

These notes were taken by A. Venkatesh and the speaker (B. Green) does not bear any responsibilities for errors contained herein.

**Introduction.**

**Definition 1.** Let  $G$  be an  $s$ -step nilpotent Lie group, connected and simply connected, i.e. the lower central series

$$G = G_0 \supset G_1 \supset G_2 = [G, G] \supset G_3 = [G, [G, G]] \supset \dots G_s = \{\text{id}\}.$$

**Example 1.**

$$(1) \quad G = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \mathbb{R} & \mathbb{R} \\ 0 & 1 & \mathbb{R} \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

is 3-step nilpotent;  $\mathbb{R}^d$  is 1-step nilpotent.

Let  $\Gamma$  be a discrete cocompact subgroup of  $G$ ; in the example (1) above  $\Gamma$  can be taken to be matrices with integral entries. Topologically, in this instance,  $G/\Gamma$  is  $[0, 1]^3$  with the faces identified, and  $G$  acts by right multiplication.

**Definition 2.** A nilsequence is a function on  $\mathbb{Z}$  of the form  $n \mapsto F(g^n \Gamma)$  and  $F : G/\Gamma \rightarrow [-1, 1]$  is nice-ish<sup>1</sup> function.

Why would we consider this? In joint work with Terry Tao, we try to count configurations of primes. For example, we should like to have an asymptotic for

$$(2) \quad \sum_{\underline{n} \in K} \Lambda(\psi_1(\underline{n})) \dots \Lambda(\psi_t(\underline{n})),$$

where  $\Lambda$  is the van Mangoldt function;  $\psi_i : \mathbb{Z}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  are affine linear forms, and  $\underline{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^d$ ;  $K$  is a “nice” large domain, e.g.  $K \subset [-N, N]^d$ . This formalism includes, for example, counting the number of arithmetic progressions of some fixed length.

Hardy and Littlewood already formulated a conjecture concerning the asymptotic of (2), which took into account “local obstructions”, e.g.  $\psi_1$  and  $\psi_2$  should not always have opposite parity; or (archimedean obstruction)  $\psi_j$  should take positive values on the set  $K$ . More precisely,

$$(3) \quad (2) = \beta_\infty \prod_p \beta_p + o(N^d),$$

where

$$\beta_\infty = \text{vol}(K \cap (\psi_1, \dots, \psi_j)^{-1}(\mathbb{R}_+)), \beta_p = p^{-d} \sum_{\underline{n} \in (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^d} \prod_{j=1}^t \Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}}(\psi_j(\underline{n})),$$

where  $\Lambda_{\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}}(n) = \begin{cases} 0, & p \nmid n. \\ \frac{p}{p-1}, & \text{else} \end{cases}$  is a local analog of the von Mangoldt function. For example,

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \leq N} \Lambda(n) \Lambda(n+2) \sim 2 \prod_{p \geq 3} (1 - (p-1)^{-2})$$

<sup>1</sup>Lipschitz, or continuous...

**Theorem 1.** (Green-Tao, 2006). Suppose the system  $(\psi_j)$  has complexity  $s$ . Assume also that:

- $GI(s)$  – inverse conjectures for Gowers norms, see below;
- $MN(s)$  – Möbius-Nilsequences conjectures, see below.

Then the Hardy-Littlewood conjecture is true.

Known cases of the conjectures.:  $GI(1), GI(2)$ ; finite field model (Tao-Ziegler, very recent!);  $MN(s)$ , all  $s$ .

**Some ideas in the proof of the Theorem.** We consider the multilinear functional:

$$T(f_1, \dots, f_t) = N^{-d} \sum_{\underline{n}} \prod_{j=1}^t f_j(\psi_j(\underline{n}))$$

Here  $f_i$  are functions on  $\mathbb{Z}$ ; (1) is the special case with  $f_j$  all equal to the von-Mangoldt function.

**Convention:** Where not stated, sums over  $\underline{n}$  range over  $[1, N]^d$ , and integer sums range over  $[1, N]$ .

Now, one splits  $\Lambda = \Lambda^\sharp + \Lambda^\flat$ ; here, for instance, we could obtain  $\Lambda^\sharp$  by retaining all  $d \leq R$  in the expression  $\sum \mu(d) \log(n/d)$ ; here  $R \sim N^{0.0001}$ , where 0.0001 depends on the forms  $\psi_t$ . One may split, correspondingly,

$$T(\Lambda, \dots, \Lambda) = T(\Lambda^\sharp, \dots, \Lambda^\sharp) + (2^t - 1 \text{ other terms}),$$

The first term, which is roughly the analog of the “major arcs” in the Hardy-Littlewood method, contributes the main term. It remains to show the other terms are small; the hardest case is  $T(\Lambda^\flat, \dots, \Lambda^\flat)$ .

