

A Central Limit Theorem for the Zeroes of the Zeta Function

Brad Rodgers

ABSTRACT. On the assumption of the Riemann hypothesis, we generalize a central limit theorem of Fujii regarding the number of zeroes of Riemann's Zeta function that lie in a mesoscopic interval. The result mirrors results of Soshnikov and others in random matrix theory. In an appendix we put forward some general theorems regarding our knowledge of the Zeta zeroes in the mesoscopic regime.

1. Introduction

This is an account of a mesoscopic central limit theorem for the number of zeroes of the Riemann Zeta function as counted by a (possibly) smoothed counting function. We assume the Riemann hypothesis (RH) throughout the note, although we discuss meaningful ways around this assumption in the conclusion. On RH, the zeroes of the Riemann Zeta function may be labeled $\frac{1}{2} + i\gamma$, where γ is real. As is customary, we sometimes refer the γ 's themselves as zeroes, at least where there is no confusion caused. Our concern is the statistical distribution of γ near some large (random) height T .

Notation: We will follow the conventions that $e(x) = e^{i2\pi x}$, $\hat{f}(\xi) = \int e(-x \cdot \xi) f(x) dx$, $\check{g}(x) = \int e(x \cdot \xi) g(\xi) d\xi$. In addition we use the notations $|f(x)| \lesssim g(x)$ and $f(x) = O(g(x))$ interchangeably.

If $N(T)$ is the number of nontrivial zeroes in the upper half plane with height no more than T , then the number of zeroes $N(t+h) - N(t)$ to occur in an interval $[t, t+h]$ is expected to be roughly $h \frac{\log t}{2\pi}$ [30]. It was first shown by Fujii [9] that the oscillation of this quantity is Gaussian, with a variance depending upon the number of zeroes expected to lie in the interval.

THEOREM 1 (Fujii's mesoscopic central limit theorem). *Let $n(T)$ be a fixed function tending to infinity as $T \rightarrow \infty$ in such a way that $n(T) = o(\log T)$, and let X_T be a probability space with random variable t uniformly distributed on the interval $[T, 2T]$. Then, letting $\Delta = \Delta(t, T) := N(t + \frac{2\pi n(T)}{\log T}) - N(t)$,*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{X_T} \Delta &= n(T) + o(1), \\ \text{Var}_{X_T}(\Delta) &\sim \frac{1}{\pi^2} \log n(T),\end{aligned}$$

and in distribution

$$\frac{\Delta - \mathbb{E}\Delta}{\sqrt{\text{Var}\Delta}} \Rightarrow N(0, 1)$$

as $T \rightarrow \infty$.

The main purpose of this note is to generalize Fujii's theorem in the following way:

Research supported in part by an NSF RTG Grant.

THEOREM 2 (A general mesoscopic central limit theorem). *Let $n(T)$ and X_T be as in Theorem 1. For a fixed real valued function η with compact support and bounded variation, define*

$$\Delta_\eta = \Delta_\eta(t, T) = \sum_{\gamma} \eta\left(\frac{\log T}{2\pi n(T)}(\gamma - t)\right),$$

where the sum is over all zeros γ , counted with multiplicity. In the case that $\int |x| |\hat{\eta}(x)|^2 dx$ diverges, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{X_T} \Delta_\eta &= n(T) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \eta(\xi) d\xi + o(1), \\ \text{Var}_{X_T}(\Delta_\eta) &\sim \int_{-n(T)}^{n(T)} |x| |\hat{\eta}(x)|^2 dx \end{aligned}$$

and in distribution

$$\frac{\Delta_\eta - \mathbb{E} \Delta_\eta}{\sqrt{\text{Var} \Delta_\eta}} \Rightarrow N(0, 1)$$

as $T \rightarrow \infty$.

It is a straightforward computation to see that Theorem 1 follows from Theorem 2 by letting $\eta = \mathbf{1}_{[-1/2, 1/2]}$.

We focus mainly on the proof of Theorem 2 in this note, but one can also prove, in essentially the same way, a mesoscopic central limit theorem for variances which converge:

THEOREM 3. *For $n(T)$ and X_T as in Theorem 2, but η with compact support and bounded second derivative, the integral $\int |x| |\hat{\eta}(x)|^2 dx$ is necessarily finite, but the conclusion of Theorem 2 remains true even still.*

We call Theorems 1, 2, and 3 ‘mesoscopic’ central limit theorems as they concern collections of $n(T)$ zeroes which grow to infinity, but intervals whose length $\frac{2\pi n(T)}{\log T}$ tends to 0 all the same.

On such mesoscopic intervals (averaged as in Theorems 1 and 2), all evidence points to the zeroes resembling points in a determinantal point process with sine kernel. In the microscopic regime (when $n(T) = O(1)$) this is known to be the case, provided we restrict our attention to sufficiently smooth test functions. (See Rudnick and Sarnak [23] or Hughes and Rudnick [14].) The techniques that follow allow us to recover these results for smooth test functions, as well as extend them to a mesoscopic regime, in a sense to be specified. We discuss these matters further in the appendix.

For the moment, we may simply note the similarity of Theorems 1 and 2 to certain results in the theories of random matrices and determinantal point processes (for an introduction to the latter, see [12] or the introduction of [27]):

THEOREM 4 (Costin and Lebowitz). *Let X be a determinantal point process on $\mathbb{R}$ with sine kernel $K(x, y) = \frac{\sin \pi(x-y)}{\pi(x-y)}$, and Δ a count of the number of points lying in the interval $[0, L]$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_X \Delta &= L, \\ \text{Var}_X(\Delta) &\sim \frac{1}{\pi^2} \log L \end{aligned}$$

and in distribution

$$\frac{\Delta - \mathbb{E} \Delta}{\sqrt{\text{Var} \Delta}} \Rightarrow N(0, 1)$$

as $L \rightarrow \infty$.

In fact much more generally [27],

THEOREM 5 (Soshnikov). *For a family of determinantal point processes parameterized by a variable L , with Hermitian correlation kernels, if f_L are bounded measurable functions with precompact support, define*

$$\Delta_f = \sum f(x_i)$$

where $((x_i))$ are the points of the point process. As long as $\text{Var}_L \Delta_{f_L} \rightarrow \infty$, and

$$\sup |f_L(x)| = O(\text{Var} \Delta_{f_L})^\epsilon, \quad \mathbb{E}_L \Delta_{|f|_L} = O((\text{Var} \Delta_{f_L})^\delta)$$

for all $\epsilon > 0$, and some $\delta > 0$, then in distribution,

$$\frac{\Delta_{f_L} - \mathbb{E} \Delta_{f_L}}{\sqrt{\text{Var} s_{f_L}}} \Rightarrow N(0, 1),$$

as $L \rightarrow \infty$.

A computation reveals that Soshnikov's theorem agrees with Theorem 2 for $f_L(x) = f(x/L)$ for a sine kernel determinantal point process. In the case that the variance converges (or in the language of Theorem 2, $|x||\hat{\eta}(x)|^2$ is integrable), the analogous result was heuristically derived by Spohn [29], and proved rigorously by Soshnikov in [28].

Although we obtain a partial analogue of this result in Theorem 3, we do not recover the full analogue. We should expect that Theorem 2 is true even in the case that $\int |x||\hat{\eta}(x)|^2 dx$ converges with no more restrictions on η than a bound on variation – this would encompass Theorem 3 – but in the latter theorem we require not only that this integral converge, but that it converge somewhat rapidly. Bounding an error term prevents us from accessing the results in between the two theorems, even though by analogy we should fully expect them to be true.

Other similar results for the eigenvalues of unitary matrices were proved by Diaconis and Evans in [6], using a perspective perhaps most akin to ours here.

In fact, Fujii proved a more general result than Theorem 1, encompassing macroscopic intervals as well. In order to state Fujii's result succinctly, we recall the definition

$$S(t) := \arg \zeta\left(\frac{1}{2} + it\right),$$

where argument is defined by a continuous rectangular path from 2 to $2 + it$ to $\frac{1}{2} + it$, beginning with $\arg 2 = 0$, and by upper semicontinuity in case this path passes through a zero. $S(t)$, as it ends up, is small and oscillatory, and our interest in it derives from the fact that it appears as an error term in the zero counting function:

$$(1) \quad N(T) = \frac{1}{\pi} \arg \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{4} + i\frac{T}{2}\right) - \frac{T}{2\pi} \log \pi + 1 + S(T).$$

THEOREM 6 (Fujii's macroscopic central limit theorem). *Let X_T be as in Theorem 1, and $n(T)$ with $\log T \lesssim n(T) \lesssim T$. Define $\tilde{\Delta} = S(t + \frac{2\pi n(T)}{\log T}) - S(t)$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}_{X_T} \tilde{\Delta} = o(1),$$

$$\text{Var}_{X_T}(\tilde{\Delta}) \sim \frac{1}{\pi^2} \log \log T,$$

and in distribution

$$\frac{\tilde{\Delta}}{\sqrt{\text{Var} \tilde{\Delta}}} \Rightarrow N(0, 1)$$

as $T \rightarrow \infty$.

Note that in this case, if Δ is defined as before with respect to the function $N(t)$, $\mathbb{E}_{X_T} \Delta$ does not have quite as nice an expression owing to the growth of the logarithm function.

