

You have already seen the main steps of Merten-Newman proof of Prime Number Theorem in your HW assignments. Since it is an important result, I would like to quickly go over its proof again.

$\zeta(s) \neq 0$ if $\text{Re}(s) \geq 0$

• If $\zeta(1+it_0) = 0$, then $|\zeta(\sigma+it_0)| \ll |\sigma-1|$. (for $1 < \sigma < 2$)

$$[\zeta \text{ is holomorphic at } 1+it_0 \Rightarrow \lim_{\sigma \rightarrow 1} \frac{\zeta(\sigma+it_0) - \zeta(1+it_0)}{\sigma-1} = \zeta'(1+it_0).]$$

• $\zeta(s) = \frac{1}{s-1} + \phi(s)$ where ϕ is holomorphic on $\text{Re}(s) > 0$.

$$\Rightarrow |\zeta(\sigma)| \ll \frac{1}{|\sigma-1|} \quad (\text{for } 1 < \sigma < 2)$$

• $|\zeta(\sigma+2it_0)| \ll 1$ as ζ is continuous on a neighborhood of $1+2it_0$.

$$\Rightarrow |\zeta(\sigma)^3 \zeta(\sigma+it_0)^4 \zeta(\sigma+2it_0)| \xrightarrow{\sigma \rightarrow 1^+} 0. \quad \textcircled{I}$$

• On the other hand,

$\ln |\zeta(s)| = \text{Re}(\ln \zeta(s))$ [Notice that the real part of a complex logarithmic function of a holomorphic function does NOT depend on the choice of the logarithmic function.]

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Re}(\ln \zeta(s)) &= \sum_p \text{Re}(-\ln(1 - \frac{1}{p^s})) \\ &= \sum_p \text{Re}\left(\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m p^{ms}}\right) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda(n) \text{Re}(n^{-s}) \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda(n) = \begin{cases} 1/m & \text{if } n=p^m \end{cases}$

$$\text{where } \lambda(n) = \begin{cases} 1 & n=1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\Rightarrow \ln |\zeta(\sigma)^3 \cdot \zeta(\sigma+it)^4 \cdot \zeta(\sigma+2it)| = 3 \operatorname{Re}(\ln \zeta(\sigma)) + 4 \operatorname{Re}(\ln \zeta(\sigma+it)) + \operatorname{Re}(\ln \zeta(\sigma+2it))$$

$$= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda(n) \left[3 \operatorname{Re}(n^{-\sigma}) + 4 \operatorname{Re}(n^{-\sigma-it}) + \operatorname{Re}(n^{-\sigma-2it}) \right]$$

$$\boxed{\operatorname{Re}(n^{-\sigma-it}) = n^{-\sigma} \cos[(\ln n)t]}$$

$$\downarrow = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\lambda(n)}{n^{\sigma}} \left[3 + 4 \cos((\ln n)t) + \underbrace{\cos(2(\ln n)t)}_{2 \cos^2((\ln n)t) - 1} \right]$$

$$= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{2 \lambda(n)}{n^{\sigma}} (\cos[(\ln n)t] + 1)^2$$

$$\text{In particular, } |\zeta(\sigma)|^3 |\zeta(\sigma+it)|^4 |\zeta(\sigma+2it)| \geq 1 \quad \textcircled{\text{II}}$$

for any $\sigma > 1$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

$\textcircled{\text{II}}$ clearly contradicts $\textcircled{\text{I}}$.

Logarithm of $\zeta(s)$.

By the above result, $\overbrace{(s-1)\zeta(s)}^{h(s)}$ is holomorphic and non-zero at any point of an open neighborhood U of $\{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid \operatorname{Re}(z) \geq 0\}$. Hence

$$\exists g: U \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \text{ holomorphic s.t. } e^{g(s)} = h(s)$$

$$\Rightarrow g'(s) e^{g(s)} = h'(s) \Rightarrow g'(s) = \frac{h'(s)}{h(s)}$$

$$h'(s) = (s-1)\zeta'(s) + \zeta(s) \quad (\text{for } s \neq 1)$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{h'(s)}{h(s)} = \frac{\zeta'(s)}{\zeta(s)} + \frac{1}{s-1} \quad (\text{for } s \neq 1)$$

$$\Rightarrow -\frac{\zeta'(s)}{\zeta(s)} = \frac{1}{s-1} - \underbrace{g'(s)}_{\text{holomorphic on } U}$$

Summation form of $\frac{\zeta'(s)}{\zeta(s)}$.

