## Chapter 1 Additional Questions

8) Prove that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^{\sigma}} \text{ converges if, and only if, } \sigma > 1.$$

$$\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n (\log n)^{\sigma}} \text{ converges if, and only if, } \sigma > 1.$$

$$\sum_{n=3}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n \log n (\log \log n)^{\sigma}} \text{ converges if, and only if, } \sigma > 1.$$
(23)

Can you see a pattern?

**9**) i Using the observation that  $\log 1 = 0$  improve the result of Question 4i to

$$N \log N - N + 2 - \log 2 \le \sum_{1 \le n \le N} \log n \le (N+1) \log N - N + 2 - 2 \log 2.$$

ii. Deduce that for such N,

$$\frac{e^2}{2} \left(\frac{N}{e}\right)^N \le N! < \frac{N}{2} \left(\frac{e^2}{2} \left(\frac{N}{e}\right)^N\right).$$
(24)

This is an increase on the lower bound of (20) by a factor of  $e/2 \approx 1.359..$ and a decrease on the upper bound by a factor of  $e/4 \approx 0.679...$  Alternatively the improvement can be seen in that the lower and upper bounds in (24) differ by a factor of N/2 whilst in the earlier (20) the factor is N. Can we do better and have a factor that does not depend on N? See a later Problem Sheet.

10) Recall from notes the definition of the set

$$\mathcal{N} = \{n : p | n \Rightarrow p \le N\}.$$

Then unique factorisation of integers justifies, for real  $s = \sigma > 1$ , the last equality in

$$\zeta(\sigma) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^{\sigma}} \ge \sum_{n \in \mathcal{N}} \frac{1}{n^{\sigma}} = \prod_{p \le N} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^{\sigma}}\right)^{-1}.$$
 (25)

This is a rather convoluted way of showing that  $\zeta(\sigma) > 0$  for  $\sigma > 1$  since this *finite* product can not be zero (to be zero one of the factors would have to be zero). Yet can (25) be generalised to *complex* s so that we can conclude that  $\zeta(s) \neq 0$  for Re s > 1?

In the lectures we prove that

$$\left|\zeta(s) - \prod_{p \le N} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^s}\right)^{-1}\right| \le \sum_{n \notin \mathcal{N}} \frac{1}{n^{\sigma}} \le \sum_{n \ge N+1} \frac{1}{n^{\sigma}} \le \frac{1}{(\sigma - 1) N^{\sigma - 1}}.$$
 (26)

and deduced that

$$\zeta(s) = \prod_{p} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^s}\right)^{-1} \tag{27}$$

for  $\operatorname{Re} s > 1$ . From this we see, on multiplying both sides of (27) by a *finite* number of terms that, for any N > 1,

$$\prod_{p \le N} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p^s} \right) \zeta(s) = \prod_{p > N} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p^s} \right)^{-1}.$$
(28)

i) Prove that for any M > N,

$$\left| \prod_{N$$

**Hint** Write the product as a sum and use the same ideas that gave the bound (26).

ii) Deduce that given  $s : \operatorname{Re} s > 1$  there exists N = N(s) > 1 such that

$$\left|\prod_{p\leq N} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^s}\right)\zeta(s) - 1\right| \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

**Hint** Take a limit over M in Part i.

iii) Deduce

$$|\zeta(s)| > \frac{1}{2} \left| \prod_{p \le N} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p^s} \right)^{-1} \right|.$$

Hint Perhaps use the triangle inequality in the form |a| > |b| - |a - b|.

This is our generalisation of (25). The N depends on s but for a given s it is finite and this finite product is never zero and so  $|\zeta(s)| > 0$ , i.e.  $\zeta(s) \neq 0$  for Re s > 1.

**11**) i) By looking at an integral justify

$$\log\left(\frac{1}{1-x}\right) < 2x$$

for  $0 \le x < 1/2$ .

ii) Use this to prove a weaker form of Theorem 1.4,

$$\sum_{p \le N} \frac{1}{p} > \frac{1}{2} \log \log (N+1) \,.$$

(It may be weaker, but the proof is shorter.)

