

LOWER BOUNDS FOR MOMENTS OF THE DERIVATIVE OF THE RIEMANN ZETA FUNCTION

PENG GAO

ABSTRACT. We establish in this paper sharp lower bounds for the $2k$ -th moment of the derivative of the Riemann zeta function on the critical line for all real $k \geq 0$.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010): 11M06

Keywords: lower bounds, moments, derivative, Riemman zeta function

1. INTRODUCTION

It is an important subject in analytical number theory to investigate moments of the Riemann zeta function $\zeta(s)$ on the critical line as they can be applied to study the maximum size of the zeta function as well as primes in short intervals via zero density estimates. We denote the $2k$ -th moment of $\zeta(s)$ on the critical line by

$$M_k(T) = \int_T^{2T} |\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it)|^{2k} dt.$$

The study on $M_k(T)$ dates back to the work of G.H. Hardy and J. E. Littlewood [13], who established an asymptotic formula for $M_1(T)$. In [18], A. E. Ingham established an asymptotic formula for $M_2(T)$. No other asymptotic formulas are known for $M_k(T)$ except for the trivial case $k = 0$. Despite of this, J. P. Keating and N. C. Snaith [21] made precise conjectured formulas for $M_k(T)$ for all real $k \geq 0$ by drawing analogues with the random matrix theory. Using multiple Dirichlet series, A. Diaconu, D. Goldfeld and J. Hoffstein [10] also obtained the same conjectured formulas. More precise asymptotic formulas with lower order terms were conjectured by J. B. Conrey, D. W. Farmer, J. P. Keating, M. O. Rubinstein and N. C. Snaith in [5].

Owing much to the work in [1, 2, 6–8, 14–17, 26–31, 34, 35], we now have sharp upper and lower bounds for $M_k(T)$ of the conjectured order of magnitude for all $k \geq 0$ with some of them being valid under the truth of the Riemann hypothesis (RH).

Among the many methods applied in the above work, we point out notably a simple and powerful method developed by Z. Rudnick and K. Soundararajan [31, 32] towards establishing sharp lower bounds for moments of families of L -functions, a method of K. Soundararajan [35] and its refinement by A. J. Harper [14] to derive sharp upper bounds for moments of families of L -functions under the generalized Riemann hypothesis (GRH). We note also an upper bounds principle developed by M. Radziwiłł and K. Soundararajan in [27] for establishing upper bounds for moments of families of L -functions as well as its dual lower bounds principle developed by W. Heap and K. Soundararajan in [16].

Similar to $M_k(T)$, it is also interesting to study moments of the derivatives of $\zeta(s)$ on the critical line. For integers $l \geq 1$, let

$$I_{k,l}(T) = \int_1^T |\zeta^{(l)}(\frac{1}{2} + it)|^{2k} dt.$$

An asymptotic formula for $I_{1,l}(T)$ is also given in the above mentioned work of A. E. Ingham [18]. In [4], J. B. Conrey obtained an asymptotic formula for $I_{2,l}(T)$. Also, in connection with the random matrix theory, J.B. Conrey, M.O. Rubinstein and N.C. Snaith [9, Conjecture 1] conjectured that

$$I_{k,1}(T) \sim a_k b_k T (\log T)^{k^2 + 2k},$$

for some explicit constants a_k, b_k .

Under RH, M. B. Milinovich [22] established essentially upper bounds of the correct order of magnitude for $I_{k,l}(T)$ for positive integers k, l . His result was further improved to yield optimal upper bounds by A. Ivić [19] for $I_{k,2}(T)$ for positive integers k . The methods employed in [22] and [19] allow one to deduce upper bounds for $I_{k,l}(T)$ from the corresponding ones for $M_k(T)$. As sharp upper bounds for $M_k(T)$ are known for all $k \geq 0$ under RH from the

work of K. Soundararajan [35] and for all $0 \leq k \leq 2$ unconditionally from the work of W. Heap, M. Radziwiłł and K. Soundararajan [15], we may apply the methods in [22] and [19] to derive that unconditionally for $1/2 \leq k \leq 2$ and under RH for $k \geq 2$, we have for all integers $l \geq 1$,

$$I_{k,l}(T) \ll_{k,l} T(\log T)^{k^2+2kl}.$$

On the other hand, K. Sono [33], T. Christ and J. Kalpokas [3] studied lower bounds for $I_{k,l}(T)$. It follows from [3, Corollary 1.1] that we have for any rational $k \geq 1$ and any positive integer l ,

$$I_{k,l}(T) \gg_{k,l} T(\log T)^{k^2+2kl}.$$

The aim of this paper is to obtain sharp lower bounds for $I_{k,l}(T)$ for all real $k \geq 0$. For simplicity, we shall focus on $I_{k,1}(T)$ throughout, although our methods carry over to treat $I_{k,l}(T)$ for other l as well. Our main result is as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *For large T and any $k \geq 0$, we have*

$$I_{k,1}(T) \gg_k T(\log T)^{k^2+2k}.$$

Combining Theorem 1.1 and our discussions above, we immediately obtain the following result concerning the order of magnitude of $I_{k,1}(T)$.

