

# DIVISORS OF SHIFTED PRIMES

DIMITRIS KOUKOULOPOULOS

**ABSTRACT.** We bound from below the number of shifted primes  $p+s \leq x$  that have a divisor in a given interval  $(y, z]$ . Kevin Ford has obtained upper bounds of the expected order of magnitude on this quantity as well as lower bounds in a special case of the parameters  $y$  and  $z$ . We supply here the corresponding lower bounds in a broad range of the parameters  $y$  and  $z$ . As expected, these bounds depend heavily on our knowledge about primes in arithmetic progressions. As an application of these bounds, we determine the number of shifted primes that appear in a multiplication table up to multiplicative constants.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

When one studies the multiplicative structure of the integers a natural and important question that arises is how many integers possess a divisor in a prescribed interval  $(y, z]$ . More precisely, for  $y < z$  and  $x \geq 1$  define

$$H(x, y, z) := |\{n \leq x : \exists d|n \text{ with } y < d \leq z\}|.$$

The study of this function was initiated by Besicovitch [2] and was further developed by Erdős [6], [7], [9] and Tenenbaum [23], [24], who obtained bounds on  $H(x, y, z)$  in various cases of the parameters  $y$  and  $z$ . In his seminal paper [25] Tenenbaum focused on estimating  $H(x, y, z)$  for all  $x, y, z$  and he obtained reasonably sharp bounds on it. A consequence of Tenenbaum's work was the realization that, for fixed  $x$  and  $y$ , the behavior of  $H(x, y, z)$  changes when  $z$  is around  $y + y(\log y)^{-\log 4+1}$ ,  $2y$  and  $y^2$ . The problem of establishing the correct order of magnitude of  $H(x, y, z)$  was completely resolved by Ford in his profound work [11], where he discovered a striking connection between the distribution of the prime factors of integers with a divisor in  $(y, z]$  and random walks with certain constraints. We state here the core of the main theorem in [11]. First, for a given pair  $(y, z)$  with  $2 \leq y < z$  define  $\eta, u, \beta$  and  $\xi$  by

$$(1.1) \quad z = e^\eta y = y^{1+u}, \quad \eta = (\log y)^{-\beta}, \quad \beta = \log 4 - 1 + \frac{\xi}{\sqrt{\log \log y}}.$$

Also, put

$$z_0(y) := y \exp\{(\log y)^{-\log 4+1}\} \approx y + y(\log y)^{-\log 4+1},$$

$$G(\beta) = \begin{cases} \frac{1+\beta}{\log 2} \log\left(\frac{1+\beta}{e \log 2}\right) & 0 \leq \beta \leq \log 4 - 1, \\ \beta & \log 4 - 1 \leq \beta, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\delta := 1 - \frac{1 + \log \log 2}{\log 2} = 0.086071 \dots$$

---

*Date:* November 3, 2018.

*2000 Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 11N25, secondary: 11N13.

Then the result is formulated as follows.

**Theorem 1.1** (Ford [11]). *Let  $x > 100000$  and  $100 \leq y \leq z - 1$  with  $z \leq x$ .*

(a) *If  $y \leq \sqrt{x}$ , then*

$$\frac{H(x, y, z)}{x} \asymp \begin{cases} \frac{\log(z/y) = \eta}{\beta} & y + 1 \leq z \leq z_0(y), \\ \frac{\max\{1, -\xi\}(\log y)^{G(\beta)}}{u^\delta (\log \frac{z}{u})^{-3/2}} & z_0(y) \leq z \leq 2y, \\ 1 & 2y \leq z \leq y^2, \\ & z \geq y^2. \end{cases}$$

(b) *If  $y > \sqrt{x}$ , then*

$$H(x, y, z) \asymp \begin{cases} H(x, \frac{x}{z}, \frac{x}{y}) & \frac{x}{y} \geq \frac{x}{z} + 1, \\ \eta x & \text{else.} \end{cases}$$

When the interval  $(y, z]$  is relatively short, Tenenbaum established an asymptotic formula for  $H(x, y, z)$ .

**Theorem 1.2** (Tenenbaum [25]). *If  $z \leq \sqrt{x}$  and  $\xi \rightarrow \infty$ , then*

$$H(x, y, z) \sim \eta x \quad (y \rightarrow \infty, z - y \rightarrow \infty).$$

There are several directions towards one might attempt to generalize Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. One of them comes from restricting the range of  $n$  to be some subset of the natural numbers  $\mathcal{A}$ . Motivated by this question we set

$$H(x, y, z; \mathcal{A}) := |\{n \in [0, x] \cap \mathcal{A} : \exists d | n \text{ with } y < d \leq z\}|.$$

If  $\mathcal{A}$  is reasonably well-distributed in arithmetic progressions, then a simple heuristic shows that we should have

$$H(x, y, z; \mathcal{A}) \approx \frac{|\mathcal{A} \cap [0, x]|}{x} H(x, y, z).$$

In the case that  $\mathcal{A}$  is an arithmetic progression Ford, Khan, Shparlinski and Yankov [12] obtained upper bounds on  $H(x, y, z; \mathcal{A})$ .

In the present paper we focus on the special and important case when  $\mathcal{A} = P_s := \{p + s : p \text{ prime}\}$  for fixed  $s \neq 0$ . It is well-known that  $P_s$  is well-distributed in arithmetic progressions  $a \pmod{q}$  with  $(a - s, q) = 1$ . Making this precise using sieving arguments and combining it with the methods developed in [11] can lead to bounds on  $H(x, y, z; P_s)$  of the expected order of magnitude. The upper bounds were settled by Ford [11]. We state below a short interval version of Theorem 6 in [11]; for a proof of it see the proofs of Theorem 6 and Lemma 6.1 in [11].

**Theorem 1.3** (Ford [11]). *Fix  $s \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ . Let  $2 \leq y \leq \sqrt{x}$ ,  $y + 1 \leq z \leq x$  and  $x(\log z)^{-10} \leq \Delta \leq x$ . Then*

$$H(x, y, z; P_s) - H(x - \Delta, y, z; P_s) \ll_s \begin{cases} \frac{\Delta}{x} \frac{H(x, y, z)}{\log x} & z \geq y + (\log y)^{2/3}, \\ \frac{\Delta}{\log x} \sum_{\substack{y < d \leq z \\ (d, s) = 1}} \frac{1}{\phi(d)} & z \leq y + (\log y)^{2/3}. \end{cases}$$

In general, lower bounds are more difficult because they rely on more precise knowledge about the distribution of primes in arithmetic progressions, which is a notoriously difficult problem. A special case was worked out by Ford.

**Theorem 1.4** (Ford [11]). *For fixed  $s, a, b$  with  $s \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$  and  $0 \leq a < b \leq 1$ , we have*

$$H(x, x^a, x^b; P_s) \gg_{s,a,b} \frac{x}{\log x}.$$

The purpose of this paper is to provide lower bounds on  $H(x, y, z; P_s)$  in a broader range of the parameters  $y$  and  $z$ . We split our results according to the range of the parameter  $\eta = \log(z/y)$ . For small values of  $\eta$  lower bounds on  $H(x, y, z; P_s)$  depend heavily on inequalities of the form

$$(1.2) \quad \pi(x; q, a) \geq \frac{cx}{\phi(q) \log x} \quad \text{for } (a, q) = 1$$

for some  $c > 0$ , uniformly in some range of  $q$  with a possible ‘small’ exceptional set, namely reverse Brun-Titchmarsh inequalities. Such results have been proven by Alford, Granville and Pomerance [1] and Harman [16]. Also, Bombieri, Friedlander and Iwaniec proved in [3] an asymptotic formula for

$$\sum_{\substack{q \leq Q \\ (q,a)=1}} \pi(x; q, a),$$

when  $Q \leq x^{1-\epsilon}$  and  $a$  is fixed. Combining these results with the arguments leading to Theorem 1.2 we show the following theorem. Here and for the rest of this paper  $x_0(\cdot)$  denotes a sufficiently large positive constant which depends only on the parameters given, e.g.  $x_0(s)$ , and its meaning might change from statement to statement. Constants implied by  $\ll$ ,  $\gg$  and  $\asymp$  are absolute unless otherwise specified, e.g. by a subscript.

**Theorem 1.5** (Small values of  $\eta$ ). *Fix  $s \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ . Let  $x \geq 2$  and  $3 \leq y + 1 \leq z$  with  $y \leq \sqrt{x}$  and  $\{y < d \leq z : (d, s) = 1\} \neq \emptyset$ .*

(a) *If  $x \geq x_0(s)$ ,  $z \leq x^{0.472}$  and*

$$y + \exp\{4.532(\log y)^{1/4}\} \leq z \leq y + \frac{y}{(\log y)^2},$$

*then*

$$(1.3) \quad H(x, y, z; P_s) \gg_s \begin{cases} \frac{H(x, y, z)}{\log x} & z \geq y + (\log y)^{2/3}, \\ \frac{x}{\log x} \sum_{\substack{y < d \leq z \\ (d,s)=1}} \frac{1}{\phi(d)} & z \leq y + (\log y)^{2/3}. \end{cases}$$

(b) *Let  $\epsilon > 0$ . If  $x \geq x_0(s, \epsilon)$ ,  $z \leq x^{5/12-\epsilon}$  and*

$$y + \log \log y \leq z \leq y + \frac{y}{(\log y)^2},$$

then (1.3) holds with the implied constant depending on  $\epsilon$  as well. If, in addition,  $(z - y)/\log \log y \rightarrow \infty$  as  $y \rightarrow \infty$ , then

$$H(x, y, z; P_s) \sim_{\epsilon, s} \begin{cases} f(s) \frac{315\zeta(3)}{2\pi^4} \frac{\eta x}{\log x} & \text{if } \frac{z - y}{(\log y)^{2/3}} \rightarrow \infty, \\ \frac{x}{\log x} \sum_{\substack{y < d \leq z \\ (d, s) = 1}} \frac{1}{\phi(d)} & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

as  $y \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $f(s) = \prod_{p|s} \frac{(p-1)^2}{p^2 - p + 1}$ .

- (c) If (1.2) holds for some  $c > 0$ , uniformly in  $q \leq Q$  for some  $Q = Q(x) \leq \sqrt{x}$ ,  $x \geq x_0(s, c)$  and

$$z \leq y + \frac{y}{(\log y)^2},$$

then (1.3) is valid for  $z \leq Q$  with the implied constant depending on  $c$  as well.

- (d) Let  $B \geq 2$  be fixed. If

$$z \geq y + \frac{y}{(\log y)^B} \quad \text{and} \quad \xi \rightarrow \infty,$$

then

$$H(x, y, z; P_s) \sim_{s, B} f(s) \frac{315\zeta(3)}{2\pi^4} \frac{\eta x}{\log x} \quad (y \rightarrow \infty).$$

For intermediate and large values of  $\eta$  we need results about primes in arithmetic progressions *on average* in order to control error terms coming from the linear sieve. The most famous such result is the Bombieri-Vinogradov theorem [4, p. 161]. This theorem allows one to get the expected order of  $H(x, y, z; P_s)$  for  $y \leq x^{1/2-\epsilon}$ . To go beyond this threshold we make use of Theorem 9 in [3].

**Theorem 1.6** (Intermediate and large values of  $\eta$ ; short intervals). *Fix  $s \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$  and  $B \geq 2$ . Let  $x \geq x_0(s, B)$ ,  $x(\log x)^{-B} \leq \Delta \leq x$  and  $3 \leq y + 1 \leq z \leq x$  with  $\{y < d \leq z : (d, s) = 1\} \neq \emptyset$ ,  $y \leq \sqrt{x}$  and*

$$z \geq y + \frac{y}{(\log y)^B}.$$

*Then*

$$H(x, y, z; P_s) - H(x - \Delta, y, z; P_s) \gg_{s, B} \frac{\Delta}{x} \frac{H(x, y, z)}{\log x}.$$

We may combine Theorems 1.3 and 1.6 with an argument given in [11] to obtain the expected order of  $H(x, y, z; P_s)$  in the full range of the parameters  $y$  and  $z$ , when  $\eta \geq (\log y)^{-B}$  for some fixed  $B \geq 2$ .

**Theorem 1.7** (Intermediate and large values of  $\eta$ ). *Fix  $s \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$  and  $B \geq 2$ . Let  $x \geq x_0(s, B)$  and  $3 \leq y + 1 \leq z \leq x$  with  $\{y < d \leq z : (d, s) = 1\} \neq \emptyset$  and*

$$z \geq y + \frac{y}{(\log y)^B}.$$

*Then*

$$H(x, y, z; P_s) \asymp_{s, B} \frac{H(x, y, z)}{\log x}.$$

Finally, when  $\eta$  is very large we are able to establish an asymptotic formula for  $H(x, y, z; P_s)$ , similar with the one given for  $H(x, y, z)$  in Theorem 21(iv) of [15].

**Theorem 1.8** (Very large values of  $\eta$ ). *Let  $s \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ . If  $2 \leq y \leq z \leq x$ , then*

$$H(x, y, z; P_s) = \frac{x}{\log x} \left( 1 + O_s \left( \frac{\log y}{\log z} \right) \right).$$

**Shifted primes in the multiplication table.** A nice application of Theorem 1.7 is on the multiplication table problem. This problem, which was first posed by Erdős [8],[9], is to count the number of distinct integers of the form  $ab$  with  $1 \leq a, b \leq \sqrt{x}$ , namely to estimate the quantity

$$A(x) := |\{ab : 1 \leq a, b \leq \sqrt{x}\}|.$$

Another related question is to estimate

$$A(x; P_s) := |\{p + s = ab : 1 \leq a, b \leq \sqrt{x}\}|,$$

that is how many shifted primes appear in the multiplication table. The order of  $A(x)$  was determined by Ford in [11], where he proved that

$$A(x) \asymp \frac{x}{(\log x)^\delta (\log \log x)^{3/2}}.$$

This follows by the elementary inequalities

$$H\left(\frac{x}{2}, \frac{\sqrt{x}}{2}, \sqrt{x}\right) \leq A(x) \leq \sum_{m \geq 0} H\left(\frac{x}{2^m}, \frac{\sqrt{x}}{2^{m+1}}, \frac{\sqrt{x}}{2^m}\right)$$

and Theorem 1.1. Similarly, using Theorem 1.7 we establish the order of magnitude of  $A(x; P_s)$ .

