

THE MULTIVARIATE RATE OF CONVERGENCE FOR SELBERG'S CENTRAL LIMIT THEOREM

ASHER ROBERTS

ABSTRACT. In this paper we quantify the rate of convergence in Selberg's central limit theorem for $\log |\zeta(1/2 + it)|$ based on the method of proof given by Radziwiłł and Soundararajan in [12]. We achieve the same rate of convergence of $(\log \log \log T)^2 / \sqrt{\log \log T}$ as Selberg in [14] in the Kolmogorov distance by using the Dudley distance instead. We also prove the theorem for the multivariate case given by Bourgade in [4] with the same rate of convergence as in the single variable case.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let τ be a random point distributed uniformly on $[T, 2T]$. Selberg's Central Limit Theorem states that as $T \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\log |\zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + i\tau)| > V \sqrt{\tfrac{1}{2} \log \log T} \right) \rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_V^\infty e^{-u^2/2} du, \quad \forall V \in \mathbb{R}.$$

We adapt the techniques of Radziwiłł and Soundararajan in [12] that proved Selberg's Central Limit for $\log |\zeta(1/2 + it)|$ to prove Theorem 1, and consequently prove the multivariate theorem of Bourgade [4] stated in Corollary 1.

1.1. Main Results.

Definition 1. The Dudley (bounded Wasserstein) distance between two random vectors in \mathbb{R}^n defined on a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ is given by

$$d_{\mathcal{D}}(X, Y) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{L}} |\mathbb{E}[f(X)] - \mathbb{E}[f(Y)]|$$

where $\mathcal{L} = \{f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid f \text{ is Lipschitz, } \|f\|_\infty \leq 1 \text{ and } \|f\|_{\text{Lip}} \leq 1\}$. Here and throughout the paper $\|f\|_\infty$ denotes the supremum norm of f and $\|f\|_{\text{Lip}} = \sup_{x \neq y} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{\|x - y\|_2}$ with $\|\cdot\|_2$ denoting the L^2 norm.

We use the Dudley distance (e.g. see Gaunt and Li [6]) to estimate the rate of convergence. The boundedness property of this metric helps us when estimating the error associated with mollifying $\zeta(s)$ and connecting our mollifier to prime sums (Propositions 2 and 3). The Lipschitz property helps us when computing the remaining estimates needed, since computing the error associated with moving off axis and with truncating prime sums (Propositions 1

and 5) would be more difficult using the Kolmogorov distance.

The main result of the paper is Theorem 1. We use the Vinogradov notation $f \ll g$ to mean $f = O(g)$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorem 1. *Let τ be a random point distributed uniformly on $[T, 2T]$, and let $|h - h'| \sim (\log T)^{-\alpha}$ for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Then for T large enough,*

$$d_{\mathcal{D}} \left[\left(\frac{\log |\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + i(\tau + h))|}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \log \log T}}, \frac{\log |\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + i(\tau + h'))|}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \log \log T}} \right), (\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z}') \right] \ll \frac{(\log \log \log T)^2}{\sqrt{\log \log T}},$$

where $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z}')$ is a Gaussian vector with mean 0 and covariance matrix $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & \alpha \\ \alpha & 1 \end{pmatrix}$.

In [14] Selberg claims a rate of convergence of $(\log \log \log T)^2 / \sqrt{\log \log T}$ using the Kolmogorov distance, a proof of which is given by Tsang in [15]. We have been able to replicate this rate using the Dudley distance, which suffices to prove Bourgade's theorem [4].

Corollary 1. *Let τ be a random point distributed uniformly on $[T, 2T]$. Then for any measurable subset $\mathcal{B} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$, as $T \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left(\log |\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + i(\tau + h))|, \log |\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + i(\tau + h'))| \right) \in \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \log \log T} \mathcal{B} \right) \rightarrow \int_{\mathcal{B}} \frac{e^{-(x^T C^{-1} x)/2}}{2\pi \sqrt{\det C}} dx,$$

where $|h - h'| \sim (\log T)^{-\alpha}$ for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ and C is the covariance matrix $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & \alpha \\ \alpha & 1 \end{pmatrix}$.

1.2. Relation to Previous Results. The multivariate extension of Selberg's central limit theorem for $\log \zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it)$ was proven by Bourgade in [4] using techniques similar to the ones Selberg originally used to prove his theorem in [13]. Later, Radziwiłł and Soundararajan used a more streamlined technique to prove Selberg's theorem for $\log |\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it)|$ in [12]. Corollary 1 states that convergence is true for two points, but the argument in the proof can be extended to a finite set of points using the same techniques. In this sense, Corollary 1 presents a new proof for the multivariate extension given in [4] in the real case. Our work is ill-suited for proving the theorem in the imaginary case for the same reason as in [12]. Our work can also be extended to obtain analogous results for Dirichlet L -functions, as Hsu and Wong did in [7] to prove the central limit theorem in the single variable case using the techniques of Radziwiłł and Soundararajan.

Some modifications to the approach of [12] are needed to prove Theorem 1. In [12] the parameter W used to move off axis is taken to be $(\log \log \log T)^4$. However, this results in the worse rate of convergence of

$$\frac{(\log \log \log T)^4}{\sqrt{\log \log T}}$$

when applying our techniques, prompting us to move closer to the critical line and take $W = (\log \log \log T)^2$. We then have to correspondingly modify the parameters X and Y in our mollifier M to account for this change when mollifying ζ in Lemma 2. Achieving the rate of convergence given in Theorem 1 necessitates a few other changes as well. When approximating $\log |M^{-1}(s)|$ with $\operatorname{Re} \mathcal{P}(s)$ in Proposition 3 we look directly at the difference $\exp(-\mathcal{P}(s)) - M(s)$, bypassing the Dirichlet series approximation for $\exp(-\mathcal{P}(s))$ given by $\mathcal{M}(s)$ in Proposition 3 of [12]. This allows us to more precisely estimate the associated error. We also employ a technique of Arguin, Belius, Bourgade, Radziwiłł, and Soundararajan in [1] to compute $\lfloor \log \log T \rfloor$ moments for $\mathcal{P}(s)$ in Lemma 7, since this gives us the moments of a linear combination of $\mathcal{P}(s)$. This allows us to calculate the rate of convergence in a multivariate context. The moments of a linear combination also provide a more direct proof of the real case in [4] using the Cramér-Wald device.

Improving upon the rate of convergence in [14] using our techniques is difficult, since it requires taking $W = o((\log \log \log T)^2)$, which is not large enough to handle our parameter X when mollifying ζ in Lemma 2 (adjusting X to handle W is essentially equivalently difficult, as this results in the mollifier becoming too large). Selberg also obtains a rate of $\log \log \log T / \sqrt{\log \log T}$ for the imaginary part of $\log \zeta$, and an explicit proof of this is given in [16] in the context of mod-gaussian convergence (more information is given in Kowalski and Nikeghbali [10]). Our techniques in and of themselves are ill-suited to obtain this result due to the difficulty in mollifying the imaginary part of ζ with the method used in Proposition 2.

In random matrix theory, Bourgade, Hughes, Nikeghbali, and Yor show in [5] that

$$\left| \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\log |\det(I - A)|}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \log N}} \leq x \right) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^x e^{-t^2/2} dt \right| \leq \frac{C}{(\log N)^{3/2} (1 + |x|)^3}$$

where $\det(I - A)$ is the characteristic polynomial of an $N \times N$ matrix sampled under the Haar measure on the unitary group $U(N)$, and C is a constant. This result might suggest a rate of convergence for Selberg's central limit theorem of $1/(\log \log T)^{3/2}$. However, it seems from Proposition 6 that it is unlikely for one to be able to obtain a better rate than $1/\sqrt{\log \log T}$.

1.3. Structure of the Proofs. All proofs are given in Section 2. The proof of Theorem 1 follows by six successive propositions. The distance between the random variables are explicit at each step of the proof. The trickiest propositions to handle are Propositions 2 and 6, mollifying ζ and comparing moments via Fourier transforms. However, the steps that incur the greatest errors are Propositions 1 and 5, moving off axis and truncating the prime sum. Although these steps are proven in a very straightforward fashion, it is difficult to improve them due to the impact of any modifications on Propositions 2 and 6. That is, using a longer mollifier would allow us to get closer to the critical line in Proposition 1, but would consequently incur too great of an error when mollifying ζ in Proposition 2. In addition,

using a longer prime sum would improve the error in Proposition 5, but then the error in comparing Fourier transforms in Proposition 6 would be too large.

