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Abstract

We present a derivation of the numerical phenomenon that differences between the Riemann zeta function’s nontrivial zeros tend to avoid being equal to the imaginary parts of the zeros themselves, a property called statistical “repulsion” between the zeros and their differences. Our derivation relies on the statistical properties of the prime zeta function, whose singularity structure specifies the positions of the Riemann zeros. We show that the prime zeta function on the critical line is asymptotically normally distributed with a covariance function that is closely approximated by the logarithm of the Riemann zeta function’s magnitude on the 1-line. This creates notable negative covariance at separations approximately equal to the imaginary parts of the Riemann zeros. This covariance function and the singularity structure of the prime zeta function combine to create a conditional statistical bias at the locations of the Riemann zeros that predicts the zero-difference repulsion effect. Our method readily generalizes to describe similar effects in the zeros of related Dirichlet L-functions.
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1 Introduction

Numerical evidence from multiple sources has shown a notable phenomenon in the famous nontrivial zeros of the Riemann zeta function. It appears that differences between the Riemann zeros tend to avoid being equal to the imaginary parts of the Riemann zeros themselves. This “repulsion effect” has been presented in Snaith’s (2010) review and it was recently discovered in histograms of Riemann zero differences by Perez Marco (2011). Clear numerical evidence for this repulsion effect is visible in Figure 1, where a histogram of differences for the first 100,000 Riemann zeros clearly shows troughs around the imaginary parts of the Riemann zeros themselves.

The first predictions of this effect came from research on the 2-point correlation function of the Riemann zeros, following the influential tradition initiated by Montgomery (1973). The effect was originally predicted by Bogolmny & Keating (1996), who gave a heuristic argument based on ideas from quantum chaos. Conrey & Snaith (2008) then provided support for this argument by showing its derivation from a conjecture on the ratios of L-functions given by Conrey, Farmer, & Zirnbauer (2008). Rodgers (2013) gave further support for Bogolmny & Keating’s result under the Riemann Hypothesis, and Ford and Zaharescu (2015) provided unconditional proof of the effect.

In this paper we take a different approach and present an alternative, probabilistic derivation of the repulsion effect, using the statistical properties of prime Dirichlet series. Our argument reaches a related conclusion to previous research, showing that the repulsion effect originates from the influence
of $\zeta(1 + i\Delta)$. We show that the statistical properties of the prime zeta function on the critical line, $P(1/2 + i\tau)$, are described by a covariance function closely approximated by $\log |\zeta(1 + i\Delta)|$. This produces negative covariance at separations $\Delta$ approximately equal to the imaginary parts of the Riemann zeros. By an important relation between $P(s)$ and $\log \zeta(s)$, the singularity structure of $P(1/2 + i\tau)$ determines the location of Riemann zeros on the critical line. We then show that the combination of $P(1/2 + i\tau)$’s singularity structure and covariance structure creates a conditional bias at the Riemann zeros, which predicts the zero-difference repulsion effect. We close by briefly noting how our methodology may be readily generalized to predict the same effect in the complex zeros of related Dirichlet L-functions.

2 Covariance in Prime Dirichlet Series

We first study the statistical properties of prime Dirichlet series with the form

$$X_t(\tau) = \sum_{p \leq t} a_p e^{i(\tau \log p + \theta_p)}$$

(2.1)

where the $a_p > 0$ are real numbers indexed by the prime numbers $p$, $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\theta_p \in [0, 2\pi)$. It is clear that $EX_t(\tau) = 0$ for $\tau$ uniformly distributed in $\mathbb{R}$. We will focus on (2.1)’s covariance function, which is given by another prime Dirichlet series.

