

# IMPLICATIONS OF SUBCONVEXITY BOUNDS FOR THE MOMENTS OF $\zeta(s)$

KEVIN SMITH

**ABSTRACT.** It is well-known that upper bounds for moments of the Riemann zeta function  $\zeta(s)$  have implications for subconvexity bounds. In this paper we explore some implications in the opposite direction using functional analysis in the right-half of the critical strip. The main results characterise potential transitions in the behaviour of the moments.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Since Montgomery's work [17] on the pair-correlation of the zeros of the Riemann zeta function  $\zeta(s)$ , in particular the work of Katz and Sarnak [15], Keating and Snaith [16], Conrey, Farmer, Keating, Rubinstein and Snaith [1] and Farmer, Gonek and Hughes [5], it is now widely believed that zero distributions, moments and bounds in families of  $L$ -functions approximating critical lines and critical points correspond to those of the characteristic polynomials of large random matrices in one of the classical compact groups. For the moments of  $\zeta(s)$ ,

$$M_k(\sigma, T) = \int_0^T |\zeta(\sigma + it)|^{2k} dt,$$

it was conjectured (assuming the Riemann hypothesis) by Keating and Snaith [16] by analogy with the unitary case, and by Conrey and Ghosh [4] and Conrey and Gonek [3] using conjectures on additive divisor sums, that

$$(1.1) \quad M_k(1/2, T) \sim a_k g_k T (\log T)^{k^2}$$

where

$$(1.2) \quad a_k = \prod_{p \text{ prime}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)^{(k-1)^2} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \binom{k-1}{n}^2 p^{-n} \quad \text{and} \quad g_k = \frac{G^2(k+1)}{G(2k+1)}$$

in which  $G(z)$  is Barnes'  $G$ -function. In particular, the work of Keating and Snaith and Gonek, Hughes and Keating [7] predicts that the factor  $g_k(\log T)^{k^2}$  arises from the influence of the zeros and their distribution on the critical line  $\sigma = 1/2$ , while the constant factor  $a_k$  arises from the influence of the primes. More recently, building

on work of Soundararajan [19], Harper [11] has shown that the Riemann hypothesis alone implies that

$$(1.3) \quad M_k(1/2, T) \ll_k T(\log T)^{k^2} \quad (k > 0).$$

Lower bounds for  $M_k(1/2, T)$  of the correct order of magnitude for all  $k \geq 1$  were computed by Radziwiłł and Soundararajan [18] and for all  $k > 0$  by Heap and Soundararajan [9]. However, the upper bound in (1.3) is known unconditionally only when  $k \leq 2$ . The cases  $k = 1$  and  $2$  are classical results of Hardy and Littlewood [8] and Ingham [13], respectively. The difficulties involved in computing  $M_k(\sigma, T)$  increase not only with increasing  $k$  on the critical line, but also as  $\sigma$  decreases toward  $1/2$  for each fixed  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . However, in the region  $1/2 < \sigma < 1$  where zeros are rarer (of course, the Riemann hypothesis predicts there are none), it is expected that  $M_k(\sigma, T)$  is completely determined by the influence of the primes. Indeed, this is a consequence of the Lindelöf hypothesis which we discuss below.

Denoting by  $d_k(n)$  the number of ways of writing  $n$  as a product of  $k$  factors,  $M_k(\sigma, T)$  obeys a convexity principle as a function of  $\sigma$ , one consequence of which is that the statements

$$(1.4) \quad M_k(\sigma_k, T) \ll T^{1+\epsilon} \quad (\sigma_k \geq 1/2),$$

$$(1.5) \quad M_k(\sigma, T) \ll T \quad (1/2 \leq \sigma_k < \sigma < 1)$$

and

$$(1.6) \quad \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{M_k(\sigma, T)}{T} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_k^2(n)}{n^{2\sigma}} \quad (1/2 \leq \sigma_k < \sigma < 1)$$

are equivalent (Titchmarsh [20], Section 7.9). Another consequence is that for every  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  there is a  $\sigma_k < 1$  with the above property. General results of this type are given by Ivic ([14], Section 8.5). However, beyond the theorems of Hardy and Littlewood and Ingham mentioned above which yield  $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = 1/2$ , currently the best known estimates are  $\sigma_3 \leq 7/12$  (due to Ivic cited above),  $\sigma_4 \leq 5/8$  and  $M_3(1/2, T) \ll_{\epsilon} T^{5/4+\epsilon}$ . The latter two results are consequences of Heath-Brown's twelfth moment estimate [12].

Subconvexity bounds are described by the continuous non-negative non-increasing convex function

$$\mu(\sigma) = \inf\{\mu : \zeta(\sigma + it) \ll t^{\mu}\}.$$

Here, the Lindelöf hypothesis asserts that  $\mu(1/2) = 0$  (currently the best known bound is  $\mu(1/2) < 13/84$  due to Bourgain [2]). In terms of moments, the Lindelöf hypothesis is equivalent to the statement that  $M_k(1/2, T) \ll_{k,\epsilon} T^{1+\epsilon}$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

i.e.

$$(1.7) \quad \mu(1/2) = 0 \Leftrightarrow \sigma_k = 1/2 \quad (k \in \mathbb{N})$$

due to Hardy and Littlewood [10] and, since (1.4), (1.5) and (1.6) are equivalent, it is evident that the Lindelöf hypothesis depends only on the moments in the region  $\sigma > 1/2$ . In fact, it is a consequence of quite general properties of  $\zeta(s)$  that the implication (1.7) has a “pointwise” analogue in one direction at least, i.e.

$$(1.8) \quad \sigma_k = 1/2 \Rightarrow \mu(1/2) < 1/2k$$

(for instance, see Ivic ([14], Section 8.1) or Heath-Brown’s notes ([20], Chapter 7). Yet, beyond that which can be derived as a consequence of convexity, i.e. results of the type given by Ivic ([14], Section 8.5), the implications of

$$(1.9) \quad \mu(1/2) < 1/2k$$

for the numbers  $\sigma_k$  are unclear. In particular, the converse statement of (1.8) is not known. Similarly, despite that the inverse statement  $\sigma_k > 1/2$  certainly implies that  $\mu(1/2) > 0$ , in other words

$$(1.10) \quad \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{M_k(\sigma, T)}{T} = \infty \quad (1/2 \leq \sigma < \sigma_k),$$

it is not apparent what lower bound for  $\mu(1/2)$  could be given if  $\sigma_k > 1/2$  were true for some  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

In the absence of further information in this direction, in this paper we assume (1.9) and establish some results of a probabilistic character. The main idea in our work is that (1.9) permits us to perform a sort of “Fourier analysis” that leads to particular insights regarding those values of  $1/2 < \sigma < 1$  for which  $M_k(\sigma, T) \ll_k T$ , or not. These are contained in theorems 1 and 2 below.

