

NOTE ON THE PRIME NUMBER THEOREM

YONG-CHEOL KIM

ABSTRACT. We survey the classical results on the prime number theorem.

In this chapter, we are very interested in the asymptotic behavior of a single number theoretic function $\pi(n)$ which counts all prime numbers between 1 and n , or $\pi(x)$ which is extended to \mathbb{R} and defined by

$$\pi(x) = \sum_{p \leq x} 1.$$

It is well-known that Euclid showed that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \pi(x) = \infty;$$

that is, there exist infinitely many prime numbers.

Proposition 5.1. *There exists a constant $c > 0$ such that*

$$\pi(x) \geq c \cdot \ln \ln x.$$

Proof. First of all, we prove that if p_n is the n th prime number then we have that

$$p_n \leq 2^{2^{n-1}}.$$

Since there must be some p_{n+1} dividing the number $p_1 p_2 \cdots p_n - 1$ and not exceeding it, it follows from the induction step that

$$p_{n+1} \leq 2^{2^0} 2^{2^1} \cdots 2^{2^{n-1}} = 2^{2^0 + 2^1 + \cdots + 2^{n-1}} \leq 2^{2^n}.$$

If $x \geq 2$ is some real number, then we select the largest natural number n satisfying $2^{2^{n-1}} \leq x$, so that we have that $2^{2^n} > x$. Hence we conclude that

$$\pi(x) \geq n \geq \frac{1}{\ln 2} \cdot \ln \left(\frac{\ln x}{\ln 2} \right) \geq \frac{1}{\ln 2} \cdot \ln \ln x. \quad \square$$

Proposition 5.2. *There exists a constant $c > 0$ such that*

$$\pi(x) \geq c \cdot \ln x$$

for all sufficiently large x .

Proof. Since each square-free integer $n \leq x$ can be only be divided by $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_{\pi(x)}$, n can be written uniquely as

$$n = \prod_{k=1}^{\pi(x)} p_k^{\alpha_k}$$

where α_k takes only the values 0 or 1. Thus there are at most $2^{\pi(x)}$ square-free integers $n \leq x$. From Corollary 4.2.21, we see that the density of the square-free integers tends to $6/\pi^2$; that is, the number of square-free numbers $n \leq x$ grows asymptotically to $6x/\pi^2$. This implies that there is some constant $c_0 < 6/\pi^2$ such that

$$c_0 \cdot x \leq 2^{\pi(x)}$$

for all sufficiently large x . Hence we complete the proof. \square

Neither of Proposition 5.1 and Proposition 5.2 describes the asymptotic behavior of $\pi(x)$ quite well. Long time ago, Legendre and Gauss conjectured that

$$\pi(x) \sim \frac{x}{\ln x}.$$

The truth of this assertion is the core of the prime number theorem. For more delicate description of $\pi(x)$, we consider the integral logarithm function $\text{li } x$ defined as the Cauchy principal value integral

$$\text{li } x = \int_0^x \frac{1}{\ln t} dt = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow \infty} \left(\int_0^{1-\varepsilon} \frac{1}{\ln t} dt + \int_{1+\varepsilon}^x \frac{1}{\ln t} dt \right).$$

It follows from de l'Hospital's rule that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\text{li } x}{\frac{x}{\ln x}} = \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\frac{1}{\ln x}}{\frac{1}{\ln x} - \frac{1}{\ln^2 x}} = 1.$$

Thus we obtain the asymptotic behavior of $\text{li } x$ as follows;

$$\text{li } x \sim \frac{x}{\ln x}.$$

Hence the asymptotic relation $\pi(x) \sim \text{li } x$ is called the prime number theorem. In fact, Gauss conjectured that $\text{li } x$ describes $\pi(x)$ even better than $x/\ln x$.

Lemma 5.3. (a) $\sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) \left[\frac{x}{n} \right] = x \ln x - x + \mathcal{O}(\ln x)$.

$$(b) \sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) \left(\left[\frac{x}{n} \right] - 2 \left[\frac{x}{2n} \right] \right) = x \ln 2 + \mathcal{O}(\ln x).$$

Proof. (a) By the definition of the Mangoldt function, we have that

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \ln n = \sum_{n \leq x} \sum_{m|n} \Lambda(m) = \sum_{m \leq x} \Lambda(m) \sum_{n \leq x: m|n} 1 = \sum_{m \leq x} \Lambda(m) \left[\frac{x}{m} \right].$$

Thus it follows from Proposition 4.2.3[the Euler's sum formula] that

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) \left[\frac{x}{n} \right] = \sum_{n \leq x} \ln n = \int_1^x \ln t \, dt + \mathcal{O}(\ln x) = x \ln x - x + \mathcal{O}(\ln x).$$

(b) By applying (a) and the fact that $\sum_{x/2 < n \leq x} \Lambda(n) \left[\frac{x}{2n} \right] = 0$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) \left(\left[\frac{x}{n} \right] - 2 \left[\frac{x}{2n} \right] \right) &= \sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) \left[\frac{x}{n} \right] - 2 \sum_{n \leq x/2} \Lambda(n) \left[\frac{x}{2n} \right] - 2 \sum_{x/2 < n \leq x} \Lambda(n) \left[\frac{x}{n} \right] \\ &= x \ln x - x - 2 \left(\frac{x}{2} \ln \frac{x}{2} - \frac{x}{2} \right) + \mathcal{O}(\ln x) \\ &= x \ln 2 + \mathcal{O}(\ln x). \end{aligned}$$

Hence we complete the proof. \square

Theorem 5.4[Chebyshev's Theorem]. *There exist two constants $c_1 > 0$ and $c_2 > 0$ such that*

$$c_1 \cdot \frac{x}{\ln x} \leq \pi(x) \leq c_2 \cdot \frac{x}{\ln x}$$

for all sufficiently large x .

Proof. Since $[\alpha] - 2 \left[\frac{\alpha}{2} \right]$ is always an integer and satisfies the following inequality

$$-1 = \alpha - 1 - 2 \frac{\alpha}{2} < [\alpha] - 2 \left[\frac{\alpha}{2} \right] < \alpha - 2 \left(\frac{\alpha}{2} - 1 \right) = 2,$$

we see that

$$(5.1) \quad 0 \leq [\alpha] - 2 \left[\frac{\alpha}{2} \right] \leq 1.$$

Thus by (5.1) and (b) of Lemma 5.3 we have that

$$\begin{aligned} x \ln 2 + \mathcal{O}(\ln x) &= \sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) \left(\left[\frac{x}{n} \right] - 2 \left[\frac{x}{2n} \right] \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) = \sum_{p \leq x} \left[\frac{\ln x}{\ln p} \right] \ln p \\ &\leq \ln x \sum_{p \leq x} 1 = \pi(x) \ln x, \end{aligned}$$

and so we can get the first inequality by dividing by $\ln x$. For the second inequality, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi(x) \ln x - \pi\left(\frac{x}{2}\right) \ln \frac{x}{2} &= \ln \frac{x}{2} \left(\pi(x) - \pi\left(\frac{x}{2}\right) \right) + \pi(x) \ln 2 \\
&= \ln \frac{x}{2} \left(\pi(x) - \pi\left(\frac{x}{2}\right) \right) + \mathcal{O}(x) \\
&= \mathcal{O} \left(\sum_{x/2 < p \leq x} \ln p + x \right) \\
&= \mathcal{O} \left(\sum_{x/2 < n \leq x} \Lambda(n) \cdot (1 - 0) + x \right) \\
&= \mathcal{O} \left(\sum_{x/2 < n \leq x} \Lambda(n) \left(\left[\frac{x}{n} \right] - 2 \left[\frac{x}{2n} \right] \right) + x \right) \\
&= \mathcal{O} \left(\sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) \left(\left[\frac{x}{n} \right] - 2 \left[\frac{x}{2n} \right] \right) + x \right) \\
&= \mathcal{O}(x).
\end{aligned}$$

