

# The Prime Number Theorem by Distribution Theory

Jasson Vindas

`jvindas@cage.Ugent.be`

Department of Pure Mathematics and Computer Algebra  
Ghent University

Logic and Analysis Seminar  
October 8, 2009

# The prime number theorem

The aim of this talk is to give a purely **distributional** proof of the Prime Number Theorem (PNT), that is,

$$\pi(x) \sim \frac{x}{\log x}, \quad x \rightarrow \infty,$$

where

$$\pi(x) = \sum_{p \text{ prime}, p < x} 1.$$

The word distributional refers to **Schwartz** distributions.

# The techniques

The proof is based on:

- Chebyshev elementary estimate
- The non-vanishing of the Riemann zeta function on  $\Re z = 1$
- Arguments from **generalized asymptotics**
  - $S$ -asymptotics
  - Quasiasymptotics

# The techniques

The proof is based on:

- Chebyshev elementary estimate
- The non-vanishing of the Riemann zeta function on  $\Re z = 1$
- Arguments from **generalized asymptotics**
  - $S$ -asymptotics
  - Quasiasymptotics

# Outline

- 1 Preliminaries
  - Notation
  - Generalized asymptotics
  - Riemann zeta function
- 2 Special functions and distributions related to prime numbers
  - Chebyshev function
  - A special distribution
  - Properties of  $v(x)$
- 3 Proof
  - Steps
  - Step 1
  - Step 2
  - Final Step

# Notation

## from distribution theory

- $\mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R})$  and  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$  denote the spaces of smooth compactly supported functions and smooth rapidly decreasing functions
- $\mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R})$  and  $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$  the spaces of distributions and tempered distributions
- The Fourier transform in  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$  is defined as

$$\hat{\phi}(x) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{ixt} \phi(t) dt$$

- The evaluation of  $f$  at a test function  $\phi$  is denoted by

$$\langle f(x), \phi(x) \rangle$$

# Notation

## Examples of distributions

### Some particular distributions

- If  $f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$ ,

$$\langle f(x), \phi(x) \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x)\phi(x)dx$$

- The Heaviside function  $H := \chi_{[0, \infty)}$ :

$$\langle H(x), \phi(x) \rangle = \int_0^{\infty} \phi(x)dx$$

- The translated Dirac delta ‘function’ concentrated at  $a$ :

$$\langle \delta(x - a), \phi(x) \rangle = \phi(a)$$

# Notation

## Examples of distributions

### Some particular distributions

- If  $f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$ ,

$$\langle f(x), \phi(x) \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x)\phi(x)dx$$

- The Heaviside function  $H := \chi_{[0, \infty)}$ :

$$\langle H(x), \phi(x) \rangle = \int_0^{\infty} \phi(x)dx$$

- The translated Dirac delta ‘function’ concentrated at  $a$ :

$$\langle \delta(x - a), \phi(x) \rangle = \phi(a)$$



# Notation

## Examples of distributions

### Some particular distributions

- If  $f \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$ ,

$$\langle f(x), \phi(x) \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(x)\phi(x)dx$$

- The Heaviside function  $H := \chi_{[0, \infty)}$ :

$$\langle H(x), \phi(x) \rangle = \int_0^{\infty} \phi(x)dx$$

- The translated Dirac delta ‘function’ concentrated at  $a$ :

$$\langle \delta(x - a), \phi(x) \rangle = \phi(a)$$

# Notation

## Operations

- **Derivatives:**  $\langle f'(x), \phi(x) \rangle = -\langle f(x), \phi'(x) \rangle$
- Dilation:  $\langle f(\lambda x), \phi(x) \rangle = (1/\lambda) \langle f(x), \phi(x/\lambda) \rangle$
- Translation:  $\langle f(x+h), \phi(x) \rangle = \langle f(x), \phi(x-h) \rangle$
- Fourier transform for  $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ :

$$\langle \hat{f}(x), \phi(x) \rangle = \langle f(x), \hat{\phi}(x) \rangle$$

Examples:

- $H'(x) = \delta(x)$
- if  $s(x) = \sum_{\lambda_n < x} a_n$ , then  $s'(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n \delta(x - \lambda_n)$

# Notation

## Operations

- Derivatives:  $\langle f'(x), \phi(x) \rangle = -\langle f(x), \phi'(x) \rangle$
- Dilation:  $\langle f(\lambda x), \phi(x) \rangle = (1/\lambda) \langle f(x), \phi(x/\lambda) \rangle$
- Translation:  $\langle f(x+h), \phi(x) \rangle = \langle f(x), \phi(x-h) \rangle$
- Fourier transform for  $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ :

$$\langle \hat{f}(x), \phi(x) \rangle = \langle f(x), \hat{\phi}(x) \rangle$$

Examples:

