

# The $k$ -fold Divisor Function in Arithmetic Progression to Large Moduli

David T. Nguyen

UC Santa Barbara

West Coast Number Theory Conference  
Chico, CA, December 15-19, 2018

## Background—Where does the sum come from?

- **Gauss** ( $\sim 1792$ ) conjectured the **Prime Number Theorem**:

$$\text{Gauss (1792): } \sum_{p \leq X} 1 \sim \frac{X}{\log X}.$$

$$\sum_{p \leq X} 1 \rightarrow \sum_{p \leq X} \log p \rightarrow \sum_{p^\alpha \leq X} \log p = \sum_{n \leq X} \Lambda(n) \rightarrow \sum_{\substack{n \leq X \\ n \equiv a \pmod{d}}} \Lambda(n) \rightarrow \sum_{\substack{n \leq X \\ n \equiv a \pmod{d}}} f(n).$$

## Background—Where does the sum come from?

- **Gauss** ( $\sim 1792$ ) conjectured the **Prime Number Theorem**:

$$\text{Gauss (1792): } \sum_{p \leq X} 1 \sim \frac{X}{\log X}.$$

$$\sum_{p \leq X} 1 \rightarrow \sum_{p \leq X} \log p \rightarrow \sum_{p^\alpha \leq X} \log p = \sum_{n \leq X} \Lambda(n) \rightarrow \sum_{\substack{n \leq X \\ n \equiv a \pmod{d}}} \Lambda(n) \rightarrow \sum_{\substack{n \leq X \\ n \equiv a \pmod{d}}} f(n).$$

- For us, we consider the  **$k$ -fold divisor function**

$$f(n) = \tau_k(n) = \sum_{\substack{d_1 d_2 \cdots d_k = n \\ d_i > 0}} 1, \quad k \geq 1.$$

Thus,  $\tau_k(n)$  is the coefficient of  $n^{-s}$  in the Dirichlet series

$$\zeta(s)^k = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \tau_k(n) n^{-s}.$$

## Background—Where does the sum come from?

- **Gauss** ( $\sim 1792$ ) conjectured the **Prime Number Theorem**:

$$\text{Gauss (1792): } \sum_{p \leq X} 1 \sim \frac{X}{\log X}.$$

$$\sum_{p \leq X} 1 \rightarrow \sum_{p \leq X} \log p \rightarrow \sum_{p^\alpha \leq X} \log p = \sum_{n \leq X} \Lambda(n) \rightarrow \sum_{\substack{n \leq X \\ n \equiv a \pmod{d}}} \Lambda(n) \rightarrow \sum_{\substack{n \leq X \\ n \equiv a \pmod{d}}} f(n).$$

- For us, we consider the  **$k$ -fold divisor function**

$$f(n) = \tau_k(n) = \sum_{\substack{d_1 d_2 \cdots d_k = n \\ d_i > 0}} 1, \quad k \geq 1.$$

Thus,  $\tau_k(n)$  is the coefficient of  $n^{-s}$  in the Dirichlet series

$$\zeta(s)^k = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \tau_k(n) n^{-s}.$$

- **Ultimate goal:** For each  $k \geq 1$ ,  $d \geq 1$ ,  $(a, d) = 1$ , estimate the sum

$$\sum_{\substack{n \leq X \\ n \equiv a \pmod{d}}} \tau_k(n)$$

for  $d$  as **large** as possible with an error as **small** as possible.

## Why $\tau_k(n)$ ?

- It turns out that  $\tau_k(n)$  is closely related to **primes**, e.g., **Linnik identity** (1963), **Vaughan identity** (1977), **Heath-Brown identity** (1982), etc... Heuristically,

$$\frac{1}{\zeta(s)} = \frac{1}{1 - (1 - \zeta(s))} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 - \zeta(s))^n = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} (-1)^k \zeta(s)^k,$$

so a hard problem with primes on the left side is converted into infinitely many, though more accessible, problems about  $\tau_k$  on the right side.

---

<sup>1</sup>J. B. Friedlander and H. Iwaniec, Ann. of Math. (2) 121 (1985), **no. 2**, 319-350.

<sup>2</sup>D. Goldston, J. Pintz, and C. Yıldırım, Ann. of Math. 170 (2009), **no. 2**, 819-862.

<sup>3</sup>Y. Zhang, Ann. of Math. 179 (2014), **no. 3**, 1121-1174.

