

Results for the Mobius Function and Liouville Function over the Shifted Primes

N. A. Carella

Abstract: This article provides new asymptotic conditional results for the summatory Mobius function $\sum_{p \leq x} \mu(p+a) = O(x(\log x)^{-c})$ and the summatory Liouville function $\sum_{p \leq x} \lambda(p+a) = O(x(\log x)^{-c})$ over the shifted primes, where $a \neq 0$ is a fixed parameter, and $c > 1$ is an arbitrary constant. These results improve the current estimates $\sum_{p \leq x} \mu(p+a) = (1-\delta)\pi(x)$, and $\sum_{p \leq x} \lambda(p+a) = (1-\delta)\pi(x)$ for $\delta > 0$, respectively. Furthermore, a conditional proof for the autocorrelation function $\sum_{p \leq x} \mu(p+a)\mu(p+b) = O(x(\log x)^{-c})$, and an unconditional proof for the autocorrelation function $\sum_{p \leq x} \lambda(p+a)\lambda(p+b) = O(x(\log x)^{-c})$ over the shifted primes, where $a \neq b$, are also included.

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Results for the Mobius Function over the Shifted Primes	5
2.1	Average Orders of Mobius Functions	5
2.2	Twisted Exponential Sums	5
2.3	Mean Values and Hypotheses over the Shifted Primes	6
2.4	Mobius Function over the Shifted Primes	7
2.5	Squarefree Shifted Primes	8
2.6	Nonlinear Autocorrelation Functions Results	9
2.7	Single-Sign Pattern Mobius Characteristic Functions	11
2.8	Single-Sign Pattern Mobius Counting Functions	11
2.9	Double-Sign Patterns Mobius Characteristic Functions	13
2.10	Double-Sign Patterns Mobius Counting Functions	13
2.11	Result for the Mobius Autocorrelation Function	15
3	Results for the Liouville Function over the Shifted Primes	17
3.1	Average Orders of Liouville Functions	17
3.2	Single-Sign Patterns Liouville Characteristic Functions	17
3.3	Single-Sign Pattern Liouville Counting Functions	18
3.4	Result for Liouville Summatory Function	19

July 26, 2022

AMS MSC: Primary 11N37, Secondary 11L20.

Keywords: Shifted prime; Arithmetic function; Mobius function; Liouville function; vonMangoldt function; Chowla conjecture; Sarnak conjecture.

3.5	Result for the Liouville-Mobius Correlation Function	20
3.6	Double-Sign Patterns Liouville Characteristic Functions	21
3.7	Double-Sign Patterns in Liouville Counting Functions	22
3.8	Result for the Liouville Autocorrelation Function	23
4	Hardy-Littlewood-Chowla Conjecture	25
4.1	Twisted vonMangoldt Function over the Squarefree Shifted Primes . .	25
4.2	Signed vonMangoldt Function over the Shifted Primes	26
4.3	Twisted vonMangoldt Function over the Shifted Primes	27
5	Results for the Mobius Autocorrelation Function over the Integers	28
5.1	Introduction	28
5.2	Nonlinear Autocorrelation Functions Results	29
5.3	Logarithm Average and Arithmetic Average Connection	31
5.4	Single-Sign Patterns Mobius Characteristic Functions	32
5.5	Double-Sign Patterns Characteristic Functions	32
5.6	Trivial Double-Sign Patterns Counting Functions	33
5.7	Double-Sign Patterns Counting Functions	35
5.8	Equidistribution of Double-Sign Patterns	37
6	Result for the Mobius Autocorrelation Function over the Integers	38
7	Results for the Liouville Autocorrelation Function over the Integers	39
7.1	Logarithm Average and Arithmetic Average Connection	39
7.2	Single-Sign Patterns Liouville Characteristic Functions	41
7.3	Double-Sign Patterns Liouville Characteristic Functions	41
7.4	Single-Sign Pattern Liouville Counting Functions	42
7.5	Double-Sign Patterns in Liouville Counting Functions	42
7.6	Equidistribution of Double-Sign Patterns	43
7.7	Equivalent Subsets of Sign Patterns Patterns	45
7.8	Result for the Liouville Autocorrelation Function	46
8	Correlation Functions Problems	47
8.1	Mobius autocorrelation function problems	47
8.2	Liouville autocorrelation function problems	49
8.3	Intercorrelation functions problems	50
8.4	Hardy-Littlewood-Chowla conjecture problems	50

1 Introduction

The Mobius function $\mu : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$ is defined by

$$\mu(n) = \begin{cases} (-1)^v & n = p_1 p_2 \cdots p_w \\ 0 & n \neq p_1 p_2 \cdots p_w, \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where $n = p_1^{v_1} p_2^{v_2} \cdots p_w^{v_w}$, the $p_i \geq 2$ are primes, and $v_i \geq 0$. Similarly, the Liouville function $\lambda : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$ is defined by

$$\lambda(n) = (-1)^{p_1^{v_1} p_2^{v_2} \cdots p_w^{v_w}}. \quad (2)$$

The Mobius autocorrelation function

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n) \mu(n+a) \quad (3)$$

and the Liouville autocorrelation function

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \lambda(n) \lambda(n+a) \quad (4)$$

are topics of current research in several area of Mathematics, [37], [35], [25], et alii. Restricting the autocorrelation functions of multiplicative functions (3) over the integers to the shifted primes reduce these functions to standard arithmetic averages over the shifted primes. For example, (3) reduces to

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \mu(p) \mu(p+a) = - \sum_{p \leq x} \mu(p+a). \quad (5)$$

Similarly, an autocorrelation function of degree 3,

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n) \mu(n+a) \mu(n+b), \quad (6)$$

where $a, b \neq 0$ such that $a \neq b$ are small fixed integers, over the integers reduces to an autocorrelation function of degree 2,

$$- \sum_{p \leq x} \mu(p+a) \mu(p+b) \quad (7)$$

over the shifted primes. Accordingly, these two open problems are equivalent.

Currently, the best asymptotic result for this summatory function is

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \mu(p+a) = (1-\delta)\pi(x), \quad (8)$$

where $\delta > 0$ is a constant, see [11, Theorem 1], and the restricted average

$$\sum_{a \leq z} \sum_{p \leq x} \mu(p+a) = o(z\pi(x)), \quad (9)$$

see [20] for extensive details on recent developments on this topic. It is expected that $\sum_{p \leq x} \mu(p+a) = o(\pi(x))$. This note proposes the first nontrivial upper bound.

Theorem 1.1. *Assume Hypothesis 2.1. Let $c > 1$ be an arbitrary constant, and let $x > 1$ be a large number. If $a \neq 0$ is a small fixed integer, then*

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \mu(p+a) = O\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^c}\right).$$

There is a similar result for the Liouville function, but it has a sharper error term.

Theorem 1.2. *Assume Hypothesis 2.1. Let $x > 1$ be a large number. If $a \neq 0$ is a small fixed integer, then*

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \lambda(p+a) = O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right),$$

where $c > 0$ is an absolute constant.

Furthermore, a conditional result for the Mobius autocorrelation function over the shifted primes achieves the followings asymptotic formula.

Theorem 1.3. *Assume Hypothesis 2.2. Let $x > 1$ be a large number, and let $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ be small fixed integers such that $a \neq b$. Then,*

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \mu(p+a)\mu(p+b) = O\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^c}\right),$$

where $c > 1$ is an arbitrary constant.

Unexpectedly, the matching result for the Liouville autocorrelation function is unconditional and has a sharper error term.

Theorem 1.4. *Assume Hypothesis 2.2. Let $x > 1$ be a large number, and let $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ be small fixed integers such that $a \neq b$. Then,*

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \lambda(p+a)\lambda(p+b) = O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right),$$

where $c > 0$ is an absolute constant.

The essential foundational materials for the analysis of the Mobius function are covered in Section 2. The proof of Theorem 1.1 for the summatory Mobius function over the shifted primes is assembled in Subsection 2.4, and the proof for the Mobius autocorrelation function over the shifted primes is assembled in Subsection 2.11.

The essential foundational materials for the analysis of the Liouville function are covered in Section 3. The proof of Theorem 1.2 for the summatory Liouville function over the shifted primes is assembled in Subsection 3.4. The proof of Theorem 1.4 for the Liouville autocorrelation function over the shifted primes appears in Subsection 3.8

For completeness some results on the Mobius autocorrelation function and the Liouville autocorrelation function over the integers, based on the sign patterns technique, are included in Section 5.1 and Section 7 respectively.

2 Results for the Mobius Function over the Shifted Primes

2.1 Average Orders of Mobius Functions

Theorem 2.1. *If $\mu : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$ is the Mobius function, then, for any large number $x > 1$, the following statements are true.*

$$(i) \sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n) = O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right), \quad \text{unconditionally,}$$

$$(ii) \sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n) = O\left(x^{1/2+\varepsilon}\right), \quad \text{conditional on the RH,}$$

where $c > 0$ is an absolute constant, and $\varepsilon > 0$ is an arbitrarily small number.

Proof. See [5, p. 6], [29, p. 182], [14, p. 347], et alii. ■

There are many sharp bounds of the summatory function of the Mobius function, say, $O(xe^{-c(\log x)^\delta})$, and the conditional estimate $O(x^{1/2+\varepsilon})$ presupposes that the nontrivial zeros of the zeta function $\zeta(\rho) = 0$ in the critical strip $\{0 < \Re(s) < 1\}$ are of the form $\rho = 1/2 + it, t \in \mathbb{R}$. However, the simpler notation will be used whenever it is convenient.

Theorem 2.2. *Let $x \geq 1$ be a large number, and let $q \ll (\log x)^B$, where $B \geq 0$ is an arbitrary constant. If $1 \leq a < q$ are relatively prime integers, then,*

$$\sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \equiv a \pmod{q}}} \mu(n) = O\left(\frac{x}{\log^C x}\right),$$

where $C = C(B) > 0$ is a constant.

Proof. A sketch of the proof appears in [29, p. 385]. ■

2.2 Twisted Exponential Sums

One of the earliest result for twisted sums is stated below.

Theorem 2.3. ([4]) *If α is a real number, and $D > 0$ is an arbitrary constant, then*

$$\sup_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}} \sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n) e^{i2\pi\alpha n} < \frac{c_1 x}{(\log x)^D},$$

where $c_1 = c_1(D) > 0$ is a constant depending on D , as the number $x \rightarrow \infty$.

2.3 Mean Values and Hypotheses over the Shifted Primes

There are several mean values and equidistribution results for arithmetic functions over arithmetic progressions of level of distribution $\theta < 1/2$. The best known case is the Bombieri-Vinogradov theorem, see [5, Theorem 15.4], the case for the Mobius function is proved in [36, Theorem 1] and [33] states the following.

Corollary 2.1. ([33, Corollary 1]) *Let $a \geq 1$ be a fixed parameter, and let $x \geq 1$ be a large number. If $C > 0$ is a constant, then*

$$\sum_{q \leq x^{1/2}/\log^B x} \max_{a \bmod q} \max_{z \leq x} \left| \sum_{\substack{n \leq z \\ n \equiv a \pmod q}} \mu(n) \right| \ll \frac{x}{(\log x)^C}, \quad (10)$$

where the constant $B > 0$ depends on C .

However, there is no literature on the mean values and equidistribution for arithmetic functions over arithmetic progressions of shifted prime. A comparable result is expected to hold.

Hypothesis 2.1. *Let $a \geq 1$ be a fixed parameter, and let $x \geq 1$ be a large number. If $C > 0$ is a constant, then*

$$(i) \quad \sum_{q \leq x^{1/2}/\log^B x} \max_{a \bmod q} \max_{z \leq x} \left| \sum_{\substack{p \leq z \\ p \equiv d \pmod q}} \lambda(p+a) \right| \ll \frac{x}{(\log x)^C},$$

$$(ii) \quad \sum_{q \leq x^{1/2}/\log^B x} \max_{a \bmod q} \max_{z \leq x} \left| \sum_{\substack{p \leq z \\ p \equiv d \pmod q}} \mu(p+a) \right| \ll \frac{x}{(\log x)^C},$$

where the constant $B > 0$ depends on C .

A similar mean value for the autocorrelation over arithmetic progression is of interest in the theory of arithmetic correlation functions.

Hypothesis 2.2. *Let $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ be a fixed pair of small integers such that $a \neq b$, and let $x \geq 1$ be a large number. If $C > 0$ is a constant, then*

$$(i) \quad \sum_{q \leq x^{1/2}/\log^B x} \max_{d \bmod q} \max_{z \leq x} \left| \sum_{\substack{p \leq z \\ p \equiv d \pmod q}} \lambda(p+a)\lambda(p+b) \right| \ll \frac{x}{(\log x)^C},$$

$$(ii) \quad \sum_{q \leq x^{1/2}/\log^B x} \max_{d \bmod q} \max_{z \leq x} \left| \sum_{\substack{p \leq z \\ p \equiv d \pmod q}} \mu(p+a)\mu(p+b) \right| \ll \frac{x}{(\log x)^C},$$

where the constant $B > 0$ depends on C .

2.4 Mobius Function over the Shifted Primes

The analysis of the average order over the shifted primes

$$R(a, x) = \sum_{p \leq x} \mu(p + a) \quad (11)$$

is currently viewed as an intractable problem, the restricted double average order

$$\sum_{a \leq z} \sum_{p \leq x} \mu(p + a) = o(z\pi(x)) \quad (12)$$

is the only result available in the literature, see [20, Theorem 1.1] for the exact details. An asymptotic formula for the Mobius function over the shifted primes is considered in this section. Theorem 1.1 is the same as the result proved below.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $x \geq 1$ be a large number, and let $\mu : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$ be the Mobius function. If $a \neq 0$ is a fixed integer, then,*

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \mu(p + a) = O\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^c}\right),$$

where $c > 0$ is an arbitrary constant.

Proof. Let $x_0 = x^{1/2-\varepsilon}$, with $\varepsilon > 0$. Substitute the identity $\mu(n)\lambda(n)\mu^2(n)$, and partition the equivalent finite sum.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{p \leq x} \mu(p + a) &= \sum_{p \leq x} \lambda(p + a)\mu^2(p + a) \quad (13) \\ &= \sum_{p \leq x} \lambda(p + a) \sum_{d^2 | p+a} \mu(d) \\ &= \sum_{d^2 \leq x} \mu(d) \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2 | p+a}} \lambda(p + a) \\ &= \sum_{d^2 \leq x_0} \mu(d) \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2 | p+a}} \lambda(p + a) + \sum_{x_0 < d^2 \leq x} \mu(d) \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2 | p+a}} \lambda(p + a). \end{aligned}$$

By Hypothesis 2.1, the first term has the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{d^2 \leq x_0} \mu(d) \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2 | p+a}} \lambda(p + a) &\leq \sum_{d^2 \leq x_0} \left| \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv -a \pmod{d^2}}} \lambda(p + a) \right| \quad (14) \\ &= O\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^c}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where $c > 1$ is an arbitrary constant. The second term has the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x_0 < d^2 \leq x} \mu(d) \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2 | p+a}} \lambda(p + a) &\leq \sum_{x_0 < d^2 \leq x} \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv -a \pmod{d^2}}} 1 \quad (15) \\ &= O(x^{1/2+\varepsilon}). \end{aligned}$$

The sum of (14) and (15) completes the verification. ■

2.5 Squarefree Shifted Primes

Let $p \geq 2$ be prime, and let $a \neq 0$ be a fixed integer. The number of squarefree integers of the form $p+a$, or totient integers, have the following asymptotic formula expressed in terms of the logarithm integral $\text{li}(x) = \int_2^x (\log t)^{-1} dt$.