We denote by

$$|S| = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{meas}(S \cap [0, T])}{T}$$

the natural density of Lebesgue measurable subsets  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^+$  (if  $|S| = 0$  we say that  $S$  is null) and  $\Pr(|g| \geq x) = |X|$  where  $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^+$  is the subset on which  $|g| \geq x$ . To begin, we observe that the trivial bound

$$\left| \frac{\int_0^T f^2 g dt}{\int_0^T |f|^2 dt} \right| \leq \text{ess sup}_{[0, T]} |g|$$

may be significantly improved when  $T$  is large if  $f$  is not concentrated on a null set, by which we mean the following.

**Proposition 1** (Concentration on a null set). *The following statements are equivalent. If  $f$  satisfies them, we say that  $f$  is not concentrated on a null set (not CNS).*

(a) *If  $g$  is bounded then*

$$(1.11) \quad \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\left| \int_0^T f^2 g dt \right|}{\int_0^T |f|^2 dt} \leq \sup\{x : \Pr(|g| \geq x) > 0\}.$$

(b) *If  $S$  is null then*

$$(1.12) \quad \int_{S \cap [0, T]} |f|^2 dt = o\left(\int_0^T |f|^2 dt\right) \quad (T \rightarrow \infty).$$

Moreover, if  $\int_0^T |f|^2 dt \gg T$ , we may include

(c) *If  $S$  is null then for every  $\epsilon > 0$  there is a bounded function  $f_{N,S}$  ( $N = N(\epsilon)$ ) such that*

$$(1.13) \quad \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_{S \cap [0, T]} |f - f_{N,S}|^2 dt}{\int_0^T |f|^2 dt} < \epsilon.$$

If also  $\int_0^T |f|^2 dt \ll T$  then condition (c) may be replaced with

(d) *For every  $\epsilon > 0$  there is a bounded function  $f_N$  ( $N = N(\epsilon)$ ) such that*

$$(1.14) \quad \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T |f - f_N|^2 dt < \epsilon.$$

**Theorem 1.** *Assume  $\mu(1/2) < 1/2k$ ,  $1/2 < \sigma < 1$  and  $\sigma \neq \sigma_k$ . Then  $\zeta^k(\sigma + it)$  is not CNS if and only if  $\sigma_k < \sigma < 1$ .*

Thus, Theorem 1 shows that if  $\mu(1/2) < 1/2k$  and  $\sigma_k > 1/2$  then the density

$$(1.15) \quad \frac{|\zeta(\sigma + it)|^{2k}}{M_k(\sigma, T)} \quad (t \in [0, T], k \in \mathbb{N})$$

must undergo a critical transition at the point  $\sigma_k$  in the sense that (1.12) holds with  $f(t) = |\zeta(\sigma + it)|^k$  for  $\sigma_k < \sigma < 1$  and fails for  $1/2 < \sigma < \sigma_k$ . Since we know that  $\mu(1/2) < 1/6$  and  $1/2 \leq \sigma_3 \leq 7/12$ , this suggests an alternative way to try to rule out the possibility that  $\sigma_3 > 1/2$ . Theorem 1 arises as a special case of the more general statement Proposition 5 given in Section 2, which captures the influence of a broader class of locally integrable functions being concentrated on a null set. It is here that functional analysis plays a key role.

One explanation for the apparent disparity between bounds for  $\mu(1/2)$  and bounds for  $\sigma_k$ , and indeed our ability to compute the moments, is that such atypical large values of  $|\zeta(\sigma + it)|^k$  (if they exist) must occur “near” the imaginary ordinates of zeros away from the critical line (if they exist). This is clear from, for example, the proof

of Proposition 2 below. Yet, the available estimates for the density of zeros decay (as a function of  $\sigma$ ) too slowly for us to draw the inverse or converse conclusions from them alone. Here several different types of estimate for the number  $N(\sigma, T)$  of zeros  $\rho = \beta + i\gamma$  with  $\beta \geq \sigma$  and  $|\gamma| \leq T$  are available ([20], Section 9.15), but these typically involve functions  $\alpha(\sigma)$  and  $\beta(\sigma)$  such that

$$(1.16) \quad N(\sigma, T) \ll T^{\alpha(\sigma)} (\log T)^{\beta(\sigma)}$$

in which  $\alpha(\sigma)$  decays slowly in the range  $\sigma > 1/2$  with  $\alpha(1/2) = 1$ . Nonetheless, these zero density estimates are sufficient to establish Proposition 2 below. Here we set  $\theta_{P_N} = \arg P_N$  where

$$(1.17) \quad P_N(\sigma + it) = \exp \left( \sum_{2 \leq n \leq N^2} \frac{\Lambda_N(n)}{n^{\sigma+it} \log n} \right),$$

$$\Lambda_N(n) = \begin{cases} \Lambda(n) & (n \leq N) \\ \Lambda(n) \left( 2 - \frac{\log n}{\log N} \right) & (\text{otherwise}) \end{cases}$$

in which  $\Lambda(n)$  is the Von-Mangoldt function

$$\Lambda(n) = \begin{cases} \log p & (n = p^m, p \text{ prime}, m \in \mathbb{N}) \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}). \end{cases}$$

We also set  $Z_N = \zeta/P_N$  and

$$\theta_{Z_N} = \arg Z_N$$

so  $\theta_{Z_N} = \theta_\zeta - \theta_{P_N} \pmod{(-\pi, \pi]}$  and

$$|\zeta|^{2k} e^{2ik\theta_{Z_N}} = |P_N|^{2k} Z_N^{2k} = \zeta^{2k} e^{-2ik\theta_{P_N}} \quad (k \in \mathbb{N}).$$

**Proposition 2.** *For every  $1/2 < \sigma < 1$  and  $\epsilon > 0$*

$$\Pr(|\theta_{Z_N}(\sigma + it) \pmod{(-\pi, \pi]}| \geq \epsilon) = 0 \quad (N > N(\epsilon)).$$

Proposition 2 plays a key role in our proofs because it implies that  $f = e^{ik\theta_\zeta}$  satisfies (1.14) with  $f_N = e^{ik\theta_{P_N}}$  for  $1/2 < \sigma < 1$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Our second theorem demonstrates a “zero-one” law for the density (1.15) in the range  $1/2 < \sigma < 1$ .

**Theorem 2.** *Assume  $\mu(1/2) < 1/2k$ . For every  $\epsilon > 0$*

$$\limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_0^T |\zeta(\sigma + it)|^{2k} \sin^2(k\theta_{Z_N}(\sigma + it)) dt}{M_k(\sigma, T)} \begin{cases} = 1/2 & (N \in \mathbb{N}, 1/2 < \sigma < \sigma_k) \\ < \epsilon & (N > N(\epsilon), \sigma_k < \sigma < 1). \end{cases}$$

One side of this law states that, if  $\sigma_k > 1/2$ , then for every  $1/2 < \sigma < \sigma_k$  and  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  the distribution of the angles  $k\theta_{Z_N}(\sigma + it) \pmod{(-\pi, \pi]}$  with respect to the density (1.15) is consistent with that of a continuous random variable uniformly distributed on  $(-\pi, \pi]$  with respect to the density (1.15). On the other hand, the other side of this law states that the expected value of those angles with respect to the density (1.15) converges to 0 as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  for every  $\sigma_k < \sigma < 1$ . Thus we obtain a highly structured consequence of the event  $\sigma_k > 1/2$  conditionally on  $\mu(1/2) < 1/2k$ . In light of Proposition 2 above, Theorem 2 lends support to the hypothesis that it is more natural for the events  $\mu(1/2) < 1/2k$  and  $\sigma_k > 1/2$  to be mutually exclusive, i.e. that  $\mu(1/2) < 1/2k \Rightarrow \sigma_k = 1/2$ , which would be a favourable outcome as it implies that  $\sigma_3 = 1/2$ .