Theorem 2.1. Suppose $\tau$ is uniformly distributed in $\mathbb{R}$. Then (2.1)’s summands are independent and for all $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}$

$$2R_t(\Delta) = \sum_{p \leq t} a_p^2 \cos (\Delta \log p)$$

(2.2)

where

$$R_t(\Delta) = E \{\text{Re} X_t(\tau + \Delta) \text{Re} X_t(\tau)\} = E \{\text{Im} X_t(\tau + \Delta) \text{Im} X_t(\tau)\}.$$ (2.3)

Proof. We first derive the characteristic function of (2.1)’s imaginary part. Recall that a random variable $x$’s characteristic function is defined

$$\varphi_x(\lambda) = E \{e^{i\lambda x}\}.$$ (2.4)

We substitute (2.1)’s imaginary part into (2.4) to write

$$\varphi_{X_t}(\lambda) = E \left\{ \prod_{p \leq t} \exp \left( ia_p \lambda \sin (\tau \log p + \theta_p) \right) \right\}.$$ (2.5)

We expand (2.5) using the Bessel function identity

$$e^{ix \sin \phi} = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} J_n(x) e^{in\phi}$$

(2.6)

where $J_n(\cdot)$ is the $n$th-order Bessel function of the first kind (Laurinčikas 1996). This gives

$$\varphi_{X_t}(\lambda) = E \left\{ \sum_{n_1, \ldots, n_N} J_{n_1} (a_{p_1} \lambda) \ldots J_{n_N} (a_{p_N} \lambda) e^{i(n_1 \theta_{p_1} + \ldots + n_N \theta_{p_N})} e^{i\tau(n_1 \log p_1 + \ldots + n_N \log p_N)} \right\}.$$ (2.7)
The exponential terms on (2.7)’s far right-hand side are unit circle rotations with $\tau$. Therefore taking the expected value will cause all terms to vanish except those for which

$$n_1 \log p_1 + \ldots + n_N \log p_N = 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.8)

However, by unique-prime-factorization, the $\log p$’s are linearly independent over the rational numbers. Therefore the only solution to (2.8) is given by

$$n_1 = n_2 = \ldots = n_N = 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.9)

This simplifies (2.7) to give

$$\varphi_{\text{Im}X_t}(\lambda) = \prod_{p \leq t} J_0(a_p \lambda).$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.10)

We next note from (2.4) and (2.6) that the characteristic function for a single summand in (2.1)’s imaginary part, $a_p \sin(\tau \log p + \theta_p)$, is given by

$$\varphi_p(\lambda) = J_0(a_p \lambda).$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.11)

Therefore, by (2.10) and (2.11),

$$\varphi_{\text{Im}X_t}(\lambda) = \prod_{p \leq t} \varphi_p(\lambda).$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.12)

This proves that the summands of (2.1)’s imaginary part are statistically independent. Essentially equivalent reasoning using the identity

$$e^{ix \cos \phi} = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} i^n J_n(x) e^{in\phi}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.13)

gives equivalent results for (2.1)’s real part.

We next compute the covariance function for (2.1)’s imaginary part. We first write

$$\text{Im}X_t(\tau + \Delta)\text{Im}X_t(\tau) = \sum_{p \leq t} a_p^2 \sin((\tau + \Delta) \log p + \theta_p) \sin(\tau \log p + \theta_p) + 2 \sum_{p \neq q, p,q \leq t} a_p a_q \sin((\tau + \Delta) \log p + \theta_p) \sin(\tau \log q + \theta_q).$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.14)

By the independence of (2.1)’s summands from (2.10)-(2.12), the expected value of (2.14)’s last summation vanishes. We then note that

$$\sin((\tau + \Delta) \log p + \theta_p) \sin(\tau \log p + \theta_p) = \frac{1}{2} (\cos(\Delta \log p) - \cos((2\tau + \Delta) \log p + 2\theta_p)).$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.15)

The expected value of (2.15)’s second term vanishes. Applying this reasoning to (2.14)’s first summation gives the result (2.2). Essentially equivalent reasoning using the identity

$$\cos((\tau + \Delta) \log p + \theta_p) \cos(\tau \log p + \theta_p) = \frac{1}{2} (\cos(\Delta \log p) + \cos((2\tau + \Delta) \log p + 2\theta_p))$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.16)

gives the result (2.2) for (2.1)’s real part as well.

