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1. Introduction. In this paper it will be shown how one may express the number of lattice points in certain triangles and tetrahedra in terms of Dedekind–Rademacher sums. One of the principal benefits of doing so is that the reciprocity law for Dedekind–Rademacher sums may be used in conjunction with the Euclidean algorithm to rapidly compute the exact number of lattice points in these triangles and tetrahedra. Formulae of a somewhat different nature for the number of lattice points in triangles and tetrahedra have been discovered by Ehrhart ([4], [5], [6], [7], [8]).

The results that appear below generalize the following beautiful result of Mordell ([14]; [18], pp. 39–44), which expresses the number of lattice points in certain tetrahedra in terms of classical Dedekind sums.

Theorem 1.1. Let \( p, q \) and \( r \) be three pairwise coprime integers, and let \( N(p, q, r) \) denote the number of lattice points in the tetrahedron

\[
0 \leq x < p, \quad 0 \leq y < q, \quad 0 \leq z < r, \quad 0 < \frac{x}{p} + \frac{y}{q} + \frac{z}{r} < 1.
\]

Then

\[
N(p, q, r) = \frac{1}{6} pqr + \frac{1}{4} (pq + qr + pr) + \frac{1}{4} (p + q + r) + \frac{1}{12} \left( \frac{qr}{p} + \frac{pr}{q} + \frac{pq}{r} \right) - 2 - s(gr, p) + s(gr, q) + s(gr, r),
\]

where

\[
s(gr, p) = \sum_{0 \leq y < p} \sum_{0 \leq z < r} \left( \frac{y}{q} + \frac{z}{r} \right)
\]

It should be remarked that Hirzebruch [12] has used the curious connection between Dedekind sums and the topology of certain manifolds to provide another proof of Theorem 1.1. Also note that Carlitz [3] has generalized Theorem 1.1 to obtain three-term relations for generalized Dedekind–Rademacher sums.
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In the last section of this paper it will be shown that a conjecture of Rademacher concerning the parity of the number of lattice points in certain higher dimensional tetrahedra is false.

2. Dedekind–Rademacher sums. Let \( h \) and \( k \) be relatively prime integers with \( h \) positive, and let \( x \) and \( y \) be real numbers. The Dedekind–Rademacher sum is defined to be

\[
s(h, k; x, y) = \sum_{\mu \pmod{k}} \left( \frac{\mu + y}{k} \right) \left( \frac{x}{h} \right) \left( \frac{\mu + y}{k} \right)
\]

where as usual

\[
(a) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{x - [x]}{2} & \text{if } a \notin \mathbb{Z}, \\
0 & \text{if } a \in \mathbb{Z}.
\end{cases}
\]

It is easy to see that \( s(h, k; x, y) \) is periodic with period one in both \( x \) and \( y \). When \( x \) and \( y \) are both integers, the Dedekind–Rademacher sum \( s(h, k; x, y) \) reduces to the classical Dedekind sum

\[
s(h, k) = \sum_{\mu \pmod{k}} \left( \frac{\mu + y}{k} \right) \left( \frac{\mu + x}{k} \right).
\]

An explicit formula proved in [17] may be given for Dedekind–Rademacher sums when \( h = 1 \) and \( x = 0 \).

**Lemma 2.3.** Let \( h \) be a positive integer and \( y \) a real number. Then

\[
s(h, 1; 0, y) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{h}{12} + \frac{1}{6k} - \frac{1}{4} & \text{if } y \in \mathbb{Z}, \\
\frac{h}{12} + \frac{1}{k} \tilde{B}_2(y) & \text{if } y \notin \mathbb{Z}
\end{cases}
\]

where \( \tilde{B}_2(y) = (y - [y])^2 - (y - [y]) + \frac{1}{2} \), the second periodic Bernoulli function evaluated at \( y \).

Apostol [1] has given the following easily derived explicit formula for \( s(2, k) \).

**Lemma 2.4.** If \( k \) is odd,

\[
s(2, k) = \frac{(k - 1)(k - 5)}{24k}.
\]

The fundamental fact about Dedekind–Rademacher sums is that they satisfy the following reciprocity law, proved by Rademacher [17].

**Theorem 2.5.** When \( x \) and \( y \) are not both integers

\[
s(h, k; x, y) + s(k, h; y, x) = (x)(y) + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{h}{h} \tilde{B}_2(y) + \frac{k}{h} \tilde{B}_2(x) + \frac{1}{hk} \tilde{B}_2(hy + ky) \right).
\]

However, when \( x \) and \( y \) are both integers the reciprocity law for classical Dedekind sums remains in effect:

\[
s(h, k; x, y) + s(k, h; x, y) = s(h, k) + s(k, h) = \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{12} \left( \frac{h}{k} + \frac{k}{h} + 1 \right).
\]

The reciprocity law, together with the following lemma, also proved in [17], may be used to compute Dedekind–Rademacher sums, using the Euclidean algorithm.

**Lemma 2.6.** Let \( m \) be an integer. Then

\[
s(h, k; x, y) = s(h, m - h, k; x + my, y).
\]

Several properties of the function \((a)\) will be needed later. It is easy to see that \((x + 1) = (x)\) and \((x - 1) = -(x)\). The following properties of \((a)\) are often useful.

