Evaluer la somme $\sum_{a\in\mathcal{A}}(f_1(a_1)+f_2(a_2)+\ldots+f_s(a_s)-K)^q$, où K est une constante complexe et $q\in N^*$, ou la somme

$$\sum_{a\in\mathcal{A}}(f_1(a_1)-K_1)^{q_1}(f_2(a_2)-K_2)^{q_2}\ldots(f_s(a_s)-K_s)^{q_s},$$

où $K_1, K_2, \ldots, K_s$ sont des constantes complexes et $q_1, q_2, \ldots, q_s$ des entiers $\geqslant 0$.

Ici $\mathcal{A}_d$ devrait être remplacée par la partie $\mathcal{A}_{d_1,d_2,\ldots,d_s}$ de $\mathcal{A}$ formée des termes pour lesquels $d_1|a_1, d_2|a_2, \ldots, d_s|a_s$ et la relation

$$|\mathcal{A}_d| = \frac{\omega(d)}{d}X + r_d$$

par

$$|\mathcal{A}_{d_1,\ldots,d_s}| = \frac{\omega(d_1, d_2, \ldots, d_s)}{d_1 d_2 \ldots d_s}X + r_{d_1,\ldots,d_s},$$

où ω est une fonction multiplicative de s entiers > 0.

Les résultats peuvent être appliqués à des problèmes de moments correspondant aux problèmes considérés par Kubilius dans les chapitres V et VIII de son livre [7].

Références

[1] K. Alladi, *A new application of the sieve to probabilistic number theory*, Proc. Conf. on Analytic Number Theory, Austin 1982, Lecture Notes n° 1052, 1984.

[2] H. Delange, *Sur un théorème d'Erdős et Kac*, Acad. Roy. Belg. Cl. Sci. 5 (1956), p. 130–144.

[3] — *Sur certaines fonctions arithmétiques additives*, Séminaire Delange–Pisot, 2e année (1960–61), n° 6.

[4] P. Erdős and M. Kac, *The Gaussian law of errors in the theory of additive number theoretic functions*, Amer. J. Math. 62 (1940), p. 738–742.

[5] H. Halberstam, *On the distribution of additive number theoretic functions II*, J. London Math. Soc. 31 (1956), p. 1–14.

[6] — *On the distribution of additive number theoretic functions III*, ibid. 31 (1956), p. 14–27.

[7] J. Kubilius, *Probabilistic methods in the theory of numbers* (en russe), Vilnius 1962; Transl. of Math. Mon. n° 11 (1964).

[8] D. P. Parent, *Exercices de théorie des nombres*, Gauthier-Villars, 1978.

UNIVERSITÉ DE PARIS-SUD
MATHÉMATIQUE, bât. 425
91405 Orsay (France)

Reçu le 1.4.1986 (1613)

ACTA ARITHMETICA
XLIX (1988)

Differences of the partition function

by

A. M. Odlyzko (Murray Hill, N. J.)

Dedicated to Paul Erdős
on the occasion of his 75th birthday

1. Introduction. If $f(n)$ is any function on the nonnegative integers, define its first difference Δf by $\Delta f(n) = f(n)-f(n-1)$ for $n \geqslant 1$, $\Delta f(0) = f(0)$. The kth difference $\Delta^k f$ of f is then defined recursively by $\Delta^k f = \Delta(\Delta^{k-1} f)$. A few years ago, I. J. Good [5a] asked about the behavior of $\Delta^k p(n)$, where $p(n)$ denotes the number of unrestricted partitions of n. He initially conjectured [5a] that if $k > 3$, then the sequence $\Delta^k p(n)$, $n = 0, 1, \ldots$, alternates in sign. However, computations by R. Razen and independently by I. J. Good and his associates [5b] found counterexamples to this conjecture, and led to a new conjecture, namely that for each fixed k, $\Delta^k p(n) > 0$ for n sufficiently large. I. J. Good [5b] even made the stronger conjecture that for each k, there is an $n_0(k)$ such that $\Delta^k p(n)$ alternates in sign for $n < n_0(k)$, and $\Delta^k p(n) \geqslant 0$ for $n \geqslant n_0(k)$. He also suggested that $6(k-1)(k-2)+k^3/2$ might be a good approximation to $n_0(k)$. Some further computations by R. A. Gaskins led I. J. Good to revise his conjecture about the size of $n_0(k)$, and suggest that $\pi k^{5/2}$ might be a good approximation to it [5c].

At about the same time as the first publication of I. J. Good's problem, the same question about the sign of $\Delta^k p(n)$ was also raised independently by G. E. Andrews, and was answered by H. Gupta [6]. Gupta noted that $\Delta p(n) > 0$ for all n, and gave a simple proof of the result that $\Delta^2 p(n) \geqslant 0$ for $n \geqslant 2$, while $\Delta^2 p(0) = 1$, $\Delta^2 p(1) = -1$. Gupta also noted that it can be shown easily using the Hardy–Ramanujan–Rademacher series ([1], [2], [3], [7], [8]) for $p(n)$ that for each k, $\Delta^k p(n) > 0$ if n is sufficiently large. In fact, this result can be obtained from some of the earliest of the Hardy–Ramanujan approximations [7] to $p(n)$:

$$p(n) = \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{2}}\frac{d}{dn}\left(\lambda_n^{-1}\exp(C\lambda_n)\right) + O\left(\exp\left((C/2+\varepsilon)n^{1/2}\right)\right), \tag{1.1}$$

for every $\varepsilon > 0$, where $C = \pi(2/3)^{1/2}$ and $\lambda_n = (n-1/24)^{1/2}$. The kth difference of the second term on the right side of (1.1) is of the same order of magnitude as that term (for k fixed, $n \to \infty$), while the kth difference of the first term is very close to its kth derivative. Thus we obtain the estimate

$$\Delta^k p(n) = C_k n^{-k/2} p(n)(1+O(n^{-1/2})) \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty, \tag{1.2}$$

where $C_k = (\pi/\sqrt{6})^k$. (Gupta's asymptotic estimate of $\Delta^k p(n)$ in [6] is incorrect.) Gupta's computations led him to the same conjecture as Good's about $\Delta^k p(n)$ alternating up to some $n_0(k)$ and then immediately becoming positive, but Gupta conjectured that $n_0(k) \sim k^3$ as $k \to \infty$.

Another easy proof that $\Delta^k p(n)$ is positive for large n can be obtained by applying the theorem of Bateman and Erdős [4]. They showed that if $p_A(n)$ denotes the number of partitions of n into summands taken from some set A of positive integers (repetitions allowed), then $\Delta^k p_A(n) \geq 0$ for all large n if and only if the greatest common divisor of each subset $B \subseteq A$ with $|A \backslash B| = k$ is equal to 1. The Bateman and Erdős result is far too general, though, to provide information about initial segments of $\Delta^k p_A(n)$.

