

On a system of two diophantine inequalities with prime numbers

by

D. I. TOLEV (Plovdiv)

1. Introduction and statement of the result. In 1952 Piatetski-Shapiro [3] considered the diophantine inequality

$$(1) \quad |p_1^c + \dots + p_r^c - N| < \varepsilon,$$

where $c > 1$ is not an integer and $\varepsilon > 0$ is an arbitrarily small number. He showed that if $H(c)$ denotes the least r such that (1) has solutions in prime numbers p_1, \dots, p_r for arbitrarily small ε and for $N > N_0(c, \varepsilon)$, then

$$\limsup_{c \rightarrow \infty} \frac{H(c)}{c \log c} \leq 4.$$

Piatetski-Shapiro also proved that $H(c) \leq 5$ for $1 < c < 3/2$. In [4] the author improved this result for c close to one. More precisely, it is shown that if $1 < c < 15/14$, then the inequality

$$|p_1^c + p_2^c + p_3^c - N| < N^{-(1/c)(15/14-c)} \log^9 N$$

has solutions in prime numbers p_1, p_2, p_3 for sufficiently large N . In the present paper we shall consider the system of two inequalities with prime unknowns

$$(2) \quad \begin{aligned} |p_1^c + \dots + p_5^c - N_1| &< \varepsilon_1(N_1), \\ |p_1^d + \dots + p_5^d - N_2| &< \varepsilon_2(N_2), \end{aligned}$$

where c and d are different numbers greater than one but close to one and $\varepsilon_1(N_1), \varepsilon_2(N_2)$ tend to zero as N_1 and N_2 tend to infinity. Of course, we have to impose a condition on the orders of N_1 and N_2 because of the inequality

$$(x_1^c + \dots + x_5^c)^{d/c} \leq x_1^d + \dots + x_5^d \leq 5^{1-d/c} (x_1^c + \dots + x_5^c)^{d/c}$$

which holds for every positive x_1, \dots, x_5 provided $1 < d < c$. We shall prove the following theorem.

THEOREM. *Suppose that c, d, α, β are real numbers satisfying the inequalities*

$$(3) \quad 1 < d < c < 35/34,$$

$$(4) \quad 1 < \alpha < \beta < 5^{1-d/c}.$$

Then there exist numbers $N_1^{(0)}, N_2^{(0)}$, depending on c, d, α, β , such that for all real numbers N_1, N_2 satisfying $N_1 > N_1^{(0)}, N_2 > N_2^{(0)}$ and

$$(5) \quad \alpha \leq N_2/N_1^{d/c} \leq \beta,$$

the system (2) with

$$\varepsilon_1(N_1) = N_1^{-(1/c)(35/34-c)} \log^{12} N_1,$$

$$\varepsilon_2(N_2) = N_2^{-(1/d)(35/34-d)} \log^{12} N_2$$

has solutions in prime numbers p_1, \dots, p_5 .

2. Notation and an outline of the proof. Let c, d be numbers satisfying (3), and α, β numbers satisfying (4). Throughout the paper the constants in O -terms and \ll -symbols are absolute or depend on c, d, α, β .

$A \asymp B$ means $A \ll B \ll A$; N_1, N_2 are large numbers satisfying (5), $X = N_1^{1/c}$, $\varepsilon_1 = X^{-(35/34-c)} \log^{10} X$, $\varepsilon_2 = X^{-(35/34-d)} \log^{10} X$, $K_1 = \varepsilon_1^{-1} \log X$, $K_2 = \varepsilon_2^{-1} \log X$, η is a positive number, sufficiently small in terms of c and d , $\tau_1 = X^{3/4-c-\eta}$, $\tau_2 = X^{3/4-d-\eta}$, $e(t) = e^{2\pi it}$, $\varphi(t) = e^{-\pi t^2}$, $\varphi_\delta(t) = \delta\varphi(\delta t)$, $\chi(t)$ is the characteristic function of the interval $[-1, 1]$, x, y, t, t_1, t_2, \dots are real numbers, k, l, m, n, q are integers, and p, p_1, p_2, \dots prime numbers.

