#### 18.785: Analytic Number Theory, MIT, spring 2007 (K.S. Kedlaya) Error bounds in the prime number theorem

In this unit, we introduce (without proof for now) a formula which relates the distribution of primes to the zeroes of the Riemann zeta function. Given a suitable zero-free region for  $\zeta(s)$  in the critical strip, this can be used to prove the prime number theorem with an estimate for the error term.

## 1 Zeta zeroes and prime numbers

For  $x \notin \mathbb{N}$ , define the counting function

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

where  $\Lambda:\mathbb{N}\to\mathbb{R}$  is the von Mangoldt function

$$\Lambda(n) = \begin{cases} \log p & n = p^a, a \ge 1\\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

If  $x \in \mathbb{N}$ , it is convenient to modify the definition to

$$\psi(x) = \sum_{n < x} \Lambda(n) + \frac{1}{2} \Lambda(x).$$

Note that for the function  $\vartheta$  we defined earlier as

$$\vartheta(x) = \sum_{p \le x} \log p,$$

we have

$$\psi(x) - \vartheta(x) = O(x^{1/2} \log x) \qquad (x \to \infty)$$

so the prime number theorem is equivalent to

$$\psi(x) \sim x \qquad (x \to \infty).$$

The formula of von Mangoldt expresses the difference  $\psi(x) - x$  in terms of the zeroes of  $\zeta(s)$ . We will prove this formula in a later unit.

**Theorem 1** (von Mangoldt's formula). For  $x \ge 2$  and T > 0,

$$\psi(x) - x = -\sum_{\rho:|\operatorname{Im}(\rho)| < T} \frac{x^{\rho}}{\rho} - \frac{\zeta'(0)}{\zeta(0)} - \frac{1}{2}\log(1 - x^{-2}) + R(x, T)$$

with  $\rho$  running over the zeroes of  $\zeta(s)$  in the region  $\operatorname{Re}(s) \in [0,1]$ , and

$$R(x,T) = O\left(\frac{x\log^2(xT)}{T} + (\log x)\min\left\{1,\frac{x}{T\langle x\rangle}\right\}\right).$$

Here  $\langle x \rangle$  denotes the distance from x to the nearest prime power other than possibly x itself.

The region  $\operatorname{Re}(s) \in [0,1]$  is called the *critical strip* for  $\zeta$ , because we can account for all of the zeroes outside this strip: they are the trivial zeroes  $s = -2, -4, \ldots$  forced by the functional equation and the fact that  $\Gamma(s/2)$  has poles at nonpositive even integers. In fact, the last term in the formula is merely  $-\sum_{\rho} \frac{x^{\rho}}{\rho}$  for  $\rho$  running over the trivial zeroes. Incidentally, one can check by a numerical calculation that there are no real zeroes of  $\zeta$ 

Incidentally, one can check by a numerical calculation that there are no real zeroes of  $\zeta$  in the critical strip, by numerically approximating the integral representation of  $\xi(s)$ . This raises an interesting point: in general, direct numerical approximation can be used to prove that an analytic function does not vanish in a region, but not that it does vanish at a particular point. The best one can do is use a zero-counting formula to prove that there must be a zero near the proposed vanishing point.

Note that for x fixed, R(x,T) = o(1) as  $T \to \infty$ , so we have

$$\psi(x) - x = -\sum_{\rho} \frac{x^{\rho}}{\rho} - \frac{\zeta'(0)}{\zeta(0)} - \frac{1}{2}\log(1 - x^{-2})$$

as long as we interpret the sum over  $\rho$  to mean the limit of the partial sums over  $|\operatorname{Im}(\rho)| < T$ as  $T \to \infty$ . This formula, while pretty, is not as useful in practice as the form with remainder; we will use the remainder form by taking T to be some (preferably large) function of x as  $x \to \infty$ .

### 2 How to use von Mangoldt's formula

In order to use von Mangoldt's formula to bound  $\psi(x) - x$ , we need to give an upper bound on the sum  $\sum_{\rho} x^{\rho} / \rho$  for  $\rho$  running over nontrivial zeroes of  $\zeta$  in the region  $|\operatorname{Im}(s)| \leq T$ .

Put  $\beta = \operatorname{Re}(\rho), \gamma = \operatorname{Im}(\rho)$ . Suppose we can prove that  $\beta < 1 - f(|\gamma|)$  for some nonincreasing function  $f : [0, \infty) \to (0, 1/2)$ ; then

$$|x^{\rho}| = x^{\beta} < x^{1 - f(|\gamma|)} < x^{1 - f(T)}$$

and  $|\rho| \ge |\gamma|$ . We thus have

$$\left| \sum_{\rho: |\gamma| < T} \frac{x^{\rho}}{\rho} \right| \le x^{1 - f(T)} \sum_{\rho: |\gamma| < T} \frac{1}{\gamma}.$$

Let N(T) be the number of zeroes in the critical strip with  $|\gamma| \leq T$ . Then

$$\sum_{\rho:0<|\gamma|< T} \frac{1}{\gamma} = \int_0^T t^{-1} dN(t) = \frac{N(T)}{T} + \int_0^T t^{-2} N(t) \, dt.$$

At this point we need some information about N(T); again, we will prove this (and a bit more) later.

