

Explicit results for Euler's factorial series in arithmetic progressions under GRH

Neea Palojärvi*

Department of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Helsinki, P.O. Box 68, 00014 Helsinki

neea.palojarvi@helsinki.fi

Abstract

In this article, we study the Euler's factorial series $F_p(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n!t^n$ in p -adic domain under the Generalized Riemann Hypothesis. First, we show that if we consider primes in $k\varphi(m)/(k+1)$ residue classes in the reduced residue system modulo m , then under certain explicit extra conditions we must have $\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 F_p(\alpha_1) + \dots + \lambda_k F_p(\alpha_k) \neq 0$ for at least one such prime. We also prove an explicit p -adic lower bound for the previous linear form. Secondly, we consider the case where we take primes in arithmetic progressions from more than $k\varphi(m)/(k+1)$ residue classes. Then there is an infinite collection of intervals each containing at least one prime which is in those arithmetic progressions and for which we have $\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 F_p(\alpha_1) + \dots + \lambda_k F_p(\alpha_k) \neq 0$. We also derive an explicit p -adic lower bound for the previous linear form.

Keywords: Euler's factorial series, p -adic, linear form, lower bounds, explicit estimate

1 Introduction

In the eighteenth century, Leonhard Euler's studied factorial series (see. e.g. [21]). His interest of these series has also lead us to study *Euler's factorial series* which is defined as follows:

$$F(t) := {}_2F_0(1, 1|t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n!t^n.$$

Further, we write $F_p(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n!t^n$ when we consider the Euler's factorial series in p -adic domain. It is in a class of series which can be written by $\sum_{n \geq 0} a_n n!t^n$, where a_n satisfies certain properties. These series are called *F-series* and they were introduced by V. G. Chirskii [5, 6]. Euler's factorial series has also connections to quantum physics (see e.g. [4, 14]).

It is clear that using standard Archimedean metric, Euler's factorial series converges only when $t = 0$. However, using p -adic metric, the series converges for all integers t . Hence, an interesting question is, how close to zero the term $F_p(t)$ can be using p -adic metric. Or even more, if we look at a linear form

$$\Lambda_p = \lambda_0 + \lambda_1 F_p(\alpha_1) + \lambda_2 F_p(\alpha_2) + \dots + \lambda_k F_p(\alpha_k), \quad (1)$$

*The work was supported by the Emil Aaltonen Foundation.

where $k \geq 1$, numbers λ_j are integers, $\lambda_j \neq 0$ for at least one index j and numbers α_j are distinct non-zero integers, can Λ_p be zero? If not, how close is it to zero in p -adic metric?

D. Bertrand, V. G. Chirskii and J. Yebbou considered these problems for F -series over $\mathbb{K}(x)$ where \mathbb{K} is an algebraic number field over \mathbb{Q} . In 2004, they showed (see [3]) that assuming some extra conditions relating to a certain differential system, there is an infinite collection of intervals containing a prime p such that for some valuation $v \mid p$ certain linear forms of the F -series are not zero. v -adic lower bounds for the linear forms were also given and the results were effective.

Now the question is that could we prove something similar but explicit considering linear forms in Euler's factorial series. May some other conditions help us to maintain these results or be useful to obtain the results? Or do we know any more precise results about the terms $F_p(t)$ which do not equal to zero?

In 2015, V. G. Chirskii [7] proved that there exists infinitely many primes such that $F_p(1) \neq 0$. Three years later, T. Matala-aho and W. Zudilin [16] showed the following condition:

Theorem 1.1. [16, Theorem 1] *Given $t \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$, let $R \subseteq \mathbb{P}$, where \mathbb{P} denotes the set of primes, be such that*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} c^n n! \prod_{p \in R} |n!|_p^2 = 0, \quad \text{where } c = c(t; R) := 4|t| \prod_{p \in R} |t|_p^2. \quad (2)$$

Then either there exists a prime $p \in R$ for which $F_p(t)$ is irrational, or there are two distinct primes $p, q \in R$ such that $F_p(t) \neq F_q(t)$.

In 2019, A.-M. Ernvall-Hytönen, T. Matala-aho and L. Seppälä [10] studied more about these type of conditions when they considered the case where $k = 1$ and $\lambda_1 \neq 0$ in formula (1). They showed that if condition (2) is satisfied for all sets $R \setminus S$, where S is any finite subset of R , then there exists infinitely many primes $p \in R$ such that $\Lambda_p \neq 0$. This raised a question, what kind of sets could satisfy condition (2). Hence, in the same article, they showed that a set R , which consists of primes in more than $\varphi(m)/2$ residue classes in the reduced residue system modulo $m \geq 3$, satisfies the condition (2) and there are infinitely primes in R such that $\Lambda_p \neq 0$. Even more, they also proved the following, conditional result:

Theorem 1.2. [10, Theorem 8] *Assume the Generalized Riemann Hypothesis. Let $m \geq 3$ be a given integer. Assume that R is any union of primes in $\psi(m)/2$ residue classes in reduced residue system modulo m . Then there is a value d_m such that if t is any non-zero integer satisfying the bound*

$$4|t| \prod_{p \in R} |t|_p^2 < d_m,$$

then there exists a prime number $p \in R$ for which $\lambda_0 - \lambda_1 F_p(\xi) \neq 0$. Here λ_0 and $\lambda_1 \neq 0$ are fixed integers.

Further, very recently A.-M. Ernvall-Hytönen, T. Matala-aho and L. Seppälä [12] showed an explicit, p -adic lower bound for Λ_p with $k = 1$, $\lambda_1 \neq 0$ and $\alpha_1 = \pm p^a$ when p^a large enough.

In 2020, L. Seppälä [20] generalized the results for the Euler's factorial series at algebraic integer points and for linear forms Λ_p with $k \geq 1$. She showed that if a type (2) condition holds, then for some valuation v we must have $\Lambda_v \neq 0$. She also proved explicit lower bounds for $|\Lambda_v|_v$ where numbers p are in certain intervals. In addition to proving the previous results for sets of primes, L. Seppälä considered primes in arithmetic progressions. She proved that if we consider a set R which consists of primes in more than $k\varphi(m)/(k+1)$ residue classes in reduced residue system modulo m , then for some non-Archimedean valuation v satisfying $v \mid p$ for some $p \in R$, we have $\Lambda_v \neq 0$.

In this article, we first prove that if a type (2) condition holds for a set R and for Λ_p with $k \geq 1$, then $\Lambda_p \neq 0$ for some $p \in R$. This is done in Theorem 2.1 and the result is a slight improvement to Corollary 9.1 in [20]. Then, in Theorem 2.2 we prove an explicit version of Theorem 1.2 and generalize it to cases $k > 1$, too. After that, in Theorem 2.5 we show explicit p -adic lower bounds for the terms $|\Lambda_p|_p$, where numbers p are in arithmetic progressions in $k\varphi(m)/(k+1)$ residue classes up to some height which depends on the linear form. Finally, in Theorem 2.8 we prove p -adic lower bounds for $|\Lambda_p|_p$ also in the case where we take primes in arithmetic progressions in certain intervals from more than $k\varphi(m)/(k+1)$ residue classes. In addition to the main results, some corollaries for functions

$$\pi(x; m, a) := \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv a \pmod{m}}} 1, \quad \theta(x; m, a) := \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv a \pmod{m}}} \log p \quad (3)$$

and related functions are derived in Sections 4.2 and 4.3.

Throughout the article p denotes a prime number and \mathbb{P} is a set of prime numbers. We also use abbreviation GRH for the Generalized Riemann Hypothesis.

2 Results

In this section, we describe the main results.

Before the actual results, we describe some definitions and notations. First we define terms c_1 and c_2 for integers $k, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ and set R :

$$c_1 := c_1(\bar{\alpha}) = 2^k \left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \{|\alpha_j|\} \right)^k \quad \text{and} \quad c_2 := c_2(\bar{\alpha}; R) := c_1 \prod_{p \in R} \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \{|\alpha_i|_p\} \right)^{k+1}. \quad (4)$$

Further, in Table 1 we define numbers $a_1(m, k)$ and $a_2(m)$ for different integers m .

m	$a_1(m, k)$	$a_2(m)$
$3 \leq m \leq 432$	$e^{-4.017\varphi(m)k}$	$\log(\max\{m, \sqrt{1865}\}) + 4.017$
$433 \leq m \leq 10^5$	$e^{-k(12.650\varphi(m)+0.292)}$	$\log m + \frac{0.292}{\varphi(m)} + 12.650$
$10^5 < m < 4 \cdot 10^5$	$e^{-k(8.184\varphi(m)+0.052)}$	$\log m + \frac{0.052}{\varphi(m)} + 8.184$
$4 \cdot 10^5 \leq m < 10^{29}$	$e^{-k(5.563\varphi(m)+0.032)}$	$\log m + \frac{0.032}{\varphi(m)} + 5.563$
$m \geq 10^{29}$	$e^{-k(2.897\varphi(m)+0.001)}$	$\log m + \frac{0.001}{\varphi(m)} + 2.897$

Table 1: Definitions for $a_1(m, k)$ and $a_2(m)$ for different integers m .

The first result tells that if a certain condition holds, then a linear form of functions F_p must be non-zero.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $k \geq 1$ be an integer and let $\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$ be integers such that $\lambda_i \neq 0$ for at least one index i . Further, assume that numbers $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_k$ are non-zero integers. Let R be a non-empty set of prime numbers such that condition*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} c_2(\bar{\alpha}; R)^n (kn + k)! \cdot (kn + k) \prod_{p \in R} |(kn)!n!|_p = 0 \quad (5)$$

holds. Then for at least one prime number $p \in R$ we have $\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 F_p(\alpha_1) + \dots + \lambda_k F_p(\alpha_k) \neq 0$.

The previous result raises a question for what kind of non-empty set the condition (5). Next we prove that primes in enough many arithmetic progressions satisfy the condition if one extra assumption for number c_2 is assumed.

Theorem 2.2. Assume that $k \geq 1$, $m \geq 3$ and $\lambda_0, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k$ be integers such that $\lambda_j \neq 0$ for at least one index j . Even more, assume also that GRH holds. Further, suppose that R is any union of primes in $k\psi(m)/(k+1)$ residue classes in the reduced residue system modulo m .

If $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_k$ are any non-zero integers for which $c_2(\bar{\alpha}; R)$ satisfies the bound

$$c_2(\bar{\alpha}; R) < \frac{a_1(m, k)}{(ke)^k} e^{-k\varphi(m) \log(\max\{m, \sqrt{1865}\})}, \quad (6)$$

where we denote $\bar{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_k)$, then there exists a prime number $p \in R$ for which

$$\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 F_p(\alpha_1) + \dots + \lambda_k F_p(\alpha_k) \neq 0.$$

Remark 2.3. We notice that there actually are sets R such that condition (6) holds: For example, let $k = 1$, $m = 3$, R containing all primes which are congruent to 1 modulo 3 and $\alpha_1 = \alpha_k = p \in R$ such that $p > 3760e^{9.034}$. Then inequality (6) is satisfied.

Remark 2.4. It is essential to use number c_2 given in (4) instead of number c_2 in [20, Theorem 3.1] since the later one is always at least one and the upper bound obtained in Theorem 2.2 is smaller than one. This also justifies the need to prove Theorem 2.1.

Since the previous theorem tells us that under certain conditions there is a prime such that a linear form does not equal to zero, a natural question is, how close it is to zero and how large the possible prime number is. To answer this question, we first denote

$$(A_1(m, k), A_2(m, k)) \quad (7)$$

$$:= \begin{cases} (27.640k\varphi(m) + 40.160k + 0.054, 0.017k^2 + 0.033k + 0.011) & \text{if } 3 \leq m \leq 60 \\ ((0.001\varphi(m) + 1.502)k, 0.373k^2 + 0.741k + 0.191) & \text{if } m \geq 61 \end{cases},$$

and $D(m, k, \bar{\alpha}; R) := -(\log c_2(\bar{\alpha}; R) + k(\log k + a_2(m)\varphi(m) + 1))$. Now we are ready to describe the next result:

Theorem 2.5. Assume that numbers k, λ_j and m and set R are defined as in Theorem 2.2. Assume also GRH and that $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_k$ are pairwise distinct non-zero integers such that $c(\bar{\alpha}; R')$, where

$$R' := R \cap \left[2, k \left(\max\{1865, m^{\varphi(m)}, \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \{|\alpha_j|\} + 2\} \right) \right],$$

is smaller than the right-hand side of inequality (6). Suppose also that $\max_{0 \leq i \leq k} \{|\lambda_i|\} \leq H$, where

$$\frac{\log H}{D(m, k, \bar{\alpha}; R')} \geq \max \left\{ 1866, m^{\varphi(m)} + 1, \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \{|\alpha_j|\} + 1, e^{\frac{2A_1(m, k)}{D(m, k, \bar{\alpha}; R')} + 1} \right\}. \quad (8)$$

Further, let us also denote the set

$$R \cap \left[2, \frac{2k \log H}{D(m, k, \bar{\alpha}; R')} + 2k \right) \quad (9)$$

by R'' .

Then, for some $p \in R''$ we have

$$|\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 F_p(\alpha_1) + \dots + \lambda_k F_p(\alpha_k)|_p > H^{-\left(\frac{k^2 \log \log H}{D(m, k, \bar{\alpha}; R')} - \frac{k^2 \log D(m, k, \bar{\alpha}; R') + 2k^2 + 3k \log 2 - 2k}{D(m, k, \bar{\alpha}; R')} + \frac{2k^2 A_1(m, k)}{D(m, k, \bar{\alpha}; R')^2} + A_2(m, k) \right)}.$$

Remark 2.6. According to Remark 2.3, taking suitable numbers α_j and a large enough H it is possible to find number $c_2(\bar{\alpha}; R')$ such that inequality (6) holds and bound (8) is satisfied.

