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Abstract

Given any positive integer \( n \), let \( A(n) \) denote the height of the \( n \)th cyclotomic polynomial, that is its maximum coefficient in absolute value. It is well known that \( A(n) \) is unbounded. We conjecture that every natural number can arise as value of \( A(n) \) and prove this assuming that for every pair of consecutive primes \( p \) and \( p' \) with \( p \geq 127 \) we have \( p' - p < \sqrt{p} + 1 \).

We also conjecture that every natural number occurs as maximum coefficient of some cyclotomic polynomial and show that this is true if Andrica’s conjecture that always \( \sqrt{p'} - \sqrt{p} < 1 \) holds. This is the first time, as far as the authors know, a connection between prime gaps and cyclotomic polynomials is uncovered. Using a result of Heath-Brown on prime gaps we show unconditionally that every natural number \( m \leq x \) occurs as \( A(n) \) value with at most \( O(x^{3/5+\epsilon}) \) exceptions. On the Lindelöf Hypothesis we show there are at most \( O(x^{1/2+\epsilon}) \) exceptions and study them further by using deep work of Bombieri–Friedlander–Iwaniec on the distribution of primes in arithmetic progressions beyond the square-root barrier.

1 Introduction

Let \( n \geq 1 \) be an integer. The \( n \)th cyclotomic polynomial

\[
\Phi_n(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{\varphi(n)} a_n(j)x^j,
\]

is a polynomial of degree \( \varphi(n) \), with \( \varphi \) Euler’s totient function. For \( j > \varphi(n) \) we put \( a_n(j) = 0 \). The coefficients \( a_n(j) \) are usually very small. In the 19th century mathematicians even thought that they are always 0 or \( \pm 1 \). The first counterexample to this claim occurs at \( n = 105 \): indeed, \( a_{105}(7) = -2 \). The number 105 is the smallest ternary number (see Definition 1) and these will play a major role in this article. Issai Schur proved that every negative even number occurs as a cyclotomic coefficient. Emma Lehmer [27] reproduced his unpublished proof. Schur’s argument is easily adapted to show that every integer occurs as a cyclotomic coefficient; see Suzuki [33] or Moree and Hommersom [29] Proposition
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Let \( m \geq 1 \) be given. Ji, Li and Moree [23] adapted Schur’s argument and proved that
\[
\{a_{mn}(j) : n \geq 1, j \geq 0\} = \mathbb{Z}.
\] (1)
Fintzen [11] determined the set of all cyclotomic coefficients \( a_n(j) \) with \( j \) and \( n \) in prescribed arithmetic progression, thus generalizing (1).

We put
\[
A(n) = \max_{k \geq 0} |a_n(k)|, \ A = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} A(n), \ A\{n\} = \{a_n(k) : k \geq 0\},
\]
in particular \( A(n) \) is the height of the cyclotomic polynomial \( \Phi_n \).

It is a classical result that if \( n \) has at most two distinct odd prime factors, then \( A(n) = 1 \), cf. Lam and Leung [26]. The first non-trivial case arises where \( n \) has precisely three distinct odd prime divisors and thus is of the form \( n = p^e q^f r^g \), with \( 2 < p < q < r \) prime numbers. It is easy to deduce that \( A\{p^e q^f r^g\} = A\{pqr\} \) using elementary properties of cyclotomic polynomials (as given for example in [29, Lemma 2]). It thus suffices to consider only the case where \( e = f = g = 1 \) and so \( n = pqr \). This motivates the following definition.

**Definition 1.** A cyclotomic polynomial \( \Phi_n(x) \) is said to be ternary if \( n = pqr \), with \( 2 < p < q < r \) primes. In this case we call the integer \( n = pqr \) ternary. We put \( A_t = \{A(n) : n \text{ is ternary}\} \).

Note that \( A_t \subseteq A \). In this article we address the nature of the sets \( A, A_t \) and \( A_{opt} \) (see Definition 2 below).

**Conjecture 1.** We have \( A = \mathbb{N} \), that is for any given natural number \( m \) there is a cyclotomic polynomial having height \( m \).

**Conjecture 2.** We have \( A_t = \mathbb{N} \), that is for any given natural number \( m \) there is a ternary \( n \) such that \( \Phi_n \) has height \( m \).

The argument of Schur cannot be adapted to resolve Conjecture 1 as it allows one to control only the coefficients in a tail of a polynomial that quickly becomes very large if we want to show that some larger number occurs as a coefficient, and typically will have much larger coefficients than the coefficient constructed. Instead, we will make use of various properties of ternary cyclotomic polynomials. This class of cyclotomic polynomials has been intensively studied as it is the simplest one where the coefficients display non-trivial behavior. For these we still have \( \{a_n(j) : n \text{ is ternary}, j \geq 0\} = \mathbb{Z} \), as a consequence of the following result.

**Theorem 1** (Bachman, [3]). For every odd prime \( p \) there exists an infinite family of polynomials \( \Phi_{pqr} \) such that \( A\{pqr\} = \left(-\frac{p-1}{2}, \frac{p+1}{2}\right] \cap \mathbb{Z} \) and another one such that \( A\{pqr\} = \left(-\frac{p+1}{2}, \frac{p-1}{2}\right] \cap \mathbb{Z} \).

If \( n \) is ternary, then \( A\{n\} \) consists of consecutive integers. Moreover, we have \( |a_n(j+1) - a_n(j)| \leq 1 \) for \( j \geq 0 \); see Gallot and Moree [15]. Note that for each of the members \( \Phi_{pqr} \) of the two families the cardinality of \( A\{pqr\} \) is \( p + 1 \). This is not always the case for arbitrary ternary \( n \) and even best possible in the sense that \( \#A\{pqr\} \leq p + 1 \) for arbitrary ternary \( n \) (by [2] Corollary 3)).
Definition 2. If the cardinality of $A\{pqr\}$ is exactly $p+1$, we say that $\Phi_{pqr}$ is ternary optimal and call $n = pqr$ optimal. We denote the set of all $A(n)$ with $n$ optimal by $A_{opt}$.

Note that the bound for the size of $A\{pqr\}$ depends only on the smallest prime factor, $p$. Similarly, it has been known since the 19th century that $A(pqr) \leq p - 1$.

We expect the following to be true regarding ternary optimal polynomials.

Conjecture 3. We have $A_{opt} = N\{1, 5\}$.

We will see that this conjecture is closely related to the following prime number conjecture we propose (with $p_n$ the $n^{th}$ prime number).

Conjecture 4. Let $n \geq 31$ (and so $p_n \geq 127$). Then

$$p_{n+1} - p_n < \sqrt{p_n} + 1.$$  

Although prime gaps $d_n := p_{n+1} - p_n$ have been studied in extenso in the literature, this particular conjecture we have not come across. It seems to be far out of reach, as under RH the best result is due to Cramér [9] who showed in 1920 that $d_n = O(\sqrt{p_n} \log p_n)$. More explicitly, Carneiro et al. [8] showed under RH that $d_n \leq \frac{23}{25}\sqrt{p_n} \log p_n$ for every $p_n > 3$.

There is a whole range of conjectures on gaps between consecutive primes. The most famous one is Legendre’s that there is a prime between consecutive squares is a bit weaker, but for example Firoozbakht’s conjecture that $p_n^{1/n}$ is a strictly decreasing function of $n$ is much stronger. Firoozbakht’s conjecture implies that $d_n < (\log p_n)^2 - \log p_n + 1$ for all $n$ sufficiently large (see Sun [32]), contradicting a heuristic model; see Banks et al. [5], suggesting that given any $\epsilon > 0$ there are infinitely many $n$ such that $d_n > (2e^{-\gamma} - \epsilon)(\log p_n)^2$, with $\gamma$ Euler’s constant.