This paper carries the investigation of $\Delta^k p(n)$ further, and largely settles the Good–Gupta conjectures. The main result is the following.

THEOREM. *There is a k_0 so that if $k \geq k_0$, then there is an integer $n_0(k)$ such that $(-1)^n \Delta^k p(n) > 0$ for $0 \leq n < n_0(k)$ and $\Delta^k p(n) \geq 0$ for $n \geq n_0(k)$. Furthermore,*

$$n_0(k) \sim \frac{6}{\pi^2} k^2 (\log k)^2 \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty. \tag{1.3}$$

With more work it would probably be possible to establish the above result for all k. Such an extension would require replacing various O-estimates by explicit numerical bounds. We should note that the above result does not exclude the possibility that $\Delta^k p(n) = 0$ might occur. In fact, the proof shows that for each large k, $\Delta^k p(n) = 0$ can hold for at most one value of n, and it can be shown with more effort that values of k for which $\Delta^k p(n) = 0$ occurs for some n are very rare. It is probably true that $\Delta^k p(n) = 0$ has only finitely many solutions among all pairs k, n, but this conjecture seems to be hard to prove.

The asymptotic approximation (1.3) is not very accurate for small k. For example, from the computational results quoted in [5c], it appears that $n_0(30) = 15416$. Now for $k = 30$, $\pi k^{5/2} = 15486.49\ldots$, while $6\pi^{-2} k^2 (\log k)^2 = 6329.32\ldots$ The proof of (1.3) can be used to obtain more accurate estimates of $n_0(k)$, however.

2. Intuitive explanation of result. If $F(z)$ denotes the generating function of $p(n)$,

$$F(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} p(n) z^n, \tag{2.1}$$

then it is well known (and easy to see) that

$$F(z) = \prod_{m=1}^{\infty} (1-z^m)^{-1}. \tag{2.2}$$

If we define $F_k(z)$ to be the generating function of $\Delta^k p(n)$,

$$F_k(z) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \Delta^k p(n) z^n, \tag{2.3}$$

then

$$F_k(z) = (1-z)^k F(z) = (1-z)^k \prod_{m=1}^{\infty} (1-z^m)^{-1}. \tag{2.4}$$

The theorem could be proved by investigating the analytic behavior of $F_k(z)$, but we will only use $F_k(z)$ to explain why the Good–Gupta conjectures are true.

The basic philosophy in the use of generating functions for asymptotic analysis is that the singularities of the function determine the behavior of the coefficients. Generally speaking, a dominant singularity (i.e., one near which the function grows faster than near other points) at 1 corresponds to a monotone increasing sequence, while a dominant singularity at -1 corresponds to an alternating sequence. The function $F(z)$ has the unit circle as its natural boundary. However, as was shown by Hardy and Ramanujan [7], $F(z)$ is most singular (i.e., grows fastest) near 1, is next most singular at -1, and is much better behaved away from those two points. This led them to the following refinement of (1.1):

$$p(n) = \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{2}} \frac{d}{dn}(\lambda_n^{-1/2}\exp(C\lambda_n)) + \frac{(-1)^n}{2\pi} \frac{d}{dn}(\lambda_n^{-1}\exp(C\lambda_n/2)) + O(\exp(n^{1/2}(C/3+\varepsilon))) \tag{2.5}$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$. (Taking other points on $|z| = 1$ into account led Hardy–Ramanujan to their famous asymptotic series [7].) The first term on the right in (2.5) comes from $z = 1$, the second from $z = -1$, and the remainder is the contribution of the rest of the circle.

The importance of the fact that $z = 1$ is the dominant singularity of $F(z)$ and $z = -1$ is next most dominant is that when we study $\Delta^k p(n)$, we deal with the generating function $F_k(z) = (1-z)^k F(z)$. The effect of multiplying $F(z)$ by $(1-z)^k$ is that the singularity at $z = -1$ increases in influence, as the function is increased by about 2^k near $z = -1$. On the other hand, the singularity at $z = 1$ diminishes in influence. Since $F(z)$ grows much faster than any polynomial in $(1-z)^{-1}$ as $z \to 1$, this diminution is fairly small very close to $z = 1$, and therefore for large n, the size of $\Delta^k p(n)$ largely reflects the influence of the singularity at $z=1$. However, for small n, this diminution is nontrivial, and allows $z=-1$ to dominate. All the other points on $|z|=1$ make contributions that are still smaller than that of $z=-1$. The reason that the transition from alternation of signs to positivity is very sharp is that in the transition zone, the singularity at $z=1$ begins to dominate very rapidly. Let us write

$$\Delta^k p(n) = a(n)+(-1)^n b(n)+c(n),$$

where $a(n)$ is the positive contribution from $z=1$, $b(n)$ is the absolute value of the contribution from $z=-1$, and $c(n)$ is the remainder. Then in the transition region $a(n+1)-a(n)$ is about $2(b(n+1)-b(n))$, and is much larger than $c(n)$, so that once $\Delta^k p(n)$ becomes nonnegative, it stays nonnegative.

The above presents an intuitive explanation of the mechanism that causes the Good–Gupta phenomenon of alternation followed by abrupt transition to positivity. This explanation could be developed into a rigorous proof, using relatively simple analytic methods. The estimates in the transitional region between alternation of signs and positivity would in fact be fairly simple, using the rough estimates of [7]. However, the need to cover the range of small values of n requires more delicate analysis, and so the proof presented below uses the Rademacher convergent series expansion for $p(n)$ ([1], [2], [3], [8]). The explanation above presents an intuitive picture of what is happening which is not obvious from the proof below, in which the analytic behavior of the generating function shows up only indirectly in the form of the Rademacher expansion (3.3).

3. Detailed proof. We first use a very simple argument to show that for k large, $\Delta^k p(n)$ alternates in sign for n up to about $k/2$.

PROPOSITION 3.1. *For any $\varepsilon\in(0, 10^{-10})$ there is a $k_1(\varepsilon)$ such that if $k\geqslant k_1(\varepsilon)$ and $0\leqslant n\leqslant(1/2-\varepsilon)k$, then*

$$(-1)^n \Delta^k p(n) > 0.$$

Proof. Note that in the range $0\leqslant n\leqslant(1/2-\varepsilon)k$,

$$(-1)^n \Delta^k p(n) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} (-1)^j \binom{k}{n-j} p(j).$$

Now, if $0\leqslant j<n$,

$$\binom{k}{n-j}\binom{k}{n-j-1}^{-1} = \frac{k-n+j+1}{n-j} \geqslant \frac{k-n+1}{n} \geqslant 1+\varepsilon.$$

By the Hardy–Ramanujan approximation (1.1), we see that

$$p(j+1)/p(j) < 1+\varepsilon \quad \text{for} \quad j\geqslant 2m_0(\varepsilon).$$

Hence, for every $m_1\geqslant m_0$, we have

(3.1)
$$\sum_{j=2m_1}^{n} (-1)^j \binom{k}{n-j} p(j) \geqslant \sum_{m=m_1}^{\lfloor n/2\rfloor} \left\{\binom{k}{n-2m} p(2m) - \binom{k}{n-2m-1} p(2m+1)\right\} > 0$$

since each term is positive.