In fact, it will in general prove preferable to work with $S(t)$ in place of $N(t)$ in the computations that follow. Differentiating (1), we have

$$[\tilde{d}(\xi) - \frac{\Omega(\xi)}{2\pi}] d\xi = dS(\xi),$$

where

$$\tilde{d}(\xi) := \sum_{\gamma} \delta(\xi - \gamma),$$

with the sum over zeroes counted with multiplicity, and

$$\Omega(\xi) := \frac{1}{2} \frac{\Gamma'}{\Gamma} \left(\frac{1}{4} + i \frac{\xi}{2} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\Gamma'}{\Gamma} \left(\frac{1}{4} - i \frac{\xi}{2} \right) - \log \pi.$$

Using the moment method and Stirling's formula¹, Theorem 2 will be implied by

THEOREM 7. *For η a real-valued function with compact support and bounded variation, for $n(T) \rightarrow \infty$ as $T \rightarrow \infty$ in such a way that $n(T) = o(\log T)$,*

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_T^{2T} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}} \eta \left(\frac{\log T}{2\pi n(T)} (\xi - t) \right) dS(\xi) \right]^k dt = (c_k + o(1)) \left[\int_{-n(T)}^{n(T)} |x| |\hat{\eta}(x)|^2 dx \right]^{k/2},$$

provided the integral on the right diverges. Here $c_\ell := (\ell - 1)!!$ for even ℓ , and $c_\ell := 0$ for odd ℓ , are the moments of a standard normal variable.

Theorem 3 will follow from the above statement where η is instead restricted as in Theorem 3.

In order to prove his results, Fujii made use of the moment method, and the following approximation due to Selberg [24],[25],

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_T^{2T} \left[S(t) + \frac{1}{\pi} \sum_{p \leq T^{1/k}} \frac{\sin(t \log p)}{\sqrt{p}} \right]^{2k} dt = O(1),$$

which Selberg had used earlier to derive a more global central limit theorem for $S(t)$,

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_T^{2T} |S(t)|^{2k} dt \sim \frac{(2k-1)!!}{(2\pi^2)^k} (\log \log T)^k.$$

These formulas are sufficient to prove Theorem 2 for test functions η which are sums of a finite number of indicator functions. They break down, however, in an attempt to prove the theorem for general η , since, although one can approximate η by simple functions, the error terms thus generated rapidly overwhelm the main terms of the moments.

Our approach, roughly stated, is a sort of weak analogue of Selberg's and Fujii's. In this, we follow the derivation [14] of Hughes and Rudnick of mock-gaussian behavior in the microscopic regime with respect to sufficiently smooth test functions. We extend these computations to the mesoscopic regime, still requiring smoothness, but the key point which allows us to obtain our central limit theorem is that any test function will become sufficiently smooth when dilated as they are in the central limit theorems 2 and 3. This is one clarifying feature of our proof. The proof of Fujii's theorem making use of Selberg's approximation for $S(t)$ leaves the link between this central limit theorem and the microscopic determinantal structure of the zeroes somewhat mysterious.

This approach, with slightly more work, can be used to produce Fujii's Theorem 6 as well, although in this case an analogue of Theorem 2 would appear to be less satisfying. We shall not prove so in this note, but in the macroscopic case already if η is so much as absolutely continuous, the variance and higher moments of $\tilde{\Delta}_\eta$ (defined in the obvious way) tend to 0. This is a feature of the rigidity of the distribution of zeroes at this regime, which while not quite as rigid as a clock distribution (see [16]

¹Stirling's formula implies that $\frac{\Omega(\xi)}{2\pi} = \frac{\log(|\xi|+2)/2\pi}{2\pi} + O\left(\frac{1}{|\xi|+2}\right)$.

for a definition), resemble at this level this distribution perhaps somewhat more than they do a sine kernel determinantal point process. One should compare this analogy with the classical theorems that for a fixed h , $N(t+h) - N(t) \asymp \log t$ for *all* sufficiently large t , with constants depending upon h . (See [30], Theorems 9.2 and 9.14.) In this regime, arithmetic factors play a heavy explicit role; this will be implicitly evident in the proof that follows. In this, we can recover the heuristic observations of Berry [1] regarding the origin for the variance terms in Fujii's theorems. Indeed, one can already discern, by comparing Fujii's central limit theorem to the central limit theorem of Costin and Lebowitz, that the statistics of the zeros in this regime cannot be modeled too closely by a sine-kernel determinantal process. Outside of the mesoscopic regime, these statistics demonstrate an important 'resurgence phenomenon' discovered heuristically by Bogolmony and Keating, and explored in [3], [19], [21] and [26].

Zeév Rudnick pointed out to the author that he had used similar ideas with Faifman in [8] to prove a Fujii-type central limit theorem, for counting functions with a strict cutoff, in the finite field setting.

One can apply these ideas to get central limit theorems as well for the number of low-lying zeroes of $L(s, \chi_d)$, where χ_d ranges over the family of primitive quadratic characters, by extending the microscopic statistics of Rubenstein [22]. Details will appear elsewhere.

While a version of this note was in preparation, a preprint [4] of Bourgade and Kuan was uploaded which independently proves Theorem 2, along with its aforementioned analogue for converging variances. They proceed by a slightly different method which makes use of the Helffer-Sjöstrand functional calculus and a formula of Selberg. Their conditions on admissible test functions differ slightly as well; in particular they state a result which in its technical range of test functions is more general than Theorem 3. The method of either paper could be extended to yield a more general result, somewhat messier in its formulation. This matter is discussed in somewhat greater detail in the proof of Theorem 3. It would appear that the methods in the two approaches can be pushed in slightly different directions, so that neither method properly contains all results which can be produced by the other.

Tantalizingly, however, either method seems to include a class of test functions – lying within the class of test functions with converging variance – for which a central limit theorem, by analogy with random matrix theory, ought to be true, but for which we have no proof. This matter is discussed further in the appendix.

2. Local Limit Theorems for Smooth Test Functions

This section consists mainly in minor quantitative refinements in the argument of Hughes and Rudnick [14]. In turn, their argument is similar to Selberg's in making use of the fundamental theorem of arithmetic to evaluate certain integrals. Our main tool in what follows will be the well known explicit formula relating the zeroes of the Zeta function to the primes.

THEOREM 8 (The explicit formula). *For g a measurable function such that $g(x) = \frac{g(x+) + g(x-)}{2}$, and for some $\delta > 0$,*

$$(a) \quad \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{(\frac{1}{2} + \delta)|x|} |g(x)| dx < +\infty,$$

$$(b) \quad \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{(\frac{1}{2} + \delta)|x|} |dg(x)| < +\infty,$$

we have

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \hat{g}\left(\frac{\xi}{2\pi}\right) dS(\xi) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} [g(x) + g(-x)] e^{-x/2} d(e^x - \psi(e^x)),$$

where here $\psi(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n)$, for the von Mangoldt function Λ .

The integral on the left denotes a principle value integral, $\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \int_{-L}^L$. In what follows we will frequently work with test functions for which the distinction between this principle value integral and an ordinary integral disappears, and where this is the case we will cease to make one in notation.

Written in this way, the explicit formula is true only on the Riemann hypothesis. It is due in varying stages to Riemann [20], Guinand [11], and Weil [31], and expresses a Fourier duality between the error term in the prime number theorem and the error term for of the zero-counting function.

Without the Riemann hypothesis, we must write the left hand side as

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{|\gamma| < L} \hat{g}\left(\frac{y}{2\pi}\right) - \int_{-L}^L \frac{\Omega(\xi)}{2\pi} \hat{g}\left(\frac{\xi}{2\pi}\right) d\xi$$

where our sum is over γ (possibly complex) such that $\frac{1}{2} + i\gamma$ is a nontrivial zero of the zeta function. It is proven by a simple contour integration argument, making use of the reflection formula to evaluate one-half of the contour. (For a proof, see [15] or [18].)

We will also need the following corollary of the prime number theorem.

LEMMA 9 (A prime number asymptotic). *For f compact with bounded second derivative,*

$$(2) \quad \frac{1}{H^2} \sum_p \frac{\log^2 p}{p} f\left(\frac{\log p}{H}\right) = O\left(\frac{\|f\|_\infty + \|f'\|_\infty + \|f''\|_\infty}{H^2}\right) + \int_0^\infty x f(x) dx.$$

PROOF. That something like this is true is evident from the prime number theorem (or even Chebyshev), but some formal care is required to get the desired error term. We will need that,

$$\sum_{p \leq n} \frac{\log p}{p} = \log n + C + O\left(\frac{1}{\log^2 n}\right)$$

for some constant C , which is a formula on the level of the prime number theorem (and can be proven from the prime number theorem with a strong error term using partial summation.)

