

# A localization theorem in the theory of diophantine approximation and an application to Pell's equation

by

A. ROCKETT and P. SZÜSZ (Stony Brook, N.Y.)

**Introduction.** Some thirty years ago the second of us showed (Szűsz [3]) that for any irrational number  $\alpha$  the inequality

$$\|\alpha x\| < x^{\delta-1} \quad (0 < \delta < 1)$$

has a solution in any interval  $(n, n^{1/\delta})$  where  $\|z\|$  denotes the distance from  $z$  to the nearest integer. Since, as is well known,  $\|\alpha x\| < x^{-1}$  is solvable with natural numbers  $x$ , it would be interesting to give a "localization" for the numbers  $x$  satisfying  $\|\alpha x\| < x^{-1}$  but it is easy to see that one can give a counterexample to any such statement. Further, one could ask for a characterization of the natural numbers  $x$  for which

$$(1) \quad \|\alpha x\| < K/x$$

holds where  $K$  is a positive constant.

Let the regular continued fraction representation of  $\alpha$  be  $[a_0; a_1, a_2, \dots]$  and let the denominators of the convergents be  $B_0 = 1, B_1, B_2, \dots$ . In Section 1 we prove

**THEOREM 1.** *Let  $K \geq 1/\sqrt{5}$  and let  $\alpha$  be an irrational number. Then all positive integers  $x$  satisfying (1) have the form*

$$(2) \quad c_{n+1} B_n + c_{n+2} B_{n+1} + \dots + c_{n+m} B_{n+m-1}$$

with  $m < C \log(2K+1)+3$ , where  $C$  is an absolute constant and the coefficients  $c_{k+1}$  satisfy  $0 \leq c_i < a_i$ ,  $0 \leq c_{k+1} \leq a_{k+1}$  for  $k > 0$  and if  $c_{k+1} = a_{k+1}$  then  $c_k = 0$ .

This result extends the classical result of Legendre that  $m = 1$  for  $K \leq 1/2$  and that  $m \leq 2$  for  $K = 1$  (see Perron [2], Sections 13 and 16). In Section 2 we apply our result to Pell's equation  $x^2 - dy^2 = N$ . While this equation has been treated for  $|N| < \sqrt{d}$  (see Perron [2] for references), we can drop this restriction and thus generalize the classical results.

**1. Proof of the main theorem.** We use the notations of Perron [2] for regular continued fractions:

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha &= [a_0; a_1, a_2, \dots], \\ [a_0; a_1, \dots, a_k] &= A_k/B_k \quad \text{where} \quad (A_k, B_k) = 1, \\ \zeta_k &= [a_k; a_{k+1}, \dots].\end{aligned}$$

We set

$$D_k = B_k \alpha - A_k = (-1)^k / (B_k \zeta_{k+1} + B_{k-1}).$$

Since  $A_{k+1} = a_{k+1} A_k + A_{k-1}$  and  $B_{k+1} = a_{k+1} B_k + B_{k-1}$ , it follows that  $D_{k+1} = a_{k+1} D_k + D_{k-1}$ . Since  $D_{k+1} = -D_k / \zeta_{k+2}$ , the  $D_k$ 's alternate in sign and their absolute values decrease monotonically to zero.

LEMMA 1.1 (Ostrowski [1]). *Every positive integer  $x$  has a unique representation as*

$$(3) \quad x = \sum_{k=0}^N c_{k+1} B_k$$

where  $0 \leq c_1 < a_1$ ,  $0 \leq c_{k+1} \leq a_{k+1}$  for  $k > 0$  and if  $c_{k+1} = a_{k+1}$  then  $c_k = 0$ .

The proof can be done by induction on  $x$ .

Let  $c_{n+1}$  be the first nonzero coefficient in the representation (3) of  $x$  so that  $c_{n+1} > 0$  and  $c_{k+1} = 0$  for  $0 \leq k < n \leq N$ .

LEMMA 1.2. *We have*

$$|(c_{n+1}-1)D_n - D_{n+1}| < \left| \sum_{k=0}^N c_{k+1} D_k \right| < |c_{n+1} D_n - D_{n+1}|.$$

Proof. Since the  $D_k$ 's alternate in sign,

$$\left| \sum_{k=0}^N c_{k+1} D_k \right| > |c_{n+1} D_n + (a_{n+2}-1) D_{n+1} + a_{n+4} D_{n+3} + \dots|$$

and the lower estimate follows since  $a_{k+1} D_k = D_{k+1} - D_{k-1}$ . The upper estimate is obtained similarly by considering  $|c_{n+1} D_n + a_{n+3} D_{n+2} + a_{n+5} D_{n+4} + \dots|$ .

