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Abstract: Let $n$ be a positive integer and $f(x) := x^{2n} + 1$. In this paper, we study orders of primes dividing products of the form $P_{m,n} := f(1)f(2)\cdots f(m)$. We prove that if $m > \max\{10^{12}, 4^{n+1}\}$, then there exists a prime divisor $p$ of $P_{m,n}$ such that $\text{ord}_p(P_{m,n}) \leq n \cdot 2^{n-1}$. For $n = 2$, we establish that for every positive integer $m$, there exists a prime divisor $p$ of $P_{m,2}$ such that $\text{ord}_p(P_{m,2}) \leq 4$. Consequently, $P_{m,2}$ is never a fifth or higher power. This extends work of Cilleruelo [6] who studied the case $n = 1$.

1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN RESULT

For a prime $p$ and a nonzero integer $s$, define $\text{ord}_p(s)$ to be the unique non-negative integer $i$ for which $p^i|s$ but $p^{i+1} \nmid s$. Let $f(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ be a polynomial of degree $k \geq 2$ with positive leading coefficient which does not vanish at any positive integer. Set

$$A_f(m) := f(1)f(2)\cdots f(m)$$

and note that this is nonzero for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ by the above assumption.

A major unsolved problem in analytic number theory concerns the question whether $f$ represents infinitely many primes if $f$ is irreducible and there exists no prime $p$ dividing $f(m)$ for all integers $m$. If $f$ represents infinitely many primes, then trivially, for infinitely many integers $m$, there exists a prime such that $\text{ord}_p(A_f(m)) = 1$. For particular polynomials $f$, several authors investigated the related question whether for all sufficiently large integers $m$ there exists a prime $p$ with $\text{ord}_p(A_f(m)) = 1$. If this is the case, then, in particular, $A_f(m)$ is a perfect power for at most finitely many $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Below we summarize a number of results from the literature. For the polynomial $f(x) = x^2 + 1$, J. Cilleruelo [6] proved the following result which we shall generalize in this paper.

**Theorem 1** (Cilleruelo). Let $f(x) = x^2 + 1$ and $m > 3$. Then there exists a prime divisor $p$ of $A_f(m)$ with $\text{ord}_p(A_f(m)) = 1$. Consequently, $A_f(m)$ is a perfect power only for $m = 3$, in which case we have $A_f(3) = 10^2$.

Cilleruelo’s work [6] used only elementary tools such as Chebyshev’s upper bound inequality for the primes counting function. In subsequent work by Fang [8], his
technique was applied to products $A_f(m)$ corresponding to the polynomials $4x^2 + 1$ and $2x^2 - 2x + 1$. Yang, Togbé and He [12] proved that for any irreducible quadratic polynomial $f(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$, there exists a prime $p$ with $\text{ord}_p(A_f(m)) = 1$ if $m \geq C$, where $C$ is a computable constant depending on the coefficients of $f(x)$.

Furthermore, the above problem has been investigated by many authors for polynomials of the form $f(x) = x^k + 1$, where $k$ is an odd positive integer. Gürel and Kisisel [9] settled the case when $k = 3$. Based on an idea due to W. Zudilin, Zhang and Wang [13] extended this result to odd primes $k \geq 5$. Recently, Chen et al. [4] managed to handle all odd prime powers $k$. Chen and Gong [3] treated the case when $k$ is a product of at most two odd primes and Dey and Laishram [7] managed to cover all $k$'s which are composed of at most four odd primes.

Thus, for polynomials $f(x) = x^k + 1$ with $k$ odd, a lot of research has been done. With regard to even $k$'s, the authors are aware only of Cilleruelo’s Theorem, stated above, for the case $k = 2$. In this paper, we investigate orders of primes dividing $A_f(m)$ for polynomials of the form $f(x) = x^k + 1$ when $k$ is a power of 2. Note that $f(x) = x^k + 1$ is irreducible iff $k$ is a power of 2. Throughout the sequel, we set

$$P_{m,n} := \prod_{x \leq m} \left(x^{2^n} + 1\right).$$

We shall extend Cilleruelo’s Theorem for the case $n = 1$ to larger $n$’s as follows.