Theorem 2.5. *Let $x \geq 1$ be a large number, and let $\mu : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$ be the Mobius function. If $a \neq 0$ is a fixed integer, then,*

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \mu(p+a)^2 = s_0 \text{li}(x) + O\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^c}\right),$$

where $s_0 = 0.373955\dots$ is a constant, and $c > 1$ is an arbitrary constant.

Proof. Substituting the identity $\mu(n)^2 = \sum_{d^2|n} \mu(d)$, and switching the order of summation yield

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{p \leq x} \mu(p+a)^2 &= \sum_{p \leq x} \sum_{d^2|p+a} \mu(d) & (16) \\ &= \sum_{d^2 \leq x} \mu(d) \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2|p+a}} 1 \\ &= \sum_{d^2 \leq x_0} \mu(d) \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2|p+a}} 1 + \sum_{x_0 < d^2 \leq x} \mu(d) \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2|p+a}} 1, \end{aligned}$$

where $x_0 = (\log x)^{2c}$, and $c > 1$ is a constant. Applying the Siegel-Walfisz theorem, see [8, p. 405], [5, Theorem 15.3], et cetera, to the first subsum in the partition yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{d^2 \leq x_0} \mu(d) \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2|p+a}} 1 &= \sum_{d^2 \leq x_0} \mu(d) \left(\frac{\text{li}(x)}{\varphi(d^2)} + O\left(xe^{-c_0\sqrt{\log x}}\right) \right) & (17) \\ &= \text{li}(x) \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{\mu(n)}{\varphi(n^2)} + O\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^c}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where $c_0 > 0$ is an absolute constant. An estimate of the second subsum in the partition yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x_0 < d^2 \leq x} \mu(d) \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2|p+a}} 1 &\leq \sum_{x_0 < d^2 \leq x} \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2|p+a}} 1 & (18) \\ &\ll x \sum_{x_0 < d^2 \leq x} \frac{1}{d^2} \\ &\ll \frac{x}{(\log x)^c}. \end{aligned}$$

Summing (17) and (18) completes the verification. ■

The well known constant has the numerical approximation

$$s_0 = \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{\mu(n)}{\varphi(n^2)} = \prod_{p \geq 2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p(p-1)}\right) = 0.373955838964330040631201\dots \quad (19)$$

2.6 Nonlinear Autocorrelation Functions Results

The asymptotic formula for squarefree autocorrelation function over the shifted primes is evaluated now.

Theorem 2.6. *Let $\mu : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$ be the Mobius function, and let $a, b \neq 0$ be integers such that $a \neq b$. Then, for any sufficiently large number $x \geq 1$,*

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \mu^2(p+a)\mu^2(p+b) = s_0^2 \text{li}(x) + O\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^c}\right),$$

where $s_0 = 0.373955\dots$, and $c > 1$ is an arbitrary constant.

Proof. Substitute the identity $\mu(n)^2 = \sum_{d^2|n} \mu(d)$, and switching the order of summation yield

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{p \leq x} \mu^2(p+a)\mu^2(p+b) &= \sum_{p \leq x} \sum_{d^2|p+a} \mu(d) \sum_{e^2|p+b} \mu(e) & (20) \\ &= \sum_{d^2 \leq x} \mu(d) \sum_{e^2 \leq x} \mu(e) \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2|p+a, e^2|p+b}} 1 \\ &= \sum_{d^2 \leq x_0} \mu(d) \sum_{e^2 \leq x_0} \mu(e) \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2|p+a, e^2|p+b}} 1 \\ &\quad + \sum_{x_0 < d^2 \leq x} \mu(d) \sum_{x_0 < e^2 \leq x} \mu(e) \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2|p+a, e^2|p+b}} 1, \end{aligned}$$

where $x_0 = (\log x)^c$, and $c > 1$ is an arbitrary constant. Let $q = d^2e^2$, $\gcd(d, e) = 1$, and $p \equiv f \pmod{q}$. Applying the Siegel-Walfisz theorem, see [8, p. 405], [5, Theorem 15.3], et cetera, to the first subsum in the partition yields

$$\begin{aligned} T(x) &= \sum_{d^2 \leq x_0} \mu(d) \sum_{e^2 \leq x_0} \mu(e) \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2|p+a, e^2|p+b}} 1 & (21) \\ &= \sum_{d^2 \leq x_0} \mu(d) \sum_{e^2 \leq x_0} \mu(e) \left(\frac{\text{li}(x)}{\varphi(d^2e^2)} + O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right) \right) \\ &= \sum_{d^2 \leq x_0} \frac{\mu(d)}{\varphi(d^2)} \sum_{e^2 \leq x_0} \frac{\mu(e)}{\varphi(e^2)} \left(\text{li}(x) + O\left(xe^{-c_0\sqrt{\log x}}\right) \right) \\ &= \text{li}(x) \left(\sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{\mu(n)}{\varphi(n^2)} \right)^2 + O\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^c}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the constant $s_0 = \sum_{n \geq 1} \mu(n)\varphi(n^2)^{-1}$ is computed in (19), and $c_0 > 0$ is an

absolute constant. An estimate of the second subsum in the partition yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{x_0 < d^2 \leq x} \mu(d) \sum_{x_0 < e^2 \leq x} \mu(e) \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2 | p+a, e^2 | p+b}} 1 &\leq \sum_{x_0 < d^2 \leq x} \sum_{x_0 < e^2 \leq x} \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2 | p+a, e^2 | p+b}} 1 \\
&\ll x \sum_{x_0 < d^2 \leq x} \frac{1}{d^2} \sum_{x_0 < e^2 \leq x} \frac{1}{e^2} \\
&\ll \frac{x}{(\log x)^c}.
\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Summing (21) and (22) completes the verification. \blacksquare

Theorem 2.7. *Assume Hypothesis 2.1. Let $x \geq 1$ be a large number, and let $\mu : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$ be the Mobius function. If $a, b \neq 0$ are small fixed integers such that $a \neq b$, then, for any sufficiently large number $x \geq 1$,*

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \mu(p+a)^2 \mu(p+b) = O\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^c}\right),$$

where $c > 0$ is an arbitrary constant.

Proof. Substitute the identity $\mu(n)^2 = \sum_{d^2 | n} \mu(d)$, and switching the order of summation yield

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{p \leq x} \mu(p+a)^2 \mu(p+b) &= \sum_{p \leq x} \mu(p+b) \sum_{d^2 | p+a} \mu(d) \\
&= \sum_{d^2 \leq x} \mu(d) \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2 | p+a}} \mu(p+b) \\
&= \sum_{d^2 \leq x^{2\varepsilon}} \mu(d) \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2 | p+a}} \mu(p+b) + \sum_{x^{2\varepsilon} < d^2 \leq x} \mu(d) \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2 | p+a}} \mu(p+b),
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

where $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/4)$. Applying Hypothesis 2.1 to the first subsum in the partition yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{d^2 \leq x^{2\varepsilon}} \mu(d) \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ d^2 | n}} \mu(n+t) &\leq \sum_{q \leq x^\varepsilon} \left| \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv -a \pmod{q}}} \mu(p+b) \right| \\
&= O\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^c}\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

where $q = d^2$. An estimate of the second subsum in the partition yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{x^{2\varepsilon} < d^2 \leq x} \mu(d) \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2 | p+a}} \mu(p+b) &\leq \sum_{x^{2\varepsilon} < d^2 \leq x} \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2 | p+a}} 1 \\
&\ll x \sum_{x^{2\varepsilon} < d^2 \leq x} \frac{1}{d^2} \\
&\ll x^{1-\varepsilon}.
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

Summing (24) and (25) completes the verification. \blacksquare

Theorem 2.8. *Assume Hypothesis 2.2. Let $x \geq 1$ be a large number, and let $\mu : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$ be the Mobius function. If $a_0, a_1, a_2 \neq 0$ are small fixed integers such that $a_0 < a_1 < a_2$, then, for any sufficiently large number $x \geq 1$,*

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \mu(p + a_0)^2 \mu(p + a_1) \mu(p + a_2) = O\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^c}\right),$$

where $c > 0$ is an arbitrary constant.

Proof. Except for minor changes, the verification is similar to the previous proof, for example, repeat (23) to (25), but uses Hypothesis 2.2. \blacksquare

2.7 Single-Sign Pattern Mobius Characteristic Functions

The analysis of single-Sign pattern characteristic function

$$\mu^\pm(n) = \mu^2(n) \left(\frac{1 \pm \mu(n)}{2} \right) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \mu(n) = \pm 1, \\ 0 & \text{if } \mu(n) \neq \pm 1, \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

of the subset of integers

$$\mathcal{P}_\mu^\pm = \{n \geq 1 : \mu(n) = \pm 1\} \quad (27)$$

is well known. Here, the same idea is extended to the shifted primes.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $a \neq 0$ be an integer, and let $\mu(n) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ be the Mobius function. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^\pm(a, p) &= \mu^2(p + a) \left(\frac{1 \pm \mu(p + a)}{2} \right) \\ &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \mu(p + a) = \pm 1, \\ 0 & \text{if } \mu(p + a) \neq \pm 1, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

are the characteristic functions of the subset of primes

$$\mathcal{P}_\mu^\pm(a) = \{p \geq 2 : \mu(p + a) = \pm 1\}. \quad (29)$$

2.8 Single-Sign Pattern Mobius Counting Functions

The single-sign patterns $\mu(n) = 1$ and $\mu(n) = -1$ counting functions over the integers have the forms

$$R^+(x) = \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ \mu(n)=1}} 1 = \sum_{n \leq x} \left(\frac{1 + \mu(n)}{2} \right) \mu^2(n) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{x}{\zeta(2)} + O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right), \quad (30)$$

and

$$R^-(x) = \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ \mu(n)=-1}} 1 = \sum_{n \leq x} \left(\frac{1 - \mu(n)}{2} \right) \mu^2(n) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{x}{\zeta(2)} + O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right), \quad (31)$$

respectively. In terms of these functions, the summatory Mobius function has the asymptotic formula

$$R(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n) = R^+(x) - R^-(x) = O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right). \quad (32)$$

Basically, it is a different form of the Prime Number Theorem

$$\pi(x) = \text{li}(x) + O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right), \quad (33)$$

where $\text{li}(x) = \int_2^x (\log t)^{-1} dt$ is the logarithm integral, and $c > 0$ is an absolute constant, see [6, Eq. 27.12.5], [7, Theorem 3.10], et alii.

The same idea extends to the single-sign patterns $\mu(p+a) = 1$ and $\mu(p+a) = -1$ of the shifted primes. Let $R(a, x) = \sum_{p \leq x} \mu(p+a)$. The single-sign pattern counting functions are defined by

$$R^+(a, x) = \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ \mu(p+a)=1}} 1 = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{P}_\mu^+(a)} 1, \quad (34)$$

$$R^-(a, x) = \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ \mu(p+a)=-1}} 1 = \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_\mu^-(a)} 1. \quad (35)$$

The single-sign pattern counting functions (34) to (35) are precisely the cardinalities of the subsets of integers

1. $\mathcal{P}_\mu^+(a) \subset \mathbb{P}$,
2. $\mathcal{P}_\mu^-(a) \subset \mathbb{P}$,

defined in (29). The symbol $\mathbb{P} = \{2, 3, 5, \dots\}$ denotes the set of prime numbers.

The next result is required to complete the analysis of the asymptotic formula for $R(a, x) = \sum_{p \leq x} \mu(p+a)$, which is completed in the next section.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $x \geq 1$ be a large number, and let $a \neq 0$ be a fixed integer. Then,*

$$R^\pm(a, x) = \frac{1}{2}s_0 \text{li}(x) + \frac{1}{2}R(a, x) + O\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^c}\right),$$

where $s_0 = 0.373955\dots$, and $c > 0$ are constants.

Proof. Consider the pattern $\mu(p+a) = +1$. Now, use Lemma 2.1 to express the single-sign pattern counting function as

$$\begin{aligned} 2R^+(a, x) &= \sum_{p \leq x} \mu^+(a, p) \\ &= \sum_{p \leq x} \mu^2(p+a) (1 + \mu(p+a)) \\ &= \sum_{p \leq x} \mu^2(p+a) + \sum_{p \leq x} \mu^3(p+a). \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

The two finite sums have the following evaluations or estimates.

$$1. \sum_{p \leq x} \mu^2(p+a) = s_0 \operatorname{li}(x) + O\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^c}\right),$$

where $s_0 = 0.373955\dots$ is a constant, see Theorem 2.5.

$$2. \sum_{n \leq x} \mu^3(p+a) = \sum_{p \leq x} \mu(p+a),$$

since $\mu^{2k+1}(n) = \mu(n)$ for any integer k .

Summing these evaluations or estimates verifies the claim for $R^+(a, x) \geq 0$. The verification for the other single-sign pattern counting function $R^-(a, x) \geq 0$, is similar. \blacksquare

2.9 Double-Sign Patterns Mobius Characteristic Functions

The analysis of single-sign pattern characteristic functions is extended here to the double-sign patterns

$$\mu(p+a) = \pm 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \mu(p+b) = \pm 1, \quad (37)$$

where $a, b \neq 0$ such that $a \neq b$, and $p \geq 2$ is prime. The current research has emphasized the sign patterns over the integers, confer [15], [34, Corollary 1.7], [18], and there is some literature on the patterns over the shifted primes, [30], and similar literature, for details.

Lemma 2.3. *Let $a, b \neq 0$ such that $a \neq b$ be small fixed integers, and let $\mu(n) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ be the Mobius function. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^{\pm\pm}(a, b, p) &= \mu^2(p+a)\mu^2(p+b) \left(\frac{1 \pm \mu(p+a)}{2}\right) \left(\frac{1 \pm \mu(p+b)}{2}\right) \\ &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \mu(p+a) = \pm 1, \mu(p+b) = \pm 1, \\ 0 & \text{if } \mu(p+a) \neq \pm 1, \mu(p+b) \neq \pm 1, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

are the characteristic functions of the subset of integers

$$\mathcal{P}_\mu^{\pm\pm}(a, b) = \{p \geq 2 : \mu(p+a) = \pm 1, \mu(p+b) = \pm 1\}. \quad (39)$$

2.10 Double-Sign Patterns Mobius Counting Functions

The single-sign counting functions for the single patterns $\mu(p+a) = 1$ and $\mu(p+a) = -1$ are extended to the double-sign counting functions for the double signs patterns

$$(\mu(p+a), \mu(p+b)) = (\pm 1, \pm 1). \quad (40)$$

The double-sign counting functions are defined by

$$R^{++}(a, b, x) = \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ \mu(p+a)=1, \mu(p+b)=1}} 1 = \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_\mu^{++}(a, b)} 1, \quad (41)$$

$$R^{+-}(a, b, x) = \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ \mu(p+a)=1, \mu(p+b)=-1}} 1 = \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\mu}^{+-}(a, b)} 1, \quad (42)$$

$$R^{-+}(a, b, x) = \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ \mu(p+a)=-1, \mu(p+b)=1}} 1 = \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\mu}^{-+}(a, b)} 1, \quad (43)$$

$$R^{--}(a, b, x) = \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ \mu(p+a)=-1, \mu(p+b)=-1}} 1 = \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_{\mu}^{--}(a, b)} 1. \quad (44)$$

The double-sign counting functions (41) to (44) are precisely the cardinalities of the subsets of integers

1. $\mathcal{P}_{\mu}^{++}(a, b) \subset \mathbb{P}$,
2. $\mathcal{P}_{\mu}^{+-}(a, b) \subset \mathbb{P}$,
3. $\mathcal{P}_{\mu}^{-+}(a, b) \subset \mathbb{P}$,
4. $\mathcal{P}_{\mu}^{--}(a, b) \subset \mathbb{P}$,

defined in (39). In terms of these functions, the double autocorrelation function has form

$$\begin{aligned} R(a, b, x) &= \sum_{p \leq x} \mu(p+a)\mu(p+b) \\ &= R^{++}(a, b, x) - R^{+-}(a, b, x) + R^{--}(a, b, x) - R^{-+}(a, b, x). \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

The next result is required to complete the analysis of the asymptotic formula for $R(a, b, x)$, which is completed in the next section.