We have seen that using Euler product we get:

$$e^{-\sum_p \operatorname{Ln}(1 - \frac{1}{p^s})} = \zeta(s) \text{ for } \operatorname{Re}(s) > 1$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow \frac{\zeta'(s)}{\zeta(s)} &= -\sum_p \frac{d}{ds} \operatorname{Ln}(1 - \frac{1}{p^s}) \\ &= -\sum_p \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m} \frac{d}{ds} (e^{-m(\ln p)s}) \\ &= \sum_p \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{\ln p}{p^{ms}} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\Delta(n)}{n^s} \end{aligned}$$

$$\text{where } \Delta(n) = \begin{cases} \ln p & \text{if } n=p^m \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

$$= \sum_p \frac{\ln p}{p^s} + r(s) \quad \text{where } r \text{ is holomorphic on } \operatorname{Re}(s) > \frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon_0.$$

In particular, $r(s)$ can be assumed to be bounded on U (this is an assumption on U .)

So altogether we get:

$\exists \phi: U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ holomorphic s.t.

$$\text{for } \operatorname{Re}(s) > 1, \quad \sum_p \frac{\ln p}{p^s} = \frac{1}{s-1} + \phi(s).$$

Let $\psi(t) := \sum_{p \leq t} \ln p$. We have proved that $\prod_{p \leq n} p < 4^n$.

$$\Rightarrow \psi(t) \ll t. \quad \textcircled{\text{III}}$$

Using integration-by-part we have:

$$\sum_{p \leq x} (\ln p) p^{-s} = \psi(x) \cdot x^{-s} + s \int_2^x \psi(t) \cdot t^{-(s+1)} dt$$

$\textcircled{\text{III}} \Rightarrow$ For $\operatorname{Re}(s) > 1$,

$$\sum_p \frac{\ln p}{p^s} = s \int_2^{\infty} \frac{\psi(t)}{t^{s+1}} dt.$$

$$\Rightarrow \phi(s) = s \int_2^{\infty} \frac{\psi(t)}{t^{s+1}} dt - \frac{1}{s-1}$$

$$\Rightarrow \phi(s) - 1 = s \int_2^{\infty} \frac{\psi(t)}{t^{s+1}} dt + \frac{s}{1-s}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow \frac{\phi(s) - 1}{s} &= \int_1^{\infty} \frac{\psi(t)}{t^{s+1}} dt - \int_1^{\infty} \frac{1}{t^s} dt \\ &= \int_1^{\infty} \frac{\psi(t) - t}{t^{s+1}} dt. \end{aligned}$$

So:

\exists a holomorphic function $g_1: U \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ s.t.

$$g_1(s) = \int_1^{\infty} \frac{\psi(t) - t}{t^{s+1}} dt \quad \text{for } \operatorname{Re}(s) > 1.$$

The following analytic theorem is crucial:

Theorem. Suppose $f(t)$ is bounded and locally integrable.

Suppose $g(z) := \int_0^{\infty} f(t) e^{-tz} dt$ for $\operatorname{Re}(z) > 0$

has a holomorphic extension to $\operatorname{Re}(z) \geq 0$. Then

$$\int_0^{\infty} f(t) dt < \infty \quad \text{and} \quad \int_0^{\infty} f(t) dt = g(0).$$

we have $\int_1^{\infty} (\psi(t) - t) e^{-(s+1)t} dt$ for $\operatorname{Re}(s) > 1$
 has holomorphic extension to $\operatorname{Re}(s) \geq 1$.

Let $t = e^x \Rightarrow dt = e^x dx \Rightarrow$

$$\int_0^{\infty} (\psi(e^x) - e^x) \cdot e^{-x(s+1)} \cdot e^x dx = \int_0^{\infty} (\psi(e^x) - e^x) e^{-xs} dx$$

Let $z = s - 1$. So $\int_0^{\infty} \frac{\psi(e^x) - e^x}{e^x} \cdot e^{-xz} dx$

is bounded

and locally integrable

is defined for $\operatorname{Re}(z) > 0$ and

h

this multiplicative extension is realized.

