

SUMS OF POWERS OF PRIMES II

LAWRENCE C. WASHINGTON

ABSTRACT. For a real number k , define $\pi_k(x) = \sum_{p \leq x} p^k$. When $k > 0$, we prove that

$$\pi_k(x) - \pi(x^{k+1}) = \Omega_{\pm} \left(\frac{x^{\frac{1}{2}+k}}{\log x} \log \log \log x \right)$$

as $x \rightarrow \infty$, and we prove a similar result when $-1 < k < 0$. This strengthens a result in a paper by J. Gerard and the author and it corrects a flaw in a proof in that paper. We also quantify the observation from that paper that $\pi_k(x) - \pi(x^{k+1})$ is usually negative when $k > 0$ and usually positive when $-1 < k < 0$.

For a real number k , define

$$\pi_k(x) = \sum_{p \leq x} p^k, \quad \psi_k(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) n^k,$$

where the first sum runs over prime numbers and $\Lambda(n) = \log p$ if $n = p^m$ (with $m \geq 1$) is a prime power, and $\Lambda(n) = 0$ otherwise. Then $\pi_0(x) = \pi(x)$, the number of primes less than or equal to x , and $\psi_0(x) = \psi(x)$ is the Chebyshev function (*Note:* There are other uses of the notation ψ_k in the literature that are different from the present one). As usual, we use the notation $f(x) = \Omega_{\pm}(g(x))$ to indicate that there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that $f(x) > cg(x)$ for a sequence of $x \rightarrow \infty$ and $f(x) < -cg(x)$ for a sequence of $x \rightarrow \infty$. Our goal is to prove the following:

Theorem 1. *Let θ_0 be the supremum of the real parts of the zeros of $\zeta(s)$, and let $\epsilon > 0$. As $x \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\pi_k(x) - \pi(x^{k+1}) = \begin{cases} \Omega_{\pm}(x^{\theta_0+k-\epsilon}) & \text{if } k > 0, \\ \Omega_{\pm}(x^{(k+1)(\theta_0-\epsilon)}) & \text{if } -1 < k < 0 \text{ and } \theta_0 < 1. \end{cases}$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 11N05, Secondary: 11M26.
Key words and phrases. Oscillations, Riemann Hypothesis.

If the Riemann Hypothesis is true,

$$\pi_k(x) - \pi(x^{k+1}) = \begin{cases} \Omega_{\pm} \left(\frac{x^{k+\frac{1}{2}} \log \log \log x}{\log x} \right) & \text{if } k > 0, \\ \Omega_{\pm} \left(\frac{x^{\frac{k+1}{2}} \log \log \log x}{\log x} \right) & \text{if } k < 0. \end{cases}$$

We are not able to treat the case where $\theta_0 = 1$ and $k < 0$.

A paper of J. Gerard and the author [2] showed that $\pi_k(x)$ is asymptotic to $\pi(x^{k+1})$ (see also [4] and [8]) and proved the first half of the theorem. Unfortunately, this proof was based on an incorrect formula. When the correct formula is used, the proof in [2] is valid only when the Riemann Hypothesis is false. The main work of the present paper uses a technique of Littlewood to establish the second half of the theorem, namely under the assumption that the Riemann Hypothesis is true. The second half implies the first half when $\theta_0 = 1/2$.

In [2], a heuristic explanation was given for why $\pi_k(x) - \pi(x^{k+1})$ is usually negative when $k > 0$ and usually positive when $-1 < k < 0$. In Sections 2 and 3 of the present paper, the following more quantitative results are proved. The methods in these sections were inspired by [5].