We have then, using the abbreviation $F(x) = xf(x)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{H^2} \sum_p \frac{\log^2 p}{p} f\left(\frac{\log p}{H}\right) &= \frac{1}{H} \sum_n \left[F\left(\frac{\log n}{H}\right) - F\left(\frac{\log(n+1)}{H}\right) \right] \left(\log n + C + O\left(\frac{1}{\log^2 n}\right) \right) \\ &= O\left(\frac{\|f\|_\infty + \|f'\|_\infty}{H^2}\right) + \sum_n \frac{\log n - \log(n+1)}{H} \cdot \frac{\log n}{H} F'\left(\frac{\log n}{H}\right), \end{aligned}$$

by partial summation and the mean value theorem. Again using the mean value theorem, this time to approximate an integral, we have that this expression is

$$O\left(\frac{\|f\|_\infty + \|f'\|_\infty + \|f''\|_\infty}{H^2}\right) + \int_0^\infty x F'(x) dx,$$

which upon integrating by parts is the right hand side of (2). $\square$

In what follows instead of working with the average $\frac{1}{T} \int_T^{2T}$ we work with smooth averages $\int \sigma(t/T)/T$ for bump functions σ . What we will show is that

THEOREM 10. *For η as in Theorem 7, and σ non-negative of mass 1 such that $\hat{\sigma}$ has compact support and $\sigma(t) \log^k(|t| + 2)$ is integrable,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\sigma(t/T)}{T} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}} \eta\left(\frac{\log T}{2\pi n(T)}(\xi - t)\right) dS(\xi) \right]^k dt = (c_k + o(1)) \left[\int_{-n(T)}^{n(T)} |x| |\hat{\eta}(x)|^2 dx \right]^{k/2}.$$

We will show that this implies Theorem 7 at the end of Section 4. We have a computational lemma.

LEMMA 11. *Given non-negative integrable σ of mass 1 such that $\hat{\sigma}$ has compact support, and integrable functions $\eta_1, \eta_2, \dots, \eta_k$ such that $\text{supp } \hat{\eta}_\ell \subset [-\delta_\ell, \delta_\ell]$ with $\delta_1 + \delta_2 + \dots + \delta_k = \Delta < 2$. For large enough T (depending on Δ and the region in which $\hat{\sigma}$ is supported),*

$$(3) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\sigma(t/T)}{T} \prod_{\ell=1}^k \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \eta_\ell \left(\frac{\log T}{2\pi} (\xi_\ell - t) \right) dS(\xi_\ell) \right) dt = O_k \left(\frac{1}{T^{1-\Delta/2}} \prod_{\ell=1}^k \frac{\|\hat{\eta}_\ell\|_\infty}{\log T} \right) \\ + \left(\frac{-1}{\log T} \right)^k \sum_{n_1^{\epsilon_1} n_2^{\epsilon_2} \dots n_k^{\epsilon_k} = 1} \prod_{\ell=1}^k \frac{\Lambda(n_\ell)}{\sqrt{n_\ell}} \hat{\eta}_\ell \left(\frac{\epsilon_\ell \log n_\ell}{\log T} \right),$$

where the sum is over all $n \in \mathbb{N}^k$, $\epsilon \in \{-1, 1\}^k$ such that $n_1^{\epsilon_1} n_2^{\epsilon_2} \dots n_k^{\epsilon_k} = 1$.

PROOF. By the explicit formula, the right hand side of (3) is

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\sigma(t/T)}{T} \left(\prod_{\ell=1}^k \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\log T} \left[\hat{\eta}_\ell \left(-\frac{x_\ell}{\log T} \right) e^{-ix_\ell t} + \hat{\eta}_\ell \left(\frac{x_\ell}{\log T} \right) e^{ix_\ell t} \right] e^{-x_\ell/2} d(e^{x_\ell} - \psi(e^{x_\ell})) \right) dt \\ = \sum_{\epsilon \in \{-1, 1\}^k} \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} \frac{\hat{\sigma} \left(-\frac{T}{2\pi} (\epsilon_1 x_1 + \dots + \epsilon_k x_k) \right)}{\log^k T} \prod_{\ell=1}^k \hat{\eta}_\ell \left(\frac{\epsilon_\ell x_\ell}{\log T} \right) e^{-x_\ell/2} d(e^{x_\ell} - \psi(e^{x_\ell})).$$

We can expand the product $\prod e^{-x_\ell/2} d(e^{x_\ell} - \psi(e^{x_\ell}))$ into a sum of signed terms of the sort $d\beta_1(x_1) \cdot \dots \cdot d\beta_k(x_k)$, where $d\beta_\ell(x)$ is either $e^{x/2} dx$ or $e^{-x/2} d\psi(e^x)$. In the case that at least one $d\beta_j$ in our product is $e^{x/2} dx$ we have

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\hat{\sigma} \left(-\frac{T}{2\pi} (\epsilon_1 x_1 + \dots + \epsilon_k x_k) \right)}{\log^k T} \hat{\eta}_j \left(\frac{\epsilon_j x_j}{\log T} \right) d\beta_j(x_j) \right| \lesssim \frac{\|\hat{\eta}_j\|_\infty}{T \log^k T} T^{\delta_j/2},$$

so that in this case

$$\left| \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} \frac{\hat{\sigma} \left(-\frac{T}{2\pi} (\epsilon_1 x_1 + \dots + \epsilon_k x_k) \right)}{\log^k T} \prod_{\ell=1}^k \hat{\eta}_\ell \left(\frac{\epsilon_\ell x_\ell}{\log T} \right) d\beta_\ell(x_\ell) \right| \lesssim \frac{\|\hat{\eta}_j\|_\infty T^{\delta_j/2}}{T \log^k T} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{k-1}} \prod_{\ell \neq j} \hat{\eta}_\ell \left(\frac{\epsilon_\ell x_\ell}{\log T} \right) d\beta_\ell(x_\ell) \\ \lesssim \frac{T^{\Delta/2}}{T} \prod_{\ell} \frac{\|\hat{\eta}_\ell\|_\infty}{\log T}$$

Into such error terms we can absorb all products $d\beta_1 \dots d\beta_k$ except that product made exclusively of prime counting measures, namely $(-1)^k \prod e^{-x_\ell/2} d\psi(e^{x_\ell})$. Evaluating the integral of this product measure we have that the left hand side of (3) is

$$O_k \left(\frac{1}{T^{1-\Delta/2}} \prod_{\ell=1}^k \frac{\|\hat{\eta}_\ell\|_\infty}{\log T} \right) + \left(\frac{-1}{\log T} \right)^k \sum_{\epsilon \in \{-1, 1\}^k} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}^k} \hat{\sigma} \left(-\frac{T}{2\pi} (\epsilon_1 \log n_1 + \dots + \epsilon_k \log n_k) \right) \prod_{\ell=1}^k \frac{\Lambda(n_\ell)}{\sqrt{n_\ell}} \hat{\eta}_\ell \left(\frac{\epsilon_\ell \log n_\ell}{\log T} \right).$$

Note that if $|\epsilon_1 \log n_1 + \dots + \epsilon_k \log n_k|$ is not 0, it is greater than $|\log(1 - 1/\sqrt{n_1 \dots n_k})| \geq \frac{\log 2}{\sqrt{n_1 \dots n_k}}$ since n_i is always an integer. As $\sqrt{n_1 \dots n_k} \leq T^{\Delta/2} = o(T)$ and $\hat{\sigma}$ has compact support, for large enough T our sum is over only those ϵ, n such that $\epsilon_1 \log n_1 + \dots + \epsilon_k \log n_k = 0$. $\square$

Finally, we can use our prime number asymptotic, Lemma 9, to obtain

LEMMA 12. *For $u_1, \dots, u_k$ with bounded second derivative*

$$(4) \quad \frac{1}{H^k} \sum_{n_1^{\epsilon_1} \dots n_k^{\epsilon_k} = 1} \prod_{\ell=1}^k \frac{\Lambda(n_\ell)}{\sqrt{n_\ell}} u_\ell \left(\frac{\epsilon_\ell \log n_\ell}{H} \right) = S_{[k]} + \sum_{\emptyset \subseteq J \subsetneq [k]} S_J \cdot O_k \left(\prod_{\ell \notin J} \frac{\|u_\ell\|_\infty + \|u'_\ell\|_\infty + \|u''_\ell\|_\infty}{H} \right),$$

where $[k] = \{1, \dots, k\}$ and here for a set J we define

$$S_J = \sum_{\lambda} \prod_{\lambda} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |x| u_{i_{\lambda}}(x) u_{j_{\lambda}}(-x) dx$$

where the sum is over all partitions of J into disjoint pairs $\{i_{\lambda}, j_{\lambda}\}$.

Said another way,

$$S_J = \sum_{\pi \in C(J)} \prod_{\ell \in J} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |x| u_{\ell}(x) u_{\pi(\ell)}(-x) dx \right)^{1/2}$$

where the set $C(J)$ is null for $|J|$ odd, and for $|J|$ even is the set of $(|J| - 1)!!$ permutations of J whose cycle type is of $|J|/2$ disjoint 2-cycles.

PROOF. By Lemma 9, for any i, j ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{H^2} \sum_{p_1^{\epsilon_1} p_2^{\epsilon_2} = 1} \frac{\log p_1 \log p_2}{\sqrt{p_1 p_2}} u_i \left(\frac{\epsilon_1 \log p_1}{H} \right) u_j \left(\frac{\epsilon_2 \log p_2}{H} \right) \\ &= \int |x| u_i(x) u_j(-x) dx + O \left(\frac{\|u_i u_j\|_{\infty} + \|(u_i u_j)'\|_{\infty} + \|(u_i u_j)''\|_{\infty}}{H^2} \right) \\ (5) \quad &= \int |x| u_i(x) u_j(-x) dx + O \left(\left[\frac{\|u_i\|_{\infty} + \|u_i'\|_{\infty} + \|u_i''\|_{\infty}}{H} \right] \left[\frac{\|u_j\|_{\infty} + \|u_j'\|_{\infty} + \|u_j''\|_{\infty}}{H} \right] \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the initial sum is over all primes p_1, p_2 and signs ϵ_1, ϵ_2 with $p_1^{\epsilon_1} p_2^{\epsilon_2} = 1$.

