Mean values of long Dirichlet polynomials

Winston Heap

э

・ロト ・ 日 ・ ・ ヨ ・ ・ ヨ ・ ・

General mean values

We are interested in mean values of Dirichlet polynomials

$$\sum_{n\leqslant N}a(n)n^{-it}.$$

Primarily, since they approximate *L*-functions in regions where their Dirichlet series do not converge.

Typically, the length of the sum N will depend on the height t. For instance, given large t ∈ [T, 2T]

$$\zeta(\frac{1}{2}+it)^k \approx \sum_{n \leqslant T^{k/2}} d_k(n) n^{-1/2-it},$$
$$\log \zeta(\frac{1}{2}+it) \approx \sum_{p \leqslant T^{\epsilon}} p^{-1/2-it}.$$

(I) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1)) < ((1))

• We consider the mean value

$$\int_{T}^{2T} \left| \sum_{n \leqslant N} a(n) n^{-it} \right|^2 dt$$

for large *T*, general coefficients $a(n) \ll n^{\epsilon}$ and *N* dependent on *T*.

Montgomery–Vaughan mean value theorem:

$$\int_{T}^{2T} \left| \sum_{n \leq N} a(n) n^{-it} \right|^2 dt = (T + O(N)) \sum_{n \leq N} |a(n)|^2$$

So if N = o(T) we get an asymptotic formula. In a lot of cases, actually expect $\sim cT \sum |a(n)|^2$, even for *N* much larger than *T*.

• Terminology: If

 $N \ll T$ "Short Dirichlet polynomial" $N \gg T$ "Long Dirichlet polynomial".

• To see what's needed for long polys let's compute:

$$\int_{T}^{2T} \left| \sum_{n \leq N} a(n) n^{-it} \right|^{2} dt$$

= $\sum_{m,n \leq N} a(m) \overline{a(n)} \int_{T}^{2T} (m/n)^{-it} dt$
= $T \sum_{n \leq N} |a(n)|^{2} + \sum_{\substack{m \neq n \\ m,n \leq N}} a(m) \overline{a(n)} \frac{(m/n)^{-it}}{-i \log(m/n)} \Big|_{T}^{2T}$

• Worst case m = n + 1 and $n \approx N$ then

$$\log(m/n) = \log(1+\frac{1}{n}) \approx \frac{1}{N}.$$

Can give a large contribution, a lot of care is needed.

・ロット (母) ・ ヨ) ・ ヨ)

• To understand long Dirichlet polynomials we need precision in off-diagonals $m - n = h \neq 0$. In turn requires understanding the correlation sums

$$\sum_{n\leqslant x}a(n)\overline{a(n+h)}.$$

Typically need full asymptotic formula with power saving in error term.

• For example, when $a(n) = d_k(n)$ and k = 2 these are reasonably well understood:

$$\sum_{n \leqslant x} d(n)d(n+h) = c_2(h)x(\log x)^2 + c_1(h)x\log x + c_0(h)x + O_h(x^{\theta+\epsilon}).$$

Ingham, Estermann, Heath-Brown ($\theta = 5/6$ uniformly in $h \ll x^{5/6}$ via Weil's bound), then using spectral theory for sums of Kloosterman sums: Deshouillers–lwaniec ($\theta = 2/3$ and fixed $h \ge 1$), Kusnetsov, Motohashi ($\theta = 2/3$ with uniformity in *h*).

・ロト ・回ト ・ヨト ・ヨト … ヨ

• Divisor functions with $k \ge 3$ are more mysterious. It is conjectured that

$$\sum_{n\leqslant x} d_k(n)d_k(n+h) = x P_{k,h}(\log x) + O_{k,h}(x^{\theta})$$

for some polynomial $P_{k,h}(y)$ of degree 2(k-1) and $\theta < 1$.

• For sixth moment of the Riemann zeta function would be applying asymptotic with $x = T^{3/2}$ and $|h| \leq T^{1/2}$. Error term in divisor problem translates, pretty much, directly into error term for moment problem. So in order for the error term of the sixth moment to be $\ll T$, we would require

$$\theta \leqslant 2/3$$

uniformly in such *h*.

• For eighth moment would have $x = T^2$ so would require squareroot cancellation $\theta = 1/2$. For higher moments one requires cancellation *amongst* the error terms when averaged over *h*.