Corollary 1.2. *For large T and any $1/2 \leq k \leq 2$, we have*

$$I_{k,1}(T) \asymp T(\log T)^{k^2+2k}.$$

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is based on the above mentioned lower bounds principle of W. Heap and K. Soundararajan [16], together with the approach taken in [3, Section 5]. We note that a similar approach to the one used in [3, Section 5] has already been employed by M. B. Milinovich and N. Ng [23] in their study on lower bounds for the discrete moments of the derivative of $\zeta(s)$ at nontrivial zeros. Since these discrete moments can be regarded as analogues to $I_{k,1}(T)$ and are studied by the author in [11], the proof of Theorem 1.1 also makes use of some approaches there as well.

2. PRELIMINARIES

We reserve the letter p for a prime number in this paper and we recall the following well-known results on sums of primes (see [25, Theorem 2.7]).

Lemma 2.1. *Let $x \geq 2$. We have, for some constant b ,*

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{p} &= \log \log x + b + O\left(\frac{1}{\log x}\right), \\ \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{\log p}{p} &= \log x + O(1). \end{aligned}$$

We note the following mean value theorem given in [24, Lemma 4.1] concerning integrals over Dirichlet polynomials.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $\{a_n\}$ and $\{b_n\}$ be sequences of complex numbers. Let T_1 and T_2 be positive real numbers and $g(t)$ be a real-valued function that is continuously differentiable on the interval $[T_1, T_2]$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{T_1}^{T_2} g(t) \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n n^{-it} \right) \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n n^{it} \right) dt \\ &= \int_{T_1}^{T_2} g(t) dt \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n b_n + O \left(\left(|g(T_1)| + |g(T_2)| + \int_{T_1}^{T_2} |g'(t)| dt \right) \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n |a_n|^2 \right)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n |b_n|^2 \right)^{1/2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

3.1. The lower bound principle. We may assume that $k > 0$ and T is a large number throughout the proof. We also point out that the explicit constants involved in estimations using \ll or the big- O notations in the proof depend on k only and are uniform with respect to p and T .

We follow the ideas of A. J. Harper in [14] to define for a large number M depending on k only,

$$\alpha_0 = 0, \quad \alpha_j = \frac{20^{j-1}}{(\log \log T)^2} \quad \forall j \geq 1, \quad \mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}_{k,T} = \max\{j : \alpha_j \leq 10^{-M}\}.$$

We denote $\ell_j := \lceil e^{2k} \alpha_j^{-3/4} \rceil$ for $1 \leq j \leq \mathcal{J}$ and divide the interval $(0, T^{\alpha_{\mathcal{J}}}]$ into disjoint subintervals $I_j = (T^{\alpha_{j-1}}, T^{\alpha_j}]$, $1 \leq j \leq \mathcal{J}$. We define for any real number ℓ and any $x \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$E_{\ell}(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{\lceil \ell \rceil} \frac{x^j}{j!}.$$

We also define for any real number α and any $1 \leq j \leq \mathcal{J}$,

$$\mathcal{P}_j(s) = \sum_{p \in I_j} \frac{1}{p^s}, \quad \mathcal{N}_j(s, \alpha) = E_{\ell_j}(\alpha \mathcal{P}_j(s)), \quad \mathcal{N}(s, \alpha) = \prod_{j=1}^{\mathcal{J}} \mathcal{N}_j(s, \alpha).$$

We deduce from [11, (3.1)] and Lemma 2.1 that for any large number N , we can take T large enough so that

$$(3.1) \quad \mathcal{P}_1(1) \leq \frac{1}{N} \ell_1, \quad \mathcal{P}_j(1) \leq \min(10, \frac{1}{N} \ell_j), \quad 2 \leq j \leq \mathcal{J}.$$

We denote $\Omega(n)$ for the number of prime powers dividing n and $g(n)$ for the multiplicative function given on prime powers by $g(p^r) = 1/r!$ and define functions $b_j(n)$, $1 \leq j \leq \mathcal{J}$ such that $b_j(n) = 0$ or 1 and that $b_j(n) = 1$ only when $\Omega(n) \leq \ell_j$ and all the prime factors of n are from the interval I_j . We then have

$$\mathcal{N}_j(s, \alpha) = \sum_{n_j} \frac{\alpha^{\Omega(n_j)}}{g(n_j)} b_j(n_j) \frac{1}{n_j^s}, \quad 1 \leq j \leq \mathcal{J}.$$

It follows from [11, Section 3.1] that each $\mathcal{N}_j(s, \alpha)$ is a short Dirichlet polynomial of length at most $T^{\alpha_j \lceil e^{2k} \alpha_j^{-3/4} \rceil}$ and that $\mathcal{N}(s, \alpha)$ is also a short Dirichlet polynomial of length at most $T^{40e^2 k 10^{-M/4}}$.