It follows that

$$\frac{1}{H^k} \sum_{p_1^{\epsilon_1} \dots p_k^{\epsilon_k} = 1} \prod_{\ell=1}^k \frac{\log p_{\ell}}{\sqrt{p_{\ell}}} u_{\ell} \left(\frac{\epsilon_{\ell} \log p_{\ell}}{H} \right) = S_{[k]} + \sum_{\emptyset \subseteq J \subsetneq [k]} S_J \cdot O_k \left(\prod_{\ell \notin J} \frac{\|u_{\ell}\|_{\infty} + \|u'_{\ell}\|_{\infty} + \|u''_{\ell}\|_{\infty}}{H} \right),$$

as, by the fundamental theorem of arithmetic, $p_1^{\epsilon_1} \dots p_k^{\epsilon_k} = 1$ if and only if primes match up pairwise $p_i = p_j$ with $\epsilon_i = -\epsilon_j$. The error term listed accumulates by expanding those products in which terms of the sort (5) occur.

It remains to show that

$$(6) \quad \frac{1}{H^k} \sum_{p_1^{\epsilon_1 \lambda_1} \dots p_k^{\epsilon_k \lambda_k} = 1} \prod_{\ell=1}^k \frac{\log p_{\ell}}{p_{\ell}^{\lambda_{\ell}/2}} u_{\ell} \left(\frac{\epsilon_{\ell} \lambda_{\ell} \log p_{\ell}}{H} \right) = \sum_{\emptyset \subseteq J \subsetneq [k]} S_J \cdot O_k \left(\prod_{\ell \notin J} \frac{\|u_{\ell}\|_{\infty} + \|u'_{\ell}\|_{\infty} + \|u''_{\ell}\|_{\infty}}{H} \right),$$

where the sum is over primes $p_1, \dots, p_k$, signs $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_k$, and positive integers $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k) \in \mathbb{N}_+^k \setminus \{(1, 1, \dots, 1)\}$. But the left hand side sum of (6) restricted to λ with $\lambda_1 \geq 3, \dots, \lambda_k \geq 3$ is plainly

$$O \left(\prod_{\ell=1}^k \frac{\|u_{\ell}\|_{\infty}}{H} \right).$$

On the other hand, for λ with λ_j fixed to equal 2 for some j , by the fundamental theorem of arithmetic $p_1^{\epsilon_1 \lambda_1} \dots p_k^{\epsilon_k \lambda_k} = 1$ only in the case that $p_j = p_{j'}$ for some $j' \neq j$, so that thus restricted left hand side sum of (6) is

$$\sum_{\substack{I \subset [k] \\ j \notin I}} O \left(\sum_{p_j} \frac{1}{p_j^{3/2}} \cdot \prod_{\ell' \notin I} \frac{\|u_{\ell'}\|_{\infty}}{H} \times \frac{1}{H^{|I|}} \sum_p \prod_{\ell \in I} \frac{\log p_{\ell}}{p_{\ell}^{\lambda_{\ell}/2}} u_{\ell} \left(\frac{\epsilon_{\ell} \lambda_{\ell} \log p_{\ell}}{H} \right) \right)$$

where the sum with index labeled p is over p, λ, ϵ such that $\prod_{\ell \in I} p_{\ell}^{\epsilon_{\ell} \lambda_{\ell}} = 1$, and I has the function in this sum of collecting those p_i which are not equal to p_j . This expression is unpleasant, but our consolation is that it is only an error term. Applying it inductively, to bound the sums restricted to

$\prod_{\ell \in I} p_\ell^{\epsilon_\ell \lambda_\ell} = 1$, yields the Lemma. (We have here fixed $\lambda_j = 2$, but of course to get an upper bound we need add at most k sums like this.) $\square$

As a consequence of Lemmas 11 and 12, with $H = \frac{\log T}{n(T)}$,

COROLLARY 13. *For η and σ as in Lemma 11,*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\sigma(t/T)}{T} \prod_{\ell=1}^k \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \eta_\ell \left(\frac{\log T}{2\pi n(T)} (\xi_\ell - t) \right) dS(\xi_\ell) \right) dt \\ = S_{[k]} + O_k \left(\frac{1}{T^{1-\Delta/2}} \prod_{\ell=1}^k \frac{\|\hat{\eta}_\ell\|_\infty}{\log T/n(T)} \right) + \sum_{\emptyset \subseteq J \subsetneq [k]} S_J \cdot O_k \left(\prod_{\ell \notin J} \frac{\|\hat{\eta}_\ell\|_\infty + \|\hat{\eta}'_\ell\|_\infty + \|\hat{\eta}''_\ell\|_\infty}{\log T/n(T)} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where S_J is defined as in Lemma 12 with $u_\ell = \hat{\eta}_\ell$.

Remark: As an aside, we note that by modifying the above analysis, making Δ small enough, one can obtain an asymptotic even in the case that $n(T)$ grows like $O(T^{1-\delta})$, for $\delta > 0$. In this case the result is less elegant, since the arithmetic factors present in Lemma 11 do not smooth out in the final asymptotic. We do not pursue these computations here, but they can be used to recover Fujii's macroscopic result, Theorem 6.

From Corollary 13 it is an easy computation to see that

LEMMA 14. *For η , σ and $n(T)$ as in Theorem 7, with η , σ , and k fixed*

$$(7) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\sigma(t/T)}{T} \left[\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \check{K}_{n(T)} * \eta \left(\frac{\log T}{2\pi n(T)} (\xi - t) \right) dS(\xi) \right]^k dt = (c_k + o(1)) \left[\int_{-n(T)}^{n(T)} |x| |\hat{\eta}(x)|^2 dx \right]^{k/2},$$

provided that K is chosen based on k to have sufficiently compact support.

PROOF. Note that $[\check{K}_{n(T)} * \eta(\frac{\cdot}{n(T)})]^\wedge(\xi) = n(T)K(\xi)\hat{\eta}(n(T)\xi)$. By Corollary 13, for K chosen to be supported in $(-1/k, 1/k)$ we have the left hand side of (7) is

$$(c_k + o(1)) \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}} K^2 \left(\frac{x}{n(T)} \right) |x| \cdot |\hat{\eta}(x)|^2 dx \right]^{k/2}.$$

Because η is of bounded variation, $\hat{\eta}(x) = O(1/x)$, and for any $c_1 > c_2 > 0$,

$$\int_{c_1 n(T)}^{c_2 n(T)} |x| |\hat{\eta}(x)|^2 dx \lesssim \log(c_1/c_2) = o \left(\int_{-n(T)}^{n(T)} |x| |\hat{\eta}(x)|^2 dx \right),$$

since this latter integral diverges.² As we have that when $x \rightarrow 0$, $K^2(x) = 1 + o(1)$,

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} K^2 \left(\frac{x}{n(T)} \right) |x| \cdot |\hat{\eta}(x)|^2 dx \sim \int_{-n(T)}^{n(T)} |x| |\hat{\eta}(x)|^2 dx.$$

$\square$

3. An Upper Bound

We will be able to complete the proofs of our central limit theorems by showing that the left hand side of (7) is a good approximation to the left hand side of the equation in Theorem 7. We accomplish this mainly through the use of the following upper bound

²Even in the case it converges this o -bound is true, albeit for a different reason.

THEOREM 15. For σ as in Lemma 11,

$$(8) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\sigma(t/T)}{T} \left[\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \eta\left(\frac{\log T}{2\pi}(\xi - t)\right) \tilde{d}(\xi) d\xi \right]^k dt \lesssim_k \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\sigma(t/T)}{T} \left[\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} M_k \eta\left(\frac{\log T}{2\pi}(\xi - t)\right) \log(|\xi| + 2) d\xi \right]^k dt,$$

with

$$M_k \eta(\xi) = \sum_{\nu=-\infty}^{\infty} \sup_{I_k(\nu)} |\eta| \cdot \mathbf{1}_{I_k(\nu)}(\xi),$$

where for typographical reasons we have denoted the interval $[k\nu - k/2, k\nu + k/2]$ by $I_k(\nu)$, and the order of our bound depends upon k , $\|\hat{\sigma}\|$ and the region in which $\hat{\sigma}$ can be supported.