Theorem 2.1 shows that, for each prime $p$, the $p^{i\tau}$ are independent random variables. This independence property enables the straightforward evaluation of (2.1)’s covariance function. Next we apply Theorem 2.1’s results to study the repulsion effect in the nontrivial zeros of the Riemann zeta function.
3 Application to the Riemann Zeros

We use the notation \( P_t(s) = \sum_{p \leq t} p^{-s} \) and we denote the case with infinite \( t \) as simply \( P(s) \), which is the prime zeta function. We consider the particular series

\[
P_t(1/2 + i\tau) = \sum_{p \leq t} \frac{1}{p^{1/2 + i\tau}},
\]

which is an important object for research on the Riemann zeta function’s behavior on the critical line (see e.g. Fyodorov & Keating 2014, Arguin & Tai 2019). We will apply the previous section’s results to study (3.1)’s statistical properties. We first use the results of Section 2 to show that (3.1)’s real and imaginary parts are asymptotically normally distributed.

**Lemma 3.1.** For \( \tau \) uniformly distributed in \( \mathbb{R} \), as \( t \to \infty \),

\[
\frac{1}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \log \log t}} \text{Re} P_t(1/2 + i\tau) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \log \log t}} \text{Im} P_t(1/2 + i\tau) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1).
\]

**Proof.** We note from (2.2) that the variance of (3.1)’s real and imaginary parts is given by

\[
\text{var} \{\text{Re} X_t(\tau)\} = \text{var} \{\text{Im} X_t(\tau)\} = R_t(0) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p \leq t} a_p^2.
\]

Setting \( a_p = 1/p^{1/2} \) then shows that

\[
\text{var} \{\text{Re} P_t(1/2 + i\tau)\} = \text{var} \{\text{Im} P_t(1/2 + i\tau)\} = \frac{1}{2} P_t(1) = \frac{1}{2} \log \log t + O(1)
\]

by Mertens’ 2nd theorem. We next note that since \( P_t(1/2 + i\tau)’s \) summands are independent by Theorem 2.1, we may apply Lyapunov’s Central Limit Theorem (see e.g. Billingsley 1995) with \( \delta = 2 \), using (3.4) to give

\[
\frac{1}{(1/2 P_t(1))^2} \sum_{p \leq t} E \left\{ \left( \frac{\cos(\tau \log p)}{p^{1/2}} \right)^4 \right\} = \frac{1}{(1/2 P_t(1))^2} \sum_{p \leq t} E \left\{ \left( \frac{\sin(\tau \log p)}{p^{1/2}} \right)^4 \right\} = C \frac{1}{\log^2 \log t} + O(\log \log t) = O\left( \frac{1}{\log^2 \log t} \right),
\]

where \( C = E \cos^4(\omega \tau) = E \sin^4(\omega \tau) = 12/32 \) for arbitrary \( \omega \in \mathbb{R} \). This completes the proof of (3.2), since (3.5) vanishes as \( t \to \infty \). \( \square \)

The result (3.2) is quite similar to the famous central limit theorem proven by Selberg (1946). This can be explained for the real part with the following important fact, which is used in proofs of Selberg’s limit theorem, and which we will use later.

\[
\text{Re} P_t \times X(t)(1/2 + i\tau) \Rightarrow \text{Re} P(1/2 + i\tau)
\]

as \( t \to \infty \), where \( t \leq \tau \leq 2t \) and \( X(t) = 1/(\log \log \log t)^2 \) (Radziwill & Soundararajan 2017). Since (3.1) is asymptotically normally distributed, its statistical dependence structure is entirely described by its covariance function as \( t \to \infty \). By (2.2), the covariance function for (3.1) is given by

\[
2R_t(\Delta) = \sum_{p \leq t} \frac{\cos(\Delta \log p)}{p} = \text{Re} P_t(1 + i\Delta).
\]
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Figure 2: A graph of (3.7)'s $2R_t(\Delta)$ with $t = p_{1,000,000}$ (Red) along with $\log|\zeta(1 + i\Delta)|$ (Green) for $0 \leq \Delta \leq 100$. Vertical lines are positioned at values of $\Delta$ such that $\zeta(1/2 + i\Delta) = 0$.