**Theorem 2** (Hadamard). We have  $N(T) = O(T \log T)$  as  $T \to \infty$ .

This implies that

$$\left| \sum_{\rho:|\gamma| < T} \frac{1}{\gamma} \right| = O(\log^2 T),$$

SO

$$\left| \sum_{\rho: |\gamma| < T} \frac{x^{\rho}}{\rho} \right| = O(x^{1 - f(T)} \log^2 T).$$

For x an integer, we now take T = T(x) to be a suitable function of x, and invoke von Mangoldt's formula with remainder to deduce that

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

# 3 The Riemann Hypothesis

Riemann calculated a few of the zeroes of  $\zeta$  and, based on this evidence, made the following remarkable conjecture (whose resolution is worth \$1,000,000 from the Clay Mathematics Institute).

**Conjecture 3** (Riemann Hypothesis). The nontrivial zeroes of  $\zeta$  all lie on the line  $\operatorname{Re}(s) = \frac{1}{2}$ .

This is a best-case scenario in terms of deducing error bounds on  $\psi(x) - x$ . Namely, suppose every nontrivial zero  $\rho$  of  $\zeta$  satisfies  $c \leq \operatorname{Re}(\rho) \leq 1 - c$  for some  $c \in (0, 1/2)$ ; then we can take f(T) = c in (1), yielding

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

By taking T(x) = x, we obtain

$$\psi(x) - x = O(x^{1-c}\log^2 x).$$

If I can take c to be any value less than 1/2, that means

$$\psi(x) - x = O(x^{1/2 + \epsilon}) \qquad (\epsilon > 0),$$

and similarly one gets a strong estimate on  $\pi(x)$  (see exercises).

Unfortunately, for *no* value of c > 0 are we able at present to prove that every nontrivial zero  $\rho$  satisfies  $\operatorname{Re}(\rho) \leq 1 - c$ . We will give a much smaller zero-free region in a later unit.

# 4 Variants for *L*-functions

For  $\chi$  a Dirichlet character, define

$$\psi(x,\chi) = \sum_{n \le x} \chi(n) \Lambda(n),$$

where again we multiply the n = x term by 1/2 if it is present.

**Theorem 4.** For  $\chi$  a nonprincipal Dirichlet character of level N,

$$\psi(x,\chi) = -\sum_{\rho:|\gamma| < T} \frac{x^{\rho}}{\rho} - (1-a)\log x - b(\chi) + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{x^{a-2m}}{2m-a} + R(x,T),$$

where  $b(\chi)$  is an explicit constant, a = 1 for  $\chi$  even and a = 0 for  $\chi$  odd, and

$$R(x,T) = O\left(\frac{x\log^2(NxT)}{T} + (\log x)\min\left\{1,\frac{x}{T\langle x\rangle}\right\}\right).$$

For a fixed N, one can use this formula together with a zero-free region for all of the  $L(s, \chi)$  with  $\chi$  of level N, to obtain a prime number theorem for arithmetic progressions of difference N with an estimate for the error term.

However, one would also like to be able to establish a prime number theorem with error term for arithmetic progressions where the difference is allowed to vary. In this case, one of course must have a zero-free region for all of the relevant characters. But there are two extra complications.

- One must understand how the constant  $b(\chi)$  varies with  $\chi$ .
- One must deal with possible roots of  $L(s, \chi)$  that are very close to s = 0 or s = 1 (so-called *Siegel zeroes*).

Dealing with these goes beyond the level of detail I have in mind for this course; see Davenport  $\S14-22$  for a systematic exposition.

### Exercises

1. Assume that  $\psi(x) = x + o(x^{1-\epsilon})$  for some given  $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$ . Deduce a corresponding upper bound for  $\pi(x) - \operatorname{li}(x)$ , where  $\operatorname{li}(x)$  is the logarithmic integral function

$$\operatorname{li}(x) = \int_2^x \frac{dt}{\log t}$$

Then deduce that

$$\pi(x) - \frac{x}{\log x} \neq o(x^{1-\delta})$$

for any  $\delta > 0$ . (This last statement can be proved unconditionally, but don't worry about that for now.) This is the sense in which li(x) is a better approximation than  $x/(\log x)$  of the count of primes.