

A DYNAMICAL PROOF OF THE PRIME NUMBER THEOREM

REDMOND MCNAMARA

ABSTRACT. We present a new, elementary, dynamical proof of the prime number theorem.

1. INTRODUCTION

The prime number theorem states that

$$\# \text{ of primes } \leq N = (1 + o_{N \rightarrow \infty}(1)) \frac{N}{\log N}.$$

In some sense, the result was first publicly conjectured by Legendre in 1798 who suggested that

$$\# \text{ of primes } \leq N = (1 + o_{N \rightarrow \infty}(1)) \frac{N}{A \log N + B},$$

for some constants A and B . Legendre specifically conjectured $A = 1$ and $B = -1.08366$. Gauss conjectured the same formula and stated he was not sure what the constants A and B might turn out to be. Gauss' conjecture was based on millions of painstaking calculations first obtained in 1792 and 1793 which were never published but nonetheless predate Legendre's work on the subject. The first major breakthrough on the problem was due to Chebyshev who showed that

$$c + o_{N \rightarrow \infty}(1) \leq \frac{\# \text{ of primes } \leq N \log N}{N} \leq C + o_{N \rightarrow \infty}(1)$$

for some explicit constants c and C . There is a long history of improvements to these explicit constants for which we refer to Goldstein [Gol73] and Goldfeld [Gol04]. The prime number theorem was important motivation for Riemann's seminal work on the zeta function.

The first proofs of the prime number theorem were given independently by Hadamard and de la Vallée Poussin in 1896. The key step in their proof was a difficult argument showing that the Riemann zeta function did not have a zero on the line $\text{Re}(z) = 1$. Their proof was later substantially simplified by many mathematicians. In 1930, Wiener found a "Fourier analytic" proof of the prime number theorem. In 1949, Erdős [Erd49] and Selberg [Sel50] discovered an elementary proof of the prime number theorem, where here elementary is used in the technical sense that the proof involves no complex analysis and does not necessarily mean that the proof is easy reading. The bitter battle over credit for this result is the subject of an informative note by Goldfeld [Gol04]. Other proofs are due to Daboussi [Dab89] and Hildebrand [Hil86]. In a blog post from 2014, Tao proves the prime number theorem using the theory of Banach algebras [Taob]. A published version of this theorem can be found in a book by Einsiedler and Ward [EW17]. In an unpublished book from 2014, Granville and Soundarajan prove the prime number

theorem using pretentious methods (see, for instance, [GHS19]). A note by Zagier [Zag97] from 1997 contains perhaps the quickest proof of the prime number theorem using a tauberian argument in the spirit of the Erdos-Selberg proof combined with complex analysis in the form of Cauchy's theorem. Zagier attributes this proof to Newman.

The goal of this note is to present a new proof of the prime number theorem. Florian Richter and I discovered similar proofs concurrently and independently. His proof can be found in [Ric]. Terence Tao wrote up a version of this argument on his blog following personal communication from the author which can be found in [Tao].

The proof proceeds via an observation of Landau that cancellation in the Mobius function is equivalent to the prime number theorem i.e. it suffices to prove that

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \leq N} \mu(n) = o_{N \rightarrow \infty}(1).$$

Next, we observe that for more primes, outside an exceptional set on which the sum of the reciprocals of the primes is bounded, we have that

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \leq N} \mu(n) \approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \leq N} p \mathbb{1}_{p|n} \mu(n).$$

Since μ is multiplicative and $\mu(np) = -\mu(n)$ for most n , we conclude that

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \leq N} \mu(n) \approx \frac{p}{N} \sum_{n \leq N/p} -\mu(n).$$

If we can find primes p , p_1 and p_2 such that

$$\frac{p_1 p_2}{p} \approx 1$$

then we can conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \leq N} \mu(n) &\approx \frac{p}{N} \sum_{n \leq N/p} -\mu(n) \\ &\approx \frac{p_1 p_2}{N} \sum_{n \leq N/p_1 p_2} \mu(n). \end{aligned}$$

From this we may conclude that

$$\approx 0.$$

Thus, our goal is to find primes p_1 , p_2 and p where $p_1 p_2 \approx p$. To do this, we invoke the Selberg symmetry formula which states that the number of primes plus a weighted count of semiprimes is as expected.

1.1. Acknowledgments. I would like to thank Florian Richter for his patience and conversation. I would also like to thank Terence Tao including this proof in his class on number theory and for many helpful discussions. I would also like to thank Tim Austin, Will Baker, Bjorn Bringmann, Asgar Janneshan, Gyu Eun Lee, Cark Lyons, Bar Roytman and Will Swartworth for helpful conversations.

