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#### Abstract

A set of $m$ positive integers $\left\{a_{1}, \ldots, a_{m}\right\}$ is called a Diophantine $m$-tuple if the product of any two elements in the set increased by one is a perfect square. The conjecture according to which there does not exist a Diophantine quintuple is still open. In this paper, we show that if $\{a, b, c, d, e\}$ is a Diophantine quintuple with $a<b<c<d<e$, then $b>3 a$; moreover, $b>\max \left\{21 a, 2 a^{3 / 2}\right\}$ in case $c>a+b+2 \sqrt{a b+1}$.


## 1. Introduction

A set of $m$ positive integers $\left\{a_{1}, \ldots, a_{m}\right\}$ with the property that the product of any two elements in the set increased by one is a perfect square is called a Diophantine m-tuple.

The first example $\{1,3,8,120\}$ of a Diophantine quadruple was found by Fermat. In general, for a given Diophantine triple $\{a, b, c\}$, the set $\left\{a, b, c, d_{+}\right\}$ is always a Diophantine quadruple, where

$$
d_{+}=a+b+c+2 a b c+2 \sqrt{(a b+1)(a c+1)(b c+1)}
$$

(see [1]). A set of the type $\left\{a, b, c, d_{+}\right\}$is called a regular Diophantine quadruple. Fermat's set $\{1,3,8,120\}$ is regular, and, according to [17], in [18] and independently in [1] it is conjectured that any Diophantine quadruple is regular, implying the folklore conjecture that there does not exist a Diophantine quintuple. In [8] Dujella obtained results very close to settling this conjecture by proving that there does not exist a Diophantine sextuple and that there exist only finitely many Diophantine quintuples. Later bounds on the number of Diophantine quintuples are provided in $[9,11,16]$. Historical and recent

[^0]developments of the study of Diophantine $m$-tuples are found on Dujella's webpage: http://web.math.pmf.unizg.hr/~duje/dtuples.html.

The existence of Diophantine sets boils down to solving systems of generalized Pell equations. Recently, the first author ([6, Lemma 2.4]; see also Lemma 3.4 below) improved the lower bound for hypothetical solutions to the system relevant in the study of Diophantine quintuples (note that a similar assertion is obtained in [23]). Using this lemma, he investigated the properties that Diophantine quintuples should have, and in particular updated the known upper bounds for the fourth element $d([6$, Theorem 2.1]) and for the number of Diophantine quintuples ([6, Theorem 1.3]).

The aim of this paper is to show the non-existence of Diophantine quintuples such that the two smallest elements are rather close to each other. More precisely, we prove the following.

Theorem 1.1. There exists no Diophantine quintuple $\{a, b, c, d, e\}$ with $a<b<c<d<e$ and $b \leq 3 a$.

Theorem 1.2. There exists no Diophantine quintuple $\{a, b, c, d, e\}$ with $a<b<c<d<e, c>a+b+2 \sqrt{a b+1}$ and $b \leq \max \left\{21 a, 2 a^{3 / 2}\right\}$.

In addition to the above mentioned result [6, Lemma 2.4], a key role in our deliberations plays an amelioration (Theorem 2.2 in Section 2) of Rickert's theorem (see [21]; cf. also [5, Theorem 3.2], [12, Theorem 2.5]). The improvements were obtained by adjusting an idea found in Bennett's paper [3] to our situation. The proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 are given in the last section.

## 2. A version of Rickert's theorem

For any irregular quadruple $\{a, b, c, d\}$ with $a<b<c<d$, a lower bound for the second element $b$ has been obtained by using a version ([10, Lemma $5]$ ) of the Baker-Davenport reduction method ([2, Lemma]) in the proof of [13, Theorem 1.2]. Computations performed in order to establish the above mentioned theorem (and described at length on the last page of [13]) can be summarized as follows.

Lemma 2.1. Suppose that $\{a, b, c, d\}$ is a Diophantine quadruple with $a<$ $b<c<d_{+}<d$.

- If $b<2 a$, then $b>21000$.
- If $2 a \leq b \leq 8 a$, then $b>130000$.
- If $b>8 a$, then $b>2000$.