**Lemma 2.7.** Let \( h \) be a positive integer and let \( x \) be a real number. Then

\[
\sum_{\mu \pmod{h}} \left( \frac{\mu + x}{h} \right) = (x).
\]

**Lemma 2.8.** Let \( n \) be a positive integer and let \( x \) be a real number. Then

\[
\sum_{\mu \pmod{n}} \left( \frac{\mu + x}{n} \right) = (nx).
\]

A proof of Lemma 2.7 may be found in [19]. Lemma 2.8 follows from Lemma 2.7 by taking \( h = n \) and \( x = nx \).

In certain special cases, Dedekind–Rademacher sums may be expressed in terms of classical Dedekind sums. The following result of this kind will be useful later.

**Lemma 2.9.** Let \( h \) and \( k \) be positive integers. Then

\[
s(h, k; h/2, 0) = \begin{cases} 
s(h, k) & \text{if } h \text{ is even}, \\
s(2h, k) - s(h, k) & \text{if } h \text{ is odd}.
\end{cases}
\]

**Proof.** If \( h \) is even, \( s(h, k; h/2, 0) = s(h, k) \) since \( h/2 \) is an integer. When \( h \) is odd, \( s(h, k; h/2, 0) = s(h, k; 1/2, 0) \). Now

\[
s(h, k; \frac{1}{2}, 0) + s(k, h) = \sum_{\mu \pmod{k}} \left( \frac{\mu}{k} \right) \left( \frac{h\mu}{k} \right) + \left( \frac{h\mu}{k} + \frac{1}{2} \right) = \sum_{\mu \pmod{k}} \left( \frac{\mu}{k} \right) \left( \frac{2h\mu}{k} \right) = s(2h, k),
\]

where the second equality is a consequence of Lemma 2.8.
3. Formulae for the number of lattice points in triangles. In this section a general formula involving Dedekind–Rademacher sums will be found for the number of lattice points inside certain triangles. Let \( \mathcal{C} \) be a real number with \( 0 \leq \mathcal{C} < 1 \) and let \( p \) and \( q \) be relatively prime positive integers. Let \( \mathcal{S} = (p, 0), \mathcal{Z} = (0, q), \mathcal{A} = (p(1 - \mathcal{C}), 0), \mathcal{B} = (0, q(1 - \mathcal{C})), \) and \( \mathcal{E} = (0, 0) \). The lattice points \((x, y)\) in the interior of the triangle \( \mathcal{S} \mathcal{B} \mathcal{C} \) and on its boundary, excluding points on the segment \( \mathcal{S} \mathcal{B} \), are precisely those pairs of integers \((x, y)\) satisfying \( 0 \leq x < p, 0 \leq y < q, \) and \( 0 \leq x/p + y/q < 1 - \mathcal{C} \). Let \( N(p, q; \mathcal{C}) \) be the number of these lattice points; a formula will now be found for \( N(p, q; \mathcal{C}) \).

Let \( \mathcal{F} = x/p + y/q + \mathcal{C} \). The points \((x, y)\) to be counted are those for which \( \mathcal{F} < 1 \). Note that for \( 0 \leq x < p, 0 \leq y < q, \) one has \( \mathcal{F} < 3 \), since \( \mathcal{C} < 1 \). To find a formula for \( N(p, q; \mathcal{C}) \) one starts with an identity similar to one used by Mordell to count lattice points in tetrahedra.

\[
2N(p, q; \mathcal{C}) = \sum_{x,y} \left( \left[ \mathcal{F} \right] - 1 \right) \left( \left[ \mathcal{F} \right] - 2 \right)
\]

where the summation is over the range of \( 0 \leq x < p, 0 \leq y < q \).

Equality holds in (3.1) because the points to be enumerated are those for which \( \left[ \mathcal{F} \right] = 0 \), while other points in the range give \( \left[ \mathcal{F} \right] = 1 \) or \( \left[ \mathcal{F} \right] = 2 \) and hence contribute zero to the sum. Since

\[
\left[ \mathcal{F} \right] = \begin{cases} 
\left( \mathcal{F} - ((\mathcal{F}) - 1/2) \right) & \text{if } \mathcal{F} \notin \mathbb{Z}, \\
\left( \mathcal{F} - ((\mathcal{F}) - 1) \right) & \text{if } \mathcal{F} \in \mathbb{Z}
\end{cases}
\]

one has

\[
\sum_{x,y} \left( \left[ \mathcal{F} \right] - 1 \right) \left( \left[ \mathcal{F} \right] - 2 \right) = \sum_{x,y} \left( \mathcal{F} - ((\mathcal{F}) - 1/2) \right) \left( \mathcal{F} - ((\mathcal{F}) - 1) \right) - \frac{1}{12} \delta_0 - \frac{1}{2} \delta_1 - \frac{1}{3} \delta_2
\]

where \( \delta_0 \) is the number of solutions of \( \mathcal{F} = f \in \mathbb{Z} \). Note that \( \delta_0 = \delta_1 = \delta_2 = 0 \) if \( pq \) is not an integer.

