

PSEUDORANDOMNESS OF PRIMES AT LARGE SCALES

SUN-KAI LEUNG

ABSTRACT. Assuming a variant of the Hardy–Littlewood prime k -tuple conjecture, we compute mixed moments of the number of primes in disjoint short intervals and short progressions respectively. This involves estimating the mean of singular series over any product of lattices, which is of independent interest. As a consequence, we establish the convergence of both sequences of suitably normalized primes to a standard Poisson point process.

1. INTRODUCTION

The study of prime numbers dates back over 2000 years to the era of Euclid and Eratosthenes. While significant progress has been made during these two millennia, the exact distribution of primes remains a mystery. One of the biggest challenges is that, despite being a deterministic sequence of natural numbers, primes exhibit highly pseudorandom behavior, apart from some obvious “local obstructions” (see [Tao08, p. 194]), such as the absence of consecutive primes other than the pair $\{2, 3\}$ due to parity. Therefore, natural questions arise: to what extent are primes pseudorandom at appropriate larger scales? Can such pseudorandomness be rigorously justified?

In this paper, we provide one possible answer that suitably normalized primes in short intervals and short progressions, respectively, are located on the positive real number line $(0, \infty)$ as if they were randomly positioned points in the sense of a Poisson point process.

Such a point process models the random and independent occurrence of events. Due to its Poissonian property and complete independence, a Poisson point process is often referred to as a purely random process. Thanks to the Kolmogorov extension theorem, it is completely characterized by the finite-dimensional distribution, i.e. the joint probability distributions for the number of events in all finite collections of disjoint intervals (see [DV03, p. 19]). This leads to the following convenient definition.

Definition 1.1 (Standard Poisson point process). A point process $\xi = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \delta_{X_n}$ (or $\{X_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ by abuse of notation) on $(0, \infty)$ is called a *standard Poisson point process* if for any integer $r \geq 1$ and any collection of disjoint intervals $\{I_i\}_{i=1}^r$ in $(0, \infty)$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(N(\xi; I_i) = k_i, 1 \leq i \leq r) = \prod_{i=1}^r e^{-|I_i|} \frac{|I_i|^{k_i}}{k_i!},$$

where $N(\xi; I_i) := \#\{n \geq 1 : X_n \in I_i\}$ is the number of random points in the interval I_i .

To be more precise, we shall establish the convergence of sequences of suitably normalized primes to a standard Poisson point process conditionally. For our purpose, we first recall the definition of convergence to a point process (see [DV08, Definition 11.1.IV., Theorem 11.1. VII.]), and propose a variant of the Hardy–Littlewood prime k -tuple conjecture, which is essentially [Leu24, Conjecture 1.1] without the power-saving error term, again inspired by the modified Cramér model (see [Gra95, pp. 23–24]).

Definition 1.2 (Convergence to a point process). Let ξ, ξ_1, ξ_2, \dots be point processes on $(0, \infty)$. Then we say ξ_n converges to ξ in distribution as $n \rightarrow \infty$ if $\xi_n \xrightarrow{d} \xi$ as random measures. Equivalently, for any integer $r \geq 1$ and any collection of disjoint intervals $\{I_i\}_{i=1}^r$ in $(0, \infty)$, we have the convergence in distribution

$$(N(\xi_n; I_1), \dots, N(\xi_n; I_r)) \xrightarrow{d} (N(\xi; I_1), \dots, N(\xi; I_r))$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Conjecture 1.1 (q -variant of Hardy–Littlewood prime k -tuple conjecture (HL[q])). Given integers $k, q, H \geq 1$, let $N \gg \varphi(q) \log q$ be an integer and $\mathcal{H} \subseteq [0, H]$ be a set consisting of k distinct multiples of q which is *admissible*, i.e. $v_p(\mathcal{H}) := \#\{h \in \mathcal{H} \pmod{p}\} < p$ for any prime p . Then as $N \rightarrow \infty$, we have

$$\sum_{\substack{1 \leq n \leq N \\ (n, q) = 1}} \prod_{h \in \mathcal{H}} 1_{\mathbb{P}}(n + h) = (1 + o_{k, H}(1)) \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}; q) \sum_{\substack{1 \leq n \leq N \\ (n, q) = 1}} \left(\prod_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \log(n + h) \right)^{-1},$$

where $1_{\mathbb{P}}$ is the prime indicator function, and $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}; q)$ is the *singular series* defined as the Euler product

$$\left(\frac{\varphi(q)}{q} \right)^{-k} \prod_{p \nmid q} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p} \right)^{-k} \left(1 - \frac{v_p(\mathcal{H})}{p} \right).$$

Note that $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}; q) = (\varphi(q)/q)^{-1} \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H})$, where

$$\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}) := \prod_p \left(1 - \frac{1}{p} \right)^{-k} \left(1 - \frac{v_p(\mathcal{H})}{p} \right)$$

is the classical singular series.

Assuming HL[1] with sufficient uniformity, Gallagher [Gal76] showed that the prime count in short intervals has a Poissonian limiting distribution. More precisely, if $\lambda > 0$, then for any integer $k \geq 0$, we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \#\{N < n \leq 2N : \pi(n + H) - \pi(n) = k\} = e^{-\lambda} \frac{\lambda^k}{k!},$$

where $H = \lambda \log N$, i.e. we have the convergence in distribution to a Poissonian random variable with parameter λ

$$\pi(n + H) - \pi(n) \xrightarrow{d} \text{Poisson}(\lambda).$$

For longer intervals, assuming HL[1] with a power-saving error term, Montgomery and Soundararajan [MS04] showed that the prime count in short intervals has a Gaussian limiting distribution. See [GR07, pp. 59–73] for further discussion.