**Theorem 2.** Let $n \geq 2$ be an integer. Then there exists a prime divisor $p$ of $P_{m,n}$ with $\text{ord}_p(P_{m,n}) \leq n \cdot 2^{n-1}$ if $m > \max\{10^{12}, 4^n + 1\}$. Consequently, in this case, $P_{m,n}$ is not a perfect $q$-th power if $q$ is a positive integer exceeding $n \cdot 2^{n-1}$.

For $n = 2$, we establish the following stronger result.

**Theorem 3.** For all positive integers $m$, there exists a prime divisor $p$ of $P_{m,2}$ with $\text{ord}_p(P_{m,2}) \leq 4$. Consequently, $P_{m,2}$ is never a perfect $q$-th power if $q$ is a positive integer exceeding 4.

2. Notations and preliminaries

In this section, we provide some inequalities related to primes counting functions which are essential to prove our main results. As usual, we reserve the symbol '$p$' for primes and use the notations

$$\pi(x) := \sum_{p \leq x} 1, \quad \pi(x; a, q) := \sum_{p \leq x \atop p \equiv a \mod q} 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \theta(x; a, q) := \sum_{p \leq x \atop p \equiv a \mod q} \log p$$

throughout this paper. Below are the lemmas that we shall use.

**Lemma 4.** For any $x \geq 10^6$, we have

$$\pi(x) \leq 1.1 \cdot \frac{x}{\log x}.$$
Proof. In [5], it was established that
\[ \pi(x) \leq \left(1 + \frac{1.2762}{\log x}\right) \cdot \frac{x}{\log x} \text{ if } x > 1. \]
If \( x \geq 10^6 \), the desired bound follows. \( \square \)

Lemma 5. For any integer \( n \geq 2 \) and any real \( x \geq 4^{n+1} \), we have
\[ \pi(x; 2^{n+1}, 1) \leq \frac{4 \cdot x}{2^n \log x}. \]

Proof. The Brun-Titchmarsh inequality, as given by Montgomery and Vaughan [11], asserts that
\[ \pi(x; q, a) \leq \frac{2x}{\varphi(q) \log(x/q)} \]
whenever \( q < x \). This implies
\[ \pi(x; 2^{n+1}, 1) \leq \frac{2x}{2^n \log(x/2^{n+1})}. \]
It follows that
\[ \pi(x; 2^{n+1}, 1) \leq \frac{2x}{2^n \log(x/2^{n+1})} \leq \frac{4x}{2^n \log x} \]
if \( x \geq 4^{n+1} \), which completes the proof. \( \square \)

Lemma 6. For any \( x \geq 10^6 \) and \( a \in \{1, 3, 5, 7\} \), we have
\[ \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\mid p \equiv a \mod 8}} \frac{\log p}{p} > 0.245 \log x - 3.15. \]

Proof. Using partial summation, we transform the sum in question into
\[ \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\mid p \equiv a \mod 8}} \frac{\log p}{p} = \frac{\theta(x; 8, a)}{x} + \int_2^x \frac{\theta(t; 8, a)}{t^2} \, dt > \frac{\theta(x; 8, a)}{x} + \int_{10^6}^x \frac{\theta(t; 8, a)}{t^2} \, dt. \] \( (1) \)
By Corollary 1.7. in [2], we have
\[ \left| \frac{\theta(t; q, a)}{\varphi(q)} \right| < 0.024 \cdot \frac{t}{\log t} \text{ if } 1 \leq q \leq 10^5, \ (q, a) = 1 \text{ and } t \geq 10^6. \] \( (2) \)
This implies
\[ \frac{\theta(t; 8, a)}{x} > \frac{t}{4} - 0.024 \cdot \frac{t}{\log t} \]
if \( t \geq 10^6 \). Plugging this into (1), and performing integration, we get
\[ \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\mid p \equiv a \mod 8}} \frac{\log p}{p} > \frac{1}{4} - 0.024 \cdot \frac{1}{\log x} + \left[ \frac{1}{4} \log t - 0.024 \log \log t \right]_{10^6}^x. \] \( (3) \)
Since \( \frac{\log x}{\log \log x} \) is an increasing function for \( x \geq 10^6 \), we have
\[ \log \log x < 0.191 \log x. \]
Using this inequality, we obtain the desired result from [3]. \( \square \)
3. Systems of congruences modulo prime powers

