

Ω -results for Beurling's zeta function and lower bounds for the generalised Dirichlet divisor problem

Article

Accepted Version

Hilberdink, T. W. (2010) Ω -results for Beurling's zeta function and lower bounds for the generalised Dirichlet divisor problem. *Journal of Number Theory*, 130 (3). pp. 707-715. ISSN 0022-314X doi: 10.1016/j.jnt.2009.09.008 Available at <https://centaur.reading.ac.uk/23360/>

It is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from the work. See [Guidance on citing](#).

To link to this article DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jnt.2009.09.008>

Publisher: Elsevier

All outputs in CentAUR are protected by Intellectual Property Rights law, including copyright law. Copyright and IPR is retained by the creators or other copyright holders. Terms and conditions for use of this material are defined in the [End User Agreement](#).

www.reading.ac.uk/centaur

CentAUR

Central Archive at the University of Reading

Reading's research outputs online

Ω-results for Beurling's zeta function and lower bounds for the generalised Dirichlet divisor problem¹

Titus W. Hilberdink

Abstract

In this paper we study generalised prime systems for which the integer counting function $N_{\mathcal{P}}(x)$ is asymptotically well-behaved, in the sense that $N_{\mathcal{P}}(x) = \rho x + O(x^\beta)$, where ρ is a positive constant and $\beta < \frac{1}{2}$. For such systems, the associated zeta function $\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(s)$ is holomorphic for $\sigma = \Re s > \beta$. We prove that for $\beta < \sigma < \frac{1}{2}$, $\int_0^T |\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma + it)|^2 dt = \Omega(T^{2-2\sigma-\varepsilon})$ for any $\varepsilon > 0$, and also for $\varepsilon = 0$ for all such σ except possibly one value.

The Dirichlet divisor problem for generalised integers concerns the size of the error term in $N_{k\mathcal{P}}(x) - \text{Res}_{s=1}(\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(s)^k x^s/s)$, which is $O(x^\theta)$ for some $\theta < 1$. Letting α_k denote the infimum of such θ , we show that $\alpha_k \geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2k}$.

Keywords: Beurling's generalised primes, Dirichlet divisor problem.

AMS Mathematics subject classification 2010: 11N80.

1. Introduction

A *generalised prime system* (or *g-prime system*) \mathcal{P} is a sequence of positive reals p_1, p_2, p_3, \dots satisfying

$$1 < p_1 \leq p_2 \leq \dots \leq p_n \leq \dots$$

and for which $p_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. From these can be formed the system \mathcal{N} of *generalised integers* or *Beurling integers*; that is, the numbers of the form

$$p_1^{a_1} p_2^{a_2} \dots p_k^{a_k}$$

where $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $a_1, \dots, a_k \in \mathbb{N}_0$.² Such systems were first introduced by Beurling [2] and have been studied by many authors since then (see in particular [1]). Define the g-integer counting function $N_{\mathcal{P}}(x)$ and the associated Beurling zeta function, respectively, by

$$N_{\mathcal{P}}(x) = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}, n \leq x} 1, \quad \zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(s) = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \frac{1}{n^s}.$$

(Here, $\sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}}$ means a sum over all the g-integers, counting multiplicities.) In this paper, we shall be concerned with g-prime systems for which

$$N_{\mathcal{P}}(x) = \rho x + O(x^\beta), \tag{1.1}$$

for some $\beta < \frac{1}{2}$ and $\rho > 0$. Then $\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(s)$ is defined and holomorphic for $\Re s > 1$, and has an analytic continuation to the half-plane $\Re s > \beta$ except for a simple pole at $s = 1$ with residue ρ . Furthermore, $\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(s)$ has *finite order* for $\Re s > \beta$; i.e. $\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma + it) = O(|t|^\lambda)$ for some λ for $\sigma > \beta$. Let $\mu_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma)$ denote the infimum of all such λ . It is well-known that $\mu_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma)$ is non-negative,

¹Journal of Number Theory **130** (2010) 707-715.

