

Buchstab's Function and Irregularities
in the distribution of primes

Recall $\Phi(x, z) = \#\{n \leq x : P^-(n) > z\}$. By Theorem LS1,

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(x, x^{1/s}) &= S^+(x, s) + S^-(x, s) \\ (\Phi) \quad &= \frac{x\omega(s)}{\log(x^{1/s})} + O_N\left(\frac{x}{\log^2 x}\right)\end{aligned}$$

uniformly for $1 + \frac{1}{N} \leq s \leq N$ (N is any fixed positive integer), where

$$\omega(s) = \frac{F(s) + f(s)}{2e^\gamma}.$$

By the differential-delay equations for f and F , we have

$$(\omega) \quad \omega(s) = \frac{1}{s} \quad (1 \leq s \leq 2), \quad (s\omega(s))' = \omega(s-1) \quad (s > 2).$$

Moreover, ω has a continuous derivative for $s > 2$.

Lemma ω . The function $\omega(s) - e^{-s}$ changes sign infinitely often.

Proof Recall that $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \omega(s) = e^{-s}$. Suppose that $\omega(s)$ has finitely many sign changes.

Let $\Delta(s) = \omega(s) - e^{-s}$. By (ω) ,

$$(\Delta) \quad (s\Delta(s))' = \Delta(s-1).$$

Integrating from u to ∞ gives $-u\Delta(u) = \int_u^\infty \Delta(s)ds$. Thus, if

$\Delta(u) \geq 0$ for large u or $\Delta(u) \leq 0$ for large u , then $\Delta(u) = 0$ for large u .

$\Delta(u) \geq 0$ for large u or $\Delta(u) \leq 0$ for large u , then $\Delta(u) = 0$ for large u .

Let $u_0 = \inf \{u : \Delta(s) = 0 \text{ for } s > u\}$. By (ω) , $u_0 > 2$. But (Δ) implies that

$\Delta(s-1) = 0$ for $s > u_0$, contradicting the definition of u_0 .

Remarks In fact, $\omega(u) - e^{-u}$ changes sign on every unit interval $[y, y+1]$ for $y \geq 1$.

Primes in short intervals

It is generally expected that $\pi(x) - \pi(x-y) \sim \frac{y}{\log x}$ if y is "not too small". Unconditionally, it is known that

$$(\pi) \quad \pi(x) - \pi(x-y) \sim \frac{y}{\log x}$$

for $x^{\frac{3}{2}+\varepsilon} \leq y \leq x$ (Huxley, 1972). Assuming the Riemann Hypothesis, (π) holds for $x^{\frac{1}{2}+\varepsilon} \leq y \leq x$, and (Selberg, 1943) holds for "almost all" intervals $[x-y, x]$ if $y = (\log x)^{2+\varepsilon}$; that is, if $y = (\log x)^{2+\varepsilon}$, (π) holds for all $x \leq X$ except for a set of $x \leq X$ of measure $\sigma(X)$.

By Theorem A, we know that (π) is false for some x and

$$y = c \log x \frac{\log_2 x \log_4 x}{(\log_3 x)^2}.$$

Cramér argued heuristically that

$$0 < \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{P_n P_{n+1}}{\log^2 P_n} < \infty,$$

so that (π) shouldn't hold for $y = c(\log x)^2$.

Theorem M (H. Maier, 1985)

For every $\lambda > 1$, (π) is false for $y = (\log x)^\lambda$. More precisely,

$$\liminf_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\pi(x) - \pi(x-y)}{y/\log x} < 1, \quad \limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\pi(x) - \pi(x-y)}{y/\log x} > 1.$$

The proof is based on Lemma ω and Maier's "matrix method". We also need a result on primes in progressions.

Lemma Ga (Gallagher, 1970)

For certain positive constants c_1, c_2, c_3 the following holds:

If $q \geq c_1$, and for all Dirichlet characters χ modulo q , $L(0+it, \chi) \neq 0$

for $\sigma > 1 - \frac{c_2}{\log(q(t+2))}$, and $(a, q) = 1$, then

$$\pi(2x, q, a) - \pi(x, q, a) = \frac{\text{li}(2x) - \text{li}(x)}{\phi(q)} \left(1 + O\left(e^{-c_3 \frac{\log x}{\log q}} + e^{-c_3 \sqrt{\log x}}\right) \right).$$

Lemma

For infinitely many integers k , $g = \prod_{p \leq k} p$ satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma Ga, if c_2 is small enough.