Lemma 2.4. *Assume Hypothesis 2.1. Let $x \geq 1$ be a large number, and let $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $a \neq b$, be fixed integers. Then,*

$$R^{\pm\pm}(a, b, x) = \frac{1}{4}s_0^2 \text{li}(x) + \frac{1}{4}R(a, b, x) + O\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^c}\right),$$

where $s_0 = 0.373955\dots$, and $c > 1$ is an arbitrary constants.

Proof. Without loss in generality, consider the pattern $(\mu(p+a), \mu(p+b)) = (+1, +1)$. Now, use Lemma 2.3 to express the double-sign pattern counting function as

$$\begin{aligned} 4R^{++}(a, b, x) &= \sum_{p \leq x} \mu^{++}(a, b, p) \\ &= \sum_{p \leq x} \mu^2(p+a)\mu^2(p+b) (1 + \mu(p+a)) (1 + \mu(p+b)) \\ &= \sum_{p \leq x} \mu^2(p+a)\mu^2(p+b) (1 + \mu(p+a) + \mu(p+b) + \mu(p+a)\mu(p+b)) \\ &= \sum_{p \leq x} \mu^2(p+a)\mu^2(p+b) + \sum_{p \leq x} \mu^3(p+a)\mu^2(p+b) \\ &\quad + \sum_{p \leq x} \mu(p+a)^2\mu^3(p+b) + \sum_{p \leq x} \mu^3(p+a)\mu^3(p+b) \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

The last four finite sums have the following evaluations or estimates.

$$1. \sum_{p \leq x} \mu^2(p+a)\mu^2(p+b) = s_0^2 \operatorname{li}(x) + O\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^c}\right),$$

where $s_0 > 0$ is a constant, see Theorem 2.6.

$$2. \sum_{p \leq x} \mu^3(p+a)\mu^2(p+b) = O\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^c}\right),$$

where $c > 0$ is an arbitrary constant, see Theorem 2.7.

$$3. \sum_{p \leq x} \mu^2(p+a)\mu^3(p+b) = O\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^c}\right),$$

where $c > 0$ is an arbitrary constant, see Theorem 2.7.

$$4. \sum_{p \leq x} \mu^3(p+a)\mu^3(p+b) = \sum_{p \leq x} \mu(p+a)\mu(p+b),$$

since $\mu^{2k+1}(n) = \mu(n)$ for any integer k .

Summing these evaluations or estimates verifies the claim for $R^{++}(a, b, x) \geq 0$. The verifications for the next three double-sign pattern counting functions $R^{+-}(a, b, x) \geq 0$, $R^{-+}(a, b, x) \geq 0$, and $R^{--}(a, b, x) \geq 0$ are similar. ■

2.11 Result for the Mobius Autocorrelation Function

Proof. (Theorem 1.3) Utilize the identity $\mu(n) = \lambda(n)\mu^2(n)$ to rewrite the autocorrelation function.

$$R(a, b, x) = \sum_{p \leq x} \mu(p+a)\mu(p+b) \tag{47}$$

$$= \sum_{p \leq x} \lambda(p+a)\mu^2(p+a)\lambda(p+b)\mu^2(p+b)$$

$$= \sum_{p \leq x} \mu(p+a)\mu(p+b) \tag{48}$$

$$= \sum_{d^2 \leq x} \mu(d) \sum_{e^2 \leq x} \mu(e) \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2 | p+a \\ e^2 | p+b}} \lambda(p+a)\lambda(p+b).$$

Let $x_0 \leq x^{1/8-\varepsilon}$, where $\varepsilon > 0$, and partition it.

Applying Hypothesis 2.1 to the first term yields the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned}
T_0(a, b, x) &= \sum_{d^2 \leq x_0} \mu(d) \sum_{e^2 \leq x_0} \mu(e) \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2 | p+a \\ e^2 | p+b}} \lambda(p+a) \lambda(p+b) \quad (49) \\
&\leq \sum_{q \leq x_0^4} \left| \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv f \pmod q}} \lambda(p+a) \lambda(p+b) \right| \\
&= O\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^c}\right), \quad (50)
\end{aligned}$$

where $q = \text{lcm}(d^2, e^2) \leq x_0^4 \leq x^{1/2-\varepsilon}$, and $c > 1$ is an arbitrary constant.

The second term has the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned}
T_1(a, b, x) &= \sum_{d^2 \leq x_0} \mu(d) \sum_{x_0 < e^2 \leq x} \mu(e) \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2 | p+a \\ e^2 | p+b}} \lambda(p+a) \lambda(p+b) \quad (51) \\
&\leq \sum_{x_0 < d^2 \leq x, x_0 < e^2 \leq x} \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2 | p+a \\ e^2 | p+b}} 1 \\
&= O(x^{1-\varepsilon}).
\end{aligned}$$

The third term has the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned}
T_2(a, b, x) &= \sum_{x_0 < d^2 \leq x} \mu(d) \sum_{e^2 \leq x_0} \mu(e) \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2 | p+a \\ e^2 | p+b}} \lambda(p+a) \lambda(p+b) \quad (52) \\
&\leq \sum_{x_0 < d^2 \leq x, e^2 \leq x_0} \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2 | p+a \\ e^2 | p+b}} 1 \\
&= O(x^{1-\varepsilon}).
\end{aligned}$$

The fourth term has the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned}
T_3(a, b, x) &= \sum_{x_0 < d^2 \leq x} \mu(d) \sum_{x_0 < e^2 \leq x} \mu(e) \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2 | p+a \\ e^2 | p+b}} \lambda(p+a) \lambda(p+b) \quad (53) \\
&\leq \sum_{x_0 < d^2 \leq x, x_0 < e^2 \leq x} \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2 | p+a \\ e^2 | p+b}} 1 \\
&= O(x^{1-\varepsilon}).
\end{aligned}$$

Summing (49) to (53) completes the proof. ■

3 Results for the Liouville Function over the Shifted Primes

3.1 Average Orders of Liouville Functions

Theorem 3.1. *If $\lambda : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$ is the Liouville function, then, for any large number $x > 1$, the following statements are true.*

$$(i) \sum_{n \leq x} \lambda(n) = O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right), \quad \text{unconditionally,}$$

$$(ii) \sum_{n \leq x} \lambda(n) = O\left(x^{1/2+\varepsilon}\right), \quad \text{conditional on the RH.}$$

where $c > 0$ is an absolute constant, and $\varepsilon > 0$ is an arbitrarily small number.

Proof. (i) Substitute the identity $\lambda(n) = \sum_{d^2|n} \mu(n/d^2)$ to convert the summatory function to

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n \leq x} \lambda(n) &= \sum_{n \leq x} \sum_{d^2|n} \mu(n/d^2) \\ &= \sum_{d^2 \leq x} M(x/d^2), \end{aligned} \quad (54)$$

where $M(t) = \sum_{n \leq t} \mu(n)$. Applying Theorem 2.1 yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{d^2 \leq x} M(x/d^2) &= O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}} \sum_{d \leq \sqrt{x}} \frac{1}{d^2}\right) \\ &= O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

where $c > 0$ is an absolute constant. ■

3.2 Single-Sign Patterns Liouville Characteristic Functions

The analysis of single-sign pattern characteristic function

$$\lambda^\pm(n) = \left(\frac{1 \pm \lambda(n)}{2}\right) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \lambda(n) = \pm 1, \\ 0 & \text{if } \lambda(n) \neq \pm 1, \end{cases} \quad (56)$$

of the subset of integers

$$\mathcal{N}_\lambda^\pm = \{n \geq 1 : \lambda(n) = \pm 1\} \quad (57)$$

is well known. Here, the same idea is extended to the shifted primes.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $a \neq 0$ be an integer, and let $\lambda(n) \in \{-1, 1\}$ be the Liouville function. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^\pm(a, p) &= \left(\frac{1 \pm \lambda(p+a)}{2}\right) \\ &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \lambda(p+a) = \pm 1, \\ 0 & \text{if } \lambda(p+a) \neq \pm 1, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

are the characteristic functions of the subset of primes

$$\mathcal{P}_\lambda^\pm(a) = \{p \geq 2 : \lambda(p+a) = \pm 1\}. \quad (59)$$

3.3 Single-Sign Pattern Liouville Counting Functions

The single-sign patterns $\lambda(n) = 1$ and $\lambda(n) = -1$ single-sign pattern counting functions over the integers have the forms

$$Q^+(x) = \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ \lambda(n)=1}} 1 = \sum_{n \leq x} \left(\frac{1 + \lambda(n)}{2} \right) = \frac{1}{2}[x] + O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right), \quad (60)$$

and

$$Q^-(x) = \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ \lambda(n)=-1}} 1 = \sum_{n \leq x} \left(\frac{1 - \lambda(n)}{2} \right) = \frac{1}{2}[x] + O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right), \quad (61)$$

where $[x]$ is the largest integer function, respectively. In terms of the single-sign pattern counting functions, the summatory function has the asymptotic formula

$$Q(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} \lambda(n) = Q^+(x) - Q^-(x) = O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right). \quad (62)$$

Basically, it is a form of the prime number theorem, stated in (33).

The same idea extends to the single-sign patterns $\lambda(p+a) = 1$ and $\lambda(p+a) = -1$ of the shifted primes. Let $Q(a, x) = \sum_{p \leq x} \lambda(p+a)$. The single-sign patterns counting functions are defined by

$$Q^+(a, x) = \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ \lambda(p+a)=1}} 1 = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{B}^+(a)} 1, \quad (63)$$

$$Q^-(a, x) = \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ \lambda(p+a)=-1}} 1 = \sum_{p \in \mathcal{B}^-(a)} 1. \quad (64)$$

The single-sign patterns counting functions (63) to (64) are precisely the cardinalities of the subsets of integers

1. $\mathcal{P}_\lambda^+(a) \subset \mathbb{P}$,
2. $\mathcal{P}_\lambda^-(a) \subset \mathbb{P}$,

defined in (59). The symbol $\mathbb{P} = \{2, 3, 5, \dots\}$ denotes the set of prime numbers.

The next result is required to complete the analysis of the asymptotic formula for $Q(a, x) = \sum_{p \leq x} \lambda(p+a)$, which is completed in the next section.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $x \geq 1$ be a large number, and let $a \neq 0$ be a fixed integer. Then,*

$$Q^\pm(a, x) = \frac{1}{2} \text{li}(x) + \frac{1}{2} Q(a, x) + O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right),$$

where $c > 0$ is an absolute constant.

Proof. Consider the pattern $\lambda(p+a) = +1$. Now, use Lemma 3.1 to express the single-sign pattern counting function as

$$\begin{aligned} 2Q^+(a, x) &= \sum_{p \leq x} \lambda^+(a, p) \\ &= \sum_{p \leq x} (1 + \lambda(p+a)) \\ &= \sum_{p \leq x} 1 + \sum_{p \leq x} \lambda(p+a). \end{aligned} \tag{65}$$

The first finite sum is $\sum_{p \leq x} 1 = \pi(x)$, see (33) for more details, and the second sum is $Q(a, x)/2$. Summing these evaluations or estimates verifies the claim for $Q^+(a, x) \geq 0$. The verification for the next single-sign pattern counting function $Q^-(a, x) \geq 0$, is similar. ■

3.4 Result for Liouville Summatory Function

The analysis of the average order over the shifted primes

$$Q(a, x) = \sum_{p \leq x} \lambda(p+a) \tag{66}$$

is currently viewed as an intractable problem, the restricted double average order

$$\sum_{a \leq z} \sum_{p \leq x} \lambda(p+a) = o(z\pi(x)) \tag{67}$$

is the only result available in the literature, see [30], and [20, Theorem 1.1] for the exact details. However, the introduction of the single-sign counting function $Q^+(a, x)$ and $Q^-(a, x)$ transforms the problem into an elementary problem.

Proof. (Theorem 1.2) Let $x_0 = x^{1/2-\varepsilon}$, with $\varepsilon > 0$. Utilize the identity $\lambda(n) = \sum_{d^2|n} \mu(n/d^2)$ to rewriting the Liouville summatory function in terms of the Mobius function, and partition the finite sum.

$$\begin{aligned} Q(a, x) &= \sum_{p \leq x} \lambda(p+a) \\ &= \sum_{p \leq x} \sum_{d^2|p+a} \mu((p+a)/d^2) \\ &= \sum_{d^2 \leq x} \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2|p+a}} \mu((p+a)/d^2) \\ &= \sum_{d^2 \leq x_0} \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2|p+a}} \mu((p+a)/d^2) + \sum_{x_0 < d^2 \leq x} \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2|p+a}} \mu((p+a)/d^2). \end{aligned} \tag{68}$$

By Hypothesis 2.1, the first term has the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{d^2 \leq x_0} \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2 | p+a}} \mu((p+a)/d^2) &\leq \sum_{d^2 \leq x_0} \left| \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2 | p+a}} \mu((p+a)/d^2) \right| \\ &= \left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^c} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

where $c > 0$ is an arbitrary constant. The second term has the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x_0 < d^2 \leq x} \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2 | p+a}} \mu((p+a)/d^2) &\leq \sum_{x_0 < d^2 \leq x} \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2 | p+a}} 1 \\ &\leq x \sum_{x_0 < d^2 \leq x} \frac{1}{d^2} \\ &= O(x^{1/2+\varepsilon}). \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

The sum of (69) and (70) completes the verification. ■

3.5 Result for the Liouville-Mobius Correlation Function

Theorem 3.2. *Let $c > 1$ be an arbitrary constant, and let $x > 1$ be a large number. If $a \neq 0$ is a small fixed integer, then*

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n) \lambda(n+a) = O\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^c}\right).$$

Proof. Let $x_0 = (\log x)^{2c}$, with $c > 0$ is arbitrary. Rewriting the summatory Mobius-Liouville correlation function in terms of the Mobius function, and partition the finite sum.

$$\begin{aligned} D(a, x) &= \sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n) \lambda(n+a) \\ &= \sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n) \sum_{d^2 | n+a} \mu((n+a)/d^2) \\ &= \sum_{d^2 \leq x} \mu((n+a)/d^2) \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ d^2 | n+a}} \mu(n) \\ &= \sum_{d^2 \leq x_0} \mu((n+a)/d^2) \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ d^2 | n+a}} \mu(n) + \sum_{x_0 < d^2 \leq x} \mu((n+a)/d^2) \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ d^2 | n+a}} \mu(n). \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