As already mentioned, the existence of Diophantine sets hinges on the solvability of a certain system of generalized Pell equations. It is also well known that solutions to such systems appear as common terms to several second-order linear recurrent sequences. In order to get a better upper bound
for the index of appearance of a hypothetical solution in the relevant sequence, we slightly improve [12, Theorem 2.5], which is a version of Rickert's theorem ([21]).

THEOREM 2.2. Let $a, b$ and $N$ be integers with $0<a \leq b-5, b>2000$ and $N \geq 3.706 a^{\prime} b^{2}(b-a)^{2}$, where $a^{\prime}=\max \{b-a, a\}$. Assume that $N$ is divisible by $a b$. Then the numbers $\theta_{1}=\sqrt{1+b / N}$ and $\theta_{2}=\sqrt{1+a / N}$ satisfy

$$
\max \left\{\left|\theta_{1}-\frac{p_{1}}{q}\right|,\left|\theta_{2}-\frac{p_{2}}{q}\right|\right\}>\left(\frac{1.413 \cdot 10^{28} a^{\prime} b N}{a}\right)^{-1} q^{-\lambda}
$$

for all integers $p_{1}, p_{2}, q$ with $q>0$, where

$$
\lambda=1+\frac{\log \left(10 a^{-1} a^{\prime} b N\right)}{\log \left(2.699 a^{-1} b^{-1}(b-a)^{-2} N^{2}\right)}<2 .
$$

The proof of the original result, as well as of all subsequent versions of it, relies on a very general construction recalled below.

Lemma 2.3. ([5, Lemma 3.1]) Let $\theta_{1}, \ldots, \theta_{m}$ be arbitrary real numbers and $\theta_{0}=1$. Assume that there exist positive real numbers $l, p, L$ and $P$ with $L>1$ such that for each positive integer $k$, we can find integers $p_{i j k}$ $(0 \leq i, j \leq m)$ with nonzero determinant,

$$
\left|p_{i j k}\right| \leq p P^{k} \quad(0 \leq i, j \leq m)
$$

and

$$
\left|\sum_{j=0}^{m} p_{i j k} \theta_{j}\right| \leq l L^{-k}(0 \leq i \leq m)
$$

Then

$$
\max \left\{\left|\theta_{1}-\frac{p_{1}}{q}\right|, \ldots,\left|\theta_{m}-\frac{p_{m}}{q}\right|\right\}>c q^{-\lambda}
$$

holds for all integers $p_{1}, \ldots, p_{m}, q$ with $q>0$, where

$$
\lambda=1+\frac{\log P}{\log L} \quad \text { and } \quad c^{-1}=2 m p P(\max \{1,2 l\})^{\lambda-1}
$$

Proof of Theorem 2.2. We apply Lemma 2.3 with $m=2$ and $\theta_{1}, \theta_{2}$ as in Theorem 2.2. For $0 \leq i, j \leq 2$ and arbitrary integers $a_{i}$ (which will be specialized to $0, a$ and $b$ in due time), let $p_{i j}(x)$ be the polynomial defined by

$$
p_{i j}(x)=\sum_{i j}\binom{k+\frac{1}{2}}{h_{j}}\left(1+a_{j} x\right)^{k-h_{j}} x^{h_{j}} \prod_{l \neq j}\binom{-k_{i l}}{h_{l}}\left(a_{j}-a_{l}\right)^{-k_{i l}-h_{l}}
$$

where $k_{i l}=k+\delta_{i l}$ with $\delta_{i l}$ the Kronecker delta, $\sum_{i j}$ denotes the sum over all non-negative integers $h_{0}, h_{1}, h_{2}$ satisfying $h_{0}+h_{1}+h_{2}=k_{i j}-1$, and $\prod_{l \neq j}$ denotes the product from $l=0$ to $l=2$ omitting $l=j$ (which is the
expression (3.7) in [21] with $\nu=1 / 2$ ). As seen in the proof of [12, Theorem 2.5], we have

$$
f(x):=2^{2 k-1} \prod_{l \neq j}\left(a_{j}-a_{l}\right)^{k_{i l}+h_{l}} p_{i j}(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x] .
$$