 When a(n) is indicator function of the primes, or rather a(n) = Λ(n), this is part of the famous Hardy–Littlewood k-tuples conjecture. In a strong form this predicts

$$\sum_{n \leqslant x} \Lambda(n) \Lambda(n+h) = \mathfrak{G}(h) x + O_h(x^{1/2+\epsilon})$$

for some constant $\mathfrak{G}(h)$.

 We examine two applications/occurrences of this conjecture in zeta function theory.

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト

Prime Dirichlet polynomials I: Pair correlation of zeros

 Want to understand interactions between nearby zeros at some large height T. So consider

$$\sum_{\mathbf{0} \leqslant \gamma, \gamma' \leqslant T} f\Big(\frac{\gamma - \gamma'}{2\pi/\log T}\Big)$$

for some *f* concentrated around 0.

Unfolding the inverse Fourier transform this is

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \widehat{f}(\alpha) \sum_{0 \leqslant \gamma, \gamma' \leqslant T} T^{i\alpha(\gamma - \gamma')} d\alpha.$$

Inner sums are now separable, but a little too erratic. Also, applying explicit formula will give pointwise problem on Dirichlet polynomials - not much better. Idea: Can smooth sum and make it a mean value at the same time by introducing some averaging.

(D) < ((()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) < (()) <

 Since f is concentrated can introduce extra (less concentrated) factor at little cost:

$$\sum_{\mathbf{0}\leqslant\gamma,\gamma'\leqslant T} f\Big(\frac{\gamma-\gamma'}{2\pi/\log T}\Big) w(\gamma-\gamma')$$

where $w(u) = 4/(4 + u^2)$.

• Then inner sum is

$$\sum_{0 \leq \gamma, \gamma' \leq T} T^{i\alpha(\gamma - \gamma')} w(\gamma - \gamma') = \frac{2}{\pi} \int_0^T \left| \sum_{\gamma} \frac{T^{i\alpha\gamma}}{1 + (\gamma - t)^2} \right|^2 dt + \cdots$$

since $w(u) = \frac{2}{\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1+t^2} \frac{1}{1+(u-t)^2} dt$. So we have a smoothed, averaged sum now on the right.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □

• Apply explicit formula: for $y \ge 1$,

$$\sum_{\gamma} \frac{y^{i\gamma}}{1 + (\gamma - t)^2} \approx -y^{-1/2 + it} \sum_{y \leqslant n \leqslant 2y} \Lambda(n) n^{-it} + \frac{y^{1/2}}{1 + t^2} + \frac{\log(2 + |t|)}{y^{1 - it}}$$

• With $y = T^{\alpha}$, applying MV the mean square of first term is

$$\frac{1}{T^{\alpha}} \int_{0}^{T} \Big| \sum_{n \asymp T^{\alpha}} \Lambda(n) n^{-it} \Big|^{2} dt = \frac{1}{T^{\alpha}} (T + O(T^{\alpha})) \sum_{n \asymp T^{\alpha}} \Lambda(n)^{2}$$
$$\sim \alpha T \log T$$

provided $0 < \alpha < 1$. Note we are only using short sum information here.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆ □▶ ◆ □▶ ● □ ● ● ●

In this way, Montgomery showed that the normalised function

$$F(\alpha) := \frac{2\pi}{T \log T} \sum_{0 \leqslant \gamma, \gamma' \leqslant T} T^{i\alpha(\gamma - \gamma')} w(\gamma - \gamma')$$

satisfies

$$F(\alpha) \sim \alpha + T^{-2\alpha} \log T$$

for $0 < \alpha < 1$. Also, more trivially *F* is even so we understand $F(\alpha)$ for $-1 < \alpha < 1$.

Returning to the original sum:

$$\sum_{0 \leqslant \gamma, \gamma' \leqslant T} f\left(\frac{\gamma - \gamma'}{2\pi/\log T}\right) = \frac{T}{2\pi} \log T \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \widehat{f}(\alpha) F(\alpha) d\alpha + \cdots$$

So can understand the right hand side provided supp $\hat{f} \subset [-1, 1]$.

• To understand local properties of zeros we would like to take *f* as concentrated as possible. But then \hat{f} gets wider so it is desirable to understand $F(\alpha)$ outside the range [-1, 1].

