

A NOTE ON A CONJECTURE OF GONEK

MICAH B. MILINOVICH, NATHAN NG

Abstract: We derive a lower bound for a second moment of the reciprocal of the derivative of the Riemann zeta-function over the zeros of $\zeta(s)$ that is half the size of the conjectured value. Our result is conditional upon the assumption of the Riemann Hypothesis and the conjecture that the zeros of the zeta-function are simple.

Keywords: Riemann zeta-function, mean-value theorems, Gonek's conjecture.

1. Introduction

Let $\zeta(s)$ denote the Riemann zeta-function. Using a heuristic method similar to Montgomery's study [13] of the pair-correlation of the imaginary parts of the non-trivial zeros of $\zeta(s)$, Gonek has made the following conjecture [7, 8].

Conjecture. *Assume the Riemann Hypothesis and that the zeros of $\zeta(s)$ are simple. Then, as $T \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\sum_{0 < \gamma \leq T} \frac{1}{|\zeta'(\rho)|^2} \sim \frac{3}{\pi^3} T \quad (1.1)$$

where the sum runs over the non-trivial zeros $\rho = \frac{1}{2} + i\gamma$ of $\zeta(s)$.

The assumption of the simplicity of the zeros of the zeta-function in the above conjecture is so that the sum over zeros on the right-hand side of (1.1) is well defined. While the details of Gonek's method have never been published, he announced his conjecture in [5]. More recently, a different heuristic method of Hughes, Keating, and O'Connell [10] based upon modeling the Riemann zeta-function and its derivative using the characteristic polynomials of random matrices has led to the same conjecture. Through the work of Ingham [11], Titchmarsh (Chapter 14 of [21]), Odlyzko and te Riele [17], Gonek (unpublished), and Ng [15],

MBM is supported in part by a University of Mississippi College of Liberal Arts summer research grant. NN is supported in part by an NSERC Discovery grant.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: primary: 11M06; secondary: 11M26

it is known that the behavior of this and related sums are intimately connected to the distribution of the summatory function

$$M(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n)$$

where $\mu(\cdot)$, the Möbius function, is defined by $\mu(1) = 1$, $\mu(n) = (-1)^k$ if n is divisible by k distinct primes, and $\mu(n) = 0$ if $n > 1$ is not square-free. See also [9] and [20] for connections between similar sums and other arithmetic problems.

In support of his conjecture, Gonek [5] has shown, assuming the Riemann Hypothesis and the simplicity of the zeros of $\zeta(s)$, that

$$\sum_{0 < \gamma \leq T} \frac{1}{|\zeta'(\rho)|^2} \geq CT \tag{1.2}$$

for some constant $C > 0$ and T sufficiently large. In this note, we show that the inequality in (1.2) holds for any constant $C < \frac{3}{2\pi^3}$.

Theorem. *Assume the Riemann Hypothesis and that the zeros of $\zeta(s)$ are simple. Then, for any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$\sum_{0 < \gamma \leq T} \frac{1}{|\zeta'(\rho)|^2} \geq \left(\frac{3}{2\pi^3} - \varepsilon \right) T \tag{1.3}$$

for T sufficiently large.

While our result differs from the conjectural lower bound by a factor of 2, any improvements in the strength of this lower bound have, thus far, eluded us. It would be interesting to investigate whether for $k > 0$ there is a constant $C_k > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{0 < \gamma \leq T} \frac{1}{|\zeta'(\rho)|^{2k}} \geq C_k T (\log T)^{(k-1)^2} \tag{1.4}$$

for T sufficiently large. However, a lower bound of this form is probably not of the correct order of magnitude for all k . This is because it is expected that for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there are infinitely many zeros $\rho = \frac{1}{2} + i\gamma$ of $\zeta(s)$ satisfying $|\zeta'(\rho)|^{-1} \gg |\gamma|^{1/3-\varepsilon}$. If such a sequence of zeros were to exist, it would then follow that

$$\sum_{0 < \gamma \leq T} \frac{1}{|\zeta'(\rho)|^{2k}} = \Omega\left(T^{2k/3-\varepsilon}\right)$$

and the lower bound in (1.4) would be significantly weaker than this Ω -result when $k > \frac{3}{2}$.