Let τ be a random point distributed uniformly on $[T, 2T]$ and set

$$(1) \quad \sigma_0 = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{W}{\log T}, \quad s_0 = \sigma_0 + i(\tau + h), \quad \text{and } s'_0 = \sigma_0 + i(\tau + h').$$

It is necessary to take $W = o(\sqrt{\log \log T})$, in order to typically approximate $\log |\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + i(\tau + h))|$ and $\log |\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + i(\tau + h'))|$ by $\log |\zeta(s_0)|$ and $\log |\zeta(s'_0)|$, respectively, as in Proposition 1 of [12]. There is some flexibility in the choice of W , but as we will see in Proposition 1 below, W is the primary contributor to the overall rate of convergence that we obtain, so we take

$$(2) \quad W = K(\log \log \log T)^2,$$

where K is a large constant. To simplify notation, let

$$\mathfrak{s} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \log \log T}$$

denote the standard deviation appearing in Theorem 1. The contribution towards the rate of convergence in Theorem 1 by moving off axis is then given by

Proposition 1 (Moving off axis). *With the notation above, we have*

$$d_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W}) \ll \frac{(\log \log \log T)^2}{\sqrt{\log \log T}},$$

where $\mathbf{V} = (\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{V}')$, $\mathbf{W} = (\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{W}')$ are intermediary variables defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V} &= \frac{\log |\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + i(\tau + h))|}{\mathfrak{s}} & \mathcal{W} &= \frac{\log |\zeta(s_0)|}{\mathfrak{s}} \\ \mathcal{V}' &= \frac{\log |\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + i(\tau + h'))|}{\mathfrak{s}} & \mathcal{W}' &= \frac{\log |\zeta(s'_0)|}{\mathfrak{s}}. \end{aligned}$$

We now take

$$X = T^{1/(K' \log \log \log T)} \quad \text{and} \quad Y = T^{1/(K' \log \log T)}$$

where $2 < K' < K$ (for the K in equation (2)) is a large constant and a mollifier

$$M(s) = \sum_n \frac{\mu(n)a(n)}{n^s}$$

with

$$a(n) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } p \mid n \Rightarrow p \leq X, \\ & \text{and } \Omega(n) \leq 100 \log \log T \text{ for } p \leq Y, \\ & \text{and } \Omega(n) \leq 100 \log \log \log T \text{ for } Y \leq p \leq X, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where p is prime and $\Omega(n)$ is the number of prime factors of n (with multiplicity). The constant K' is needed in the definitions of the parameters X and Y to control the size of the mollifier, and this constant is what necessitates the insertion of a larger constant in our choice of W . The contribution towards the rate of convergence in Theorem 1 by mollifying is then given by

Proposition 2 (Mollifying). *With the notation above, we have*

$$d_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{X}) \ll \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log \log T}},$$

where $\mathbf{W} = (\mathcal{W}, \mathcal{W}')$ is defined as in Proposition 1 and $\mathbf{X} = (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}')$ is the intermediary variable given by

$$\mathcal{X} = \frac{\log |M^{-1}(s_0)|}{\mathfrak{s}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{X}' = \frac{\log |M^{-1}(s'_0)|}{\mathfrak{s}}.$$

We approximate the mollifier $M(s)$ with the sum

$$\mathcal{P}(s) = \sum_{2 \leq n \leq X} \frac{\Lambda(n)}{n^s \log n},$$

where $\Lambda(n)$ is the von Mangoldt function given by

$$\Lambda(n) = \begin{cases} \log p & \text{if } n = p^k, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then the contribution towards the rate of convergence in Theorem 1 by using this approximation is

Proposition 3 (Approximating the mollifier). *With the notation above, we have*

$$d_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) \ll (\log \log T)^{-80},$$

where $\mathbf{X} = (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{X}')$ is defined as in Proposition 2 and $\mathbf{Y} = (\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y}')$ is the intermediary variable given by

$$\mathcal{Y} = \frac{\operatorname{Re} \mathcal{P}(s_0)}{\mathfrak{s}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{Y}' = \frac{\operatorname{Re} \mathcal{P}(s'_0)}{\mathfrak{s}}.$$

We then discard the higher order primes in the sum $\operatorname{Re} \mathcal{P}(s)$, electing to instead compare the moments of

$$P(s) = \operatorname{Re} \sum_{p \leq X} \frac{1}{p^s}$$

with those of a Gaussian random variable. The higher order primes in $\mathcal{P}(s)$ have a contribution towards the rate of convergence in Theorem 1 given by

Proposition 4 (Discarding higher order primes). *With the notation above, we have*

$$d_{\mathcal{D}} \left[\mathbf{Y}, \left(\frac{P(s_0)}{\mathfrak{s}}, \frac{P(s'_0)}{\mathfrak{s}} \right) \right] \ll \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log \log T}},$$

where $\mathbf{Y} = (\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{Y}')$ is the intermediary variable defined in Proposition 3.

Next we split $P(s)$, setting

$$P_1(s) = \operatorname{Re} \sum_{p \leq Y} \frac{1}{p^s} \quad \text{and} \quad P_2(s) = \operatorname{Re} \sum_{Y \leq p \leq X} \frac{1}{p^s},$$

so that $P(s) = P_1(s) + P_2(s)$. In comparing the Fourier transform of $P(s)$ to that of a Gaussian vector in Proposition 6, we incur an error of order $1/\log \log T$ for $P_1(s)$, which is absorbed by our normalization of $1/\sqrt{\log \log T}$, and an error of $1/\log \log \log T$ for $P_2(s)$, which is greater than our normalization. As a result, we use Proposition 5 to work with just $P_1(s)$ when comparing moments, because the additional error generated by dropping $P_2(s)$ is smaller than the error from moving off-axis in Proposition 1.

Proposition 5 (Truncating the prime sum). *With the notation above, we have*

$$d_{\mathcal{D}} \left[\left(\frac{P(s_0)}{\mathfrak{s}}, \frac{P(s'_0)}{\mathfrak{s}} \right), \left(\frac{P_1(s_0)}{\mathfrak{s}}, \frac{P_1(s'_0)}{\mathfrak{s}} \right) \right] \ll \frac{\sqrt{\log \log \log T}}{\sqrt{\log \log T}}.$$

The contribution towards the rate of convergence in Theorem 1 by approximating a normal distribution with $P_1(s)$ is

Proposition 6 (Comparing moments). *With the notation above, we have*

$$d_{\mathcal{D}} \left[\left(\frac{P_1(s_0)}{\mathfrak{s}}, \frac{P_1(s'_0)}{\mathfrak{s}} \right), \mathbf{Z} \right] \ll \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log \log T}},$$

where $\mathbf{Z} = (\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z}')$ is a Gaussian vector with mean 0 and covariance matrix $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & \alpha \\ \alpha & 1 \end{pmatrix}$.

Acknowledgements

I give thanks to Prof. Louis-Pierre Arguin for his unending support and guidance throughout the preparation of this paper. I would also like to thank Emma Bailey for her insightful comments, along with everyone who read through the paper and offered edits. Your feedback is very much appreciated.

Partial support is provided by grants NSF CAREER 1653602 and NSF DMS 2153803.

2. PROOFS

2.1. Proof of Theorem 1.

Proof. With the notation above, we have, by Propositions 1 to 6 and the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
& d_{\mathcal{D}} \left[\left(\frac{\log |\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + i(\tau + h))|}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \log \log T}}, \frac{\log |\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + i(\tau + h'))|}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \log \log T}} \right), (\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z}') \right] \\
& \ll d_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W}) + d_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{X}) + d_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) + d_{\mathcal{D}} \left[\mathbf{Y}, \left(\frac{P(s_0)}{\mathfrak{s}}, \frac{P(s'_0)}{\mathfrak{s}} \right) \right] \\
& \quad + d_{\mathcal{D}} \left[\left(\frac{P(s_0)}{\mathfrak{s}}, \frac{P(s'_0)}{\mathfrak{s}} \right), \left(\frac{P_1(s_0)}{\mathfrak{s}}, \frac{P_1(s'_0)}{\mathfrak{s}} \right) \right] + d_{\mathcal{D}} \left[\left(\frac{P_1(s_0)}{\mathfrak{s}}, \frac{P_1(s'_0)}{\mathfrak{s}} \right), \mathbf{Z} \right] \\
& \ll \frac{(\log \log \log T)^2}{\sqrt{\log \log T}}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Once Theorem 1 is proved, Corollary 1 follows immediately upon proving that convergence in the bounded Wasserstein distance implies convergence in distribution, since we can then take $T \rightarrow \infty$ in Theorem 1.