From (3.1) and (3.2) one has

\[
2N(p, q; \mathcal{C}) + \frac{1}{2} \delta_0 + \frac{1}{2} \delta_1 + \frac{1}{3} \delta_2 = \sum_{x,y} \left( \mathcal{F} - \left( \mathcal{F} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \right) \left( \mathcal{F} - \left( \mathcal{F} - \frac{1}{4} \right) \right) + \sum_{x,y} \left( \mathcal{F} \right)^2
\]

\[
= \mathcal{S}_4 - 2 \mathcal{S}_3 + \mathcal{S}_2.
\]

Each of the sums \( \mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{S}_3, \) and \( \mathcal{S}_4 \) will now be evaluated. First consider \( \mathcal{S}_2 \).

\[
\mathcal{S}_2 = \sum_{x,y} \left( \left( \frac{x}{p} + \frac{y}{q} + \mathcal{C} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \left( \frac{x}{p} + \frac{y}{q} + \mathcal{C} - \frac{3}{2} \right) \right) = \sum_{x,y} \left( \frac{x^2}{p^2} + \frac{y^2}{q^2} \right) + 2 \sum_{x,y} \left( \frac{xq}{pq} + \frac{yp}{pq} \right) + 2(\mathcal{C} - 2) \sum_{x,y} \left( \frac{x}{p} + \frac{y}{q} \right) + \sum_{x,y} \left( \mathcal{C} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \left( C - \frac{3}{2} \right)
\]

\[
= \frac{q(p - 1) (2q - 1)}{6p} + \frac{p(q - 1) (2p - 1)}{6q} + \frac{(p - 1) (q - 1)}{2} + \frac{(C - 2) (p - 1) (q - 1) + pg (C - \frac{3}{2})}{6p} + \frac{(p - 1) (q - 1)}{2} + \frac{(C - 2) (p - 1) (q - 1) + pg (C - \frac{3}{2})}{6q}
\]

\[
= pq \left( \mathcal{C} - 2 + \frac{11}{12} \right) + (p + q) (1 - \mathcal{C}) + \frac{q}{6p} + \frac{p}{6q} + \frac{1}{2}.
\]

Dedekind–Rademacher sums arise in the evaluation of \( \mathcal{S}_2 \).

\[
\mathcal{S}_2 = \sum_{x,y} \left( \mathcal{F} - ((\mathcal{F}) - 1/2) \right) \left( \mathcal{F} - ((\mathcal{F}) - 1) \right)
\]

\[
= \sum_{x,y} \left( \frac{x}{p} + \frac{y}{q} + \mathcal{C} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \left( \frac{x}{p} + \frac{y}{q} + \mathcal{C} - \frac{3}{2} \right)
\]

\[
= \sum_{x,y} \left( \frac{x^2}{p^2} + \frac{y^2}{q^2} \right) + 2 \sum_{x,y} \left( \frac{xq}{pq} + \frac{yp}{pq} \right) + 2(\mathcal{C} - 2) \sum_{x,y} \left( \frac{x}{p} + \frac{y}{q} \right) + \sum_{x,y} \left( \mathcal{C} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \left( C - \frac{3}{2} \right)
\]

From Lemma 2.7 one has

\[
\sum_{x,y} \left( \mathcal{F} \right) = \sum_{x,y} \left( \frac{x}{p} + \frac{y}{q} + \mathcal{C} \right) = \sum_{x,y} \left( \frac{x + Cpq}{pq} \right) = \left( Cpq \right).
\]

Using Lemma 2.8 and recalling definition (2.1),

\[
\sum_{x,y} \left( \frac{x}{p} + \frac{y}{q} + \mathcal{C} \right) = \sum_{x,y} \left( \frac{x}{p} \right) \left( \frac{y}{q} + \mathcal{C} \right) - \frac{1}{12} \sum_{x,y} \left( \frac{y}{q} + \mathcal{C} \right)
\]

\[
= \sum_{x,y} \left( \frac{x}{p} \right) \left( \frac{y}{q} + \mathcal{C}q \right) - \frac{1}{12} \left( C \right) = s(p, q; Cq, 0) - \frac{1}{12} \left( C \right).
\]

Likewise

\[
\sum_{x,y} \left( \frac{y}{q} + \mathcal{C} \right) = s(p, q; Cq, 0) - \frac{1}{12} \left( C \right).
\]

Hence

\[
\mathcal{S}_2 = s(p, q; Cq, 0) + s(p, q; Cq, 0) - \frac{1}{12} \left( C \right) + \left( C - 1 \right) \left( Cpq \right).
\]

Finally to find \( \mathcal{S}_4 \), write

\[
\mathcal{S}_4 = \sum_{x,y} \left( \frac{x}{p} \right) \left( \frac{y}{q} + \mathcal{C} \right) = \sum_{x,y} \left( \frac{xq}{pq} + \frac{yp}{pq} + \mathcal{C} \right)
\]

\[
= \sum_{x,y} \left( \frac{xq}{pq} + \frac{yp}{pq} \right) + \left( C - 1 \right) \left( C pq \right) = \left( Cpq \right).
\]

using Lemma 2.3.
Consequently, by inserting the values of $S_1, S_2,$ and $S_3$ into (3.3) one obtains

**Theorem 3.4.** Let $p$ and $q$ be relatively prime positive integers and let $0 < C < 1$. Then

$$2N(p, q; C) + \frac{1}{4} \delta_0 + \frac{1}{6} \delta_1 - \frac{1}{2} \delta_2$$
$$= (1-C) pq + (1-C)(p+q) + \frac{q}{6p} + \frac{p}{6q} + \frac{1}{2} -$$
$$-2(s(p, q; C, 0) + s(q, p; C, 0) + l((Cp)) + (l(Cq)) + l(1-C)((Cpq))$$
$$+ \begin{cases} \frac{1}{6pq} & \text{if } Cpq \in \mathbb{Z}, \\ \frac{1}{pq} B_1(Cpq) & \text{if } Cpq \notin \mathbb{Z}. \end{cases}$$