The previous lower bound is quite long and includes the term $D(m, k, \bar{\alpha}; R')$ which may be a little bit more difficult to determine. Hence, we prove a little bit weaker but a more simple result. First, we denote

$$C_1(m, k) := \begin{cases} 0.0004k^2 + 0.039k + 0.0004 & \text{if } 3 \leq m \leq 60 \\ 0.066k^2 + 2.895k + 0.056 & \text{if } m \geq 61 \end{cases}$$

and then describe the result:

Corollary 2.7. Let us use the same definitions and assumptions as in Theorem 2.5. Then, for some prime number $p \in R'$ we have

$$|\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 F_p(\alpha_1) + \lambda_2 F_p(\alpha_2) + \dots + \lambda_k F_p(\alpha_k)|_p > H^{-C_1(m, k)(\log \log H)^2}.$$

m	$A_3(m, k)$	$A_4(m)$	$C_2(m, k, \varepsilon)$
$3 \leq m \leq 43$	$15.480k + 16.480$	3.275	$\frac{50.697k^2 + 53.972k}{\varepsilon} + 3.710k^2 - 2.538k$
$44 \leq m \leq 60$	$5.401k + 6.401$	9.855	$\frac{53.227k^2 + 63.082k}{\varepsilon} + 11.152k^2 - 7.650k$
$61 \leq m \leq 432$	$4.955k + 5.955$	11.302	$\frac{56.002k^2 + 67.304k}{\varepsilon} + 11.457k^2 - 11.040k$
$433 \leq m \leq 10^5$	$7.169k + 8.169$	6.620	$\frac{47.459k^2 + 54.079k}{\varepsilon} + 6.636k^2 - 6.593k$
$10^5 < m < 4 \cdot 10^5$	$4.422k + 5.422$	13.852	$\frac{61.254k^2 + 75.106k}{\varepsilon} + 13.853k^2 - 13.851k$
$4 \cdot 10^5 \leq m < 10^{29}$	$3.863k + 4.863$	18.124	$\frac{70.014k^2 + 88.138k}{\varepsilon} + 18.125k^2 - 18.123k$
$m \geq 10^{29}$	$3.192k + 4.192$	27.692	$\frac{88.393k^2 + 116.085k}{\varepsilon} + 27.693k^2 - 27.691k$

Table 2: Definitions for $A_3(m, k)$, $A_4(m, k)$ and $C_2(m, k, \varepsilon)$ for different values m .

However, in the last two results the exponent of H goes to minus infinity when H goes to infinity. We would like to get an exponent which does not go to minus infinity when H goes to infinity. Hence, as a final main result, we prove that if we consider more than $k\varphi(m)/(k+1)$ residue classes, then under certain conditions we obtain the lower bound we wanted:

Theorem 2.8. Assume that m, k and $\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_k$ satisfy the same hypothesis as in Theorem 2.2 and let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ be distinct non-zero integers. Assume also GRH and that $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ is a real number, set R consists of primes in arithmetic progressions in at least $(k + \varepsilon)\varphi(m)/(k + 1)$ residue classes modulo m and that we have $\max_{0 \leq i \leq k} \{|\lambda_i|\} \leq H$ where

$$\frac{\log H}{\varepsilon} \geq se^s \quad (10)$$

and

$$s \geq \max \left\{ 1866, m^{\varphi(m)} + 1, c_1 + 1, \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \{|\alpha_j|\} + 1, \left(\frac{A_3(m, k)}{\varepsilon} \right)^{1.6} + 1 \right\}. \quad (11)$$

Then there exists a prime

$$p \in R \cap \left(\log \left(\frac{\log H}{\varepsilon \log \left(\frac{\log H}{\varepsilon} \right)} \right), k \left(\frac{A_4(m) \log H}{\varepsilon \log \left(\frac{\log H}{\varepsilon} \right)} + 2 \right) \right) \quad (12)$$

such that

$$|\lambda_0 + \lambda_1 F_p(\alpha_1) + \lambda_2 F_p(\alpha_2) + \dots + \lambda_k F_p(\alpha_k)|_p > H^{-\left(\frac{k}{\varepsilon} + 1\right) - \frac{C_2(m, k, \varepsilon) \log \log \log H}{\varepsilon \log \log H}}.$$

3 Outline of the proofs

In this section, we describe the main idea of the proofs. The idea is to estimate functions $F(\alpha_j)$ using Padé approximations and then obtain the main results applying these approximations. Similar ideas have been used, for example, in articles [10, 15, 20].

We use Padé approximations to estimate the functions $F(\alpha_j)$ and write

$$B_{n,\mu,0}(t)F(\alpha_j t) - B_{n,\mu,j}(t) = S_{n,\mu,j}(t)$$

for each $j = 1, 2, \dots, k$. Further, we write

$$B_{n,\mu,0}(1)\Lambda_p = \sum_{j=0}^k \lambda_j B_{n,\mu,j}(1) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j S_{n,\mu,j}(1) := T(n, \mu) + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j S_{n,\mu,j}(1). \quad (13)$$

Now, let now R be a set of certain primes in arithmetic progressions. It is clearly non-empty in Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 and it is proved to be non-empty in Theorems 2.5 and 2.8 (see Section 4.4). If we have $\Lambda_p = 0$ for all $p \in R$ (i.e. contradiction to Theorem 2.1), from which it follows that

$$|T(n+1, \mu)|_p = \left| \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j S_{n+1,\mu,j}(1) \right|_p,$$

or if we have

$$|B_{n+1,\mu,0}(1)\Lambda_p|_p \leq \left| \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j S_{n+1,\mu,j}(1) \right|_p \quad (14)$$

for all $p \in R$, then estimate

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= |T(n+1, \mu)| \prod_{p \in R} |T(n+1, \mu)|_p \leq |T(n+1, \mu)| \prod_{p \in R} |T(n+1, \mu)|_p \\ &\leq (k+1) \max_{0 \leq i \leq k} \{|\lambda_i|\} \max_{0 \leq i \leq k} \{|B_{n+1,\mu,i}(1)|\} \cdot \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \left\{ \prod_{p \in R} |S_{n+1,\mu,i}(1)|_p \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

holds. In order to prove Theorems 2.1, 2.5 and 2.8 and Corollary 2.7, we show that the right-hand side of inequality (15) is smaller than 1 for some integer n when μ is selected in such a way that $T(n+1, \mu) \neq 0$ (see [20, Lemma 6.2]). This is a contradiction. Hence neither $\Lambda_p = 0$ nor inequality (14) cannot hold for all $p \in R$. The first one proves Theorem 2.1 and Theorem 2.2 follows from that.

Now, in order to prove Theorems 2.5 and 2.8 and Corollary 2.7 we still have to do a little bit more work. Since there must exist $p \in R$ for which inequality (14) cannot hold, we must have

$$1 \leq |T(n+1, \mu)| |T(n+1, \mu)|_p = |T(n+1, \mu)| |B_{n+1,\mu,0}(1)\Lambda_p|_p \leq |T(n+1, \mu)| |\Lambda_p|_p. \quad (16)$$

Hence, in order to find lower bounds for the terms $|\Lambda_p|_p$, it is sufficient to find an upper bound for the term $|T(n, \mu)|$.

The estimates for the Padé approximations are derived in Section 4.1. In Sections 4.2 and 4.3 we prove some results related to primes in arithmetic progressions which are used later in our main proofs. In Section 4.4, we show that there exist primes in sets (9) and (12) in Theorems 2.5 and 2.8. In Sections 5 and 6, we prove Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 respectively. In Sections 7.1 and 8.1 we show the contradictions that the right-hand side of inequality (15) must be smaller than one, first in a setup of Theorem 2.5 and then with respect to Theorem 2.8. Finally, in Sections 7.2 and 8.2, we prove Theorems 2.5 and 2.8 and Corollary 2.7.

4 Preliminary estimates

4.1 Estimates for Padé approximations

In this section, we consider Padé approximations for the Euler factorial series and prove estimates for them.

First we give formulas for Padé approximations and then derive some upper bounds for them. The following function is used in the definitions:

$$\sigma_i := \sigma_i(n, \bar{\alpha}) = (-1)^i \sum_{\substack{i_1 + \dots + i_k = i \\ 0 \leq i_j \leq n}} \binom{n}{i_1} \binom{n}{i_2} \cdots \binom{n}{i_k} \alpha_1^{n-i_1} \alpha_2^{n-i_2} \cdots \alpha_k^{n-i_k}. \quad (17)$$

Now we describe the Padé approximations we are going to use:

Theorem 4.1. [20, Theorem 4.2 and Section 4.2] *Let μ, k, α_i be defined as Theorem 2.5 and assume that $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Then we have*

$$B_{n,\mu,0}(t)F(\alpha_j t) - B_{n,\mu,j}(t) = S_{n,\mu,j}(t), \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, k,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} B_{n,\mu,0}(t) &= \sum_{i=0}^{kn} \sigma_i \cdot \frac{(kn + \mu)!}{(i + \mu)!} t^{kn-i} \\ B_{n,\mu,j}(t) &= (kn + \mu)! \sum_{N=0}^{kn+\mu-1} t^N \sum_{h=0}^{\min\{kn, N\}} \sigma_{kn-h} \cdot \frac{(N-h)!}{(kn + \mu - h)!} \cdot \alpha_j^{N-h} \\ S_{n,\mu,j}(t) &= (kn + \mu)! n! t^{(k+1)n+\mu} \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} h! \binom{n+h}{h} \alpha_j^{n+h+\mu} t^h \sum_{i=0}^{kn} \sigma_i \binom{i + \mu + n + h}{i + \mu} \alpha_j^i. \end{aligned}$$

Next we estimate the approximations. In order to do it, we need the following lemma:

Lemma 4.2. [20, Lemma 4.1, estimate (15)] *Let k be defined as Theorem 2.5, $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and $\sigma_i(n, \bar{\alpha})$ be defined as in (17). Then we have*

$$\sum_{i=1}^{kn} |\sigma_i(n, \bar{\alpha})| t^i \leq \prod_{i=1}^k (|\alpha_i| + t)^n.$$

Now we are ready to estimate the Padé approximations:

Lemma 4.3. *Let μ, k, α_i be defined as Theorem 2.5, assume that $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and let terms $B_{n,\mu,0}(1), B_{n,\mu,j}(1)$ and $S_{n,\mu,j}(1)$ be as in Theorem 4.1. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} |B_{n,\mu,0}(1)| &\leq (kn)! \binom{kn + \mu}{\mu} \prod_{i=1}^k (|\alpha_i| + 1)^n, \\ |B_{n,\mu,j}(1)| &\leq (kn + \mu)! \cdot (kn + k) \cdot |\alpha_j|^{k-1} \prod_{i=1}^k (|\alpha_i| + |\alpha_j|)^n \\ \text{and } |S_{n,\mu,j}(1)|_p &\leq |(kn + \mu)! n!|_p \cdot \left(\max\{|\alpha_j|_p\} \right)^{(k+1)n}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The estimate for the term $B_{n,\mu,0}(1)$ follows from [20, Section 7]. So let us move on to estimate the term $B_{n,\mu,j}(1)$. Using Lemma 4.2 we can deduce

$$\begin{aligned} |B_{n,\mu,j}(1)| &= \left| (kn + \mu)! \sum_{N=0}^{kn+\mu-1} \sum_{h=0}^{\min\{kn,N\}} \sigma_{kn-h} \cdot \frac{(N-h)!}{(kn+\mu-h)!} \cdot \alpha_j^{N-h} \right| \\ &\leq (kn + \mu)! \sum_{N=0}^{kn+\mu-1} |\alpha_j|^{N-kn} \sum_{h=0}^{\min\{kn,N\}} |\sigma_{kn-h}| \cdot |\alpha_j|^{kn-h} \\ &\leq (kn + \mu)! \cdot (kn + k) \cdot |\alpha_j|^{k-1} \prod_{i=1}^k (|\alpha_i| + |\alpha_j|)^n, \end{aligned}$$

which proves the second case.

Now we have only the term $S_{n,\mu,j}(1)$ left. Keeping in mind that the numbers $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_k$ are integers and using the estimate

$$|\sigma_i|_p = \left| \sum_{i_1+\dots+i_k=i} \binom{n}{i_1} \binom{n}{i_2} \cdots \binom{n}{i_k} \alpha_1^{n-i_1} \alpha_2^{n-i_2} \cdots \alpha_k^{n-i_k} \right|_p \leq \left(\max\{|\alpha_j|_p\} \right)^{kn-i},$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} |S_{n,\mu,j}(1)|_p &= \left| (kn + \mu)! n! \sum_{h=0}^{\infty} h! \binom{n+h}{h} \alpha_j^{n+h+\mu} \sum_{i=0}^{kn} \sigma_i \binom{i+\mu+n+h}{i+\mu} \alpha_j^i \right|_p \\ &\leq |(kn + \mu)! n!|_p \cdot \max_{\substack{0 \leq h < \infty, \\ 0 \leq i \leq kn}} \left| h! \binom{n+h}{h} \binom{i+\mu+n+h}{i+\mu} \right|_p \left(\max\{|\alpha_j|_p\} \right)^{(k+1)n+\mu} \\ &\leq |(kn + \mu)! n!|_p \cdot \left(\max\{|\alpha_j|_p\} \right)^{(k+1)n}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence we have proved the estimate for the term $S_{n,\mu,j}(1)$ too. \square

4.2 Estimates for the functions $\pi(x; m, a)$ and $\theta(x; m, a)$

In this section we derive estimates for primes in arithmetic progressions and for related functions. Indeed, we consider functions $\pi(x; m, a)$ and $\theta(x; m, a)$ which are given in (3). The estimates are later used in Section 4.3 to derive estimates for sum sums which are used to prove the main results.