2. PROOF OF THE PRIME NUMBER THEOREM

Proposition 2.1. *Let w_i be a sequence of nonnegative real numbers. Let u and v_i be vectors in a Hilbert space. Then*

$$\sum_{i=1}^n w_i |\langle u, v_i \rangle|^2 \leq \|u\|^2 \cdot \left(\sup_i \sum_{j=1}^n w_j |\langle v_i, v_j \rangle| \right).$$

Proof. By duality, there exists c_i such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n w_i |c_i|^2 = 1$$

and

$$\sum_{i=1}^n w_i |\langle u, v_i \rangle|^2 = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i c_i \langle u, v_i \rangle \right)^2$$

and therefore by conjugate bilinearity of the inner product

$$= \left\langle u, \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \bar{c}_i v_i \right\rangle^2.$$

By Cauchy Schwarz, this is at most

$$\leq \|u\|^2 \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \bar{c}_i v_i \right\|^2.$$

By the pythagorean theorem this is given by

$$= \|u\|^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n w_i w_j c_i \bar{c}_j \langle v_i, v_j \rangle.$$

The geometric mean is dominated by the arithmetic mean.

$$\leq \|u\|^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n w_i w_j \frac{1}{2} (|c_i| + |c_j|) |\langle v_i, v_j \rangle|.$$

By symmetry this is

$$= \|u\|^2 \sum_{i=1}^n w_i |c_i|^2 \sum_{j=1}^n w_j |\langle v_i, v_j \rangle|.$$

Because everything is nonnegative, we may replace the inner term with a supremum

$$\leq \|u\|^2 \sum_{i=1}^n w_i |c_i|^2 \sup_k \sum_{j=1}^n w_j |\langle v_k, v_j \rangle|.$$

Using that $\sum w_i |c_i|^2 = 1$ completes the proof. \square

Proposition 2.2. *Let S denote a set of primes less than some natural number P . Let $\ell(S)$ denote*

$$\ell(S) = \sum_{p \in S} \frac{1}{p}.$$

Then

$$\left(\frac{1}{\ell(S)} \sum_{p \in S} \frac{1}{p} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \leq N} f(n)(1 - p\mathbb{1}_{p|n}) \right|^2 \right)^{-1/2} = O(1).$$

Proof. We will apply Proposition 2.1: our Hilbert space is L^2 on the space of function on the integers $\{1, \dots, N\}$ equipped with counting measure; set $w_p = \frac{1}{p}$; set $v_p = (n \mapsto 1 - p\mathbb{1}_{p|n})$ and $u = f$; thus, by Proposition 2.1

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{p \in S} \frac{1}{p} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \leq N} f(n)(1 - p\mathbb{1}_{p|n}) \right|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \leq N} |f(n)|^2 \cdot \sup_{p \in S} \sum_{q \in S} \frac{1}{q} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \leq N} (1 - p\mathbb{1}_{p|n})(1 - q\mathbb{1}_{q|n}) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Since f is 1-bounded, we may bound the L^2 norm of f by 1. For all $p \neq q$,

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \leq N} (1 - p\mathbb{1}_{p|n})(1 - q\mathbb{1}_{q|n}) = O\left(\frac{P^2}{N}\right).$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{p \in S} \frac{1}{p} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \leq N} f(n)(1 - p\mathbb{1}_{p|n}) \right|^2 \\ & \leq \sup_{p \in S} \sum_{q \in S} \frac{1}{q} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \leq N} (1 - p\mathbb{1}_{p|n})(1 - q\mathbb{1}_{q|n}) \right| \\ & \leq \sup_{p \in S} \frac{1}{p} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \leq N} (1 - p\mathbb{1}_{p|n})(1 - p\mathbb{1}_{p|n}) \right| + O\left(\frac{P^3}{N}\right) \\ & \leq O(1). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

The main idea in the proof of the prime number theorem is to apply this proposition to the Mobius function. Landau showed that the prime number theorem is elementarily equivalent to the statement that

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \leq N} \mu(n) = o_{N \rightarrow \infty}(1).$$

Pick a large natural number P and an even larger natural number N . (For instance, the reader may imagine that $N = \exp \exp \exp(P)$). Then Proposition 2.2 says that for most primes p ,

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \leq N} \mu(n) \approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \leq N} \mu(n)p\mathbb{1}_{p|n}$$

By change of variables, this is approximately

$$\approx \frac{p}{N} \sum_{n \leq N/p} \mu(pn)$$

For most natural numbers n ,

$$\mu(pn) = -\mu(n).$$

Thus,

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \leq N} \mu(n) \approx -\frac{p}{N} \sum_{n \leq N/p} \mu(n).$$

Suppose we can find primes p , q and r such that

$$\frac{p}{qr} \approx 1$$

or put another way

$$p \approx qr.$$

Suppose further that these primes are chosen such that appropriate versions of

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \leq N} \mu(n) \approx -\frac{p}{N} \sum_{n \leq N/p} \mu(n)$$

also hold for q and r . Then applying this argument successively, we find that

$$\frac{qr}{N} \sum_{n \leq N/qr} \mu(n) \approx -\frac{p}{N} \sum_{n \leq N/p} \mu(n)$$

But since $qr \approx p$,

$$\frac{p}{N} \sum_{n \leq N/p} \mu(n) \approx -\frac{p}{N} \sum_{n \leq N/p} \mu(n)$$

which can only happen if both sides are approximately 0.

Thus, our goal will be to find primes and semiprimes which are close to each other and which are sufficiently generic. More generally, if we could find natural numbers a and b , one with an odd number of prime factors and one with an even number of prime factors with

$$a \approx b$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \leq N} \mu(n) &\approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \leq N} \mu(n) a \mathbb{1}_{a|n} \\ &\approx \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \leq N} \mu(n) b \mathbb{1}_{b|n} \end{aligned}$$

then again we could prove that

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \leq N} \mu(n) \approx 0$$

and deduce the prime number theorem.