From this, we have more generally the following estimate

$$\pi\left(\frac{x}{2^k}\right) \ln \frac{x}{2^k} - \pi\left(\frac{x}{2^{k+1}}\right) \ln \frac{x}{2^{k+1}} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{x}{2^k}\right), \quad k \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Thus for any $K \in \mathbb{N}$ we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
\pi(x) \ln x - \pi\left(\frac{x}{2^{K+1}}\right) \ln \frac{x}{2^{K+1}} &= \sum_{k=0}^K \left(\pi\left(\frac{x}{2^k}\right) \ln \frac{x}{2^k} - \pi\left(\frac{x}{2^{k+1}}\right) \ln \frac{x}{2^{k+1}} \right) \\
&= \mathcal{O} \left(\sum_{k=0}^K \frac{x}{2^k} \right) = \mathcal{O}(x).
\end{aligned}$$

This implies that $\pi(x) = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{x}{\ln x}\right)$. \square

Proposition 5.5. *The following asymptotic equation*

$$\pi(x) \sim \frac{x}{\ln x}$$

is equivalent to the asymptotic equation $\psi(x) \sim x$ where the ψ -function is defined by

$$\psi(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) = \sum_{p, \nu \geq 1: p^\nu \leq x} \ln p.$$

(Here the function ψ is introduced by Chebyshev.)

Proof. From the definition of the function ψ , we have that

$$(5.2) \quad \psi(x) = \sum_{p \leq x} \left[\frac{\ln x}{\ln p} \right] \ln p \leq \ln x \sum_{p \leq x} 1 = \pi(x) \ln x.$$

On the other hand, we note that for any y with $1 < y < x$,

$$\begin{aligned}\pi(x) &= \pi(y) + \sum_{y < p \leq x} 1 \leq \pi(y) + \sum_{y < p \leq x} \frac{\ln p}{\ln y} \\ &\leq c_2 \cdot \frac{y}{\ln y} + \frac{\psi(x)}{\ln y}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, multiplying by the factor $\ln x/x$, the above inequality becomes

$$(5.3) \quad \pi(x) \cdot \frac{\ln x}{x} \leq c_2 \cdot \frac{y \ln x}{x \ln y} + \frac{\psi(x)}{x} \cdot \frac{\ln x}{\ln y}.$$

If we set $y = x/\ln x$ in (5.3), then we have that

$$(5.4) \quad \pi(x) \cdot \frac{\ln x}{x} \leq \frac{c_2}{\ln x - \ln \ln x} + \frac{\psi(x)}{x} \cdot \frac{1}{1 - \frac{\ln \ln x}{\ln x}}.$$

Hence we complete the proof from (5.2) and (5.4). \square

Theorem 5.6[Mertens' Theorem]. *If p runs through all prime numbers, then we have the following asymptotic approximations;*

$$\begin{aligned}(a) \quad \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{\ln p}{p} &= \ln x + \mathcal{O}(1), \quad (b) \quad \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{p} = \ln \ln x + c_3 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\ln x}\right), \\ (c) \quad \prod_{p \leq x} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) &= \frac{c_4}{\ln x} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\ln x}\right)\right),\end{aligned}$$

where $c_3 > 0$ and $c_4 > 0$ are some constants.

Proof. (a) From (a) of Lemma 5.3 and Theorem 5.4, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}x \ln x - x + \mathcal{O}(\ln x) &= \sum_{n \leq x} \Lambda(n) \left[\frac{x}{n}\right] \\ &= \sum_{p \leq x} \left[\frac{x}{p}\right] \ln p + \sum_{p \leq \sqrt{x}, \nu \geq 2: p^\nu \leq x} \left[\frac{x}{p^\nu}\right] \ln p \\ &= \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{\ln p}{p} \cdot x - \sum_{p \leq x} \left\{\frac{x}{p}\right\} \ln p + \mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{p \leq \sqrt{x}} \sum_{2 \leq \nu \leq \frac{\ln x}{\ln p}} \frac{x}{p^\nu} \ln p\right) \\ &= x \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{\ln p}{p} + \mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{p \leq x} \ln p\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(x \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\ln n}{n^2}\right) \\ &= x \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{\ln p}{p} + \mathcal{O}\left(\ln x \cdot c_2 \cdot \frac{x}{\ln x}\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(x \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\ln n}{n^2}\right) \\ &= x \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{\ln p}{p} + \mathcal{O}(x).\end{aligned}$$

This implies the first one.

(b) It follows from Proposition 4.2.2" [Abel transformation] that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{p} &= \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{\ln p}{p} \cdot \frac{1}{\ln p} \\ &= \frac{1}{\ln x} \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{\ln p}{p} + \int_2^x \sum_{p \leq t} \frac{\ln p}{p} \cdot \frac{1}{t \ln^2 t} dt \\ &= 1 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\ln x}\right) + \int_2^x \frac{1}{t \ln t} dt + \int_2^x \left(\sum_{p \leq t} \frac{\ln p}{p} - \ln t \right) \frac{1}{t \ln^2 t} dt. \end{aligned}$$

Since $a(t) = \sum_{p \leq t} \frac{\ln p}{p} - \ln t$ is bounded by (a), the following integral

$$\int_2^\infty \frac{a(t)}{t \ln^2 t} dt$$

converges, and moreover we have that

$$\int_2^\infty \frac{1}{t \ln t} dt = \ln \ln t - \ln \ln 2.$$

Therefore we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{p} &= \ln \ln x + \left(1 - \ln \ln 2 + \int_2^\infty \frac{a(t)}{t \ln^2 t} dt \right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\ln x} + \int_x^\infty \frac{|a(t)|}{t \ln^2 t} dt \right) \\ &= \ln \ln x + c_3 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\ln x} \right). \end{aligned}$$

(c) If we define the constant c_5 by

$$c_5 = \sum_{n=2}^\infty \frac{1}{n} \sum_p \frac{1}{p^n},$$

then it follows from simple calculation that

$$\begin{aligned} \ln \left(\prod_{p \leq x} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p} \right) \right) &= \sum_{p \leq x} \ln \left(1 - \frac{1}{p} \right) = - \sum_{p \leq x} \sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{p^{-n}}{n} \\ &= - \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{p} - \sum_{n=2}^\infty \frac{1}{n} \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{p^n} \\ &= - \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{p} - c_5 + \mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{n=2}^\infty \frac{1}{n} \sum_{p > x} \frac{1}{p^n} \right) \\ &= - \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{p} - c_5 + \mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{n=2}^\infty \sum_{m > x} \frac{1}{m^n} \right) \\ &= - \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{p} - c_5 + \mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{n=2}^\infty \frac{1}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{(n-1)x^{n-1}} \right) \\ &= - \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{p} - c_5 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{x} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence this implies the required result. \square

Lemma 5.7[Tauberian Theorem of Ingham and Newman].