To deal with the remaining sum, we note that

$$\sum_{j=0}^{2m_1-1} (-1)^j \binom{k}{n-j} p(j) = \binom{k}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{2m_1-1} (-1)^j \binom{k}{n-j}\binom{k}{n}^{-1} p(j).$$

Now for $0\leqslant j\leqslant 2m_1-1$ and $n\leqslant(1/2-\varepsilon)k$,

$$\binom{k}{n-j}\binom{k}{n}^{-1} = \prod_{i=1}^{j} \frac{n-j+i}{k-n+i} = \left(\frac{n}{k}\right)^j (1+O(k^{-1})),$$

(the constant in the O-notation depending on m_1 and ε), so

$$\sum_{j=0}^{2m_1-1} (-1)^j \binom{k}{n-j}\binom{k}{n}^{-1} p(j) = \sum_{j=0}^{2m_1-1} (-1)^j \left(\frac{n}{k}\right)^j p(j) + O(k^{-1}). \tag{3.2}$$

The infinite sum (2.1) for $F(z)$ does not vanish on the segment $[-(1/2-\varepsilon), 0]$ because it has the convergent infinite product (2.2) in which all the terms are nonzero, and therefore for some $\delta=\delta(\varepsilon)>0$, we must have $F(z)\geqslant\delta$ for $z\in[-(1/2-\varepsilon), 0]$. Since the partial sums of the infinite sum in (2.1) converge to $F(z)$ uniformly on compact subsets of the unit disk, there is some m_2 such that for all $m\geqslant 2m_2-1$, and all $z\in[-(1/2-\varepsilon), 0]$,

$$\sum_{j=0}^{m} p(j) z^j \geqslant \delta/2.$$

We now select $m_1=\max(m_0, m_2)$, so that m_1 depends on ε alone, and discover from (3.2) that for $k\geqslant k_1(\varepsilon)$,

$$\sum_{j=0}^{2m_1-1} (-1)^j \left(\frac{n}{k}\right)^j p(j) + O(k^{-1}) \geqslant \delta/4,$$

which proves the proposition. ∎

We next consider slightly larger values of n. First we recall the Rademacher convergent series expansion for $p(n)$ ([1], [2], [3], [8]). As before, we let

$$C = \pi(2/3)^{1/2}, \qquad \lambda_n = (n-1/24)^{1/2}.$$

Then, for any $n\geqslant 1$,

$$p(n) = \frac{1}{\pi 2^{1/2}} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} A_m(n)\, m^{1/2} \frac{d}{dn}\left(\lambda_n^{-1} \sinh(C m^{-1} \lambda_n)\right), \tag{3.3}$$

where the $A_m(n)$ satisfy

(3.4) $$A_1(n) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad A_2(n) = (-1)^n \quad \text{for} \quad n \geq 1,$$

(3.5) $$|A_m(n)| \leq m \quad \text{for all } m, n \geq 1.$$

(The $A_m(n)$ are known explicitly in terms of Dedekind sums ([1], [2], [3], [7], [8]).)

We define, for $m, n \geq 1$,

(3.6) $$f_m(n) = m^{1/2} \frac{d}{dn} (\lambda_n^{-1} \sinh(Cm^{-1} \lambda_n)),$$

and $f_m(0) = 0$, and we let

(3.7) $$R_n = \sum_{m=3}^{\infty} A_m(n) f_m(n),$$

so that

(3.8) $$p(n) = \pi^{-1} 2^{-1/2} \{f_1(n) + (-1)^n f_2(n) + R_n\}.$$

LEMMA 3.2. *For all* $n \geq 1$,

(3.9) $$|R_n| \leq \tfrac{3}{5} f_2(n)$$

and

(3.10) $$|R_n| \leq 10 f_3(n).$$

Proof. The estimates (3.9) and (3.10) can be verified numerically for $1 \leq n \leq 50$ by computing $p(n)$, $f_1(n)$, and $f_2(n)$. (Tables of values of $p(n)$ are contained in [1], [7], for example, or they can be computed using the recurrences in [1], [3], [7].) For $n > 50$, we use the estimate ([3], pp. 191–192)

$$\Big|\sum_{m=5}^{\infty} A_m(n) f_m(n)\Big| \leq 2C^2 \lambda_n^{-1} \{C\lambda_n/12 + 25^{-1} \sinh(C\lambda_n/4)\}$$

together with the explicit formulas for $f_3(n)$ and $f_4(n)$ to prove (3.9) and (3.10). ∎

The estimate (3.9) is tight only for very small n, while the constant 10 in (3.10) could easily be decreased with slightly more careful work.

We next investigate $\Delta^k p(n)$ for ranges of n not covered by Proposition 3.1.

PROPOSITION 3.3. *There are constants* c_1, k_2, *and* $\varepsilon > 0$ *such that if* $k \geq k_2$, *then the following estimates hold*:

(a) *For* $2k/5 \leq n \leq k-2$,

(3.11) $$|\Delta^k f_1(n)| \leq c_1 k^{1/2} \binom{k}{n}.$$

(b) *For* $k-1 \leq n \leq k+1$,

(3.12) $$|\Delta^k f_1(n)| \leq c_1 k^5 \exp(c_1 k^{1/2}).$$

(c) *For* $k+2 \leq n$,

(3.13) $$|\Delta^k f_1(n)| \leq c_1 n^{-k/10} \exp(c_1 n^{1/2}).$$

(d) *For* $(1/2-\varepsilon) k \leq n \leq k/2$,

(3.14) $$|\Delta^k f_1(n)| \leq \frac{23}{10} \binom{k}{n}.$$

Proof. From the proof of Rademacher's convergent series (3.3) (see [2], p. 109, for example) we find that

(3.15) $$f_1(n) = \frac{\alpha}{2\pi i} \int_{(\beta)} t^{-5/2} \exp(t + \gamma \lambda_n^2 t^{-1})\, dt,$$

where

(3.16) $$\alpha = \pi^{7/2} 6^{-3/2}, \quad \gamma = \pi^2/6,$$

β is any constant with $\beta > 0$, and (β) denotes the straight line from $\beta - i\infty$ to $\beta + i\infty$. Therefore, if

(3.17) $$|z|\, e^{\gamma/\beta} < 1,$$

then

(3.18) $$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f_1(n) z^n = \frac{\alpha}{2\pi i} \int_{(\beta)} t^{-5/2} \exp(t - \gamma/(24t)) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} z^n e^{\gamma n/t}\, dt = \frac{\alpha}{2\pi i} \int_{(\beta)} t^{-5/2} z \exp\left(t + \frac{23\gamma}{24t}\right) \frac{dt}{1 - ze^{\gamma/t}},$$

and so

(3.19) $$G_k(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} z^n \Delta^k f_1(n) = \frac{\alpha(1-z)^k}{2\pi i} \int_{(\beta)} t^{-5/2} z \exp\left(t + \frac{23\gamma}{24t}\right) \frac{dt}{1 - ze^{\gamma/t}}.$$

The expansion (3.18) has been obtained only under the assumption (3.17), but the integral on the right-hand side of (3.18) is analytic in all of $\mathbf{C} \setminus [e^{-\gamma/\beta}, \infty)$ (i.e., the entire complex plane with a slit along the positive real axis from $e^{-\gamma/\beta}$ to infinity removed). Thus (3.19) gives an analytic continuation of $g_k(z)$ to the domain $\mathbf{C} \setminus [1, \infty)$, provided that when z is real, $z \in (0, 1)$, we choose $\beta > -\gamma/\log z$.