2. Proof of Theorem

The method we use to prove our theorem is based on a recent idea of Rudnick and Soundararajan [18]. Let

$$\xi = T^{\vartheta} \tag{2.1}$$

where $0 < \vartheta < 1$ is fixed and define the Dirichlet polynomial

$$\mathcal{M}_\xi(s) = \sum_{n \leq \xi} \mu(n)n^{-s}$$

where μ is the Möbius function. Assuming the Riemann Hypothesis, for any non-trivial zero $\rho = \frac{1}{2} + i\gamma$ of $\zeta(s)$, we see that $\overline{\mathcal{M}_\xi(\rho)} = \mathcal{M}_\xi(1 - \rho)$. From this observation and Cauchy's inequality it follows that

$$\sum_{0 < \gamma \leq T} \frac{1}{|\zeta'(\rho)|^2} \geq \frac{|M_1|^2}{M_2} \tag{2.2}$$

where

$$M_1 = \sum_{0 < \gamma \leq T} \frac{1}{\zeta'(\rho)} \mathcal{M}_\xi(1 - \rho) \quad \text{and} \quad M_2 = \sum_{0 < \gamma \leq T} |\mathcal{M}_\xi(\rho)|^2.$$

Our Theorem is a consequence of the following proposition.

Proposition. *Assume the Riemann Hypothesis and let $0 < \vartheta < 1$ be fixed. Then*

$$M_2 = \frac{3}{\pi^3} (\vartheta + \vartheta^2) T \log^2 T + O(T \log T). \tag{2.3}$$

If we further assume that the zeros of $\zeta(s)$ are all simple, then there exists a sequence $\mathcal{T} := \{\tau_n\}_{n=3}^\infty$ such that $n < \tau_n \leq n + 1$ and for $T \in \mathcal{T}$ we have

$$M_1 = \frac{3\vartheta}{\pi^3} T \log T + O(T). \tag{2.4}$$

We now deduce our theorem from the above proposition.

Proof of Theorem. Let $T \geq 4$ and choose τ_n to satisfy $T - 1 \leq \tau_n < T$. Combining (2.2), (2.4), and (2.3) we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{0 < \gamma \leq T} \frac{1}{|\zeta'(\rho)|^2} &\geq \sum_{0 < \gamma \leq \tau_n} \frac{1}{|\zeta'(\rho)|^2} \geq \frac{\vartheta^2}{(\vartheta + \vartheta^2)} \frac{3}{\pi^3} \tau_n + o(\tau_n) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{(1 + \vartheta^{-1})} \frac{3}{\pi^3} T + o(T) \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

under the assumption of the Riemann Hypothesis and the simplicity of the zeros of $\zeta(s)$. From (2.5), our theorem follows by letting $\vartheta \rightarrow 1^-$. ■

We could have just as easily estimated the sums M_1 and M_2 using a Dirichlet polynomial $\sum_{n \leq \xi} a_n n^{-s}$ for a large class of coefficients a_n in place of $\mathcal{M}_\xi(s)$. In the special case where

$$a_n = \mu(n)P\left(\frac{\log \xi/n}{\log \xi}\right)$$

for polynomials P , we can show that the choice $P = 1$ is optimal in the sense that it leads to largest lower bound in (1.3).

