

# Magic squares, the symmetric group and Möbius randomness

Ofir Gorodetsky

## Abstract

Diaconis and Gamburd computed moments of secular coefficients in the CUE ensemble. We use the characteristic map to give a new combinatorial proof of their result. We also extend their computation to moments of traces of symmetric powers, where the same result holds but in a wider range.

Our combinatorial proof is inspired by gcd matrices, as used by Vaughan and Wooley and by Granville and Soundararajan. We use these CUE computations to suggest a conjecture about moments of character sums twisted by the Möbius function, and establish a version of it in function fields.

## 1 Introduction

Consider the complex unitary group  $U(N)$  endowed with the probability Haar measure. The  $n$ th secular coefficient of  $U \in U(N)$  is defined through the expansion

$$\det(zI + U) = \sum_{n=0}^N z^{N-n} \text{Sc}_n(U).$$

If  $A = (a_{i,j})$  is an  $m \times n$  matrix with non-negative integer entries, Diaconis and Gamburd [DG06] define the row-sum vector  $\text{row}(A) \in \mathbb{Z}^m$  and column-sum vector  $\text{col}(A) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$  by

$$\text{row}(A)_i = \sum_{j=1}^n a_{i,j}, \quad \text{col}(A)_j = \sum_{i=1}^m a_{i,j}.$$

Given two partitions  $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m)$  and  $\tilde{\mu} = (\tilde{\mu}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mu}_n)$  they denote by  $N_{\mu, \tilde{\mu}}$  the number of non-negative integer matrices  $A$  with  $\text{row}(A) = \mu$  and  $\text{col}(A) = \tilde{\mu}$ . Given sequences  $(a_1, \dots, a_\ell)$  and  $(b_1, \dots, b_\ell)$  of non-negative integers, they proved the following equality [DG06, Thm. 2]:

$$\int_{U(N)} \prod_{j=1}^{\ell} \text{Sc}_j(U)^{a_j} \overline{\text{Sc}_j(U)^{b_j}} dU = N_{\mu, \tilde{\mu}} \quad (1.1)$$

as long as  $\sum_{j=1}^{\ell} j a_j, \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} j b_j \leq N$ . Here  $\mu$  and  $\tilde{\mu}$  are the partitions with  $a_j$  and  $b_j$  parts of size  $j$ , respectively.

Identity (1.1) answered a question raised in [HKS<sup>+</sup>96, SHW98], where the first two moments were computed. The results in [DG06] inspired the study of pseudomoments of the Riemann zeta function [CG06] and were used in [KRRGR18] to study the variance of divisor functions in short intervals. Recently, Najnudel, Paquette and Simm studied the distribution of  $\text{Sc}_n$  with  $n$  growing with  $N$  [NPS20].

In S2 we give a new combinatorial proof of (1.1), which makes use of the characteristic map. This is in the spirit of Bump's derivation [Bum04, Prop. 40.4] of the Diaconis-Shahshahani moment computation [DS94]. In §3 we show that a result similar to (1.1) holds for traces of symmetric powers in place of secular coefficients, with substantially relaxed conditions:  $\min\{\sum a_j, \sum b_j\} \leq N$ . These traces are also the complete homogeneous symmetric polynomials  $h_n$  evaluated on the eigenvalues of the matrix. This result can be derived from a theorem of Baxter [Joh97, Prop. 2.11] but again, our proof is combinatorial in nature.

In §4 we show how an analogue of our proof of (1.1) has appeared in number-theoretic works of Vaughan and Wooley and of Granville and Soundararajan. The number-theoretic analogues of (1.1) concern moments of character sums on which there are several unconditional results in the literature. However, our result on symmetric traces corresponds to a question about moments of character sums twisted by the Möbius (or Liouville) function, which seems very difficult and reflects the random nature of Möbius.

## 2 Proof of the Diaconis-Gamburd Theorem

### 2.1 The symmetric group

For a permutation  $\pi$  we say that  $S$  is an invariant set for  $\pi$  if  $\pi(S) = S$ . Equivalently,  $S$  is a union of cycles of  $\pi$ . Given a partition  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_\ell) \vdash n$ , we define the following function on the symmetric group  $S_n$  acting on  $[n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ :

$$d_\lambda(\pi) = \#\{(A_1, \dots, A_\ell) : \cup A_i = [n], \text{ each } A_i \text{ is an invariant set with } |A_i| = \lambda_i\},$$

where  $\cup$  means disjoint union. We use the letter  $d$  here as short for *divisor*, as these functions are analogous to divisor functions over the integers. Given  $\mu, \tilde{\mu} \vdash n$ , let us define

$$N_{\mu, \tilde{\mu}}(n) := \frac{1}{|S_n|} \sum_{\pi \in S_n} d_\mu(\pi) d_{\tilde{\mu}}(\pi),$$