We now use (3.19) to obtain bounds for $\Delta^k f_1(n)$. If $\mathrm{Re}(z) < 1$, $|1-z| \geqslant 1/100$, we choose $\beta = 1000$, and then for $\mathrm{Re}(t) = \beta$ we have

$$\left|\frac{z\exp\left(t+\frac{23\gamma}{24t}\right)}{1-ze^{\gamma/t}}\right| \leqslant c_2$$

for some constant $c_2 > 0$. Therefore, for some $c_3 > 0$,

$$|G_k(z)| \leqslant c_3 |1-z|^k \tag{3.20}$$

holds for all z with $\mathrm{Re}(z) < 1$, $|1-z| \geqslant 1/100$.

Suppose next that $\mathrm{Re}(z) < 1$, $0 < |1-z| < 1/100$. In this case we let $w = 1-\mathrm{Re}(z)$ and $\beta = 2\gamma/w$. Then $|z| \geqslant 1-w$, $|e^{\gamma/t}| \leqslant e^{w/2}$,

$$|1-ze^{\gamma/t}| \geqslant (1-w)e^{w/2}-1 \geqslant w/10,$$

and so

$$|G_k(z)| \leqslant \frac{c_4}{w}|1-z|^k \exp(2\gamma/w). \tag{3.21}$$

We now use the estimates (3.20) and (3.21) to bound $\Delta^k f_1(n)$. We have

$$\Delta^k f_1(n) = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_S G_k(z)\frac{dz}{z^{n+1}}, \tag{3.22}$$

where S is any simple closed curve around the origin in the domain $\boldsymbol{C}\backslash[1, \infty)$. We will select a radius $r > 0$ later. Given r, we choose S to consist of S_1, that portion of the circle $|z| = r$ that lies to the left of the line $\mathrm{Re}(z) = 1-(2\gamma/n)^{1/2}$ (which might be all of that circle) together with S_2, the straight line segment formed by the intersection of the disk $|z| \leqslant r$ and the line $\mathrm{Re}(z) = 1-(2\gamma/n)^{1/2}$ when there is such an intersection. By (3.20), we find that

$$\left|\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{S_1} G_k(z)\frac{dz}{z^{n+1}}\right| \leqslant c_5\frac{(1+r)^k}{r^n} + c_5 n^{1/2}\,100^{-k} r^{-n}\exp\left((2\gamma n)^{1/2}\right).$$

On the other hand, by (3.21) we find that when S_2 exists,

$$\left|\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{S_2} G_k(z)\frac{dz}{z^{n+1}}\right| \leqslant c_6 n^{1/2}\exp\left((2\gamma n)^{1/2}\right)\int_{S_2}\frac{|1-z|^k}{|z|^{n+1}}|dz|.$$

Hence we conclude that for any $r > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}|\Delta^k f_1(n)| \leqslant\ & c_7(1+r)^k r^{-n} + c_7 n^{1/2}\,100^{-k} r^{-n}\exp\left((2\gamma n)^{1/2}\right) \\ & + c_8 n^{1/2}\exp\left((2\gamma n)^{1/2}\right)\int_0^{\omega}\frac{(2\gamma n^{-1}+v^2)^{k/2}}{(1-2(2\gamma/n)^{1/2}+2\gamma/n+v^2)^{(n+1)/2}}\,dv,\end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

where

$$\omega = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } r \leqslant 1-(2\gamma/n)^{1/2}, \\ (r^2-1+2(2\gamma/n)^{1/2}-2\gamma/n)^{1/2} & \text{if } r > 1-(2\gamma/n)^{1/2}. \end{cases} \tag{3.24}$$

For $2k/5 \leqslant n \leqslant k-2$, we now select $r = n/(k-n)$. We have for k sufficiently large and for $0 \leqslant v \leqslant \omega$,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{(2\gamma n^{-1}+v^2)^{k/2}}{(1-2(2\gamma n^{-1})^{1/2}+2\gamma/n+v^2)^{(n+1)/2}} &\leqslant \frac{(2\gamma n^{-1}+\omega^2)^{k/2}}{(1-2(2\gamma n^{-1})^{1/2}+2\gamma/n+\omega^2)^{(n+1)/2}} \\ &= \frac{(r^2-1)^{k/2}}{r^{n+1}},\end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}|\Delta^k f_1(n)| &\leqslant c_9(1+r)^k r^{-n} + c_{10} n^{1/2}(r^2-1)^{k/2} r^{-n}\exp\left((2\gamma n)^{1/2}\right) \\ &\leqslant c_{11}(1+r)^k r^{-n} \leqslant c_{12} k^{1/2}\binom{k}{n}.\end{aligned} \tag{3.25}$$

For $k-1 \leqslant n \leqslant k+1$, we select $r = k$ and obtain from (3.23) the bound

$$\begin{aligned}|\Delta^k f_1(n)| &\leqslant c_{13} k^{k-n} + c_{14} k^{3/2}\exp\left((2\gamma k)^{1/2}\right)\frac{(k^2-1)^{k/2}}{k^{n+1}} \\ &\leqslant c_{15} k^5 \exp\left((2\gamma k)^{1/2}\right).\end{aligned} \tag{3.26}$$

Finally, for $k+1 < n$, we let $r \to \infty$ and obtain, for $a = 1-2(2\gamma n^{-1})^{1/2} + 2\gamma n^{-1}$,

$$|\Delta^k f_1(n)| \leqslant c_{16} n^{1/2}\exp\left((2\gamma n)^{1/2}\right)\int_0^{\infty}\frac{(2\gamma n^{-1}+v^2)^{k/2}}{(1-2(2\gamma n^{-1})^{1/2}+2\gamma/n+v^2)^{(n+1)/2}}\,dv.$$