Numerical evidence suggests that the behavior of the series (3.7) is closely connected to the imaginary parts of the Riemann zeros. This connection is visually evident in Figure 2, where we have computed (3.7) using the first 1 million primes. It is clear that (3.7) has minima approximately positioned at values of $\Delta$ such that $\zeta(1/2 + i\Delta) = 0$. These minima correspond to notable anti-correlations over such distances $\Delta$. It is also clear that (3.7) very closely follows the function $\log|\zeta(1 + i\Delta)|$.

To explain this phenomenon, we first note that there is no requirement in Theorem 2.1 that $t$ be finite. We therefore conclude that the covariance function for the full prime zeta function on the critical line, $P(1/2 + i\tau)$, is given by the prime zeta function on the 1-line, $P(1 + i\Delta)$, i.e.,

$$2R(\Delta) = 2 \lim_{t \to \infty} R_t(\Delta) = \sum_p \frac{\cos(\Delta \log p)}{p} = \text{Re}P(1 + i\Delta). \quad (3.8)$$

We next prove the following relation between $P(1/2 + i\tau)$'s covariance function and the Riemann zeta function.

**Lemma 3.2.** For all $\Delta \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$2R(\Delta) = \log|\zeta(1 + i\Delta)| - \varepsilon(\Delta), \quad (3.9)$$

where $|\varepsilon(\Delta)| < 1 - \gamma \approx .422784$. 


Proof. We first note the following result relating $P(s)$ and $\log \zeta(s)$ for $\text{Re}(s) > 0$, $\text{Im}(s) \neq 0$, which can be derived by using the Euler product representation of $\zeta(s)$, taking the logarithm, and applying Möbius inversion (see Glaisher 1891, Fröburg 1968).

$$P(s) = \log \zeta(s) + \sum_{n=2}^\infty \frac{\mu(n)}{n} \log \zeta(ns),$$

(3.10)

where $\mu(n)$ denotes the Möbius function. We next note from the Dirichlet series representation of $\zeta(n+in\Delta)$ that for $n \geq 2$, $|\zeta(n+in\Delta)| = 1$ shows that $|\zeta(n+1)| \leq 1 < 1$. Therefore by the alternating series expansion of the logarithm,

$$|\log \zeta(n+in\Delta)| = \left| \sum_{k=1}^\infty \frac{(-1)^{k+1}}{k} (\zeta(n+in\Delta) - 1)^k \right| < |\zeta(n+in\Delta)| \leq \zeta(n) - 1. \quad (3.11)$$

Then by (3.11) and since $\mu(n) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ for all $n$, we have

$$\left| \sum_{n=2}^\infty \frac{\mu(n)}{n} \log \zeta(n+in\Delta) \right| < \sum_{n=2}^\infty \frac{|\log \zeta(n+in\Delta)|}{n} < \sum_{n=2}^\infty \frac{\zeta(n) - 1}{n} = 1 - \gamma. \quad (3.12)$$

(3.12)’s last equality can be shown by using the integral definition of $\zeta(n)$ for $n > 1$ along with $\Gamma(n)$’s factorial and integral definition to write

$$\sum_{n=2}^\infty \frac{\zeta(n) - 1}{n} = \sum_{n=2}^\infty \frac{1}{n!} \int_0^\infty x^{n-1} \left( \frac{1}{e^x - 1} - \frac{1}{e^x} \right) \, dx = \int_0^\infty \frac{e^x - 1 - x}{xe^x(e^x - 1)} \, dx$$

$$= \int_0^\infty \frac{dx}{e^x} - \int_0^\infty \left( \frac{1}{e^x - 1} - \frac{1}{xe^x} \right) \, dx = 1 - \gamma \quad (3.13)$$

since (3.13)’s last integral is an identity for $\gamma$ (Whittaker & Watson 1990). Applying (3.12) in (3.10) with $s = 1 + i\Delta$ shows that

$$P(1 + i\Delta) = \log \zeta(1 + i\Delta) + f(\Delta) \quad (3.14)$$

where $|f(\Delta)| < 1 - \gamma$. Combining (3.8) and (3.14) with $\text{Re} f(\Delta) = -\varepsilon(\Delta)$ completes the proof. \hfill \Box

This shows that (3.8)’s $R(\Delta)$ is highly dependent on $\log |\zeta(1 + i\Delta)|$, which produces negative minima at $\Delta$ near values such that $\zeta(1/2 + i\Delta) = 0$. This behavior is also exhibited by (3.7), which can be explained by showing that (3.7) converges in mean square and hence converges in probability to (3.8) very quickly as $t$ increases.