2.2. Proof of Corollary 1.

Proof. Fix $\epsilon > 0$ and suppose that

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{L}} |\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{V}_T)] - \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{Z})]| < \epsilon$$

for a sequence of vectors \mathbf{V}_T , as defined in Proposition 1 (we append T to the \mathbf{V} used above to stress that we are considering it as a sequence in T in this context), and a Gaussian vector \mathbf{Z} , as given in Proposition 6. Let $g : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a bounded, continuous function and let B_R be a ball in \mathbb{R}^2 of radius R large enough such that $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{Z} \in B_R^c) < \epsilon$. Then we can find a “smooth indicator function” $h_R : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$, i.e., a bounded Lipschitz function such that $h_R = 1$ on B_R , $h_R = 0$ on $B_{R+\epsilon}^c$, and h_R is smooth between B_R and $B_{R+\epsilon}^c$, and let $h_R^c = 1 - h_R$. Because g is bounded, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{V}_T)h_R^c(\mathbf{V}_T)] \ll \mathbb{E}[h_R^c(\mathbf{V}_T)].$$

Because h_R^c is a bounded Lipschitz function, this is $\ll \mathbb{E}[h_R^c(\mathbf{Z})]$ by assumption, and thus $< \epsilon$ due to the largeness of R . Hence we can find $T'(\epsilon)$ such for $T > T'(\epsilon)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{V}_T)] - \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{Z})]| \\
& = |\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{V}_T)h_R(\mathbf{V}_T)] + \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{V}_T)h_R^c(\mathbf{V}_T)] - \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{Z})h_R(\mathbf{Z})] - \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{Z})h_R^c(\mathbf{Z})]| \\
& \ll |\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{V}_T)h_R(\mathbf{V}_T)] - \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{Z})h_R(\mathbf{Z})]| + \epsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Using the Stone-Weierstrass theorem, we can find a polynomial f such that $|gh_R(\mathbf{X}) - fh_R(\mathbf{X})| < \epsilon$ uniformly on B_R . Therefore,

$$|\mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{V}_T)h_R(\mathbf{V}_T)] - \mathbb{E}[g(\mathbf{Z})h_R(\mathbf{Z})]| \ll |\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{V}_T)h_R(\mathbf{V}_T)] - \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{Z})h_R(\mathbf{Z})]| + \epsilon,$$

but this is $< 2\epsilon$ by assumption, since fh_R is a bounded Lipschitz function. \square

2.3. Proof of Proposition 1.

Proof. We have

$$d_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{V}, \mathbf{W}) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{L}} |\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{V})] - \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{W})]| \leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbb{E}[|f(\mathbf{V}) - f(\mathbf{W})|].$$

Since $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ where $f \in \mathcal{L}$ is Lipschitz with $\|f\|_{\text{Lip}} \leq 1$, we have $|f(v) - f(w)| \leq \|f\|_{\text{Lip}} \|v - w\|_2 \leq \|v - w\|_1$ with $\|\cdot\|_1$ denoting the L^1 norm, and thus

$$(3) \quad |f(\mathbf{V}) - f(\mathbf{W})| \leq \|\mathbf{V} - \mathbf{W}\|_1.$$

Therefore, by definition of the Dudley distance, the above distance is less than or equal to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{V} - \mathbf{W}\|_1] &= \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{V} - \mathcal{W}| + |\mathcal{V}' - \mathcal{W}'|] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{V} - \mathcal{W}|] + \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{V}' - \mathcal{W}'|], \end{aligned}$$

by the linearity of expectation. We now introduce Proposition 1 of [12] as Lemma 1.

Lemma 1. *With the notation above, for T large enough and any $\sigma > 1/2$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left|\log|\zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + i\tau)| - \log|\zeta(\sigma + i\tau)|\right|\right] \ll (\sigma - \tfrac{1}{2}) \log T.$$

The proof of Lemma 1 uses Hadamard's factorization formula for the completed ζ -function and is given in [12]. The zeros of $\zeta(s)$ are mentioned only when using the Riemann-von Mangoldt formula to evaluate the resulting integral. By Lemma 1, both $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{V} - \mathcal{W}|]$ and $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{V}' - \mathcal{W}'|]$ are $\ll W/\sqrt{\log \log T}$, and so our result follows. \square

2.4. Proof of Proposition 2.

Proof. Similar to the way we proved Proposition 1, we have

$$d_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{X}) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{L}} |\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{W})] - \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{X})]| \leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbb{E}[|f(\mathbf{W}) - f(\mathbf{X})|].$$

We then evaluate the expectation by splitting it into separate cases, so that the last inequality is

$$\begin{aligned}
(4) \quad & \ll \sup_{f \in \mathcal{L}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[|f(\mathbf{W}) - f(\mathbf{X})| \cdot \mathbb{1} \left(|\zeta(s_0)M(s_0) - 1| \leq \frac{1}{2}, |\zeta(s'_0)M(s'_0) - 1| \leq \frac{1}{2} \right) \right] \right. \\
(5) \quad & \left. + \mathbb{E} \left[|f(\mathbf{W}) - f(\mathbf{X})| \cdot \mathbb{1} \left(|\zeta(s'_0)M(s'_0) - 1| > \frac{1}{2} \right) \right] \right. \\
(6) \quad & \left. + \mathbb{E} \left[|f(\mathbf{W}) - f(\mathbf{X})| \cdot \mathbb{1} \left(|\zeta(s_0)M(s_0) - 1| > \frac{1}{2} \right) \right] \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

As we obtained the inequality (3) by taking advantage of the Lipschitz nature of f , we similarly obtain

$$|f(\mathbf{W}) - f(\mathbf{X})| \leq \|\mathbf{W} - \mathbf{X}\|_1.$$

Therefore, by definition of the Dudley distance, the expectation in (4) is less than or equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{W} - \mathbf{X}\|_1 \cdot \mathbb{1} \left(|\zeta(s_0)M(s_0) - 1| \leq \frac{1}{2}, |\zeta(s'_0)M(s'_0) - 1| \leq \frac{1}{2} \right) \right] \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left[|\mathcal{W} - \mathcal{X}| \cdot \mathbb{1} \left(|\zeta(s_0)M(s_0) - 1| \leq \frac{1}{2} \right) + |\mathcal{W}' - \mathcal{X}'| \cdot \mathbb{1} \left(|\zeta(s'_0)M(s'_0) - 1| \leq \frac{1}{2} \right) \right] \\
& = \frac{1}{\mathfrak{s}} \mathbb{E} \left[|\log |\zeta(s_0)M(s_0)|| \cdot \mathbb{1} \left(|\zeta(s_0)M(s_0) - 1| \leq \frac{1}{2} \right) \right] \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{\mathfrak{s}} \mathbb{E} \left[|\log |\zeta(s'_0)M(s'_0)|| \cdot \mathbb{1} \left(|\zeta(s'_0)M(s'_0) - 1| \leq \frac{1}{2} \right) \right].
\end{aligned}$$

On the event $|\zeta(s)M(s) - 1| \leq 1/2$ we have $|\log |\zeta(s)M(s)|| \leq \log 2$, and so both summands are $\ll 1/\sqrt{\log \log T}$. Since f is bounded, the expectations in (5) and (6) are less than or equal to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left(|\zeta(s_0)M(s_0) - 1| > \frac{1}{2} \right) + \mathbb{P} \left(|\zeta(s'_0)M(s'_0) - 1| > \frac{1}{2} \right) \\
& \ll \mathbb{E} [|\zeta(s_0)M(s_0) - 1|^2] + \mathbb{E} [|\zeta(s'_0)M(s'_0) - 1|^2].
\end{aligned}$$

We now introduce an analog of Proposition 4 of [12] as Lemma 2.

Lemma 2. *With the notation above, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}[|\zeta(\sigma_0 + i\tau)M(\sigma_0 + i\tau) - 1|^2] \ll (\log \log T)^{-K/K'}.$$

Proof. The proof follows the same procedure as in [12], with slight modifications to accommodate for our different choice of W . The main difference is in equation (12). The approximate

functional equation for $\zeta(\sigma_0 + it)$ in the range $T \leq t \leq 2T$ (e.g. Theorem 1.8 of [8]) given by $\zeta(\sigma_0 + it) = \sum_{n \leq T} n^{-\sigma_0 - it} + O(T^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \int_T^{2T} \zeta(\sigma_0 + it) M(\sigma_0 + it) dt &= \int_T^{2T} \left[\sum_{n \leq T} \frac{1}{n^{\sigma_0 + it}} + O(T^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \right] \sum_m \frac{\mu(m)a(m)}{m^{\sigma_0 + it}} dt \\ &= \sum_{n \leq T} \sum_m \frac{a(m)\mu(m)}{(mn)^{\sigma_0}} \int_T^{2T} (mn)^{-it} dt + O(T^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{K'}}) \\ &= T + O(T^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{K'}}), \end{aligned}$$

since the length of M being $X = T^{1/(K' \log \log \log T)}$ implies $M \ll T^{1/K'}$ and $K' > 2$. Thus we can expand the square to obtain

$$(7) \quad \int_T^{2T} |1 - \zeta(\sigma_0 + it)M(\sigma_0 + it)|^2 dt = \int_T^{2T} |\zeta(\sigma_0 + it)M(\sigma_0 + it)|^2 dt - T + O(T^{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{K'}}).$$

To evaluate this integral, we introduce Lemma 6 of [13].