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be given. A significant part of our method consists in finding an as small as possible number $N = N(n)$ such that for every partition

$$N = k_1 + k_2 + \cdots + k_s \quad (k_1 \geq k_2 \geq \ldots \geq k_s)$$

(4)

of $N$ and any distinct $x_1, \ldots, x_s \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying a system of congruences of the form

$$x_1^{2^n} + 1 \equiv 0 \mod p^{k_1}$$

$$\vdots$$

$$x_s^{2^n} + 1 \equiv 0 \mod p^{k_s}$$

with $p$ an odd prime, it follows that

$$p \ll_n x,$$

where we set

$$x := \max \{|x_1|, \ldots, |x_s|\}.$$

It will become clear in section 8 how this problem, which is also of independent interest, enters the proof of Theorems 2 and 3. The following sections 4 to 7 are dedicated to solving this problem. The result will lead us directly to the quantity $n \cdot 2^{n-1}$ in Theorem 2.

4. Reformulation in Cyclotomic fields

For a number field $K$, we denote by $\mathcal{O}_K$ the ring of algebraic integers in $K$. If $L$ is a finite extension of the number field $K$ and $a \in L$, we denote by $N_{L/K}(a)$ the norm of $a$ over $K$.

We write

$$x_1^{2^n} + 1 = \prod_{j=1}^{2^n} (x_j + \alpha_j),$$

where $\{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{2^n}\}$ is the set of primitive $2^{n+1}$-th roots of unity. Then

$$p|(x_1^{2^n} + 1) \Rightarrow \mathfrak{P}|(x_1 + \alpha_1)\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1)}$$

for some prime ideal $\mathfrak{P}$ in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1)}$ lying over $p$, but

$$\mathfrak{P} \nmid (x_1 + \alpha_1)\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1)}$$

for any prime ideal $\mathfrak{P} \neq \mathfrak{P}$ conjugate to $\mathfrak{P}$. Otherwise, $\mathfrak{P}$ would divide both the ideals $(x_1 + \alpha_1)\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1)}$ and $(x_1 + \alpha_j)\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1)}$ for some $j \neq 1$ and hence the ideal $(\alpha_1 - \alpha_j)\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1)}$. However, this is not possible because $p > 2$ and the discriminant

$$\text{disc}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1)}) = \prod_{1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq 2^n} (\alpha_{j_1} - \alpha_{j_2})^2$$

of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1)}$ has no rational prime divisors other than 2. Hence, from the first congruence in (5), it follows that

$$\mathfrak{P}^{k_1}|(x_1 + \alpha_1)\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}(\alpha_1)}.$$
If \( i \in \{2, \ldots, s\} \), then \( \mathfrak{P}|(x_i + \alpha_{j_i})\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)} \) for some unique \( j_i \in \{1, \ldots, 2^n\} \), and we have

\[
\mathfrak{P}^{k_i}(x_i + \alpha_{j_i})\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)}
\]

from the \( i-th \) congruence in (5) by a similar argument as above. Set \( j_1 := 1 \). Since \( k_1 \geq k_2 \geq \ldots \geq k_s \), it follows that for every \( r \in \{1, \ldots, s\} \), we have

\[
\mathfrak{P}^{k_r}|(x_i + \alpha_{j_i})\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}(\zeta)} \quad \text{if} \quad 1 \leq i \leq r.
\]

(6)

Now let \( m < n \) be a non-negative integer and \( r \in \{1, \ldots, s\} \). Denote by \( \zeta_k \) a primitive \( k \)-th root of unity. If \( \beta_1, \ldots, \beta_r \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{2^m+1})} \) are such that

\[
\beta_1 \alpha_{j_1} + \cdots + \beta_r \alpha_{j_r} = 0,
\]

then

\[
\beta_1(x_1 + \alpha_{j_1}) + \cdots + \beta_r(x_r + \alpha_{j_r}) \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{2^m+1})}.
\]

