

Friday, February 17

no classes next week!

Recall: if  $\theta = \sup$  of real parts of zeros of  $f(s)$  (so that  $\frac{1}{2} \leq \theta \leq 1$ , and RH  $\Leftrightarrow \theta = \frac{1}{2}$ ), then

$$\psi(x) - x \ll x^\theta \log^2 x.$$

What about corresponding lower bounds?

Recall: "London's theorem" (Theorem 1.7 in MV): Let  $\alpha(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n n^{-s}$  have abscissa of convergence  $\sigma_c$ . If

$a_n \geq 0$  for all sufficiently large  $n$ , then  $\alpha(s)$  has a singularity at  $s = \sigma_c$ .

An analogy:

Lemma 15.1: Let  $A(x)$  be a bounded, Riemann integrable function, and suppose that  $A(x) \geq 0$  for  $x \geq x_0$ . Let  $\sigma_c$  be the infimum of  $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\int_{x_0}^{\infty} A(x) x^{-\sigma} dx$  converges. Then

$F(s) = \int_{x_0}^{\infty} A(x) x^{-s} dx$  (is analytic in  $\{\sigma > \sigma_c\}$  and) has a singularity at  $s = \sigma_c$ .

Example: Let  $SG(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & x=1 \\ 0 & 1 < x < 2 \\ 1 & 2 \leq x < 3 \\ 0 & 3 \leq x < 4 \\ 1 & 4 \leq x < 5 \\ \dots \end{cases}$

and  $A(x) = \frac{SG(x)}{x}$

$$\int_{1^-}^{\infty} x^{-s} dSG(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{n-1} n^{-s} = \zeta(s) (1 - 2^{1-s}).$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{1}{s} \zeta(s) (1 - 2^{1-s}) = \int_{1^-}^{\infty} \frac{SG(x)}{A(x)} x^{-s} dx$$

for  $\sigma > 0$

General phenomenon:

$$\text{if } S(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} a_n \text{ and } A(x) = \frac{S(x)}{x}$$

$$\text{then } \frac{1}{s} \alpha(s) = \int_1^{\infty} A(x) x^{-s} dx$$

$$\text{where } \alpha(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n n^{-s}$$

Typical usage of Landau's theorem:

- If  $A(x)$  is eventually nonnegative, then the rightmost singularity of  $F(s)$  is on the real axis.

- Contrapositive: if the rightmost singularity of  $F(s)$  is not on the real axis, then  $A(x)$  is not eventually nonnegative (or eventually nonpositive).

Thus  $A(x)$  changes sign infinitely often.

"Rightmost" means "largest real part",

Recall:

$$\psi(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n)$$

$$\theta(x) = \sum_{p \leq x} \log p$$

$$\Pi(x) = \sum_{2 \leq n \leq x} \frac{\Lambda(n)}{\log n}$$

$$\pi(x) = \sum_{p \leq x} 1$$

Let  $\theta$  be the supremum of real parts of zeros of  $\zeta(s)$ .

Theorem 15.2: For every  $\varepsilon > 0$ ,

$$\chi(x) - x = O_{\pm}(x^{\theta - \varepsilon}).$$

(In other words,

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\chi(x) - x}{x^{\theta - \varepsilon}} > 0 \text{ and}$$

$$\liminf_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\chi(x) - x}{x^{\theta - \varepsilon}} < 0.)$$

$$\text{And } \Pi(x) - \text{li}(x) = O_{\pm}(x^{\theta - \varepsilon}).$$

Proof: We know  $-\frac{\zeta'(s)}{\zeta(s)} = s \int_1^{\infty} \psi(x) x^{-s-1} dx$

and so

$$\int_1^{\infty} (\psi(x) - x - x^{\theta-\epsilon}) x^{-s-1} dx$$

$$= \underbrace{-\frac{1}{s} \frac{\zeta'(s)}{\zeta(s)} - \frac{1}{s-1} - \frac{1}{s-\theta+\epsilon}}$$

• no singularity at  $s=1$  (cancellation)

$\Rightarrow$  largest real singularity is at  $s = \theta - \epsilon$ .

•  $\zeta(s)$  has zeros with real part larger than  $\theta - \epsilon$  (by def'n of  $\theta$ )

so the RHS has singularities to the right of  $\theta - \epsilon$ .