We now write for simplicity that

$$(3.2) \quad \mathcal{N}(s, \alpha) = \sum_n \frac{a_{\alpha}(n)}{n^s}.$$

We note that $a_{\alpha}(n) \neq 0$ only when $n = \prod_{1 \leq j \leq \mathcal{J}} n_j$ such that $b_j(n_j) = 1$, in which case we have

$$a_{\alpha}(n) = \prod_{n_j} \frac{\alpha^{\Omega(n_j)}}{g(n_j)} b_j(n_j).$$

We combine [11, (2.1), (3.3)] to see that for all $n \geq 3$,

$$(3.3) \quad a_{\alpha}(n) \leq e^{\frac{|\alpha| \log n}{\log \log n} (1 + O(\frac{1}{\log \log n}))} \text{ and } a_{\alpha}(n) = 0 \text{ when } n > T^{40e^2 k 10^{-M/4}}.$$

Moreover, we note that [11, (3.4)] implies that for $\Re(s) \geq -1/\log T$ and T large enough,

$$(3.4) \quad |\mathcal{N}(s, \alpha)| \ll e^{|\alpha| \frac{\log T}{\log \log T} (1 + O(\frac{1}{\log \log T}))} T^{40e^2 k 10^{-M/4} (1 + 1/\log T)}.$$

In the proof of Theorem 1.1, we need the following lower bounds principle of W. Heap and K. Soundararajan [16] for our case.

Lemma 3.2. *With notations as above, we have for $0 < k \leq 1/2$,*

$$(3.5) \quad \int_1^T -\zeta'(\frac{1}{2} + it) \mathcal{N}(\frac{1}{2} + it, k-1) \overline{\mathcal{N}(\frac{1}{2} - it, k)} dt \ll \left(\int_1^T |\zeta'(\frac{1}{2} + it)|^{2k} dt \right)^{1/2} \left(\int_1^T |\zeta'(\frac{1}{2} + it)|^2 |\mathcal{N}(\frac{1}{2} + it, k-1)|^2 dt \right)^{(1-k)/2} \\ \times \left(\int_1^T \prod_{j=1}^{\mathcal{J}} (|\mathcal{N}_j(\frac{1}{2} + it, k)|^2 + |\mathcal{Q}_j(\frac{1}{2} + it, k)|^{2r_k}) dt \right)^{k/2}.$$

Also, we have for $k > 1/2$,

$$(3.6) \quad \int_1^T -\zeta'(\frac{1}{2} + it) \mathcal{N}(\frac{1}{2} + it, k-1) \overline{\mathcal{N}(\frac{1}{2} - it, k)} dt \\ \leq \left(\int_1^T |\zeta'(\frac{1}{2} + it)|^{2k} dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2k}} \left(\int_1^T \prod_{j=1}^{\mathcal{J}} (|\mathcal{N}_j(\frac{1}{2} + it, k)|^2 + |\mathcal{Q}_j(\frac{1}{2} + it, k)|^{2r_k}) dt \right)^{\frac{2k-1}{2k}}.$$

Here the implied constants in (3.5) and (3.6) depend on k only, and we define

$$\mathcal{Q}_j(s, k) = \left(\frac{64 \max(2, k + 3/2) \mathcal{P}_j(s)}{\ell_j} \right)^{\ell_j},$$

with $r_k = 2 + \lceil 1/k \rceil$ for $0 < k \leq 1/2$ and $r_k = 1 + \lceil 2k/(2k-1) \rceil$ for $k > 1/2$.

We skip the proof of the above lemma as it can be established similar to those of [11, Lemma 3.2-3.3]. We deduce from the above lemma that in order to establish Theorem 1.1, it suffices to prove the following three propositions.

Proposition 3.3. *With notations as above, we have for $k > 0$,*

$$(3.7) \quad \int_1^T -\zeta'(\tfrac{1}{2} + it) \mathcal{N}(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, k-1) \mathcal{N}(\tfrac{1}{2} - it, k) dt \gg T(\log T)^{k^2+1}.$$

Proposition 3.4. *With notations as above, we have for $0 < k \leq 1/2$,*

$$(3.8) \quad \int_1^T |\zeta'(\tfrac{1}{2} + it)|^2 |\mathcal{N}(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, k-1)|^2 dt \ll T(\log T)^{k^2+2}.$$

Proposition 3.5. *With notations as above, we have for $k > 0$,*

$$\int_1^T \prod_{i=1}^{\mathcal{J}} (|\mathcal{N}_i(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, k)|^2 + |\mathcal{Q}_i(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, k)|^{2r_k}) dt \ll T(\log T)^{k^2}.$$

We shall omit the proof of Proposition 3.5 as it is similar to that of [11, Proposition 3.5], upon making use of Lemma 2.2. In the rest of the paper, we shall prove the remaining two propositions.

3.6. Proof of Proposition 3.3. The proof is based on the approaches used in Section 5 of [3] and Section 5 of [24]. We denote the left side expression in (3.7) by S_1 and apply Cauchy's residue theorem to deduce that

$$S_1 = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathcal{C}} -\zeta'(s) \mathcal{N}(s, k-1) \mathcal{N}(1-s, k) ds,$$

where \mathcal{C} consists of line segments from $\frac{1}{2} + i$ to $\kappa + i$, then from $\kappa + i$ to $\kappa + iT$ and lastly from $\kappa + iT$ to $\frac{1}{2} + iT$, where $\kappa = 1 + (\log T)^{-1}$.