Since also

\[
\mathfrak{P}^{k_r}|(\beta_1(x_1 + \alpha_{j_1}) + \cdots + \beta_r(x_r + \alpha_{j_r}))\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{2^m+1})}
\]

using (6), it follows that

\[
\beta_1(x_1 + \alpha_{j_1}) + \cdots + \beta_r(x_r + \alpha_{j_r}) \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{2^m+1})}.
\]

If in addition

\[
\beta_1 x_1 + \cdots + \beta_r x_r \neq 0,
\]

then we deduce that

\[
p^{k_r} \leq N_{\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{2^m+1})}\mathbb{Q} (\beta_1(x_1 + \alpha_{j_1}) + \cdots + \beta_r(x_r + \alpha_{j_r}))
\]

and hence

\[
p^{k_r} \ll_{n,m,\beta_1,\ldots,\beta_r} x^{2^m},
\]

which implies

\[
p \ll_{n,m,\beta_1,\ldots,\beta_r} x,
\]

provided that

\[
k_r \geq 2^m.
\]

(8)

Clearly, we also have the bound

\[
p \ll_{n} x
\]

if

\[
k_r \geq 2^n.
\]

(9)

Now we consider an arbitrary non-negative integer \( m \). If \( m \geq n \), then we set \( R(m, n) := 1 \). If \( m < n \), then let \( R(m, n) \) be the smallest number \( r \) such that given any \( r \) primitive \( 2^{n+1} \)-th roots of unity \( \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_r \) (not necessarily distinct), there exist

\[
\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_r \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{2^m+1})}
\]

such that

\[
\beta_1 \gamma_1 + \cdots + \beta_r \gamma_r = 0
\]

and

\[
\beta_1 x_1 + \cdots + \beta_r x_r \neq 0
\]
for any distinct positive integers $x_1, \ldots, x_r$. Then it follows that
\[ p \ll_n x, \]
provided that for any partition of the form in (4) we have
\[ r \geq R(m, n) \quad \text{and} \quad k_r \geq 2^m \quad (10) \]
for some $r \in \{1, \ldots, s\}$ and $m \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$.

Note that $R(m, n)$ decreases as $m$ increases. Hence, we may choose
\[ m := \lfloor \log_2 k_r \rfloor \]
and our above condition reduces to
\[ r \geq R(\lfloor \log_2 k_r \rfloor, n) \quad \text{for some } r \in \{1, \ldots, s\}. \quad (11) \]

5. Determining $R(m, n)$

Throughout the sequel, for any real number $x$, we denote by $\lceil x \rceil$ the smallest integer greater or equal $x$ and by $\lfloor x \rfloor$ the largest integer less or equal $x$. We now prove the following.

**Lemma 7.** For any natural numbers $m$ and $n$, we have
\[ R(m, n) = \lfloor 2^{n-m-1} \rfloor + 1. \]

**Proof.** This is trivial if $m \geq n$. So assume $m < n$. Then we claim that among $2^{n-m-1} + 1$ (not necessarily distinct) primitive $2^{n+1}$-th roots of unity, there exist two, $\gamma_1$ and $\gamma_2$, such that $\beta := \gamma_1 / \gamma_2$ is a $2^{m+1}$-th root of unity. This is equivalent to saying that among $2^{n-m-1} + 1$ (not necessarily distinct) odd integers in $\{1, 3, \ldots, 2^{n+1} - 1\}$, there exist two whose difference is divisible by $2^{n-m}$. Indeed, these integers fall into $2^{n-m-1}$ possible residue classes modulo $2^{n-m}$. By pigeonhole principle, two of them fall into the same residue class, and hence the claim follows.