Let λ denote a sufficiently small positive number, depending on α, β, c, d , whose value will be determined more precisely in Lemma 1. We define

$$(6) \quad B = \sum_{\lambda X < p_1, \dots, p_5 \leq X} (\log p_1) \dots (\log p_5) \\ \times \chi\left(\frac{p_1^c + \dots + p_5^c - N_1}{\varepsilon_1 \log X}\right) \chi\left(\frac{p_1^d + \dots + p_5^d - N_2}{\varepsilon_2 \log X}\right),$$

$$(7) \quad S(x, y) = \sum_{\lambda X < p \leq X} (\log p) e(xp^c + yp^d),$$

$$(8) \quad D = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} S^5(x, y) e(-N_1x - N_2y) \varphi_{\varepsilon_1}(x) \varphi_{\varepsilon_2}(y) dx dy.$$

We divide the plane into three regions: Ω_1 —a neighbourhood of the origin, Ω_2 —an intermediate region and Ω_3 —a trivial region, as follows:

$$\Omega_1 = \{(x, y) : \max(|x|/\tau_1, |y|/\tau_2) < 1\},$$

$$\Omega_2 = \{(x, y) : \max(|x|/\tau_1, |y|/\tau_2) \geq 1, \max(|x|/K_1, |y|/K_2) \leq 1\},$$

$$\Omega_3 = \{(x, y) : \max(|x|/K_1, |y|/K_2) > 1\}.$$

Correspondingly, we represent the integral D as

$$(9) \quad D = D_1 + D_2 + D_3,$$

where D_i denotes the contribution to the integral D in (9) arising from the set Ω_i .

The theorem will be proved if we show that B tends to infinity as X tends to infinity. The result of Lemma 3 implies that it is sufficient to prove that D tends to infinity as X tends to infinity. The last statement is a consequence of (9) and of the inequalities

$$(10) \quad |D_3| \ll 1,$$

$$(11) \quad |D_2| \ll \frac{\varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 X^{5-c-d}}{\log X},$$

$$(12) \quad |D_1| \gg \varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 X^{5-c-d}.$$

Inequality (10) is an easy consequence of the fact that $\varphi(t)$ tends to zero very fast as $|t|$ tends to infinity (see Lemma 4). The main difficulty is to prove (11) and (12). We estimate $|D_1|$ from below in Section 4. In Section 5 we estimate D_2 . The proof of the theorem is given in Section 6.

3. Known results and some preliminary lemmas

LEMMA 1. Let $\delta \in [\alpha, \beta]$. There exists $\lambda > 0$ depending on α, β, c, d such that for the volume V of the domain in five-dimensional space defined by

$$t_1, \dots, t_5 > \lambda, \quad |t_1^c + \dots + t_5^c - 1| < \mu_1, \quad |t_1^d + \dots + t_5^d - \delta| < \mu_2,$$

we have

$$V \gg \mu_1 \mu_2,$$

provided μ_1, μ_2 are sufficiently small.

PROOF. The proof is not difficult and we omit it.

LEMMA 2. The function $\varphi(t) = e^{-\pi t^2}$ has the properties

$$(i) \quad \varphi(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \varphi(t)e(-xt) dt,$$

$$(ii) \quad \chi(t/\varrho) \geq \varphi(t) - e^{-\pi \varrho^2} \quad \text{for } \varrho > 0,$$

$$(iii) \quad \varphi(t) \geq e^{-\pi} \quad \text{for } |t| \leq 1.$$

PROOF. The proof of (i) can be found for instance in [1, p. 261]; (ii) and (iii) are obvious.

LEMMA 3. For the quantities B and D defined in (6) and (8) we have

$$B \geq D + O(1).$$

PROOF. This follows from Lemma 2.

LEMMA 4. For the integral D_3 (defined in (9)) we have

$$|D_3| \ll 1.$$

PROOF. This follows from Lemma 2.

LEMMA 5. If \mathcal{D} is a region in the plane with area $S_{\mathcal{D}}$ whose boundary is rectifiable and has length $L_{\mathcal{D}}$, then for the number $N_{\mathcal{D}}$ of integer points in \mathcal{D} we have the estimate

$$|N_{\mathcal{D}} - S_{\mathcal{D}}| \ll 1 + L_{\mathcal{D}},$$

where the constant in the \ll -symbol is absolute.

PROOF. See [2, p. 194].