We apply (3.4) and the estimation (see [12, (20)])

$$\zeta'(s) \ll \begin{cases} (1+|t|)^{(1-\Re(s))/2+\epsilon}, & 0 \leq \Re(s) \leq 1, \\ (1+|t|)^\epsilon, & \Re(s) \geq 1, \end{cases}$$

to see that the integral is bounded by $O(T^{1-\epsilon})$ on the horizontal edges of the contour. We thus conclude that

$$(3.9) \quad S_1 = S_{1,R} + O(T^{1-\epsilon}),$$

where

$$(3.10) \quad S_{1,R} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\kappa+i}^{\kappa+iT} -\zeta'(s) \mathcal{N}(s, k-1) \mathcal{N}(1-s, k) ds + O(T^{1-\epsilon}).$$

To evaluate $S_{1,R}$, we define the Dirichlet convolution $f * g$ for two arithmetic functions $f(k), g(k)$ by

$$f * g(k) = \sum_{mn=k} f(m)g(n).$$

Using this notation and that given in (3.2), we apply Lemma 2.2 to evaluate $S_{1,R}$ in (3.10) to see that

$$S_{1,R} = \frac{T-1}{2\pi} \sum_n \frac{(\log * a_{k-1})(n) \cdot a_k(n)}{n} + O\left(\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(\log * a_{k-1})(n)^2}{n^{2\kappa-1}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_k(n)^2}{n^{1-2\kappa}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right).$$

We apply the estimations given in (3.3) to see that for T large enough,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_k(n)^2}{n^{1-2\kappa}} \ll e^{4k \log T / \log \log T} \sum_{n \leq T^{40e^2 k^{10} - M/4}} \frac{1}{n^{1-2\kappa}} \ll T^{1-\epsilon}.$$

Moreover, we have that

$$(\log * a_{k-1})(n) \leq \log n \sum_{n \leq T^{40e^2 k^{10} - M/4}} |a_{k-1}(n)| \leq T^{1/2-\epsilon} \log n.$$

It follows from the above that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(\log * a_{k-1})(n)^2}{n^{2\kappa-1}} \ll T^{1-2\epsilon} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\log^2 n}{n^{2\kappa-1}} \ll T^{1-\epsilon},$$

where the last estimation above follows from the bound that (see [24, (16)]) uniformly for $\sigma > 1$ and any integer $i \geq 0$,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\log^i n}{n^\sigma} \ll \frac{1}{(\sigma-1)^{i+1}}.$$

We then conclude from the above discussions that

$$\begin{aligned} (3.11) \quad S_{1,R} &= \frac{T-1}{2\pi} \sum_{n,m} \frac{a_{k-1}(m)a_k(mn)(\log n)}{mn} + O(T^{1-\varepsilon}) \\ &= \frac{T-1}{2\pi} \sum_n \frac{\log n}{n} \sum_m \frac{a_{k-1}(m)a_k(mn)}{m} + O(T^{1-\varepsilon}). \end{aligned}$$

It remains to estimate the last expression above. To do so, we may assume that $n = \prod_{j=1}^{\mathcal{J}} n_j$ with $b_j(n_j) = 1$ for $1 \leq j \leq \mathcal{J}$. Then the inner sum of the last expression above becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_m \frac{a_{k-1}(m)a_k(mn)}{m} &= \prod_{j=1}^{\mathcal{J}} \left(\sum_{m_j} \frac{1}{m_j} \frac{k^{\Omega(n_j m_j)}(k-1)^{\Omega(m_j)}}{g(n_j m_j)g(m_j)} b_j(n_j m_j) b_j(m_j) \right) \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^{\mathcal{J}} \left(\sum_{m_j} \frac{1}{m_j} \frac{k^{\Omega(n_j m_j)}(k-1)^{\Omega(m_j)}}{g(n_j m_j)g(m_j)} b_j(n_j m_j) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality above follows by noting that $b_j(n_j m_j) = 1$ implies that $b_j(m_j) = 1$ for all $1 \leq j \leq \mathcal{J}$.

Note that the factor $b_j(n_j m_j)$ restricts m_j to have all prime factors in I_j such that $\Omega(n_j m_j) \leq \ell_j$. If we remove this restrictions on Ω , then the sum over m_j becomes

$$\sum_{m_j} \frac{1}{m_j} \frac{k^{\Omega(n_j m_j)}(k-1)^{\Omega(m_j)}}{g(n_j m_j)g(m_j)} = \prod_{\substack{p \in I_j \\ (p, n_j)=1}} \left(1 + \frac{k(k-1)}{p} + O\left(\frac{1}{p^2}\right) \right) \prod_{\substack{p_{i,j} \in I_j \\ p_{i,j}^{l_{i,j}} \parallel n_j \\ l_{i,j} \geq 1}} \left(\frac{k^{l_{i,j}}}{l_{i,j}!} + \frac{k^{l_{i,j}+1}(k-1)}{(l_{i,j}+1)!p_{i,j}} + \frac{k^{l_{i,j}+2}(k-1)^2}{(l_{i,j}+2)!2!p_{i,j}^2} + \dots \right).$$

We recast the last product above as

$$\prod_{\substack{p_{i,j} \in I_j \\ p_{i,j}^{l_{i,j}} \parallel n_j \\ l_{i,j} \geq 1}} \left(\frac{k^{l_{i,j}}}{l_{i,j}!} + \frac{k^{l_{i,j}+1}(k-1)}{(l_{i,j}+1)!p_{i,j}} + \frac{k^{l_{i,j}+2}(k-1)^2}{(l_{i,j}+2)!2!p_{i,j}^2} + \dots \right) = \frac{k^{\Omega(n_j)}}{g(n_j)} \prod_{\substack{p \in I_j \\ p \mid n_j}} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{p}\right) \right),$$

and we note that each factor in the last product above is positive.