PROOF. We make use of the Fourier pair $V(\xi) = \left(\frac{\sin \pi \xi}{\pi \xi}\right)^2$ and $\hat{V}(x) = (1 - |x|)_+$. Note that

$$\eta(\xi) \lesssim \sum_{\nu} \sup_{I_k(\nu)} |\eta| \underbrace{V\left(\frac{\xi - \nu}{k}\right)}_{:= V_{\nu,k}(\xi)}.$$

The right hand side of this is similar to $M_k \eta$ and we denote it by $M'_k \eta$. What is important about the scaling is that $\hat{V}_{\nu,k}$ is supported in $(-1/k, 1/k)$. Note that the left hand side of (8) is bound by

$$\begin{aligned} &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\sigma(t/T)}{T} \left[\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} M'_k \eta\left(\frac{\log T}{2\pi}(\xi - t)\right) \tilde{d}(\xi) d\xi \right]^k dt \\ &\lesssim [A^{1/k} + B^{1/k}]^k, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\sigma(t/T)}{T} \left[\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} M'_k \eta\left(\frac{\log T}{2\pi}(\xi - t)\right) dS(\xi) \right]^k dt, \\ B &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\sigma(t/T)}{T} \left[\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} M'_k \eta\left(\frac{\log T}{2\pi}(\xi - t)\right) \log(|\xi| + 2) d\xi \right]^k dt, \end{aligned}$$

by Minkowski, and the fact that $\Omega(\xi)/2\pi = O(\log(|\xi| + 2))$.

By the restricted range of support for $\hat{V}_{\nu,k}$ and Lemmas 11 and 12, for integers $\nu_1, \dots, \nu_k$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\sigma(t/T)}{T} \prod_{\ell=1}^k \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} V_{\nu_{\ell},k}\left(\frac{\log T}{2\pi}(\xi - t)\right) dS(\xi_{\ell}) \right) dt = O_k(1).$$

Whence, taking a multilinear sum,

$$\begin{aligned} A &\lesssim_k \prod_{\ell=1}^k \sum_{\nu} \sup_{I_k(\nu)} |\eta| \\ &\lesssim B \end{aligned}$$

as $\log(|\xi| + 2) \gtrsim 1$.

Finally,

$$M'_k \eta(\xi) \lesssim \sum_{\mu=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1 + \mu^2} M_k \eta(\xi + \mu),$$

so using $\log(|\xi + \mu| + 2) \lesssim \log(|\xi| + 2) \log(|\mu| + 2)$,

$$B \lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\sigma(t/T)}{T} \left[\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} M_k \eta\left(\frac{\log T}{2\pi}(\xi - t)\right) \cdot \log(|\xi| + 2) d\xi \right]^k dt.$$

These estimates on A and B give us the result. $\square$

This result should be viewed as a slight generalization of an $O_A(1)$ upper bound given by Fujii for the average number of zeros in an interval $[t, t + A/\log T]$ where t ranges from T to $2T$ [9].

4. Proof of Theorems 2 and 3

We are now finally in a position to prove our main results. We first prove Theorem 10, then pass to Theorem 7 (and hence to Theorem 2).

PROOF OF THEOREM 10. We want to show that

$$E_T := \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\sigma(t/T)}{T} \left[\int_{\mathbb{R}} \eta\left(\frac{\log T}{2\pi n(T)}(\xi - t)\right) dS(\xi) \right]^k - \left[\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \check{K}_{n(T)} * \eta\left(\frac{\log T}{2\pi n(T)}(\xi - t)\right) dS(\xi) \right]^k dt$$

is asymptotically negligible. In part because k can be odd, we must use some care. To this end we have the following lemma.

LEMMA 16. For $(X, d\mu)$ a measure space, f, g real valued functions on X , and $k \geq 1$ an integer

$$\left| \int (f^k - g^k) d\mu \right| \lesssim_k \|f - g\|_{L^k(d\mu)} (\|f\|_{L^k(d\mu)}^{k-1} + \|g\|_{L^k(d\mu)}^{k-1}).$$

PROOF. If f^k and g^k are both almost everywhere the same sign, this is implied by Minkowski (with implied constant k). On the other hand, if f^k and g^k are almost always of opposite sign, the estimate is trivial. We can prove the lemma in general by breaking the integral over X into two integrals over these subcases, and combine our estimates by noting that for positive a and b , $a^\alpha + b^\alpha \leq 2 \max(a^\alpha, b^\alpha) \lesssim (a + b)^\alpha$, where (in our case) $\alpha = (k - 1)/k$. $\square$

This leads us to consider

$$(9) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\sigma(t/T)}{T} \left[\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (\eta - \check{K}_{n(T)} * \eta)\left(\frac{\log T}{2\pi n(T)}(\xi - t)\right) dS(\xi) \right]^k dt,$$

which by Theorem 15 is bound by

$$\begin{aligned} &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\sigma(t/T)}{T} \left[\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} M_{k/n(T)}(\eta - \check{K}_{n(T)} * \eta)\left(\frac{\log T}{2\pi n(T)}(\xi - t)\right) \cdot \log(|\xi| + 2) d\xi \right]^k dt \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\sigma(t/T)}{T} \left[\frac{2\pi n(T)}{\log T} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} M_{k/n(T)}(\eta - \check{K}_{n(T)} * \eta)(\xi) \log\left(\left|t + \frac{2\pi n(T)}{\log T}\xi\right| + 2\right) d\xi \right]^k dt \\ &\lesssim \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\sigma(t/T)}{T} \frac{\log^k(|t| + 2)}{\log^k T} dt \right) \left[n(T) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} M_{k/n(T)}(\eta - \check{K}_{n(T)} * \eta)(\xi) d\xi \right]^k \\ &\quad + \left[\frac{2\pi n(T)}{\log T} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} M_{k/n(T)}(\eta - \check{K}_{n(T)} * \eta)(\xi) \log(|\xi| + 2) d\xi \right]^k. \end{aligned}$$

Note, if we label $L(\xi) = \log(|\xi| + 2)$, we have $M_{k/n(T)}(\eta - \check{K}_{n(T)} * \eta)(\xi) \log(|\xi| + 2) \leq M_{k/n(T)}[(\eta - \check{K}_{n(T)} * \eta)L](\xi)$.

At this point we make use of the fact that η is of bounded variation. Because η has compact support,

$$\int \log(|\xi| + 2) |d\eta(\xi)| < +\infty.$$

In addition, $\check{K}_{n(T)} * \eta$ is bounded in variation for the same reason that

$$\int \log(|\xi| + 2) |d\check{K}_{n(T)} * \eta(\xi)| = K(0) \int \log(|\xi| + 2) |d\eta(\xi)| < +\infty.$$

By the product rule then, $\text{var}[(\eta - \check{K}_{n(T)} * \eta)L]$ is bounded, for $\text{var}(\cdot)$ the total variation.

We have the following three lemmas:

LEMMA 17. *For $f \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ and of bounded variation $\text{var}(f)$, and K as above,*

$$\|f - \check{K}_H * f\|_{L^1} \lesssim \frac{\text{var}(f)}{H}.$$

The proof is utterly standard, but I was unable to find a reference. The key point is that K is smooth and compact, so that $|x||\check{K}(x)|$ is integrable.

PROOF. Note that $\check{K}_H(x) = H\check{K}(Hx)$, so

$$\begin{aligned} \|f - \check{K}_H * f\|_{L^1} &= \left\| \int H\check{K}(H\tau)f(t) d\tau - \int H\check{K}(H\tau)f(t - \tau) d\tau \right\|_{L^1(dt)} \\ &\leq H \int \check{K}(H\tau) \|f(t) - f(t - \tau)\|_{L^1(dt)} d\tau \\ &\leq H \int \check{K}(H\tau) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{-\tau}^0 |df(t + h)| dh dt \right) d\tau \\ &= H \int \check{K}(H\tau) |\tau| d\tau \cdot \text{var}(f) \\ &\lesssim \frac{\text{var}(f)}{H}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Likewise, because $|\check{K}(x)||x|^2$ is integrable, and $|\check{K}(x)||x|\log(|x| + 2)$ is of order $|\check{K}(x)||x|$ around $x = 0$ and is bound up to a constant by $|\check{K}(x)||x|^2$ otherwise, we have similarly,

LEMMA 18.

$$\|f - \check{K}_H * f\|_{L^1(\log(|t| + 2)dt)} \lesssim \frac{1}{H} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \log(|t| + 2) |df(t)|.$$

Finally,

LEMMA 19. *For f of bounded variation, and any $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \varepsilon \|f\|_{L^\infty(\varepsilon[k-1/2, k+1/2])} \lesssim \|f\|_{L^1} + \varepsilon \cdot \text{var}(f).$$

PROOF. For arbitrarily small ε' , we can choose $x_k \in \varepsilon[k-1/2, k+1/2]$ so that $|f(x_k)|$ is sufficiently close to $\|f\|_{L^\infty(\varepsilon[k-1/2, k+1/2])}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \varepsilon \|f\|_{L^\infty(\varepsilon[k-1/2, k+1/2])} &\leq \varepsilon' + \varepsilon \sum_k |f(x_k)| \\ &\leq \varepsilon' + \sum_j (x_{2j+2} - x_{2j}) |f(x_{2j})| + \sum_{j'} (x_{2j'+1} - x_{2j'-1}) |f(x_{2j'-1})|. \end{aligned}$$

More,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int |f| dx - \sum_j (x_{2j+2} - x_{2j}) |f(x_{2j})| \right| &\leq \sum_j \int_{x_{2j}}^{x_{2j+2}} \left| |f(x)| - |f(x_{2j})| \right| dx \\ &\leq \sum_j (x_{2j+2} - x_{2j}) \int_{x_{2j}}^{x_{2j+2}} |df(x)| \\ &\leq 3\varepsilon \cdot \text{var}(f) \end{aligned}$$

as $(x_{2j+2} - x_{2j}) \leq 3\varepsilon$ always. The same estimate holds for a sum over odd indices, and we have then

$$\sum_k \varepsilon \|f\|_{L^\infty(\varepsilon[k-1/2, k+1/2])} \leq \varepsilon' + 6\varepsilon \cdot \text{var}(f) + 2 \int |f| dx.$$