We prove the above proposition in the next two sections; the sum M_1 is estimated in section 3 and the sum M_2 is estimated in section 4. The evaluation of sums like M_1 dates back to Ingham’s [11] important work on $M(x)$ in which he considered sums of the form

$$\sum_{0 < \gamma < T} (T - \gamma)^k \zeta'(\rho)^{-1}$$

for $k \in \mathbb{R}$. The sum M_2 is of the form

$$\sum_{0 < \gamma < T} |A(\rho)|^2 \quad \text{where } A(s) = \sum_{n \leq \xi} a_n n^{-s} \tag{2.6}$$

is a Dirichlet polynomial with $\xi \leq T$. Such sums have played an important role in various applications. For instance, results concerning the distribution of consecutive zeros of $\zeta(s)$ and discrete mean values of the zeta-function and its derivatives are proven in [1, 2, 3, 6, 12, 13, 16, 19]. In each of these articles, the evaluation of the discrete mean (2.6) either makes use of the Guinand-Weil explicit formula or of Gonek’s uniform version [6] of Landau’s formula

$$\sum_{\substack{0 < \gamma < T \\ \zeta(\beta+i\gamma)=0}} x^{\beta+i\gamma} = -\frac{T}{2\pi} \Lambda(x) + E(x, T) \tag{2.7}$$

for $x, T > 1$ where $E(x, T)$ is an explicit error function uniform in x and T . A novel aspect of our approach is that it does not require the use of the Guinand-Weil explicit formula or of the Landau-Gonek explicit formula (2.7). Instead we evaluate M_2 using the residue theorem and a version of Montgomery and Vaughan’s mean value theorem for Dirichlet polynomials [14]. Our approach is simpler and it is likely that it can be extended to evaluate the discrete mean (2.6) for a large class of coefficients a_n when $\xi \leq T$.

3. The estimation of M_1

To estimate M_1 , we require the following version of Montgomery and Vaughan’s mean value theorem for Dirichlet polynomials.

Lemma. *Let $\{a_n\}$ and $\{b_n\}$ be two sequences of complex numbers. For any real number $T > 0$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n n^{-it} \right) \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} b_n n^{it} \right) dt \\ = T \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n b_n + O \left(\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n |a_n|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n |b_n|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right). \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

Proof. This is Lemma 1 of Tsang [22]. The special case where $b_n = \overline{a_n}$ is originally due to Montgomery and Vaughan [14]. It turns out, as shown by Tsang, that this special case is equivalent to the more general case stated in the lemma. ■

Let $T \geq 4$ and set $c = 1 + (\log T)^{-1}$. It is well known (see Theorem 14.16 of Titchmarsh [21]) that assuming the Riemann Hypothesis there exists a sequence $\mathcal{T} = \{\tau_n\}_{n=3}^\infty$, $n < \tau_n \leq n + 1$, and a fixed constant $A > 0$ such that

$$|\zeta(\sigma + i\tau_n)|^{-1} \ll \exp\left(\frac{A \log \tau_n}{\log \log \tau_n}\right) \tag{3.2}$$

uniformly for $\frac{1}{2} \leq \sigma \leq 2$. We now prove the estimate (2.4) assuming that $T \in \mathcal{T}$. Recall that $|\gamma| > 1$ for every non-trivial zero $\rho = \frac{1}{2} + i\gamma$ of $\zeta(s)$. Thus, assuming that all the zeros of $\zeta(s)$ are simple, the residue theorem implies that

$$\begin{aligned} M_1 &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \left(\int_{c+i}^{c+iT} + \int_{c+iT}^{1-c+iT} + \int_{1-c+iT}^{1-c+1} + \int_{1-c+1}^{c+i} \right) \frac{1}{\zeta(s)} \mathcal{M}_\xi(1-s) ds \\ &= I_1 + I_2 + I_3 + I_4, \end{aligned}$$

say. Here we are using the fact that the residue of the function $1/\zeta(s)$ at $s = \rho$ equals $1/\zeta'(\rho)$ if ρ is a simple zero of $\zeta(s)$.