- $H'(x) = \delta(x)$
- if  $s(x) = \sum_{\lambda_n < x} a_n$ , then  $s'(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n \delta(x - \lambda_n)$

# Notation

## Operations

- Derivatives:  $\langle f'(x), \phi(x) \rangle = -\langle f(x), \phi'(x) \rangle$
- Dilation:  $\langle f(\lambda x), \phi(x) \rangle = (1/\lambda) \langle f(x), \phi(x/\lambda) \rangle$
- Translation:  $\langle f(x+h), \phi(x) \rangle = \langle f(x), \phi(x-h) \rangle$
- Fourier transform for  $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ :

$$\langle \hat{f}(x), \phi(x) \rangle = \langle f(x), \hat{\phi}(x) \rangle$$

Examples:

- $H'(x) = \delta(x)$

- if  $s(x) = \sum_{\lambda_n < x} a_n$ , then  $s'(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n \delta(x - \lambda_n)$

# Notation

## Operations

- Derivatives:  $\langle f'(x), \phi(x) \rangle = -\langle f(x), \phi'(x) \rangle$
- Dilation:  $\langle f(\lambda x), \phi(x) \rangle = (1/\lambda) \langle f(x), \phi(x/\lambda) \rangle$
- Translation:  $\langle f(x+h), \phi(x) \rangle = \langle f(x), \phi(x-h) \rangle$
- Fourier transform for  $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ :

$$\langle \hat{f}(x), \phi(x) \rangle = \langle f(x), \hat{\phi}(x) \rangle$$

Examples:

- $H'(x) = \delta(x)$

- if  $s(x) = \sum_{\lambda_n < x} a_n$ , then  $s'(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n \delta(x - \lambda_n)$

# Notation

## Operations

- Derivatives:  $\langle f'(x), \phi(x) \rangle = -\langle f(x), \phi'(x) \rangle$
- Dilation:  $\langle f(\lambda x), \phi(x) \rangle = (1/\lambda) \langle f(x), \phi(x/\lambda) \rangle$
- Translation:  $\langle f(x+h), \phi(x) \rangle = \langle f(x), \phi(x-h) \rangle$
- Fourier transform for  $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ :

$$\langle \hat{f}(x), \phi(x) \rangle = \langle f(x), \hat{\phi}(x) \rangle$$

Examples:

- $H'(x) = \delta(x)$
- if  $s(x) = \sum_{\lambda_n < x} a_n$ , then  $s'(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n \delta(x - \lambda_n)$

# Quasiasymptotics

## Generalized asymptotics

The idea is to study the **weak** asymptotic behavior of the dilates of  $f$ . So we look for asymptotic representations

$$f(\lambda x) \sim \rho(\lambda)g(x).$$

### Definition

We say that  $f \in \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R})$  has **quasiasymptotic behavior** at  $\infty$  in  $\mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R})$  with respect to  $\rho$  if for some  $g \in \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R})$  and each  $\phi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R})$ ,

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \left\langle \frac{f(\lambda x)}{\rho(\lambda)}, \phi(x) \right\rangle = \langle g(x), \phi(x) \rangle.$$

# Quasiasymptotics

## Generalized asymptotics

The idea is to study the **weak** asymptotic behavior of the dilates of  $f$ . So we look for asymptotic representations

$$f(\lambda x) \sim \rho(\lambda)g(x).$$

### Definition

We say that  $f \in \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R})$  has **quasiasymptotic behavior** at  $\infty$  in  $\mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R})$  with respect to  $\rho$  if for some  $g \in \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R})$  and each  $\phi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R})$ ,

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \left\langle \frac{f(\lambda x)}{\rho(\lambda)}, \phi(x) \right\rangle = \langle g(x), \phi(x) \rangle.$$



# Quasiasymptotics

## Generalized asymptotics

We will study in connection to the PNT a particular case of quasiasymptotics, namely, a limit of the form

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} f(\lambda x) = \beta H(x), \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R}), \quad (1)$$

where  $H(x)$  is the **Heaviside** function.

- (1) should be always interpreted in the weak topology of  $\mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R})$ , i.e.,

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \langle f(\lambda x), \phi(x) \rangle = \beta \int_0^{\infty} \phi(x) dx, \quad \forall \phi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}). \quad (2)$$

- We may also talk about (1) in **other** spaces of distributions; for instance in  $\mathcal{D}'(0, \infty)$

# Quasiasymptotics

## Generalized asymptotics

We will study in connection to the PNT a particular case of quasiasymptotics, namely, a limit of the form

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} f(\lambda x) = \beta H(x), \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R}), \quad (1)$$

where  $H(x)$  is the **Heaviside** function.