Proof By classical results, if $c_4 > 0$ is small enough, then for all q ,

$$(*) \quad L(\sigma + it, \chi) \neq 0 \quad \text{for } \sigma \geq 1 - \frac{c_4}{\log(g(1+2t))}.$$

(3)

with the possible exception of one real zero for one real χ .

Let k be large, $g = \prod_{p \leq k} p$. If the exceptional zero β exists for $\chi \bmod g$, then $\beta > 1 - \frac{c_4}{\log(2g)}$. Since $\log g \approx k$, there is a $k' \geq k$

so that if $g' = \prod_{p \leq k'} p$, then

$$1 - \frac{c_4}{\log(2g')} < \beta < 1 - \frac{c_4/2}{\log(2g')}.$$

As χ induces a character χ' modulo g' (both with the same conductor), $L(\beta, \chi') = 0$ and hence (χ', β) is the unique pair of (character, zero) that violate $(*)$ with g replaced by g' . Hence, with $c_2 = \frac{c_4}{2}$, the hypothesis of Lemma Ga holds either with modulus g or with g' .

4/29/11.

Proof of Theorem M

Fix λ and some $\lambda_1 > \lambda$. Let k be sufficiently large such that

$$g = \prod_{p \leq k} p$$

satisfies the hypothesis of Lemma Ga. Put

$$U = \lfloor k^{\lambda_1} \rfloor$$

$$D = \lfloor \log \log g \rfloor + 1$$

$$R = q^{D-1}$$

$$X = Rq = q^D.$$

Consider the matrix

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 1+Rq & 2+Rq & \cdots & U+Rq \\ 1+(R+1)q & 2+(R+1)q & \cdots & U+(R+1)q \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ 1+(2R-1)q & 2+(2R-1)q & \cdots & U+(2R-1)q \end{pmatrix}$$

If k is large, then $U < g$, since $U \sim (\log g)^{\lambda_1}$ (here, by \sim and $o(1)$ we mean as $k \rightarrow \infty$; U, D, R and X also $\rightarrow \infty$ as $k \rightarrow \infty$). Hence the entries of M are distinct integers in $(X, 2X]$.

(4)

Let N be the number of primes in M . By Lemma Ga,

$$\begin{aligned} N &= \sum_{\substack{1 \leq a \leq u \\ (a, g) = 1}} \pi(2x; g, a) - \pi(x; g, a) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{1 \leq a \leq u \\ (a, g) = 1}} \frac{\text{li}(2x) - \text{li}(x)}{\phi(g)} \left(1 + O(e^{-c_3 \sqrt{\log x}} + e^{-c_3 \log \log x}) \right) \\ &\sim \frac{x}{\phi(g) \log x} \cdot \Phi(u, k). \end{aligned}$$

By (2),

$$\Phi(u, k) \sim \frac{\omega(\lambda_1) u}{\log k},$$

and by Mertens estimate,

$$\phi(g) = g \prod_{p \leq k} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) \sim \frac{e^{-\gamma g}}{\log k}.$$

Therefore,

$$(N) \quad N \sim \frac{u x e^{\gamma} \omega(\lambda_1)}{g \log x}.$$

Part I Take λ_1 so that $e^{\gamma} \omega(\lambda_1) < 1$. Such λ_1 exists by Lemma ω . There are R rows of M , each consisting of an interval of u integers.

By (N), some row has

$$\leq (1 + o(1)) \frac{u e^{\gamma} \omega(\lambda_1)}{\log x}$$

primes. Note that

$$u \sim (\log g)^{\lambda_1} = (\log x)^{\lambda_1 + o(1)}$$

Break this row into $(u/y) + o(1)$ intervals of length $y = (\log 2x)^{\lambda}$. Then some subinterval contains at most

$$(1 + o(1)) \frac{u}{(y + o(1))} \frac{e^{\gamma} \omega(\lambda_1)}{\log x} \sim \frac{y}{\log x} e^{\gamma} \omega(\lambda_1)$$

primes. That is, for some $x' \in (x, 2x]$,

$$\frac{\pi(x') - \pi(x' - (\log x')^{\lambda})}{(\log x')^{\lambda-1}} \leq \frac{\pi(x') - \pi(x' - y)}{(\log x')^{\lambda-1}} \leq (1 + o(1)) e^{\gamma} \omega(\lambda_1).$$

For large enough k the right side is < 1 .