Now the integral on the right side above is (for large k and $n \geqslant k+2$)

$$\begin{aligned}&\leqslant \int_0^{n^{-1/10}}\frac{(2n^{-1/5})^{k/2}}{(1-2(2\gamma n^{-1})^{1/2})^{(n+1)/2}}\,dv + \int_{n^{-1/10}}^{\infty}\frac{dv}{(1-2(2\gamma n^{-1})^{1/2}+v^2)^{(n+1-k)/2}} \\ &\leqslant 2^k n^{-k/10}\exp(c_{17} n^{1/2}) + \int_{n^{-1/5}}^{\infty}\frac{u^{-1/2}}{(1-2(2\gamma n^{-1})^{1/2}+u)^{(n+1-k)/2}}\,du \\ &\leqslant 2^k n^{-k/10}\exp(c_{17} n^{1/2}) + (1-2(2\gamma n^{-1})^{1/2}+n^{-1/5})^{-(n-1-k)/2},\end{aligned}$$

and this yields the estimate

$$|\Delta^k f_1(n)| \leqslant c_{18} n^{-k/10}\exp(c_{19} n^{1/2}). \tag{3.27}$$

To complete the proof of the proposition, we consider $(1/2-\varepsilon)k \leqslant n \leqslant k/2$, where $\varepsilon \in (0, 10^{-10})$ will be selected later. We use the same contour of integration as before, with $r = n/(k-n)$, except that we let

$$S_3 = \{z \in S\colon |z+r| \leqslant k^{-1/3}\}. \tag{3.28}$$

Then, by using estimates similar to those developed earlier, but bounding $|1-z|$ on $S\setminus S_3$ more carefully, we obtain

$$(3.29)\qquad \left|\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{S\setminus S_3}\frac{G_k(z)}{z^{n+1}}dz\right| \leqslant c_{20}r^{-n}\max_{z\in S\setminus S_3}|1-z|^k + c_{21}n^{1/2}(r^2-1)^{k/2}r^{-n}\exp\left((2\gamma n)^{1/2}\right).$$

Now for $z\in S\setminus S_3$, and k sufficiently large,

$$|1-z|\leqslant(1+r)(1-k^{-2/3}/10),$$

and so for k large,

$$(3.30)\qquad \left|\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{S\setminus S_3}\frac{G_k(z)}{z^{n+1}}dz\right|\leqslant c_{22}(1+r)^k r^{-n}\exp(-k^{1/4}).$$

We next estimate the integral over S_3 by the saddle point method. Using (3.19) and interchanging orders of integration, we obtain

$$(3.31)\qquad \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{S_3}\frac{G_k(z)}{z^{n+1}}dz = \frac{\alpha}{2\pi i}\int_{(\beta)}t^{-5/2}\exp\left(t+\frac{23\gamma}{24t}\right)dt\cdot g(n,z,t),$$

where

$$g(n,z,t)=\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{S_3}\frac{z(1-z)^k}{1-ze^{\gamma/t}}\frac{dz}{z^{n+1}}.$$

Making the change of variable $z=-re^{i\theta}$, $-\theta_0\leqslant\theta\leqslant\theta_0$, where $\theta_0\sim r^{-1}k^{-1/3}$ as $k\to\infty$, we find that

$$(3.32)\qquad g(n,z,t)=\frac{(-1)^{n-1}r^{1-n}}{2\pi}\int_{-\theta_0}^{\theta_0}\frac{(1+re^{i\theta})^k}{1+re^{i\theta+\gamma/t}}e^{-(n-1)i\theta}d\theta.$$

We now select $\beta=100$, say. Then γ/t is bounded for all t on the line from $\beta-i\infty$ to $\beta+i\infty$, and $1+r\exp(i\theta+\gamma/t)$ is bounded away from 0. Furthermore,

$$(3.33)\qquad 1+re^{i\theta}=(1+r)\exp\left(\frac{ir}{1+r}\theta-\frac{r\theta^2}{2(1+r)^2}+O(|\theta|^3)\right),$$

where the constant in the O-term is independent of r. (Recall that $1-10^{-5}\leqslant r\leqslant 1$.) Next $kr/(1+r)=n\theta$, so

$$(3.34)\qquad g(n,z,t) = \frac{(-1)^{n-1}r^{1-n}(1+r)^k}{2\pi}\int_{-\theta_0}^{\theta_0}\frac{\exp\left(-\frac{rk\theta^2}{2(1+r)^2}+O(k|\theta|^3)+i\theta\right)}{1+re^{i\theta+\gamma/t}}dt = \frac{(-1)^{n-1}r^{1-n}(1+r)^{k+1}}{\sqrt{2\pi rk}}\,\frac{1+O(k^{-1/3})}{1+re^{\gamma/t}},$$

and therefore

$$(3.35)\qquad \Delta^k f_1(n)=\frac{\alpha(-1)^{n-1}r^{1-n}(1+r)^{k+1}}{\sqrt{2\pi rk}}\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{(\beta)}t^{-5/2}\frac{\exp\left(t+\frac{23\gamma}{24t}\right)}{1+re^{\gamma/t}}dt + O(k^{-5/6}(1+r)^k r^{-n}).$$

Let

$$(3.36)\qquad h(r)=\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{(\beta)}t^{-5/2}\frac{\exp\left(t+\frac{23\gamma}{24t}\right)}{1+re^{\gamma/t}}dt.$$

Then $h(r)$ is a continuous function of r for $0<r<2$, say, and we will evaluate $h(r)$ for $r<1$ but close to 1. Consider first $r>1$. Then we have (using the usual Bessel function expansions that come up in Rademacher's proof)

$$(3.37)\qquad \begin{aligned} h(r) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{(\beta)}t^{-5/2}\frac{\exp\left(t+\frac{23\gamma}{24t}\right)}{re^{\gamma/t}(1+r^{-1}e^{-\gamma/t})}dt \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{(\beta)}t^{-5/2}\exp\left(t+\frac{23\gamma}{24t}\right)\sum_{m=1}^{\infty}(-1)^{m-1}r^{-m}e^{-m\gamma/t}dt \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty}(-1)^{m-1}r^{-m}\frac{1}{2\pi i}\int_{(\beta)}t^{-5/2}\exp\left(t-(m-23/24)\gamma/t\right)dt \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty}(-1)^{m-1}r^{-m}J_{3/2}(\eta_m)(\eta_m/2)^{-3/2} \\ &= \pi^{-1/2}\gamma^{-1}\sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\frac{(-1)^{m-1}r^{-m}}{m-23/24}\left(\frac{\sin(\eta_m)}{\eta_m}-\cos(\eta_m)\right), \end{aligned}$$

where $\eta_m=2\gamma^{1/2}(m-23/24)^{1/2}$. Now

$$(3.38)\qquad \begin{aligned} \left|\sum_{m=1000}^{\infty}\frac{(-1)^{m-1}r^{-m}\sin(\eta_m)}{\eta_m(m-23/24)}\right| &\leqslant \frac{1}{2\gamma^{1/2}}\sum_{m=1000}^{\infty}\left(m-\frac{23}{24}\right)^{-3/2} \\ &\leqslant \frac{1}{2\gamma^{1/2}}\int_{998}^{\infty}u^{-3/2}du \\ &= \gamma^{-1/2}998^{-1/2}\leqslant 0.025. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, for some $v\in[m, m+1]$