- (1) should be always interpreted in the weak topology of  $\mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R})$ , i.e.,

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \langle f(\lambda x), \phi(x) \rangle = \beta \int_0^{\infty} \phi(x) dx, \quad \forall \phi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R}). \quad (2)$$

- We may also talk about (1) in **other** spaces of distributions; for instance in  $\mathcal{D}'(0, \infty)$

# S–asymptotics

## Generalized asymptotics

Let  $f \in \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R})$  and  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$  a relation of the form

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} f(x+h) = \beta, \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R}),$$

means that the limit is taken in the **weak** topology of  $\mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R})$ , that is, for each  $\phi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R})$  the following limit holds,

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} \langle f(x+h), \phi(x) \rangle = \beta \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi(x) dx. \quad (3)$$

- The above relation is an example of the so-called **S–asymptotics** of generalized functions, i.e.,

$$f(x+h) \sim \rho(h)g(x), \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R}).$$

- $\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} f(x+h) = \beta$  in  $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$  means that  $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$  and  $\phi$  can be taken from  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$  in (3)

# S–asymptotics

## Generalized asymptotics

Let  $f \in \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R})$  and  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$  a relation of the form

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} f(x+h) = \beta, \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R}),$$

means that the limit is taken in the **weak** topology of  $\mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R})$ , that is, for each  $\phi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R})$  the following limit holds,

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} \langle f(x+h), \phi(x) \rangle = \beta \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi(x) dx. \quad (3)$$

- The above relation is an example of the so-called **S–asymptotics** of generalized functions, i.e.,

$$f(x+h) \sim \rho(h)g(x), \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R}).$$

- $\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} f(x+h) = \beta$  in  $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$  means that  $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$  and  $\phi$  can be taken from  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$  in (3)

# S–asymptotics

## Generalized asymptotics

Let  $f \in \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R})$  and  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}$  a relation of the form

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} f(x+h) = \beta, \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R}),$$

means that the limit is taken in the **weak** topology of  $\mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R})$ , that is, for each  $\phi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R})$  the following limit holds,

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} \langle f(x+h), \phi(x) \rangle = \beta \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi(x) dx. \quad (3)$$

- The above relation is an example of the so-called **S–asymptotics** of generalized functions, i.e.,

$$f(x+h) \sim \rho(h)g(x), \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R}).$$

- $\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} f(x+h) = \beta$  in  $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$  means that  $f \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$  and  $\phi$  can be taken from  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$  in (3)

# Riemann zeta function

## Properties

Consider the Riemann zeta function

$$\zeta(z) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^z}, \quad \Re z > 1.$$

### Properties

- $\zeta(z) - \frac{1}{z-1}$  admits an analytic continuation to a neighborhood of  $\Re z = 1$
- $\zeta(1 + ix)$ ,  $x \neq 0$ , is free of zeros

# Chebyshev function

We denote by  $\Lambda$  the **von Mangoldt** function defined on the natural numbers as

$$\Lambda(n) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } n = 1, \\ \log p, & \text{if } n = p^m \text{ with } p \text{ prime and } m > 0, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

and by  $\psi$  the **Chebyshev function**

$$\psi(x) = \sum_{p^m < x} \log p = \sum_{n < x} \Lambda(n).$$

# Chebyshev function

We denote by  $\Lambda$  the **von Mangoldt** function defined on the natural numbers as

$$\Lambda(n) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } n = 1, \\ \log p, & \text{if } n = p^m \text{ with } p \text{ prime and } m > 0, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

and by  $\psi$  the **Chebyshev function**

$$\psi(x) = \sum_{p^m < x} \log p = \sum_{n < x} \Lambda(n).$$



# Chebyshev's elementary estimate

It is very well known since the time of Chebyshev that

- The PNT is equivalent to the statement

$$\psi(x) \sim x \quad (4)$$

- Chebyshev's elementary **estimate**:  $\exists M > 0$  such that  $\psi(x) < Mx$

Our approach to the PNT will be to show (4). The proof is based on finding the (**quasi-**) asymptotic behavior of  $\psi'(x)$ ; observe that

$$\psi'(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \Lambda(n) \delta(x - n).$$

# Chebyshev's elementary estimate

It is very well known since the time of Chebyshev that

- The PNT is equivalent to the statement

$$\psi(x) \sim x \quad (4)$$

- Chebyshev's elementary **estimate**:  $\exists M > 0$  such that  $\psi(x) < Mx$