Noting

$$
\binom{-k_{i l}}{h_{l}}=(-1)^{h_{l}}\binom{k_{i l}+h_{l}-1}{h_{l}}
$$

we see from [4, Lemma 4.1] (or [3, Lemma 3.2]) that $P_{2}(k)$ divides the greatest common divisor, denoted by $\Pi_{2}(k)$, of the coefficients of $f(x)$, where $P_{2}(k)$ is the product over all primes $p$ satisfying $p>\sqrt{2 k+1}, \operatorname{gcd}(p, 2 k)=1$ and $\{(k-1) / p\}>3 / 4$ (as usual, $\{t\}$ denotes the fractional part of a real number $t)$; in particular, we have $\Pi_{2}(k) \geq P_{2}(k)$. Denoting by $J_{l}(k)$ the open interval $((k-1) / l, 4(k-1) /(4 l-1))$, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
P_{2}(k) \geq \prod_{l=1}^{\left[\frac{k-1}{\sqrt{2 k-1}}\right]} \prod_{\substack{p \in J_{l}(k) \\ \operatorname{gcd}(p, 2 k)=1}} p \tag{2.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now we appeal to Corollary $2^{*}$ of Theorem $7^{*}$ (the case $(c, d)=(15,70877)$ in the table) and the Note added in proof from [22] in order to get a lower bound for the right-hand side of (2.1). If $k \geq 903683$, then
$\sum_{l=1}^{13} \sum_{\substack{p \in J_{l}(k) \\ \operatorname{gcd}(p, 2 k)=1}} \log p>\sum_{l=1}^{13}\left(\frac{4}{4 l-1}-\frac{4}{15(4 l-1) \log \frac{4(k-1)}{4 l-1}}-\frac{1.000081}{l}\right)(k-1)$

$$
-\log k
$$

$$
>0.47064(k-1)-\log k>0.4706 k
$$

which implies that $\Pi_{2}(k)>e^{0.4706 k}>1.6^{k}$. For each $1 \leq k \leq 903682$, put

$$
g(k)=\sum_{l=1}^{\left[\frac{k-1}{\sqrt{2 k+1}}\right]} \sum_{\substack{p \in J_{l}(k) \\ \operatorname{gcd}(p, 2 k)=1}} \log p-k \log 1.6 .
$$

Then, with the help of a computer we find that $g(k)>-31.342$, where the minimal value of $g(k)$ is attained in the case of $k=607$. This estimate yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Pi_{2}(k)>\frac{1.6^{k}}{e^{31.342}}>\frac{1.6^{k}}{4.09 \cdot 10^{13}} \tag{2.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

which also holds for $k \geq 903683$.
If we take $a_{0}=0, a_{1}=a$ and $a_{2}=b$, the proof of [12, Theorem 2.5] shows that

$$
p_{i j k}:=2^{-1}\left[4 a b(b-a)^{2} N\right]^{k} \Pi_{2}(k)^{-1} p_{i j}(1 / N) \in \mathbb{Z}
$$

which together with (2.2) and the proof of [15, Theorem 21] implies that

$$
\left|p_{i j k}\right|<p P^{k}, \quad\left|\sum_{j=0}^{2} p_{i j k} \theta_{j}\right|<l L^{-k}
$$

where

$$
\begin{aligned}
p & =\frac{4.09 \cdot 10^{13}}{2}\left(1+\frac{a^{\prime}}{2 N}\right)^{1 / 2}<2.046 \cdot 10^{13} \\
P & =\frac{32\left(1+\frac{3 b-a}{2 N}\right) a b(b-a)^{2} N}{1.6 \zeta}<\frac{10 a^{\prime} b N}{a} \\
(\zeta & =\left\{\begin{array}{ll}
a^{2}(2 b-a) & \text { if } b-a \geq a, \\
(b-a)^{2}(a+b) & \text { if } b-a<a
\end{array}\right) \\
l & =\frac{4.09 \cdot 10^{13}}{2} \cdot \frac{27}{64}\left(1-\frac{b}{N}\right)^{-1}<8.628 \cdot 10^{12}
\end{aligned}, \begin{aligned}
& 1.6 \\
& L
\end{aligned}=\frac{27}{4 a b(b-a)^{2} N} \cdot \frac{b}{4}\left(1-\frac{b}{N}\right)^{2} N^{3}>\frac{2.699 N^{2}}{a b(b-a)^{2}} . . ~ \$
$$

Moreover, the assumption $N \geq 3.706 a^{\prime} b^{2}(b-a)^{2}$ implies that

$$
\lambda=1+\frac{\log \left(10 a^{-1} a^{\prime} b N\right)}{\log \left(2.699 a^{-1} b^{-1}(b-a)^{-2} N^{2}\right)}<2
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
c^{-1} & <4 \cdot 2.046 \cdot 10^{13} \cdot \frac{10 a^{\prime} b N}{a}\left(17.256 \cdot 10^{12}\right)^{\lambda-1} \\
& <\frac{1.413 \cdot 10^{28} a^{\prime} b N}{a} .
\end{aligned}
$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 2.2.