The main contribution to M_1 comes from the integral I_1 ; the remainder of the integrals contribute an error term. Observe that

$$I_1 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_1^T \sum_{m=1}^\infty \frac{\mu(m)}{m^{c+it}} \sum_{n \leq \xi} \frac{\mu(n)}{n^{1-c-it}} dt.$$

By (3.1) with $a_m = \mu(m)m^{-c}$ and $b_n = \mu(n)n^{-1+c}$ it follows that

$$I_1 = \frac{(T-1)}{2\pi} \sum_{n \leq \xi} \frac{\mu(n)^2}{n} + O\left(\left(\sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{\mu(n)^2}{n^{2c-1}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{n \leq \xi} \mu(n)^2 n^{2c-1}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right).$$

Since

$$\sum_{n \leq \xi} \frac{\mu(n)^2}{n} = \frac{6}{\pi^2} \log \xi + O(1), \tag{3.3}$$

we conclude that

$$I_1 = \frac{3}{\pi^3} T \log \xi + O\left(\xi \sqrt{\log T} + T\right)$$

for our choice of c . Here we have used the fact that

$$\sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{\mu(n)^2}{n^{2c-1}} \leq \zeta(2c-1) \ll \log T.$$

To estimate the contribution from the integral I_2 , we recall the functional equation for the Riemann zeta-function which says that

$$\zeta(s) = \chi(s)\zeta(1-s) \tag{3.4}$$

where

$$\chi(s) = 2^s \pi^{s-1} \Gamma(1-s) \sin\left(\frac{\pi s}{2}\right).$$

Stirling’s asymptotic formula for the Gamma-function can be used to show that

$$|\chi(\sigma + it)| = \left(\frac{|t|}{2\pi}\right)^{1/2-\sigma} \left(1 + O(|t|^{-1})\right) \tag{3.5}$$

uniformly for $-1 \leq \sigma \leq 2$ and $|t| \geq 1$. Combining this estimate and (3.2), it follows that, for $T \in \mathcal{T}$,

$$|\zeta(\sigma + iT)|^{-1} \ll T^{\min(\sigma-1/2, 0)} \exp\left(\frac{A \log T}{\log \log T}\right)$$

uniformly for $-1 \leq \sigma \leq 2$. In addition, we have the trivial bound

$$|M_\xi(\sigma + it)| \ll \xi^{1-\sigma}. \tag{3.6}$$

Thus, estimating the integral I_2 trivially, we find that

$$I_2 \ll \exp\left(\frac{A \log T}{\log \log T}\right) \int_{1-c}^c T^{\min(\sigma-1/2, 0)} \xi^\sigma d\sigma \ll \xi \exp\left(\frac{A \log T}{\log \log T}\right).$$

To bound the contribution from the integral I_3 , we notice that the functional equation for $\zeta(s)$ combined with the estimate in (3.5) implies that, for $1 \leq |t| \leq T$,

$$|\zeta(1-c+it)|^{-1} \ll |t|^{1/2-c} |\zeta(c-it)|^{-1} \ll |t|^{1/2-c} \zeta(c) \ll |t|^{-1/2} \log T.$$

It therefore follows that

$$I_3 \ll \log T \left(\sum_{n \leq \xi} \frac{|\mu(n)|}{n^c}\right) \int_1^T t^{-1/2} dt \ll \sqrt{T} (\log T) \log \xi.$$

Finally, since $1/\zeta(s)$ and $\mathcal{M}_\xi(1-s)$ are bounded on the interval $[1-c+i, c+i]$, we find that $I_4 \ll 1$. Hence, our combined estimates for I_1, I_2, I_3 , and I_4 imply that

$$M_1 = \frac{3}{\pi^3} T \log \xi + O\left(\xi \exp\left(\frac{A \log T}{\log \log T}\right) + T\right).$$

From this and (2.1), the estimate in (2.4) follows.

