# Math 539 Notes

## Henry Xia

## January 16, 2020

## Contents

1	Introduction	1
	1.1 Notation	
	1.2 Riemann-Stieltjes Integral	2
<b>2</b>	Dirichlet Series	3
	2.1 Dirichlet convolutions	6

## 1 Introduction

Motivating questions (some statistics):

- the "probability" that a random number has some property
- the "distribution" of some given multiplicative/additive function

Idea: we can answer the question for  $\{1, ..., \lfloor x \rfloor\}$  for some parameter x. Then, take the limit  $x \to \infty$  for all natural numbers.

### 1.1 Notation

Let  $g(x) \geq 0$ .

**Definition 1.1.** O(g(x)) means some unspecified function u(x) such that  $|u(x)| \le cg(x)$  for some constant c > 0.

**Example 1.2.** Show that  $e^{2x} - 1 = 2x + O(x^2)$  for x = [-1, 1].

*Proof.* Observe that  $f(z) = e^{2z} - 1 - 2z$  is analytic (and entire) and has a double zero at z = 0 (one can check that f(z) = f'(z) = 0. Hence,  $g(z) = (e^{2z} - 1 - 2z)/z^2$  has a removable singularity at z = 0, whence g is analytic and entire. Let  $C = \max\{|g(z)| : |z| \le 1\}$ . Then

$$|g(z)| \le C \implies |e^{2z} - 1 - 2z| \le C|z^2| \implies e^{2z} - 1 - 2z = O(|z|^2).$$

**Exercise 1.3.** Show that  $\sqrt{x+1} = \sqrt{x} + O(1/\sqrt{x})$  for  $x \in [1, \infty)$ .

**Definition 1.4.**  $f(x) \ll g(x)$  means f(x) = O(g(x)).

**Exercise 1.5.** Suppose that  $f_1 \ll g_1, f_2 \ll g_2$ , then  $f_1 + f_2 \ll \max\{g_1, g_2\}$ .  $\checkmark$ 

**Exercise 1.6.** Let f, g be continuous on  $[0, \infty)$ , and  $f \ll g$  on  $[123, \infty)$ . Show that  $f \ll g$  on  $[0, \infty)$ .

**Definition 1.7.**  $f(x) \sim g(x)$  means  $\lim \frac{f(x)}{g(x)} = 1$ .

**Definition 1.8.** f(x) = o(g(x)) means  $\lim \frac{f(x)}{g(x)} = 0$ .

**Definition 1.9.**  $f(x) = O_y(g(x))$  means f, g depend on some parameter y, and the implicit constant depends on y.

**Exercise 1.10.** For any  $A, \epsilon > 0$ , show that  $(\log x)^A \ll_{A,\epsilon} x^{\epsilon}$ .

## 1.2 Riemann-Stieltjes Integral

Appendix A in the book.

**Definition 1.11.** Some definitions for partitions

- 1. Let  $\underline{x} = \{x_0, ..., x_N\}$  be a partition of [c, d] if  $c = x_0 < \cdots < x_N = d$ .
- 2. The mesh size  $m(\underline{x}) = \max_{1 \le i \le N} x_i x_{i-1}$ .
- 3. Sample points  $\xi_i \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$ .

**Definition 1.12** (Riemann-Stieltjes Integral). Given two functions f(x) and g(x), define the Riemann-Stieltjes integral as

$$\int_{c}^{d} f(x) \ dg(x) = \lim_{m(\underline{x}) \to 0} \sum_{j=1}^{N} f(\xi_{j}) (g(x_{j}) - g(x_{j-1})).$$

**Remark 1.13.** Setting g(x) = x gives the Riemann integral.

**Theorem 1.14.** Let f(x) have bounded variation and let g(x) be continuous on [c, d], or vice versa. Then  $\int_c^d f(x) dg(x)$  exists.

Remark 1.15. If a function is piecewise monotone, then it has bounded variation.

**Example 1.16.** Given a sequence  $a_{nn\in\mathbb{N}}$ , define the summatory function  $A(x) = \sum_{n\leq x} a_n$ . Then, on any [c,d], A(x) is bounded, piecewise continuous and piecewise monotone. Hence, the Riemann-Stieltjes integral exists when g is continuous.

Remark 1.17. We present 3 facts that we will use.