**Corollary 1.1.** *If  $x \geq x_0(s)$ , then*

$$A(x; P_s) \asymp_s \frac{A(x)}{\log x}.$$

## 2. BACKGROUND MATERIAL

**Notation.** We make use of some standard notation. If  $a(n)$ ,  $b(n)$  are two arithmetic functions, then we denote with  $a * b$  their Dirichlet convolution. Furthermore, for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $1 \leq y \leq z$  we put  $\omega(n; y, z) := |\{p \text{ prime} : p|n, y < p \leq z\}|$  and  $\Omega(n; y, z) := \sum \{a : p^a || n, y < p \leq z\}$ , where  $p^a || n$  means that  $p^a | n$  and  $p^{a+1} \nmid n$ . Also, for brevity let  $\omega(n; z) := \omega(n; 1, z)$  and  $\Omega(n; z) := \Omega(n; 1, z)$ . For  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  we use  $P^+(n)$  and  $P^-(n)$  to denote the largest and smallest prime factor of  $n$ , respectively, with the notational conventions that  $P^+(1) = 0$  and  $P^-(1) = +\infty$ . Given  $1 \leq y < z$ ,  $\mathcal{P}(y, z)$  denotes the set of all integers  $n$  such that  $P^+(n) \leq z$  and  $P^-(n) > y$ . In addition,  $\pi(x; q, a)$  stands for the number of primes up to  $x$  in the arithmetic progression  $a \pmod{q}$ . Lastly, for a Dirichlet character  $\chi$ ,  $N(\sigma, V, \chi)$  denotes the number of zeroes  $\rho = \beta + i\gamma$  of its associated  $L$ -function with  $|\gamma| \leq V$  and  $\beta \geq \sigma$ .

In this section we state various preliminary results that are needed in order to prove Theorems 1.5, 1.6, 1.7 and 1.8. First, we list a series of results on primes in arithmetic progressions. We start with a lemma which is a direct corollary of Theorem 2.1 in [1].

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $\epsilon \in (0, 1/12)$ . There exists  $x_\epsilon \geq 1$  such that for every  $x \geq x_\epsilon$ , there is a set  $\mathcal{D}_\epsilon(x) \subset \mathbb{N} \cap [\log x, x]$  with  $|\mathcal{D}_\epsilon(x)| \ll_\epsilon 1$  so that for every  $(a, q) = 1$  with  $q \leq x^{5/12-\epsilon}$ ,*

$$\left| \pi(x; q, a) - \frac{\text{li}(x)}{\phi(q)} \right| \leq \epsilon \frac{\text{li}(x)}{\phi(q)},$$

*with the possible exception of  $q \in \mathcal{MD}_\epsilon(x) = \{md : m \in \mathbb{N}, d \in \mathcal{D}_\epsilon(x)\}$ .*

Harman [16], allowing a larger set of exceptional moduli, gave a variation of Lemma 2.1. His starting point is the following result.

**Lemma 2.2.** *Given  $\epsilon > 0$ , there are constants  $K(\epsilon) \geq 2$  and  $c(\epsilon) > 0$  such that if  $K(\epsilon) < q < x^{0.472}$  and for every  $d|q$  with  $\chi$  a primitive character (mod  $d$ ) we have*

$$L(\sigma + it, \chi) \neq 0 \quad \text{for } \sigma > 1 - \frac{1}{(\log q)^{3/4}}, \quad |t| \leq \exp\{\epsilon(\log q)^{3/4}\},$$

*then for any  $a$  with  $(a, q) = 1$  we have*

$$\pi(x; q, a) \geq \frac{c(\epsilon)x}{\phi(q) \log x}.$$

Using Lemma 2.2 along with estimates on averages of  $N(\sigma, V, \chi)$  Harman showed a variation of Lemma 2.1. The main part of the argument is given in [16], but the result is not stated explicitly; we state it and prove it here for the sake of completeness.

**Lemma 2.3.** *There exist absolute positive constants  $c_1, c_2$  and  $x_0$  so that for all  $x \geq x_0$  there is a set  $\mathcal{E}(x) \subset \mathbb{N} \cap [\log x, x]$  satisfying the following:*

- (1)  $|\mathcal{E}(x)| \leq \exp\{3.641(\log x)^{1/4}\};$
- (2)  $|\mathcal{E}(x) \cap [1, \exp\{c_1(\log x)^{3/4}\}]| \ll 1;$
- (3) *For every  $(a, q) = 1$  with  $q \leq x^{0.472}$  we have*

$$\pi(x; q, a) \geq \frac{c_2 x}{\phi(q) \log x},$$

*with the possible exception of  $q \in \mathcal{ME}(x) = \{me : m \in \mathbb{N}, e \in \mathcal{E}(x)\}$ .*

*Proof.* Set  $W = (0.4166 \log x)^{3/4}$ . From [4, p. 93, 95] there is an absolute constant  $c_1$  so that there is at most one primitive character  $\chi_1$  to a modulus  $q_1 \leq V = \exp\{c_1(\log x)^{3/4}\}$  whose  $L$ -function has a zero  $\rho$  with  $|\text{Im}(\rho)| \leq V$  and  $\text{Re}(\rho) > 1 - 1/W$ . By [4, p. 96], this exceptional modulus  $q_1$  will satisfy  $q_1 \geq \log x$ . In addition, Montgomery showed in [19] that

$$(2.1) \quad \sum_{q \leq Q} \sum_{\chi \pmod{q}}^* N(\sigma, V, \chi) \ll (Q^2 V)^{2(1-\sigma)/\sigma} (\log QV)^{13} \quad (4/5 \leq \sigma \leq 1),$$

where  $\sum^*$  means that the sum runs over primitive characters only. Inequality (2.1) with  $Q = x^{0.472}$  and  $\sigma = 1 - 1/W$  yields that  $N(\sigma, V, \chi) = 0$  for all primitive characters to every moduli  $q \leq x^{0.472}$  with at most  $\exp\{3.64094(\log x)^{1/4}\}$  exceptions. Call this exceptional set  $\mathcal{E}_1(x)$ . This set contains no elements  $\leq \log x$  and at most one element  $\leq V$ , by the discussion in the beginning of the proof. Next, applying Lemma 2.1 with  $\epsilon_0 = 2/3 \times 10^{-4}$  we obtain a set  $\mathcal{D}_{\epsilon_0}(x) \subset [\log x, x]$  with boundedly many elements and the property that if  $q \leq x^{0.4166}$  and  $q \notin \mathcal{MD}_{\epsilon_0}(x)$ , then

$$(2.2) \quad \pi(x; q, a) \geq (1 - \epsilon_0) \frac{x}{\phi(q) \log x} \quad \text{for } (a, q) = 1.$$

Set

$$\mathcal{E}(x) := \mathcal{E}_1(x) \cup \mathcal{D}_{\epsilon_0}(x).$$

Then, clearly, conditions (1) and (2) hold for  $\mathcal{E}(x)$ . Also, if  $q \leq x^{0.4166}$  is such that  $q \notin \mathcal{ME}(x)$ , then (3) holds by (2.2). Finally, if  $q \in [x^{0.4166}, x^{0.472}]$  and  $q \notin \mathcal{ME}(x)$ , then the hypothesis of Lemma 2.2 is met and we deduce (3). This completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

Below we state the Brun-Titchmarsh inequality [14, Theorem 3.7].

**Lemma 2.4.** *Uniformly in  $1 \leq q < y \leq x$  and  $(a, q) = 1$  we have that*

$$\pi(x; q, a) - \pi(x - y; q, a) \ll \frac{y}{\phi(q) \log(2y/q)}.$$

In addition, we will need a generalization of Lemma 2.4, which is an easy application of the results and methods in [21]. Let  $\mathcal{M}$  denote the class of functions  $F : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$  which for every  $\epsilon > 0$  satisfy the inequality

$$F(nm) \leq \min\{A_F^{\Omega(m)}, B_{F,\epsilon} m^\epsilon\} F(n) \quad \text{for all } (m, n) = 1,$$

for some positive constants  $A_F$  and  $B_{F,\epsilon}$ .

**Lemma 2.5.** *Let  $F \in \mathcal{M}$ ,  $a \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$  and  $1 \leq q \leq h < x$  such that  $(a, q) = 1$  and  $x > |a|$ . If  $q \leq x^{1-\epsilon}$  and  $\frac{h}{q} \geq (\frac{x-a}{q})^\epsilon$  for some  $\epsilon > 0$ , then*

$$\sum_{\substack{x-h < p \leq x \\ p \equiv a \pmod{q}}} F\left(\frac{p-a}{q}\right) \ll_{a,\epsilon,F} \frac{h}{\phi(q)(\log x)^2} \sum_{n \leq x} \frac{F(n)}{n};$$

the implied constant depends on  $F$  only via the constants  $A_F$  and  $B_{F,\alpha}$ ,  $\alpha > 0$ .

*Proof.* Without loss of generality we may assume that  $F(1) = 1$ . Also, suppose that  $x \geq x_0(\epsilon, a, F)$ , where  $x_0(a, \epsilon, v_0)$  is a sufficiently large constant; otherwise, the result is trivial. Put  $X = (x-a)/q$  and  $H = h/q$ . Setting  $p = qm + a$  we find that

$$\sum_{\substack{x-h < p \leq x \\ p \equiv a \pmod{q}}} F\left(\frac{p-a}{q}\right) \leq \sum_{\substack{X-H < m \leq X \\ P^-(qm+a) > X^{1/3}}} F(m) + \sum_{\substack{X-H < m \leq X \\ qm+a \leq \sqrt{X}}} F(m).$$

Let  $F_1(n) = F(n)$  and  $F_2(n)$  be the characteristic function of integers  $n$  such that  $P^-(n) > \sqrt{X}$ . Let  $Q_1(x) = x$ ,  $Q_2(x) = qx + a$  and  $Q = Q_1 Q_2$ . Also, if  $P(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ , then let  $\rho_P(m)$  be the number of solution of the congruence  $P(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{m}$ . By Corollary 3 in [21], we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{X-H < m \leq X \\ P^-(qm+a) > \sqrt{X}}} F(m) &= \sum_{X-H < m \leq X} F_1(m) F_2(mq + a) \\ (2.3) \quad &\ll_{a,\epsilon,F} H \prod_{p \leq X} \left(1 - \frac{\rho_Q(p)}{p}\right) \prod_{j=1}^2 \sum_{n \leq X} \frac{F_j(n) \rho_{Q_j}(n)}{n} \\ &\ll_{a,\epsilon} \frac{h}{\phi(q)} \frac{1}{\log^2 x} \sum_{n \leq X} \frac{F(n)}{n}, \end{aligned}$$

since  $q \leq x^{1-\epsilon}$  and the discriminant of  $Q$  depends only on  $a$ . Also, if the sum

$$\sum_{\substack{X-H < m \leq X \\ qm+a \leq \sqrt{X}}} F(m)$$

is non-zero, then  $H \geq X/2$ . In this case, Corollary 3 in [21] implies that

$$\sum_{\substack{X-H < m \leq X \\ m \leq X^{1/3}}} F(m) \ll_{a,\epsilon,F} \frac{X^{1/3}}{\log X} \sum_{n \leq X} \frac{F(n)}{n} \ll_{a,\epsilon} \frac{h}{q \log^2 x} \sum_{n \leq X} \frac{F(n)}{n},$$

which, combined with (2.3), completes the proof of the lemma.  $\square$

Using Lemma 2.5 we may prove the following estimate.

**Lemma 2.6.** *Let  $1 \leq v \leq v_0 < 2$ ,  $a \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $1 \leq q \leq x$  and  $1 \leq y \leq (x-a)/q$  such that  $(a, q) = 1$  and  $x > |a|$ . If  $q \leq x^{1-\epsilon}$  for some  $\epsilon > 0$ , then*

$$\sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv a \pmod{q}}} v^{\Omega(\frac{p-a}{q}; y)} \ll_{a,\epsilon,v_0} \frac{x}{\phi(q) \log x} (\log y)^{v-1}.$$

*Proof.* We may assume that  $x \geq x_0(a, \epsilon, v_0)$ , where  $x_0(a, \epsilon, v_0)$  is a sufficiently large constant. Let  $X = (x-a)/q$  and write  $v^{\Omega(n;y)-\omega(n;y)} = 1 * b$ , where  $b$  is a multiplicative function so that

$$b(p^l) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } l = 1 \text{ or } p > y, \\ v^{l-2}(v-1) & \text{if } l \geq 2 \text{ and } p \leq y. \end{cases}$$

Then

$$v^{\Omega(n;y)} = v^{\omega(n;y)} \sum_{kf=n} b(k) \leq \sum_{kf=n} b(k) v^{\omega(k;y)} v^{\omega(f;y)}$$

and consequently

$$(2.4) \quad \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv a \pmod{q}}} v^{\Omega(\frac{p-a}{q}; y)} \leq \sum_{k \leq X} v^{\omega(k;y)} b(k) \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv a \pmod{qk}}} v^{\omega(\frac{p-a}{qk}; y)}.$$

If  $k \leq \sqrt{X}$ , then  $kq \leq x^{1-\epsilon/3}$ . So Lemma 2.5 implies that

$$\sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv a \pmod{qk}}} v^{\omega(\frac{p-a}{qk}; y)} \ll_{a,\epsilon,v_0} \frac{x(\log y)^{v-1}}{\phi(kq) \log x}.$$

If  $k > \sqrt{X}$ , then

$$\sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv a \pmod{qk}}} v^{\omega(\frac{p-a}{qk}; y)} \leq \sum_{m \leq X/k} v^{\omega(m)} \ll_{a,\epsilon,v_0} \frac{x(\log X)^{v-1}}{kq},$$

by Theorem 01 in [15]. Hence the right hand side of (2.4) is

$$\begin{aligned} &\ll_{a,\epsilon,v_0} \frac{x(\log y)^{v-1}}{\phi(q) \log x} \sum_{k \leq \sqrt{X}} \frac{v^{\omega(k;y)} b(k)}{\phi(k)} + \frac{x(\log X)^{v-1}}{qX^{\alpha/2}} \sum_{\sqrt{X} < k \leq X} \frac{v^{\omega(k;y)} b(k) k^{\alpha}}{k} \\ &\ll_{a,\epsilon,v_0} \frac{x(\log y)^{v-1}}{\phi(q) \log x}, \end{aligned}$$



provided that  $2^{1-\alpha} > v_0$ , which completes the proof.  $\square$

We complete the results about primes in arithmetic progressions with the following estimate.