Now, for $\gamma_1$, $\gamma_2$, $\beta$ as above, we have $\gamma_1 - \beta \gamma_2 = 0$, but clearly $x_1 - \beta x_2 \neq 0$ for any two distinct positive integers $x_1$ and $x_2$. This proves that
\[ R(m, n) \leq 2^{n-m-1} + 1. \]

It remains to show that
\[ R(m, n) > 2^{n-m-1}. \quad (12) \]
Assume the contrary. We look at the example
\[ \gamma_j = \zeta_{2^{n+1}}^{2^j - 1}, \quad j = 1, \ldots, 2^{n-m-1}. \]
These are primitive $2^{n+1}$-th roots of unity. Moreover, the set
\[ \{ \zeta_{2^{n+1}}^{-1} \gamma_1, \ldots, \zeta_{2^{n+1}}^{-1} \gamma_{2^{n-m-1}} \} \]
forms an integral basis of $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{2^n})$ over $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{2^{n+1}})$. Hence, if $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_{2^{n-m-1}} \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{2^{n+1}})}$, then
\[ \beta_1 \gamma_1 + \ldots + \beta_{2^{n-m-1}} \gamma_{2^{n-m-1}} = 0 \]
implies $\beta_1 = \ldots = \beta_{2n-m-1} = 0$. But then our second condition
\[ \beta_1 x_1 + \ldots + \beta_{2n-m-1} x_{2n-m-1} \neq 0 \]
is violated for any integers $x_1, \ldots, x_{2n-m-1}$. This gives a contradiction. Hence, (12) follows which completes the proof. \hfill \Box

Remark. For our purposes, it would have sufficed to prove that $R(m,n) \leq 2^{n-m-1} + 1$.

6. Transformation into a combinatorial condition

By the considerations in the previous section, an admissible $N(n)$ is the smallest integer $N$ such that every partition of the form in (1) satisfies the condition
\[ r \geq \lceil 2^{n-\lfloor \log_2 k_r \rfloor} \rceil + 1 \quad \text{for some} \quad r \in \{1, \ldots, s\}. \quad (13) \]
In the following, we construct an extreme partition satisfying (13). We take $k_1, \ldots, k_s$ as large as possible such that (13) is not satisfied if $1 \leq r \leq s-1$ but satisfied if $r = s$. This property determines the partition in question completely, namely we obtain
\[ s = 2^{n-1} + 1, \]
\[ k_r = 2^{n-\lfloor \log_2 r \rfloor} - 1 \quad \text{if} \quad r \leq s - 1 \]
and
\[ k_s = 1. \]
Moreover, we calculate that
\[ N = k_1 + \cdots + k_s \]
\[ = (2^n - 1) + \sum_{0 \leq j \leq n-2} 2^j \left( 2^{n-j} - 1 \right) + 1 \]
\[ = 2^n + (n - 1) \cdot 2^{n-1} - \sum_{0 \leq j \leq n-2} 2^j \]
\[ = n \cdot 2^{n-1} + 1. \quad (14) \]

Examples: For $n = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$, we get the partitions
\[ 2 = 1 + 1, \]
\[ 5 = 3 + 1 + 1, \]
\[ 13 = 7 + 3 + 1 + 1 + 1, \]
\[ 33 = 15 + 7 + 3 + 3 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1, \]
\[ 81 = 31 + 15 + 7 + 7 + 3 + 3 + 3 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1. \]

In the following, we prove that this actually gives exactly the minimal number $N$ we are aiming for.

Lemma 8. The number
\[ N(n) = n \cdot 2^{n-1} + 1 \]
is the smallest positive integer $N$ such that every partition of the form in (1) satisfies the condition (13).
Proof. Look at the extreme partition constructed above. $N$ cannot be chosen smaller because
\[ n \cdot 2^{n-1} = k_1 + \cdots + k_{s-1} \]
is a partition of $n \cdot 2^{n-1}$ which does not satisfy the required condition. Now, if
\[ N = n \cdot 2^{n-1} + 1 = k_1' + \cdots + k'_{r'} \quad (k'_1 \geq \cdots \geq k'_r) \]
is any partition different from our extreme partition above, then $s' \geq s$ or $k'_r > k_r$ for some $r \in \{1, \ldots, s\}$. In the first case,
\[ s' \geq s = 2^{n-1} + 1 \geq \left[2^{n-\log_2 k'_r} - 1\right] + 1. \]
In the second case,
\[ r \geq \left[2^{n-\log_2 k'_r} - 1\right] + 1 \]
by construction of the partition $N = k_1 + \cdots + k_s$. Hence, our new partition $N = k_1' + \cdots + k'_{r'}$ satisfies the desired condition. This completes the proof. \hfill \Box

