Mathematics. - On additive properties of squares of primes. I. By P. Erdös. (Communicated by Prof. J. G. van der Corput).
(Communicated at the meeting of November 27, 1937.)

## Introduction.

In three papers, one of which is published ${ }^{1}$ ), and the other two of which will appear shortly, I proved the following results: The densities of the sets of integers $p^{2}+q^{2}-r^{2}\left(p, q, t\right.$, odd primes) and $p^{2}-q^{2}+2^{t}$ are positive. In the introduction of I, I stated the following conjecture: The density of the integers of the form $p^{2}+q^{2}+r^{2}$ is positive. Now I have succeeded in proving this conjecture and the present paper will contain proofs of the following 4 theorems ${ }^{2}$ ):

1. The number of integers not exceeding $n$, of the form $p^{2}+q^{2}$ is greater than $c_{1} \frac{n}{(\log n)^{2}}$.
2. There exists an infinity of integers $m$ such that the equation $m=p^{2}+q^{2}$ has one and only one solution.
3. The density of the integers of the form $p^{2}+q^{2}+r^{2}$ is positive.
4. The density of the integers of the form $p^{2}+q^{2}+2^{t_{i}}+2^{t_{i}}$ is positive. It is clear that 1 . follows from 4. Nevertheless we give an independent proof of 1 , partly because it will help to make clear the method and partly because we shall be able to deduce 2. from it. From 3. and a well known result of Schnirelmann we immediately deduce that a constant $c_{2}$ exists such that every integer is the sum of $c_{2}$ or less positive squares of primes. The chief importance of 4 . lies in the fact that the number of integers of the form $p^{2}+q^{2}+2^{t_{1}}+2^{t_{2}}$ not exceeding $n$ does not exceed $c_{3} n$.

Throughout this paper $n$ denotes a sufficiently large integer, $c_{1}, c_{2}, \ldots$ and $\gamma$ positive absolute constants, $\gamma$ will be used only as an exponent of $n$.

## § 1.

We require the following
Lemma 1. Let $e_{1}, e_{2}, \ldots, e_{k} ; f_{1}, f_{2}, \ldots, f_{k_{-}}$be integers with $\left|e_{i}\right|,\left|f_{j}\right|<n^{c_{4}}$, and for no $i$ and $j e_{i}=e_{j}, f_{i}=f_{j}$ at the same time, then the number $A$ of pairs of positive integers $x$ and $y$, not exceeding $n$, for which

$$
\begin{equation*}
e_{1} x+f_{1} y, e_{2} x+f_{2} y, \ldots, e_{k} x+f_{k} y \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

are all primes, is less than $c_{5} \frac{n^{2}(\log \log n)^{k+1}}{(\log n)^{k}}$.

[^0]Proof. We first estimate for fixed $y$ the number $A_{y}$ of $x$ not exceeding $n$, for which all the integers (1) are primes. We may evidently suppose $\left(e_{i}, f_{i}\right)=1, i=1,2, \ldots k$. Let $p$ be any prime not exceeding $n^{\gamma}$ with $p \dagger e_{1} e_{2} \ldots e_{k}$ and $\left|e_{i} x+f_{i} y\right|>n^{\gamma}(i=1,2, \ldots, k)$, then

$$
x \not \equiv-\frac{f_{1} y}{e_{1}},-\frac{f_{2} y}{e_{2}}, \ldots,-\frac{f_{k} y}{e_{k}}(\bmod p)
$$

since $e_{i} x+f_{i} y$ are all primes.
These $k$ residues are all different if $p \dagger f(y)$, where

$$
f(y)=y e_{1} e_{2} \ldots e_{k} \operatorname{II}_{i \leqslant k}\left(e_{i} f_{j}-e_{j} f_{i}\right) .
$$

We may suppose $f(y) \neq 0$ for evidently $\left.e_{i} f_{j}-e_{j} f_{i} \neq 0\right)$.
Thus, by Lemma 2. of I and by the fact that there are at most $2 k n^{\gamma}$, values of $x$ for which one of the inequalities $\left|e_{i} x+f_{i} y\right|>n^{\prime}(i=1,2 \ldots k)$ is not true, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{g}<c_{6} n \prod_{\substack{p<n^{\gamma} \\ p \nmid f(g)}}\left(1-\frac{k}{p}\right)+2 k n^{\gamma} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