Let $F(t)$ be a bounded complex-valued function defined on $(0, \infty)$ and integrable over every compact subset of $(0, \infty)$, and let $G(z)$ be an analytic function defined on a domain containing the closed half-plane $\Pi = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \operatorname{Re}(z) \geq 0\}$. If $G(z)$ agrees with the Laplace transformation of $F(t)$ for all $z \in \Pi$, i.e.

$$G(z) = \int_0^{\infty} F(t) e^{-zt} dt, \operatorname{Re}(z) > 0,$$

then the improper integral

$$\int_0^{\infty} F(t) dt$$

converges.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $|F(t)| \leq 1$ for all $t > 0$. For $\lambda > 0$, we set

$$G_{\lambda}(z) = \int_0^{\lambda} F(t) e^{-zt} dt.$$

Then we see that $G_{\lambda}(z)$ is analytic on \mathbb{C} . Thus it suffices to show that

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} G_{\lambda}(0) = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{\lambda} F(t) dt = G(0).$$

Fix $\varepsilon > 0$. Then there are $\delta = \delta(\varepsilon) > 0$ and $R > 0$ such that $1/R < \varepsilon/3$ and $G(z)$ is analytic on the compact region

$$\Omega_{\delta, R} := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : \operatorname{Re}(z) \geq \delta, |z| \leq R\}$$

with boundary $\partial\Omega_{\delta, R} = \gamma$ which is a simple closed contour oriented counterclockwise. By Cauchy integral formula, we have that

$$(5.5) \quad G(0) - G_{\lambda}(0) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} \frac{G(z) - G_{\lambda}(z)}{z} dz.$$

We observe that for $x = \operatorname{Re}(z) > 0$,

$$(5.6) \quad |G(z) - G_{\lambda}(z)| = \left| \int_{\lambda}^{\infty} F(t) e^{-zt} dt \right| \leq \int_{\lambda}^{\infty} e^{-xt} dt = \frac{e^{-\lambda x}}{x},$$

and for $x = \operatorname{Re}(z) < 0$,

$$(5.7) \quad |G_{\lambda}(z)| = \left| \int_0^{\lambda} F(t) e^{-zt} dt \right| \leq \int_0^{\lambda} e^{-xt} dt = \frac{e^{-\lambda x}}{|x|}.$$

With technical reasons given in (5.6) and (5.7), the relation (5.5) can be written again as

$$(5.8) \quad G(0) - G_{\lambda}(0) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma} [G(z) - G_{\lambda}(z)] e^{\lambda z} \left(\frac{1}{z} + \frac{z}{R^2} \right) dz.$$

If we denote by γ_+ the part of γ lying in $\operatorname{Re}(z) > 0$, then we see that

$$\frac{1}{z} + \frac{z}{R^2} = \frac{2x}{R^2},$$

on γ_+ , and thus it follows from (5.6) and (5.8) that

$$(5.9) \quad \begin{aligned} |G(0) - G_\lambda(0)| &\leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\gamma_+} \left| [G(z) - G_\lambda(z)] e^{\lambda z} \left(\frac{1}{z} + \frac{z}{R^2} \right) \right| dz \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \cdot \frac{e^{-\lambda x}}{x} \cdot e^{\lambda x} \cdot \frac{2x}{R^2} \cdot \pi R = \frac{1}{R} < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}. \end{aligned}$$

If we denote by γ_- the part of γ lying in $\operatorname{Re}(z) < 0$, then we have that

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_-} G_\lambda(z) e^{\lambda z} \left(\frac{1}{z} + \frac{z}{R^2} \right) dz = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{|z|=R} G_\lambda(z) e^{\lambda z} \left(\frac{1}{z} + \frac{z}{R^2} \right) dz$$

since $G_\lambda(z)$ is analytic on \mathbb{C} . Thus similarly to (5.9) we obtain that

$$(5.10) \quad \left| \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_-} G_\lambda(z) e^{\lambda z} \left(\frac{1}{z} + \frac{z}{R^2} \right) dz \right| \leq \frac{1}{R} < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}.$$

Since the function $G(z) \left(\frac{1}{z} + \frac{z}{R^2} \right)$ is analytic on γ_- , there is a constant $M = M(\delta, R) = M(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that

$$\left| G(z) e^{\lambda z} \left(\frac{1}{z} + \frac{z}{R^2} \right) \right| \leq M e^{\lambda \operatorname{Re}(z)}$$

for each $z \in \gamma_-$. Since $\operatorname{Re}(z) < 0$ for $z \in \gamma_-$, the integral

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_-} G(z) e^{\lambda z} \left(\frac{1}{z} + \frac{z}{R^2} \right) dz$$

tends to zero as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, and so there is a constant $N > 0$ such that

$$(5.11) \quad \left| \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\gamma_-} G(z) e^{\lambda z} \left(\frac{1}{z} + \frac{z}{R^2} \right) dz \right| < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}$$

whenever $\lambda > N$. Thus if $\lambda > N$, then it follows from (5.9), (5.10), and (5.11) that

$$|G(0) - G_\lambda(0)| < \varepsilon.$$

Therefore we are done. \square

Corollary 5.8[Simplified Version of the Theorem of Weiner and Ikehara].

Let $f(x)$ be a monotone nondecreasing function defined for $x \geq 1$ with $f(x) = \mathcal{O}(x)$. Suppose that $g(z)$ is analytic in some region containing the closed half-plane $\operatorname{Re}(z) \geq 1$ except for a simple pole at $z = 1$ with residue α and, for any z with $\operatorname{Re}(z) > 1$, $g(z)$ coincides with the Mellin transform of $f(x)$, i.e.

$$g(z) = z \int_1^\infty f(x) x^{-z-1} dx, \quad \operatorname{Re}(z) > 1.$$

Then we have that $f(x) \sim \alpha x$.

Proof. We note that the function $F(t)$ defined by

$$F(t) = e^{-t} f(e^t) - \alpha$$

is bounded on $(0, \infty)$ and integrable on each compact subset of $(0, \infty)$. Also its Laplace transform

$$(5.12) \quad G(z) = \int_0^\infty [e^{-t} f(e^t) - \alpha] e^{-zt} dt = \int_1^\infty f(x) x^{-z-2} dx - \frac{\alpha}{z} = \frac{1}{z+1} g(z+1) - \frac{\alpha}{z}$$

is well-defined in $\operatorname{Re}(z) > 0$. By the assumption, the right-hand side of (5.12) is analytic in some region containing the closed half-plane $\operatorname{Re}(z) \geq 0$. Thus it follows from Lemma 5.7 [Tauberian Theorem of Ingham and Newman] that the improper integral

$$\int_0^\infty [e^{-t} f(e^t) - \alpha] dt = \int_1^\infty \frac{f(x) - \alpha x}{x^2} dx$$

converges. Now we shall prove that $f(x) \sim \alpha x$ by using the nondecreasing monotonicity of f .

If $\limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(x)}{x} > \alpha$, then there exists some $\delta > 0$ so that $f(y) > (\alpha + 2\delta)y$ for infinitely many and arbitrarily large y . Thus $f(x) > (\alpha + 2\delta)y > (\alpha + \delta)x$ for all x with $y < x < \left(\frac{\alpha + 2\delta}{\alpha + \delta}\right)y$, and

$$\int_y^{\left(\frac{\alpha+2\delta}{\alpha+\delta}\right)y} \frac{f(x) - \alpha x}{x^2} dx > \int_y^{\left(\frac{\alpha+2\delta}{\alpha+\delta}\right)y} \frac{\delta}{x} dx = \delta \cdot \ln \left(\frac{\alpha + 2\delta}{\alpha + \delta} \right) > 0.$$

This gives a contradiction. So we conclude that

$$(5.13) \quad \limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(x)}{x} \leq \alpha.$$

If $\liminf_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(x)}{x} < \alpha$, then there exists some $\delta > 0$ with $\delta < \alpha/2$ so that $f(y) < (\alpha - 2\delta)y$ for infinitely many and arbitrarily large y . Thus $f(x) < (\alpha - 2\delta)y < (\alpha - \delta)x$ for all x with $\left(\frac{\alpha - 2\delta}{\alpha - \delta}\right)y < x < y$, and

$$\int_{\left(\frac{\alpha-2\delta}{\alpha-\delta}\right)y}^y \frac{f(x) - \alpha x}{x^2} dx < \int_{\left(\frac{\alpha-2\delta}{\alpha-\delta}\right)y}^y \frac{-\delta}{x} dx = -\delta \cdot \ln \left(\frac{\alpha - \delta}{\alpha - 2\delta} \right) < 0.$$

This gives a contradiction. So we conclude that

$$(5.14) \quad \liminf_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(x)}{x} \geq \alpha.$$

Therefore we complete the proof from (5.13) and (5.14). \square

Lemma 5.9[Mertens]. $\zeta(z) \neq 0$ for any z with $\operatorname{Re}(z) = 1$ and $z \neq 1$.