Lemma 3. *Let h and k be non-negative integers, with $h, k \leq T$. Then, for any $1 \geq \sigma > \frac{1}{2}$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_T^{2T} \left(\frac{h}{k}\right)^{it} |\zeta(\sigma + it)|^2 dt &= \int_T^{2T} \left(\zeta(2\sigma) \left(\frac{(h,k)^2}{hk}\right)^\sigma + \left(\frac{t}{2\pi}\right)^{1-2\sigma} \zeta(2-2\sigma) \left(\frac{(h,k)^2}{hk}\right)^{1-\sigma} \right) dt \\ &\quad + O(T^{1-\sigma+\epsilon} \min(h, k)). \end{aligned}$$

This lemma allows us to break down the integral in (7) into the three summands

$$(8) \quad \zeta(2\sigma_0) \left(\int_T^{2T} dt \right) \sum_{h,k} \frac{\mu(h)\mu(k)a(h)a(k)}{(hk)^{2\sigma_0}} (h, k)^{2\sigma_0},$$

$$(9) \quad \zeta(2-2\sigma_0) \left(\int_T^{2T} \left(\frac{t}{2\pi}\right)^{1-2\sigma_0} dt \right) \sum_{h,k} \frac{\mu(h)\mu(k)a(h)a(k)}{hk} (h, k)^{2-2\sigma_0},$$

$$(10) \quad O(T^{1-\sigma_0+\epsilon} \min(h, k)) \sum_{h,k} \frac{\mu(h)\mu(k)a(h)a(k)}{(hk)^{\sigma_0}}.$$

We split h and k , so that $h = h_1 h_2$ and $k = k_1 k_2$ where h_1 and k_1 are composed of primes below Y , and h_2 and k_2 of primes between Y and X . We then write $a(h) = a_1(h_1)a_2(h_2)$, and similarly for k , so that (8) factors as

$$(11) \quad T\zeta(2\sigma_0) \left(\sum_{h_1, k_1} \frac{\mu(h_1)\mu(k_1)a_1(h_1)a_1(k_1)}{(h_1 k_1)^{2\sigma_0}} (h_1, k_1)^{2\sigma_0} \right) \left(\sum_{h_2, k_2} \frac{\mu(h_2)\mu(k_2)a_2(h_2)a_2(k_2)}{(h_2 k_2)^{2\sigma_0}} (h_2, k_2)^{2\sigma_0} \right).$$

Due to the multiplicativity of the factors in the sum, the first factor in (11) can be expressed as

$$\sum_{\substack{h_1, k_1 \\ p|h_1 k_1 \Rightarrow p \leq Y}} \frac{\mu(h_1)\mu(k_1)}{(h_1 k_1)^{2\sigma_0}} (h_1, k_1)^{2\sigma_0} = \prod_{p \leq Y} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^{2\sigma_0}} - \frac{1}{p^{2\sigma_0}} + \frac{1}{p^{2\sigma_0}}\right) = \prod_{p \leq Y} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^{2\sigma_0}}\right),$$

together with an error term resulting from the cases where h_1 and k_1 have more than $100 \log \log T$ prime factors. By symmetry, we can assume that h_1 has more than $100 \log \log T$ factors and see that the error term is

$$\begin{aligned} &\ll \sum_{\substack{h_1, k_1 \\ p|h_1 k_1 \Rightarrow p \leq Y \\ \Omega(h_1) > 100 \log \log T}} \frac{|\mu(h_1)\mu(k_1)|}{(h_1 k_1)^{2\sigma_0}} (h_1, k_1)^{2\sigma_0} \\ &\ll e^{-100 \log \log T} \sum_{\substack{h_1, k_1 \\ p|h_1 k_1 \Rightarrow p \leq Y}} \frac{|\mu(h_1)\mu(k_1)|}{(h_1 k_1)^{2\sigma_0}} (h_1, k_1)^{2\sigma_0} e^{\Omega(h_1)} \end{aligned}$$

using Rankin's trick. Again, due to multiplicativity, this is

$$\begin{aligned} &\ll (\log T)^{-100} \prod_{p \leq Y} \left(1 + \frac{e}{p^{2\sigma_0}} + \frac{1}{p^{2\sigma_0}} + \frac{e}{p^{2\sigma_0}}\right) = (\log T)^{-100} \prod_{p \leq Y} \left(1 + \frac{1+2e}{p^{2\sigma_0}}\right) \\ &= (\log T)^{-100} \exp \left[\sum_{p \leq Y} \left(\frac{1+2e}{p^{2\sigma_0}} \right) + O\left(\frac{1}{p^{4\sigma_0}}\right) \right] \\ &\ll (\log T)^{-100} \exp[(1+2e) \log \log Y] \ll (\log T)^{-90}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the second factor in (11) is

$$\prod_{Y < p \leq X} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^{2\sigma_0}}\right) + O((\log \log T)^{-90}).$$

By inserting these factors into (11), the first summand (8) is

$$\sim T \zeta(2\sigma_0) \prod_{p \leq X} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^{2\sigma_0}}\right) = T \prod_{p > X} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^{2\sigma_0}}\right)^{-1}.$$

We then use the prime number theorem with classical error (e.g. Theorem 6.9 of [11]), which states that the prime-counting function $\pi(X)$ can be written as

$$\pi(X) = \int_2^X \frac{1}{\log y} dy + O(xe^{-c\sqrt{\log X}}).$$

This allows us to write the product as

$$\prod_{p>X} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^{2\sigma_0}}\right)^{-1} = \exp\left(\int_X^\infty \frac{1}{\log t} \frac{1}{t^{2\sigma_0}} dt + o(1)\right),$$

where the integral can be evaluated using integration by parts to obtain

(12)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{t^{1-2\sigma_0}}{(1-2\sigma_0)\log t} \Big|_X^\infty + \int_X^\infty \frac{1}{(1-2\sigma_0)t^{2\sigma_0}(\log t)^2} dt &\ll \frac{X^{1-2\sigma_0}}{(2\sigma_0-1)\log X} + \frac{X^{1-2\sigma_0}}{(1-2\sigma_0)^2(\log X)^2} \\ &\ll \frac{X^{-W/\log T}}{\frac{W}{\log T} \log X} \\ &= \frac{\exp[-W/(K' \log \log \log T)]}{W/(K' \log \log \log T)} \\ &= \frac{\exp(-K \log \log \log T/K')}{K \log \log \log T/K'} \\ &\ll (\log \log T)^{-K/K'}. \end{aligned}$$

By similar reasoning, the second summand (9) is

$$\sim \left(\int_T^{2T} \left(\frac{t}{2\pi}\right)^{1-2\sigma_0} dt\right) \zeta(2-2\sigma_0) \prod_{p \leq X} \left(1 - \frac{2}{p} + \frac{1}{p^{2\sigma_0}}\right) = o(T),$$

and since the error term (10) is $o(T)$, the desired expectation estimate results from the contribution by the first summand (8). \square

Finishing the proof of Proposition 2, observe that by Lemma 2, both $\mathbb{E}[|\zeta(s_0)M(s_0) - 1|^2]$ and $\mathbb{E}[|\zeta(s'_0)M(s'_0) - 1|^2]$ are $\ll (\log \log T)^{-K/K'}$, and our result follows, since $K > K'$. \square

2.5. Proof of Proposition 3.

Proof. Similar to the way we proved Proposition 1 and Proposition 2, we have

$$d_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{L}} |\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{X})] - \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{Y})]| \leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{L}} \mathbb{E}[|f(\mathbf{X}) - f(\mathbf{Y})|].$$

Next set $P_1(s) = \operatorname{Re} \sum_{p \leq Y} (1/p^s)$ and $P_2(s) = \operatorname{Re} \sum_{Y \leq p \leq X} (1/p^s)$, so that $P(s) = P_1(s) + P_2(s)$. Recall the definitions of s_0, s'_0 given in equation (1). We then evaluate the expectation by splitting it into separate cases, so that the last inequality is

$$(13) \quad \ll \mathbb{E}[|\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{Y}|_1 \cdot \mathbb{1}(|P_1(r)| \leq \log \log T, |P_2(r)| \leq \log \log \log T, r \in \{s_0, s'_0\})]$$

$$(14) \quad + \sum_{r \in \{s_0, s'_0\}} [\mathbb{P}(|P_1(r)| > \log \log T) + \mathbb{P}(|P_2(r)| > \log \log \log T)],$$

where we use the Lipschitz property in the definition of \mathcal{L} for (13) and the boundedness property for (14). First, by considering (13), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{Y}\|_1 \cdot \mathbb{1}(|P_1(r)| \leq \log \log T, |P_2(r)| \leq \log \log \log T, r \in \{s_0, s'_0\})] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{X} - \mathcal{Y}| \cdot \mathbb{1}(|P_1(s_0)| \leq \log \log T, |P_2(s_0)| \leq \log \log \log T) \\ &\quad + |\mathcal{X}' - \mathcal{Y}'| \cdot \mathbb{1}(|P_1(s'_0)| \leq \log \log T, |P_2(s'_0)| \leq \log \log \log T)] \\ &= \frac{1}{\mathfrak{s}} \mathbb{E}[|\log |M^{-1}(s_0)| - \operatorname{Re} \mathcal{P}(s_0)| \cdot \mathbb{1}(|P_1(s_0)| \leq \log \log T, |P_2(s_0)| \leq \log \log \log T)] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\mathfrak{s}} \mathbb{E}[|\log |M^{-1}(s'_0)| - \operatorname{Re} \mathcal{P}(s'_0)| \cdot \mathbb{1}(|P_1(s'_0)| \leq \log \log T, |P_2(s'_0)| \leq \log \log \log T)]. \end{aligned}$$

To finish our bound on (13) we calculate the necessary expectations on the given events with the following lemma, which shows that both summands are $\ll (\log \log T)^{-80}$. Here we take a different approach than Proposition 3 of [12] in order to clearly quantify the associated error with this step of the proof of Theorem 1.