**Proposition 2.1.** *Suppose  $\mu, \tilde{\mu} \vdash n$ . We have*

$$N_{\mu, \tilde{\mu}}(n) = N_{\tilde{\mu}, \mu}.$$

*Proof.* By definition, given a partition  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\ell) \vdash n$  we may express  $d_\lambda(\pi)$  as a sum over ordered set partitions:

$$d_\lambda(\pi) = \sum_{\substack{(A_1, \dots, A_\ell) : \cup A_i = [n] \\ |A_i| = \lambda_i}} \alpha_{A_1, \dots, A_\ell}(\pi) \quad (2.1)$$

where  $\alpha_{A_1, \dots, A_\ell}$  is the indicator function of permutations  $\pi \in S_n$  with  $\pi(A_i) = A_i$  for all  $i$ . Applying (2.1) with  $\lambda = \mu$  and multiplying by (2.1) with  $\lambda = \tilde{\mu}$  we obtain

$$d_\mu(\pi) d_{\tilde{\mu}}(\pi) = \sum_{\substack{(A_1, \dots, A_{\ell(\mu)}) \\ \cup A_i = [n] \\ |A_i| = \mu_i}} \sum_{\substack{(B_1, \dots, B_{\ell(\tilde{\mu})}) \\ \cup B_i = [n] \\ |B_i| = \tilde{\mu}_i}} \alpha_{A_1, \dots, A_{\ell(\mu)}}(\pi) \alpha_{B_1, \dots, B_{\ell(\tilde{\mu})}}(\pi)$$

where  $\ell(\lambda)$  is the number of parts in a partition. Averaging this over  $S_n$  and interchanging the order of summation, we find

$$N_{\mu, \tilde{\mu}}(n) = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\substack{(A_1, \dots, A_{\ell(\mu)}) \\ \cup A_i = [n] \\ |A_i| = \mu_i}} \sum_{\substack{(B_1, \dots, B_{\ell(\tilde{\mu})}) \\ \cup B_i = [n] \\ |B_i| = \tilde{\mu}_i}} \sum_{\pi \in S_n} \alpha_{A_1, \dots, A_{\ell(\mu)}}(\pi) \alpha_{B_1, \dots, B_{\ell(\tilde{\mu})}}(\pi). \quad (2.2)$$

The inner sum in the right-hand side of (2.2) counts permutations  $\pi \in S_n$  for which  $A_i$  are invariant sets, as well as the  $B_j$ . In particular  $\pi(A_i \cap B_j) \subseteq A_i, B_j$ , forcing  $\pi(A_i \cap B_j) = A_i \cap B_j$ . Conversely, given a permutation such that  $\pi(A_i \cap B_j) = A_i \cap B_j$  for all  $i, j$ , it necessarily satisfies  $\pi(A_i) = A_i$  and  $\pi(B_j) = B_j$  for all  $i, j$ . Thus, the inner sum counts  $\pi$ s with  $\pi(A_i \cap B_j) = A_i \cap B_j$ . The sets  $\{A_i \cap B_j\}_{i,j}$  are disjoint and their union is  $[n]$ , and so such  $\pi$ s are determined uniquely by their restrictions to  $A_i \cap B_j$ , which may be arbitrary, proving that the inner sum is  $\prod_{i,j=1}^n |A_i \cap B_j|!$ . Hence,

$$N_{\mu, \tilde{\mu}}(n) = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\substack{(A_1, \dots, A_{\ell(\mu)}) \\ \cup A_i = [n] \\ |A_i| = \mu_i}} \sum_{\substack{(B_1, \dots, B_{\ell(\tilde{\mu})}) \\ \cup B_i = [n] \\ |B_i| = \tilde{\mu}_i}} \prod_{i,j} |A_i \cap B_j|!. \quad (2.3)$$

Observe that the  $n \times m$  matrix  $C = (|A_i \cap B_j|)$  has  $\text{row}(C) = \mu$  and  $\text{col}(C) = \tilde{\mu}$ . Hence

$$N_{\mu, \tilde{\mu}}(n) = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\substack{C=(c_{i,j}) \text{ a matrix} \\ \text{counted by } N_{\mu, \tilde{\mu}}}} \prod_{i,j} c_{i,j}! \cdot \#\{[n] = \cup_{i,j} C_{i,j}, |C_{i,j}| = c_{i,j}\}.$$