By applying the inequality

$$
1<\left(1-\frac{k}{p}\right)\left(1+\frac{k+1}{p}\right), \quad p>k(k+1)
$$

for the primes $p>k(k+1)$ dividing $f(y)$ we obtain from (2)

$$
A_{y}<c_{6} n \prod_{k(k+1)<p<n^{\gamma}}\left(1-\frac{k}{p}\right) \prod_{p / f(g)}\left(1+\frac{k+1}{p}\right)+2 k n^{\gamma}<c_{5} \frac{n(\log \log n)^{k+1}}{(\log n)^{k}} \text { (3) }
$$

since

$$
\prod_{k(k+1)<p<n^{r}}\left(1-\frac{k}{p}\right)<\frac{\mathbf{c}_{7}}{(\log n)^{k}}
$$

and

$$
\prod_{p \mid f(y)}\left(1+\frac{k+1}{p}\right)<\mathrm{c}_{8}(\log \log f(y))^{k+1}<\mathrm{c}_{9}(\log \log n)^{k+1}
$$

Thus, from (3).

$$
A=\sum_{y=1}^{n} A_{y}<c_{5} \frac{n^{2}(\log \log n)^{k+1}}{(\log n)^{k}}
$$

which proves the lemma.
Theorem I. The number $B$ of integers m, not exceeding $n$, of the form $p^{2}+q^{2}$ is greater then $c_{1} \frac{n}{(\log n)^{2}}$.

We prove a more general result containing at the same time Theorem II. namely:

The number $B^{\prime}$ of integers $m$ not exceeding $n$ for which the equation

$$
m=p^{2}+q^{2} \text { with } p \geqslant q
$$

has one and only one solution is greater than $c_{10} \frac{n}{(\log n)^{2}}$.
Proof. Denote by $\varphi(m)$ the number of solutions of the equation

$$
m=p^{2}+q^{2} \text { with } p \geqslant q ;
$$

we then have

$$
\begin{equation*}
B^{\prime}=\sum_{m=1}^{n} \varphi(m)-\sum_{\substack{m=1 \\ p(m) \geqslant 2}}^{n} \varphi(m) \geqslant \sum_{m=1}^{n} \varphi(m)-\sum_{m=1}^{n}\left([\varphi(m)]^{2}-\varphi(m)\right) . \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Evidently

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{m=-}^{n} \varphi(m)>\frac{1}{2}\left[\pi\left(1 / 2 n^{1 / 2}\right)\right]^{2}>c_{11} \frac{n}{(\log n)^{2}} . \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Next we prove

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{m=1}^{n}\left([\varphi(m)]^{2}-\varphi(m)\right)<\frac{n}{(\log n)^{5 / 2}} . \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Denote by $C$ the number of solutions of

$$
\begin{equation*}
p^{2}+q^{2}=r^{2}+s^{2} \quad\left(p^{2}+q^{2} \leqslant n, p<r\right) \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

then

$$
\sum_{m=1}^{n}\left([\varphi(m)]^{2}-\varphi(m)\right)=2 C,
$$

so that it will suffice to estimate $C$.
We write (7) in the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
r^{2}-p^{2}=q^{2}-s^{2} \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

and put

$$
\begin{equation*}
r-p=2 a, \quad q-s=2 b \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Evidently $a, b<n^{1 / 2}$. We may suppose $a>b>0$.
By (8) and (9),

$$
a p-b s=b^{2}-a^{2}
$$

or

$$
p=\frac{b(s+b)}{a}-a .
$$

$\mathrm{Put}(a, b)=d, \frac{a}{d}=a^{\prime}, \frac{b}{d}=b^{\prime}$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
p=\frac{b^{\prime}\left(s+b^{\prime} d\right)}{a^{\prime}}-a^{\prime} d \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

From (10) we obtain

$$
s \equiv-b^{\prime} d\left(\bmod a^{\prime}\right)
$$

which means

$$
\begin{equation*}
s=-b^{\prime} d+a^{\prime} x \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

From (11), (10) and (9) we have

$$
\left.\begin{array}{rl}
p & =-a^{\prime} d+b^{\prime} x  \tag{12}\\
r & =a^{\prime} d+b^{\prime} x \\
q & =b^{\prime} d+a^{\prime} x
\end{array}\right\} .
$$

Denote now by $D$ the number of solutions of (11) and (12) with

$$
\begin{equation*}
1 \leqslant a^{\prime} d \leqslant n^{1 / 2}, \quad 1 \leqslant a^{\prime} x \leqslant n^{2 / 2} \quad\left(a^{\prime}>b^{\prime}>0\right) \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

then evidently

$$
D \geqslant C
$$

(for if $a^{\prime}, d, x$ do not satisfy (13) then at least one of the primes $p, q, r, s$ is greater than $n^{1 / 2}$ ).

Hence it will be sufficient to estimate $D$.
Now we write

$$
D=D^{\prime}+D^{\prime \prime},
$$

where $D^{\prime}$ denotes the number of solutions of (11) and (12) with $d \leqslant n^{1 / 4}$, and $D^{\prime \prime}$ the number of solutions of (11) and (12) with $n^{1 / 4}<d \leqslant n^{1 / 2}$.