So by the Analytic Theorem,

$$\int_0^{\infty} \frac{\varphi(e^x) - e^x}{e^x} dx < \infty$$

$$(t = e^x \Rightarrow dt = e^x dx \Rightarrow \frac{dt}{t} = dx.)$$

$$\Rightarrow \int_1^{\infty} \frac{\varphi(t) - t}{t^2} dt < \infty.$$

Proof of PNT.

If $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\varphi(t)}{t} \neq 1$, then

$\exists \varepsilon_0 > 0$ and a sequence $t_1 < t_2 < \dots$ s.t.

$$\left| \frac{\varphi(t_n)}{t_n} - 1 \right| > \varepsilon_0.$$

So passing to a subsequence, if needed, we can and will

assume that either $\frac{\varphi(t_n)}{t_n} > 1 + \varepsilon_0 = \lambda > 1$ for any n

or $\frac{\varphi(t_n)}{t_n} < 1 - \varepsilon_0 = \lambda < 1$ for any n .

In the first case, we have

$$\int_{t_n}^{\lambda t_n} \frac{\varphi(t) - t}{t^2} dt \geq \int_{t_n}^{\lambda t_n} \frac{\lambda t_n - t}{t^2} dt$$

$$= \lambda t_n \left(\frac{1}{t_n} - \frac{1}{\lambda t_n} \right) - [\ln(\lambda t_n) - \ln t_n]$$

$$= (\lambda - 1) - \ln \lambda > 0. \quad \textcircled{IV}$$

On the other hand, since $\int_1^{\infty} \frac{\varphi(t) - t}{t^2} dt < \infty$, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{t_n}^{\lambda t_n} \frac{\varphi(t) - t}{t^2} dt = 0, \text{ which contra. } \textcircled{IV}$$

In the second case, we have

$$\int_{\lambda t_n}^{t_n} \frac{2^{\lambda(t)-t}}{t^2} dt < \int_{\lambda t_n}^{t_n} \frac{\lambda t_n - t}{t^2} dt = -[(\lambda - 1) - \ln \lambda] < 0 \quad \textcircled{V}$$

Again $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\lambda t_n}^{t_n} \frac{2^{\lambda(t)-t}}{t^2} dt = 0$, which contradicts \textcircled{V} .

Some of the consequences of the above results.

We have proved that there is an open neighborhood U of $\{z \in \mathbb{C} \mid \operatorname{Re}(z) > 0\}$ such that $g_1(s) = (s-1)\zeta(s)$ is holomorphic on U and $g_1(s) \neq 0, \forall s \in U$.

Hence $g_2(s) = \frac{1}{g_1(s)}$ is holomorphic on U , and so $g_3(s) = (s-1)g_2(s)$ is holomorphic on U and $g_3(1) = 0$.

Notice that $g_3(s) = \frac{1}{\zeta(s)}$ for $s \in U \setminus \{1\}$.

You have proved in your HW assignments that if

f_1 and f_2 are multiplicative functions
 $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{f_i(n)}{n^s}$ are absolutely convergent for $\operatorname{Re}(s) > \rho_0$ } \Rightarrow

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{f_1 * f_2(n)}{n^s} = \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{f_1(n)}{n^s} \right) \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{f_2(n)}{n^s} \right)$$

for $\operatorname{Re}(s) > \rho_0$.

In particular, for $\operatorname{Re}(s) > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(n)}{n^s} \right) \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^s} \right) &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(\mu * 1)(n)}{n^s} \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{I(n)}{n^s} = 1. \end{aligned}$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{1}{\zeta(s)} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(n)}{n^s} \quad \text{for } \operatorname{Re}(s) > 1.$$

\searrow

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \frac{1}{n^s} = \frac{M(x)}{x^s} + \int_1^x \frac{M(t)}{t^{s+1}} dt$$

$$\Rightarrow \text{for } \operatorname{Re}(s) > 1, g_3(s) = \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{M(x)}{x^s} + s \int_1^{\infty} \frac{M(t)}{t^{s+1}} dt$$

$$\left| \frac{M(x)}{x^s} \right| \leq \frac{x}{x^{\sigma}} = \frac{1}{x^{\sigma-1}} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } x \rightarrow \infty$$

$$\Rightarrow \text{for } \operatorname{Re}(s) > 1, g_3(s) = s \int_1^{\infty} \frac{M(t)}{t^{s+1}} dt$$