Our approach to the PNT will be to show (4). The proof is based on finding the (**quasi-**) asymptotic behavior of  $\psi'(x)$ ; observe that

$$\psi'(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \Lambda(n) \delta(x - n).$$

# The distribution $v(x)$

We shall study the (S-)asymptotic properties of the distribution

$$v(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\Lambda(n)}{n} \delta(x - \log n).$$

clearly  $v \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ . Let us take the Fourier-Laplace transform of  $v$ , that is, for  $\Im z > 0$

$$\hat{v}(z) = \langle v(t), e^{izt} \rangle = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\Lambda(n)}{n^{1-iz}} = -\frac{\zeta'(1-iz)}{\zeta(1-iz)},$$

a formula that Riemann obtained by logarithmic differentiation of the Euler product  $\zeta(z) = \prod_p 1/(1-p^{-z})$ . Then,

$$\hat{v}(x) = -\frac{\zeta'(1-ix)}{\zeta(1-ix)}.$$

# The distribution $v(x)$

We shall study the (S-)asymptotic properties of the distribution

$$v(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\Lambda(n)}{n} \delta(x - \log n).$$

clearly  $v \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ . Let us take the **Fourier-Laplace** transform of  $v$ , that is, for  $\Im z > 0$

$$\hat{v}(z) = \langle v(t), e^{izt} \rangle = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\Lambda(n)}{n^{1-iz}} = -\frac{\zeta'(1-iz)}{\zeta(1-iz)},$$

a formula that Riemann obtained by logarithmic differentiation of the Euler product  $\zeta(z) = \prod_p 1/(1-p^{-z})$ . Then,

$$\hat{v}(x) = -\frac{\zeta'(1-ix)}{\zeta(1-ix)}.$$

# The distribution $v(x)$

We shall study the (S-)asymptotic properties of the distribution

$$v(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\Lambda(n)}{n} \delta(x - \log n) .$$

clearly  $v \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ . Let us take the **Fourier-Laplace** transform of  $v$ , that is, for  $\Im z > 0$

$$\hat{v}(z) = \langle v(t), e^{izt} \rangle = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\Lambda(n)}{n^{1-iz}} = -\frac{\zeta'(1-iz)}{\zeta(1-iz)} ,$$

a formula that Riemann obtained by logarithmic differentiation of the Euler product  $\zeta(z) = \prod_p 1/(1 - p^{-z})$ . Then,

$$\hat{v}(x) = -\frac{\zeta'(1-ix)}{\zeta(1-ix)} .$$

# Properties of $\nu(x)$ to be used

It follows from the properties of  $\zeta$  that the distributional **boundary** value of  $\hat{\nu}(z) - \frac{i}{z}$  is a function, i.e.,

- $\hat{\nu}(x) - \frac{i}{(x+i0)} \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$

In addition, we will make use of Chebyshev's estimate:

- $\psi(x) < Mx$

Momentaneous hypothesis (to be **avoided** later)

$$\frac{\zeta'(1+ix)}{\zeta(1+ix)} = O(\log^\beta |x|), \quad |x| \rightarrow \infty$$

Consequently,  $\hat{\nu}(x) - i/(x+i0) = O(\log^\beta |x|)$

# Properties of $\nu(x)$ to be used

It follows from the properties of  $\zeta$  that the distributional **boundary** value of  $\hat{\nu}(z) - \frac{i}{z}$  is a function, i.e.,

- $\hat{\nu}(x) - \frac{i}{(x + i0)} \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$

In addition, we will make use of Chebyshev's estimate:

- $\psi(x) < Mx$

Momentaneous hypothesis (to be **avoided** later)

$$\frac{\zeta'(1 + ix)}{\zeta(1 + ix)} = O(\log^\beta |x|), \quad |x| \rightarrow \infty$$

Consequently,  $\hat{\nu}(x) - i/(x + i0) = O(\log^\beta |x|)$

# Properties of $\nu(x)$ to be used

It follows from the properties of  $\zeta$  that the distributional **boundary** value of  $\hat{\nu}(z) - \frac{i}{z}$  is a function, i.e.,

- $\hat{\nu}(x) - \frac{i}{(x + i0)} \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$

In addition, we will make use of Chebyshev's estimate:

- $\psi(x) < Mx$

Momentaneous hypothesis (to be **avoided** later)

$$\frac{\zeta'(1 + ix)}{\zeta(1 + ix)} = O(\log^\beta |x|), \quad |x| \rightarrow \infty$$

Consequently,  $\hat{\nu}(x) - i/(x + i0) = O(\log^\beta |x|)$



# Properties of $\nu(x)$ to be used

It follows from the properties of  $\zeta$  that the distributional **boundary** value of  $\hat{\nu}(z) - \frac{i}{z}$  is a function, i.e.,