LEMMA 6. Let $I = [u_1, u_2]$ and $J = [v_1, v_2]$ be subintervals of the real line and let $1 \leq \Delta \leq X$. Denote by W the number of integers n_1, \dots, n_4 satisfying the following conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda X \leq n_1, \dots, n_4 \leq X, \quad \Delta \leq n_1 - n_2 \leq 2\Delta, \quad \Delta \leq n_4 - n_3 \leq 2\Delta, \\ n_2^c + n_4^c - n_1^c - n_3^c \in I, \quad n_2^d + n_4^d - n_1^d - n_3^d \in J. \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$W \ll X^{4-c-d}(u_2 - u_1)(v_2 - v_1) + X^{3-c}(u_2 - u_1) + X^{3-d}(v_2 - v_1) + \Delta X.$$

PROOF. It is clear that

$$(13) \quad W \ll \sum_{\substack{\lambda X \leq n_1, n_2 \leq X \\ \Delta \leq n_1 - n_2 \leq 2\Delta}} W(n_1, n_2),$$

where $W(n_1, n_2)$ denotes the number of integral points in the region \mathcal{D} in the (x, y) -plane, defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda X \leq x, y \leq X, \quad \Delta \leq x - y \leq 2\Delta, \\ x^c - y^c \in n_1^c - n_2^c + I, \quad x^d - y^d \in n_1^d - n_2^d + J. \end{aligned}$$

(As usual, if $I = [u_1, u_2]$ then $\lambda + I$ denotes the interval $[\lambda + u_1, \lambda + u_2]$.) We may assume that \mathcal{D} is not empty, otherwise $W(n_1, n_2) = 0$. By Lemma 5 we have

$$(14) \quad W(n_1, n_2) \ll S_{\mathcal{D}} + L_{\mathcal{D}} + 1,$$

where $S_{\mathcal{D}}, L_{\mathcal{D}}$ denote the area and the length of the boundary of \mathcal{D} . Consider the map

$$\Phi : (x, y) \mapsto (u = x^c - y^c, v = x^d - y^d).$$

It is a bijection between the domain $\{0 < y < x\}$ in the (x, y) -plane and the domain $\{0 < v < u^{d/c}\}$ in the (u, v) -plane. We have

$$\left| \frac{D(u, v)}{D(x, y)} \right| = -cd(xy)^{d-1}(x^{c-d} - y^{c-d}).$$

In \mathcal{D} we have

$$(15) \quad x \asymp X, \quad y \asymp X, \quad x - y \asymp \Delta,$$

therefore in this region $|D(u, v)/D(x, y)| \asymp \Delta X^{c+d-3}$. Hence

$$(16) \quad S_{\mathcal{D}} = \int_{\Phi(\mathcal{D})} \int_{\Phi(\mathcal{D})} \left| \frac{D(x, y)}{D(u, v)} \right| du dv \ll \Delta^{-1} X^{3-c-d} \int_{\Phi(\mathcal{D})} \int_{\Phi(\mathcal{D})} du dv \\ \ll \Delta^{-1} X^{3-c-d} (u_2 - u_1)(v_2 - v_1),$$

because $\Phi(\mathcal{D})$ is a subset of the rectangle \mathcal{K} in the (u, v) -plane, defined by

$$u \in n_1^c - n_2^c + I, \quad v \in n_1^d - n_2^d + J.$$

Let us now estimate $L_{\mathcal{D}}$. Denote by $l_{\mathcal{D}}$ the curve which is the boundary of \mathcal{D} . It is easy to see that it consists of finitely many parts l_0 such that $\Phi(l_0)$ is either a segment lying on the boundary of \mathcal{K} or the graph of an increasing differentiable function $v = v(u)$ defined for $u' \leq u \leq u''$, where

$$(17) \quad u', u'' \in n_1^c - n_2^c + I, \quad v(u'), v(u'') \in n_1^d - n_2^d + J.$$

Consider the second case. It is clear that the curve l_0 in the (x, y) -plane can be parametrized in the following way:

$$x = x(u, v(u)), \quad y = y(u, v(u)), \quad u' \leq u \leq u''.$$

(Here $x(u, v)$ and $y(u, v)$ are the components of Φ^{-1} .) Then for the length L_0 of l_0 we have

$$(18) \quad L_0 = \int_{u'}^{u''} \sqrt{\left(\frac{d}{du} x(u, v(u)) \right)^2 + \left(\frac{d}{du} y(u, v(u)) \right)^2} du \\ \ll \int_{u'}^{u''} (|x_u(u, v(u))| + |y_u(u, v(u))| \\ + v'(u)|x_v(u, v(u))| + v'(u)|y_v(u, v(u))|) du.$$