## Why $\tau_k(n)$ ?

- It turns out that  $\tau_k(n)$  is closely related to **primes**, e.g., **Linnik identity** (1963), **Vaughan identity** (1977), **Heath-Brown identity** (1982), etc... Heuristically,

$$\frac{1}{\zeta(s)} = \frac{1}{1 - (1 - \zeta(s))} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 - \zeta(s))^n = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} (-1)^k \zeta(s)^k,$$

so a hard problem with primes on the left side is converted into infinitely many, though more accessible, problems about  $\tau_k$  on the right side.

- Concretely,

**Friedlander & Iwaniec**<sup>1</sup> (1985)  
 $\tau_3(n)$

↓ **GPY sieve**<sup>2</sup> ↓

**Y. Zhang**<sup>3</sup> (2014)  
Bounded gaps between primes!

---

<sup>1</sup>J. B. Friedlander and H. Iwaniec, Ann. of Math. (2) 121 (1985), **no. 2**, 319-350.

<sup>2</sup>D. Goldston, J. Pintz, and C. Yıldırım, Ann. of Math. 170 (2009), **no. 2**, 819-862.

<sup>3</sup>Y. Zhang, Ann. of Math. 179 (2014), **no. 3**, 1121-1174.

## Why $\tau_k(n)$ ?

- It turns out that  $\tau_k(n)$  is closely related to **primes**, e.g., **Linnik identity** (1963), **Vaughan identity** (1977), **Heath-Brown identity** (1982), etc... Heuristically,

$$\frac{1}{\zeta(s)} = \frac{1}{1 - (1 - \zeta(s))} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 - \zeta(s))^n = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=0}^n \binom{n}{k} (-1)^k \zeta(s)^k,$$

so a hard problem with primes on the left side is converted into infinitely many, though more accessible, problems about  $\tau_k$  on the right side.

- Concretely,

**Friedlander & Iwaniec**<sup>1</sup> (1985)  
 $\tau_3(n)$

↓ **GPY sieve**<sup>2</sup> ↓

**Y. Zhang**<sup>3</sup> (2014)  
Bounded gaps between primes!

Work on **large prime gaps**, e.g., **K. Ford, S. Konyagin, J. Maynard, C. Pomerance, and T. Tao** (2018).

---

<sup>1</sup>J. B. Friedlander and H. Iwaniec, Ann. of Math. (2) 121 (1985), **no. 2**, 319-350.

<sup>2</sup>D. Goldston, J. Pintz, and C. Yıldırım, Ann. of Math. 170 (2009), **no. 2**, 819-862.

<sup>3</sup>Y. Zhang, Ann. of Math. 179 (2014), **no. 3**, 1121-1174.

What is known about distribution of  $\tau_k$ ?

- Only reasonably well understood for  $k = 1, 2, 3!$



## What is known about distribution of $\tau_k$ ?

- Only reasonably well understood for  $k = 1, 2, 3$ !
- Simplest case  $k = 1$ :

$$\sum_{\substack{n \leq X \\ n \equiv a \pmod{d}}} 1 = \frac{X}{d} + O(1).$$

This tells us, in particular, that  $d \leq X$ .

## What is known about distribution of $\tau_k$ ?

- Only reasonably well understood for  $k = 1, 2, 3$ !
- Simplest case  $k = 1$ :

$$\sum_{\substack{n \leq X \\ n \equiv a \pmod{d}}} 1 = \frac{X}{d} + O(1).$$

This tells us, in particular, that  $d \leq X$ .

- More precisely, for  $(a, d) = 1$ , let

$$\Delta(\tau_k; X, d, a) = \sum_{\substack{n \leq X \\ n \equiv a \pmod{d}}} \tau_k(n) - \frac{1}{\varphi(d)} \sum_{\substack{n \leq X \\ (n, d) = 1}} \tau_k(n).$$

Then, for each  $k$ , we seek  $\theta_k > 0$  as large as possible such that, for all  $\epsilon > 0$ , there is  $\delta > 0$ , such that

$$\Delta(\tau_k; X, d, a) \ll \frac{X^{1-\delta}}{\varphi(d)}$$

for all  $d \leq X^{\theta_k - \epsilon}$ . The number  $\theta_k$  is called the **level of distribution** for  $\tau_k$ .