The proofs of theorems 1 and 2 are postponed until Section 3 because several details of the arguments are quite general and the functional analysis in Section 2 handles them in a clearer way. The proofs of propositions 1 and 2 are given in Section 4.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES. ALMOST-PERIODICITY

Throughout this paper we write  $\zeta = \zeta(\sigma + it)$  for any fixed  $\sigma \in (1/2, 1)$  unless otherwise specified, and  $f, g \in L_{2,\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R}^+)$ . Writing

$$(2.1) \quad \langle f, g \rangle = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T f(t) \overline{g(t)} dt$$

and  $\|f\| = \sqrt{\langle f, f \rangle}$  when the limits exists, it is clear from (1.14) and the reverse triangle inequality that if the  $\|f_N\|$  exist then  $\|f\| = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|f_N\|$ . For example, this is the case when the  $f_N$  in (1.14) are Bohr almost-periodic functions, that is, the  $f_N$  have a (necessarily bounded and continuous) uniformly convergent generalised Fourier series

$$(2.2) \quad g = \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} c_\lambda e_\lambda$$

where  $e_\lambda(t) = e^{i\lambda t}$ , in which case the Fourier coefficients  $c_\lambda = \langle g, e_\lambda \rangle$  are necessarily square-summable and  $\|f_N\|^2 = \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} |\langle f_N, e_\lambda \rangle|^2$ . In this case, the  $f$  in (1.14) belongs to the closure of the space of Bohr functions in the seminorm  $\|\cdot\|$ . In other words, the equivalence class  $\phi + f$  for  $\|\phi\| = 0$  belongs to the Hilbert space  $B^2 = B^2(\mathbb{R}^+)$  of Besicovitch almost-periodic function on  $\mathbb{R}^+$ , in which case we write  $f_N \rightarrow f$  in  $B^2$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . For  $f, g \in B^2$  the inner product (2.1) exists and the Parseval relation<sup>1</sup>

$$(2.3) \quad \langle f, g \rangle = \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \langle f, e_\lambda \rangle \overline{\langle g, e_\lambda \rangle}$$

---

<sup>1</sup>The coefficients  $\langle f, e_\lambda \rangle$  are necessarily non-zero for at most countably many  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ .

holds. Conversely, if  $f \in B^2$  then for instance we may take  $f_N$  to be a partial sum

$$(2.4) \quad f_N = \sum_{n \leq N} \langle f, e_{\lambda_n} \rangle e_{\lambda_n}$$

and verify (1.14) for this sequence using Bessel's inequality. Thus, if  $f \in B^2$  then  $f$  is not CNS. Reasoning along similar lines, we have the following pointwise equivalence.

**Proposition 3.** *For each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\sigma_k = 1/2 \Leftrightarrow \zeta^k \in B^2$ .*

Therefore, since  $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = 1/2$ , the functions  $\zeta, \zeta^2 \in B^2$  are not CNS.

Although it is not known that  $\sigma_k = 1/2$  for  $k > 2$ , our next proposition permits us to compute the Fourier coefficient of  $\zeta^k$  in any case.

**Proposition 4.** *For each  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ , if  $\mu(1/2) < 1/k$  then*

$$\langle \zeta^k, e_\lambda \rangle = \begin{cases} \frac{d_k(n)}{n^\sigma} & (\lambda = -\log n \quad (n \in \mathbb{N})) \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}). \end{cases}$$

Thus, by Proposition 4 and the fact that  $\mu(1/2) < 1/6$ , there is a broader class of “almost-periodic” functions to which the functions  $\zeta^k$  ( $1 \leq k \leq 6$ ) belong, which we now introduce.

**Lemma 1.** *Let  $E = \{e_\lambda : \lambda \in \mathbb{R}\}$  and consider the set of all  $f$  satisfying*

$$\|f\|_{A^2}^2 = \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} |\langle f, e_\lambda \rangle|^2 < \infty.$$

*Then the set  $A^2 = A^2(\mathbb{R}^+)$  of equivalence classes  $\phi + f$  with  $\phi \in E^\perp$  is a Hilbert space with inner product*

$$(2.5) \quad \langle f, g \rangle_{A^2} = \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \langle f, e_\lambda \rangle \overline{\langle g, e_\lambda \rangle}$$

*and we have*

$$(2.6) \quad A^2 = E^\perp \oplus B^2.$$

It is clear from (2.6) that if  $f \in A^2$  then  $f \in B^2 \Leftrightarrow \|\phi\| = 0$ . However, the space  $A^2$  does contain many more functions than  $B^2$  and it is easily checked that there exist  $\phi \in E^\perp$  for which  $0 < \|\phi\| \leq \infty$ , for example

$$\left\| \frac{\zeta(1/2 + i\cdot)}{\log^{1/2}(\cdot + 1)} \right\| = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \left\| \frac{\zeta(1/2 + i\cdot)}{\log^{1/3}(\cdot + 1)} \right\| = \infty.$$

Nonetheless, if  $f \in A^2$  has certain properties that we assume in Proposition 5 below, then we may conclude that there are precisely two possibilities: either  $f \in B^2$ , or  $f$  is CNS. Before stating the result, we note that  $B^2$  has a particular group of unitary operators acting on it. This is the content of Lemma 2.

**Lemma 2.** *The set  $U = \{u \in B^2 : |u| = 1\}$  is a multiplicative subgroup of  $B^2$ . In particular, if  $u \in U$  then  $u^j \in U$  ( $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ ). Moreover, if  $u_\lambda = ue_\lambda$  then the set  $\{u_\lambda : \lambda \in \mathbb{R}\}$  is an orthonormal basis for  $B^2$ . Equivalently, the map  $f \rightarrow uf$  ( $u \in U$ ) is a unitary operator on  $B^2$ .*

Propositions 3, 4 and lemmas 1, 2 are proved in Section 5.

The main result of this section is Proposition 5, where we write  $\theta_f = \arg f$ .

**Proposition 5.** *Let  $g \in B^2$ ,  $\langle f, e_\lambda \rangle = \langle g, e_\lambda \rangle$  and  $\langle f^2, e_\lambda \rangle = \langle g^2, e_\lambda \rangle$  ( $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ ), so that  $f, f^2 \in A^2$ . Also let  $e^{i\theta_f}, e^{i\theta_g} \in U$ ,  $\langle e^{i\theta_f}, e_\lambda \rangle = \langle e^{i\theta_g}, e_\lambda \rangle$  ( $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ ), and let  $e^{i\theta_{g_N}}$  be a sequence of Bohr functions such that  $e^{i\theta_{g_N}} \rightarrow e^{i\theta_g}$  in  $B^2$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Then we have the following.*

- (a)  $f \in B^2$  if and only if  $f$  is not CNS.
- (b) If the maps  $h \mapsto e^{i\theta_f}h$  and  $h \mapsto e^{i\theta_g}h$  are bounded operators on  $A^2$ , then  $f \in B^2$ .

