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Abstract. We study rather general multiple zeta-functions whose denominators are given by polynomials. The main aim is to prove explicit formulas for the values of those multiple zeta-functions at non-positive integer points. We first treat the case when the polynomials are power sums, and observe that some “trivial zeros” exist. We also prove that special values are sometimes transcendental. Then we proceed to the general case, and show an explicit expression of special values at non-positive integer points which involves certain period integrals. We give examples of transcendental values of those special values or period integrals. We also mention certain relations among Bernoulli numbers which can be deduced from our explicit formulas. Our proof of explicit formulas are based on the Euler-Maclaurin summation formula, Mahler’s theorem, and a Raabe-type lemma due to Friedman and Pereira.
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1 Introduction

Denote by \( \mathbb{N}, \mathbb{N}_0, \mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C} \) the set of positive integers, non-negative integers, rational integers, rational numbers, real numbers, and complex numbers, respectively.

Let \( \gamma = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n \) and \( b = (b_1, \ldots, b_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n \) be two vectors of complex parameters such that \( \Re(\gamma_j) > 0 \) and \( \Re(b_j) > -\Re(\gamma_1) \) for all \( j = 1, \ldots, n \). The generalized Euler-Zagier multiple zeta-function, introduced in \[16\], is defined for \( n \)-tuples
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of complex variables \( s = (s_1, \ldots, s_n) \) by

\[
\zeta_n(s; \gamma; b) := \sum_{m_1 \geq 1} \cdots \sum_{m_n \geq 0} \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^{n} (\gamma_1 m_1 + \cdots + \gamma_j m_j + b_j)^{s_j}}.
\]

(1)

If \( b_1 = 0 \) and \( b_j = \gamma_2 + \cdots + \gamma_j \) for all \( j = 2, \ldots, n \) then \( \zeta_n(s; \gamma; b) \) coincides with the multiple zeta-function \( \zeta_n(s; \gamma) \) considered in [12]. If in addition \( \gamma_j = 1 \) for all \( j = 1, \ldots, n \), then \( \zeta_n(s; \gamma; b) \) coincides with the classical Euler-Zagier multiple zeta-function

\[
\sum_{1 \leq m_1 < m_2 < \cdots < m_n \leq m_1} \frac{1}{m_1^{s_1} \cdots m_n^{s_n}}.
\]

The generalized Euler-Zagier multiple zeta-function \( \zeta_n(s; \gamma; b) \) converges absolutely in the domain

\[
\mathcal{D}_n := \{ s = (s_1, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n | \Re(s_j + \cdots + s_n) > n + 1 - j \ (1 \leq j \leq n) \},
\]

and has the meromorphic continuation to the whole complex space \( \mathbb{C}^n \) whose poles are located in the union of the hyperplanes

\[
s_j + \cdots + s_n = (n + 1 - j) - k_j \ (1 \leq j \leq n, k_1, \ldots, k_n \in \mathbb{N}_0).
\]

Moreover it is known that for \( n \geq 2 \), almost all non-positive integer points lie on the singular locus above and are point of indeterminacy. In [13], Y. Komori proved that for any \( N = (N_1, \ldots, N_n) \in \mathbb{N}_0^n \) and \( \theta = (\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n \) such that \( \theta_j + \cdots + \theta_n \neq 0 \) for all \( j = 1, \ldots, n \), the limit

\[
\zeta^\theta_n(-N; \gamma; b) := \lim_{t \to 0} \zeta_n(-N + t\theta; \gamma; b)
\]

exists and express this limit in term of \( N, \theta \) and generalized Bernoulli numbers defined implicitly as coefficients of some multiple series.

In our recent work [9], we proved a closed explicit formula for \( \zeta^\theta_n(-N; \gamma; b) \) in terms of \( N, \theta \) and only classical Bernoulli numbers \( B_n \) defined by

\[
\frac{X}{e^X - 1} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{B_n}{n!} X^n.
\]

(4)

We also gave several results on the values of its partially twisted analogues in [10].

The aim of the present paper is to consider the case of multiple Dirichlet series whose denominator is given by polynomials of any degree. A natural non-linear extension of the Euler-Zagier multiple zeta-function is the series defined for \( n \)–tuples of complex variables \( s = (s_1, \ldots, s_n) \) by

\[
\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(s) := \sum_{m_1, \ldots, m_n \geq 1} \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^{n} (\gamma_1 m_1^{d_1} + \cdots + \gamma_j m_j^{d_j})^{s_j}}.
\]

(5)
We begin with the discussion of this type of series, because of the following two reasons. First, this series is “not so far” from the Euler-Zagier multiple zeta-function (1), so we can find several common features with (1), or even with the Riemann zeta-function (such as trivial zeros). Secondly, on the other hand, some properties different from the linear case already appear in this special type of non-linear case (such as the transcendency of special values). In Section 2 we will state the main results on (5) (Proposition 1, Theorem 1, Theorem 2 and corollaries). We will prove Proposition 1 in Section 4, Theorem 1 and its corollaries in Section 5, and then Theorem 2 in Section 6.

Then we proceed to the discussion of more general multiple series with polynomial denominators. Consider for any \( j = 1, \ldots, n \) a polynomial \( P_j \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \ldots, X_j] \) in \( j \) variables and assume that for all \( j = 1, \ldots, n \),

\[
P_j(x_1, \ldots, x_j) \to \infty \text{ as } x_1 + \cdots + x_j \to \infty, \quad (x = (x_1, \ldots, x_j) \in [1, \infty)^j). \tag{6}
\]

We assume here for simplicity that for all \( j = 1, \ldots, n \),

\[
P_j(x_1, \ldots, x_j) > 0 \quad \text{for all } (x_1, \ldots, x_j) \in [1, \infty)^j, \tag{7}
\]

and define the multiple zeta-function with polynomial denominators for \( n \)-tuples of complex variables \( s = (s_1, \ldots, s_n) \) by

\[
\zeta_n(s; P) := \sum_{m_1, \ldots, m_n \geq 1} \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^{n} P_j(m_1, \ldots, m_j)^{s_j}}, \tag{8}
\]

where \( P = (P_1, \ldots, P_n) \).

By using Lemma 1 of [8], the condition (6) implies that for all \( j = 1, \ldots, n \), there exist two constants \( \delta_j = \delta_j(P_j) > 0 \) and \( C_j = C_j(P_j) > 0 \) such that

\[
P_j(x_1, \ldots, x_j) \geq C_j (x_1 + \cdots + x_j)^{\delta_j} \quad \text{for all } x = (x_1, \ldots, x_j) \in [1, \infty)^j. \tag{9}
\]

Therefore it follows that \( \zeta_n(s; P) \) converges absolutely in the domain

\[
\mathcal{D}_n(P) := \{ s = (s_1, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n \mid \Re\left(\sum_{i=j}^{n} \delta_i s_i\right) > n - j \quad \text{for all } j = 1, \ldots, n\}. \tag{10}
\]

In fact, (9) implies

\[
\zeta_n(s; P) \ll \sum_{m_1, \ldots, m_n \geq 1} \prod_{j=1}^{n} (m_1 + \cdots + m_j)^{-\delta_j \Re s_j},
\]

and the right-hand side is convergent in the region \( \mathcal{D}_n(P) \) (see [17 Theorem 3]).
Assume that for any \( j = 1, \ldots, n \), \( P_j \) satisfies the assumption

\[(H_0S) \quad \frac{\partial^\alpha P_j}{P_j} \text{ is bounded in } [1, \infty)^j \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^j,\]

where \( \partial^\alpha = \partial^{\alpha_1} \cdots \partial^{\alpha_j} \) for \( \alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_j) \). The method of [7] and [8] (see Remark 2 in page 74 of [7]) implies that \( s \mapsto \zeta_n(s; P) \) has a meromorphic continuation to the whole space \( \mathbb{C}^n \) and that there exists a finite set \( I(P) \subset \mathbb{N}_0^n \) and nonnegative integers \( d_\alpha (\alpha \in I(P)) \) such that the possible poles are located in the set

\[P(P) := \bigcup_{\alpha \in I(P)} \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} \{ s = (s_1, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n \mid \langle s, \alpha \rangle = d_\alpha - k \}.\]

Our main result on [8] (Theorem 3) shows that if \( P_j \) satisfies the above \((H_0S)\) for all \( j = 1, \ldots, n - 1 \) and if \( P_n \) is elliptic homogeneous then for any \( \mathbf{N} = (N_1, \ldots, N_n) \in \mathbb{N}_0^n \), the limit

\[\zeta_n^{e_n}(-\mathbf{N}; P) := \lim_{t \to 0} \zeta_n(-\mathbf{N} + te_n; P) = \lim_{t \to 0} \zeta_n \left( (-N_1, \ldots, -N_{n-1}, -N_n + t); P \right),\]

where \( e_n = (0, \ldots, 0, 1) \), exists and can be written as a closed formula in terms of \( \mathbf{N} \), the classical Bernoulli numbers and a finite number of “periods” (in the sense of Kontsevich-Zagier [14]) which depend explicitly on the polynomials \( P_1, \ldots, P_n \). These periods can be interpreted as multivariate analogs of the values of the Euler gamma function at rational numbers.

We will state Theorem 3 and its corollary in Section 3. In order to prove Theorem 3, we will first evaluate the values of Mahler’s series at non-positive integers (Theorem 4) in Section 7 and then prove Theorem 3 in Section 8.

The important issue here is that these periods are not necessary rational numbers and therefore (in contrast with the linear case) the regularized values \( \zeta_n^{e_n}(-\mathbf{N}; P) \) are not necessary in the field generated over \( \mathbb{Q} \) by the coefficients of the polynomials \( P_j \) and the direction \( e_n \). Some examples are given in Section 9.

The method developed in Section 7 is influenced by the idea of the work of Friedman and Pereira [11], so there is some common feature shared with our previous work [9]. However, the method here is not a direct generalization of the method in [9]. As a consequence, the formulas obtained in [9] and in the present paper do not coincide, and so, comparing those two formulas we can obtain certain non-trivial relations among Bernoulli numbers. This point will be discussed in the last section.

In the following sections, the empty sum is to be understood as zero.
2 Values of $\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(s)$ at $n$-tuples of non-positive integers

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $d = (d_1, \ldots, d_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$ and $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n$ be such that $\Re(\gamma_j) > 0$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, n$.

In this section we state the results for the series $\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(s)$ defined by \ref{eq:zetadgamma}. The following result gives some basic properties of $\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(s)$.