- $\hat{\nu}(x) - \frac{i}{(x + i0)} \in L^1_{\text{loc}}(\mathbb{R})$

In addition, we will make use of Chebyshev's estimate:

- $\psi(x) < Mx$

Momentaneous hypothesis (to be **avoided** later)

$$\frac{\zeta'(1 + ix)}{\zeta(1 + ix)} = O(\log^\beta |x|), \quad |x| \rightarrow \infty$$

Consequently,  $\hat{\nu}(x) - i/(x + i0) = O(\log^\beta |x|)$

# The plan

## Steps

- 1 To show that

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} v(x+h) = 1, \quad \text{in } \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$$

- 2 To show that

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \psi'(\lambda x) = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \Lambda(n) \delta(\lambda x - n) = H(x), \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(0, \infty)$$

- 3 Final step, Step 2 is used to conclude

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

# The plan

## Steps

- 1 To show that

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} v(x+h) = 1, \quad \text{in } \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$$

- 2 To show that

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \psi'(\lambda x) = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \Lambda(n) \delta(\lambda x - n) = H(x), \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(0, \infty)$$

- 3 Final step, Step 2 is used to conclude

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

# The plan

## Steps

- 1 To show that

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} v(x+h) = 1, \quad \text{in } \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$$

- 2 To show that

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \psi'(\lambda x) = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \Lambda(n) \delta(\lambda x - n) = H(x), \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(0, \infty)$$

- 3 Final step, Step 2 is used to conclude

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

$\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} v(x+h) = 1$  in  $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$

Step 1

Proof.

Let  $\phi \in \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle v(x+h), \phi(x) \rangle &= \int_{-h}^{\infty} \phi(x) dx + \left\langle v(x+h) - H(x+h), \widehat{\phi}_1(x) \right\rangle \\ &= \int_{-h}^{\infty} \phi(x) dx + \left\langle \widehat{v}(x) - \frac{i}{(x+i0)}, e^{-ihx} \phi_1(x) \right\rangle \\ &= \int_{-h}^{\infty} \phi(x) dx + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left( \widehat{v}(x) - \frac{i}{(x+i0)} \right) \phi_1(x) e^{-ihx} dx \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi(x) dx + o(1), \quad h \rightarrow \infty \end{aligned}$$



$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \psi'(\lambda x) = H(x), \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(0, \infty)$$

Step 2

Proof.

Step 2 implies that  $e^{x+h}v(x+h) \sim e^{x+h}$ , in  $\mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R})$ , explicitly,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \Lambda(n) \phi(\log n - h) \sim e^h \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^x \phi(x) dx, \quad \forall \phi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R})$$

Changing variable in the last integral and writing  $\lambda = e^h$ ,

$$\langle \psi'(\lambda x), \phi_1(x) \rangle = \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \Lambda(n) \phi_1\left(\frac{n}{\lambda}\right) \sim \int_0^{\infty} \phi_1(x) dx, \quad (5)$$

where  $\phi_1(x) = \phi(\log x)$ . Thus, (5) holds  $\forall \phi_1 \in \mathcal{D}(0, \infty)$ .  $\square$

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \psi'(\lambda x) = H(x), \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(0, \infty)$$

Step 2

Proof.

Step 2 implies that  $e^{x+h}v(x+h) \sim e^{x+h}$ , in  $\mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R})$ , explicitly,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \Lambda(n) \phi(\log n - h) \sim e^h \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^x \phi(x) dx, \quad \forall \phi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R})$$

Changing variable in the last integral and writing  $\lambda = e^h$ ,

$$\langle \psi'(\lambda x), \phi_1(x) \rangle = \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \Lambda(n) \phi_1\left(\frac{n}{\lambda}\right) \sim \int_0^{\infty} \phi_1(x) dx, \quad (5)$$

where  $\phi_1(x) = \phi(\log x)$ . Thus, (5) holds  $\forall \phi_1 \in \mathcal{D}(0, \infty)$ .  $\square$

$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \psi'(\lambda x) = H(x), \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(0, \infty)$$

Step 2

Proof.

Step 2 implies that  $e^{x+h}v(x+h) \sim e^{x+h}$ , in  $\mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R})$ , explicitly,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \Lambda(n) \phi(\log n - h) \sim e^h \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^x \phi(x) dx, \quad \forall \phi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R})$$

Changing variable in the last integral and writing  $\lambda = e^h$ ,

$$\langle \psi'(\lambda x), \phi_1(x) \rangle = \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \Lambda(n) \phi_1\left(\frac{n}{\lambda}\right) \sim \int_0^{\infty} \phi_1(x) dx, \quad (5)$$

where  $\phi_1(x) = \phi(\log x)$ . Thus, (5) holds  $\forall \phi_1 \in \mathcal{D}(0, \infty)$ . □



$$\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \psi'(\lambda x) = H(x), \quad \text{in } \mathcal{D}'(0, \infty)$$

Step 2

Proof.