*Aside: the Gowers norms.* .

Suppose  $|f_i| \leq 1$  (less would be fine!). In that case, we have:

$$T(f_1, \dots, f_t) = \frac{1}{N^d} \sum_{\underline{n} \in [N]^d} \prod_{j=1}^t f_j(\psi_j(\underline{n})),$$

satisfies (generalized von-Neumann = many applications of Cauchy-Schwarz):

$$|T(f_1, \dots, f_t)| \leq \|f_i\|_{U^{s+1}}$$

for any  $i$ , where  $s$  is the complexity of the system of forms. The first norms are defined thus:

$$(4) \quad \|f\|_{U^2}^4 = \frac{1}{N^3} \sum_{x, h_1, h_2} f(x) \overline{f(x+h_1)} \overline{f(x+h_2)} f(x+h_1+h_2),$$

$$(5) \quad \|f\|_{U^3}^8 = \frac{1}{N^4} \left( \sum_{x, h_1, h_2, h_3} f(x) \dots \overline{f(x+h_1+h_2+h_3)} \right).$$

Now, as remarked above, it suffices to control the Gowers norms  $\|\Lambda^\flat, \dots, \Lambda^\flat\|_{U^{s+1}} = o(1)$ . Via the expression  $\Lambda^\flat = \sum_{d \geq R, d|n} \mu(d) \log(n/d)$ , this reduces, in substance, to verifying:

$$(6) \quad \|\mu\|_{U^s} = o(1).$$

---

<sup>2</sup>Remark: this uses a finite-field analogue of the correspondence principle!

*The inverse conjectures.*

**Conjecture 1.** *Let  $f : \{1, \dots, N\} \rightarrow [-1, 1]$ , where  $\|f\|_{U^{s+1}} \geq \delta$ . Then, there exists an  $s$ -step nilsequence,  $n \mapsto F(g^n \Gamma)$  such that  $\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \leq N} f(n) f(g^n \Gamma) \right| \geq \delta/2$ , where  $\|F\|_{Lip}, \dim(G/\Gamma) = O_\delta(1)$ .*

**Example 2.** *If  $G/\Gamma = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ , a corresponding sequence would be  $n \mapsto e^{in\theta}$ .*

Why this conjecture?

- (1) It is necessary: if  $\frac{1}{N} \sum_n f(n) F(g^n \Gamma) \geq \delta/2$ , then  $\|f\|_{U^{s+1}} \geq \delta^c$ .
- (2) Ergodic theorists (Host and Kra) have proved an ergodic analogue.

*The MN conjecture.* It asserts that  $\left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N \mu(n) F(g^n \Gamma) \right| \ll_A \log^{-A} N$ . (The power of log is necessary;  $o(1)$  would not suffice for the application.)

**Nilpotence and parallelograms.** Due to Host and Kra; I call it the ‘‘Rubik’s cube argument.’’

In the definition of Gowers norms we have ‘‘parallepipeds’’, e.g.

$$(n, n + h_1, n + h_2, \dots, n + h_1 + h_2 + h_3).$$

*Beautiful picture which could not be reproduced due to limitations of the scribe.*

Take a set  $X$ , and suppose that  $G$  acts on  $X$ ; we suppose that  $X$  has a notion of ‘‘three-dimensional parallepipeds,’’ i.e.  $P \subset X^8$ . We suppose that 7 vertices of a parallepiped determine the remaining one.

*We should like,* if  $P$  is a parallepiped with ‘‘faces’’  $F, F'$  (both collections of four elements), then also  $(gF, F')$  is a parallepiped, i.e.  $(g, g, g, g, 1, 1, 1, 1)$  preserves  $P$ ; similarly,  $(h, h, 1, 1, h, h, 1, 1)$  preserves  $P$ . The commutator of these two, equals  $([g, h], [g, h], 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)$ ; it must also preserve  $P$ .

Proceeding once more, we arrive at the following conclusion:

- (7) For  $g_1, g_2, g_3 \in G$ ,  $([g_1, [g_2, g_3]], 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1)$  preserves  $P$ .

Since the latter seven vertices determine the first, it follows that  $[g_1, [g_2, g_3]] = 1$ . Thus the automorphism group of the parallepiped structure must be nilpotent.