**Lemma 2.7.** *Let  $a \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $A > 0$ . There exists  $B = B(A)$  so that if  $R \leq x^{1/10-\epsilon}$  and  $QR < x(\log x)^{-B}$ , then*

$$\sum_{\substack{r \leq R \\ (r,a)=1}} \left| \sum_{\substack{q \leq Q \\ (q,a)=1}} \left( \pi(x; rq, a) - \frac{\text{li}(x)}{\phi(rq)} \right) \right| \ll_{a, \epsilon, A} \frac{x}{(\log x)^A}.$$

*Proof.* Use Theorem 9 in [3] plus partial summation.  $\square$

We need an estimate on the summatory function of the reciprocals of Euler's  $\phi$  function and other closely related quantities. Such a result was proved by Sitaramachandra [22]. Using the methods of [22] we extend this result according to the needs of this paper.

**Lemma 2.8.** *Let  $a \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $s \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $x \geq 1$  such that  $1 \leq |s| \leq x$ . Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ (n,s)=1}} \frac{\phi(a)}{\phi(an)} &= \frac{315\zeta(3)}{2\pi^4} \frac{\phi(s)}{|s|} g(as) \left( \log x + \gamma - \sum_{p \nmid as} \frac{\log p}{p^2 - p + 1} + \sum_{p|s} \frac{\log p}{p - 1} \right) \\ &\quad + O\left( \tau(s) \frac{a|s|}{\phi(as)} \frac{(\log 2x)^{2/3}}{x} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where  $g(as) = \prod_{p|as} \frac{p(p-1)}{p^2-p+1}$ .

*Proof.* Since the proof of this part is along the same lines with the proof of the main result in [22], we simply sketch it. Let  $P(x) = \{x\} - 1/2$ , where  $\{x\}$  denotes the fractional part of  $x$ . Then using the estimate

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \frac{P(x/n)}{n} \ll (\log 2x)^{2/3},$$

which was proved in [26, p. 98], along with an argument similar with the one leading to Lemma 2.2 in [22], we find that

$$(2.5) \quad \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ (n,m)=1}} \frac{\mu^2(n)}{\phi(n)} P(x/n) \ll \frac{|m|}{\phi(m)} (\log 2x)^{2/3}$$

for every  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Also, by the Euler-McLaurin's summation formula we have

$$(2.6) \quad \sum_{n \leq x} \frac{1}{n} = \log x + \gamma - \frac{P(x)}{x} + O\left(\frac{1}{x^2}\right).$$

Observe that the arithmetic function  $n \rightarrow \phi(a)/\phi(an)$  is multiplicative. In particular, we have that

$$\frac{\phi(a)}{\phi(an)} = \sum_{\substack{kf=n \\ (k,a)=1}} \frac{\mu^2(k)}{k\phi(k)f}.$$

Therefore inserting the asymptotic estimate (2.6) into the above relation and estimating the error terms as in [22] gives us that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ (n,s)=1}} \frac{\phi(a)}{\phi(an)} &= \sum_{\substack{k \leq x \\ (k,as)=1}} \frac{\mu^2(k)}{k\phi(k)} \sum_{\substack{f \leq x/k \\ (f,s)=1}} \frac{1}{f} = \sum_{d|s} \frac{\mu(d)}{d} \sum_{\substack{k \leq x/d \\ (k,as)=1}} \frac{\mu^2(k)}{k\phi(k)} \sum_{l \leq x/kd} \frac{1}{l} \\
&= \sum_{d|s} \frac{\mu(d)}{d} \sum_{\substack{k \leq x/d \\ (k,as)=1}} \frac{\mu^2(k)}{k\phi(k)} \left( \log \frac{x/d}{k} + \gamma - \frac{k}{x/d} P\left(\frac{x/d}{k}\right) + O\left(\frac{k^2}{(x/d)^2}\right) \right) \\
&= \sum_{d|s} \frac{\mu(d)}{d} \sum_{\substack{k=1 \\ (k,as)=1}}^{\infty} \frac{\mu^2(k)}{k\phi(k)} \left( \log \frac{x/d}{k} + \gamma \right) + O\left(\frac{\tau(s)as}{\phi(as)} \frac{(\log 2x)^{2/3}}{x}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

since  $|s| \leq x$ . Finally, a simple calculation and the identity

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu^2(k)}{k\phi(k)} = \frac{315\zeta(3)}{2\pi^4}$$

complete the proof.  $\square$

We state below a result which is known as the ‘fundamental lemma’ in sieve theory. For a proof refer to [18] (see also [13] for part (a)).

**Lemma 2.9.** *Let  $D \geq 2$ ,  $D = Z^v$  with  $v \geq 3$ .*

(a) *There exist two sequences  $\{\lambda^+(d)\}_{d \leq D}$ , and  $\{\lambda^-(d)\}_{d \leq D}$  such that*

$$|\lambda^{\pm}(d)| \leq 1,$$

$$\begin{cases} (\lambda^- * 1)(n) = (\lambda^+ * 1)(n) = 1 & \text{if } P^-(n) > Z, \\ (\lambda^- * 1)(n) \leq 0 \leq (\lambda^+ * 1)(n) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

*and, for any multiplicative function  $\alpha(d)$  with  $0 \leq \alpha(p) \leq \min\{\kappa, p-1\}$ ,*

$$\sum_{d \leq D} \lambda^{\pm}(d) \frac{\alpha(d)}{d} = \prod_{p \leq Z} \left(1 - \frac{\alpha(p)}{p}\right) (1 + O_{\kappa}(v^{-v})).$$

(b) *There exists a sequence  $\{\rho(d)\}_{d \leq D}$  such that*

$$|\rho(d)| \leq 1,$$

$$\begin{cases} (\rho * 1)(n) = 1 & \text{if } P^-(n) > Z, \\ (\rho * 1)(n) \leq 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

*and, for any multiplicative function  $\alpha(d)$  satisfying  $0 \leq \alpha(p) \leq p-1$  and*

$$\prod_{y < p \leq w} \left(1 - \frac{\alpha(p)}{p}\right)^{-1} \leq \frac{\log w}{\log y} \left(1 + \frac{L}{\log y}\right) \quad (3/2 \leq y \leq w),$$

*we have*

$$\sum_{d \leq D} \rho(d) \frac{\alpha(d)}{d} \gg_L \prod_{p \leq Z} \left(1 - \frac{\alpha(p)}{p}\right),$$

*provided that  $D \geq D_0(L)$ , where  $D_0(L)$  is a constant depending only on  $L$ .*

We now introduce some notation we will be utilizing later. For  $a$  and  $k$  in  $\mathbb{N}$  define

$$\tau(a) := |\{d \in \mathbb{N} : d|n\}|$$

and

$$\tau_k(a) := |\{(d_1, \dots, d_k) \in \mathbb{N}^k : d_1 \cdots d_k = a\}|.$$

Moreover, for  $\sigma > 0$  let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(a; \sigma) &:= \{x \in \mathbb{R} : \exists d|a \text{ such that } e^x < d \leq e^{x+\sigma}\} \\ &= \bigcup_{d|a} [\log d - \sigma, \log d) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$L(a; \sigma) := \text{meas}(\mathcal{L}(a; \sigma)),$$

where ‘meas’ denotes the Lebesgue measure on the real line. We note the straightforward inequality

$$(2.7) \quad L(ab; \sigma) \leq \tau(a)L(b; \sigma) \quad \text{for } (a, b) = 1,$$

which is item (ii) of Lemma 3.1 in [11].

When  $\eta$  is in the intermediate range of values, the basic result we will use to bound  $H(x, y, z; P_s)$  from below is the following estimate.

**Lemma 2.10.** *Let  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $B > 0$ ,  $x \geq 1$ ,  $3 \leq y + 1 \leq z$  with  $z \leq x^{2/3}$  and  $\eta \in [(\log y)^{-B}, \frac{\log y}{100}]$ . Then*

$$H(x, y, z) \asymp_{\epsilon, B} \frac{x}{\log^2 y} \sum_{\substack{a \leq y^\epsilon \\ \mu^2(a)=1}} \frac{L(a; \eta)}{a}.$$

The proof of Lemma 2.10 can be found in [11]. Even though this result is not stated explicitly, it is a direct corollary of the methods there: see Theorem 1 and Lemmas 4.1, 4.2, 4.5, 4.8 and 4.9 in [11]. Also, we will need the following result, which is Corollary 1 in [11].

**Lemma 2.11.** *Suppose  $x_1, y_1, z_1, x_2, y_2, z_2$  are real numbers with  $2 \leq y_i + 1 \leq z_i \leq x_i$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ),  $\log(z_1/y_1) \asymp \log(z_2/y_2)$ ,  $\log y_1 \asymp \log y_2$  and  $\log(x_1/z_1) \asymp \log(x_2/z_2)$ . Then*

$$\frac{H(x_1, y_1, z_1)}{x_1} \asymp \frac{H(x_2, y_2, z_2)}{x_2}.$$

Finally, we state a covering lemma, which is a special case of Lemma 3.15 in [10]. Here for  $I$  an interval of the real line we denote by  $rI$  the interval that has the same center as  $I$  and  $r$  times its diameter.

**Lemma 2.12.** *Let  $A = \bigcup_{n=1}^N I_n \subset \mathbb{R}$ , where the sets  $I_n$  are nonempty intervals of the form  $[a, b)$ . Then there exists a subcollection  $\{I_{i_m}\}_{m=1}^M$  of mutually disjoint intervals so that*

$$A \subset \bigcup_{m=1}^M 3I_{i_m}.$$

3. SMALL VALUES OF  $\eta$ 

In this section we give the proof of Theorem 1.5. First, we show an auxiliary result.

**Lemma 3.1.** *Let  $a \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $x \geq 2$  and  $3 \leq Q_1 + 1 \leq Q_2 \leq 2Q_1$  with  $Q_1 \leq \sqrt{x}$  and  $\{Q_1 < q \leq Q_2 : (q, a) = 1\} \neq \emptyset$ .*

(a) *Let  $\epsilon \in (0, 1/12)$ . If  $x \geq x_0(a, \epsilon)$  and  $Q_1 + \log \log Q_1 \leq Q_2 \leq x^{5/12-\epsilon}$ , then*

$$(3.1) \quad \sum_{\substack{Q_1 < q \leq Q_2 \\ (q, a) = 1}} \pi(x; q, a) \gg_{a, \epsilon} \frac{x}{\log x} \sum_{\substack{Q_1 < q \leq Q_2 \\ (q, a) = 1}} \frac{1}{\phi(q)}.$$

*If, in addition,  $(Q_2 - Q_1)/\log \log Q_1 \rightarrow \infty$  as  $Q_1 \rightarrow \infty$ , then*

$$(3.2) \quad \sum_{\substack{Q_1 < q \leq Q_2 \\ (q, a) = 1}} \pi(x; q, a) \sim_{a, \epsilon} \frac{x}{\log x} \sum_{\substack{Q_1 < q \leq Q_2 \\ (q, a) = 1}} \frac{1}{\phi(q)} \quad (Q_1 \rightarrow \infty).$$

(b) *If  $x \geq x_0(a)$  and  $Q_1 + \exp\{4.532(\log Q_1)^{1/4}\} \leq Q_2 \leq x^{0.472}$ , then (3.1) holds with the implied constant depending only on  $a$ .*

(c) *Let  $B \geq 2$ . If  $Q_2 \geq Q_1 + Q_1(\log Q_1)^{-B}$ , then*

$$\sum_{\substack{Q_1 < q \leq Q_2 \\ (q, a) = 1}} \pi(x; q, a) \sim_{a, B} f(a) \frac{315\zeta(3)}{2\pi^4} \frac{x \log(Q_2/Q_1)}{\log x}.$$

*Proof.* (a) For every  $\epsilon_1 \in (0, \epsilon]$  and  $x \geq x_{\epsilon_1}$  Lemmas 2.1 and 2.4 imply that

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{Q_1 < q \leq Q_2 \\ (q, a) = 1}} \pi(x; q, a) &= (1 + \epsilon_1 \theta) \text{li}(x) \sum_{\substack{Q_1 < q \leq Q_2 \\ q \notin \mathcal{MD}_{\epsilon_1}(x) \\ (q, a) = 1}} \frac{1}{\phi(q)} + O\left(\frac{x}{\log x} \sum_{\substack{Q_1 < q \leq Q_2 \\ q \in \mathcal{MD}_{\epsilon_1}(x)}} \frac{1}{\phi(q)}\right) \\ &= (1 + \epsilon_1 \theta) \text{li}(x) \sum_{\substack{Q_1 < q \leq Q_2 \\ (q, a) = 1}} \frac{1}{\phi(q)} + O\left(\frac{x}{\log x} \sum_{\substack{Q_1 < q \leq Q_2 \\ q \in \mathcal{MD}_{\epsilon_1}(x)}} \frac{1}{\phi(q)}\right), \end{aligned}$$

for some  $|\theta| \leq 1$ . Fix  $d \in \mathcal{D}_{\epsilon_1}(x)$ . If  $d \geq Q_2 - Q_1$ , then the interval  $(Q_1/d, Q_2/d]$  contains at most one integer and therefore

$$(3.4) \quad \sum_{Q_1/d < m \leq Q_2/d} \frac{1}{\phi(dm)} \ll \frac{\log \log Q_1}{Q_1}.$$