First, we mention three results which are used to prove our estimates for functions $\pi(x; m, a)$ and $\theta(x; m, a)$:

Theorem 4.4. [13, Theorem 1] *Assume the GRH. Let a and m be integers and x be a real number such that $\gcd(a, m) = 1$, $m \geq 3$ and $x \geq m$. Then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \pi(x; m, a) - \frac{\text{li}(x)}{\varphi(m)} \right| &< \left(\frac{1}{8\pi\varphi(m)} + \frac{1}{6\pi} \right) \sqrt{x} \log x + (0.184 \log m + 8.396) \sqrt{x} \\ &+ (6.05 \log m + 158.745) \frac{\sqrt{x}}{\log x} + (5.048 \log^2 m + 152.085 \log m + 1731.270) \frac{\sqrt{x}}{\log^2 x} \\ &+ (0.184 \log m + 8.250) x^{1/4} \log \log x + (5.254 \log^2 m + 121.765 \log m + 939.260) x^{1/4} \\ &+ (80.768 \log^2 m + 1753.168 \log m + 11605.056) \frac{\sqrt{x}}{\log^3 x} - 237.934. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4.5. [18, Theorem 15, estimates (3.41) and (3.42)] Let a be an integer and γ be Euler's constant. For $3 \leq a$ we have

$$\frac{a}{\varphi(a)} < e^\gamma \log \log a + \frac{5}{2 \log \log a}$$

except when $a = 223\,092\,870 = 2 \cdot 3 \cdot 5 \cdot 7 \cdot 11 \cdot 13 \cdot 17 \cdot 19 \cdot 23$ in which case we have

$$\frac{a}{\varphi(a)} < e^\gamma \log \log a + \frac{5}{2.50637 \log \log a}.$$

Corollary 4.6. Let $a \geq 3$, $a \notin \{3, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 18, 20, 24, 30, 36, 42, 60\}$ be an integer. Then $\varphi(a) > a^{0.7}$.

Proof. Let us first assume that $a \geq 209$. Then $5/(2 \log \log a) < 0.5e^\gamma \log \log a$, $1.5e^\gamma \log \log a < a^{0.3}$ and by Lemma 4.5 the claim holds for $a \geq 209$. Further, when we check numerically the cases $a \leq 208$, we see that the claim holds also in this case. \square

Now we denote

$$a_3(m) := 0.184 \log m + \begin{cases} 19.795 + \frac{27.414}{\varphi(m)} & \text{if } 3 \leq m \leq 432 \\ 8.779 + \frac{6.492}{\varphi(m)} & \text{if } 433 \leq m \leq 10^5 \\ 8.401 + \frac{6.056}{\varphi(m)} & \text{if } 10^5 < m < 4 \cdot 10^5 \\ 8.398 + \frac{6.053}{\varphi(m)} & \text{if } 4 \cdot 10^5 \leq m < 10^{29} \\ 8.397 + \frac{6.051}{\varphi(m)} & \text{if } m \geq 10^{29} \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

and prove an estimate for $\pi(x; m, a)$ when x is large enough with respect to m :

Lemma 4.7. Suppose the same assumptions as in Theorem 4.4. Assume also that $x \geq \max\{m^{\varphi(m)}, 1865\}$. Then

$$\left| \pi(x; m, a) - \frac{\text{li}(x)}{\varphi(m)} \right| \leq \left(\frac{1}{8\pi\varphi(m)} + \frac{1}{6\pi} \right) \sqrt{x} \log x + a_3(m)\sqrt{x} - 237.934.$$

Proof. Let us first consider case $3 \leq m \leq 10^5$ and $x \leq 10^{11}$. Since $\varphi(m) < m \leq 10^5$ and $x \geq 1865$, by [2, Theorem 1.9] we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \pi(x; m, a) - \frac{\text{li}(x)}{\varphi(m)} \right| &\leq \frac{\text{li}(2)}{\varphi(m)} + 2.734 \frac{\sqrt{x}}{\log x} \leq \left(\frac{1}{8\pi\varphi(m)} + \frac{1}{6\pi} \right) \sqrt{x} \log x \\ &+ \sqrt{x} \left(\frac{\text{li}(2)}{\sqrt{1865} \cdot 10^5} - \frac{\log 1865}{8\pi \cdot 10^5} + \frac{2.734}{\log 1865} - \frac{\log 1865}{6\pi} + \frac{237.934}{\sqrt{1865}} \right) - 237.934 \\ &< \left(\frac{1}{8\pi\varphi(m)} + \frac{1}{6\pi} \right) \sqrt{x} \log x + 5.474\sqrt{x} - 237.934. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Let us now consider the rest of the cases.

The rest of the cases follow easily from Theorem 4.4: Using the theorem and the assumption $x \geq m^{\varphi(m)}$, we can deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \pi(x; m, a) - \frac{\text{li}(x)}{\varphi(m)} \right| &< \left(\frac{1}{8\pi\varphi(m)} + \frac{1}{6\pi} \right) \sqrt{x} \log x + \left(0.184 \log m + 8.396 + \frac{6.05}{\varphi(m)} \right. \\ &\left. + \frac{5.048}{\varphi(m)^2} \right) \sqrt{x} + \left(158.745 + \frac{152.085}{\varphi(m)} + \frac{80.768}{\varphi(m)^2} \right) \frac{\sqrt{x}}{\log x} + \left(1731.270 + \frac{1753.168}{\varphi(m)} \right) \frac{\sqrt{x}}{\log^2 x} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + 11605.056 \frac{\sqrt{x}}{\log^3 x} + \left(\frac{0.184}{\varphi(m)} \log x + 8.250 \right) x^{1/4} \log \log x \\
& + \left(\frac{5.254}{\varphi(m)^2} \log^2 x + \frac{121.765}{\varphi(m)} \log x + 939.26 \right) x^{1/4} - 237.934.
\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Let us start first consider the case $3 \leq m \leq 432$. We have $\varphi(m) \geq 2$ and $x \geq 10^{11} + 1$, since we have already considered the case $x \leq 10^{11}$. Using decreasing functions and estimate (20), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \pi(x; m, a) - \frac{\text{li}(x)}{\varphi(m)} \right| & \leq \left(\frac{1}{8\pi\varphi(m)} + \frac{1}{6\pi} \right) \sqrt{x} \log x \\
& + \left(0.184 \log m + 19.795 + \frac{27.414}{\varphi(m)} \right) \sqrt{x} - 237.934.
\end{aligned}$$

Comparing this estimate to the case $x \leq 10^{11}$ (see estimate (19)), we see that the previous estimate applies also to the case $x \leq 10^{11}$.

The cases $433 \leq m \leq 10^5$, $10^5 < m < 4 \cdot 10^5$, $4 \cdot 10^5 \leq m < 10^{29}$ and $m \geq 10^{29}$ can be proved similarly as the previous case but in these cases, by Corollary 4.6 we use lower bound $m^{m^{0.7}}$ for x instead of $10^{11} + 1$. \square

Remark 4.8. *In the previous result, the result is divided to different cases with respect to number m . These cases come from the cases which we use in Lemma 4.10.*

Next we prove estimates for function $\theta(x; m, a)$. In order to prove those estimates, we use function

$$\psi(x; m, a) := \sum_{\substack{p^k \leq x \\ p^k \equiv a \pmod{m}}} \log p$$

and with notation $\text{GRH}(m, \text{div})$ we mean that the Generalized Riemann Hypothesis holds for Dirichlet characters modulo m and all moduli dividing m .

First, we mention a useful estimate for the function $\psi(x; m, a)$:

Theorem 4.9. *[13, Theorem 3] Let $x \geq 2$ be a real number and $m \geq 3$ and a , where $\gcd(a, m) = 1$, be integers. Assume $\text{GRH}(m, \text{div})$. We have*

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \psi(x; m, a) - \frac{x}{\varphi(m)} \right| & < \left(\frac{1}{8\pi\varphi(m)} + \frac{1}{6\pi} \right) \sqrt{x} \log^2 x + (0.184 \log m + 8.250) \sqrt{x} \log x \\
& + (5.314 \log m + 124.318) \sqrt{x} + (5.048 \log^2 m + 109.573 \log m + 725.316) \frac{\sqrt{x}}{\log x} \\
& + (2.015 \log m + 0.5) \log x + R(m),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$R(m) = \begin{cases} 0.014\sqrt{m} \log m + 0.034\sqrt{m} + 3.679 \log m + 263.886 & \text{if } 3 \leq m < 4 \cdot 10^5 \\ 1.858 \log^2 m + 3.679 \log m + 104.626 & \text{if } 4 \cdot 10^5 \leq m < 10^{29} \\ (0.297 \log \log m + 0.603) \log^2 m + 3.679 \log m + 104.626 & \text{if } m \geq 10^{29}. \end{cases}$$

Now we denote

$$a_4(m) := \begin{cases} 0.129, & \text{if } 3 \leq m \leq 432 \\ \frac{1}{8\pi\varphi(m)} + 1.384, & \text{if } 433 \leq m \leq 10^5 \\ \frac{1}{8\pi\varphi(m)} + 4.120, & \text{if } 10^5 < m < 4 \cdot 10^5 \\ \frac{1}{8\pi\varphi(m)} + 3.440, & \text{if } 4 \cdot 10^5 \leq m < 10^{29} \\ \frac{1}{8\pi\varphi(m)} + 0.571, & \text{if } m \geq 10^{29} \end{cases}.$$

and move on to estimate function $\theta(x; m, a)$.

Lemma 4.10. *Let x, m and a be as in Theorem 4.9 and let also $x \geq \max\{\sqrt{1865}, m\}$. Assume that the GRH(m, div). Then we have*

$$\left| \theta(x; m, a) - \frac{x}{\varphi(m)} \right| \leq a_4(m) \sqrt{x} \log^2 x.$$

Proof. First we notice that as in the third paragraph of the proof of Theorem 1 in [13], we have

$$0 \leq \psi(x; m, a) - \theta(x; m, a) < 1.4262 \sqrt{x}. \quad (21)$$

Hence we can use estimate given in Theorem 4.9. Since the formula is quite long and since we also know sharper estimates in some special cases, we would like to simplify the result and we divide the proof to different cases depending on the number m .

Let us first consider the case $3 \leq m \leq 72$. First, if $\sqrt{1865} \leq x \leq 10^{10}$, then by [17, Table 2] we have

$$\left| \theta(x; m, a) - \frac{x}{\varphi(m)} \right| < 1.817557 \sqrt{x} \leq \frac{1.817557}{(\log \sqrt{1865})^2} \sqrt{x} \log^2 x < 0.129 \sqrt{x} \log^2 x.$$

Similarly, if $x \geq 10^{10}$, then by [9, Corollary 3.3] and estimate (21), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \theta(x; m, a) - \frac{x}{\varphi(m)} \right| &< \frac{11}{32\pi} \sqrt{x} \log^2 x + 1.4262 \sqrt{x} = \left(\frac{11}{32\pi} + \frac{1.4262}{(\log(10^{10}))^2} \right) \sqrt{x} \log^2 x \\ &< 0.113 \sqrt{x} \log^2 x. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Since $0.113 < 0.129$, we can use the first estimate also in the case $x \geq 10^{10}$.

Let us now consider the case $73 \leq m \leq 10^5$. By [2, Theorem 1.9]

$$\left| \theta(x; m, a) - \frac{x}{\varphi(m)} \right| < 2.072 \sqrt{x} \leq \frac{2.072}{(\log 73)^2} \sqrt{x} \log^2 x < 0.113 \sqrt{x} \log^2 x \quad (23)$$

for $x \leq 10^{11}$. Further, if $x \geq 10^{11}$ and $m \leq 432$, then by estimate (21) and [9, Theorem 3.7], we get

$$\left| \theta(x; m, a) - \frac{x}{\varphi(m)} \right| < 1.4262 \sqrt{x} + \frac{11}{32\pi} \sqrt{x} \log^2 x < 0.112 \sqrt{x} \log^2 x. \quad (24)$$

Hence, in the cases $3 \leq m \leq 432$ we can use the coefficient 0.129. However, we still have to consider cases $433 \leq m$ and $10^{11} < x$ as well as $m > 10^5$.

For the rest of the cases we apply Theorem 4.9. Using Theorem 4.9 and estimate (21) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \theta(x; m, a) - \frac{x}{\varphi(m)} \right| &< \left(\frac{1}{8\pi\varphi(m)} + \frac{1}{6\pi} + 0.184 \right) \sqrt{x} \log^2 x \\ &+ (8.250 + 5.314 + 5.048) \sqrt{x} \log x + (124.318 + 109.573 + 1.4262) \sqrt{x} \\ &+ 725.316 \frac{\sqrt{x}}{\log x} + 2.015 \log^2 x + 0.5 \log x + R(x) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{8\pi\varphi(m)} + \frac{1}{6\pi} + 0.184 \right) \sqrt{x} \log^2 x + 18.612 \sqrt{x} \log x + 235.3172 \sqrt{x} \\ &+ 725.316 \frac{\sqrt{x}}{\log x} + 2.015 \log^2 x + 0.5 \log x + R(x), \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where $R(x)$ is interpreted by setting $m = x$ to the formulas but using different cases depending on the number m , not by the number x . We divide consideration to four different cases depending on the size of the number m .

