LONGER GAPS BETWEEN VALUES OF BINARY QUADRATIC FORMS

RAINER DIETMANN AND CHRISTIAN ELSHOLTZ

Abstract. We prove new lower bounds on large gaps between integers which are sums of two squares, or are represented by any binary quadratic form of discriminant $D$, improving results of Richards. Let $s_1, s_2, \ldots$ be the sequence of positive integers, arranged in increasing order, that are representable by any binary quadratic form of fixed discriminant $D$, then
\[
\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{s_{n+1} - s_n}{\log s_n} \geq \frac{\varphi(|D|)}{2|D|(1 + \log \varphi(|D|))} \gg \frac{1}{\log \log |D|},
\]
improving a lower bound of $\frac{1}{|D|}$ of Richards. In the special case of sums of two squares, we improve Richards’s bound of $1/4$ to $\frac{195}{449} = 0.434 \ldots$. We also generalize Richards’s result in another direction: Let $d = 2^{r}d'$ where $d'$ is odd. For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists a smallest positive integer $y_k$ such that none of the integers $y_k + j^2, 1 \leq j \leq k$, is a sum of two squares. Moreover,
\[
\limsup_{k \to \infty} \frac{k}{\log y_k} \geq \frac{1}{4d'}.
\]

1. Introduction

Let
\[ (s_1, s_2, s_3, s_4, s_5, s_6 \ldots) = (0, 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, \ldots) \]
denote the sequence of integers, in increasing order, which can be written as a sum of two squares of integers. The question of the size of large gaps between these integers was investigated by Turán and Erdős [4], Warlimont [9] and Richards [8]; see also [5], [1], [7] and [2] for related or more recent work by Hooley, Balog and Wooley, Maynard, and Bonfoh and Enyi. Erdős writes that Turán proved that infinitely often
\[ s_{n+1} - s_n \gg \frac{\log s_n}{\log \log s_n} \]
holds, which Erdős [4] improved to
\[ s_{n+1} - s_n \gg \frac{\log s_n}{\sqrt{\log \log s_n}}. \tag{1} \]
In fact, Erdős’s result was a bit more general, and Warlimont [9] independently obtained the same estimate (1), again in a more general context for sequences with hypotheses slightly different from [4]. In a very short and elegant paper Richards…
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improved this further to
\[(2) \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{s_{n+1} - s_n}{\log s_n} \geq \frac{1}{4}.
\]
In fact, the result he obtained was again more general: Fix a fundamental discriminant \(D\) and denote by \(s_1, s_2, \ldots\) the integers, in increasing order, representable by any binary quadratic form of discriminant \(D\). Then
\[(3) \limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{s_{n+1} - s_n}{\log s_n} \geq \frac{1}{|D|}.
\]
The special case \(D = -4\) corresponds to sums of two squares and recovers (2).

Apparently, Richards’s record has not been broken since 1982. In this paper we obtain the following improvements to (2) and (3).

**Theorem 1.** Let \(s_1 < s_2 < \ldots\) be the sequence of positive integers that are sums of two squares. Then
\[
\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{s_{n+1} - s_n}{\log s_n} \geq \frac{195}{449} = 0.434\ldots
\]

**Theorem 2.** Let \(D\) be a fundamental discriminant, i.e. \(D \equiv 1 \pmod{4}\) and \(D\) being squarefree, or \(D \equiv 0 \pmod{4}\), \(D \equiv 2 \pmod{4}\) being squarefree and \(D \equiv 3 \pmod{4}\). Further, let \((s_1, s_2, \ldots)\) be the sequence of positive integers, in increasing order, that are representable by any binary quadratic form of discriminant \(D\). Then
\[
\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{s_{n+1} - s_n}{\log s_n} \geq \frac{\varphi(|D|)}{2|D|(1 + \log \varphi(|D|))},
\]
where \(\varphi\) denotes Euler’s totient function.

Note that
\[
\frac{\varphi(|D|)}{|D|} \gg \frac{1}{\log \log |D|},
\]
implying that
\[
\limsup_{n \to \infty} \frac{s_{n+1} - s_n}{\log s_n} \gg \frac{1}{\log |D| \log \log |D|}.
\]
This is a significant improvement over the bound \(1/D\) by Richards and now the dependence on \(|D|\) has become very mild.

Our approach largely follows that of Richards, but has a much more careful analysis which prime factors of medium size are required for the argument.

Let us include Richards’s proof of (2) first, as its simplicity helps with understanding. Fix any \(\varepsilon > 0\) and then fix a sufficiently large gap size \(k\). For each prime \(p \leq 4k, p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}\) let \(\beta = \beta(p)\) be the highest power with \(p^\beta \leq 4k\). Let
\[(4) \quad P = \prod_{p \leq 4k, p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}} p^{\beta(p)+1}.
\]
Define \(y \in \{1, \ldots, P\}\) by \(4y \equiv -1 \pmod{P}\). Then as shown below, none of the integers in
\[I = \{y+1, \ldots, y+k\}\]
is the sum of two squares. By the prime number theorem in arithmetic progressions (see for example formula (17.1) in [7]), as \(k\) and thus \(P\) is sufficiently large in terms of \(\varepsilon\), we have
\[
P < (4k)^{2(1+\varepsilon)(2k/\log 4k)} = \exp((1 + \varepsilon)4k),
\]
whence
\[ k > \frac{\log P}{4(1 + \varepsilon)}. \]

Since \( 4y \equiv -1 \pmod{P} \), we have that
\[ 4(y + j) \equiv 4j - 1 \pmod{P}, \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq k. \]

Now \( 4j - 1 \) is exactly divisible by some prime power \( p^\alpha \) with \( p \equiv 3 \pmod{4} \) and \( \alpha \) odd. As \( \alpha \leq \beta(p) \), and \( P \) is divisible by \( p^{\beta+1} \), it follows that \( y + j \) is also exactly divisible by \( p^\alpha \), and therefore \( y + j \) is indeed not the sum of two squares. This proves \( \mathcal{P} \). In fact, the argument generalizes to yield the following result on long gaps between sums of two squares in sparse sequences.

