

RH-Dependent Estimates of Remainder in Modified Mertens Formula¹⁾

by Gennadiy Kalyabin²⁾

Abstract: Assuming the validity of Riemann Hypothesis (**RH**), we derive the explicit bilateral estimates ("narrow passage") for the remainder in the *modified* Mertens asymptotic formula for the sums of primes' reciprocals.

These results are reversible, thus yielding some new criteria for **RH**.

Keywords: Mertens formula, Ingham method, Riemann Hypothesis.

Bibliography: 7 items

1. Notations, brief history and main results

As usually, let N, j, k, m, n (perhaps with indices) run the set \mathbb{N} of all positive integers, $\mathbb{N}_0 := \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, p run the set $\mathbb{P} := \{p_1, p_2, \dots\}$, $p_j < p_{j+1}$, of all primes, ε be an arbitrary positive number, δ_k denote sequences, which $\rightarrow +0$ (perhaps different even within one and the same formula); $C(a)$ stand for positive constants which may depend only on a parameter a ; symbols \triangleright and \square denote the proof's beginning and end; $\log x$ and γ stand (resp.) for the natural logarithm of a positive x and the Euler-Masceroni constant:

$$\gamma := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{k} - \log n \right) = 0.577\ 215 \dots \quad (1.1)$$

In 1874 F. Mertens [1] proved his famous asymptotic formula

$$S(x) := \sum_{p \leq x} \log \frac{p}{p-1} = \log \log x + \gamma + R(x) \text{ with } R(x) = O\left(\frac{1}{\log x}\right). \quad (1.2)$$

¹ This work was partly supported by the grant of Russian Foundation of Fundamental Research (project # 14 - 01 - 00684.)

² Samara, Russia; gennadiy.kalyabin@gmail.com

In 1984 assuming **RH** G. Robin [2, Th. 3] has come to the fundamentally stronger estimate:

$$|R(x)| \leq \frac{\log x}{8\pi\sqrt{x}}, \quad x > X_0. \quad (1.3)$$

J.-L. Nicolas (1983) has considered the modified Mertens formula³):

$$S(x) = \log \log \theta(x) + \gamma + Q(x), \quad x \geq 3. \quad (1.4)$$

which differs from (1.2) by replacing x in $\log \log$ by the first Chebyshev function: $\theta(x) := \sum \{\log p : p \leq x\}$, cf. [5, S. 3.3], and the following assertion was established [3, th. 3]:

Proposition 1. *Each of the two conditions is sufficient for **RH**:*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(i)} \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0 : \quad B_\varepsilon^+ &:= \limsup Q(x) x^{0.5-\varepsilon} < +\infty, \\ \text{(ii)} \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0 : \quad B_\varepsilon^- &:= \liminf Q(x) x^{0.5-\varepsilon} > -\infty. \end{aligned} \quad (1.5)$$

Later the author, basing on the connection between (1.4) and the Ramanujan inequality for Gronwall numbers, has proved in [4]:

Proposition 2. *The relationship*

$$A^+ := \limsup Q(x) \sqrt{x} \log x < \infty, \quad (1.6)$$

*is necessary for **RH**, and this being the case, then necessarily $A^+ \leq 2\sqrt{2}$.*

The aim of this paper is to strengthen these results (using different approach) by conditional (**RH-dependent**) narrow estimates for A^+ and for the quantity:

$$A^- := \liminf Q(x) \sqrt{x} \log x. \quad (1.7)$$

Theorem. *Assume **RH**. Then one has:*

$$\text{(i)} \quad A^+ \leq 2.5, \quad \text{(ii)} \quad A^- \geq 1.5. \quad (1.8)$$

Remark 1. Directly from definitions, Propositions 1, 2 and the Theorem it follows that

$$\mathbf{RH} \Rightarrow (1.8)(\text{ii}) \Rightarrow (1.5)(\text{ii}) \Rightarrow \mathbf{RH} \Rightarrow (1.8)(\text{i}) \Rightarrow (1.6) \Rightarrow (1.5)(\text{i}) \Rightarrow \mathbf{RH}.$$

Therefore the Theorem demonstrates, that all six relationships in this chain are equivalent.