Applying Theorem 2.2 to the first term yields the asymptotic formula

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{d^2 \leq x_0} \mu((n+a)/d^2) \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ d^2 | n+a}} \mu(n) &= \sum_{d^2 \leq x_0} \mu((n+a)/d^2) \cdot O\left(\frac{x}{d^2} e^{-c_0 \sqrt{\log x}}\right) \\
&= O\left(x e^{-c_0 \sqrt{\log x}} \sum_{d^2 \leq x} \frac{1}{d^2}\right) \\
&= O\left(x e^{-c_0 \sqrt{\log x}}\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{72}$$

where $c_0 > 0$ is an absolute constant. The second term has the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{x_0 < d^2 \leq x} \mu((n+a)/d^2) \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ d^2 | n+a}} \mu(n) &\leq \sum_{x_0 < d^2 \leq x} \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ d^2 | n+a}} 1 \\
&\leq x \sum_{x_0 < d^2 \leq x} \frac{1}{d^2} \\
&= O\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^c}\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

where $c > 0$ is an arbitrary constant. ■

3.6 Double-Sign Patterns Liouville Characteristic Functions

The analysis of single-sign pattern characteristic functions is extended here to the double-sign patterns

$$\lambda(p+a) = \pm 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda(p+b) = \pm 1, \tag{74}$$

where $a, b \neq 0$ such that $a \neq b$, and $p \geq 2$ is prime. The current research has emphasized the sign patterns over the integers, confer [15], [34, Corollary 1.7], [18], [32], and there is some literature on the sign patterns over the shifted primes, [30], and similar literature, for details.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $a \neq b$ be small fixed integers, and let $\lambda(n) \in \{-1, 1\}$ be the Liouville function. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda^{\pm\pm}(a, b, p) &= \left(\frac{1 \pm \lambda(p+a)}{2}\right) \left(\frac{1 \pm \lambda(p+b)}{2}\right) \\
&= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \lambda(p+a) = \pm 1, \mu(p+b) = \pm 1, \\ 0 & \text{if } \lambda(p+a) \neq \pm 1, \mu(p+b) \neq \pm 1, \end{cases}
\end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

are the characteristic functions of the subset of integers

$$\mathcal{P}_\lambda^{\pm\pm}(a, b) = \{p \geq 2 : \lambda(p+a) = \pm 1, \lambda(p+b) = \pm 1\}. \tag{76}$$

3.7 Double-Sign Patterns in Liouville Counting Functions

The counting functions for the single-sign patterns $\lambda(p+a) = 1$ and $\lambda(p+a) = -1$ are extended to the counting functions for the double-sign patterns

$$(\lambda(p+a), \lambda(p+b)) = (\pm 1, \pm 1). \quad (77)$$

The double-sign patterns counting functions are defined by

$$Q^{++}(a, b, x) = \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ \lambda(p+a)=1, \lambda(p+b)=1}} 1 = \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda^{++}(a,b)} 1, \quad (78)$$

$$Q^{+-}(a, b, x) = \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ \lambda(p+a)=1, \lambda(p+b)=-1}} 1 = \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda^{+-}(a,b)} 1, \quad (79)$$

$$Q^{-+}(a, b, x) = \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ \lambda(p+a)=-1, \lambda(p+b)=1}} 1 = \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda^{-+}(a,b)} 1, \quad (80)$$

$$Q^{--}(a, b, x) = \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ \lambda(p+a)=-1, \lambda(p+b)=-1}} 1 = \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}_\lambda^{--}(a,b)} 1. \quad (81)$$

The double-sign patterns counting functions (78) to (81) are precisely the cardinalities of the subsets of integers

1. $\mathcal{P}_\lambda^{++}(a, b) \subset \mathbb{P}$,
2. $\mathcal{P}_\lambda^{+-}(a, b) \subset \mathbb{P}$,
3. $\mathcal{P}_\lambda^{-+}(a, b) \subset \mathbb{P}$,
4. $\mathcal{P}_\lambda^{--}(a, b) \subset \mathbb{P}$,

defined in (76). The symbol $\mathbb{P} = \{2, 3, 5, \dots\}$ denotes the set of prime numbers. In terms of the double-sign patterns counting functions, the autocorrelation function has form

$$\begin{aligned} Q(a, b, x) &= \sum_{p \leq x} \lambda(p+a)\lambda(p+b) \\ &= Q^{++}(a, b, x) - Q^{+-}(a, b, x) + Q^{-+}(a, b, x) - Q^{--}(a, b, x). \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

The next result is required to complete the analysis of the asymptotic formula for $Q(a, b, x)$, which is completed in the next section.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $x \geq 1$ be a large number, and let $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $a \neq b$, be fixed integers. If $\lambda : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$ is the Liouville function, then,*

$$Q^{\pm\pm}(a, b, x) = \frac{1}{4} \text{li}(x) + \frac{1}{4} Q(a, b, x) + O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right),$$

where $c > 0$ is an absolute constant.

Proof. Without loss in generality, consider the pattern $(\lambda(p+a), \lambda(p+b)) = (+1, +1)$. Now, use Lemma 3.3 to express the double-sign pattern counting function as

$$\begin{aligned}
4Q^{++}(a, b, x) &= \sum_{p \leq x} \lambda^{++}(a, b, p) & (83) \\
&= \sum_{p \leq x} (1 + \lambda(p+a))(1 + \lambda(p+b)) \\
&= \sum_{p \leq x} (1 + \lambda(p+a) + \lambda(p+b) + \lambda(p+a)\lambda(p+b)) \\
&= \sum_{p \leq x} 1 + \sum_{p \leq x} \lambda(p+a) + \sum_{p \leq x} \lambda(p+b) + \sum_{p \leq x} \lambda(p+a)\lambda(p+b) \\
&\geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

The first three finite sums on the last line have the following evaluations or estimates.

1. $\sum_{p \leq x} 1 = \text{li}(x) + O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right)$, confer (33) for more details,
2. $\sum_{p \leq x} \lambda(p+a) = O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right)$, see Theorem 3.1,
3. $\sum_{p \leq x} \lambda(p+b) = O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right)$, see Theorem 3.1.

In all cases $c > 0$ is an absolute constant, unconditionally. Summing these evaluations or estimates verifies the claim for $Q^{++}(a, b, x) \geq 0$. The verifications for the next three double-sign pattern counting functions $Q^{+-}(a, b, x) \geq 0$, $Q^{-+}(a, b, x) \geq 0$, and $Q^{--}(a, b, x) \geq 0$ are similar. ■

3.8 Result for the Liouville Autocorrelation Function

Unlike the conditional result for the Mobius autocorrelation function in Theorem 1.4, the matching result for the Liouville autocorrelation function is unconditional, and has a sharper error term.

Proof. (Theorem 1.4) Utilize the identity $\lambda(n) = \sum_{d^2|n} \mu(n/d^2)$ to rewriting the Liouville summatory function in terms of the Mobius function.

$$\begin{aligned}
Q(a, b, x) &= \sum_{p \leq x} \lambda(p+a)\lambda(p+b) & (84) \\
&= \sum_{p \leq x} \sum_{d^2|p+a} \mu((p+a)/d^2) \sum_{e^2|p+b} \mu((p+b)/e^2) \\
&= \sum_{d^2 \leq x} \sum_{e^2 \leq x} \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2|p+a \\ e^2|p+b}} \mu((p+a)/d^2)\mu((p+b)/e^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Let $x_0 \leq x^{1/8-\varepsilon}$, with $\varepsilon > 0$, and partition the finite sum.

Applying Hypothesis 2.2 to the first term yields the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned}
T_0(a, b, x) &= \sum_{d^2 \leq x_0} \sum_{e^2 \leq x_0} \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2 | p+a \\ e^2 | p+b}} \mu((p+a)/d^2) \mu((p+b)/e^2) \quad (85) \\
&\leq \sum_{q \leq x_0^4} \left| \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p \equiv f \pmod{q}}} \mu(p+a) \mu(p+b) \right| \\
&= O\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^c}\right), \quad (86)
\end{aligned}$$

where $q = \text{lcm}(d^2, e^2) \leq x_0^4 \leq x^{1/2-\varepsilon}$, and $c > 1$ is an arbitrary constant.

The second term has the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned}
T_1(a, b, x) &= \sum_{d^2 \leq x_0} \sum_{x_0 < e^2 \leq x} \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2 | p+a \\ e^2 | p+b}} \mu((p+a)/d^2) \mu((p+b)/e^2) \quad (87) \\
&\leq \sum_{x_0 < d^2 \leq x, x_0 < e^2 \leq x} \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2 | p+a \\ e^2 | p+b}} 1 \\
&= O(x^{1-\varepsilon}).
\end{aligned}$$

The third term has the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned}
T_2(a, b, x) &= \sum_{x_0 < d^2 \leq x} \sum_{e^2 \leq x_0} \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2 | p+a \\ e^2 | p+b}} \mu((p+a)/d^2) \mu((p+b)/e^2) \quad (88) \\
&\leq \sum_{x_0 < d^2 \leq x, e^2 \leq x_0} \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2 | p+a \\ e^2 | p+b}} 1 \\
&= O(x^{1-\varepsilon}).
\end{aligned}$$

The fourth term has the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned}
T_3(a, b, x) &= \sum_{x_0 < d^2 \leq x} \sum_{x_0 < e^2 \leq x} \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2 | p+a \\ e^2 | p+b}} \mu((p+a)/d^2) \mu((p+b)/e^2) \quad (89) \\
&\leq \sum_{x_0 < d^2 \leq x, x_0 < e^2 \leq x_0} \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2 | p+a \\ e^2 | p+b}} 1 \\
&= O(x^{1-\varepsilon}).
\end{aligned}$$

Summing (85) to (89) completes the proof. ■

4 Hardy-Littlewood-Chowla Conjecture

The Hardy-Littlewood-Chowla Conjecture is a hybrid of the Hardy-Littlewood conjecture, see [3], [16, Conjecture B], and the Chowla conjecture, see [1], [31]. A version of the merged conjectures has the structure described below.

Conjecture 4.1. *Let $x \geq 1$ be a large number, let a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{k-1} be a fixed admissible k -tuple, and let $b_0 < b_1 < \dots < b_{l-1}$ be a fixed subset of small integers. Then,*

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n + a_0) \Lambda(n + a_1) \cdots \Lambda(n + a_{k-1}) \mu(n + b_0) \mu(n + b_1) \cdots \mu(n + b_{l-1}) = o(x).$$

The special case $k = 0$ reduces to the Chowla conjecture, and the special case $l = 0$ reduces to the Hardy-Littlewood conjecture. The other cases for $(k, l) \neq (0, 0)$ has been proved on average for almost all combinations of the admissible k -tuple a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{k-1} , and the small subset of integers $b_0 < b_1 < \dots < b_{l-1}$, the details of the proof are provided in [21].

The first proof for the case $k = 1$ and $l = 1$ for any fixed pair of small integers $a_0 = 0$ and $b_0 \neq 0$ is proved in Theorem 4.1, unconditionally.

4.1 Twisted vonMangoldt Function over the Squarefree Shifted Primes

Lemma 4.1. *Let $x \geq 1$ be a large number, and let $a \neq 0$ be a fixed integer. Then,*

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) \mu^2(n + a) = s_0 x + O\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^c}\right),$$

where $s_0 = 0.373955\dots$, and $c > 1$ is a constant.

Proof. Substituting the identity $\mu(n)^2 = \sum_{d^2|n} \mu(d)$, and switching the order of summation yield

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) \mu^2(n + a) &= \sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) \sum_{d^2|n+a} \mu(d) & (90) \\ &= \sum_{d^2 \leq x} \mu(d) \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ d^2|n+a}} \Lambda(n) \\ &= \sum_{d^2 \leq x_0} \mu(d) \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ d^2|n+a}} \Lambda(n) + \sum_{x_0 < d^2 \leq x} \mu(d) \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ d^2|n+a}} \Lambda(n), \end{aligned}$$

where $x_0 = (\log x)^{2c_1}$, with $c_1 > 1$. Applying the Siegel-Walfisz theorem, see [8, p. 405], [5, Theorem 15.3], et cetera, to the first subsum in the above partition yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{d^2 \leq x_0} \mu(d) \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ d^2|n+a}} \Lambda(n) &= \sum_{d^2 \leq x_0} \mu(d) \left(\frac{x}{\varphi(d^2)} + O\left(xe^{-c_0\sqrt{\log x}}\right) \right) & (91) \\ &= s_0 x + O\left(xe^{-c_1\sqrt{\log x}}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where $c_0, c_2 > 0$ are absolute constants, and

$$s_0 = \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{\mu(n)}{\varphi(n^2)} = \prod_{p \geq 2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p(p-1)}\right) 0.373955838964330040631201 \dots, \quad (92)$$

the same constant appears in (19). An estimate of the second subsum in the partition yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x_0 < d^2 \leq x} \mu(d) \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2 | p+a}} \Lambda(n) &\leq (\log x) \sum_{x_0 < d^2 \leq x} \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ d^2 | p+a}} 1 \\ &\ll x(\log x) \sum_{x_0 < d^2 \leq x} \frac{1}{d^2} \\ &\ll \frac{x}{(\log x)^{c_1-1}}. \end{aligned} \quad (93)$$

Summing (90) and (91), and setting $c = c_1 - 1 > 0$ complete the verification. ■

4.2 Signed vonMangoldt Function over the Shifted Primes

Define the pattern indicator function

$$\mu^+(n) = \mu^2(n) \left(\frac{1 + \mu(n)}{2} \right) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \mu(n) = 1, \\ 0 & \text{if } \mu(n) \neq 1, \end{cases} \quad (94)$$

and

$$\mu^-(n) = \mu^2(n) \left(\frac{1 - \mu(n)}{2} \right) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \mu(n) = -1, \\ 0 & \text{if } \mu(n) \neq -1. \end{cases} \quad (95)$$

These are the same as the characteristic functions stated in (153).

Lemma 4.2. *Let $x \geq 1$ be a large number, and let $a \neq 0$ be a fixed integer. Then,*

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) \mu^\pm(n+a) = \frac{1}{2} s_0 x + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) \mu(n+a) + O\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^c}\right),$$

where $s_0 > 0$ is a constant, and $c > 1$ is an absolute constant.

Proof. Without loss in generality, consider the pattern $\mu^+(n+a) = +1$. Now, use the indicator function (94) to express the single-sign pattern counting function as

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) \mu^+(n+a) &= \sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) \mu^2(n+a) (1 + \mu(n+a)) \\ &= \sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) (\mu^2(n+a) + \mu^3(n+a)) \\ &= \sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) \mu^2(n+a) + \sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) \mu(n+a) \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

By Lemma 4.1, the first finite sums has asymptotic evaluation

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) \mu^2(n+a) = s_0 x + O\left(x e^{-c_0 \sqrt{\log x}}\right) \quad (97)$$

where $s_0 > 0$ is a constant, and $c_0 > 0$ is an absolute constant. Summing these evaluations or estimates verifies the claim for $\sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) \mu^+(n+a) \geq 0$. The verifications for the other single-sign pattern counting function $\sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) \mu^-(n+a) \geq 0$ is similar. ■

4.3 Twisted vonMangoldt Function over the Shifted Primes

The first case of the hybrid finite, confer Conjecture (4.1), involving the vonMangoldt function and the Mobius function is verified here.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $x \geq 1$ be a large number, and let $a \neq 0$ be a fixed integer. Then,*

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) \mu(n+a) = O\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^c}\right), \quad (98)$$

where $c > 1$ is an arbitrary constant.

Proof. Rewrite it in terms of the Mobius function over the shifted primes $N(x) = \sum_{p \leq x} \mu(p+a) = O(x(\log x)^{-c_0})$ computed in Theorem 1.1, as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) \mu(n+a) &= \sum_{p \leq x} (\log p) \mu(p+a) & (99) \\ &= \int_1^x (\log t) dN(t) \\ &= (\log x) O\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^{c_0}}\right) - \int_1^x \frac{N(t)}{t} dt \\ &= O\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^{c_0-1}}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where $c = c_0 - 1 > 1$ is an arbitrary constant. ■

For an interesting application of Theorem 4.1, set $a = 2k$. Then, a result in [28, Theorem 1.1] proves that (98) and

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) \Lambda(n+2k) = \mathfrak{G}(2k)x + o(x) \quad (100)$$

are equivalent.