$$\frac{r^{-m}\cos(\eta_m)}{m-\frac{23}{24}}-\frac{r^{-m-1}\cos(\eta_{m+1})}{m+\frac{1}{24}} = -\frac{d}{du}\frac{r^{-u}\cos(\eta_u)}{u-\frac{23}{24}}\bigg|_{u=v}$$

$$=\frac{\cos(\eta_v)}{(v-\frac{23}{24})^2}+\frac{\gamma^{1/2}\sin(\eta_v)}{(v-\frac{23}{24})^{3/2}}+\frac{r^{-v}(\log r)\cos(\eta_v)}{v-\frac{23}{24}},$$

so for $r\in(1, 1+10^{-10})$,

$$(3.39)\quad \left|\sum_{m=1000}^{\infty}\frac{(-1)^{n-1}\cos(\eta_m)}{m-\frac{23}{24}}\right| \leqslant \sum_{q=500}^{\infty}\left\{\frac{1}{(2q-1)^2}+\frac{\gamma^{1/2}}{(2q-1)^{3/2}}+\frac{r^{-2q}\log r}{2q-1}\right\}$$

$$\leqslant \int_{498}^{\infty}\frac{du}{(2u)^2}+\int_{498}^{\infty}\frac{\gamma^{1/2}}{(2u)^{3/2}}du+(\log r)\int_{498}^{\infty}\frac{r^{-2u}}{2u}du$$

$$\leqslant 0.042.$$

Therefore for $r\in(1, 1+10^{-10})$,

$$h(r) = \pi^{-1/2}\gamma^{-1}(A+B),$$

where

$$A=\sum_{m=1}^{998}\frac{(-1)^{m-1}r^{-m}}{m-\frac{23}{24}}\left(\frac{\sin(\eta_m)}{\eta_m}-\cos(\eta_m)\right) = 1.415972\ldots$$

by direct calculation, and $|B|\leqslant 0.042+0.025\leqslant 0.07$. Hence for $r\in(1, 1+10^{-10})$,

$$(3.40)\quad 0.46\leqslant h(r)\leqslant 0.51,$$

Since $h(r)$ is continuous for $0<r<2$, we must have

$$(3.41)\quad |h(r)|\leqslant 0.6 \quad \text{for} \quad 1-\varepsilon\leqslant r\leqslant 1/2$$

if $\varepsilon<10^{-10}$ is small enough.

We now combine all the above estimates to obtain the claims of the proposition, valid for c_1 and k large enough and ε small enough. ∎

We now proceed to the proof of the theorem. We select an ε given by Proposition 3.3. Then, applying Proposition 3.1 with this value of ε, we see that $(-1)^n\Delta^k p(n)>0$ for all n, $0\leqslant n\leqslant(1/2-\varepsilon)k$, and all $k\geqslant k_3 = \max(k_1(\varepsilon), k_2)$.

Next, for $k\geqslant k_3$ and $(1/2-\varepsilon)k\leqslant n\leqslant k/2$, we have

$$(3.42)\quad (-1)^n\Delta^k p(n) = \sum_{j=0}^{n}(-1)^j\binom{k}{n-j}p(j)$$

$$=\binom{k}{n}+(-1)^n\pi^{-1}2^{-1/2}\Delta^k f_1(n)$$

$$+\pi^{-1}2^{-1/2}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\binom{k}{n-j}\big(f_2(j)+(-1)^{n-j}R_j\big).$$

By Lemma 3.2, each term in the n-term sum above is >0, while by (3.14),

$$(3.43)\quad |\pi^{-1}2^{-1/2}\Delta^k f_1(n)|<\tfrac{3}{5}\binom{k}{n}.$$

Therefore $(-1)^n\Delta^k p(n)>0$ in this range also.

Consider now $k/2\leqslant n\leqslant k-2$. In this range, in view of Lemma 3.2, it suffices to show that

$$G=\sum_{j=1}^{n}\binom{k}{n-j}f_2(j)$$

satisfies $|G|>3|\Delta^k f_1(n)|$. However, by (3.11) we have $3|\Delta^k f_1(n)|<c_{23}2^k$. On the other hand, if $J=\lfloor n-k/2+1\rfloor$, then for k sufficiently large, $J+k^{1/4}\leqslant j\leqslant J+2k^{1/4}$,

$$\binom{k}{n-j}\geqslant 10^{-1}k^{-1/2}2^k,$$

and so

$$(3.44)\quad G\geqslant\frac{2^k}{10k^{1/2}}f_2(J+\lfloor k^{1/4}\rfloor)\geqslant 2^k\exp(10^{-1}Ck^{1/8}),$$

which gives the desired result for $k\geqslant k_4\geqslant k_3$. The same lower bound for G holds also for $k-1\leqslant n\leqslant k$, and so by (3.12) we obtain the result of the theorem for that range also if $k\geqslant k_5\geqslant k_4$.

Next, consider $n\geqslant k+1$. By Lemma 3.2, to obtain $(-1)^n\Delta^k p(n)>0$ it suffices to show that if

$$H=\sum_{j=0}^{k}\binom{k}{j}f_2(n-j),$$

then H satisfies $H>3|\Delta^k f_1(n)|$. However, $f_2(m)\geqslant 10^{-3}$ for all $m\geqslant 1$, so

$$H\geqslant 10^{-3}\sum_{j=0}^{k}\binom{k}{j}=10^{-3}2^k,$$

and by (3.12) and (3.13), we have $(-1)^n \Delta^k p(n) > 0$ for all n with $k+1 \leqslant n \leqslant 10^{-3} c_1^{-2} k^2 (\log k)^2$, provided $k \geqslant k_5 \geqslant k_4$.

Before proceeding to consider the range $n > 10^{-3} c_1^{-2} k^2 (\log k)^2$, we make the following general observation. If $f(x)$ is a C^∞ $[1/2, \infty)$ function, say, then for $x > 3/2$,

$$\Delta f(x) = f(x) - f(x-1) = \int_{x-1}^{x} f'(t)\, dt. \tag{3.45}$$

More generally, for $x > k+1/2$,

$$\Delta^k f(x) = \int_{1/2}^{\infty} f^{(k)}(u)\, \chi_k(x-u)\, du, \tag{3.46}$$

where

$$\chi_k(t) = \chi_1 * \ldots * \chi_1(t) \tag{3.47}$$

is the k-fold convolution of the characteristic function of the unit interval,

$$\chi_1(t) = \begin{cases} 1, & 0 \leqslant t \leqslant 1, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The formula (3.46) reduces to (3.45) for $k = 1$. For higher values, it is easily proved by induction. If we assume that (3.46) holds for $k-1 \geqslant 1$, then (since $(\Delta g)' = \Delta g'$)

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^k f(x) &= \int_{x-1}^{x} \left(\Delta^{k-1} f(t)\right)' dt = \int_{x-1}^{x} \left(\Delta^{k-1} f'(t)\right) dt \\ &= \int_{x-1}^{x} dt \int_{1/2}^{\infty} f^{(k)}(u)\, \chi_{k-1}(t-u)\, du \\ &= \int_{1/2}^{\infty} f^{(k)}(u)\, du \int_{x-1}^{x} \chi_{k-1}(t-u)\, dt \\ &= \int_{1/2}^{\infty} f^{(k)}(u)\, \chi_k(x-u)\, du, \end{aligned}$$

which proves (3.46) for k.