Proposition 3.1. Suppose $\Delta$ is uniformly distributed in $\mathbb{R}$, then for all $t \geq 2$,

$$E \left\{ (\text{Re} P_t(1 + i\Delta) - \text{Re} P(1 + i\Delta))^2 \right\} = \frac{P(2) - P_t(2)}{2} \leq .22612371... \quad (3.15)$$

Proof. We recall the independence of (2.1)’s summands and that $E \cos^2(\omega \Delta) = 1/2$ for arbitrary $\omega$ to write

$$E \left\{ (\text{Re} P(1 + i\Delta) - \text{Re} P_t(1 + i\Delta))^2 \right\} = E \left\{ \left( \sum_{p > t} \frac{\cos (\Delta \log p)}{p} \right)^2 \right\}$$

$$= E \left\{ \sum_{p > t} \frac{\cos^2 (\Delta \log p)}{p^2} \right\} + 2 \sum_{p > q \geq t} \frac{\cos (\Delta \log p) \cos (\Delta \log q)}{pq} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p > t} \frac{1}{p^2},$$

which completes the proof of (3.15). \hfill \Box
Overall, the covariance structure of \( P_t(1/2 + i\tau) \), with finite or infinite \( t \), is heavily influenced by \( \log |\zeta(1 + i\Delta)| \), which creates negative covariance like that depicted in Figure 2.

We next apply the formula (3.10) to the critical line to note that

\[
\text{Re} P(1/2 + i\tau) = \log |\zeta(1/2 + i\tau)| + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(n)}{n} \log |\zeta(n(1/2 + i\tau))|. \tag{3.16}
\]

Recall that \( \zeta(s) \) has no zeros with \( \text{Re}(s) \geq 1 \) (Hadamard, de la Vallée Poissin 1896) and its only pole is at \( s = 1 \). Also, one can easily show that the terms of the series on (3.16)’s far right-hand side are \( O\left(\frac{1}{n^{2/3}}\right) \) as \( n \to \infty \) and hence the series is convergent for any \( \tau \neq 0 \). Therefore, for \( \tau \neq 0 \), the singularities of (3.16) unambiguously define the positions of \( \zeta(1/2 + i\tau) \)’s zeros. With this context, we next consider the following limit theorem, which nearly completes our derivation of \( \zeta(1/2 + i\tau) \)’s zero-difference repulsion effect.

**Theorem 3.1.** For all \( 0 < \Delta \leq \tau \), as \( \tau \to \infty \),

\[
p \left( \frac{\text{Re} P(1/2 + i(\tau + \Delta))}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \log \log \tau}} \right| \zeta(1/2 + i\tau) = 0 \right) \to \mathcal{N} \left( \frac{-\log |\zeta(1 + i\Delta)| + \varepsilon(\Delta)}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \log \log \tau}}, 1 \right) \tag{3.17}
\]

where \( p(\cdot|\cdot) \) denotes the conditional probability density function.

**Proof.** By Lemma 3.1, both \( \text{Re} P_t(1/2 + i\tau) \) and \( \text{Re} P_t(1/2 + i(\tau + \Delta)) \) are normally and identically distributed as \( t \to \infty \). We therefore use the following formula for normally and identically distributed \( x \) and \( y \) with \( E\{x\} = E\{y\} = 0 \).

\[
E\{x|y\} = \text{corr}\{x,y\} \times \frac{\text{var}\{x\}}{\text{var}\{y\}} \times y = \frac{\text{cov}\{x,y\}}{\text{var}\{y\}} \times y. \tag{3.18}
\]