This is in line with Cramér’s [10] conjecture of 1936 that

$$0 < \liminf_{x \to \infty} \frac{\max\{d_n : p_n \leq x\}}{(\log x)^2} \leq \limsup_{x \to \infty} \frac{\max\{d_n : p_n \leq x\}}{(\log x)^2} < \infty,$$

who gave heuristical arguments in support of this assertion. His conjecture implies that $d_n = O((\log p_n)^2)$, which if true, clearly shows that the claimed bound in Conjecture 4 holds for all sufficiently large $n$. Further work on $d_n$ can be found in [6, 13, 18].

We denote the set of natural numbers $\leq h$ by $N_h$.

Theorem 2. Let $h$ be an integer such that (2) holds for $127 \leq p_n < 2h$. Then

$$N_h \subseteq A_t \subseteq A, \quad N_h \{1, 5\} \subseteq A_{opt}.$$

Moreover, $1, 5 \notin A_{opt}$.

Corollary 1. If Conjecture 4 is true, then so are Conjectures 1, 2 and 3.

Theorem 2 is in essence a consequence of a result of Moree and Roşu [30] (Theorem 6 below) generalizing Theorem 1, as we shall see in §2.

A lot of numerical work on large gaps has been done (see the website [31]). This can be used to infer that the inequality (2) holds whenever $127 \leq p_n \leq 2 \cdot 2^{63} \approx 1.8 \cdot 10^{19}$; see Visser [34]. This in combination with Theorem 2 leads to the following proposition.
**Proposition 1.** Every integer up to $9 \cdot 10^{18}$ occurs as the height of some ternary cyclotomic polynomial.

The following theorem is the main result of our paper. Its proof rests on combining Lemma 3, the key lemma used to prove Theorem 2 with deep work by Heath-Brown [21] and Yu [36] on gaps between primes.

**Theorem 3.** Almost all positive integers occur as the height of an optimal ternary cyclotomic polynomial. Specifically, for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$, the number of positive integers $\leq x$ that do not occur as a height of an optimal ternary cyclotomic polynomial is $\ll x^{3/5+\epsilon}$. Under the Lindelöf Hypothesis this number is $\ll x^{1/2+\epsilon}$.

(Readers unfamiliar with the Lindelöf Hypothesis are referred to the paragraph §3 before the statement of Lemma 7.)

In addition to Conjecture 4, there are two further prime number conjectures of relevance for the topic at hand: Conjecture 5, that we have not come across in the literature, and Andrica’s conjecture (Conjecture 6).

**Conjecture 5.** Let $h > 1$ be odd. There exists a prime $p \geq 2h - 1$, such that $1 + (h - 1)p$ is a prime too.

The widely believed Bateman–Horn conjecture [1] implies that given an odd $h > 1$, there are infinitely many primes $p$ such that $1 + (h - 1)p$ is a prime too, and thus Conjecture 5 is a weaker version of this.

**Theorem 4.** If Conjecture 5 holds true, then $A_t$ contains all odd natural numbers. Unconditionally $A_t$ contains a positive fraction of all odd natural numbers.

The first assertion is a consequence of work of Gallot, Moree and Wilms [17] and involves ternary cyclotomic polynomials that are not optimal. The second makes use of deep work of Bombieri, Friedlander and Iwaniec [6] on the level of distribution of primes in arithmetic progressions with fixed residue and varying moduli. The level of distribution that is needed here goes beyond the square root barrier (that is studied in the Bombieri–Vinogradov theorem, for example) and this is due to the condition $p \geq 2h - 1$ in Conjecture 5 see Remark 3 for more details. As far as we know, this is the first time that this kind of level of distribution is used in the subject of cyclotomic coefficients (see §4 for the details). We would like to point out though that Fouvry [14] has used the classical Bombieri–Vinogradov theorem in a rather different way and context, namely, for studying the number of nonzero coefficients of cyclotomic polynomials $\Phi_n$ with $n$ having two distinct prime factors.

In the final section we consider cyclotomic polynomials with prescribed maximum or minimum coefficient. Here Andrica’s conjecture (see, e.g., Visser [34]), a slightly stronger version of Legendre’s conjecture, shows up.

**Conjecture 6.** (Andrica’s conjecture). For $n \geq 1$, $p_{n+1} - p_n < \sqrt{p_n} + \sqrt{p_{n+1}}$, or equivalently $\sqrt{p_{n+1}} - \sqrt{p_n} < 1$.

We will prove the following result.

**Theorem 5.** Andrica’s conjecture implies that every natural number occurs as maximum coefficient of some cyclotomic polynomial.
That prime numbers play such an important role in our approach is a consequence of working with ternary cyclotomic polynomials. One would want to work with $\Phi_n$ with $n$ having at least four prime factors, however this leads to a loss of control over the behaviour of the coefficients in general and the maximum in particular.

2 More on ternary cyclotomic polynomials

Given any $m \geq 1$, Moree and Roşu [30] constructed optimal ternary infinite families of $\Phi_{pqr}$ such that $A(pqr) = (p+1)/2 + m$, provided that $p$ is large enough in terms of $m$. This result, Theorem 6 below, allows one to show that for $p \geq 11$ there are cyclotomic polynomials having heights $(p+1)/2 + 1, \ldots, (p+1)/2 + k$, with $k$ an integer close to $\sqrt{p}/2$. If the gaps between consecutive primes are always small enough, these heights cover all integers large enough and this would allow one to prove Conjecture 2. If large prime gaps do occur, then we are led to study the total length of prime gaps large enough up to $x$ (cf. $E(x)$ in Lemma 5). Conveniently for us a good upper bound for this was recently obtained by Heath-Brown [21]; see Lemma 6.

The remainder of this section is devoted to deriving consequences of Theorem 6 and proving Theorem 2.

Theorem 6. (Moree and Roşu [30, Theorem 1.1]). Let $p \geq 4m^2 + 2m + 3$ be a prime, with $m \geq 1$ any integer. Then there exists an infinite sequence of prime pairs $\{(q_j, r_j)\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ with $q_j < q_{j+1}, pq_j < r_j$, such that

$$A\{pq_j, r_j\} = \left\{\frac{(p-1)}{2} + m, \ldots, \frac{p+1}{2} + m\right\}.$$ 

We note that the two families of Theorem 1 are also infinite in the sense of this theorem. Thus Theorem 6 also holds for $m = 0$.

Put

$$\mathcal{R} = \left\{\frac{p+1}{2} + m : p \text{ is a prime, } m \geq 0, \, 4m^2 + 2m + 3 \leq p\right\}. \quad (3)$$

Lemma 1. We have $\mathcal{R} \subseteq A_{opt}$.

Proof. For the elements of $\mathcal{R}$ with $m = 0$ this follows from Theorem 1 for those with $m \geq 1$ it follows from Theorem 6. \qed

Lemma 2. If $p_{n+1} - p_n < \sqrt{p_n} + 1$ holds for $127 \leq p_n < 2h$ with $h$ an integer, then we have $\mathbb{N}_h \setminus \{1, 5, 63\} \subseteq \mathcal{R}$.

The proof is a consequence of part a) of the following lemma and the computational observation that 1, 5 and 63 are the only natural numbers < 64 that are not in $\mathcal{R}$.

By $\lfloor r \rfloor$ we denote the entire part of a real number $r$. 