Consider the single-sign pattern natural density defined by

$$\delta_0^\pm(a) = \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{n \leq x : \Lambda(n) \mu(n+a) = \pm 1 \log p\}}{x}. \quad (101)$$

Theorem 4.2. *Let $x \geq 1$ be a large number, and let $a \neq 0$ be a fixed integer. Then, the values $n \in [1, x]$ such that*

$$\Lambda(n)\mu(n+a) = \log p$$

are equidistributed on the interval $[1, x]$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$. A similar result is valid for $\Lambda(n)\mu(n+a) = -\log p$.

Proof. The single-sign pattern counting function stated in Lemma 4.2 leads to an analytic expression for the natural density

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_0^\pm(a) &= \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{n \leq x : \Lambda(n)\mu(n+a) = \pm 1 \log p\}}{x} \\ &= \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{s_0 x + \sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n)\mu(n+a) + O(x(\log x)^{-c})}{2x} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} s_0. \end{aligned} \tag{102}$$

Here, the last line follows from Theorem 4.1, and $s_0 = 0.3739\dots$ ■

5 Results for the Mobius Autocorrelation Function over the Integers

5.1 Introduction

The current estimate of the logarithmic average order of the autocorrelation of the Mobius function μ has the asymptotic formula

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \frac{\mu(n)\mu(n+t)}{n} = O\left(\frac{\log x}{\sqrt{\log \log x}}\right), \tag{103}$$

where $t \neq 0$ is a fixed parameter, in [12, Corollary 1.5] and [13, Corollary 2]. This improves the estimate $O((\log x)(\log \log x)^{-c})$, where $c > 0$ is a constant, described in [34, p. 5]. Here, the following result is considered.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\mu : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$ be the Mobius function. Then, for any sufficiently large number $x > 1$, and a fixed integer $t \neq 0$,*

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n)\mu(n+t) = O\left(\frac{x}{(\log \log x)^{1/2-\varepsilon}}\right), \tag{104}$$

where $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrarily small.

Section 5.2 to Section 5.7 cover the basic standard materials in analytic number theory, and new materials. The proof of Theorem 5.1 is assembled in Section 6.

5.2 Nonlinear Autocorrelation Functions Results

The number of squarefree integers have the following asymptotic formulas.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\mu : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$ be the Mobius function. Then, for any sufficiently large number $x \geq 1$,*

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \mu^2(n) = \frac{6}{\pi^2}x + O(x^{1/2}).$$

Proof. Use identity $\mu(n)^2 = \sum_{d^2|n} \mu(d)$, and other elementary routines, or confer to the literature. ■

The constant coincides with the density of squarefree integers. Its approximate numerical value is

$$\frac{6}{\pi^2} = \prod_{p \geq 2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^2}\right) = 0.607988295164627617135754\dots, \quad (105)$$

where $p \geq 2$ ranges over the primes. The remainder term

$$E(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} \mu^2(n) - \frac{6}{\pi^2}x \quad (106)$$

is a topic of current research, its optimum value is expected to satisfies the upper bound $E(x) = O(x^{1/4+\varepsilon})$ for any small number $\varepsilon > 0$. Currently, $E(x) = O(x^{1/2}e^{-\sqrt{\log x}})$ is the best unconditional remainder term.

Assuming $t \neq 0$, the earliest result for the autocorrelation of the squarefree indicator function $\mu^2(n)$ appears to be

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \mu^2(n)\mu^2(n+t) = cx + O(x^{2/3}), \quad (107)$$

where $c > 0$ is a constant, this is proved in [24]. Except for minor adjustments, the generalization to the k -tuple autocorrelation function has nearly the same structure.

Theorem 5.2. *Let $q \neq 0$, a_0, a_1, \dots, a_{k-1} be small integers, such that $0 \leq a_0 < a_1 < \dots < a_{k-1}$. Let $x \geq 1$ be a large number, and let $\mu : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$ be the Mobius function. Then,*

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \mu^2(n+a_0)\mu^2(n+a_1)\cdots\mu^2(n+a_{k-1}) = \prod_{p \geq 2} \left(1 - \frac{\varpi(p)}{p^2}\right) x + O(x^{2/3+\varepsilon}),$$

where

$$\varpi(p) = \#\{m \leq p^2 : qm + a_i \equiv 0 \pmod{p^2} \text{ for } i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, k-1\}. \quad (108)$$

The small number $\varepsilon > 0$ and the implied constant depends on $q \neq 0$.

Proof. Consult [24], [23, Theorem 1.2], and the literature. ■

Example 5.1. For the parameters $q = 2$, $a_0 = 0$, and $a_1 = 1$, the number of solutions of the system of equations is $\varpi(p) = \#\{m \leq p^2 : qm + a_i \equiv 0 \pmod{p^2} = 2$ for any prime $p \geq 2$, so constant $s_1 = s_1(t)$ has the numerical value, (using $p \leq 10^5$),

$$s_1 = \prod_{p \geq 2} \left(1 - \frac{\varpi(p)}{p^2}\right) = \prod_{p \geq 2} \left(1 - \frac{2}{p^2}\right) = 0.322634616660543396347 \dots \quad (109)$$

Lemma 5.2. Let $x \geq 1$ be a large number, and let $\mu : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\}$ be the Mobius function. If $t \neq 0$ is a fixed integer, then,

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n)^2 \mu(n+t) = O\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^c}\right),$$

where $c > 0$ is an arbitrary constant.

Proof. Substitute the identity $\mu(n)^2 = \sum_{d^2|n} \mu(d)$, and switching the order of summation yield

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n)^2 \mu(n+t) &= \sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n+t) \sum_{d^2|n} \mu(d) & (110) \\ &= \sum_{d^2 \leq x} \mu(d) \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ d^2|n}} \mu(n+t) \\ &= \sum_{d^2 \leq x^{2\varepsilon}} \mu(d) \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ d^2|n}} \mu(n+t) + \sum_{x^{2\varepsilon} < d^2 \leq x} \mu(d) \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ d^2|n}} \mu(n+t), \end{aligned}$$

where $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/4)$. Applying Corollary 2.1 to the first subsum in the partition yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{d^2 \leq x^{2\varepsilon}} \mu(d) \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ d^2|n}} \mu(n+t) &\leq \sum_{q \leq x^\varepsilon} \left| \mu(d) \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ m \equiv b \pmod{q}}} \mu(m) \right| & (111) \\ &= O\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^c}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where $q = d^2$. An estimate of the second subsum in the partition yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{x^{2\varepsilon} < d^2 \leq x} \mu(d) \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ d^2|n}} \mu(n+t) &\leq \sum_{x^{2\varepsilon} < d^2 \leq x} \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ d^2|n}} 1 & (112) \\ &\ll x \sum_{d^2 \leq x} \frac{1}{d^2} \\ &\ll x^{1-\varepsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

Summing (111) and (112) completes the verification. ■

5.3 Logarithm Average and Arithmetic Average Connection

Let $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be an arithmetic function. The connection between the logarithm average

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \frac{f(n)}{n} = M_L(x) + E_L(x) \quad (113)$$

and the arithmetic average

$$\sum_{n \leq x} f(n) = M_A(x) + E_A(x), \quad (114)$$

where $M_i(x)$ and $E_i(x)$ are the main terms and error terms respectively, is important in partial summations. The error term $E_L(x)$ required to compute an effective arithmetic average (114) directly from the logarithm average (113) is explained in [10, Section 2.12], see also [10, Exercise 2.12].

Lemma 5.3. *Let $t \neq 0$ be a small integer, and let $x \geq 1$ be a large number. An effective nontrivial arithmetic average $\sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n)\mu(n+t) = o(x)$ can be computed directly from the logarithm average $A(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n)\mu(n+t)n^{-1}$ if and only if $A(x) = O(1/f(x))$, where $f(x)$ is a monotonically increasing function.*

Proof. Assume it is nontrivial. By partial summation,

$$\begin{aligned} o(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n)\mu(n+t) &= \sum_{n \leq x} n \cdot \frac{\mu(n)\mu(n+t)}{n} \\ &= \int_1^x z dA(z) \\ &= xA(x) - \int_1^x A(z)dz. \end{aligned} \quad (115)$$

This implies that $A(x) = O(x/f(x))$. Conversely. If $A(x) = O(x/f(x))$, then

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n)\mu(n+t) = o(x) \quad (116)$$

as claimed. ■

The known logarithm average (103) is not of the form $A(x) = O(1/f(x))$, but it can be used to compute an *absolute* upper bound.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $t \neq 0$ be a small integer, and let $x \geq 1$ be a large number. If the logarithm average $A(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n)\mu(n+t)n^{-1} = O(\log x)(\log \log x)^{-1/2}$, then the arithmetic average $\sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n)\mu(n+t) \ll x(\log \log x)^{-1/2+\varepsilon}$, where $\varepsilon > 0$ is a small number.*

Proof. Assume $B(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n)\mu(n+t) \gg x(\log \log x)^{-1/2+\varepsilon}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\log x}{(\log \log x)^{1/2}} &\gg \sum_{n \leq x} \frac{\mu(n)\mu(n+t)}{n} \\ &= \int_1^x \frac{1}{z} dB(z) \\ &= \frac{B(x)}{x} + \int_1^x \frac{B(z)}{z^2} dz. \end{aligned} \quad (117)$$

Since the integral

$$\int_1^x \frac{B(z)}{z^2} dz = \int_2^x \frac{1}{z(\log \log z)^{1/2-\varepsilon}} dz \gg \frac{\log x}{(\log \log x)^{1/2-\varepsilon}}, \quad (118)$$

for sufficiently large $x \geq 1$, the assumption is false. Hence, it implies that there is an absolute upper bound $B(x) \ll x(\log \log x)^{-1/2+\varepsilon}$. \blacksquare

5.4 Single-Sign Patterns Mobius Characteristic Functions

The analysis of single-sign pattern characteristic function is well known.

Lemma 5.5. *If $\mu(n) \in \{-1, 1\}$ is the Mobius function, then,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^\pm(n) &= \mu^2(n) \left(\frac{1 \pm \mu(n)}{2} \right) \\ &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \mu(n) = \pm 1, \\ 0 & \text{if } \mu(n) \neq \pm 1, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (119)$$

are the characteristic functions of the subset of primes

$$\mathcal{N}_\mu^\pm = \{n \geq 1 : \mu(n) = \pm 1\}. \quad (120)$$

5.5 Double-Sign Patterns Characteristic Functions

The principle of single-sign pattern characteristic function is extended to the double-sign patterns $(\mu(n+a), \mu(n+b)) = (\pm 1, \pm 1)$, where $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ is a pair of small integers such that $a \neq b$. Other sign patterns are topics of current research, confer [15], [18], [34, Corollary 1.7], [27], and similar literature, for details. A new and different approach to the analysis of double-sign patterns, triple-sign patterns, etcetera, based on elementary methods, is provided here.

Lemma 5.6. *Let $t \neq 0$ be an integer, and let $\mu(n) \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ be the Mobius function. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mu^{\pm\pm}(n, t) &= \mu^2(n)\mu^2(n+t) \left(\frac{1 \pm \mu(n)}{2} \right) \left(\frac{1 \pm \mu(n+t)}{2} \right) \\ &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \mu(n) = \pm 1, \mu(n+t) = \pm 1, \\ 0 & \text{if } \mu(n) \neq \pm 1, \mu(n+t) \neq \pm 1, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (121)$$

are the characteristic functions of the subset of integers

$$\mathcal{N}_\mu^{\pm\pm}(t) = \{n \geq 1 : \mu(n) = \pm 1, \mu(n+t) = \pm 1\}. \quad (122)$$

5.6 Trivial Double-Sign Patterns Counting Functions

Let $\epsilon_i \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$, and $(\mu(n), \mu(n+t)) = (\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1)$ denote an arbitrary double-sign pattern. The trivial double-sign patterns

$$(-1, 0), \quad (0, -1), \quad (0, 0), \quad (0, 1), \quad (1, 0), \quad (123)$$

do not contribute to the autocorrelation function. Nevertheless, it is sometimes required to quantify the natural densities of these double-sign patterns.

Lemma 5.7. *For a large number $x \geq 1$, the zero double-sign pattern $(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1) = (0, 0)$ counting function is given by*

$$R^{00}(t, x) = \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ \mu(n) \neq 0, \mu(n+t) \neq 0}} 1 = s_2 x + O(x^{2/3}),$$

where $s_2 = 1 - 2\zeta(2)^{-1} + s_1 > 0$ is a constant. Further, the natural density of the double zero pattern $(0, 0)$ is

$$\delta^{00}(t) = 1 - 2\zeta(2)^{-1} + s_1.$$

Proof. The counting function for the zero double-sign pattern $(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1) = (0, 0)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} R^{00}(t, x) &= \sum_{n \leq x} (1 - \mu^2(n)) (1 - \mu^2(n+t)) & (124) \\ &= \sum_{n \leq x} (1 - \mu^2(n) - \mu^2(n+t) + \mu^2(n)\mu^2(n+t)) \\ &= \sum_{n \leq x} 1 - \sum_{n \leq x} \mu^2(n) - \sum_{n \leq x} \mu^2(n+t) + \sum_{n \leq x} \mu^2(n)\mu^2(n+t) \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

The last four finite sums have the following evaluations or estimates.

1. $\sum_{n \leq x} 1 = [x],$
2. $\sum_{n \leq x} \mu^2(n) = \zeta(2)^{-1}x + O(x^{1/2}),$ see Lemma 5.1,
3. $\sum_{n \leq x} \mu^2(n+t) = \zeta(2)^{-1}x + O(x^{1/2}),$ see Lemma 5.1,
4. $\sum_{n \leq x} \mu^2(n)\mu^2(n+t) = s_1 x + O(x^{2/3}),$ see Theorem 5.2,

where $[x]$ is the largest integer function, and $s_1 = s_1(t) > 0$ is a constant. Summing these evaluations or estimates verifies the claim for $R^{00}(t, x) \geq 0$. ■

Lemma 5.8. *For a large number $x \geq 1$, the zero double-sign pattern $(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1) = (0, 0)$ counting function is given by*

$$R^{01}(t, x) = \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ \mu(n)=0, \mu(n+t)=1}} 1 = s_2 x + O(x^{2/3}), \quad (125)$$

where $s_2 = (\zeta(2)^{-1} - s_1)/2 > 0$, and $c > 0$ is an absolute constant. Further, the natural density of the double zero pattern $(0, 1)$

$$\delta^{01}(t) = (\zeta(2)^{-1} - s_1)/2.$$

Proof. The counting function for double-sign pattern $(\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1) = (0, 1)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} 2R^{01}(t, x) &= \sum_{n \leq x} (1 - \mu^2(n)) (1 + \mu(n+t)) \mu^2(n+t) \\ &= \sum_{n \leq x} \mu^2(n+t) - \sum_{n \leq x} \mu^2(n) \mu^2(n+t) \\ &\quad + \sum_{n \leq x} \mu^3(n+t) - \sum_{n \leq x} \mu^2(n) \mu^3(n+t) \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (126)$$

The last four finite sums have the following evaluations or estimates.