・ロット (母) ・ ヨ) ・ ヨ)

• For this we need to understand mean values of longer Dirichlet polynomials. Assuming the Hardy–Littlewood conjecture

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) \Lambda(n+h) = \mathfrak{G}(h) x + O_h(x^{1/2+\epsilon})$$

Montgomery showed that

 $F(\alpha) \sim 1$

for $1 \leq \alpha \leq 2 - \epsilon$ and conjectured that this remains true for larger α .

- For larger α the error terms in the HL conjecture would probably have to exhibit cancellation amongst themselves when averaged over h, similarly to the higher moments of the zeta function.
- In any case, Montgomery's conjecture implies all sorts of nice consequences for zeros.

• Pair correlation function and connection with random matrix theory:

$$\frac{2\pi}{T\log T}\sum_{\substack{\frac{2\pi a}{\log T}\leqslant \gamma-\gamma'\leqslant \frac{2\pi b}{\log T}}}1\sim \int_a^b \Big(1-\Big(\frac{\sin\pi u}{\pi u}\Big)^2\Big)du$$

• There exist arbitrarily small normalised gaps between zeros:

$$\liminf_{\gamma \to \infty} \frac{\gamma^+ - \gamma}{2\pi/\log \gamma} = 0$$

In a quantitative form this implies no Siegel zeros.

Almost all zeros are simple.

Prime Dirichlet polynomials II: Value distribution of $\log \zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it)$

• Selberg's Central Limit Theorem: for fixed $V \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\Phi(V) := \frac{1}{T} \mu \left(t \in [T, 2T] : \frac{\log |\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it)|}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \log \log T}} \geqslant V \right) \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_V^\infty e^{-x^2/2} dx$$

as $T \to \infty$ where μ denotes Lebesgue measure. So the zeta function is as large as $\exp(c\sqrt{\log \log T})$ and as small as $\exp(-c\sqrt{\log \log T})$ a positive proportion of the time.

• For the 2*k*th moment $\int_{T}^{2T} |\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it)|^{2k} dt$ it is values of size

$$(\log T)^k = \exp(k \log \log T)$$

that dominate, so of interest to understand CLT for large V ($\approx k \sqrt{\log \log T}$).

 Soundararajan (2009) gave large deviation bounds on the Riemann hypothesis:

$$\Phi(V) \ll \exp(-(1-\epsilon)V^2/2)$$

for $V \ll \sqrt{\log \log T} \log_3 T$. This allowed for near sharp bounds on the 2*k*th moment of the zeta function:

$$\int_T^{2T} |\zeta(\tfrac{1}{2}+it)|^{2k} dt \ll T(\log T)^{k^2+\epsilon}.$$

• It is of interest to push these large deviations are far as possible since the global maximum of the zeta function is unknown. It is conjectured to be around $\exp(\sqrt{\log T} \log \log T)$, which gives a huge range for which we don't know the distribution:

$$\sqrt{\log\log T}\log_3 T \ll V \ll \sqrt{\log T}$$

Main tool for central limit theorem: The explicit formula

$$\log \zeta(\frac{1}{2}+it) = \sum_{p \leqslant X} \frac{1}{p^{1/2+it}} - \sum_{\rho} \int_{1/2}^{\infty} \frac{X^{\rho-\sigma-it}}{\rho-\sigma-it} d\sigma + \cdots$$

for large X.

- In the sum over zeros $X^{\rho-\sigma-it} \ll X^{1/2-\sigma} \ll 1$ on RH, and singularities are logarithmic so can be integrated *dt*.
- Sum is localised over zeros ρ with imaginary part within distance 1/log X of t. This gives around log t/log X terms on average. So on average we have

$$\log \zeta(\frac{1}{2}+it) = \sum_{p \leqslant X} \frac{1}{p^{1/2+it}} + O\left(\frac{\log t}{\log X}\right).$$

• Note we can choose $X = T^{\epsilon}$ to give a short sum plus a bounded error.

• In particular, for 2*k*th moment choose $X = T^{1/k}$ so that sum over primes is short. Then

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_{T}^{2T} |\log \zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it)|^{2k} dt = \frac{1}{T} \int_{T}^{2T} \left| \sum_{p \leqslant X} \frac{1}{p^{1/2 + it}} \right|^{2k} dt + \cdots$$
$$\sim \sum_{\substack{p_{1} \cdots p_{k} = p_{k+1} \cdots p_{2k} \\ p_{j} \leqslant X}} \frac{1}{(p_{1} \cdots p_{2k})^{1/2}}$$
$$= k! \left(\sum_{p \leqslant X} \frac{1}{p} \right)^{k} + \cdots$$
$$= k! (\log \log T)^{k} + \cdots$$

i.e. (Complex) Gaussian.