Definition 2.3. Let ε be a positive real number, let P be a natural number which is sufficiently large depending on ε and let N be a natural number sufficiently large depending on P . Denote by $\ell(N)$ the quantity

$$\ell(N) = \sum_{n \leq N} \frac{1}{n}.$$

Denote by $S(N)$ the set of primes p such that

$$\frac{1}{N} \left| \sum_{n \leq N} \mu(n) - \sum_{n \leq N} \mu(n) p \mathbb{1}_{p|n} \right| \geq \varepsilon.$$

Then we say a prime p is good if

$$\frac{1}{\ell(N)} \sum_{n \leq N} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{1}_{p \in S(n)} \leq \varepsilon.$$

Otherwise, we say p is bad.

Corollary 2.4. Let ε be a positive real number, let P be a natural number which is sufficiently large depending on ε and let N be a natural number sufficiently large depending on P . Then the set of bad primes is small in the sense that

$$\sum_{p \text{ bad} \leq P} \frac{1}{p} = O(\varepsilon^{-3}).$$

Proof. By Proposition 2.2, for each n sufficiently large,

$$\sum_{p \leq P} \frac{1}{p} \mathbb{1}_{p \notin S(n)} = O(\varepsilon^{-2}).$$

Summing in n gives,

$$\sum_{p \leq P} \frac{1}{p} \frac{1}{\ell(N)} \sum_{n \leq N} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{1}_{p \notin S(n)} = O(\varepsilon^{-2}) + o_{N \rightarrow \infty, P}(1).$$

We remark that for N sufficiently large depending on P , this second error term may be absorbed into the first term. By definition, the set of bad primes is the set of primes such that

$$\frac{1}{\ell(N)} \sum_{n \leq N} \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{1}_{p \notin S(n)} \geq \varepsilon.$$

But then by Chebyshev's theorem,

$$\sum_{p \text{ bad} \leq P} \frac{1}{p} = O(\varepsilon^{-3}).$$

as desired. \square

Proposition 2.5. Suppose that k_0 is sufficiently large. Then for every $k \geq k_0$,

$$\sum_{p \in I_k} \frac{1}{p} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{k}$$

or

$$\sum_{\substack{p_1 p_2 \in I_k \\ p_i \geq \exp(\varepsilon^3 k)}} \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{k}.$$

Proof. This follows from the Selberg symmetry formula. \square

Proposition 2.6. *Suppose that k_0 is sufficiently large. Then there exists k and k' such that $|k - k'| \leq 1$ with k and k' in $[k_0, \varepsilon^{-2} + k_0]$*

$$\sum_{p \in I_k} \frac{1}{p} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{k}$$

and

$$\sum_{\substack{p_1 p_2 \in I_{k'} \\ p_i \geq \exp(\varepsilon^3 k')}} \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{k'}$$

Proof. Suppose not. Then by Proposition 2.5, for each k in $[k_0, \varepsilon^{-2} + k_0]$ either

$$\sum_{p \in I_k} \frac{1}{p} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{k}$$

or

$$\sum_{\substack{p_1 p_2 \in I_k \\ p_i \geq \exp(\varepsilon^3 k)}} \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{k}.$$

If both hold for some k , then by choosing $k = k'$, we could conclude that Proposition 2.6 holds. Thus, we will assume that exactly one of

$$\sum_{p \in I_k} \frac{1}{p} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{k}$$

or

$$\sum_{\substack{p_1 p_2 \in I_k \\ p_i \geq \exp(\varepsilon^3 k)}} \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{k}$$

hold for any choice of k . Whichever holds for k_0 must also hold for $k_0 + 1$ since otherwise we may choose $k = k_0$ and $k' = k_0 + 1$. Inductively, we may assume that for every k in $[k_0, \varepsilon^{-2} + k_0]$ either

$$\sum_{p \in I_k} \frac{1}{p} < \frac{\varepsilon}{k}$$

or

$$\sum_{\substack{p_1 p_2 \in I_k \\ p_i \geq \exp(\varepsilon^3 k)}} \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} < \frac{\varepsilon}{k}.$$

Summing in k , we obtain a contradiction with Mertens theorem: either

$$\sum_{p \in \exp[k_0, \varepsilon^{-2} + k_0]} \frac{1}{p} \lesssim \varepsilon \log k_0$$

or

$$\sum_{k \in [k_0, \varepsilon^{-2} + k_0]} \sum_{\substack{p_1 p_2 \in I_k \\ p_i \geq \exp(\varepsilon^3 k)}} \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} < \varepsilon \log k_0.$$

\square

Proposition 2.7. *For N large, there exists p_1, p_2 and p such that*

$$\frac{p_1 p_2}{p} = 1 + O(\varepsilon)$$

with p_1, p_2 and p good.

Proof. By Proposition 2.6, it suffices to show that, for some k_0

$$\sum_{\substack{p \in \exp[k_0, \varepsilon^{-2} + k_0] \\ p \text{ bad}}} \frac{1}{p} \ll \frac{\varepsilon}{k_0}$$

and that

$$\sum_{\substack{p_1 p_2 \in \exp[k_0, \varepsilon^{-2} + k_0] \\ p_1 \text{ bad} \\ p_1^{\varepsilon^3} \leq p_2 \leq p_1^{\varepsilon^{-3}}}} \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \ll \frac{\varepsilon}{k_0}.$$

For the sake of contradiction, suppose first that

$$\sum_{\substack{p \in \exp[k_0, \varepsilon^{-2} + k_0] \\ p \text{ bad}}} \frac{1}{p} \gtrsim \frac{\varepsilon}{k_0}.$$