Lemma 4. *With notation as above, we have*

$$|\log |M^{-1}(s)| - \operatorname{Re} \mathcal{P}(s)| \ll (\log \log T)^{-80}$$

whenever the events $\{|\mathcal{P}_1(s)| \leq \log \log T\}$, $\{|\mathcal{P}_2(s)| \leq \log \log \log T\}$, $\{|P_1(s)| \leq \log \log T\}$, and $\{|P_2(s)| \leq \log \log \log T\}$ hold for

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}_1(s) &= \sum_{2 \leq n \leq Y} \frac{\Lambda(n)}{n^s \log n} & \mathcal{P}_2(s) &= \sum_{Y < n \leq X} \frac{\Lambda(n)}{n^s \log n} \\ P_1(s) &= \operatorname{Re} \sum_{p \leq Y} \frac{1}{p^s} & P_2(s) &= \operatorname{Re} \sum_{Y < p \leq X} \frac{1}{p^s} \end{aligned}$$

(so that $\mathcal{P}(s) = \mathcal{P}_1(s) + \mathcal{P}_2(s)$, $P(s) = P_1(s) + P_2(s)$).

Proof. Let

$$\begin{aligned} a_1(n) &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } p \mid n \Rightarrow p \leq Y, \\ & \text{and } \Omega(n) \leq 100 \log \log T \text{ for } p \leq Y, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \\ \tilde{a}_1(n) &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } p \mid n \Rightarrow p \leq Y, \\ & \text{and } \Omega(n) > 100 \log \log T \text{ for } p \leq Y, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

and set

$$M_1(s) = \sum_n \frac{\mu(n) a_1(n)}{n^s} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E}_1(s) = \sum_n \frac{\mu(n) \tilde{a}_1(n)}{n^s}.$$

Then using the Taylor series for $\log(1-x)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \exp(-\mathcal{P}_1(s)) &= \exp\left(-\sum_{k \geq 1} \sum_{p \leq Y} \frac{(p^{-s})^k}{k}\right) = \exp\left(\sum_{p \leq Y} \log(1-p^{-s})\right) \\ (15) \qquad &= \prod_{p \leq Y} (1-p^{-s}) = M_1(s) + \mathcal{E}_1(s). \end{aligned}$$

We rewrite $\mathcal{E}_1(s)$, as in Lemma 23 of [3],

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_1(s) &= \sum_n \frac{\mu(n)\tilde{a}_1(n)}{n^s} = \sum_{\ell > 100 \log \log T} (-1)^\ell \left(\sum_{p_1 < \dots < p_\ell} \frac{1}{(p_1 \cdots p_\ell)^s} \right) \\ &= \sum_{\ell > 100 \log \log T} (-1)^\ell \left(\sum_{\substack{m_1, \dots, m_k, \dots \\ m_1 + 2m_2 + \dots + km_k + (k+1)m_{k+1} + \dots = \ell}} \prod_{1 \leq j} \frac{(-P_1(js))^{m_j}}{m_j! j^{m_j}} \right) \\ &\ll \sum_{m_1, \dots, m_k, \dots} e^{(-100 \log \log T + m_1 + 2m_2 + \dots + km_k + \dots)} \prod_{1 \leq j} \frac{|P_1(js)|^{m_j}}{m_j! j^{m_j}} \\ &= e^{(-100 \log \log T)} e^{\sum_{1 \leq j} e^j |P_1(js)|/j}. \end{aligned}$$

By assumption, $|P_1(s)| \leq \log \log T$. In addition, since $|P_1(2s)| \ll \log \log T$ by Mertens's Theorem (as in Lemma 6) and $|P_1(\ell s)| \leq 10^{-\ell}$ for $\ell \geq 3$ by summability, we obtain a bound of $(\log T)^{-90}$ for $\mathcal{E}_1(s)$. We also have $|\mathcal{P}_1(s)| \leq \log \log T$ by assumption, and this gives us a lower bound of $(\log T)^{-1}$ for $M_1(s)$ via (15), since

$$(\log T)^{-1} \leq \exp(-\mathcal{P}_1(s)) = M_1(s) + \mathcal{E}_1(s).$$

Inserting these bounds into (15) and taking the log of both sides, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Re} \mathcal{P}_1(s) &= -\log |M_1(s) + \mathcal{E}_1(s)| \\ &= \log \left| M_1(s) \left(1 + \frac{\mathcal{E}_1(s)}{M_1(s)} \right) \right|^{-1} \\ &\ll \log |M_1^{-1}(s)| + (\log T)^{-80}. \end{aligned}$$

We can define M_2 similarly for $\mathcal{P}_2(s)$, so that $M(s) = M_1(s)M_2(s)$ and $\mathcal{E}_2(s) \ll (\log \log T)^{-90}$ when $|P_2(s)| \leq \log \log \log T$. We can also obtain a lower bound of $(\log \log T)^{-1}$ for $M_2(s)$, giving us

$$\operatorname{Re} \mathcal{P}_2(s) \ll \log |M_2^{-1}(s)| + (\log \log T)^{-80}.$$

Since this error is worse than our error for $\mathcal{P}_1(s)$, it becomes our error estimate for $\mathcal{P}(s)$. \square

Turning our attention to (14), we calculate the required probabilities using the moments of $P_1(s)$ and $P_2(s)$ given by the following lemma. Note that we introduce Lemma 3.4 of [1] as

Lemma 5 to calculate the moments of $P_1(s)$, instead of the process used in Proposition 2 of [12], in order to compare moments of linear combinations of $P_1(s)$ when proving Proposition 6 in equation (23).

Lemma 5. *For any non-negative integer k we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\operatorname{Re} \left(u \sum_{p \leq Y} \frac{1}{p^{s_0}} + u' \sum_{p \leq Y} \frac{1}{p^{s'_0}} \right) \right)^{2k} \right] \\ &= 2^{-k} \frac{(2k)!}{k!} [V(u, u')^k + O_k(V(u, u')^{k-2})] + O\left(\frac{Y^{4k}}{T}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where O_k indicates that the implied constant depends on k and

$$V(u, u') = \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{p \leq Y} \frac{1}{p^{2\sigma_0}} (u^2 + (u')^2 + 2uu' \cos(|h - h'| \log p)) \right).$$

In particular, the expression is

$$\ll 2^{-k} \frac{(2k)!}{k!} \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{p \leq Y} \frac{1}{p} (u^2 + (u')^2 + 2uu' \cos(|h - h'| \log p)) \right)^k + O\left(\frac{Y^{4k}}{T}\right).$$

If k is odd, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\operatorname{Re} \left(u \sum_{p \leq Y} \frac{1}{p^{s_0}} + u' \sum_{p \leq Y} \frac{1}{p^{s'_0}} \right) \right)^k \right] = O\left(\frac{Y^{2k}}{T}\right).$$

Proof. Fix first an integer k . Rearranging terms gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\operatorname{Re} \left(u \sum_{p \leq Y} \frac{1}{p^{\sigma_0 + i(\tau+h)}} + u' \sum_{p \leq Y} \frac{1}{p^{\sigma_0 + i(\tau+h')}} \right) \right)^k \right] \\ (16) \quad &= \frac{1}{T} \int_T^{2T} 2^{-k} \left[\sum_{p \leq Y} \left(\frac{up^{-ih} + u'p^{-ih'}}{p^{\sigma_0}} p^{-it} + \frac{up^{ih} + u'p^{ih'}}{p^{\sigma_0}} p^{it} \right) \right]^k dt. \end{aligned}$$

Set

$$a(p) = \frac{up^{-ih} + u'p^{-ih'}}{p^{\sigma_0}}, \quad b(p) = \frac{up^{ih} + u'p^{ih'}}{p^{\sigma_0}}$$

and

$$a(n) = \prod_j a(p_j)^{\alpha_j}, \quad b(n) = \prod_j b(p_j)^{\alpha_j}, \quad g(p^\alpha) = \frac{1}{\alpha!}$$

where $n = p_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots p_r^{\alpha_r}$. Then, (16) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{T} \int_T^{2T} 2^{-k} \left(\sum_{p \leq Y} (a(p)p^{-it} + b(p)p^{it}) \right)^k dt \\ &= \frac{1}{T} \int_T^{2T} 2^{-k} \sum_{\ell=0}^k \binom{k}{\ell} \left(\ell! \sum_{\Omega(m)=\ell} a(m)g(m)m^{-it} \right) \left((k-\ell)! \sum_{\Omega(n)=k-\ell} b(n)g(n)n^{-it} \right) dt. \end{aligned}$$

If k is odd then this is

$$\begin{aligned} O_{u,u'} \left(\frac{Y^k \log(Y^k)}{T} 2^{-k} \sum_{\ell=0}^k \binom{k}{\ell} (\pi(Y)^\ell + \pi(Y)^{k-\ell}) \right) &= O_{u,u'} \left(\frac{Y^k \log(Y^k)}{T} 2^{-k} \left(\frac{Y}{\log Y} \right)^k \right) \\ &= O_{u,u'} \left(\frac{Y^{2k}}{T} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where $\pi(Y) \sim Y/\log Y$ denotes the number of primes below Y .