Lemma 3. Let $n \geq 5$.

a) If $p_{n+1} - p_n < \sqrt{p_n} + 1$, then $I_n \cap \mathbb{N} \subset \mathcal{R}$, where $I_n := \left[ \frac{p_{n+1}}{2}, \frac{p_{n+1} + 1}{2} \right]$.

b) If $p_{n+1} - p_n \geq \sqrt{p_n} + 1$, then there are at most

$$[(p_{n+1} - p_n - \sqrt{p_n} + 1)/2]$$

integers in the interval $I_n$ that are not in $\mathcal{R}$.

Proof. The assumption on $n$ implies that $p_n \geq 11$. Put $z_n = (\sqrt{p_n} - 1)/2$. Note that $4z_n^2 + 2z_n + 3 = p_n - \sqrt{p_n} + 3 < p_n$. As $4x^2 + 2x + 3$ is increasing for $x \geq 0$, the inequality $4x^2 + 2x + 3 < p_n$ is satisfied for every real number $0 \leq x \leq z_n$. In particular it is satisfied for $x = m_n$, with $m_n$ the unique integer in the interval $[z_n - 1, z_n]$. Thus $m_n \geq (\sqrt{p_n} - 3)/2$ and $4m_n^2 + 2m_n + 3 \leq p_n$. It follows that

$$\left[ \frac{p_n + 1}{2}, \frac{p_n + 1}{2} + m_n \right] \cap \mathbb{N} \subseteq \mathcal{R}.$$ 

As $(p_{n+1} + 1)/2$ is clearly in $\mathcal{R}$, part a) follows if we can show that the final number $(p_{n+1} + 1)/2 + m_n$ is at least $(p_{n+1} - 1)/2$. Since both numbers are integers we can express this as $(p_{n+1} + 1)/2 + m_n > (p_{n+1} - 1)/2$. The validity of this inequality is obvious, since

$$\frac{p_n + 1}{2} + m_n \geq \frac{p_n + 1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{p_n} - 3}{2} > \frac{p_{n+1} - 3}{2},$$

where the second inequality is a consequence of our assumption $d_n < \sqrt{p_n} + 1$.

Part b) follows on noting that the number of integers of $\mathcal{R}$ that are not in $I_n$ is bounded above by $d_n/2 - 1 - m_n$, which we see is bounded above by the integer in (4) on using $m_n \geq (\sqrt{p_n} - 3)/2$.

Since we believe that (4) holds for all $p_n \geq 127$, Lemma 2 leads us to make the following conjecture.

Conjecture 7. We have $\mathcal{R} = \mathbb{N}\setminus\{1, 5, 63\}$.

The numbers 1, 5 and 63 are special in our story.

Lemma 4. The integers 1 and 5 are in $\mathcal{A}_l \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, but not in $\mathcal{A}_{opt}$. The integer 63 is in $\mathcal{A}_{opt} \subset \mathcal{A}_l \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, but not in $\mathcal{R}$.

Proof. If $pqr$ is optimal, then $A(pqr) \geq (p + 1)/2 \geq 2$ and so $1 \not\in \mathcal{A}_{opt}$. It is also easy to see that there is no optimal $pqr$ such that $A(pqr) = 5$. If such an optimal $pqr$ would exist, then as $A(pqr) \leq 3$ for $p \leq 5$ and $A(pqr) \geq 6$ for $p \geq 11$ (for an optimal $pqr$), this would force $p = 7$ and $A\{7qr\} = [-5, 2] \cap \mathbb{Z}$ or $A\{7qr\} = [-2, 5] \cap \mathbb{Z}$, contradicting the result of Zhao and Zhang [37] that $A\{7qr\} \subseteq [-4, 4] \cap \mathbb{Z}$.

The number 63 is in $\mathcal{A}_{opt}$. This follows on applying Theorem 3.1 of [30]. The obvious approach is to consider the largest prime $p$ such that $(p + 1)/2 < 63$, which is $p = 113$, and take $l = 11$ (here and below we use the notation of Theorem 3.1). For this combination the result does not apply, unfortunately. However, it does for $p = 109$ and $l = 15$, in which case we obtain $A\{109 \cdot 6803 \cdot 12084113\} = [-46, \ldots, 63] \cap \mathbb{Z}$ (with $q = 6803$, $\rho = 2870$, $\sigma = 62$, $s = 46$, $\tau = 18$, $w = 45$, $r_1 = 12084113$).

Proof of Theorem 2. This follows on combining Lemmas 1, 2 and 4.
3 Proof of Theorem 3

The goal of this section is to prove Theorem 3. The quantity of central interest, $N(x)$, is defined below.

Definition 3. The number of integers $\leq x$ that does not occur as a height of an optimal ternary cyclotomic polynomial is denoted by $N(x)$.

Lemma 5. We have $N(x) \leq E(2x)/2 + O(1)$, where

$$E(x) = \sum_{p_n \leq x, p_{n+1} \geq \sqrt{p_n}+1} (p_{n+1} - p_n - \sqrt{p_n} + 1).$$

Proof. By Lemma 1 it suffices to bound above the number of integers $\leq x$ that are not in $\mathcal{R}$. By Lemma 3b) this cardinality, in turn, is bounded above by $E(2x)/2 + O(1)$. \qed

If Cramér’s conjecture $d_n = O((\log p_n)^2)$ holds true, then this lemma implies that $N(x) = O(1)$.

Heath-Brown [21] recently proved the following result which gives an upper bound for $E(x)$.

Lemma 6 (Heath-Brown). We have

$$\sum_{p_n \leq x, p_{n+1} \geq \sqrt{p_n}} (p_{n+1} - p_n) \ll x^{3/5+\epsilon}.$$

Proof of the conditional bound of Theorem 3. This follows on combining the latter upper bound for $E(x)$ with Lemma 5. \qed

In order to complete the proof of Theorem 3 we need to improve the exponent $3/5$ in Lemma 6 to $1/2$, conditionally on the Lindelöf Hypothesis. The Lindelöf Hypothesis states that for all fixed $\epsilon > 0$ we have

$$\zeta(1/2 + it) = O_\epsilon(t^\epsilon), \ t \in \mathbb{R}, \ t > 1,$$

where as usual $\zeta$ denotes the Riemann zeta function. It is well-known that the Riemann Hypothesis implies the Lindelöf Hypothesis, but not vice versa. There is a large body of work concerning the Lindelöf Hypothesis (see, for example, the recent work of Bourgain [7]), however, it is still open.

We will make use of the following result of Yu [36].

Lemma 7 (Yu). Fix any $\epsilon > 0$. Under the Lindelöf Hypothesis we have

$$\sum_{p_n \leq x} (p_{n+1} - p_n)^2 \ll x^{1+\epsilon}.$$

From it one can easily derive a conditional improvement of Lemma 6.