4. The estimation of M_2

We now turn our attention to estimating the sum M_2 . As before, let $T \geq 4$ and $c = 1 + (\log T)^{-1}$. Assuming the Riemann Hypothesis, we notice that

$$M_2 = \sum_{0 < \gamma \leq T} \mathcal{M}_\xi(\rho) \mathcal{M}_\xi(1-\rho).$$

Therefore, by the residue theorem, we see that

$$M_2 = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \left(\int_{c+i}^{c+iT} + \int_{c+iT}^{1-c+iT} + \int_{1-c+iT}^{1-c+1} + \int_{1-c+1}^{c+i} \right) M_\xi(s)M_\xi(1-s)\frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(s) ds$$

$$= J_1 + J_2 + J_3 + J_4,$$

say. In order to evaluate the integrals over the horizontal part of the contour we shall impose some extra conditions on T . Without loss of generality, we may assume that T satisfies

$$|\gamma - T| \gg \frac{1}{\log T} \quad \text{for all ordinates } \gamma \text{ and}$$

$$\frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(\sigma+iT) \ll (\log T)^2 \quad \text{uniformly for all } 1 - c \leq \sigma \leq c. \tag{4.1}$$

In each interval of length one such a T exists. This well known argument may be found in [4], page 108. Applying (3.6) we find that

$$\sum_{T < \gamma < T+1} |M_\xi(\rho)M_\xi(1-\rho)| \ll \xi(\log T).$$

Here we have used the standard estimate that there are $O(\log T)$ zeros of $\zeta(s)$ with ordinates in the interval $[T, T + 1]$. Therefore our choice of T determines M_2 up to an error term $O(\xi \log T)$. First we estimate the horizontal portions of the contour. By (3.6) and (4.1), we have

$$J_2 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_c^{1-c} M_\xi(\sigma+it)M_\xi(1-\sigma-it)\frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(\sigma+it) d\sigma \ll \xi(\log T)^2.$$

Similarly, it may be shown that $J_4 \ll \xi$. Next we relate J_3 to J_1 . We have

$$J_3 = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_T^1 M_\xi(1-c+it)M_\xi(c-it)\frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(1-c+it) dt$$

$$= -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_1^T M_\xi(1-c-it)M_\xi(c+it)\frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(1-c-it) dt$$

By differentiating (3.4), the functional equation, we find that

$$-\frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(1-c-it) = -\frac{\chi'}{\chi}(1-c-it) + \frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(c+it)$$

and hence that

$$J_3 = -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_1^T M_\xi(1-c-it)M_\xi(c+it)\frac{\chi'}{\chi}(1-c-it) dt$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_1^T M_\xi(1-c-it)M_\xi(c+it)\frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(c+it) dt.$$

By (3.4) and Stirling’s formula it can be shown that

$$-\frac{\chi'}{\chi}(1-c-it) = \log\left(\frac{|t|}{2\pi}\right)(1 + O(|t|^{-1}))$$

uniformly for $1 \leq |t| \leq T$. By (3.6), the term $O(|t|^{-1})$ contributes to J_3 an amount which is $O(\xi \log T)$ and, hence, it follows that

$$J_3 = K + \overline{J_1} + O(\xi(\log T))$$

where

$$K = \int_1^T \log\left(\frac{t}{2\pi}\right) M_\xi(c+it) M_\xi(1-c-it) dt.$$

Collecting estimates, we deduce that

$$M_2 = K + 2\Re J_1 + O(\xi(\log T)^2). \tag{4.2}$$

To complete our estimation of M_2 , it remains to evaluate K and then J_1 . Integrating by parts, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} K &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \log\left(\frac{T}{2\pi}\right) \int_1^T M_\xi(c+it) M_\xi(1-c-it) dt \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_1^T \left(\int_1^t M_\xi(c+iu) M_\xi(1-c-iu) du \right) \frac{dt}{t}. \end{aligned}$$