Next by replacing k with $2k$ in (16) to compute the even moments, we get

$$(17) \quad 2^{-2k} (2k)! \sum_{\Omega(n)=k} a(n)b(n)g(n)^2 + O\left(\frac{Y^{4k}}{T}\right).$$

We then split the sum into cases where n is square-free and is not square-free so that

$$k! \sum_{\Omega(n)=k} a(n)b(n)g(n)^2 = k! \sum_{\substack{\Omega(n)=k \\ n \text{ is square free}}} a(n)b(n) + k! \sum_{\substack{\Omega(n)=k \\ n \text{ is not square free}}} a(n)b(n)g(n)^2.$$

When n is square-free, we have

$$\begin{aligned} k! \sum_{\substack{\Omega(n)=k \\ n \text{ is square free}}} a(n)b(n) &= k! \sum_{p_1 < \cdots < p_k} a(p_1 \cdots p_k)b(p_1 \cdots p_k) \\ &= \sum_{p_1, \dots, p_k} a(p_1 \cdots p_k)b(p_1 \cdots p_k) \\ &= \left(\sum_{p \leq Y} a(p)b(p) \right)^k. \end{aligned}$$

When n is not square-free, the worst possibility is when n has a single prime factor with power $\alpha_k > 1$, in which case we have

$$\begin{aligned}
k! \sum_{\substack{\Omega(n)=k \\ n \text{ is not square free}}} a(n)b(n)g(n)^2 &= \frac{1}{(\alpha_k)^2} \sum_{\Omega(n)=k} a(n)b(n) \frac{k!}{\alpha_1! \cdots \alpha_{k-2}!} \\
&= O_k \left(\sum_{p_1, \dots, p_{k-2}} a(p_1 \cdots p_{k-2}) b(p_1 \cdots p_{k-2}) \right) \\
&= O_k \left(\sum_{p \leq Y} a(p)b(p) \right)^{k-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus (17) is equal to

$$(18) \quad 2^{-2k} \frac{(2k)!}{k!} \left[\left(\sum_{p \leq Y} a(p)b(p) \right)^k + O_k \left(\sum_{p \leq Y} a(p)b(p) \right)^{k-2} \right] + O \left(\frac{Y^{4k}}{T} \right).$$

Then, since

$$\begin{aligned}
a(p)b(p) &= \frac{1}{p^{2\sigma_0}} (up^{-ih} + u'p^{-ih'}) (up^{ih} + u'p^{ih'}) \\
&= \frac{1}{p^{2\sigma_0}} (u^2 + (u')^2 + 2uu' \operatorname{Re} p^{i(h'-h)}),
\end{aligned}$$

equation (18) becomes

$$2^{-k} \frac{(2k)!}{k!} [V(u, u')^k + O_k(V(u, u')^{k-2})] + O \left(\frac{Y^{4k}}{T} \right),$$

which is

$$\begin{aligned}
&\ll 2^{-k} \frac{(2k)!}{k!} [V(u, u')^k] + O \left(\frac{Y^{4k}}{T} \right) \\
(19) \quad &= 2^{-k} \frac{(2k)!}{k!} \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{p \leq Y} \frac{1}{p} (u^2 + (u')^2 + 2uu' \cos(|h - h'| \log p)) \right)^k + O \left(\frac{Y^{4k}}{T} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Without the error terms, Lemma 5 suggests that the moment-generating function for $(P_1(s_0), P_1(s'_0))$ matches that of a Gaussian vector with mean 0 and covariance

$$C = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{p \leq Y} \frac{1}{p} & \sum_{p \leq Y} \frac{\cos(|h - h'| \log p)}{p} \\ \sum_{p \leq Y} \frac{\cos(|h - h'| \log p)}{p} & \sum_{p \leq Y} \frac{1}{p} \end{bmatrix}.$$

The sums in this covariance matrix can be evaluated and normalized to achieve the entries given in Theorem 1, as is done in the following lemma.

Lemma 6. *We have*

$$\sum_{p \leq Y} \frac{1}{p} \sim \log \log T,$$

and when $|h - h'| \sim (\log T)^{-\alpha}$ for $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ we have

$$\sum_{p \leq Y} \frac{\cos(|h - h'| \log p)}{p} \sim \alpha \log \log T.$$

Proof. Since $\log \log Y \sim \log \log T$, we evaluate the first sum using Mertens's theorem (e.g. see [9] (2.15)), which states that

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{p} = \log \log x + O(1).$$

To evaluate the second sum, we use the prime number theorem together with summation by parts to get

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{p \leq Y} \frac{\cos(|h - h'| \log p)}{p} \\ &= \int_2^Y \frac{\cos(|h - h'| \log t)}{t \log t} dt + O \left(e^{-c\sqrt{\log 2}} + \int_2^Y \frac{\cos(|h - h'| \log t) + |h - h'| \sin(|h - h'| \log t)}{t} e^{-c\sqrt{\log t}} dt \right). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the change of variable $w = |h - h'| \log t$ gives

$$\int_2^Y \frac{|h - h'| \sin(|h - h'| \log t)}{t} e^{-c\sqrt{\log t}} dt = \int_{|h - h'| \log 2}^{|h - h'| \log Y} \sin w e^{-c\sqrt{w/|h - h'|}} dw \ll e^{-c\sqrt{\log 2}},$$

and the integral with cosine in the error term is evaluated similarly. To evaluate the last remaining integral we split it into cases where the argument of cosine is smaller than 1 and where it is greater than or equal to 1, obtaining

$$\int_2^Y \frac{\cos(|h - h'| \log t)}{t \log t} dt = \int_2^{e^{|h - h'|^{-1}}} \frac{\cos(|h - h'| \log t)}{t \log t} dt + \int_{e^{|h - h'|^{-1}}}^Y \frac{\cos(|h - h'| \log t)}{t \log t} dt.$$

For the first integral, we apply the estimate $\cos(|h - h'|v) = 1 + O(|h - h'|^2 v^2)$ for $v = \log t$ on the range $\log 2 \leq v \leq |h - h'|^{-1}$ to get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_2^{e^{|h-h'|^{-1}}} \frac{\cos(|h-h'|\log t)}{t \log t} dt &= \int_{\log 2}^{|h-h'|^{-1}} \frac{\cos(|h-h'|v)}{v} dv \\ &= \int_{\log 2}^{|h-h'|^{-1}} \frac{1}{v} dv + O\left(|h-h'|^2 \int_{\log 2}^{|h-h'|^{-1}} v dv\right) \\ &= \log |h-h'|^{-1} - \log \log 2 + O(1). \end{aligned}$$

For the second integral, we integrate by parts, obtaining

$$\int_{|h-h'|^{-1}}^{\log Y} \frac{\cos(|h-h'|v)}{v} dv = \frac{\sin(|h-h'|v)}{|h-h'|v} \Big|_{|h-h'|^{-1}}^{\log Y} + \int_{|h-h'|^{-1}}^{\log Y} \frac{\sin(|h-h'|v)}{|h-h'|v^2} dv = O(1),$$

since both terms are $O(1)$. Therefore

$$\sum_{p \leq Y} \frac{\cos(|h-h'|\log p)}{p} \sim \log |h-h'|^{-1} \sim \alpha \log \log T.$$

□

We now use Lemma 5 to bound the probabilities of large values of $|P_1(s)|$ and $|P_2(s)|$ in Lemma 7 and finish the proof.