**Theorem 3.** Let \( d = 2^d \) where \( d' \) is odd. For all \( k \in \mathbb{N} \) there exists a smallest positive integer \( y_k \) such that none of the integers \( y_k + j^d, 1 \leq j \leq k \), is a sum of two squares. Moreover,
\[
\limsup_{k \to \infty} \frac{k}{\log y_k} \geq \frac{1}{4d'}.
\]

**Remark.** When \( d = 2^r \), i.e. \( d' = 1 \), the quantitative bound is as good as Richards’; in particular, the special case \( d = 1 \) recovers exactly Richards’s result \( \mathcal{P} \).

As the details of the proofs of Theorems \( \mathcal{P} \) and \( \mathcal{Q} \) are quite technical, we outline the underlying ideas and structure of the proofs. An even more elaborate analysis along the same lines in case of Theorem \( \mathcal{Q} \) could probably lead to a further slight improvement; in case of Theorem \( \mathcal{Q} \) we refrained from introducing our new refinement in order to keep the statement clean as in this case our focus was more on the qualitative side of the result. The key observation for an improvement in the argument above is as follows: We concluded that \( 4j - 1 \) is exactly divisible by some prime power \( p^\alpha \) with \( p \equiv 3 \pmod{4} \) and odd \( \alpha \), say \( 4j - 1 = p^\alpha r \). If \( 4j - 1 < 4k \) is composite, then \( p < \frac{4}{5}k \). Primes \( p \) with \( \frac{4}{5}k \leq p \leq 4k \) included in the product \( \mathcal{P} \) therefore are only used once in the argument, namely when \( p = 4j - 1 \). Now integers in \( I = \{y + 1, \ldots, y + k\} \) which are congruent to \( 3 \pmod{4} \) are obviously not sums of two squares. Hence, additionally assuming that \( y \equiv 0 \pmod{4} \), we conclude that for \( j \equiv 3 \pmod{4} \) we trivially know that \( y + j \) is not a sum of two squares. As \( 4j - 1 \equiv 11 \pmod{16} \) in this case, we deduce that primes \( p \equiv 11 \pmod{16} \), with \( 4k/5 \leq p \leq 4k \), are not needed in the product \( \mathcal{Q} \). In other words, for fixed \( k \) one can use a smaller \( P \), or for a given size of \( y \), one can find a larger \( k \) than in Richards’s argument. This basic approach just described in fact would replace the \( \frac{1}{4} \) in \( \mathcal{Q} \) by
\[
\left( 2 \times \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{4}{5} + \frac{3}{4} \left( 4 - \frac{4}{5} \right) \right) \right)^{-1} = \frac{5}{16} = 0.3125,
\]
but it can be further refined in two ways: First, considering higher powers of \( 2 \) one finds a larger proportion of residue classes for \( j \) one can dispense with; for example the residue classes \( j \equiv 3, 6, 7 \) modulo 8 immediately rule out that \( y + j \) is a sum of two squares, provided that \( y \equiv 0 \pmod{8} \). Therefore the primes \( p = 4j - 1 \geq \frac{4}{5}k \) with \( p \equiv 11, 23, \) or \( 27 \pmod{32} \) are not needed. Secondly, also smaller primes \( p \) can be considered; for example primes \( p \) with \( \frac{4}{5}k \leq p < \frac{4}{5}k \) can only occur in the argument if either \( 4j - 1 = p \) or \( 4j - 1 = 5p \). One residue class one can disregard here is for example \( p \equiv 11 \pmod{32} \), as for such \( p \) both \( p \) and \( 5p \) are modulo 32 in the set of residue classes 11, 23 and 27 which were ruled out above for \( 4j - 1 \).
Implementing and optimizing these kinds of improvements lead to the result in Theorem 1.

A similar idea is used to prove Theorem 2. Here instead of $4j - 1$ the progression $|D| j + r$ shows up, for some $r$ with $\left( \frac{D}{r} \right) = -1$. Whereas Richards [8] uses all primes $p$ with $\left( \frac{D}{p} \right) = -1$, it turns out that for large primes $p$ used only once, namely when $|D| j + r = p$ (i.e. $L/\ell_2 < p \leq L$), only $p$ with $p \equiv r \pmod{|D|}$ need to be considered. Similarly, for somewhat smaller primes $p$ used only twice, only two residue classes modulo $|D|$ have to be covered, and so on. This leads to a considerably smaller product $P$.

Notation: We say that a prime power $p^\alpha$ exactly divides an integer $n$ if $p^\alpha$ divides $n$ but $p^{\alpha+1}$ does not. The symbol $\left( \frac{m}{n} \right)$ always denotes the Kronecker symbol of $m$ over $n$. Also, as the proof of Theorem 1 in section 2 requires quite heavy notation, we have a summary of abbreviations in appendix A and some examples for the sets of residue classes introduced in appendix B.
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2. Longer gaps between sums of two squares

In this section we will prove Theorem 1. For all $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\ell \geq 2$ define

\begin{equation}
S_\ell = \{2^a b \in \{1, \ldots, 2^\ell\} : a \leq \ell - 2, b \equiv 3 \pmod{4}\}.
\end{equation}

Clearly

\begin{equation}
S_\ell \subset S_{\ell+1}
\end{equation}

for all $\ell \geq 2$. In the following it is convenient to use the projection

$$\pi_\ell : \mathbb{Z} \to \{1, \ldots, 2^\ell\}$$
$$x \mapsto n \in \{1, \ldots, 2^\ell\} \text{ such that } x \equiv n \pmod{2^\ell}.$$  

Lemma 1. For $\ell \geq 2$ we have

$$\#S_\ell = 2^{\ell-1} - 1.$$  

Moreover, if $\pi_\ell(n) \in S_\ell$, then $n$ is not the sum of two squares.