Part II Take λ , so that $e^\lambda \omega(\lambda) > 1$. Such λ , exists by Lemma ω .
By (N), some row of M has

$$\geq (1+o(1)) \frac{e^\lambda \omega(\lambda)}{\log x}$$

primes. Let $y = (\log x)^{\lambda}$. By an argument similar to that in Part I,
some interval of length y in some row of M has

$$\geq (1+o(1)) \frac{y}{\log x} e^\lambda \omega(\lambda)$$

primes. Then, for some $x' \in (x, 2x]$,

$$\frac{\pi(x') - \pi(x' - (\log x')^{\lambda})}{(\log x')^{\lambda-1}} \geq \frac{\pi(x') - \pi(x-y)}{(\log x')^{\lambda-1}} \geq (1+o(1)) e^\lambda \omega(\lambda).$$

For large k , the right side is > 1 .

Primes in progressions to large moduli

$$\text{Let } \Delta(x; Q) = \sum_{q \leq Q} \max_{(a,q)=1} \max_{y \leq x} \left| \psi(y; q, a) - \frac{y}{\phi(q)} \right|, \quad \psi(y; q, a) = \sum_{n \leq y, n \equiv a \pmod{q}} \Lambda(n).$$

Theorem BV is: $\forall A > 0 \exists B$ such that

$$\Delta(x; \sqrt{x}(\log x)^{-B}) \ll \frac{x}{(\log x)^A}.$$

Elliott-Halberstam conjecture: $\forall A > 0, \forall \varepsilon > 0, \Delta(x; x^{1-\varepsilon}) \ll \frac{x}{(\log x)^A}$.

E.H. also conjecture: $\forall A > 0 \exists B > 0$ so that $\Delta(x; x(\log x)^{-B}) \ll \frac{x}{(\log x)^A}$.
False!

5/2/11. Theorem For all $B > 0$,

$$(\text{Friedlander, Granville}, 1989) \quad \Delta(x; x(\log x)^{-B}) \gg_B \frac{x}{\log \log x}.$$

Proof Fix $\lambda > B$ with $e^\lambda \omega(\lambda) \neq 1$ (such λ exists by Lemma ω).

Put $z = (\log x)^{B/2}$ and

$$a = \prod_{p \leq z} p$$

so that $a \leq \sqrt{x}$. Let $Q = x/(\log x)^B$ and consider

$$S = \sum_{\substack{Q/2 < q \leq Q \\ (a, q) = 1}} \psi(x; q, a) = \sum_{\substack{Q/2 < q \leq Q \\ (a, q) = 1}} \left(\sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv a \pmod{q}}} \log p \right) + O(\sqrt{x}),$$

since for $b \geq 2$, $p^b - a$ has at most 1 prime factor $> Q/2$, and $p^b \leq x$.

(6)

If $\frac{Q}{2} < q \leq Q$ and $p \equiv a \pmod{q}$ is prime with $p \leq x$, then

$$p = rq + a, \quad r \leq \frac{x-a}{Q} \text{ and } \frac{Q}{2}r + a \leq p \leq \min(x, Qr+a).$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} S &= \sum_{\substack{r \leq \frac{2(x-a)}{Q} \\ (r,a)=1}} \Psi(\max(x, Qr+a); r, a) - \Psi\left(\frac{Q}{2}r + a; r, a\right) + O(\sqrt{x}) \quad (\text{use Siegel-Walfisz}) \\ &\log(Qr+a) = \log x + O(\log \log x) \\ &= \left(1 + O\left(\frac{\log \log x}{\log x}\right)\right) \sum_{\substack{r \leq \frac{2(x-a)}{Q} \\ (r,a)=1}} \frac{\max(x, Qr+a) - \left(\frac{Q}{2}r + a\right)}{\phi(r)}. \end{aligned}$$

Now $r \leq 2(\log x)^B$, hence

$$\phi(r) = r \prod_{p|r} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) = r e^{O\left(\frac{\omega(r)}{z}\right)} = r e^{O\left(\frac{\log r}{z}\right)} = r \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{z}}\right)\right),$$