Some other criteria for **RH** in diverse terms will be adduced in Sect. 3.

³ For $x < 3$ $\log \log \theta(x)$ cannot be defined as a real number

2. Proof of the Theorem

We begin with some preliminary assertions.

Recall that **RH** may be reformulated in terms of the deviation of Chebyshev function $\theta(x)$ from x : $\Delta(x) := \theta(x) - x$, which is *unconditionally* $O(x \exp(-c\sqrt{\log x}))$ by virtue of **PNT**, cf [5], th. 5.19.

Therefore (cf. also (1.2), (1.4)) for some \tilde{x} in between of x and $\theta(x)$ one has:

$$Q(x) = R(x) + \log \log x - \log \log \theta(x) = R(x) - \frac{\Delta(x)}{\tilde{x} \log \tilde{x}} = O\left(\frac{1}{\log x}\right). \quad (2.1)$$

The proposition below is well known classical result by H. von Koch (1901), cf., e.g., [5], th. 5.21.

Proposition 3. *The following assertions are equivalent:*

$$(i) \quad \mathbf{RH} \text{ holds true;} \quad (ii) \quad |\Delta(x)| < x^{0.5+\varepsilon}, \quad \forall \varepsilon > 0, \quad \forall x > X_\varepsilon;$$

$$(iii) \quad |\Delta(x)| \leq \frac{\sqrt{x} \log^2 x}{8\pi}, \quad x > X_0. \quad (2.2)$$

In the Ingham's monograph [6], S. V.10, form. (35), the helpful conditional estimate for the primitive of $(\psi(x) - x)$ is adduced.

Proposition 4. *Assume **RH**; then $|\int_0^x (\psi(t) - t) dt| < 0.1x^{3/2}$, $x < X_0$.*

Whence, taking into account the relationship $\theta(x) = \psi(x) - \sqrt{x} + O(x^{1/3})$, one obtains:

Proposition 5. *The validity of **RH** implies the following bilateral estimates for the $(\theta(x) - x)$ -primitive:*

$$\Phi(x) := \int_0^x \Delta(t) dt = (-2/3 + b(x))x^{3/2}; \quad |b(x)| < 0.1, \quad x > X_0. \quad (2.3)$$

The main point of the Theorem's proof is the following corollary of **RH**.

Lemma 1. *Assume **RH**. Introduce the quantities $(3 \leq x < y < \infty)$:*

$$H(x, y) := \sum_{x < p \leq y} \frac{1}{p} - \log \log \theta(y^+) + \log \log \theta(x); \quad H(x) := \lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} H(x, y). \quad (2.4)$$

Then:

$$(i) \quad -2.5 \leq \liminf H(x) \sqrt{x} \log x; \quad (ii) \quad \limsup H(x) \sqrt{x} \log x \leq -1.5. \quad (2.5)$$

▷ First let us note that the Taylor formula implies:

$$\log \log \theta(x) - \log \log x = \frac{\Delta(x)}{\underline{x \log x}} - \frac{\log \hat{x} + 1}{2\hat{x}^2 \log^2 \hat{x}} \Delta^2(x), \quad (2.6)$$

where \hat{x} is a certain number in between of x and $\theta(x)$.

