The work of James Maynard

Anish Ghosh

Tata Institute

August 25, 2022



• 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, ...

- 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, ...
- (3,5), (5,7), (11,13), ..., (71,73), ..., (137,139), ...?

- 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, ...
- (3,5), (5,7), (11,13), ..., (71,73), ..., (137,139), ...?
- (5,7,11), (7,11,13), (11,13,17), (13,17,19), ...?

- 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, ...
- (3,5), (5,7), (11,13), ..., (71,73), ..., (137,139), ...?
- (5,7,11), (7,11,13), (11,13,17), (13,17,19), ...?
- Yitang Zhang (2013): there are infinitely many pairs of primes that differ by at most 70 million

- 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, ...
- (3,5), (5,7), (11,13), ..., (71,73), ..., (137,139), ...?
- (5,7,11), (7,11,13), (11,13,17), (13,17,19), ...?
- Yitang Zhang (2013): there are infinitely many pairs of primes that differ by at most 70 million
- Toy examples of a beautiful result of Maynard:

- 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, ...
- (3,5), (5,7), (11,13), ..., (71,73), ..., (137,139), ...?
- (5,7,11), (7,11,13), (11,13,17), (13,17,19), ...?
- Yitang Zhang (2013): there are infinitely many pairs of primes that differ by at most 70 million
- Toy examples of a beautiful result of Maynard:
 - can replace 70 million by 246

- 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, ...
- (3,5), (5,7), (11,13), ..., (71,73), ..., (137,139), ...?
- (5,7,11), (7,11,13), (11,13,17), (13,17,19), ...?
- Yitang Zhang (2013): there are infinitely many pairs of primes that differ by at most 70 million
- Toy examples of a beautiful result of Maynard:
 - can replace 70 million by 246
 - there are infinitely many triples of primes within 433992 of each other.

DIOPHANTINE APPROXIMATION

• The resolution of the Duffin-Schaeffer conjecture by Koukoulopoulos and Maynard.

DIOPHANTINE APPROXIMATION

- The resolution of the <u>Duffin-Schaeffer conjecture</u> by Koukoulopoulos and Maynard.
- How well can we approximate real numbers by rational ones?

DIOPHANTINE APPROXIMATION

- The resolution of the <u>Duffin-Schaeffer conjecture</u> by Koukoulopoulos and Maynard.
- How well can we approximate real numbers by rational ones?
- Theorem (Dirichlet): If x ∈ ℝ\Q, then |x − a/q| < q⁻² for infinitely many pairs (a, q) ∈ ℤ × ℕ.

• It is very difficult to determine Diophantine properties of *individual* numbers

- It is very difficult to determine Diophantine properties of *individual* numbers
- μ(x) := sup{v > 0 : 0 < |x − a/q| <
 q^{-v} for infinitely many pairs (a, q) ∈ ℤ × ℕ}.

• It is very difficult to determine Diophantine properties of *individual* numbers

• Roth: $\mu(x) = 2$ for algebraic x

• It is very difficult to determine Diophantine properties of *individual* numbers

•
$$\mu(x) := \sup\{v > 0 : 0 < |x - a/q| < q^{-v}$$
 for infinitely many pairs $(a, q) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{N}\}.$

• Roth:
$$\mu(x) = 2$$
 for algebraic x

• $\mu(\pi) = ?$

Sparsity

• Another difficult problem is to sample the denominators in special sets

Sparsity

- Another difficult problem is to sample the denominators in special sets
- Theorem (Matömaki). Let x be an irrational number and let ε > 0. Then there are infinitely many integers a and prime numbers p such that |x − a/p| < p^{-4/3+ε}.

Sparsity

- Another difficult problem is to sample the denominators in special sets
- Theorem (Matömaki). Let x be an irrational number and let ε > 0. Then there are infinitely many integers a and prime numbers p such that |x − a/p| < p^{-4/3+ε}.
- The conjectured correct exponent is 2.