Theorem 2.

$$\int_1^{\infty} \frac{\pi_k(t) - \pi(t^{k+1})}{t^{k+2}} dt = \frac{-1}{k+1} \log(k+1) \quad \begin{cases} < 0 & \text{if } k > 0, \\ > 0 & \text{if } -1 < k < 0. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 3. *Let $0 < k \leq 10.32$. The following are equivalent:*

- (1) *The Riemann Hypothesis.*
- (2)

$$\int_1^x (\pi_k(t) - \pi(t^{k+1})) dt < 0 \quad \text{for all } x \text{ sufficiently large.}$$

1. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Proof. When $k < 0$ and $\theta_0 < 1$, the result was proved in [2, p. 174]. It was also proved that

$$\pi_k(x) - \pi(x^{k+1}) = -E(x^{k+1}) + x^k E(x) - k \int_2^x t^{k-1} E(t) dt + O(1),$$

where $E(x) = \pi(x) - \text{li}(x)$. When the Riemann Hypothesis holds, the estimate $E(y) = O(y^{1/2} \log y)$ (see [6, Theorem 13.1]), combined with Littlewood's oscillation result (see below, or [6, p. 479]), yields the

stronger statement given in the second half of the theorem:

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_k(x) - \pi(x^{k+1}) &= \Omega_{\pm} \left(\frac{x^{\frac{k+1}{2}} \log \log \log x}{\log x} \right) + x^k O(x^{1/2} \log x) \\ &+ O \left(\int_2^x t^{k-1} t^{1/2} \log t dt \right) + O(1) \\ &= \Omega_{\pm} \left(\frac{x^{\frac{k+1}{2}} \log \log \log x}{\log x} \right), \end{aligned}$$

since $(k+1)/2 > k + \frac{1}{2}$ when $k < 0$.

In the above, we have used the following well-known lemma. Since we also use it several times in the following, we state it explicitly.

Lemma 1. *Let r be a real number (positive or negative) and let $\ell > -1$. Then*

$$\int_2^x t^{\ell} \log^r t dt = \frac{1}{\ell+1} x^{\ell+1} \log^r x + O(x^{\ell+1} \log^{r-1} x)$$

as $x \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof.

$$\int_2^x t^{\ell} \log^r t dt = \frac{1}{\ell+1} x^{\ell+1} \log^r x + O(1) - \frac{1}{\ell+1} \int_2^x r t^{\ell} \log^{r-1} t dt.$$

When $\ell > 0$ and t is sufficiently large, $t^{\ell} \log^{r-1} t$ is increasing, so

$$\int_2^x t^{\ell} \log^{r-1} t dt \leq x^{\ell+1} \log^{r-1} x,$$

for large x .

Now suppose $-1 < \ell \leq 0$. Choose $0 < \alpha < 1$ and choose ϵ with $0 < \epsilon < (\ell+1)(1-\alpha)/\alpha$. Then $\alpha(\ell+1+\epsilon) < \ell+1$, so when x is sufficiently large,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_2^x t^{\ell} \log^{r-1} t dt &= \int_2^{x^{\alpha}} t^{\ell} \log^{r-1} t dt + \int_{x^{\alpha}}^x t^{\ell} \log^{r-1} t dt \\ &= O \left(\int_2^{x^{\alpha}} t^{\ell+\epsilon} dt \right) + O \left((\log^{r-1} x) \int_{x^{\alpha}}^x t^{\ell} dt \right) \\ &= O(x^{\alpha(\ell+1+\epsilon)}) + O(x^{\ell+1} \log^{r-1} x) \\ &= O(x^{\ell+1} \log^{r-1} x). \end{aligned}$$

□

For the remainder of this section, we are interested in $k > 0$, although we state the lemmas in forms that hold for $k > -1$.

Let

$$(1) \quad \Pi_k(x) = \pi_k(x) + \frac{1}{2}\pi_{2k}(x^{1/2}) + \frac{1}{3}\pi_{3k}(x^{1/3}) + \frac{1}{4}\pi_{4k}(x^{1/4}) + \cdots$$

$$(2) \quad = \sum_{n \leq x} \frac{\Lambda(n)n^k}{\log n}.$$

In [2], the formula (1) was given incorrectly (it used $\pi_k(x^{1/2}), \pi_k(x^{1/3})$, etc. instead of $\pi_{2k}(x^{1/2}), \pi_{3k}(x^{1/3})$, etc.).