Summing in $k_0 \leq \log \log N$, we get that

$$\sum_{\substack{p \leq \log N \\ p \text{ bad}}} \frac{1}{p} \gtrsim \log \log \log N$$

which contradicts Corollary 2.4. Second, suppose that

$$\sum_{\substack{p_1 p_2 \in \exp[k_0, \varepsilon^{-2} + k_0] \\ p_1 \text{ bad} \\ p_1^{\varepsilon^3} \leq p_2 \leq p_1^{\varepsilon^{-3}}}} \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \gtrsim \frac{\varepsilon}{k_0}.$$

Summing in $k_0 \leq \log \log N$ gives

$$\sum_{\substack{p_1 p_2 \leq \log N \\ p_1 \text{ bad} \\ p_1^{\varepsilon^3} \leq p_2 \leq p_1^{\varepsilon^{-3}}}} \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \gtrsim \frac{\varepsilon}{k_0}.$$

For each p_1 , by Chebyshev's theorem,

$$\sum_{p_1^{\varepsilon^3} \leq p_2 \leq p_1^{\varepsilon^{-3}}} \frac{1}{p_2} \lesssim 1.$$

By Corollary 2.4, this implies

$$\sum_{\substack{p_1 p_2 \leq \log N \\ p_1 \text{ bad} \\ p_1^{\varepsilon^3} \leq p_2 \leq p_1^{\varepsilon^{-3}}}} \frac{1}{p_1 p_2} \lesssim \varepsilon^{-2}$$

which yields a contradiction. \square

Theorem 2.8. *The prime number theorem holds, i.e.*

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \leq N} \Lambda(n) = 1 + o_{N \rightarrow \infty}(1)$$

Proof. Let ε be a positive real number, let P be a natural number which is sufficiently large depending on ε and let N be a natural number sufficiently large depending on P . By Proposition 2.7, there exist primes p_1, p_2 and p all good such that

$$\frac{p_1 p_2}{p} = 1 + O(\varepsilon).$$

By definition of a good prime,

$$\frac{1}{M} \left| \sum_{n \leq M} \mu(n) - \sum_{n \leq M} \mu(n) p \mathbb{1}_{p|n} \right| \geq \varepsilon,$$

for at most a small set of M whose reciprocals sum to less than a constant times $\varepsilon \cdot \log N$ and similarly for p_1 and p_2 . In particular, let $S(M)$ denote the set of primes such that

$$\frac{1}{M} \left| \sum_{n \leq M} \mu(n) - \sum_{n \leq M} \mu(n) p \mathbb{1}_{p|n} \right| \geq \varepsilon.$$

Then by definition of a good prime,

$$\frac{1}{\ell(N)} \sum_{M \leq N} \frac{1}{M} \mathbb{1}_{p_1 \in S(M)} \mathbb{1}_{p_2 \in S(M)} \mathbb{1}_{p \in S(M)} = O(\varepsilon).$$

Thus, we may conclude that

$$\frac{1}{\ell(N)} \sum_{M \leq N} \frac{1}{M} \frac{1}{M} \left| \sum_{n \leq M} \mu(n) - \sum_{n \leq M} \mu(n) p \mathbb{1}_{p|n} \right| = O(\varepsilon).$$

Since $\mu(np) = -\mu(n)$, we conclude that

$$\frac{1}{\ell(N)} \sum_{M \leq N} \frac{1}{M} \left| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{n \leq M} \mu(n) + \frac{p}{M} \sum_{n \leq M/p} \mu(n) \right| = O(\varepsilon).$$

Similarly, since p_1 is good,

$$\frac{1}{\ell(N)} \sum_{M \leq N} \frac{1}{M} \left| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{n \leq M} \mu(n) + \frac{p_1}{M} \sum_{n \leq M/p_1} \mu(n) \right| = O(\varepsilon).$$

By change of variables,

$$\frac{1}{\ell(N)} \sum_{M \leq N} \frac{1}{M} \left| \frac{p_1}{M} \sum_{n \leq M/p_1} \mu(n) + \frac{p_1 p_2}{M} \sum_{n \leq M/p_1 p_2} \mu(n) \right| = O(\varepsilon) + O\left(\frac{\log p_1}{\log N}\right).$$

By the triangle inequality and since N is much larger than p_1 ,

$$\frac{1}{\ell(N)} \sum_{M \leq N} \frac{1}{M} \left| \frac{p}{M} \sum_{n \leq M/p} \mu(n) + \frac{p_1 p_2}{M} \sum_{n \leq M/p_1 p_2} \mu(n) \right| = O(\varepsilon).$$

But since $\frac{p_1 p_2}{p} = 1 + O(\varepsilon)$,

$$\frac{1}{\ell(N)} \sum_{M \leq N} \frac{1}{M} \left| \frac{p}{M} \sum_{n \leq M/p} \mu(n) \right| = O(\varepsilon).$$

and therefore, using that p is good again,

$$\frac{1}{\ell(N)} \sum_{M \leq N} \frac{1}{M} \left| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{n \leq M} \mu(n) \right| = O(\varepsilon).$$

This is an averaged version on the equation we want. We want that

$$\left| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{n \leq M} \mu(n) \right| = O(\varepsilon),$$

for all M sufficiently large. To prove this we use the identity

$$\mu \cdot \log = -\mu * \Lambda.$$

Summing both sides up to N gives

$$\sum_{n \leq N} \mu(n) \log n = - \sum_{n \leq N} \sum_{d|n} \mu\left(\frac{n}{d}\right) \Lambda(d).$$