- So p^{-it} look like independent random variables on unit circle.
- Shortness of polynomials limits large deviation results. Would be nice to be able to compute long polynomials but don't have access to the correlation sums/Hardy–Littlewood k-tuples conjecture.

Mean values of longer Dirichlet polynomials

 In special cases can compute mean values of long Dirichlet polynomials over primes assuming RH. Makes use of weights. Need

• $\phi_X : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ bounded and of compact support in [0, X].

• The Mellin transform $\widehat{\phi}_X(s) = \int_0^\infty \phi_X(u) u^{s-1} du$ satisfies

$$\widehat{\phi}_X(s) \ll \frac{X^{\Re(s)}}{|s|^2}$$

for fixed $\Re(s)$ as $\Im(s) \to \infty$.

For fixed $\Re(s) > 0$, we have

$$rac{1}{\log X} \widehat{\phi}_X(s/\log X) \ll rac{1}{1+\Im(s)^2}.$$

Satisfied by the pair

$$\phi(u) = \mathbbm{1}_{0 < u \leqslant X} \cdot (1 - \frac{\log u}{\log X}), \qquad \widehat{\phi}_X(s) = X^s / (s^2 \log X).$$

But unfortunately not by $\phi_X(u) = \mathbb{1}_{0 < u \leq X}$ and its transform $\widehat{\phi}_X(s) = X^s/s$.

Theorem

Assume the Riemann hypothesis and let ϕ_X be as above. Then for $X \leq T^4$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_{T}^{2T} \left| \sum_{p \leqslant X} \frac{\phi_X(p)}{p^{1/2 + it}} \right|^{2k} dt = k! \left(\sum_{p \leqslant X} \frac{\phi_X(p)^2}{p} \right)^k + O((ck)^{5k} (\log \log T)^{k-1/2})$$

and

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_{T}^{2T} \left(\mathfrak{F} \sum_{p \leqslant X} \frac{\phi_X(p)}{p^{1/2 + it}} \right)^{2k} dt = c_k \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{p \leqslant X} \frac{\phi_X(p)^2}{p} \right)^k + O((ck)^{5k} (\log \log T)^{k - 1/2})$$

where \mathfrak{F} denotes either the real or imaginary part and

$$m{c}_k = egin{cases} rac{(2k)!}{2^k k!} & 2k ext{ is even,} \ 0 & 2k ext{ is odd.} \end{cases}$$

Rough idea: Recall that on average we have

$$\log \zeta(\frac{1}{2}+it) = \sum_{p \leqslant X} \frac{1}{p^{1/2+it}} + O\left(\frac{\log t}{\log X}\right).$$

One can check the zero sum is not very sensitive to long or short *X* - so this should hold regardless of whether $X \gg T$ or not.

• So take short $Y = T^{1/k}$ and compare the above at X and Y to give

$$\sum_{p \leqslant X} \frac{1}{p^{1/2+it}} = \sum_{p \leqslant Y} \frac{1}{p^{1/2+it}} + O\left(\frac{\log t}{\log Y}\right)$$

on average i.e. we can replace a long poly with a short one on average.

 In practice is best to avoid zeros entirely, so we use a contour integral and shift very close to the half-line, but not past it.

Proof sketch: Work with the weight

$$\phi_X(u) = \mathbb{1}_{0 < u \leq X} \cdot (1 - \frac{\log u}{\log X}), \qquad \widehat{\phi}_X(s) = X^s / (s^2 \log X).$$

Can accept errors of O(1) throughout.