*Proof of Proposition 5.* As we have seen, if  $f \in B^2$  then  $f$  is not CNS, so we now assume that  $f$  is not CNS and prove the converse statement. Using the identity  $1 - \cos(2x) = 2 \sin^2(x)$  we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 0 &\leq \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T |f|^2 dt - \Re \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T f^2 e^{-2i\theta_{g_N}} dt \\
 &= \frac{2}{T} \int_0^T |f|^2 \sin^2(\theta_f - \theta_{g_N}) dt \\
 (2.7) \quad &\leq \frac{2 \sup\{x : \Pr(\sin^2(\theta_f - \theta_{g_N}) \geq x) > 0\} + 2\epsilon}{T} \int_0^T |f|^2 dt
 \end{aligned}$$

for every  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $T \geq T(\epsilon)$  by (1.11). Since  $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|e^{i\theta_f} - e^{i\theta_{g_N}}\| = 0$ , there is also an  $N(\epsilon)$  such that  $\Pr(\sin^2(\theta_f - \theta_{g_N}) \geq \epsilon) = 0$  for  $N \geq N(\epsilon)$ , so (3.7) shows that

$$0 \leq \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T |f|^2 dt - \Re \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T f^2 e^{-2i\theta_{g_N}} dt \leq \frac{4\epsilon}{T} \int_0^T |f|^2 dt$$

for  $N \geq N(\epsilon)$  and  $T \geq T(\epsilon)$ , which gives

$$(2.8) \quad \Re \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T f^2 e^{-2i\theta_{g_N}} dt \leq \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T |f|^2 dt \leq \frac{1}{1-4\epsilon} \Re \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T f^2 e^{-2i\theta_{g_N}} dt$$

for  $0 < \epsilon < 1/4$ . Since  $e^{-2i\theta_{g_N}}$  is a Bohr function it has a uniformly convergent Fourier series of the form (2.2), so the map  $f \mapsto e^{-2i\theta_{g_N}} f$  is a bounded operator on  $A^2$ . Therefore, since  $f^2 \in A^2$ , the limits

$$(2.9) \quad \langle f^2, e^{2i\theta_{g_N}} \rangle = \lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T f^2 e^{-2i\theta_{g_N}} dt$$



exist and from (2.8) we see that the second moment  $\|f\|^2$  exists and

$$(2.10) \quad \|f\|^2 = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \Re \langle f^2, e^{2i\theta_{g_N}} \rangle.$$

Moreover, since  $\langle f^2, e_\lambda \rangle = \langle g^2, e_\lambda \rangle$  and  $e^{2i\theta_{g_N}}$  is a Bohr function, we have

$$(2.11) \quad \langle f^2, e^{2i\theta_{g_N}} \rangle = \langle g^2, e^{2i\theta_{g_N}} \rangle = \langle g, e^{2i\theta_{g_N}} \bar{g} \rangle = \langle g, e^{2i(\theta_{g_N} - \theta_g)} g \rangle.$$

Since also

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|e^{2i(\theta_{g_N} - \theta_g)} - 1\| = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|e^{2i\theta_{g_N}} - e^{2i\theta_g}\| = 0$$

and again because  $e^{2i\theta_{g_N}}$  is a Bohr function, it follows that  $e^{2i(\theta_{g_N} - \theta_g)} \in U \subset B^2$  so the map  $h \mapsto e^{2i(\theta_g - \theta_{g_N})} h$  is a bounded operator on  $B^2$  by Lemma 2. Thus, since norm convergence implies weak convergence, by (2.10) and (2.11) we have

$$(2.12) \quad \|f\|^2 = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \Re \langle g, e^{2i(\theta_{g_N} - \theta_g)} g \rangle = \langle g, g \rangle = \|g\|^2.$$

Lastly, writing

$$g_M = \sum_{n \leq M} \langle g, e_{\lambda_n} \rangle e_{\lambda_n}$$

(not necessarily the same as  $g_N$  above) and using (2.12) and  $\langle f, e_\lambda \rangle = \langle g, e_\lambda \rangle$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|f - g_M\|^2 &= \|f\|^2 + \|g_M\|^2 - 2\Re \langle f, \bar{g}_M \rangle \\ &= \|g\|^2 - \|g_M\|^2 \\ &= \|g - g_M\|^2 \leq \epsilon \quad (M > M(\epsilon)), \end{aligned}$$

showing that  $f \in B^2$ .

To complete the proof we show that if the maps  $h \mapsto e^{i\theta_f} h$  and  $h \mapsto e^{i\theta_g} h$  are also bounded operators on  $A^2$  (and therefore unitary) then  $f \in B^2$ . Indeed, we have

$$(2.13) \quad \|f\|^2 = \langle |f|^2, 1 \rangle_{A^2} = \langle f^2 e^{-2i\theta_f}, 1 \rangle_{A^2} = \langle f^2, e^{2i\theta_f} \rangle_{A^2}$$

for  $f^2 \in A^2$  because the map  $h \mapsto e^{i\theta_f} h$  ( $h \in A^2$ ) is unitary. Then, from the definition of the  $A^2$  inner product (2.5), since  $\langle f^2, e_\lambda \rangle = \langle g^2, e_\lambda \rangle$ ,  $e^{i\theta_f}, e^{i\theta_g} \in U$  and  $\langle e^{i\theta_f}, e_\lambda \rangle = \langle e^{i\theta_g}, e_\lambda \rangle$ , (2.13) is equal to

$$\langle g^2, e^{2i\theta_f} \rangle_{A^2} = \langle g^2, e^{2i\theta_g} \rangle_{A^2} = \langle g^2 e^{-2i\theta_g}, 1 \rangle_{A^2} = \langle |g|^2, 1 \rangle_{A^2} = \|g\|^2$$

which gives (2.12). □

## 3. PROOF OF THEOREMS 1 AND 2

**3.1. Theorem 1.** This follows from Proposition 5 if  $f = \zeta^k$  satisfies the conditions of Proposition 5 assuming that  $\mu(1/2) < 1/2k$ . Firstly, this implies that

$$(3.1) \quad \langle f^j, e_\lambda \rangle = \begin{cases} \frac{d_{jk}(n)}{n^\sigma} & (\lambda = -\log n \quad (n \in \mathbb{N})) \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}). \end{cases}$$

for  $j = 1$  and  $2$ , by Proposition 4. Set  $g_N = P_N^k$  and note that since  $B^2$  is a Hilbert space there is a  $g \in B^2$  such that

$$(3.2) \quad \langle g, e_\lambda \rangle = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \langle g_N, e_\lambda \rangle = \begin{cases} \frac{d_k(n)}{n^\sigma} & (\lambda = -\log n \quad (n \in \mathbb{N})) \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}) \end{cases}$$