**Proposition 1.** 1. The multiple zeta function $\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(s)$ converges absolutely and uniformly in any compact subset of the domain

$$D_{n,d}(0) := \{s = (s_1, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n \mid \Re(s_j + \cdots + s_n) > \frac{1}{d_j} + \cdots + \frac{1}{d_n} \ (1 \leq j \leq n)\},$$

2. $\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(s)$ has meromorphic continuation to the whole complex space $\mathbb{C}^n$ whose possible singularities are located on the union of the hyperplanes

$$s_j + \cdots + s_n = \frac{1}{d_j} + \frac{\varepsilon_{j+1}}{d_{j+1}} + \cdots + \frac{\varepsilon_n}{d_n} - k_j \ (1 \leq j \leq n),$$

where $k_j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\varepsilon_{j+1}, \ldots, \varepsilon_n \in \{0, 1\}$.

3. Assume that for all $j = 1, \ldots, n$ and $\varepsilon_{j+1}, \ldots, \varepsilon_n \in \{0, 1\}$:

$$\frac{1}{d_j} + \sum_{k=j+1}^{n} \frac{\varepsilon_k}{d_k} \notin \mathbb{N}. \quad (11)$$

Then, for all $N = (N_1, \ldots, N_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$, $s = N$ is a regular point of $\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(s)$.

Point 3 of Proposition \ref{prop:zetadgamma} implies that under assumption \ref{eq:zetadgamma} the $n$–tuples of integers are regular point of $\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(s)$. This is an important feature different from the linear case.

Our following first main result gives a relation among those values at integer points.

**Theorem 1.** Let $n \geq 2$, $d = (d_1, \ldots, d_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$ and $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n$ be such that $\Re(\gamma_j) > 0$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, n$. Assume that the $d_j$’s satisfy the assumption \ref{eq:zetadgamma}. Then, for all $N = (N_1, \ldots, N_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ such that $N_n \leq 0$, we have

$$\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(N) = -\frac{1}{2} \zeta_{n-1,d',\gamma'}(N_1, \ldots, N_{n-2}, N_{n-1} + N_n)$$

$$- \sum_{1 \leq k \leq \lfloor (1 - d_n N_n) / 2 \rfloor} \frac{B_{2k}}{2k} \left( -\frac{N_n}{(2k - 1)/d_n} \right)^{(2k-1)/d_n}.$$
\[ \times \zeta_{n-1,d',\gamma'} \left( N_1, \ldots, N_{n-2}, N_{n-1} + N_n + \frac{2k-1}{d_n} \right), \quad (12) \]

where \( d' = (d_1, \ldots, d_{n-1}) \) and \( \gamma' = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_{n-1}) \).

Since \( d_n | (2k-1) \), we see that
\[ \left( N_1, \ldots, N_{n-2}, N_{n-1} + N_n + \frac{2k-1}{d_n} \right) \in (-N_0)^{n-1} \]
for \( N = (N_1, \ldots, N_n) \in (-N_0)^{n} \) and \( k \in \{1, \ldots, [(1 - d_n N_n)/2]\} \). Therefore, Theorem 1 gives a simple method to compute the values of \( \zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(N) \) \( (N \in (-N_0)^{n}) \) by induction on \( n \).

In particular, in some special cases, Theorem 1 gives simple closed forms of \( \zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(N) \), which we state as the following corollaries.

Let \( \zeta(s) \) be the Riemann zeta-function. It is well known that \( \zeta(-N) \in \mathbb{Q} \) for all \( N \in \mathbb{N}_0 \) and
\[ \zeta(0) = -\frac{1}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \zeta(-N) = 0 \text{ for all even positive integer } N. \quad (13) \]

With our notations here (see (5)) the property (13) can be reformulated as follows:
\[ \zeta_{1,2,1}(0) = -\frac{1}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad \zeta_{1,2,1}(-N) = 0 \text{ for all positive integer } N. \]

Our first corollary of Theorem 1 extends these properties to the multivariable setting as follows:

**Corollary 1.** Let \( n \in \mathbb{N}, \ d = (d_1, \ldots, d_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n \) and \( \gamma = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n \) be such that \( \Re(\gamma_j) > 0 \) for all \( j = 1, \ldots, n \). Assume that the \( d_j \)'s satisfy the assumption (11).

Then,
1. For all \( N = (N_1, \ldots, N_n) \in \mathbb{N}_0^n \), \( s = -N \) is a regular point of \( \zeta_{n,d,\gamma} \) and \( \zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(-N) \) lies in the field generated over \( \mathbb{Q} \) by the coefficients \( \gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n \);
2. If \( d_2, \ldots, d_n \) are even integers, then for all \( N = (N_1, \ldots, N_n) \in \mathbb{N}_0^n \),
\[ \zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(-N) = \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^{n-1} \gamma_1^{N_1} (-1)^d_1 N_1 \frac{B_{d_1,|N|+1}}{(d_1|N|+1)}; \]
3. In particular, if \( d_1, \ldots, d_n \) are even integers, then
\[ \zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(0_n) = \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^n, \]

where \( 0_n = (0, \ldots, 0) \in \mathbb{N}_0^n \), and
\[ \zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(-N) = 0 \text{ for all } N = (N_1, \ldots, N_n) \in \mathbb{N}_0^n \setminus \{0\}. \]
If $d_2, \ldots, d_n$ are not all even integers the expression of $\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}$ at $n$-tuples of non-positive integers are more complicated. However, we have the following partial result:

**Corollary 2.** Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $d = (d_1, \ldots, d_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$ and $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n$ be such that $\Re(\gamma_j) > 0$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, n$. Assume that the $d_j$s satisfy the assumption (11). Then

1. $\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(0_n) = \left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)^n$;

2. $\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(0_{n-1}, -1) = \left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)^{n-1} \left( (-1)^{d_1} B_{d_1+1} \gamma_1 - \sum_{j=2}^{n} \frac{B_{d_j+1}}{d_j+1} \gamma_j \right)$;

3. $\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(0_{n-1}, -2) = \left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)^{n-2} \sum_{k=2}^{n} \frac{B_{d_k+1}}{d_k+1} \gamma_k \left( (-1)^{d_1} B_{d_1+1} \gamma_1 - \sum_{j=2}^{k-1} \frac{B_{d_j+1}}{d_j+1} \gamma_j \right)$.

**Remark:** The values of $\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(0_{n-2}, -1, 0)$ and $\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(0_{n-2}, -2, 0)$ can also be computed by using points 2 and 3 and the formulas

$$\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(0_{n-2}, -\ell, 0) = -\frac{1}{2} \zeta_{n-1,d',\gamma'}(0_{n-2}, -\ell) \quad (\ell = 1, 2)$$

which immediately follows from (12).

The following corollary of Theorem 1 is more intriguing (and we hope also interesting). It gives a link between the values of Riemann zeta-function at (odd or even) positive integers and the values of a double zeta-function at mixed pairs of integers.

**Corollary 3.** Let $d_1 \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}$ and $d_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $\frac{1}{d_1} + \frac{1}{2d_2} \not\in \mathbb{N}$. Then, for all $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\zeta(d_1) = -2 \zeta_{2,(d_1,2d_2),(1,1)}(1 + N, -N).$$

**Remark:** Since $\zeta(d_1)$ is transcendental at least when $d_1$ is even, Corollary 3 especially implies that for $d$ satisfying the assumption (11), if the components of $N \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ are not all non-positive, the value $\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(N)$ is not necessary in the field generated over $\mathbb{Q}$ by the coefficients $\gamma_j$. This is contrary to the situation described in point 1 of Corollary 1.
The following result shows that if the assumption (11) does not hold, then even \( n \)-tuples of non-positive integers can lie on the singular locus of \( \zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(s) \). However the directional limits exist, and unlike the classical case, they can be highly transcendental!

**Theorem 2.** Let \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) be such that \( n \geq 3 \). Let \( \gamma = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n) \) be such that \( \Re \gamma_j > 0 \) for all \( j = 1, \ldots, n \). Let \( d = (d_1, \ldots, d_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n \). Assume that for \( j = 1, \ldots, n \) and \( \varepsilon_{j+1}, \ldots, \varepsilon_n \in \{0, 1\} \):

\[
\frac{1}{d_j} + \sum_{k=j+2}^n \frac{\varepsilon_k}{d_k} \in \mathbb{N} \quad \text{if and only if} \quad j = 2 \quad \text{and} \quad \varepsilon_3 = \cdots = \varepsilon_n = 1. \tag{14}
\]

Denote \( b := \sum_{k=2}^n d_k^{-1} \) (which is \( \in \mathbb{N} \) by (14)). Let \( N = (N_1, \ldots, N_n) \in \mathbb{N}_0^n \). Let \( \theta = (\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n \) be such that \( \theta_2 + \cdots + \theta_n \neq 0 \) and \( \theta_n \neq 0 \). Then, the directional limit \( \zeta_{n,d,\gamma}^\theta(-N) := \lim_{t \to 0, \, t \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}} \zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(-N + t\theta) \) exists and is given by

\[
\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}^\theta(-N) = C(N, d) \left( B_{d_1(|N|+b)+1} \left( \gamma_1 |N|+b \prod_{j=2}^n \gamma_j^{-1/d_j} \right) \left( \frac{\theta_n}{\theta_2 + \cdots + \theta_n} \right) \prod_{j=2}^n \Gamma \left( \frac{1}{d_j} \right) \right) + H_{n,d,\gamma}(N), \tag{15}
\]

where

\[
C(N, d) := \prod_{j=3}^n \left( \prod_{u=-N_{j-1}-\cdots-N_n}^{N_j-\cdots-N_n-1} \left( u - \sum_{k=j}^n \frac{1}{d_k} \right) \right) \times \frac{(-1)^{N_2+\cdots+N_{n-1}+b+d_1(|N|+b)N_n!}}{(N_2+\cdots+N_n+b!)(\prod_{j=2}^n d_j) (d_1(|N|+b)+1)} \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \{0\};
\]

\[
H_{n,d,\gamma}(N) := -\frac{1}{2} \zeta_{n-1,d',\gamma'}(-N_1, \ldots, -N_{n-2}, -N_n, -N_1 - N_n) - \sum_{d_n/2k=1}^{[(1+d_nN_n)/2]} B_{2k} \left( \frac{N_n}{(2k-1)/d_n} \right) \gamma_n^{(2k-1)/d_n} \times \zeta_{n-1,d',\gamma'}(-N_1, \ldots, -N_{n-2}, -N_n, -N_1 - N_n + (2k-1)/d_n) \in \mathbb{Q}(\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n),
\]

where \( d' := (d_1, \ldots, d_{n-1}) \) and \( \gamma' := (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_{n-1}) \).