Lemma 8. Assume the Lindelöf Hypothesis and fix any $\epsilon > 0$. Then we have

$$\sum_{p_n \leq x, p_{n+1} \geq \sqrt{p_n}} (p_{n+1} - p_n) \ll x^{1/2+\epsilon}.$$
Proof. Using dyadic division of the interval $[1, x]$ we obtain
\[
\sum_{p_n \leq x, \frac{d_n}{n} \geq \sqrt{p_n}} d_n \ll (\log x) \max_{1 \leq y \leq x} \sum_{y < p_n \leq 2y, \frac{d_n}{n} \geq \sqrt{p_n}} d_n \leq (\log x) \sum_{y < p_n \leq 2y, \frac{d_n}{n} \geq \sqrt{p_n}} \frac{d_n^2}{\sqrt{p_n}},
\]
which by Lemma 7 is at most
\[
(\log x) \max_{1 \leq y \leq x} \frac{1}{\sqrt{y}} \sum_{y < p_n \leq 2y} d_n^2 \ll \epsilon x^{1/2+\epsilon}.
\]

Proof of the conditional bound of Theorem 3. This follows on combining Lemma 5 with Lemma 8. □

Remark 1. Although it is not required for the applications in the present paper, one can prove slightly stronger variants of Lemmas 6 and 8, namely, that for every fixed $C > 0$ and $\epsilon > 0$, we have unconditionally
\[
\sum_{p_n \leq x} (p_{n+1} - p_n) \ll_{C, \epsilon} x^{\alpha+\epsilon},
\]
with $\alpha = 3/5$ (unconditionally) and $\alpha = 1/2$ under the Lindelöf Hypothesis (for details see Kosyak et al. [25]).

4 A special case of the Bateman–Horn conjecture on average

The goal of this section is to prove Theorem 4. Although the unconditional statement in Theorem 4 is surpassed by the unconditional statement in Theorem 3, the proof of Theorem 4 is, in a way, ‘orthogonal’ to the one of Theorem 3, it thus has the potential of working in variations of the problem where the method behind Theorem 3 would fail. Interestingly, like our prime gap criterion, it rests on a variation (implicit in Lemma 9) of a certain very well studied problem involving prime numbers. Both prime number questions are, however, quite different. Lemma 9 allows one to show that many odd heights occur among the ternary cyclotomic polynomials in a way different from Theorem 6.

Lemma 9. Let $h > 1$ be odd. If there exists a prime $p \geq 2h - 1$, such that the integer $q := 1 + (h - 1)p$ is a prime too, then $A(pqr) = h$ for some prime $r > q$. For $r$ one can take any prime $r_1 > q$ satisfying $r_1(p + q)/2 \equiv 1 \pmod{pq}$.

Proof. Define
\[
M(p; q) = \max_{r > q} \{A(pqr) : 2 < p < q < r\}. \tag{5}
\]
Gallot et al. [17, Theorem 43] showed that if $q \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$, then
\[
M(p; q) = \min \left\{ \left( \frac{q - 1}{p} + 1, \frac{p + 1}{2} \right) \right\}.
\]
The conditions on $p$ and $h$ ensure that $M(p; q) = h$. By [17, Lemma 24] it follows that $A(pqr_1) \geq h$. This in combination with $M(p; q) = h$ shows that $A(pqr_1) = h$. □
In case $p \geq 2h + 1$ the ternary cyclotomic polynomials from Lemma 9 are not optimal. We demonstrate this in case $h = 63$ (with $p = 131$ and $q = 8123$).

**Example 1.** Using the latter result and [17, Lemma 24], we find that

$$A(131 \cdot 8123 \cdot 25497973) = \frac{8123 - 1}{131} + 1 = 63$$

and $a_{131,8123,25497973}(13459462019674) = -63$.

We define the set $G \subset \mathbb{N}$ as follows,

$$G := \{ m \in \mathbb{N} : \exists p \in (4m, 32m) \text{ such that } 1 + 2mp \text{ is prime} \}.$$

We would like to point out that the requirement $p < 32m$ is not necessary for the proof of Theorem 4, but is needed in the proof of Theorem 9.

In the remaining part of this section we show that the density of $G$ among all integers is positive, i.e. that there exists $c_0 > 0$ such that

$$\liminf_{M \to +\infty} \frac{\# \{ m \in G \cap [1, M] \}}{M} \geq c_0. \quad (6)$$

For any natural number $m$ and any real number $x$ we define

$$\pi_m(x) := \# \left\{ p \in \left[ \frac{4}{M}, x \right) : 1 + 2mp \text{ is prime} \right\}.$$

Further, for any $x \geq 0$ we define

$$G(x) := \{ m \in \mathbb{N} \cap [1, x/4) : \exists p \in (4m, x] \text{ such that } 1 + 2mp \text{ is prime} \}.$$

**Lemma 10.** For all $x, M \in \mathbb{R}$ with $x > 8M$ and $M \geq 1$ we have

$$\# \{ m \in G(x) \cap (M/4, M] \} \sum_{1 \leq m \leq M} \pi_m(x)^2 \geq \left( \sum_{M/4 < m \leq M} \pi_m(x) \right)^2.$$

**Proof.** Put

$$u_m(x) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } \pi_m(x) \neq 0; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Fix $x > 8M$. By Cauchy’s inequality we have

$$\sum_{M/4 < m \leq M} \pi_m(x) = \sum_{M/4 < m \leq M} \pi_m(x)u_m(x)$$

$$\leq \# \{ M/4 < m \leq M : \pi_m(x) > 0 \}^{1/2} \left( \sum_{1 \leq m \leq M} \pi_m(x)^2 \right)^{1/2}.$$

If $m \leq M$ and $p \geq x/2$, then $4m \leq 4M < x/2 \leq p$, hence

$$\# \{ M/4 < m \leq M : \pi_m(x) > 0 \} \leq \# \{ m \in G(x) \cap (M/4, M] \},$$

concluding the proof. \qed
We would like to estimate the sums \( \sum_{M/4 < m \leq M} \pi_m(x) \) and \( \sum_{1 \leq m \leq M} \pi_m(x)^2 \) appearing above. An upper bound, say \( A \), for \( \sum_{1 \leq m \leq M} \pi_m(x)^2 \) is easily obtained by using standard sieve results. Now if we could derive a lower bound \( B \) for \( \sum_{M/4 < m \leq M} \pi_m(x) \), then by Lemma 10 we get

\[
\# \{ m \in G(x) \cap (M/4, M] \} \geq \frac{B^2}{A}.
\]

Unfortunately the condition \( x > 8M \) makes it difficult to obtain a good lower bound for \( \sum_{M/4 < m \leq M} \pi_m(x) \). We overcome this by using deep work of Bombieri, Friedlander and Iwaniec regarding the level of distribution of primes in arithmetic progressions with fixed residue and varying moduli.

We start with estimating \( \sum_{1 \leq m \leq M} \pi_m(x)^2 \), for which we need the following lemma, which is obtained on putting \( b = k = l = 1 \) in [19, Theorem 3.12].

**Lemma 11.** Let \( a \) be a positive even integer. Then for all \( x > 1 \) we have, uniformly in \( a \), that

\[
\# \{ p \leq x : ap + 1 \text{ is prime} \} \leq \frac{8C_2 x}{(\log x)^2} \prod_{p \mid a, p > 2} \left( \frac{p - 1}{p - 2} \right) \left\{ 1 + O\left( \frac{\log \log x}{\log x} \right) \right\},
\]

where

\[
C_2 = \prod_{p > 2} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{(p - 1)^2} \right)
\]

is the twin prime constant.

**Remark 2.** Hardy and Littlewood conjectured, based on heuristic reasoning, that asymptotically

\[
\# \{ p \leq x : p + 2 \text{ is prime} \} \sim 2C_2 \frac{x}{(\log x)^2}.
\]

A similar heuristic reasoning leads to the conjecture that asymptotically

\[
\# \{ p \leq x : ap + 1 \text{ is prime} \} \sim C_2 \left( \prod_{p \mid a, p > 2} \left( \frac{p - 1}{p - 2} \right) \right) \frac{x}{(\log x)^2}.
\]

Both conjectures are special cases of the Bateman-Horn conjecture, cf. [1].