In the special case $C = 0$ one has $\delta_0 = 1$ and $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = 0$. So

$$2N(p, q; 0) + \frac{1}{4}$$
$$= pq + p + q + \frac{q}{6p} + \frac{p}{6q} + \frac{1}{4} - 2(s(p, q) + s(q, p)) - \frac{1}{4}$$
$$= pq + p + q + \frac{1}{4}.$$}

The last equality is a consequence of the reciprocity law for Dedekind sums. Hence

$$N(p, q; 0) = \frac{(p+1)(q+1)}{2} - 1.$$

This is the expected value since $N(p, q; 0)$ equals the number of lattice points inside $\mathcal{D}$ or on the rectangle with vertices $\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{Z}, \text{ and } (p, q)$, and below the diagonal $\mathcal{P}2$. By the correspondence $w' = p-x, y' = q-y$, it is easy to see that the number of lattice points above the diagonal equals the number below the diagonal. Since $\delta = 1$, there are exactly 2 lattice points, namely $\mathcal{D}$ and $\mathcal{S}$, on the diagonal. Since there are $(p+1)(q+1)$ total lattice points inside or on the rectangle, one concludes

$$N(p, q; 0) = \frac{(p+1)(q+1)}{2} - 1.$$

The formula for $N(p, q; C)$ when $C = \frac{1}{2}$ simplifies considerably and will be needed later. In this case, there is another geometric interpretation of $N(p, q; C, \mathcal{D})$; it equals the number of lattice points with even coordinates inside the triangle $\mathcal{P}2\mathcal{Z}$ or on its boundary excluding the segment $\mathcal{P}2$, i.e., $N(p, q; \frac{1}{2})$ is the number of solutions of $0 \leq x/p + y/q < 1$ with $0 \leq x < p$ and $0 \leq y < q$, with both $x$ and $y$ even. The values of $N(p, q; \frac{1}{2})$ are related to quadratic reciprocity and arise in topological investigations. See the work of Hirzebruch and Mayer [13] for a discussion of these topics.

A consequence of Theorem 3.4 is

**Corollary 3.5.** If $p$ is odd and $q$ is even and if $(p, q) = 1$, then

$$N(p, q; \frac{1}{2}) = \frac{pq}{8} + \frac{p+q}{4} - s(2p, q) + s(p, q).$$

If $p$ and $q$ are both odd and if $(p, q) = 1$, then

$$N(p, q; \frac{1}{2}) = \frac{pq}{8} + \frac{p+q}{4} + \frac{q}{6p} + \frac{p}{6q} + \frac{1}{24pq} - s(2p, q) - s(2q, p).$$

**Proof.** When $p$ is odd and $q$ is even, $\delta_0 = \delta_2 = 0$, and $\delta_1 = 1$, and $\frac{1}{2} \notin \mathbb{Z}$. Hence from Theorem 3.4,

$$2N(p, q; \frac{1}{2}) = \frac{pq}{4} + \frac{p+q}{2} + \frac{q}{6p} + \frac{p}{6q} + \frac{1}{2} -$$
$$-2\left(s\left(p, q; \frac{1}{2}, 0\right) + s\left(q, p; \frac{1}{2}, 0\right)\right).$$

But from Lemma 2.3 and from Dedekind sum reciprocity

$$s(p, q; p/2, 0) + s(q, p; q/2, 0) = s(2p, q) - s(p, q) + s(q, p)$$

$= s(2p, q) - 2s(p, q) - \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{12} \left(\frac{p}{q} + \frac{q}{p} + \frac{1}{pq}\right).$

The desired formula is obtained by substituting (3.7) into (3.8) and then dividing by 2.

When both $p$ and $q$ are odd, $\delta_0 = \delta_1 = \delta_2 = 0$ and $\frac{1}{2} \notin \mathbb{Z}$. Note $B_2(\frac{1}{2}pq) = B_2(\frac{1}{2}) = -\frac{1}{12}$. Hence Theorem 3.4 implies

$$2N(p, q; \frac{1}{2}) = \frac{pq}{4} + \frac{p+q}{2} + \frac{q}{6p} + \frac{p}{6q} + \frac{1}{2} -$$
$$-2\left(s\left(p, q; \frac{1}{2}, 0\right) + s\left(q, p; \frac{1}{2}, 0\right)\right).$$

From Lemma 2.3 and using the reciprocity law for Dedekind sums one has

$$s\left(p, q; \frac{1}{2}, 0\right) + s\left(q, p; \frac{1}{2}, 0\right) = s(2p, q) - s(p, q) + s(2q, p) - s(q, p)$$

$= s(2p, q) + s(2q, p) + \frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{12} \left(\frac{p}{q} + \frac{q}{p} + \frac{1}{pq}\right).$
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The desired formula is obtained by substitution of (3.9) into (3.8), and upon division by 2. □

In special cases, the Dedekind sums occurring in the formula for \( N(p, q; \frac{1}{2}) \) may be explicitly evaluated. For example one has

**Corollary 3.10.** If \( p \equiv 1 \pmod{q} \) and \( p \) is odd, then

\[
N(p, q; \frac{1}{2}) = \frac{(p+3)(q+2)}{8} + \frac{1}{2q} \quad \text{if} \quad q \text{ is even},
\]

\[
N(p, q; \frac{1}{2}) = \frac{(p-1)(q-2)}{8q} + \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{if} \quad q \text{ is odd}.
\]

**Proof.** If \( q \) is even, Corollary 3.5 implies

\[
N(p, q; \frac{1}{2}) = \frac{pq}{8} + \frac{p+q}{4} - s(2p, q) + 2s(p, q).
\]

Using Lemma 2.3 one has

\[
s(2p, q) = s(2, q) = s\left(1, \frac{q}{2}\right) = \frac{(q-2)(q-4)}{24q},
\]

and

\[
s(p, q) = s(1, q) = \frac{(q-1)(q-2)}{12q}.
\]

Substituting (3.12) and (3.13) into (3.11) yields the desired formula for even \( q \).