It is easy to verify that the partial derivatives of $x(u, v)$ and $y(u, v)$ satisfy

$$x_u = \frac{1}{cx^{d-1}(x^{c-d} - y^{c-d})}, \quad x_v = \frac{-y^{c-d}}{dx^{d-1}(x^{c-d} - y^{c-d})}, \\ y_u = \frac{1}{cy^{d-1}(x^{c-d} - y^{c-d})}, \quad y_v = \frac{-x^{c-d}}{dy^{d-1}(x^{c-d} - y^{c-d})}.$$

Therefore by (15) we conclude that in $\Phi(\mathcal{D})$ we have

$$x_u \asymp \Delta^{-1}X^{2-c}, \quad -x_v \asymp \Delta^{-1}X^{2-d}, \quad y_u \asymp \Delta^{-1}X^{2-c}, \quad -y_v \asymp \Delta^{-1}X^{2-d}.$$

Hence by (17) and (18) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} L_0 &\ll \int_{u'}^{u''} (\Delta^{-1}X^{2-c} + \Delta^{-1}X^{2-d}v'(u)) du \\ &\ll \Delta^{-1}X^{2-c}(u_2 - u_1) + \Delta^{-1}X^{2-d}(v_2 - v_1). \end{aligned}$$

If $\Phi(l_0)$ is a segment lying on the boundary of \mathcal{K} , we proceed in the same way, and we obtain the same estimate for L_0 . Therefore

$$(19) \quad L_{\mathcal{D}} \ll \Delta^{-1}X^{2-c}(u_2 - u_1) + \Delta^{-1}X^{2-d}(v_2 - v_1).$$

The assertion of the lemma follows from (13), (14), (16) and (19).

4. The integral over the neighbourhood of the origin. In this section we estimate from below the quantity $|D_1|$. Set

$$(20) \quad I(x, y) = \int_{\lambda X}^X e(xt^c + yt^d) dt.$$

We shall show that in Ω_1 the sum $S(x, y)$ is “close” to the integral $I(x, y)$, which implies that D_1 is “close” to

$$(21) \quad H_1 = \int_{\Omega_1} \int I^5(x, y)e(-N_1x - N_2y)\varphi_{\varepsilon_1}(x)\varphi_{\varepsilon_2}(y) dx dy.$$

Outside Ω_1 the integral $I(x, y)$ is “small”, so H_1 is “close” to

$$(22) \quad H = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} I^5(x, y)e(-N_1x - N_2y)\varphi_{\varepsilon_1}(x)\varphi_{\varepsilon_2}(y) dx dy.$$

In turn this integral is greater than the volume of a domain in five-dimensional space, which we are able to estimate from below.

LEMMA 7. *If $S(x, y)$ and $I(x, y)$ are defined by (7) and (20) then for $(x, y) \in \Omega_1$ we have*

$$S(x, y) = I(x, y) + O(Xe^{-(\log X)^{1/5}}).$$

Proof. We proceed as in the proof of Lemma 14 of [4] and the result follows.

LEMMA 8. *We have*

$$E = \int_{\Omega_1} \int |S(x, y)|^4 \varphi_{\varepsilon_1}(x)\varphi_{\varepsilon_2}(y) dx dy \ll \varepsilon_1\varepsilon_2 X^{4-c-d} \log^8 X.$$

Proof. It is clear that

$$\begin{aligned}
 (23) \quad E &\ll \varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 \int_{\Omega_1} \int |S(x, y) \overline{S(x, y)}|^2 dx dy \\
 &= \varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 \int_{\Omega_1} \int \left| \sum_{\lambda X < p \leq X} \log^2 p \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + 2 \operatorname{Re} \sum_{\lambda X < p_2 < p_1 \leq X} (\log p_1)(\log p_2) \right. \\
 &\quad \left. \times e(x(p_1^c - p_2^c) + y(p_1^d - p_2^d)) \right|^2 dx dy \\
 &\ll \varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 \tau_1 \tau_2 X^2 \log^2 X + \varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 E_1,
 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$E_1 = \int_{\Omega_1} \int \left| \sum_{\lambda X < p_2 < p_1 \leq X} (\log p_1)(\log p_2) e(x(p_1^c - p_2^c) + y(p_1^d - p_2^d)) \right|^2 dx dy.$$