The inner expression in the right-hand side is the number of ordered set partitions of  $[n]$  into subsets  $C_{i,j}$  of size  $c_{i,j}$  (these sets correspond to  $A_i \cap B_j$  and one reconstructs  $A_i$  by  $A_i = \cup_j C_{i,j}$  and similarly  $B_j = \cup_i C_{i,j}$ ). This is just the multinomial

$$\binom{n}{(c_{i,j}) : 1 \leq i \leq \ell(\mu), 1 \leq j \leq \ell(\tilde{\mu})} = \frac{n!}{\prod c_{i,j}!},$$

so that (2.3) simplifies to

$$N_{\mu, \tilde{\mu}}(n) = \sum_{\substack{X \text{ a matrix} \\ \text{counted by } N_{\mu, \tilde{\mu}}}} 1 = N_{\mu, \tilde{\mu}}$$

as claimed.  $\square$

## 2.2 The characteristic map

Endow  $S_n$  with the uniform probability measure. The characteristic (or Frobenius) map  $\text{Ch}^{(N)}$  is a linear map from class functions on  $S_n$  to class functions on  $U(N)$ , with the property that if  $n \leq N$  it is an isometry with respect to the  $L_2$ -norm, see [Bum04, Thm. 40.1]. It may be given by

$$\text{Ch}^{(N)}(f) = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\pi \in S_n} f(\pi) p_{\lambda(\pi)},$$

see [Bum04, Thm. 39.1]. Here  $\lambda(\pi)$  is the partition associated with  $\pi$ , and  $p_\lambda$  is the power sum symmetric polynomial associated with  $\lambda$ , evaluated at the eigenvalues of  $U \in U(N)$ .

**Lemma 2.2.** *Suppose  $\lambda \vdash n$ . We have*

$$\text{Ch}^{(N)}(\text{sgn} \cdot d_\lambda) = e_\lambda,$$

where  $\text{sgn}$  is the sign representation and  $e_\lambda$  is the elementary symmetric polynomial associated with the partition  $\lambda$ .

*Proof.* Given  $\pi \in S_n$ , we set  $p_\pi = p_{\lambda(\pi)}$  for convenience. We then have, by plugging (2.1) in the definition of  $\text{Ch}^{(N)}(\text{sgn} \cdot d_\lambda)$  and interchanging order of summation,

$$\text{Ch}^{(N)}(\text{sgn} \cdot d_\lambda) = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{\substack{(A_1, \dots, A_{\ell(\lambda)}) : \cup A_i = [n] \\ |A_i| = \lambda_i}} \sum_{\substack{\pi \in S_n \\ \pi|_{A_i} = A_i}} \text{sgn}(\pi) p_\pi.$$

We claim that the inner sum is  $e_\lambda$ . Indeed, since  $\pi$  is determined by the restrictions  $\pi|_{A_i}$ , and since  $p_\lambda = \prod_i p_{\lambda_i}$ , we have

$$\sum_{\substack{\pi \in S_n \\ \pi|_{A_i} = A_i}} \text{sgn}(\pi) p_\pi = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell(\lambda)} \left( \sum_{\pi_i \in S_{A_i}} \text{sgn}(\pi) p_{\pi_i} \right) = \prod_{i=1}^{\ell(\lambda)} \lambda_i! e_{\lambda_i},$$

where the last equality follows from the Newton-Girard identity  $\sum_{\pi \in S_m} \text{sgn}(\pi) p_\pi / m! = e_m$ . To finish, note that the number of ordered set partitions of  $[n]$  into  $\ell(\lambda)$  sets of sizes  $\lambda_i$  is exactly the binomial coefficient  $\binom{n}{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_{\ell(\lambda)}}$ .  $\square$

## 2.3 Conclusion of proof

Here we establish (1.1). Let  $(a_1, \dots, a_\ell)$  and  $(b_1, \dots, b_\ell)$  be sequences of non-negative integers with  $\sum_{j=1}^\ell j a_j, \sum_{j=1}^\ell j b_j \leq N$ . Let  $\mu$  and  $\tilde{\mu}$  be the partitions with  $a_j$  and  $b_j$  parts of size  $j$ , respectively.

If  $\sum j a_j \neq \sum j b_j$ , it is easy to see that both sides of (1.1) vanish. Indeed, for the right-hand side, note that the integrand is an homogeneous polynomial in the eigenvalues of  $U$ , whose degree is non-zero, so its

integral must vanish by translation-invariance of the Haar measure. On the other hand, if  $N_{\mu, \tilde{\mu}}$  is non-zero, we must have that  $\mu$  and  $\tilde{\mu}$  sum to the same number (if  $A = (a_{i,j})$  is a matrix counted by  $N$  then both  $\mu$  and  $\tilde{\mu}$  sum to  $\sum_{i,j} a_{i,j}$ ).