Let us first consider the case $433 \leq m \leq 10^5$ and $x \geq 10^{11}$. Using functions which are decreasing for all $x \geq 10^{11}$, by estimate (25) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \theta(x; m, a) - \frac{x}{\varphi(m)} \right| &< \frac{\sqrt{x} \log^2 x}{8\pi\varphi(m)} + \left(\frac{1}{6\pi} + \frac{18.626}{\log(10^{11} + 1)} + \frac{235.3512}{(\log(10^{11} + 1))^2} + \frac{725.316}{(\log(10^{11} + 1))^3} \right. \\ &+ 0.184 + \frac{2.015}{\sqrt{10^{11} + 1}} + \frac{4.179}{\sqrt{10^{11} + 1} \log(10^{11} + 1)} + \left. \frac{263.886}{\sqrt{10^{11} + 1} (\log(10^{11} + 1))^2} \right) \sqrt{x} \log^2 x \\ &< \left(\frac{1}{8\pi\varphi(m)} + 1.384 \right) \sqrt{x} \log^2 x. \end{aligned}$$

Together with estimate (23) this leads to an estimate in the case $433 \leq m \leq 10^5$. Even more, using $10^5 + 1$ instead of $10^{11} + 1$, we get the wanted estimate for the case $10^5 < m < 4 \cdot 10^5$. The cases $4 \cdot 10^5 \leq m < 10^{29}$ and $m \geq 10^{29}$ can be proved similarly but we use the second and the last formulas for $R(x)$ from Theorem 4.9 instead of the last one and values $4 \cdot 10^5$ and 10^{29} for x . \square

In some of the results we are going to prove in the next section, it is used that $x \geq \max\{m^{\varphi(m)}, 1865\}$. Hence we define

$$a_5(m) := \begin{cases} 0.113 & \text{if } 3 \leq m \leq 432 \\ \frac{1}{8\pi\varphi(m)} + 0.076 & \text{if } 433 \leq m \leq 10^5 \\ \frac{1}{8\pi\varphi(m)} + 0.054 & \text{if } m > 10^5 \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

and prove the following estimate for $\theta(x; m, a)$ when $x \geq \max\{m^{\varphi(m)}, 1865\}$:

Lemma 4.11. *Let x, m and a be as in Theorem 4.9 and let also $x \geq \max\{m^{\varphi(m)}, 1865\}$. Assume $GRH(m, \text{div})$. Then we have*

$$\left| \theta(x; m, a) - \frac{x}{\varphi(m)} \right| < a_5(m) \sqrt{x} \log^2 x.$$

Proof. The claim follows similarly as the results in Lemma 4.7 and Lemma 4.10:

Let us first consider the case $3 \leq m \leq 432$ and assume that $3 \leq m \leq 72$. If $1865 \leq x \leq 10^{10}$, then by [17, Table 2] we have

$$\left| \theta(x; m, a) - \frac{x}{\varphi(m)} \right| < 1.817557 \sqrt{x} \leq \frac{1.817557}{\log^2 1865} \sqrt{x} \log^2 x < 0.033 \sqrt{x} \log^2 x.$$

For the case $x \geq 10^{10}$ we can use estimate (22) which gives 0.113 and by estimates (23) and (24) this coefficient can be used also in the case $73 \leq m \leq 432$.

Now we move on to the cases $m \geq 433$. Using Theorem 4.9, estimate (21) and the assumption $x \geq m^{\varphi(m)}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \theta(x; m, a) - \frac{x}{\varphi(m)} \right| &< \left(\frac{1}{8\pi\varphi(m)} + \frac{1}{6\pi} + \frac{0.184}{\varphi(m)} \right) \sqrt{x} \log^2 x + \sqrt{x} \log x \left(8.250 + \frac{5.314}{\varphi(m)} \right. \\ &+ \left. \frac{5.048}{\varphi(m)^2} \right) + \left(125.7442 + \frac{109.573}{\varphi(m)} \right) \sqrt{x} + 725.316 \frac{\sqrt{x}}{\log x} + \frac{2.015}{\varphi(m)} \log^2 x + 0.5 \log x + R(\sqrt{x}), \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where $R(\sqrt{x})$ is interpreted similarly as in the similar step in the proof of Lemma 4.10.

Let us now assume that $433 \leq m \leq 10^5$. Since by assumptions and Corollary 4.6 $x \geq m^{\varphi(m)} > m^{m^{0.7}} \geq 433^{433^{0.7}}$, using functions which are decreasing for all x in consideration, the right-hand side of estimate (27) is

$$\begin{aligned}
&< \frac{\sqrt{x} \log^2 x}{8\pi\varphi(m)} + \left(\frac{0.184}{433^{0.7}} + \frac{8.250 + 5.314/433^{0.7} + 5.048/433^{1.4}}{433^{0.7} \log 433} + \frac{125.7442 + 109.573/433^{0.7}}{(433^{0.7} \log 433)^2} \right. \\
&+ \frac{1}{6\pi} + \frac{725.316}{(433^{0.7} \log 433)^3} + \frac{0.007}{(433^{433^{0.7}})^{1/4} 433^{0.7} \log 433} + \frac{0.034}{(433^{433^{0.7}})^{1/4} (433^{0.7} \log 433)^2} \\
&+ \left. \frac{2.015}{\sqrt{433^{433^{0.7}}}} + \frac{0.5 + 3.679/2}{\sqrt{433^{433^{0.7}} \cdot 433^{0.7} \log 433}} + \frac{263.886}{\sqrt{433^{433^{0.7}} (433^{0.7} \log 433)^2}} \right) \sqrt{x} \log^2 x \\
&< \left(\frac{1}{8\pi\varphi(m)} + 0.076 \right) \sqrt{x} \log^2 x.
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, replacing 433 with $10^5 + 1$, we get an estimate for the case $10^5 < m < 4 \cdot 10^5$. Even more, the estimate for the last case follow similarly when we consider cases $4 \cdot 10^5 \leq m < 10^{29}$ and $m \geq 10^{29}$ using their respective functions $R(\sqrt{x})$. \square

4.3 Estimates for some functions depending on the functions $\pi(x; m, a)$ and $\theta(x; m, a)$

In this section, we prove estimates for sum functions closely related to the functions $\pi(x; m, a)$ and $\theta(x; m, a)$. These estimates are used to prove the main results.

First we prove a results concerning to sum running over primes. Please keep in mind that the term $a_2(m)$ is defined in Table 1.

Lemma 4.12. *Let m, a and x be as in Theorem 4.9 and let n be a positive integer. Assume also that $x \geq \max\{m^{\varphi(m)}, 1865\}$ and that RH and GRH(m, div) hold. Then we have*

$$\left| - \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv a \pmod{m}}} \frac{n}{p-1} \log p + \frac{n \log x}{\varphi(m)} \right| < a_2(m)n.$$

Proof. By Abel's summation formula we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
- \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv a \pmod{m}}} \frac{n}{p-1} \log p &= - \frac{n}{x-1} \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv a \pmod{m}}} \log p - n \int_2^x \frac{1}{(y-1)^2} \sum_{\substack{p \leq y \\ p \equiv a \pmod{m}}} \log p dy \\
&= - \frac{n}{x-1} \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv a \pmod{m}}} \log p - n \int_2^M \frac{1}{(y-1)^2} \sum_{\substack{p \leq y \\ p \equiv a \pmod{m}}} \log p dy \\
&\quad - n \int_M^x \frac{1}{(y-1)^2} \sum_{\substack{p \leq y \\ p \equiv a \pmod{m}}} \log p dy, \tag{28}
\end{aligned}$$

where $M = \max\{m, \sqrt{1865}\}$. We consider each of the previous three terms on the last three lines of the equality.

First, by Lemma 4.11, in the first term we have

$$-\left(\frac{x}{\varphi(m)} + a_5(m)\sqrt{x}\log^2 x\right) < -\sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv a \pmod{m}}} \log p < -\left(\frac{x}{\varphi(m)} - a_5(m)\sqrt{x}\log^2 x\right).$$

Please notice that since all of the terms on the last two lines of computations (28) are non-positive, absolute value of the largest error term depends on the case $-a_5(m)n\sqrt{x}\log^2 x/(x-1)$.

Similarly, now using Lemma 4.10, the third term on the right-hand side of equality (28) is between the values

$$-n \int_M^x \frac{y}{(y-1)^2 \cdot \varphi(m)} dy \pm n \int_M^x \frac{a_4(m)\sqrt{y}\log^2 y}{(y-1)^2} dy$$

and we are interested in the case where there is a minus sign in front of the second integral. The first integral is

$$\int_M^x \frac{y}{(y-1)^2} dy = \left[\frac{1}{(1-y)} + \log(y-1) \right]_M^x = \log(x-1) - \log(M-1) + \frac{1}{1-x} - \frac{1}{1-M}$$

and since $M \geq \sqrt{1865}$, the another one is

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_M^x \frac{\sqrt{y}\log^2 y}{(y-1)^2} dy \right| &< \frac{2.2024}{2} \int_M^x \frac{\log^2 y}{y^{1.5}} dy \\ &= 2.2024 \left(\frac{\log^2 M + 4\log M + 8}{\sqrt{M}} - \frac{\log^2 x + 4\log x + 8}{\sqrt{x}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Let us now move on to the second term in the right-hand side of equation (28). Under Riemann Hypothesis, by [19, Theorem 10, (6.5)] we have

$$0 \leq \sum_{\substack{p \leq y \\ p \equiv a \pmod{m}}} \log p \leq \sum_{p \leq y} \log p < y + \frac{\sqrt{y}\log^2 y}{8\pi}$$

for all $y > 0$. Hence, in order to estimate the second term in equation (28), it is sufficient to compute an integral

$$\begin{aligned} \int_2^M \frac{y + \sqrt{y}\log^2 y/(8\pi)}{(y-1)^2} dy &\leq \int_2^M \left(\frac{y}{(y-1)^2} + \frac{\sqrt{2}\log^2 y}{8\pi y^{1.5}} \right) dy \\ &= \left[\frac{1}{1-y} + \log(y-1) - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4\pi} \left(\frac{\log^2 y + 4\log y + 8}{\sqrt{y}} \right) \right]_2^M \\ &= -\frac{1}{M-1} + \log(M-1) + 1 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4\pi} \left(\frac{\log^2 M + 4\log M + 8}{\sqrt{M}} - \frac{\log^2 2 + 4\log 2 + 8}{\sqrt{2}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have estimated all of the terms in (28).

Putting everything together we get

$$\left| -\sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv a \pmod{m}}} \frac{n}{p-1} \log p + \frac{n \log x}{\varphi(m)} \right| < n \left| -\frac{a_4(m)\sqrt{x}\log^2 x}{x-1} + \frac{1}{M-1} - \log(M-1) \right|$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -1 - \left(\frac{x-1}{x-1} + \log(x-1) - \log x - \log(M-1) - \frac{1}{1-M} \right) \frac{1}{\varphi(m)} \\
& + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4\pi} \left(\frac{\log^2 M + 4 \log M + 8}{\sqrt{M}} - \frac{\log^2 2 + 4 \log 2 + 8}{\sqrt{2}} \right) \\
& - 2.2024a_4(m) \left(\frac{\log^2 M + 4 \log M + 8}{\sqrt{M}} - \frac{\log^2 x + 4 \log x + 8}{\sqrt{x}} \right) \Big| \\
& < n \left| -\frac{a_4(m)\sqrt{x}\log^2 x}{x-1} + \frac{\varphi(m)-1}{(M-1)\varphi(m)} + \log(M-1) \cdot \frac{1-\varphi(m)}{\varphi(m)} - 2 \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \frac{\log(x-1) - \log x}{\varphi(m)} + \left(\frac{\log^2 M + 4 \log M + 8}{\sqrt{M}} \right) \left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{4\pi} - 2.2024a_4(m) \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4\pi} \left(\frac{\log^2 2 + 4 \log 2 + 8}{\sqrt{2}} \right) + 2.2024a_4(m) \left(\frac{\log^2 x + 4 \log x + 8}{\sqrt{x}} \right) \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $-1 - \log(x-1) + \log x < 0$ for all x under consideration, $\frac{1}{M-1} - \log(M-1) < 0$, $\varphi(m) \geq 2$, the function $(\log^2 y + 4 \log y + 8) / \sqrt{y}$ is decreasing for all $y > 0$, $a_4(m) \geq 0.129$ and $x \geq 1865$, the right-hand side is

$$\begin{aligned}
& < n \left| -\frac{a_5(m)\sqrt{x}\log^2 x}{x-1} - \log M - 2 - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4\pi} \left(\frac{\log^2 2 + 4 \log 2 + 8}{\sqrt{2}} \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{4\pi} - 2.2024a_4(m) \right) \left(\frac{\log^2 M + 4 \log M + 8}{\sqrt{M}} \right) \right| \tag{29} \\
& < \left(\log M + \left(2.2024a_4(m) - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4\pi} \right) \left(\frac{\log^2 M + 4 \log M + 8}{\sqrt{M}} \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \frac{a_5(m)\sqrt{x}\log^2 x}{x-1} + 2.896 \right) n.
\end{aligned}$$

We are almost ready, we still want to simplify the last line in estimate (29) a little bit. Let us consider the last line in (29) in different cases depending on the size of m . In each of the cases we apply the facts that the functions $(\log^2 y + 4 \log y + 8) / \sqrt{y}$ and $\sqrt{y} \log^2 y / (y-1)$ are decreasing for all $y > 0$.