**Remarks:**
1. The fact that $C(N, d) \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \{0\}$ follows from assumption (14), because (14) implies that $\sum_{k=j}^{n} d_k^{-1} \notin \mathbb{N}$ for $j \geq 3$. The fact that $H_{n,d,\gamma}(N) \in \mathbb{Q}(\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n)$ follows from point 1 of Corollary 3, since $d' = (d_1, \ldots, d_{n-1})$ satisfies $\frac{1}{d_j} + \sum_{k=j+1}^{n-1} d_k^{-1} \notin \mathbb{N}$ for $j \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}$ and $\varepsilon_{j+1}, \ldots, \varepsilon_{n-1} \in \{0, 1\}$.

2. If $d_1(|N| + b)$ is an odd integer, then $B_{d_1(|N| + b) + 1} \neq 0$, and hence Theorem 2 shows (because of the existence of the factor $\theta_n/(\theta_2 + \cdots + \theta_n)$) that $s = -N$ indeed lies on the singular locus of $\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(s)$ and is a point of indeterminacy.

It is to be stressed that Theorem 2 gives a link between the diophantine properties of the multiple zeta values of $\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}$ at $n$-tuples of non positive integers and the important problem in the transcendental theory concerning the diophantine properties of the values of Euler’s gamma function at rational points. In fact, $\Gamma(1/2) = \sqrt{\pi}$ is a transcendental number, and $\Gamma(1/3), \Gamma(1/4)$ and $\Gamma(1/6)$ are also transcendental (Chudnovsky [4, 5]; see also the introduction of [6]). Therefore we deduce immediately from Theorem 2 the following result. Let $\overline{Q}$ be the set of all algebraic numbers.

**Corollary 4.** Let $q \in \{2, 3, 4, 6\}$ and $d_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $d_1 > q$. Set $n = q + 1$ and $d = (d_1, q, \ldots, q) \in \mathbb{N}^n$. Let $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n) \in \overline{Q}^n$ be such that $\Re \gamma_j > 0$ $\forall j = 1, \ldots, n$. Let $\theta = (\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_n) \in \overline{Q}^n$ be such that $\theta_2 + \cdots + \theta_n \neq 0$ and $\theta_n \neq 0$. Then, for all $N = (N_1, \ldots, N_n) \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$ such that $d_1(|N| + b)$ is an odd integer,

$$
\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}^\theta(-N) = \zeta_{n,d,\gamma}^\theta(-N_1, \ldots, -N_n)
$$

is a transcendental number.

**Proof:** It is enough to check that under the conditions $d_1 > q$ and $n = q + 1$, $d = (d_1, q, \ldots, q)$ satisfies (14), and apply Chudnovsky’s result to the gamma factors on the right-hand side of (15). \hfill \Box

## 3 Values of $\zeta_n(s; P)$ at non-positive integers

Hereafter, for vectors $a = (a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ and $b = (b_1, \ldots, b_n)$ we write $|a| = a_1 + \cdots + a_n$, $a! = a_1! \cdots a_n!$, and $a^b = a_1^{b_1} \cdots a_n^{b_n}$. The inequality $a \leq b$ means $a_i \leq b_i$ for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Also we introduce the following notations. Let $n, d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $q, N \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

1. Define for any $\beta = (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n) \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$,

$$
I_N(\beta) := \{\alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d) \in \mathbb{N}_0^d; \sum_{k=1}^{d} k\alpha_k + |\beta| = dN + q + n\};
$$

2. Define for any $k = 1, \ldots, d$, $\Delta_k = \{\gamma = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n) \in \mathbb{N}_0^n; |\gamma| = k\}$, hence $|\Delta_k| = \binom{n+k-1}{n-1}$.
3. Define for any \( \alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_d) \in \mathbb{N}_0^d \),
\[
V(\alpha) := \left\{ u = (u_1, \ldots, u_d); \ u_k = (u_k, \gamma)_{\gamma \in \Delta_k^i} \in \mathbb{N}_0^{(n+k-1)}, \ |u_k| = \alpha_k \ (1 \leq k \leq d) \right\};
\]

4. Define for any \( u = (u_1, \ldots, u_d) \in \prod_{k=1}^d \mathbb{N}_0^{(n+k-1)} \),
\[
g(u) := (g_1(u), \ldots, g_n(u)) \text{ where } g_i(u) := \sum_{k=1}^d \sum_{\gamma \in \Delta_k^i} u_k \gamma_i \ (1 \leq i \leq n);
\]

5. \( \hat{y}(i) = (y_1, \ldots, y_{i-1}, 1, y_{i+1}, \ldots, y_n) \) for any \( y_1, \ldots, y_{i-1}, y_{i+1}, \ldots, y_n \) and any \( i = 1, \ldots, n; \)

6. For any polynomial \( P \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \ldots, X_n] \), any \( \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^d \), any \( u \in V(\alpha) \) and any \( i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \), we define the polynomial \( P_{\alpha,u} \) in \( n-1 \) variables \( y_1, \ldots, y_{i-1}, y_{i+1}, \ldots, y_n \) by
\[
P_{\alpha,u}(\hat{y}(i)) := \frac{\alpha!}{(\prod_{k=1}^d u_k!)} \prod_{k=1}^d \prod_{\gamma \in \Delta_k^i} \left( \frac{\partial^\gamma P(\hat{y}(i))}{\gamma!} \right)^{u_k \gamma}.
\]

For any elliptic and homogeneous polynomial \( P \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \ldots, X_n] \) of degree \( d \) and any polynomial \( Q \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \ldots, X_n] \) of degree \( q \), we define the following integrals, which are periods in the sense of Kontsevich-Zagier [14] when the coefficients of relevant polynomials are rational:

**Definition 1.** Let \( \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^d, u \in V(\alpha), \beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^n \) and \( i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \). The integral (period) \( K_i(P; Q; N; \alpha, u, \beta) \) is defined by
\[
K_i(P; Q; N; \alpha, u, \beta) := \int_{[0,1]^{n-1}} P(\hat{y}(i))^{N - |\alpha|} P_{\alpha,u}(\hat{y}(i)) (\partial^\beta Q(\hat{y}(i))) \prod_{k=1 \atop k \neq i}^n dy_k. \quad (16)
\]

With these notations, the main result in this section is the following:

**Theorem 3.** Consider a polynomial \( P_j \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \ldots, X_j] \) in \( j \) variables for any \( j = 1, \ldots, n \). Assume that the assumptions [12], [17] hold. Assume also that for all \( j = 1, \ldots, n - 1 \) the polynomial \( P_j \) satisfies the assumption \( (H_0S) \) and that the polynomial \( P_n \) is elliptic and homogeneous of degree \( d \geq 1 \). Denote by \( \zeta_n(s; P) \) the meromorphic continuation of
\[
s = (s_1, \ldots, s_n) \mapsto \sum_{m_1, \ldots, m_n \geq 1} \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^n P_j(m_1, \ldots, m_j)^{s_j}}
\]
\[
h_{\alpha}(s; P) := \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^n P_j(m_1, \ldots, m_j)^{s_j}}
\]

\[
\zeta_n(s; P) := \sum_{\alpha \neq 0} \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^n P_j(m_1, \ldots, m_j)^{s_j}}
\]

\[
\sum_{\alpha \neq 0} \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^n P_j(m_1, \ldots, m_j)^{s_j}}
\]

\[
\sum_{\alpha \neq 0} \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^n P_j(m_1, \ldots, m_j)^{s_j}}
\]
to the whole complex space $\mathbb{C}^n$. Then, for any $N = (N_1, \ldots, N_n) \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$, the limit
\[
\zeta_n^{e_n}(-N; P) := \lim_{t \in \mathbb{C}, t \to 0} \zeta_n(-N + te_n; P) = \lim_{t \in \mathbb{C}, t \to 0} \zeta_n((-N_1, \ldots, -N_{n-1}, -N_n + t); P)
\]
exists and is given by
\[
\zeta_n^{e_n}(-N; P) = \sum_{\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^d} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^d} \sum_{u \in V(\alpha)} \frac{(-1)^{|\alpha|}}{d! |\alpha|!} \prod_{i=1}^n K_i(P_n; Q_N; 0; \alpha, u, \beta) \prod_{i=1}^n \tilde{B}_{g_i(u) + \beta_i},
\]
where
1. $\tilde{B}_k := B_k$ (the classical Bernoulli number) for all $k \neq 1$ and $\tilde{B}_1 := -B_1 = \frac{1}{2}$,
2. $Q_N = \prod_{j=1}^n P_j(X_1, \ldots, X_j)^{N_j}$ and $q_N = \deg Q_N = \sum_{j=1}^n N_j \deg P_j$.

Remark. Recently some authors (such as [1]) prefer to define Bernoulli numbers in a slightly different way from (4), that is, by
\[
\frac{Xe^X}{e^X - 1} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{B}_n X^n.
\]
This $\tilde{B}_n$ is exactly the same as $\tilde{B}_n$ above.

An interesting illustration of Theorem 3 is given by its following corollary. Define the generalized gamma factor $G_{n-1}(m; \mu)$ by
\[
G_{n-1}(m; \mu) := \int_{(0,1)^{n-1}} \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{n-1} t_i^{\mu_i - 1} dt_1 \cdots dt_{n-1}}{(1 + t_1 + \cdots + t_{n-1})^m}
\]
for any $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and any $\mu = (\mu_1, \ldots, \mu_{n-1}) \in (0, \infty)^{n-1}$.

Corollary 5. Consider for any $j = 1, \ldots, n$ a polynomial $P_j \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \ldots, X_j]$ in $j$ variables. Assume that the assumptions (4), (7) hold. Assume also that for all $j = 1, \ldots, n - 1$ the polynomial $P_j$ satisfies the assumption $(H_0S)$ and that
\[
P_n = X_1^d + \cdots + X_n^d \quad \text{where} \quad d \geq 1.
\]
Then,
\[
\zeta_n^{e_n}(-N; P) = \sum_{\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^d} \sum_{\mu \in \mathbb{N}_0^d} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^d} \sum_{\gamma = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_d) \in (0, \mathbb{N})^d} \frac{(-1)^{|\alpha|} |\alpha|! (\beta_1)! \cdots (\beta_d)! \partial^\beta Q_N(0)}{d^n \beta! \prod_{k=1}^d \gamma_k!}.
\]
\[
\left[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} G_{n-1}(|\alpha|; \mu^i(\nu; \gamma)) \right] \times \prod_{i=1}^{n} B_{\beta_{i}-\nu_{i}+\sum_{k=1}^{n} k \gamma_{i}^{k}},
\]
where for any \( \nu = (\nu_1, \ldots, \nu_n) \in \mathbb{N}_0^n \) and any \( \gamma = (\gamma^1, \ldots, \gamma^d) \in (\mathbb{N}_0^d) \) with \( \gamma^k = (\gamma_1^k, \ldots, \gamma_n^k) \in \mathbb{N}_0^n \),
\[
\mu^i(\nu; \gamma) = (\mu_1^i(\nu; \gamma), \ldots, \mu_{i-1}^i(\nu; \gamma), \mu_{i+1}^i(\nu; \gamma), \ldots, \mu_n^i(\nu; \gamma))
\]
with \( \mu_j^i(\nu; \gamma) = \frac{1}{d} \left( 1 + \nu_j + \sum_{k=1}^{d} (d - k) \gamma_j^k \right) \).