All that we will need to know about the $\chi_k(t)$ is that $\chi_k(t) \geqslant 0$, $\chi_k(t) = 0$ for $t < 0$ and $t > k$, and

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \chi_k(t)\, dt = 1. \tag{3.48}$$

To deal with the remaining range, $n \geqslant 10^{-3} c_1^{-2} k^2 (\log k)^2$, we need to investigate the derivatives of $f_1(x)$ more precisely than before. Let $g(y) = f_1(y+1/24)$, so that $f_1^{(r)}(x) = g^{(r)}(x-1/24)$. We consider $r^2 \log r \leqslant y$. Then

$$g^{(r)}(y) = \frac{d^{r+1}}{dy^{r+1}} \{y^{-1/2} \sinh(C y^{1/2})\} = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{C^{2j+1} (j)_{r+1}}{(2j+1)!} y^{j-r-1}, \tag{3.49}$$

where

$$(z)_m = z(z-1) \ldots (z-m+1).$$

Let a_j denote the jth term in the sum in (3.49). By looking at the ratio a_{j+1}/a_j, we see that the maximum occurs for $j = J + O(1)$, where

$$J = \lfloor (r + (C^2 y + r^2)^{1/2})/2 \rfloor, \tag{3.50}$$

and that for $m = j - J$, $|m| \leqslant J^{5/9}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{a_j}{a_J} &= (1 + O(J^{-1/3})) \left[\frac{C^2 y}{2(2J+3)(J-r)}\right]^m \prod_{h=0}^{|m|-1} \left\{\left(1 + \frac{h}{J-r}\right)\left(1 + \frac{2h}{2J+3}\right)\right\}^{-1} \\ &= (1 + O(J^{-1/3})) \exp\left(-\frac{m^2 (J - r/2)}{J(J-r)}\right), \end{aligned}$$

while

$$\sum_{|j-J| \geqslant J^{5/9}} a_j = O(J^{-1} a_J).$$

Therefore we conclude that for $y > r^2 \log r$, $r \geqslant 2$,

$$g^{(r)}(y) = (\pi J)^{1/2} a_J (1 + O(y^{-1/6})), \tag{3.51}$$

where the constant implied by the O-notation is independent of y and r, and $J = J(y, r)$ is given by (3.50). Furthermore, if in fact $y > (r+1)^2 \log(r+1)$, then

$$|J(y, r+1) - J(y, r)| = O(1),$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} g^{(r+1)}(y) &= \frac{J-r}{y} g^{(r)}(y) (1 + O(y^{-1/6})) \\ &= \frac{C}{2y^{1/2}} g^{(r)}(y) (1 + O(y^{-1/6} + r y^{-1/2})). \end{aligned} \tag{3.52}$$

Also,

$$|J(y+r, r) - J(y, r)| = O(1),$$

so for $0 \leqslant t \leqslant r$,

$$g^{(r)}(y+t) = g^{(r)}(y)(1 + O(y^{-1/6})). \tag{3.53}$$

We first show that if $\eta\in(0, 10^{-2})$ is given, then for

$$10^{-3} c_1^{-2} k^2 (\log k)^2 \leqslant n \leqslant (1-\eta)\, 6\pi^{-2} k^2 (\log k)^2,$$

we have

$$f_1^{(k)}(n) \leqslant \big(1+O(k^{-1/5})\big) 2^k f_2(n-k)^{(1-\eta/100)}, \tag{3.54}$$

and that for $(1+\eta)\, 6\pi^{-2} k^2 (\log k)^2 \leqslant n$,

$$f_1^{(k)}(n-k) > \big(1+O(k^{-1/5})\big) 2^k f_2(n)^{(1+\eta/100)}. \tag{3.55}$$

We consider only (3.55) in detail. Suppose therefore that $\eta\in(0, 10^{-2})$ is given, and we have

$$n \geqslant (1+\eta)\, 6\pi^{-2} k^2 (\log k)^2, \tag{3.56}$$

where we can take k very large.

We define J by (3.50) with $r = k$, $y = n-k-1/24$. Then

$$J = \tfrac{1}{2} C n^{1/2} + \tfrac{1}{2} k + o(k) \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty$$

with n satisfying (3.56), and

$$\begin{aligned} f_1^{(k)}(n-k) &\geqslant a_J \geqslant J^{-1} C^{2J} \big((2J)!\big)^{-1} (J)_{k+1} (n-k-1)^{J-k-1} \\ &\geqslant J^{-2} C^{2J} 2^{-2J} J^{-2J} e^{+2J} J^{k+1} n^{J-k-1} \cdot T, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$T = \left(1-\frac{k+1}{n}\right)^{J-k-1} \prod_{m=1}^{k} \left(1-\frac{m}{J}\right) \geqslant \exp\big(-c_{24}\, k (\log k)^{-1}\big).$$

Furthermore,

$$2^{2J} J^{2J} n^{-J} = C^{2J} \exp\big(k+o(k)\big),$$

so

$$\begin{aligned} f_1^{(k)}(n-k) &\geqslant n^{-2} J^k n^{-k} \exp\big(C n^{1/2} (1+o(1))\big) \\ &\geqslant n^{-k/2-2} 2^{-k} C^k \exp\big(C n^{1/2} (1+o(1))\big) \quad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty, \end{aligned}$$

which now implies (3.55) (subject to (3.56)) for large enough k.

Given (3.54) and (3.55), it is clear that for $k \geqslant k_6 = k_6(\eta)$ (with $k_6 \geqslant k_5$),

$$(-1)^n \Delta^k p(n) > 0 \quad \text{for} \quad 0 \leqslant n \leqslant (1-\eta)\, 6\pi^{-2} k^2 (\log k)^2,$$

$$\Delta^k p(n) > 0 \quad \text{for} \quad n \geqslant (1+\eta)\, 6\pi^{-2} k^2 (\log k)^2,$$

since by (3.46) and the monotonicity of $f_1^{(k)}(x)$ we have

$$f_1^{(k)}(n-k) \leqslant \Delta^k f_1(n) \leqslant f_1^{(k)}(n),$$

while

$$2^k f_2(n-k) \leqslant \sum_{j=0}^{k} \binom{k}{j} f_2(n-j) \leqslant 2^k f_2(n),$$

and by Lemma 3.2,

$$\sum_{j=0}^{k} \left|\binom{k}{j} R_{n-j}\right| < 10 \cdot 2^k f_3(n).$$

Since this holds for every $\eta\in(0, 10^{-2})$ (with k_6 depending on η), this shows that if $n_0(k)$ exists, then $n_0(k) \sim 6\pi^{-2} k^2 (\log k)^2$ as $k \to \infty$.