As ε' was arbitrary, the lemma follows. $\square$

Making use of these lemmas we have that

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} M_{k/n(T)}(\eta - \check{K}_{n(T)} * \eta)(\xi) d\xi \lesssim_{\eta, k} \frac{1}{n(T)},$$

and

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} M_{k/n(T)}[(\eta - \check{K}_{n(T)} * \eta) \cdot L](\xi) d\xi \lesssim_{\eta, k} \frac{1}{n(T)}.$$

Hence (9) is bound. By Lemma 16,

$$\begin{aligned} (10) \quad E_T &\lesssim_{\eta, k} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\sigma(t/T)}{T} \left| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \eta\left(\frac{\log T}{2\pi n(T)}(\xi - t)\right) dS(\xi) \right|^k dt \right)^{(k-1)/k} \\ &\quad + \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\sigma(t/T)}{T} \left| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \check{K}_{n(T)} * \eta\left(\frac{\log T}{2\pi n(T)}(\xi - t)\right) dS(\xi) \right|^k dt \right)^{(k-1)/k}. \end{aligned}$$

For k even, this implies by Lemma 14 (our Fourier truncation central limit theorem), and the fact that $\int |x||\hat{\eta}|^2 dx = +\infty$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\sigma(t/T)}{T} \left[\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \eta\left(\frac{\log T}{2\pi n(T)}(\xi - t)\right) dS(\xi) \right]^k dt &= (c_k + o(1)) \left[\int_{-n(T)}^{n(T)} |x||\hat{\eta}(x)|^2 dx \right]^{k/2} \\ &\quad + O \left[\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\sigma(t/T)}{T} \left| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \eta\left(\frac{\log T}{2\pi n(T)}(\xi - t)\right) dS(\xi) \right|^k dt \right)^{(k-1)/k} \right] \end{aligned}$$

This bound implies the left hand side diverges, and thus the conclusion of Theorem 10 for even k . For odd k , by Hölder (or Cauchy-Schwartz),

$$(11) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\sigma(t/T)}{T} \left| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \eta\left(\frac{\log T}{2\pi n(T)}(\xi - t)\right) dS(\xi) \right|^k dt \leq (\sqrt{c_{2k}} + o(1)) \left[\int_{-n(T)}^{n(T)} |x||\hat{\eta}(x)|^2 dx \right]^{k/2},$$

and hence, using (10) again, Theorem 10 for odd k as well. $\square$

PROOF OF THEOREM 7. To see that Theorem 10 implies Theorem 7, note that for any $\epsilon > 0$, we can find σ_1 of the sort delimited in Theorem 10, so that $\|\mathbf{1}_{[1,2]} - \sigma_1\|_{L^1} < \epsilon/2$. Further, we can find σ_2 , a linear combination of translations and dilations of the function $\left(\frac{\sin \pi t}{\pi t}\right)^2$, so that σ_2 is non-negative and $|\mathbf{1}_{[1,2]}(t) - \sigma_1(t)| \leq \sigma_2(t)$ for all t , and $\|\sigma_2\|_{L^1} < \epsilon$. Note (for simplicity of notation) that (11) is true for even k as well, and by rescaling linearly, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\sigma_2(t/T)}{T} \left| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \eta\left(\frac{\log T}{2\pi n(T)}(\xi - t)\right) dS(\xi) \right|^k dt \leq \epsilon(\sqrt{c_{2k}} + o(1)) \left[\int_{-n(T)}^{n(T)} |x||\hat{\eta}(x)|^2 dx \right]^{k/2}.$$

Then

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\mathbf{1}_{[1,2]}(t/T)}{T} \left[\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \eta\left(\frac{\log T}{2\pi n(T)}(\xi - t)\right) dS(\xi) \right]^k dt = [c_k + o(1) + \epsilon \cdot (O_k(1) + o(1))] \left[\int_{-n(T)}^{n(T)} |x| |\hat{\eta}(x)|^2 dx \right]^{k/2}.$$

(Note that here the $O_k(1)$ term is bound absolutely by $\sqrt{c_{2k}}$.) As ϵ is arbitrary, the theorem follows. $\square$

PROOF OF THEOREM 3. A proof will follow almost exactly as before. We need only to show that Theorem 7 is true for η instead of the sort delimited in Theorem 3. The reader may check that the only part of the proof which requires modification is that the error term E_T , at the start of section 4, cannot be shown to be asymptotically negligible in the same way as before, since now asymptotically negligible means that $E_T = o(1)$. But using Lemma 16 in the same way as before, this will be the case, and therefore the theorem, so long as

$$(12) \quad \|\eta - \tilde{K}_H * \eta\|_{L^1} = o(1/H),$$

for some K as above. This is certainly the case for those η delimited in Theorem 2, using the fact that for such η , $\hat{\eta}(\xi) = o(1/(1 + |\xi|)^2)$. $\square$

Remark: (12) is true for a wider range of functions than $C_c^2(\mathbb{R})$; but it does not encompass the elegant criterion, “all functions which are of bounded variation and compactly supported.” It is *not* the case for η a Cantor function, for instance. We expect the theorem to remain true in this case, but to prove this would seem to require upper bounds on correlation functions for Zeta zeroes with respect to oscillatory functions, extending outside the range of functions considered by Rudnick and Sarnak. Although here we require only upper bounds, not exact evaluations, this still goes beyond what we currently seem able to prove.

5. Appendix: Towards a Mesoscopic Theory

We include in this appendix a more general discussion of the statistics of the zeroes of the Zeta function in the mesoscopic regime. Our discussion will culminate in Theorem 25, a statement from which one can deduce both the microscopic linear statistics of the sort considered by Rudnick and Sarnak and the central limit theorems discussed above, along with covariance statements for translated linear statistics separated by mesoscopic distances.

To motivate what follows, we want to show first that Corollary 13 implies the well-known result of Rudnick and Sarnak that, upon ordering the positive ordinates of the zeroes $0 < \gamma_1 \leq \gamma_2 \leq \dots$,

THEOREM 20 (Rudnick-Sarnak). *For $\eta(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_k)$ such that $\text{supp } \hat{\eta} \subseteq \{x \in \mathbb{R}^k : |x_1| + \dots + |x_k| < 2\}$,*

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{T} \int_T^{2T} \sum_{\substack{i_1, \dots, i_k \\ \text{distinct}}} \eta\left(\frac{\log T}{2\pi}(\gamma_{i_1} - t), \dots, \frac{\log T}{2\pi}(\gamma_{i_k} - t)\right) dt = \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} \eta(x) \det_{k \times k} [S(x_i - x_j)] d^k x,$$

where $S(\xi) = \frac{\sin \pi \xi}{\pi \xi}$ and $\det_{k \times k} [S(\xi_i - \xi_j)]$ is a $k \times k$ determinant with ij^{th} entry $S(\xi_i - \xi_j)$.

That is to say, with respect to sufficiently smooth functions, the zeroes of the Zeta function tend weakly to a determinantal point process with sine-kernel.

One may do this either through a combinatorial sieving procedure – effectively this is the proof of Rudnick and Sarnak – or alternatively one may use the combinatorics of Diaconis and Shahshahani. For us, it will be more enlightening to use the latter. Proceeding in this manner originated with Hughes and Rudnick, although our range of test functions will coincide with the slightly wider range used originally by Rudnick and Sarnak.

The theorem of Diaconis and Shahshahani we will need is

THEOREM 21 (Diaconis-Shahshahani). *Let $\mathcal{U}(n)$ be the set of $n \times n$ unitary matrices endowed with Haar measure. Consider $a = (a_1, \dots, a_k)$ and $b = (b_1, \dots, b_k)$ with $a_1, a_2, \dots, b_1, b_2, \dots \in \{0, 1, \dots\}$. If $\sum_{j=1}^k j a_j \neq \sum_{j=1}^k j b_j$,*

$$(13) \quad \int_{\mathcal{U}(n)} \prod_{j=1}^k \text{Tr}(g^j)^{a_j} \overline{\text{Tr}(g^j)^{b_j}} dg = 0.$$

Furthermore, in the case that

$$\max \left(\sum_{j=1}^k j a_j, \sum_{j=1}^k j b_j \right) \leq n$$

we have

$$(14) \quad \int_{\mathcal{U}(n)} \prod_{j=1}^k \text{Tr}(g^j)^{a_j} \overline{\text{Tr}(g^j)^{b_j}} dg = \delta_{ab} \prod_{j=1}^k j^{a_j} a_j!$$

In addition, for unrestricted a

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}(n)} \prod_{j=1}^k |\text{Tr}(g^j)|^{2a_j} dg \leq \prod_{j=1}^k j^{a_j} a_j!$$

but we will not need this fact. In general, for products of traces outside of the restricted range of the theorem, no pattern emerges which is as nice as (14). Since our restricted range here corresponds – as we will show shortly – to the only range of test functions for which the statistics of the Zeta function's zeroes can be rigorously evaluated, this fact must be seen as somewhat curious.

Here trace is defined in the standard way, so that $\text{Tr}(I_{n \times n}) = n$. For a proof of Theorem 21, see [6] or [2].