Inspired by their work, assuming HL[q] with a power-saving error term, the author [Leu24] recently computed moments of the number of primes not exceeding N in progressions to a common large modulus q as $a \pmod{q}$ varies. Consequently, depending on the size of $\varphi(q)$ with respect to N , the prime count exhibits a Gaussian or Poissonian law. In particular, if $\lambda > 0$, then for any integer $k \geq 0$, we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\varphi(q)} |\{a \pmod{q} : \pi(N; q, a) = k\}| = e^{-\lambda} \frac{\lambda^k}{k!},$$

where $N = \lambda\varphi(q) \log q$, i.e. we have the convergence in distribution to a Poissonian with parameter λ

$$\pi(N; q, a) \xrightarrow{d} \text{Poisson}(\lambda).$$

See also [Gra89] in which a is fixed but q varies instead.

As we shall demonstrate, both Gallagher and the author's results are special cases of Corollaries 2.1 and 2.2 respectively.

2. MAIN RESULTS

Analogous to [Gal76], [MS04] and [Leu24], to establish the convergence in distribution of point processes, we compute mixed moments of the number of primes in short intervals and short progressions respectively. To state our main results, let us denote $\text{diam}(\mathcal{I}) := \sup \cup_{1 \leq i \leq r} I_i - \inf \cup_{1 \leq i \leq r} I_i$ as the diameter of the collection of disjoint intervals $\mathcal{I} = \{I_i\}_{i=1}^r$ in $(0, \infty)$, and $\left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} k \\ j \end{smallmatrix} \right\}$ as the *Stirling number of the second kind*, i.e. the number of ways to partition a set of k objects into j non-empty subsets.

Theorem 2.1. *Given an integer $r \geq 1$, let $\mathcal{I} = \{I_i\}_{i=1}^r$ be a collection of disjoint intervals in $(0, \infty)$. Suppose $HL[1]$ holds for $1 \leq H \leq \text{diam}(\mathcal{I})$ uniformly. Then for all integers $k_1, \dots, k_r \geq 0$, we have*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{N < n \leq 2N} \prod_{i=1}^r \# \left\{ p > n : \frac{p-n}{\log N} \in I_i \right\}^{k_i} = \prod_{i=1}^r \left(\sum_{j_i=1}^{k_i} \left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} k_i \\ j_i \end{smallmatrix} \right\} |I_i|^{j_i} \right).$$

Theorem 2.2. *Given an integer $r \geq 1$, let $\mathcal{I} = \{I_i\}_{i=1}^r$ be a collection of disjoint intervals in $(0, \infty)$. Suppose $HL[q]$ holds for $1 \leq H \leq \text{diam}(\mathcal{I})\varphi(q) \log q$ uniformly. Then for all integers $k_1, \dots, k_r \geq 0$, we have*

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\varphi(q)} \sum_{a \pmod{q}}^* \prod_{i=1}^r \# \left\{ p \equiv a \pmod{q} : \frac{p}{\varphi(q) \log q} \in I_i \right\}^{k_i} = \prod_{i=1}^r \left(\sum_{j_i=1}^{k_i} \left\{ \begin{smallmatrix} k_i \\ j_i \end{smallmatrix} \right\} |I_i|^{j_i} \right).$$

Applying the method of moments, by Definitions 1.1 and 1.2, the convergence of both sequences of suitably normalized primes in short intervals and short progressions to a standard Poisson point process is an immediate consequence.

Corollary 2.1. *Given an integer $r \geq 1$, let $\mathcal{I} = \{I_i\}_{i=1}^r$ be a collection of disjoint intervals in $(0, \infty)$. Suppose $HL[1]$ holds for $1 \leq H \leq \text{diam}(\mathcal{I})$ uniformly. Then for all integers $k_1, \dots, k_r \geq 0$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \# \left\{ N < n \leq 2N : \# \left\{ p > n : \frac{p-n}{\log N} \in I_i \right\} = k_i, 1 \leq i \leq r \right\} \\ = \prod_{i=1}^r e^{-|I_i|} \frac{|I_i|^{k_i}}{k_i!}, \end{aligned}$$

i.e. the point process $\left\{ \frac{p_i(n)-n}{\log N} \right\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$, for $N < n \leq 2N$ chosen uniformly at random, converges in distribution to the standard Poisson point process as $N \rightarrow \infty$, where p_i denotes the i -th least prime after n . In particular, by taking $r = 1$ and $I_1 = (0, \lambda]$, we recover [Gal76, Theorem 1].

Remark 2.1. On the ‘‘Fourier side’’, one formulation of the GUE hypothesis states that the point process $\left\{ \frac{\log T}{2\pi} (\gamma_n - t) \right\}$, for $T < t \leq 2T$ chosen uniformly at random, converges in distribution to the sine-kernel process, where γ_n is the n -th (counted with potential multiplicities) least positive ordinate of a nontrivial zero of the Riemann zeta function $\zeta(s)$ (see [RR23] for instance).

Corollary 2.2. *Given an integer $r \geq 1$, let $\mathcal{I} = \{I_i\}_{i=1}^r$ be a collection of disjoint intervals in $(0, \infty)$. Suppose $HL[q]$ holds for $1 \leq H \leq \text{diam}(\mathcal{I})\varphi(q) \log q$ uniformly. Then for all integers $k_1, \dots, k_r \geq 0$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\varphi(q)} \# \left\{ a \pmod{q} : \# \left\{ p \equiv a \pmod{q} : \frac{p}{\varphi(q) \log q} \in I_i \right\} = k_i, 1 \leq i \leq r \right\} \\ = \prod_{i=1}^r e^{-|I_i|} \frac{|I_i|^{k_i}}{k_i!}, \end{aligned}$$

i.e. the point process $\{\frac{p_i(q,a)}{\varphi(q) \log q}\}_{i=1}^\infty$, for $a \pmod{q}$ chosen uniformly at random, converges in distribution to the standard Poisson point process as $q \rightarrow \infty$, where $p_i(q,a)$ denotes the i -th least prime which is congruent to $a \pmod{q}$. In particular, by taking $r = 1$ and $I_1 = (0, \lambda]$, we recover [Leu24, Corollary 1.2].