LEMMA 1.3. *For any integer  $x > 1$  either*

$$(4) \quad \|\alpha x\| = \left| \sum_{k=0}^N c_{k+1} D_k \right|$$

or  $\|\alpha x\| > D_2$ .

Proof. A simple calculation shows that if  $c_1 = c_2 = 0$  then the right-hand side of (4) is  $< 1/2$ . The exceptional cases occur when  $a_1 = 1$  and  $c_2 > 0$  and when  $c_1 > 0$ .

We now prove Theorem 1. From Lemmas 1.2 and 1.3 we see that  $\|\alpha x\|$  is minimized for integers of the form

$$x = B_n + (a_{n+2}-1) B_{n+1} + a_{n+4} B_{n+3} + \dots + a_{n+2m} B_{n+2m-1} = B_{n+2m} - B_{n+1}$$

and for such numbers we have that

$$\|\alpha x\| x > |-D_{n+1}| x > (B_{n+2m} - B_{n+1}) / (B_{n+2} + B_{n+1}) > (G^{2m-3} - 1) / 2$$

where  $G = (1 + \sqrt{5})/2$  since  $B_{k+2m}/B_{k+2} > G^{2m-3}$  for any  $\alpha$ . Thus if  $\|\alpha x\| x < K$  we must have  $(G^{2m-3} - 1)/2 < K$  and our result follows.

We note that an upper estimate for  $\|\alpha x\| x$  would require an upper bound for the ratios  $B_{k+1}/B_k$  and these ratios are unbounded for almost all  $\alpha$ .

**2. An application to Pell's equation.** We now consider the positive integer solutions of  $x^2 - dy^2 = N$  where the integer  $d > 1$  is not a perfect square. For  $N > 0$ , we have that  $\|y \sqrt{d}\|^2 + 2\sqrt{d} \|y \sqrt{d}\| y = N$  and so  $\|y \sqrt{d}\| y < N/2 \sqrt{d}$ . If  $0 < N < \sqrt{d}$  then  $\|y \sqrt{d}\| y < 1/2$  and we obtain the classical result that the only solutions are those given by the convergents of  $\sqrt{d}$  (the case  $N < 0$  follows in a similar manner since the convergents of  $\sqrt{d}$  and  $1/\sqrt{d}$  coincide with one trivial exception). For  $|N| > \sqrt{d}$ , it follows that the solutions will be as described by Theorem 1 (together with the corresponding sums of  $A_k$ 's).

With the notations of Perron [2] for the regular continued fraction of  $\sqrt{d}$ , we have

$$\zeta_0 = (\sqrt{d} + 0)/1, \quad \dots, \quad \zeta_k = (\sqrt{d} + P_k)/Q_k, \quad \dots$$

where  $a_k Q_k = P_k + P_{k+1}$  and  $d - (P_{k+1})^2 = Q_k Q_{k+1}$ . Thus the partial quotients satisfy  $a_k < 2\sqrt{d}$  and we have the estimate  $B_{k+1}/B_k < 1 + 2\sqrt{d}$ ; such an estimation does not hold in general but it does hold for quadratic surds.

From the upper estimate in Lemma 1.2 we see that  $\|y \sqrt{d}\|$  is maximized for integers of the form

$$y = a_{n+1} B_n + a_{n+3} B_{n+2} + \dots + a_{n+2m+1} B_{n+2m} = B_{n+2m+1} - B_{n-1}.$$

For such numbers

$$\|y \sqrt{d}\| y < |a_{n+1} D_n - D_{n+1}| y = |-D_{n-1}| y < B_{n+2m+1}/B_n < (1 + 2\sqrt{d})^{2m+1}$$

and we have shown

**THEOREM 2.** *The positive integer solutions of  $x^2 - dy^2 = N$  where  $2K_1 \sqrt{d} < |N| < 2K_2 \sqrt{d}$  are given by (2) and the corresponding sums of  $A_k$ 's with  $C_1 \log K_1 < m < C_2 \log(2K_2 + 1) + 3$  where  $C_1$  depends only on  $d$  and  $C_2$  is an absolute constant.*