Now assume  $\sum ja_j = \sum jb_j = n \leq N$ . As  $\text{Sc}_j(U)^{a_j} \overline{\text{Sc}_j(U)^{b_j}} = e_\mu \overline{e_{\tilde{\mu}}}$  by definition, the fact that  $\text{Ch}^{(N)}$  is an isometry if  $n \leq N$  shows, through Lemma 2.2, that the integral in (1.1) is equal to

$$\frac{1}{|S_n|} \sum_{\pi \in S_n} (\text{sgn} \cdot d_\mu)(\pi) \overline{(\text{sgn} \cdot d_{\tilde{\mu}})(\pi)} = \frac{1}{|S_n|} \sum_{\pi \in S_n} d_\mu(\pi) d_{\tilde{\mu}}(\pi) = N_{\mu, \tilde{\mu}}(n),$$

and the proof is concluded by applying Proposition 2.1.

### 3 Symmetric powers

Let  $\text{TrSym}^n(U)$  be the trace of the  $n$ th symmetric power of  $U \in U(N)$ . This is also the  $n$ th complete homogeneous symmetric polynomial  $h_n$  evaluated on the eigenvalues of  $U$ .

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $\{a_j\}_{j=1}^\ell, \{b_j\}_{j=1}^\ell$  be sequences of non-negative integers. We have*

$$\int_{U(N)} \prod_{j=1}^\ell (\text{TrSym}^j(U))^{a_j} \overline{(\text{TrSym}^j(U))^{b_j}} dU = N_{\mu, \tilde{\mu}} \quad (3.1)$$

as long as  $\min\{\sum_{j=1}^\ell a_j, \sum_{j=1}^\ell b_j\} \leq N$ . Here  $\mu$  and  $\tilde{\mu}$  are the partitions with  $a_j$  and  $b_j$  parts of size  $j$ , respectively.

We start with the following corollary of Lemma 2.2.

**Corollary 3.2.** *Suppose  $\lambda \vdash n$ . We have  $\text{Ch}^{(N)}(d_\lambda) = h_\lambda$ .*

This follows from Lemma 2.2 through the existence of an involution  $\iota$  on the space of symmetric polynomials, with the properties  $\text{Ch}^{(N)}(\text{sgn} \cdot f) = \iota(\text{Ch}^{(N)}(f))$  [Bum04, Thm. 39.3] and  $\iota(e_\lambda) = h_\lambda$  [Bum04, Thm. 36.3]. Alternatively, one may repeat the proof of Lemma 2.2 with the Newton-Girard identity  $\sum_{\pi \in S_m} p_\pi / m! = h_m$ .

Next we prove the following well-known identity, often proved as a consequence of the RSK correspondence.

**Lemma 3.3.** *Given  $\mu, \tilde{\mu} \vdash n$  we have*

$$\sum_{\lambda \vdash n} K_{\lambda, \mu} K_{\lambda, \tilde{\mu}} = N_{\mu, \tilde{\mu}} \quad (3.2)$$

where  $K_{\lambda, \mu}$  are the Kostka numbers.

*Proof.* We may expand  $e_\lambda$  in the Schur basis, see [Sta99, p. 335]:

$$e_\mu = \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} K_{\lambda', \mu} s_\lambda$$

where  $\lambda'$  is the conjugate of  $\lambda$ . Orthogonality of Schur functions [DG06, Eq. (22)] implies that

$$\int_{U(n)} \prod_{j=1}^\ell \text{Sc}_j(U)^{a_j} \overline{\text{Sc}_j(U)^{b_j}} dU = \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} K_{\lambda', \mu} K_{\lambda', \tilde{\mu}} = \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} K_{\lambda, \mu} K_{\lambda, \tilde{\mu}}.$$

On the other hand, this integral was shown to equal  $N_{\mu, \tilde{\mu}}$ .  $\square$

We now prove Theorem 3.1. The case  $\sum_{j=1}^\ell ja_j \neq \sum_{j=1}^\ell jb_j$  is treated as in the secular coefficients case. Next, assume that  $\sum ja_j = \sum jb_j = n$  and  $\min\{\sum_{j=1}^\ell a_j, \sum_{j=1}^\ell b_j\} \leq N$ . The multiset of eigenvalues of

$\text{TrSym}^j U$  consists of products of  $j$  eigenvalues of  $U$ , and so the integrand in the left-hand side of (3.1) is  $h_\mu \overline{h_{\tilde{\mu}}}$ . We may expand  $h_\lambda$  in the Schur basis, see Stanley [Sta99, Cor. 7.12.4]:

$$h_\mu = \sum_{\lambda \vdash n} K_{\lambda, \mu} s_\lambda.$$

Orthogonality of Schur functions implies that the left-hand side of (3.1) is

$$\sum_{\substack{\lambda \vdash n \\ \ell(\lambda) \leq N}} K_{\lambda, \mu} K_{\lambda, \tilde{\mu}}.$$

As  $K_{\lambda, \mu} \neq 0$  implies  $\ell(\lambda) \leq \ell(\mu)$  [Sta99, Prop. 7.10.5], and  $\min\{\ell(\mu), \ell(\mu')\} = \min\{\sum a_j, \sum b_j\} \leq N$  by assumption, this sum is equal to the full sum  $\sum_{\lambda \vdash n} K_{\lambda, \mu} K_{\lambda, \tilde{\mu}}$  and the proof is concluded by (3.2).