Remark 2.2. Similarly, it is also believed that $\{\frac{\log q}{2\pi} \gamma_{\chi,n}\}$, for a non-trivial primitive character $\chi \pmod{q}$ chosen uniformly at random, converges in distribution to the sine-kernel process, where $\gamma_{\chi,n}$ is the n -th (counted with potential multiplicities) least positive ordinate of a nontrivial zero of the Dirichlet L-function $L(s, \chi)$ (see [HR03] for instance).

The proofs of Theorems 2.1 and 2.2 share the same structure, although the latter is more technical due to additional changes of variables (Hooley's switching trick). To avoid repetition, this paper includes only the proof of Theorem 2.2.

3. ESTIMATES OF SINGULAR SERIES

As observed in [Gal76], while primes exhibit “local” correlations, leading to those singular series defined in Conjecture 1.1, such correlations diminish “globally” as the classical singular series is 1 on average over hypercubes. Similarly, the following (unconditional) proposition, which is a “multidimensional” version of [Leu24, Lemma 6.1] but without an explicit error term, lies at the crux of the mixed moment computation.

Proposition 3.1. *Given integers $q, r \geq 1$, let $\{J_i\}_{i=1}^r$ be a collection of disjoint intervals in $(0, \infty)$ with $\min_{1 \leq i \leq r} |J_i|/q \rightarrow \infty$ as $\min_{1 \leq i \leq r} |J_i| \rightarrow \infty$. Then for any $(b, q) = 1$ and $l_1, \dots, l_r \geq 1$, we have*

$$\sum_{\substack{h_1^{(i)}, \dots, h_{l_i}^{(i)} \in J_i \text{ distinct} \\ h_1^{(i)} \equiv \dots \equiv h_{l_i}^{(i)} \equiv b \pmod{q}}} \cdots \sum \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}; q) = (1 + o_{l_1, \dots, l_r}(1)) \prod_{i=1}^r \left(\frac{|J_i|}{\varphi(q)} \right)^{l_i}$$

as $\min_{1 \leq i \leq r} |J_i| \rightarrow \infty$, where $\mathcal{H} = \{h_1^{(i)}, \dots, h_{l_i}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^r$, i.e. the singular series $\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}; q)$ is, on average, $(\varphi(q)/q)^{-(l_1 + \dots + l_r)}$ over any product of lattices of ranks l_1, \dots, l_r .

Proof. We shall follow the proof in [Gal76]. Let $p \nmid q$ be a prime. Then we define

$$\left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)^{-k} \left(1 - \frac{v_p(\mathcal{H})}{p}\right) =: 1 + a(p, v_p(\mathcal{H})),$$

and

$$a(d; \mathcal{H}) := \prod_{p|d} a(p, v_p(\mathcal{H}))$$

for any square-free integer d coprime to q . It follows from the definition that

$$\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}; q) = \sum_{\substack{d=1 \\ (d,q)=1}}^{\infty} \mu^2(d) a(d; \mathcal{H}),$$

which can be verified to be absolutely convergent, so that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{h_1^{(i)}, \dots, h_{l_i}^{(i)} \in J_i \text{ distinct} \\ h_1^{(i)} \equiv \dots \equiv h_{l_i}^{(i)} \equiv b \pmod{q}}} \cdots \sum \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}; q) &= \left(\frac{\varphi(q)}{q} \right)^{-|\mathbf{l}|} \sum_{\substack{d=1 \\ (d,q)=1}}^{\infty} \mu^2(d) \sum_{\substack{h_1^{(i)}, \dots, h_{l_i}^{(i)} \in J_i \text{ distinct} \\ h_1^{(i)} \equiv \dots \equiv h_{l_i}^{(i)} \equiv b \pmod{q}}} \cdots \sum a(d; \mathcal{H}) \\ &=: \left(\frac{\varphi(q)}{q} \right)^{-|\mathbf{l}|} \sum_{\substack{d=1 \\ (d,q)=1}}^{\infty} \mu^2(d) S'(d), \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

where $|\mathbf{l}| := l_1 + \dots + l_r$. Arguing as in [Gal76], one can choose a suitable integer $D \geq 1$ for which the contribution from $d > D$ is negligible.

From now on, let $1 \leq d \leq D$. Then, by interchanging the order of summation, the sum $S'(d)$ becomes

$$\sum_{\mathbf{v}=(v_p)_{p|d}} \prod_{p|d} a(p, v_p) \sum_{\substack{h_1^{(i)}, \dots, h_{l_i}^{(i)} \in J_i \text{ distinct} \\ h_1^{(i)} \equiv \dots \equiv h_{l_i}^{(i)} \equiv b \pmod{q} \\ (v_p(\mathcal{H}))_{p|d}=\mathbf{v}}} \cdots \sum 1 =: S(d) + R(d),$$

where

$$S(d) := \sum_{\mathbf{v}=(v_p)_{p|d}} \prod_{p|d} a(p, v_p) \sum_{\substack{h_1^{(i)}, \dots, h_{l_i}^{(i)} \in J_i \\ h_1^{(i)} \equiv \dots \equiv h_{l_i}^{(i)} \equiv b \pmod{q} \\ (v_p(\mathcal{H}))_{p|d}=\mathbf{v}}} \cdots \sum 1$$

and $R(d)$ is the sum of the remaining non-distinct terms, which is

$$\ll_r \sum_{\mathbf{v}=(v_p)_{p|d}} \prod_{p|d} |a(p, v_p)| \left(\min_{1 \leq i \leq r} \frac{|J_i|}{q} \right)^{-1} \prod_{i=1}^r \left(\frac{|J_i|}{q} \right)^{l_i}.$$