In the case $3 \leq m \leq 432$, we apply the facts $M \geq \max\{m, \sqrt{1865}\} \geq \sqrt{1865}$ and $x \geq 1865$. Further, in the rest of the cases we use $M \geq m$ and that by Corollary 4.6 and assumptions we have $x \geq m^{\varphi(m)} \geq m^{m^{0.7}}$. The claim follows from these facts. \square

Next we define

$$a_6(m) := \begin{cases} 27.640 + \frac{39.717}{\varphi(m)} & \text{if } 3 \leq m \leq 60 \\ 0.001 + \frac{1.501}{\varphi(m)} & \text{if } m \geq 61 \end{cases}$$

and estimate a term which depends on p -adic valuation of factorials:

Lemma 4.13. *Let m and a be defined as in Theorem 4.9 and x as in Lemma 4.12. Assume also GRH. Further, let $n \geq x$ be a positive integer. Then we have*

$$\left| \log \left(\prod_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv a \pmod{m}}} |n!|_p \right) + \frac{n \log x}{\varphi(m)} \right| < a_2(m)n + \frac{x \log n}{\varphi(m) \log x} + \frac{x}{\varphi(m)} + \frac{a_6(m)n}{\log n}.$$

Proof. We follow the same steps as in the proof of Lemma 9 in [10]. First, we modify the first term on the left-hand side of the claim and then derive the right-hand side using Lemma 4.10.

First, we write the the first term on the left-hand side as

$$\log \left(\prod_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv a \pmod{m}}} |n!|_p \right) = \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv a \pmod{m}}} \log |n!|_p. \quad (30)$$

As in [10, Proof of Lemma 9], by a well known fact we have

$$p^{-\frac{n}{p-1}} \leq |n!|_p \leq p^{-\frac{n}{p-1} + \frac{\log n}{\log p} + 1}$$

and hence we can estimate the right-hand side of equation (30) with sums

$$- \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv a \pmod{m}}} \frac{n}{p-1} \log p \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv a \pmod{m}}} (\log n + \log p). \quad (31)$$

We consider these sums separately.

First we notice that the first sum in (31) can be estimated with Lemma 4.12. Hence we can move to the rest of the terms in (31).

By Lemma 4.7 and Lemma 4.11 we have

$$\left| \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv a \pmod{m}}} (\log n + \log p) \right| < \log n \left(\frac{\text{li}(x)}{\varphi(m)} + \left(\frac{1}{8\pi\varphi(m)} + \frac{1}{6\pi} \right) \sqrt{x} \log x \right. \\ \left. + a_3(m)\sqrt{x} - 237.934 \right) + \frac{x}{\varphi(m)} + a_5(m)\sqrt{x} \log^2 x. \quad (32)$$

Further, by [2, Lemma 5.9] we have

$$\text{li}(x) = \text{Li}(x) + \text{li}(2) < \frac{x}{\log x} + \frac{3x}{2\log^2 x} + \text{li}(2) \quad (33)$$

for all $x \geq 1865$. Hence we have estimated the second sum in (31).

Let us now combine our estimates. Using Lemma 4.12 and estimates (32) and (33) for the sums in (31) we have

$$\left| \log \left(\prod_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv a \pmod{m}}} |n!|_p \right) + \frac{n \log x}{\varphi(m)} \right| < a_2(m)n + \frac{x \log n}{\varphi(m) \log x} + \frac{x}{\varphi(m)} + \frac{3x \log n}{2\varphi(m) \log^2 x} \\ + \left(\frac{1}{8\pi\varphi(m)} + \frac{1}{6\pi} \right) \sqrt{x} \log x \cdot \log n + a_5(m)\sqrt{x} \log^2 x \\ + a_3(m)\sqrt{x} \log n + \left(\frac{\text{li}(2)}{\varphi(m)} - 237.934 \right) \log n.$$

Since $x \leq n$, the function $x/\log^2 x$ is increasing for all x under consideration and we have $\text{li}(2)/\varphi(m) - 237.934 < 0$ for all m , the right-hand side is

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq a_2(m)n + \frac{x \log n}{\varphi(m) \log x} + \frac{x}{\varphi(m)} \\ &\quad + \frac{3n}{2\varphi(m) \log n} + \left(\frac{1}{8\pi\varphi(m)} + \frac{1}{6\pi} + a_5(m) \right) \sqrt{n} \log^2 n + a_3(m) \sqrt{n} \log n. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Next we would like to simplify the last line in estimate (34).

Keeping in mind definitions (18) and (26) the terms $a_3(m)$ and $a_5(m)$, we get different estimates for the last line in (34). Since $n \geq \max\{m^{\varphi(m)}, 1865\}$, for $m \in [3, 60]$ we apply $n \geq 1865$ and for $m \geq 61$ by Corollary 4.6 we use $n \geq 60^{60^{0.7}}$. The claim follows from these estimates. \square

Remark 4.14. Since $|q|_p = 1$ for all primes $p > q$, for all $x > n$ we have

$$\log \left(\prod_{\substack{p \in \mathbb{P} \\ p \equiv a \pmod{m}}} |n!|_p \right) = \log \left(\prod_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv a \pmod{m}}} |n!|_p \right) = \log \left(\prod_{\substack{p \leq n \\ p \equiv a \pmod{m}}} |n!|_p \right).$$

4.4 Non-empty sets

In this section, we prove that certain sets are non-empty. These results are applied in Sections 7 and 8. First we mention a useful lemma and then we prove the result.

Lemma 4.15. [8, Theorem 1.1, Table 1] Assume GRH, let $m \geq 3$ and a be integers such that $(a, m) = 1$. Further, assume that $h \geq \varphi(m) (\log x/2 + \log m + 12) \sqrt{x}$ and $x \geq (23\varphi(m) \log m)^2$. Then there is a prime p which is congruent to a modulo m with $|p - x| < h$.

Lemma 4.16. Let us use the same definitions and assumptions as in Theorem 2.5, let R_1 correspond to R in Theorem 2.2 and let $x_1 \geq m^{\varphi(m)}$. Then there is at least one prime in the set $R_1 \cap [2, x_1]$.

Further, let us use the same definitions and assumptions as in Theorem 2.8, let R_2 correspond to R in Theorem 2.8 and let $\log x_2 \geq m^{\varphi(m)}$. Then there is at least one prime in the set $R_2 \cap (\log x_2, x_2]$.

Proof. The idea is that we first estimate the sizes of the terms x_1 and x_2 and then apply Lemma 4.15. First, it is easy to check that there is at least one prime in $R_1 \cap [2, x_1]$ when $m \in [3, 60]$. Hence, by Corollary 4.6 we can assume that

$$\frac{x_1}{2} \geq \frac{m^{\varphi(m)}}{2} \geq 0.5 \cdot 61^{61^{0.7}} > 10^{31} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{x_2}{2} \geq \frac{m^{\varphi(m)} e^{m^{\varphi(m)}}}{2 \log(m^{\varphi(m)} e^{m^{\varphi(m)}})} > 3256.$$

Even more, we clearly have $x_2/2 > 0.4e^{m^{\varphi(m)}} > (23\varphi(m) \log m)^2$ for all $m \geq 3$ and $\varphi(m) \geq 2$ and

$$\log x_2 + 2 \left(\frac{\log x_2}{2} + \log 3 + 12 \right) \sqrt{x_2} < \frac{x_2}{2}.$$

Hence, by Lemma 4.15 there is at least one prime in $R_2 \cap (\log x_2, x_2]$ when $m = 3$ and we can assume $m \geq 4$ and $x_2/2 > 10^6$ in this case. Further, since $x_2/2 > m^{\varphi(m)}/2$ and $\log x_2 < x_2/100$, in order to prove the claim, by Lemma 4.15 it is sufficient to show that

$$\varphi(m) \left(\frac{\log x}{2} + \log m + 12 \right) \sqrt{x} < 0.49x \quad \text{and} \quad 0.5x_1 \geq (23 \log(0.5x_1))^2 \quad (35)$$

for $x_1 > 10^{31}$, $x \geq \max\{m^{\varphi(m)}/2, 10^6\}$ where $m \geq 4$.

The last inequality in (35) is clearly true and we can concentrate on to prove the first inequality in (35). Since $\varphi(m) \log x \leq \log(2x) \log x / \log m < \sqrt{x}/6$ and $\log(2x) < \sqrt{x}/60$ for all x under consideration, we have

$$\varphi(m) \left(\frac{\log x}{2} + \log m + 12 \right) \sqrt{x} < \frac{x}{12} + \frac{x}{60} + \frac{x}{60 \log 4} < 0.49x,$$

which proves the claim. \square

5 Proof of Theorem 2.1

In this section, we prove Theorem 2.1.

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Let us assume contrary, indeed that for all $p \in R$ we have $\Lambda_p = 0$. As in Section 3, we obtain

$$1 \leq (k+1) \max_{0 \leq i \leq k} \{|\lambda_i|\} \max_{0 \leq i \leq k} \{|B_{n,\mu,i}(1)|\} \cdot \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \left\{ \prod_{p \in R} |S_{n,\mu,i}(1)|_p \right\}.$$

By Lemma 4.3 the right-hand side is

$$\leq (k+1) \max_{0 \leq i \leq k} \{|\lambda_i|\} \left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \{|\alpha_j|\} \right)^{k-1} c_2(\bar{\alpha}; R)^n (kn+k)! \cdot (kn+k) \prod_{p \in R} |(kn)!n!|_p,$$

where $c_2(\bar{\alpha}; R)$ is defined as in (4). Thus, if condition (5) holds, then the right-hand side of the previous inequality is smaller than one when n is large enough. This is a contradiction and hence we cannot have $\Lambda_p = 0$ for all $p \in R$. \square

6 Proof of Theorem 2.2

In this section we prove Theorem 2.2.

Proof of Theorem 2.2. First of all, by Theorem 2.1 it is sufficient to show that the limit superior of the formula

$$n \log c(\bar{\alpha}; R) + \log(kn+k) + \log((kn+k)!) + \log \left(\prod_{p \in R} |(nk)! \cdot n!|_p \right) \quad (36)$$

is minus infinity. Hence, we consider the sum in (36).

First we consider the second and third term in sum (36). The second term can be estimated with

$$\log(kn+k) = \log(n+1) + \log k < \log n + \log k + \frac{1}{n}, \quad (37)$$

for all $n > 0$. By the previous estimate and by Stirling's formula (see e.g. [1, formula 6.1.38]) we have

$$\log((kn+k)!) = (kn+k) \log(kn+k) - (kn+k) + O(\log n) = kn \log n + kn \log \frac{k}{e} + O(\log n).$$

Hence, we have estimated the second and the third term in sum (36).

Using the estimates obtained in the previous paragraph, Lemma 4.13 and Remark 4.14, sum (36) is

$$\begin{aligned}
&= n \log c_2(\bar{\alpha}; R) + kn \log n + kn (\log k - 1) + O(\log n) \\
&\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{k\varphi(m)/(k+1)} \left(\log \left(\prod_{p \in \bar{h}_j \cap \mathbb{P}} |(nk)!|_p \right) + \log \left(\prod_{p \in \bar{h}_j \cap \mathbb{P}} |n!|_p \right) \right) \\
&< n (\log c_2(\bar{\alpha}; R) + k (\log k + a_2(m)\varphi(m) + 1)) + O\left(\frac{n}{\log n}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Using upper bound (6) for the number $c_2(\bar{\alpha}; R)$, the right-hand side of the previous inequality goes to $-\infty$ when n goes to infinity. By Theorem 2.1 the claim follows. \square

7 Preliminaries and proofs for Theorem 2.5 and Corollary 2.7

In this section, we prove Theorem 2.5 and Corollary 2.7. The section is divided to two parts: First we derive the contradiction that the right-hand side of inequality (15) is smaller than one (see Section 3) as well as estimates for the number n which gives the contradiction. After that, we are ready to prove Theorem 2.5 and Corollary 2.7.

7.1 Contradiction and estimates for number n

In this section, we show that the right-hand side of inequality (15) is smaller than one. Further, we also estimate the number n which gives the mentioned contradiction.

First, we define

$$\begin{aligned}
N_1(a, R) &:= a (\log c_2(\bar{\alpha}; R) + k (\log k + a_2(m)\varphi(m) + 1)) + \frac{a_6(m)k\varphi(m)a}{\log a} \\
&\quad + 2.5 \log a + \log(k+1) + 2.5 \log k + \log H + (k-1) \log \left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \{|\alpha_j|\} \right) \\
&\quad + \log \sqrt{2\pi} + 1 + k (a_2(m)\varphi(m) + 2) + \frac{a_6(m)k\varphi(m)}{\log a} + \frac{19}{12a}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now we prove the contradiction keeping in mind that the term $c_2(\bar{\alpha}; R)$ is defined in (4) and the term $a_2(m)$ in Table 1:

Lemma 7.1. *Assume GRH. Let $k, m, \lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_k$ and R be defined as in Theorem 2.2. Further, let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ and R' be defined as in Theorem 2.5,*

$$\frac{\log H}{-(\log c(\bar{\alpha}; R') + k (\log k + a_2(m)\varphi(m) + 1))} \geq \max \left\{ 1866, m^{\varphi(m)} + 1, \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \{|\alpha_j|\} + 1 \right\} \quad (38)$$

and

$$n := \max \{a \in \mathbb{Z} : N_1(a, R') \geq 0\}. \quad (39)$$

Then, we have

$$(k+1) \max_{0 \leq i \leq k} \{|\lambda_i|\} \max_{0 \leq i \leq k} \{|B_{n+1, \mu, i}(1)|\} \cdot \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \left\{ \prod_{p \in R \cap [2, k(n+2)]} |S_{n+1, \mu, i}(1)|_p \right\} < 1.$$

Proof. We would like to estimate the left-hand side of the claim. Hence, we first notice that due to assumptions (39) and (38) we must have

$$n > \frac{-\log H}{\log c_2(\bar{\alpha}; R') + k(\log k + a_2(m)\varphi(m) + 1)} - 1 \geq \max\{1865, m^{\varphi(m)}, \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \{|\alpha_j|\}\}.$$

Thus we can apply Lemma 4.13 in our estimates and $R' \subseteq R \cap [2, k(n+2)]$.