Theorem 3.1 may also be derived from a theorem of Baxter on Toeplitz determinants for certain generating functions [Joh97, Prop. 2.11], special cases of which appearing in earlier works of Szegő and Onsager. A weaker version of Theorem 3.1, with max in place of min, may be derived from formulas for averages of ratios of characteristic polynomials [CFZ05, BG06].

## 4 Relation to number theory, and a conjecture

Over  $\mathbb{F}_q[T]$ , the polynomial ring over the finite field of  $q$  elements, it is straightforward to define an analogue of  $d_\lambda$ . Letting  $\mathcal{M}_{n, q} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_q[T]$  be the subset of monic polynomials of degree  $n$ , we can set

$$d_{\lambda, q}(f) = d_\lambda(\pi)$$

where  $\pi \in S_n$  is any permutation whose cycle structure agrees with the prime factorization of  $f$ , so that if  $f = \prod_i P_i$  then  $\pi$  has cycles of length  $\{\deg P_i\}_i$ . If  $\mu, \tilde{\mu}$  are partitions of  $n$  then

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{q^n} \sum_{f \in \mathcal{M}_{n, q}} d_{\mu, q}(f) d_{\tilde{\mu}, q}(f) = \frac{1}{|S_n|} \sum_{\pi \in S_n} d_\mu(\pi) d_{\tilde{\mu}}(\pi) = N_{\mu, \tilde{\mu}}. \quad (4.1)$$

This has to do with a general principle and applies for a general class of functions. However, this specific equality can be established directly, as we sketch now. The sum in the left-hand side of (4.1) counts solutions to the equation

$$f_1 f_2 \cdots f_{\ell(\mu)} = g_1 g_2 \cdots g_{\ell(\tilde{\mu})}$$

where  $\deg f_i = \mu_i$  and  $\deg g_j = \tilde{\mu}_j$ . We can associate with any tuple of solutions a *gcd matrix*

$$h_{i, j} = \gcd(g_i, f_j),$$

analogous to the matrix constructed in the proof of Proposition 2.1. At least if the  $\{g_i\}_i$  as well as the  $\{f_j\}_j$  are pairwise coprime we may reconstruct them from  $h_{i, j}$  via  $g_i = \prod_j h_{i, j}$  and  $h_j = \prod_i h_{i, j}$ . Fortunately, in the large- $q$  limit we can impose these coprimality conditions and only incur an error of  $o_{q \rightarrow \infty}(q^n)$ , which will be negligible compared to the main term.

Given a gcd matrix  $h_{i, j}$  we can further form a *degree matrix*  $\deg h_{i, j}$ , which is counted by  $N_{\mu, \tilde{\mu}}$ . For each degree matrix  $d_{i, j}$  counted by  $N_{\mu, \tilde{\mu}}$  we need to count the number of gcd matrices corresponding to it, that is, monic  $h_{i, j}$  with  $\deg h_{i, j} = d_{i, j}$  and  $h_{i, j}$  being pairwise coprime (a consequence of the pairwise coprimality of  $\{g_i\}_i$  and  $\{f_j\}_j$ ). As already mentioned, in the large- $q$  limit these coprimality conditions do not affect asymptotics, and the number of such  $h_{i, j}$  is  $q^{\sum_{i, j} d_{i, j}} (1 + o_{q \rightarrow \infty}(1)) = q^n (1 + o_{q \rightarrow \infty}(1))$ . All in all, we recover (4.1).

This idea can be made to work for fixed- $q$  as well using a clever construction of Vaughan and Wooley [VW95, §8], which can be used to show  $\sum_{f \in \mathcal{M}_{n, q}} d_{\mu, q}(f) d_{\tilde{\mu}, q}(f)$  is a polynomial in  $q$  of degree  $n$  and leading coefficient  $N_{\mu, \tilde{\mu}}$ , but we do not give details. They construct matrices which take into account common factors. They used an inductive process to associate with a solution of  $m_1 \cdots m_{\ell(\mu)} = n_1 \cdots n_{\ell(\tilde{\mu})}$  a  $\ell(\mu) \times \ell(\tilde{\mu})$  matrix  $a_{i, j}$  such that  $m_i = \prod_{r=1}^{\ell(\tilde{\mu})} a_{r, i}$  and  $n_i = \prod_{r=1}^{\ell(\mu)} a_{i, r}$ ; this also works with polynomials

instead of integers. The process goes by letting  $a_{1,1} = \gcd(m_1, n_1)$  and then defining, using induction on  $i + j$ ,  $a_{i,j} = \gcd(m_i / \prod_{\ell < j} a_{i,\ell}, n_j / \prod_{\ell < i} a_{\ell,j})$ .