1. $\sum_{n \leq x} \mu^2(n+t) = \zeta(2)^{-1} x + O(x^{1/2})$, see Lemma 5.1,
2. $\sum_{n \leq x} \mu^2(n) \mu^2(n+t) = s_0 x + O(x^{2/3})$, see Theorem 5.2,
3. $\sum_{n \leq x} \mu^3(n+t) = O(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}})$, see Theorem 2.1,
4. $\sum_{n \leq x} \mu^2(n) \mu^3(n+t) = O(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}})$, see Lemma 5.2,

where $s_0 = s_0(t) > 0$ is a constant, and $c > 0$ is an absolute constant. Summing these evaluations or estimates verifies the claim for $R^{01}(t, x) \geq 0$. \blacksquare

The same counting function and natural density given in Lemma 5.8 applies to any of the trivial double-sign patterns $(0, -1)$, $(1, 0)$, $(-1, 0)$. The verification is similar, mutatis mutandis.

The numerical value of these densities are the followings.

1. $s_1 = 0.32263461660543396347\dots$, computed in Example 5.1,
2. $s_2 = 1 - 2\zeta(2)^{-1} + s_1 = 0.106780412897381\dots$,
3. $s_3 = (\zeta(2)^{-1} - s_1)/2 = 0.142646242624296\dots$

5.7 Double-Sign Patterns Counting Functions

The single-sign patterns $\mu(n) = 1$ and $\mu(n) = -1$ have single-sign pattern counting functions of the forms

$$R^+(x) = \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ \mu(n)=1}} 1 = \sum_{n \leq x} \left(\frac{1 + \mu(n)}{2} \right) \mu^2(n) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{x}{\zeta(2)} + O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right), \quad (127)$$

and

$$R^-(x) = \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ \mu(n)=-1}} 1 = \sum_{n \leq x} \left(\frac{1 - \mu(n)}{2} \right) \mu^2(n) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{x}{\zeta(2)} + O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right), \quad (128)$$

these follow from Lemma 5.1 and Theorem 2.1. In terms of these functions, the summatory Mobius function has the asymptotic formula

$$\begin{aligned} R(x) &= \sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n) & (129) \\ &= R^+(x) - R^-(x) \\ &= \left(\left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{x}{\zeta(2)} \right) + O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right) \right) - \left(\left(\frac{1}{2} \frac{x}{\zeta(2)} \right) + O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right) \right) \\ &= O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Basically, it is a different form of the Prime Number Theorem

$$\pi(x) = \text{li}(x) + O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right), \quad (130)$$

where $\text{li}(x) = \int_2^x (\log t)^{-1} dt$ is the logarithm integral, and $c > 0$ is an absolute constant, see [6, Eq. 27.12.5], [7, Theorem 3.10], et alii.

The same principle is applied to the double-sign patterns $(\mu(n), \mu(n+t)) = (\pm 1, \pm 1)$ to derive the extended results provided here.

The double-sign pattern counting functions are defined by

$$R^{++}(t, x) = \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ \mu(n)=1, \mu(n+t)=1}} 1 = \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \in \mathcal{N}_\mu^{++}(t)}} 1, \quad (131)$$

$$R^{+-}(t, x) = \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ \mu(n)=1, \mu(n+t)=-1}} 1 = \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \in \mathcal{N}_\mu^{+-}(t)}} 1, \quad (132)$$

$$R^{-+}(t, x) = \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ \mu(n)=-1, \mu(n+t)=1}} 1 = \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \in \mathcal{N}_\mu^{-+}(t)}} 1, \quad (133)$$

$$R^{--}(t, x) = \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ \mu(n)=-1, \mu(n+t)=-1}} 1 = \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ n \in \mathcal{N}_\mu^{--}(t)}} 1. \quad (134)$$

The double-sign pattern counting functions (131) to (134) are precisely the cardinalities of the subsets of integers

1. $\mathcal{N}_\mu^{++}(t) \subset \mathbb{N}$,
2. $\mathcal{N}_\mu^{+-}(t) \subset \mathbb{N}$,
3. $\mathcal{N}_\mu^{-+}(t) \subset \mathbb{N}$,
4. $\mathcal{N}_\mu^{--}(t) \subset \mathbb{N}$,

defined in (122). The next result is required to complete the analysis of the asymptotic formula for $R(t, x)$, which is completed in the next section.

Lemma 5.9. *Let $x \geq 1$ be a large number, and let $t \neq 0$ be a fixed integer. Then,*

$$R^{\pm\pm}(t, x) = \frac{1}{4}s_1x + \frac{1}{4}R(t, x) + O\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^c}\right),$$

where $s_1 = s_1(t) > 0$, and $c > 0$ are constants.

Proof. Without loss in generality, consider the double-sign pattern $(\mu(n), \mu(n+t)) = (+1, +1)$. Now, use Lemma 5.6 to express the double-sign pattern counting function as

$$\begin{aligned} 4R^{++}(t, x) &= \sum_{n \leq x} \mu^{++}(t, n) & (135) \\ &= \sum_{n \leq x} \mu^2(n)\mu^2(n+t) (1 + \mu(n)) (1 + \mu(n+t)) \\ &= \sum_{n \leq x} \mu^2(n)\mu^2(n+t) (1 + \mu(n) + \mu(n+t) + \mu(n)\mu(n+t)) \\ &= \sum_{n \leq x} \mu^2(n)\mu^2(n+t) + \sum_{n \leq x} \mu^3(n)\mu^2(n+t) \\ &\quad + \sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n)^2\mu^3(n+t) + \sum_{n \leq x} \mu^3(n)\mu^3(n+t) \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

The last four finite sums have the following evaluations or estimates.

1. $\sum_{n \leq x} \mu^2(n)\mu^2(n+t) = s_0(t)x + O(x^{2/3})$, see Theorem 5.2,
2. $\sum_{n \leq x} \mu^3(n)\mu^2(n+t) = O\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^c}\right)$, see Lemma 5.2,
3. $\sum_{n \leq x} \mu^2(n)\mu^3(n+t) = O\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^c}\right)$, see Lemma 5.2,
4. $\sum_{n \leq x} \mu^3(n)\mu^3(n+t) = \sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n)\mu(n+t)$, since $\mu^{2k+1}(n) = \mu(n)$ for $k \geq 0$.

where $s_1 = s_1(t) > 0$ is a constant, and $c > 0$ is a constant. Summing these evaluations or estimates verifies the claim for $R^{++}(t, x) \geq 0$. The verifications for the next three double-sign pattern counting functions $R^{+-}(t, x) \geq 0$, $R^{-+}(t, x) \geq 0$, and $R^{--}(t, x) \geq 0$ are similar. \blacksquare

5.8 Equidistribution of Double-Sign Patterns

The nontrivial result for the summatory Möbius function

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n) = R^+(x) - R^-(x) = O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right) \quad (136)$$

has no main term. It vanishes because the number of single-sign patterns $R^+(x) = \#\{n \leq x : \mu(n) = 1\}$ and $R^-(x) = \#\{n \leq x : \mu(n) = -1\}$ have the same cardinality. This implies that the single-sign patterns are equidistributed on the interval $[1, x]$, and each has the natural density $\delta_\mu^\pm = 3/\pi^2$, see (127) for more detail. This idea is extended in the proof of the equidistribution of the double-sign patterns.

Recall that $R^{\pm\pm}(t, x) = \#\{n \leq x : \mu(n) = \pm 1, \mu(n+t) = \pm 1\}$, and the natural density of a double-sign pattern is defined by

$$\delta_\mu^{\pm\pm}(t) = \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{n \leq x : \mu(n) = \pm 1, \mu(n+t) = \pm 1\}}{x}. \quad (137)$$

Theorem 5.3. *Let $x \geq 1$ be a large number, and let $t \neq 0$ be a fixed integer. Then, the double-sign patterns $++$, $+-$, $-+$, and $--$ of the Möbius pair $\mu(n), \mu(n+t)$ are equidistributed on the interval $[1, x]$. In particular, each double-sign pattern has the natural density*

$$\delta_\mu^{\pm\pm}(t) = \frac{1}{4}s_1,$$

where $s_1 = s_1(t) > 0$ is a constant.

Proof. By Lemma 5.4, $R(t, x) = o(x)$. Accordingly, the limit of the proportion of double-sign pattern

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\mu^{\pm\pm}(t) &= \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{n \leq x : \mu(n) = \pm 1, \mu(n+t) = \pm 1\}}{x} \\ &= \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{s_1x + R(t, x) + O(x(\log x)^{-c})}{4x} \\ &= \frac{1}{4}s_1. \end{aligned}$$

■

This proves that the double-sign patterns $++$, $+-$, $-+$, and $--$ are equidistributed on the interval $[1, x]$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$.

Example 5.2. Let $t = 1$. The constant $s_1 = s_1(1) = 0.322634\dots$ for the double-sign patterns $\mu(n) = \pm 1, \mu(n+1) = \pm 1$ is computed in Example 5.1. Thus, by Theorem 5.3, in any sufficiently large interval $[1, x]$, the number of double-sign patterns

$$R^{\pm\pm}(t, x) = \delta_\mu^{\pm\pm}(t)x + O\left(\frac{x}{(\log \log x)^{1/2-\varepsilon}}\right) \quad (138)$$

are the followings.

1. $R^{++}(t, x) = \frac{0.3226 \dots}{4}x + O\left(\frac{x}{(\log \log x)^{1/2-\varepsilon}}\right)$, for $\mu(n) = 1, \mu(n+1) = 1$,
2. $R^{+-}(t, x) = \frac{0.3226 \dots}{4}x + O\left(\frac{x}{(\log \log x)^{1/2-\varepsilon}}\right)$, for $\mu(n) = 1, \mu(n+1) = -1$,
3. $R^{-+}(t, x) = \frac{0.3226 \dots}{4}x + O\left(\frac{x}{(\log \log x)^{1/2-\varepsilon}}\right)$, for $\mu(n) = -1, \mu(n+1) = 1$,
4. $R^{--}(t, x) = \frac{0.3226 \dots}{4}x + O\left(\frac{x}{(\log \log x)^{1/2-\varepsilon}}\right)$, for $\mu(n) = -1, \mu(n+1) = -1$.

Consequently, the main term of the autocorrelation function

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n)\mu(n+1) &= R^{++}(t, x) - R^{+-}(t, x) + R^{--}(t, x) - R^{-+}(t, x) \\ &= O(x(\log \log x)^{-1/2+\varepsilon}). \end{aligned} \quad (139)$$

vanished. For $x = 10^4$, the actual value of the autocorrelation function is

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n)\mu(n+1) = 12, \quad (140)$$

and the actual values of the double-sign counting functions are tabulated below.

$\mu(n)$	$\mu(n+1)$	$R^{\pm\pm}(1, x)$
+1	+1	3228/4
+1	-1	3152/4
-1	+1	3282/4
-1	-1	3256/4

The differences among the double-sign counting functions $R^{\pm\pm}(1, x)$ seem to be properties of the biases toward the different double-sign patterns.

6 Result for the Mobius Autocorrelation Function over the Integers

The elementary results presented in the previous sections are utilized here to prove an effective form of the autocorrelation function $\sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n)\mu(n+t)$, which is a significant improvement over the current results in the literature, see (103). The average result claims that

$$\sum_{t \leq T} \sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n)\mu(n+t) = o(Tx), \quad (141)$$

see [26, Theorem 1.1] for the precise details, and the conjecture due to Chowla, see [1], and [31], claims that

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n)\mu(n+t) = o(x), \quad (142)$$

for any small fixed integer $t \neq 0$.

Proof: (Theorem 5.1). By Theorem 5.3, each double-sign pattern has the asymptotic formula

$$R^{\pm\pm}(t, x) = \frac{1}{4}s_1x + O(x(\log \log x)^{-1/2+\varepsilon}). \quad (143)$$

In terms of the previous double-sign pattern counting functions, the Möbius autocorrelation function has form

$$\begin{aligned} R(t, x) &= \sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n)\mu(n+t) \\ &= R^{++}(t, x) - R^{+-}(t, x) + R^{--}(t, x) - R^{-+}(t, x) \\ &= \frac{1}{4}s_1(t)x + O(x(\log \log x)^{-1/2+\varepsilon}) - \frac{1}{4}s_1(t)x + O(x(\log \log x)^{-1/2+\varepsilon}) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{4}s_1(t)x + O(x(\log \log x)^{-1/2+\varepsilon}) - \frac{1}{4}s_1(t)x + O(x(\log \log x)^{-1/2+\varepsilon}) \\ &= O(x(\log \log x)^{-1/2+\varepsilon}), \end{aligned} \quad (144)$$

where $\varepsilon > 0$ is an arbitrarily small number. Quod erat demonstrandum. \blacksquare

7 Results for the Liouville Autocorrelation Function over the Integers

The current estimate of the logarithmic average order of the autocorrelation of the Liouville function λ has the asymptotic formula

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \frac{\lambda(n)\lambda(n+t)}{n} = O\left(\frac{\log x}{\sqrt{\log \log x}}\right), \quad (145)$$

where $t \neq 0$ is a fixed parameter, in [12, Corollary 1.5] and [13, Corollary 2]. This improves the estimate $O((\log x)(\log \log \log x)^{-c})$, where $c > 0$ is a constant, described in [34, p. 5]. Here, the following result is considered.

Theorem 7.1. *Let $\lambda : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$ be the Liouville function, and let $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ be a pair of fixed integers such that $a \neq b$. Then, for any sufficiently large number $x > 1$,*

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \lambda(n+a)\lambda(n+b) = O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right), \quad (146)$$

where $c > 0$ is an absolute constant.

Subsection 7.1 to Subsection 7.5 cover basic materials in analytic number theory, and new materials. The proof of Theorem 7.1 is spliced together in Subsection 7.6.

7.1 Logarithm Average and Arithmetic Average Connection

Let $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be an arithmetic function. The connection between the logarithm average

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \frac{f(n)}{n} = M_L(x) + E_L(x) \quad (147)$$

and the arithmetic average

$$\sum_{n \leq x} f(n) = M_A(x) + E_A(x), \quad (148)$$

where $M_i(x)$ and $E_i(x)$ are the main terms and error terms respectively, is important in partial summations. The error term $E_L(x)$ required to compute an effective arithmetic average (148) directly from the logarithm average (147) is explained in [10, Section 2.12], see also [10, Exercise 2.12].

Lemma 7.1. *Let $t \neq 0$ be a small integer, and let $x \geq 1$ be a large number. An effective nontrivial arithmetic average $\sum_{n \leq x} \lambda(n)\lambda(n+t) = o(x)$ can be computed directly from the logarithm average $A(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} \lambda(n)\lambda(n+t)n^{-1}$ if and only if $A(x) = O(1/f(x))$, where $f(x)$ is a monotonically increasing function.*

Proof. Assume it is nontrivial. By partial summation,

$$\begin{aligned} o(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} \lambda(n)\lambda(n+t) &= \sum_{n \leq x} n \cdot \frac{\lambda(n)\lambda(n+t)}{n} \\ &= \int_1^x z dA(z) \\ &= xA(x) - \int_1^x A(z) dz. \end{aligned} \quad (149)$$

This implies that $A(x) = O(x/f(x))$. Conversely. If $A(x) = O(x/f(x))$, then

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \lambda(n)\lambda(n+t) = o(x) \quad (150)$$

as claimed. ■

The known logarithm average (145) is not of the form $A(x) = O(1/f(x))$, but it can be used to compute an *absolute* upper bound.