It is a simple exercise in enumerative combinatorics to see that (13) and (14) imply that for $|j_1| + \dots + |j_k| \leq 2n$

$$\int_{\mathcal{U}(n)} \prod_{\ell=1}^k \text{Tr}(g^{j_\ell}) dg = \sum_{\lambda} \prod_{\lambda} |j_{\mu_\lambda}| \delta(j_{\mu_\lambda} = -j_{\nu_\lambda})$$

where once again the sum is over all partitions of $[k]$ into disjoint pairs $\{\mu_\lambda, \nu_\lambda\}$, and $\delta(j_{\mu_\lambda} = -j_{\nu_\lambda})$ is 1 or 0 depending upon whether $j_{\mu_\lambda} = -j_{\nu_\lambda}$ or not.

We are able to use this to study the determinantal point process with sine kernel because the eigenvalues of a random unitary matrix, properly spaced, are themselves a determinantal point process with kernel tending to that of the sine kernel. This is due, in effect, to Weyl.

PROPOSITION 22. *Let $\{e(\theta_1), e(\theta_2), \dots, e(\theta_n)\}$ be the eigenvalues of a random unitary matrix, distributed according to Haar measure, with $\theta_i \in [-1/2, 1/2]$ for all i . Then the points $\{n\theta_1, \dots, n\theta_n\}$ comprise a determinantal point process $\mathcal{S}_n$ on $[-n/2, n/2]$ with kernel in x, y given by $S_n(x - y) = \frac{\sin \pi(x-y)}{n \sin(\pi(x-y)/n)}$. That is for any test function η ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}_n} \sum_{\substack{i_1, \dots, i_k \\ \text{distinct}}} \eta(\xi_{i_1}, \dots, \xi_{i_k}) &= \int_{\mathcal{U}(n)} \sum_{\substack{i_1, \dots, i_k \\ \text{distinct}}} \eta(n\theta_{i_1}, \dots, n\theta_{i_k}) dg \\ &= \int_{[-n/2, n/2]^k} \eta(x_1, \dots, x_k) \det_{k \times k} [S_n(x_i - x_j)] d^k x \end{aligned}$$

For further discussion see [5].

We use this to prove

THEOREM 23. *If $\mathcal{S}$ is the determinantal point process with kernel in x, y given by $S(x-y)$ for $S(x) = \frac{\sin \pi x}{\pi x}$, then for functions $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_k$ such that, as in Lemma 11, $\text{supp } \eta_\ell \in [-\delta_\ell, \delta_\ell]$ with $\delta_1 + \dots + \delta_k \leq 2$,*

$$(15) \quad \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \prod_{\ell=1}^k \left(\Delta_{\eta_\ell} - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \Delta_{\eta_\ell} \right) = S_{[k]}$$

where $S_{[k]}$ is defined as in Corollary 13, and here $\Delta_\eta = \sum \eta(\xi_i)$ as before, for $\{\xi_i\}$ the points of the process.

Note that here, by definition, $\mathbb{E} \Delta_\eta = \int \eta dx$.

Before we come to the proof, we note that as an easy consequence, upon expanding the product in 15 and applying induction,

COROLLARY 24. *A point process $\mathcal{P}$ satisfies (15) for all k over the range of test functions restricted as in Theorem 23 if and only if for all k and for any integrable η defined on $\mathbb{R}^k$ with $\text{supp } \eta \subseteq \{y \in \mathbb{R}^k : |y_1| + \dots + |y_k| \leq 2\}$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \sum_{\substack{i_1, \dots, i_k \\ \text{distinct}}} \eta(\xi_{i_1}, \dots, \xi_{i_k}) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} \eta(x_1, \dots, x_k) \det_{k \times k} [S(x_i - x_j)] d^k x.$$

PROOF OF THEOREM 23. For a function η , define

$$\eta^{(n)}(\theta) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \eta(\theta + nk).$$

Note that for Schwartz η , $\eta^{(n)} \rightarrow \eta$ uniformly. We have then that for fixed Schwartz $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_k$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \prod_{\ell=1}^k \left(\Delta_{\eta_\ell} - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \Delta_{\eta_\ell} \right) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}_n} \prod_{\ell=1}^k \left(\Delta_{\eta_\ell^{(n)}} - \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}_n} \Delta_{\eta_\ell^{(n)}} \right) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{U}(n)} \prod_{\ell=1}^k \left(\sum_{\nu=1}^n \eta_\ell^{(n)}(n\theta_\nu) - n \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} \eta_\ell^{(n)}(n\theta) d\theta \right) dg \end{aligned}$$

But by Poisson summation,

$$\eta_\ell^{(n)}(n\theta_\nu) - \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} \eta_\ell^{(n)}(n\theta) d\theta = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{1}{n} \hat{\eta}_\ell \left(\frac{j}{n} \right) e(j\theta),$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{U}(n)} \prod_{\ell=1}^k \left(\sum_{\nu=1}^n \eta_\ell^{(n)}(n\theta_\nu) - n \int_{-1/2}^{1/2} \eta_\ell^{(n)}(n\theta) d\theta \right) dg &= \int_{\mathcal{U}(n)} \prod_{\ell=1}^k \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{1}{n} \hat{\eta}_\ell \left(\frac{j}{n} \right) \text{Tr}(g^j) dg \\ &= \sum_{j_1, \dots, j_k \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}} \prod_{\ell=1}^k \frac{1}{n} \hat{\eta}_\ell \left(\frac{j_\ell}{n} \right) \cdot \int_{\mathcal{U}(n)} \prod_{\ell=1}^k \text{Tr}(g^{j_\ell}) dg. \end{aligned}$$

But for $\hat{\eta}_1, \dots, \hat{\eta}_k$ restricted as in the Theorem, this sum is only over those j with $|\frac{j_1}{n}| + \dots + |\frac{j_k}{n}| \leq 2$. In this case the above sum reduces to

$$\sum_{\lambda} \prod_{\lambda} \left(\sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}} \frac{1}{n} \frac{|j|}{n} \hat{\eta}_{\mu_\lambda} \left(\frac{j}{n} \right) \hat{\eta}_{\nu_\lambda} \left(\frac{-j}{n} \right) \right).$$

Clearly this tends to $S_{[k]}$. □

PROOF OF THEOREM 20. Using Corollary 13 for $n(T) = 1$, we have for $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_\ell$ as in Theorem 23,

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\sigma(t/T)}{T} \prod_{\ell=1}^k \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \eta\left(\frac{\log T}{2\pi}(\xi_\ell - t)\right) dS(\xi_\ell) dt = S_{[k]}.$$

But by Stirling's formula,

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \eta\left(\frac{\log T}{2\pi}(\xi_\ell - t)\right) dS(\xi) = \sum_{\gamma} \eta\left(\frac{\log T}{2\pi}(\gamma - t)\right) - \int \eta(x) dx + o(1).$$

Expanding the product as in Corollary 24, and passing from σ to $\mathbf{1}_{[1,2]}$ as before yields the claim for $\eta = \eta_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \eta_k$. We can pass to general η by uniformly approximating such η and using Theorem 15 to bound the difference between the linear statistics of η and those of its approximation. $\square$

The convergence here is microscopic, and therefore cannot, unless spread over a wider region as in Corollary 23, yield a mesoscopic central limit theorem like Fujii's or Theorem 2. In a general way, it does appear that in the mesoscopic regime, the zeroes of the Zeta functions are spaced like the points of a sine-kernel determinantal point process – and that moreover we have knowledge of this fact as long as any test functions used remain microscopically band-limited (or quite close to it). Stating this principle in a way which is both (i) precise, and (ii) satisfying, is a rough task however. We shall make an attempt below, but we should be forthright that it is only the first of these conditions and not the second that is really achieved. Before proceeding, it is worthwhile to discuss the matter heuristically somewhat further.

We say that a point process $\mathcal{P}$ is “mock-determinantal with sine-kernel” if its correlation functions agree with that of $\mathcal{S}$ with respect to sufficiently smooth test functions; that is

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{P}} \sum_{\substack{i_1, \dots, i_k \\ \text{distinct}}} \eta(\xi_{i_1}, \dots, \xi_{i_k}) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \sum_{\substack{i_1, \dots, i_k \\ \text{distinct}}} \eta(\xi_{i_1}, \dots, \xi_{i_k})$$

with respect to – say for our purposes – η with $\hat{\eta}$ supported on $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^k : |x_1| + \dots + |x_k| \leq 2\}$. Using the proof above for the zeroes of the Zeta function, one can show that Theorems 2 and 3 hold for any such $\mathcal{P}$. That is for η restricted as in either theorem, a parameter L which grows, and $\Delta_\eta = \sum \eta(\xi_i/L)$,

$$\frac{\Delta_\eta - \mathbb{E}\Delta_\eta}{\sqrt{\text{Var}\Delta_\eta}} \Rightarrow N(0, 1),$$

as $L \rightarrow \infty$. (As here we are dealing with a single point process $\mathcal{P}$, ‘mesoscopic’ restrictions on the growth of L play no role.) We may ask whether there exists any such mock-determinantal point processes $\mathcal{P}$ for which η is of bounded variation, but $(\Delta_\eta - \mathbb{E}\Delta_\eta)/\sqrt{\text{Var}\Delta_\eta}$ does not tend to the normal distribution. I do not know the answer to this, but I suspect that there does. This would imply that to fill the small gap between Theorems 2 and 3 and their random matrix analogues will require (a small amount of) statistical information about the zeroes of the zeta function outside of that provided by test functions which are band-limited as in Rudnick-Sarnak.