²Here, $\mathbb{N} = \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$, $\mathbb{N}_0 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, and $\mathbb{P} = \{2, 3, 5, \dots\}$ — the set of primes.

decreasing, and convex (and hence continuous) (see, for example, [5]). For $\mathcal{P} = \mathbb{P}$ (so that $\mathcal{N} = \mathbb{N}$), the Lindelöf Hypothesis is the conjecture that $\mu_{\mathbb{P}}(\sigma) = \mu_0(\sigma)$ for all σ , where

$$\mu_0(\sigma) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} - \sigma & \text{if } \sigma < \frac{1}{2} \\ 0 & \text{if } \sigma \geq \frac{1}{2} \end{cases}.$$

In [4], it was proven that for all g-prime systems satisfying (1.1), $\mu_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma)$ must be *at least* as large as $\mu_0(\sigma)$: i.e. $\mu_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma) \geq \frac{1}{2} - \sigma$ for $\sigma \in (\beta, \frac{1}{2})$. In this paper we prove a stronger result by considering the mean square behaviour of $\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma + it)$. For $\sigma > \beta$, define $\nu_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma)$ to be the infimum of numbers λ such that

$$\int_1^T |\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma + it)|^2 dt = O(T^{1+2\lambda}).$$

As in the case of $\mu_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma)$, $\nu_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma)$ is non-negative and convex decreasing (cf. [6], §7.8). Trivially, $\nu_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma) \leq \mu_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma)$. We show here that $\nu_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma) \geq \mu_0(\sigma)$. In fact we prove slightly more.

Theorem 1

Let \mathcal{P} be a g-prime system for which (1.1) holds for some $\beta < \frac{1}{2}$ and $\rho > 0$. Then $\nu_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma) \geq \mu_0(\sigma)$ for $\sigma \in (\beta, \frac{1}{2})$. Furthermore,

$$\int_0^T |\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma + it)|^2 dt = o(T^{2-2\sigma}) \quad (1.2)$$

can hold for at most one value of σ in this range. In this case $T^{2\sigma-2} \int_0^T |\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma + it)|^2 dt$ is unbounded for all other values of σ .

Remark. For $\mathcal{P} = \mathbb{P}$, we have $\nu_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma) = \mu_0(\sigma)$, which shows the first part of Theorem 1 is best possible. However, in this case we have the asymptotic formula

$$\int_1^T |\zeta(\sigma + it)|^2 dt \sim \frac{\zeta(2-2\sigma)}{(2\pi)^{1-2\sigma}(2-2\sigma)} T^{2-2\sigma}$$

for $0 < \sigma < \frac{1}{2}$, showing that the exceptional value need not exist. In fact it seems unlikely an exceptional value exists and hence that $\int_0^T |\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma + it)|^2 dt = \Omega(T^{2-2\sigma})$ for all $\sigma \in (\beta, \frac{1}{2})$, but we cannot quite show this. Furthermore it seems plausible that we should have $\int_0^T |\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma + it)|^2 dt \geq C_{\sigma} T^{2-2\sigma}$ for some $C_{\sigma} > 0$.

2. Dirichlet divisor problems for g-primes

For a g-prime system satisfying (1.1) (with $\beta < 1$), we can study the equivalent of the Dirichlet divisor problem concerning the error term in the asymptotic formula for the average of the ‘generalised divisor’ function. For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $k\mathcal{P}$ denote the g-prime system obtained from \mathcal{P} by letting every g-prime from \mathcal{P} be counted k times. (If an original g-prime has multiplicity m , then in the new system it will have multiplicity km .) The Beurling zeta function of $k\mathcal{P}$ is

$$\zeta_{k\mathcal{P}}(s) = \zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(s)^k.$$

By standard methods using Perron’s formula,

$$N_{k\mathcal{P}}(x) = \text{Res}_{s=1} \left\{ \frac{\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(s)^k}{s} x^s \right\} + \Delta_{\mathcal{P},k}(x) = xP_{k-1}(\log x) + \Delta_{\mathcal{P},k}(x),$$

where $P_{k-1}(\cdot)$ is a polynomial of degree $k-1$ and $\Delta_{\mathcal{P},k}(x) = O(x^\theta)$ for some $\theta < 1$, depending on k . Let α_k denote the infimum of such θ . The *generalised Dirichlet divisor problem* is the problem of determining α_k . Also let β_k denote the infimum of ϕ for which

$$\int_0^x \Delta_{\mathcal{P},k}(y)^2 dy = O(x^{1+2\phi}).$$

Trivially, $\beta_k \leq \alpha_k$.