Lemma 2. *Let $k > -1$. Then*

$$\Pi_k(x) = \pi_k(x) + \frac{1}{2}\pi_{2k}(x^{1/2}) + O(x^{k+\frac{1}{3}}) + O(\log x)$$

and

$$\Pi_k(x) = \pi_k(x) + O\left(\frac{x^{k+\frac{1}{2}}}{\log x}\right) + O(\log x).$$

Proof. There are $O(\log x)$ positive integers ℓ such that $x^{1/\ell} \geq 2$, so the sum in (1) has $O(\log x)$ nonzero terms. When $k \geq 0$, we have

$$\pi_k(y) \leq \pi(y)y^k \leq 1.3 \frac{y^{k+1}}{\log y}$$

(the first inequality is the trivial estimate and the second is in [7]). Therefore,

$$\frac{1}{3}\pi_{3k}(x^{1/3}) + \frac{1}{4}\pi_{4k}(x^{1/4}) + \cdots = O\left(\frac{x^{k+\frac{1}{3}}}{\log x} \log x\right) = O(x^{k+\frac{1}{3}}).$$

Now suppose $-1 < k < 0$. Let n be the largest positive integer such that $nk \geq -1$. Since $(n+1)k < -1$, we have $\pi_{mk}(y) \leq \pi_{(n+1)k}(y) = O(1)$ for all $m \geq n+1$, and at most $O(\log x)$ terms in (1) are nonzero.

Moreover, $\pi_{2k}(y) \sim \pi(y^{2k+1})$, from which it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_k(x) &= \pi_k(x) + \frac{1}{2}\pi_{2k}(x^{1/2}) \\ &+ \frac{x^{k+\frac{1}{3}}}{(3k+1)\log(x)} + o\left(\frac{x^{k+\frac{1}{3}}}{(3k+1)\log(x)}\right) \\ &+ \cdots + \frac{x^{k+\frac{1}{n}}}{(nk+1)\log(x)} + o\left(\frac{x^{k+\frac{1}{n}}}{(nk+1)\log(x)}\right) + O(\log x) \\ &= \pi_k(x) + \frac{1}{2}\pi_{2k}(x^{1/2}) + O\left(\frac{x^{k+\frac{1}{3}}}{\log x}\right) + O(\log x), \end{aligned}$$

as desired (the implied constants depend on k , but not on x).

The second equality of the lemma follows from the first equality and the fact that $\pi_{2k}(y) \sim \pi(y^{2k+1})$. \square

In [2], it was proved that $\Pi_k(x) - \Pi_0(x^{k+1}) = \Omega_{\pm}(x^{\theta_0+k-\epsilon})$. When $k > 0$, Lemma 2 allows us to change $\Pi_k(x)$ and $\Pi_0(x^{k+1})$ to $\pi_k(x)$ and $\pi(x^{k+1})$ with errors of $o(x^{k+\frac{1}{2}})$ and $o(x^{\frac{k+1}{2}})$, respectively. These are dominated by the oscillation term if the Riemann Hypothesis is false.

Henceforth, we assume the Riemann Hypothesis (RH) is true and deduce Theorem 1 in this case.

Lemma 3. *Let k be a real number and let $c > k + 1$. If $x > 0$, then*

$$\int_2^x \psi_k(t) dt = \frac{-1}{2\pi i} \int_{c-i\infty}^{c+i\infty} \frac{\zeta'(s-k)}{\zeta(s-k)} \frac{x^{s+1} ds}{s(s+1)}.$$

Proof. The proof is identical to the proof in [3, pp. 31-32]. \square

Lemma 4. *Assume RH. Let*

$$A = \operatorname{Res}_{s=0} \left(\frac{\frac{\zeta'(s-k)}{\zeta(s-k)}}{s(s+1)} \right), \quad B = \operatorname{Res}_{s=-1} \left(\frac{\frac{\zeta'(s-k)}{\zeta(s-k)}}{s(s+1)} \right).$$

If $k > -1$, then

$$\int_2^x \psi_k(t) dt = \frac{x^{k+2}}{(k+1)(k+2)} - \sum_{\rho} \frac{x^{\rho+k+1}}{(\rho+k)(\rho+k+1)} - Ax + B + O(x^{k-1})$$

as $x \rightarrow \infty$. The sum is over the zeros ρ of $\zeta(s)$ with $\operatorname{Re}(\rho) = 1/2$, counted with multiplicity.