Using Rankin's trick by noticing that $2^{\Omega(n_j m_j) - \ell_j} \geq 1$ if $\Omega(n_j m_j) > \ell_j$, we see that the error introduced this way does not exceed

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{m_j} \frac{1}{m_j} \frac{k^{\Omega(n_j m_j)} |1-k|^{\Omega(m_j)}}{g(n_j m_j)g(m_j)} 2^{\Omega(n_j m_j) - \ell_j} \\ &= 2^{\Omega(n_j) - \ell_j} \sum_{m_j} \frac{1}{m_j} \frac{k^{\Omega(n_j m_j)} 2^{\Omega(m_j)} |1-k|^{\Omega(m_j)}}{g(n_j m_j)g(m_j)} \\ &\leq 2^{\Omega(n_j) - \ell_j/2} \frac{k^{\Omega(n_j)}}{g(n_j)} \prod_{\substack{p \in I_j \\ (p, n_j)=1}} \left(1 + \frac{k(k-1)}{p} + O\left(\frac{1}{p^2}\right) \right) \prod_{\substack{p \in I_j \\ p \mid n_j}} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{p}\right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last estimation above follows from (3.1).

It follows that we may write

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_m \frac{a_{k-1}(m)a_k(mn)}{m} &= \prod_{p \in \bigcup_{j=1}^{\mathcal{J}} I_j} \left(1 + \frac{k(k-1)}{p} + O\left(\frac{1}{p^2}\right)\right) \\
&\quad \times \prod_{j=1}^{\mathcal{J}} \left(1 + f_j(n_j)\right) \frac{k^{\Omega(n_j)}}{g(n_j)} \prod_{\substack{p \in I_j \\ p|n_j}} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)\right) \left(1 + \frac{k(k-1)}{p} + O\left(\frac{1}{p^2}\right)\right)^{-1} \\
&= \prod_{p \in \bigcup_{j=1}^{\mathcal{J}} I_j} \left(1 + \frac{k(k-1)}{p} + O\left(\frac{1}{p^2}\right)\right) \prod_{j=1}^{\mathcal{J}} \left(1 + f_j(n_j)\right) \frac{k^{\Omega(n_j)}}{g(n_j)} \prod_{\substack{p \in I_j \\ p|n_j}} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$|f_j(n_j)| \leq 2^{\Omega(n_j) - \ell_j/2}.$$

We apply the above estimation to see that

$$\begin{aligned}
(3.12) \quad &\sum_n \frac{\log n}{n} \sum_m \frac{a_{k-1}(m)a_k(mn)}{m} \\
&= \prod_{p \in \bigcup_{j=1}^{\mathcal{J}} I_j} \left(1 + \frac{k(k-1)}{p} + O\left(\frac{1}{p^2}\right)\right) \sum_{n=\prod_j n_j} \frac{\log n}{n} \prod_{j=1}^{\mathcal{J}} \left(1 + f_j(n_j)\right) \frac{k^{\Omega(n_j)}}{g(n_j)} b_j(n_j) \prod_{\substack{p \in I_j \\ p|n_j}} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Note that we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{n=\prod_j n_j} \frac{\log n}{n} \prod_{j=1}^{\mathcal{J}} \left(1 + f_j(n_j)\right) \frac{k^{\Omega(n_j)}}{g(n_j)} b_j(n_j) \prod_{\substack{p \in I_j \\ p|n_j}} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)\right) \\
&= \sum_{n=\prod_j n_j} \prod_{j=1}^{\mathcal{J}} \frac{1}{n_j} \left(1 + f_j(n_j)\right) \frac{k^{\Omega(n_j)}}{g(n_j)} b_j(n_j) \prod_{\substack{p \in I_j \\ p|n_j}} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)\right) \left(\sum_j \log n_j\right) \\
&= \sum_{j'=1}^{\mathcal{J}} \prod_{\substack{j=1 \\ j \neq j'}}^{\mathcal{J}} \left(\sum_{n_j} \frac{1}{n_j} \left(1 + f_j(n_j)\right) \frac{k^{\Omega(n_j)}}{g(n_j)} b_j(n_j) \prod_{\substack{p \in I_j \\ p|n_j}} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)\right)\right) \\
&\quad \times \left(\sum_{n_{j'}} \frac{\log n_{j'}}{n_{j'}} \left(1 + f_{j'}(n_{j'})\right) \frac{k^{\Omega(n_{j'})}}{g(n_{j'})} b_{j'}(n_{j'}) \prod_{\substack{p \in I_{j'} \\ p|n_{j'}}} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)\right)\right).
\end{aligned}$$