Lemma 7. *With notation as above, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(|P_1(s)| > \log \log T) &\ll \frac{1}{\log T} \\ \mathbb{P}(|P_2(s)| > \log \log \log T) &\ll \frac{1}{\log \log T}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By the upper bound (19), in particular for $u = 1, u' = 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[|P_1(s)|^{2k}] \ll \frac{(2k)!}{k!2^k} \left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \log \log T} \right)^{2k}$$

when k is small enough to handle the error term of $O(Y^{4k}/T)$. Therefore, we can set $k = \lfloor \log \log T \rfloor$ due to our choice of Y . The way we obtained the moments of $(P_1(s_0), P_1(s'_0))$ in Lemma 5 can also be used to show that

$$(20) \quad \mathbb{E}[|P_2(s)|^{2k}] \ll \frac{(2k)!}{k!2^k} \left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \log \log \log T} \right)^{2k} + O\left(\frac{X^{4k}}{T}\right).$$

We then use Markov's inequality to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(|P_1(s)| > \log \log T) &\leq \frac{1}{(\log \log T)^{2k}} \mathbb{E}[|P_1(s)|^{2k}] \\
&\ll \frac{1}{(\log \log T)^{2k}} \left[\frac{(2k)!}{k!2^k} \left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \log \log T} \right)^{2k} \right] \\
&\ll \frac{1}{(\log \log T)^{2k}} \left[\frac{(2k)^{2k} \exp(-2k)}{k^k 2^k \exp(-k)} \left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \log \log T} \right)^{2k} \right] \\
&= \exp \left[-k \log \frac{(\log \log T)^2}{\log \log T} + k \log k - k \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Evaluating at $k = \lfloor \log \log T \rfloor$, the last line becomes $\exp(-\log \log T) = 1/\log T$, and the result follows for $P_1(s)$. The proof for $P_2(s)$ is similar. \square

By Lemma 7, (14) is $\ll 1/\log \log T$, and thus the significant contribution towards the error in Proposition 3 comes from (13). \square

2.6. Proof of Proposition 4.

Proof. Similar to the way we proved Propositions 1 to 3, by taking advantage of the Lipschitz nature of the Dudley distance, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&d_{\mathcal{D}} \left[\mathbf{Y}, \left(\frac{P(s_0)}{\mathfrak{s}}, \frac{P(s'_0)}{\mathfrak{s}} \right) \right] \\
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \mathbf{Y} - \left(\frac{P(s_0)}{\mathfrak{s}}, \frac{P(s'_0)}{\mathfrak{s}} \right) \right\|_1 \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \mathcal{Y} - \frac{P(s_0)}{\mathfrak{s}} \right| + \left| \mathcal{Y}' - \frac{P(s'_0)}{\mathfrak{s}} \right| \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \mathcal{Y} - \frac{P(s_0)}{\mathfrak{s}} \right| \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \mathcal{Y}' - \frac{P(s'_0)}{\mathfrak{s}} \right| \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Computing the difference, we get, for $s = s_0$ or $s = s'_0$,

$$(21) \quad \frac{1}{\mathfrak{s}} |\operatorname{Re} \mathcal{P}(s) - P(s)| \leq \frac{1}{\mathfrak{s}} \left| \sum_{2 \leq p^2 \leq X} \frac{1}{2p^{2s}} \right| + \frac{1}{\mathfrak{s}} \left| \sum_{\substack{2 \leq p^k \leq X, \\ k \geq 3}} \frac{\log p}{p^{ks}(k \log p)} \right|.$$

Then since

$$\left| \sum_{\substack{2 \leq p^k \leq X, \\ k \geq 3}} \frac{\log p}{p^{ks}(k \log p)} \right| \leq \sum_{\substack{2 \leq p^k \leq X, \\ k \geq 3}} \frac{1}{3p^{k\sigma_0}} = O(1)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sum_{2 \leq p^2 \leq X} \frac{1}{2p^{2(\sigma_0+i\tau)}} \right| \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sum_{2 \leq p^2 \leq X} \frac{1}{2p^{2(\sigma_0+i\tau)}} \right|^2 \right]^{1/2} \\ &= \frac{1}{T} \int_T^{2T} \left| \sum_{2 \leq p^2 \leq X} \frac{1}{2p^{2(\sigma_0+it)}} \right|^2 dt \\ &= \frac{1}{T} \cdot \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\substack{p_1, p_2 \leq \sqrt{X} \\ p_1 \neq p_2}} \int_T^{2T} \frac{1}{p_1^{2(\sigma_0+it)} p_2^{2(\sigma_0-it)}} dt \\ &\ll \sum_{p \leq \sqrt{X}} \frac{1}{p^{4\sigma_0}} + \sum_{\substack{p_1, p_2 \leq \sqrt{X} \\ p_1 \neq p_2}} \frac{1}{p_1^{2\sigma_0} p_2^{2\sigma_0}} \sqrt{p_1 p_2} = O(1), \end{aligned}$$

we see that (21) is $\ll 1/s$. □

2.7. Proof of Proposition 5.

Proof. We have

$$d_{\mathcal{D}} \left[\left(\frac{P(s_0)}{s}, \frac{P(s'_0)}{s} \right), \left(\frac{P_1(s_0)}{s}, \frac{P_1(s'_0)}{s} \right) \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{P_2(s_0)}{s} \right)^2 + \left(\frac{P_2(s'_0)}{s} \right)^2 \right]^{1/2}.$$

By the upper bound (20) for the moments of $P_2(s)$, the expectation above is less than or equal to $\frac{1}{s}(\sqrt{\log \log \log T} + O(1))$. □

2.8. Proof of Proposition 6.

Proof. We obtain the error in approximating $(P_1(s_0), P_1(s'_0))$ with a Gaussian vector by comparing their Fourier transforms using Lemma 3.11 of [1], which we introduce as Lemma 8,

Lemma 8. *Let μ and ν be two probability measures on \mathbb{R}^2 with Fourier transform $\hat{\mu}$ and $\hat{\nu}$. There exists constant $c > 0$ such that for any function $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with Lipschitz constant 1 and for any $R, F > 0$,*

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} f d\mu - \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} f d\nu \right| \leq \frac{1}{F} + \|f\|_{\infty} \left\{ (RF)^2 \|(\hat{\mu} - \hat{\nu}) \mathbb{1}_{(-F, F)^2}\|_{\infty} + \mu(((-R, R)^2)^c) + \nu(((-R, R)^2)^c) \right\}.$$

To use Lemma 8, we first truncate the Fourier transform of $(P_1(s_0), P_1(s'_0))$ for $\xi, \xi' \in \mathbb{R}$ by writing

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\frac{i\xi P_1(s_0) + i\xi' P_1(s'_0)}{\mathfrak{s}} \right) \cdot \mathbb{1}(|P_1(r)| \leq \log \log T, r \in \{s_0, s'_0\}) \right] \\ &= \sum_{n \leq N} \frac{1}{n!} i^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\xi P_1(s_0) + \xi' P_1(s'_0)}{\mathfrak{s}} \right)^n \cdot \mathbb{1}(|P_1(r)| \leq \log \log T, r \in \{s_0, s'_0\}) \right] \\ &+ \sum_{n > N} \frac{1}{n!} i^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\xi P_1(s_0) + \xi' P_1(s'_0)}{\mathfrak{s}} \right)^n \cdot \mathbb{1}(|P_1(r)| \leq \log \log T, r \in \{s_0, s'_0\}) \right] \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n > N} \frac{1}{n!} i^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\xi P_1(s_0) + \xi' P_1(s'_0)}{\mathfrak{s}} \right)^n \cdot \mathbb{1}(|P_1(r)| \leq \log \log T, r \in \{s_0, s'_0\}) \right] \\ & \ll \sum_{n > N} \frac{1}{n!} |\xi + \xi'|^n \frac{(\log \log T)^n}{\mathfrak{s}^n}. \end{aligned}$$

To estimate the last line, observe that

$$\left| e^z - \sum_{j=0}^n \frac{z^j}{j!} \right| \leq \sum_{j=n+1}^{\infty} \frac{|z|^j}{j!} \leq \frac{|z|^n}{n!} \leq \frac{|z|^n}{\left(\frac{n}{e}\right)^n}$$

by Stirling's formula, and is furthermore less than or equal to e^{-n} for $n \geq 10(|z| + 1)$. We can therefore take $z = \xi(\log \log T)^{1/2}$ where $|\xi| \leq C\sqrt{\log \log T}$ (and similarly for ξ'), $N \geq C \log \log T$ for some constant C to get

$$(22) \quad \sum_{n > N} \frac{1}{n!} |\xi + \xi'|^n \frac{(\log \log T)^n}{\mathfrak{s}^n} \ll \sum_{n > N} \frac{1}{n!} \left(C\sqrt{\log \log T} \right)^n (2 \log \log T)^{n/2} \\ \ll e^{-\sqrt{2}C \log \log T}.$$

By redefining the constant C , this is $(\log T)^{-C}$. We will finish the proof by introducing a lemma that shows that the difference in expectations between the Fourier transforms of the prime sums and that of a Gaussian vector is small.