Proof. Suppose that $c \in \{1, \ldots, 2^\ell\}$ is of the form $c = 2^a b$ for $a \leq \ell - 2$ and $b \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$. If $n \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfies $n \equiv c \pmod{2^\ell}$, then $n = 2^\ell m + 2^a b = 2^a (2^{\ell-a} m + b)$ for a suitable integer $m$. Now $2^{\ell-a} m + b \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, so $n$ must be divisible by a prime $p$ with $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ to an exact odd power, whence $n$ cannot be a sum of two squares. It is immediate to check that the number of such $c$ of the form above is

$$\sum_{a=0}^{\ell-2} 2^{\ell-a-2} = 2^{\ell-1} - 1,$$

because for fixed $a \leq \ell - 2$ there are exactly $2^{\ell-a-2}$ elements of $\{1, \ldots, 2^{\ell-a}\}$ that are congruent to 3 modulo 4. □
Define the map $\tau$ by 
\[ \tau: \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}; \quad j \mapsto 4j - 1, \]
and for $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, $\ell \geq 2$ define 
\[ T_{\ell+2} = \tau(S_{\ell}) = \pi_{\ell+2}(\tau(S_{\ell})) \subset \{1, \ldots, 2^{\ell+2}\}. \]
Again, one observes that 
\[ \ell \geq \pi_{\ell+2}(\tau(S_{\ell})) \subset \{1, \ldots, 2^{\ell+2}\}. \]
for all $\ell \geq 4$.

**Lemma 2.** Let $\ell \geq 2$ and $s \in S_{\ell}$ with $s \neq 3 \times 2^{\ell-2}$. Then we have $\pi_{\ell}(s+2^{\ell-1}) \in S_{\ell}$.

**Proof.** As $s \in S_{\ell}$, $s \neq 3 \times 2^{\ell-2}$, it follows that $s \equiv 2^a b \pmod{2^\ell}$ where $a \leq \ell - 3$ and $b \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$. Hence $s+2^{\ell-1} \equiv 2^a(b+2^{\ell-1-a}) \pmod{2^\ell}$, where $b+2^{\ell-1-a} \equiv b \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, whence $\pi_{\ell}(s+2^{\ell-1}) \in S_{\ell}$. \(\square\)

**Corollary 1.** Let $\ell \geq 2$ and $t \in T_{\ell+2}$ with $t \neq 3 \times 2^{\ell-1}$. Then $\pi_{\ell+2}(t+2^{\ell+1}) \in T_{\ell+2}$.

**Lemma 3.** Let $\ell \geq 3$. Then $3 \times 2^\ell - 1 \notin T_{\ell+1}$.

**Proof.** Let $x = 3 \times 2^\ell - 1$. Since $T_{\ell+1} \subset \{1, \ldots, 2^{\ell+1}\}$ and $x > 2^\ell+1$, clearly $x \notin T_{\ell+1}$. \(\square\)

Let 
\[ U_3 = \{3\} \subset S_3, \]
and for $\ell \geq 4$, recursively define 
\[ U_\ell = U_{\ell-1} \cup \{u + 2^{\ell-1} : u \in U_{\ell-1}\} \cup \{3 \times 2^{\ell-2}\}. \]
It follows by induction from (3), (6), Lemma 2, (8) and (9) that $U_\ell \subset S_\ell$ for all $\ell \geq 3$. Moreover, for $\ell \geq 2$ define 
\[ V_\ell = \{s \in S_\ell : \pi_{\ell+2}(5\tau(s)) \in T_{\ell+2}\}. \]
The important property of $V_\ell$ used later is that if $x \in T_\ell$ is also in the subset $\tau(V_\ell)$ of $T_\ell$, then $\pi_\ell(5x) \in T_\ell$ as well.

In a similar way, define 
\[ W_5 = \{24\} \subset U_5, \]
and, for $\ell \geq 6$, 
\[ W_\ell = W_{\ell-1} \cup \{u + 2^{\ell-1} : u \in W_{\ell-1}\} \cup \{3 \times 2^{\ell-2}\}. \]
As above one shows that 
\[ W_\ell \subset U_\ell \]
for all $\ell \geq 5$. Further, for $\ell \geq 2$ let 
\[ R_\ell = \{s \in S_\ell : \pi_{\ell+2}(5\tau(s)) \in T_{\ell+2} \text{ and } \pi_{\ell+2}(9\tau(s)) \in T_{\ell+2}\}. \]
Note that 
\[ R_\ell \subset V_\ell \]
for all $\ell \geq 5$, and that the important property of $R_\ell$ used later is that if $x \in T_\ell$ is also in the subset $\tau(R_\ell)$ of $T_\ell$, then $\pi_\ell(5x) \in T_\ell$ and $\pi_\ell(9x) \in T_\ell$ as well.