We denote $\mathcal{N}_j, 1 \leq j \leq \mathcal{J}$ for the set of integers n_j such that n_j is divisible only by primes $p \in I_j$. We estimate the last sum of the last expression above by observing that $1 - 2^{\Omega(n_j) - \ell_j/2} \leq 0$ when $\Omega(n_j) \geq \ell_j/2$, so that

$$\sum_{n_j} \frac{\log n_j}{n_j} \left(1 + f_j(n_j)\right) \frac{k^{\Omega(n_j)}}{g(n_j)} b_j(n_j) \prod_{\substack{p \in I_j \\ p|n_j}} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)\right) \geq \sum_{n_j \in \mathcal{N}_j} \frac{\log n_j}{n_j} \left(1 - 2^{\Omega(n_j) - \ell_j/2}\right) \frac{k^{\Omega(n_j)}}{g(n_j)} \prod_{\substack{p \in I_j \\ p|n_j}} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)\right).$$

We further observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{n_j \in \mathcal{N}_j} \frac{\log n_j}{n_j} \left(1 - 2^{\Omega(n_j) - \ell_j/2}\right) \frac{k^{\Omega(n_j)}}{g(n_j)} \prod_{\substack{p \in I_j \\ p|n_j}} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)\right) \\
&= -\frac{d}{ds} \left(\sum_{n_j \in \mathcal{N}_j} \frac{1}{n_j^{1+s}} \left(1 - 2^{\Omega(n_j) - \ell_j/2}\right) \frac{k^{\Omega(n_j)}}{g(n_j)} \prod_{\substack{p \in I_j \\ p|n_j}} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)\right)\right) \Big|_{s=0}.
\end{aligned}$$

Upon writing

$$\sum_{n_j \in \mathcal{N}_j} \frac{1}{n_j^{1+s}} \frac{k^{\Omega(n_j)}}{g(n_j)} \prod_{\substack{p \in I_j \\ p|n_j}} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)\right) = \prod_{p \in I_j} \left(1 + \frac{k}{p^{1+s}} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)\right) + \frac{k^2}{2!p^{2(1+s)}} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)\right) + \cdots\right),$$

we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{d}{ds} \left(\sum_{n_j \in \mathcal{N}_j} \frac{1}{n_j^{1+s}} \frac{k^{\Omega(n_j)}}{g(n_j)} \prod_{\substack{p \in I_j \\ p|n_j}} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)\right) \right) \Big|_{s=0} \\ &= \prod_{p \in I_j} \left(1 + \frac{k}{p} + O\left(\frac{1}{p^2}\right)\right) \left(\sum_{p \in I_j} \left(\frac{k \log p}{p} + O\left(\frac{1}{p^2}\right)\right) \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)\right)^{-1} \right) \\ &= \prod_{p \in I_j} \left(1 + \frac{k}{p} + O\left(\frac{1}{p^2}\right)\right) \left(\sum_{p \in I_j} \frac{k \log p}{p} + O\left(\frac{1}{p^2}\right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Note also that we have

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{d}{ds} \left(\sum_{n_j \in \mathcal{N}_j} \frac{2^{\Omega(n_j) - \ell_j/2}}{n_j^{1+s}} \frac{k^{\Omega(n_j)}}{g(n_j)} \prod_{\substack{p \in I_j \\ p|n_j}} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)\right) \right) \Big|_{s=0} \\ &= 2^{-\ell_j/2} \prod_{p \in I_j} \left(1 + \frac{2k}{p} + O\left(\frac{1}{p^2}\right)\right) \left(\sum_{p \in I_j} \frac{2k \log p}{p} + O\left(\frac{1}{p^2}\right) \right) \\ &\leq 2^{-\ell_j/4} \prod_{p \in I_j} \left(1 + \frac{k}{p} + O\left(\frac{1}{p^2}\right)\right) \left(\sum_{p \in I_j} \frac{k \log p}{p} + O\left(\frac{1}{p^2}\right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n_j \in \mathcal{N}_j} \frac{\log n_j}{n_j} \left(1 - 2^{\Omega(n_j) - \ell_j/2}\right) \frac{k^{\Omega(n_j)}}{g(n_j)} \prod_{\substack{p \in I_j \\ p|n_j}} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)\right) \\ &\geq (1 - 2^{-\ell_j/4}) \prod_{p \in I_j} \left(1 + \frac{k}{p} + O\left(\frac{1}{p^2}\right)\right) \left(\sum_{p \in I_j} \frac{k \log p}{p} + O\left(\frac{1}{p^2}\right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

We apply similar arguments as above to see that we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n_j} \frac{1}{n_j} \left(1 + f_j(n_j)\right) \frac{k^{\Omega(n_j)}}{g(n_j)} b_j(n_j) \prod_{\substack{p \in I_j \\ p|n_j}} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)\right) \\ &\geq \sum_{n_j \in \mathcal{N}_j} \frac{1}{n_j} \left(1 - 2^{\Omega(n_j) - \ell_j/2}\right) \frac{k^{\Omega(n_j)}}{g(n_j)} \prod_{\substack{p \in I_j \\ p|n_j}} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)\right) \geq (1 - 2^{-\ell_j/4}) \prod_{p \in I_j} \left(1 + \frac{k}{p} + O\left(\frac{1}{p^2}\right)\right). \end{aligned}$$