Proof. The proof proceeds by moving the line of integration to the left. The details are the same as in [3, pp. 73-74], where the proof is given when $k = 0$. \square

Lemma 5. *Assume RH and let $k > -1$. Then*

$$\int_2^x \psi_k(t) dt = \sum_{n \leq x} (x-n) \Lambda(n) n^k = \frac{x^{k+2}}{(k+1)(k+2)} + O(x^{k+\frac{3}{2}}) + O(x).$$

Proof. The first equality is proved by integration by parts:

$$\int_2^x \psi_k(t) dt = x\psi_k(x) - \int_{2-}^x t d\psi_k(t) = x \sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) n^k - \sum_{n \leq x} n^{k+1} \Lambda(n),$$

which yields the result.

The second equality follows from Lemma 4 and the absolute convergence of $\sum 1/\rho^2$. \square

Lemma 6. *Assume RH and let $k > -1$. Then*

$$\pi_k(x) - \pi(x^{k+1}) = \frac{\psi_k(x) - \frac{x^{k+1}}{k+1}}{\log x} + O(x^{\frac{k+1}{2}} \log x) + O\left(\frac{x^{k+\frac{1}{2}}}{\log x}\right).$$

Proof. We first prove the lemma with $\Pi_k(x)$ in place of $\pi_k(x)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_k(x) &= \int_{2-}^x \frac{d\psi_k(t)}{\log t} \\ &= \frac{\psi_k(x)}{\log x} + \int_2^x \frac{\psi_k(t) - \frac{t^{k+1}}{k+1}}{t \log^2 t} dt + \frac{1}{k+1} \int_2^x \frac{t^k}{\log^2 t} dt \\ &= \frac{\psi_k(x)}{\log x} + I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned}$$

Integration by parts yields

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \frac{\sum_{n \leq x} (x-n) \Lambda(n) n^k - \frac{x^{k+2}}{(k+1)(k+2)}}{x \log^2 x} + O(1) \\ &+ \int_2^x \frac{\sum_{n \leq t} (t-n) \Lambda(n) n^k - \frac{t^{k+2}}{(k+1)(k+2)}}{t^2 \log^2 t} \left(1 + \frac{2}{\log t}\right) dt \\ &= O\left(\frac{x^{k+\frac{1}{2}}}{\log^2 x}\right) + O(1) + \int_2^x \frac{O(t^{k+\frac{3}{2}}) + O(t)}{t^2 \log^2 t} dt \quad (\text{by Lemma 5}) \\ &= O\left(\frac{x^{k+\frac{1}{2}}}{\log^2 x}\right) + O(1). \end{aligned}$$

Integration by parts also yields

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 &= \frac{1}{k+1} \int_2^x \frac{t^{k+1}}{t \log^2 t} dt \\
&= \frac{-x^{k+1}}{(k+1) \log x} + \int_2^x \frac{t^k}{\log t} dt + O(1) \\
&= \frac{-x^{k+1}}{(k+1) \log x} + \int_2^{x^{k+1}} \frac{du}{\log u} + O(1) \quad (\text{substitute } u = t^{k+1}) \\
&= \frac{-x^{k+1}}{(k+1) \log x} + \pi(x^{k+1}) + O\left(x^{\frac{k+1}{2}} \log x\right).
\end{aligned}$$

In the last equality, we have used the fact [6, Theorem 13.1] that the Riemann Hypothesis implies $\pi(y) = Li(y) + O(y^{1/2} \log y)$. Putting everything together yields

$$(3) \quad \Pi_k(x) = \frac{\psi_k(x) - \frac{x^{k+1}}{k+1}}{\log x} + \pi(x^{k+1}) + O(x^{\frac{k+1}{2}} \log x) + O\left(\frac{x^{k+\frac{1}{2}}}{\log^2 x}\right).$$