and  $\|g - g_N\| < \epsilon$  for  $N > N(\epsilon)$ . Also, by (2.3) we have

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle g^2, e_\lambda \rangle &= \langle g, \bar{g}e_\lambda \rangle = \sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{R}} \langle g, e_\nu \rangle \overline{\langle g, e_{\lambda-\nu} \rangle} \\ &= \sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{R}} \langle g, e_\nu \rangle \langle g, e_{\lambda-\nu} \rangle \\ &= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_k(m)}{m^\sigma} \langle g, e_{\lambda+\log m} \rangle \end{aligned}$$

and, since  $\lambda + \log m$  is the logarithm of the reciprocal of a natural number if and only if  $\lambda = -\log n$  and  $m|n$ , (3.3) is

$$(3.4) \quad \langle g^2, e_\lambda \rangle = \begin{cases} \sum_{m|n} \frac{d_k(m)}{m^\sigma} \frac{d_k(n/m)}{(n/m)^\sigma} = \frac{d_{2k}(n)}{n^\sigma} & (\lambda = -\log n \quad (n \in \mathbb{N})) \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}). \end{cases}$$

Thus by (3.1), (3.2) and (3.4), this  $g \in B^2$  satisfies  $\langle f, e_\lambda \rangle = \langle g, e_\lambda \rangle$  and  $\langle f^2, e_\lambda \rangle = \langle g^2, e_\lambda \rangle$  ( $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ ).

Now, since  $\theta_{g_N} = \theta_{P_N^k} = \Im \log P_N^k \pmod{(-\pi, \pi]}$  and

$$\Im \log P_N^k(\sigma + it) = -k \sum_{2 \leq n \leq N^2} \frac{\Lambda_N(n) \sin(t \log n)}{n^\sigma \log n} \pmod{(-\pi, \pi]}$$

by (1.17), it follows that

$$e^{i\theta_{g_N}(\sigma+it)} = \exp \left( -ik \sum_{2 \leq n \leq N^2} \frac{\Lambda_N(n) \sin(t \log n)}{n^\sigma \log n} \right)$$

is a Bohr function because  $e^{iy}$  ( $y \in \mathbb{R}$ ) is uniformly continuous and a uniformly continuous function of a uniformly convergent sequence is uniformly convergent. Since also

$$(3.5) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|e^{i(\theta_{g_N} - \theta_f)} - 1\| = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|e^{i\theta_{g_N}} - e^{i\theta_f}\| = 0$$

by Proposition 2, it follows that  $e^{i\theta_f} \in U$ . Moreover, since

$$\ell_N = \sum_{2 \leq n \leq N^2} \frac{\Lambda_N(n)}{n^{\sigma+i \cdot \log n}}$$

is a Bohr function, we have  $\ell_N \rightarrow \ell$  in  $B^2$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  in which the limit  $\ell \in B^2$  is necessarily bounded except possibly on a null set, so that also the  $\ell_N$  ( $N \in \mathbb{N}$ ) are bounded except possibly on a null set. Therefore, since

$$\|g - \exp \ell_N\| = \|g - g_N\| < \epsilon \quad (N > N(\epsilon)),$$

we note that  $g$  cannot vanish except possibly on a null set. As such, since

$$\| |g| - |g_N| e^{i(\theta_{g_N} - \theta_g)} \| = \|g - g_N\|,$$

it follows that

$$\Pr(|\theta_{g_N} - \theta_g \pmod{(-\pi, \pi]}| \geq \epsilon) = 0 \quad (N > N(\epsilon))$$

so  $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \|e^{i\theta_{g_N}} - e^{i\theta_g}\| = 0$ . In other words,  $e^{i\theta_{g_N}} \rightarrow e^{i\theta_g}$  in  $B^2$  as  $N \rightarrow \infty$  so  $e^{i\theta_g} \in U$  and  $\|e^{i\theta_f} - e^{i\theta_g}\| = 0$  by (3.5) and the triangle inequality. Since the latter implies that  $\langle e^{i\theta_f}, e_\lambda \rangle = \langle e^{i\theta_g}, e_\lambda \rangle$  ( $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ ) by Cauchy-Schwarz, we conclude that  $f = \zeta^k$  satisfies the conditions of Proposition 5 provided that  $\mu(1/2) < 1/2k$ .

**3.2. Theorem 2.** If  $\sigma_k > 1/2$  we have

$$(3.6) \quad \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{M_k(\sigma, T)}{T} = \infty \quad (1/2 \leq \sigma < \sigma_k).$$

Using the identity  $1 - \cos(2x) = 2 \sin^2(x)$ , we then have

$$M_k(\sigma, T) - \Re \int_0^T \zeta^{2k} e^{-2ik\theta_{P_N}} dt = 2 \int_0^T |\zeta|^{2k} \sin^2(k\theta_{Z_N}) dt$$

so that

$$(3.7) \quad \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_0^T |\zeta|^{2k} \sin^2(k\theta_{Z_N}) dt}{M_k(\sigma, T)} = \frac{1}{2} - \liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Re \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \zeta^{2k} e^{-2ik\theta_{P_N}} dt}{\frac{2}{T} M_k(\sigma, T)}.$$

Since  $\zeta^{2k} \in A^2$  if  $\mu(1/2) < 1/2k$ , the numerator of the second term on the right hand side of (3.7) converges to the limit  $\langle \zeta^{2k}, e^{2ik\theta_{P_N}} \rangle$  as  $T \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Re \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \zeta^{2k} e^{-2ik\theta_{P_N}} dt}{\frac{2}{T} M_k(\sigma, T)} &\sim \liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\Re \langle \zeta^{2k}, e^{2ik\theta_{P_N}} \rangle}{\frac{2}{T} M_k(\sigma, T)} \\ &= \frac{\Re \langle \zeta^{2k}, e^{2ik\theta_{P_N}} \rangle}{2} \left( \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{M_k(\sigma, T)}{T} \right)^{-1} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

by (3.6).

On the other hand, if  $\mu(1/2) < 1/2k$ , then a trivial modification of the proof of Proposition 3 shows that  $\zeta^k(\sigma + it) \in B^2$  for  $\sigma_k < \sigma < 1$ . In particular,  $\zeta^k(\sigma + it)$  is not CNS for  $\sigma_k < \sigma < 1$ , in which case we have

$$\limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_0^T |\zeta|^{2k} \sin^2(k\theta_{Z_N}) dt}{M_k(\sigma, T)} \leq \sup\{x : \Pr(\sin^2(k\theta_{Z_N}) \geq x) > 0\} < \epsilon \quad (N > N(\epsilon))$$

by (1.11) and Proposition 2.