We divide the sum over p_1, p_2 above into $O(\log X)$ sums in each of which the summation is over p_1, p_2 such that $\Delta \leq p_1 - p_2 < 2\Delta$, where $1 \leq \Delta \leq X$. We then have

$$(24) \quad E_1 \ll E_2 \log^2 X,$$

where

$$E_2 = \int_{\Omega_1} \int \left| \sum_{\substack{\lambda X < p_1, p_2 \leq X \\ \Delta \leq p_1 - p_2 < 2\Delta}} (\log p_1)(\log p_2) e(x(p_1^c - p_2^c) + y(p_1^d - p_2^d)) \right|^2 dx dy$$

and Δ is chosen in such a way that E_2 is maximal. Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned}
 E_2 &= \int_{\Omega_1} \int \sum_{\substack{\lambda X < p_1, \dots, p_4 \leq X \\ \Delta \leq p_1 - p_2 < 2\Delta \\ \Delta \leq p_4 - p_3 < 2\Delta}} (\log p_1) \dots (\log p_4) \\
 &\quad \times e(x(p_1^c - p_2^c + p_3^c - p_4^c) + y(p_1^d - p_2^d + p_3^d - p_4^d)) dx dy \\
 &= \sum_{\substack{\lambda X < p_1, \dots, p_4 \leq X \\ \Delta \leq p_1 - p_2 < 2\Delta \\ \Delta \leq p_4 - p_3 < 2\Delta}} (\log p_1) \dots (\log p_4) \int_{-\tau_1}^{\tau_1} e(x(p_1^c - p_2^c + p_3^c - p_4^c)) dx \\
 &\quad \times \int_{-\tau_2}^{\tau_2} e(y(p_1^d - p_2^d + p_3^d - p_4^d)) dy.
 \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$(25) \quad E_2 \ll E_3 \log^4 X,$$

where

$$E_3 = \sum_{\substack{\lambda X < n_1, \dots, n_4 \leq X \\ \Delta \leq n_1 - n_2 < 2\Delta \\ \Delta \leq n_4 - n_3 < 2\Delta}} \Gamma(n_1, \dots, n_4),$$

and

$$\Gamma(n_1, \dots, n_4) = \min(\tau_1, |n_1^c - n_2^c + n_3^c - n_4^c|^{-1}) \min(\tau_2, |n_1^d - n_2^d + n_3^d - n_4^d|^{-1}).$$

For any integers k, l we define the intervals I_k, J_l as follows:

$$I_k = \begin{cases} [-1/\tau_1, 1/\tau_1] & \text{for } k = 0, \\ [2^{k-1}/\tau_1, 2^k/\tau_1] & \text{for } k \geq 1, \\ [-2^{|k|}/\tau_1, -2^{|k|-1}/\tau_1] & \text{for } k \leq -1; \end{cases}$$

$$J_l = \begin{cases} [-1/\tau_2, 1/\tau_2] & \text{for } l = 0, \\ [2^{l-1}/\tau_2, 2^l/\tau_2] & \text{for } l \geq 1, \\ [-2^{|l|}/\tau_2, -2^{|l|-1}/\tau_2] & \text{for } l \leq -1. \end{cases}$$

It is clear that there exist $k_0, l_0 > 0$ such that

$$(26) \quad k_0, l_0 \ll \log X$$

and

$$(27) \quad E_3 \ll \sum_{\substack{|k| \leq k_0 \\ |l| \leq l_0}} E(k, l),$$

where

$$E(k, l) = \sum_{n_1, \dots, n_4; (28)} \Gamma(n_1, \dots, n_4).$$

Here n_1, \dots, n_4 satisfy the conditions imposed in (28):

$$(28) \quad \begin{aligned} \lambda X &\leq n_1, \dots, n_4 \leq X, \\ \Delta &\leq n_1 - n_2 \leq 2\Delta, \\ \Delta &\leq n_4 - n_3 \leq 2\Delta, \\ n_2^c + n_4^c - n_1^c - n_3^c &\in I_k, \\ n_2^d + n_4^d - n_1^d - n_3^d &\in J_l. \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of $\Gamma(n_1, \dots, n_4)$ we get

$$E(k, l) \ll \frac{\tau_1 \tau_2}{2^{|k|+|l|}} \sum_{n_1, \dots, n_4; (28)} 1.$$

We estimate the last sum by Lemma 6 to obtain

$$E(k, l) \ll X^{4-c-d}.$$

The assertion of the lemma follows from the last inequality and from (23)–(27).