1. If A(x) is the summatory function as above, and f(x) is continuous, then

$$\int_{c}^{d} f(x) \ dA(x) = \sum_{c < n \le d} a_n f(n).$$

2. (Integration by parts). If the integrals exist, then

$$\int_{c}^{d} f(x) \ dg(x) = f(x)g(x)|_{c}^{d} - \int_{c}^{d} g(x) \ df(x).$$

3. If f(x) is continuously differentiable, then

$$\int_{c}^{d} g(x) df(x) = \int_{c}^{d} g(x)f'(x) dx.$$

**Example 1.18** (Summation by parts). Consider  $\sum_{n < y} \frac{a_n}{n}$ . Let f(x) = 1/x, then we can write

$$\sum_{n \le y} \frac{a_n}{n} = \sum_{n \le y} a_n \cdot \frac{1}{n} = \int_0^y \frac{1}{x} dA(x) = \frac{1}{x} A(x) \Big|_0^y - \int_0^y A(x) d\left(\frac{1}{x}\right) = \frac{A(y)}{y} - \int_0^y A(x) \frac{1}{x^2} dx.$$

The final manipulation that we want to get is

$$\sum_{n \le y} a_n f(n) = A(y) f(y) - \int_0^y A(x) f'(x) \ dx. \tag{1}$$

## 2 Dirichlet Series

A Dirichlet series is  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{-s}$ . Facts about Dirichlet series:

- converge in some right half-plane  $\{s \in \mathbb{C} : \Re s > R\}$  for some R (possibly  $R = \pm \infty$ ).
- Sometimes converge conditionally. Example:  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^n / n^{1/2}$ .
- $(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n n^{-s})(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n n^{-s}) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n n^{-s}$  where  $c = \sum_{d=n} a_d b_e = \sum_{d|n} a_d b_{e/d}$ . (multiplicative convolution)

Some notation: for  $s \in \mathbb{C}$ , we write  $s = \sigma + it$ , that is  $\sigma$  is the real part of s, and t is the imaginary part of s. Note that if x > 0, then  $|x^s| = |x^{\sigma}| |x^{it}| = |x^{\sigma}| |e^{it \log x}| = |x^{\sigma}|$ .

**Theorem 2.1.** Let  $\alpha(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n n^{-s}$  be a Dirichlet series. Suppose that  $s_0 \in \mathbb{C}$  is such that  $\alpha(s_0)$  converges. Then  $\alpha(s)$  converges uniformly in the sector  $S = \{s \in \mathbb{C} : \sigma \geq \sigma_0, |t - t_0| \leq H |\sigma - \sigma_0|\}$  for any H > 0.

*Proof.* WLOG, let  $s_0 = 0$ , otherwise we can do a change of variables. Let  $A(x) = \sum_{n \le x} a_n = \alpha(0) - R(x)$ . Then, for  $\sigma > 0$ ,

$$\sum_{M < n \le N} a_n n^s = \int_M^N x^{-s} \ dA(x) = \int_M^N x^{-s} \ d(\alpha(0) - R(x))$$

$$= \int_M^N x^{-s} \ d\alpha(0) - \int_M^N x^{-s} \ dR(x) = -\int_M^N x^{-s} \ dR(x)$$

$$= -x^{-s} R(x) \Big|_M^N + \int_M^N R(x) \ d(x^{-s})$$

$$= R(M) M^{-s} - R(N) N^{-s} - s \int_M^N R(x) x^{-s-1} \ dx.$$

Note that  $R(N)N^{-s} \to 0$  as  $N \to \infty$ , and that  $R(x)x^{-s-1} \ll x^{-\sigma-1}$ . Hence, letting  $N \to \infty$  gives

$$\sum_{M < n} a_n n^{-s} = R(M) M^{-s} - s \int_M^\infty R(x) x^{-s-1} \ dx \to 0 \text{ as } M \to \infty.$$

Now, choose M large such that  $|R(x)| < \epsilon$  for all  $x \ge M$ . Then,

$$\left| \sum_{n>M} a_n n^{-s} \right| \le \epsilon M^{-\sigma} + |s| \int_M^\infty \epsilon x^{-\sigma - 1} dx$$

$$= \epsilon M^{-\sigma} + |s| \epsilon x^{-\sigma} \frac{1}{-\sigma} \Big|_M^\infty$$

$$= \epsilon M^{-\sigma} + |s| \epsilon \frac{M^{-\sigma}}{\sigma} = \frac{\epsilon}{M^{\sigma}} \left( 1 + \frac{|s|}{\sigma} \right).$$

Since  $s \in S$ , we have

$$|s| = \sqrt{\sigma^2 + t^2} \le \sqrt{\sigma^2 + |H\sigma|^2} = \sigma\sqrt{1 + H^2},$$

so  $\left|\sum_{n>M} a_n n^{-s}\right| \leq \epsilon (1+\sqrt{1+H^2})$  as  $M\to\infty$ . Observe that the latter only depends on H, so the convergence is uniform.