#### 4. PROOF OF PROPOSITIONS 1 AND 2

**4.1. Proposition 1.** Let  $g$  be bounded, assume (1.12) and denote by  $S^c$  the complement of  $S$  in  $\mathbb{R}^+$ . Then for every null set  $S$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_0^T f^2 g dt \right| &= \left| \int_{S^c \cap [0, T]} f^2 g dt + \int_{S \cap [0, T]} f^2 g dt \right| \\ &\leq \left| \int_{S^c \cap [0, T]} f^2 g dt \right| + o \left( \int_0^T |f|^2 dt \right) \\ &\leq (1 + o(1)) \sup_{t \in S^c \cap [0, T]} |g(t)| \int_0^T |f|^2 dt. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $S$  is an arbitrary null set, we minimise over those  $S$  giving

$$(4.1) \quad \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\left| \int_0^T f^2 g dt \right|}{\int_0^T |f|^2 dt} \leq \inf_{|S|=0} \sup_{t \in S^c} |g(t)| = \sup\{x : \Pr(|g| \geq x) > 0\}$$

which is (1.11). Conversely, assume (4.1) and take  $g = e^{-2i\theta_f} \chi_S$  where  $\chi_S$  is the characteristic function of  $S$ . Then

$$\limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_{S \cap [0, T]} |f|^2 dt}{\int_0^T |f|^2 dt} = \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\left| \int_0^T f^2 g dt \right|}{\int_0^T |f|^2 dt} \leq \sup\{x : \Pr(|g| \geq x) > 0\} = 0$$

which gives (1.12).

Now suppose that  $\int_0^T |f|^2 dt \gg T$ . We have

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \frac{\int_{S \cap [0, T]} |f|^2 dt}{\int_0^T |f|^2 dt} \right)^{1/2} &\sim \left| \left( \frac{\int_{S \cap [0, T]} |f|^2 dt}{\int_0^T |f|^2 dt} \right)^{1/2} - \left( \frac{\int_{S \cap [0, T]} |f_{N, S}|^2 dt}{\int_0^T |f|^2 dt} \right)^{1/2} \right| \\ &\leq \left( \frac{\int_{S \cap [0, T]} |f - f_{N, S}|^2 dt}{\int_0^T |f|^2 dt} \right)^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

so (1.13) implies (1.12). Conversely, (1.12) implies (1.13) by taking  $f_{N, S} = 0$ .

To complete the proof, we note that if  $\int_0^T |f|^2 dt \ll T$  then  $f$  is bounded except possibly on a null set  $S = S(f)$ , so there is already a bounded function  $f_{N, S^c}$  such that  $|f - f_{N, S^c}|^2 < \epsilon$  on  $S^c$ . Thus, taking

$$f_N = f_{N, S} \chi_S + f_{N, S^c} \chi_{S^c},$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T |f - f_N|^2 dt &= \frac{1}{T} \int_{S \cap [0, T]} |f - f_{N, S}|^2 dt + \frac{1}{T} \int_{S^c \cap [0, T]} |f - f_{N, S^c}|^2 dt \\ &\ll \frac{\int_{S \cap [0, T]} |f - f_{N, S}|^2 dt}{\int_0^T |f|^2 dt} + \frac{\epsilon}{T} \text{meas}(S^c \cap [0, T]) \end{aligned}$$

and using (1.13) gives (1.14). Conversely, (1.14) implies (1.13) if  $\int_0^T |f|^2 dt \gg T$ .

**4.2. Proof of Proposition 2.** For  $X > 2$  we write

$$\text{Arg} Z_X = \theta_{Z_X} \pmod{(-\pi, \pi]} = \Im \log Z_X \pmod{(-\pi, \pi]}$$

and note that the result will follow if it can be shown that there is a null set  $R = R(\sigma, T)$  such that for every fixed  $\sigma > 1/2 + \delta$  and  $\epsilon > 0$  there is an  $N(\epsilon)$  such that

$$(4.2) \quad \limsup_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_{[0, T] \setminus R} |\log Z_N(\sigma + it)| dt < \epsilon \quad (N > N(\epsilon)).$$

Let  $N(\sigma, T)$  denote the number of zeros  $\rho = \beta + i\gamma$  with  $\beta \geq \sigma$  and  $|\gamma| \leq T$  and recall the well-known result that for every fixed  $\sigma > 1/2$  there is an  $\alpha(\sigma) < 1$  such that  $N(\sigma, T) \ll T^{\alpha(\sigma)}$ . Accordingly, for  $\delta > 0$  fixed and  $1/2 + \delta \leq \sigma < 1$  note that the number of zeros with  $\beta \geq 1/4 + \sigma/2$  and  $|\gamma| \leq T$  is  $\ll T^{\alpha(1/4 + \sigma/2)}$  for some  $\alpha(1/4 + \sigma/2) < 1$ . Thus if  $\Delta = o(T^{1 - \alpha(1/4 + \sigma/2)})$  we may omit every interval of the line segment  $[\sigma, \sigma + iT]$  on which  $|t - \gamma| < \Delta$  for some  $\rho = \beta + i\gamma$  with  $\beta \geq 1/4 + \sigma/2$  while ensuring that the union  $S(\sigma, T)$  of the remaining intervals of the line segment

have 1-dimensional measure  $\sim T$  and, in particular, that if  $|t - \gamma| < \Delta$  for some  $s \in S$  and  $\rho = \beta + i\gamma$  then

$$(4.3) \quad \sigma - \beta > \sigma - 1/4 - \sigma/2 \geq \delta/2.$$

Firstly we will show that for a suitable choice of  $X = X(T)$  the integral

$$(4.4) \quad \frac{-i}{T} \int_S |\log Z_X(s)| ds \ll \frac{1}{\log^A T} \quad (A \geq 0)$$

Then we will use an approximation argument to show that this implies (4.2). To this end, recall the formula

$$(4.5) \quad \log Z_X(s) = \sum_{\rho} F_2((s - \rho) \log X) + O\left(\frac{X^{2-2\sigma}}{(1+t^2) \log^2 X}\right)$$

where

$$F_2(z) = \int_z^\infty \frac{e^{-2w} - e^{-w}}{w^2} dw$$

due to Gonek ([6], p. 10), and note that the contribution of the error term in (4.5) to the integral (4.4) is

$$(4.6) \quad \ll \frac{X}{T \log^2 X}.$$

Since

$$\int_{(s-\rho) \log X}^\infty \frac{e^{-w} dw}{w^2} = \int_0^\infty \frac{X^{-w-s+\rho} dw}{(w+s-\rho)^2 \log X} \ll \frac{X^{\beta-\sigma}}{|s-\rho|^2 \log X},$$

we write

$$\sum_{\rho} = \sum_{\rho: |t-\gamma| < \Delta} + \sum_{\rho: \Delta \leq |t-\gamma| < T} + \sum_{\rho: |t-\gamma| \geq T}$$

and observe that on  $S$  the sum in (4.5) is

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{aligned} &\ll \frac{X^{-\delta/2}}{\delta^2 \log X} \sum_{\substack{|t-\gamma| < \Delta \\ \sigma-\beta \geq \delta/2}} 1 + \frac{X^{-\delta/2}}{\log X} \sum_{\substack{\Delta \leq |\gamma-t| < T \\ \sigma-\beta \geq \delta/2}} \frac{1}{(\gamma-t)^2} \\ &+ \frac{X}{\log X} \sum_{\substack{\Delta \leq |\gamma-t| < T \\ \sigma-\beta < \delta/2}} \frac{1}{(\gamma-t)^2} + \frac{X}{\log X} \sum_{|\gamma-t| \geq T} \frac{1}{(\gamma-t)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling now that the total number of zeros  $\rho = \beta + i\gamma$  with  $0 < \gamma < t$  is

$$N(t) = \frac{t}{2\pi} \log \frac{t}{2\pi} - \frac{t}{2\pi} + \frac{7}{8} + O(\log t),$$

it may be easily deduced (see for instance Gonek ([6], pp. 8-10)) that

$$(4.8) \quad \sum_{\rho: |\gamma-t| < \Delta} 1 \ll \Delta \log t \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{\rho: |\gamma-t| \geq \Delta} \frac{1}{(\gamma-t)^2} \ll \frac{\log t}{\Delta}.$$