Now by switching the order of summation

$$= - \sum_{d \leq N} \Lambda(d) \left(\sum_{n \leq N/d} \mu(n) \right).$$

If it were not for the factor of $\Lambda(d)$, this would be exactly what we want. Each $\sum_{n \leq M} \mu(n)$ for an integer M occurs in this sum the number of times that $\left\{ \frac{N}{d} \right\} = M$ where $\{\cdot\}$ denotes the fractional part which is proportional to $\frac{N}{M}$. The factor of $\Lambda(d)$ can be removed using the Brun Titchmarsh inequality as follows. First, we break up the sum into different scales

$$= - \sum_{a \in (1+\varepsilon)^{\mathbb{N}}} \sum_{\substack{d \leq N \\ a \leq d < (1+\varepsilon)a}} \Lambda(d) \left(\sum_{n \leq N/d} \mu(n) \right).$$

For all d between a and $(1+\varepsilon)a$, the sums $\sum_{n \leq N/d} \mu(n)$ all give roughly the same value.

$$\begin{aligned} &= - \sum_{a \in (1+\varepsilon)^{\mathbb{N}}} \sum_{\substack{d \leq N \\ a \leq d < (1+\varepsilon)a}} \Lambda(d) \left(\sum_{n \leq N/a} \mu(n) \right) \cdot (1 + O(\varepsilon)) \\ &= - \sum_{a \in (1+\varepsilon)^{\mathbb{N}}} \left(\sum_{n \leq N/a} \mu(n) \right) \left(\sum_{\substack{d \leq N \\ a \leq d < (1+\varepsilon)a}} \Lambda(d) \right) \cdot (1 + O(\varepsilon)), \end{aligned}$$

where the second step just involves pulling out the sum now that it no longer depends on d . By the Brun Titchmarsh inequality,

$$\leq \sum_{a \in (1+\varepsilon)^{\mathbb{N}} // a \leq N} \left| \sum_{n \leq N/a} \mu(n) \right| \cdot (10\varepsilon a),$$

which simplifies to

$$\leq 10 \sum_{M \leq N} \frac{N}{M} \left| \sum_{n \leq M} \mu(n) \right| \cdot (1 + O(\varepsilon)).$$

But we already showed that this sum is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} &= O(\varepsilon N \ell(N)) \\ &= O(\varepsilon N \log N). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\log n = \log N(1 + O(\varepsilon))$ for n between $\varepsilon \frac{N}{\log N}$ and N we conclude that

$$\sum_{n \leq N} \mu(n) = O(\varepsilon).$$

But this classically implies the prime number theorem. \square

3. IN WHAT WAYS IS THIS A DYNAMICAL PROOF?

To begin the argument, we showed that for all N , for most p i.e. all p outside a bad set where

$$\sum_{p \text{ bad}} \frac{1}{p} \leq C_\varepsilon$$

we have that

$$\sum_{n \leq N} \mu(n) = \sum_{n \leq N} \mu(n) p \mathbb{1}_{p|n}.$$

We did this using an L^2 orthogonality argument. Alternately, we can argue using a variant of Tao's entropy decrement argument. Let \mathbf{n} be a random integer less than N . Let $\mathbf{x}_i = \mu(\mathbf{n} + i)$ and let $\mathbf{y}_p = \mathbf{n} \bmod p$. In probability and dynamics, a stochastic process is a sequence of random variables $(\dots, \xi_{-2}, \xi_{-1}, \xi_0, \xi_1, \xi_2, \dots)$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}((\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k) \in A) = \mathbb{P}((\xi_{1+m}, \dots, \xi_{k+m}) \in A)$$

for any set A and for any m . In our setting $(\dots, \mathbf{x}_{-2}, \mathbf{x}_{-1}, \mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots)$ is approximately stationary in the sense that

$$\mathbb{P}((\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_k) \in A) \approx \mathbb{P}((\mathbf{x}_{1+m}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{k+m}) \in A)$$

where the two terms differ by some small error which is $o_{N \rightarrow \infty, m}(1)$. A stationary process is the same as a random variable in a measure preserving system where ξ_{i+1} is the transformation applied to ξ_i . A key invariant of a stationary process is thus the Kolmogorov Sinai entropy:

$$h(\xi) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$$

where

$$H(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n)$$

is the Shannon entropy of (ξ_1, \dots, ξ_n) . This limit exists because

$$\frac{1}{n}H(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \leq n} H(\xi_i | \xi_1, \dots, \xi_{i-1})$$

by the chain rule, which is equal to

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \leq n} H(\xi_0 | \xi_{-1}, \dots, \xi_{-i+1})$$

by stationary. This is a Caesar average of a decreasing sequence which is therefore decreasing. Since entropy is nonnegative, we can conclude that the limit exists. In our case, because $(\dots, \mathbf{x}_{-1}, \mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{x}_1, \dots)$ is almost stationary, we can conclude that

$$\frac{1}{n}H(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n)$$

is almost decreasing in the sense that, for $m < n$,

$$\frac{1}{m}H(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m) \leq \frac{1}{n}H(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n) + o_{N \rightarrow \infty, n}(1).$$

The same is true for the relative entropy

$$\frac{1}{n}H(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n | \mathbf{y}_{p_1}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{p_k})$$

for any fixed set of primes p_1, \dots, p_k .