Corollary 2.2. If  $\alpha(s_0)$  converges, then  $\alpha(s)$  converges for all s with  $\sigma > \sigma_0$ .

**Corollary 2.3.** If  $\alpha(s_0)$  diverges, then  $\alpha(s)$  diverges for all s with  $\sigma < \sigma_0$ .

Remark 2.4. The Dirichlet series  $\alpha(s)$  has an abscissa of convergence  $\sigma_c$  such that  $\alpha(s)$  converges if  $\sigma > \sigma_c$ , and diverges if  $\sigma < \sigma_c$ . It is allowed to have  $\sigma_c = \pm \infty$ . Furthermore,  $\alpha(s)$  converges locally uniformly right of  $\sigma_c$ , whence  $\alpha(s)$  is analytic.

**Remark 2.5.** Observe that  $\int_1^N x^{-s} dA(x) = \sum_{1 < n \le N} a_n n^{-s} = \sum_{n=2}^N a_n n^{-s}$ . Sometimes we write  $\int_{-1}^N$  to include the 1.

**Theorem 2.6.** Let  $\alpha(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n n^{-s}$  have an abscissa of convergence  $\sigma_c \geq 0$ . Then for  $\sigma > \sigma_c$ , we have  $\alpha(s) = s \int_1^{\infty} A(x) x^{-s-1} dx$ . Moreover,

$$\limsup_{x \to \infty} \frac{\log |A(x)|}{\log x} = \sigma_c.$$

*Proof.* Observe that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N} a_n n^{-s} = \int_{1^{-}}^{N} x^{-s} dA(x) = x^{-s} A(x) \Big|_{1^{-}}^{N} - \int_{1^{-}}^{N} A(x) d(x^{-s})$$
$$= A(N) N^{-s} - \int_{1^{-}}^{N} A(x) (-sx^{-s-1} dx) = A(N) N^{-s} + s \int_{1}^{N} A(x) x^{-s-1} dx.$$

Observe that in the last line, we can replace  $1^-$  with 1 because the integrand is bounded. Define  $\phi = \limsup_{x \to \infty} \frac{\log |A(x)|}{\log x}$ . We compare this to  $\sigma_c$ .

Let  $\sigma = \phi + \epsilon$  for some  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then  $\frac{\log |A(x)|}{\log x} < \phi + \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$  for large x, so  $A(x) \ll x^{\phi + \varepsilon/2}$ . Then,  $A(N)N^{-s} \ll N^{\phi + \varepsilon/2}N^{-(\phi + \varepsilon)} = N^{-\varepsilon/2}$ . Hence,

$$\int_N^\infty A(x) x^{-\sigma-1} \ dx \ll \int_N^\infty x^{-\phi+\varepsilon/2} x^{-(\phi+\varepsilon+1)} \ dx = \int_N^\infty x^{-1-\varepsilon/2} \ dx \ll N^{-\varepsilon/2}.$$

It follows that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{N} a_n n^{-s} = O(N^{-\varepsilon/2}) + s \left( \int_{1}^{\infty} A(x) x - s - 1 \, dx + O(N^{-\varepsilon/2}) \right).$$

Let  $N \to \infty$  gives  $s \int_1^\infty A(x) x^{-s-1} dx$  converges. Hence  $\sigma_c \le \phi$ . Conversely, let  $\sigma_0 = \sigma_c + \varepsilon$ , and let  $R_0(x) = \sum_{n>x} a_n n^{-\sigma_0} = \alpha(\sigma_0) - \sum_{n \le x} a_n n^{-\sigma_0}$ . Observe that

$$A(N) = -R_0(N)N^{\sigma_0} + \sigma_0 \int_0^N R_0(x)x^{\sigma_0 - 1} dx.$$

Since  $\alpha(0)$  converges,  $R_0(x) = o(1)$  so  $R_0(x) \ll 1$ . Then

$$A(N) \ll 1 \cdot N^{\sigma_0} + \sigma_0 \int_0^N 1 \cdot x^{\sigma_0 - 1} dx = N^{\sigma_0} + N^{\sigma_c} \ll N^{\sigma_0} = N^{\sigma_c + \varepsilon}.$$

Hence  $\frac{\log|A(x)|}{\log x} \ll \frac{(\sigma_c + \varepsilon)\log x}{\log x} = \sigma_c + \varepsilon$ , so  $\phi \leq \sigma_c + \varepsilon$ . Take  $\varepsilon \to 0$ , so  $\phi \leq \sigma_c$ .

