## ON THE CLASS-NUMBER OF THE CORPUS $P(\sqrt{-k})$ .

By S. CHOWLA, Govt. College, Lahore.

(Communicated by Sir S. S. Bhatnagar, F.R.S.)

(Received October 28, 1946.)

1. In a paper carrying the title of the present paper, Littlewood (1928) proved: If the extended Riemann hypothesis (e.R.h.) is true, there exist infinitely many k such that

$$L(1) = \sum_{1}^{\infty} \frac{x(n)}{n} > \{1 + 0(1)\} e^{C} \log \log k$$

where x(n) is a real primitive character (mod k).

This result was proved by Walfisz (1942) without assuming the e.R.h. His proof is based on the so-called 'class-number relations' discovered by Kronecker. In this paper I use the method developed by me in my paper 'An improvement of a theorem of Linnik and Walfisz' to give another proof of the result without assuming the e.R.h.

 $\S 2$ . Throughout we use the notation of my paper 3. In the definitions we only change the definition of b so that

$$\left(\frac{b}{p_r}\right) = +1 \text{ for } 1 \le r \le (g-1),$$

$$\left(\frac{b}{p_g}\right) = -1,$$

$$b \equiv 1 \pmod{8},$$

$$1 < b < 8a:$$

as before,

(1) 
$$T(x) = \sum_{x < n \leq 2x} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m} \left( \frac{8an+b}{m} \right);$$

also S(x) is the same sum but with m going up to  $x^{\frac{1}{2}}$  in the inner sum. The difference between T(x) and S(x) is of the order  $x^{\frac{1}{2}}$ , as proved in my paper 3.

The sum S(x) is split up as before:

$$S(x) = S_1(x) + S_2(x) + S_3(x)$$
.

We find that

$$\begin{split} S_1(x) \sim \frac{1}{4}e^C x & (\log \log x), \\ S_2(x) = O(x^{\frac{1}{2}}), \\ S_3(x) = O\left(\frac{x(\log \log x)^2}{\log x}\right); \end{split}$$

VOL. XIII-No. 4.

the sums  $S_2(x)$  and  $S_3(x)$  are estimated in exactly the same way as in my paper 3,  $S_1(x)$  only being different. Thus we have

(A) 
$$T(x) \sim \frac{1}{2}e^{C}x \log \log x.$$

We now write

(2) 
$$T(x) = T_1(x) + T_2(x)$$

where  $T_1(x)$  is defined by (1) with the difference that in the outer sum n is restricted to take values such that (8an+b) is quadratfrei;  $T_2(x)$  is defined by the right-hand side of (1) but with n running through values in which (8an+b) is divisible by a square greater than 1. We proceed to estimate  $T_2(x)$ . Now the numbers (8an+b) cannot be divisible by  $p_r^2$  unless r > g. The number of numbers (8an+b) when  $x < n \le 2x$  such that 8an+b is divisible by  $p_r^2$  (r > g) is clearly of the order

$$\sum_{r>\varepsilon} \left(\frac{x}{p_r^2}\right) = O\left(\sum_{n>\varepsilon} \frac{x}{n^2 \log^2 n}\right)$$

$$= O\left(\frac{x}{q \log^2 q}\right) = O\left\{\frac{x(\log \log x)^2}{\log x(\log \log x)^2}\right\} = O\left(\frac{x}{\log x}\right).$$

Again, as observed by Davenport, we have

$$\sum_{n=n}^{v} x(n) = O(\sqrt{k} \log k)$$

where x(n) is any non-principal character (mod k). It follows, since  $a < x^{\frac{1}{30}}$   $(x > x_0)$ proved in my paper 3, that

(4) 
$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m} \left( \frac{8an+b}{m} \right) = O(\log x)$$

for every n with  $x < n \le 2x$ . It now follows from (4) and (3) that

(5) 
$$T_2(x) = O\left(\frac{x}{\log x} \log x\right) = O(x).$$

From (A), (2) and (5) we finally get

(6) 
$$T_1(x) \sim \frac{1}{2}e^C x \log \log x,$$

i.e.