7. Back to congruences modulo prime powers

Now we are ready to prove what we formulated as a goal in section 3. In addition, we observe that we can get an upper bound for $p$ which does only depend on $x$ and not on $n$. Indeed, taking our proof of Lemma 7 into consideration, we may choose $\beta_u = 1$ and $\beta_v = -\beta$ with $\beta$ a $2^{m+1}$-th root of unity for suitable distinct $u, v \in \{1, \ldots, r\}$ and $\beta_i = 0$ if $i \notin \{1, \ldots, r\} \setminus \{u, v\}$. This implies
\[ |\sigma(\beta_1)(x_1 + \sigma(\alpha_{j_1})) + \cdots + \sigma(\beta_r)(x_r + \sigma(\alpha_{j_r}))| \leq 2(x + 1) \]
for any $\sigma \in \Gal(\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{2^{m+1}}) : \mathbb{Q})$ and hence
\[ N_{\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{2^{m+1}}) : \mathbb{Q}}(\beta_1(x_1 + \alpha_{j_1}) + \cdots + \beta_r(x_r + \alpha_{j_r})) \leq 2^{2^n}(x + 1)^{2^n}. \]
Upon recalling that $\beta_1(x_1 + \alpha_{j_1}) + \cdots + \beta_r(x_r + \alpha_{j_r}) \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{2^{m+1}})}$, it follows that
\[ N_{\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{2^{m+1}}) : \mathbb{Q}}(\beta_1(x_1 + \alpha_{j_1}) + \cdots + \beta_r(x_r + \alpha_{j_r})) \leq 2^{2^n}(x + 1)^{2^n}. \]
Under the condition 8 which says that $k_r \geq 2^m$, it follows now from (7) that
\[ p \leq 2(x + 1). \]
Similarly, we find that
\[ p \leq x + 1 \]
under the condition 9 which says that $k_r \geq 2^n$.

Summarizing our results in the previous sections and taking our observation above into account, we thus have established the following.

**Theorem 9.** Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be given. Set $N = N(n) := n \cdot 2^{n-1} + 1$. Then if
\[ N = k_1 + k_2 + \cdots + k_s \quad (k_1 \geq k_2 \geq \cdots \geq k_s) \]
is any partition of $N$ and the system of congruences
\[ x_1^{2^n} + 1 \equiv 0 \mod p^{k_1} \]
\[ \vdots \]
\[ x_s^{2^n} + 1 \equiv 0 \mod p^{k_s} \]
holds for distinct \( x_1, \ldots, x_s \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( p \) an odd prime, then

\[ p \leq 2(x + 1), \]

where \( x := \{|x_1|, \ldots, |x_s|\} \).

8. PROOF OF Theorem 2

Let us assume that \( n \geq 2, \ m > \max\{10^{12}, 4^n+1\} \) and

\[ \text{ord}_p(P_{m,n}) > n \cdot 2^{n-1} \]

for all primes \( p \) dividing \( P_{m,n} \). Then from Theorem 9 it follows that

\[ p \leq 2(m + 1) \quad (15) \]

for all these primes. (This will be essential in our proof.) Hence, we can write \( P_{m,n} \) as

\[ P_{m,n} = \prod_{p \leq 2(m+1)} p^{\alpha_p}, \quad (16) \]

where the \( \alpha_p \)'s are non-negative integers with either \( \alpha_p = 0 \) or \( \alpha_p > n \cdot 2^{n-1} \). Clearly,

\[ P_{m,n} > \prod_{x \leq m} x^{2^n} = (m!)^{2^n}. \quad (17) \]

Write

\[ m! = \prod_{p \leq m} p^{\beta_p}, \quad (18) \]

where the \( \beta_p \)'s are positive integers.