We define the mutual information between two random variables \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} as

$$I(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) = H(\mathbf{x}) - H(\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{y})$$

and more generally the conditional mutual information

$$I(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y} | \mathbf{z}) = H(\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{z}) - H(\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}).$$

We assume for the rest of the explanation that all random variables take only finitely many values. Mutual information measures how close two random variables are to independent. Two random variables \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} are independent if and only if

$$I(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}) = 0.$$

Intuitively, we think of \mathbf{x} and \mathbf{y} as close to independent if the mutual information is small. The crux of the entropy decrement argument is that we can find primes p such that $(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_p)$ is close to independent of \mathbf{y}_p . The argument is as follows. Let $p_1 < p_2 < \dots < p_k$ be a sequence of primes. Consider the relative entropy

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{p_k}H(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{p_k} | \mathbf{y}_{p_1}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{p_k}) \\ &= \frac{1}{p_k}H(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{p_k} | \mathbf{y}_{p_1}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{p_{k-1}}) - \frac{1}{p_k}I(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{p_k}; \mathbf{y}_{p_k} | \mathbf{y}_{p_1}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{p_{k-1}}) \end{aligned}$$

and because the relative entropy is almost decreasing

$$= \frac{1}{p_{k-1}}H(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{p_{k-1}} | \mathbf{y}_{p_1}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{p_{k-1}}) - \frac{1}{p_k}I(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{p_k}; \mathbf{y}_{p_k} | \mathbf{y}_{p_1}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{p_{k-1}}) + o(1).$$

Inductively, we find

$$\leq H(\mathbf{x}_1) - \sum_{j \leq k} \frac{1}{p_j}I(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{p_j}; \mathbf{y}_{p_j} | \mathbf{y}_{p_1}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{p_{j-1}}) + o(1)$$

We conclude that the set of bad primes p_j for which

$$I(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{p_j}; \mathbf{y}_{p_j} | \mathbf{y}_{p_1}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{p_{j-1}}) \geq \varepsilon$$

satisfies

$$\sum_{p_j \text{ bad}} \frac{1}{p_j} \leq H(\mathbf{x}_1) + o(1) < \infty.$$

Thus, for most primes,

$$I(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{p_j}; \mathbf{y}_{p_j} | \mathbf{y}_{p_1}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{p_{j-1}}) < \varepsilon.$$

We say such primes are good. Intuitively, if p is good then $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_p$ and \mathbf{y}_p are nearly independent. This is formalized by Pinsker's inequality. Pinsker's inequality states that

$$d_{TV}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \leq D(\mathbf{x} | \mathbf{y})^{1/2}$$

where d_{TV} is the total variation distance and D is the Kullback Leibler divergence. For our purposes, the important thing about the Kullback Liebler divergence is that if \mathbf{y}' is a random variable with the same distribution as \mathbf{y} which is independent of \mathbf{x} then

$$D((\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) || (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}')) = I(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}).$$

Therefore, we conclude that

$$d_{TV}((\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}')) \leq I(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y})^{1/2}.$$

Similarly, there is a relative version

$$d_{TV}((\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}), (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}', \mathbf{z})) \leq I(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y} | \mathbf{z})^{1/2},$$

where now \mathbf{y}' has the same distribution as \mathbf{y} but is relatively independent of \mathbf{x} over \mathbf{z} meaning that

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x} \in A, \mathbf{y} \in B | \mathbf{z} = c) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x} \in A | \mathbf{z} = c) \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{y} \in B | \mathbf{z} = c).$$

Thus, for bounded function F ,

$$\mathbb{E}F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z}) = \mathbb{E}F(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}', \mathbf{z}) + O(I(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y})^{1/2}),$$

where again \mathbf{y}' is relatively independent of \mathbf{x} over \mathbf{z} . In our case, for a good prime p where

$$I(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_p; \mathbf{y}_p | (y_q)_{q < p}) < \varepsilon$$

we note that

$$\mathbb{E}F(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_p, \mathbf{y}_p) = \mathbb{E}F(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_p, \mathbf{y}'_p) + O(\varepsilon^{1/2}).$$

for any bounded function F where \mathbf{y}'_p is relatively independent of $(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_p)$ over $(y_q)_{q < p}$. Since \mathbf{y}_p and $(y_q)_{q < p}$ are already very nearly independent by the Chinese remainder theorem (and in fact if N is a multiple of the product of primes less than p , then \mathbf{y}_p and $(y_q)_{q < p}$ are genuinely independent) we can conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}F(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_p, \mathbf{y}_p) = \mathbb{E}F(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_p, \mathbf{y}'_p) + O(\varepsilon^{1/2}),$$

where now \mathbf{y}'_p is genuinely independent of $(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_p)$. For example, if we want to evaluate

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \leq N} \mu(n)$$

we could interpret this as

$$\mathbb{E}F(\mathbf{x}_0)$$

where $F(x) = x$. Alternately, we can average

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \leq N} \mu(n) \approx \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i \leq p} \mu(n+i),$$

which is

$$\mathbb{E}F(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_p)$$

where now $F(x_1, \dots, x_p) = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i \leq p} x_i$. Now let \mathbf{y}'_p as before be independent of $(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_p)$ and uniformly distributed among residue classes mod p . Then this is also

$$\mathbb{E}F(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_p, \mathbf{y}'_p)$$

where

$$F(x_1, \dots, x_p, y_p) = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i \leq p} x_i p \mathbb{1}_{y_p = -i}.$$