By Landau's theorem,  $\psi(x) - x - x^{\theta-\epsilon} > 0$  infinitely often. (proves  $\Omega_+$ )

Similarly, looking at  $\psi(x) - x + x^{\theta-\epsilon}$  establishes the  $\Omega_-$  part. //

Similarly, one can show

$$s \int_2^{\infty} \text{li}(x) x^{-s-1} dx = -\log(s-1) + r(s)$$

where  $r(s)$  is entire; and then

$$\int_2^{\infty} (x^{\theta-\epsilon} - (\psi(x) - \text{li}(x))) x^{-s-1} dx$$

$$= \frac{1}{s-\theta+\epsilon} - \frac{1}{s} \log(\zeta(s)(s-1)) + \frac{r(s)}{s}$$

and examine singularities ...

Recall:  $\theta(x) = \psi(x) - x^{\frac{1}{2}} + O(x^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp(-c\sqrt{x}))$

$$\pi(x) = \psi(x) - \frac{x^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\log x} + O\left(\frac{x^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\log^2 x}\right)$$

So: if  $\theta > \frac{1}{2}$ , then  $\theta(x) - x = \Omega_+(x^{\theta-\epsilon})$

$\pi(x) - \text{li}(x) = \text{some } \Omega_+$

- If  $\theta = \frac{1}{2}$ , then we only know  

$$\theta(x) - x = \Omega_-(x^{\theta - \epsilon})$$

$$\pi(x) - li(x) = \text{some } \Omega_-.$$

Theorem 15.3: Suppose  $\rho(p) = 0$   
 with  $\text{Re } p = \theta$ . ("Supremum is  
 Attained, SA). Then

$$\limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\psi(x) - x}{x^\theta} \geq \frac{1}{|\rho|}.$$

$$\liminf_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\psi(x) - x}{x^\theta} \leq -\frac{1}{|\rho|}.$$

In particular, unconditionally

$$\psi(x) - x = \Omega_\pm(\sqrt{x})$$

$$II(x) - li(x) = \Omega_\pm\left(\frac{\sqrt{x}}{\log x}\right).$$

But only  $\Omega$  for  $\theta(x) - x$  and  $\pi(x) - li(x)$ .

Littlewood (1918):

$$\psi(x) - x = \Omega_\pm(\sqrt{x} \log \log \log x).$$

$$II(x) - li(x) = \Omega_\pm\left(\sqrt{x} \frac{\log \log \log x}{\log x}\right).$$

↓

$$\theta(x) - x = \Omega_\pm(\sqrt{x} \log \log \log x)$$

$$\pi(x) - li(x) = \Omega_\pm\left(\sqrt{x} \frac{\log \log \log x}{\log x}\right)$$

In particular,

$\pi(x) > li(x)$  infinitely often.

Montgomery's Conjecture:

right maximal order  
 of  $\psi(x) - x$  should be  $\sqrt{x} (\log \log x)^2$   
 $\left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} \right)$

[Added after class]

We can use the same techniques to get oscillation theorems for things like

$$\textcircled{1} \quad \Psi(x; q, a) - \frac{x}{\phi(q)} \\ - \frac{1}{\phi(q)} \sum_{\chi \pmod{q}} \bar{\chi}(a) \sum_{L(p, \chi)=0} \frac{\chi^p}{p} + \text{small}$$

or  $\Psi(x; q, a) - \Psi(x; q, b)$

$$\textcircled{2} = \frac{1}{\phi(q)} \sum_{\chi \pmod{q}} (\bar{\chi}(b) - \bar{\chi}(a)) \sum_p \frac{\chi^p}{p} + \text{small}$$

Notice  $\textcircled{1}$  depends on the poles of

$$\sum_x \bar{\chi}(a) \frac{L'(s, \chi)}{L(s, \chi)} \quad \text{and } \textcircled{2} \text{ depends on}$$

the zeros of  $\sum_x (\bar{\chi}(a) - \bar{\chi}(b)) \frac{L'(s, \chi)}{L(s, \chi)}$  ;

both sets of zeros are subsets of the set of zeros of

$$\prod L(s, \chi), \text{ but these might } \chi \pmod{q}$$

be cancellation in  $\textcircled{2}$  (when  $\chi(a) = \chi(b)$ ) or  $\textcircled{1}/\textcircled{2}$  (when two  $L(s, \chi)$  share a zero).

So " $\textcircled{1}$ " could depend on  $a$  and/or  $b$  in principle.