This process was discovered independently by Granville and Soundararajan in the proof of [GS01, Thm. 4]. We explain how these gcd matrices arose in their work because it is not too difficult to relate it to matrix integrals. They were interested in the order of magnitude of moments of character sums:

$$M_k(x, q) = \frac{1}{\phi(q)} \sum_{\chi \bmod q} \left| \sum_{n \leq x} \chi(n) \right|^{2k}.$$

Here the sum is over all Dirichlet characters modulo  $q$ . Using orthogonality of characters, we have

$$M_k(x, q) = \#\{n_1 n_2 \cdots n_k \equiv m_1 m_2 \cdots m_k \pmod{q}, n_i, m_i \leq x, (n_i m_i, q) = 1\}.$$

If  $x^k \leq q$ , this reduces to

$$M_k(x, q) = \#\{n_1 n_2 \cdots n_k = m_1 m_2 \cdots m_k, n_i, m_i \leq x, (n_i m_i, q) = 1\}.$$

They were also interested in moments of sums of random multiplicative functions. Let  $\alpha$  be a random completely multiplicative function ( $\alpha(nm) = \alpha(n)\alpha(m)$  for all  $n, m \geq 1$ ), chosen in such a way that  $\{\alpha(p)\}_p$  ( $p$  prime) are i.i.d random variables taking values uniformly on  $S^1$ . Then we have the orthogonality relation

$$\mathbb{E}\alpha(n)\overline{\alpha}(m) = \delta_{nm}$$

and similarly,

$$M_k(x) := \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{n \leq x} \alpha(n) \right|^{2k} = \#\{n_1 n_2 \cdots n_k = m_1 m_2 \cdots m_k, n_i, m_i \leq x\}.$$

The gcd matrices one associates with the solutions counted by  $M_k$  can be counted and in turn lead to bounds on  $M_k$  as in [GS01, Thm. 4]. We refer the reader to Heap and Lindqvist [HL16] for asymptotics results for  $M_k(x)$  and  $M_k(x, q)$ , where the restriction  $x^k \leq q$  is naturally assumed in the latter case (cf. Harper, Nikeghbali and Radziwiłł [HNR15]). See also Harper [Har19, Har20] estimates on  $M_k(x)$  in a wide range of  $k$ , including non-integer  $k$ .

In function fields, the connection between character sums and secular coefficients is natural. If  $\chi$  is a non-principal Dirichlet character modulo  $Q$ , we can form its Dirichlet L-function

$$L(u, \chi) = \sum_{f \text{ monic}} \chi(f) u^{\deg f},$$

which is a polynomial whose  $n$ th coefficient is *exactly* a character sum. By Weil's RH, we can see that

$$\sum_{f \in \mathcal{M}_{n,q}} \chi(f) \ll_{n, \deg Q} q^{\frac{n}{2}}.$$

If  $\chi$  is odd and primitive we have  $\deg L(u, \chi) = \deg Q - 1$  and the zeros of  $L$  all lie on  $|u| = q^{-1/2}$  so that we can write  $L(u, \chi)$  as a characteristic polynomial of a scaled unitary matrix:

$$L(u, \chi) = \det(I_{\deg Q - 1} - u\sqrt{q}\Theta_\chi), \Theta_\chi \in U(\deg Q - 1).$$

Comparing coefficients, we find that

$$\text{Sc}_n(\Theta_\chi) = \frac{(-1)^n}{q^{\frac{n}{2}}} \sum_{f \in \mathcal{M}_{n,q}} \chi(f).$$

If  $nk \leq \deg Q$  then orthogonality relations show

$$\frac{1}{\phi(Q)} \sum_{\chi \bmod Q} \left| \sum_{f \in \mathcal{M}_{n,q}} \chi(f) \right|^{2k} = \#\{f_1 f_2 \cdots f_k = g_1 g_2 \cdots g_k, \deg f_i = \deg g_i = n, (f_i g_i, Q) = 1\}, \quad (4.2)$$

which is asymptotic to  $q^{nk}N_{(nk, nk)}$  in the large- $q$  limit by using gcd matrices. We can also package (4.2) as

$$\frac{1}{\phi(Q)} \sum_{\chi \bmod Q} \left| \sum_{f \in \mathcal{M}_{n,q}} \chi(f) \right|^{2k} = \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{\substack{f \in \mathcal{M}_{n,q} \\ (f, Q)=1}} \alpha(f) \right|^{2k} \quad (4.3)$$

where now  $\alpha$  is a random completely multiplicative function in  $\mathbb{F}_q[T]$  and  $nk \leq \deg Q$ . On the other hand, in the large- $q$  limit almost all characters are primitive and odd [KR14, Eq. (3.25)] and we obtain

$$\frac{1}{\phi(Q)} \sum_{\chi \bmod Q} \left| \sum_{f \in \mathcal{M}_{n,q}} \chi(f) \right|^{2k} = o_{q \rightarrow \infty}(q^{nk}) + q^{nk}(1 + o_{q \rightarrow \infty}(1)) \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\chi \text{ odd,} \\ \text{primitive mod } Q}} |\text{Sc}_n(\Theta_\chi)|^{2k}.$$