Estimating the first, second and fourth summations in (4.7) using (4.8) we find that it is

$$\ll \frac{X}{\log X} \sum_{\substack{\Delta \leq |\gamma-t| < T \\ \sigma-\beta < \delta/2}} \frac{1}{(\gamma-t)^2} + \frac{\log t}{\log X} \left( X^{-\delta/2} \left( \frac{\Delta}{\delta^2} + \frac{1}{\Delta} \right) + \frac{X}{T} \right).$$

Now if  $X(T) = \log^{(2+2A)/\delta} T$  for some fixed  $A \geq 0$ , the above is

$$\ll \frac{\delta \log^{(2+2A)/\delta} T}{\log \log T} \sum_{\substack{\Delta \leq |\gamma-t| < T \\ \sigma-\beta < \delta/2}} \frac{1}{(t-\gamma)^2} + \frac{1}{\log^A T \log \log T} \left( \frac{\Delta}{\delta} + \frac{\delta}{\Delta} \right)$$

so, given also the estimate (4.6) with this choice of  $X$ , the integral (4.4) is

$$(4.9) \quad \begin{aligned} & \ll \frac{\delta \log^{(2+2A)/\delta} T}{T \log \log T} \sum_{\substack{|\gamma| < 2T \\ \sigma-\beta < \delta/2}} \int_{\{0 < t < T: \Delta < |t-\gamma| < T\}} \frac{dt}{(t-\gamma)^2} \\ & + \frac{1}{\log^A T \log \log T} \left( \frac{\Delta}{\delta} + \frac{\delta}{\Delta} \right) \end{aligned}$$

in which the integral is bounded by

$$\int_{\Delta < t < 3T} \frac{dt}{t^2} \ll \frac{1}{\Delta} + \frac{1}{T}$$

so (4.9) is

$$\ll \frac{\delta T^{\alpha(1/2+\delta/2)-1} \log^{(2+2A)/\delta} T}{\Delta \log \log T} + \frac{1}{\log^A T \log \log T} \left( \frac{\Delta}{\delta} + \frac{\delta}{\Delta} \right),$$

where we have used the zero density estimate  $\ll T^{\alpha(1/2+\delta/2)}$  for the number of zeros with  $|\gamma| < 2T$  and  $\beta > \sigma - \delta/2 \geq 1/2 + \delta/2$ . Since this exponent is strictly less than one for any fixed  $\delta > 0$  and  $\Delta$  was arbitrary, this proves (4.4) for this choice of  $X$ .

We now use an approximation argument to show that the above conclusion implies the proposition. Using the mean value theorem for Dirichlet polynomials with  $X$  as

above,  $N < \log^{(1+A)/\delta} T$  and  $\sigma > 1/2 + \delta$  we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \int_T^{2T} \left| \log \frac{P_X}{P_N}(\sigma + it) \right|^2 dt &\ll T \sum_{n>N} \frac{|\Lambda_X(n) - \Lambda_N(n)|^2}{n^{2\sigma} \log^2 n} \\
 &\ll TN^{1-2\sigma+\delta} \\
 &= TN^{-\delta}.
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{4.10}$$

Replacing  $T$  by  $T/2, T/4, \dots$  in (4.10) and summing, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \left| \log \frac{P_X}{P_N}(\sigma + it) \right|^2 dt \ll N^{-\delta}.
 \tag{4.11}$$

Lastly, using the triangle inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{-i}{T} \int_S |\log Z_N(s)| ds &\leq \frac{-i}{T} \int_S |\log Z_X(s)| ds + \frac{1}{T} \int_0^T \left| \log \frac{P_X}{P_N}(\sigma + it) \right| dt \\
 &\ll \frac{1}{\log^A T} + N^{-\delta/2}
 \end{aligned}$$

by (4.4) and (4.11), which proves (4.2).

## 5. PROOFS OF THE AUXILIARY RESULTS

**5.1. Proposition 3.** Clearly  $\zeta^k \in B^2$  implies that  $\sigma_k = 1/2$ , so we assume  $\sigma_k = 1/2$  and prove the converse statement. It follows from  $\mu(1/2) < 1/2k$  and Proposition 4 that

$$\langle \zeta^k, e_\lambda \rangle = \begin{cases} \frac{d_k(n)}{n^\sigma} & (\lambda = -\log n \quad (n \in \mathbb{N})) \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}) \end{cases}$$

so, if we set  $f = \zeta^k$  and

$$f_N = \sum_{n \leq N} \frac{d_k(n)}{n^\sigma} n^{-i},$$

then

$$(5.1) \quad \|f - f_N\|^2 = \|f\|^2 + \|f_N\|^2 - 2\Re\langle f, \bar{f}_N \rangle = \|f\|^2 - \|f_N\|^2 = \sum_{n>N} \frac{d_k^2(n)}{n^{2\sigma}}$$

by (1.6). Since (5.1) is clearly  $< \epsilon$  for  $N > N(\epsilon)$ , we see that  $\sigma_k = 1/2 \Rightarrow \zeta^k \in B^2$ .



**5.2. Proposition 4.** Fix  $\delta > 0$ . Denote by  $R$  the rectangle with vertices  $[\sigma + iT, 1 + \delta + iT, 1 + \delta + i, \sigma + i]$  and consider the integral

$$(5.2) \quad \frac{1}{2iT} \int_R \zeta^k(s) e^{\lambda(2\sigma-s)} ds.$$

Assuming that  $\mu(1/2) < 1/k$ , there is an  $A > 0$  such that the sum of the horizontal segments is

$$(5.3) \quad \ll \frac{1}{T} \int_{\sigma}^{1+\delta} |\zeta(r + iT)|^k e^{\lambda(2\sigma-r)} dr + \frac{e^{\lambda\sigma}}{T} \ll \frac{e^{\lambda\sigma}}{T^A}$$

and the sum of the vertical segments is

$$(5.4) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{e^{2\lambda\sigma}}{T} \int_1^T \zeta^k(1 + \delta + it) e^{-\lambda(1+\delta+it)} dt - \frac{e^{\lambda\sigma}}{T} \int_1^T \zeta^k(\sigma + it) e^{-i\lambda t} dt \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_k(n)}{n^{1+\delta}} \frac{e^{\lambda(2\sigma-1-\delta)}}{T} \int_1^T e^{-i(\lambda+\log n)t} dt - \frac{e^{\lambda\sigma}}{T} \int_1^T \zeta^k(\sigma + it) e^{-i\lambda t} dt \end{aligned}$$

because the Dirichlet series above is absolutely convergent. By (5.2), (5.3) and (5.4) we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{T} \int_1^T \zeta^k(\sigma + it) e^{-i\lambda t} dt &= e^{\lambda(\sigma-1-\delta)} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{d_k(n)}{n^{1+\delta}} \frac{1}{T} \int_1^T e^{-i(\lambda+\log n)t} dt + O(T^{-A}) \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{d_k(n)}{n^{\sigma}} + o(1) & (\lambda = -\log n) \\ o(1) & (\text{otherwise}). \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