## What is known about distribution of $\tau_k$ ?

- Only reasonably well understood for  $k = 1, 2, 3$ !
- Simplest case  $k = 1$ :

$$\sum_{\substack{n \leq X \\ n \equiv a \pmod{d}}} 1 = \frac{X}{d} + O(1).$$

This tells us, in particular, that  $d \leq X$ .

- More precisely, for  $(a, d) = 1$ , let

$$\Delta(\tau_k; X, d, a) = \sum_{\substack{n \leq X \\ n \equiv a \pmod{d}}} \tau_k(n) - \frac{1}{\varphi(d)} \sum_{\substack{n \leq X \\ (n, d) = 1}} \tau_k(n).$$

Then, for each  $k$ , we seek  $\theta_k > 0$  as large as possible such that, for all  $\epsilon > 0$ , there is  $\delta > 0$ , such that

$$\Delta(\tau_k; X, d, a) \ll \frac{X^{1-\delta}}{\varphi(d)}$$

for all  $d \leq X^{\theta_k - \epsilon}$ . The number  $\theta_k$  is called the **level of distribution** for  $\tau_k$ .

- **Conjecture (c.f. Elliott-Halberstam):**  $\theta_k = 1$  for all  $k$ . **GRH**  $\implies \theta_k < 1/2$  for all  $k$ . Moduli  $d > X^{1/2}$  are called **large moduli**. This is sometimes referred to as the “**square-root barrier**”.

Recall that, for each  $k$ , we seek  $\theta_k > 0$  as large as possible such that, for each  $\epsilon > 0$ , there is  $\delta > 0$ , such that

$$\Delta(\tau_k; X, d, a) \ll \frac{X^{1-\delta}}{\varphi(d)} \quad (1)$$

for all  $d \leq X^{\theta_k - \epsilon}$ .

Recall that, for each  $k$ , we seek  $\theta_k > 0$  as large as possible such that, for each  $\epsilon > 0$ , there is  $\delta > 0$ , such that

$$\Delta(\tau_k; X, d, a) \ll \frac{X^{1-\delta}}{\varphi(d)} \quad (1)$$

for all  $d \leq X^{\theta_k - \epsilon}$ .

- Known results for individual distribution estimate (1) for  $\tau_k$ . Only for  $k = 1, 2, 3$  is the exponent of distribution  $\theta_k$  for  $\tau_k$  known to hold for a value larger than  $1/2$ .

$k$	$\theta_k$	References
$k = 1$	$\theta_1 = 1$	See previous slide.
$k = 2$	$\theta_2 = 2/3$	<a href="#">Selberg, Linnik, Hooley</a> (independent, unpublished, 1950's).
$k = 3$	$\theta_3 = 1/2 + 1/230$ $\theta_3 = 1/2 + 1/82$	<a href="#">Friedlander and Iwaniec</a> (1985). <a href="#">Heath-Brown</a> (1986).
$k = 4$	$\theta_4 < 1/2$	<a href="#">Linnik</a> (1961).
$k \geq 4$	$\theta_k = 8/(3k + 4)$	<a href="#">Lavrik</a> (1965).
$k = 5$	$\theta_5 = 9/20$	<a href="#">Friedlander and Iwaniec</a> (1985).
$k = 6$	$\theta_6 = 5/12$	<a href="#">Friedlander and Iwaniec</a> (1985).
$k \geq 7$	$\theta_k = 8/3k$	<a href="#">Friedlander and Iwaniec</a> (1985).
$k \geq 4$	$\theta_k \geq 1/2$	<b>Open</b>

Recall that, for each  $k$ , we seek  $\theta_k > 0$  as large as possible such that, for each  $\epsilon > 0$ , there is  $\delta > 0$ , such that

$$\Delta(\tau_k; X, d, a) \ll \frac{X^{1-\delta}}{\varphi(d)} \quad (1)$$

for all  $d \leq X^{\theta_k - \epsilon}$ .

- Known results for individual distribution estimate (1) for  $\tau_k$ . Only for  $k = 1, 2, 3$  is the exponent of distribution  $\theta_k$  for  $\tau_k$  known to hold for a value larger than  $1/2$ .