We conclude with an explicit calculation of the values represented by  $x^2 - dy^2$  for  $x = A_k + cA_{k+1}$  and  $y = B_k + cB_{k+1}$  where  $1 \leq c \leq a_{k+2} - 1$ . Since  $x^2 - dy^2 = (y\sqrt{d} - x)(y\sqrt{d} - x)^*$  where  $(z)^*$  denotes the conjugate of  $z$ , we have that for  $x = A_k$  and  $y = B_k$ ,  $x^2 - dy^2 = D_k(D_k)^* = (-1)^{k+1}Q_{k+1}$  (see Perron [2]). Thus for  $x = A_k + cA_{k+1}$  and  $y = B_k + cB_{k+1}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} x^2 - dy^2 &= D_k(D_k)^*(1 - c/\zeta_{k+2})(1 - c/(\zeta_{k+2})^*) \\ &= (-1)^{k+1}(Q_{k+1} + cQ_{k+2}(2P_{k+2}/Q_{k+2} - c)) \\ &= (-1)^{k+1}V_{k+1}(c). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $2P_{k+2}/Q_{k+2} = \zeta_{k+2} + (\zeta_{k+2})^*$  we have  $\zeta_{k+2} > 2P_{k+2}/Q_{k+2} > \zeta_{k+2} - 1 > c$  and so  $V_{k+1}(c) > Q_{k+1}$  for  $1 \leq c \leq a_{k+2} - 1$ . The maximum of  $V_{k+1}$  occurs when  $c = \|P_{k+2}/Q_{k+2}\|$  and is approximately  $Q_{k+1} + (P_{k+2})^2/Q_{k+2} = d/Q_{k+2}$ . Since  $Q_{k+2} = 1$  at the end of each period of  $\sqrt{d}$ ,  $V_{k+1}$  can take values as large as  $d$ .

For an integer of the form (2) with  $m > 2$ , we see from the recursion formula  $B_{k+1} = a_{k+1}B_k + B_{k-1}$  that it can be rewritten as  $sB_k + tB_{k+1}$  where  $s > 1$  and  $t > 0$  are integers. Then the previous calculations may be repeated to find the value of  $x^2 - dy^2$  in terms of  $Q_{k+1}$ ,  $Q_{k+2}$  and  $P_{k+2}$ .

#### References

- [1] Alexander Ostrowski, *Bemerkungen zur Theorie der Diophantischen Approximationen*, Abh. Math. Sem. Hamburg Univ. 1 (1922), pp. 77-98.
- [2] Oskar Perron, *Die Lehre von den Kettenbrüchen*, Bd. I, 3te Aufl., B. G. Teubner, 1954.
- [3] Peter Szűs, *Bemerkungen zur Approximationen einer Reellen Zahl durch Brüche*, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hung. 6 (1955), pp. 203-212.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS  
SUNY AT STONY BROOK  
STONY BROOK, NEW YORK 11794 USA

Received on 13.5.1985  
and in revised form on 11.7.1985

(1508)

## A generalization of Atkinson's formula to $L$ -functions

by

TOM MEURMAN (Turku)

### 1. Introduction. Let

$$(1.1) \quad I(q, T) = \sum_{\chi \bmod q} \int_0^T |L(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, \chi)|^2 dt$$

and define  $E(q, T)$  via the identity

$$(1.2) \quad I(q, T) = \frac{\varphi^2(q)}{q} T \left( \log \frac{qT}{2\pi} + \sum_{p|q} \frac{\log p}{p-1} + 2\gamma - 1 \right) + E(q, T),$$

where  $\varphi$  is Euler's function and  $\gamma$  is his constant.

Consider first the case  $q = 1$ . Atkinson [1] has established for  $E(1, T)$  a very precise explicit expression in terms of two sums involving the divisor function  $d(n)$ . Recently Jutila [7] found a new interesting application of this formula by showing that it yields in a simple manner Balasubramanian's [2] estimate  $E(1, T) \ll T^{1/3+\varepsilon}$ , valid for any positive  $\varepsilon$ .

The more general function  $E(q, T)$  has been studied by Rane [9] (in fact, he considers  $E(q, T) - E(q, 1)$ ) who proved

$$(1.3) \quad E(q, T) \ll qT^{1/2} \log T.$$

A simpler proof of this is due to Balasubramanian and Ramachandra [3].

Our object is to generalize Atkinson's formula to  $E(q, T)$  (Theorem 1). Then we deduce by Jutila's method a new inequality for  $E(q, T)$  (Corollary 1). In turn, this implies immediately new mean value estimates for  $L$ -functions (Corollary 2), which can be applied to estimate the density of the zeros in small rectangles (Corollary 3).

We proceed to state the main results. Let

$$(1.4) \quad e(T, u) = \left(1 + \frac{\pi u}{2T}\right)^{-1/4} \left( \left(\frac{2T}{\pi u}\right)^{1/2} \operatorname{arsinh} \left( \left(\frac{\pi u}{2T}\right)^{1/2} \right) \right)^{-1},$$

$$(1.5) \quad f(T, u) = 2T \operatorname{arsinh} \left( \left(\frac{\pi u}{2T}\right)^{1/2} \right) + (\pi^2 u^2 + 2\pi u T)^{1/2} - \frac{\pi}{4},$$

$$(1.6) \quad g(T, u) = T \log \frac{T}{2\pi u} - T + 2\pi u + \frac{\pi}{4}.$$