**Lemma 12.** Let \( x, M \) be any two positive real numbers. Then

\[
\sum_{1 \leq m \leq M} \pi_m(x)^2 \leq 64C_1C_2^2 M \frac{x^2}{(\log x)^4} \left\{ 1 + O\left( \frac{\log \log x}{\log x} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \right) \right\},
\]

where

\[
C_1 := \prod_{p > 2} \left( 1 + \frac{2}{p(p - 2)} + \frac{1}{p(p - 2)^2} \right),
\]

\( C_2 \) is the twin prime constant, and the implied constant is absolute.
Proof. By Lemma 11 with $a = 2m$, we get

$$\pi_m(x)^2 \leq 8^2 C_2^2 \frac{x^2}{(\log x)^4} \prod_{\substack{p \mid 2m \\ p > 2}} \left( \frac{p - 1}{p - 2} \right)^2 \left\{ 1 + O \left( \frac{\log \log x}{\log x} \right) \right\},$$

therefore, we conclude that $\sum_{1 \leq m \leq M} \pi_m(x)^2$ is at most

$$8^2 C_2^2 \frac{x^2}{(\log x)^4} \left\{ 1 + O \left( \frac{\log \log x}{\log x} \right) \right\} \sum_{1 \leq m \leq M} \prod_{\substack{p \mid m \\ p > 2}} \left( \frac{p - 1}{p - 2} \right)^2.$$

We define the multiplicative function $f$ via

$$f(p^e) := 1_{p > 2}(p) 1_{e = 1}(e) \left( \frac{2}{p - 2} + \frac{1}{(p - 2)^2} \right), \quad (e \in \mathbb{N}, \text{ } p \text{ prime}).$$

One can easily verify that

$$\prod_{\substack{p \mid k \\ p > 2}} \left( \frac{p - 1}{p - 2} \right)^2 = \sum_{d \mid k} f(d) = \sum_{d \mid k \\ 2 \nmid d} f(d)$$

for all non-zero integers $k$. This shows that

$$\sum_{1 \leq m \leq M} \prod_{\substack{p \mid 2m \\ p > 2}} \left( \frac{p - 1}{p - 2} \right)^2 = \sum_{1 \leq d \leq M} \sum_{1 \leq m \leq M} \frac{1}{d(2d)} = M \sum_{1 \leq d \leq M} \frac{f(d)}{d} + O \left( \sum_{1 \leq d \leq M} f(d) \right),$$

where we used several times that $f(d) = 0$ if $d$ is even. Noting that $f(p) \leq C/p$ for some absolute constant $C > 0$ yields the bound

$$f(d) \leq \mu(d) \frac{C^{\omega(d)} d}{d} \ll \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}, \quad (d \in \mathbb{N}),$$

which can be used to obtain

$$\sum_{1 \leq d \leq M} \frac{f(d)}{d} = \sum_{d = 1}^{\infty} \frac{f(d)}{d} + O \left( \sum_{d > M} \frac{1}{d^{3/2}} \right) = C_1 + O \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{M}} \right)$$

and

$$\sum_{1 \leq d \leq M} f(d) \ll \sum_{1 \leq d \leq M} \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \ll \sqrt{M}.$$

Putting everything together it follows that

$$\sum_{1 \leq m \leq M} \prod_{\substack{p \mid 2m \\ p > 2}} \left( \frac{p - 1}{p - 2} \right)^2 = C_1 M + O(\sqrt{M}),$$

which is sufficient for our purposes. \qed
We now proceed to evaluate the sum $\sum_{1 \leq m \leq M} \pi_m(x)$ appearing in Lemma 10. Writing $n = 1 + 2mp$ we see that it equals

$$\sum_{M/4 < m \leq M} \sum_{1 + 2mp \text{ prime}} 1 = \sum_{x/2 \leq p < x} \sum_{M/4 < m \leq M} \sum_{1 + 2mp \text{ prime}} 1$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{\log(1 + 2Mx)} \sum_{x/2 \leq p < x} \sum_{\text{n prime}} \log n, \quad (7)$$

where we used that $\log n \leq \log(1 + 2Mp) \leq \log(1 + 2Mx)$.

**Remark 3.** One now recognizes the argument in the latter sum as a counting function of primes in an arithmetic progression of varying modulus $p$, as $p$ runs through $[x/2, x)$. We would now use the Bombieri–Vinogradov theorem, however, the size of the primes $n$ is of the order of magnitude

$$1 + 2Mp \approx 2Mx,$$

since the moduli $p$ have typical size $x$. Thus, owing to the condition $x > 8M$, we are counting primes in a progression whose modulus exceeds the square-root of the size of the primes. Therefore, the Bombieri–Vinogradov theorem cannot be applied in our case. To be more precise, it can only be applied when the moduli are bounded by $\sqrt{z}/(\log z)^A$, where $A > 0$ and $z$ is the length of the interval $(0, z]$ we are counting primes in. This means that we need

$$p \leq \frac{\sqrt{2Mp}}{(\log(2Mp))^{A}},$$

for some fixed $A > 0$, and this can only happen when $x = o(M)$. To deal with this problem we shall need a special case (Lemma 13 below), of the work of Bombieri, Friedlander and Iwaniec [6].

As usual let

$$\theta(x; q, a) := \sum_{p \leq x, p \equiv a (\text{mod } q)} \log p, \quad \psi(x; q, a) := \sum_{n \leq x, n \equiv a (\text{mod } q)} \Lambda(n),$$

with $\Lambda$ the von Mangoldt function.

**Lemma 13** (Bombieri–Friedlander–Iwaniec [6]). For any $t \geq y \geq 3$ we have

$$\sum_{\sqrt{ty}/2 \leq q < \sqrt{ty}} \left| \psi(t; q, 1) - \frac{t}{\phi(q)} \right| \ll t \left( \frac{\log y}{\log t} \right)^2 \left( \log \log t \right)^B,$$

where $B$ is an absolute constant and the implied constant is absolute.

This estimate is obtained on setting $a = 1, x = t$ and $Q = \sqrt{ty}$ in [6, Main Theorem, p. 363].
Lemma 14. For any \( t \geq y \geq 3 \) with \( y \leq t^{1/20} \) we have

\[
\sum_{q\text{ prime}} \frac{\theta(t; q, 1) - \frac{t}{\phi(q)}}{\sqrt{ty/2} < q < \sqrt{ty}} \ll t \left( \frac{\log y}{\log t} \right)^2 \left( \log \log t \right)^B,
\]

where \( B \) is an absolute constant and the implied constant is absolute.