LEMMA 9. For the integral $I(x, y)$ defined by (20) we have

$$F = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |I(x, y)|^4 \varphi_{\varepsilon_1}(x) \varphi_{\varepsilon_2}(y) dx dy \ll \varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 X^{4-c-d} \log^4 X.$$

Proof. Define

$$h(t_1, t_2) = e(x(t_1^c - t_2^c) + y(t_1^d - t_2^d)).$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} I(x, y) \overline{I(x, y)} &= \int_{\lambda X < t_1, t_2 < X} \int h(t_1, t_2) dt_1 dt_2 \\ &= 2 \operatorname{Re} \int_{\substack{\lambda X < t_1, t_2 < X \\ X^{-1} < t_1 - t_2}} \int h(t_1, t_2) dt_1 dt_2 + O(1). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$F \ll 1 + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left| \int_{\substack{\lambda X < t_1, t_2 < X \\ X^{-1} < t_1 - t_2}} \int h(t_1, t_2) dt_1 dt_2 \right|^2 \varphi_{\varepsilon_1}(x) \varphi_{\varepsilon_2}(y) dx dy.$$

We represent the integral over t_1, t_2 as a sum of no more than $O(\log X)$ integrals

$$J_{\Delta} = \int_{\substack{\lambda X < t_1, t_2 < X \\ \Delta < t_1 - t_2 < 2\Delta}} \int h(t_1, t_2) dt_1 dt_2,$$

where $X^{-1} \leq \Delta \leq X$. We then have

$$(29) \quad F \ll 1 + F_1 \log^2 X,$$

where

$$F_1 = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |J_{\Delta}|^2 \varphi_{\varepsilon_1}(x) \varphi_{\varepsilon_2}(y) dx dy$$

and Δ is chosen in such a way that the integral F_1 is maximal. We have

$$\begin{aligned} F_1 &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{\substack{\lambda X < t_1, \dots, t_4 < X \\ \Delta < t_1 - t_2 < 2\Delta \\ \Delta < t_4 - t_3 < 2\Delta}} \int e(x(t_1^c - t_2^c + t_3^c - t_4^c) + y(t_1^d - t_2^d + t_3^d - t_4^d)) \\ &\quad \times \varphi_{\varepsilon_1}(x) \varphi_{\varepsilon_2}(y) dt_1 \dots dt_4 dx dy \end{aligned}$$

and by Lemma 2(i),

$$F_1 = \int_{\substack{\lambda X < t_1, \dots, t_4 < X \\ \Delta < t_1 - t_2 < 2\Delta \\ \Delta < t_4 - t_3 < 2\Delta}} \varphi\left(\frac{t_1^c - t_2^c + t_3^c - t_4^c}{\varepsilon_1}\right) \varphi\left(\frac{t_1^d - t_2^d + t_3^d - t_4^d}{\varepsilon_2}\right) dt_1 \dots dt_4.$$

We change the variables as follows:

$$u_1 = t_1^c - t_2^c, \quad u_2 = t_4^c - t_3^c, \quad u_3 = t_1^d - t_2^d, \quad u_4 = t_4^d - t_3^d.$$

For the Jacobian determinant we have

$$\left| \frac{D(u_1, \dots, u_4)}{D(t_1, \dots, t_4)} \right| \asymp \Delta^2 X^{2c+2d-6}.$$

Hence

$$(30) \quad F_1 \ll \Delta^{-2} X^{6-2c-2d} I_1 I_2,$$

where

$$I_1 = \int \int_{u_1, u_2 \asymp \Delta X^{c-1}} \varphi\left(\frac{u_1 - u_2}{\varepsilon_1}\right) du_1 du_2,$$

$$I_2 = \int \int_{u_3, u_4 \asymp \Delta X^{d-1}} \varphi\left(\frac{u_3 - u_4}{\varepsilon_2}\right) du_3 du_4.$$

By Lemma 2(ii) we have

$$I_1 \ll X^{-2} + \int \int_{u_1, u_2 \asymp \Delta X^{c-1}} \chi\left(\frac{u_1 - u_2}{\varepsilon_1 \log X}\right) du_1 du_2 \ll \varepsilon_1 \Delta X^{c-1} \log X.$$

Analogously

$$I_2 \ll \varepsilon_2 \Delta X^{d-1} \log X.$$

The estimates (29) and (30) imply

$$F \ll \varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 X^{4-c-d} \log^4 X.$$

The lemma is proved.