As we noted, for p a good prime, this is approximately,

$$\mathbb{E}F(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_p, \mathbf{y}'_p) \approx \mathbb{E}F(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_p, \mathbf{y}_p)$$

and unpacking definitions this is

$$\mathbb{E}F(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_p, \mathbf{y}_p) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \leq N} \frac{1}{p} \sum_{i \leq p} \mu(n+i) p \mathbb{1}_{n \equiv -1 \pmod{p}}$$

and undoing the averaging in i gives

$$\approx \frac{p}{N} \sum_{n \leq N} \mu(n) \mathbb{1}_{p|n}.$$

Thus, the analogue of Corollary 2.4 can be proved using the entropy decrement argument, which can be interpreted in the dynamical setting.

The rest of the proof can also be translated to the dynamical setting. The Furstenberg system corresponding to the Mobius function can be constructed as follows. The underlying space is the set of functions from \mathbb{Z} to $\{-1, 0, 1\}$. We construct a random variable on this space as follows. Consider a random shift of the Mobius function. Formally, let \mathbf{n} be a uniformly chosen random integer between 1 and N and let \mathbf{x}_N denote the function μ (say extended by 0 to the left) shifted by \mathbf{n} i.e. $\mathbf{x}_N(i) = \mu(i + \mathbf{n})$. Since the underlying space of functions from \mathbb{Z} to $\{-1, 0, 1\}$ is compact, there is a subsequence of $(\mathbf{x}_N)_N$ which converges weakly to a random variable \mathbf{x} . Since the distribution of each random variable \mathbf{x}_N is “approximately” shift invariant, the distribution of the limit \mathbf{x} is actually shift invariant. Thus, we obtain a shift invariant measure ν on the space of functions from \mathbb{Z} to $\{-1, 0, 1\}$ with the property that if f is the “evaluation at zero” map

$$f((a_n)_{n \in \mathbb{Z}}) = a_0$$

then

$$\int f(x) \nu(dx) = \mathbb{E}f(\mathbf{x})$$

is the limit of terms of the form

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \leq N} \mu(n).$$

Thus, we can encode questions about the average of μ or more generally shifts like $\mu(n)\mu(n+1)$ in a dynamical way.

In order to take advantage of the fact that μ is multiplicative, we need to impose extra structure on the dynamical systems we associate to μ . This extra structure is implicit in [TT18] and [TT19] and is explicitly described first in [Taoc]. See also [Saw] and [McN]. One key feature of multiplicative functions is that they are statistically multiplicative in the sense that for any $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_k$ in $\{-1, 0, 1\}$,

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \leq N} \mathbb{1}_{\mu(n+pi)=\epsilon_i \text{ for all } i} p \mathbb{1}_{p|n} = \frac{p}{N} \sum_{n \leq N/p} \mathbb{1}_{\mu(n+i)=\epsilon_i \text{ for all } i} \mu(n) + O\left(\frac{1}{p}\right).$$

For N in some subsequence, we can think of the right hand side as

$$\approx \nu\{x: f(T^{ip}x) = \epsilon_i\}.$$

We would like a way of encoding this identity in our dynamical system. One solution is to use logarithmic averaging. Now let \mathbf{n} denote a random integer between 1 and N which is not uniformly distributed but which is logarithmically distributed meaning the probability that $\mathbf{n} = m$ is proportional to $\frac{1}{m}$ for $m \leq N$. Let $\mathbf{x}_N(i) = \mu(n+i)$ be a random translate of the Mobius function. Consider the pair $(\mathbf{x}_N, \mathbf{n})$ in the space of pairs of functions from \mathbb{Z} to $\{-1, 0, 1\}$ and profinite integers. This product space is compact so there is a weak limit (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) where \mathbf{x} is a functions from \mathbb{Z} to $\{-1, 0, 1\}$ and \mathbf{y} is a profinite integer. Let $T(x, y) = (n \mapsto x(n+1), y+1)$. Let ρ be the distribution of (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) which is a T -invariant measure on our space. Consider the map I_p on pairs of functions and profinite integers which are $0 \pmod p$ which dilates the function by p , multiplies the function by -1 and divides the profinite integer by p i.e.

$$I_p(x, y) = (n \mapsto -x(pn), y/p).$$

For a point (x, y) in our space, let M denote the projection onto the second factor

$$M(x, y) = y.$$

Let f be the ‘‘evaluation of the function at 0’’ function i.e.

$$f(x, y) = x(0).$$

Then the dynamical system has the following properties, where x is always a function from \mathbb{Z} to $\{-1, 0, 1\}$ p and q are primes and y is a profinite integer:

- (1) For all p , for all x and y such that $M(x, y) = 0 \pmod p$,

$$I_p(T^p(x, y)) = T^p(I_p(x, y)).$$

- (2) For all p and q , for all x and y where $M(x, y)$ is $0 \pmod{pq}$, we have

$$I_p(I_q(x, y)) = I_q(I_p(x, y)).$$

- (3) For all p , and for all measurable functions on our space ϕ ,

$$\int \phi(x, y) \rho(dxdy) = \int p \mathbb{1}_{M(x, y) = 0 \pmod p} \phi(I_p(x, y)) \rho(dxdy) + O\left(\frac{1}{p}\right).$$