Thus, as $x \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} S &\sim \sum_{\substack{r \leq 2x/Q \\ (r,a)=1}} \frac{\max(x, Qr) - \frac{Q}{2}r}{r} \\ &= \frac{Q}{2} \Phi\left(\frac{x}{Q}, z\right) - \frac{Q}{2} \left\{ \Phi\left(\frac{2x}{Q}, z\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{x}{Q}, z\right) \right\} + x \sum_{\substack{\frac{x}{Q} < r \leq 2x/Q \\ (r,a)=1}} \frac{1}{r} \\ &= Q \Phi\left(\frac{x}{Q}, z\right) - \frac{Q}{2} \Phi\left(\frac{2x}{Q}, z\right) + x \left\{ \left. \frac{\Phi(t)}{t} \right|_{t=x/Q}^{t=2x/Q} + \int_{x/Q}^{2x/Q} \frac{\Phi(t)z}{t^2} dt \right\} \\ &= \int_{x/Q}^{2x/Q} \frac{\Phi(t, z)}{t^2} dt. \end{aligned}$$

Uniformly for $\frac{x}{Q} \leq t \leq \frac{2x}{Q}$, $\frac{\log t}{\log z} = \frac{B \log \log x + O(1)}{(B/\lambda) \log \log x} \sim \lambda$, so $\Phi(t, z) \sim \omega(\lambda) \frac{t}{\log z}$,

so that

$$S \sim X \cdot \frac{\omega(\lambda)}{\log z} \int_{x/Q}^{2x/Q} \frac{dt}{t} = \frac{X \omega(\lambda) \log 2}{\log z}.$$

On the other hand, we obtain an asymptotic for

$$T := \sum_{\substack{\frac{Q}{2} < q \leq Q \\ (a, q)=1}} \frac{x}{\phi(q)}.$$

Break the sum into two parts : T_1 , the sum over q with $\omega(q) \geq 10 \log \log Q$,
and T_2 , the sum over those q with $\omega(q) \leq 10 \log \log Q$.

(7)

By Proposition C,

$$\#\left\{\frac{Q}{2} < q \leq Q : \omega(q) \geq 10 \log \log Q\right\} \ll \frac{Q}{(\log Q)^{5-\sqrt{e}}} \ll \frac{Q}{(\log x)^3}.$$

Hence

$$T_1 \ll \sum_{\substack{\frac{Q}{2} < q \leq Q \\ \omega(q) \geq 10 \log \log Q}} \frac{x \log \log Q}{q} \ll \frac{x}{(\log x)^2}.$$

Also, for $(q, a) = 1$, $P^-(q) \geq z$, so for $\omega(q) \leq 10 \log \log q$,

$$\phi(q) = q \prod_{p|q} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) = q e^{O\left(\frac{\omega(q)}{z}\right)} = q \left(1 + O\left(\frac{\log \log x}{z}\right)\right) \sim q,$$

so that

$$T_2 \sim x \sum_{\substack{\frac{Q}{2} < q \leq Q \\ (a, q) = 1 \\ \omega(q) < 10 \log \log q}} \frac{1}{q} = x \sum_{\substack{\frac{Q}{2} < q \leq Q \\ (a, q) = 1}} \frac{1}{q} + O\left(\frac{x}{\log^3 x}\right)$$

$$\sim x \left[\frac{\Phi(t, z)}{t} \Big|_{Q/2}^Q + \int_{Q/2}^Q \frac{\Phi(t, z)}{t^2} dt \right] \quad \frac{\log t}{\log z} \gg \frac{\log x}{\log \log x} \rightarrow \infty$$

$$\sim x \int_{Q/2}^Q \frac{e^{-\gamma/\log z}}{t} dt \sim \frac{x e^{-\gamma} \log 2}{\log z}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(x; \frac{x}{(\log x)^B}) &\geq \sum_{\substack{\frac{Q}{2} < q \leq Q \\ (a, q) = 1}} \left| \psi(x; q, a) - \frac{x}{\phi(q)} \right| \\ &\geq \left| \sum_{\substack{\frac{Q}{2} < q \leq Q \\ (a, q) = 1}} \left(\psi(x; q, a) - \frac{x}{\phi(q)} \right) \right| \\ &\sim \frac{x \log 2}{\log z} \left| \omega(\lambda) - e^{-\gamma} \right| \gg_B \frac{x}{\log \log x} \end{aligned}$$

Theorem (Friedlander, Granville, Hildebrand, Maier 1991)VA > 0, if $Q = x \exp\left\{-\frac{A}{2} \frac{(\log_2 x)^2}{\log_3 x}\right\}$, then

$$\Delta(x; Q) \gg \frac{x}{(\log x)^A}.$$