**Lemma 4.** Let $\ell \geq 3$. Then $\#U_\ell = 2^{\ell-2} - 1$ and $U_\ell \subset V_\ell$. 

\[ \text{Note that } R_\ell \subset V_\ell \]
for all $\ell \geq 5$, and that the important property of $R_\ell$ used later is that if $x \in T_\ell$ is also in the subset $\tau(R_\ell)$ of $T_\ell$, then $\pi_\ell(5x) \in T_\ell$ and $\pi_\ell(9x) \in T_\ell$ as well.
Proof. We prove the lemma by induction on $\ell$. For $\ell = 3$, it is immediate to check that
\[ U_3 = V_3 = \{3\}, \]
whence
\[ \#U_3 = 1 = 2^{\ell-2} - 1, \]
and no element in $U_3$ is divisible by $2^{\ell-1}$. Now let $\ell \geq 4$, and suppose that
\[ \#U_{\ell-1} = 2^{\ell-3} - 1, \]
no element in $U_{\ell-1}$ is divisible by $2^{\ell-2}$ and $U_{\ell-1} \subset V_{\ell-1}$. The three sets on the right hand side of (3) are disjoint as $U_{\ell-1} \subset \{1, \ldots, 2^{\ell-1}\}$, \( \{u + 2^{\ell-1} : u \in U_{\ell-1}\} \subset \{2^{\ell-1} + 1, \ldots, 2^{\ell}\} \), and no element in $U_{\ell-1}$ is divisible by $2^{\ell-2}$. Hence
\[ \#U_\ell = 2\#U_{\ell-1} + 1 = 2^{\ell-2} - 1 \]
and no element in $U_\ell$ is divisible by $2^{\ell-1}$. To prove $U_\ell \subset V_\ell$, let $s \in U_\ell$.

Case I: $s = 3 \times 2^{\ell-2}$. Then
\[
\frac{1}{4}(5\tau(s) - 3 \times 2^{\ell+2} + 1) = \frac{1}{4}(5 \times (4 \times 3 \times 2^{\ell-2} - 1) - 3 \times 2^{\ell+2} + 1) = 3 \times 2^{\ell-2} - 1, \]
hence
\[ 5\tau(s) \equiv 4 \times (3 \times 2^{\ell-2} - 1) - 1 \pmod{2^{\ell+2}}. \]
Now $3 \times 2^{\ell-2} - 1 \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, so $3 \times 2^{\ell-2} - 1 \in S_\ell$, whence $4 \times (3 \times 2^{\ell-2} - 1) - 1 \in T_{\ell+2}$, so $\pi_{\ell+2}(5\tau(s)) \in T_{\ell+2}$.

Case II: $s \neq 3 \times 2^{\ell-2}$. Then by definition of $U_\ell$, we have $\pi_{\ell-1}(s) \in U_{\ell-1}$, so $\pi_{\ell+1}(5\tau(s)) \in T_{\ell+1}$ by our inductive assumption $U_{\ell-1} \subset V_{\ell-1}$. Hence $\pi_{\ell+2}(5\tau(s)) \in T_{\ell+1}$ or $\pi_{\ell+2}(5\tau(s)) \in \{u + 2^{\ell+1} : u \in T_{\ell+1}\}$. If $\pi_{\ell+2}(5\tau(s)) \in T_{\ell+1}$ then by (7) we immediately obtain $\pi_{\ell+2}(5\tau(s)) \in T_{\ell+2}$ as required, whereas if $\pi_{\ell+2}(5\tau(s)) \in \{u + 2^{\ell+1} : u \in T_{\ell+1}\}$ then (7), Lemma 4 and Corollary 1 again yield $\pi_{\ell+2}(5\tau(s)) \in T_{\ell+2}$.

Lemma 5. Let $\ell \geq 5$. Then $\#W_\ell = 2^{\ell-4} - 1$ and $W_\ell \subset R_\ell$.

Proof. We use a similar strategy as in the proof of Lemma 4 the proof for $\#W_\ell = 2^{\ell-4} - 1$ is completely analogous, so let us focus on the second part $W_\ell \subset R_\ell$. The case $\ell = 5$ is immediately checked directly. Now suppose that $\ell \geq 6$ and $W_{\ell-1} \subset R_{\ell-1}$. For $s \neq 3 \times 2^{\ell-2}$ we argue in exactly the same way as in the proof of Lemma 4. Therefore let us only discuss the case $s = 3 \times 2^{\ell-2}$. Here
\[
\frac{1}{4}(9\tau(s) - 6 \times 2^{\ell+2} + 1) = \frac{1}{4}(9 \times (4 \times 3 \times 2^{\ell-2} - 1) - 6 \times 2^{\ell+2} + 1) = 2 \times (3 \times 2^{\ell-3} - 1), \]
hence
\[ 9\tau(s) \equiv 4 \times 2 \times (3 \times 2^{\ell-3} - 1) - 1 \pmod{2^{\ell+2}}. \]
Now $2 \times (3 \times 2^{\ell-3} - 1) \equiv 6 \pmod{8}$, so $2 \times (3 \times 2^{\ell-3} - 1) \in S_\ell$, thus $4 \times 2 \times (3 \times 2^{\ell-3} - 1) - 1 \in T_{\ell+2}$ and $\pi_{\ell+2}(9\tau(s)) \in T_{\ell+2}$ from the proof of Lemma 4 we already know that $\pi_{\ell+2}(5\tau(s)) \in T_{\ell+2}$.
We now follow the idea of Richards [8] already explained in the introduction. Let \( \varepsilon > 0 \). Then, in terms of \( \varepsilon \), fix a sufficiently large positive integer \( \ell \geq 5 \) and a sufficiently large positive integer \( k \), and let the sets \( S_\ell, T_\ell+2, U_\ell, V_\ell, W_\ell, R_\ell \) be defined as above. In the following it is convenient to define

\[
A := T_{\ell+2}, \quad B := \pi_{\ell+2}(\tau(U_\ell)), \quad C := \pi_{\ell+2}(\tau(W_\ell)).
\]

Note that \( C \subset B \subset A \) since \( W_\ell \subset U_\ell \subset S_\ell \). By Lemma 1, Lemma 4 and Lemma 5 we have

\[
\# A = \# T_{\ell+2} = \# S_\ell = 2^{\ell-1} - 1, \quad \# B = \# U_\ell = 2^{\ell-2} - 1, \quad \# C = \# W_\ell = 2^{\ell-4} - 1.
\]