Proof. Clearly

\[
\psi(t; q, 1) = \theta(t; q, 1) + \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \sum_{\substack{p \leq t^{1/k} \\text{mod } q \equiv 1 \mod \varphi(q)}} \log p.
\]

The inner sum vanishes if \( t^{1/k} < 2 \), therefore only the integers \( k \leq (\log t)/\log 2 \) need to be taken into account. The contribution of all such integers with \( k \geq 3 \) is \( \ll t^{1/3} \log t \), since the sum over \( p \) is \( \ll t^{1/k} \) by the prime number theorem. The steps so far are the standard arguments that one performs when moving from asymptotics for \( \psi \) to asymptotics for \( \theta \), however, in our case, owing to the level of distribution being comparable to the square root of the length of the interval, the term \( k = 2 \) cannot be controlled with the classical arguments. Instead, we use the bound

\[
\frac{1}{\log t} \sum_{\substack{p \leq \sqrt{t} \\text{mod } q \equiv 1 \mod \varphi(q)}} \log p \leq \sum_{\substack{m \leq \sqrt{t} \\text{mod } q \equiv 1 \mod \varphi(q)}} 1 = \sum_{\substack{m \leq \sqrt{t} \\text{mod } q \equiv 1 \mod \varphi(q)}} 1 + \sum_{\substack{m \leq \sqrt{t} \\text{mod } q \equiv -1 \mod \varphi(q)}} 1,
\]

where we used the fact that \( q \) is prime. Each of the sums in the right side is trivially \( \ll \sqrt{t}/q + 1 \) and therefore

\[
\sum_{\substack{p \leq \sqrt{t} \\text{mod } q \equiv 1 \mod \varphi(q)}} \log p \ll (\log t) \left( \frac{\sqrt{t}}{q} + 1 \right).
\]

We thus find that

\[
\psi(t; q, 1) = \theta(t; q, 1) + O \left( t^{1/3}(\log t) + \frac{\sqrt{t}}{q} \log t \right).
\]

This shows that the sum over \( q \) in the statement of this lemma is

\[
\ll \sum_{\sqrt{ty}/2 \leq q < \sqrt{ty}} \left| \psi(t; q, 1) - \frac{t}{\phi(q)} \right| + \sum_{\sqrt{ty}/2 \leq q < \sqrt{ty}} \left( t^{1/3}(\log t) + \frac{\sqrt{t}}{q} \log t \right).
\]

The first sum can be bounded by Lemma \[13\] Noting that \( \sum_{x/2 < q \leq x} 1/q = O(1) \), cf. \[5\], we see that the second sum is

\[
\ll \sqrt{ty} t^{1/3}(\log t) + \sqrt{t} \log t,
\]

which is \( \ll t^{19/20} \ll t(\log t)^{-2} \), as \( y \leq t^{1/20} \).
Lemma 15. Let \( \psi : (1, \infty) \to (4, \infty) \) be any function satisfying \( \psi(M) \leq \log M \). For any \( M > 1 \), we let \( x = M \psi(M) \) and have

\[
\sum_{M/4 < m \leq M} \pi_m(x) \geq \frac{Mx}{2\log(Mx)} \log 2 \left\{ 1 + O \left( \frac{(\log \log x)^{B+2}}{\log x} \right) \right\} \pi^1(x),
\]

where \( B \) is the absolute constant from Lemma 14.

Proof. The condition \( p \in [x/2, x) \) in the definition of \( \pi_m(x) \) ensures that the interval \((1 + Mx/2, 1 + Mx]\) is contained in the interval \((1 + Mp/2, 1 + 2Mp]\).

Therefore, by (7) we see that the sum in our lemma is at least

\[
\frac{1}{\log(1 + 2Mx)} \sum_{x/2 < p < x} \sum_{\text{n prime}}^{n \equiv 1 (\text{mod } p)} \log n.
\]

Using Lemma 14 with \( t = Mx \) and \( y = \psi(M) \) shows that this is

\[
\frac{(1 + Mx) - (1 + Mx^2)}{\log(1 + 2Mx)} \sum_{x/2 < p < x} \frac{1}{p - 1} + O \left( \frac{Mx}{\log(Mx)} \left( \frac{\log \psi(M)}{\log x} \right)^2 (\log \log x)^B \right).
\]

Using the standard estimate

\[
\sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{p - 1} = \log \log x + C' + O \left( \frac{1}{(\log x)^2} \right),
\]

we obtain

\[
\sum_{x/2 < p \leq x} \frac{1}{p - 1} = \frac{\log 2}{\log x} \left\{ 1 + O \left( \frac{1}{\log x} \right) \right\}. \quad (8)
\]

It follows that the main term is as claimed in our lemma. Furthermore, on using the bound \( \log \psi(M) \ll \log \log M \ll \log \log x \), we see that the error term is

\[
\ll \frac{Mx}{\log(Mx)} \left( \frac{(\log \log x)^{B+2}}{(\log x)^2} \right),
\]

as required. \( \square \)

Proof of Theorem 4. The first assertion is a corollary of Lemma 9.

The inequalities obtained in Lemmas 12 and 13 with \( \psi(M) = 9 \) in combination with the inequality in Lemma 10 give rise, on choosing \( x = 1 + 8M \), to the inequality

\[
\# \{m \in G(1 + 8M) \cap (M/4, M]\} \geq 64C_1C_2^2M \frac{Mx}{\log x^4} \geq \left( \frac{Mx}{\log(Mx) \log x} \right)^2 (1 + o(1)).
\]

In particular, the estimate \( \log(Mx) \leq 2 \log x \) yields

\[
\# \{m \in G(1 + 8M) \cap (M/4, M]\} \geq c'M(1 + o(1)),
\]

\[
\sum_{x/2 < p \leq x} \frac{1}{p - 1} = \frac{\log 2}{\log x} \left\{ 1 + O \left( \frac{1}{\log x} \right) \right\}. \quad (8)
\]

It follows that the main term is as claimed in our lemma. Furthermore, on using the bound \( \log \psi(M) \ll \log \log M \ll \log \log x \), we see that the error term is

\[
\ll \frac{Mx}{\log(Mx)} \left( \frac{(\log \log x)^{B+2}}{(\log x)^2} \right),
\]

as required. \( \square \)

Proof of Theorem 4. The first assertion is a corollary of Lemma 9.

The inequalities obtained in Lemmas 12 and 13 with \( \psi(M) = 9 \) in combination with the inequality in Lemma 10 give rise, on choosing \( x = 1 + 8M \), to the inequality

\[
\# \{m \in G(1 + 8M) \cap (M/4, M]\} \geq 64C_1C_2^2M \frac{Mx}{\log x^4} \geq \left( \frac{Mx}{\log(Mx) \log x} \right)^2 (1 + o(1)).
\]

In particular, the estimate \( \log(Mx) \leq 2 \log x \) yields

\[
\# \{m \in G(1 + 8M) \cap (M/4, M]\} \geq c'M(1 + o(1)),
\]
where
\[ c' = \frac{(\log 2)^2}{1024C_1C_2^2} > 0. \]

Note that since \( 4/M < m \), we have
\[ p \leq x = 1 + 8M < 1 + 32m, \]
and hence \( p < 32m \), therefore, the set \( G(1 + 8M) \) is contained in \( G \). We conclude that (6) holds with \( c_0 = c' \). It follows that a positive proportion of all integers \( m \) have the property that there exists a prime \( p > 4m \) with also \( 1 + 2mp \) being a prime. By Lemma [9] we have \( 1 + 2m \in \mathcal{A}_t \) for each of those \( m \), and it thus follows that unconditionally \( \mathcal{A}_t \) contains a positive fraction of all odd natural numbers.

**Remark 4.** The proof actually yields that a positive proportion of all integers \( m \) have the property that there exists a prime \( 4m < p < 32m \) with also \( 1 + 2mp \) being a prime. This is what we will use in the proof of Theorem 7.

5 Some related issues

5.1 Estimating the smallest \( n \) for which \( A(n) = h \)

**Definition 4.** Given a natural number \( h \), let \( n_h \) be the smallest ternary integer, if it exists, such that \( A(n_h) = h \).

The entries in the column \( k/\varphi(pqr) \) in Table 1 suggest the following question.

**Question 1.** Let \( h > 1 \) be an integer. Does there exist an absolute constant \( 0 < c \leq 1/2 \) such that if \( |a_n(k)| = h \), then \( k > c\varphi(n_h) \)?