**Definition 2.7.** The abscissa of absolute convergence is  $\sigma_a = \inf \{ \sigma \in \mathbb{R} : \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |a_n| n^{-\sigma} \text{ converges} \}.$ 

**Example 2.8.** Let  $\eta(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{n-1} n^{-s}$ . Observe that  $\sigma_c = 0$  by the alternating series test. However, we only have absolute convergence when  $\sigma > 1$ , so the abscissa of absolute convergence is  $\sigma_a = 1$ .

**Remark 2.9.** When  $a_n \geq 0$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have  $\sigma_c = \sigma_a$ .

**Theorem 2.10.** For any Dirichlet series  $\alpha(s)$ , we have  $\sigma_c \leq \sigma_a \leq \sigma_c + 1$ .

*Proof.* The first inequality is trivial.

Let  $\sigma = \sigma_c + 1 + \varepsilon$  where  $\varepsilon > 0$ . We show that  $\alpha(\sigma)$  converges absolutely. Note that  $\alpha(s)$  converges at  $s = \sigma_c + \varepsilon/2$ , that is

$$a_n n^{-(\sigma_c + \varepsilon/2)} = o(1) \implies a_n n^{-(\sigma_c + \varepsilon/2)} \ll 1.$$

Then,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |a_n| \, n^{-(\sigma_c + 1 + \varepsilon)} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left| a_n n^{-(\sigma_c + \varepsilon/2)} \right| n^{-(1 + \varepsilon/2)} \ll \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{-(1 + \varepsilon/2)} \ll 1.$$

It follows that  $\alpha(\sigma)$  converges absolutely for all  $\varepsilon > 0$ .

**Theorem 2.11** (Landau's Theorem). Let  $\alpha(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n n^{-s}$  with  $\sigma_c < \infty$ . If  $a_n \ge 0$  for each  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then,  $\alpha(s)$  has a singularity at  $s = \sigma_c$ .

*Proof.* Suppose that there does not exist a singularity at  $s = \sigma_c$ . Then, there exists an analytic continuation of  $\alpha$  to  $C = \{s \in \mathbb{C} : |s - \sigma_c| < \delta\}$ .

Let  $z = \sigma_c - \frac{1}{4}\delta$  and let  $w = \sigma_c + \frac{3}{4}\delta$ . Let  $D = \{s \in \mathbb{C} : |s - w| < \frac{5}{4}\delta\}$ . Observe that  $D \subset C \cup \{s \in \mathbb{C} : \sigma > 0\}$ , so  $\alpha$  has an analytic continuation to D. Let P(s) be the power series of  $\alpha$  centered at w. Observe that  $z \in D$ , so it suffices to show that  $P(z) = \alpha(z)$ , whence we contradict

the assumption that the abscissa of convergence is  $\sigma_c$ . Note that

$$P(z) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha^{(k)}(w)}{k!} (z - w)^k$$

$$= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} (z - w)^k \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n (-\log n)^k n^{-w} \qquad \text{we can differentiate termwise for } \alpha^{(k)}(w)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} (w - z)^k \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n (\log n)^k n^{-w} \qquad \text{where the terms are all nonnegative}$$

$$= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n n^{-w} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} (w - z)^k (\log n)^k$$

$$= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n n^{-w} e^{(w-z)\log n} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n n^{-z}.$$

It follows that  $\alpha(z)$  converges left of  $\sigma_c$ , which is a contradiction.

#### 2.1 Dirichlet convolutions

Motivating question: are these calculations legitimate?

• 
$$\zeta(s)^2 = \sum_{l,m=1}^{\infty} (lm)^{-s} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} d(n)n^{-s}$$
.

• 
$$\zeta(s) = \prod_{p \text{ prime}} (1 + p^{-s} + p^{-2s} + \cdots) = \prod_{p \text{ prime}} (1 - p^{-s})^{-1}$$
.

**Definition 2.12.** Let  $a = \{a_n\}$ ,  $b = \{b_n\}$  be sequences. The Dirichlet/multiplicative convolution a \* b by  $c = \{c_n\}$  where  $c_n = \sum_{de=n} a_d b_e = \sum_{d|n} a_d b_{n/d}$ .