LEMMA 10. *For the integrals H_1 and H defined by (21) and (22) we have*

$$|H - H_1| \ll \frac{\varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 X^{5-c-d}}{\log X}.$$

Proof. Clearly

$$(31) \quad |H - H_1| \ll \int \int_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega_1} |I(x, y)|^5 \varphi_{\varepsilon_1}(x) \varphi_{\varepsilon_2}(y) dx dy$$

$$\ll \max_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega_1} |I(x, y)| \int \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |I(x, y)|^4 \varphi_{\varepsilon_1}(x) \varphi_{\varepsilon_2}(y) dx dy.$$

It is not difficult to see that

$$\max_{\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \Omega_1} |I(x, y)| \ll X^{5/6}.$$

We estimate the integral (31) using Lemma 9 and the result follows.

LEMMA 11. *The integral H defined by (22) satisfies*

$$H \gg \varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 X^{5-c-d}.$$

PROOF. This follows from (5) and Lemmas 1 and 2.

LEMMA 12. *The integral D_1 defined by (9) satisfies*

$$|D_1| \gg \varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 X^{5-c-d}.$$

PROOF. If H_1 is defined by (21) then

$$\begin{aligned} |D_1 - H_1| &\ll \int_{\Omega_1} \int_{\Omega_1} |S^5(x, y) - I^5(x, y)| \varphi_{\varepsilon_1}(x) \varphi_{\varepsilon_2}(y) \, dx \, dy \\ &\ll \max_{\Omega_1} |S(x, y) - I(x, y)| \\ &\quad \times \int_{\Omega_1} \int_{\Omega_1} (|S(x, y)|^4 + |I(x, y)|^4) \varphi_{\varepsilon_1}(x) \varphi_{\varepsilon_2}(y) \, dx \, dy. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by Lemmas 7–9,

$$|D_1 - H_1| \ll \frac{\varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 X^{5-c-d}}{\log X}.$$

This estimate and Lemma 10 imply

$$D_1 = H + O\left(\frac{\varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 X^{5-c-d}}{\log X}\right).$$

Now we use Lemma 11 and the result follows.

5. The integral over the intermediate region

LEMMA 13. *For the sum $S(x, y)$ defined in (7) we have uniformly for $(x, y) \in \Omega_2$,*

$$|S(x, y)| \ll \varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 \frac{X^{3-c-d}}{\log^{10} X}.$$

PROOF. The proof is a standard application of Vaughan’s identity (see [5]). See also Lemma 10 in [4].

LEMMA 14. *We have*

$$L = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |S(x, y)|^4 \varphi_{\varepsilon_1}(x) \varphi_{\varepsilon_2}(y) \, dx \, dy \ll X^2 \log^6 X.$$

PROOF. It is clear that

$$\begin{aligned} S(x, y) \overline{S(x, y)} &= \sum_{\lambda X < p \leq X} \log^2 p \\ &\quad + 2 \operatorname{Re} \sum_{\lambda X < p_2 < p_1 \leq X} (\log p_1)(\log p_2) e(x(p_1^c - p_2^c) + y(p_1^d - p_2^d)). \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$(32) \quad L \ll X^2 \log^2 X + L_1,$$

where

$$L_1 = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left| \sum_{\substack{\lambda X < p_2 < p_1 \leq X}} (\log p_1)(\log p_2)e(x(p_1^c - p_2^c) + y(p_1^d - p_2^d)) \right|^2 \times \varphi_{\varepsilon_1}(x)\varphi_{\varepsilon_2}(y) dx dy.$$

We divide the sum over p_1, p_2 into no more than $O(\log X)$ sums in each of which the summation is over p_1, p_2 such that $\Delta \leq p_1 - p_2 < 2\Delta$, where $1 \leq \Delta \leq X$. Then we have

$$(33) \quad L_1 \ll L_2 \log^2 X,$$

where

$$L_2 = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left| \sum_{\substack{\lambda X < p_2 < p_1 \leq X \\ \Delta \leq p_1 - p_2 < 2\Delta}} (\log p_1)(\log p_2)e(x(p_1^c - p_2^c) + y(p_1^d - p_2^d)) \right|^2 \times \varphi_{\varepsilon_1}(x)\varphi_{\varepsilon_2}(y) dx dy$$