Since Lemma 2 tells us that

$$\Pi_k(x) = \pi_k(x) + O\left(\frac{x^{k+\frac{1}{2}}}{\log x}\right) + O(\log x),$$

the result of the lemma follows. \square

Lemma 6 translates oscillations of $\psi_k(x)$ into oscillations of $\pi_k(x) - \pi(x^{k+1})$. We now use a method of Littlewood, as modified by Ingham, to produce oscillations in $\psi_k(x)$. The following lemma allows us to look at $\psi_k(x)$ averaged over a small interval.

Lemma 7. *Assume RH and let $k > -1$. Then, uniformly for $x \geq 4$ and $\frac{1}{2x} \leq \delta \leq \frac{1}{2}$,*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{(e^\delta - e^{-\delta})x} \int_{e^{-\delta}x}^{e^\delta x} \left(\psi_k(u) - \frac{u^{k+1}}{k+1} \right) du \\
&= -2x^{k+\frac{1}{2}} \sum_{\gamma>0} \frac{\sin(\gamma\delta)}{\gamma\delta} \frac{\sin(\gamma \log x)}{\gamma} + O(x^{\frac{1}{2}+k}).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proof follows from Lemma 4, as in the proof of [6, Lemma 15.9]. \square

Finally, the proof of Theorem 1 can now be completed using a Diophantine approximation argument, as in the proof of [6, Theorem 15.11]. In particular, suitable large values of x coupled with small

values δ can be found to show that the sum of the right side of the formula in Lemma 7 is $\Omega_{\pm}(\log \log \log x)$. Since the left side is the average over an interval, we find that

$$\psi_k(x) - \frac{x^{k+1}}{k+1} = \Omega_{\pm} \left(x^{k+\frac{1}{2}} \log \log \log x \right).$$

When $k > 0$ in Lemma 6, the oscillation term dominates. This yields the desired result for $\pi_k(x) - \pi(x^{k+1})$ and completes the proof of Theorem 1. \square

2. PROOF OF THEOREM 2

Proof. Recall that

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{p} = \log \log x + B + o(1),$$

where $B = 0.261497\dots$ is a constant [7].

The substitution $u = t^{k+1}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_1^x \frac{\pi(t^{k+1})}{t^{k+2}} dt &= \frac{1}{k+1} \int_1^{x^{k+1}} \frac{\pi(u)}{u^2} du \\ &= \frac{-1}{k+1} \frac{\pi(x^{k+1})}{x^{k+1}} + \frac{1}{k+1} \int_1^{x^{k+1}} \frac{1}{u} d\pi(u) \\ &= \frac{-1}{k+1} \frac{\pi(x^{k+1})}{x^{k+1}} + \frac{1}{k+1} \sum_{p \leq x^{k+1}} \frac{1}{p} \\ &= \frac{1}{k+1} \log \log(x^{k+1}) + \frac{B}{k+1} + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_1^x \frac{\pi_k(t)}{t^{k+2}} dt &= \frac{-1}{k+1} \frac{\pi_k(x)}{x^{k+1}} + \frac{1}{k+1} \int_1^x \frac{1}{t^{k+1}} d\pi_k(t) \\ &= \frac{-1}{k+1} \frac{\pi_k(x)}{x^{k+1}} + \frac{1}{k+1} \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{p^{k+1}} p^k \\ &= \frac{1}{k+1} \log \log(x) + \frac{B}{k+1} + o(1). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\int_1^x \frac{\pi_k(t) - \pi(t^{k+1})}{t^{k+2}} dt = \frac{-1}{k+1} \log(k+1) + o(1).$$

This yields the theorem. \square

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 3

Proof. Assume the Riemann Hypothesis is true. We need the following technical result:

Lemma 8. *Assume RH and let $k > 0$. Then*

$$\left| \int_2^x \frac{\psi_k(t) - \frac{t^{k+1}}{(k+1)}}{\log t} dt \right| < 0.04621 \frac{x^{k+\frac{3}{2}}}{\log x}$$

for all sufficiently large x .