Proof. We observe that $3 + 4 \cos \theta + \cos(2\theta) = 2(1 + \cos \theta)^2 \geq 0$ for any $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. If $\zeta(1 + it) = 0$ for some $t \neq 0$, then the equation

$$\Theta(s) = \zeta(s)^3 \cdot \zeta(s + it)^4 \cdot \zeta(s + 2it)$$

has a zero at $s = 1$. Thus we have that

$$(5.15) \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow 1} \ln |\Theta(s)| = -\infty.$$

Now it follows from Theorem 4.3.11 that for any $s = \sigma > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \ln |\zeta(\sigma + it)| &= -\operatorname{Re} \left(\sum_p \ln(1 - p^{-\sigma - it}) \right) \\ &= \operatorname{Re} \left(\sum_p \left(p^{-\sigma - it} + \frac{1}{2}(p^2)^{-\sigma - it} + \frac{1}{3}(p^3)^{-\sigma - it} + \dots \right) \right) \\ &= \operatorname{Re} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n n^{-\sigma - it} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where b_n 's are certain nonnegative constants. This leads to the following inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} \ln |\Theta(\sigma)| &= \operatorname{Re} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n n^{-\sigma} (3 + 4n^{-it} + n^{-2it}) \right) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n n^{-\sigma} (3 + 4 \cos(t \ln n) + \cos(2t \ln n)) \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

which contradict to (5.15). Hence we complete the proof. \square

Theorem 5.10[Prime Number Theorem].

If $\pi(x)$ denotes the number of prime numbers $p \leq x$, then we have that $\pi(x) \sim \frac{x}{\ln x}$.

Proof. First of all, by Theorem 5.4[Chebyshev's Theorem] we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(x) &= \sum_{p \leq x} \left[\frac{\ln x}{\ln p} \right] \ln p \leq \ln x \sum_{p \leq x} 1 \\ &= \pi(x) \ln x = \mathcal{O}(x). \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 5.5, it suffices to show that

$$\psi(x) \sim x.$$

By Theorem 4.3.18, the Mellin transform of $\psi(x)$ is

$$-\frac{\zeta'(z)}{\zeta(z)} = z \int_1^{\infty} \frac{\psi(x)}{x^{z+1}} dx, \quad \operatorname{Re}(z) > 1.$$

In order to apply Corollary 5.8, we shall show that the function

$$-\frac{\zeta'(z)}{\zeta(z)} - \frac{1}{z-1}$$

is analytic in some region containing the closed half-plane $\operatorname{Re}(z) \geq 1$. By Proposition 4.3.16, there is some $\delta > 0$ so that

$$\zeta(z) = \frac{1}{z-1}(1 + h(z))$$

where $h(z)$ is analytic in $B(1; \delta)$ and $|h(z)| < 1$ there. Thus this implies that the function

$$-\frac{\zeta'(z)}{\zeta(z)} - \frac{1}{z-1} = -\frac{h'(z)}{1+h(z)}$$

is analytic at $z = 1$. Finally, it follows from Proposition 4.3.16 and Lemma 5.9 that the function

$$-\frac{\zeta'(z)}{\zeta(z)} - \frac{1}{z-1}$$

is analytic at any other points z with $\operatorname{Re}(z) = 1$. Hence are are done. \square

Corollary 5.11. *Let $f(x)$ be a number theoretic function with nonnegative values and with*

$$\sum_{n \leq x} f(n) = \mathcal{O}(x),$$

and let the Dirichlet series

$$F(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{f(n)}{n^z}$$

be analytic in $\operatorname{Re}(z) > 1$ in the sense that the function

$$F(z) - \frac{\alpha}{z-1} \quad (\alpha \text{ is some fixed constant})$$

is analytic in some region containing the closed half-plane $\operatorname{Re}(z) \geq 1$. Then we have that

$$\sum_{n \leq x} f(n) \sim \alpha x.$$

Proof. It easily follows from Corollary 5.8 and the following integral representation

$$F(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{f(n)}{n^z} = z \int_1^{\infty} \left(\sum_{n \leq x} f(n) \right) x^{-z-1} dx. \quad \square$$

Corollary 5.12. *Let $f(n)$ and $g(n)$ be two number theoretic functions satisfying that $f(n) \geq 0$, $g(n) = \mathcal{O}(f(n))$, and $\sum_{n \leq x} f(n) = \mathcal{O}(x)$. If two Dirichlet series*

$$F(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{f(n)}{n^z} \quad \text{and} \quad G(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{g(n)}{n^z}$$

are analytic in $\operatorname{Re}(z) > 1$ in the sense that the functions

$$F(z) - \frac{\alpha}{z-1}, \quad G(z) - \frac{\beta}{z-1} \quad (\alpha \text{ and } \beta \text{ are some fixed constants})$$

are analytic in some region containing the closed half-plane $\operatorname{Re}(z) \geq 1$, then we have that

$$\sum_{n \leq x} g(n) \sim \gamma x.$$

Proof. First, we assume that $g(n)$ is real-valued. Let us choose some constant $K > 0$ so large that $|g(n)| \leq Kf(n)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We now apply Corollary 5.11 to the Dirichlet series generated by the number theoretic function $h(n) = Kf(n) + g(n)$, given by

$$H(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{h(n)}{n^z} = KF(z) + G(z).$$

By Corollary 5.11, we have that

$$\sum_{n \leq x} h(n) = K \sum_{n \leq x} f(n) + \sum_{n \leq x} g(n) \sim K\alpha x + \sum_{n \leq x} g(n)$$

and

$$\sum_{n \leq x} h(n) \sim K\alpha x + \beta x.$$

This implies the conclusion.

If $g(n)$ is complex-valued, then we set $G^*(z) = \overline{G(\bar{z})}$ and we consider

$$G_1(z) \doteq \frac{1}{2}[G(z) + G^*(z)] = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\operatorname{Re}(g(n))}{n^z}$$

and

$$G_2(z) \doteq \frac{1}{2i}[G(z) - G^*(z)] = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\operatorname{Im}(g(n))}{n^z}.$$

Hence we complete the proof by applying the above argument to $G_1(z)$ and $G_2(z)$. \square

In what follows, we furnish three examples as a foretaste of importance of Corollary 5.12.