Combining (16), (17) and (18), we have

\[ \left( \prod_{p \leq m} p^{\beta_p} \right)^{2^n} < \left( \prod_{p \leq 2(m+1)} p^{\alpha_p} \right). \]

Taking logarithm, it follows that

\[ \sum_{p \leq m} \beta_p \log p < \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{p \leq 2(m+1)} \alpha_p \log p. \quad (19) \]

Since

\[ x^{2^n} + 1 \equiv \begin{cases} 1 \mod 4 & \text{if } x \text{ is even,} \\ 2 \mod 4 & \text{if } x \text{ is odd,} \end{cases} \]

we see that

\[ \alpha_2 = \left\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \right\rfloor. \quad (20) \]

Now let \( p \) be an odd prime dividing \( x^{2^n} + 1 \). Then \( p \equiv 1 \mod 2^{n+1} \) and, moreover, there are exactly \( 2^n \) solutions to the congruence

\[ x^{2^n} + 1 \equiv 0 \mod p. \]

(Note that the \( 2^{n+1} \)-th cyclotomic field \( \mathbb{Q}(\zeta_{2^{n+1}}) \) is the splitting field of the polynomial \( x^{2^n} + 1 \) over \( \mathbb{Q} \), and the rational primes which split completely in this field are
exactly those congruent to 1 mod \(2^{n+1}\). By Hensel’s lemma, they extend uniquely to solutions of 
\[ x^{2^n} + 1 \equiv 0 \mod p^j, \]
for any \(j \geq 1\). Thus, each interval of length \(p^j\) contains exactly \(2^n\) solutions of this congruence. It follows that
\[
\alpha_p = \sum_{j \leq \log(m^{2^n} + 1)} \frac{\#\{x \leq m : p^j \mid (x^{2^n} + 1)\}}{\log p} \leq \sum_{j \leq \log(m^{2^n} + 1)} 2^n \left\lfloor \frac{m}{p^j} \right\rfloor. \tag{21}
\]
Also we have
\[
\beta_p = \sum_{j \leq \log m} \frac{\#\{x \leq m : p^j \mid x\}}{\log p} = \sum_{j \leq \log m} \left\lfloor \frac{m}{p^j} \right\rfloor. \tag{22}
\]
From (21) and (22), we deduce that
\[
\frac{\alpha_p}{2^n} - \beta_p \leq \sum_{j \leq \log(m^{2^n} + 1)} \left( \left\lfloor \frac{m}{p^j} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{m}{p^j} \right\rfloor \right) = \sum_{j \leq \log m} \left( \left\lfloor \frac{m}{p^j} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{m}{p^j} \right\rfloor \right) + \sum_{j \leq \log(m^{2^n} + 1)} \left\lfloor \frac{m}{p^j} \right\rfloor \leq \frac{1}{\log p} \sum_{j \leq \log(m^{2^n} + 1)} \left( \frac{m}{p^j} \right) \leq \frac{\log(m^{2^n} + 1)}{\log p}. \tag{23}
\]
Combining inequalities (19), (20) and (23), and recalling that \(\alpha_p = 0\) if \(p > 2\) and \(p \not\equiv 1 \mod 2^{n+1}\), we obtain
\[
\sum_{p \leq m, p \equiv 1 \mod 2^{n+1}} \beta_p \log p < -\sum_{p \leq m, p \equiv 1 \mod 2^{n+1}} \beta_p \log p + \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{p \leq 2^{(m+1)}} \alpha_p \log p + \frac{1}{2^n} \alpha_2 \log 2 \leq \frac{1}{2^n} \left\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \right\rfloor \log 2 + \sum_{p \equiv 1 \mod 2^{n+1}} \left( \frac{\alpha_p}{2^n} - \beta_p \right) \log p + \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{m < p \leq 2^{(m+1)}} \alpha_p \log p \tag{24}
\]
\[
< \frac{1}{2^n} \left\lfloor \frac{m}{2} \right\rfloor \log 2 + \pi(m; 2^{n+1}, 1) \log(m^{2^n} + 1) + \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{m < p \leq 2^{(m+1)}} \alpha_p \log p.
\]

If \(p > m\), then from (21), we have
\[
\alpha_p < 2^{2n}\tag{25}
\]

since
\[
\log(m^{2^n} + 1) < 2^n \log(m + 1) \leq 2^n \log p.
\]
Moreover, from (22), we have
\[
\beta_p \geq \sum_{j \leq M} \left\lceil \frac{m}{p^j} \right\rceil \geq \frac{m(1 - p^{-M})}{p - 1} - M,
\]
where \( M = \left\lfloor \frac{\log m}{\log p} \right\rfloor \). Hence, for \( p \leq m \), we deduce that
\[
\beta_p \geq \frac{m - p}{p - 1} - M \geq \frac{m - 1}{p - 1} - \frac{2 \log m}{\log p}.
\] (26)