On the other hand, if  $d \leq Q_2 - Q_1$ , then

$$(3.5) \quad \sum_{Q_1/d < m \leq Q_2/d} \frac{1}{\phi(dm)} \ll \frac{\log \log Q_1}{d} \log(Q_2/Q_1).$$

Since  $d \geq \log x$  and  $|\mathcal{D}_{\epsilon_1}(x)| \ll_{\epsilon_1} 1$ , by (3.4) and (3.5) we deduce that

$$(3.6) \quad \sum_{\substack{Q_1 < q \leq Q_2 \\ q \in \mathcal{MD}_{\epsilon_1}(x)}} \frac{1}{\phi(q)} \ll_{\epsilon_1} \frac{\log \log Q_1}{Q_1} + \frac{\log \log Q_1}{\log x} \log(Q_2/Q_1).$$

Also,

$$(3.7) \quad \sum_{\substack{Q_1 < q \leq Q_2 \\ (q,a)=1}} \frac{1}{\phi(q)} \geq \sum_{\substack{Q_1 < q \leq Q_2 \\ (q,a)=1}} \frac{1}{q} \gg_a \log(Q_2/Q_1) \asymp \frac{Q_2 - Q_1}{Q_1},$$

uniformly in  $Q_1 + 1 \leq Q_2 \leq 2Q_1$  with  $\{Q_1 < q \leq Q_2 : (q, a) = 1\} \neq \emptyset$ . The above inequality, (3.3) and (3.6) imply that

$$(3.8) \quad \sum_{\substack{Q_1 < q \leq Q_2 \\ (q,a)=1}} \pi(x; q, a) = (1 + \epsilon_1 \theta) \text{li}(x) \sum_{\substack{Q_1 < q \leq Q_2 \\ (q,a)=1}} \frac{1}{\phi(q)} \left( 1 + O_{a, \epsilon_1} \left( \frac{\log \log Q_1}{\log x} + \frac{\log \log Q_1}{Q_2 - Q_1} \right) \right).$$

This proves that (3.2) holds. To show that (3.1) holds, fix a large positive constant  $M = M(\epsilon, a)$  with  $M \geq x_\epsilon$ . If  $Q_1 \leq M$  and  $x$  is large enough, then

$$\sum_{\substack{Q_1 < q \leq Q_2 \\ (q,a)=1}} \pi(x; q, a) \geq \max_{\substack{Q_1 < q \leq Q_2 \\ (q,a)=1}} \pi(x; q, a) \gg_{a, \epsilon} \frac{x}{\log x} \asymp_{a, \epsilon} \frac{x}{\log x} \sum_{\substack{Q_1 < q \leq Q_2 \\ (q,a)=1}} \frac{1}{\phi(q)},$$

by our assumption that  $\{Q_1 < q \leq Q_2 : (q, a) = 1\} \neq \emptyset$  and the Prime Number Theorem for arithmetic progressions [4, p. 123]. So we may suppose that  $Q_1 > M$ . By (3.3), (3.6) and (3.7) with  $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon$ , we deduce that

$$(3.9) \quad \sum_{\substack{Q_1 < q \leq Q_2 \\ (q,a)=1}} \pi(x; q, a) \geq \frac{x}{2 \log x} \left( \sum_{\substack{Q_1 < q \leq Q_2 \\ (q,a)=1}} \frac{1}{\phi(q)} - C_{a, \epsilon} \frac{\log \log Q_1}{Q_1} \right)$$

for some positive constant  $C_{a, \epsilon}$ . We separate two cases. If

$$(3.10) \quad \sum_{\substack{Q_1 < q \leq Q_2 \\ (q,a)=1}} \frac{1}{\phi(q)} \geq 2C_{a, \epsilon} \frac{\log \log Q_1}{Q_1},$$

then (3.1) holds by (3.9). So assume that (3.10) fails. Then, by (3.7) and our assumption that  $Q_2 \geq Q_1 + \log \log Q_1$ , we have that

$$(3.11) \quad \frac{\log \log Q_1}{Q_1} \ll \log \frac{Q_2}{Q_1} \ll_a \sum_{\substack{Q_1 < q \leq Q_2 \\ (q,a)=1}} \frac{1}{q} \leq \sum_{\substack{Q_1 < q \leq Q_2 \\ (q,a)=1}} \frac{1}{\phi(q)} \leq 2C_{a, \epsilon} \frac{\log \log Q_1}{Q_1}.$$

Also, Lemma 2.1 implies that

$$(3.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{Q_1 < q \leq Q_2 \\ (q,a)=1}} \pi(x; q, a) &\geq \frac{x}{2 \log x} \sum_{\substack{Q_1 < q \leq Q_2 \\ (q,a)=1, q \notin \mathcal{MD}_\epsilon(x)}} \frac{1}{\phi(q)} \\ &\geq \frac{x}{2 \log x} \left( \sum_{\substack{Q_1 < q \leq Q_2 \\ (q,a)=1}} \frac{1}{q} - \sum_{\substack{Q_1 < q \leq Q_2 \\ q \in \mathcal{MD}_\epsilon(x)}} \frac{1}{q} \right). \end{aligned}$$

By the argument leading to (3.6) we find that

$$(3.13) \quad \sum_{\substack{Q_1 < q \leq Q_2 \\ q \in \mathcal{MD}_\epsilon(x)}} \frac{1}{q} \ll_\epsilon \frac{1}{Q_1} + \frac{\log(Q_2/Q_1)}{\log x}.$$

Inserting (3.11) and (3.13) into (3.12) proves (3.1) in the case that (3.10) does not hold too.

(b) When  $Q_1 \leq x^{0.41666} < x^{5/12}$ , the result follows from part (a). When  $Q_1 > x^{0.41666}$ , note that

$$Q_2 - Q_1 \geq \exp\{4.532(\log Q_1)^{1/4}\} \geq \exp\{3.6411(\log x)^{1/4}\}.$$

So following a very similar argument with the one given in part (a) and using Lemma 2.3 in place of Lemma 2.1 we obtain the desired result.

(c) Apply Lemmas 2.7 and 2.8.  $\square$

We are now in position to prove Theorem 1.5.

*Proof of Theorem 1.5.* First, assume that  $z \leq y + y(\log y)^{-2}$ . We treat all four parts of the theorem simultaneously. Let  $y_0$  be a large constant, possibly depending on  $s, B, \epsilon$  and  $c$ , the constant in (1.2), according to the assumptions of each of the parts (a), (b) and (c). If  $y \leq y_0$ , then we trivially have that

$$H(x, y, z; P_s) \geq \max_{\substack{y < d \leq z \\ (d, s) = 1}} \pi(x - s; d, -s) \asymp_{y_0} \frac{x}{\log x},$$

by our assumption that  $\{y < d \leq z : (d, s) = 1\} \neq \emptyset$  and the Prime Number Theorem for arithmetic progressions [4, p. 123]. So assume that  $y > y_0$ . By the inclusion-exclusion principle, we have that

$$(3.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{y < d \leq z} \pi(x - s; d, -s) - \sum_{y < d_1 < d_2 \leq z} \pi(x - s; [d_1, d_2], -s) \\ \leq H(x, y, z; P_s) \leq \sum_{y < d \leq z} \pi(x - s; d, -s). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.4 then implies that

$$(3.15) \quad H(x, y, z; P_s) = \sum_{\substack{y < d \leq z \\ (d, s) = 1}} \pi(x - s; d, -s) + O\left(\sum_{y < d_1 < d_2 \leq z} \frac{x}{\log(2x/[d_1, d_2])\phi([d_1, d_2])}\right).$$

In the sum over  $d_1$  and  $d_2$  on the right hand side of (3.15) set  $m = (d_1, d_2)$  and  $d_i = mt_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . Since  $t_1 + 1 \leq t_2$ , we get that  $m \leq d_2 - d_1 \leq z - y$ . Moreover, notice that

$$\log \frac{2x}{[d_1, d_2]} = \log \frac{2x}{t_1 t_2 m} \geq \log \frac{2xm}{z^2} \gg \frac{\log 2m \log x}{\log y},$$

uniformly in  $y \leq \sqrt{x}$ . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{y < d_1 < d_2 \leq z} \frac{1}{\log(2x/[d_1, d_2])\phi([d_1, d_2])} \\ \ll \frac{(\log y)(\log \log y)}{\log x} \sum_{m \leq z-y} \frac{1}{m \log 2m} \sum_{y/m < t_1 < t_2 \leq z/m} \frac{1}{t_1 t_2} \\ \leq \frac{(\log y)(\log \log y)}{\log x} \sum_{m \leq z-y} \frac{1}{m \log 2m} \left( \sum_{y/m < t \leq z/m} \frac{1}{t} \right)^2 \\ \ll \frac{\eta^2 (\log y)(\log \log y)^2}{\log x} \ll \frac{\eta}{\log x} \frac{(\log \log y)^2}{\log y}, \end{aligned}$$

which combined with (3.15) yields that

$$H(x, y, z; P_s) = \sum_{\substack{y < d \leq z \\ (d, s) = 1}} \pi(x - s; d, -s) + O_s\left(\frac{\eta x}{\log x} \frac{(\log \log y)^2}{\log y}\right).$$

This completes the proof of parts (a), (b) and (c) as well as of part (d) when  $z \leq y + y(\log y)^{-2}$ . It remains to show part (d) when  $z > y + y(\log y)^{-2}$ , in which case  $(\log y)^{-2} \ll \eta \ll (\log y)^{-\log 4 + 1}$ . First, by (3.14) and Lemma 3.1(c), we have that

$$H(x, y, z; P_s) \leq \sum_{\substack{y < d \leq z \\ (d, s) = 1}} \pi(x - s; d, -s) + O_s(1) \sim_s f(s) \frac{315\zeta(3)}{2\pi^4} \frac{\eta x}{\log x},$$

which proves the desired upper bound. For the lower bound, let  $\chi$  be the characteristic function of integers  $n$  satisfying

$$\Omega(n; y) \leq L(y) := 2 \log \log y + \psi(y)(\log \log y)^{1/2},$$

where  $\psi(y) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $y \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\psi(y) \ll (\log \log y)^{1/6}$ . Then the inclusion-exclusion principle and Lemma 3.1(c) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} H(x, y, z; P_s) &\geq \sum_{\substack{p+s \leq x \\ \exists d \in (y, z]: d|p+s}} \chi(p+s) \\ (3.16) \quad &\geq \sum_{p+s \leq x} \chi(p+s) \left( \sum_{\substack{d|p+s \\ y < d \leq z}} 1 - \sum_{\substack{[d_1, d_2] \parallel p+s \\ y < d_1 < d_2 \leq z}} 1 \right) \\ &\geq f(s) \frac{315\zeta(3)}{2\pi^4} \frac{\eta x}{\log x} (1 - o_s(1)) - S - S', \end{aligned}$$

where

$$S := \sum_{\substack{p+s \leq x \\ p \nmid s}} (1 - \chi(p+s)) \sum_{\substack{d|p+s \\ y < d \leq z}} 1 \quad \text{and} \quad S' := \sum_{\substack{p+s \leq x \\ p \nmid s}} \chi(p+s) \sum_{\substack{[d_1, d_2] \parallel p+s \\ y < d_1 < d_2 \leq z}} 1.$$

To bound  $S$ , observe that for every  $1 \leq v \leq 3/2$  we have that

$$\begin{aligned} S &\leq v^{-L(y)} \sum_{\substack{p+s \leq x \\ p \nmid s}} v^{\Omega(p+s; y)} \sum_{\substack{d|p+s \\ y < d \leq z}} 1 \\ (3.17) \quad &\leq v^{-L(y)} \sum_{\substack{y < d \leq z \\ (d, s) = 1}} v^{\Omega(d; y)} \sum_{\substack{p+s \leq x \\ p \equiv -s \pmod{d}}} v^{\Omega(\frac{p+s}{d}; y)} \\ &\ll_s \frac{x v^{-L(y)} (\log y)^{v-1}}{\log x} \sum_{y < d \leq z} \frac{v^{\Omega(d)}}{\phi(d)}, \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 2.6. Writing

$$\frac{m}{\phi(m)} = \sum_{k|d} \frac{\mu^2(k)}{\phi(k)}$$

and using Theorem 04 in [15] we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{y < d \leq z} \frac{v^{\Omega(d)}}{\phi(d)} &= \sum_{k \leq z} \frac{\mu^2(k) v^{\Omega(k)}}{k \phi(k)} \sum_{y/k < f \leq z/k} \frac{v^{\Omega(f)}}{f} \\
&\ll \sum_{k \leq \sqrt{y}} \frac{\mu^2(k) v^{\Omega(k)}}{k \phi(k)} (\eta (\log(y/k))^{v-1} + (\log(y/k))^{v-3}) \\
(3.18) \quad &+ \sum_{\sqrt{y} < k \leq z} \frac{\mu^2(k) v^{\Omega(k)}}{k \phi(k)} (\log y)^{v-1} \\
&\ll \eta (\log y)^{v-1} + \frac{(\log y)^{v-1}}{y^{1/4}} \sum_{\sqrt{y} < k \leq z} \frac{\mu^2(k) v^{\Omega(k)}}{\sqrt{k} \phi(k)} \\
&\ll \eta (\log y)^{v-1},
\end{aligned}$$

since  $\eta \gg (\log y)^{-2}$ . Combining inequalities (3.17) and (3.18) we find that

$$S \ll_s \frac{\eta x}{\log x} \frac{(\log y)^{2v-2}}{v^{L(y)}}.$$

Setting  $v = L(y)/2 \log \log y$  we deduce that

$$(3.19) \quad S \ll_s \frac{\eta x}{\log x} \exp\left\{-\frac{\psi(y)^2}{4} + O\left(\frac{\psi(y)^3}{(\log \log y)^{1/2}}\right)\right\} = o\left(\frac{\eta x}{\log x}\right) \quad (y \rightarrow \infty).$$