Applying the Chinese remainder theorem, the inner sum of $S(d)$ is

$$\begin{aligned} &\prod_{i=1}^r \left(\frac{|J_i|}{q} + O(1) \right)^{l_i} \prod_{p|d} \binom{p}{v_p} \left\{ \begin{matrix} |\mathbf{l}| \\ v_p \end{matrix} \right\} v_p! \\ &= \left(1 + O_r \left(\left(\min_{1 \leq i \leq r} \frac{|J_i|}{q} \right)^{-1} \right) \right) \prod_{i=1}^r \left(\frac{|J_i|}{q} \right)^{l_i} \prod_{p|d} \binom{p}{v_p} \left\{ \begin{matrix} |\mathbf{l}| \\ v_p \end{matrix} \right\} v_p!, \end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} S'(d) &= \prod_{i=1}^r \left(\frac{|J_i|}{q} \right)^{l_i} A(d) + O_r \left(\left(\min_{1 \leq i \leq r} \frac{|J_i|}{q} \right)^{-1} \prod_{i=1}^r \left(\frac{|J_i|}{q} \right)^{l_i} B(d) \right) \\ &\quad + O_r \left(\left(\min_{1 \leq i \leq r} \frac{|J_i|}{q} \right)^{-1} \prod_{i=1}^r \left(\frac{|J_i|}{q} \right)^{l_i} C(d) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

where

$$A(d) := \sum_{\mathbf{v}} \prod_{p|d} a(p, v_p) \binom{p}{v_p} \left\{ \begin{matrix} |\mathbf{l}| \\ v_p \end{matrix} \right\} v_p! = \prod_{p|d} \sum_{v_p=1}^p a(p, v_p) \binom{p}{v_p} \left\{ \begin{matrix} |\mathbf{l}| \\ v_p \end{matrix} \right\} v_p!,$$

$$B(d) := \sum_{\mathbf{v}} \prod_{p|d} |a(p, v_p)| \binom{p}{v_p} \left\{ \begin{matrix} |\mathbf{l}| \\ v_p \end{matrix} \right\} v_p! = \prod_{p|d} \sum_{v_p=1}^p |a(p, v_p)| \binom{p}{v_p} \left\{ \begin{matrix} |\mathbf{l}| \\ v_p \end{matrix} \right\} v_p!$$

and

$$C(d) := \sum_{\mathbf{v}} \prod_{p|d} |a(p, v_p)| = \prod_{p|d} \sum_{v_p=1}^p |a(p, v_p)|.$$

Arguing as in [Gal76], the contribution from the big O terms to (3.1) is negligible.

Finally, by definition the p -th factor $A(p)$ is

$$\frac{1}{(p-1)^{|\mathbf{l}|}} \left((p^{|\mathbf{l}|} - (p-1)^{|\mathbf{l}|}) \sum_{v=1}^p \binom{p}{v} \left\{ \begin{matrix} |\mathbf{l}| \\ v \end{matrix} \right\} v! - p^{|\mathbf{l}|-1} \sum_{v=1}^p v \binom{p}{v} \left\{ \begin{matrix} |\mathbf{l}| \\ v \end{matrix} \right\} v! \right).$$

Using the identities

$$\sum_{v=1}^p \binom{p}{v} \left\{ \begin{matrix} |\mathbf{l}| \\ v \end{matrix} \right\} v! = p^{|\mathbf{l}|}$$

and

$$\sum_{v=1}^p v \binom{p}{v} \left\{ \begin{matrix} |\mathbf{l}| \\ v \end{matrix} \right\} v! = (p^{|\mathbf{l}|} - (p-1)^{|\mathbf{l}|})p$$

(see [Gal76, p. 8]), we conclude that $A(d) = 1$ if $d = 1$ and vanishes otherwise. Therefore, the proposition follows from (3.1) and (3.2). \square

We also require an upper bound for individual (classical) singular series.

Lemma 3.1. *Given integers $k, q \geq 1$, let $H \geq 2q$ be an integer and $\mathcal{H} \subseteq [0, H]$ be a set consisting of k distinct multiples of q . Then*

$$\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}) \ll_k \left(\log \frac{H}{q} \right)^{k-1}.$$

Proof. By definition, we have

$$\mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}) = \prod_{\substack{p \leq H/q \\ p \nmid q}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p} \right)^{-k} \left(1 - \frac{v_p(\mathcal{H})}{p} \right) \prod_{\substack{p > H/q \\ p \nmid q}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p} \right)^{-k} \left(1 - \frac{v_p(\mathcal{H})}{p} \right). \quad (3.3)$$

Since the set \mathcal{H} consists of distinct multiples of q , we must have $v_p(\mathcal{H}) = k$ provided that $p > H/q$ and $p \nmid q$, so that the last product is

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{\substack{p > H/q \\ p \nmid q}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p} \right)^{-k} \left(1 - \frac{v_p(\mathcal{H})}{p} \right) &= \prod_{\substack{p > H/q \\ p \nmid q}} \left(1 + O_k \left(\frac{1}{p^2} \right) \right) \\ &= 1 + O_k \left(\left(\frac{H}{q} \log \frac{H}{q} \right)^{-1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since the first product of (3.3) is $\ll_k \log^{k-1}(H/q)$ using Mertens' estimates, the lemma follows. \square