## 3. Proofs of the main results

Let $\{a, b, c\}$ be a Diophantine triple with $a<b<c$ and $r, s, t$ the positive integers satisfying $a b+1=r^{2}, a c+1=s^{2}, b c+1=t^{2}$. Assume that $\{a, b, c, d\}$ is a Diophantine quadruple. Then, there exist positive integers $x, y, z$ satisfying $a d+1=x^{2}, b d+1=y^{2}, c d+1=z^{2}$. Eliminating $d$ from these equations, we obtain the following system of generalized Pell equations

$$
\begin{align*}
a z^{2}-c x^{2} & =a-c  \tag{3.1}\\
b z^{2}-c y^{2} & =b-c \tag{3.2}
\end{align*}
$$

The solutions of equations (3.1) and (3.2) can be respectively expressed as $z=v_{m}$ and $z=w_{n}$ with positive integers $m$ and $n$, where

$$
\begin{array}{rlrl}
v_{0} & =z_{0}, & v_{1}=s z_{0}+c x_{0}, & \\
w_{0}=z_{1}, & w_{1}=t z_{1}+c y_{1}, & & w_{n+2}=2 t v_{m+1}-v_{m}  \tag{3.4}\\
\end{array}
$$

Lemma 3.1. (cf. [7, Lemma 12]) Let $N=a b c$ and let $\theta_{1}, \theta_{2}$ be as in Theorem 2.2. Then all positive solutions of the system of Diophantine equations (3.1) and (3.2) satisfy

$$
\max \left\{\left|\theta_{1}-\frac{s b x}{a b z}\right|,\left|\theta_{2}-\frac{t a y}{a b z}\right|\right\}<\frac{c}{2 a} z^{-2} .
$$

Lemma 3.2. Suppose that there exist integers $m \geq 3$ and $n \geq 2$ such that $z=v_{2 m}=w_{2 n}$ and $\left|z_{0}\right|=1$, and that $c \geq 3.706 a^{\prime} b(b-a)^{2} / a$. Then, $\log z>n \log (4 b c)$.

Proof. One can prove this lemma in the same way as [7, Lemma 25] (see also the proof of [12, Lemma 2.10]).

Now we are ready to obtain an upper bound for the solution.
Lemma 3.3. Suppose that there exist integers $m \geq 3$ and $n \geq 2$ such that $z=v_{2 m}=w_{2 n}$ and $\left|z_{0}\right|=1$, and that $c \geq 3.706 a^{\prime} b(b-a)^{2} / a$. Then,

$$
n<\frac{4 \log \left(8.406 \cdot 10^{13} a^{1 / 2}\left(a^{\prime}\right)^{1 / 2} b^{2} c\right) \log \left(1.643 a^{1 / 2} b^{1 / 2}(b-a)^{-1} c\right)}{\log (4 b c) \log \left(0.2699 a\left(a^{\prime}\right)^{-1} b^{-1}(b-a)^{-2} c\right)}
$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.1, we may apply Theorem 2.2 with $q=a b z, p_{1}=$ $s b x, p_{2}=t a y$, and $N=a b c$. In view of Lemma 3.1, we have

$$
z^{2-\lambda}<0.7065 \cdot 10^{28} a a^{\prime} b^{4} c^{2}<\left(8.406 \cdot 10^{13} a^{1 / 2}\left(a^{\prime}\right)^{1 / 2} b^{2} c\right)^{2} .
$$

From

$$
\frac{1}{2-\lambda}=\frac{\log \left(2.699 a b(b-a)^{-2} c^{2}\right)}{\log \frac{2.699 a(b-a)^{-2} c}{10 a^{\prime} b}}<\frac{2 \log \left(1.643 a^{1 / 2} b^{1 / 2}(b-a)^{-1} c\right)}{\log \left(0.2699 a\left(a^{\prime}\right)^{-1} b^{-1}(b-a)^{-2} c\right)}
$$

and Lemma 3.2 we obtain the asserted inequality.
We need a recent improvement on the lower bound for the solution. Its proof is similar to the proof of [23, Lemma 2].