Lemma 9.

$$\left| \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\frac{i\xi P_1(s_0) + i\xi' P_1(s'_0)}{\mathfrak{s}} \right) \right] - \mathbb{E}[\exp(i\xi \mathcal{Z} + i\xi' \mathcal{Z}')] \right| \ll \frac{1}{(\log \log T)^2}.$$

Proof. In order to compare moments, we will truncate at N , which we do by splitting

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\frac{i\xi P_1(s_0) + i\xi' P_1(s'_0)}{\mathfrak{s}} \right) \right] - \mathbb{E}[\exp(i\xi \mathcal{Z} + i\xi' \mathcal{Z}')] \right| \\
&= \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\frac{i\xi P_1(s_0) + i\xi' P_1(s'_0)}{\mathfrak{s}} \right) \cdot \mathbb{1}(|P_1(r)| \leq \log \log T, r \in \{s_0, s'_0\}) \right] - \mathbb{E}[\exp(i\xi \mathcal{Z} + i\xi' \mathcal{Z}')] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\frac{i\xi P_1(s_0) + i\xi' P_1(s'_0)}{\mathfrak{s}} \right) \cdot \mathbb{1}(|P_1(s_0)| > \log \log T \text{ or } |P_1(s'_0)| > \log \log T) \right] \right| \\
&\ll \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\frac{i\xi P_1(s_0) + i\xi' P_1(s'_0)}{\mathfrak{s}} \right) \cdot \mathbb{1}(|P_1(r)| \leq \log \log T, r \in \{s_0, s'_0\}) \right] - \mathbb{E}[\exp(i\xi \mathcal{Z} + i\xi' \mathcal{Z}')] \right| \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{\log T},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\frac{i\xi P_1(s_0) + i\xi' P_1(s'_0)}{\mathfrak{s}} \right) \cdot \mathbb{1}(|P_1(s_0)| > \log \log T \text{ or } |P_1(s'_0)| > \log \log T) \right] \\
&\ll \mathbb{P}(|P_1(s_0)| > \log \log T \text{ or } |P_1(s'_0)| > \log \log T) \\
&\ll \frac{1}{\log T}.
\end{aligned}$$

We then compute a truncation estimate for $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z}')$ similar to the way we did in (22) for $(P_1(s_0), P_1(s'_0))$ by writing

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{n>N} \frac{1}{n!} i^n \mathbb{E}[(\xi \mathcal{Z} + \xi' \mathcal{Z}')^n] &\ll \sum_{n>N} \frac{1}{n!} |\xi + \xi'|^n \frac{n!}{2^{n/2} (n/2)!} \left(\frac{1}{2} \log \log T\right)^{n/2} \\
&\ll \sum_{n>N} \frac{1}{(n/2)!} \left(C \sqrt{\log \log T}\right)^n \left(\frac{1}{2} \log \log T\right)^{n/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Again, we estimate this sum by taking $N \geq C \log \log T$, so that N is large enough that we can apply Stirling's formula to get $(\log T)^{-C'}$ for some constant C' . Thus, we see that the difference in moments is of order

$$\begin{aligned}
&\ll \left| \sum_{n \leq N} \frac{1}{n!} i^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\xi P_1(s_0) + \xi' P_1(s'_0)}{\mathfrak{s}} \right)^n \cdot \mathbb{1}(|P_1(r)| \leq \log \log T, r \in \{s_0, s'_0\}) \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \sum_{n \leq N} \frac{1}{n!} i^n \mathbb{E}[(\xi \mathcal{Z} + \xi' \mathcal{Z}')^n] \right| + (\log T)^{-D},
\end{aligned}$$

where $D = \min\{C, C'\}$. In order to compare moments without the event $\{|P_1(r)| \leq \log \log T, r \in \{s_0, s'_0\}\}$, we reinsert the event $\{|P_1(s_0)| > \log \log T \text{ or } |P_1(s'_0)| > \log \log T\}$

by adding and subtracting to obtain

$$(23) \quad \left| \sum_{n \leq N} \frac{1}{n!} i^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\xi P_1(s_0) + \xi' P_1(s'_0)}{\mathfrak{s}} \right)^n \right] - \sum_{n \leq N} \frac{1}{n!} i^n \mathbb{E}[(\xi \mathcal{Z} + \xi' \mathcal{Z}')^n] \right. \\ \left. - \sum_{n \leq N} \frac{1}{n!} i^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\xi P_1(s) + \xi' P_1(s')}{\mathfrak{s}} \right)^n \cdot \mathbb{1}(|P_1(s_0)| > \log \log T \text{ or } |P_1(s'_0)| > \log \log T) \right] \right| + (\log T)^{-D}$$

where

$$\sum_{n \leq N} \frac{1}{n!} i^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\xi P_1(s_0) + \xi' P_1(s'_0)}{\mathfrak{s}} \right)^n \cdot \mathbb{1}(|P_1(s_0)| > \log \log T \text{ or } |P_1(s'_0)| > \log \log T) \right] \\ \leq \sum_{n \leq N} \frac{1}{n!} i^n \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\xi P_1(s_0) + \xi' P_1(s'_0)}{\mathfrak{s}} \right)^{2n} \right]^{1/2} \cdot \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{1}(|P_1(s_0)| > \log \log T \text{ or } |P_1(s'_0)| > \log \log T)]^{1/2} \\ \ll \sum_{n \leq N} \frac{1}{n!} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\xi P_1(s_0) + \xi' P_1(s'_0)}{\mathfrak{s}} \right)^{2n} \right]^{1/2} \cdot \frac{1}{\log T} \ll \frac{1}{\log T}$$

by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. We finish by applying the moment estimate in equation (19), so that (23) is of order

$$\frac{V(u, u')^{N/2-2}}{\mathfrak{s}^N} + \frac{Y^{2N}}{T} + \frac{1}{\log T} + (\log T)^{-D} \\ \ll \frac{1}{(\log \log T)^2}.$$

□

Now, using Lemma 8 and Lemma 9, we have

$$d_{\mathcal{D}} \left[\left(\frac{|P_1(s_0)|}{\mathfrak{s}}, \frac{|P_1(s'_0)|}{\mathfrak{s}} \right), (\mathcal{Z}, \mathcal{Z}') \right] \\ \leq \frac{1}{F} + \left\{ (RF) \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(\frac{i\xi P_1(s_0) + i\xi' P_1(s'_0)}{\mathfrak{s}} \right) \right] - \mathbb{E}[\exp(i\xi \mathcal{Z} + i\xi' \mathcal{Z}')] \right| \right. \\ \left. + \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \frac{P_1(s_0)}{\mathfrak{s}} \right| > R \text{ or } \left| \frac{P_1(s'_0)}{\mathfrak{s}} \right| > R \right) + \mathbb{P}(|\mathcal{Z}| > R \text{ or } |\mathcal{Z}'| > R) \right\}$$

for any $R, F > 0$. Thus, by taking $R = \sqrt{\log \log T}$ and $F = C\sqrt{\log \log T}$, this becomes

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{\log \log T}} + \left[C \log \log T \left(\frac{1}{(\log \log T)^2} \right) + \frac{1}{\log T} + \frac{1}{(\log T)^D} \right] \ll \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log \log T}}.$$

□

3. REFERENCES

- [1] L.-P. Arguin, D. Belius, P. Bourgade, M. Radziwiłł, and K. Soundararajan. *Maximum of the Riemann zeta function on a short interval of the critical line*. Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 72(3), 500-535 (2019).
- [2] L.-P. Arguin, D. Belius, A. Harper. *Maxima of a randomized Riemann zeta function, and branching random walks*. Ann. Appl. Probab. 27(1), 178-215 (2017).
- [3] L.-P. Arguin, P. Bourgade, and M. Radziwiłł. *The Fyodorov-Hiary-Keating Conjecture. I.* (2020). Preprint arXiv:2007.00988.
- [4] P. Bourgade. *Mesoscopic fluctuations of the zeta zeros*. Probability Theory and Related Fields. 148, 479-500 (2010).
- [5] P. Bourgade, C. P. Hughes, A. Nikeghbali, and M. Yor. *The characteristic polynomial of a random unitary matrix: A probabilistic approach*. Duke Math. J. 145(1), 45-69 (2008).
- [6] R.E. Gaunt and S. Li. *Bounding Kolmogorov distances through Wasserstein and related integral probability metrics*. (2022). Preprint arXiv:2201.12087.
- [7] P. Hsu and P. Wong. *On Selberg's central limit theorem for Dirichlet L-functions*. Journal de Théorie des Nombres de Bordeaux. 32, 685-710 (2020).
- [8] A. Ivić. *The Riemann Zeta Function*. Wiley. (1985).
- [9] H. Iwaniec and E. Kowalski. *Analytic Number Theory*. Colloquium Publ. 53. A.M.S. (2004).
- [10] E. Kowalski and A. Nikeghbali. *Mod-Gaussian convergence and the value distribution of $\zeta(1/2 + it)$ and related quantities*. J. London Math. Soc. 86(1), 291-319 (2012).
- [11] H. Montgomery and R. Vaughan. *Multiplicative Number Theory I: Classical Theory (Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. (2006).
- [12] M. Radziwiłł and K. Soundararajan. *Selberg's central limit theorem for $\log |\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it)|$* . Enseign. Math. 63(1-2), 1-19 (2017).
- [13] A. Selberg. *Contributions to the theory of the Riemann zeta-function*. Arch. Math. Naturvid. 48(5), 89-155 (1946).
- [14] A. Selberg. *Old and new conjectures and results about a class of Dirichlet series*. Proceedings of the Amalfi Conference on Analytic Number Theory (Maiori, 1989). Univ. Salerno, Salerno. 367-385 (1992).
- [15] K. Tsang. *The distribution of the values of the Riemann zeta-function*. Thesis Princeton University (1984).
- [16] M. Wahl. *On the mod-Gaussian convergence of a sum over primes*. Mathematische Zeitschrift. 276(3), 635-654 (2014).