Corollary 5.13. *If $\mu(n)$ is the Möbius function and $\lambda(n)$ is the Liouville function, then we have that*

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n) = \mathfrak{o}(x) \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{n \leq x} \lambda(n) = \mathfrak{o}(x).$$

Proof. By Proposition 4.3.15, we apply Corollary 5.12 to the associated Dirichlet series $G(z) = 1/\zeta(z)$ and $G(z) = \zeta(2z)/\zeta(z)$ which are analytic in some region containing the closed half-plane $\operatorname{Re}(z) \geq 1$. Since they have no singularity at $z = 1$, we conclude that $\beta = 0$. \square

As a third example, we consider the Dirichlet series

$$\zeta_i(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{r(n)}{n^z}$$

generated by the number theoretic function $r(n)$ which counts the number of the representations of n as the sum of two squares. By Proposition 3.25 in Chapter 3, $r(n)$ can be considered as the number of representations $n = \omega\bar{\omega}$ where ω runs through the ring $\mathbb{Z}(i)$. Thus we obtain that

$$\zeta_i(z) = \sum_{\omega \in \mathbb{Z}(i) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{1}{|\omega|^{2z}} = \sum_{\omega \in \mathbb{Z}(i) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{1}{(\omega\bar{\omega})^z},$$

which is called the ζ -**function** for the number theory on the ring $\mathbb{Z}(i)$. In order to keep track of the arguments of $\omega \in \mathbb{Z}(i) \setminus \{0\}$, Hecke originated the following Dirichlet series

$$\Xi(h, z) = \sum_{\omega \in \mathbb{Z}(i) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{1}{|\omega|^{2z}} \cdot e^{4ih \arg(\omega)}, \quad h \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Then it is clear that $\Xi(0, z) = \zeta_i(z)$ and

$$\Xi(h, z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^z} \left(\sum_{|\omega|^2=n} e^{4ih \arg(\omega)} \right), \quad \operatorname{Re}(z) > 1.$$

Its convergence for $\operatorname{Re}(z) > 1$ follows from the convergence of $\zeta_i(z)$ for $\operatorname{Re}(z) > 1$; which can be derived from the estimate

$$\sum_{x \leq n \leq y} \frac{r(n)}{n^z} = \frac{1}{y^z} \mathcal{O}(y-x) + z \int_x^y \mathcal{O}(t-x) t^{-z-1} dt = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{x^{z-1}}\right)$$

which is obtained by applying Proposition 4.2.2[Abel Transformation] and Proposition 4.2.8. The argument function $\arg(\omega)$ in $\Xi(h, z)$ is uniquely defined in $-\pi < \arg(\omega) \leq \pi$.

Definition 5.14. Let f be a complex-valued function defined on $\mathbb{Z}(i)$. Then f is said to be multiplicative if $f \neq 0$ and

$$(5.16) \quad f(\mathbf{mn}) = f(\mathbf{m})f(\mathbf{n})$$

for any pair $(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) \in \mathbb{Z}(i) \times \mathbb{Z}(i)$ with no common prime factor. If (5.16) holds for any pair $(\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n}) \in \mathbb{Z}(i) \times \mathbb{Z}(i)$, then we say that f is completely multiplicative.

For instance, for $h \in \mathbb{Z}$ we consider the function $f(\omega) = e^{4ih \arg(\omega)}$. Then it is certainly completely multiplicative and satisfies that $f(\mathbf{u}) = 1$ for unit elements $\mathbf{u} = 1, i, -1, -i$. This is the reason why the factor 4 in the exponent was taken in $\Xi(h, z)$.

Proposition 5.15. Let f be a complex-valued function defined on $\mathbb{Z}(i)$ satisfying that $f(\mathbf{u}) = 1$ for all units $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{Z}(i)$. Suppose that the infinite series

$$F(z) = \sum_{\omega \in \mathbb{Z}(i) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{f(\omega)}{|\omega|^{2z}}$$

converges absolutely for $\operatorname{Re}(z) > \tau_0$.

(a) If f is multiplicative, then we have that for all z with $\operatorname{Re}(z) > 1$,

$$F(z) = 4 \prod_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Z}_p^+(i)} \left(\sum_{\mu=1}^{\infty} \frac{f(\mathbf{p}^\mu)}{|\mathbf{p}|^{2\mu z}} \right)$$

where $\mathbb{Z}_p^+(i)$ is the set of all prime elements \mathbf{p} of $\mathbb{Z}(i)$ with $0 \leq \arg(\mathbf{p}) < \pi/2$.

(b) If f is completely multiplicative, then we have that for all z with $\operatorname{Re}(z) > 1$,

$$F(z) = 4 \prod_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Z}_p^+(i)} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{f(\mathbf{p})}{|\mathbf{p}|^{2z}}}.$$

(c) For $h \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have that

$$\Xi(h, z) = 4 \prod_{\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{Z}_p^+(i)} \frac{1}{e^{4ih \arg(\mathbf{p})} \left(1 - \frac{1}{|\mathbf{p}|^{2z}} \right)}, \quad \operatorname{Re}(z) > 1.$$

Proof. It easily follows from the modification of Proposition 4.3.13. \square

Definition 5.16. We consider the function Λ_i defined on $\mathbb{Z}(i)$ given by

$$\Lambda_i(\omega) = \begin{cases} \ln |\mathbf{p}|, & \text{if } \omega = \mathbf{u}\mathbf{p}^\nu \text{ for a unit } \mathbf{u} \text{ and a prime } \mathbf{p} \\ 0, & \text{if } \omega \text{ is not such a prime power,} \end{cases}$$

which is called the generalized Mangoldt function.

In Chapter 4, we saw the relation between the Mangoldt function and the quotient $\zeta'(z)/\zeta(z)$. Similarly, in what follows we study the connection between the generalized Mangoldt function and the quotient

$$-\frac{\Xi'(h, z)}{\Xi(h, z)};$$

in particular, this quotient will play an important role in the Mellin transform of the function

$$(5.17) \quad \psi_i(x) = \sum_{\omega \in \mathbb{B}_x(i)} \Lambda_i(\omega)$$

where $\mathbb{B}_x(i) = \{\omega \in \mathbb{Z}(i) : |\omega|^2 \leq x\}$.

Lemma 5.17. *For $\operatorname{Re}(z) > 1$ and $h \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have that*

$$-\frac{\Xi'(h, z)}{\Xi(h, z)} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\omega \in \mathbb{Z}(i) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\Lambda_i(\omega)}{|\omega|^{2z}} e^{4ih \arg(\omega)}.$$

Proof. Since $\log(1 - e^{4ih \arg(\mathfrak{p})} \cdot |\mathfrak{p}|^{-2z}) = \mathcal{O}(|\mathfrak{p}|^{-2\operatorname{Re}(z)})$, the series

$$H(z) \doteq \log 4 - \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{Z}_p^+(i)} \log \left(1 - \frac{e^{4ih \arg(\mathfrak{p})}}{|\mathfrak{p}|^{2z}} \right)$$

converges uniformly in every compact subsets inside the half-plane $\operatorname{Re}(z) > 1$, and so $H(z)$ is analytic in $\operatorname{Re}(z) > 1$. We also have the relation

$$e^{H(z)} = \Xi(h, z).$$

Thus we obtain that

$$H'(z) \cdot \Xi(h, z) = \Xi'(h, z).$$

Therefore we complete the proof by calculating $H'(z)$ as follows;

$$\begin{aligned} H'(z) &= \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{Z}_p^+(i)} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{e^{4ih \arg(\mathfrak{p})}}{|\mathfrak{p}|^{2z}}} \cdot \frac{e^{4ih \arg(\mathfrak{p})} \cdot \log |\mathfrak{p}|^2}{|\mathfrak{p}|^{2z}} \\ &= 2 \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{Z}_p^+(i)} \frac{\log |\mathfrak{p}| \cdot e^{4ih \arg(\mathfrak{p})}}{|\mathfrak{p}|^{2z}} \cdot \sum_{\mu=0}^{\infty} \frac{e^{4ih \arg(\mathfrak{p}^\mu)}}{|\mathfrak{p}^\mu|^{2z}} \\ &= 2 \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{Z}_p^+(i)} \sum_{\mu=1}^{\infty} \frac{\log |\mathfrak{p}| \cdot e^{4ih \arg(\mathfrak{p}^\mu)}}{|\mathfrak{p}^\mu|^{2z}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathfrak{u} \in \mathfrak{U}} \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{Z}_p^+(i)} \sum_{\mu=1}^{\infty} \frac{\log |\mathfrak{u}\mathfrak{p}| \cdot e^{4ih \arg((\mathfrak{u}\mathfrak{p})^\mu)}}{|(\mathfrak{u}\mathfrak{p})^\mu|^{2z}} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\omega \in \mathbb{Z}(i) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\Lambda_i(\omega)}{|\omega|^{2z}} e^{4ih \arg(\omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathfrak{U} denotes the set of all unit elements \mathfrak{u} of $\mathbb{Z}(i)$. \square