Now we estimate the left-hand side of the claim. First, we notice that by Lemma 4.16 there is at least one prime in the set $R \cap [2, k(n+2)]$. As in the proof of Theorem 2.1, using Lemma 4.3 and keeping in mind $\mu \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$, the left-hand side of the claim is

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq (k+1)H \left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \{|\alpha_j|\} \right)^{k-1} c_2(\bar{\alpha}; R')^{n+1} (k(n+1) + \mu)! \cdot (k(n+1) + k) \\ &\quad \left(\prod_{p \in R \cap [2, k(n+2)]} |(k(n+1) + \mu)!|_p \right) \cdot \left(\prod_{p \in R \cap [2, k(n+2)]} |(n+1)!|_p \right). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly as in the proof of Theorem 2.2 and especially in estimate (37) and by Stirling's formula (see e.g. [1, formula 6.1.38]), the logarithm of the right-hand side can be estimated as

$$\begin{aligned} &< \log(k+1) + \log H + (k-1) \log \left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \{|\alpha_j|\} \right) + (n+1) \log c_2(\bar{\alpha}; R') + \log k + \log(n+1) \\ &+ \frac{1}{n+1} + (k(n+1) + \mu + 0.5) \log(k(n+1) + \mu) - k(n+1) - \mu + \log \sqrt{2\pi} + \frac{1}{12(k(n+1) + \mu)} \\ &\quad + \log \left(\prod_{p \in R \cap [2, k(n+2)]} |(k(n+1) + \mu)!|_p \right) + \log \left(\prod_{p \in R \cap [2, k(n+2)]} |(n+1)!|_p \right). \end{aligned}$$

Our goal is to show that the previous estimate is at most zero. Since $R \cap [2, k(n+2)]$ contains primes in arithmetic progressions up to height $k(n+2)$ and $0 \leq \mu \leq k$, by Lemma 4.13 and Remark 4.14 the right-hand side is

$$\begin{aligned} &< \log(k+1) + \log H + (k-1) \log \left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \{|\alpha_j|\} \right) + (n+1) \log c_2(\bar{\alpha}; R') + \log k + \log(n+1) \\ &+ \frac{13}{12(n+1)} + (k(n+1) + \mu + 0.5) \log(k(n+1) + \mu) - k(n+1) - \mu + \log \sqrt{2\pi} \\ &+ \frac{k\varphi(m)}{k+1} \left(-\frac{(k(n+1) + \mu) \log(k(n+1) + \mu)}{\varphi(m)} + \left(a_2(m) + \frac{2}{\varphi(m)} \right) (k(n+1) + \mu) \right. \\ &+ a_6(m) \frac{k(n+1) + \mu}{\log(k(n+1) + \mu)} - \frac{(n+1) \log(n+1)}{\varphi(m)} + \left. \left(a_2(m) + \frac{2}{\varphi(m)} \right) (n+1) \right. \\ &\left. + \frac{a_6(m)(n+1)}{\log(n+1)} \right) \\ &< (n+1) (\log c_2(\bar{\alpha}; R') + k(\log k + a_2(m)\varphi(m) + 1)) + \frac{a_6(m)k\varphi(m)(n+1)}{\log(n+1)} \\ &\quad + 2.5 \log(n+1) + \log(k+1) + 2.5 \log k + \log H + (k-1) \log \left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \{|\alpha_j|\} \right) \\ &\quad + \log \sqrt{2\pi} + 1 + k(a_2(m)\varphi(m) + 2) + \frac{a_6(m)k\varphi(m)}{\log(n+1)} + \frac{19}{12(n+1)} \\ &= N_1(n+1). \end{aligned}$$

Because of assumption (39), the right-hand side is smaller than zero. \square

Remark 7.2. The assumption (6) is essential in order to find number n such that $N_1(n+1) < 0$.

In the previous lemma, number n is given quite a quite complicated way. In order to apply the result, we would like to give a simplified upper bound for number n . We have included more assumptions for number H in this simplified version to obtain a simpler result. In the result, please keep in mind that $A_1(m, k)$ is given in (7).

Lemma 7.3. Let us use the same definitions and assumptions as in Lemma 7.1 including that n is defined as in (39). Assume also that H satisfies the bounds given in (8).

Then we have

$$n < -\frac{A_1(m, k)n/\log n + \log H}{\log c_2(\bar{\alpha}; R') + k(\log k + a_2(m)\varphi(m) + 1)}$$

and

$$n < -\frac{2 \log H}{\log c_2(\bar{\alpha}; R') + k(\log k + a_2(m)\varphi(m) + 1)}.$$

Proof. The idea is to prove bounds for number n using the term $N_1(n)$: By assumption (39) we have $0 \leq N_1(n)$. We derive an upper bound of form $(\log c_2 + k(\log k + a_2(m)\varphi(m) + 1))n + A_1(m, k)n/\log n + \log H$ for the term $N_1(n)$. Using this upper bound and keeping the inequality $0 \leq N_1(n)$ in mind, we find the wanted upper bounds.

Let us now derive the upper bound for the term $N_1(n)$. As in the first paragraph of the proof of Lemma 7.1, we can deduce that $n > m^{\varphi(m)}$ and $n > \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \{|\alpha_j|\}$ and we also have $\log k < \log(k+1) < k$ for all $k \geq 1$. Hence, the term $N_1(n)$ can be estimated as

$$\begin{aligned} N_1(n) &< n(\log c_2(\bar{\alpha}; R') + k(\log k + a_2(m)\varphi(m) + 1)) + \frac{n}{\log n} \left(a_6(m)k\varphi(m) + \frac{(k+1.5)\log^2 n}{n} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{ka_2(m)\log^2 n}{n \log m} + \frac{(5.5k + \log \sqrt{2\pi} + 1)\log n}{n} + \frac{ka_6(m)\log n}{n \log m} + \frac{19 \log n}{12n^2} \right) + \log H. \end{aligned}$$

Next we derive the coefficient for $n/\log n$ using different cases depending on the size of m . In the case $m \in [3, 60]$ we set $n = 1865$, $\log m = \log 3$ and $\varphi(m) = 2$ when $\varphi(m)$ is in the denominator. In the cases $m \geq 61$, by Corollary 4.6 we set $n = m^{m^{0.7}}$ and $\varphi(m) = m^{0.7}$ where m corresponds the lower bound of the case. After these substitutions, we have shown that the upper bound for the coefficient of $n/\log n$ is $A_1(m, k)$ and the first wanted upper bound follows.

Let us now move the second bound. We have obtained

$$-\left(\log c_2(\bar{\alpha}; R') + k(\log k + a_2(m)\varphi(m) + 1) + \frac{A_1(m, k)}{\log n} \right) n < \log H. \quad (40)$$

Due to the assumption (8), the left-hand side is positive. Dividing the inequality by the coefficient of n and setting

$$\log n = -\frac{2A_1(m, k)}{\log c_2(\bar{\alpha}; R') + k(\log k + a_2(m)\varphi(m) + 1)}$$

we get the second result. \square

Remark 7.4. In the case $m \geq 61$, there is no term which does not depend on the number k in $A_1(m, k)$. The reason for this is that it is included to the term k using three decimal accuracy.

Remark 7.5. It is actually sufficient to assume that

$$\frac{\log H}{-(\log c_2(\bar{\alpha}; R') + k(\log k + a_2(m)\varphi(m) + 1))} \geq e^{-\frac{A_1(m, k)}{\log c_2(\bar{\alpha}; R') + k(\log k + a_2(m)\varphi(m) + 1)}} + 1$$

in order the left-hand side of (40) to be positive. However, an exact lower bound would lead the left-hand side to be arbitrary close to zero. To avoid this problem and to make computations easier, a larger lower bound was selected.

7.2 Proofs for Theorem 2.5 and Corollary 2.7

In this section, we prove p -adic lower bounds for linear forms in the Euler's factorial series. First, we prove a useful lemma regarding to the lower bound for the term $\log H$. In the proof, $W(x)$ denotes the Lambert W function meaning that $W(x)e^{W(x)} = x$ and $W(x)$ corresponds to the principal value.

Lemma 7.6. *Assume that $\log H \geq xe^{y/x} + x$, where H , x and $y \geq 1$ are positive real numbers. Then*

$$\frac{y}{2 \log \log H} \leq x \leq \frac{\log H}{2}.$$

Proof. Let us prove the claim by assuming the contrary: $x < y/(2 \log \log H)$ or $x > \log H/2$.

Let us first consider the first case. First we notice that the function $xe^{y/x} + x$ obtains its minimum at $x = y/(W(1/e) + 1)$, where W is the Lambert W function. Hence, we have

$$\log H \geq xe^{y/x} + x \geq \frac{y}{W(1/e) + 1} \left(e^{W(1/e)+1} + 1 \right) > 3.591y. \quad (41)$$

Thus, we also have

$$\frac{y}{2 \log \log H} < \frac{y}{2 \log(3.591y)} < y/(W(1/e) + 1) \approx 0.782y,$$

Also, since the function $xe^{y/x} + x$ is decreasing for all $x < y/(W(1/e) + 1)$, we have

$$xe^{y/x} + x > \frac{ye^{2 \log \log H}}{2 \log \log H} + \frac{y}{2 \log \log H} > \frac{(\log H)^2}{\log \log H} > \log H,$$

for all $H > e$. This is a contradiction.

In the second case we have

$$xe^{y/x} + x > \frac{\log H \cdot e^0}{2} + \frac{\log H}{2} = \log H,$$

which is again a contradiction. Hence, the claim holds. \square

Remark 7.7. *It is possible to prove a little bit sharper bounds in Lemma 7.6 formulating the bounds with the Lambert W function instead of logarithms. However, in order to keep the results relatively simple, logarithms were decided to be used.*

Now we are ready to move Theorem 2.5:

Proof of Theorem 2.5. First of all, by Lemma 4.16, there is at least one prime number in the set $R \cap [2, k(n+2)]$. Further, because of Lemma 7.1, there exists a number n such that the right-hand side of estimate (15) is smaller than one. On the other hand, in estimate (15) we noticed that the same term is at least one if there is no number $p \in R \cap [2, k(n+2)]$ such that

$$|B_{n+1, \mu, 0}(1) \Lambda_p|_p > \left| \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j S_{n+1, \mu, j}(1) \right|_p. \quad (42)$$

This is a contradiction and hence there must be a prime number $p \in R \cap [2, k(n+2)]$ such that inequality (42) holds. We consider this prime number p . First we prove that p is in the set (9) and then that the wanted lower bound is satisfied.

Trivially we must have $p \geq 2$. Further, by Lemma 7.3, we have

$$k(n+2) < -\frac{2k \log H}{\log c_2(\bar{\alpha}; R') + k(\log k + a_2(m)\varphi(m) + 1)} + 2k.$$

Hence, number p is in the wanted set and we can move on to find a p -adic lower bound for the linear form.

We only have to find a lower bound for the term $|\Lambda_p|_p$. By estimate (16) it is sufficient to find an upper bound for the term $|T(n+1, \mu)|$ so we will consider this term.

By definition (13) of the term $T(n+1, \mu)$, Lemma 4.3 and Stirling's formula (see e.g. [1, formula 6.1.38]) we have

$$|T(n+1, \mu)| \leq (k+1)H \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} |B_{n+1, \mu, j}(1)| \leq (k+1)H \sqrt{2\pi} \cdot e^{\frac{1}{12k(n+1)}} \cdot e^{-k} \left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \{|\alpha_j|\} \right)^{k-1} \cdot (k(n+2))^{k+1.5} e^{k(n+1)(\log 2 + \log(k(n+2)) - 1 + \log(\max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \{|\alpha_j|\}))}.$$

Applying the facts $\log(a+1) < \log a + 1/a$, $\log k < k$ and $k \geq 1$ and assumption (8) meaning that $n > \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \{|\alpha_j|\}$, the logarithm of the right-hand side is

$$\begin{aligned} < \log H + kn \log n + n \left(k(k-1) \log \left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \{|\alpha_j|\} \right) + k(k + \log 2 - 1) \right) \\ + \log n \left(k^2 + 2k + 0.5 + \frac{(2k + 2.5)k + \log \sqrt{2\pi} + 1 + k \log 2}{\log n} + \frac{4k + 37/12}{n \log n} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

By Lemma 7.3, we can estimate

$$n \log n < -\frac{A_1(m, k)n + \log H \cdot \log n}{\log c_2(\bar{\alpha}; R') + k(\log k + a_2(m)\varphi(m) + 1)} \quad (44)$$

and use the second estimate proved for number n in Lemma 7.3 Hence, estimate (43) is

$$\begin{aligned} < \log H + k \log H \cdot \frac{\log \log H + \log 2 - \log D}{D} + \frac{kA_1(m, k) \log H}{D^2} + \frac{kA_1(m, k)^2 n / \log n}{D^2} \\ + \left(\frac{\log H}{D} + \frac{A_1(m, k)n / \log n}{D} \right) \left(k(k-1) \log \left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \{|\alpha_j|\} \right) + k(k + \log 2 - 1) \right) \\ + \log \left(\frac{2 \log H}{D} \right) \cdot \left(k^2 + 2k + 0.5 + \frac{(2k + 2.5 + \log 2)k + \log \sqrt{2\pi} + 1}{\log n} + \frac{4k + 37/12}{n \log n} \right) \\ < \log H \cdot \left(\frac{k}{D} \log \log H + 1 + \frac{k(\log 2 - \log D)}{D} + \frac{kA_1(m, k)}{D^2} \right. \\ + \frac{k(k-1) \log(\max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \{|\alpha_j|\}) + k(k + \log 2 - 1)}{D} + \frac{2kA_1(m, k)^2}{D^3(\log \log H + \log(2/D))} \\ + \frac{2A_1(m, k)(k(k-1) \log(\max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \{|\alpha_j|\}) + k(k + \log 2 - 1))}{D^2(\log \log H + \log(2/D))} \\ \left. + \frac{\log(2 \log H/D)}{\log H} \cdot \left(k^2 + 2k + 0.5 + \frac{(2k + 2.5 + \log 2)k + \log \sqrt{2\pi} + 1}{\log n} + \frac{4k + 37/12}{n \log n} \right) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

where $D := D(m, k, \bar{\alpha}; R') = -(\log c_2(\bar{\alpha}; R') + k(\log k + a_2(m)\varphi(m) + 1))$. Next we simplify the previous estimate. Our goal is to write it in a form $A \log H \cdot \log \log H + B$, where A and B do not depend on number H but may depend on other terms such as number m .