A deep equidistribution theorem of Katz [Kat13] says that (at least for squarefree  $Q$ ) as  $q \rightarrow \infty$  the average over  $\Theta_\chi$  converges to an average over  $U(\deg Q - 1)$  endowed with the Haar measure, and we again get  $q^{nk}N_{(nk, nk)}$ , now by (1.1).

What about traces of symmetric powers? These arise when twisting a character by the Möbius function. In general, given a Dirichlet character modulo  $Q$ , we have

$$\frac{1}{L(u, \chi)} = \sum_{f \text{ monic}} \mu(f) \chi(f) u^{\deg f}.$$

The  $n$ th coefficient of this rational function is

$$\sum_{f \in \mathcal{M}_{n,q}} \mu(f) \chi(f) \ll_{n, \deg Q} q^{\frac{n}{2}}$$

by Weil's RH. If  $\chi$  is odd and primitive we have

$$\frac{1}{L(u, \chi)} = \frac{1}{\det(I_{\deg Q - 1} - u\sqrt{q}\Theta_\chi)} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} q^{\frac{n}{2}} u^n \text{TrSym}^n(\Theta_\chi).$$

In the large- $q$  limit almost all characters are primitive and odd and we obtain, at least for squarefree  $Q$ ,

$$\frac{1}{\phi(Q)} \sum_{\chi \bmod Q} \left| \sum_{f \in \mathcal{M}_{n,q}} \mu(f) \chi(f) \right|^{2k} = o_{q \rightarrow \infty}(q^{nk}) + q^{nk}(1 + o_{q \rightarrow \infty}(1)) \mathbb{E}_{\substack{\chi \text{ odd,} \\ \text{primitive mod } Q}} |\text{TrSym}^n(\Theta_\chi)|^{2k},$$

so that, as  $q \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\frac{1}{\phi(Q)} \sum_{\chi \bmod Q} \left| \sum_{f \in \mathcal{M}_{n,q}} \mu(f) \chi(f) \right|^{2k} \sim q^{nk} \int_{U(\deg Q - 1)} |\text{TrSym}^n(U)|^{2k} = q^{nk} N_{(nk, nk)}$$

if  $k \leq \deg Q - 1$ . Here in the first equality we used [Kat13, Thm.] and in the second we used Theorem 3.1. In the restricted range  $nk \leq \deg Q$  we can mimic (4.2) and (4.3) and obtain

$$\frac{1}{\phi(Q)} \sum_{\chi \bmod Q} \left| \sum_{f \in \mathcal{M}_{n,q}} \mu(f) \chi(f) \right|^{2k} = \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{\substack{f \in \mathcal{M}_{n,q} \\ (f, Q)=1}} \mu^2(f) \alpha(f) \right|^{2k}.$$

Our last argument tells us that if we replace equality with an asymptotic then this holds in the wider range  $k \leq \deg Q - 1$ . We believe this should hold without taking the large- $q$  limit, and suggest the following conjecture in integers.

**Conjecture 4.1.** *Suppose  $q$  and  $x$  tend to  $\infty$  and that  $k < \log q$ . We have*

$$\frac{1}{\phi(q)} \sum_{\chi \bmod q} \left| \sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n) \chi(n) \right|^{2k} \sim \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ (n,q)=1}} \mu^2(n) \alpha(n) \right|^{2k}, \quad (4.4)$$

$$\frac{1}{\phi(q)} \sum_{\chi \bmod q} \left| \sum_{n \leq x} \lambda(n) \chi(n) \right|^{2k} \sim \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ (n,q)=1}} \alpha(n) \right|^{2k}.$$

Here  $k$  is allowed to vary with  $x$  and  $q$ , and  $\lambda$  is the Liouville function  $\lambda(n) = (-1)^{\sum_{p^k | n} 1}$ .

We view the conjecture as a manifestation of Möbius cancellation. Even for  $k = 1$  this is a very difficult open problem, related to the variance of  $\mu$  and  $\lambda$  in arithmetic progressions, see e.g. [KR16].