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.2

To lighten the notation, we adopt the convention $\tilde{x} := \frac{x}{\varphi(q) \log q}$. Without loss of generality, we assume $I_i = (\alpha_i, \beta_i]$ with $0 < \alpha_1 < \beta_1 < \dots < \alpha_r < \beta_r$ and $k_i \geq 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$. Then, adapting the proof of [Leu24, Theorem 1.2], we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\varphi(q)} \sum_{a \pmod{q}}^* \prod_{i=1}^r \# \left\{ p \equiv a \pmod{q} : \frac{p}{\varphi(q) \log q} \in I_i \right\}^{k_i} \\ &= \frac{1}{\varphi(q)} \sum_{a \pmod{q}}^* \prod_{i=1}^r \sum_{\substack{\widetilde{p_1^{(i)}}, \dots, \widetilde{p_{k_i}^{(i)}} \in I_i \\ p_1^{(i)} \equiv \dots \equiv p_{k_i}^{(i)} \equiv a \pmod{q}}} 1 \\ &= \frac{1}{\varphi(q)} \sum_{a \pmod{q}}^* \prod_{i=1}^r \sum_{j_i=1}^{k_i} \binom{k_i}{j_i} j_i! \sum_{\substack{\widetilde{p_1^{(i)} < \dots < p_{j_i}^{(i)}} \in I_i \\ p_1^{(i)} \equiv \dots \equiv p_{j_i}^{(i)} \equiv a \pmod{q}}} 1. \end{aligned}$$

Making the change of variables $p_1^{(i)} = n_i + d_1^{(i)}, \dots, p_{j_i}^{(i)} = n_i + d_{j_i}^{(i)}$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$, this becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\varphi(q)} \sum_{a \pmod{q}}^* \prod_{i=1}^r \sum_{j_i=1}^{k_i} \binom{k_i}{j_i} j_i! \sum_{\substack{0=d_1^{(i)} < \dots < d_{j_i}^{(i)} \\ d_1^{(i)} \equiv \dots \equiv d_{j_i}^{(i)} \equiv 0 \pmod{q}}} \sum_{\substack{\widetilde{n_i : n_i + d_1^{(i)}}, \dots, \widetilde{n_i + d_{j_i}^{(i)}} \in I_i \\ n_i \equiv a \pmod{q}}} 1_{\mathbb{P}}(n_i + d_1^{(i)}) \cdots 1_{\mathbb{P}}(n_i + d_{j_i}^{(i)}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\varphi(q)} \sum_{a \pmod{q}}^* \sum_{1 \leq j_i \leq k_i, 1 \leq i \leq r} \left(\prod_{i=1}^r \binom{k_i}{j_i} j_i! \right) \sum_{\substack{0=d_1^{(i)} < \dots < d_{j_i}^{(i)} \\ d_1^{(i)} \equiv \dots \equiv d_{j_i}^{(i)} \equiv 0 \pmod{q}}} \sum_{\substack{\widetilde{n_i : n_i + d_1^{(i)}}, \dots, \widetilde{n_i + d_{j_i}^{(i)}} \in I_i \\ n_i \equiv a \pmod{q}}} \prod_{i=1}^r 1_{\mathbb{P}}(n_i + d_1^{(i)}) \cdots 1_{\mathbb{P}}(n_i + d_{j_i}^{(i)}) \\ &= \frac{1}{\varphi(q)} \sum_{1 \leq j_i \leq k_i, 1 \leq i \leq r} \left(\prod_{i=1}^r \binom{k_i}{j_i} j_i! \right) \sum_{\substack{0=d_1^{(i)} < \dots < d_{j_i}^{(i)} \\ d_1^{(i)} \equiv \dots \equiv d_{j_i}^{(i)} \equiv 0 \pmod{q}}} \sum_{\substack{\widetilde{n_i : n_i + d_1^{(i)}}, \dots, \widetilde{n_i + d_{j_i}^{(i)}} \in I_i \\ n_1 \equiv \dots \equiv n_k \pmod{q} \\ (n_1 \cdots n_k, q) = 1}} \prod_{i=1}^r 1_{\mathbb{P}}(n_i + d_1^{(i)}) \cdots 1_{\mathbb{P}}(n_i + d_{j_i}^{(i)}). \end{aligned}$$

Making another change of variables $n_i = n + h_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$, this becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\varphi(q)} \sum_{1 \leq j_i \leq k_i, 1 \leq i \leq r} \left(\prod_{i=1}^r \left\{ \begin{matrix} k_i \\ j_i \end{matrix} \right\} j_i! \right) \sum_{\substack{0=d_1^{(i)} < \dots < d_{j_i}^{(i)} \\ d_1^{(i)} \equiv \dots \equiv d_{j_i}^{(i)} \equiv 0 \pmod{q}}} \dots \sum_{\substack{0=h_1 < \dots < h_r \\ h_1 \equiv \dots \equiv h_r \equiv 0 \pmod{q}}} \sum_{\substack{0=h_1 < \dots < h_r \\ h_1 \equiv \dots \equiv h_r \equiv 0 \pmod{q}}} \\ & \sum_{\substack{\widetilde{n}: n+h_i+d_1^{(i)}, \dots, n+h_i+d_{j_i}^{(i)} \in I_i \\ (n,q)=1}} \prod_{i=1}^r 1_{\mathbb{P}}(n+h_i+d_1^{(i)}) \dots 1_{\mathbb{P}}(n+h_i+d_{j_i}^{(i)}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.1)$$