For \mathbb{P} , it is known that

$$\alpha_k \geq \beta_k \geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2k} \quad (2.1)$$

and it is conjectured that there is equality throughout (actually $\beta_k = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2k}$ for all k is equivalent to the Lindelöf Hypothesis — see [6], Theorem 13.4). We use Theorem 1 to show that (2.1) remains true for \mathcal{P} satisfying (1.1). In fact we have the following two corollaries:

Corollary 2

Let \mathcal{P} satisfy (1.1) for some $\beta < \frac{1}{2}$. Then for $\sigma \in (\beta, \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2k})$,

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{|\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma + it)|^{2k}}{|\sigma + it|^2} dt \quad (2.2)$$

diverges. Further, if $\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2k}$ is not the exceptional value in (1.2), then the integral also diverges for $\sigma = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2k}$.

Corollary 3

Let \mathcal{P} satisfy (1.1) for some $\beta < \frac{1}{2}$. With α_k and β_k as above, $\alpha_k \geq \beta_k \geq \max\{\beta, \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2k}\}$.

3. Proofs

Proof of Theorem 1. If $\nu_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma') < \frac{1}{2} - \sigma'$ for some $\sigma' \in (\beta, \frac{1}{2})$ then, by continuity of $\nu_{\mathcal{P}}(\cdot)$, $\nu_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma) < \frac{1}{2} - \sigma$ throughout some interval around σ' and (1.2) holds for all such σ ; in particular for two such values. We shall show that this is impossible.

Suppose, for a contradiction, that (1.2) holds for $\sigma = \sigma_0, \sigma_1$ where $\beta < \sigma_0 < \sigma_1 < \frac{1}{2}$.

For $N \geq 1$ let $\zeta_{N,\mathcal{P}}(s) = \sum_{n \leq N} n^{-s}$, where the sum ranges over $n \in \mathcal{N}$. As was stated in [4] (and shown in [3]), for $\sigma < \frac{1}{2}$ there exist constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that for $R \geq c_1 N$,

$$\sum_{r=1}^R \int_0^{2r-1} |\zeta_{N,\mathcal{P}}(\sigma + it)|^2 dt \geq c_2 R^2 N^{1-2\sigma}. \quad (3.1)$$

Also, writing $s = \sigma + it$, and following the arguments in [3], we have

$$\zeta_{N,\mathcal{P}}(s) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{c-iT}^{c+iT} \frac{\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(s+w)N^w}{w} dw + O\left(\frac{N^c}{T(c+\sigma-1)}\right) + O\left(\frac{N^{1-\sigma}}{T} \sum_{\substack{\frac{N}{2} < n < 2N \\ n \in \mathcal{N}}} \frac{1}{|n-N|}\right), \quad (3.2)$$

for $|t| < T$, $c > 1 - \sigma$ and $N \notin \mathcal{N}$. We shall put $c = 1 - \sigma + \frac{1}{\log N}$ and choose N in such a way that $(N - \alpha, N + \alpha) \cap \mathcal{N} = \emptyset$. (As was shown in [4], this is possible for arbitrarily large N if

$0 < \alpha < \frac{1}{4\rho}$.) With this choice of N , the final sum in (3.2) was shown to be $O(\sqrt{N})$. As such (3.2) becomes

$$\zeta_{N,\mathcal{P}}(s) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{c-iT}^{c+iT} \frac{\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(s+w)N^w}{w} dw + O\left(\frac{N^{\frac{3}{2}-\sigma}}{T}\right). \quad (3.3)$$

Now put $\sigma = \sigma_1$ and push the contour in the integral to the left as far as $\Re w = \sigma_0 - \sigma_1 < 0$, picking up the residues at $w = 0$ and $w = 1 - s$ (since $|t| < T$).