For \( q \) odd, Corollary 3.5 gives

\[
N(p, q; \frac{1}{2}) = \frac{pq}{8} + \frac{p+q}{4} + \frac{q}{6p} + \frac{p}{6q} - s(2p, q) - s(2q, p).
\]

Lemma 2.4 shows that

\[
s(2p, q) = s(2, q) = \frac{(q-1)(q-5)}{24q}.
\]

From Dedekind sum reciprocity and from Lemma 2.5, since \( p \equiv 1 \pmod{2q} \),

\[
s(2q, p) = \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{12} \left( \frac{p}{2q} + \frac{2q}{p} + \frac{1}{2pq} \right) - s(p, 2q)
\]

\[
= -\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{12} \left( \frac{p}{2q} + \frac{2q}{p} + \frac{1}{2pq} \right) - s(1, 2q)
\]

\[
= -\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{12} \left( \frac{p}{2q} + \frac{2q}{p} + \frac{1}{2pq} \right) - \frac{(2q-1)(q-1)}{12q},
\]

Substituting the values found for \( s(2p, q) \) and \( s(2q, p) \) into (3.14) gives the result for odd \( q \).

**4. Formulae for the number of lattice points in tetrahedra.** In this section formulae for the number of lattice points in certain tetrahedra will be found. Let \( p, q, \) and \( r \) be pairwise co-prime positive integers and let \( C \) be a non-negative real number with \( C < \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{r} \). Let \( N(p, q, r; C) \) denote the number of lattice points inside or on the tetrahedron bounded by the three coordinate planes and by the plane \( \frac{x}{p} + \frac{y}{q} + \frac{z}{r} = 1 - C \), excluding points on the face where \( \frac{x}{p} + \frac{y}{q} + \frac{z}{r} = 1 - C \). Hence \( N(p, q, r; C) \) equals the number of solutions in integers \( x, y, \) and \( z \) of the system of inequalities \( 0 \leq x < p, 0 \leq y < q, 0 \leq z < r \) and \( 0 \leq \frac{x}{p} + \frac{y}{q} + \frac{z}{r} + C < 1 \). Let \( E = \frac{x}{p} + \frac{y}{q} + \frac{z}{r} + C \). Then

\[
2N(p, q, r; C) = \sum_{0 \leq E \leq 1} \left[ [(E) - 1] [(E) - 2] \right]
\]

where the summation is over the set of \( (x, y, z) \) with \( 0 \leq x < p, 0 \leq y < q, \) and \( 0 \leq z < r \). Since \( 0 \leq C < \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{r} \), one has \( 0 \leq E < 3 \), and so the only points which give a nonzero contribution to the sum are those points for which \( 0 \leq E < 1 \), and each of these contribute 2 to the sum.

To evaluate this sum, note that

\[
\sum_{0 \leq E \leq 1} \left[ [(E) - 1] [(E) - 2] \right] = \sum_{0 \leq E \leq 1} \left[ (E - [(E)]) - \frac{1}{3} (E - [(E)]) - \frac{1}{6} \delta_0 - \frac{1}{3} \delta_1 + \frac{1}{2} \delta_2 \right]
\]

where \( \delta_j \) equals the number of solutions of \( E = j \). Note that \( \delta_0 = \delta_1 = \delta_2 = 0 \) if \( Cpr \) is not an integer.

To compute \( N(p, q, r; C) \) it is necessary to evaluate

\[
S = \sum_{0 \leq E \leq 1} \left[ (E - [(E)]) - \frac{1}{3} (E - [(E)]) - \frac{1}{6} \delta_0 - \frac{1}{3} \delta_1 + \frac{1}{2} \delta_2 \right] = \sum_{0 \leq E \leq 1} (E - [(E)]) - 2 \sum_{0 \leq E \leq 1} (E - 2)([(E)]) + \sum_{0 \leq E \leq 1} ([(E)])^2
\]

\[= S_1 - 2S_2 + S_3.\]
The three sums $S_1$, $S_2$, and $S_3$ will now be considered.

$$S_1 = \sum_{a,b,c} \left( E - \frac{1}{2} \right) ((E)) = \sum_{a,b,c} \left( \frac{a}{p} + \frac{y}{q} + \frac{z}{r} + C - \frac{1}{2} \right) \left( \frac{2}{p} + \frac{y}{q} + \frac{z}{r} + C - \frac{1}{2} \right)$$

$$= \sum_{a,b,c} \left[ \frac{a^2}{p^2} + \frac{y^2}{q^2} + \frac{z^2}{r^2} + 2 \sum_{a,b,c} \left( \frac{ax}{pq} + \frac{ay}{pr} + \frac{az}{qr} \right) + \right.$$ 

$$\left. + (2C - 1) \sum_{a,b,c} \left( \frac{a}{p} + \frac{y}{q} + \frac{z}{r} \right) + \sum_{a,b,c} (C - \frac{1}{2}) (C - \frac{1}{2}) \right]$$

$$= \frac{qg(p-1)(2p-1)}{6p} + \frac{yr(q-1)(2q-1)}{6q} + \frac{pr(r-1)(2r-1)}{6p} +$$

$$+ \frac{(q-1)(q-1)q}{2} + \frac{(r-1)(r-1)r}{2} + \frac{(p-1)(p-1)p}{2} +$$

$$+ (C-1)(C-1)qr + (q-1)pr + (r-1)pq + pq(C-\frac{1}{2})(C-\frac{1}{2})$$

$$= \left( \frac{C^2 - C + \frac{1}{4}}{4} \right) pqr + \frac{1}{2} - C \right) \left( pq + qr + pr \right) +$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} (p + q + r) + \frac{1}{6} \left( \frac{pr}{q} + \frac{pq}{r} + \frac{qr}{p} \right).$$