Step 2 implies that  $e^{x+h}v(x+h) \sim e^{x+h}$ , in  $\mathcal{D}'(\mathbb{R})$ , explicitly,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \Lambda(n) \phi(\log n - h) \sim e^h \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^x \phi(x) dx, \quad \forall \phi \in \mathcal{D}(\mathbb{R})$$

Changing variable in the last integral and writing  $\lambda = e^h$ ,

$$\langle \psi'(\lambda x), \phi_1(x) \rangle = \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \Lambda(n) \phi_1\left(\frac{n}{\lambda}\right) \sim \int_0^{\infty} \phi_1(x) dx, \quad (5)$$

where  $\phi_1(x) = \phi(\log x)$ . Thus, (5) holds  $\forall \phi_1 \in \mathcal{D}(0, \infty)$ . □

# Final Step: $\psi(x) \sim x$

## Proof

Formally,

$$\frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{n < \lambda} \Lambda(n) = \langle \psi'(\lambda x), \chi_{[0,1)}(x) \rangle .$$

We approximate  $\chi_{[0,1)}$  by elements of  $\mathcal{D}(0, \infty)$ .

- Let  $\varepsilon$  be an arbitrary small positive number
- Choose  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$  with the properties:
  - $0 \leq \phi_1, \phi_2 \leq 1$
  - $\text{supp } \phi_1 \subseteq (0, 1]$ ,  $\phi_1(x) = 1$  on  $[\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$
  - $\text{supp } \phi_2 \subseteq (0, 1 + \varepsilon]$ , and  $\phi_2(x) = 1$  on  $[\varepsilon, 1]$

# Final Step: $\psi(x) \sim x$

## Proof

Formally,

$$\frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{n < \lambda} \Lambda(n) = \langle \psi'(\lambda x), \chi_{[0,1)}(x) \rangle .$$

We approximate  $\chi_{[0,1)}$  by elements of  $\mathcal{D}(0, \infty)$ .

- Let  $\varepsilon$  be an arbitrary small positive number
- Choose  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$  with the properties:
  - $0 \leq \phi_1, \phi_2 \leq 1$
  - $\text{supp } \phi_1 \subseteq (0, 1]$ ,  $\phi_1(x) = 1$  on  $[\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$
  - $\text{supp } \phi_2 \subseteq (0, 1 + \varepsilon]$ , and  $\phi_2(x) = 1$  on  $[\varepsilon, 1]$

# Final Step: $\psi(x) \sim x$

## Proof

Formally,

$$\frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{n < \lambda} \Lambda(n) = \langle \psi'(\lambda x), \chi_{[0,1)}(x) \rangle .$$

We approximate  $\chi_{[0,1)}$  by elements of  $\mathcal{D}(0, \infty)$ .

- Let  $\varepsilon$  be an arbitrary small positive number
- Choose  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$  with the properties:
  - $0 \leq \phi_1, \phi_2 \leq 1$
  - $\text{supp } \phi_1 \subseteq (0, 1]$ ,  $\phi_1(x) = 1$  on  $[\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$
  - $\text{supp } \phi_2 \subseteq (0, 1 + \varepsilon]$ , and  $\phi_2(x) = 1$  on  $[\varepsilon, 1]$

# Final Step: $\psi(x) \sim x$

## Proof

Formally,

$$\frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{n < \lambda} \Lambda(n) = \langle \psi'(\lambda x), \chi_{[0,1)}(x) \rangle .$$

We approximate  $\chi_{[0,1)}$  by elements of  $\mathcal{D}(0, \infty)$ .