The contribution along the horizontal line $[\sigma_0 - \sigma_1 + iT, c + iT]$ is, in modulus, less than

$$\frac{1}{2\pi T} \int_{\sigma_0 - \sigma_1}^c N^y |\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma_1 + y + i(t+T))| dy.$$

Using the uniform bound $|\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma + it)| = O(t^{\frac{1-\sigma}{1-\beta}+\varepsilon})$, this is at most a constant times

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_{\sigma_0 - \sigma_1}^{1-\sigma_1} T^{\frac{1-\sigma_1-y}{1-\beta}+\varepsilon} N^y dy + \frac{1}{T} \int_{1-\sigma_1}^{1-\sigma_1+\frac{1}{\log N}} T^\varepsilon N^y dy = O(T^{\frac{\beta-\sigma_0}{1-\beta}+\varepsilon} N^{\sigma_0-\sigma_1}) + O(T^{\varepsilon-1} N^{1-\sigma_1}). \quad (3.4)$$

Similarly on $[\sigma_0 - \sigma_1 - iT, c - iT]$.

The integral along $\Re w = \sigma_0 - \sigma_1$ is at most

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{N^{\sigma_0-\sigma_1}}{2\pi} \int_{-T}^T \frac{|\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma_0 + i(t+y))|}{\sqrt{(\sigma_1 - \sigma_0)^2 + y^2}} dy &= O\left(N^{\sigma_0-\sigma_1} \int_1^{2T} \frac{|\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma_0 + iy)|}{y} dy\right) \\ &= o(N^{\sigma_0-\sigma_1} T^{\frac{1}{2}-\sigma_0}), \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

using³ the hypothetical bound $\int_0^T |\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma_0 + it)|^2 dt = o(T^{2-2\sigma_0})$.

The residues at $w = 0$ and $w = 1 - s$ are, respectively, $\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(s)$ and $\rho N^{1-s}/(1-s) = O(\frac{N^{1-\sigma_1}}{|t|+1})$. Putting (3.3), (3.4), and (3.5) together gives

$$\zeta_{N,\mathcal{P}}(\sigma_1 + it) = \zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma_1 + it) + O\left(\frac{N^{1-\sigma_1}}{|t|+1}\right) + O(N^{1-\sigma_1} T^{\varepsilon-1}) + o(N^{\sigma_0-\sigma_1} T^{\frac{1}{2}-\sigma_0}) + O\left(\frac{N^{\frac{3}{2}-\sigma_1}}{T}\right),$$

for $|t| < T$. (Note that the first O -term in (3.4) is superfluous since $\frac{\beta-\sigma_0}{1-\beta} < \frac{1}{2} - \sigma_0$.) Hence, using $(a+b+c+d+e)^2 \leq 5(a^2+b^2+c^2+d^2+e^2)$, we have

$$|\zeta_{N,\mathcal{P}}(\sigma_1 + it)|^2 \leq 5|\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma_1 + it)|^2 + O\left(\frac{N^{2-2\sigma_1}}{t^2+1}\right) + O(N^{2-2\sigma_1} T^{2\varepsilon-2}) + o(N^{2\sigma_0-2\sigma_1} T^{1-2\sigma_0}) + O\left(\frac{N^{3-2\sigma_1}}{T^2}\right).$$

Now apply $\sum_{r=1}^R \int_0^{2^{r-1}} \dots dt$ to both sides to give (for $2R-1 < T$)

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{r=1}^R \int_0^{2^{r-1}} |\zeta_{N,\mathcal{P}}(\sigma_1 + it)|^2 dt &= O\left(\sum_{r=1}^R \int_0^{2^{r-1}} |\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma_1 + it)|^2 dt\right) + O\left(\sum_{r=1}^R \int_0^{2^{r-1}} \frac{N^{2-2\sigma_1}}{(t+1)^2} dt\right) \\ &\quad + O(R^2 N^{2-2\sigma_1} T^{2\varepsilon-2}) + O\left(\frac{R^2 N^{3-2\sigma_1}}{T^2}\right) + o(R^2 N^{2(\sigma_0-\sigma_1)} T^{1-2\sigma_0}) \\ &= o(R^{3-2\sigma_1}) + O(RN^{2-2\sigma_1}) + O(R^2 N^{2-2\sigma_1} T^{2\varepsilon-2}) + O\left(\frac{R^2 N^{3-2\sigma_1}}{T^2}\right) + o(R^2 N^{2(\sigma_0-\sigma_1)} T^{1-2\sigma_0}) \end{aligned}$$