The sum $S_1$ is the term where Dedekind-Rademacher sums arise.

$$S_2 = \sum_{a,b,c} \left( E - \frac{1}{2} \right) ((E)) = \sum_{a,b,c} \left( \frac{a}{p} + \frac{1}{2} \right) ((E)) +$$

$$+ \sum_{a,b,c} \left( \frac{a}{p} + \frac{1}{2} \right) ((E)) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{a,b,c} ((E)).$$

First from Lemma 2.6,

$$\sum_{a,b,c} ((E)) = \sum_{a,b,c} \left( \frac{a}{p} + \frac{y}{q} + \frac{z}{r} + C \right)$$

$$= \sum_{a,b,c} \left( \frac{a^2}{p^2} + \frac{y}{q} + \frac{z}{r} + C \right)$$

$$= \sum_{a,b,c} \left( \frac{a^2}{p^2} + \frac{y}{q} + \frac{z}{r} + C \right)$$

$$= \sum_{a,b,c} \left( \frac{a^2}{p^2} + \frac{y}{q} + \frac{z}{r} + C \right)$$

Next note that applying Lemma 2.8 shows that

$$\sum_{a,b,c} \left( \frac{a}{p} + \frac{1}{2} \right) ((E)) = \sum_{a,b,c} \left( \frac{a}{p} + \frac{y}{q} + \frac{z}{r} + C \right) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{a,b,c} \left( \frac{y}{q} + \frac{z}{r} + C \right)$$

$$= \sum_{a,b,c} \left( \frac{a}{p} + \frac{y}{q} + \frac{z}{r} + C \right) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{a,b,c} \left( \frac{y}{q} + \frac{z}{r} + C \right)$$

$$= \sum_{a,b,c} \left( \frac{a}{p} + \frac{y}{q} + \frac{z}{r} + C \right) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{a,b,c} \left( \frac{y}{q} + \frac{z}{r} + C \right)$$

$$= s(qg, p, Cqr, 0) - \frac{1}{2} \left( Cqr \right).$$

The other two terms are computed in a similar manner. One finds that

$$S_2 = s(qg, p, Cqr, 0) + s(qg, q, Cgq, 0) + s(pq, r, Cpq, 0) -$$

$$- \frac{1}{2} \left( Cpqg - \frac{1}{2} (Cqr) - \frac{1}{2} (Cgq) - \frac{1}{2} (Cpq) \right).$$

Finally, to evaluate $S_3$, one uses Lemma 2.3,

$$S_3 = \sum_{a,b,c} ((E)) = \sum_{a,b,c} \left( \frac{a}{p} + \frac{y}{q} + \frac{z}{r} + C \right)^2$$

$$= \sum_{a,b,c} \left( \frac{qgr}{p} + \frac{r}{p} + \frac{q}{r} + \frac{g}{q} + \frac{r}{p} \right).$$

Substituting the values found for $S_1$, $S_2$, and $S_3$ into (4.3) and using (4.1) and (4.2) yields

**Theorem 4.4.** If $p, q,$ and $r$ are pairwise coprime positive integers and if $0 < C < \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{r}$, then

$$2N(p,q,r;C) + \frac{1}{2} \delta_0 + \frac{1}{2} \delta_1 - \frac{1}{2} \delta_2$$

$$= (C^2 - C + \frac{1}{4}) pqr + (C - C) (pq + qr + pr) + \frac{1}{2} (p + q + r) + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{pr}{q} + \frac{pq}{r} + \right.$$

$$\left. + \frac{qr}{p} \right) - 2(s(qr, p, Cqr, 0) + s(pr, q, Cpq, 0) + s(pq, r, Cpq, 0)$$

$$+ ((Cpq) + ((Cpr) + (Cq)) + ((Cqr)) + ((Cpq)) + \left[ \frac{1}{2} \delta_0 - \frac{1}{4} \right] \text{ if } Cpqe \in \mathbb{Z},$$

$$+ ((Cpq) + ((Cpr) + (Cq)) + ((Cqr)) + ((Cpq)) + \left[ \frac{1}{2} \delta_0 - \frac{1}{4} \right] \text{ if } Cpqe \notin \mathbb{Z}.}$$
When \( C = 0 \), Theorem 4.4 becomes
\[
2N(p, q, r; 0) + \frac{3}{2} = \frac{1}{2}pq+q+\frac{1}{2}(pq+qr+pr)+\frac{1}{2}(p+q+r) +
\frac{1}{6}\left[\frac{p}{q} + \frac{q}{r} + \frac{r}{p}\right] - 2s(p, q) - s(p, q) + s(p, q, r) + \frac{1}{6pq} - \frac{1}{4}.
\]
This agrees with Mordell’s result, Theorem 1.1, since the origin is included in \( N(p, q, r; 0) \) but not in Mordell’s enumeration \( N(p, q, r) \).