Next, we turn to the estimation of  $S'$ . Note that for every  $1/10 \leq v \leq 1$  we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.20) \quad S' &\leq v^{-L(y)} \sum_{\substack{p+s \leq x \\ p \nmid s}} v^{\Omega(p+s; y)} \sum_{\substack{[d_1, d_2] \mid p+s \\ y < d_1 < d_2 \leq z}} 1 \\
&= v^{-L(y)} \sum_{\substack{y < d_1 < d_2 \leq z \\ (d_1 d_2, s)=1}} v^{\Omega([d_1, d_2]; y)} \sum_{\substack{p+s \leq x, p \nmid s \\ p \equiv -s \pmod{[d_1, d_2]}}} v^{\Omega(\frac{p+s}{[d_1, d_2]}; y)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Set

$$S'_1 := \sum_{\substack{y < d_1 < d_2 \leq z \\ (d_1 d_2, s)=1 \\ (d_1, d_2) > y^2 x^{-3/4}}} v^{\Omega([d_1, d_2]; y)} \sum_{\substack{p+s \leq x, p \nmid s \\ p \equiv -s \pmod{[d_1, d_2]}}} v^{\Omega(\frac{p+s}{[d_1, d_2]}; y)}$$

and

$$S'_2 := \sum_{\substack{y < d_1 < d_2 \leq z \\ (d_1 d_2, s)=1 \\ (d_1, d_2) \leq y^2 x^{-3/4}}} v^{\Omega([d_1, d_2]; y)} \sum_{\substack{p+s \leq x, p \nmid s \\ p \equiv -s \pmod{[d_1, d_2]}}} v^{\Omega(\frac{p+s}{[d_1, d_2]}; y)}.$$

Put  $m = (d_1, d_2)$  and  $d_i = mt_i$  so that  $[d_1, d_2] = mt_1 t_2$ . Note that  $m \leq z - y$ . First, we deal with  $S'_1$ . Since  $v^{\Omega(n; y)} \leq v^{\omega(n; y)}$  for  $v \leq 1$  and  $[d_1, d_2] \leq 2x^{3/4}$  in the range of  $S'_1$ , Lemma 2.5 gives us that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.21) \quad S'_1 &\ll_s \sum_{y^2 x^{-3/4} < m \leq z-y} \sum_{y/m < t_1 < t_2 \leq z/m} \frac{v^{\Omega(mt_1 t_2; y)} x (\log y)^{v-1}}{\phi(mt_1 t_2) \log x} \\
&\ll \frac{x (\log y)^{v-1} \log \log y}{\log x} \sum_{m \leq z-y} \frac{v^{\Omega(m)}}{m} \left( \sum_{y/m < t \leq z/m} \frac{v^{\Omega(t)}}{t} \right)^2,
\end{aligned}$$



uniformly in  $1/10 \leq v \leq 1$ . By relation (2.39) in [15] we have

$$(3.22) \quad \sum_{y/m < t \leq z/m} \frac{v^{\Omega(t)}}{t} \ll \eta \left( \log \frac{1}{\eta} \right)^{1-v} \left( \log \frac{y}{m} \right)^{v-1} \asymp \eta (\log \log y)^{1-v} \left( \log \frac{y}{m} \right)^{v-1},$$

which, combined with (3.21), yields that

$$(3.23) \quad S'_1 \ll_s \frac{\eta^2 x (\log y)^{v-1} (\log \log y)^{3-2v}}{\log x} \sum_{m \leq z-y} \frac{v^{\Omega(m)}}{m} \left( \log \frac{y}{m} \right)^{2v-2}.$$

We now estimate  $S'_2$ . First, for  $d_1, d_2$  in the range of summation of  $S'_2$  we have  $x(d_1, d_2)/y^2 \leq x^{1/4}$ , by definition. So if  $S'_2$  is a non-empty sum, we must have that  $y \geq x^{3/8}$  and  $m = (d_1, d_2) \leq x^{1/4} \leq y^{2/3}$ . Consequently,

$$S'_2 \leq \sum_{\substack{m \leq y^{2/3} \\ (m, s)=1}} \sum_{\substack{y/m < t_1 < t_2 \leq z/m \\ (t_1 t_2, s)=1}} \sum_{\substack{p+s \leq x, p \nmid s \\ p \equiv -s \pmod{mt_1 t_2}}} v^{\Omega(p+s; y)}.$$

Set  $p + s = mt_1 t_2 k$ . Then we will have that  $k \leq x/(yt_1)$ ,  $\frac{z-y}{m} \geq (\frac{z}{m})^{1/2}$  and  $mt_1 k \leq (t_1 k z)^{7/8}$ . So

$$\begin{aligned} S'_2 &\leq \sum_{\substack{m \leq y^{2/3} \\ (m, s)=1}} \sum_{\substack{y/m < t_1 \leq z/m \\ (t_1, s)=1}} \sum_{\substack{k \leq x/(yt_1) \\ (k, s)=1}} v^{\Omega(mt_1 k; y)} \sum_{\substack{t_1 k y < p+s \leq t_1 k z \\ p \equiv -s \pmod{mt_1 k}}} v^{\omega(\frac{p+s}{mt_1 k}; y)} \\ &\ll_s \sum_{m \leq y^{2/3}} \sum_{y/m < t_1 \leq z/m} \sum_{k \leq x/(yt_1)} \frac{v^{\Omega(mt_1 k; y)} t_1 k (z-y) (\log(t_1 k z))^{v-2}}{\phi(mt_1 k)} \\ &\ll \frac{\eta y (\log y)^{v-1} \log \log y}{\log x} \sum_{m \leq y^{2/3}} \frac{v^{\Omega(m)}}{m} \sum_{y/m < t_1 \leq z/m} v^{\Omega(t_1)} \sum_{k \leq x m / y^2} v^{\Omega(k)} \\ &\ll \frac{\eta x (\log y)^{v-1} \log \log y}{y \log x} \sum_{m \leq y^{2/3}} v^{\Omega(m)} (\log 2m)^{v-1} \sum_{y/m < t_1 \leq z/m} v^{\Omega(t_1)}, \end{aligned}$$

uniformly in  $1/10 \leq v \leq 1$ , by Lemma 2.5 and Theorem 01 in [15], since  $x^{3/8} \leq y \leq \sqrt{x}$  and  $\Omega(n; y) \geq \Omega(n) - 1$  for  $n \leq y^2$ . Also,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{y/m < t_1 \leq z/m} v^{\Omega(t_1)} &\asymp \frac{y}{m} \sum_{y/m < t_1 \leq z/m} \frac{v^{\Omega(t_1)}}{t_1} \ll \frac{\eta y (\log \log y)^{1-v}}{m} \left( \log \frac{y}{m} \right)^{v-1} \\ &\asymp \frac{\eta y (\log y)^{v-1} (\log \log y)^{1-v}}{m}, \end{aligned}$$

by (3.22), since  $m \leq y^{2/3}$ . Hence

$$(3.24) \quad S'_2 \ll_s \frac{\eta^2 x (\log y)^{2v-2} (\log \log y)^{2-v}}{\log x} \sum_{m \leq y^{2/3}} \frac{v^{\Omega(m)}}{m} (\log 2m)^{v-1}.$$

Inequalities (3.20), (3.23) and (3.24) imply that

$$S' \ll_s \frac{\eta^2 x v^{-L(y)} (\log \log y)^{3-2v}}{\log x} \sum_{m \leq z-y} \frac{v^{\Omega(m)}}{m} (\log m)^{v-1} \left( \log \frac{y}{m} \right)^{2v-2}.$$

If we set  $v = 1/2$ , by partial summation and the estimate  $\sum_{n \leq x} v^{\Omega(n)} \ll x(\log 2x)^{v-1}$  we find that

$$\sum_{m \leq z-y} \frac{v^{\Omega(m)}}{m} (\log m)^{v-1} \left( \log \frac{y}{m} \right)^{2v-2} \ll \frac{\log \log y}{\log y}$$

and consequently

$$S' \ll_s \frac{\eta^2 x}{\log x} (\log y)^{\log 4 - 1} 2^{\psi(y)\sqrt{\log \log y}} (\log \log y)^3.$$

Lastly, putting  $\psi(y) = \min\{\xi, (\log \log y)^{1/6}\}$  yields that

$$S' \ll_s \frac{\eta x}{\log x} \frac{(\log \log y)^3}{e^{(1-\log 2)\xi\sqrt{\log \log y}}} = o\left(\frac{\eta x}{\log x}\right).$$

Inserting the above estimate and (3.19) into (3.16) gives us that

$$H(x, y, z; P_s) \geq f(s) \frac{315\zeta(3)}{2\pi^4} \frac{\eta x}{\log x} (1 - o_s(1)),$$

which completes the proof of part (d) in the case that  $z > y + (\log y)^{-2}$  too.  $\square$

#### 4. INTERMEDIATE AND LARGE VALUES OF $\eta$

To prove Theorem 1.6 we reduce the counting in  $H(x, y, z; P_s) - H(x - \Delta, y, z; P_s)$  to the estimation of a sum involving  $L(a; \eta)$  as done in [11] for bounding  $H(x, y, z)$ ; then we apply Lemma 2.10. First, we show the following result. Theorem 1.6 will then follow as an easy corollary.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Fix  $s \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$  and  $B \geq 2$ . Let  $x \geq x_0(s, B)$  and  $3 \leq y + 1 \leq z$  with  $z \leq x^{2/3}$ ,  $\eta \in [(\log y)^{-B}, \frac{\log y}{100}]$  and  $\{y < d \leq z : (d, s) = 1\} \neq \emptyset$ . Then for*

$$\frac{x}{(\log x)^B} \leq \Delta \leq \frac{x}{2}$$

*we have that*

$$H(x, y, z; P_s) - H(x - \Delta, y, z; P_s) \gg_{s,B} \frac{\Delta}{x} \frac{H(x, y, z)}{\log x}.$$

*Proof.* Fix  $\Delta \in (x(\log x)^{-B}, x/2]$  and set  $s_1 = 2/(s, 2)$ . Let  $y_0 = y_0(s, B)$  be a large positive constant. If  $y \leq y_0$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} H(x, y, z; P_s) - H(x - \Delta, y, z; P_s) &\geq \max_{\substack{y < d \leq z \\ (d, s) = 1}} \left( \pi(x - s; d, -s) - \pi(x - \Delta - s; d, -s) \right) \\ &\gg_{y_0} \frac{\Delta}{\log x} \asymp_{y_0} \frac{\Delta}{x} \frac{H(x, y, z)}{\log x}, \end{aligned}$$

by the Prime Number Theorem for arithmetic progressions [4, p. 123] and our assumption that  $\{y < d \leq z : (d, s) = 1\} \neq \emptyset$ . Suppose now that  $y > y_0$ . Fix an integer  $v = v(s) \geq 3$  and set  $w = z^{1/20v}$ . We will choose  $v$  later; till then, all implied constants will be independent of  $v$ . Consider integers  $n = aqb_1b_2s_1 \in (x - \Delta, x]$  with

- (1)  $a \leq w$ ,  $\mu^2(a) = 1$  and  $(a, 2s) = 1$ ;
- (2)  $\log(y/q) \in \mathcal{L}(a; \eta)$ ,  $P^-(q) > w$  and  $(q, 2s) = 1$ ;
- (3)  $b_1 \in \mathcal{P}(w, z)$  and  $\tau(b_1) \leq v^2$ ;
- (4)  $P^-(b_2) > z$ ;
- (5)  $n - s$  is prime.