$k$	$\theta_k$	References
$k = 1$	$\theta_1 = 1$	See previous slide.
$k = 2$	$\theta_2 = 2/3$	<a href="#">Selberg, Linnik, Hooley</a> (independent, unpublished, 1950's).
$k = 3$	$\theta_3 = 1/2 + 1/230$ $\theta_3 = 1/2 + 1/82$	<a href="#">Friedlander and Iwaniec</a> (1985). <a href="#">Heath-Brown</a> (1986).
$k = 4$	$\theta_4 < 1/2$	<a href="#">Linnik</a> (1961).
$k \geq 4$	$\theta_k = 8/(3k + 4)$	<a href="#">Lavrik</a> (1965).
$k = 5$	$\theta_5 = 9/20$	<a href="#">Friedlander and Iwaniec</a> (1985).
$k = 6$	$\theta_6 = 5/12$	<a href="#">Friedlander and Iwaniec</a> (1985).
$k \geq 7$	$\theta_k = 8/3k$	<a href="#">Friedlander and Iwaniec</a> (1985).
$k \geq 4$	$\theta_k \geq 1/2$	<b>Open</b>

- This stubborn problem (showing that  $\theta_k > 1/2$ ) has stood static for any  $k \geq 4$  ever since the 80's. (Also, the value  $\theta_2 = 2/3$  for  $\tau(n)$  has not been improved since the 50's.) To make progress, various **averages** on  $\Delta(\tau_k; X, d, a)$  are considered by many authors.

- **Y. Zhang** (2014): restrict to **smooth moduli**; in his remarkable work on bounded gaps between primes, a crucial step is to prove, for any  $a \neq 0$ ,

$$\sum_{\substack{d < X^{1/2+2\varpi} \\ (d,a)=1 \\ d \text{ is } X^\varpi\text{-smooth}}} \mu(d)^2 |\Delta(\Lambda; X, d, a)| \ll \frac{X}{(\log X)^A}.$$

- **Y. Zhang** (2014): restrict to **smooth moduli**; in his remarkable work on bounded gaps between primes, a crucial step is to prove, for any  $a \neq 0$ ,

$$\sum_{\substack{d < X^{1/2+2\varpi} \\ (d,a)=1 \\ d \text{ is } X^\varpi\text{-smooth}}} \mu(d)^2 |\Delta(\Lambda; X, d, a)| \ll \frac{X}{(\log X)^A}.$$

- Zhang's method originally for  $\Lambda$  applies equally to  $\tau_k$ :

### Theorem 0 (F. Wei, B. Xue, and Y. Zhang <sup>a</sup> (2016))

<sup>a</sup>F. Wei, B. Xue, and Y. Zhang, *Sci. China Math.* 59 (2016), **no. 9**, 1663-1668.

For  $a \neq 0$ , denote

$$\mathcal{D} = \{d \geq 1 : (d, a) = 1, \mu(d)^2, (d, \prod_{p < X^{1/1168}} p) > X^{71/584}\}.$$

Then, for any  $k \geq 4$ , we have

$$\sum_{\substack{d < X^{293/584} \\ d \in \mathcal{D}}} |\Delta(\tau_k; X, d, a)| \ll_{k,a} X \exp(-\log^{1/2} X).$$



- **Y. Zhang** (2014): restrict to **smooth moduli**; in his remarkable work on bounded gaps between primes, a crucial step is to prove, for any  $a \neq 0$ ,

$$\sum_{\substack{d < X^{1/2+2\varpi} \\ (d,a)=1 \\ d \text{ is } X^\varpi\text{-smooth}}} \mu(d)^2 |\Delta(\Lambda; X, d, a)| \ll \frac{X}{(\log X)^A}.$$

- Zhang's method originally for  $\Lambda$  applies equally to  $\tau_k$ :

### Theorem 0 (F. Wei, B. Xue, and Y. Zhang <sup>a</sup> (2016))

<sup>a</sup>F. Wei, B. Xue, and Y. Zhang, *Sci. China Math.* 59 (2016), **no. 9**, 1663-1668.

For  $a \neq 0$ , denote

$$\mathcal{D} = \{d \geq 1 : (d, a) = 1, \mu(d)^2, (d, \prod_{p < X^{1/1168}} p) > X^{71/584}\}.$$

Then, for any  $k \geq 4$ , we have

$$\sum_{\substack{d < X^{293/584} \\ d \in \mathcal{D}}} |\Delta(\tau_k; X, d, a)| \ll_{k,a} X \exp(-\log^{1/2} X).$$

- We provide a sharpening of this error term.