The special case of \( C = \frac{1}{2} \) will now be considered. Note that \( N(p, q, r; \frac{1}{2}) \) equals the number of lattice points \((x, y, z)\) with all three of \( x, y, \) and \( z \) even inside or on the tetrahedron described by the inequalities \( 0 \leq x < p \), \( 0 \leq y < q \), \( 0 \leq z < r \) and \( 0 \leq \frac{x}{p} + \frac{y}{q} + \frac{z}{r} < 1 \), excluding points on the face \( \frac{x}{p} + \frac{y}{q} + \frac{z}{r} = 1 \). When \( C = \frac{1}{2} \), the restriction \( C < \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} + \frac{1}{r} \) may be lifted. Consider the sum
\[
S = \sum_{x, y, z} \left[ (E-1)(E-2) \right]
\]
where \( E = \frac{x}{p} + \frac{y}{q} + \frac{z}{r} + \frac{1}{2} \).

The \( N = N(p, q, r; \frac{1}{2}) \) points with \( \frac{1}{2} \leq E < 1 \) and the \( N' \) points with \( 3 \leq E < \frac{3}{2} \) each contribute 2 to \( S \), whereas points with \( 1 \leq E < 3 \) contribute zero to \( S \); there are never any points with \( E = 2 \) or \( E = 3 \). Hence
\[
S = 2N + 2N'.
\]
Let \( N'' \) be the number of lattice points with \( 0 \leq x < p \), \( 0 \leq y < q \), \( 0 \leq z < r \) satisfying \( \frac{x}{p} + \frac{y}{q} + \frac{z}{r} < \frac{1}{2} \). Then excluding these \( N'' \) points there is a one-to-one correspondence between the remaining \( N - N'' \) points with \( \frac{1}{2} \leq E < 1 \) and the \( N'' \) points with \( 3 \leq E < \frac{3}{2} \), given by \( x' = x - x \), \( y' = y - y \), \( z' = z - z \). Hence
\[
N' = N - N''.
\]
Clearley \( N(p, q, r; \frac{1}{2}) + N(p, r; \frac{1}{2}) + N(q, r; \frac{1}{2}) \) equals the number of lattice points with \( \frac{1}{2} \leq E < 1 \) and with exactly one coordinate zero, plus twice the number of lattice points with \( \frac{1}{2} \leq E < 1 \) and with exactly two coordinates zero, plus 3 since the origin is counted thrice. Therefore
\[
N'' = N(p, q, r; \frac{1}{2}) + N(p, r; \frac{1}{2}) + N(q, r; \frac{1}{2}) -
- \left[\frac{p-1}{2}\right] - \left[\frac{q-1}{2}\right] - \left[\frac{r-1}{2}\right] - 2.
\]
Consequently from (4.5), (4.6), (4.7), and (4.8), it follows that
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(4.9)} \quad S &= dN(p, q, r; \frac{1}{2}) - 2N'' \\
&= dN(p, q, r; \frac{1}{2}) - 2N(p, q; \frac{1}{2}) - 2N(p, r; \frac{1}{2}) - 2N(q, r; \frac{1}{2}) +
+ 2\left[\frac{p-1}{2}\right] + 2\left[\frac{q-1}{2}\right] + 2\left[\frac{r-1}{2}\right] + 4.
\end{align*}
\]
As before one finds from (4.3) and the previous evaluations of \( S_1, S_2, \) and \( S_3 \) that
\[
\begin{align*}
(4.10) \quad S + \frac{3}{4} \delta &= \frac{1}{2}pq+q+\frac{1}{2}(p+q+r)+\frac{1}{2}(pq+qr+pr)
- 2s(p, q, r; 3) + s(p, q; 2) + s(p, r; 2) + s(q, r; 2) + s(pq, r; 2) -
1\left[\frac{1}{6pq} - \frac{1}{4}\right] \quad \text{if } pq \text{ is even}
+ 1\left[\frac{1}{12pq} - \frac{1}{4}\right] \quad \text{if } pq \text{ is odd}.
\end{align*}
\]
The fact that \( B_1(pq/2) = B_1(\frac{1}{2}) = -\frac{1}{12} \) if \( pq \) is odd has been used.

The case where \( pq \) is even will be considered first. Since \( p, q, \) and \( r \) are coprime, at most one of \( p, q, \) and \( r \) is even. Assume \( p \) is even and \( q \) and \( r \) are odd. Then \( \delta_1 = 1 \). Lemma 2.9 implies
\[
(4.11) \quad s(\frac{p}{2}, \frac{q}{2}; 0) + s(p, q; 2, 0) + s(p, r; 2, 0) + s(q, r; 2, 0) + s(pq, r; 2, 0)
= s(2p, q) - s(\frac{p}{2}, q) + s(p, q) + s(p, r) + s(q, r) + s(pq, r).
\]

One also finds from Corollary 3.5 that
\[
(4.12) \quad N(p, q; \frac{1}{2}) = \frac{pq}{8} + \frac{p+q}{4} - s(2q, p) + 2s(q, p),
\]
\[
N(p, r; \frac{1}{2}) = \frac{pr}{8} + \frac{p+r}{4} - s(2r, p) + 2s(r, p),
\]
\[
N(q, r; \frac{1}{2}) = \frac{qr}{8} + \frac{q+r}{4} + \frac{q}{6r} + \frac{r}{6q} + \frac{1}{24qr} -
- s(2q, r) - s(2r, q).
\]