(3)

(7) 
$$\sum_{\substack{x < n \leq 2x \\ (8an+b) \text{ quadratfrei}}} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m} \cdot \left(\frac{8an+b}{m}\right) \sim \frac{1}{2}e^{C}x \log \log x.$$

Since 'almost all' (8an + b) are quadratfrei when  $x < n \le 2x$ , it follows from (7) that there exists a positive integer n with  $x < n \le 2x$  and such that (8an + b) is quadratfrei and

(8) 
$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m} \left( \frac{8an+b}{m} \right) > \frac{1}{2}e^{C} \left\{ 1 + O(1) \right\} \log \log (8an+b)$$

since  $\log \log x \sim \log \log (8an+b)$ . From the Reciprocity Law for Jacobi's symbol

$$\left(\frac{8an+b}{m}\right) = \left(\frac{m}{8an+b}\right) \text{ when } m \equiv 1 \pmod{2},$$

$$\left(\frac{8an+b}{m}\right) = 0 \text{ when } m \equiv 0 \pmod{2},$$

by definition. Hence (8) becomes

(9) 
$$\sum_{m=d-1} \frac{1}{m} \left( \frac{m}{8an+b} \right) > \frac{1}{2} e^{C} \left\{ 1 + 0(1) \right\} \log \log (8an+b);$$

now

$$\left(\frac{2}{8an+b}\right) = +1 \text{ since } b \equiv 1 \pmod{8}.$$

Hence

(10)

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m} \left( \frac{m}{8an+b} \right) = \left( 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2^2} + \cdots \right) \sum_{\text{mod } d} \left( \frac{m}{8an+b} \right) \frac{1}{m}$$
$$= 2 \sum_{m=d} \frac{1}{m} \left( \frac{m}{8an+b} \right).$$

From (9) and (10) we get

(11) 
$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m} \left( \frac{m}{8an+b} \right) > e^{C} \left\{ 1 + 0(1) \right\} \log \log (8an+b)$$

for suitable n with  $x < n \le 2x$ , and for all  $x > x_0$  since (8an + b) is quadratfrei in (8), (9), (10), (11) we finally get

Theorem 1. For all  $x>x_0$  there exists a quadratfrei number k=8an+b where  $x < n \le 2x$  such that

(12) 
$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m} \left( \frac{m}{k} \right) > \{1 + 0(1)\} e^{C} \log \log k.$$

Since  $\left(\frac{m}{k}\right)$  is a real primitive character (mod k) in (12), on account of k being quadratfrei, we can write Theorem 1 as

Theorem 2. For all  $x>x_0$  there exists a number k-between x and  $x^2$  and such that

$$\sum_{1}^{\infty} \frac{x(n)}{n} > \{1 + 0(1)\} e^{C} \log \log k$$

where x(n) is a real primitive character (mod k). Thus Littlewood's Theorem (and more) has been proved without assuming the e.R.h.

## **§3.** REFERENCES.

Littlewood, J. E. (1928). 'On the class-number of the corpus  $P(\sqrt{-k})$ '. Proc. London Math.

Soc., 27, 358-372.

Walfisz, A. (1942). 'Über die Klassenzahl binarer quadratis chen Formen'. Trav. Inst. Math. Tbilissi, 11, 57-71.

[Note: In a paper entitled 'On the k-analogue of a result in the theory of the Riemann Zeta function', Mathematische Zeitschrift (1934), Band 38, 483-487, I have proved that

$$\sum_{1}^{\infty} \frac{x(n)}{n} = \Omega_{R} (\log \log k)$$

where x(n) is a real primitive character (mod k).]

Note added during proof correction (May 7, 1947).

My paper 'An improvement of a theorem of Linnik and Walfisz' has been accepted for publication by the London Math. Society. There is very little difference between the arguments of the present papers and those of the paper to be published by the London Math. Society.