A further question is to relate the size of \( n_h \) to \( h \). See the final column of Table 1 for some numerical data.

**Conjecture 8.** We have \( h^{E_1} \ll n_h \ll h^{E_2} \), with \( E_1 \) and \( E_2 \) positive constants.

Theorem 7 shows that for a positive fraction of integers \( h \) the upper bound in the conjecture holds true. Its formulation involves Linnik’s constant \( L \).

**Definition 5.** For coprime integers \( a \) and \( d \), let \( p_c(a, d) \) denote the smallest prime \( > d^c \) in the progression \( a \mod d \).

Linnik proved in 1944 that there exist positive constants \( C \) and \( L \) such that \( p_0(a, d) \leq C \, d^L \). The constant \( L \) is known as Linnik’s constant. Xylouris [35] proved that \( L \leq 5 \), heavily relying on a fundamental paper by Heath-Brown [20], who obtained \( L \leq 5.5 \).

The following result generalizes Linnik’s theorem.

**Lemma 16.** Let \( e > 0 \) be a real number. For coprime integers \( a \) and \( d \), let \( p_c(a, d) \) denote the smallest prime \( > d^c \) in the progression \( a \mod d \). Then there exists some absolute constant \( C \) such that \( p_c(a, d) \ll d^{c+C} \), where the implied constant is also absolute.
Proof. We use Corollary 18.8 of the book of Iwaniec and Kowalski [22]. It states that there exists an explicit effectively computable constant \( L_1 > 0 \) such that for all sufficiently large \( d \) and all \( x \geq d^{L_1} \) we have

\[
\psi(x; d, a) \gg \frac{x}{\varphi(d) \sqrt{d}},
\]

where the implied constant is absolute. Since \( \varphi(d) \leq d \), this implies that

\[
\psi(x; d, a) \gg \frac{x}{d^{3/2}}.
\]

For all \( x > d^6 \) we have \( \sqrt{x} \leq x^{3/4} d^{-3/2} \) and hence,

\[
\psi(x; d, a) - \theta(x; d, a) \leq \psi(x) - \theta(x) \ll \sqrt{x} \leq \frac{x^{3/4}}{d^{3/2}}.
\]

Therefore, if \( x > d^{L_1+6} \) we deduce that

\[
\theta(x; d, a) \gg \frac{x}{d^{3/2}},
\]

where the implied constant is absolute. To conclude our proof we note that \( p_e(a, d) \) is bounded by any real number \( x > d^e \) which satisfies

\[
\theta(x; d, a) > \theta(d^e; d, a).
\]

Since \( \theta(d^e; d, a) \leq \theta(d^e) \leq 2d^e \) by the prime number theorem, it suffices to find the least \( x > d^e \) for which \( \theta(x; d, a) \geq 2d^e \). Clearly, this holds as long as \( x > d^{L_1+6} \) and \( x d^{-3/2} > Cd^e \) for some large constant \( C \). For both of these properties to hold it is sufficient that \( x \gg d^{e+6+L_1} \), from which we infer that

\[
P_e(a, d) \ll d^{e+6+L_1},
\]

with an absolute implied constant. \( \square \)

The next result makes some progress towards Conjecture \[\Box\] It requires only Linnik’s theorem for its proof.

**Theorem 7.** Let \( \epsilon > 0 \). Let \( n_h \) be the smallest ternary integer, if it exists, such that \( A(n_h) = h \). There exists a constant \( c_\epsilon > 0 \) such that \( n_h < c_\epsilon h^{3(L+1+\epsilon)} \) for a positive proportion of the odd natural numbers \( h \).

**Proof.** Let \( m \) be an integer such that there exists a prime \( 4m < p < 32m \) with also \( q := 1 + 2mp \) being a prime. For any such \( m \) we will show that \( h := 1 + 2m \in A_t \) and construct a ternary \( n \) such that \( A(n) = h \) satisfying the required bound. Since, as we have seen in the proof of Theorem \[4\] (cf. Remark \[4\], there is a positive proportion of such \( m \), the result follows.

We let \( 0 < r_1 < pq \) be the unique solution of \( r_1(p+q)/2 \equiv 1 \pmod{pq} \). If \( r_1 \) is even, we put \( r = p_0(r_1, pq) \). Note that \( r > pq \). If \( r_1 \) is odd, we let \( s \) be the smallest prime not dividing \( r_1 + pq \). Let \( \delta > 0 \) be arbitrary. Since the product of primes \( \leq x \) is asymptotically equal to \( e^x \), we conclude that \( s < (pq)^\delta \) for all \( m \) large enough. Observe that \( r_1 + pq \) and \( spq \) are coprime. We put \( r = p_0(r_1 + pq, spq) \). Note that \( r > q \). By Lemma \[9\] we have \( A(pqr) = h \). Since \( pqr > n_h \) and

\[
pqr = O(m \cdot m^2 \cdot (m^{3(1+\delta)})^L) = O(h \cdot h^2 \cdot (h^{3(1+\delta)})^L) = O(h^{3(L+1+\epsilon)}),
\]

with \( \epsilon = \delta L \), the proof is completed. \( \square \)
The next result can be seen as a supplementing Theorem 3. The proof requires Lemma 16 and a more precise version of Theorem 6 that is too long to be formulated here.

**Theorem 8.** Let $t_h$ be the smallest optimal ternary integer, if it exists, such that $A(t_h) = h$. There exists positive constants $c$ and $T$ such that $t_h < ch^T$ for all $h \leq x$ with at most $\ll_{\epsilon} x^{3/5+\epsilon}$ exceptions.

**Proof.** We will use [30, Theorem 3.1], the full version of Theorem 6. As Theorem 6 is used in the proof of Theorem 3, we get the same number of possible exceptions $h \leq x$. In terms of the $m$ of Theorem 6, we have $l = 2m - 1$, with $l \leq \sqrt{p}$. We take $h = (p + l + 2)/2$. The prime $q$ indicated in the theorem is bounded above by $p_2(a, p)$, with $a$ an appropriate residue class. The prime $r$ has to exceed $pq$ and be in an appropriate residue class modulo $pq$. By Lemma 16 we have $pq \leq pp_2(a, p) \ll p^{T_1}$ for some constant $T_1$. Thus by Lemma 16 again, $r$ is $\ll p^{T_2}$ for some constant $T_2$. Thus $pqr \ll p^{1+T_1+T_2}$. The result then follows with $T = 1 + T_1 + T_2$ on noticing that $p = O(h)$. \qed

### 5.2 Prescribed maximum or minimum coefficient

So far we focused on possible heights of cyclotomic polynomials. Instead one can ask for possible maxima and minima. In this section we will argue why the following conjecture is reasonable.

**Conjecture 9.** Each non-zero integer occurs either as maximum or as minimum coefficient of some cyclotomic polynomial.

**Definition 6.** We denote the maximum and minimum coefficient of $\Phi_n$ by $A^+(n)$, respectively $A^-(n)$. We put $\mathcal{A}^+_t = \{A^+(n) : n \text{ is ternary}\}$ and define $\mathcal{A}^-_t$ analogously. We denote by $\mathcal{A}^+_\text{opt}$ the set of all $A^+(n)$, with $n$ optimal and define $\mathcal{A}^-_\text{opt}$ analogously.

Since our arguments rest on properties of ternary cyclotomic polynomials, the next result due to Kaplan makes plausible that asking for which maximal coefficients can occur is in essence the same as asking for which possible minimum coefficients can occur.