**5.3. Lemma 1.**  $A^2$  is an inner product space by definition. Since  $B^2$  is a dense subset (in the  $A^2$  metric, of course), the completeness of  $A^2$  is inherited from that of  $B^2$  and for every  $f \in A^2$  we then have  $f = \phi + g$  pointwise for some  $\phi \in E^\perp$  and  $g \in B^2$ .

**5.4. Lemma 2.** Let  $u \in B^2$  and  $\nu \in \mathbb{R}$  be fixed. Since the set  $\{e_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}}$  is a complete orthonormal set in  $B^2$ , for every  $\epsilon > 0$  there is an integer  $M(u, \epsilon)$  and a sequence of real numbers  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_M$  such that

$$(5.5) \quad \left\| \bar{u} - \sum_{m \leq M} \langle \bar{u}, e_{\lambda_m - \nu} \rangle e_{\lambda_m - \nu} \right\| < \epsilon \quad (M > M(u, \epsilon)).$$

If  $|u| = 1$ , then it is immediate from (5.5) that

$$(5.6) \quad \left\| e_\nu - \sum_{m \leq M} \langle e_\nu, u e_{\lambda_m} \rangle u e_{\lambda_m} \right\| < \epsilon \quad (M > M(u, \epsilon)).$$

For each  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$  we write  $u_\lambda = ue_\lambda$  and note that the set  $\{u_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}}$  is an orthonormal set in  $B^2$ . Now suppose that the set  $\{u_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}}$  is not dense in  $B^2$ , and let  $V$  be the proper subspace spanned by  $\{u_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}}$ . Since  $\{e_\nu\}_{\nu \in \mathbb{R}}$  is a complete orthonormal set there is an  $e_{\nu_0} \in V^\perp$ , which contradicts (5.6) so  $\{u_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}}$  is dense in  $B^2$ . Since a dense orthonormal set in a Hilbert space is complete, it follows that the set  $\{u_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}}$  is a complete orthonormal set in  $B^2$  and by Parseval's theorem we have

$$\sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} |\langle \bar{u}f, e_\lambda \rangle|^2 = \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} |\langle f, u_\lambda \rangle|^2 = \|f\|^2 \quad (f \in B^2).$$

Thus the transformations  $M_u$  are continuous on  $B^2$  and therefore unitary.

Lastly, to see that  $U$  is a multiplicative subgroup, note that if  $u, v \in U$  and  $uv = w$  then

$$\left\| w - \sum_{m \leq M} \langle w, v_{\lambda_m} \rangle v_{\lambda_m} \right\| = \left\| u - \sum_{m \leq M} \langle u, e_{\lambda_m} \rangle e_{\lambda_m} \right\| < \epsilon$$

which implies  $w \in U$  because  $\{v_\lambda\}_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}}$  is a complete orthonormal set in  $B^2$ .

**Acknowledgement.** I would like to thank Julio Andrade, Roger Heath-Brown and Christopher Hughes for their comments and suggestions on this work. I am also grateful to be supported by the Faculty of Environment, Science and Economy at the University of Exeter.

## REFERENCES

- [1] J.B. Conrey, D.W. Farmer, J.P. Keating, M.O. Rubinstein and N.C. Snaith. *Integral moments of L-functions*. P. Lond. Math. Soc. 91, 33-104 (2005).
- [2] J. Bourgain. *Decoupling, exponential sums and the Riemann zeta function*. J. Amer. Math. Soc. 30, 205-224 (2017).
- [3] J.B. Conrey, S.M. Gonek. *High moments of the Riemann zeta-function*. Duke Math. J. 107, 577-604 (2001).
- [4] J. B. Conrey, A. Ghosh. *A conjecture for the sixth power moment of the Riemann zeta-function*. Internat. Math. Res. Notices 15, 775-780 (1998).
- [5] D. Farmer, S. Gonek, C. Hughes. *The maximum size of L-functions*. Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik (Crelle's Journal). 609 (2007)
- [6] S. Gonek. *Finite Euler products and the Riemann hypothesis*. Transactions of the American Mathematical Society 364, 4, (2012) 2157-2191.
- [7] S. M. Gonek, C. P. Hughes, J. P. Keating. *A hybrid Euler-Hadamard product for the Riemann zeta function*. Duke Math. J. 136, 507-549 (2007).
- [8] G.H. Hardy, J.E. Littlewood. *Contributions to the theory of the Riemann zeta-function and the theory of the distribution of primes*. Acta Math. 41, 119-196 (1918).
- [9] W. Heap, K. Soundararajan. *Lower bounds for moments of zeta and L-functions revisited*. Mathematika, 68: 1-14 (2022).

- [10] G.H. Hardy, J.E. Littlewood. *On Lindelöf's hypothesis concerning the zeros of the Riemann zeta-function*. Proc. Royal. Soc. (A) 103, 403-412 (1923).
- [11] A. Harper. *Sharp conditional bounds for moments of the Riemann zeta function*. Preprint arXiv.1305.4618.
- [12] D.R. Heath-Brown. *The twelfth power moment of the Riemann zeta-function*. The Quarterly Journal of Mathematics 29, 4, 443-468 (1978).
- [13] A.E. Ingham. *Mean-values theorems in the theory of the Riemann zeta-function*. Proc. Lond. Math. Soc. 27, 273-300 (1926).
- [14] A. Ivić. *The Theory of the Riemann Zeta-Function with Applications*. John Wiley & Sons, New York (1985).
- [15] N. Katz and P. Sarnak. *Zeros of zeta functions and symmetry*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. 36, 1-26 (1999).
- [16] J.P. Keating, N.C. Snaith. *Random matrix theory and  $\zeta(1/2 + it)$* . Commun. Math. Phys. 214 57-89 (2000).
- [17] H.L. Montgomery. *The pair correlation of zeros of the zeta function*. Analytic number theory, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., XXIV, Providence, R.I. American Mathematical Society, 181-193 (1973).
- [18] M. Radziwiłł, K. Soundararajan. *Continuous lower bounds for moments of zeta and L-functions*. Mathematika, 59: 119-128 (2013).
- [19] K. Soundararajan. *Moments of the Riemann zeta-function*. Annals of Mathematics 170, 981-993 (2009).
- [20] E.C. Titchmarsh. *The theory of the Riemann zeta-function*. 2nd ed. Oxford Univ. Press, New York, (1986).

Email address:ks614@exeter.ac.uk