- Let  $\varepsilon$  be an arbitrary small positive number
- Choose  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$  with the properties:
  - $0 \leq \phi_1, \phi_2 \leq 1$
  - $\text{supp } \phi_1 \subseteq (0, 1]$ ,  $\phi_1(x) = 1$  on  $[\varepsilon, 1 - \varepsilon]$
  - $\text{supp } \phi_2 \subseteq (0, 1 + \varepsilon]$ , and  $\phi_2(x) = 1$  on  $[\varepsilon, 1]$

# Final Step: $\psi(x) \sim x$

Proof (continuation)

- Evaluating at  $\phi_2$  and using Chebyshev's estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{n < \lambda} \Lambda(n) &\leq \limsup_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{n < \varepsilon \lambda} \Lambda(n) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \Lambda(n) \phi_2 \left( \frac{n}{\lambda} \right) \right) \\ &\leq M\varepsilon + \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \langle \psi'(\lambda x), \phi_2(x) \rangle \\ &= M\varepsilon + \int_0^{1+\varepsilon} \phi_2(x) dx \leq 1 + \varepsilon(M + 1) \end{aligned}$$

- Likewise,  $1 - 2\varepsilon \leq \liminf_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{n < \lambda} \Lambda(n)$
- Therefore,  $\psi(\lambda) = \sum_{n < \lambda} \Lambda(n) \sim \lambda$

# Final Step: $\psi(x) \sim x$

Proof (continuation)

- Evaluating at  $\phi_2$  and using Chebyshev's estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{n < \lambda} \Lambda(n) &\leq \limsup_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{n < \varepsilon \lambda} \Lambda(n) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \Lambda(n) \phi_2 \left( \frac{n}{\lambda} \right) \right) \\ &\leq M\varepsilon + \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \langle \psi'(\lambda x), \phi_2(x) \rangle \\ &= M\varepsilon + \int_0^{1+\varepsilon} \phi_2(x) dx \leq 1 + \varepsilon(M + 1) \end{aligned}$$

- Likewise,  $1 - 2\varepsilon \leq \liminf_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{n < \lambda} \Lambda(n)$

- Therefore,  $\psi(\lambda) = \sum_{n < \lambda} \Lambda(n) \sim \lambda$

# Final Step: $\psi(x) \sim x$

Proof (continuation)

- Evaluating at  $\phi_2$  and using Chebyshev's estimate:

$$\begin{aligned} \limsup_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{n < \lambda} \Lambda(n) &\leq \limsup_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{n < \varepsilon \lambda} \Lambda(n) + \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \Lambda(n) \phi_2 \left( \frac{n}{\lambda} \right) \right) \\ &\leq M\varepsilon + \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \langle \psi'(\lambda x), \phi_2(x) \rangle \\ &= M\varepsilon + \int_0^{1+\varepsilon} \phi_2(x) dx \leq 1 + \varepsilon(M + 1) \end{aligned}$$

- Likewise,  $1 - 2\varepsilon \leq \liminf_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\lambda} \sum_{n < \lambda} \Lambda(n)$
- Therefore**,  $\psi(\lambda) = \sum_{n < \lambda} \Lambda(n) \sim \lambda$



# Avoiding: growth properties of $\zeta'(1+ix)/\zeta(1+ix)$

We remove the use of growth properties from **Step 1**. We show again that

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} v(x+h) = 1, \quad \text{in } \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$$

- First,  $v(x+h) = O(1)$  in  $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ , as  $h \rightarrow \infty$

Proof.

Set  $g(x) = e^{-x}\psi(e^x)$ , by Chebyshev estimate  $g(x+h) = O(1)$  in  $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ . Next,  $g'(x+h) = O(1)$ , but  $g'(x) = -g(x) + e^{-x} \sum \Lambda(n)\delta(x - \log n) = -g(x) + v(x)$ .  $\square$

- Second,  $\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} \langle v(x+h), \phi(x) \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi(x) dx$ , for  $\phi$  in a **dense** subspace of  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$

# Avoiding: growth properties of $\zeta'(1+ix)/\zeta(1+ix)$

We remove the use of growth properties from **Step 1**. We show again that

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} v(x+h) = 1, \quad \text{in } \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$$

- First,  $v(x+h) = O(1)$  in  $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ , as  $h \rightarrow \infty$

## Proof.

Set  $g(x) = e^{-x}\psi(e^x)$ , by Chebyshev estimate  $g(x+h) = O(1)$  in  $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ . Next,  $g'(x+h) = O(1)$ , but  $g'(x) = -g(x) + e^{-x} \sum \Lambda(n)\delta(x - \log n) = -g(x) + v(x)$ .  $\square$

- Second,  $\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} \langle v(x+h), \phi(x) \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi(x) dx$ , for  $\phi$  in a dense subspace of  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$

# Avoiding: growth properties of $\zeta'(1+ix)/\zeta(1+ix)$

We remove the use of growth properties from **Step 1**. We show again that

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} v(x+h) = 1, \quad \text{in } \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$$

- First,  $v(x+h) = O(1)$  in  $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ , as  $h \rightarrow \infty$