³If $f \geq 0$ and $\int_0^T f^2 = o(T^\lambda)$ (some $\lambda > 1$), then $\int_{T/2}^T \frac{f(y)}{y} dy \leq \frac{2}{T} \int_0^T f \leq \frac{2}{T} \sqrt{T \int_0^T f^2} = o(T^{\frac{\lambda-1}{2}})$, and $\int_1^T \frac{f(y)}{y} dy = o(T^{\frac{\lambda-1}{2}})$ follows.

using (1.2) for σ_1 . Let $T = 2R$. The left-hand side above is at least $c_2 R^2 N^{1-2\sigma_1}$ by (3.1) if $R \geq c_1 N$. Dividing both sides through by $R^2 N^{1-2\sigma_1}$ gives

$$c_2 \leq o\left(\left(\frac{R}{N}\right)^{1-2\sigma_1}\right) + O\left(\frac{N}{R}\right) + O(NR^{2\varepsilon-2}) + O\left(\frac{N^2}{R^2}\right) + o\left(\left(\frac{R}{N}\right)^{1-2\sigma_0}\right). \quad (3.6)$$

Put $R = KN$ where $K \geq c_1$ is a fixed, but arbitrary, constant. Letting $N \rightarrow \infty$, the o -terms both tend to zero as does the middle O -term. Hence

$$c_2 \leq \frac{A}{K} + \frac{B}{K^2}$$

for some absolute constants A, B . But K can be made arbitrarily large, so this gives a contradiction.

For the final part, suppose (1.2) holds for $\sigma = \sigma_0$ say. If $\int_0^T |\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma' + it)|^2 dt = O(T^{2-2\sigma'})$ for some $\sigma' \in (\beta, \frac{1}{2})$ with $\sigma' \neq \sigma_0$, then (1.2) actually holds for all σ between σ_0 and σ' . (This follows from the Phragmen-Lindelöf Theorem for a strip (see [6], §7.8, with ε in the place of C)). This was shown to be impossible, and hence $T^{2\sigma-2} \int_0^T |\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma' + it)|^2 dt$ must be unbounded for all $\sigma \neq \sigma_0$. □

Now we apply Theorem 1 to find lower bounds in the Dirichlet divisor problem. Note that Theorem 1 actually shows that given $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\int_{T/2}^T |\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma + it)|^2 dt = \Omega(T^{2-2\sigma-\varepsilon}),$$

for if it was $o(T^{2-2\sigma-\varepsilon})$, then by telescoping it would follow that $\int_0^T |\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma + it)|^2 dt = o(T^{2-2\sigma-\varepsilon})$ which is false.

Proofs of Corollaries 2 and 3. By Hölder's inequality,

$$\int_{T/2}^T |\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma + it)|^{2k} dt \geq \frac{2^{k-1}}{T^{k-1}} \left(\int_{T/2}^T |\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma + it)|^2 dt \right)^k,$$

for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. By Theorem 1, given $\varepsilon > 0$, $\int_{T/2}^T |\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma + it)|^2 dt \geq aT^{2-2\sigma-\varepsilon}$ for some $a > 0$ and some arbitrarily large T . Hence for such T ,

$$\int_{T/2}^T |\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma + it)|^{2k} dt \geq a^k T^{k(1-2\sigma)+1-\varepsilon k}.$$

It follows that

$$\int_{T/2}^T \frac{|\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma + it)|^{2k}}{|\sigma + it|^2} dt \geq a' T^{k(1-2\sigma)-1-\varepsilon k}$$

for some $a' > 0$. But for $\sigma < \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2k}$, we have $k(1-2\sigma) - 1 > 0$. Hence for ε sufficiently small, $k(1-2\sigma) - 1 - \varepsilon k > 0$ also, and so $\int_{T/2}^T \frac{|\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma + it)|^{2k}}{|\sigma + it|^2} dt \not\rightarrow 0$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$, and Corollary 2 follows. Of course, if $\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2k}$ is not the exceptional value in Theorem 1, then we can take $\varepsilon = 0$ in the above and the result also holds for $\sigma = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2k}$.