Condition (2) implies that there exists  $d|a$  so that  $y/d < q \leq z/d$ ; in particular, we have that  $\tau(n, y, z) \geq 1$  and thus  $n$  is counted by  $H(x, y, z; P_s) - H(x - \Delta, y, z; P_s)$ . Also,  $\Omega(q) \leq \frac{\log z}{\log w} = 20v$  and therefore

$$\tau(qb_1) \leq 2^{\Omega(q)} \tau(b_1) \leq 2^{20v} v^2.$$

Since each  $n$  has at most  $\tau(qb_1) \leq 2^{20v} v^2$  representations of this form, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & 2^{20v} v^2 (H(x, y, z; P_s) - H(x - \Delta, y, z; P_s)) \\ & \geq \sum_{\substack{a \leq w \\ \mu^2(a)=1 \\ (a, 2s)=1}} \sum_{\substack{\log(y/q) \in \mathcal{L}(a) \\ P^-(q) > w \\ (q, 2s)=1}} \sum_{\substack{(x-\Delta)/aqs_1 < b_1 b_2 \leq x/aqs_1 \\ b_1 \in \mathcal{P}(w, z), P^-(b_2) > z \\ \tau(b_1) \leq v^2 \\ aqb_1 b_2 s_1 - s \text{ prime}}} 1 \\ & =: \sum_{\substack{a \leq w \\ \mu^2(a)=1 \\ (a, 2s)=1}} \sum_{\substack{\log(y/q) \in \mathcal{L}(a) \\ P^-(q) > w \\ (q, 2s)=1}} B_0(a, q). \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

Given  $a$  and  $q$  as above, put

$$B(a, q) := \sum_{\substack{(x-\Delta)/aqs_1 < b \leq x/aqs_1 \\ P^-(b) > w \\ aqbs_1 - s \text{ prime}}} 1 \quad \text{and} \quad R(a, q) := B(a, q) - B_0(a, q).$$

Let  $b$  be such that  $P^-(b) > w$ . Write  $b = b_1 b_2$  with  $b_1 \in \mathcal{P}(w, z)$  and  $P^-(b_2) > z$  and put  $F(b) := \tau(b_1)$ . Then for fixed  $a$  and  $q$  with  $(aq, 2s) = 1$ , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} R(a, q) & \leq \frac{1}{v^2} \sum_{\substack{(x-\Delta)/aqs_1 < b \leq x/aqs_1 \\ P^-(b) > w \\ aqbs_1 - s \text{ prime}}} F(b) = \frac{1}{v^2} \sum_{\substack{x-\Delta < p+s \leq x \\ p \equiv -s \pmod{aqs_1} \\ P^-(\frac{p+s}{aqs_1}) > w}} F\left(\frac{p+s}{aqs_1}\right) \\ & \ll_s \frac{1}{v} \frac{\Delta}{\phi(aq) \log x \log w}, \end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 2.5. Inserting the above estimate into (4.1) yields that

$$\begin{aligned} & 2^{20v} v^2 (H(x, y, z; P_s) - H(x - \Delta, y, z; P_s)) \geq \sum_{\substack{a \leq w \\ \mu^2(a)=1 \\ (a, 2s)=1}} \sum_{\substack{\log(y/q) \in \mathcal{L}(a) \\ P^-(q) > w \\ (q, 2s)=1}} B(a, q) \\ & - O_s \left( \frac{1}{v} \frac{\Delta}{\log x \log w} \sum_{\substack{a \leq w \\ \mu^2(a)=1 \\ (a, 2s)=1}} \sum_{\substack{\log(y/q) \in \mathcal{L}(a) \\ P^-(q) > w \\ (q, 2s)=1}} \frac{1}{\phi(aq)} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

Next, we need to approximate the characteristic function of integers  $n$  with  $P^-(n) > w$  with a ‘smoother’ function, the reason being that the error term  $\pi(x; rq, a) - \text{li}(x)/\phi(rq)$  in Lemma 2.7 is weighted with the smooth function 1 as  $q$  runs through

$[1, Q] \cap \mathbb{N}$ . To do this we appeal to Lemma 2.9(a) with  $Z = w$  and  $D = z^{1/20}$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 & 2^{20v} v^2 (H(x, y, z; P_s) - H(x - \Delta, y, z; P_s)) \\
 & \geq \sum_{\substack{a \leq w \\ \mu^2(a)=1, (a, 2s)=1}} \sum_{\substack{\log(y/q) \in \mathcal{L}(a) \\ (q, 2s)=1}} (\lambda^- * 1)(q) B(a, q) - O_s(\mathcal{R}_1) \\
 & \geq \sum_{\substack{a \leq w \\ \mu^2(a)=1, (a, 2s)=1}} \sum_{\substack{\log(y/q) \in \mathcal{L}(a) \\ (q, 2s)=1}} (\lambda^+ * 1)(q) B(a, q) - O_s(\mathcal{R}_1 + \mathcal{R}_2),
 \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

where

$$\mathcal{R}_1 := \frac{1}{v} \frac{\Delta}{\log x \log w} \sum_{\substack{a \leq w \\ \mu^2(a)=1, (a, 2s)=1}} \sum_{\substack{\log(y/q) \in \mathcal{L}(a) \\ (q, 2s)=1}} \frac{(\lambda^+ * 1)(q)}{\phi(aq)}$$

and

$$\mathcal{R}_2 := \sum_{\substack{a \leq w \\ \mu^2(a)=1, (a, 2s)=1}} \sum_{\substack{\log(y/q) \in \mathcal{L}(a) \\ (q, 2s)=1}} ((\lambda^+ * 1)(q) - (\lambda^- * 1)(q)) B(a, q).$$

We now bound  $\mathcal{R}_2$  from above. For fixed  $a$  and  $q$  with  $(aq, 2s) = 1$  we have

$$B(a, q) \ll_s \frac{\Delta}{\phi(aq) \log x \log w},$$

by the arithmetic form of the large sieve [20] or Lemma 2.5. Since  $\lambda^+ * 1 - \lambda^- * 1$  is always non-negative, we get that

$$\mathcal{R}_2 \ll \frac{\Delta}{\log x \log w} \sum_{\substack{a \leq w \\ \mu^2(a)=1, (a, 2s)=1}} \sum_{\substack{\log(y/q) \in \mathcal{L}(a) \\ (q, 2s)=1}} \frac{(\lambda^+ * 1)(q) - (\lambda^- * 1)(q)}{\phi(aq)}. \tag{4.4}$$

Fix  $a \leq w$  with  $(a, 2s) = 1$  and let  $\{I_r\}_{r=1}^R$  be the collection of the intervals  $[\log d - \eta, \log d]$  with  $d|a$ . Then for  $I = [\log d - \eta, \log d]$  in this collection, Lemmas 2.8 and 2.9(a) imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sum_{\substack{\log(y/q) \in 3I \\ (q, 2s)=1}} \frac{(\lambda^+ * 1)(q) - (\lambda^- * 1)(q)}{\phi(aq)} \\
 & = \sum_{\substack{c \leq z^{1/20} \\ (c, 2s)=1}} (\lambda^+(c) - \lambda^-(c)) \sum_{\substack{e^{-\eta} y/cd < m \leq e^{2\eta} y/cd \\ (m, 2s)=1}} \frac{1}{\phi(acm)} \\
 & = \frac{315\zeta(3)}{2\pi^4} \frac{g(2as)\phi(2s)}{2|s|\phi(a)} \sum_{\substack{c \leq z^{1/20} \\ (c, 2s)=1}} \frac{\lambda^+(c) - \lambda^-(c)}{c} \frac{g(ac)}{g(a)} \frac{c\phi(a)}{\phi(ac)} (3\eta + O_s(cy^{-2/3})) \\
 & \ll_s \frac{\eta}{v^v \phi(a)} \prod_{\substack{p \leq w \\ p \nmid 2s, p|a}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \prod_{\substack{p \leq w \\ p \nmid 2sa}} \left(1 - \frac{g(p)}{p-1}\right) + \frac{1}{\phi(a)\sqrt{y}} \ll_s \frac{1}{v^v} \frac{\eta}{\phi(a) \log w},
 \end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

provided that  $y_0$  is large enough, since  $g(p) \leq (p-1)^2/p$  for  $p \geq 3$ ,  $g(p) = 1 + O(p^{-2})$  and  $g(a) \asymp 1$ . By Lemma 2.12, there exists a sub-collection  $\{I_{r_t}\}_{t=1}^T$  of mutually

disjoint intervals so that

$$\bigcup_{t=1}^T 3I_{r_t} \supset \mathcal{L}(a; \eta).$$

Consequently

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{\log(y/q) \in \mathcal{L}(a) \\ (q, 2s)=1}} \frac{(\lambda^+ * 1)(q) - (\lambda^- * 1)(q)}{\phi(aq)} &\leq \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{\substack{\log(y/q) \in 3I_{r_t} \\ (q, 2s)=1}} \frac{(\lambda^+ * 1)(q) - (\lambda^- * 1)(q)}{\phi(aq)} \\ &\ll_s \frac{1}{v^v} \frac{T\eta}{\phi(a) \log w} \\ &= \frac{1}{v^v} \frac{1}{\phi(a) \log w} \text{meas}\left(\bigcup_{t=1}^T I_{r_t}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{v^v} \frac{L(a; \eta)}{\phi(a) \log w}, \end{aligned}$$

since  $\lambda^+ * 1 - \lambda^- * 1$  is always non-negative. By the above inequality and (4.4) we get that

$$(4.6) \quad \mathcal{R}_2 \ll_s \frac{1}{v^v} \frac{\Delta}{\log x \log^2 w} \sum_{\substack{a \leq w \\ \mu^2(a)=1, (a, 2s)=1}} \frac{L(a; \eta)}{\phi(a)}.$$

We now bound from the below the sum

$$\mathcal{S} := \sum_{\substack{a \leq w \\ \mu^2(a)=1, (a, 2s)=1}} \sum_{\substack{\log(y/q) \in \mathcal{L}(a) \\ (q, 2s)=1}} (\lambda^+ * 1)(q) B(a, q).$$

We fix  $a$  and  $q$  with  $(aq, 2s) = 1$  and seek a lower bound on  $B(a, q)$ . By Lemma 2.9(b) applied with  $Z = w$  and  $D = w^3$ , there exists a sequence  $\{\rho(d)\}_{d \leq w^3}$  such that  $\rho * 1$  is bounded above by the characteristic function of integers  $b$  with  $P^-(b) > w$ . So, if we put

$$E(x; k, a) := \pi(x - s; k, a) - \pi(x - \Delta - s; k, a) - \frac{\text{li}(x - s) - \text{li}(x - \Delta - s)}{\phi(k)},$$

then Lemma 2.9(b) and the fact that  $2|s_1s$  imply that

$$\begin{aligned} B(a, q) &= \sum_{\substack{x-\Delta < p+s \leq x \\ p \equiv -s \pmod{aqs_1} \\ P^-((p+s)/aqs_1) > w}} 1 \geq \sum_{\substack{x-\Delta < p+s \leq x \\ p \equiv -s \pmod{aqs_1} \\ p \nmid s}} (\rho * 1)\left(\frac{p+s}{aqs_1}\right) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{m \leq w^3 \\ (m, s)=1}} \rho(m) (\pi(x - s; aqs_1 m, -s) - \pi(x - s - \Delta; aqs_1 m, -s)) + O_s(1) \\ &= (\text{li}(x - s) - \text{li}(x - s - \Delta)) \sum_{\substack{m \leq w^3 \\ (m, s)=1}} \frac{\rho(m)}{\phi(aqs_1 m)} + O_s(1) + \mathcal{R}'_{aqs_1} \\ &\geq C_s \frac{\Delta}{\phi(aq) \log x \log w} + \mathcal{R}'_{aqs_1} \end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant  $C_s$ , where

$$\mathcal{R}'_{aq_{s_1}} = \sum_{\substack{m \leq w^3 \\ (m,s)=1}} \rho(m) E(x; aqs_1 m, -s).$$

Since  $\lambda^+ * 1$  is always non-negative, we deduce that

$$(4.7) \quad \mathcal{S} \geq C_s \frac{\Delta}{\log x \log w} \sum_{\substack{a \leq w \\ \mu^2(a)=1, (a,2s)=1}} \sum_{\substack{\log(y/q) \in \mathcal{L}(a;\eta) \\ (q,2s)=1}} \frac{(\lambda^+ * 1)(q)}{\phi(aq)} + \mathcal{R}',$$

where

$$\mathcal{R}' = \sum_{\substack{a \leq w \\ \mu^2(a)=1, (a,s)=1}} \sum_{\substack{\log(y/q) \in \mathcal{L}(a;\eta) \\ (q,s)=1}} (\lambda^+ * 1)(q) \mathcal{R}'_{aq_{s_1}}.$$

Combining (4.3), (4.6) and (4.7) we get that

$$(4.8) \quad \begin{aligned} & 2^{20v} v^2 (H(x, y, z; P_s) - H(x - \Delta, y, z; P_s)) \\ & \geq \frac{C_s}{2} \frac{\Delta}{\log x \log w} \sum_{\substack{a \leq w \\ \mu^2(a)=1, (a,2s)=1}} \sum_{\substack{\log(y/q) \in \mathcal{L}(a) \\ (q,2s)=1}} \frac{(\lambda^+ * 1)(q)}{\phi(aq)} \\ & - O_s(|\mathcal{R}'| + \frac{1}{v^v} \frac{\Delta}{\log x \log^2 w} \sum_{\substack{a \leq w \\ \mu^2(a)=1, (a,2s)=1}} \frac{L(a; \eta)}{\phi(a)}), \end{aligned}$$

provided that  $v$  is large enough. Fix now  $a \leq w$  with  $(a, 2s) = 1$  and look at the sum over  $q$  on the right hand side of (4.8). Let  $\{I_r\}_{r=1}^R$  be the collection of the intervals  $[\log d - \eta, \log d]$  with  $d|a$ . Then using a similar argument with the one leading to (4.5), we find that for  $I$  in this collection

$$\sum_{\substack{\log(y/q) \in I \\ (q,2s)=1}} \frac{(\lambda^+ * 1)(q)}{\phi(aq)} \gg_s \frac{\eta}{\phi(a) \log w},$$

provided that  $y_0$  and  $v$  are large enough. Moreover, by Lemma 2.12, there exists a sub-collection  $\{I_{r_t}\}_{t=1}^T$  of mutually disjoint intervals so that

$$\eta T = \text{Vol}\left(\bigcup_{t=1}^T I_{r_t}\right) \geq \frac{1}{3} \text{Vol}\left(\bigcup_{r=1}^R I_r\right) = \frac{L(a; \eta)}{3}.$$