## Proof.

Set  $g(x) = e^{-x}\psi(e^x)$ , by Chebyshev estimate  $g(x+h) = O(1)$  in  $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ . Next,  $g'(x+h) = O(1)$ , but  $g'(x) = -g(x) + e^{-x} \sum \Lambda(n)\delta(x - \log n) = -g(x) + v(x)$ .  $\square$

- Second,  $\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} \langle v(x+h), \phi(x) \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi(x) dx$ , for  $\phi$  in a dense subspace of  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$

# Avoiding: growth properties of $\zeta'(1+ix)/\zeta(1+ix)$

We remove the use of growth properties from **Step 1**. We show again that

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} v(x+h) = 1, \quad \text{in } \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$$

- First,  $v(x+h) = O(1)$  in  $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ , as  $h \rightarrow \infty$

## Proof.

Set  $g(x) = e^{-x}\psi(e^x)$ , by Chebyshev estimate  $g(x+h) = O(1)$  in  $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ . Next,  $g'(x+h) = O(1)$ , but  $g'(x) = -g(x) + e^{-x} \sum \Lambda(n)\delta(x - \log n) = -g(x) + v(x)$ .  $\square$

- Second,  $\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} \langle v(x+h), \phi(x) \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi(x) dx$ , for  $\phi$  in a dense subspace of  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$

# Avoiding: growth properties of $\zeta'(1 + ix)/\zeta(1 + ix)$

We remove the use of growth properties from **Step 1**. We show again that

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} v(x+h) = 1, \quad \text{in } \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$$

- First,  $v(x+h) = O(1)$  in  $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ , as  $h \rightarrow \infty$

## Proof.

Set  $g(x) = e^{-x}\psi(e^x)$ , by Chebyshev estimate  $g(x+h) = O(1)$  in  $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ . Next,  $g'(x+h) = O(1)$ , but  $g'(x) = -g(x) + e^{-x} \sum \Lambda(n)\delta(x - \log n) = -g(x) + v(x)$ .  $\square$

- Second,  $\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} \langle v(x+h), \phi(x) \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi(x) dx$ , for  $\phi$  in a dense subspace of  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$

# Avoiding: growth properties of $\zeta'(1+ix)/\zeta(1+ix)$

We remove the use of growth properties from **Step 1**. We show again that

$$\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} v(x+h) = 1, \quad \text{in } \mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$$

- First,  $v(x+h) = O(1)$  in  $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ , as  $h \rightarrow \infty$

## Proof.

Set  $g(x) = e^{-x}\psi(e^x)$ , by Chebyshev estimate  $g(x+h) = O(1)$  in  $\mathcal{S}'(\mathbb{R})$ . Next,  $g'(x+h) = O(1)$ , but  $g'(x) = -g(x) + e^{-x} \sum \Lambda(n)\delta(x - \log n) = -g(x) + v(x)$ .  $\square$

- Second,  $\lim_{h \rightarrow \infty} \langle v(x+h), \phi(x) \rangle = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi(x) dx$ , for  $\phi$  in a **dense** subspace of  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$

Avoiding: growth properties of  $\zeta'(1 + ix)/\zeta(1 + ix)$ 

Proof.

Let  $\phi = \widehat{\phi}_1$  with  $\text{supp } \phi_1$  compact.

$$\begin{aligned}\langle v(x+h), \phi(x) \rangle &= \int_{-h}^{\infty} \phi(x) dx \\ &\quad + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left( \widehat{v}(x) - \frac{i}{(x+i0)} \right) \phi_1(x) e^{-ihx} dx \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi(x) dx + o(1), \quad h \rightarrow \infty\end{aligned}$$

□

- Banach-Steinhaus theorem immediately gives the result

Avoiding: growth properties of  $\zeta'(1 + ix)/\zeta(1 + ix)$ 

## Proof.

Let  $\phi = \widehat{\phi}_1$  with  $\text{supp } \phi_1$  compact.

$$\begin{aligned}\langle v(x+h), \phi(x) \rangle &= \int_{-h}^{\infty} \phi(x) dx \\ &\quad + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left( \widehat{v}(x) - \frac{i}{(x+i0)} \right) \phi_1(x) e^{-ihx} dx \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \phi(x) dx + o(1), \quad h \rightarrow \infty\end{aligned}$$



- Banach-Steinhaus theorem immediately gives the result



## Some references

This talk is based on:

- J.Vindas, R.Estrada, A quick distributional way to the Prime Number Theorem, Indag. Math. (N.S.) 20(1) (2009), in press

Distributional methods in prime number theory:

- J. Korevaar, Distributional Wiener-Ikehara theorem and twin primes, Indag. Math. (N.S.) 16 (2005), 37–49
- J. Korevaar, Prime pairs and the zeta function, J. Approx. Theory 158 (2009), 69–96