Substituting (3.8) into (3.18) gives

\[
E\{\text{Re} P_t(1/2 + i(\tau + \Delta))|\text{Re} P_t(1/2 + i\tau)\} = \frac{R_t(\Delta)}{R_t(0)} \times \text{Re} P_t(1/2 + i\tau) \tag{3.19}
\]

and taking \( t \to \infty \) gives

\[
E\{\text{Re} P(1/2 + i(\tau + \Delta))|\text{Re} P(1/2 + i\tau)\} = \frac{R(\Delta)}{R(0)} \times \text{Re} P(1/2 + i\tau)
\]

\[
= \frac{2R(\Delta)}{\log \zeta(1) + O(1)} \times \text{Re} P(1/2 + i\tau) = 2R(\Delta) \frac{\text{Re} P(1/2 + i\tau)}{\lim_{x \to 0+} \log \frac{1}{x} + O(1)}, \tag{3.20}
\]

where the second line is reached by recalling from (3.9) that \( R_t(0) \to R(0) = \frac{1}{2} \log \zeta(1) + O(1) \) and noting from the Laurent expansion of \( \zeta(x) \) that

\[
\zeta(1) = \lim_{x \to 1^+} \frac{1}{x - 1} = \lim_{x \to 0^+} \frac{1}{x}.
\]

For any finite value of \( \text{Re} P(1/2 + i\tau) \), (3.19) will vanish. However, by (3.16), at the Riemann zeros we have

\[
E\{\text{Re} P(1/2 + i(\tau + \Delta))|\zeta(1/2 + i\tau) = 0\} = 2R(\Delta) \frac{\lim_{x \to 0^+} \log x + \text{I}t.}{-\lim_{x \to 0^+} \log x + O(1)} = -2R(\Delta) = -\log |\zeta(1 + i\Delta)| + \varepsilon(\Delta) \tag{3.21}
\]
from Lemma 3.2. We next note the bivariate normal conditional variance formula,
\[
\text{var}\{x|y\} = \text{var}\{x\} \left(1 - \left(\frac{\text{cov}\{x,y\}}{\text{var}\{x\}}\right)^2\right) = \text{var}\{x\} - \left(\frac{\text{cov}\{x,y\}}{\text{var}\{x\}}\right)^2.
\] (3.22)
Again noting Lemma 3.1 and applying (3.22) to \(\text{Re} P_t(1/2 + i\tau)\) and \(\text{Re} P_t(1/2 + i(\tau + \Delta))\) with \(\Delta \neq 0\) as \(t \to \infty\) then gives
\[
\text{var}\{\text{Re} P_t(1/2 + i(\tau + \Delta))|\text{Re} P_t(1/2 + i\tau)\} = \frac{1}{2} P_t(1) - \frac{R_t^2(\Delta)}{2} = \frac{1}{2} P_t(1) + o(1) = \frac{1}{2} \log \log t + O(1)
\] (3.23)
by (3.8)-(3.9) and Merten’s 2nd theorem. We lastly note from (3.6) that for \(0 < \Delta \leq \tau\) and \(t = \tau^{1/(\log \log \log \tau)^2}\),
\[
P_t(1/2 + i(\tau + \Delta)) \overset{d}{\to} P(1/2 + i(\tau + \Delta))
\]
as \(\tau \to \infty\). We therefore conclude from (3.21) and (3.23) that as \(\tau \to \infty\)
\[
p(\text{Re} P(1/2 + (\tau + \Delta))|\zeta(1/2 + i\tau) = 0) \to \mathcal{N}\left(-\log |\zeta(1+i\Delta)| + \varepsilon(\Delta), \frac{1}{2} \log \log \tau + o(\log \log \tau)\right)
\] (3.24)
This completes the proof of (3.17).

(3.19)-(3.21) shows that \(\text{Re} P(1/2 + i(\tau + \Delta))\)’s conditional expectation asymptotically vanishes at all \(\tau \neq 0\) unless \(\zeta(1/2 + i\tau) = 0\), where it then becomes closely approximated by \(-\log |\zeta(1+i\Delta)|\).