Lemma 3.4. ([6, Lemma 2.4]) If there exist integers $m \geq 3$ and $n \geq 2$ such that $z=v_{2 m}=w_{2 n}$ and $\left|z_{0}\right|=1$, then $m>0.5 b^{-1 / 2} c^{1 / 2}$.

The following is useful to refine some estimates for the solutions.
Lemma 3.5. If $\{a, b\}$ is a Diophantine pair with $b>a+2$, then

$$
b-a \geq 2 \sqrt{a+1}+1
$$

Proof. The assumption $b-a>2$ implies $a+b-2 r \geq 1$, from which the assertion can be easily deduced.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Assuming the contrary, we will show a contradiction. First of all, we note that if we replace " $c$ " in (3.1), (3.2), (3.3), (3.4) by " $d$ ", then $z=v_{2 m}=w_{2 n}$ and $\left|z_{0}\right|=1$ hold for some $m \geq 3$ and $n \geq 2$ (see the part just before the proof of [12, Theorem 2.1]).

Suppose first that $b<2 a$. Then $a^{\prime}=a$ and $b-a<b / 2$. Since

$$
\begin{gathered}
\frac{3.706 a^{\prime} b(b-a)^{2}}{a}<3.706 b \cdot \frac{b^{2}}{4}=0.9265 b^{3}, \\
d>4 a b c>4 \cdot \frac{b}{2} \cdot b(a+b+2 r)>2\left(\frac{1}{2}+1+\sqrt{2}\right) b^{3}>5.8284 b^{3},
\end{gathered}
$$

we can apply Lemma 3.2 with $c$ replaced by $d$. By Lemma 3.5 (which can be applied thanks to the main result in [14]) we have

$$
a^{1 / 2}(b-a)^{-1} \leq \frac{\sqrt{a}}{2 \sqrt{a+1}+1}<0.5,
$$

which together with Lemma 3.3 implies

$$
n<\frac{4 \log \left(8.406 \cdot 10^{13} b^{3} d\right) \log \left(0.8215 b^{1 / 2} d\right)}{\log (4 b d) \log \left(1.0796 b^{-3} d\right)}
$$

Since the right-hand side is a decreasing function of $d$ and $d>5.8284 b^{3}$, we have

$$
n<\frac{4 \log \left(4.9 \cdot 10^{14} b^{6}\right) \log \left(4.789 b^{7 / 2}\right)}{\log \left(23.3136 b^{4}\right) \log (6.292)}<h_{1}(b)
$$

where

$$
h_{1}(b)=\frac{21 \log (280.78 b) \log (1.565 b)}{\log (2.197 b) \log (6.292)} .
$$

On the other hand, we know by Lemma 3.4 with $m \leq 2 n$ that

$$
n>0.25 b^{-1 / 2} d^{1 / 2}>0.6035 b,
$$

which implies $0.6035 b<h_{1}(b)$. Therefore we obtain $b<200$, which contradicts Lemma 2.1.

Suppose secondly that $2 a \leq b \leq 3 a$, so that $a^{\prime}=b-a \leq 2 b / 3$. Since

$$
\begin{gathered}
\frac{3.706 a^{\prime} b(b-a)^{2}}{a}=3.706 \cdot \frac{b}{a} \cdot(b-a)^{3}<3.295 b^{3}, \\
d>4 a b c \geq 4 \cdot \frac{b}{3} \cdot b(a+b+2 r)>3.317 b^{3}
\end{gathered}
$$

we can apply Lemma 3.2 with $d$ instead of $c$. Since $a^{\prime}=b-a \leq 2 b / 3$, and $a^{1 / 2}(b-a)^{1 / 2} \leq b / 2$ by the arithmetic mean-geometric mean inequality, we see from Lemma 3.3 that

$$
n<\frac{4 \log \left(4.203 \cdot 10^{13} b^{3} d\right) \log (2.3236 d)}{\log (4 b d) \log \left(0.3036 b^{-3} d\right)}
$$