Proof. From [1, Corollary 1], with the standard notation $\rho = \frac{1}{2} + i\gamma$ for zeros of $\zeta(s)$ in the critical strip, we know that

$$\sum_{\rho} \left| \frac{1}{(\rho+k)(\rho+k+1)} \right| < \sum_{\rho} \frac{1}{\gamma^2} < 0.04620999.$$

Let $D(x) = \psi_k(x) - \frac{x^{k+1}}{(k+1)}$. Integration by parts yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_2^x \frac{D(t)}{\log t} dt &= \frac{\int_2^x D(t) dt}{\log x} + \int_2^x \frac{\int_2^t D(u) du}{t \log^2 t} dt \\ &< 0.04620999 \frac{x^{k+\frac{3}{2}}}{\log x} + 0.04620999 \int_2^x \frac{t^{k+\frac{1}{2}}}{\log^2 t} dt + o(x) + o(x^{k-1}) \\ &\text{(from Lemma 4)} \\ &< 0.04621 \frac{x^{k+\frac{3}{2}}}{\log x} \end{aligned}$$

when x is large. □

We know that

$$\Pi_k(x) = \pi_k(x) + \frac{x^{k+\frac{1}{2}}}{(2k+1)\log x} + o\left(\frac{x^{k+\frac{1}{2}}}{\log x}\right),$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_1^x (\Pi_k(t) - \pi_k(t)) dt &= \int_2^x \frac{t^{k+\frac{1}{2}}}{(2k+1)\log t} + o\left(\int_2^x \frac{t^{k+\frac{1}{2}}}{\log t} dt\right) \\ &= (1+o(1)) \frac{x^{k+\frac{3}{2}}}{(k+\frac{3}{2})(2k+1)\log x} \end{aligned}$$

as $x \rightarrow \infty$. From Lemma 8 and (3),

$$\int_1^x (\Pi_k(t) - \pi(t^{k+1})) dt \leq (0.04621 + o(1)) \frac{x^{k+\frac{3}{2}}}{(k+\frac{3}{2})\log x}$$

for x sufficiently large. Therefore,

$$\int_1^x (\pi_k(t) - \pi(t^{k+1})) dt \leq \left(0.04621 - \frac{1}{2k+1} + o(1) \right) \frac{x^{k+\frac{3}{2}}}{(k+\frac{3}{2}) \log x} < 0$$

for x sufficiently large, when $k \leq 10.32$.

Remark. It would be possible to improve the upper bound 10.32 slightly by using knowledge of the first several values of γ to estimate the early terms of $\sum 1/(\rho+k)(\rho+k+1)$, but it follows from a theorem of Lehman (see [1]) that this sum is approximately a constant times $\log(k)/k$, hence is larger than $1/(2k+1)$ for large k .

Now suppose the Riemann Hypothesis is false. Then

$$\theta_0 = \sup\{\operatorname{Re}(\rho) \mid \zeta(\rho) = 0\} > \frac{1}{2}.$$

Let $0 < \epsilon < \theta_0 - \frac{1}{2}$ and let

$$F(x) = \int_1^x (\Pi_k(t) - \Pi_0(t^{k+1})) dt.$$

Then $F(x) = o(x^{k+2})$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$. Let $s \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\operatorname{Re}(s) > k+1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} G(s) &:= \int_1^\infty \left(\frac{F(t) - t^{\theta_0+k+1-\epsilon}}{t^{s+2}} \right) dt \\ &= \frac{-F(t)}{(s+1)t^{s+1}} \Big|_1^\infty + \frac{1}{s+1} \int_1^\infty \frac{\Pi_k(t) - \Pi_0(t^{k+1})}{t^{s+1}} dt \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\theta_0 + k - s - \epsilon} \\ &= \frac{1}{s(s+1)} \left(\log \zeta(s-k) - \log \zeta\left(\frac{s}{k+1}\right) \right) + \frac{1}{\theta_0 + k - s - \epsilon}. \end{aligned}$$

The last equality follows from a second integration by parts plus a change of variables in the second part of the integral; see [2, p. 173]. The last line represents a function that is analytic for all real numbers $s > \theta_0 + k - \epsilon$.