Lemma 7.2. *Let $t \neq 0$ be a small integer, and let $x \geq 1$ be a large number. If the logarithm average $A(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} \lambda(n)\lambda(n+t)n^{-1} = O(\log x)(\log \log x)^{-1/2}$, then the arithmetic average $\sum_{n \leq x} \lambda(n)\lambda(n+t) \ll x(\log \log x)^{-1/2+\varepsilon}$, where $\varepsilon > 0$ is a small number.*

Proof. Assume $B(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} \lambda(n)\lambda(n+t) \gg x(\log \log x)^{-1/2+\varepsilon}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\log x}{(\log \log x)^{1/2}} &\gg \sum_{n \leq x} \frac{\lambda(n)\lambda(n+t)}{n} \\ &= \int_1^x \frac{1}{z} dB(z) \\ &= \frac{B(z)}{z} + \int_1^x \frac{B(z)}{z^2} dz. \end{aligned} \quad (151)$$

Since the integral

$$\int_1^x \frac{B(z)}{z^2} dz = \int_2^x \frac{1}{z(\log \log z)^{1/2-\varepsilon}} dz \gg \frac{\log x}{(\log \log x)^{1/2-\varepsilon}}, \quad (152)$$

for sufficiently large $x \geq 1$, the assumption is false. Hence, it implies that there is an absolute upper bound $B(x) \ll x(\log \log x)^{-1/2+\varepsilon}$. ■

7.2 Single-Sign Patterns Liouville Characteristic Functions

The analysis of single-sign pattern characteristic function

$$\lambda^\pm(n) = \left(\frac{1 \pm \lambda(n)}{2} \right) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \lambda(n) = \pm 1, \\ 0 & \text{if } \lambda(n) \neq \pm 1, \end{cases} \quad (153)$$

of the subset of integers

$$\mathcal{N}_\lambda^\pm = \{n \geq 1 : \mu(n) = \pm 1\} \quad (154)$$

is well known. Here, the same idea is extended to the shifted primes.

Lemma 7.3. *Let $a \neq 0$ be an integer, and let $\lambda(n) \in \{-1, 1\}$ be the Liouville function. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^\pm(a, n) &= \left(\frac{1 \pm \lambda(n+a)}{2} \right) \\ &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \lambda(n+a) = \pm 1, \\ 0 & \text{if } \lambda(n+a) \neq \pm 1, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (155)$$

are the characteristic functions of the subset of primes

$$\mathcal{N}_\lambda^\pm(a) = \{n \geq 1 : \lambda(n+a) = \pm 1\}. \quad (156)$$

7.3 Double-Sign Patterns Liouville Characteristic Functions

The analysis of single-sign pattern characteristic functions is extended here to the double-sign patterns

$$\lambda(n) = \pm 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda(n+t) = \pm 1, \quad (157)$$

where $t \neq 0$ is a small integer, and $n \geq 1$ is an integer. Some of the research appears in [15], [34, Corollary 1.7], [18], [32], and similar literature.

Lemma 7.4. *Let $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $t \neq 0$ be small fixed integer, and let $\lambda(n) \in \{-1, 1\}$ be the Liouville function. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^{\pm\pm}(t, p) &= \left(\frac{1 \pm \lambda(n)}{2} \right) \left(\frac{1 \pm \lambda(n+t)}{2} \right) \\ &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \lambda(n) = \pm 1, \mu(n+t) = \pm 1, \\ 0 & \text{if } \lambda(n) \neq \pm 1, \mu(n+t) \neq \pm 1, \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (158)$$

are the characteristic functions of the subset of integers

$$\mathcal{B}^{\pm\pm}(t) = \{n \geq 1 : \lambda(n) = \pm 1, \lambda(n+t) = \pm 1\}. \quad (159)$$

7.4 Single-Sign Pattern Liouville Counting Functions

The single-sign patterns $\lambda(n) = 1$ and $\lambda(n) = -1$ single-sign pattern counting functions over the integers have the forms

$$Q^+(x) = \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ \lambda(n)=1}} 1 = \sum_{n \leq x} \left(\frac{1 + \lambda(n)}{2} \right) = \frac{1}{2}[x] + O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right), \quad (160)$$

and

$$Q^-(x) = \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ \lambda(n)=-1}} 1 = \sum_{n \leq x} \left(\frac{1 - \lambda(n)}{2} \right) = \frac{1}{2}[x] + O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right), \quad (161)$$

where $[x]$ is the largest integer function, respectively. In terms of the single-sign pattern counting functions, the summatory function has the asymptotic formula

$$Q(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} \lambda(n) = Q^+(x) - Q^-(x) = O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right). \quad (162)$$

Basically, it is a different form of the Prime Number Theorem

$$\pi(x) = \text{li}(x) + O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right), \quad (163)$$

where $\text{li}(x) = \int_2^x (\log t)^{-1} dt$ is the logarithm integral, and $c > 0$ is an absolute constant, see [6, Eq. 27.12.5], [7, Theorem 3.10], et alii.

7.5 Double-Sign Patterns in Liouville Counting Functions

The counting functions for the single-sign patterns $\lambda(n) = 1$ and $\lambda(n+t) = -1$ are extended to the counting functions for the double-sign patterns

$$(\lambda(n), \lambda(n+t)) = (\pm 1, \pm 1). \quad (164)$$

The double-sign patterns counting functions are defined by

$$Q^{++}(t, x) = \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ \lambda(n)=1, \lambda(n+t)=1}} 1 = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{B}^{++}(t)} 1, \quad (165)$$

$$Q^{+-}(t, x) = \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ \lambda(n)=1, \lambda(n+t)=-1}} 1 = \sum_{n \in \mathcal{B}^{+-}(t)} 1, \quad (166)$$

$$Q^{-+}(t, x) = \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ \lambda(n)=-1, \lambda(n+t)=1}} 1 = \sum_{p \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda^{-+}(t)} 1, \quad (167)$$

$$Q^{--}(t, x) = \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ \lambda(n)=-1, \lambda(n+t)=-1}} 1 = \sum_{p \in \mathcal{N}_\lambda^{--}(t)} 1. \quad (168)$$

The double-sign patterns counting functions (165) to (168) are precisely the cardinalities of the subsets of integers

1. $\mathcal{N}_\lambda^{++}(t) \subset \mathbb{N}$,
2. $\mathcal{N}_\lambda^{+-}(t) \subset \mathbb{N}$,
3. $\mathcal{N}_\lambda^{-+}(t) \subset \mathbb{N}$,
4. $\mathcal{N}_\lambda^{--}(t) \subset \mathbb{N}$,

defined in (159).

Lemma 7.5. *Let $x \geq 1$ be a large number, and let $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $t \neq 0$, be a fixed integer. If $\lambda : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$ is the Liouville function, then,*

$$Q^{\pm\pm}(t, x) = \frac{1}{4}[x] \pm \frac{1}{4}Q(t, x) + O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right),$$

where $c > 0$ is an absolute constant.

Proof. Without loss in generality, consider the pattern $(\lambda(n), \lambda(n+t)) = (+1, +1)$. Now, use Lemma 7.4 to express the double-sign pattern counting function as

$$\begin{aligned} 4Q^{++}(t, x) &= \sum_{n \leq x} \lambda^{++}(t, n) \\ &= \sum_{n \leq x} (1 + \lambda(n))(1 + \lambda(n+t)) \\ &= \sum_{n \leq x} (1 + \lambda(n) + \lambda(n+t) + \lambda(n)\lambda(n+t)) \\ &= \sum_{n \leq x} 1 + \sum_{n \leq x} \lambda(n) + \sum_{n \leq x} \lambda(n+t) + \sum_{n \leq x} \lambda(n)\lambda(n+t) \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{169}$$

The first three finite sums on the last line have the following evaluations or estimates.

1. $\sum_{p \leq x} 1 = [x]$, where $[x]$ is the largest integer function.
2. $\sum_{n \leq x} \lambda(n) = O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right)$, see Theorem 3.1.
3. $\sum_{n \leq x} \lambda(n+t) = O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right)$, see Theorem 3.1.

In all cases $c > 0$ is an absolute constant, unconditionally. Summing these evaluations or estimates verifies the claim for $Q^{++}(t, x) \geq 0$. The verifications for the next three double-sign pattern counting functions $Q^{+-}(t, x) \geq 0$, $Q^{-+}(t, x) \geq 0$, and $Q^{--}(t, x) \geq 0$ are similar. \blacksquare

7.6 Equidistribution of Double-Sign Patterns

The nontrivial result for the summatory Liouville function

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \lambda(n) = Q^+(x) - Q^-(x) = O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right) \tag{170}$$

has no main term. It vanishes because the number of single-sign patterns $Q^+(x) = \#\{n \leq x : \lambda(n) = 1\}$ and $Q^-(x) = \#\{n \leq x : \lambda(n) = -1\}$ have the same cardinality. This implies that the single-sign patterns are equidistributed on the interval $[1, x]$, and each has the natural density $\delta_\lambda^\pm = 1/2$, see (160) to (168) for more detail. This idea is extended in the proof of the equidistribution of the double-sign patterns.

Recall that $Q^{\pm\pm}(t, x) = \#\{n \leq x : \lambda(n) = \pm 1, \lambda(n+t) = \pm 1\}$, and the natural density of a double-sign pattern is defined by

$$\delta_\lambda^{\pm\pm}(t) = \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{n \leq x : \lambda(n) = \pm 1, \lambda(n+t) = \pm 1\}}{x}. \quad (171)$$

Theorem 7.2. *Let $x \geq 1$ be a large number, and let $t \neq 0$ be a fixed integer. Then, the double-sign patterns $++$, $+-$, $-+$, and $--$ of the Liouville pair $\lambda(n), \lambda(n+t)$ are equidistributed on the interval $[1, x]$. In particular, each double-sign pattern has the natural density*

$$\delta_\lambda^{\pm\pm}(t) = \frac{1}{4}.$$

Proof. Observe that for large $x \geq 1$, $Q^{\pm\pm}(t, x) > 0$, this follows from Lemma 7.5. Next, compute the limit of the proportion of double-sign pattern

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_\lambda^{\pm\pm}(t) &= \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\#\{n \leq x : \lambda(n) = \pm 1, \lambda(n+t) = \pm 1\}}{x} \\ &= \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{[x] + Q(t, x) + O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right)}{4x} \\ &= \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{[x] + o(x) + O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right)}{4x} \\ &= \frac{1}{4}, \end{aligned}$$

since $Q(t, x) \ll x(\log \log x)^{-1/2+\varepsilon}$, see Lemma 7.2. This proves that the double-sign patterns $++$, $+-$, $-+$, and $--$ are equidistributed on the interval $[1, x]$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$. \blacksquare

Example 7.1. Let $t = 1$. By Theorem 7.2, in any sufficiently large interval $[1, x]$, the number of any double-sign pattern $\lambda(n) = \pm 1, \lambda(n+1) = \pm 1$ is

$$Q^{\pm\pm}(t, x) = \delta^{\pm\pm}(t)x + o(x) = \frac{1}{4}x + o(x). \quad (172)$$

The numerical data for $x = 10^4$, shows that the actual value of the autocorrelation function is

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \lambda(n)\lambda(n+1) = 112, \quad (173)$$

and the actual values of the double-sign pattern counting functions are tabulated below.

$\lambda(n)$	$\lambda(n+1)$	Actual Count	Expected $R^{\pm\pm}(1, x)$
+1	+1	9924/4	10000/4 + $o(x)$
+1	-1	9888/4	10000/4 + $o(x)$
-1	+1	9888/4	10000/4 + $o(x)$
-1	-1	10300/4	10000/4 + $o(x)$

Given the small scale of this experiment, $x = 10^4$, the actual data fits the prediction very well. The tiny differences among the actual values, (in third column), and the prediction by the double-sign pattern counting functions $Q^{\pm\pm}(1, x)$ seem to be properties of the races between the different subsets of integers $\mathcal{N}_\lambda^{\pm\pm}(t)$ attached to the double-sign patterns, see (??). For an introduction to the literature in comparative number theory, prime number races, and similar topics, see [9], et cetera.

Example 7.2. Let $t = 1$. This is a numerical example over a short interval $[x, x + y] = [10^7, 10^7 + 10^3]$. There is no theoretical result for this case. However, the number of any double-sign pattern $\lambda(n) = \pm 1, \lambda(n + 1) = \pm 1$ should be

$$Q^{\pm\pm}(t, x) = \delta^{\pm\pm}(t)x + o(x) = \frac{1}{4}x + o(x). \tag{174}$$

The numerical data shows that the actual value of the autocorrelation function is

$$\sum_{x \leq n \leq x+y} \lambda(n)\lambda(n+1) = 27, \tag{175}$$

and the actual values of the double-sign pattern counting functions are tabulated below.

$\lambda(n)$	$\lambda(n+1)$	Actual Count	Expected $Q^{\pm\pm}(1, x)$
+1	+1	1100/4	1000/4 + $o(x)$
+1	-1	976/4	1000/4 + $o(x)$
-1	+1	972/4	1000/4 + $o(x)$
-1	-1	956/4	1000/4 + $o(x)$

The above analysis and data suggest the followings conditional results

$$Q^{\pm\pm}(t, x) = \delta_\lambda^{\pm\pm}(t)x + O(x^{1/2+\varepsilon}) = \frac{1}{4}x + O(x^{1/2+\varepsilon}), \tag{176}$$

and

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \lambda(n)\lambda(n+1) = O(x^{1/2+\varepsilon}), \tag{177}$$

where $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrarily small.

7.7 Equivalent Subsets of Sign Patterns Patterns

The join double-sign-patterns counting functions is defined by

$$Q^+(t, x) = \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ \lambda(n)=1, \lambda(n+t)=1}} 1 + \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ \lambda(n)=-1, \lambda(n+t)=-1}} 1, \tag{178}$$

and

$$Q^-(t, x) = \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ \lambda(n)=1, \lambda(n+t)=-1}} 1 + \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ \lambda(n)=-1, \lambda(n+t)=+1}} 1. \tag{179}$$

Lemma 7.6. *Let $x \geq 1$ be a large number, and let $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $t \neq 0$, be a fixed integer. If $\lambda : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$ is the Liouville function, then,*

$$Q^\pm(t, x) = \frac{1}{2}[x] + O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right),$$

where $c > 0$ is an absolute constant.

Proof. By Theorem 7.2, each of the sign pattern $++$ and $--$ are equidistributed over the interval $[1, x]$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$, and each has the same natural density $\delta_\lambda^{++}(t) = \delta_\lambda^{--}(t) = 1/4$. Thus, each double-sign pattern counting functions has an asymptotic formula of the form

$$Q^{\pm\pm}(t, x) = \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ \lambda(n)=\pm 1, \lambda(n+t)=\pm 1}} 1 = \frac{1}{4}x + E^{\pm\pm}(x), \quad (180)$$

where $E^{\pm\pm}(x) = o(x)$ is an error term.

Let $\pi : \mathcal{Z} \leftrightarrow \mathcal{Z}$ be a permutation of the subset of integers $\mathcal{Z} = \{1, 2, 3, \dots, [x]\}$, defined by $\pi(n) = m$. Each integer $n \leq x$ such that $\lambda(n)\lambda(n+t) = +1$ is mapped to an unique integer $m = \pi(n) \leq x$ such that $\lambda(m) = +1$. Therefore, the two counting functions are the same

$$\sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ \lambda(n)=1, \lambda(n+t)=1}} 1 + \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ \lambda(n)=-1, \lambda(n+t)=-1}} 1 + E_0(x) = \sum_{\substack{m \leq x \\ \lambda(m)=+1}} 1, \quad (181)$$

up to an error term $E_0(x) = o(x)$. Substituting the evaluations in (180), and (160), for each counting function yields

$$\left(\frac{1}{4}[x] + E^{++}(x)\right) + \left(\frac{1}{4}[x] + E^{--}(x)\right) + E_0(x) = \frac{1}{2}[x] + O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right). \quad (182)$$

Therefore, the total sum of error terms is bounded by

$$E(x) = E^{++}(x) + E^{--}(x) + E_0(x) = O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right), \quad (183)$$

where $c > 0$ is an absolute constant. ■

7.8 Result for the Liouville Autocorrelation Function

The result for the Liouville autocorrelation function is unconditional, and has a standard error term.