**Proposition 2.** (Implicit in Kaplan [24], explicit in Bachman and Moree [4]). If $r, s > pq$, then

$$A\{pqr\} = \begin{cases} A\{pqs\} & \text{if } s \equiv r \text{ (mod } pq)\}; \\
-A\{pqs\} & \text{if } s \equiv -r \text{ (mod } pq)\}.
$$

This proposition can be used to prove the following lemma.

**Lemma 17.** If $A(pqr) = M(p; q)$, then there exist primes $r_1$ and $r_2$ such that $A^+(pqr_1) = M(p; q)$ and $A^-(pqr_2) = -M(p; q)$.

**Proof.** The integers in $[-M(p; q), M(p; q)] \cap \mathbb{Z}$ are precisely those that appear in $\Phi_{pqr}$ as $r$ ranges over the primes exceeding $q$; see Gallot, Moree and Wilms [17], Proposition 1]. \qed
In the proof of Theorem 4 exclusively heights are considered that are of the form $M(p; q)$. This observation together with Lemma 17 then leads to a proof of the following variant of Theorem 4.

**Theorem 9.** If Conjecture 5 holds true, then $A^- - t \cup A^+ + t$ contains all odd integers. Unconditionally both $A_+^+ + t$ and $A^- - t$ contain a positive fraction of all odd integers.

In our proof of Theorem 2 we actually show that $R \subseteq A^+_{opt}$. The optimal ternary cyclotomic polynomials $\Phi_{pqr}$ used come from Theorem 6 and satisfy $r > pq$. This allows one then to invoke Proposition 2 and conclude that $-R \subseteq A^-_{opt}$.

**Theorem 10.** The set $A^- - t \cup A^+ + t$ contains almost all integers. Specifically, for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$, the number of integers with absolute value $\leq x$ that do not occur in $A^- - t \cup A^+ + t$ is $\ll x^{3/5+\epsilon}$. Under the Lindelöf Hypothesis this number is $\ll x^{1/2+\epsilon}$.

Finally, we will derive a variant of Theorem 2. We put $R^{\pm} = \{ \frac{p-1}2 - m, \frac{p+1}2 + m : p \text{ is a prime}, m \geq 0, 4m^2 + 2m + 3 \leq p \}$.

**Lemma 18.** We have $R^{\pm} \subseteq A^+_{opt}$ and $-R^{\pm} \subseteq A^-_{opt}$.

**Proof.** For the elements of $R$ with $m = 0$ this follows from Theorem 1 for those with $m \geq 1$ it follows from Theorem 6 in combination with Proposition 2.

Taking $p = 3, 11, 127$ and $m = 0$ we see that $\{1, 5, 63\}$ are in $R^{\pm}$. This in combination with Conjecture 7 and Lemma 18 leads to the following conjecture.

**Conjecture 10.** We have $R^{\pm} = \mathbb{N}$, $A^+_{opt} = \mathbb{N}$ and $A^-_{opt} = -\mathbb{N}$.

Let $I_n$ be as in Lemma 3.

**Lemma 19.** Let $n \geq 5$.

a) If $p_{n+1} - p_n < \sqrt{p_n} + \sqrt{p_{n+1}}$, then $I_n \cap \mathbb{N} \subseteq R^{\pm}$.

b) If $p_{n+1} - p_n < \sqrt{p_n} + \sqrt{p_{n+1}}$ holds for $11 \leq p_n < 2h$ with $h$ an integer, then we have $\mathbb{N}_h \subseteq R^{\pm}$.

**Proof.** We let the integer $m_n$ be as in the proof of Lemma 3 and recall that $m_n \geq (\sqrt{p_n} - 3)/2$. Part a) follows if we can show that the final number $(p_n + 1)/2 + m_n$ is at least $(p_{n+1} - 1)/2 - m_{n+1} - 1$. Since both numbers are integers it suffices to require that

$$\frac{p_n + 1}2 + m_n > \frac{p_{n+1} - 1}2 - m_{n+1} - 2.$$ 

This is equivalent with $d_n/2 < m_n + m_{n+1} + 3$. Now our assumption on $d_n$ implies that

$$d_n/2 < (\sqrt{p_n} - 3)/2 + (\sqrt{p_{n+1}} - 3)/2 + 3 \leq m_n + m_{n+1} + 3,$$

as wanted.

b) This is a consequence of part a) and the observation that $1, 2, 3, 4$ and $5$ are in $R^{\pm}$.

**Proof of Theorem 5.** A consequence of Lemma 19b and the observation that we also have $p' - p < \sqrt{p} + \sqrt{p'}$ for $p \leq 11$.\]
## Ternary cyclotomic polynomials of small height

Table 1: Ternary examples with prescribed height

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>height</th>
<th>( p )</th>
<th>( q )</th>
<th>( r )</th>
<th>( k )</th>
<th>sign</th>
<th>diff.</th>
<th>( \frac{k}{\phi(pqr)} )</th>
<th>( \log(pqr) )</th>
<th>( \log h )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.714</td>
<td>5.146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.011</td>
<td>5.468</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.623</td>
<td>5.496</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.623</td>
<td>5.353</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1008</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.913</td>
<td>4.675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2499</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.060</td>
<td>5.338</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6013</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.009</td>
<td>5.402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5596</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.750</td>
<td>4.324</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14538</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.848</td>
<td>4.379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4801</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.305</td>
<td>2.675</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>20375</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.527</td>
<td>4.028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14471</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.209</td>
<td>4.566</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>58333</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4.601</td>
<td>4.065</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52286</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.430</td>
<td>4.065</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>45939</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4.273</td>
<td>4.065</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>133844</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4.565</td>
<td>4.446</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38240</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.039</td>
<td>4.379</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>178013</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.608</td>
<td>3.302</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>101051</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.302</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>235842</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4.387</td>
<td>4.481</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>217278</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.321</td>
<td>4.437</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>165453</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4.166</td>
<td>3.441</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>108355</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.055</td>
<td>4.341</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>189160</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.183</td>
<td>4.330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>224640</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>4.055</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>96529</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.852</td>
<td>3.359</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>332589</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4.105</td>
<td>4.587</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>186685</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.001</td>
<td>3.314</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>552035</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4.170</td>
<td>4.452</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>389139</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.116</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>444435</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4.024</td>
<td>4.456</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>881529</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4.174</td>
<td>3.471</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>389314</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3.904</td>
<td>4.731</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>409320</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3.879</td>
<td>4.833</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>544198</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3.934</td>
<td>4.701</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1246426</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4.148</td>
<td>4.445</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>671716</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>3.975</td>
<td>4.030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>3355658</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>4.337</td>
<td>4.797</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>941094</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3.952</td>
<td>4.497</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>1624556</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>4.146</td>
<td>3.774</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 gives the minimum ternary integer \( n = pqr \) with \( p < q < r \) such that \( A(n) = m \) for the numbers \( m = 1, \ldots, 40 \). The integer \( k \) has the property that \( a_{pqr}(k) = \pm m \), with the sign coming from the sixth column. The seventh column records the difference between the largest and smallest coefficient and is in bold if this is optimal, that is, if it the difference equals \( p \) (compare Definition 2). The second-to-last column gives the relative position of \( k \) in \( \Phi_{pqr} \). The final column gives, for \( h > 1 \), the exponent \( e \) such that \( pqr = h^e \).

The heights \( h \) in Table 1 satisfy \( h \leq 2p/3 \) with equality only in case \( h = 2 \). This is consistent with the generalized Sister Beiter conjecture due to Gallot and Moree [16].
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