Let γ_k be the infimum of σ (with $\sigma > \beta$) for which $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{|\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma+it)|^{2k}}{|\sigma+it|^2} dt$ converges. By Corollary 2, $\gamma_k \geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2k}$. An identical argument as in the $\mathcal{P} = \mathbb{P}$ case (see [6], Theorem 12.5) shows that $\gamma_k = \beta_k$. (The argument is simply based upon Parseval's formula for Mellin transforms, which in this case is the identity

$$\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{|\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma+it)|^{2k}}{|\sigma+it|^2} dt = \int_0^{\infty} \frac{\Delta_{\mathcal{P},k}(x)^2}{x^{1+2\sigma}} dx$$

for σ in some interval $(\theta, 1)$ with $\theta < 1$.) Hence $\beta_k \geq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2k}$. □

4. On the line $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$

In this article, we have considered the mean-value along vertical lines $\Re s = \sigma$ with $\sigma < \frac{1}{2}$. This raises the question of what happens on the line $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$. For $\mathcal{P} = \mathbb{P}$, we have $\int_0^T |\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it)|^2 dt \sim T \log T$, so do we have $\int_0^T |\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(\frac{1}{2} + it)|^2 dt = \Omega(T \log T)$ in general? As in the $\sigma < \frac{1}{2}$ case, we relate the behaviour of the mean-square value at $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$ to the behaviour of the mean-square for some $\sigma = \sigma_0 < \frac{1}{2}$.

Theorem 4

Let \mathcal{P} be a g -prime system for which (1.1) holds. If $\int_1^T \frac{|\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma+it)|}{t} dt = o((T \log T)^{\frac{1}{2}-\sigma})$ for some $\sigma \in (\beta, \frac{1}{2})$, then $\int_0^T |\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(\frac{1}{2} + it)|^2 dt = \Omega(T \log T)$.

Note that the assumption is implied by $\int_1^T |\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(\sigma+it)|^2 dt = o(T^{2-2\sigma}(\log T)^{1-2\sigma})$.

Sketch of Proof. We follow the proof of Theorem 1 as much as possible, this time taking $\sigma_1 = \frac{1}{2}$.

Using the argument in [3] for $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$, (3.1) becomes: *there exist constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that for $R \geq c_1 N / \log N$,*

$$\sum_{r=1}^R \int_0^{2r-1} \left| \zeta_{N,\mathcal{P}}\left(\frac{1}{2} + it\right) \right|^2 dt \geq c_2 R^2 \log N. \quad (4.1)$$

To see this, note that we have

$$\int_0^T \left| \zeta_{N,\mathcal{P}}\left(\frac{1}{2} + it\right) \right|^2 dt = T \sum_{n \leq N}^* \frac{1}{n} + 2 \sum_{n \leq N} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{m < n} \frac{S_{m,n}(T)}{\sqrt{m}},$$

where $S_{m,n}(T) = \frac{\sin(T \log(n/m))}{\log(n/m)}$. (Here $m, n \in \mathcal{N}$ and the $*$ indicates that any multiplicities must be squared.) In any case, we have $\sum_{n \leq N}^* \frac{1}{n} \geq \sum_{n \leq N} \frac{1}{n} \geq k_1 \log N$ for some $k_1 > 0$.⁴ For $m \leq \frac{n}{2}$, $|S_{m,n}(T)| \leq 1/\log 2$, so this part of the double sum is $O(\sum_{n \leq N} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{m \leq n/2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}) = O(N)$. Thus, for some positive constants k_1, k_2 , independent of T and N ,

$$\int_0^T \left| \zeta_{N,\mathcal{P}}\left(\frac{1}{2} + it\right) \right|^2 dt \geq k_1 T \log N + 2 \sum_{n \leq N} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{\frac{n}{2} < m < n} \frac{S_{m,n}(T)}{\sqrt{m}} - k_2 N.$$

Putting $T = 2r - 1$ for $r = 1, 2, \dots, R$, and summing both sides gives, on noticing that $\sum_{r=1}^R \sin((2r-1) \log \frac{n}{m}) = \frac{\sin^2(R \log n/m)}{\sin(\log n/m)} \geq 0$ since $0 < \log n/m < \log 2$,

$$\sum_{r=1}^R \int_0^{2r-1} \left| \zeta_{N,\mathcal{P}}\left(\frac{1}{2} + it\right) \right|^2 dt \geq k_1 R^2 \log N - k_2 RN,$$

⁴This follows readily from $N_{\mathcal{P}}(x) \sim \rho x$.

and (4.1) follows.