Since $n+h_i+d_1^{(i)}, \dots, n+h_i+d_{j_i}^{(i)} \in I_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$ if and only if

$$\widetilde{n} \in \left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq r} (\alpha_i - \widetilde{h}_i), \min_{1 \leq i \leq r} (\beta_i - \widetilde{h}_i - \widetilde{d}_{j_i}^{(i)}) \right] =: I_{\alpha, \beta; \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{h}},$$

where $\alpha := (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r), \dots, \mathbf{h} := (h_1, \dots, h_r)$, the expression (4.1) is $\Sigma_1 + \Sigma_2$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_1 := & \frac{1}{\varphi(q)} \sum_{1 \leq j_i \leq k_i, 1 \leq i \leq r} \left(\prod_{i=1}^r \left\{ \begin{matrix} k_i \\ j_i \end{matrix} \right\} j_i! \right) \sum_{\substack{0=d_1^{(i)} < \dots < d_{j_i}^{(i)} \\ d_1^{(i)} \equiv \dots \equiv d_{j_i}^{(i)} \equiv 0 \pmod{q}}} \dots \sum_{\substack{0=h_1 < \dots < h_r \\ h_1 \equiv \dots \equiv h_r \equiv 0 \pmod{q}}} \sum_{\substack{0=h_1 < \dots < h_r \\ h_1 \equiv \dots \equiv h_r \equiv 0 \pmod{q}}} \\ & \sum_{\substack{\widetilde{n} \in I_{\alpha, \beta; \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{h}} \\ (n,q)=1}} \prod_{i=1}^r 1_{\mathbb{P}}(n+h_i+d_1^{(i)}) \dots 1_{\mathbb{P}}(n+h_i+d_{j_i}^{(i)}) \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

and Σ_2 is the sum of the remaining terms, i.e.

$$|I_{\alpha, \beta; \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{h}}| := \min_{1 \leq i \leq r} (\beta_i - \widetilde{h}_i - \widetilde{d}_{j_i}^{(i)}) - \max_{1 \leq i \leq r} (\alpha_i - \widetilde{h}_i) \leq \widetilde{q}.$$

Let us deal with Σ_2 first. Since $\widetilde{n} \in I_{\alpha, \beta; \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{h}}$ and $|I_{\alpha, \beta; \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{h}}| \leq \widetilde{q}$, by a simple application of the Selberg sieve (see [IK04, Theorem 6.7]), the second line of (4.2) is

$$\begin{aligned} & \leq \sum_{\widetilde{n} \in I_{\alpha, \beta; \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{h}}} \prod_{i=1}^r 1_{\mathbb{P}}(n+h_i+d_1^{(i)}) \dots 1_{\mathbb{P}}(n+h_i+d_{j_i}^{(i)}) \\ & \ll_{\mathbf{k}} \mathfrak{S}(\{h_i+d_1^{(i)}, \dots, h_i+d_{j_i}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^r) \times \frac{q}{(\log q)^{j_1+\dots+j_r}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, \dots, k_r)$. Therefore, it follows from Lemma 3.1 that the sum Σ_2 is

$$\begin{aligned}
& \ll_{\mathbf{k}} \frac{q}{\varphi(q)} \times \max_{j_1, \dots, j_r} \frac{1}{(\log q)^{j_1 + \dots + j_r}} \sum_{\substack{0 = \widetilde{d}_1^{(i)} < \dots < \widetilde{d}_{j_i}^{(i)} < \beta_i - \alpha_i \\ d_1^{(i)} \equiv \dots \equiv d_{j_i}^{(i)} \equiv 0 \pmod{q}}} \dots \sum \\
& \sum_{\substack{0 = \widetilde{h}_1 < \dots < \widetilde{h}_r < \beta_r - \alpha_1 \\ h_1 \equiv \dots \equiv h_r \equiv 0 \pmod{q} \\ |I_{\alpha, \beta; \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{h}}| \leq \widetilde{q}}} \dots \sum \mathfrak{S}(\{h_i + d_1^{(i)}, \dots, h_i + d_{j_i}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^r) \\
& \ll_{\mathbf{k}, \alpha, \beta} \frac{q}{\varphi(q)} \left(\log \frac{\varphi(q) \log q}{q} \right)^{k-1} \max_{j_1, \dots, j_r} \frac{1}{(\log q)^{j_1 + \dots + j_r}} \\
& \sum_{\substack{0 = \widetilde{d}_1^{(i)} < \dots < \widetilde{d}_{j_i}^{(i)} < \beta_i - \alpha_i \\ d_1^{(i)} \equiv \dots \equiv d_{j_i}^{(i)} \equiv 0 \pmod{q}}} \dots \sum \sum_{\substack{0 = \widetilde{h}_1 < \dots < \widetilde{h}_r < \beta_r - \alpha_1 \\ h_1 \equiv \dots \equiv h_r \equiv 0 \pmod{q}}} 1 \\
& \ll_{\mathbf{k}, \alpha, \beta} \frac{q}{\varphi(q)} \left(\log \frac{\varphi(q) \log q}{q} \right)^{k-1} \max_{j_1, \dots, j_r} \frac{1}{(\log q)^{j_1 + \dots + j_r}} \times (\log q)^{(j_1-1) + \dots + (j_r-1) + (r-1)} \\
& \ll_{\mathbf{k}, \alpha, \beta} \frac{q}{\varphi(q) \log q} \left(\log \frac{\varphi(q) \log q}{q} \right)^{|\mathbf{k}|-1},
\end{aligned}$$

where $|\mathbf{k}| := k_1 + \dots + k_r$, which is negligible.