Let ρ be the zero of $\zeta(s)$ with $\operatorname{Re}(\rho) > \theta_0 - \epsilon$ with smallest positive imaginary part. Then $\log \zeta(s-k)$ is not analytic at $\rho+k$. Since $\theta_0 \leq 1$,

$$\theta_0 - \epsilon < \operatorname{Re}(\rho) \leq \operatorname{Re}\left(\frac{\rho+k}{k+1}\right).$$

Since the imaginary part of $(\rho+k)/(k+1)$ is less than the imaginary part of ρ , the choice of ρ implies that $\zeta((\rho+k)/(k+1)) \neq 0$ and therefore does not cancel the singularity at $\rho+k$. Therefore, $G(s)$ is not analytic at $\rho+k$.

If $F(x) - x^{\theta_0+k+1-\epsilon} \leq 0$ for all sufficiently large x , Landau's Theorem (see, for example, [2] or [3]) implies that $G(s)$ is analytic for all $s \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\operatorname{Re}(s) > \theta_0 + k - \epsilon$. Since

$$\operatorname{Re}(\rho + k) > \theta_0 + k - \epsilon,$$

this is a contradiction. Therefore, there is a sequence of $x \rightarrow \infty$ with

$$\int_1^x (\Pi_k(t) - \Pi_0(t^{k+1})) dt > x^{\theta_0+k+1-\epsilon}.$$

We now need to change from Π_k to π_k . Since $\Pi_k(t) = \pi_k(t) + O(t^{k+\frac{1}{2}}/\log x)$ and $\Pi_0(t^{k+1}) = \pi_0(t^{k+1}) + O(t^{\frac{k+1}{2}}/\log t)$,

$$\left| \int_1^x (\Pi_k(t) - \Pi_0(t^{k+1})) dt - \int_1^x (\pi_k(t) - \pi_0(t^{k+1})) dt \right| = O(x^{k+\frac{3}{2}}/\log x).$$

Since $\theta_0 + k + 1 - \epsilon > k + \frac{3}{2}$, we find that there exists a sequence of $x \rightarrow \infty$ such that

$$\int_1^x (\pi_k(t) - \pi_0(t^{k+1})) dt > 0.$$

□

We note that the proof of “(2) \implies (1)” in Theorem 3 works for all $k > 0$.

Acknowledgement.

Many thanks to Rusen Li for pointing out the mistake in [2].

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Brent, D. Platt, and T. Trudgian, Accurate estimation of sums over zeros of the Riemann zeta-function, *Math. Comp.* 90 (2021), no. 332, 2923–2935.
- [2] J. Gerard and L. C. Washington, Sums of powers of primes, *Ramanujan J.* 45 (2018), no. 1, 171–180.
- [3] A. E. Ingham, *The Distribution of Prime Numbers*, Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- [4] R. Jakimczuk, Desigualdades y formulas asintóticas para sumas de potencias de primos, *Bol. Soc. Mat. Mexicana* (3) 11 (2005), no. 1, 5–10.
- [5] D. Johnston, On the average value of $\pi(t) - li(t)$, *Canadian Math. Bulletin*, 2022.
- [6] H. L. Montgomery and R. C. Vaughan, *Multiplicative Number Theory I: Classical Theory*, Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- [7] B. Rosser and L. Schoenfeld, Approximate Formulas for Some Functions of Prime Numbers, *Illinois J. Math.* 6 (1962), 64–94.
- [8] T. Šalát and Š Znám, On sums of the prime powers, *Acta Fac. Rerum Natur. Univ. Comenian. Math.* 21 (1968), 21–24 (1969).

DEPT. OF MATHEMATICS, UNIV. OF MARYLAND, COLLEGE PARK, MD,
20742 USA

Email address: `lcw@umd.edu`