By Mellin inversion and RH

$$\sum_{p \leqslant X} \frac{\phi_X(p)}{p^{1/2+it}} = \frac{1}{2\pi i \log X} \int_{1-i\infty}^{1+i\infty} \log \zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it + s) X^s \frac{ds}{s^2}$$
$$= \frac{1}{2\pi i \log X} \int_{1/\log X - i\infty}^{1/\log X + i\infty} \log \zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it + s) X^s \frac{ds}{s^2} + O\left(\frac{X^{1/2}}{t^2}\right).$$

- So for $X \leq T^4$ the contribution from the pole can be ignored since $t \in [T, 2T]$. Note smoothings with more transform decay can allow for larger *X*.
- Then truncate integral at height ℑ(s) = ±1. Logarithm of zeta is ≪ log t and we have factor of 1/log X out front, so negligible contribution.

Then after substitution and cleaning up

$$\sum_{p\leqslant X}\frac{\phi_X(p)}{p^{1/2+it}}\sim \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\log X}^{\log X}\log\zeta(\sigma_0+it+\frac{iy}{\log X})e^{1+iy}\frac{dy}{(1+iy)^2}.$$

with $\sigma_0 = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\log X}$.

• Raising to absolute 2*k*th power and integrating with respect to *t* we need to compute correlations

$$\int_{\tau}^{2\tau} \prod_{j=1}^{k} \log \zeta(\sigma_0 + it + i\tilde{y}_j) \prod_{j=k+1}^{2k} \log \zeta(\sigma_0 - it - i\tilde{y}_j) dt$$

for small shifts \tilde{y}_j satisfying $|\tilde{y}_j| \leq 1$.

Now input short sum mean approximation

$$\log \zeta(\sigma_0 + it + i\tilde{y}_j) = \sum_{p \leqslant Y} \frac{1}{p^{\sigma_0 + it + i\tilde{y}_j}} + O(1)$$

with $Y = T^{1/k}$, say.

・ロン ・回 と ・ ヨ と ・ ヨ

Short polynomials and so diagonals give major contribution. Correlation integral is given by

$$\sum_{\substack{p_1\cdots p_k=p_{k+1}\cdots p_{2k}\\p_j \leqslant Y}} \frac{\prod_{j=1}^k p_j^{-i\tilde{y}_j} \cdot \prod_{j=k+1}^{2k} p_j^{i\tilde{y}_j}}{(p_1\cdots p_{2k})^{\sigma_0}}$$

• Mellin integrals over y_j are separable so can compute to give result:

$$\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\log X}^{\log X} p^{-1/\log X-iy/\log X}e^{1+iy}\frac{dy}{(1+iy)^2}\sim \phi_X(p)$$

so the sum is

$$\sim k! \left(\sum_{\boldsymbol{p}\leqslant Y} \frac{\phi_X(\boldsymbol{p})^2}{\boldsymbol{p}}\right)^k$$

・ロン ・回 と ・ ヨン・

э

Smoothing very helpful here. With brutal cut-off 1_{n≤X} and its transform X^s/s we would have difficulty truncating. Also, mean O(1) error term in prime sum approximation would cause blow ups:

$$\int_{-\log X}^{\log X} O(1) \cdot e^{1+iy} \frac{dy}{1+iy} \ll \log \log X$$

・ロット (母) ・ ヨ) ・ ヨ)

Large deviations

- Unfortunately doesn't give new large deviations results for log ζ haven't input any new information! Nevertheless, can still get large deviations for the polynomials.
- The *O*(1) error term in prime sum approximation leads to poor dependency on *k* in error terms:

$$O((ck)^{5k}(\log \log T)^{k-1/2}).$$

Not so useful for large deviations.

 Can use more efficient methods to get these. For the real part, we try to apply Soundararajan's upper bound

$$\log |\zeta(\frac{1}{2}+it)| \leq \Re \sum_{p \leq Y} \frac{1}{p^{1/2+it}} + \frac{\log t}{\log Y}.$$

more directly.

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト

• First modify $\widehat{\phi}_X(s)$ so that $\widehat{\phi}_X(iy)$ is positive. E.g.

$$\begin{split} \mathbb{1}_{n \leq X} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{\log n}{\log X}\right) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i \log X} \int_{c - i\infty}^{c + i\infty} \left(\frac{X}{n}\right)^s \frac{ds}{s^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i \log X} \int_{c - i\infty}^{c + i\infty} \left[\left(\frac{X}{n}\right)^s - \frac{2}{n^s} + \frac{X^{-s}}{n^s} \right] \frac{ds}{s^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i \log X} \int_{c - i\infty}^{c + i\infty} \frac{1}{n^s} \sin^2(\frac{1}{2i}s \log X) \frac{ds}{s^2}. \end{split}$$

● Then perform same argument as before shifting to ℜ(s) = 0:

$$\sum_{p \leqslant X} \frac{\phi_X(p)}{p^{1/2+it}} \sim \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\log X}^{\log X} \log \zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it + \frac{iy}{\log X}) \frac{\sin^2(\frac{1}{2}y)}{y^2} dy.$$

 Take real parts, input upper bound and analyse the tails of each component individually following Soundararajan's argument fairly closely. Extra integral over y can be dealt with easily via Hölder's inequality.