We then conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n = \prod_{j=1}^{\mathcal{J}} n_j} \frac{\log n}{n} \prod_{j=1}^{\mathcal{J}} \left(1 - 2^{\Omega(n_j) - \ell_j/2}\right) \frac{k^{\Omega(n_j)}}{g(n_j)} b_j(n_j) \prod_{\substack{p \in I_j \\ p|n_j}} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{p}\right)\right) \\ &\geq \prod_{j=1}^{\mathcal{J}} \left(1 - 2^{-\ell_j/4}\right) \prod_{p \in \bigcup_{j=1}^{\mathcal{J}} I_j} \left(1 + \frac{k}{p} + O\left(\frac{1}{p^2}\right)\right) \left(\sum_{p \in \bigcup_{j=1}^{\mathcal{J}} I_j} \frac{k \log p}{p} + O\left(\frac{1}{p^2}\right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

We apply the above estimation into (3.12) and apply (3.9), (3.11) together with Lemma 2.1 to conclude that

$$S_1 \gg T(\log T)^{k^2+1}.$$

This completes the proof of the proposition.

3.7. Proof of Proposition 3.4. We denote the left side expression in (3.8) by S_2 and apply Cauchy's integral formula for derivatives to see that

$$S_2 = \int_1^T |\zeta'(\frac{1}{2} + it)|^2 |\mathcal{N}(\frac{1}{2} + it, k-1)|^2 dt = \int_1^T \left| \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathcal{C}_1} \frac{\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + \alpha + it)}{\alpha^2} d\alpha \right|^2 |\mathcal{N}(\frac{1}{2} + it, k-1)|^2 dt,$$

where \mathcal{C}_1 denotes the positively oriented circle in the complex plane centered at 0 of radius $R = (\log T)^{-1}$. We then apply the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality to the integral over α above to deduce that

$$(3.13) \quad \begin{aligned} S_2 &\leq \left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\right)^2 \int_1^T \left| \int_{\mathcal{C}_1} \frac{1}{\alpha^4} d\alpha \right| \left| \int_{\mathcal{C}_1} |\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + \alpha + it)|^2 d\alpha \right| \left| \mathcal{N}(\frac{1}{2} + it, k-1) \right|^2 dt \\ &\leq \left(\frac{1}{2\pi}\right)^2 R^{-2} \max_{|\alpha|=R} \int_1^T |\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + \alpha + it)|^2 |\mathcal{N}(\frac{1}{2} + it, k-1)|^2 dt. \end{aligned}$$

We denote the last integral above by I and we fix an $\alpha = \beta + i\gamma$ with $\beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $|\alpha| = R$ to estimate it. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $\beta \leq 0$ and we apply Cauchy's residue theorem to deduce that

$$I = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathcal{C}_2} |\zeta(s)|^2 |\mathcal{N}(s - \alpha, k-1)|^2 ds,$$

where \mathcal{C}_2 consists of line segments from $\frac{1}{2} + \beta + (1 + \gamma)i$ to $\frac{1}{2} + (1 + \gamma)i$, then from $\frac{1}{2} + (1 + \gamma)i$ to $\frac{1}{2} + (T + \gamma)i$ and lastly from $\frac{1}{2} + (T + \gamma)i$ to $\frac{1}{2} + \beta + (T + \gamma)i$.

The integration on the on the horizontal edges of the contour can be estimated to be $O(T^{1-\varepsilon})$ using (3.4) and the convexity bound for $\zeta(s)$ (see [20, Exercise 3, p. 100]) that asserts

$$\zeta(s) \ll (1 + |s|)^{\frac{1-\Re(s)}{2} + \varepsilon}, \quad 0 \leq \Re(s) \leq 1,$$

We then deduce that

$$I = I_R + O(T^{1-\varepsilon}),$$

where

$$I_R = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{1+\gamma}^{T+\gamma} |\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it)|^2 |\mathcal{N}(\frac{1}{2} + it - \alpha, k-1)|^2 dt.$$

We now apply arguments similar to the proof of [16, Proposition 2] to deduce that for T large enough,

$$I_R \ll T(\log T)^{k^2}.$$

We apply the above estimation in (3.13) to conclude that

$$S_2 \ll T(\log T)^{k^2+2}.$$

This completes the proof of the proposition.