It remains to estimate Σ_1 , which can be spitted into two sums $\Sigma_{1,1}$ and $\Sigma_{1,2}$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
\Sigma_{1,1} & := \frac{1}{\varphi(q)} \sum_{1 \leq j_i \leq k_i, 1 \leq i \leq r} \left(\prod_{i=1}^r \left\{ \begin{matrix} k_i \\ j_i \end{matrix} \right\} j_i! \right) \sum_{\substack{0 = d_1^{(i)} < \dots < d_{j_i}^{(i)} \\ d_1^{(i)} \equiv \dots \equiv d_{j_i}^{(i)} \equiv 0 \pmod{q}}} \dots \sum_{\substack{0 = h_1 < \dots < h_r \\ h_1 \equiv \dots \equiv h_r \equiv 0 \pmod{q} \\ |I_{\alpha, \beta; \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{h}}| > \widetilde{q} \\ \{h_i + d_1^{(i)}, \dots, h_i + d_{j_i}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^r \text{ admissible}}} \\
& \sum_{\substack{\widetilde{n} \in I_{\alpha, \beta; \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{h}} \\ (n, q) = 1}} \prod_{i=1}^r 1_{\mathbb{P}}(n + h_i + d_1^{(i)}) \dots 1_{\mathbb{P}}(n + h_i + d_{j_i}^{(i)})
\end{aligned}$$

and $\Sigma_{1,2}$ is the sum of the remaining terms, i.e. the set $\{h_i + d_1^{(i)}, \dots, h_i + d_{j_i}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^r$ is non-admissible.

Suppose $\{h_i + d_1^{(i)}, \dots, h_i + d_{j_i}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^r$ is non-admissible. Then

$$\sum_{\substack{\widetilde{n} \in I_{\alpha, \beta; \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{h}} \\ (n, q) = 1}} \prod_{i=1}^r 1_{\mathbb{P}}(n + h_i + d_1^{(i)}) \dots 1_{\mathbb{P}}(n + h_i + d_{j_i}^{(i)}) \leq |\mathbf{k}|,$$

so that the sum $\Sigma_{1,2}$ is

$$\begin{aligned}
& \leq \frac{1}{\varphi(q)} \sum_{1 \leq j_i \leq k_i, 1 \leq i \leq r} \left(\prod_{i=1}^r \left\{ \begin{matrix} k_i \\ j_i \end{matrix} \right\} j_i! \right) \sum_{\substack{0 = \widetilde{d}_1^{(i)} < \dots < \widetilde{d}_{j_i}^{(i)} < \beta_i - \alpha_i \\ d_1^{(i)} \equiv \dots \equiv d_{j_i}^{(i)} \equiv 0 \pmod{q}}} \dots \sum_{\substack{0 = \widetilde{h}_1 < \dots < \widetilde{h}_r < \beta_r - \alpha_1 \\ h_1 \equiv \dots \equiv h_r \equiv 0 \pmod{q}}} |\mathbf{k}| \\
& \ll_{\mathbf{k}, \alpha, \beta} \frac{1}{\varphi(q)} \left(\frac{\varphi(q) \log q}{q} \right)^{|\mathbf{k}|-1},
\end{aligned}$$

which is again negligible.

Finally, suppose $\{h_i + d_1^{(i)}, \dots, h_i + d_{j_i}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^r$ is admissible. Then assuming $\text{HL}[q]$ uniformly for $0 \leq h_i + d_1^{(i)}, \dots, h_i + d_{k_i}^{(i)} \leq (\beta_r - \alpha_1)\varphi(q) \log q$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\substack{\tilde{n} \in I_{\alpha, \beta; \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{h}} \\ (n, q) = 1}} \prod_{i=1}^r 1_{\mathbb{P}}(n + h_i + d_1^{(i)}) \cdots 1_{\mathbb{P}}(n + h_i + d_{j_i}^{(i)}) \\ &= (1 + o_{\mathbf{k}, \alpha, \beta}(1)) \mathfrak{S}(\{h_i + d_1^{(i)}, \dots, h_i + d_{j_i}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^r; q) \\ & \sum_{\substack{\tilde{n} \in I_{\alpha, \beta; \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{h}} \\ (n, q) = 1}} \left(\prod_{i=1}^r \log(n + h_i + d_1^{(i)}) \cdots \log(n + h_i + d_{j_i}^{(i)}) \right)^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

so that the sum $\Sigma_{1,1}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\varphi(q)} \sum_{1 \leq j_i \leq k_i, 1 \leq i \leq r} \left(\prod_{i=1}^r \binom{k_i}{j_i} j_i! \right) \sum_{\substack{0 = d_1^{(i)} < \dots < d_{j_i}^{(i)} \\ d_1^{(i)} \equiv \dots \equiv d_{j_i}^{(i)} \equiv 0 \pmod{q}}} \sum_{\substack{0 = h_1 < \dots < h_r \\ h_1 \equiv \dots \equiv h_r \equiv 0 \pmod{q} \\ |I_{\alpha, \beta; \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{h}}| > \tilde{q} \\ \{h_i + d_1^{(i)}, \dots, h_i + d_{j_i}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^r \text{ admissible}}} \sum \cdots \sum \\ & \frac{1 + o_{\mathbf{k}, \alpha, \beta}(1)}{(\log q)^{j_1 + \dots + j_r}} \sum_{\substack{n: n + h_i + d_1^{(i)}, \dots, n + h_i + d_{j_i}^{(i)} \in I_i \\ (n, q) = 1}} \mathfrak{S}(\{h_i + d_1^{(i)}, \dots, h_i + d_{j_i}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^r; q). \end{aligned}$$