By (3.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_1^t M_\xi(c+iu) M_\xi(1-c-iu) du &= (t-1) \sum_{n \leq \xi} \frac{\mu(n)^2}{n} + O(\xi \sqrt{\log T}) \\ &= \frac{6}{\pi^2} t \log \xi + O(\xi \sqrt{\log T} + t) \end{aligned}$$

for $t > 1$. Substituting this estimate into the above expression for K , we see that

$$\begin{aligned} K &= \frac{3}{\pi^3} T \log\left(\frac{T}{2\pi}\right) \log \xi + O(T \log T) + O(T \log \xi) \\ &= \frac{3}{\pi^3} T \log\left(\frac{T}{2\pi}\right) \log \xi + O(T \log T). \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

We finish by evaluating the integral J_1 which is similar to the evaluation of the integral I_1 in the previous section. By another application of (3.1), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &= -\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_1^T \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha_n}{n^{c+it}} \sum_{n \leq \xi} \frac{\mu(n)}{n^{1-c-it}} dt = -\frac{(T-1)}{2\pi} \sum_{n \leq x} \frac{\alpha_n \mu(n)}{n} \\ &\quad + O\left(\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha_n^2}{n^{2c-1}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sum_{n \leq \xi} \frac{\mu(n)^2}{n^{1-2c}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where the coefficients α_n are defined by

$$\alpha_n = \sum_{\substack{k\ell=n \\ \ell \leq \xi}} \Lambda(k)\mu(\ell).$$

Observe that trivially $|\alpha_n| \leq \sum_{u|n} \Lambda(u) \leq \log n$. It follows that the error term in the above expression for J_1 is $\ll \zeta''(2c-1)^{\frac{1}{2}} \xi \ll \xi(\log T)^{\frac{3}{2}}$. Finally, we note that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n \leq x} \frac{\alpha_n \mu(n)}{n} &= \sum_{\ell \leq x} \frac{\mu(\ell)}{\ell} \sum_{\substack{k \leq \frac{x}{\ell} \\ p \text{ prime}, j \geq 0}} \frac{\Lambda(k)\mu(k\ell)}{k} = \sum_{\ell \leq \xi} \frac{\mu(\ell)}{\ell} \sum_{\substack{p^j \leq x/\ell \\ p \text{ prime}, j \geq 0}} \frac{\mu(p^j \ell) \log p}{p^j} \\ &= \sum_{\ell \leq \xi} \frac{\mu(\ell)}{\ell} \sum_{p \leq x/\ell} \frac{\mu(p\ell) \log p}{p} + O(\log \xi) \\ &= - \sum_{\ell \leq \xi} \frac{\mu(\ell)^2}{\ell} \sum_{p \leq x/\ell} \frac{\log p}{p} + O\left(\log \xi + \sum_{\ell \leq \xi} \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{p|\ell} \frac{\log p}{p}\right) \end{aligned}$$

since $\mu(p\ell) = -\mu(\ell)$ if $(p, \ell) = 1$ and $\mu(p\ell) = 0 = O(1)$ if $p|\ell$. The sum in the error term is

$$\sum_{\ell \leq \xi} \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{p|\ell} \frac{\log p}{p} = \sum_{p \leq x} \frac{(\log p)}{p^2} \sum_{\substack{\ell' \leq \frac{\xi}{p}}} \frac{1}{\ell'} \ll \log \xi.$$

Hence, by the elementary result $\sum_{p \leq \xi} \frac{\log p}{p} = \log \xi + O(1)$, (3.3), and partial summation, we deduce that

$$\sum_{n \leq x} \frac{\alpha_n \mu(n)}{n} = - \sum_{l \leq \xi} \frac{\mu(l)^2 \log(\frac{\xi}{l})}{l} + O(\log \xi) = - \frac{3}{\pi^2} (\log \xi)^2 + O(\log \xi).$$

Therefore, combining formulae, we have

$$J_1 = - \frac{3}{2\pi^3} T(\log \xi)^2 + O(T \log T). \tag{4.4}$$

Finally (4.2), (4.3), and (4.4) imply that

$$M_2 = \frac{3}{\pi^3} T \log T \log \xi + \frac{3}{\pi^3} T(\log \xi)^2 + O(T \log T)$$

and, thus, by (2.1) we deduce (2.3).