In (3.2), we need a better estimate for the final sum. Let $M \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, with N such that $(N - \alpha, N + \alpha) \cap \mathcal{N} = \emptyset$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{\frac{N}{2} < n < 2N \\ n \in \mathcal{N}}} \frac{1}{|n - N|} &= \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{\alpha N^{\frac{m-1}{M}} \leq |n-N| < \alpha N^{\frac{m}{M}}} \frac{1}{|n - N|} + O(1) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\alpha} \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{1}{N^{\frac{m-1}{M}}} \left(N(N + \alpha N^{m/M}) - N(N - \alpha N^{m/M}) \right) + O(1) \\ &= O(N^{1/M}) + O(N^\beta), \end{aligned}$$

using (1.1). Since M is arbitrary, this is $O(N^{\beta+\varepsilon})$ for every $\varepsilon > 0$ in any case. Thus (3.3) becomes

$$\zeta_{N,\mathcal{P}}(s) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{c-iT}^{c+iT} \frac{\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(s+w)N^w}{w} dw + O\left(\frac{N^{\frac{1}{2}+\beta+\varepsilon}}{T}\right).$$

The analysis up to (3.5) remains the same (with $\sigma_0 = \sigma$ and $\sigma_1 = \frac{1}{2}$) but in (3.5) we use the bound assumed in the statement to give $o(N^{\sigma-\frac{1}{2}}(T \log T)^{\frac{1}{2}-\sigma})$. The arguments following (3.5) remain valid and we put $T = 2R$ again, but this time we divide through by $R^2 \log N$. On assuming $\int_0^T |\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(\frac{1}{2} + it)|^2 dt = o(T \log T)$, (3.6) now becomes

$$c_2 \leq o\left(\frac{\log R}{\log N}\right) + O\left(\frac{N}{R \log N}\right) + O\left(\frac{NR^{2\varepsilon-2}}{\log N}\right) + O\left(\frac{N^{1+2\beta+2\varepsilon}}{R^2}\right) + o\left(\left(\frac{R \log R}{N}\right)^{1-2\sigma} \frac{1}{\log N}\right).$$

Put $R = KN / \log N$ where $K \geq c_1$ is a fixed, but arbitrary, constant. Letting $N \rightarrow \infty$, all the terms tend to zero except the first O -term. Hence

$$c_2 \leq \frac{A}{K}$$

for some absolute constant A . As K can be made arbitrarily large, this gives a contradiction. Hence $\int_0^T |\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}(\frac{1}{2} + it)|^2 dt = \Omega(T \log T)$. □

References

- [1] P. T. Bateman and H. G. Diamond, Asymptotic distribution of Beurling's generalised prime numbers in: *Studies in Number Theory* 6, Prentice-Hall, 1969, pp. 152-212.
- [2] A. Beurling, Analyse de la loi asymptotique de la distribution des nombres premiers généralisés, I, *Acta Math.* **68** (1937), 255-291.
- [3] T. W. Hilberdink, Well-behaved Beurling primes and integers, *J. Number Theory* **112** (2005) 332-344.
- [4] T. W. Hilberdink, A lower bound for the Lindelöf function associated to generalised integers, *J. Number Theory* **122** (2007) 336-341.
- [5] E. C. Titchmarsh, *The Theory of Functions*, Second edition, Oxford University Press, 1986.
- [6] E. C. Titchmarsh, *The Theory of the Riemann Zeta-function*, Second edition, Oxford University Press, 1986.

Titus W. Hilberdink, Department of Mathematics, University of Reading, Whiteknights, PO
Box 220, Reading RG6 6AX, UK.
E-mail address: t.w.hilberdink@reading.ac.uk