Acknowledgments. P. G. is supported in part by NSFC grant 11871082.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. Balasubramanian and K. Ramachandra, *Proof of some conjectures on the mean-value of Titchmarsh series. I*, Hardy-Ramanujan J. **13** (1990), 1–20.
- [2] S. Bettin, V. Chandee, and M. Radziwiłł, *The mean square of the product of the Riemann zeta-function with Dirichlet polynomials*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **729** (2017), 51–79.
- [3] T. Christ and J. Kalpokas, *Lower bounds of discrete moments of the derivatives of the Riemann zeta-function on the critical line*, J. Théor. Nombres Bordeaux **25** (2013), no. 2, 285–305.
- [4] J. B. Conrey, *The fourth moment of derivatives of the Riemann zeta-function*, Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2) **39** (1988), no. 153, 21–36.
- [5] J. B. Conrey, D. W. Farmer, J. P. Keating, M. O. Rubinstein, and N. C. Snaith, *Integral moments of L-functions*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **91** (2005), no. 1, 33–104.
- [6] J. B. Conrey and A. Ghosh, *Mean values of the Riemann zeta-function. III*, Proceedings of the Amalfi Conference on Analytic Number Theory (Maiori, 1989), 35–59, Univ. Salerno, Salerno, 1992.
- [7] ———, *On mean values of the zeta-function*, Mathematika **31** (1984), no. 1, 159–161.
- [8] J. B. Conrey and S. M. Gonek, *High moments of the Riemann zeta-function*, Duke Math. J. **107** (2001), no. 3, 577–604.
- [9] J. B. Conrey, M. O. Rubinstein, and N. C. Snaith, *Moments of the derivative of characteristic polynomials with an application to the Riemann zeta function*, Comm. Math. Phys. **267** (2006), no. 3, 611–629.
- [10] A. Diaconu, D. Goldfeld, and J. Hoffstein, *Multiple Dirichlet series and moments of zeta and L-functions*, Compositio Math. **139** (2003), no. 3, 297–360.
- [11] P. Gao, *Sharp lower bounds for moments of $\zeta'(\rho)$* (Preprint). arXiv:2106.03057.

- [12] S. M. Gonek, *Mean values of the Riemann zeta function and its derivatives*, Invent. Math. **75** (1984), no. 1, 123–141.
- [13] G. H. Hardy and J. E. Littlewood, *Contributions to the theory of the Riemann zeta-function and the theory of the distribution of primes*, Acta Math. **41** (1916), no. 1, 119–196.
- [14] A. J. Harper, *Sharp conditional bounds for moments of the Riemann zeta function* (Preprint). arXiv:1305.4618.
- [15] W. Heap, M. Radziwiłł, and K. Soundararajan, *Sharp upper bounds for fractional moments of the Riemann zeta function*, Q. J. Math. **70** (2019), no. 4, 1387–1396.
- [16] W. Heap and K. Soundararajan, *Lower bounds for moments of zeta and L-functions revisited* (Preprint). arXiv:2007.13154.
- [17] D. R. Heath-Brown, *Fractional moments of the Riemann zeta function*, J. London Math. Soc. (2) **24** (1981), no. 1, 65–78.
- [18] A. E. Ingham, *Mean-Value Theorems in the Theory of the Riemann Zeta-Function*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (2) **27** (1927), no. 4, 273–300.
- [19] A. Ivić, *On certain moments of Hardy’s function $Z(t)$ over short intervals*, Mosc. J. Comb. Number Theory **7** (2017), no. 2, 59–73.
- [20] H. Iwaniec and E. Kowalski, *Analytic Number Theory*, American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, vol. 53, American Mathematical Society, Providence, 2004.
- [21] J. P. Keating and N. C. Snaith, *Random matrix theory and L-functions at $s = 1/2$* , Comm. Math. Phys. **214** (2000), no. 1, 91–110.
- [22] M. B. Milinovich, *Moments of the Riemann zeta-function at its relative extrema on the critical line*, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. **43** (2011), no. 6, 1119–1129.
- [23] M. B. Milinovich and N. Ng, *A note on a conjecture of Gonek*, Funct. Approx. Comment. Math. **46** (2012), no. part 2, 177–187.
- [24] ———, *Lower bounds for moments of $\zeta'(\rho)$* , Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN **12** (2014), 3190–3216.
- [25] H. L. Montgomery and R. C. Vaughan, *Multiplicative number theory. I. Classical theory*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 97, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007.
- [26] M. Radziwiłł, *The 4.36th moment of the Riemann zeta-function*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN **18** (2012), 4245–4259.
- [27] M. Radziwiłł and K. Soundararajan, *Moments and distribution of central L-values of quadratic twists of elliptic curves*, Invent. Math. **202** (2015), no. 3, 1029–1068.
- [28] K. Ramachandra, *Some remarks on the mean value of the Riemann zeta function and other Dirichlet series. I*, Hardy-Ramanujan J. **1** (1978), 15pp.
- [29] ———, *Some remarks on the mean value of the Riemann zeta function and other Dirichlet series. II*, Hardy-Ramanujan J. **3** (1980), 1–24.
- [30] ———, *Some remarks on the mean value of the Riemann zeta function and other Dirichlet series. III*, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I Math. **5** (1980), no. 1, 145–158.
- [31] Z. Rudnick and K. Soundararajan, *Lower bounds for moments of L-functions*, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA **102** (2005), no. 19, 6837–6838.
- [32] ———, *Lower bounds for moments of L-functions: symplectic and orthogonal examples*, in: Multiple Dirichlet series, automorphic forms, and analytic number theory, 293–303, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. **75**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2006.
- [33] K. Sono, *Lower bounds for the moments of the derivatives of the Riemann zeta-function and Dirichlet L-functions*, Lith. Math. J. **52** (2012), no. 4, 420–434.
- [34] K. Soundararajan, *Mean-values of the Riemann zeta-function*, Mathematika **42** (1995), no. 1, 158–174.
- [35] ———, *Moments of the Riemann zeta function*, Ann. of Math. (2) **170** (2009), no. 2, 981–993.