References

[1] H. M. Bui, M. B. Milinovich, and N. C. Ng, *A note on the gaps between consecutive zeros of the Riemann zeta-function*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **138** (2010), 4167–4175.

- [2] J. B. Conrey, A. Ghosh, and S. M. Gonek, *A note on gaps between zeros of the zeta function*, Bull. London Math. Soc. **16** (1984), no. 4, 421–424.
- [3] J. B. Conrey, A. Ghosh, D. A. Goldston, S. M. Gonek, and D. R. Heath-Brown, *On the distribution of gaps between zeros of the zeta-function*, Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2) **36** (1985), no. 141, 43–51.
- [4] Harold Davenport, *Multiplicative number theory. Third edition. Revised and with a preface by Hugh L. Montgomery*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 74. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2000.
- [5] S. M. Gonek, *On negative moments of the Riemann zeta-function*, Mathematika **36** (1989), 71–88.
- [6] S. M. Gonek, *An explicit formula of Landau and its applications to the theory of the zeta function*, Contemp. Math **143** (1993), 395–413.
- [7] S. M. Gonek, *Some theorems and conjectures in the theory of the Riemann zeta-function*, unpublished manuscript.
- [8] S. M. Gonek, *The second moment of the reciprocal of the Riemann zeta-function and its derivative*, Talk at Mathematical Sciences Research Institute, Berkeley, June 1999.
- [9] C. B. Haselgrove, *A disproof of a conjecture of Pólya*, Mathematika **5** (1958), 141–145.
- [10] C. P. Hughes, J. P. Keating, and N. O’Connell, *Random matrix theory and the derivative of the Riemann zeta-function*, Proc. Roy. Soc. London A **456** (2000), 2611–2627.
- [11] A.E. Ingham, *On two conjectures in the theory of numbers*, Amer. J. Math. **64** (1942), 313–319.
- [12] M. B. Milinovich, *Upper bounds for the moments of $\zeta'(\rho)$* , Bull. London Math. Soc. **42** (2010), no. 1, 28–44.
- [13] H. L. Montgomery, *The pair correlation of zeros of the zeta function*, in: Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. 24, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R. I., 1973, 181–193.
- [14] H. L. Montgomery and R.C. Vaughan, *Hilbert’s inequality*, J. London Math. Soc. (2) **8** (1974), 73–82.
- [15] N. Ng, *The distribution of the summatory function of the Möbius function*, Proc. London Math. Soc. **89** (2004), no. 2, 361–389.
- [16] N. Ng, *The fourth moment of $\zeta'(\rho)$* , Duke Math. J. **125** (2004), no. 2, 243–266.
- [17] A. M. Odlyzko and H. J. J. te Riele, *Disproof of the Mertens conjecture*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **357** (1985), 138–160.
- [18] Z. Rudnick and K. Soundararajan, *Lower bounds for moments of L-functions*, Proc. Natl. Sci. Acad. USA **102** (2005), 6837–6838.
- [19] K. Soundararajan, *On the distribution of gaps between zeros of the Riemann zeta-function*, Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser. (2) **42** (1996), no. 3, 383–387.
- [20] H. M. Stark, *On the asymptotic density of the k-free integers*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **17** (1966), 1211–1214.
- [21] E. C. Titchmarsh, *The Theory of the Riemann Zeta-function*, Oxford University Press, 1986.
- [22] K. M. Tsang, *Some Ω -theorems for the Riemann zeta-function*, Acta Arith. **46** (1986), no. 4, 369–395.

Addresses: Micah B. Milinovich: Department of Mathematics. University of Mississippi. 329 Hume Hall, University, MS 38677 USA;
Nathan Ng: University of Lethbridge, Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, 4401 University Drive, Lethbridge, AB Canada T1K 3M4.

E-mail: mbmilino@olemiss.edu, nathan.ng@uleth.ca

Received: 3 January 2011