Hence if \( \ell \) is chosen sufficiently large in terms of \( \varepsilon \), then

\[
\frac{\# A}{\phi(2^{\ell+2})} \geq \frac{1}{4}(1 - \varepsilon); \quad \frac{\# B}{\phi(2^{\ell+2})} \geq \frac{1}{8}(1 - \varepsilon); \quad \frac{\# C}{\phi(2^{\ell+2})} \geq \frac{1}{32}(1 - \varepsilon).
\]

Now for each prime \( p \leq 4k \) define

\[
\beta(p) = \max_{p^m \leq 4k} m,
\]

let

\[
X = (1 + \varepsilon)\frac{4}{13}k, \quad Y = (1 + \varepsilon)\frac{4}{9}k, \quad Z = (1 + \varepsilon)\frac{4}{5}k,
\]

and let

\[
P = 2^\ell \prod_{p_1 \equiv 3 \pmod{4}}^{X \leq p_1 \leq X} p_1^{\beta(p) + 1} \prod_{p_2 \equiv 3 \pmod{4}}^{X < p_2 \leq Y, \pi_{\ell+2}(p_2) \not\in C} p_2^{\beta(p) + 1} \prod_{p_3 \equiv 3 \pmod{4}}^{Y < p_3 \leq Z} p_3^{\beta(p) + 1} \prod_{p_4 \equiv 3 \pmod{4}}^{Z < p_4 \leq 4k, \pi_{\ell+2}(p_4) \not\in B} p_4^{\beta(p) + 1},
\]

where \( p_1, \ldots, p_4 \) denote prime numbers. Then by the prime number theorem in arithmetic progressions (see for example formula (17.1) in [6]), using the upper bound \( p^{\beta(p) + 1} \leq (4k)^2 \), the lower bounds (10) and the fact that all elements in \( A \) are congruent to 3 modulo 4, we obtain

\[
P \leq (4k)^2(1 + \varepsilon)\frac{\log P}{\log(4k)},
\]

where

\[
\alpha = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{4}{13} + \frac{4}{9} - \frac{4}{13} \right) \frac{15}{16} + \left( \frac{4}{5} - \frac{4}{9} \right) \frac{3}{4} + \left( 4 - \frac{4}{5} \right) \frac{1}{2}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{449}{195}.
\]

Hence

\[
P \leq \exp \left( (1 + \varepsilon)\frac{449}{195}k \right),
\]

so

\[
\frac{k}{\log P} \geq \frac{195}{(1 + \varepsilon)449}.
\]

Now use the Chinese Remainder Theorem to find \( y \in \{1, \ldots, P\} \) such that
Lemma 4. Finally, if \(\tau\) whether property (iii) above.

Remark squares.

Case IV: \(C\) case because

We claim that none of the numbers \(y + 1, \ldots, y + k\) is a sum of two squares, which together with \(y \leq P\) and [\textbf{1}]) proves the theorem. To settle the claim, let \(1 \leq j \leq k\).

If \(\tau(j) \in S_e\), then by Lemma [\textbf{1}] and property (i) above \(y + j\) cannot be a sum of two squares, so we can assume that \(\tau(j) \notin S_e\), whence \(\tau_{\ell+2}(\tau(j)) \notin A\). Now \(\tau(j) \equiv 3 \pmod{4}\), so \(\tau(j)\) must be divisible by a prime \(p\) with \(p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}\) where \(3 \leq p \leq 4k - 1\) and \(p^7 \mid |\tau(j)|\) for odd \(\gamma \leq \beta(p)\).

Case I: \(p \leq X\). Then by property (ii) above \(4y \equiv -1 \pmod{p^{\beta(p)+1}}\).

Case II: \(Z < p \leq 4k\). Then \(p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}\) and \(p \mid \tau(j)\) imply that \(\tau(j) = p\), so \(\tau_{\ell+2}(\tau(j)) = \tau_{\ell+2}(p) \notin A\) and by property (v) above, we have \(4y \equiv -1 \pmod{p^{\beta(p)+1}}\).

Case III: \(Y < p \leq Z\). Then \(p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}\) and \(p \mid \tau(j)\) imply that \(\tau(j) = p\) or \(\tau(j) = 5p\). As above, if \(\tau(j) = p\) we conclude that \(\tau_{\ell+2}(p) \notin A\), whereas if \(\tau(j) = 5p\) we obtain \(\tau_{\ell+2}(5p) \notin A\). Writing \(p = \tau(s)\) for some positive integer \(s\), we then find that \(\tau(s) \notin V_t\), whence by Lemma [\textbf{1}] also \(\tau(s) \notin U_t\), hence \(\tau_{\ell+2}(p) \notin B\).

As \(B \subset A\), we get \(\tau_{\ell+2}(p) \notin B\) regardless of whether \(\tau(j) = p\) or \(\tau(j) = 5p\), so by property (iv) again \(4y \equiv -1 \pmod{p^{\beta(p)+1}}\).

Case IV: \(X < p \leq Y\). Then \(p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}\) and \(p \mid \tau(j)\) imply that \(\tau(j) = p\) or \(\tau(j) = 5p\) or \(\tau(j) = 9p\). If \(\tau(j) = p\), then \(\tau_{\ell+2}(p) = \tau_{\ell+2}(\tau(j)) \notin A\). Next, if \(\tau(j) = 5p\), then \(\tau_{\ell+2}(\tau(j)) = \tau_{\ell+2}(5p) \notin A\), hence as above \(\tau_{\ell+2}(p) \notin B\) by Lemma [\textbf{1}] Finally, if \(\tau(j) = 9p\), then \(\tau_{\ell+2}(\tau(j)) = \tau_{\ell+2}(9p) \notin A\), hence as above \(\tau_{\ell+2}(p) \notin C\) by Lemma [\textbf{2}] As \(C \subset B \subset A\), we obtain \(\tau_{\ell+2}(p) \notin C\) regardless whether \(\tau(j) = p\), \(\tau(j) = 5p\) or \(\tau(j) = 9p\), whence \(4y \equiv -1 \pmod{p^{\beta(p)+1}}\) by property (iii) above.