Lemma 5.18. *For all z with $\operatorname{Re}(z) > 1$, we have the integral representation*

$$-\frac{\zeta'_i(z)}{\zeta_i(z)} = \frac{z}{2} \int_1^\infty \frac{\psi_i(x)}{x^{z+1}} dx$$

where ψ_i is a function defined by $\psi_i(x) = \sum_{\omega \in \mathbb{B}_x(i)} \Lambda_i(\omega)$.

Proof. By Lemma 5.17, we have that

$$-\frac{\zeta'_i(z)}{\zeta_i(z)} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\omega \in \mathbb{Z}(i) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\Lambda_i(\omega)}{|\omega|^{2z}}.$$

It also follows from Proposition 4.2.2[Abel Transformation] that

$$(5.18) \quad \sum_{\omega \in \mathbb{B}_x(i) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\Lambda_i(\omega)}{|\omega|^{2z}} = \frac{1}{x^z} \cdot \psi_i(x) - \int_1^x \psi_i(y) \cdot \frac{-z}{y^{z+1}} dy.$$

From Proposition 3.24, we observe that

$$(5.19) \quad \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{Z}_p(i), |\mathfrak{p}|^2 \leq x} 1 \sim \pi(x)$$

where $\mathbb{Z}_p(i)$ denotes the set of all prime elements of $\mathbb{Z}(i)$. Thus by the definition of $\psi_i(x)$ and Theorem 5.4[Chebyshev's theorem] we obtain that

$$(5.20) \quad \begin{aligned} \psi_i(x) &= \sum_{\omega \in \mathbb{B}_x(i)} \Lambda_i(\omega) = 4 \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{Z}_p(i), |\mathfrak{p}|^2 \leq x} \left[\frac{\ln x}{2 \ln |\omega|} \right] \ln |\omega| \\ &= \mathcal{O} \left(\sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{Z}_p(i), |\mathfrak{p}|^2 \leq x} \ln x \right) = \mathcal{O} \left(\ln x \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{Z}_p(i), |\mathfrak{p}|^2 \leq x} 1 \right) = \mathcal{O}(x). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit $x \rightarrow \infty$ in (5.18), we can complete the proof. \square

Lemma 5.19. *For $h \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$, we have that*

$$\sum_{\omega \in \mathbb{B}_x(i) \setminus \{0\}} e^{4ih \arg(\omega)} = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{x} \ln x).$$

Proof. We write $\omega = a + ib$ for $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$. Observing that $\arg(a + ib) = \pi/2 - \arg(b + ia)$ for $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$ and considering only the sum over non-associated elements, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\omega \in \mathbb{B}_x(i) \setminus \{0\}} e^{4ih \arg(\omega)} &= 4 \sum_{a > 0} \sum_{b \geq 0: a^2 + b^2 \leq x} e^{4ih \arg(a + ib)} \\ &= 8 \sum_{a > 0} \sum_{b \geq a: a^2 + b^2 \leq x} \cos(4h \arg(a + ib)) + \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{x}) \\ &= 8 \sum_{0 < a \leq \sqrt{\frac{x}{2}}} \sum_{a \leq b \leq \sqrt{x - a^2}} \cos \left(4h \tan^{-1} \left(\frac{b}{a} \right) \right) + \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{x}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\tan^{-1} \left(\frac{\sqrt{x - a^2}}{a} \right) - \tan^{-1} 1 = \mathcal{O}(1)$, it follows from Proposition 4.2.3[The Euler Sum Formula] that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\omega \in \mathbb{B}_x(i) \setminus \{0\}} e^{4ih \arg(\omega)} \\ &= 8 \sum_{1 \leq a \leq \sqrt{\frac{x}{2}}} \left(\int_a^{\sqrt{x - a^2}} \cos \left(4h \tan^{-1} \left(\frac{y}{a} \right) \right) dy + \mathcal{O} \left(1 + \int_a^{\sqrt{x - a^2}} \frac{1}{a \left(1 + \frac{y^2}{a^2} \right)} dy \right) \right) + \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{x}) \\ &= 8 \sum_{1 \leq a \leq \sqrt{\frac{x}{2}}} \int_a^{\sqrt{x - a^2}} \cos \left(4h \tan^{-1} \left(\frac{y}{a} \right) \right) dy + \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{x}) \\ &= 8 \int_1^{\sqrt{\frac{x}{2}}} \int_t^{\sqrt{x - t^2}} \cos \left(4h \tan^{-1} \left(\frac{y}{t} \right) \right) dy dt \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O} \left(\sqrt{x} + \int_1^{\sqrt{\frac{x}{2}}} \left| \frac{d}{dt} \int_t^{\sqrt{x - t^2}} \cos \left(4h \tan^{-1} \left(\frac{y}{t} \right) \right) dy \right| dt \right) + \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{x}). \end{aligned}$$

We observe that $\int_0^1 \int_t^{\sqrt{x-t^2}} \cos\left(4h \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{y}{t}\right)\right) dy dt = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{x})$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \int_t^{\sqrt{x-t^2}} \cos\left(4h \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{y}{t}\right)\right) dy &= \frac{1}{t^2} \int_t^{\sqrt{x-t^2}} \frac{4hy \sin(\tan^{-1}(\frac{y}{t}))}{1 + \frac{y^2}{t^2}} dy \\ &\quad - \frac{t}{\sqrt{x-t^2}} \cos\left(4h \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{\sqrt{x-t^2}}{t}\right)\right) - \cos(h\pi) \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(\int_t^{\sqrt{x-t^2}} \frac{y}{t^2 + y^2} dy + \frac{t}{\sqrt{x-t^2}}\right) \\ &= \mathcal{O}\left(\ln\left(\frac{x}{2t^2}\right) + 1\right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus by applying polar coordinates $t = r \cos \theta$ and $y = r \sin \theta$ with $0 < r \leq \sqrt{x}$ and $\pi/4 \leq \theta \leq \pi/2$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\omega \in \mathbb{B}_x(i) \setminus \{0\}} e^{4ih \arg(\omega)} &= 8 \int_0^{\sqrt{\frac{x}{2}}} \int_t^{\sqrt{x-t^2}} \cos\left(4h \tan^{-1}\left(\frac{y}{t}\right)\right) dy dt + \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{x} \ln x) \\ &= 8 \int_0^{\sqrt{x}} \int_{\frac{\pi}{4}}^{\frac{\pi}{2}} \cos(4h\theta) d\theta r dr + \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{x} \ln x) = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{x} \ln x), \end{aligned}$$

because the last integral vanishes for $h \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$. Therefore we complete the proof. \square

Lemma 5.20. *Let $f(n)$ be a number theoretic function satisfying*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f(n) = \alpha.$$