- (4) For all p and for all x and y such that $M(x, y) = 0 \pmod p$ we have that

$$f(I_p(x, y)) = -f(x, y).$$

A tuple $(X, \rho, T, f, M, (I_p)_p)$ where (X, ρ, T) is a measure preserving system and satisfying (1) through (4) is called a dynamical model for μ . Translating our argument over to the dynamical context, there exists some p such that

$$\int f(x, y) \rho(dxdy) \approx \int f(x, y) \cdot p \mathbb{1}_{M(x, y) = 0 \pmod p}.$$

On the other hand,

$$\int f(x, y) \cdot p \mathbb{1}_{M(x, y) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}} = \int -f(I_p(x, y)) \cdot p \mathbb{1}_{M(x, y) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}} \\ \int f(x, y).$$

We conclude that

$$\int f = 0,$$

for any dynamical model for μ .

In [Tao], Tao only constructs a dynamical model where

$$\int f \approx \frac{1}{\log N} \sum_{n \leq N} \frac{1}{n} \mu(n)$$

i.e. using logarithmic averaging. However using either Corollary 2.4 or a version of the entropy decrement argument, we can argue as follows. Let ρ_N denote the distribution of $(\mathbf{x}_N, \mathbf{n})$ in the space of pairs of functions $\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$ and profinite integers and where \mathbf{n} is uniformly distributed random integer between 1 and N and $\mathbf{x}_N(i) = \mu(\mathbf{n} + i)$. For any ϵ in S^1 and ϕ , define $\epsilon_* \rho_n$ by

$$\int \phi(x, y) \epsilon_* \rho_N(dx dy) = \int \phi(\epsilon \cdot x, y) \rho_N(dx dy).$$

Choose ϵ_N so that

$$\nu_m = \left(\sum_{n \leq m} \frac{1}{n} \right)^{-1} \sum_{N \leq m} \frac{1}{N} (\epsilon_N)_* \rho_N,$$

satisfies

$$\int f(x, y) \nu_m(x, y) = \left(\sum_{n \leq m} \frac{1}{n} \right)^{-1} \sum_{N \leq M} \frac{1}{N} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \leq N} \mu(n) \right|,$$

i.e. ϵ_N is the sign of $\sum_{n \leq N} \mu(n)$. Using a version of Corollary 2.4 or the entropy decrement argument, one can prove that for more most p (except for a set of logarithmic size at most a constant depending on ϵ),

$$(I_p)_*(p \mathbb{1}_{M \equiv 0 \pmod{p}} \nu_m) \approx \nu_m + O\left(\epsilon + \frac{\log p}{\log M}\right).$$

By the argument from before, this is enough to conclude the prime number theorem.

REFERENCES

- [Dab89] H. Daboussi, *On the prime number theorem for arithmetic progressions*, J. Number Theory **31** (1989), no. 3, 243–254. MR993901
- [Erd49] P. Erdős, *On a Tauberian theorem connected with the new proof of the prime number theorem*, J. Indian Math. Soc. (N.S.) **13** (1949), 131–144. MR333309
- [EW17] Manfred Einsiedler and Thomas Ward, *Functional analysis, spectral theory, and applications*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 276, Springer, Cham, 2017. MR3729416
- [GHS19] Andrew Granville, Adam J. Harper, and K. Soundararajan, *A new proof of Halász’s theorem, and its consequences*, Compos. Math. **155** (2019), no. 1, 126–163. MR3880027
- [Gol04] D. Goldfeld, *The elementary proof of the prime number theorem: an historical perspective*, Number theory (New York, 2003), 2004, pp. 179–192. MR2044518
- [Gol73] L. J. Goldstein, *Correction to: “A history of the prime number theorem” (Amer. Math. Monthly **80** (1973), 599–615)*, Amer. Math. Monthly **80** (1973), 1115. MR330016

- [Hil86] Adolf Hildebrand, *The prime number theorem via the large sieve*, *Mathematika* **33** (1986), no. 1, 23–30. MR859495
- [McN] Redmond. McNamara, *Sarnak's conjecture for sequences of almost quadratic word growth*.
- [Ric] Florian. Richter, *A new elementary proof of the prime number theorem*.
- [Saw] Will. Sawin, *Dynamical models for liouville and obstructions to further progress on sign patterns*.
- [Sel50] Atle Selberg, *An elementary proof of the prime-number theorem for arithmetic progressions*, *Canad. J. Math.* **2** (1950), 66–78. MR33306
- [Taoa] Terence Tao, *254a, notes 9 second moment and entropy methods*.
- [Taob] ———, *A banach algebra proof of the prime number theorem*.
- [Taoc] ———, *Furstenberg limits of the liouville function*.
- [TT18] Terence Tao and Joni Teräväinen, *Odd order cases of the logarithmically averaged Chowla conjecture*, *J. Théor. Nombres Bordeaux* **30** (2018), no. 3, 997–1015. MR3938639
- [TT19] ———, *The structure of correlations of multiplicative functions at almost all scales, with applications to the Chowla and Elliott conjectures*, *Algebra Number Theory* **13** (2019), no. 9, 2103–2150. MR4039498
- [Zag97] D. Zagier, *Newman's short proof of the prime number theorem*, *Amer. Math. Monthly* **104** (1997), no. 8, 705–708. MR1476753