• It may be more productive to characterize Diophantine properties probabilistically

- It may be more productive to characterize Diophantine properties probabilistically
- "Metric" Diophantine approximation

- It may be more productive to characterize Diophantine properties probabilistically
- "Metric" Diophantine approximation
- A := {x ∈ [0,1] : |x − a/q| < ψ(q) for infinitely many pairs (a, q) ∈ ℤ × ℕ}

- It may be more productive to characterize Diophantine properties probabilistically
- "Metric" Diophantine approximation
- A := {x ∈ [0,1] : |x − a/q| < ψ(q) for infinitely many pairs (a, q) ∈ ℤ × ℕ}
- Theorem (Khintchine):
 - If \$\sum_q q \psi(q) < \infty\$ then \$Leb(A) = 0\$.
 If \$\sum_q q \psi(q) = \infty\$ and \$q^2 \psi(q)\$ is decreasing, then \$Leb(A) = 1\$.

BOREL CANTELLI LEMMA

• $A_q = \{x \in [0,1]: \text{ there is } a \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ such that } |x - a/q| < \psi(q)\}.$

BOREL CANTELLI LEMMA

• $A_q = \{x \in [0,1]: \text{ there is } a \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ such that } |x - a/q| < \psi(q)\}.$

• So
$$A_q = [0,1] \cap \bigcup_{0 \le a \le q} \left(\frac{a}{q} - \psi(q), \frac{a}{q} + \psi(q) \right)$$

BOREL CANTELLI LEMMA

• $A_q = \{x \in [0,1]: \text{ there is } a \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ such that } |x - a/q| < \psi(q)\}.$

• So
$$A_q = [0,1] \cap \bigcup_{0 \le a \le q} \left(rac{a}{q} - \psi(q), rac{a}{q} + \psi(q)
ight)$$

• And $A = \{x \in [0, 1] : x \in A_q \text{ for infinitely many } q\} = \lim \sup_{q \to \infty} A_q.$

Borel Cantelli Lemma

• $A_q = \{x \in [0,1]: \text{ there is } a \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ such that } |x - a/q| < \psi(q)\}.$

• So
$$A_q = [0,1] \cap igcup_{0 \leq a \leq q} \left(rac{a}{q} - \psi(q), rac{a}{q} + \psi(q)
ight)$$

• And
$$A = \{x \in [0, 1] : x \in A_q \text{ for infinitely many } q\} = \lim_{q \to \infty} A_q.$$

- Let (X, B, μ) be a probability space, let A_1, A_2, \ldots be measurable sets, and let $A = \limsup_{n \to \infty} A_n$. Then
 - (The first Borel–Cantelli lemma) If $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n) < \infty$ then $\mu(A) = 0$
 - (The second Borel–Cantelli lemma) If $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu(A_n) = \infty$ and A_1, A_2, \ldots are pairwise independent, then $\mu(A) = 1$.

One applies Borel-Cantelli to [0, 1] equipped with Lebesgue measure. We have μ(A_q) = 2qψ(q).

- One applies Borel-Cantelli to [0, 1] equipped with Lebesgue measure. We have μ(A_q) = 2qψ(q).
- The convergence case follows directly

- One applies Borel-Cantelli to [0, 1] equipped with Lebesgue measure. We have μ(A_q) = 2qψ(q).
- The convergence case follows directly
- The second BC lemma cannot be used directly because the sets are not pairwise independent

- One applies Borel-Cantelli to [0, 1] equipped with Lebesgue measure. We have μ(A_q) = 2qψ(q).
- The convergence case follows directly
- The second BC lemma cannot be used directly because the sets are not pairwise independent
- One instead uses an enhanced version which permits the use of "independence on average"

ASIDE: DYNAMICS

• Many Diophantine properties admit interpretations in terms of flows on homogeneous spaces

ASIDE: DYNAMICS

- Many Diophantine properties admit interpretations in terms of flows on homogeneous spaces
- Khintchine's theorem translates to cusp excursions of the geodesic flow on the modular surface

ASIDE: DYNAMICS

- Many Diophantine properties admit interpretations in terms of flows on homogeneous spaces
- Khintchine's theorem translates to cusp excursions of the geodesic flow on the modular surface
- In this interpretation, the mixing of the geodesic flow provides independence on average

• Can the monotonicity condition in Khintchine's theorem be dropped?