In all cases,

\[4(y + j) \equiv 4j - 1 \pmod{p^{\beta(p)+1}},\]

so \(p^7 \mid |(y + j)|\). Since \(p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}\) and \(\gamma\) is odd, \(y + j\) cannot be a sum of two squares.

**Remark.** One might wonder if the study of further iterations leading to analogous sets \(D, E,\ldots\) would reduce the size of \(P\) even more. As far as we see this is not the case because \(C \cap 13C = \emptyset\), but this does not exclude other refinements.

3. **Longer gaps between numbers representable by binary quadratic forms of discriminant \(D\)**

Again, we follow the idea of Richards [\textbf{8}]: Choose a positive integer \(r \in \{1, \ldots, |D|\}\) such that the Kronecker symbol \((D/r)\) has value

\[
\left(\frac{D}{r}\right) = -1.
\]
The following two well known results are provided for easy later reference.

**Lemma 6.** For fixed \( m \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\} \) with \( m \equiv 0 \pmod{4} \) or \( m \equiv 1 \pmod{4} \), the Kronecker symbol \( \left( \frac{m}{n} \right) \) is periodic of period dividing \( |m| \), i.e. for all \( k,n \in \mathbb{Z} \) where \( n \neq 0 \) and \( n + km \neq 0 \) we have
\[
\left( \frac{m}{n + km} \right) = \left( \frac{m}{n} \right).
\]

**Proof.** This is Theorem 2.29 in [3]. \( \Box \)

**Lemma 7.** Let \( D \) be a fundamental discriminant, \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( p \) be a prime such that \( p^\alpha \) exactly divides \( n \) for odd \( \alpha \) and with \( \left( \frac{D}{p} \right) = -1 \). Then \( n \) is not representable by any binary quadratic form of discriminant \( D \).

**Proof.** Let \( R_D(n) \) be the total number of representations of \( n \) by any binary quadratic form of discriminant \( D \). Then by Theorem 3 in [10, §8], we have
\[
R_D(n) = \sum_{\ell \mid n} \left( \frac{D}{\ell} \right).
\]
Since \( \left( \frac{D}{\ell} \right) \) is multiplicative in \( \ell \), \( R_D(n) \) is multiplicative in \( n \) as well. Now \( \alpha \) is odd and \( \left( \frac{D}{p} \right) = -1 \), whence \( R_D(p^\alpha) = 0 \). By multiplicativity, as \( p^\alpha \) exactly divides \( n \), also \( R_D(n) = 0 \), so indeed \( n \) is not represented by any binary quadratic form of discriminant \( D \). \( \Box \)

Next, define the sequence \( \ell_i \) recursively by
\[
\ell_1 = 1, \quad \ell_i = \min \{ \ell \in \mathbb{N} : (\ell, D) = 1 \text{ and } \ell > \ell_{i-1} \} \quad (i > 1).
\]
Further, for \( i \in \mathbb{N} \) define
\[
T_i = \{ x \in (\mathbb{Z}/|D|\mathbb{Z})^* : \ell_j x \equiv r \pmod{|D|} \text{ for some } j \leq i \},
\]
let \( \pi \) be the projection
\[
\pi : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}/|D|\mathbb{Z},
\]
and introduce the abbreviations
\[
t = \varphi(|D|)
\]
and
\[
L = |D|(k + 1).
\]
Moreover, fix \( \varepsilon > 0 \) and in terms of \( \varepsilon \) and \( |D| \) fix a sufficiently large positive integer \( k \), and for prime \( p \) let
\[
\beta(p) = \max_{p^m \leq L} m.
\]

Finally, define
\[
P = \prod_{p \leq L/t_i : (p, D) = 1} \prod_{\ell_i \geq 1} \prod_{\pi(p_i) \in T_i} \prod_{\pi(p_i) \in T_i : \ell_i < p_i \leq L} p_i^\beta(p + 1),
\]
where \( p_1, \ldots, p_t \) denote prime numbers. Now
\[
T_i \subset T_{i+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_i \geq i \quad (i \in \mathbb{N}),
\]
hence
\[
\{ p \leq L/\ell_1 : (p, D) = 1 \} \subset \{ p \leq L/t : (p, D) = 1 \},
\]
\[
\{ L/\ell_1 < p \leq L/\ell_{t-1} : \pi(p) \in T_{t-1} \} \subset \{ p \leq L/t : (p, D) = 1 \}
\]
\[
\cup \{ L/t < p \leq L/(t-1) : \pi(p) \in T_{t-1} \},
\]
\[
\{ L/\ell_{t-1} < p \leq L/\ell_{t-2} : \pi(p) \in T_{t-2} \} \subset \{ L/(t-1) < p \leq L/(t-2) : \pi(p) \in T_{t-2} \}
\]
\[
\cup \{ L/t < p \leq L/(t-1) : \pi(p) \in T_{t-1} \}
\]
\[
\cup \{ p \leq L/t : (p, D) = 1 \},
\]
and so on. Therefore \( P \) can be bounded above by
\[
\prod_{p \leq L/t : (p, D) = 1} p^{\beta(p)+1} \prod_{i=1}^{t-1} \prod_{L/(i+1) < p \leq L/i : \pi(p) \in T_i} p^{\beta(p)+1}.
\]
Using the observations
\[
p^{\beta(p)+1} \leq L^2
\]
and
\[
\# T_i = i \quad (i \leq t)
\]
together with the prime number theorem in arithmetic progressions, we obtain
\[
P \leq L^{2(1+\epsilon)\alpha}
\]
where
\[
\alpha = \frac{L/t}{\log L/t} + \frac{L}{t} \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \frac{i (1/i - 1/(i+1))}{\log(L/i - L/(i+1))}
\]
\[
= \frac{L/t}{\log L/t} + \frac{L}{t} \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \frac{1/(i+1)}{\log(L/(i(i+1)))}
\]
\[
\leq \frac{L/t}{\log L/t} + \frac{L}{t} \frac{1}{\log(L/(t(t+1)))} \sum_{i=1}^{t-1} \frac{1}{i+1}
\]
\[
\leq \frac{L/t}{\log L/t} + \frac{L}{t} \frac{\log t}{\log(L/(t(t+1)))}
\]
\[
\leq \frac{L/t}{\log(L/(t(t+1)))} (1 + \log t).
\]