Combining inequalities (24), (25) and (26), we get
\[
\sum_{p \leq m} \left( \frac{m - 1}{p - 1} - \frac{2 \log m}{\log p} \right) \log p
\]
\[
< \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{p \leq m} \left( \log 2 + \pi(m; 2^{n+1}, 1) \log(m^{2^n} + 1) + 2^n \sum_{m < p \leq 2(m+1)} \log p, \right),
\]
which implies
\[
(m - 1) \sum_{p \leq m} \frac{\log p}{p - 1}
\]
\[
< 2\pi(m) \log m + \frac{m + 1}{2^{n+1}} \log 2 + \pi(m; 2^{n+1}, 1) \log(m^{2^n} + 1)
\]
\[
+ 2^n \left( \pi(2(m + 1); 2^{n+1}, 1) - \pi(m; 2^{n+1}, 1) \right) \log(2(m + 1))
\]
\[
< 2\pi(m) \log m + \frac{m + 1}{2^{n+1}} \log 2 + 2^n \pi(2(m + 1); 2^{n+1}, 1) \log(2(m + 1)).
\] (27)

Now recalling that \( n \geq 2 \) and using Lemma 6, we have
\[
\sum_{p \leq m} \frac{\log p}{p - 1} \geq \sum_{a \in \{3, 5, 7\}} \sum_{p \equiv a \mod 8} \frac{\log p}{p} > 3(0.245 \log m - 3.15). \] (28)

Combining inequalities (27) and (28), applying Lemmas 5 and dividing by \( m - 1 \), we obtain
\[
3(0.245 \log m - 3.15) \leq \frac{2.2 \cdot m}{m - 1} + \frac{m + 1}{m - 1} \cdot \frac{2}{2^{n+1}} + \frac{8(m + 1)}{m - 1}.
\] (29)

Note that the limit, as \( m \to \infty \), of the right-hand side is
\[
(\log 2) \cdot 2^{-(n+1)} + 10.2.
\]
Hence, if \( m \) is large enough, then the above inequality will be false. An easy calculation shows that this is the case whenever \( m > 10^{12} \) and hence we reach a contradiction. We conclude that there exists a prime \( p \) with \( \text{ord}_p(P_{m, n}) \leq n \cdot 2^{n-1} \), which completes the proof.

**Remark:** We note that the above argument would not go through if we had some much weaker condition like \( p < \beta n^\alpha \) with \( \alpha > 1 \) in place of (15).
9. **Proof of Theorem**

By Theorem 2, there exists a prime \( p \) with \( \text{ord}_p P_{m,2} \leq 4 \) if \( m > 10^{12} \). Therefore, it suffices to check that the same holds if \( 1 \leq m \leq 10^{12} \). The claim is trivial if \( 1 \leq m \leq 5 \) since \( 1 \leq \text{ord}_2 (P_{m,2}) \leq 3 \). Further, we observe that \( 6^4 + 1 = 1297 \) is a prime and the next \( x \)'s for which \( 1297 \) divides \( x^4 + 1 \) are \( x = 216, 1081, 1291, 1303 \). Moreover, for these \( x \)'s, \( \text{ord}_{1297} (x^4 + 1) = 1 \). Hence, there exists a prime \( p \) with \( \text{ord}_p (P_{m,2}) \leq 4 \) if \( 6 \leq m \leq 1302 \). Next, we observe that \( 1302^4 + 1 = 2873716601617 \) is a prime as well. The next \( x \)'s for which \( 2873716601617 \) divides \( x^4 + 1 \) are \( x = 2207155608, 2871509446009, 2873716600315, 2873716602919 \). Moreover, for these \( x \)'s, \( \text{ord}_{2873716601617} (x^4 + 1) = 1 \). Hence, we conclude that there exists a prime \( p \) with \( \text{ord}_p (P_{m,2}) \leq 4 \) if \( 1302 \leq m \leq 2873716602918 \). This completes the proof.
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