and Δ is chosen in such a way that L_2 is maximal. By Lemma 2(i), (ii) we have

$$(34) \quad L_2 = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{\lambda X < p_1, \dots, p_4 \leq X \\ \Delta \leq p_1 - p_2 < 2\Delta \\ \Delta \leq p_4 - p_3 < 2\Delta}} (\log p_1)(\log p_2)(\log p_3)(\log p_4) \times e(x(p_1^c - p_2^c + p_3^c - p_4^c) + y(p_1^d - p_2^d + p_3^d - p_4^d)) \times \varphi_{\varepsilon_1}(x)\varphi_{\varepsilon_2}(y) dx dy \\ = \sum_{\substack{\lambda X < p_1, \dots, p_4 \leq X \\ \Delta \leq p_1 - p_2 < 2\Delta \\ \Delta \leq p_4 - p_3 < 2\Delta}} (\log p_1)(\log p_2)(\log p_3)(\log p_4) \times \varphi\left(\frac{p_1^c - p_2^c + p_3^c - p_4^c}{\varepsilon_1}\right) \varphi\left(\frac{p_1^d - p_2^d + p_3^d - p_4^d}{\varepsilon_2}\right) \\ \ll 1 + L_3 \log^4 X,$$

where L_3 denotes the number of integers n_1, \dots, n_4 satisfying

$$\lambda X \leq n_1, \dots, n_4 \leq X, \quad \Delta \leq n_1 - n_2 \leq 2\Delta, \quad \Delta \leq n_4 - n_3 \leq 2\Delta, \\ n_1^c - n_2^c + n_3^c - n_4^c \in I, \quad n_1^d - n_2^d + n_3^d - n_4^d \in J,$$

and where $I = [-\varepsilon_1 \log X, \varepsilon_1 \log X]$ and $J = [-\varepsilon_2 \log X, \varepsilon_2 \log X]$. By Lemma 6 we have

$$L_3 \ll \varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 X^{4-c-d} \log^2 X + \varepsilon_1 X^{3-c} \log X + \varepsilon_2 X^{3-d} \log X + \Delta X \ll X^2$$

and the result follows from (32)–(34).

LEMMA 15. For the integral D_2 defined by (9) the following estimate holds:

$$|D_2| \ll \frac{\varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 X^{5-c-d}}{\log X}.$$

Proof. We have

$$|D_2| \ll \max_{\Omega_2} |S(x, y)| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |S(x, y)|^4 \varphi_{\varepsilon_1}(x) \varphi_{\varepsilon_2}(y) dx dy$$

and the result follows from Lemmas 13 and 14.

6. Proof of the Theorem. Lemma 3 shows that for the sum

$$B = \sum_{\lambda X < p_1, \dots, p_5 \leq X} (\log p_1) \dots (\log p_5) \times \chi\left(\frac{p_1^c + \dots + p_5^c - N_1}{\varepsilon_1 \log X}\right) \chi\left(\frac{p_1^d + \dots + p_5^d - N_2}{\varepsilon_2 \log X}\right)$$

we have

$$(35) \quad B \geq D + O(1),$$

where D is defined by (8). On the other hand,

$$(36) \quad D = D_1 + D_2 + D_3.$$

From Lemma 12 we have

$$(37) \quad |D_1| \gg \varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 X^{5-c-d}.$$

Lemma 15 states that

$$(38) \quad |D_2| \ll \frac{\varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 X^{5-c-d}}{\log X},$$

and Lemma 4 gives us

$$(39) \quad |D_3| \ll 1.$$

Consequently, by (35)–(39) we have

$$B \gg \varepsilon_1 \varepsilon_2 X^{5-c-d}.$$

The Theorem is proved.

Acknowledgements. The author would like to thank the SFB 170 in Göttingen and the Mathematics Institute of the University of Göttingen for their kind hospitality, support and the use of their facilities. The author is particularly grateful to Dr. J. Brüdern for valuable conversations and comments.

The author also wants to thank the referee for useful remarks.

References

- [1] S. Lang, *Analysis I*, Addison-Wesley, 1968.
- [2] W. Narkiewicz, *Number Theory*, World Scientific, 1983.
- [3] I. I. Piatetski-Shapiro, *On a variant of Waring–Goldbach’s problem*, Mat. Sb. 30 (1952), 105–120 (in Russian).
- [4] D. I. Tolev, *On a diophantine inequality involving prime numbers*, Acta Arith. 61 (1992), 289–306.
- [5] R. C. Vaughan, *On the distribution of αp modulo 1*, Mathematika 24 (1977), 135–141.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
UNIVERSITY OF PLOVDIV
“TSAR ASEN” 24
PLOVDIV 4000, BULGARIA

*Received on 27.6.1993
and in revised form on 18.1.1994*

(2454)