We return to our goal of characterizing the zeroes of the Zeta function in the mesoscopic regime in a way that retains microscopic statistics as well. We have:

THEOREM 25. *Let σ be as in Theorem 10, and let Z_T be the point process defined by the points $\{\frac{\log T}{2\pi}(\gamma - t)\}$ where γ runs through the ordinates of zeroes of the Zeta function, and t is a random variable in $\mathbb{R}$ with distribution given by $\sigma(t/T)/T$. For fixed $A < 2$, fixed r of compact Fourier support, and fixed $n(T)$ with $n(T) \rightarrow \infty$ but with $n(T) = o(\log T)$, we have that for $|\alpha_1| + \dots + |\alpha_k| \leq A$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{Z_T} \prod_{\ell=1}^k (\Delta_\ell - \mathbb{E}\Delta_\ell) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \prod_{\ell=1}^k (\Delta_\ell - \mathbb{E}\Delta_\ell) + \sum_{\emptyset \subseteq J \subsetneq [k]} \varepsilon([k] \setminus J) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \prod_{\ell \in J} (\Delta_\ell - \mathbb{E}\Delta_\ell),$$

where

$$\Delta_\ell = \sum r\left(\frac{\xi_i}{n(T)}\right) e(\alpha \xi_i)$$

for the terms $\varepsilon([k] \setminus J)$ having no dependence on α_i with $i \in J$, and tending to 0 uniformly as $T \rightarrow \infty$.

This may be proven by following exactly the proof of Corollary 13. By slightly modifying the proof, one may prove this theorem even for $\sigma = \mathbf{1}_{[1,2]}$ so that t is uniformly distributed between T and $2T$, but we do not pursue this matter here. By integrating in α , one can obtain microscopic and macroscopic statistics, and correlations thereof, uniformly for points separated by a distance asymptotically less than $m(T)$. One can, for instance, recover Corollary 13 for $n(T) = o(m(T))$ in this way. We are able to integrate in α without destroying error terms for the reason that $\varepsilon([k] \setminus J)$ has no dependence on α_i for $i \in J$.

In the same way, by modifying the proof of Theorem 23,

THEOREM 26. *For fixed $A < 2$, fixed r of compact Fourier support, and fixed $n(N)$ with $n(N) \rightarrow \infty$ but with $n(N) = o(N)$, we have that for $|\alpha_1| + \cdots + |\alpha_k| \leq A$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{S_N} \prod_{\ell=1}^k (\Delta_\ell - \mathbb{E} \Delta_\ell) = \mathbb{E}_S \prod_{\ell=1}^k (\Delta_\ell - \mathbb{E} \Delta_\ell) + \sum_{\emptyset \subseteq J \subsetneq [k]} \varepsilon([k] \setminus J) \cdot \mathbb{E}_S \prod_{\ell \in J} (\Delta_\ell - \mathbb{E} \Delta_\ell),$$

for Δ_ℓ (defined in the obvious way with respect to $n(N)$), and ε as in Theorem 25.

To have a more eloquent expression of the mesoscopic convergence expressed by these results would certainly be desirable.

We want finally to point out again that Selberg's approximation to $S(t)$, mentioned in the introduction, and therefore Fujii's Theorem's 1 and 6, are true unconditionally. The first of these claims was shown by Selberg, using a zero-density estimate to bound the number of zeroes lying off the critical line. I have been unable to extend this method to prove Theorem 2 unconditionally, where the points we are counting are the imaginary ordinates of non-trivial zeroes, which may in some instances lie off the real line, but it may be possible to do so all the same.

6. Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Rowan Killip, Zeev Rudnick, and Terence Tao for a number of helpful and encouraging exchanges.

References

- [1] M. Berry, *Semiclassical formula for the number variance of the Riemann zeros*, Nonlinearity 1, 399-407 (1988)
- [2] D. Bump, *Lie Groups*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 225, Springer, New York, NY (2004).
- [3] E. Bogomolny and J. Keating, *Gutzwiller's trace formula and spectral statistics: beyond the diagonal approximation*, Physical Review Letters 77 (1996) no. 8, 1472-1475.
- [4] P. Bourgade and J. Kuan, *Strong Szego asymptotics and zeros of L-functions*, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1203.5328>, preprint.
- [5] J. Conrey, *Notes on eigenvalue distributions for the classical compact groups*. in "Recent Perspectives in Random Matrix Theory and Number Theory", LMS, Lecture Note Series 322 (2005) 111 - 145.
- [6] P. Diaconis and S. Evans, *Linear Functionals of Eigenvalues of Random Matrices*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 353 (2001), 2615-2633.
- [7] P. Diaconis and M. Shahshahani, *On the Eigenvalues of Random Matrices*, J. Appl. Probab. 31A (1994), 49-62.
- [8] D. Faifman, and Z. Rudnick. *Statistics of the zeros of zeta functions in families of hyperelliptic curves over a finite field*. Compositio Mathematica 146 (1), (2010) 81-101.
- [9] A. Fujii, *On the zeros of Dirichlet L-functions I*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 196 (1974), 225-235.
- [10] A. Fujii, *Explicit formulas and oscillations*, Emerging Applications of Number Theory, Springer (1999), 219-267.

- [11] A. Guinand, *A summation formula in the theory of prime numbers*, Proc. London Math. Soc. 50 (1948), 107-119.
- [12] J. B. Hough, M. Krishnapur, Y. Peres, and B. Virág, *Zeros of Gaussian Analytic Functions and Determinantal Point Process*. AMS University Lecture Series, vol. 51, AMS, Providence, R.I. (2009).
- [13] C. Hughes, *Mock-Gaussian Behavior* in “Recent Perspectives in Random Matrix Theory and Number Theory”, LMS, Lecture Note Series 322 (2005) 337-355.
- [14] C.P. Hughes and Z. Rudnick, *Linear statistics for zeros of Riemann’s zeta function*, C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser I 335 (2002), 667-670.
- [15] H. Iwaniec and E. Kowalski, *Analytic Number Theory*, AMS Colloquium Publications, vol. 53, AMS, Providence, RI (2004).
- [16] R. Killip and M. Stoiciu, *Eigenvalue statistics for CMV matrices: from Poisson to Clock via $C\beta E$* . Duke Math. J. 146 (3) (2009), 361-399.
- [17] H. Montgomery. *The pair correlation of zeros of the zeta function*, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. 24, AMS, Providence, R.I., (1973) 181-193.
- [18] H. Montgomery and R.C. Vaughan. *Multiplicative Number Theory I. Classical Theory*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 97, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2007).
- [19] Ricardo Pérez-Marco. *Statistics on Riemann Zeros*, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1112.0346>, preprint.
- [20] B. Riemann. *Ueber die Anzahl der Primzahlen unter einer gegebenen Groesse*, Monat. der Koenigl. Preuss. Akad. der Wissen. zu Berlin aus der Jahre, 1859 (1860), p.671-680.
- [21] B. Rodgers. *Macroscopic Pair Correlation of the Riemann Zeroes for Smooth Test Functions*, <http://arxiv.org/abs/1203.3275>, preprint.
- [22] M. Rubinstein, *Low-lying zeros of L-functions and random matrix theory*, Duke Math. J. 109 (2001) 147-181.
- [23] Z. Rudnick and P. Sarnak, *Principal L-functions and random matrix theory*, Duke Math. J. 81 (2) (1996), 269-322.
- [24] A. Selberg, *On the remainder in the formula for $N(T)$, the number of zeroes of $\zeta(s)$ in the strip $0 < t < T$* , Avh. Norske Vid. Akad. Oslo. I. (1944), no. 1, 27.
- [25] A. Selberg, *Contributions to the theory of the Riemann zeta-function*, Arch. Mat. Naturvid. 48 (1946), No. 5, 89-155.
- [26] N.C. Snaith. *Riemann zeros and random matrix theory*, Milan J. Math. 78 (2010), 135-152
- [27] A. Soshnikov, *Gaussian Limit for Determinantal Random point Fields*, Ann. Probab. 30 (2002) 171-187.
- [28] A. Soshnikov, *The central limit theorem for local linear statistics in classical compact groups and related combinatorial identities*. Ann. Probab. 28 (2000) 1353-1370.
- [29] H. Spohn, *Interacting Brownian particles: a study of Dyson’s model*, in “Hydrodynamic Behavior and Interacting Particle Systems,” Springer, IMA Volumes in Mathematics and its Applications, 9 (1987) 151-179.
- [30] E.C. Titchmarsh, rev. by D.R. Heath-Brown. *The Theory of the Riemann Zeta-function. 2nd Edition* Oxford Science Publications, Clarendon Press, 1986.
- [31] A. Weil, *Sur les “formules explicites” de la thorie des nombres premiers*, Comm. Sem. Math. Univ. Lund [Medd. Lunds Univ. Mat. Sem.] (1952), 252-265.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UCLA, LOS ANGELES CA 90095-1555, USA

E-mail address: brodgers@math.ucla.edu