At such values of \(\tau\), this results in \(\text{Re} P(1/2 + i(\tau + \Delta))\)’s conditional expectation having maxima at \(\Delta\) approximately equal to the imaginary parts of Riemann zeros. The positions \(\Delta\) of these maxima in the means of (3.17) and (3.24) imply a decreased probability that \(\text{Re} P(1/2 + i(\tau + \Delta)) < L\) for any \(L < 0\). By (3.16), this implies a decreased probability that \(|\zeta(1/2 + i(\tau + \Delta))| = 0\). The results (3.17) and (3.24) thus predict the zero-difference repulsion effect.

A visualization is given in Figure 3, where (3.24)’s probability that \(\text{Re} P(1/2 + i(\tau + \Delta))\) takes an extreme negative value is graphed for \(\tau\) given by the hundred thousandth Riemann zero ordinate. It is clear that the likelihood of such an extreme negative value, which is a necessary condition for \(\zeta(1/2 + i(\tau + \Delta))\) to vanish by (3.16), is much higher for regions of \(\Delta\) away from the imaginary parts of the Riemann zeros. We lastly note that (3.24) becomes the uniform distribution, and equivalently, (3.17)’s mean vanishes as \(\tau \to \infty\). Hence this effect weakens higher up the critical line.

4 Generalization to Dirichlet L-Function Zeros

Perez Marco (2011) showed that a very similar effect occurs in many L-functions. In particular, he showed that the differences of the complex zeros of the L-functions \(L(\chi_3, s)\), \(L(\chi_4, s)\), and \(L(\chi_{7,3}, s)\) also seem to repel the Riemann zeros, indicating a connection between Riemann zeta and L-function zeros. We may explain this using our methodology by defining the following prime Dirichlet series
\[
P_\chi(s) = \sum_p \frac{\chi(p)}{p^s}
\] (4.1)
for a given Dirichlet character \(\chi\) s.t. \(\chi(p) = e^{i\theta_p}\). With \(s = 1/2 + i\tau\), Theorem 2.1 and Lemma 3.1’s reasoning may be applied to show that the real and imaginary parts of (4.1) are normally distributed.
Figure 3: A graph of \( P \{ \text{Re} \left( \frac{1}{2} + i (\tau + \Delta) \right) \leq -3\sigma |\zeta (\frac{1}{2} + i\tau) = 0 \} \), evaluated by integrating (3.24), with \( 0 < \Delta \leq 100 \) and \( \sigma = \frac{1}{2} \log \log \tau \), where \( \tau \) is the imaginary part of the 100,000th Riemann zero.

We next note that for any Dirichlet character modulo \( n \), \( \chi_n \), where \( n \) has prime factorization,

\[
n = \prod_p p^{m_p},
\]

(4.2)

\( \chi_n(p) = 0 \) for any \( p \) such that \( m_p \neq 0 \), while for any \( p \) with \( m_p = 0 \), \( |\chi_n(p)| = 1 \). Therefore we may apply Theorem 2.1 to show that, for \( s = \frac{1}{2} + i\tau \), the covariance function for (4.1)’s real and imaginary parts corresponding to the Dirichlet character \( \chi_n \) have the same form as (3.8)-(3.9) with

\[
|\varepsilon_{\chi_n}(\Delta)| < 1 - \gamma + \sum_{p \atop m_p \neq 0} \frac{1}{p}.
\]

(4.3)

For \( \chi_3 \), \( \chi_4 \), and \( \chi_{7,3} \) these error bounds are relatively small since the only prime factors of these characters’ moduli are 3, 2, and 7 respectively. However, the error bound increases for moduli \( n \) with a larger number of prime factors. We lastly note that (3.10) may be generalized to give the following relationship between Dirichlet L-functions \( L(\chi, s) \) and corresponding prime Dirichlet L-functions \( P_\chi(s) \):

\[
P_\chi(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\mu(n)}{n} \log L(ns, \chi^n).
\]

(4.4)

Then a generalization of (3.6) for series of the form (4.1), such as that provided in Hsu & Wong (2019), enables derivation of an essentially equivalent result to (3.17), which, by (4.4) and its corresponding generalization of (3.16), has the same interpretation.

Data used in this paper is accessible at http://www.dtc.umn.edu/~odlyzko/zeta_tables/index.html and https://primes.utm.edu/lists/small/millions/.
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