This should be contrasted with the more modest range  $x^k \leq q$  that occurs in the same problem without the twist by  $\mu$  or  $\lambda$ :

$$\frac{1}{\phi(q)} \sum_{\chi \bmod q} \left| \sum_{n \leq x} \chi(n) \right|^{2k} = \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ (n,q)=1}} \alpha(n) \right|^{2k}.$$

The range  $x^k \leq q$  is essentially optimal here (up to  $x^{o(1)}$ ), even if we replace equality with an asymptotic, because of the contribution of the principal character to the left-hand side which is  $x^{2k}/\phi(q)$ . We expect the contribution of the trivial character to the left-hand side of (4.4) to be much smaller. For instance, the Riemann Hypothesis says it is as small as  $x^{k(1+o(1))}/\phi(q)$ .

## 5 Acknowledgements

We thank Jon Keating and Brad Rodgers for useful comments and suggestions and Zachary Chase for a typographical correction. This project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (grant agreement No 851318).

## References

- [BG06] Daniel Bump and Alex Gamburd. On the averages of characteristic polynomials from classical groups. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 265(1):227–274, 2006.
- [Bum04] Daniel Bump. *Lie groups*, volume 225 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2004.
- [CFZ05] JB Conrey, DW Farmer, and MR Zirnbauer. Howe pairs, supersymmetry, and ratios of random characteristic polynomials for the unitary groups  $U(N)$ . *arXiv preprint math-ph/0511024*, 2005.
- [CG06] Brian Conrey and Alex Gamburd. Pseudomoments of the Riemann zeta-function and pseudomagic squares. *J. Number Theory*, 117(2):263–278, 2006.
- [DG06] Persi Diaconis and Alex Gamburd. Random matrices, magic squares and matching polynomials. *Electron. J. Combin.*, 11(2):Research Paper 2, 26, 2004/06.
- [DS94] Persi Diaconis and Mehrdad Shahshahani. On the eigenvalues of random matrices. volume 31A, pages 49–62. 1994. *Studies in applied probability*.
- [GS01] Andrew Granville and K. Soundararajan. Large character sums. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 14(2):365–397, 2001.



- [Har19] Adam J. Harper. Moments of random multiplicative functions, II: High moments. *Algebra Number Theory*, 13(10):2277–2321, 2019.
- [Har20] Adam J. Harper. Moments of random multiplicative functions, I: Low moments, better than squareroot cancellation, and critical multiplicative chaos. *Forum Math. Pi*, 8:e1, 95, 2020.
- [HKS<sup>+</sup>96] Fritz Haake, Marek Kuś, Hans-Jürgen Sommers, Henning Schomerus, and Karol Życzkowski. Secular determinants of random unitary matrices. *J. Phys. A*, 29(13):3641–3658, 1996.
- [HL16] Winston P. Heap and Sofia Lindqvist. Moments of random multiplicative functions and truncated characteristic polynomials. *Q. J. Math.*, 67(4):683–714, 2016.
- [HNR15] Adam J. Harper, Ashkan Nikeghbali, and Maksym Radziwiłł. A note on Helson’s conjecture on moments of random multiplicative functions. In *Analytic number theory*, pages 145–169. Springer, Cham, 2015.
- [Joh97] Kurt Johansson. On random matrices from the compact classical groups. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 145(3):519–545, 1997.
- [Kat13] Nicholas M. Katz. On a question of Keating and Rudnick about primitive Dirichlet characters with squarefree conductor. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (14):3221–3249, 2013.
- [KR14] Jonathan P. Keating and Zeév Rudnick. The variance of the number of prime polynomials in short intervals and in residue classes. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (1):259–288, 2014.
- [KR16] Jonathan Keating and Zeev Rudnick. Squarefree polynomials and Möbius values in short intervals and arithmetic progressions. *Algebra Number Theory*, 10(2):375–420, 2016.
- [KRRGR18] J. P. Keating, B. Rodgers, E. Roditty-Gershon, and Z. Rudnick. Sums of divisor functions in  $\mathbb{F}_q[t]$  and matrix integrals. *Math. Z.*, 288(1-2):167–198, 2018.
- [NPS20] Joseph Najnudel, Elliot Paquette, and Nick Simm. Secular coefficients and the holomorphic multiplicative chaos. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.01823*, 2020.
- [SHW98] Hans-Jürgen Sommers, Fritz Haake, and Joachim Weber. Joint densities of secular coefficients for unitary matrices. *J. Phys. A*, 31(19):4395–4401, 1998.
- [Sta99] Richard P. Stanley. *Enumerative combinatorics. Vol. 2*, volume 62 of *Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999. With a foreword by Gian-Carlo Rota and appendix 1 by Sergey Fomin.
- [VW95] R. C. Vaughan and T. D. Wooley. On a certain nonary cubic form and related equations. *Duke Math. J.*, 80(3):669–735, 1995.

MATHEMATICAL INSTITUTE, UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD, OXFORD, OX2 6GG, UK

*E-mail address:* ofir.goro@gmail.com