Theorem

Assume the Riemann hypothesis. Let ϕ_X be as above and let $X \leq T^4$. Then

$$\frac{1}{T}\mu\bigg(t\in[T,2T]:\frac{\Re\sum_{p\leqslant X}\phi_X(p)p^{-1/2-it}}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}\log\log T}}\geqslant V\bigg)$$
$$\ll \exp(-(1-\epsilon)V^2/2) + \exp(-CV\sqrt{\log\log T}\log V).$$

- In the range $V \ll \sqrt{\log_2 T} \log_3 T$ have Gaussian bounds results of this quality were previously restricted to $X \leqslant T^{1/\sqrt{\log \log T}}$.
- In the full range of *V* have $e^{-cV \log V}$ previously only available for $X \leq (\log T)^{\theta}$ with $\theta \leq 2$.
- Restricted to positive values of real part. Similar result holds for imaginary part but with no restriction on positive values.

Other polynomials

- Rough principal: Express *long* Dirichlet polynomial as contour integral in efficient way. Approximate log *ζ* by *short* Dirichlet polynomial and then compute.
- Can apply this to other long polynomials. Consider

$$\sum_{p \leqslant X} \frac{\phi_X(p) \log p}{p^{1/2 + it}}$$

which approximates $\frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(\frac{1}{2}+it)$.

• Look at mean square. Expect this to be

$$\approx \sum_{p \leqslant X} \frac{\log^2 p}{p} \asymp (\log T)^2.$$

イロト イポト イヨト イヨト

Theorem

Assume the Riemann hypothesis. Suppose $X \leq T^4$ and let $\theta = \frac{\log X}{\log T}$. Then

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_{T}^{2T} \left| \sum_{p \leqslant X} \frac{\phi_X(p) \log p}{p^{1/2 + it}} \right|^2 dt \sim \sum_{p \leqslant \min(T, X)} \frac{\phi_X(p)^2 (\log p)^2}{p} + \mathbb{1}_{X \geqslant T} \cdot (\log T)^2 \int_{1}^{\theta} F(\alpha) \phi_X(e^{\alpha/\theta})^2 d\alpha$$

- First term is diagonal contribution and second term represents off-diagonal contribution.
- Montgomery's conjecture F(α) ~ 1 gives asymptotic ~ c(log T)²
- Without this we make use of average results: ∫_b^{b+1} F(α)dα ≍ 1 to give the order ≍ (log T)².

・ロト ・回ト ・ヨト ・ヨト … ヨ

Similar contour integral argument then integration by parts gives

$$\sum_{p \leqslant X} \frac{\phi_X(p) \log p}{p^{1/2+it}} \sim \frac{1}{2\pi i \log X} \int_{1/\log X - i \log X}^{1/\log X + i \log X} \log \zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it + s) \frac{d}{ds} \left[\frac{X^s}{s^2} \right] ds.$$

- Derivative adds extra factor of log X and we're looking for ~ c(log T)². So O(1) term in approximation log ζ = ∑_p +O(1) would lead to O((log X)²) not sufficient.
- Need very sharp estimates for correlation integrals.
- Using extra contour integral argument can restrict to imaginary part of log and then only need to consider

$$\int_{T}^{2T} S(t+y_1)S(t+y_2)dt$$

where $S(t) = \frac{1}{\pi} \Im \log \zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it)$ for $|y_j| \ll \log T$.

Very precise result of Goldston (1987) gives lower order terms in

$$\int_{T}^{2T} S(t)^2 dt.$$

- These lower order terms involve Montgomery's function $F(\alpha)$.
- Using Goldston's arguments for precise estimates of mean square of S(t), we can get precise estimates for our correlation integral to give the result.

Thanks!

◆□→ ◆□→ ◆注→ ◆注→ ○注