**Theorem 2.13.** Let  $\alpha(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n n^{-s}$ , let  $\beta(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n n^{-s}$ , and let  $\gamma(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} c_n n^{-s}$ . If  $s \in \mathbb{C}$  is such that  $\alpha(s)$  and  $\beta(s)$  onvege absolutely, and if c = a \* b, then  $\gamma(s)$  converges absolutely and  $\gamma(s) = \alpha(s)\beta(s)$ .

**Example 2.14.** Observe that d(n) = (1 \* 1)(n).

**Example 2.15.** Let  $M(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(n) n^{-s}$ , where  $\mu$  is the Möbius function which defined as

$$\mu(n) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } n \text{ is not square free} \\ 1 & \text{if } n \text{ has an even number of prime divisors} \\ -1 & \text{if } n \text{ has an odd number of prime divisors} \end{cases}.$$

Equivalently, we can define  $\mu$  as the function that satisfies

$$\sum_{d|n} \mu(d) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n = 1 \\ 0 & \text{if } n > 1 \end{cases}.$$

Observe that  $M(s)\zeta(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (\mu * 1)(n)n^{-s} = 1$  for  $\sigma > 1$ , since  $(\mu * 1)(n) = \sum_{d|n} \mu(d)$ . It follows that  $M(s) = 1/\zeta(s)$ .

Since the abscissa of convergence of M is  $\sigma_c = 1$ , we get that  $\zeta(s)$  has no zeroes when  $\sigma > 1$ .

**Example 2.16** (Möbius Inversion Formula). Write  $F(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f(n) n^{-s}$  and  $G(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} g(n) n^{-s}$ . Then

$$F(s)\zeta(s) = G(s) \iff F(s) = \frac{G(s)}{\zeta(s)} = G(s)M(s)$$

$$(f*1)(n) = g(n) \iff f(n) = (g*\mu)(n)$$

$$\sum_{d|n} f(n) = g(n) \iff f(n) = \sum_{d|n} g(d)\mu\left(\frac{n}{d}\right).$$

**Example 2.17.** It is known that  $\sum_{d|n} \phi(d) = n$ . This gives  $(\phi * 1)(n) = \sum_{d|n} \phi(d) = n$ . Then, for  $\sigma > 2$ , we have

$$\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \phi(n)n^{-s}\right) \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{-s}\right) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n \cdot n^{-s} = \zeta(s-1).$$

This gives  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \phi(n) n^{-s} = \zeta(s-1)/\zeta(s)$ .

**Exercise 2.18.** Let  $\sigma_1(n) = \sum_{d|n} d$ . Show that  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sigma_1(n) n^{-s} = \zeta(s-1)\zeta(s)$ .

**Definition 2.19.** A function f is multiplicative if f(m)f(n) = f(mn) if gcd(m,n) = 1.

**Definition 2.20.** A number n is y-friable if  $p \mid n \implies p \leq y$ .

**Theorem 2.21.** Let f be a multiplicative function, and let  $F(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f(n) n^{-s}$ . If  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |f(n)| n^{-\sigma}$  converges, we have the Euler product

$$F(s) = \prod_{p \ prime} (1 + f(p)p^{-s} + f(p^2)p^{-2s} + \cdots).$$

*Proof.* Let  $\sigma > \sigma_a$ . Then, for all p, we have

$$\left|1+f(p)p^{-s}+f(p^2)p^{-2s}+\cdots\right| \le 1+\left|f(p)\right|p^{-s}+\left|f(p)\right|p^{-2s}+\cdots \le \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}\left|f(n)\right|n^{-s}.$$

Since the above converges, we can rearrange the finite product

$$\prod_{p \le y} (1 + f(p)p^{-s} + f(p^2)p^{-2s} + \cdots) = \sum_{n \text{ y-friable}} f(n)n^{-s}.$$

Now, we can compute

$$\left| F(s) - \prod_{p \le y} (1 + f(p)p^{-s} + f(p^2)p^{-2s} + \cdots) \right| = \left| F(s) - \sum_{n \text{ y-friable}} f(n)n^{-s} \right|$$

$$= \left| \sum_{n \text{ not y-friable}} f(n)n^{-s} \right|$$

$$\le \sum_{n>y} |f(n)| n^{-s} = o(1).$$

The tail goes to 0, so the theorem is proved.

**Remark 2.22.** Almost the same proof shows that the Euler product converges absolutely. In particular, it is nonzero (unless an individual factor is zero). Note that the convergence of a product is defined as the convergence of the sum of logs.

**Example 2.23.** Note that  $\mu$  is multiplicative, so  $M(s) = \prod_{p \text{ prime}} (1 - p^{-s})$ .