For $\operatorname{Re}(z) > 1$, we have the following formula

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{f(n)}{n^z} = \alpha \cdot \zeta(z) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{n^z} - \frac{1}{(n+1)^z} \right) \left(\sum_{m=1}^n f(m) - n\alpha \right).$$

Proof. Applying Lemma 4.2.1[Abel Transformation], we have that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{n=1}^N \left(\frac{1}{(n+1)^z} - \frac{1}{n^z} \right) \left(\sum_{m=1}^n f(m) - \alpha n \right) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^N \frac{1}{(n+1)^z} \left(\left(\sum_{m=1}^{n+1} f(m) - \alpha(n+1) \right) - \left(\sum_{m=1}^n f(m) - \alpha n \right) \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{(N+1)^z} \left(\sum_{m=1}^{N+1} f(m) - \alpha(N+1) \right) + (f(1) - \alpha) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{N+1} \frac{f(n) - \alpha}{n^z} - \frac{1}{(N+1)^z} \left(\alpha - \frac{1}{N+1} \sum_{m=1}^{N+1} f(m) \right) \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{N+1} \frac{f(n)}{n^z} - \alpha \sum_{n=1}^{N+1} \frac{1}{n^z} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{(N+1)^{\operatorname{Re}(z)-1}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $(N+1)^{-(\operatorname{Re}(z)-1)}$ tends to zero as $N \rightarrow \infty$ for $\operatorname{Re}(z) > 1$, and also

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{n=1}^N \left(\frac{1}{n^z} - \frac{1}{(n+1)^z} \right) \left(\sum_{m=1}^n f(m) - \alpha n \right) \right| &= \left| \sum_{n=1}^N z \left(\int_n^{n+1} \frac{1}{x^{z+1}} dx \right) \cdot n \left(\alpha - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m=1}^n f(m) \right) \right| \\ &= \mathcal{O} \left(\sum_{n=1}^N \frac{|z|}{n^{\operatorname{Re}(z)}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

converges for $\operatorname{Re}(z) > 1$, we can complete the proof by taking $N \rightarrow \infty$. \square

Lemma 5.21. For $h \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$, $\Xi(h, z)$ has an analytic continuation into the half-plane $\operatorname{Re}(z) > 1/2$. Similarly, the function

$$\zeta_i(z) - \frac{\pi}{z-1}$$

has an analytic continuation into the half-plane $\operatorname{Re}(z) > 1/2$ in the sense that $\zeta_i(z)$ is analytic on $\operatorname{Re}(z) > 1/2$ except for a simple pole at $z = 1$ with residue π .

Proof. If we set $f(n) = \sum_{|\omega|^2=n} e^{4ih \arg(\omega)}$ for $h \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$, then it follows from Lemma 5.19 that

$$\alpha = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N f(n) = 0.$$

By Lemma 5.20, we have that for $h \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$,

$$\Xi(h, z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{n^z} - \frac{1}{(n+1)^z} \right) \sum_{\omega \in \mathbb{B}_n(i) \setminus \{0\}} e^{4ih \arg(\omega)}.$$

Thus it follows from Lemma 5.19 that the following sequence

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=M}^N \left(\frac{1}{n^z} - \frac{1}{(n+1)^z} \right) \sum_{\omega \in \mathbb{B}_n(i) \setminus \{0\}} e^{4ih \arg(\omega)} &= \mathcal{O} \left(|z| \sum_{n=M}^N \sqrt{n} \ln n \left| \int_n^{n+1} \frac{1}{x^{z+1}} dx \right| \right) \\ &= \mathcal{O} \left(|z| \sum_{n=M}^N \frac{\ln n}{n^{\operatorname{Re}(z) + \frac{1}{2}}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

converges uniformly to zero as $M \rightarrow \infty$ in every compact subsets of the half-plane $\operatorname{Re}(z) > 1/2$. Hence this implies the analytic continuation of $\Xi(h, z)$.

Similarly to the above, it follows from Lemma 5.20 that

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_i(z) &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{r(n)}{n^z} \\ &= \pi \cdot \zeta(z) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{n^z} - \frac{1}{(n+1)^z} \right) \left(\sum_{m=1}^n r(m) - n\pi \right). \end{aligned}$$

From Proposition 4.2.8, we see that

$$\sum_{m=1}^n r(m) - n\pi = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{n}).$$

Therefore we complete the proof by applying the above argument once again. \square

Lemma 5.22. For $h \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$, $\Xi(h, z) \neq 0$ for any z with $\operatorname{Re}(z) = 1$.

Proof. It is trivial for the case $h = 0$ and $z = 1$, because $\zeta_i(z)$ has a pole at $z = 1$. For the other cases, we use a modified version of Lemma 5.9[Mertens].

Fix $h \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$. If $\Xi(h, 1 + it) = 0$ for some $t \neq 0$, then the equation

$$\Theta(s) = \zeta_i(z)^3 \cdot \Xi(h, s + it)^4 \cdot \Xi(2h, s + i2t)$$

has a zero at $s = 1$. Thus this implies that

$$(5.21) \quad \lim_{s \rightarrow 1} \ln |\Theta(s)| = -\infty.$$

Now it follows from Proposition 5.15, (c) that for any $s = \sigma > 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \ln |\Xi(h, \sigma + it)| &= \ln 4 - \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{Z}_p^+(i)} \ln \left| 1 - \frac{e^{4ih \arg(\mathfrak{p})}}{|\mathfrak{p}|^{2\sigma + i2t}} \right| \\ &= \ln 4 + \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{Z}_p^+(i)} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\cos n(4h \arg(\mathfrak{p}) - 2t \ln |\mathfrak{p}|)}{n |\mathfrak{p}|^{2n\sigma}}. \end{aligned}$$

This leads to the following inequalities

$$\ln |\Theta(s)| = 8 \ln 4 + \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{Z}_p^+(i)} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{3 + 4 \cos n(4h \arg(\mathfrak{p}) - 2t \ln |\mathfrak{p}|) + \cos n(8h \arg(\mathfrak{p}) - 4t \ln |\mathfrak{p}|)}{n |\mathfrak{p}|^{2n\sigma}} \geq 0,$$

which contradicts to (5.21). Hence we complete the proof. \square

Proposition 5.23. $\psi_i(x) \doteq \sum_{\omega \in \mathbb{B}_x(i)} \Lambda_i(\omega) \sim 2x$.

Proof. It is trivial that $\psi_i(x)$ is a monotone non-decreasing function on $[0, \infty)$. By (5.20), we have $\psi_i(x) = \mathcal{O}(x)$. Thus it follows from Lemma 5.18 and Lemma 5.21 that the function $-\zeta'_i(z)/\zeta_i(z)$ given by

$$-\frac{\zeta'_i(z)}{\zeta_i(z)} = z \int_1^{\infty} \frac{1}{2} \psi_i(x) \frac{1}{x^{z+1}} dx$$

is analytic in $\operatorname{Re}(z) > 1$ and the function

$$-\frac{\zeta'_i(z)}{\zeta_i(z)} - \frac{1}{z-1}$$

has an analytic continuation into some region containing the closed half-plane $\operatorname{Re}(z) \geq 1$. Therefore Corollary 5.11 implies the conclusion. \square

Proposition 5.24. $\sum_{\omega \in \mathbb{B}_x(i)} e^{4ih \arg(\omega)} \Lambda_i(\omega) = \mathfrak{o}(x)$ for $h \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$.