4 Proof of Proposition \( \Box \)

4.1 Three elementary lemmas

The following three lemmas are elementary but useful for our proofs.

**Lemma 1.** Let \( d > 0 \). Let \( a, b \in \mathbb{C} \) be such that \( \Re a > 0 \) and \( \Re b > 0 \). Let \( s \in \mathbb{C} \) be such that \( \Re(s) > 1/d \). Then
\[
\int_0^\infty (b + ax^d)^{-s} \, dx = \frac{1}{d} \frac{\Gamma(s - 1/d) \Gamma(1/d)}{a^{1/d} b^{s-1/d} \Gamma(s)}.
\]

**Proof of Lemma 1.** Assume first that \( a, b \in (0, \infty) \). By using the change of variables \( x = (b/a)^{1/d}(t^{-1} - 1)^{1/d} \), we obtain that
\[
\int_0^\infty (b + ax^d)^{-s} \, dx = \frac{1}{db^{s-1/d}a^{1/d}} \int_0^1 (1-t)^{1/d-1} t^{s-1/d-1} \, dt
\]
\[
= \frac{B(1/d, s-1/d)}{db^{s-1/d}a^{1/d}} = \frac{\Gamma(s-1/d) \Gamma(1/d)}{db^{s-1/d}a^{1/d} \Gamma(s)}.
\]

By using in addition the fact that the function \( (a, b) \mapsto \int_0^\infty (b + ax^d)^{-s} \, dx \) is holomorphic in the domain \( \{(a, b) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \mid \Re a > 0, \Re b > 0\} \), we conclude by analytic continuation that the lemma holds for all \( a, b \in \mathbb{C} \) such that \( \Re a > 0 \) and \( \Re b > 0 \). \( \Box \)

**Lemma 2.** Let \( K \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( f \in \mathcal{C}^{(2K)}([0, \infty), \mathbb{C}) \). Assume that \( \int_0^\infty |f(x)| \, dx < +\infty \), \( \int_0^\infty |f^{(2K)}(x)| \, dx < +\infty \) and \( \lim_{x \to \infty} f^{(k)}(x) = 0 \) for all \( k = 0, \ldots, 2K - 1 \). Then, the series \( \sum_{m \geq 1} f(m) \) is convergent and
\[
\sum_{m=1}^\infty f(m) = \int_0^\infty f(x) \, dx - \frac{f(0)}{2} - \sum_{k=1}^{K} \frac{B_{2k}}{(2k)!} f^{(2k-1)}(0) - \frac{1}{(2K)!} \int_0^\infty f^{(2K)}(x) B_{2K}(\{x\}) \, dx,
\]
where \( (B_k)_{k \geq 0} \) is the sequence of Bernoulli numbers and \( (B_k(\cdot))_{k \geq 0} \) is the sequence of Bernoulli polynomials with \( \{x\} \) the fractional part of \( x \).
Proof of Lemma 2: it follows easily from the classical Euler-Maclaurin formula.

Lemma 3. Let \( d \in \mathbb{N} \) and \( s \in \mathbb{C} \). Let \( a, b \in \mathbb{C} \) be such that \( \Re a > 0 \) and \( \Re b > 0 \). Set \( \delta := (\Re b/\Re a)^{1/d} \). Define the function \( f_{a,b,d,s} : (-\delta, \infty) \to \mathbb{C} \) by \( f_{a,b,d,s}(x) = (b + ax^d)^{-s} \) for any \( x > -\delta \). Then,

1. \( f_{a,b,d,s} \) is \( C^\infty \) on \( (-\delta, \infty) \).
2. For \( k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \) and \( x > -\delta \),

\[
f^{(k)}_{a,b,d,s}(x) = k! \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^d : \sum_{j=1}^d j \alpha_j = k} \binom{-s}{\alpha} \frac{|\alpha|!}{\alpha!} \left( \prod_{j=1}^d \binom{d}{j}^{\alpha_j} \right) a^{\alpha_1} x^{\sum_{j=1}^d (d-j) \alpha_j} (b + ax^d)^{-s-|\alpha|}.
\]

3. In particular, \( f^{(k)}_{a,b,d,s}(0) = k! \frac{(-s)^{k/d}}{d^{k/d}} b^{-s-k/d} \) if \( d \mid k \) and \( f^{(k)}_{a,b,d,s}(0) = 0 \) if \( d \nmid k \).

Proof of Lemma 3: When \( x > -\delta \), we have \( \Re (b + ax^d) > 0 \). Therefore \( (b + ax^d)^{-s} = \exp(-s \log(b + ax^d)) \) is well-defined and \( f_{a,b,d,s} \) is \( C^\infty \), hence point 1.

For point 2, fix \( x > -\delta \) and choose \( \varepsilon = \varepsilon_x > 0 \) small enough such that \( x + u > -\delta \) and \( |a \sum_{j=1}^d (d/j)x^{d-j}u^j| \leq (1/2)|b + ax^d| \) for all \( u \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \). It follows then from Newton’s binomial formula that for \( u \in (-\varepsilon, \varepsilon) \):

\[
f_{a,b,d,s}(x + u) = (b + a(x + u)^d)^{-s} = (b + ax^d)^{-s} \left( 1 + \frac{a \sum_{j=1}^d (d/j)x^{d-j}u^j}{b + ax^d} \right)^{-s}
\]

\[
= (b + ax^d)^{-s} \sum_{\ell=0}^\infty \binom{-s}{\ell} \left( \frac{\sum_{j=1}^d (d/j)x^{d-j}u^j}{b + ax^d} \right)^\ell a^k
\]

\[
= \sum_{\ell=0}^\infty \binom{-s}{\ell} \frac{a^\ell}{(b + ax^d)^{s+\ell}} \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^d : |\alpha| = \ell} \frac{\ell!}{\alpha!} \prod_{j=1}^d \binom{d}{j}^{\alpha_j} x^{\sum_{j=1}^d (d-j) \alpha_j} u^{\sum_{j=1}^d j \alpha_j}
\]

\[
= \sum_{k=0}^\infty \left( \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^d : \sum_{j=1}^d j \alpha_j = k} \binom{-s}{|\alpha|} \frac{a^{|\alpha|}}{(b + ax^d)^{s+|\alpha|}} \frac{|\alpha|!}{\alpha!} \left( \prod_{j=1}^d \binom{d}{j}^{\alpha_j} \right) x^{\sum_{j=1}^d (d-j) \alpha_j} u^k \right).
\]

Point 2 then follows from the uniqueness of Taylor’s expansion of \( f_{a,b} \) in a neighborhood of \( x \).

Lastly, putting \( x = 0 \), the only non-vanishing terms are under the condition \( \sum_{j=1}^d (d-j) \alpha_j = 0 \), which is equivalent to \( \alpha_1 = \cdots = \alpha_{d-1} = 0 \). Then \( d \alpha_d = k \), which implies point 3. \( \square \)
4.2 Domain of absolute convergence of $\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(s)$: proof of point 1 of Proposition [4]

We will prove point 1 of Proposition [4] by induction on $n$. If $n = 1$, $\zeta_{1,d_1,\gamma_1}(s) = \gamma_1^{-s} \zeta(d_1 s)$ and point 1 of Proposition [4] clearly holds.

Assume now that $n \geq 2$ and that point 1 of Proposition [4] holds for $n - 1$. Let $K$ be a compact subset of $D_{n,d}(0)$. Because of the definition of $D_{n,d}(0)$ we see that $\Re s_n > 1/d_n$ for all $s_n \in K$. Therefore uniformly in $s \in K$ and $m_1, \ldots, m_{n-1} \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\sum_{m_n=1}^{\infty} |(\gamma_1 m_1^{d_1} + \cdots + \gamma_n m_n^{d_n})^{-s_n}| \ll_{K,\gamma} \sum_{m_n=1}^{\infty} (m_1^{d_1} + \cdots + m_n^{d_n})^{-\Re s_n} \leq \int_0^{\infty} (m_1^{d_1} + \cdots + m_{n-1}^{d_{n-1}} + x^{d_n})^{-\Re s_n} \, dx \ll_{K,d} (m_1^{d_1} + \cdots + m_{n-1}^{d_{n-1}})^{-\Re s_n + 1/d_n},$$

where the last inequality is by Lemma [1]. We deduce that, uniformly in $s \in K$,

$$\sum_{m_1, \ldots, m_n \geq 1} |\prod_{j=1}^{n} (\gamma_1 m_1^{d_1} + \cdots + \gamma_j m_j^{d_j})^{-s_j}| \ll_{K,d,\gamma} \sum_{m_1, \ldots, m_{n-1} \geq 1} \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} (m_1^{d_1} + \cdots + m_j^{d_j})^{-\Re s_j} (m_1^{d_1} + \cdots + m_{n-1}^{d_{n-1}})^{-\Re s_n + 1/d_n} \ll_{K,d,\gamma} \zeta_{n-1,d',1}(\Re s_1, \ldots, \Re s_{n-2}, \Re s_{n-1} + \Re s_n - 1/d_n)$$

and we conclude the assertion by induction hypothesis. This ends the proof of point 1 of Proposition [4].