On the other hand, integrating twice by parts, one obtains (cf. also (2.3)):

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x < p \leq y} \frac{1}{p} - \log \log y + \log \log x &= \int_x^{y^+} \frac{d\Delta(t)}{t \log t} = \frac{\Delta(t)}{t \log t} \Big|_x^{y^+} - \int_x^{y^+} \Delta(t) \left(\frac{1}{t \log t} \right)' dt \\ &= \frac{\Delta(y^+)}{y \log y} - \frac{\Delta(x)}{\underline{x \log x}} - \Phi(t) \left(\frac{1}{t \log t} \right)' \Big|_x^y + \int_x^y \Phi(t) \left(\frac{1}{t \log t} \right)'' dt. \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

Making here y tend to ∞ , one comes to

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{x < p \leq y} \frac{1}{p} - \log \log y + \log \log x \right) = \frac{\Delta(x)}{\underline{x \log x}} + D(x) + E(x) + F(x), \quad (2.8)$$

where the notations are used:

$$\begin{aligned} D(x) &:= -\frac{\Phi(x)(\log x + 1)}{x^2 \log^2 x}, \quad E(x) := \int_x^{+\infty} \frac{\Phi(t)}{t^3 \log t} \left(2 + \frac{3}{\log t} + \frac{2}{\log^2 t} \right) dt, \\ F(x) &:= -\frac{\log \tilde{x} + 1}{2\tilde{x}^2 \log^2 \tilde{x}} \Delta^2(x). \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

Summing this with (2.6) (the terms, involving $\Delta(x)$, underlined in (2.6), (2.8), *mutually reduce*), and taking into account (2.2)(iii) and (2.3), one comes to: $H(x) = D(x) + E(x) + O(\log^3 x/x)$. But by virtue of (2.3) one has:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{17}{30} &\leq \liminf D(x) \sqrt{x} \log x \leq \limsup D(x) \sqrt{x} \log x \leq \frac{23}{30}; \\ -\frac{92}{30} &\leq \liminf E(x) \sqrt{x} \log x \leq \limsup E(x) \sqrt{x} \log x \leq -\frac{68}{30}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

and thus $-2.5 - \varepsilon < H(x) \sqrt{x} \log x < -1.5 + \varepsilon$, for all $x > X_\varepsilon$, which coincides with (2.5) \square .

Remark 2. It is important to emphasize that *without any apriory estimates* for $\Delta(x)$, i. e. unconditionally, from (2.8), (2.9) the inequality follows:

$$H(x) \leq D(x) + E(x), \quad \forall x > 3, \quad (2.11)$$

because the quantity $F(x)$ is always non-positive.

Also it's easy to check that if the function $|b(x)|$ in (2.3) would be bounded by some $\delta_0 > 0$ (instead of 0.1), then the boundaries in (2.5) would be $-2 \pm 5\delta_0$.

▷ Proceeding to the proof of the Theorem itself, let us note that defining formula (1.4) immediately implies:

$$\gamma = \lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{p \leq y} \log \frac{p}{p-1} - \log \log \theta(y) \right), \quad (2.12)$$

and taking into account definitions (1.4) and (2.4), one obtains **unconditionally**:

$$\begin{aligned} Q(x) + H(x) &= \sum_{p \leq x} \log \frac{p}{p-1} - \gamma + \lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{x < p \leq y} \frac{1}{p} - \log \log \theta(y) \right) \\ &= \lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{p \leq y} \log \frac{p}{p-1} - \log \log \theta(y) \right) - \gamma + \sum_{p > x} \left(\frac{1}{p} - \log \frac{p}{p-1} \right) \\ &= \sum_{p > x} \left(\log \left(1 - \frac{1}{p} \right) + \frac{1}{p} \right) = - \sum_{p > x} \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{kp^k} = O \left(\frac{1}{x} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

and thus (2.5)(i)(ii) imply (1.8)(i)(ii) (respectively) \square .

This completes the Theorem's proof.

3. Some corollaries and conclusive remarks

The Theorem allows to deduce some new conditions equivalent to **RH** in terms of the function $\Phi(x)$ and of the primitive of $(\psi(x) - x)^2$.

Corollary 1. *In order **RH** hold true it is necessary and sufficient that at least one (and then all) of the three conditions be fulfilled:*

$$(i) \quad \Phi(x) = O(x^{1.5+\varepsilon}); \quad (ii) \quad \Phi(x) = O(x^{1.5});$$

$$(iii) \quad \int_0^x (\psi(t) - t)^2 dt = O(x^2). \quad (3.1)$$

▷ *Necessity.* The implication **RH** \Rightarrow (iii) was established by H. Cramér (1921), cf. [5], th. 13.5. Now it remains to notice that in (3.1) (iii) \Rightarrow (ii) \Rightarrow (i) \square .