When \( p, q, \) and \( r \) are all odd, one has \( \delta_1 = 0 \). From Lemma 2.9 it follows that
\[
(4.13) \quad s(\frac{p}{2}, \frac{q}{2}; 0) + s(p, q; 2, 0) + s(p, r; 2, 0) + s(q, r; 2, 0)
= s(2p, q) - s(\frac{p}{2}, q) + s(p, q) - s(p, r) + s(q, r) + s(pq, r).
\]
From Corollary 3.5 one has

\begin{align*}
N(p, q; \frac{1}{2}) &= \frac{pq}{8} + \frac{p+q}{4} + \frac{p}{6q} + \frac{q}{6p} + \frac{1}{24pq} - s(2p, q) - s(2q, p), \\
N(p, r; \frac{1}{2}) &= \frac{pr}{8} + \frac{p+r}{4} + \frac{p}{6r} + \frac{r}{6p} + \frac{1}{24pr} - s(2p, r) - s(2r, p), \\
N(q, r; \frac{1}{2}) &= \frac{qr}{8} + \frac{q+r}{4} + \frac{q}{6r} + \frac{r}{6q} + \frac{1}{24qr} - s(2q, r) - s(2r, q).
\end{align*}

Hence from (4.9)-(4.14) one concludes

**Theorem 4.15.** Let \( p, q, r \) be pairwise coprime positive integers. Then if \( p \) is even and \( q \) and \( r \) are odd

\begin{align*}
N(p, q, r; \frac{1}{2}) &= \frac{1}{48} pqr + \frac{1}{16} (pq + qr + pr) + \frac{1}{8} (p+q+r) + \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{24} \left( \frac{pq}{r} + \frac{pr}{q} + \frac{qr}{p} \right) + \frac{1}{12} \left( \frac{q}{r} + \frac{r}{q} \right) + \frac{1}{48qr} + \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{24pq} - \frac{1}{4} \left( s(2qr, p) + s(qr, p) + s(pr, q) - s(pr, r) - s(qr, r) - s(2q, p) - s(2p, q) - s(2r, p) - s(2p, q) - s(2r, q) \right).
\end{align*}

If \( p, q, \) and \( r \) are all odd, then

\begin{align*}
N(p, q, r; \frac{1}{2}) &= \frac{1}{48} pqr + \frac{1}{16} (pq + qr + pr) + \frac{1}{8} (p+q+r) + \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{24} \left( \frac{pq}{r} + \frac{pr}{q} + \frac{qr}{p} \right) + \frac{1}{12} \left( \frac{q}{r} + \frac{r}{q} \right) + \frac{1}{48qr} + \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{24pq} - \frac{1}{4} \left( s(2qr, p) + s(qr, p) + s(pr, q) - s(pr, r) - s(qr, r) - s(2q, p) - s(2p, q) - s(2r, p) - s(2p, q) - s(2r, q) \right).
\end{align*}

In special cases, one can find a formula for \( N(p, q, r; \frac{1}{2}) \) not involving Dedekind sums. For instance, when \( p = q = r = 1 \), and \( r = p+1 \), one can find a formula for \( N(p, q, r; \frac{1}{2}) \), depending on the residue of \( p \) modulo 4, which is a rational function of \( p \). Indeed, this formula arises by explicitly evaluating the Dedekind sums that occur in (4.16), by means of Lemmata 2.3 and 2.4, and by using the reciprocity law for Dedekind sums to find a formula for \( s(4, k) \), which depends on the residue of \( k \) modulo 4.

**5. A conjecture of Rademacher.** At the 1963 Number Theory Conference in Boulder, Rademacher [15] made the following conjecture.

Let \( \{a_j\}, j = 1, 2, \ldots, n \), be pairwise coprime positive integers and let \( N_m(a_j) \) be the number of solutions of

\[ 0 < \sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{x_j}{a_j} < 1, \]

in non-negative integers \( x_j \). Then

\[ N_m(a_j) = \frac{1}{2^{m-1}} \prod_{j=1}^{m} (a_j+1) \pmod{2}. \]

This conjecture is true for \( m = 1, 2, \) and 3. The case of \( m = 3 \) has been proved by Rademacher [16], who started with Mordell's Theorem 1.1 and used congruences for Dedekind sums and by Aproxiros [2], whose proof is elementary and geometric. The author [21] also has used congruence (5.1) for \( m = 3 \) to give an elementary solution of a problem posed by Hasse [9, 10] concerning the parity of the number of lattice points in certain tetrahedra. This problem was solved by non-elementary methods by Hirzebruch [11]. Hasse needed this result in his investigations of class numbers of abelian number fields.

For \( m > 4 \), however, Rademacher's conjecture is false. Indeed, for \( m = 4 \), let \( a_1 = 3, a_2 = 4, a_3 = 5, a_4 = 7 \), and \( a_5 = 7 \). Then

\[ N_4(a_j) = 73 \equiv \frac{1}{4} (4 \cdot 5 \cdot 6 \cdot 8) = 0 \pmod{2}. \]

A counterexample for \( m > 4 \) is provided by \( a_1 = 3, a_2 = 4, a_3 = 5, a_4 = 7, a_5 = 7 \), and \( a_j = 1 \) for \( j > 4 \). Then

\[ N_m(a_j) = 73 \equiv \frac{1}{2^{m-1}} (4 \cdot 5 \cdot 6 \cdot 8 \cdot 2^{m-4}) = 0 \pmod{2}. \]
Exactly how the parity of $N_m(a)\) depends on the $a_i$ is still undetermined. The author will examine the parity of the number of lattice points in four dimensional tetrahedra further in another paper [11].
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