- Can the monotonicity condition in Khintchine's theorem be dropped?
- No. One can create dependencies using redundancies in denominators

- Can the monotonicity condition in Khintchine's theorem be dropped?
- No. One can create dependencies using redundancies in denominators
- An explicit example was given by Duffin and Schaeffer in 1941

- Can the monotonicity condition in Khintchine's theorem be dropped?
- No. One can create dependencies using redundancies in denominators
- An explicit example was given by Duffin and Schaeffer in 1941
- Namely, they gave an example of ψ such that $\sum_{q=1}^{\infty} q\psi(q) = \infty$ but $\mu(A) = 0$

THE CONJECTURE

 A^{*} := {x ∈ [0,1] : |x − a/q| < ψ(q) for infinitely many reduced fractions a/q}

THE CONJECTURE

- A^{*} := {x ∈ [0,1] : |x − a/q| < ψ(q) for infinitely many reduced fractions a/q}
- As before, A^* is the limsup of sets A_q^* which have measure $2\phi(q)\psi(q)$

THE CONJECTURE

- A^{*} := {x ∈ [0,1] : |x − a/q| < ψ(q) for infinitely many reduced fractions a/q}
- As before, A^* is the limsup of sets A_q^* which have measure $2\phi(q)\psi(q)$
- Conjecture (Duffin-Schaeffer, 1941) proved by Koukoulopoulos and Maynard in 2020.

• If
$$\sum_{q} \phi(q)\psi(q) < \infty$$
 then $\operatorname{Leb}(A^*) = 0$.
• If $\sum_{q} \phi(q)\psi(q) = \infty$ then $\operatorname{Leb}(A^*) = 1$.

• $\limsup_{Q \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{q \leq Q} \phi(q) \psi(q)}{\sum_{q \leq Q} q \psi(q)} > 0.$

•
$$\limsup_{Q \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{q \leq Q} \phi(q)\psi(q)}{\sum_{q \leq Q} q\psi(q)} > 0.$$

• This settles the conjecture when $\psi(q)$ is supported on integers without too many small prime factors.

•
$$\limsup_{Q \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{q \le Q} \phi(q) \psi(q)}{\sum_{q \le Q} q \psi(q)} > 0.$$

- This settles the conjecture when $\psi(q)$ is supported on integers without too many small prime factors.
- For almost all x ∈ ℝ, there are infinitely many reduced fractions a/p such that p is prime, and |x − a/p| < p⁻².

•
$$\limsup_{Q \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{q \leq Q} \phi(q) \psi(q)}{\sum_{q \leq Q} q \psi(q)} > 0.$$

- This settles the conjecture when $\psi(q)$ is supported on integers without too many small prime factors.
- For almost all x ∈ ℝ, there are infinitely many reduced fractions a/p such that p is prime, and |x − a/p| < p⁻².
- Theorem (Gallagher): $\mu(A^*) \in \{0, 1\}$.

•
$$\limsup_{Q \to \infty} \frac{\sum_{q \leq Q} \phi(q)\psi(q)}{\sum_{q \leq Q} q\psi(q)} > 0.$$

- This settles the conjecture when $\psi(q)$ is supported on integers without too many small prime factors.
- For almost all x ∈ ℝ, there are infinitely many reduced fractions a/p such that p is prime, and |x − a/p| < p⁻².
- Theorem (Gallagher): $\mu(A^*) \in \{0,1\}$.
- The proof uses Birkhoff's ergodic theorem applied to multiplication by 2 map on the circle.

• Theorem (Erdös, Vaaler): The Duffin–Schaeffer conjecture is true for all functions $\psi(q) \leq 1/q^2$

- Theorem (Erdös, Vaaler): The Duffin–Schaeffer conjecture is true for all functions $\psi(q) \leq 1/q^2$
- The higher dimensional analogue of the Duffin-Schaeffer conjecture is much easier and was proved by Pollington and Vaughan in 1990.