Since by assumption (8) we have

$$\log \log H - \log D > \frac{2A_1(m, k)}{D} \quad \text{and} \quad \log \log H - \log D > \max \left\{ 1, \log \left(\max_{i \leq j \leq k} \{|\alpha_j|\} \right) \right\},$$

the terms inside the brackets in the right-hand side of inequality (45) are

$$\begin{aligned} &< \frac{k}{D} \log \log H + 1 + \frac{k(\log 2 - \log D)}{D} + \frac{kA_1(m, k)}{D^2} + \frac{k(k-1)(\log \log H - \log D)}{D} \\ &+ \frac{k(k + \log 2 - 1)}{D} + \frac{kA_1(m, k)}{D^2} + \frac{2A_1(m, k)k(k-1)}{D^2} + \frac{k(k + \log 2 - 1)}{D} \\ &+ \frac{\log(2 \log H \cdot \log \log H)}{\log H} \left(\frac{(2k + 2.5 + \log 2)k + \log \sqrt{2\pi} + 1}{\log n} + k^2 + 2k + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{4k + 37/12}{n \log n} \right) \\ &< \frac{k^2}{D} \log \log H + 1 - \frac{k^2 \log D}{D} + \frac{2k^2 + 3k \log 2 - 2k}{D} + \frac{2k^2 A_1(m, k)}{D^2} \\ &+ \frac{\log \log H + \log \log \log H + \log 2}{\log H} \cdot \left(\frac{(2k + 2.5 + \log 2)k + \log \sqrt{2\pi} + 1}{\log n} \right. \\ &\left. + k^2 + 2k + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{4k + 37/12}{n \log n} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The claim follows when we do the following substitutions to the last two lines of the previous estimate: In every case, by inequality (41), we can estimate $\log H \geq 7.182A_1(m, k) > 7.182A_1(m, 1)$. Further, in the case $m \in [3, 60]$, we set $n = 1865$ and $\varphi(m) = 2$. In the case $m \geq 61$, by Corollary 4.6 we set $n = 61^{61^{0.7}}$ and $\varphi(m) = 61^{0.7}$. These lead to the wanted estimates. \square

Remark 7.8. *At the end of the fourth paragraph of the previous proof, we want to minimize the coefficients of the terms having terms $\log H$ multiplied by something which does not go to zero when H or n goes to infinity. Even more, we also want to keep the results relatively simple. Hence, in some of the cases we have used estimate (44) once, twice or not at all depending on would it improve the coefficients or not.*

As a last part of this section, let us prove Corollary 2.7:

Proof of Corollary 2.7. As in the previous proof, it is sufficient to estimate the term $\log |T(n + 1, \mu)|$. By the proof of Theorem 2.5, $\log |T(n + 1, \mu)|$ is smaller than $\log H$ multiplied by

$$< \frac{k^2}{D} \log \log H - \frac{k^2 \log D}{D} + \frac{2k^2 + 3k \log 2 - 2k}{D} + \frac{2k^2 A_1(m, k)}{D^2} + A_2(m, k). \quad (46)$$

Further, we notice that $-\log D/D \leq 0$ if $D \geq 1$ and the function $-\log D/D$ is decreasing when $0 < D < 1$. By assumption (8), Lemma 7.6 and since $A_1(m, k) > 1$, inequality (46) is

$$< (\log \log H)^2 \left(\frac{3k^2}{A_1(m, k)} + \frac{k^2 \log \log \log H}{A_1(m, k) \log \log H} + \frac{2k^2 + 3k \log 2 - 2k}{A_1(m, k) \log \log H} + \frac{A_2(m, k)}{(\log \log H)^2} \right).$$

Again, by (41) we can deduce that $\log H \geq 7.182A_1(m, 1)$. Further, the term $A_1(m, k)$ in the denominators is at least $(27.640 \cdot 2 + 40.160)k$ if $m \in [3, 60]$ and at least $(0.001 \cdot 61^{0.7} + 1.502)k$ if $m \geq 61$. Hence, the claim is proved. \square

8 Preliminaries and proof of Theorem 2.8

In this section, we prove Theorem 2.8, indeed that if we consider $(k + \varepsilon)\varphi(m)/(k + 1)$ different residue classes, then we find a p -adic lower bound for a certain linear form. The proof follows similarly as in Section 7: First we prove a contradiction that inequality (15) must be smaller than one under certain assumptions, then estimate such number n and finally, prove Theorem 2.8.

8.1 Contradiction and estimates for number n

Again, we would like to show a contradiction to estimate (15) and to prove simpler estimates for number n appearing in Lemma 8.1.

First, let us define

$$\begin{aligned} N_2(a) &:= -\varepsilon a \log a + (k + 1)a \log \log a + a(\log c_1 - k + \log k + 2(k + 1)(a_2(m)\varphi(m) + 1)) \\ &\quad + \frac{2a_6(m)\varphi(m)a(k + 1)}{\log a} + \frac{2 \log^2 a}{\log \log a} + (k + 3.5) \log a + \frac{\log k \cdot \log a}{\log \log a} + k \log \log a \\ &\quad + \log(k + 1) + 2.5 \log k + (k - 1) \log \left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \{|\alpha_j|\} \right) + 2(a_2(m)\varphi(m) + 1)k \\ &\quad + \log \sqrt{2\pi} + 1 + \log H + \frac{2a_6(m)\varphi(m)k}{\log a} + \frac{\log a}{a \log \log a} + \frac{29}{12a}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we can prove the contradiction:

Lemma 8.1. *Assume that m, k and $\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_k$ satisfy the same hypothesis as in Theorem 2.2 and let $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ and R be defined as in Theorem 2.8. Further, let also $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ and H be real numbers such that $H \geq \max_{0 \leq i \leq k} \{|\lambda_i|\}$ and $\log H/\varepsilon \geq se^s$, where $s \geq \max\{m^{\varphi(m)} + 1, 1866\}$. Even more, assume GRH and define*

$$n := \max \{a \in \mathbb{Z} : N_2(a) \geq 0\}. \quad (47)$$

Then, we have

$$(k + 1) \max_{0 \leq i \leq k} \{|\lambda_i|\} \max_{0 \leq i \leq k} \{|B_{n+1, \mu, i}(1)|\} \cdot \max_{1 \leq i \leq k} \left\{ \prod_{p \in R \cap (\log(n+1), k(n+2)]} |S_{n+1, \mu, i}(1)|_p \right\} < 1.$$

Proof. We approach the proof similarly as in the proof of Lemma 7.1. First, we notice that from definition (47) it follows that $\varepsilon(n + 1) \log(n + 1) > \log H$ and due to assumption (10) this means that $\log(n + 1) > s > \max\{m^{\varphi(m)}, 1866\}$. Hence, by Lemma 4.16 there is at least one prime in $R \cap (\log(n + 1), k(n + 2)]$ and we can apply Lemma 4.13 and Remark 4.14. Thus, the logarithm of the left-hand side of the claim is

$$\begin{aligned} &< \log(k + 1) + \log H + (k - 1) \log \left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \{|\alpha_j|\} \right) + (n + 1) \log c_1 + \log k + \log(n + 1) + \frac{1}{n + 1} \\ &\quad + (k(n + 1) + \mu + 0.5) \log(k(n + 1) + \mu) - k(n + 1) - \mu + \log \sqrt{2\pi} + \frac{1}{12(k(n + 1) + \mu)} \\ &\quad + \frac{(k + \varepsilon)\varphi(m)}{k + 1} \left(-\frac{(k(n + 1) + \mu) \log(k(n + 1) + \mu)}{\varphi(m)} + \left(2a_2(m) + \frac{2}{\varphi(m)} \right) (k(n + 1) + \mu) \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{2a_6(m)(k(n + 1) + \mu)}{\log(k(n + 1) + \mu)} + \frac{(k(n + 1) + \mu) \log \log(n + 1)}{\varphi(m)} + \frac{\log(n + 1) \cdot \log(k(n + 1) + \mu)}{\varphi(m) \log \log(n + 1)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{2 \log(n+1)}{\varphi(m)} - \frac{(n+1) \log(n+1)}{\varphi(m)} + \left(2a_2(m) + \frac{2}{\varphi(m)} \right) (n+1) + \frac{2a_6(m)(n+1)}{\log(n+1)} \\
& + \frac{(n+1) \log \log(n+1)}{\varphi(m)} + \frac{\log^2(n+1)}{\varphi(m) \log \log(n+1)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Further, using inequalities $0 \leq \mu \leq k$, (37) and $k(n+1) + \mu \geq n+1$ for all n under consideration and $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, the previous estimate is

$$\begin{aligned}
& < -\varepsilon(n+1) \log(n+1) + (k+1)(n+1) \log \log(n+1) + \frac{2a_6(m)\varphi(m)(n+1)(k+1)}{\log(n+1)} \\
& + (n+1) (\log c_1 - k + \log k + 2(k+1)(a_2(m)\varphi(m) + 1)) + \frac{2 \log^2(n+1)}{\log \log(n+1)} \\
& + (k+3.5) \log(n+1) + \frac{\log k \cdot \log(n+1)}{\log \log(n+1)} + k \log \log(n+1) \\
& + \log(k+1) + 2.5 \log k + (k-1) \log \left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \{|\alpha_j|\} \right) + 2(a_2(m)\varphi(m) + 1)k \\
& + \log \sqrt{2\pi} + 1 + \log H + \frac{2a_6(m)\varphi(m)k}{\log(n+1)} + \frac{\log(n+1)}{(n+1) \log \log(n+1)} + \frac{29}{12(n+1)} \\
& = N_2(n+1).
\end{aligned}$$

Because of the definition (47), the previous estimate is smaller than zero and the claim follows. \square

Again, we would like to provide a simpler estimate for number n . Hence, we first introduce the following lemma:

Lemma 8.2. [11, Lemma 3.3] *If $r \geq e$ is a real number, $z(y)$ is the inverse of the function $y(z) = z \log z$ and $y \geq re^r$, then*

$$z(y) \leq \left(1 + \frac{\log r}{r} \right) \frac{y}{\log y}.$$

Let us keep in mind that numbers $A_3(m, k)$ and $A_4(m)$ are given in Table 2 and prove estimates for number n :

Lemma 8.3. *Let us use the same definitions and assumptions as in Lemma 8.1. Further, let also assume that H satisfy the same assumptions as in Theorem 2.8.*

Then

$$n \log n < \frac{A_3(m, k)}{\varepsilon} n \log \log n + \frac{\log H}{\varepsilon}, \quad n < \frac{A_4(m) \log H}{\varepsilon \log \left(\frac{\log H}{\varepsilon} \right)} \quad \text{and} \quad n < \log H. \quad (48)$$

Proof. By assumption (47) we have $0 \leq N_2(n)$. We derive an upper bound of form

$$N_2(n) < -\varepsilon n \log n + A_3(m, k) n \log \log n + \log H, \quad (49)$$

for the term $N_2(n)$. Using this upper bound and keeping the inequality $0 \leq N_2(n)$ in mind, we find the wanted upper bounds.

Since by assumption (47) we have $N_2(n+1) < 0$, similarly as in the first paragraph in the proof of Lemma 8.1 we can deduce that $\log(n+1) > s$. Hence, we have

$$\log n > s - 1 \geq \max \left\{ 1865, m^{\varphi(m)}, c_1, \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \{|\alpha_j|\} \right\},$$

and we also have $\log(k+1) < k$. Thus the term $N_2(n)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} N_2(n) &< -\varepsilon n \log n + n \log \log n \left(k + 2 + \frac{2(k+1)a_2(m)}{\log m} + \frac{2(k+1)}{\log \log n} + \frac{2a_6(m)(k+1)}{\log n \cdot \log m} \right. \\ &+ \frac{2 \log^2 n}{n (\log \log n)^2} + \frac{(k+3.5) \log n}{n \log \log n} + \frac{k \log n}{n (\log \log n)^2} + \frac{2k}{n} + \frac{2a_2(m)k}{n \log m} \\ &\left. + \frac{5.5k + \log \sqrt{2\pi} + 1}{n \log \log n} + \frac{2a_6(m)k}{n \log n \cdot \log m} + \frac{\log n}{(n \log \log n)^2} + \frac{29}{12n^2 \log \log n} \right) + \log H. \end{aligned}$$

Since the terms $a_2(m)$ and $a_6(m)$ are defined differently for different values of m , we estimate $N_2(n)$ differently depending on the size of m .