▷ *Sufficiency.* Let (3.1)(i) be fulfilled, i. e. $|\Phi(x)| \leq C(\varepsilon)x^{1.5+\varepsilon}, \forall x, \varepsilon > 0$. then from (2.13), (2.11) and (2.9) one obtains for all $x > X_\varepsilon$:

$$\begin{aligned} -Q(x) &= H(x) + O\left(\frac{1}{x}\right) \leq D(x) + E(x) + O\left(\frac{1}{x}\right) \\ &\leq C_\varepsilon \left(\frac{x^{1.5+\varepsilon}}{x^2 \log^2 x} + 2 \int_x^\infty \frac{t^{1.5+\varepsilon}}{t^3 \log t} dt \right) \leq C_\varepsilon x^{-0.5+\varepsilon}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

whence $Q(x) \geq -C_\varepsilon x^{-0.5+\varepsilon}, x > X_\varepsilon$; but this coincides with (1.5)(ii), which in turn (by virtue of Proposition 1) implies **RH** \square .

The reasonings in the proofs of the Lemma and the Theorem show that

$$\text{both conditions (2.5)(i)(ii) are (separately) equivalent to RH.} \quad (3.3)$$

This allows to deduce the **RH**-criteria in terms of the consequences:

$$U_k := \sum_{j>k} \left(\frac{1}{p_j} - \frac{1}{\theta_j} \right), \text{ where } \theta_j := \theta(p_j); \quad V_k := \sum_{j>k} \left| \frac{1}{p_j} - \frac{1}{\theta_j} \right|. \quad (3.4)$$

Corollary 2. *RH is valid if and only if at least one (and then all) of the following six conditions is fulfilled for any $\varepsilon > 0, k > K_\varepsilon$:*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(i)} \quad U_k &< k^{-0.5+\varepsilon}; & \text{(ii)} \quad U_k &> -k^{-0.5+\varepsilon}; \\ \text{(iii)} \quad U_k \sqrt{p_k} \log p_k &< -1.5 + \varepsilon; & \text{(iv)} \quad U_k \sqrt{p_k} \log p_k &> -2.5 - \varepsilon; \\ \text{(v)} \quad V_k &< k^{-0.5+\varepsilon}; & \text{(vi)} \quad \frac{V_k \sqrt{p_k}}{\log p_k} &< \frac{1 + \varepsilon}{4\pi}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

▷ First we note that (cp. (2.6)) for certain $\tau_j \in (\theta_{j-1}, \theta_j)$ one has:

$$\begin{aligned} \log \log \theta_j - \log \log \theta_{j-1} &= \frac{\log p_j}{\theta_j \log \theta_j} + \frac{\log \tau_j + 1}{2\tau_j^2 \log^2 \tau_j} \log^2 p_j \\ &= \frac{1}{\theta_j} - \frac{\log \theta_j - \log p_j}{\theta_j \log \theta_j} + O\left(\frac{1}{p_j^2 \log p_j}\right) = \frac{1}{\theta_j} + O\left(\frac{1}{p_j^2 \log p_j}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Here we have also taken into account that $\log \theta_j - \log p_j = (\theta_j - p_j)/\tilde{x}_j^*$, where x_j^* is some number in between of p_j and θ_j , and $\theta_j \approx p_j$.

Therefore, for $H_j := H(p_j)$ (cf. (2.4)) one has:

$$H_{j-1} - H_j = \frac{1}{p_j} - \frac{1}{\theta_j} + O\left(\frac{1}{p_j^2 \log p_j}\right). \quad (3.7)$$

Summing these relations from $j = k$ to infinity, one obtains

$$H_k = U_k + O(1/k) = -Q(x) + O(1/k), \quad x \in (p_{k-1}, p_k]. \quad (3.8)$$

and thus (3.5)(i)(ii)(iii)(iv) are equivalent (resp.) to (1.5)(i)(ii), (1.8)(i)(ii), each of which in turn (cf. Sect. 1) \iff **RH**.