Hence

$$\sum_{\substack{\log(y/q) \in \mathcal{L}(a;\eta) \\ (q,2s)=1}} \frac{(\lambda^+ * 1)(q)}{\phi(aq)} \geq \sum_{t=1}^T \sum_{\substack{\log(y/q) \in I_{r_t} \\ (q,2s)=1}} \frac{(\lambda^+ * 1)(q)}{\phi(aq)} \gg_s \frac{\eta T}{\phi(a) \log w} \gg \frac{L(a; \eta)}{\phi(a) \log w},$$

where we used the fact that  $\lambda^+ * 1$  is non-negative. Inserting this inequality into (4.8) and choosing a large enough  $v$  we conclude that

$$(4.9) \quad \begin{aligned} H(x, y, z; P_s) - H(x - \Delta, y, z; P_s) & \geq M_s \frac{\Delta}{\log x \log^2 y} \sum_{\substack{a \leq w \\ \mu^2(a)=1, (a,2s)=1}} \frac{L(a; \eta)}{\phi(a)} \\ & - O_s(|\mathcal{R}'|) \end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant  $M_s$ . Furthermore, note that if  $a$  is squarefree, we may uniquely write  $a = db$ , where  $d|2s$ ,  $\mu^2(d) = \mu^2(b) = 1$  and  $(b, 2sd) = 1$ , in which case  $L(a; \eta) \leq \tau(d)L(b; \eta)$ , by inequality (2.7). Thus

$$\sum_{\substack{a \leq w \\ \mu^2(a)=1}} \frac{L(a; \eta)}{\phi(a)} \leq \sum_{d|2s, \mu^2(d)=1} \frac{\tau(d)}{\phi(d)} \sum_{\substack{b \leq w/d \\ \mu^2(b)=1 \\ (b, 2sd)=1}} \frac{L(b; \eta)}{\phi(b)} \leq \left( \sum_{d|s} \frac{\tau(d)}{\phi(d)} \right) \sum_{\substack{b \leq w \\ \mu^2(b)=1 \\ (b, 2s)=1}} \frac{L(b; \eta)}{\phi(b)},$$

which, combined with (4.9), Lemma 2.10 and the trivial inequality  $\phi(a) \leq a$ , implies that

$$H(x, y, z; P_s) - H(x - \Delta, y, z; P_s) \geq M'_s \frac{\Delta}{x} \frac{H(x, y, z)}{\log x} - O_s(|\mathcal{R}'|)$$

for some positive constant  $M'_s$ . In addition, observe that

$$H(x, y, z) \gg \frac{x}{(\log y)^B},$$

by Theorem 1.1 and our assumption that  $\eta \geq (\log y)^{-B}$ . Hence

$$H(x, y, z; P_s) - H(x - \Delta, y, z; P_s) \gg_s \frac{\Delta}{x} \frac{H(x, y, z)}{\log x} \left( 1 - O_s \left( \frac{(\log x)(\log y)^B |\mathcal{R}'|}{\Delta} \right) \right).$$

So it suffices to show that

$$|\mathcal{R}'| \ll \frac{\Delta}{(\log x)(\log y)^{B+1}}.$$

For any  $a \in \mathbb{N}$  there is a unique set  $D_a$  of pairs  $(d, d')$  with  $d \leq d'$ ,  $d|a$  and  $d'|a$  so that

$$\mathcal{L}(a; \eta) = \bigcup_{(d, d') \in D_a} [\log d - \eta, \log d')$$

and the intervals  $[\log d - \eta, \log d')$  for  $(d, d') \in D_a$  are mutually disjoint. With this notation we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{R}'| &= \left| \sum_a \sum_m \rho(m) \sum_{(d, d') \in D_a} \sum_{\substack{y/d' < q \leq z/d \\ (q, 2s)=1}} (\lambda^+ * 1)(q) E(x; ams_1 q, -s) \right| \\ &= \left| \sum_a \sum_m \rho(m) \sum_{(d, d') \in D_a} \sum_c \lambda^+(c) \sum_{\substack{y/cd' < g \leq z/cd \\ (g, 2s)=1}} E(x; ams_1 cg, -s) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{\substack{a \leq w \\ (a, 2s)=1}} \sum_{\substack{m \leq w^3 \\ (m, s)=1}} \sum_{\substack{c \leq z^{1/20} \\ (c, 2s)=1}} \sum_{(d, d') \in D_a} \left| \sum_{\substack{y/cd' < g \leq z/cd \\ (g, 2s)=1}} E(x; ams_1 cg, -s) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

So writing the inner sum as a difference of two sums we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{R}'| &\leq 2 \sup_{y \leq t \leq z} \left\{ \sum_{\substack{a \leq w \\ (a, 2s)=1}} \sum_{\substack{m \leq w^3 \\ (m, s)=1}} \sum_{\substack{c \leq z^{1/20} \\ (c, 2s)=1}} \sum_{f|ams_1c} \left| \sum_{\substack{g \leq t/f \\ (g, 2s)=1}} E(x; ams_1cg, -s) \right| \right\} \\
(4.10) \quad &\leq 2 \sup_{y \leq t \leq z} \left\{ \sum_{\substack{r \leq 2z^{7/60} \\ (r, s)=1}} \tau_3(r) \sum_{f|r} \left| \sum_{\substack{g \leq t/f \\ (g, 2s)=1}} E(x; rg, -s) \right| \right\} \\
&\leq 4 \sup_{y \leq t \leq z} \left\{ \sum_{\substack{r \leq z^{1/8} \\ (r, s)=1}} \tau_3(r) \sum_{f|r} \left| \sum_{\substack{g \leq t/f \\ (g, s)=1}} E(x; rg, -s) \right| \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

since  $w^4 z^{1/20} \leq z^{7/60} \leq z^{1/8}/4$  for all  $v \geq 3$ . Put  $\mu = 1 + (\log y)^{-B-7}$  and cover the interval  $[1, z^{1/8}]$  by intervals of the form  $[\mu^n, \mu^{n+1})$  for  $n = 0, 1, \dots, N$ . We may take  $N \ll (\log y)^{B+8}$ . Since  $|E(x; k, -s)| \ll \frac{\Delta}{\phi(k) \log x}$  for  $k \leq z^{9/8} \leq x^{3/4}$  with  $(k, s) = 1$  by Lemma 2.4, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\substack{r \leq z^{1/8} \\ (r, s)=1}} \tau_3(r) \sum_{n=0}^N \sum_{\substack{f|r \\ \mu^n \leq f < \mu^{n+1}}} \left| \sum_{\substack{g \leq t/f \\ (g, s)=1}} E(x; rg, -s) - \sum_{\substack{g \leq t/\mu^n \\ (g, s)=1}} E(x; rg, -s) \right| \\
&\ll \sum_{\substack{r \leq z^{1/8} \\ (r, s)=1}} \tau_3(r) \sum_{n=0}^N \sum_{\substack{f|r \\ \mu^n \leq f < \mu^{n+1}}} \sum_{t/\mu^{n+1} < g \leq t/\mu^n} \frac{\Delta}{\phi(rg) \log x} \\
&\ll \frac{\Delta \log \mu}{\log x} \sum_{r \leq z^{1/8}} \frac{\tau_3(r)}{\phi(r)} \sum_{f|r} 1 \ll \frac{\Delta}{(\log x)(\log y)^{B+1}}
\end{aligned}$$

for all  $t \in [y, z]$ , by Lemma 2.8, which is admissible. Combining the above estimate with (4.10) we find that

$$(4.11) \quad |\mathcal{R}'| \ll \sup_{y \leq t \leq z} \left\{ \sum_{n=0}^N \sum_{\substack{r \leq z^{1/8} \\ (r, s)=1}} \tau_3(r) \tau(r) \left| \sum_{\substack{g \leq t/\mu^n \\ (g, s)=1}} E(x; rg, -s) \right| \right\} + \frac{\Delta}{(\log x)(\log y)^{B+1}}.$$

Finally, since

$$\frac{x}{2} \leq x - \Delta \leq x \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta \geq \frac{x}{(\log x)^B},$$

Lemma 2.7 applied with  $A = 5B + 56$  in combination with the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{\substack{r \leq z^{1/8} \\ (r, s)=1}} \tau_3(r) \tau(r) \left| \sum_{\substack{g \leq t/\mu^n \\ (g, s)=1}} E(x; rg, -s) \right| \\
&\ll \left( \frac{\Delta}{\log x} \sum_{r \leq z^{1/8}} \sum_{g \leq t/\mu^n} \frac{(\tau_3(r) \tau(r))^2}{\phi(rg)} \right)^{1/2} \left( \sum_{\substack{r \leq z^{1/8} \\ (r, s)=1}} \left| \sum_{\substack{g \leq t/\mu^n \\ (g, s)=1}} E(x; rg, -s) \right| \right)^{1/2} \\
&\ll \sqrt{\Delta} (\log x)^{18} \frac{\sqrt{x}}{(\log x)^{5B/2+28}} \leq \frac{\Delta}{(\log x)^{2B+10}}
\end{aligned}$$



for all  $t \in [y, z]$  and all  $n \in \{0, 1, \dots, N\}$ , since  $z^{1/8} \leq x^{1/12}$  and  $z^{9/8} \leq x^{3/4}$ . Plugging this estimate into (4.11) gives us that

$$|\mathcal{R}'| \ll N \frac{\Delta}{(\log x)^{2B+10}} + \frac{\Delta}{(\log x)(\log y)^{B+1}} \ll \frac{\Delta}{(\log x)(\log y)^{B+1}},$$

which is admissible.  $\square$

We are now in position to complete the proof of Theorem 1.6.

*Proof of Theorem 1.6.* Fix  $\Delta \in (x(\log x)^{-B}, x]$  and set  $\Delta_1 = \min\{\Delta, x/2\}$ . If  $\eta \leq \frac{\log y}{100}$ , then the theorem follows immediately by Theorem 4.1 and the trivial inequality

$$H(x, y, z; P_s) - H(x - \Delta, y, z; P_s) \geq H(x, y, z; P_s) - H(x - \Delta_1, y, z; P_s).$$

On the other hand, if  $\eta \geq \frac{\log y}{100}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} & H(x, y, z; P_s) - H(x - \Delta, y, z; P_s) \\ & \geq H(x, y, y^{101/100}; P_s) - H(x - \Delta_1, y, y^{101/100}; P_s) \\ & \gg_s \frac{\Delta_1}{x} \frac{H(x, y, y^{101/100})}{\log x} \asymp \frac{\Delta}{x} \frac{H(x, y, z)}{\log x}, \end{aligned}$$

by Theorem 1.1. In any case, Theorem 1.6 holds.  $\square$

Using Theorems 1.3 and 1.6 together with the fact that if  $d|n$ , then  $(n/d)|d$  as well, we show Theorem 1.7.

*Proof of Theorem 1.7.* We may assume that  $y > \sqrt{x}$ ; else the result follows from Theorems 1.3 and 1.6 with  $\Delta = x$ . For future reference, note the trivial inequality

$$(4.12) \quad H(x, y, z; P_s) \geq \pi(z - s) - \pi(y - s) \asymp_{s,B} \frac{z - y}{\log z} \geq \frac{\eta y}{\log x},$$

by the Prime Number Theorem [4]. First, suppose that  $\eta \leq \log^{-2}(5x/z)$ . If, in addition,  $z \leq x^{2/3}$ , then the theorem follows by Theorem 4.1. So assume that  $z > x^{2/3}$ . For  $q \in \mathbb{N}$  set

$$A_q := \{p + s \in (qy, qz] : p \equiv -s \pmod{q}\}.$$

If the shifted prime  $p + s \leq x$  has a divisor  $d \in (y, z]$ , then writing  $p + s = dq$  we will have that  $q \leq x/y$  and  $p + s \in A_q$ . So, by Lemma 2.4, we find that

$$\begin{aligned} (4.13) \quad H(x, y, z; P_s) & \leq \sum_{\substack{q \leq x/y \\ (q,s)=1}} |A_q| + O_s(1) \ll_s \sum_{\substack{q \leq x/y \\ (q,s)=1}} \frac{q(z - y)}{\phi(q) \log(z - y)} \\ & \asymp_B \frac{\eta y}{\log x} \sum_{\substack{q \leq x/y \\ (q,s)=1}} \frac{q}{\phi(q)} \\ & \ll \frac{\eta x}{\log x}. \end{aligned}$$

We now bound  $H(x, y, z; P_s)$  from below. If  $x/z \leq 2|s| + 2$ , then  $y \asymp_s x$  and thus

$$H(x, y, z; P_s) \gg_{s,B} \frac{\eta x}{\log x},$$

by (4.12). Combining this with (4.13) and Theorem 1.1 we complete the proof in this case. So assume that  $x/z \geq 2|s| + 2$ , in which case

$$\{x/2z < q \leq x/z : (q, s) = 1\} \neq \emptyset.$$

It is easy to see that

$$(4.14) \quad H(x, y, z; P_s) \geq \left| \bigcup_{\substack{x/2z < q \leq x/z \\ (q, s) = 1}} A_q \right|.$$

If we set

$$T(p) := |\{x/2z < q \leq x/z : (q, s) = 1, p + s \in A_q\}|,$$

then the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (4.14) yield that

$$(4.15) \quad \left( \sum_{p+s \leq x} T(p) \right)^2 \leq H(x, y, z; P_s) \sum_{p+s \leq x} T^2(p).$$