$$\Rightarrow \text{for } \operatorname{Re}(s) > 1, \frac{g_3(s)}{s} = \int_0^{\infty} M(e^x) e^{-sx} dx$$

$$\boxed{t=e^x \Rightarrow \frac{dt}{t} = dx}$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{g_3(z+1)}{z+1} = \int_0^{\infty} \frac{M(e^x)}{e^x} \cdot e^{-zx} dx \text{ for } \operatorname{Re}(z) > 0$$

has holomorphic extension to $\operatorname{Re}(z) \geq 0$

$$\text{, and } \left| \frac{M(e^x)}{e^x} \right| \leq 1.$$

Hence by the Analytic Theorem

$$\int_0^{\infty} \frac{M(e^x)}{e^x} dx = \frac{g_3(1)}{1} = 0$$

$$\text{So } \int_1^{\infty} \frac{M(t)}{t^2} dt = 0. \quad \textcircled{\text{VI}}$$

Theorem. $\sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n) = o(x)$, i.e. $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{M(x)}{x} = 0$.

Proof. If not, $\exists x_1 < x_2 < \dots \rightarrow \infty$ and $1 > \varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that

$$\left| \frac{M(x_i)}{x_i} \right| > \varepsilon_0. \text{ Passing to a subsequence, if needed, we}$$

have either $M(x_i) > \varepsilon_0 x_i$ for any i or

$$M(x_i) < -\varepsilon_0 x_i \text{ for any } i.$$

Case 1. $M(x_i) > \varepsilon_0 x_i \Rightarrow \forall x \leq x_i, M(x) \geq M(x_i) - (x_i - x)$

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow \int_{(1-\varepsilon_0)x_i}^{x_i} \frac{M(t)}{t^2} dt &> \int_{(1-\varepsilon_0)x_i}^{x_i} \frac{t - (1-\varepsilon_0)x_i}{t^2} dt \\ &= -\ln(1-\varepsilon_0) - (1-\varepsilon_0)x_i \left[\frac{1}{x_i} - \frac{1}{(1-\varepsilon_0)x_i} \right] \\ &= -\ln(1-\varepsilon_0) - [(1-\varepsilon_0) - 1] \\ &= \varepsilon_0 - \ln(1-\varepsilon_0) > 0, \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts $\textcircled{\text{IV}}$ as before.

Case 2. $M(x_i) < -\varepsilon_0 x_i \Rightarrow \forall x \geq x_i,$

$$\begin{aligned} M(x) &\leq M(x_i) + (x - x_i) \\ &< x - (1+\varepsilon_0)x_i. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow \int_{x_i}^{(1+\varepsilon_0)x_i} \frac{M(t)}{t^2} dt &< \int_{x_i}^{(1+\varepsilon_0)x_i} \frac{t - (1+\varepsilon_0)x_i}{t^2} dt \\ &= \ln(1+\varepsilon_0) - (1+\varepsilon_0)x_i \left[\frac{1}{x_i} - \frac{1}{(1+\varepsilon_0)x_i} \right] \\ &= \ln(1+\varepsilon_0) - [(1+\varepsilon_0) - 1] \\ &= -\varepsilon_0 + \ln(1+\varepsilon_0) < 0 \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts $\textcircled{\text{VI}}$. ■

Theorem. $\sum_{n \leq x} \frac{M(n)}{n} = o(1)$, i.e. $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n \leq x} \frac{M(n)}{n} = 0.$

Proof. By integration-by-part

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n \leq x} \frac{M(n)}{n} &= M(x)/x + \int_1^x \frac{M(t)}{t^2} dt \\ \Rightarrow \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{M(n)}{n} &= \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{M(x)}{x} + \int_1^{\infty} \frac{M(t)}{t^2} dt \\ &= 0, \text{ by the previous Theorem and } \textcircled{\text{VI}}. \end{aligned}$$

■

Dirichlet's Hypothesis: $\zeta(s)$ does not correlate with any function

of "low complexity", i.e.

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n) f(n) = o\left(\sum_{n \leq x} |f(n)|\right).$$

[Warning: this is not a theorem, this is just a type of guideline.]

Remark. $M(x) = O(x^{1/2+\epsilon})$ is equivalent to Riemann Hypothesis.