Since the singular series $\mathfrak{S}(\{h_i + d_1^{(i)}, \dots, h_i + d_{j_i}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^r; q)$ vanishes provided that the set $\{h_i + d_1^{(i)}, \dots, h_i + d_{j_i}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^r$ is non-admissible, the condition on the admissibility can be disregarded. Also, the error term induced by dropping the condition $|I_{\alpha, \beta; \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{h}}| > \tilde{q}$ is negligible. Unravelling all the changes of variables made, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1 + o_{\mathbf{k}, \alpha, \beta}(1)}{\varphi(q)} \sum_{a \pmod{q}}^* \prod_{i=1}^r \sum_{j_i=1}^{k_i} \binom{k_i}{j_i} \frac{j_i!}{(\log q)^{j_i}} \sum_{\substack{\widetilde{n_1^{(i)}} < \dots < \widetilde{n_{j_i}^{(i)}} \in I_i \\ n_1^{(i)} \equiv \dots \equiv n_{j_i}^{(i)} \equiv a \pmod{q}}} \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{N}; q) \\ &= \frac{1 + o_{\mathbf{k}, \alpha, \beta}(1)}{\varphi(q)} \sum_{a \pmod{q}}^* \prod_{i=1}^r \sum_{j_i=1}^{k_i} \binom{k_i}{j_i} \frac{1}{(\log q)^{j_i}} \sum_{\substack{\widetilde{n_1^{(i)}}, \dots, \widetilde{n_{j_i}^{(i)}} \in I_i \text{ distinct} \\ n_1^{(i)} \equiv \dots \equiv n_{j_i}^{(i)} \equiv a \pmod{q}}} \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{N}; q), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{N} := \{n_1^{(i)}, \dots, n_{j_i}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^r$. Applying Proposition 3.1, this is

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1 + o_{\mathbf{k}, \alpha, \beta}(1)}{\varphi(q)} \sum_{a \pmod{q}}^* \prod_{i=1}^r \sum_{j_i=1}^{k_i} \binom{k_i}{j_i} \frac{1}{(\log q)^{j_i}} \times \prod_{i=1}^r \left(\frac{|I_i| \varphi(q) \log q}{\varphi(q)} \right)^{j_i} \\ &= (1 + o_{\mathbf{k}, \alpha, \beta}(1)) \prod_{i=1}^r \left(\sum_{j_i=1}^{k_i} \binom{k_i}{j_i} |I_i|^{j_i} \right) \end{aligned}$$

and the theorem follows.

5. SOME STATISTICS

To illustrate Corollaries 2.1 and 2.2, i.e. the pseudorandomness of primes at large scales, we provide some statistics in this section.

Regarding primes in short intervals, we set $N = 100000$ and let $n \in (N, 2N]$ be an integer. Then the following sequences of points represent the normalized primes $\{\frac{p-n}{\log N} \in (0, 20] : p > n\}$ with $n = 114159, 141971, 171693$ and 182097 respectively. These values of n are chosen by taking the early few digits of π and adding 100000 to each.




FIGURE 1. First few normalized primes in short intervals

Regarding primes in short progressions, we set $q = 100000$ and let $a \pmod{q}$ be a reduced residue class. Then the following sequences of points represent the normalized primes $\{\frac{p}{\varphi(q)\log q} \in (0, 20] : p \equiv a \pmod{q}\}$ with $a \equiv 14159, 41971, 71693$ and $82097 \pmod{q}$ respectively.




FIGURE 2. First few normalized primes in short progressions

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is grateful to Andrew Granville for his advice and encouragement. He would also like to thank Tony Haddad and Brad Rogers for helpful discussions, as well as Cihan Sabuncu and Christian Táfula for their careful proofreading.

REFERENCES

- [DV03] D. J. Daley and D. Vere-Jones. *An introduction to the theory of point processes. Vol. I.* Second. Probability and its Applications (New York). Elementary theory and methods. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2003, pp. xxii+469.
- [DV08] D. J. Daley and D. Vere-Jones. *An introduction to the theory of point processes. Vol. II.* Second. Probability and its Applications (New York). General theory and structure. Springer, New York, 2008, pp. xviii+573.
- [Gal76] P. X. Gallagher. “On the distribution of primes in short intervals”. In: *Mathematika* 23.1 (1976), pp. 4–9.
- [GR07] A. Granville and Z. Rudnick, eds. *Equidistribution in number theory, an introduction.* Vol. 237. NATO Science Series II: Mathematics, Physics and Chemistry. Springer, Dordrecht, 2007, pp. xvi+345.
- [Gra89] A. Granville. “Least primes in arithmetic progressions”. In: *Théorie des nombres (Quebec, PQ, 1987)*. de Gruyter, Berlin, 1989, pp. 306–321.
- [Gra95] A. Granville. “Harald Cramér and the distribution of prime numbers”. In: 1. Harald Cramér Symposium (Stockholm, 1993). 1995, pp. 12–28.
- [HR03] C. P. Hughes and Z. Rudnick. “Linear statistics of low-lying zeros of L -functions”. In: *Q. J. Math.* 54.3 (2003), pp. 309–333.
- [IK04] H. Iwaniec and E. Kowalski. *Analytic number theory.* Vol. 53. American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2004, pp. xii+615.
- [Leu24] S.-K. Leung. *Moments of primes in progressions to a large modulus.* 2024. arXiv: [2402.07941](https://arxiv.org/abs/2402.07941).
- [MS04] H. L. Montgomery and K. Soundararajan. “Primes in short intervals”. In: *Comm. Math. Phys.* 252.1-3 (2004), pp. 589–617.
- [RR23] J. A. de Reyna and B. Rogers. *On convergence of points to limiting processes, with an application to zeta zeros.* 2023. arXiv: [2311.13441](https://arxiv.org/abs/2311.13441).
- [Tao08] T. Tao. *Structure and randomness.* Pages from year one of a mathematical blog. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2008, pp. xii+298.

DÉPARTEMENT DE MATHÉMATIQUES ET DE STATISTIQUE, UNIVERSITÉ DE MONTRÉAL, CP 6128
SUCC. CENTRE-VILLE, MONTRÉAL, QC H3C 3J7, CANADA

Email address: sun.kai.leung@umontreal.ca