First, we estimate  $\sum_{p+s \leq x} T(p)$ . Let  $C = C(B) > 0$  be a constant so that

$$(4.16) \quad \sum_{\substack{q \leq Q \\ (q, s) = 1}} \pi(X; q, -s) = \text{li}(X) \sum_{\substack{q \leq Q \\ (q, s) = 1}} \frac{1}{\phi(q)} + O_{s,B} \left( \frac{X}{(\log X)^{B+2}} \right)$$

for all  $X \geq 2$  and all  $Q \leq X(\log X)^{-C}$ . Such a constant exists by Lemma 2.7. If  $x/z \leq (\log x)^{C+1}$ , then the Siegel-Walfisz theorem [4, p. 133] and Lemma 2.8 imply that

$$(4.17) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{p+s \leq x} T(p) &= \sum_{\substack{x/2z < q \leq x/z \\ (q, s) = 1}} (\pi(qz - s; q, -s) - \pi(qy - s; q, -s)) \\ &\gg_{s,B} \sum_{\substack{x/2z < q \leq x/z \\ (q, s) = 1}} \frac{q(z - y)}{\phi(q) \log x} \asymp \frac{\eta x}{\log x} \sum_{\substack{x/2z < q \leq x/z \\ (q, s) = 1}} \frac{1}{\phi(q)} \\ &\asymp_s \frac{\eta x}{\log x}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, if  $x/z \geq (\log x)^{C+1}$ , then (4.16) and Lemma 2.8 yield that

$$(4.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{p+s \leq x} T(p) &\geq \sum_{x/2 < p+s \leq 2x/3} \sum_{\substack{\frac{p+s}{z} \leq q < \frac{p+s}{y} \\ (q, s) = 1, q|(p+s)}} 1 \\ &= \sum_{\substack{y < d \leq z \\ (d, s) = 1}} \left( \pi(2x/3 - s; d, -s) - \pi(x/2 - s; d, -s) \right) + O_s(1) \\ &= \left( \text{li}(2x/3 - s) - \text{li}(x/2 - s) \right) \sum_{\substack{y < d \leq z \\ (d, s) = 1}} \frac{1}{\phi(d)} + O_{s,B} \left( \frac{x}{(\log x)^{B+2}} \right) \\ &\asymp_{s,B} \frac{\eta x}{\log x}, \end{aligned}$$

since  $\eta \leq \log^{-2} 5 \leq \log(3/2)$ . Also,

$$(4.19) \quad \sum_{p+s \leq x} T(p) = \sum_{\substack{x/2z < q \leq x/z \\ (q,s)=1}} |A_q| \ll_{s,B} \frac{\eta x}{\log x},$$

by (4.13). Combining inequalities (4.17), (4.18) and (4.19) we deduce that

$$(4.20) \quad \sum_{p+s \leq x} T(p) \asymp_{s,B} \frac{\eta x}{\log x},$$

uniformly in  $\eta \leq \log^{-2}(5x/z)$  and  $x/z \geq 2|s| + 2$ . We now bound from above the sum

$$(4.21) \quad \sum_{p+s \leq x} T^2(p) = \sum_{p+s \leq x} T(p) + \sum_{p+s \leq x} T(p)(T(p) - 1).$$

We have that

$$(4.22) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{p+s \leq x} T(p)(T(p) - 1) &= \sum_p \sum_{\substack{x/2z < q_1 \leq x/z \\ \frac{p+s}{z} \leq q_1 < \frac{p+s}{y} \\ q_1 | (p+s), (q_1, s)=1}} \sum_{\substack{x/2z < q_2 \leq x/z \\ \frac{p+s}{z} \leq q_2 < \frac{p+s}{y} \\ q_2 | (p+s), (q_2, s)=1 \\ q_2 \neq q_1}} 1 \\ &= 2 \sum_{\substack{\frac{x}{2z} < q_1 < q_2 \leq \frac{x}{z} \\ (q_1 q_2, s)=1}} \sum_{\substack{p \equiv -s \pmod{[q_1, q_2]} \\ q_2 y < p+s \leq q_1 z}} 1. \end{aligned}$$

Note that we must have  $q_2 < e^\eta q_1$ ; otherwise, the corresponding summand on the right hand side of (4.22) is trivially zero. Lemma 2.4 and the trivial estimate  $\pi(x+h; q, a) - \pi(x; q, a) \leq h/q + 1$  imply

$$(4.23) \quad \sum_{\substack{p \equiv -s \pmod{[q_1, q_2]} \\ q_2 y < p+s \leq q_1 z}} 1 \ll_s \frac{q_1 z - q_2 y}{\phi([q_1, q_2]) \log(3 + (q_1 z - q_2 y)/[q_1, q_2])} + 1.$$

Set  $m = (q_1, q_2)$  and  $q_i = mt_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , in the right hand side of (4.22). Then we will have  $m \leq x/2z$  and  $t_1 < t_2 < e^\eta t_1$ . With this notation (4.22) and (4.23) yield that

$$(4.24) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{p+s \leq x} T(p)(T(p) - 1) &\ll_s \log \log(x/y) \sum_{m \leq \frac{x}{2z}} \sum_{\frac{x}{2mz} < t_1 \leq \frac{x}{mz}} \sum_{t_1 < t_2 < e^\eta t_1} \frac{z/t_2 - y/t_1}{\log(3 + z/t_2 - y/t_1)} \\ &\quad + \frac{x}{z} \log(x/z) + \eta \left(\frac{x}{z}\right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

Fix  $m$  and  $t_1$ . Recall that we have assumed that  $z > x^{2/3}$  and  $(\log x)^{-B} \ll \eta \leq (\log(5x/z))^{-2}$ . So  $\log \frac{z-y}{t_1} \gg_B \log x$  and consequently

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t_1 < t_2 < e^\eta t_1} \frac{z/t_2 - y/t_1}{\log(3 + z/t_2 - y/t_1)} &\leq \int_{t_1}^{e^\eta t_1} \frac{z/u - y/t_1}{\log(3 + z/u - y/t_1)} du \\ &= \int_0^{(z-y)/t_1} \frac{w}{\log(w+3)} \frac{z}{(w+y/t_1)^2} dw \\ &\asymp_B \frac{\eta^2 y}{\log x}, \end{aligned}$$

which, combined with (4.20), (4.21) and (4.24), yields that

$$\sum_{p+s \leq x} T^2(p) \ll_{s,B} \frac{\eta x}{\log x} + \frac{\eta^2 x}{\log x} \log(x/y) \log \log(x/y) \ll \frac{\eta x}{\log x}.$$

Plugging the above estimate and (4.20) into (4.15) gives us that

$$H(x, y, z; P_s) \gg_{s,B} \frac{\eta x}{\log x},$$

which along with (4.13) and Theorem 1.1 implies that

$$H(x, y, z; P_s) \asymp_{s,B} \frac{\eta x}{\log x} \asymp \frac{H(x, y, z)}{\log x}.$$

This completes the proof of the theorem in this case. Assume now that  $\eta \geq \log^{-2}(5x/z)$ . Fix a large positive constant  $y_0 = y_0(s, B)$ . If  $x/z \leq y_0$ , then  $\eta \geq \log^{-2}(5y_0)$ . Hence (4.12) implies that

$$H(x, y, z; P_s) \gg_{s,B} \frac{z-y}{\log y} \gg_{y_0} \frac{z}{\log y} \gg_{y_0} \frac{x}{\log x}.$$

Combining the above inequality with the trivial estimate  $H(x, y, z; P_s) \leq \pi(x-s)$  and Theorem 1.1 we deduce that

$$H(x, y, z; P_s) \asymp_{y_0} \frac{x}{\log x} \asymp_{y_0} \frac{H(x, y, z)}{\log x},$$

which shows the desired result in this case. So suppose that  $x/z > y_0$ . We proceed as in the proof of Theorem 1 (iv) in [11]. Partition  $(\frac{x}{\log^2(x/z)}, x]$  into intervals  $(x_1, x_2]$  with

$$\frac{x_2}{\log^3(x/z)} \leq x_2 - x_1 \leq \frac{2x_2}{\log^3(x/z)}.$$

Observe that if  $p+s \in (x_1, x_2]$ , then

$$\tau\left(p+s, \frac{x_2}{z}, \frac{x_1}{y}\right) \geq 1 \Rightarrow \tau(p+s, y, z) \geq 1 \Rightarrow \tau\left(p+s, \frac{x_1}{z}, \frac{x_2}{y}\right) \geq 1.$$

So

$$(4.25) \quad H(x, y, z; P_s) \leq \sum_{x_1, x_2} \left\{ H\left(x_2, \frac{x_1}{z}, \frac{x_2}{y}; P_s\right) - H\left(x_1, \frac{x_1}{z}, \frac{x_2}{y}; P_s\right) \right\} + O_s\left(\frac{x}{\log x \log^2(x/z)}\right).$$

Fix such an interval  $(x_1, x_2]$ . Then

$$\log\left(\frac{x_1}{z}\right) \asymp \log\left(\frac{x}{z}\right), \quad x_2 - x_1 \geq \frac{x_2}{\log^4(x_2/y)}, \quad \log\left(\frac{x_2/y}{x_1/z}\right) \asymp \eta, \quad \frac{x_1}{z} \leq \sqrt{x_2},$$

provided that  $y_0$  is large enough. Therefore Theorems 1.1 and 1.3 and Lemma 2.11 imply that

$$(4.26) \quad \begin{aligned} H\left(x_2, \frac{x_1}{z}, \frac{x_2}{y}; P_s\right) - H\left(x_1, \frac{x_1}{z}, \frac{x_2}{y}; P_s\right) &\ll_{s,B} \frac{x_2 - x_1}{x_2 \log x_2} H\left(x_2, \frac{x_1}{z}, \frac{x_2}{y}\right) \\ &\asymp \frac{x_2 - x_1}{x \log x} H\left(x, \frac{x}{z}, \frac{x}{y}\right) \\ &\asymp \frac{x_2 - x_1}{x \log x} H(x, y, z). \end{aligned}$$

Inserting the above inequality into (4.25) and summing over  $x_1, x_2$  completes the proof of the desired upper bound. The corresponding lower bound is obtained in a similar fashion starting from

$$H(x, y, z; P_s) \geq \sum_{x_1, x_2} \left\{ H\left(x_2, \frac{x_2}{z}, \frac{x_1}{y}; P_s\right) - H\left(x_1, \frac{x_2}{z}, \frac{x_1}{y}; P_s\right) \right\}$$

and using Theorem 1.6 in place of Theorem 1.3.  $\square$

We conclude this section with the proof of Theorem 1.8.

*Proof of Theorem 1.8.* Let  $2 \leq y \leq z \leq x$ . Let  $P = \prod_{y < p \leq z} p$  be the product of all prime numbers in  $(y, z]$ . Then

$$(4.27) \quad 0 \leq \pi(x - s) - H(x, y, z; P_s) \leq |\{p \leq x - s : (p + s, P) = 1\}|.$$

Lemma 2.5 then yields that the right hand side of (4.27) is

$$\ll_s \frac{x}{\log x} \frac{\log y}{\log z},$$

which, combined with the Prime Number Theorem [4], completes the proof.  $\square$

**Acknowledgements.** The author would like to thank Kevin Ford for many valuable suggestions.

## REFERENCES

1. W. R. Alford, A. Granville and C. Pomerance, *There are infinitely many Carmichael numbers*, Ann. of Math. (2) **139** (1994), no. 3, 703-722.
2. A. S. Besicovitch, *On the density of certain sequences of integers*, Math. Ann. **110** (1934), 336-341.
3. E. Bombieri, J. B. Friedlander and H. Iwaniec, *Primes in arithmetic progressions to large moduli*, Acta Math. **156** (1986), no. 3-4, 203-251.
4. H. Davenport, *Multiplicative Number Theory*, third. ed., Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 74, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000, Revised and with a preface by Hugh L. Montgomery.
5. P. T. D. A. Elliott and H. Halberstam, *A conjecture in prime number theory*, Symp. Math., 4 (INDAM Rome, 1969/69), 59-72.
6. P. Erdős, *Notes on the sequences of integers no one of which is divisible by any other*, J. London Math. Soc. **10** (1935), 126-128.
7. P. Erdős, *A generalization of a theorem of Besicovitch*, J. London Math. Soc. **11** (1936), 92-98.
8. P. Erdős, *Some remarks on number theory*, Riveon Lematematika **9** (1955), 45-48, (Hebrew. English summary).
9. P. Erdős, *An asymptotic inequality in the theory of numbers*, Vestnik Leningrad Univ. **15** (1960), 41-49 (Russian).
10. G. B. Folland, *Real Analysis. Modern Techniques and their Applications*, second ed., Pure and Applied Mathematics (New York), A Wiley-Interscience Publication, John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1999.
11. K. Ford, *The distribution of integers with a divisor in a given interval*, Annals of Math. (2) **168** (2008), 367-433.
12. K. Ford, M. R. Khan, I. E. Shparlinski and C. L. Yankov, *On the maximal difference between an element and its inverse in residue rings*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **133** (2005), no.12, 3463-3468.
13. J. Friedlander and H. Iwaniec, *On Bombieri's asymptotic sieve*, Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci (4) **5** (1978), 719-756.

14. H. Halberstam and H. -E. Richert, *Sieve Methods*, Academic Press [A subsidiary of Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], London-New York, 1974, London Mathematical Society Monographs, No. 4.
15. R. R. Hall and G. Tenenbaum, *Divisors*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, vol. 90, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2008.
16. G. Harman, *On the number of Carmichael numbers up to  $x$* , Bull. London Math. Soc. **37** (2005), 641-650.
17. K. H. Indlekofer and N. M. Timofeev, *Divisors of shifted primes*, Publ. Math. Debrecen **60** (2002), no. 3-4, 307-345.
18. H. Iwaniec, *Rosser's sieve*, Acta Arith. **36** (1980), 171-202.
19. H. L. Montgomery, *Zeroes of  $L$ -functions*, Invent. Math. **8** (1969), 346-354.
20. H. L. Montgomery and R.C. Vaughan, *The Large Sieve*, Mathematica **20** (1973), 119-134.
21. M. Nair and G. Tenenbaum, *Short sums of certain arithmetic functions*, Acta Math. **180** (1998), 119-144.
22. R. Sitaramachandra Rao, *On an error term of Landau*, Indian J. Pure Appl. Math. **13** (1982), no. 8, 882-885.
23. G. Tenenbaum, *Lois de répartition des diviseurs. II*, Acta Arith. **38** (1980/81), 1-36.
24. G. Tenenbaum, *Lois de répartition des diviseurs. III*, Acta Arith. **39** (1981), 19-31.
25. G. Tenenbaum, *Sur la probabilité qu'un entier possède un diviseur dans un intervalle donné*, Compositio Math. **51** (1984), no. 2, 243-263.
26. A. Walfisz, *Weylsche Exponentialsummen in der Neuen Zahlentheorie*, Mathematische Forschungsberichte, XV. VEB Deutscher Verlag der Wissenschaften, Berlin 1963, 231 pp.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN, 1409 WEST GREEN STREET, URBANA, IL 61801, U.S.A.

*E-mail address:* `dkoukou2@math.uiuc.edu`