4.3 A key proposition

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $d = (d_1, \ldots, d_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$ and $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n$ be such that $\Re(\gamma_j) > 0$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, n$. Define for $\delta \in \mathbb{R}$ the set

$$D_{n,d}(\delta) := \{ s = (s_1, \ldots, s_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n \mid \Re(s_j + \cdots + s_n) > \left( \frac{1}{d_j} + \cdots + \frac{1}{d_n} \right) + \frac{\delta}{d_n} \ (j = 1, \ldots, n) \}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (18)

The following proposition is a key ingredient in this section:
Proposition 2. Let $K \in \mathbb{N}$. There exists a function $s \mapsto \mathcal{R}_{n,d,K}(s)$ holomorphic in $\mathcal{D}_{n,d}(-2K)$ such that for all $s \in \mathcal{D}_{n,d}(0)$, we have

$$
\zeta_{n,d}(s) = \frac{\Gamma(s_n-1/d_n)\Gamma(1/d_n)\gamma_n^{-1/d_n}}{d_n\Gamma(s_n)} \zeta_{n-1,d',\gamma'}(s_1, \ldots, s_{n-2}, s_{n-1} + s_n - 1/d_n) \\
- \frac{1}{2} \zeta_{n-1,d',\gamma'}(s_1, \ldots, s_{n-2}, s_{n-1} + s_n) \\
- \sum_{k=1}^{K} \frac{B_{2k}}{2k} \left( \frac{-s_n}{(2k-1)/d_n} \right)^{(2k-1)/d_n} \\
\times \zeta_{n-1,d',\gamma'}(s_1, \ldots, s_{n-2}, s_{n-1} + s_n + (2k-1)/d_n) \\
+ \mathcal{R}_{n,d,K}(s),
$$

(19)

where $d' = (d_1, \ldots, d_{n-1})$ and $\gamma' = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_{n-1})$. Furthermore, if $N = (N_1, \ldots, N_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ be such that $N_n \leq 0$ and

$$
2K > d_n \left( \frac{1}{d_1} + \cdots + \frac{1}{d_n} \right) - d_n(N_1 + \cdots + N_n)
$$

(20)

for all $j = 1, \ldots, n$, then $N \in \mathcal{D}_{n,d}(-2K)$ and $\mathcal{R}_{n,d,K}(N) = 0$.

Remark: Once the meromorphic continuation of $\zeta_{n,d}(s)$ (point 2 of Proposition 1) is proved, we can claim that (19) is valid, as an identity of meromorphic functions, in the wider region $\mathcal{D}_{n,d}(-2K)$.

Proof of Proposition 2: Let $K \in \mathbb{N}$, $s \in \mathcal{D}_{n,d}(0)$, and let $m' = (m_1, \ldots, m_{n-1}) \in \mathbb{N}^{n-1}$. Set $b(m') = \gamma_1 m_1^{d_1} + \cdots + \gamma_{n-1} m_{n-1}^{d_{n-1}}$. By using notations of Lemma 3, it follows from Lemma 2 that

$$
\sum_{m_n=1}^{\infty} (\gamma_1 m_1^{d_1} + \cdots + \gamma_{n-1} m_{n-1}^{d_{n-1}})^{-s_n} \\
= \sum_{m_n=1}^{\infty} (b(m') + \gamma_n m_n^{d_n})^{-s_n} = \sum_{m_n=1}^{\infty} f_{\gamma_n,b(m')},d_n,s_n(m_n) \\
= \int_0^{\infty} f_{\gamma_n,b(m')},d_n,s_n(x) \, dx - \frac{f_{\gamma_n,b(m')},d_n,s_n(0)}{2} \\
- \sum_{k=1}^{K} \frac{B_{2k}}{2k} f_{\gamma_n,b(m')},d_n,s_n(0) \\
- \frac{1}{(2K)^{\gamma_n,b(m')},d_n,s_n(0)} \left( x \right) \\
\times \mathcal{R}_{n,d,K}(s).
$$

(20)

On the right-hand side, apply Lemma 1 to the first term, point 3 of Lemma 3 to the third term, and point 2 of Lemma 3 to the fourth term to obtain

$$
\sum_{m_n=1}^{\infty} (\gamma_1 m_1^{d_1} + \cdots + \gamma_{n-1} m_{n-1}^{d_{n-1}})^{-s_n}
$$
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\[
\begin{align*}
\zeta(21) & \to \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^{21}} = \frac{1}{\Gamma(21)} \\
& = \frac{1}{\Gamma(s_n - 1/d_n)\Gamma(1/d_n) - \frac{1}{2} b(m')^{s_n}} - \sum_{k=1}^{K} \frac{B_{2k}}{2k} \left( \frac{-s_n}{(2k) - 1/d_n} \right) \gamma_n^{(2k-1)/d_n} b(m')^{s_n - (2k-1)/d_n} \\
& - \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus 0} \left( \frac{-s_n}{|\alpha|} \right) G_{n,d,K}(m'; s_n; \alpha) \tag{21}
\end{align*}
\]

where

\[
G_{n,d,K}(m'; s_n; \alpha) := \frac{|\alpha|!}{\alpha!} \left( \prod_{j=1}^{d_n} \binom{d_n}{j} \right) \left( \gamma_n^{j}\right) \times \int_{0}^{\infty} B_{2K}(x) x^{(d_n - j) \alpha_j} \left( b(m') + \gamma_n x^{d_n} \right)^{-s_n - |\alpha|} \, dx.
\]

Since \( s \in D_{n,d}(0) \), as we already proved, \(\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(s)\) converges absolutely. Substituting (21) to the series expression of \(\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(s)\), we obtain

\[
\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(s) = \frac{\Gamma(s_n - 1/d_n)\Gamma(1/d_n)\gamma_n^{-1/d_n}}{d_n \Gamma(s_n)} \zeta_{n-1,d',\gamma'}(s_1, \ldots, s_n - 2, s_n - 1 + s_n - 1/d_n)
\]

\[
- \frac{1}{2} \zeta_{n-1,d',\gamma'}(s_1, \ldots, s_n - 2, s_n - 1 + s_n)
\]

\[
- \sum_{k=1}^{K} \frac{B_{2k}}{2k} \left( \frac{-s_n}{(2k) - 1/d_n} \right) \gamma_n^{(2k-1)/d_n}
\]

\[
\times \zeta_{n-1,d',\gamma'}(s_1, \ldots, s_n - 2, s_n - 1 + s_n + (2k - 1)/d_n)
\]

\[+ \mathcal{R}_{n,d,K}(s), \tag{22}\]

where

\[
\mathcal{R}_{n,d,K}(s) = - \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^d \setminus 0} \left( \frac{-s_n}{|\alpha|} \right) Z_{n,d,K}(s) \tag{23}
\]

with

\[
Z_{n,d,K}(s) := \sum_{m' \in \mathbb{N}^n} \frac{G_{n,d,K}(m'; s_n; \alpha)}{\prod_{j=1}^{d_n} \left( \gamma_1 m_1^{d_1} + \cdots + \gamma_j m_j^{d_j} \right)^{s_n}}.
\]

Now we will prove that \( s \mapsto \mathcal{R}_{n,d,K}(s) \) is holomorphic in \( D_{n,d}(-2K) \). Let \( \mathcal{H} \) be a compact subset of \( D_{n,d}(-2K) \). In particular, for all \( s \in \mathcal{H}, \Re s_n + (2K)/d_n > 1/d_n \).
Lemma \[1\] implies then that we have uniformly in \(s \in \mathcal{H}, \ m' \in \mathbb{N}^{n-1} \) and \(\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^{d_n}\) such that \(\sum_{j=1}^{d_n} j\alpha_j = 2K\),

\[
|G_{n,d,K}(m'; s_n; \alpha)| \leq_{\mathcal{H},d,n,\gamma,K} \int_0^\infty \left| x^{d_n|\alpha|-2K} (|b(m')| + x^{d_n})^{-\Re s_n - |\alpha|} \right| dx
\]

\[
\leq_{\mathcal{H},d,n,\gamma,K} \int_0^\infty (|b(m')| + x^{d_n})^{-\Re s_n - (2K)/d_n} \ dx
\]

\[
\leq_{\mathcal{H},d,n,\gamma,K} |b(m')|^{-\Re s_n - (2K-1)/d_n}
\]

\[
\leq_{\mathcal{H},d,n,\gamma,K} (m_1^{d_1} + \cdots + m_{n-1}^{d_{n-1}})^{-\Re s_n - (2K-1)/d_n}.
\]

We deduce that we have uniformly in \(s \in \mathcal{H}\) and \(\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^{d_n}\) such that \(\sum_{j=1}^{d_n} j\alpha_j = 2K\),

\[
\sum_{m' \in \mathbb{N}^{n-1}} \left| \frac{G_{n,d,K}(m'; s_n; \alpha)}{\prod_{j=1}^{n-1} (\gamma_1 m_1^{d_1} + \cdots + \gamma_j m_j^{d_j}) \alpha_j} \right|
\]

\[
\leq_{\mathcal{H},d,n,\gamma,K} \sum_{m' \in \mathbb{N}^{n-1}} \left( \prod_{j=1}^{n-2} (m_1^{d_1} + \cdots + m_j^{d_j})^{-\Re s_j} \right)
\times (m_1^{d_1} + \cdots + m_{n-1}^{d_{n-1}})^{-\Re s_n - (2K-1)/d_n}.
\]

The set

\[
\{(\Re s_1, \ldots, \Re s_{n-2}, \Re s_n + (2K - 1)/d_n) \mid s \in \mathcal{H}\}
\]

is a compact subset of \(D_{n-1,\mathfrak{d}}(0)\), because for \(s \in \mathcal{H}\)

\[
\Re(s_j + \cdots + s_n) + \frac{2K - 1}{d_n} > \frac{1}{d_j} + \cdots + \frac{1}{d_n} - \frac{2K - 1}{d_n} = \frac{1}{d_j} + \cdots + \frac{1}{d_{n-1}}.
\]

We deduce then from point 1 of Proposition \[1\] that for all \(\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^{d_n}\) such that \(\sum_{j=1}^{d_n} j\alpha_j = 2K\), \(s \mapsto Z_{n,d,K,\alpha}(s)\) is holomorphic in \(D_{n,d}(-2K)\). Therefore \(s \mapsto \mathcal{R}_{n,d,K}(s)\) is also holomorphic in \(D_{n,d}(-2K)\). This implies the first assertion of Proposition \[2\]

Let \(N = (N_1, \ldots, N_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n \) be such that \(N_n \leq 0\) with \(20\) for all \(j\). It is clear that \(N \in D_{n,d}(-2K)\). Moreover, for \(\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^{d_n}\) such that \(\sum_{j=1}^{d_n} j\alpha_j = 2K\), we have \(d_n|\alpha| \geq \sum_{j=1}^{d_n} j\alpha_j = 2K > -d_n N_n + 1\) (where the last inequality is the case \(j = n\) of \(20\)), and therefore \(|\alpha| > -N_n\). It follows that \((-^s n|\alpha|)|_{s_n = N_n} = 0\). We conclude then from \(23\) that \(\mathcal{R}_{n,d,K}(N) = 0\). This ends the proof of Proposition \[2\] \(\square\)

4.4 Proof of points 2 and 3 of Proposition \[1\]

We will first prove point 2 of Proposition \[1\] by induction on \(n\): If \(n = 1\), \(\zeta_{1,d_1,\gamma_1}(s) = \gamma_1^{-1} \zeta(d_1 s)\) and point 2 of Proposition \[1\] clearly holds.
Let $n \geq 2$. Assume that point 2 of Proposition \ref{P1} holds for $n - 1$. By letting $K$ to infinity in \ref{P1}, we deduce then that $s \mapsto \zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(s)$ has meromorphic continuation to $\mathbb{C}^n$ and that the possibles singularities are located in the union of the following hyperplanes:

1. $s_n - \frac{1}{d_n} = -k_n$ ($k_n \in \mathbb{N}_0)$;
2. $s_j + \cdots + s_n - \frac{1}{d_n} = \frac{1}{d_j} + \frac{\varepsilon_{j+1}}{d_{j+1}} + \cdots + \frac{\varepsilon_{n-1}}{d_{n-1}} - k_j$ $(1 \leq j \leq n - 1)$, where $k_j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\varepsilon_{j+1}, \ldots, \varepsilon_{n-1} \in \{0, 1\}$;
3. $s_j + \cdots + s_n = \frac{1}{d_j} + \frac{\varepsilon_{j+1}}{d_{j+1}} + \cdots + \frac{\varepsilon_{n-1}}{d_{n-1}} - k_j$ $(1 \leq j \leq n - 1)$, where $k_j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\varepsilon_{j+1}, \ldots, \varepsilon_{n-1} \in \{0, 1\}$;
4. $s_j + \cdots + s_n + \frac{2k-1}{d_n} = \frac{1}{d_j} + \frac{\varepsilon_{j+1}}{d_{j+1}} + \cdots + \frac{\varepsilon_{n-1}}{d_{n-1}} - k_j$ $(1 \leq j \leq n - 1)$, where $k_j \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $d_n | 2k - 1$ and $\varepsilon_{j+1}, \ldots, \varepsilon_{n-1} \in \{0, 1\}$.

