$$
A(y) \leq \frac{\lambda}{A^* n} y^{n/d} + O(y^{(n-1/2)/d} \log y).
$$

Combining (4.6) and (4.7) yields Theorem 2.

5. We observe the relationship between Theorem 2 and the corresponding result

(5.1) 
$$
\sum_{F(y)\leq y} 1 = \frac{d}{n} \lambda y^{n/d} + O(y^{(n-1/2)/d} \log y).
$$

in [4].

Indeed, Theorem 2 essentially combines (5.1) with the fact that  $F(\gamma)$  behaves similarly as  $\gamma$  varies over different congruence classes. The latter can be expected since  $F(\gamma)/\|\gamma\|^{n/d}$  is bounded. A related question is whether the values of  $F(\gamma)$  are evenly distributed over different congruence classes, i.e., is

$$
\sum_{\substack{F(\gamma) \leq y, \\ F(\gamma) \equiv B \text{ (mod } A)}} 1 \sim \frac{\lambda}{A^* n} y^{n/d}?
$$

This leads one to investigate

$$
\sum_{0 \neq \gamma} F(\gamma) e\left(\frac{B}{A} F(\gamma)\right).
$$

It has been shown [3] that such functions can be continued analytically with at most a simple pole at  $s = n/d$ , but effective bounds have not yet been computed.

The authors would like to thank the referee for his or her helpful suggestions.

## **REFERENCES**

- 1. C. AN, On a generalization of the gamma function and its application to certain Dirichlet series, Bull. Amer. Math, Soc., vol. 75 (1969), pp. 562-568.
- 2. A generalization of Epstein's zeta function, Michigan Math. J., vol. 21 (1974), pp. 45-48.
- 3. ----, On the analytic continuation of certain Dirichlet series, J. Number Theory, vol. 6 (1974), pp. 1-6.
- 4. C. AN and A. H. STEIN, Representations of integers by positive definite forms, Bull. Inst. Math. Acad. Sinica, vol. 6 (1978), pp. 7-14.
- 5. R. AYOUB, An introduction to the analytic theory of numbers, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, 1963.

SETON HALL UNIVERSITY SOUTH ORANGE, NEW JERSEY

UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT AT WATERBURY WATERBURY, CONNECTICUT