- Theorem (Erdös, Vaaler): The Duffin–Schaeffer conjecture is true for all functions $\psi(q) \leq 1/q^2$
- The higher dimensional analogue of the Duffin-Schaeffer conjecture is much easier and was proved by Pollington and Vaughan in 1990.
- Since $\sum_{q} \phi(q) \psi(q) = \infty$, $\phi(q) \leq q$, we have that $\sum_{S} 1/q = \infty$

- Theorem (Erdös, Vaaler): The Duffin–Schaeffer conjecture is true for all functions $\psi(q) \leq 1/q^2$
- The higher dimensional analogue of the Duffin-Schaeffer conjecture is much easier and was proved by Pollington and Vaughan in 1990.
- Since $\sum_{q} \phi(q) \psi(q) = \infty$, $\phi(q) \leq q$, we have that $\sum_{S} 1/q = \infty$
- Where $S = \{q : \psi(q) > 0\}.$

- Theorem (Erdös, Vaaler): The Duffin–Schaeffer conjecture is true for all functions $\psi(q) \leq 1/q^2$
- The higher dimensional analogue of the Duffin-Schaeffer conjecture is much easier and was proved by Pollington and Vaughan in 1990.
- Since $\sum_{q} \phi(q) \psi(q) = \infty$, $\phi(q) \leq q$, we have that $\sum_{S} 1/q = \infty$
- Where $S = \{q : \psi(q) > 0\}.$
- So S has to be somewhat dense.

• Let q, r be two distinct integers > 2, let $\psi(q), \psi(r) > 0$, and let $M(q, r) = 2max\{\psi(q), \psi(r)\} \operatorname{lcm}[q, r]$. If $M(q, r) \le 1$, then $A_{\alpha}^* \cap A_{\alpha}^* = \emptyset$. Otherwise,



• Let q, r be two distinct integers > 2, let $\psi(q), \psi(r) > 0$, and let $M(q, r) = 2max\{\psi(q), \psi(r)\} \operatorname{lcm}[q, r]$. If $M(q, r) \leq 1$, then $A_q^* \cap A_r^* = \emptyset$. Otherwise,

$$\mu(A_q^* \cap A_r^*) \ll \phi(q)\psi(q)\phi(r)\psi(r) \exp\left(\sum_{\substack{p \mid qr/gcd(q,r)\\ p > M(q,r)}} \frac{1}{p}\right)$$

 Model Problem. Let D > 1 and δ ∈ (0, 1], and let
 S ⊂ [Q, 2Q] ∩ ℤ be a set of δQ/D elements such that there
 are > δ#S² pairs (q, r) ∈ S × S with gcd(q, r) > D. Must
 there be an integer d > D that divides ≫ δ100Q/D elements
 of S? Model Problem. Let D > 1 and δ ∈ (0, 1], and let
 S ⊂ [Q, 2Q] ∩ ℤ be a set of δQ/D elements such that there
 are > δ#S² pairs (q, r) ∈ S × S with gcd(q, r) > D. Must
 there be an integer d > D that divides ≫ δ100Q/D elements
 of S?

- Model Problem. Let D > 1 and δ ∈ (0, 1], and let
 S ⊂ [Q, 2Q] ∩ Z be a set of δQ/D elements such that there are > δ#S² pairs (q, r) ∈ S × S with gcd(q, r) > D. Must there be an integer d > D that divides ≫ δ100Q/D elements of S?
- A key innovation is the concept of a GCD graph

- Model Problem. Let D > 1 and δ ∈ (0, 1], and let
 S ⊂ [Q, 2Q] ∩ Z be a set of δQ/D elements such that there
 are > δ#S² pairs (q, r) ∈ S × S with gcd(q, r) > D. Must
 there be an integer d > D that divides ≫ δ100Q/D elements
 of S?
- A key innovation is the concept of a GCD graph
- An iterative Compression Algorithm inspired by Erdös-Ko-Rado and Dyson.

Thank You!