With
\[
\lim_{k \to \infty} \frac{\log L}{\log(L/(t(t+1)))} = 1,
\]
we obtain, for \( k \) sufficiently large in terms of \(|D|\) and \( \epsilon \),
\[
P \leq \exp \left( 2(1+2\epsilon) \frac{L}{t} (1 + \log t) \right),
\]
and from this
\[
\frac{k+1}{\log P} \geq \frac{\varphi(|D|)}{2(1+2\epsilon)|D|(1 + \log \varphi(|D|))}.
\]

(15)
Now choose \( y \in \{1, \ldots, P\} \) such that
\[
|D|y \equiv r \pmod{P}
\]
which is possible as \((D, P) = 1\) by definition (14) of \(P\). We claim that none of the numbers \( y + 1, \ldots, y + k \) can be represented by any binary quadratic form of discriminant \( D \), which together with \( y \leq P \) and (15) proves the theorem. To settle the claim, fix \( j \in \{1, \ldots, k\} \). Now
\[
|D|(y + j) \equiv |D|j + r \pmod{P}.
\]
Since
\[
-1 = \left(\frac{D}{r}\right) = \left(\frac{D}{|D|j + r}\right)
\]
by Lemma 6, we conclude that \(|D|j + r\) must be divisible by a prime \( p \) with \( (D/p) = -1 \) to an odd power \( \gamma \) at most \( \beta(p) \): Writing
\[
|D|j + r = p^\gamma \ell
\]
where \( \ell \) is a certain positive integer coprime to \( D \) and \( p \), we find that \(|D|j + r \leq |D|(k+1) = L \), so \( \gamma \leq \beta(p) \). If \( \gamma \geq 3 \), then \( p \leq L^{1/3} \). As \( L/\ell \geq L^{1/3} \) for sufficiently large \( k \) (in terms of \( D \)), by (14) we can then assume that \( p^{\beta(p)+1} \) divides \( P \). If \( \gamma = 1 \), then \(|D|j + r = p\ell \), so \( p \leq L \). Moreover, if \( L/\ell_{i+1} < p \leq L/\ell_i \), then \( \ell \leq \ell_i \), so \( \pi(p) \in T_i \) by definition (13) of \( T_i \), whence \( p^{\beta(p)+1} \) again divides \( P \) by (14) as well as in case \( p \leq L/\ell_i \), once more by definition (14). Using (16), we conclude that \( p \) divides \( y + j \) to an odd power, so as \( (D/p) = -1 \) by Lemma 6 the number \( y + j \) indeed cannot be represented by any binary quadratic form of discriminant \( D \).

4. Long gaps between sums of two squares in sparse sequences

In order to prove Theorem 3 we need the following auxiliary result.

**Lemma 8.** Let \( d, d' \) and \( r \) be as in the statement of Theorem 3 and let \( j \) be a positive integer. Then
\[
\gcd\left(\frac{(4d')^d - 1}{4d'j - 1}, 4d'j - 1\right) = 1.
\]

**Proof.** Let \( a = 4d'j \). Then the claim is
\[
\gcd\left(\frac{(a^d)^r - 1}{a - 1}, a - 1\right) = 1.
\]
We prove this in two parts, first
\[
\gcd\left(\frac{(a^d)^{2^r} - 1}{a^{d'} - 1}, a - 1\right) = 1,
\]
and then
\[
\gcd\left(\frac{a^{d'} - 1}{a - 1}, a - 1\right) = 1.
\]

**Part 1:** Observe that
\[
\gcd\left(\frac{(a^d)^{2^r} - 1}{a^{d'} - 1}, a - 1\right) \leq \gcd\left(\frac{(a^d)^{2^r} - 1}{a^{d'} - 1}, a^{d'} - 1\right),
\]
and therefore it is enough to prove that
\[ \gcd \left( \frac{(a^d)^2 - 1}{a^d - 1}, a^d - 1 \right) = 1. \]

Now
\[ \frac{(a^d)^2 - 1}{a^d - 1} = \sum_{i=0}^{2-1} a^{d^i} = \prod_{u=0}^{r-1} \left( a \cdot 2 \right) + 1, \]
as every integer \( i \) can be written as a sum of powers of 2. Each factor \( a \cdot 2 \) is coprime to \( a^d - 1 \), as the integer \( 2^a \cdot d - 1 \) is a multiple of \( a^d - 1 \), at distance 2 to \( a^d + 1 \), and recall that \( a^d \) is even.