First we estimate $D^{\prime}$. Denote by $D_{d, x}^{\prime}$ the number of solutions in $a^{\prime}, b^{\prime}$ of (11), and (12) for fixed $d$ and $x$.

From Lemma 1. by putting
$e_{1}=-d, e_{2}=e_{3}=x, e_{4}=d, f_{1}=f_{4}=x, f_{2}=-d, f_{3}=d, b^{\prime}=x, a^{\prime}=y$
and replacing $n$ by $\frac{n^{1 / 2}}{\max (x, d)}$, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{d, x}^{\prime}<\frac{c_{12} n(\log \log n)^{5}}{[\max (x, d)]^{2}(\log n)^{4}} \text { for } x \leqslant n^{3 / s} \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

For $x>n^{3 / 8}$ we evidently have

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{d, x}^{\prime}<\frac{n}{x^{2}} \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

From (14) and (15) we obtain

$$
\left.\begin{array}{rl}
D_{d}^{\prime}=\sum_{x=1}^{n^{1 / 2}} D_{d, x}^{\prime}= & \sum_{x=1}^{d} D_{d, x}^{\prime}+\sum_{x>d}^{n^{3 / 8}} D_{d, x}^{\prime}+\sum_{x=n^{3 / 8}}^{n^{1 / 2}} D_{d, x}^{\prime} \\
& <\frac{c_{12} n(\log \log n)^{5}}{d(\log n)^{4}}+\frac{c_{13} n(\log \log n)^{5}}{d(\log n)^{4}}+2 n^{5 / 8} \tag{16}
\end{array}\right\}
$$

Finally from (16)
$D^{\prime}=\sum_{d=1}^{n^{1 / 4}} D_{d}^{\prime}<\frac{c_{14} n(\log \log n)^{5}}{(\log n)^{3}}+2 n^{7 / 4}<c_{15} \frac{n(\log \log n)^{5}}{(\log n)^{3}}$.
Now we estimate $D^{\prime \prime}$. Denote by $D_{a^{\prime}, b^{\prime}, d}^{\prime \prime}$ the number of solutions in $x$ of (11) and (12) for fixed $a^{\prime}, b^{\prime}, d$.
By putting
$-b^{\prime} d=f_{1} y,-a^{\prime} d=f_{2} y, \quad a^{\prime} d=f_{3} y, \quad b^{\prime} d=f_{4} y, \quad e_{1}=e_{4}=a^{\prime}, \quad e_{2}=e_{3}=b^{\prime}$, and replacing $n$ by $\frac{n^{1 / 2}}{a^{\prime}}\left(a^{\prime} \leqslant \frac{n^{1 / 3}}{d}<n^{1 / 4}\right)$ we obtain from (3)

$$
D_{a^{\prime}, b^{\prime}, d}^{\prime \prime}<c_{16} \frac{n^{1 / 2}(\log \log n)^{5}}{a^{\prime}(\log n)^{4}}
$$

Now

$$
D_{a^{\prime}, d}^{\prime \prime}=\sum_{b^{\prime}=1}^{a^{\prime}} D_{a^{\prime}, b^{\prime}, d}^{\prime \prime}<c_{16} \frac{n^{1 / 2}(\log \log n)^{5}}{(\log n)^{4}}
$$

and

$$
D_{d}^{\prime \prime}=\sum_{a^{\prime}=1}^{\frac{n^{1 / 2}}{d}} D_{a^{\prime}, d}^{\prime \prime}<c_{16} \frac{n(\log \log n)^{5}}{d(\log n)^{4}}
$$

Thus finally

$$
\begin{equation*}
D^{\prime \prime}=\sum_{d>n^{1 / 4}}^{n^{1 / 2}} D_{d}^{\prime \prime}<c_{17} \frac{n(\log \log n)^{5}}{(\log n)^{3}} \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

From (17) and (18) we obtain

$$
D=D^{\prime}+D^{\prime}<\left(c_{15}+c_{17}\right) \frac{n(\log \log n)^{5}}{(\log n)^{3}}<\frac{n}{(\log n)^{5 / 2}}
$$

which proves (6).
From (4), (5) and (6) we obtain

$$
B^{\prime}>c_{11} \frac{n}{(\log n)^{2}}-\frac{n}{(\log n)^{5 / 2}}>c_{10} \frac{n}{(\log n)^{2}}
$$

Hence the result.


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ ) On the easier Waring problem for powers of primes, Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc. 33. 6 - 12 (1937). I shall refer to this paper as I.
    ${ }^{2}$ ) In connection with all these problems, see Vinogradov, Comptes Rendus de l'Acad. des Sciences de l'U. S. S. R., 16, 131-132 (1937).