Proof. (Theorem 7.1) Rewriting the autocorrelation function in terms of the double-sign patterns counting functions, and applying Lemma ?? lead to the asymp-

otic formula

$$\begin{aligned}
Q(t, x) &= \sum_{p \leq x} \lambda(n)\lambda(n+t) \\
&= Q^{++}(t, x) + Q^{--}(t, x) - Q^{+-}(t, x) - Q^{-+}(t, x) \\
&= Q^+(t, x) - Q^-(t, x) \\
&= \frac{1}{2}[x] + O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right) - \left(\frac{1}{2}[x] + O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right)\right) \\
&= O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{184}$$

where $t \neq 0$ is a small integer, and $c > 0$ is an absolute constant. ■

Example 7.3. Let $t = 1$. This is a numerical example over a short interval $[x, x + y] = [10^7, 10^7 + 10^3]$. There is no theoretical result for this case. However, the number of any double-sign pattern $\lambda(n) = \pm 1, \lambda(n + 1) = \pm 1$ should be

$$Q^{\pm\pm}(t, x) = \delta_{\lambda}^{\pm\pm}(t)x + o(x) = \frac{1}{4}x + o(x). \tag{185}$$

The numerical data shows that the actual value of the autocorrelation function is

$$\sum_{x \leq n \leq x+y} \lambda(n)\lambda(n+1) = 27, \tag{186}$$

and the actual values of the double-sign pattern counting functions are tabulated below.

$\lambda(n)$	$\lambda(n+1)$	Actual Count	Expected $Q^{\pm\pm}(1, x)$
+1	+1	1100/4	1000/4 + $o(x)$
+1	-1	976/4	1000/4 + $o(x)$
-1	+1	972/4	1000/4 + $o(x)$
-1	-1	956/4	1000/4 + $o(x)$

8 Correlation Functions Problems

8.1 Mobius autocorrelation function problems

Problem 8.1. Let $x \geq x_0$ be a large number, and let $a < b$ be small integers. Determine the oscillation results for the autocorrelation functions

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n+a)\mu(n+b) = \Omega(x^\beta)$$

over the integers, and

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \mu(p+a)\mu(p+b) = \Omega(x^\beta)$$

over the shifted primes, where $\beta \in (1/2, 1)$. In [19], there is some evidence and material for random autocorrelation functions.

Problem 8.2. Let $x \geq x_0$ be a large number, and let $a < b$ be small integers. Assume the RH. Determine the conditional results for the autocorrelation functions

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \mu(p+a)\mu(p+b) = O(x^\beta)$$

over the integers, and

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \mu(p+a)\mu(p+b) = O(x^\beta)$$

over the shifted primes, where $\beta \in (1/2, 1)$.

Problem 8.3. Let $x \geq x_0$ be a large number, let $y \geq x^{1/2}$, and let $a < b$ be small integers. Determine a nontrivial upper bound for the autocorrelation function

$$\sum_{x \leq n \leq x+y} \mu(n+a)\mu(n+b)$$

over the integers, and

$$\sum_{x \leq p \leq x+y} \mu(p+a)\mu(p+b)$$

over the shifted primes in the short interval $[x, x+y]$.

Problem 8.4. Let $x \geq x_0$ be a large number, and let $a_0 < a_1 < a_2$ be small integers. Either conditionally or unconditionally, use sign patterns techniques to verify the asymptotic for the autocorrelation function

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n+a_0)\mu(n+a_1)\mu(n+a_2) = O\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^c}\right)$$

over the integers.

Problem 8.5. Let $a_0 < a_1 < \dots < a_{k-1}$ be a subset of small integers. Determine the maximal value of $k \geq 2$ for which the autocorrelations

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n+a_0)\mu(n+a_1)\cdots\mu(n+a_{k-1})$$

over the integers, and

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \mu(p+a_0)\mu(p+a_1)\cdots\mu(p+a_{k-1})$$

over the shifted primes, have nontrivial upper bounds.

Problem 8.6. Let $x \geq x_0$ be a large number, let $1 \leq a < q \ll (\log x)^c$, with $c \geq 0$, and let $a_0 < a_1$ be small integers. Determine a nontrivial upper bound for the autocorrelation function

$$\sum_{\substack{x \leq n \\ n \equiv a \pmod{q}}} \mu(n+a_0)\mu(n+a_1)$$

over the integers in arithmetic progression, and

$$\sum_{\substack{x \leq n \\ n \equiv a \pmod{q}}} \mu(p+a_0)\mu(p+a_1)$$

over the shifted primes in arithmetic progression.

8.2 Liouville autocorrelation function problems

Problem 8.7. Let $x \geq x_0$ be a large number, and let $a < b$ be small integers. Determine the oscillation results for the autocorrelation functions

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \lambda(n+a)\lambda(n+b) = \Omega(x^\beta)$$

over the integers, and

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \lambda(p+a)\lambda(p+b) = \Omega(x^\beta)$$

over the shifted primes, where $\beta \in (1/2, 1)$. In [19], there is some evidence and material for random autocorrelation functions.

Problem 8.8. Let $x \geq x_0$ be a large number, and let $a < b$ be small integers. Assume the RH. Determine the conditional results for the autocorrelation functions

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \lambda(n+a)\lambda(n+b) = O(x^\beta)$$

over the integers, and

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \lambda(p+a)\lambda(p+b) = O(x^\beta)$$

over the shifted primes, where $\beta \in (1/2, 1)$.

Problem 8.9. Let $x \geq x_0$ be a large number, let $y \geq x^{1/2}$, and let $a < b$ be small integers. Determine a nontrivial upper bounds for the autocorrelation function

$$\sum_{x \leq n \leq x+y} \lambda(n+a)\lambda(n+b)$$

over the integers, and

$$\sum_{x \leq p \leq x+y} \lambda(p+a)\lambda(p+b)$$

over the shifted primes in the short interval $[x, x+y]$.

Problem 8.10. Let $x \geq x_0$ be a large number, and let $a_0 < a_1 < a_2$ be small integers. Use sign patterns techniques to verify the asymptotic for the autocorrelation function

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \lambda(n+a_0)\lambda(n+a_1)\lambda(n+a_2) = O\left(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log x}}\right)$$

over the integers

Problem 8.11. Let $a_0 < a_1 < \dots < a_{k-1}$ be a subset of small integers. Determine the maximal value of $k \geq 2$ for which the autocorrelations

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \lambda(n+a_0)\lambda(n+a_1)\cdots\lambda(n+a_{k-1})$$

over the integers, and

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \lambda(p+a_0)\lambda(p+a_1)\cdots\lambda(p+a_{k-1})$$

over the shifted primes, have nontrivial upper bounds.

Problem 8.12. Let $x \geq x_0$ be a large number, let $1 \leq a < q \ll (\log x)^c$, with $c \geq 0$, and let $a_0 < a_1$ be small integers. Determine a nontrivial upper bound for the autocorrelation function

$$\sum_{\substack{x \leq n \\ n \equiv a \pmod{q}}} \lambda(n + a_0)\lambda(n + a_1)$$

over the integers in arithmetic progression, and

$$\sum_{\substack{x \leq n \\ n \equiv a \pmod{q}}} \lambda(p + a_0)\lambda(p + a_1)$$

over the shifted primes in arithmetic progression.

8.3 Intercorrelation functions problems

Problem 8.13. Let $t \neq 0$ be a small integer. Use the identities $\mu(n) = \lambda(n)\mu^2(n)$ and $\lambda(n) = \sum_{d^2|n} \mu(n/d^2)$, etc., to show that

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n)\mu(n+t) = \sum_{d^2 \leq x} \sum_{e^2 \leq x} \mu(d)\mu(e) \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ d^2|n \\ e^2|n+t}} \lambda(n)\lambda(n+t),$$

and

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \lambda(n)\lambda(n+t) = \sum_{d^2 \leq x} \sum_{e^2 \leq x} \mu(d)\mu(e) \sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ d^2|n \\ e^2|n+t}} \mu(n/d^2)\mu((n+t)/e^2).$$

Problem 8.14. Let $a < b$ be a pair of small integers. Use the identities $\mu(n) = \lambda(n)\mu^2(n)$ and $\lambda(n) = \sum_{d^2|n} \mu(n/d^2)$, etc., to find an easy way to prove that

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n+a)\mu(n+b) = O\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^c}\right)$$

implies that

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \lambda(n+a)\lambda(n+b) = O\left(\frac{x}{(\log x)^c}\right),$$

where $c > 0$. Is the converse true?

8.4 Hardy-Littlewood-Chowla conjecture problems

Problem 8.15. Let $a < b$ be a pair of small integers. Use sign patterns techniques to estimate the twisted finite sum

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n)\mu(n+a)\mu(n+b).$$

Problem 8.16. Let $a < b$ be a pair of small integers. Use sign patterns techniques to estimate the twisted finite sum

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n)\lambda(n+a)\lambda(n+b).$$

References

- [1] Chowla, S. *The Riemann hypothesis and Hilbert's tenth problem*. Mathematics and Its Applications, Vol. 4. Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, New York-London-Paris, 1965. 25, 38
 - [2] N. A. Carella. *Autocorrelation of the Mobius Function*. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2202.01071>
 - [3] dePolignac, A. *Six propositions arithmologiques d'eduites du crible d'Eratosthene*. Nouv. Ann. Math. 8 (1849), 423-429. 25
 - [4] Davenport, Harold. *On some series involving arithmetical functions. II*. Quart. J. Math. Oxf., 8:313-320, 1937. 5
 - [5] De Koninck, Jean-Marie; Luca, Florian. *Analytic number theory. Exploring the anatomy of integers*. Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 134. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2012. 5, 6, 8, 9, 25
 - [6] NIST *Digital Library of Mathematical Functions*. <http://dlmf.nist.gov/>, 2019. F. W. J. Olver, ..., and M. A. McClain, eds. 12, 35, 42
 - [7] Ellison, William; Ellison, Fern. *Prime numbers*. A Wiley-Interscience Publication. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York; Hermann, Paris, 1985. 12, 35, 42
 - [8] Friedlander, John; Iwaniec, Henryk. *Opera de cribro*. American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, 57. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010. 8, 9, 25
 - [9] Granville, A.; Martin, G. *Prime Number Races*. <http://arxiv.org/abs/math/0408319>. 45
 - [10] Hildebrand, Adolph. *Introduction to Analytic Number Theory Math 531 Lecture Notes, Fall 2005*. <http://www.math.uiuc.edu/hildebr/ant>. 31, 40
 - [11] Hildebrand, Adolph. *Additive and Multiplicative Functions on Shifted Primes*. Volumes 3-59, Issue 2, September 1989, Pages 209-232. 3
 - [12] Helfgott, Harald Andres; Radziwill, Maksym. *Expansion, divisibility and parity*. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2103.06853>. 28, 39
 - [13] Helfgott, Harald Andres. *Expansion, divisibility and parity: an explanation*. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2201.00799>. 28, 39
 - [14] Hardy, G. H.; Wright, E. M. *An introduction to the theory of numbers*. Sixth edition. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2008. 5
 - [15] Hildebrand, Adolph. *On consecutive values of the Liouville function*. Enseign. Math. (2) 32 (1986), no. 3-4, 219-226. 13, 21, 32, 41
-

-
- [16] Hardy, G. H.; Littlewood, J. E. *Some problems of Partitio Numerorum, III: On the expression of a number as a sum of primes*. Acta Math. 44 (1923), 1-70. [25](#)
- [17] Iwaniec, Henryk; Kowalski, Emmanuel. *Analytic number theory*. American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, 53. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2004.
- [18] Kaczorowski, J.; Pintz, J. *Oscillatory properties of arithmetic functions I*. Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hung. 48 (1986), 173-185. doi: 10.1007/BF01949062) [13](#), [21](#), [32](#), [41](#)
- [19] Klurman, O.; Shkredov, I. D.; Xu, M. *On the random Chowla conjecture*. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2202.08767>. [47](#), [49](#)
- [20] Lichtman, Jared. *Averages of the Mobius function on shifted primes*. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2009.08969>. [3](#), [7](#), [19](#)
- [21] Lichtman, Jared; Teräväinen, Joni. *On the Hardy-Littlewood-Chowla conjecture on average*. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2111.08912>. [25](#)
- [22] Mangerel, A. *On the Bivariate Erdos-Kac Theorem and Correlations of the Mobius Function*. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1612.09544>.
- [23] Mennema, Ingela. *The distribution of consecutive square-free numbers*. Master Thesis, Leiden University, 2017. [30](#)
- [24] Mirsky, L. *Note on an asymptotic formula connected with r -free integers*. Quart. J. Math., Oxford Ser. 18, (1947). 178-182. [29](#), [30](#)
- [25] McNamara, Redmond. *Dynamical Methods for the Sarnak and Chowla Conjectures*. University Of California, Los Angeles, Dissertation 2021. [3](#)
- [26] Matomaki, Kaisa, Radziwill, M., Tao, T. *An averaged form of Chowla's conjecture*. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1503.05121>. [38](#)
- [27] Matomaki, Kaisa, Radziwill, M., Tao, T. *Sign patterns of the Liouville and Möbius functions*. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1509.01545>. [32](#)
- [28] Murty, M. R.; Vatwani, Akshaa. *Twin primes and the parity problem*. Journal of Number Theory Volume 180, November 2017, Pages 643-659. [27](#)
- [29] Montgomery, Hugh L.; Vaughan, Robert C. *Multiplicative number theory. I. Classical theory*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007. [5](#)
- [30] Pintz, J. *An approximation to the twin prime conjecture and the parity phenomenon*. Indagationes Mathematicae, Volume 26, Issue 5, December 2015, Pages 883-896. [13](#), [19](#), [21](#)
- [31] Ramare, Olivier. *Chowla's Conjecture: From the Liouville Function to the Moebius Function*. Part of the Lecture Notes in Mathematics book series (LNM, volume 2213), 16 June 2018. [25](#), [38](#)
-

-
- [32] Srinivasan, Anitha. *Infinitely many sign changes of the Liouville function*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 150 (2022), 3799-3809. [21](#), [41](#)
- [33] Siebert, Hartmut; Wolke, D. *uber einige Analoga zum Bombierischen Primzahlsatz*. Math. Z. 122 (1971), no. 4, 327-341. [6](#)
- [34] Tao, T. *The logarithmically averaged Chowla and Elliott conjectures for two-point correlations*. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1509.05422>. [13](#), [21](#), [28](#), [32](#), [39](#), [41](#)
- [35] Teravainen, T. *Topics in Multiplicative Number Theory*. University of Turku Dissertation 2018. [3](#)
- [36] Wolke, Dieter. *uber die mittlere Verteilung der Werte zahlentheoretischer Funktionen auf Restklassen. I*. Math. Ann. 202 (1973), 1-25. [6](#)
- [37] Wabnitz, Paul. *Sarnak's Conjecture about Mobius Function Randomness in Deterministic Dynamical Systems*. Universitat Leipzig, Dissertation 2016. [3](#)

ResultMobiusFunctionShiftedPrimes-SignPatterns-07-25-22-195.tex.