**Part 2:** We have the identity
\[ \sum_{i=0}^{d^r-1} i \cdot x^{(d^r-1-i)} (x-1) = \sum_{i=0}^{d^r-1-1} \sum_{j=0}^{d^r-1} a^{j} \cdot i. \]
By this identity, applied with \( a = 4d'j = x, \) a division of \( a^d - 1 = \sum_{i=0}^{d^r-1} a^i \) by \((a - 1)\) leaves the remainder \( d' \). As \( \gcd(4d'j - 1, d') = 1 \) the claim follows. \( \square \)

**Proof of Theorem** 3. It is enough to show the following: For fixed \( \varepsilon > 0 \), for all sufficiently large \( k \) there exists a positive integer \( y = y_k < \exp((1 + \varepsilon)4kd') \) such that none of the integers \( y + f_d(j), 1 \leq j \leq k \) is a sum of two squares. Fix the gap size \( k \). For each prime \( p \leq 4kd', p \equiv 3 \pmod{4} \) let \( \beta = \beta(p) \) be the highest power with \( p^\beta \leq 4kd' \). Let
\[ P = \prod_{p \leq 4kd', p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}} p^{\beta(p) + 1}. \]
Define \( y \in \{1, \ldots, P\} \) by \( (4d')^dy \equiv -1 \pmod{P} \). Then none of the integers in
\[ I = \{ y + f_d(1), \ldots, y + f_d(k) \} \]
is the sum of two squares. By the prime number theorem in arithmetic progressions,\[ P < (4kd')^{2(1+\varepsilon)(2kd'/\log 4kd')} = \exp((1 + \varepsilon)4kd'), \]
whence\[ k > \frac{\log P}{4d'(1 + \varepsilon)}. \]
Since \((4d')^dy \equiv -1 \pmod{P}\), we have that
\[ (4d')^dy + f_d(j) \equiv f_d(4d'j) - 1 \pmod{P}, \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq k. \]
Now \( \delta = 4d'j - 1 \) is a divisor of \( f_d(4d'j) - 1 \) and therefore exactly divisible by some prime power \( p^\alpha \) with \( p \equiv 3 \pmod{4} \) and \( \alpha \) odd. By lemma 3, the codivisor \( (4d')^dy \equiv -1 \pmod{\delta} \) is coprime to \( \delta \), which implies that \( f_d(4d'j) - 1 \) is exactly divisible by this prime power \( p^\alpha \). As \( \alpha \leq \beta(p) \), and \( P \) is divisible by \( p^{\beta + 1} \), it follows that \( y + f_d(j) \) is also exactly divisible by \( p^\alpha \), and is therefore not the sum of two squares. \( \square \)
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Appendix A. Table of Abbreviations

In this appendix we briefly collect some notation used in the proof of Theorem 1 in section 2. First recall the maps

\[ \pi_\ell : \mathbb{Z} \to \{1, \ldots, 2^\ell\}, \quad x \mapsto x \pmod{2^\ell} \]

and

\[ \tau : \mathbb{Z} \to \mathbb{Z}; \quad j \mapsto 4j - 1. \]

The sets \( S_\ell, T_\ell, U_\ell, V_\ell, W_\ell \) and \( R_\ell \) are then defined by

\[ S_\ell = \{2^a b \in \{1, \ldots, 2^\ell\} : a \leq \ell - 2, b \equiv 3 \pmod{4}\} \quad (\ell \geq 2), \]

\[ T_{\ell+2} = \pi_{\ell+2}(\tau(S_\ell)) \quad (\ell \geq 2), \]

\[ U_3 = \{3\}, \]

\[ U_\ell = U_{\ell-1} \cup \{u + 2^{\ell-1} : u \in U_{\ell-1}\} \cup \{3 \times 2^{\ell-2}\} \quad (\ell \geq 4), \]

\[ V_\ell = \{s \in S_\ell : \pi_{\ell+2}(5\tau(s)) \in T_{\ell+2}\} \quad (\ell \geq 2), \]

\[ W_5 = \{24\}, \]

\[ W_\ell = W_{\ell-1} \cup \{u + 2^{\ell-1} : u \in W_{\ell-1}\} \cup \{3 \times 2^{\ell-2}\} \quad (\ell \geq 6), \]

\[ R_\ell = \{s \in S_\ell : \pi_{\ell+2}(9\tau(s)) \in T_{\ell+2} \text{ and } \pi_{\ell+2}(9\tau(s)) \in T_{\ell+2}\} \quad (\ell \geq 2). \]

Note the inclusions

\[ R_\ell \subset V_\ell \subset S_\ell \quad (\ell \geq 5), \]

\[ W_\ell \subset U_\ell \subset S_\ell \quad (\ell \geq 5), \]

\[ U_\ell \subset V_\ell \quad (\ell \geq 3), \]

\[ W_\ell \subset R_\ell \quad (\ell \geq 5). \]
Appendix B. Some examples for the sets of residue classes introduced in section 2

We have

\[ S_2 = \{3\}, \]
\[ S_3 = \{3, 6, 7\}, \]
\[ S_4 = \{3, 6, 7, 11, 12, 14, 15\}, \]
\[ S_5 = \{3, 6, 7, 11, 12, 14, 15, 19, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 30, 31\}, \]
\[ T_4 = \{11\}, \]
\[ T_5 = \{11, 23, 27\}, \]
\[ T_6 = \{11, 23, 27, 43, 47, 55, 59\}, \]
\[ T_7 = \{11, 23, 27, 43, 47, 55, 59, 75, 87, 91, 95, 107, 111, 119, 123\}, \]
\[ U_3 = \{3\} = V_3 \subset S_3, \]
\[ U_4 = \{3, 11, 12\} = V_4 \subset S_4, \]
\[ U_5 = \{3, 11, 12, 19, 24, 27, 28\} = V_5 \subset S_5, \]
\[ \pi_5(\tau(U_3)) = \{11\} \subset T_5, \]
\[ \pi_6(\tau(U_4)) = \{11, 43, 47\} \subset T_6, \]
\[ \pi_7(\tau(U_5)) = \{11, 43, 47, 75, 95, 107, 111\} \subset T_7, \]
\[ W_5 = \{24\} = R_5, \]
\[ \pi_7(\tau(W_5)) = \{95\} \subset \pi_7(\tau(U_5)) \subset T_7. \]