At this point, to complete the proof of our theorem it only remains to show that one can choose $\eta\in(0, 10^{-2})$ so small that for $k \geqslant k_7 = k_7(\eta)$, $\Delta^k p(n)$ will alternate in sign and then become nonnegative and stay nonnegative as n ranges over $n_1 \leqslant n \leqslant n_2$, where

$$n_1 = \lfloor (1-\eta)\, 6\pi^{-2} k^2 (\log k)^2 \rfloor, \qquad n_2 = \lfloor (1+\eta)\, 6\pi^{-2} k^2 (\log k)^2 \rfloor.$$

Let

$$S(n) = \sum_{j=0}^{k} \binom{k}{j} f_2(n-j).$$

Then we know that for any $\eta\in(0, 10^{-2})$ and k large enough (depending only on η)

$$\Delta^k f_1(n_1) < 10^{-3} S(n_1), \qquad \Delta^k f_1(n_2) > 10^{-3} S(n_2),$$

while for any $n\in[n_1, n_2]$,

$$|\Delta^k R_n| < n^{-10} S(n).$$

Now it is easy to see from the explicit definition of $f_2(n)$ that it is monotone increasing, and

$$f_2(n+1) \leqslant f_2(n) + \frac{3C}{10 n^{1/2}} f_2(n)$$

for large enough n, so that if k is large enough and $n\in[n_1, n_2]$, then

$$S(n) \leqslant S(n+1) \leqslant S(n) + CS(n)/(3n^{1/2}).$$

On the other hand, by (3.46),

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^k f_1(n+1) - \Delta^k f_1(n) &= \Delta^{k+1} f_1(n) \\ &= \int_{n-k-1}^{n} f_1^{(k+1)}(u)\, \chi_{k+1}(n-u)\, du \geqslant f_1^{(k+1)}(n-k-1), \end{aligned}$$

and by (3.46) and (3.53), this last quantity is

$$\geqslant 2C(\Delta^k f_1(n))/(5n^{1/2}),$$

provided k is large enough. It is now easy to conclude the proof of the theorem. Let N be the least integer $\geqslant n_1$ such that $\Delta^k f_1(N) \geqslant S(N)$. Then, by the above discussion,

$$\Delta^k f_1(n) + \sum_{j=0}^{k} \binom{k}{j} |R_{n-j}| < S(n)$$

for all $n < N$, $n \geqslant n_1$, so that $(-1)^k \Delta^k p(n) > 0$ for $n < N$. On the other hand, for $n > N$, $n \leqslant n_2$,

$$\Delta^k f_1(n) > S(n) + \sum_{j=0}^{k} \binom{k}{j} |R_{n-j}|,$$

so that $\Delta^k p(n) > 0$ for all $n > N$. Finally, $\Delta^k p(N)$ can only be negative if N is odd. This completes the proof of the theorem.

Acknowledgement. The author thanks T. H. Foregger for his comments on an earlier version of the manuscript.

References

[1] G. E. Andrews, *The Theory of Partitions*, Addison-Wesley, 1976.
[2] T. M. Apostal, *Modular Functions and Dirichlet Series in Number Theory*, Springer, 1976.
[3] R. Ayoub, *An Introduction to the Analytic Theory of Numbers*, Math. Surveys # 10, Am. Math. Soc. 1963.
[4] P. T. Bateman and P. Erdős, *Monotonicity of partition functions*, Mathematika 3 (1956), pp. 1–14.
[5] (a) I. J. Good, *The differences of the partition function, Problem* 6137, Amer. Math. Monthly 84 (1977), p. 141.
(b) *Partial solutions by R. Razen and I. J. Good*, ibid. 85 (1978), pp. 830–831.
(c) *Comments by I. J. Good*, ibid. 88 (1981), p. 215.
[6] H. Gupta, *Finite differences of the partition function*, Math. Comp. 32 (1978), pp. 1241–1243.
[7] G. H. Hardy and S. Ramanujan, *Asymptotic formulae in combinatory analysis*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (2) 17 (1918), pp. 75–115.
[8] H. Rademacher, *On the partition function $p(n)$*, ibid. (2) 43 (1937), pp. 241–254.

AT&T BELL LABORATORIES
Murray Hill, NJ 07974

Received on 4.4.1986
and in revised form on 22.9.1986 (1618)

ACTA ARITHMETICA
XLIX (1988)

Rational approximation vectors

by

GEORGE SZEKERES (Kensington) and VERA T.-SÓS* (Budapest)

To Paul Erdős, for his 75th birthday

1. Introduction. It is well known and an easy consequence of the theory of continued fractions that the "best" approximations

$$V_k = N_k \beta - a_k, \quad k = 1, 2, 3, \ldots, a_k \in \mathbf{Z}, N_k \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0}$$

of an irrational β change sign with each successive approximation, that is

$$V_k > 0 \Rightarrow V_{k+1} < 0 \Rightarrow V_{k+2} > 0.$$

Here V_k is called best (or closest) if $|V_k| < |N\beta - a|$ for all integers a, N, $0 < N < N_k$.

Little is known about the analogous problem in higher dimensions. One result by Rogers [3] will be mentioned below. Given $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n) \in \mathbf{R}^n$, the best approximation vectors

$$V_k = N_k \boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{a}_k, \quad \boldsymbol{a}_k = (a_{k1}, \ldots, a_{kn}) \in \mathbf{Z}^n, \ N_k \in \mathbf{Z}_{>0}, \quad k = 1, 2, 3, \ldots$$

are characterized by the property that

$$\|N_k \boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{a}_k\| < \|N\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{a}\| \quad \text{for all } \boldsymbol{a} \in \mathbf{Z}^n, \quad 0 < N < N_k$$

where $\|\boldsymbol{x}\| = \max_j |x_j|$. For convenience we shall write (for irrational α)

$$\{\alpha\} = \alpha - a, \quad a \in \mathbf{Z}, \quad |\alpha - a| < 1/2,$$

and generally for $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n)$

$$\{\boldsymbol{\alpha}\} = (\{\alpha_1\}, \ldots, \{\alpha_n\}).$$

The notation will also be used for rational α, provided that $|\alpha - a| \neq 1/2$.

* Research supported by Hungarian National Foundation for Scientific Research, Grant No. 1811.