In a similar way to the above, we have $d>3.317 b^{3}$ and $n<h_{2}(b)$, where

$$
h_{2}(b)=\frac{18 \log (227.712 b) \log (1.976 b)}{\log (1.908 b) \log (1.007)},
$$

which together with $n>0.4553 b$ shows that $0.4553 b<h_{2}(b)$. Therefore we obtain $b<97000$, which contradicts Lemma 2.1. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Once again, we argue by reduction to absurd. By [19, Lemma 4], if $c>a+b+2 r$ then actually $c>4 a b$. Having in view Theorem 1.1, we may also assume that $b>3 a$. Hence, $a^{\prime}=b-a$.

First suppose $b \leq 21 a$. Then we find

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{3.706 a^{\prime} b(b-a)^{2}}{a} & =3.706 \cdot \frac{b}{a} \cdot(b-a)^{3}<67.23 b^{3} \\
d & >4 a b c>16 a^{2} b^{2} \geq 0.0362 b^{4}
\end{aligned}
$$

Since $b>2000$ according to Lemma 2.1, the hypothesis of Lemma 3.3 is fulfilled.

From $3 a<b$ it results $a^{1 / 2} b^{1 / 2}(b-a)^{-1}<\sqrt{3} / 2$, while the upper bound on $b$ in terms of $a$ entails $a b^{-1}(b-a)^{-3}>21^{2} b^{-3} / 20^{3}$. Using these inequalities, Lemma 3.3 yields

$$
n<\frac{4 \log \left(4.203 \cdot 10^{13} b^{3} d\right) \log (1.4229 d)}{\log (4 b d) \log \left(67.2123^{-1} b^{-3} d\right)}
$$

As the right side of the previous relation is a function decreasing in $d$, for $d>0.0362 b^{4}$ one obtains

$$
n<\frac{22.4 \log (54.996 b) \log (0.4764 b)}{\log (0.6794 b) \log \left(1856.7^{-1} b\right)}
$$

This upper bound on $n$ is compatible with the lower bound $n>b^{3 / 2} / 21$ derived with Lemma 3.4 only for $b<1980$. Thus, Lemma 2.1 leads us to a contradiction.

Suppose secondly $b \leq 2 a^{3 / 2}$. Since

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{3.706 a^{\prime} b(b-a)^{2}}{a} & <\frac{3.706 b^{4}}{(b / 2)^{2 / 3}}<5.883 b^{10 / 3} \\
d & >16(b / 2)^{4 / 3} b^{2}>6.349 b^{10 / 3}
\end{aligned}
$$

we may apply Lemma 3.3, and thereby obtain

$$
n<\frac{4 \log \left(4.203 \cdot 10^{13} b^{3} d\right) \log (1.4229 d)}{\log (4 b d) \log \left(0.17002 b^{-10 / 3} d\right)}
$$

Similarly to the first case, $d>6.349 b^{10 / 3}$ implies

$$
n<\frac{760 \log (189.597 b) \log (1.936 b)}{39 \log (2.109 b) \log (1.0794)}
$$

Comparing this upper bound with $n>2^{-2 / 3} b^{7 / 6}$ deduced from Lemma 3.4, we obtain $b<1490$. As this range is prohibited by Lemma 2.1, the proof of Theorem 1.2 is complete.

At the request of the referee, we close with a few remarks on the uniqueness of the extension of a Diophantine triple $\{a, b, c\}(a<b<c)$ with $a$ and $b$ very close to each other, such as $b \leq 3 a$ or $b \leq \max \left\{21 a, 2 a^{3 / 2}\right\}$, where we proved the non-extendibility to a Diophantine quintuple.

The main technical obstacle which presently prevents to obtain such a result is the non-availability of a lower bound on indices $m$ and $n$ for which $v_{m}=w_{n}$ as powerful as that given in Lemma 3.4 and which should be valid for all combinations odd-even. The best lower bounds proved so far for $m n$ odd are of order $b^{-3 / 4} c^{1 / 4}$ (see $\left.[6,13]\right)$. Clearly, such a bound is irrelevant in our problem unless $c \approx b^{\alpha}$ with $\alpha$ sensibly greater than 3 . Moreover, a small gap between $b$ and $c$ does not even allow one to show that the indices $m$ and $n$ have the same parity.
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