It follows that $\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(s)$ has meromorphic continuation to the whole complex space $\mathbb{C}^n$ whose possibles singularities are located in the union of the hyperplanes

$$s_j + \cdots + s_n = \frac{1}{d_j} + \frac{\varepsilon_{j+1}}{d_{j+1}} + \cdots + \frac{\varepsilon_n}{d_n} - k_j \quad (1 \leq j \leq n),$$

where $k_j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\varepsilon_{j+1}, \ldots, \varepsilon_n \in \{0, 1\}$. This ends the induction argument and also the proof of point 2 of Proposition \ref{P1}.

Now we will prove point 3 of Proposition \ref{P1}. Let $\mathbf{N} = (N_1, \ldots, N_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. Assume that $\mathbf{N}$ is a singular point of $\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(s)$. It follows then from point 2 of Proposition \ref{P1} that there exist $j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$, $\varepsilon_{j+1}, \ldots, \varepsilon_n \in \{0, 1\}$ and $k_j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that

$$N_j + \cdots + N_n = \frac{1}{d_j} + \frac{\varepsilon_{j+1}}{d_{j+1}} + \cdots + \frac{\varepsilon_n}{d_n} - k_j.$$

Therefore $\frac{1}{d_j} + \frac{\varepsilon_{j+1}}{d_{j+1}} + \cdots + \frac{\varepsilon_n}{d_n} \in \mathbb{Z}$, but this is positive. It follows then that $\frac{1}{d_j} + \frac{\varepsilon_{j+1}}{d_{j+1}} + \cdots + \frac{\varepsilon_n}{d_n} \in \mathbb{N}$, which contradicts the assumption \ref{P3}. This proves point 3 and ends the proof of Proposition \ref{P1}. \hfill $\square$

5 Proof of Theorem \ref{T1} and of Corollaries \ref{C1}, \ref{C2} and \ref{C3}

Proof of Theorem \ref{T1}: Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $d = (d_1, \ldots, d_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$ and $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n$ be such that $\Re(\gamma_j) > 0$ for all $j = 1, \ldots, n$. Assume that the $d_j$s satisfy the assumption \ref{E1}.
Let \( N = (N_1, \ldots, N_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n \) such that \( N_n \leq 0 \). Let \( K \in \mathbb{N} \) be such that \( 2K > d_n(\frac{1}{d_1} + \cdots + \frac{1}{d_n}) - d_n(N_1 + \cdots + N_n) \) for all \( j = 1, \ldots, n \). It follows then from Proposition 2 that (19) holds for all \( s \in D_{n,d}(-2K) \), moreover \( R_{n,d,K}(N) = 0 \) because \( s = N \in D_{n,d}(-2K) \).

We also know from point 3 of Proposition 1 that \( s = N \) is a regular point of \( \zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(s) \). Since (11) for \( n-1 \) is just the case \( \varepsilon_n = 0 \) in (11) for \( n \), point 3 also implies that \( s = N \) is a regular point of \( \zeta_{n-1,d',\gamma'}(s_1, \ldots, s_{n-2}, s_{n-1} + s_n) \) and \( \zeta_{n-1,d',\gamma'}(s_1, \ldots, s_{n-2}, s_{n-1} + s_n + (2k-1)/d_n) \) \((k \in \{1, \ldots, K\}) \) such that \( d_n|2k-1 \).

Furthermore, \( s = N \) is also a regular point of \( \zeta_{n-1,d',\gamma'}(s_1, \ldots, s_{n-2}, s_{n-1} + s_n - 1/d_n) \). In fact, if \( s = N \) is a singular point of \( \zeta_{n-1,d',\gamma'}(s_1, \ldots, s_{n-2}, s_{n-1} + s_n - 1/d_n) \), then the point 2 of Proposition 1 implies that there exists \( j \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\} \), \((\varepsilon_{j+1}, \ldots, \varepsilon_{n-1}) \in \{0,1\}^{n-1-j} \) and \( k_j \in \mathbb{N}_0 \) such that

\[
N_j + \cdots + N_n - 1 = \left( \frac{1}{d_j} + \frac{\varepsilon_{j+1}}{d_{j+1}} + \cdots + \frac{\varepsilon_{n-1}}{d_{n-1}} \right) - k_j.
\]

This implies that \( \frac{1}{d_j} + \frac{\varepsilon_{j+1}}{d_{j+1}} + \cdots + \frac{\varepsilon_{n-1}}{d_{n-1}} + \frac{1}{d_n} \in \mathbb{Z} \), but this is positive, hence \( \in \mathbb{N} \).

Hence a contradiction with the assumption (11).

By using in addition the fact that \( \frac{1}{\Gamma(s_n)|s_n=N_n} = 0 \), we deduce then from (19) that

\[
\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(N) = -\frac{1}{2} \zeta_{n-1,d',\gamma'}(N_1, \ldots, N_{n-2}, N_{n-1} + N_n)
- \sum_{d_n|2k-1} \frac{B_{2k}}{2k} \left( \frac{-N_n}{(2k-1)/d_n} \right)^{\gamma(2k-1)/d_n} \times \zeta_{n-1,d',\gamma'}(N_1, \ldots, N_{n-2}, N_{n-1} + N_n + (2k-1)/d_n).
\]

Lastly noting the fact that \((\frac{-N_n}{(2k-1)/d_n}) = 0 \) if \( k > (1 - d_n N_n)/2 \), we conclude the proof of Theorem 1.

Next we proceed to the proofs of corollaries.

**Proof of Corollary 1**: First prove point 1 of Corollary 1 by induction on \( n \).

When \( n = 1 \) it is clear, because

\[
\zeta_{1,d_1,\gamma_1}(-N_1) = \gamma_1^{N_1} \zeta(-d_1 N_1) = \gamma_1^{N_1} (-1)^{d_1 N_1} \frac{B_{d_1 N_1 + 1}}{d_1 N_1 + 1}.
\]

The general case then follows from the identity (12) of Theorem 1 since

\[
(-N_1, \ldots, -N_{n-2}, -N_{n-1} - N_n + (2k-1)/d_n) \in (-N_0)^{n-1}
\]

for \( N = (N_1, \ldots, N_n) \in \mathbb{N}_0^n \) and \( k \in \{1, \ldots, \lceil \frac{1+dnN_n}{2} \rceil \} \) such that \( d_n|2k-1 \).
Assume now that \( d_2, \ldots, d_n \) are even integers satisfying the assumption \( (11) \). Let \( N = (N_1, \ldots, N_n) \in \mathbb{N}_0^n \). Since now there is no \( k \) for which \( d_n | 2k - 1 \) holds, the identity \( (12) \) of Theorem \( 1 \) implies that

\[
\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(-N) = -\frac{1}{2} \zeta_{n-1,d',\gamma'}(-N_1, \ldots, -N_{n-2}, -N_{n-1} - N_n).
\]

By induction on \( n \), noting \( (24) \), we deduce that

\[
\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(-N) = \left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)^{n-1} \zeta_{1,d_1,\gamma_1}(-|N|) = \left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)^{n-1} \gamma_1^{|N|} (-1)^{d_1 |N|} \frac{B_{d_1 |N| + 1}}{(d_1 |N| + 1)}.
\]

This ends the proof of point 2 of Corollary \( 1 \). Lastly, point 3 follows immediately from point 2 because \( B_1 = -1/2 \) and \( B_{2m+1} = 0 \) for all \( m \in \mathbb{N} \).

**Proof of Corollary 2:** First, when \( N = 0_n \), from \( (12) \) we have

\[
\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(0_n) = -\frac{1}{2} \zeta_{n-1,d',\gamma'}(0_{n-1}),
\]

from which point 1 immediately follows.

Next consider the case \( N = (0_{n-1}, -1) \). The condition \( d_n | 2k - 1 \) implies whether \( d_n = 2k - 1 \) or \( (2k - 1)/d_n \geq 2 \). But in the latter case \( (2k-1)/d_n) = (2k-1)/d_n) = 0 \), so the only possibility of \( k \) on the right-hand side of \( (12) \) is \( k = (d_n + 1)/2 \). When \( d_n \) is odd this is indeed possible, and \( (12) \) gives

\[
\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(0_{n-1}, -1) = -\frac{1}{2} \zeta_{n-1,d',\gamma'}(0_{n-2}, -1) - \frac{B_{d_n+1}}{d_n+1} \gamma_n \zeta_{n-1,d',\gamma'}(0_{n-1})
\]

by using the result of point 1. This formula is also valid for even \( d_n \), because in this case \( B_{d_n+1} = 0 \). Using the above formula repeatedly, we obtain

\[
\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(0_{n-1}, -1) = \left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)^{n-1} \zeta_{1,d_1,\gamma_1}(-1) - \left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)^{n-1} \sum_{j=2}^n \frac{B_{d_j+1}}{d_j+1} \gamma_j.
\]

Since \( \zeta_{1,d_1,\gamma_1}(-1) = \gamma_1 (-1)^{d_1} B_{d_1 + 1}/(d_1 + 1) \) (see \( (24) \)), we obtain the assertion of point 2.