In each case, in $\log m$ we set number m be the lower bound of the case and we naturally use the respective formulas for $a_2(m)$ and $a_6(m)$. In the cases $3 \leq m \leq 60$, we set $\varphi(m) = 2$ and by Corollary 4.6 we set $\varphi(m) = m^{0.7}$ in the rest of the cases. Similarly, in the case $3 \leq m \leq 43$ we use $\log n = 1865$, in the case $44 \leq m \leq 60$ we use $\log n = 44^2 = 1936$ and in the rest of the cases we set $\log n = m^{0.7}$ where m corresponds the lower bound of the case. Further, in the case $m \geq 10^{29}$ we are able to find a better upper bound, $3.087k + 4.087$, but in order to make the later computations and the result in Theorem 2.8 simpler, we use $3.192k + 4.192$ instead since then we can use coefficient 1 in the last in last inequality of (48) instead of 1.127. The wanted upper bounds of form (49) for the term $N_2(n)$ follow.

Since $0 \leq N_2(n)$ and upper bound (49) holds, we have proved the first bound in (48) and we also have

$$\varepsilon n \log n \left(1 - A_3(m, k) \frac{\log \log n}{\varepsilon \log n} \right) \leq \log H. \quad (50)$$

Further, since $\log \log n / \log n$ is decreasing for all $\log n \geq e$ and by assumption (11) we have

$$\log n > \left(\frac{A_3(m, k)}{\varepsilon} \right)^{1.6} > A_3(m, 1)^{1.6} \geq 7.384^{1.6},$$

we can deduce that

$$1 - A_3(m, k) \frac{\log \log n}{\varepsilon \log n} > 1 - \frac{1.6 \log \frac{A_3(m, k)}{\varepsilon}}{(A_3(m, k)/\varepsilon)^{0.6}} > 0.$$

Thus we have obtained

$$\frac{(A_3(m, k)/\varepsilon)^{0.6}}{(A_3(m, k)/\varepsilon)^{0.6} - 1.6 \log(A_3(m, k)/\varepsilon)} \cdot \log H \geq \varepsilon n \log n \geq \varepsilon r e^r, \quad (51)$$

where

$$r = \max \left\{ 1865, m^{\varphi(m)}, \left(\frac{A_3(m, k)}{\varepsilon} \right)^{1.6} \right\}$$

by assumptions (11). Let now z be as in Lemma 8.2. Hence, by applying Lemma 8.2, setting y be the left-hand side of inequality (51) divided by ε and keeping in mind that the term $z(y)$ in Lemma 8.2 is increasing, we get

$$\begin{aligned} n = z(n \log n) &\leq z \left(\frac{(A_3(m, k)/\varepsilon)^{0.6}}{(A_3(m, k)/\varepsilon)^{0.6} - 1.6 \log(A_3(m, k)/\varepsilon)} \cdot \frac{\log H}{\varepsilon} \right) \\ &< \left(1 + \frac{\log r}{r} \right) \cdot \frac{(A_3(m, k)/\varepsilon)^{0.6}}{(A_3(m, k)/\varepsilon)^{0.6} - 1.6 \log(A_3(m, k)/\varepsilon)} \cdot \frac{\log H/\varepsilon}{\log((\log H)/\varepsilon)}. \quad (52) \end{aligned}$$

Next we prove the last two estimates in (48).

Let us now prove the case containing the term $A_4(m)$. In order to prove the wanted estimate, we recognise the followings: The functions $\log r/r$ and $x^{0.6}/(x^{0.6} - 1.6 \log x)$ are decreasing and positive for all values r, x under consideration. Hence, we can use estimate $A_3(m, k)/\varepsilon > A_3(m, 1)$ in the second term of the product in the last line of estimate (52). For number r we use the following: In the case $m \in [3, 43]$ we apply $r = 1865$, in the case $m \in [44, 60]$ we apply $r = 1936$ and in the other cases $r = m^{m^{0.7}}$, where we set number m be the lower bound of the interval under consideration. These replacements prove the second estimate in (48).

Let us now prove the last estimate in (48). Now, using the assumption that the term $\log H/\varepsilon$ is greater than $(A_3(m, k)/\varepsilon)^{1.6} e^{(A_3(m, k)/\varepsilon)^{1.6}}$, the right-hand side of estimate (52) is

$$< \frac{(A_3(m, k)/\varepsilon)^{1.6} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{\log r}{r}\right) \cdot \frac{\log H}{A_3(m, k)}}{\left((A_3(m, k)/\varepsilon)^{0.6} - 1.6 \log(A_3(m, k)/\varepsilon)\right) \left((A_3(m, k)/\varepsilon)^{1.6} + 1.6 \log(A_3(m, k)/\varepsilon)\right)}.$$

Since the function in the first line is a decreasing function of $A_3(m, k)/\varepsilon$ for all possible values of $A_3(m, k)/\varepsilon$, we can again use the estimate $A_3(m, k)/\varepsilon > A_3(m, 1)$. Further, we can also use the same estimates for r as in the previous case. This proves the last estimate in (48). \square

Remark 8.4. For the left-hand side in (50) to be positive, it is enough to assume that $s \geq -\frac{A_3(m, k)}{\varepsilon} W_{-1}\left(-\frac{\varepsilon}{A_3(m, k)}\right) + 1$ instead of the last assumption in (11). However, this would lead to more complicated computations. Hence, in order to keep the computations relatively simple, we have done a more lenient and a more simpler assumption in (11).

Remark 8.5. The exponent 1.6 of $A_3(m, k)/\varepsilon$ in assumptions (11) is selected in such a way that it is the largest exponent r with one decimal accuracy that $rx \log x/x^r < 1$ for all $x \geq 7.384$.

8.2 Proof of Theorem 2.8

In this section, we prove Theorem 2.8:

Proof of Theorem 2.8. Because of Lemmas 4.16, 8.1 and estimate (15) we must have

$$|B_{n+1, \mu, 0}(1) \Lambda_p|_p > \left| \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j S_{n+1, \mu, j}(1) \right|_p$$

for some $p \in R \cap (\log(n+1), k(n+2)]$. We consider this prime number p . First we prove that p is in set (12) and then that the wanted lower bound is satisfied.

Due to the second estimate in (48), number p is smaller than the end of the interval in (12). Even more, if

$$n+1 \leq \frac{\log H}{\varepsilon \log\left(\frac{\log H}{\varepsilon}\right)} < \frac{\log H}{\varepsilon \log \log H}, \quad (53)$$

then

$$\log(n+1)(n+1) < \frac{\log H}{\varepsilon \log \log H} \log\left(\frac{\log H}{\varepsilon \log \log H}\right) = \frac{\log H}{\varepsilon} \left(1 - \frac{\log(\varepsilon \log \log H)}{\log \log H}\right). \quad (54)$$

Further, by assumptions (10) and (11) and since $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ we have

$$\log \log H > \varepsilon \log \log H > \varepsilon \log\left(\varepsilon/\varepsilon^{1.6} e^{\varepsilon^{-1.6}}\right) > \varepsilon^{-0.6} > 1.$$

Hence, the right-hand side of estimate (54) is smaller than $\log H/\varepsilon$ if inequality (53) holds. However, this is a contradiction with the first paragraph of the proof of Lemma 8.1. Hence, inequality (53) cannot hold and hence $\log(n+1)$ is greater than the lower bound of interval in (12). Thus p is in the wanted set.

As in the proof of Theorem 2.8, we only have to find a lower bound for the term $|\Lambda_p|_p$. By estimate (16) it is sufficient to find an upper bound for the term $|T(n+1, \mu)|$.

Similarly as in the proof of Theorem 2.8, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \log |T(n+1, \mu)| &< \log H + (k+2.5) \log k + \frac{1}{k} + \log \sqrt{2\pi} + \frac{1}{12k(n+1)} - k + (k+1.5) \left(\log n + \frac{2}{n} \right) \\ &+ (k-1) \log \left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \{|\alpha_j|\} \right) (1+k(n+1)) + k(n+1) \left(\log 2 + \log k + \log n + \frac{2}{n} - 1 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Now, applying Lemma 8.3 for $n \log n$ and n and using assumptions (11), $k \geq 1$ and the facts that $\log k < k$ and $\log H/\varepsilon > \log H$, the previous estimate is

$$\begin{aligned} &< \left(\frac{k}{\varepsilon} + 1 \right) \log H + n \log \log n \left(\frac{A_3(m, k)k}{\varepsilon} + \frac{(k-1) \log (\max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \{|\alpha_j|\}) k}{\log \log n} \right. \\ &+ \frac{(2k+1.5) \log n}{n \log \log n} + \frac{k(\log k + \log 2 + 1)}{\log \log n} + \frac{1}{kn \log \log n} + \frac{4k+37/12}{n^2 \log \log n} \\ &+ \left. \frac{(2k+2.5) \log k + \log \sqrt{2\pi} + k \log 2 - 2k + (k^2-1) \log (\max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \{|\alpha_j|\})}{n \log \log n} \right) \\ &< \left(\frac{k}{\varepsilon} + 1 \right) \log H + \frac{A_4(m) \log H}{\varepsilon \log \log H} \cdot \log \log (\log H) \left(\frac{A_3(m, k)k}{\varepsilon} + k^2 - k + \frac{k^2}{n} \right. \\ &+ \left. \frac{k(k + \log 2 + 1)}{\log \log n} + \frac{3.5k \log n}{n \log \log n} + \frac{(2k + \log 2 + \log \sqrt{2\pi} + 1.5)k}{n \log \log n} + \frac{85k}{12n^2 \log \log n} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Again, we simplify this expression using different cases depending on the numbers m and n .

All functions depending on number n in the right-hand side of the previous inequality are decreasing for all $n > e$. The claim follows when we use the same bounds for number $\log n$ that were used in the proof of Lemma 8.2 to prove the first estimate in (48). \square

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Dr. Louna Seppälä for her support during the research process and Associate Professor Tim Trudgian for giving an idea to use Lemma 4.5 and Corollary 4.6.

References

- [1] M. Abramowitz and I. A. Stegun. *Handbook of Mathematical Functions: With Formulas, Graphs, and Mathematical Tables*, volume 55 of *Applied Mathematics Series*. National Bureau Of Standards, Washington, D.C., 2 edition, 1964.
- [2] M. A. Bennett, G. Martin, K. O'Bryant, and A. Rechnitzer. Explicit bounds for primes in arithmetic progressions. *Illinois J. Math.*, 62(1-4):427–532, 2018.
- [3] D. Bertrand, V. G. Chirskii, and J. Yebbou. Effective estimates for global relations on Euler-type series. *Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. (6)*, 13(2):241–260, 2004.

- [4] R. Borghi and E. J. Weniger. Convergence analysis of the summation of the factorially divergent Euler series by Padé approximants and the delta transformation. *Appl. Numer. Math.*, 94:149–178, 2015.
- [5] V. G. Chirskii. Non-trivial global relations. *Vestnik Moskov. Univ. Ser. I Mat. Mekh.*, 44(5):33–36, 1989. English translation in *Moscow Univ. Math. Bull.*, 44(5):41-44, (1989).
- [6] V. G. Chirskii. Global relations. *Mat. Zametki*, 48(2):123–127, 1990. English translation in *Math. Notes*, 48(1–2):795–798, (1989).
- [7] V. G. Chirskii. Arithmetic properties of Euler series. *Vestnik Moskov. Univ. Ser. I Mat. Mekh.*, (1):59–61, 2015. English translation in *Moscow Univ. Math. Bull.*, 70(1):41-43, (2015).
- [8] A. W. Dudek, L. Grenié, and G. Molteni. Explicit short intervals for primes in arithmetic progressions on GRH. *Int. J. Number Theory*, 15(4):825–862, 2019.
- [9] P. Dusart. *Autour de la fonction qui compte le nombre de nombres premiers*. PhD thesis, Université de Limoges, 1998.
- [10] A.-M. Ernvall-Hytönen, T. Matala-aho, and L. Seppälä. Euler’s divergent series in arithmetic progressions. *J. Integer Seq.*, 22(2):10 pp, 2019.
- [11] A.-M. Ernvall-Hytönen, T. Matala-aho, and L. Seppälä. On Mahler’s transcendence measure for e . *Constr. Approx.*, 49:405–444, 2019.
- [12] A.-M. Ernvall-Hytönen, T. Matala-Aho, and L. Seppälä. Euler’s factorial series, Hardy integral, and continued fractions. *arXiv e-prints*, 2021.
- [13] A.-M. Ernvall-Hytönen and N. Palojärvi. Explicit bound for the number of primes in arithmetic progressions assuming the Generalized Riemann Hypothesis. *Math. Comp.*, 91(335):1317–1365, 2022.
- [14] J. Fisher. On the role of power expansions in quantum field theory. *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A*, 12:3625–3663, 1997.
- [15] T. Matala-aho. On Baker type lower bounds for linear forms. *Acta Arithm.*, 172(4):305–323, 2016.
- [16] T. Matala-aho and W. Zudilin. Euler’s factorial series and global relations. *J. Number Theory*, 186:202–210, 2018.
- [17] O. Ramaré and R. Rumely. Primes in arithmetic progression. *Math. Comp.*, 65(213):397–425, 1996.
- [18] J. Rosser and L. Schoenfeld. Approximate formulas for some functions of prime numbers. *Illinois J. Math.*, 6:64–94, 1962.
- [19] L. Schoenfeld. Sharper bounds for the Chebyshev functions $\theta(x)$ and $\psi(x)$ II. *Math. Comp.*, 30:337–360, 1976.
- [20] L. Seppälä. Euler’s factorial series at algebraic integer points. *J. Number Theory*, 206:250–281, 2020.
- [21] V. S. Varadarajan. Euler and his work on infinite series. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 44(4):515–539, 2007.