Hint Part i gives

$$2\frac{1}{p} > \log\left(1-\frac{1}{p}\right)^{-1}$$
 so  $2\sum_{p\leq N}\frac{1}{p} > \log\sum_{n\in\mathcal{N}}\frac{1}{n}$ .

Why? This latter sum over n is seen in the proof of Theorem 1.4 and so follow the steps found there.

**12**) A function f is convex on [a, b] iff

$$f(a + t(b - a)) \le f(a) + t(f(b) - f(a))$$

for all  $0 \le t \le 1$ . That is, the graph for f between x = a and x = b lies **below** the chord joining the points (a, f(a)) and (b, f(b))

i) Prove that if f is convex then

$$\int_{a}^{b} f(t) dt \le \frac{1}{2} (b-a) (f(b) + f(a)).$$

ii) Prove that 1/t is concave on  $\mathbb{R}^+ = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : x > 0\}$ . Deduce that

$$\log\left(\frac{1}{1-x}\right) - x \le \frac{x^2}{2\left(1-x\right)}$$

for 0 < x < 1.

What change does this lead to in Theorem 1.4?

13) For  $\sigma > 1$  the Riemann zeta function converges absolutely and so

$$\zeta(\sigma) \ge \sum_{n=1}^{N} \frac{1}{n^{\sigma}},\tag{29}$$

for all  $N \ge 1$ , while from Theorem 1.11 we have

$$\zeta(\sigma) = \prod_{p} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p^{\sigma}} \right)^{-1} \tag{30}$$

for such  $\sigma$ . Assume that there are only *finitely* many primes and use (30) and (31) to obtain a contradiction.

**Hint** For each prime p the factor of the Euler Product is continuous, i.e.

$$\lim_{\sigma \to \sigma_0} \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p^{\sigma}} \right)^{-1} = \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p^{\sigma_0}} \right)^{-1},$$

for all  $\sigma_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ . From second year analysis the *finite* product (or sum) of functions continuous at a point, is continuous at that point, i.e. for two functions f and g if  $\lim_{\sigma\to\sigma_0} f(\sigma) = f(\sigma_0)$  and  $\lim_{\sigma\to\sigma_0} g(\sigma) = g(\sigma_0)$  then

$$\lim_{\sigma \to \sigma_0} \left( f(\sigma) + g(\sigma) \right) = f(\sigma_0) + g(\sigma_0)$$

and

$$\lim_{\sigma \to \sigma_0} \left( f(\sigma) \, g(\sigma) \right) = f(\sigma_0) \, g(\sigma_0) \, .$$

By repeated application these results hold for finitely many terms in the sum or product. Use these facts in your solution.

For comparison the *infinite* sum or product of functions continuous at a point, are **not** necessarily continuous at that point.

14) Prove that Theorem 1.4, or more precisely Question 1 above, implies

$$\sum_{p} \frac{1}{p^{\sigma}} \ge e^{-1} \left( \log \left( \frac{1}{\sigma - 1} \right) - 1 \right),$$

for  $1<\sigma<1+1/\log 3.$ 

A weaker version of Theorem 1.13.

Hint Given  $\sigma$ , truncate the sum at x, to be chosen. Get the sum into a one of summing 1/p, not  $1/p^{\sigma}$ . BUT, to simply say

$$\frac{1}{p^{\sigma}} \ge \frac{1}{p}$$

throws away too much information. Instead write

$$\frac{1}{p^{\sigma}} = \frac{1}{p} \left(\frac{1}{p}\right)^{\sigma-1} \ge \frac{1}{p} \left(\frac{1}{x}\right)^{\sigma-1},$$

since  $p \leq x$ . Finally use Question 1 and then choose x in terms of  $\sigma$ .