The case \( N = (0_{n-1}, -2) \) is similar. In this case \( N_n = -2 \), so \( k \leq [(1 - d_n N_n)/2] = [d_n + 1/2] = d_n \). Therefore \( (2k - 1)/d_n \geq 2 \) is impossible, so the only possible \( k \) is again \( k = (d_n + 1)/2 \). We obtain

\[
\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(0_{n-1}, -2) = -\frac{1}{2} \zeta_{n-1,d',\gamma'}(0_{n-2}, -2) - 2 \frac{B_{d_n+1}}{d_n+1} \gamma_n \zeta_{n-1,d',\gamma'}(0_{n-2}, -1).
\]
We rewrite the term $\zeta_{n-1,d',\gamma'}(0_{n-2},-1)$ on the right-hand side by using point 2, and then use the resulting formula repeatedly. Lastly we use $\zeta_{1,d_1,\gamma_1}(-2) = \gamma_1^2 B_{2d_1+1}/(2d_1+1)$ to arrive at the assertion of point 3.

**Remark:** If we consider the case $N = (0_{n-1},-m)$, $m \geq 3$, larger values of $k$ appear on the right-hand side of (12), so the explicit formula for $\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(0_{n-1},-m)$ is (possible to obtain but) more complicated. Therefore we only state the formula for $m \leq 2$ in Corollary 2.

**Proof of Corollary 3:** Let $d_1 \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}$ and $d_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $\frac{1}{d_1} + \frac{1}{2d_2} \notin \mathbb{N}$. It follows that $(d_1,2d_2)$ satisfies the assumption (11). Theorem 2 implies then that for $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$\zeta_{2,(d_1,2d_2),(1,1)}(1+N,-N) = -\frac{1}{2}\zeta_{1,d_1,1}(1) = -\frac{1}{2}\zeta(d_1),$$

because $2d_2|(2k-1)$ is impossible. This ends the proof of Corollary 3.

\section{Proof of Theorem 2}

In this section we assume (14). Fix $N \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$ and $K \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$2K > d_n(\frac{1}{d_1} + \cdots + \frac{1}{d_n}) + d_n(N_1 + \cdots + N_n).$$

It is easy to see that $-N \in \mathcal{D}_{n,d}(-2K)$. Furthermore, Proposition 2 implies that there exists a function $s \mapsto \mathcal{R}_{n,d,K}(s)$ holomorphic in $\mathcal{D}_{n,d}(-2K)$ and satisfying $\mathcal{R}_{n,d,K}(-N) = 0$ such that for all $s \in \mathcal{D}_{n,d}(0)$, we have

$$\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(s) = \Gamma(s_n - 1/d_n)\Gamma(1/d_n)^{-1/d_n} \zeta_{n-1,d',\gamma'}(s_1, \ldots, s_{n-2}, s_{n-1} + s_n - 1/d_n) + G_{n,d,\gamma,K}(s) + \mathcal{R}_{n,d,K}(s),$$

(25)

where

$$G_{n,d,\gamma,K}(s) := -\frac{1}{2} \zeta_{n-1,d',\gamma'}(s_1, \ldots, s_{n-2}, s_{n-1} + s_n)$$

$$- \sum_{d_k | 2k-1}^K \frac{B_{2k}}{2k} \left( \frac{-s_n}{(2k-1)/d_n} \right) \gamma_n^{(2k-1)/d_n} \times \zeta_{n-1,d',\gamma'}(s_1, \ldots, s_{n-2}, s_{n-1} + s_n + (2k-1)/d_n).$$

(26)

Proposition 2 implies that $s \mapsto G_{n,d,\gamma,K}(s)$ is meromorphic in $\mathbb{C}^n$. Moreover, if $s = -N$ is a singular point of $G_{n,d,\gamma,K}(s)$, point 2 of Proposition 2 implies then that there exists $j \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}$, $M, k_j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $\varepsilon_{j+1}, \ldots, \varepsilon_{n-1} \in \{0, 1\}$ such that

$$-N_j - \cdots - N_n + M = \frac{1}{d_j} + \frac{\varepsilon_{j+1}}{d_{j+1}} + \cdots + \frac{\varepsilon_{n-1}}{d_{n-1}} - k_j.$$
It follows that $\frac{1}{d_j} + \frac{\varepsilon_j+1}{d_j+1} + \cdots + \frac{\varepsilon_{n-1}}{d_{n-1}} \in \mathbb{N}$ which contradicts the assumption (14). As a conclusion, we find that $s = -N$ is a regular point of $G_{n,d,\gamma,K}$ and

$$G_{n,d,\gamma,K}(-N) := -\frac{1}{2} \zeta_{n-1,d',\gamma'}(-N_1, \ldots, -N_{n-2}, -N_{n-1} - N_n)$$

$$(27)$$

$$- \sum_{k=1}^{(\lfloor (1+d_n N_n)/2 \rfloor )} \frac{B_{2k}}{2k} \left( \frac{N_n}{(2k-1)/d_n} \right)^{(2k-1)/d_n} \times \zeta_{n-1,d',\gamma'}(-N_1, \ldots, -N_{n-2}, -N_{n-1} - N_n + (2k-1)/d_n).$$

Let $k \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}$, and define

$$H_{n,d,k}(s) := \frac{\prod_{j=n-k+1}^{n} \Gamma \left( s_j + \cdots + s_n - \frac{1}{d_j} - \cdots - \frac{1}{d_n} \right) \Gamma \left( \frac{1}{d_j} \right)}{\prod_{j=n-k+1}^{n-1} \Gamma \left( s_j + \cdots + s_n - \frac{1}{d_j+1} - \cdots - \frac{1}{d_n} \right) \prod_{j=n-k+1}^{n} d_j \gamma_j^{1/d_j}}.$$

We now prove the following

**Lemma 4.** For $k \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\}$, there exists a function $s \mapsto R_{n,d,K,K}(s)$, meromorphic in $\mathcal{D}_{n,d}(-2K)$, regular at $s = -N$ and satisfying $R_{n,d,K,K}(-N) = 0$, for which the formula

$$\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(s) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(s_n)} H_{n,d,k}(s)$$

$$\times \zeta_{n-k,(d_1,\ldots,d_{n-k}),(\gamma_1,\ldots,\gamma_{n-k})} \left( s_1, \ldots, s_{n-k-1}, s_{n-k} + \cdots + s_n - \frac{1}{d_{n-k+1}} - \cdots - \frac{1}{d_n} \right)$$

$$+ G_{n,d,\gamma,K}(s) + R_{n,d,K,K}(s)$$

$$(28)$$

holds for all $s \in \mathcal{D}_{n,d}(-2K)$ as an identity of meromorphic functions, where $G_{n,d,\gamma,K}$ is the function defined by (27).

**Proof:** The proof is by induction on $k$. For $k = 1$, (28) holds from (25) and (27).

Let $k \in \{1, \ldots, n-2\}$. Assume that (28) holds for $k$. We will prove that it also holds for $k + 1$.

Let $K' \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $K' > \max \left( K, K' \frac{d_{n-k}}{d_n} \right)$. Since

$$\left( s_1, \ldots, s_{n-k-1}, s_{n-k} + \cdots + s_n - \frac{1}{d_{n-k+1}} - \cdots - \frac{1}{d_n} \right) \in \mathcal{D}_{n-k,(d_1,\ldots,d_{k})}(0)$$

for all $s \in \mathcal{D}_{n,d}(0)$, applying Proposition [2] (with $K'$ instead of $K$) to the term

$$\zeta_{n-k,(d_1,\ldots,d_{n-k}),(\gamma_1,\ldots,\gamma_{n-k})} \left( s_1, \ldots, s_{n-k-1}, s_{n-k} + \cdots + s_n - \frac{1}{d_{n-k+1}} - \cdots - \frac{1}{d_n} \right)$$

$$G_{n,\gamma,K}(s) + R_{n,d,K,K}(s)$$

$$(28)$$

holds for all $s \in \mathcal{D}_{n,d}(-2K)$ as an identity of meromorphic functions, where $G_{n,d,\gamma,K}$ is the function defined by (27).
on the right-hand side of (28), for \( s \in D_{n,d}(0) \), we obtain

\[
\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(s) = \frac{1}{\Gamma(s_n)} H_{n,d,k+1}(s)
\]

\[
\times \zeta_{n-k-1,(d_1,...,d_{n-k-1}),s_n}(s_1, \ldots, s_{n-k-2}, s_{n-k-1} + \cdots + s_n - \frac{1}{d_{n-k}} - \cdots - \frac{1}{d_n})
\]

\[
+ G_{n,d,\gamma,K}(s) + \frac{1}{\Gamma(s_n)} H_{n,d,k}(s) V_{n,d,k}(s),
\]

where

\[
V_{n,d,k}(s) := -\frac{1}{2} \zeta_{n-k-1,(d_1,...,d_{n-k-1}),s_n}(s_1, \ldots, s_{n-k-2}, s_{n-k-1} + \cdots + s_n
\]

\[
- \frac{1}{d_{n-k+1}} - \cdots - \frac{1}{d_n}
\]

\[
- \sum_{k=1}^{K'} \frac{B_{2k}}{2k} \left(-s_n - \cdots - s_n + 1/d_{n-k+1} + \cdots + 1/d_n\right) \left(s_1 + \cdots + s_{n-k-2} + s_{n-k-1} + \cdots + s_n
\]

\[
- \frac{1}{d_{n-k+1}} - \cdots - \frac{1}{d_n} + \frac{2k-1}{d_{n-k}} \right)
\]

\[
\times \zeta_{n-k-1,(d_1,...,d_{n-k-1}),s_n}(s_1, \ldots, s_{n-k-2}, s_{n-k-1} + \cdots + s_n
\]

\[
- \frac{1}{d_{n-k+1}} - \cdots - \frac{1}{d_n} + \frac{2k-1}{d_{n-k}} \right)
\]

\[
+ R_{n-k,(d_1,...,d_{n-k}),K'} \left(s_1 + \cdots + s_{n-k-1} + s_{n-k} + \cdots + s_n - \frac{1}{d_{n-k+1}} - \cdots - \frac{1}{d_n}\right).
\]