# Our results

## Theorem 1 (Main result)

Let  $a \neq 0$ . Denote  $\mathcal{P}(y) = \prod_{p < y} p$ ,  $\varpi = 1/1168$ , and

$$\mathcal{D} = \{d \geq 1 : (d, a) = 1, \mu(d)^2, (d, \mathcal{P}(X^{\varpi^2})) < X^{\varpi}, \text{ and } (d, \mathcal{P}(X^{\varpi})) > X^{1/8-4\varpi}\},$$

Then, for all  $k \geq 4$ , we have

$$\sum_{\substack{d \in \mathcal{D} \\ d < X^{1/2+1/584}}} |\Delta(\tau_k; X, d, a)| \ll X^{1-\theta_k}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\theta_k = \min\{1/12(k+2), \varpi^2\}$ . The implied constant is effective and depends on  $a$  and  $k$ .

# Our results

## Theorem 1 (Main result)

Let  $a \neq 0$ . Denote  $\mathcal{P}(y) = \prod_{p < y} p$ ,  $\varpi = 1/1168$ , and

$$\mathcal{D} = \{d \geq 1 : (d, a) = 1, \mu(d)^2, (d, \mathcal{P}(X^{\varpi^2})) < X^{\varpi}, \text{ and } (d, \mathcal{P}(X^{\varpi})) > X^{1/8-4\varpi}\},$$

Then, for all  $k \geq 4$ , we have

$$\sum_{\substack{d \in \mathcal{D} \\ d < X^{1/2+1/584}}} |\Delta(\tau_k; X, d, a)| \ll X^{1-\theta_k}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\theta_k = \min\{1/12(k+2), \varpi^2\}$ . The implied constant is effective and depends on  $a$  and  $k$ .

- If we assume the Generalized Lindelöf Hypothesis, we can prove a stronger result.

## Theorem 2

On the Generalized Lindelöf Hypothesis, the estimate (2) holds with the right side replaced by

$$X^{1-1/2018^2},$$

where the  $\theta_k$  power saving is replaced by a positive constant independent of  $k$ .

- If, in addition with averaging over moduli  $d$ , we also average over primitive residue classes in each modulus, then we can further extend the range of  $d$ .

### Theorem 3

For  $k \geq 4$  we have

$$\sum_{d \leq D} \sum_{\substack{a=1 \\ (a,d)=1}}^d \Delta(\tau_k; X, d, a)^2 \ll \begin{cases} X^{2-1/6(k+4)}, & \text{for } 1 \leq D \leq X^{1-1/6(k+2)}, \\ DX(\log X)^{k^2-1}, & \text{for } X^{1-1/6(k+2)} < D \leq X. \end{cases}$$

- If, in addition with averaging over moduli  $d$ , we also average over primitive residue classes in each modulus, then we can further extend the range of  $d$ .

### Theorem 3

For  $k \geq 4$  we have

$$\sum_{d \leq D} \sum_{\substack{a=1 \\ (a,d)=1}}^d \Delta(\tau_k; X, d, a)^2 \ll \begin{cases} X^{2-1/6(k+4)}, & \text{for } 1 \leq D \leq X^{1-1/6(k+2)}, \\ DX(\log X)^{k^2-1}, & \text{for } X^{1-1/6(k+2)} < D \leq X. \end{cases}$$

- In our last result, we prove a distribution estimate involving  $\Lambda$  where the moduli  $d$  can be as large as  $X^2$ .

### Theorem 4

For  $k \geq 4$  there holds

$$\sum_{d \leq D} \sum_{\substack{a=1 \\ (a,d)=1}}^d \left( \sum_{\substack{m, n \leq X \\ m \equiv an \pmod{d}}} \tau_k(m) \Lambda(n) - \frac{X}{\varphi(d)} \sum_{\substack{n \leq X \\ (n,d)=1}} \tau_k(n) \right)^2 \ll \begin{cases} X^{4-1/3(k+4)}, & \text{for } 1 \leq D \leq X^{2-1/3(k+2)}, \\ DX^2(\log X)^{2k-2}, & \text{for } X^{2-1/3(k+2)} < D \leq X^2. \end{cases}$$

# Thank You!

Figure 1: **Chico State** Motto, “**Today decides tomorrow**”.