At last, taking into account that $p_j \approx j \log j$, $j \rightarrow \infty$, one obtains by virtue of (2.2)(iii) under assumption of **RH**:

$$\begin{aligned} V_k &= \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \left| \frac{\theta_j - p_j}{\theta_j p_j} \right| \leq \frac{1 + \delta_k}{8\pi} \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \frac{\log^2 p_j}{p_j \sqrt{p_j}} \\ &\approx \frac{1}{8\pi} \sum_{j=k}^{\infty} \frac{\sqrt{\log j}}{j \sqrt{j}} \approx \frac{\sqrt{\log k}}{4\pi \sqrt{k}} \approx \frac{\log p_k}{\sqrt{p_k}}, \quad \text{where } \delta_k \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

Hence, **RH** \Rightarrow (3.5)(vi) \Rightarrow (3.5) (v) \Rightarrow (3.5)(i) \Rightarrow **RH** \square

Remark 3. If **RH** holds true, then Theorem shows not only the fast, but also **quasi-monotonic** decrease of the remainder $Q(x)$ in (1.4), in the sense that relations $y > ax$, $a > 25/9$, $x > X_a$, imply $Q(x) > Q(y) > 0$.

The **oscillation properties** of the remainder $R(x)$ in the original Mertens formula (1.2), studied by H. Diamond and J. Pintz [7], may be easily derived from the Theorem for the case, when **RH** is valid.

Indeed, according to (2.1) one has **unconditionally**:

$$R(x) = Q(x) + \frac{\Delta(x)}{\tilde{x} \log \tilde{x}}, \quad \text{where } \tilde{x} \approx x. \quad (3.10)$$

Therefore *assuming* **RH**, which according to the Theorem (cf. (1.8)) implies $Q(x) = O(1/\sqrt{x} \log x)$, one obtains that *for any positive function* $\eta(x) \rightarrow +\infty$:

$$(i) \quad \Delta(x) = \Omega_{\pm}(\sqrt{x} \eta(x)) \iff (ii) \quad R(x) = \Omega_{\pm} \left(\frac{\eta(x)}{\sqrt{x} \log(x)} \right) \quad (3.11)$$

By virtue of the J. Littlewood result (1914), (cf., e. g. [5], th. 6.20), this holds true for $\eta(x) = \log \log x$.

The same arguments allow to conclude that the estimate $R(x) = O(\log x/\sqrt{x})$, cf. (1.3), *is not only necessary, but also sufficient for* **RH**.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- [1] Mertens F. *Über einige asymptotische Gesetze der Zahlentheorie.*
J. Reine Angew. Math., **77**, 1874, pp. 289 – 338.
- [2] Robin G. *Grandes valeurs de la fonction somme des diviseurs
et hypothèse de Riemann.*
J. Math. Pures Appl. V. 63 (1984), pp. 187 – 213.
- [3] Nicolas J.-L. *Petites valeurs de la fonction d'Euler.*
Journal of Number Theory, vol. 17, no. 3, 1983, p. 375 – 388.
- [4] Kalyabin G. A. *Remainder in the Modified Mertens Formula
and Ramanujan Inequality.*
<https://arxiv.org/abs/2201.02663>, 2022.
- [5] Narkiewicz W. *The Development of Prime Number Theory.*
Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg New York, 2000.
- [6] Ingham A. E. *Distribution of Prime Numbers.*
Cambridge at the University Press, 1932.
- [7] Diamond H. G., Pintz J. *Oscillations of Mertens' product formula.*
Journal de Théorie de Nombres de Bordeaux. T. 21, No 3 (2009), 523 - 533.