Proof. We observe that $e^{4ih \arg(\omega)} \Lambda_i(\omega) = \mathcal{O}(\Lambda_i(\omega))$ for $h \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$ and $\omega \in \mathbb{Z}(i) \setminus \{0\}$. From Lemma 5.17 and Lemma 5.22, two Dirichlet series

$$-\frac{\zeta'(z)}{\zeta(z)} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\omega \in \mathbb{Z}(i) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\Lambda_i(\omega)}{|\omega|^{2z}} \quad \text{and} \quad -\frac{\Xi'(h, z)}{\Xi(h, z)} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\omega \in \mathbb{Z}(i) \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\Lambda_i(\omega) e^{4ih \arg(\omega)}}{|\omega|^{2z}}, \quad h \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\},$$

are analytic in $\operatorname{Re}(z) > 1$ and have an analytic continuation with no singularity at $z = 1$ into some region containing the closed half-plane $\operatorname{Re}(z) \geq 1$. Therefore Corollary 5.12 and Proposition 5.23 imply the required one. \square

Theorem 5.25[Hecke's Prime Number Theorem for the ring $\mathbb{Z}(i)$].

(a) If $\pi_i(x)$ denotes the number of all non-associated prime elements \mathfrak{p} with $|\mathfrak{p}|^2 \leq x$, i.e. the number of all prime elements in $\mathbb{Z}_p^+(i) \cap \mathbb{B}_x(i)$, then we have that

$$\pi_i(x) \sim \frac{x}{\ln x}.$$

(b) If $\pi_i(x; \alpha, \beta)$ denotes the number of all prime elements $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{Z}_p(i) \cap \mathbb{B}_x(i)$ with $\alpha \leq \arg(\mathfrak{p}) < \beta$ for $0 \leq \alpha < \beta \leq 2\pi$, then we have that

$$\pi_i(x; \alpha, \beta) \sim \frac{2}{\pi} (\beta - \alpha) \frac{x}{\ln x}.$$

Proof. We observe the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \geq 2} \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{Z}_p^+(i): |\mathfrak{p}|^{2k} \leq x} e^{4ih \arg(\mathfrak{p}^k)} \ln |\mathfrak{p}| &= \mathcal{O} \left(\ln x \sum_{k \geq 2} \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{Z}_p^+(i): |\mathfrak{p}|^2 \leq x^{1/k}} 1 \right) \\ &= \mathcal{O} \left(\ln x \sum_{2 \leq k \leq \ln x / \ln 2} \frac{\sqrt{x}}{\ln \sqrt{x}} \right) \\ &= \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{x} \ln x). \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} 4 \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{Z}_p^+(i) \cap \mathbb{B}_x(i)} e^{4ih \arg(\mathfrak{p})} \ln |\mathfrak{p}| &= 4 \sum_{k \geq 1} \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{Z}_p^+(i): |\mathfrak{p}|^{2k} \leq x} e^{4ih \arg(\mathfrak{p}^k)} \ln |\mathfrak{p}| + \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{x} \ln x) \\ &= \sum_{\omega \in \mathbb{B}_x(i)} e^{4ih \arg(\omega)} \Lambda_i(\omega) + \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{x} \ln x) \\ &= \begin{cases} 2x + \mathfrak{o}(x), & h = 0, \\ \mathfrak{o}(x), & h \neq 0. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Thus it follows from the above estimate and Proposition 4.2.2 [Abel Transformation] that

$$\begin{aligned} (5.22) \quad \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{Z}_p^+(i) \cap \mathbb{B}_x(i)} e^{4ih \arg(\mathfrak{p})} &= \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{Z}_p^+(i): 2 \leq |\mathfrak{p}|^2 \leq x} e^{4ih \arg(\mathfrak{p})} \ln |\mathfrak{p}|^2 \cdot \frac{1}{\ln |\mathfrak{p}|^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{\ln x} \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{Z}_p^+(i): 2 \leq |\mathfrak{p}|^2 \leq x} e^{4ih \arg(\mathfrak{p})} \ln |\mathfrak{p}|^2 \\ &\quad - \int_2^x \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{Z}_p^+(i): 2 \leq |\mathfrak{p}|^2 \leq t} e^{4ih \arg(\mathfrak{p})} \ln |\mathfrak{p}|^2 \cdot \frac{-1}{t \ln^2 t} dt \\ &= \frac{2}{\ln x} \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{Z}_p^+(i) \cap \mathbb{B}_x(i)} e^{4ih \arg(\mathfrak{p})} \ln |\mathfrak{p}| + \mathcal{O} \left(\int_2^x \frac{1}{\ln^2 t} dt \right) \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{x}{\ln x} + \mathfrak{o} \left(\frac{x}{\ln x} \right) + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{x}{\ln x} \right), & h = 0, \\ \mathfrak{o} \left(\frac{x}{\ln x} \right) + \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{x}{\ln x} \right), & h \neq 0 \end{cases} \\ &= \begin{cases} \frac{x}{\ln x} + \mathfrak{o} \left(\frac{x}{\ln x} \right), & h = 0, \\ \mathfrak{o} \left(\frac{x}{\ln x} \right), & h \neq 0. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

(a) By (5.22) on $h = 0$, we have that

$$\pi_i(x) = \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{Z}_p^+(i) \cap \mathbb{B}_x(i)} e^{4ih \arg(\mathfrak{p})} = \frac{x}{\ln x} + \mathfrak{o}\left(\frac{x}{\ln x}\right).$$

(b) It easily follows from (5.22) on $h \neq 0$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{4\pi_i(x)} \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{Z}_p(i) \cap \mathbb{B}_x(i)} e^{2\pi ih(\frac{2}{\pi} \arg(\mathfrak{p}))} &= \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{4\pi_i(x)} \cdot 4 \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{Z}_p^+(i) \cap \mathbb{B}_x(i)} e^{2\pi ih(\frac{2}{\pi} \arg(\mathfrak{p}))} \\ &= \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\pi_i(x)} \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{Z}_p^+(i) \cap \mathbb{B}_x(i)} e^{2\pi ih(\frac{2}{\pi} \arg(\mathfrak{p}))} \\ &= \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ln x}{x} \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{Z}_p^+(i) \cap \mathbb{B}_x(i)} e^{4ih \arg(\mathfrak{p})} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus by Theorem 2.13 [Weyl's Criterion] we see that the sequence

$$\{\theta_{\mathfrak{p},x} := \frac{2}{\pi} \arg(\mathfrak{p}) : \mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{Z}_p(i) \cap \mathbb{B}_x(i), x \in \mathbb{R}_+\}$$

is uniformly distributed modulo 2π . Hence by Proposition 2.12 we have that

$$(5.23) \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{4\pi_i(x)} \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{Z}_p(i) \cap \mathbb{B}_x(i)} f(\arg(\mathfrak{p})) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f(\theta) d\theta$$

for any real-valued Riemann integrable function $f(\theta)$ on $[0, 2\pi)$. If we take $f(\theta) = \chi_{[\alpha, \beta)}(\theta)$ in (5.23), we obtain that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\pi_i(x; \alpha, \beta)}{4\pi_i(x)} = \lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{4\pi_i(x)} \sum_{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{Z}_p(i) \cap \mathbb{B}_x(i)} f(\arg(\mathfrak{p})) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} f(\theta) d\theta = \frac{1}{2\pi}(\beta - \alpha).$$

Therefore this implies the required result. \square

REFERENCES

1. G. M. Hardy and E. M. Wright, *An introduction to the theory of numbers*, Oxford Science Publications.
2. Hua Loo Keng, *Introduction to Number Theory*, Springer-Verlag.
3. E. C. Titchmarsh, *The theory of the Riemann zeta-function*, Oxford Science Publications.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, KOREA UNIVERSITY, SEOUL 136-701, KOREA