Since \( K' > \max\left(K, K \frac{d_{n-k}}{d_n}\right) \), it is easy to see that the function

\[
s \mapsto R_{n-k,(d_1,...,d_{n-k}),K'} \left(s_1 + \cdots + s_{n-k-1} + s_{n-k} + \cdots + s_n - \frac{1}{d_{n-k+1}} - \cdots - \frac{1}{d_n}\right)
\]

is holomorphic in \( D_{n,d}(-2K) \), it follows then from Proposition \( \square \) that \( s \mapsto V_{n,d,k}(s) \)

is a meromorphic function in \( D_{n,d}(-2K) \). Moreover, if \( s = -N \) is a singular point of \( V_{n,d,k}(s) \), point 3 of Proposition \( \square \) implies then that there exists \( j \in \{1, \ldots, n-k-1\} \), \( M, k_j \in \mathbb{N}_0 \) and \( \varepsilon_{j+1}, \ldots, \varepsilon_{n-k-1} \in \{0,1\} \) such that

\[-N_j - \cdots - N_n - \frac{1}{d_{n-k+1}} - \cdots - \frac{1}{d_n} + M = \frac{1}{d_j} + \frac{\varepsilon_{j+1}}{d_{j+1}} + \cdots + \frac{\varepsilon_{n-k-1}}{d_{n-k-1}} - k_j.
\]

It follows that \( \frac{1}{d_j} + \frac{\varepsilon_{j+1}}{d_{j+1}} + \cdots + \frac{\varepsilon_{n-k-1}}{d_{n-k-1}} + \frac{1}{d_{n-k+1}} + \cdots + \frac{1}{d_n} \in \mathbb{N} \) which contradicts the assumption \( \square \). As a conclusion, we prove that \( s \mapsto V_{n,d,k}(s) \) is regular at \( s = -N \).
Also, assumption (14) implies that $s \mapsto H_{n,d,k}(s)$ is a meromorphic function in $\mathbb{C}^n$ which is regular at $s = -N$. By using in addition the fact that $\frac{1}{\Gamma(s_n)}|_{s_n = -N_n} = 0$, we deduce that

$$s \mapsto R_{n,d,K,k+1}(s) := R_{n,d,K,k}(s) + \frac{1}{\Gamma(s_n)}H_{n,d,k}(s)V_{n,d,k}(s)$$

is a meromorphic function in $D_{n,d}(-2K)$ which is regular at $s = -N$ and satisfies $R_{n,d,K,k+1}(-N) = 0$. This ends the induction argument and therefore ends the proof of (28).

We are now ready to finish the proof of Theorem 2. It follows from (28) with $k = n - 1$ that

$$\zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(s) = \frac{\prod_{j=2}^{n} \Gamma\left( \frac{1}{d_j} \right)}{\prod_{j=2}^{n} d_j \gamma_j} A(s) B(s) \zeta_{1,d_1,\gamma_1}(s_1 + \cdots + s_n - b)$$

$$+ G_{n,d,\gamma,K}(s) + R_{n,d,K,n-1}(s),$$

(29)

where

1. $b := \frac{1}{d_2} + \cdots + \frac{1}{d_n} \in \mathbb{N}$;

2. $G_{n,d,\gamma,K}$ is the function defined by (26) and $s \mapsto R_{n,d,K,n-1}(s)$ is a meromorphic function in $D_{n,d}(-2K)$, regular in $s = -N$ and satisfying $R_{n,d,K,n-1}(-N) = 0$;

3. $A(s) := \frac{\prod_{j=3}^{n} \Gamma\left( s_j + \cdots + s_n - \frac{1}{d_j} - \cdots - \frac{1}{d_n} \right)}{\prod_{j=2}^{n-1} \Gamma\left( s_j + \cdots + s_n - \frac{1}{d_j+1} - \cdots - \frac{1}{d_n} \right)}$, $B(s) := \frac{\Gamma(s_2 + \cdots + s_n - b)}{\Gamma(s_n)}$.

Assumption (14) implies that $s \mapsto A(s)$ is regular in $s = -N$ and that

$$A(-N) = \frac{\prod_{j=3}^{n} \Gamma\left( -N_j - \cdots - N_n - \frac{1}{d_j} - \cdots - \frac{1}{d_n} \right)}{\prod_{j=2}^{n-1} \Gamma\left( -N_j - \cdots - N_n - \frac{1}{d_j+1} - \cdots - \frac{1}{d_n} \right)}.$$  

(30)

Moreover, by using the identity $\Gamma(z + 1) = z\Gamma(z)$, it is easy to see that for $M \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $x \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{Z}$, we have

$$\Gamma(-M - x) = \frac{\Gamma(b - x)}{(x)_{M,b}} \quad \text{where} \quad (x)_{M,b} = \prod_{k=-M}^{b-1} (k - x).$$  

(31)

Combining (30) and (31) we have

$$A(-N) = \frac{\prod_{j=3}^{n} \Gamma\left( b - \frac{1}{d_j} - \cdots - \frac{1}{d_n} \right)}{\prod_{j=3}^{n} \left( \frac{1}{d_j} + \cdots + \frac{1}{d_n} \right)^{N_j + \cdots + N_n,b}} \cdot \frac{\prod_{j=2}^{n-1} \left( \frac{1}{d_j+1} + \cdots + \frac{1}{d_n} \right)^{N_j + \cdots + N_n,b}}{\prod_{j=2}^{n-1} \Gamma\left( b - \frac{1}{d_j+1} - \cdots - \frac{1}{d_n} \right)}$$
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exists and is given by 

\[
\min_{\delta}
\]

Combining (29), (30), (33) and (27) we find that the directional limit \( \zeta_k \). By using the classical fact that for \( \theta \in \mathbb{C}^n \) such that \( \theta_2 + \cdots + \theta_n \neq 0 \) and \( \theta_n \neq 0 \). Set \( \delta = \min \{ |\theta_2 + \cdots + \theta_n|^{-1}, |\theta_n|^{-1} \} > 0 \). Then, for all \( t \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\} \) such that \( |t| < \delta \), we have

\[
B(-N + t\theta) = \frac{\Gamma(-N_2 + \cdots + N_n + b + t(\theta_2 + \cdots + \theta_n))}{\Gamma(-N_n + t\theta_n)}.
\]

By using the classical fact that for \( k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \), \( \Gamma(z) \) has a simple pole in \( z = -k \) of residue \( \frac{(-1)^k}{k!} \), we deduce that the directional limit \( B^\theta(-N) := \lim_{t \to 0, t \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}} B(-N + t\theta) \) exists and is given by

\[
B^\theta(-N) = \frac{(-1)^{N_2 + \cdots + N_{n-1} + b} N_n!}{(N_2 + \cdots + N_n + b)!} \left( \frac{\theta_n}{\theta_2 + \cdots + \theta_n} \right).
\]

Combining (29), (30), (33) and (27) we find that the directional limit \( \zeta^\theta_{n,d,\gamma}(-N) := \lim_{t \to 0, t \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}} \zeta_{n,d,\gamma}(N + t\theta) \) exists and is given by

\[
\zeta^\theta_{n,d,\gamma}(-N) = \frac{\prod_{j=2}^n \Gamma \left( \frac{1}{d_j} \right)}{\prod_{j=2}^n d_j ^{1/d_j} \gamma_j} A(-N) \, B^\theta(-N) \, \zeta_1,d_1,\gamma_1(-(|N| + b)) + G_{n,d,\gamma,\gamma,K}(-N).
\]

We conclude by using in addition the expressions given by (24), (27), (32) and (33). This ends the proof of Theorem 2. \( \square \)

7 Values of Mahler’s series at non-positive integers

Now we proceed to the discussion of more general zeta-functions \( \zeta_n(s;P) \). In this section, as a preparation, we study the values of multiple series of Mahler type at non-positive integer points. We will use notations introduced in the beginning of Section 3.

Let \( P \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \ldots, X_n] \) be an elliptic polynomial of degree \( d \geq 1 \) and let \( Q \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \ldots, X_n] \) be a polynomial of degree \( q \geq 0 \). Define \( D := \{ s \in \mathbb{R} | s > \frac{n+q}{d} \} \),

\[
Y(P,Q; s) := \int_{[1,\infty)^n} Q(x) P^{-s}(x) \, dx \quad \text{and} \quad Z(P,Q; s) := \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}^n} \frac{Q(m)}{P(m)^s}.
\]
Lemma 5. (K. Mahler [15]) Both \( Y(P, Q; s) \) and \( Z(P, Q; s) \) converges absolutely in \( \mathcal{D} \) and has meromorphic continuation to the whole complex plane \( \mathbb{C} \) with at most simple poles located in the set

\[
\mathcal{P}(P, Q) := \left\{ s = \frac{n + q - k}{d} \mid k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \right\} \setminus (-\mathbb{N}_0).
\]

For elliptic polynomials \( P \), Pierrette Cassou-Noguès obtained in the eighties ([2], [3], etc.) several important results on the values of \( Z(P, Q; -N) \) at non-positive integers \( -N \). (cf. [18] for another approach.)

In the proof of Theorem 3, we will use the following result which gives new closed formulas for the values of \( Z(P, Q; -N) \). Our proof of this result is also different from the method of Cassou-Noguès.

**Theorem 4.** Let \( P \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \ldots, X_n] \) be an elliptic and homogeneous polynomial of degree \( d \geq 1 \) and let \( Q \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \ldots, X_n] \) be a homogeneous polynomial of degree \( q \geq 0 \). Then, for any \( N \in \mathbb{N}_0 \), \( s = -N \) is not a pole of \( Z(P, Q; s) \) and

\[
Z(P, Q; -N) = \sum_{\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} \sum_{\alpha \in I_N(\beta)} \sum_{u \in V(\alpha)} \frac{(-1)^{\alpha - N} (|\alpha| - 1 - N)!N!}{d \alpha! \beta!}
\times \left( \sum_{i=1}^n K_i(P; Q; N; \alpha, u, \beta) \right) \prod_{i=1}^n \tilde{B}_{g_i(u)+\beta_i},
\]

where \( \tilde{B}_k := B_k \) is as in the statement of Theorem 3.

**Proof of Theorem 4:**

Let \( P \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \ldots, X_n] \) be an elliptic and homogeneous polynomial of degree \( d \geq 1 \) and let \( Q \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \ldots, X_n] \) be a homogeneous polynomial of degree \( q \geq 0 \). Define for any \( a = (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in [0, \infty)^n \)

\[
P_a = P(X+a) = P(X_1+a_1, \ldots, X_n+a_n) \text{ and } Q_a = Q(X+a) = Q(X_1+a_1, \ldots, X_n+a_n).
\]

Define for any \( s \in \mathcal{D} \) and any \( a = (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in [0, \infty)^n \)

\[
Y(P_a, Q_a; s) = \int_{[1, \infty)^n} Q_a(x) P_a^{-s}(x) \, dx \quad \text{and} \quad Z(P_a, Q_a; s) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} \frac{Q_a(m)}{P_a(m)^s}.
\]

Our first useful ingredient is the following result:

**Proposition 3.** Let \( a \in [0, \infty)^n \). The integral \( Y(P_a, Q_a; s) \) converges absolutely in \( \mathcal{D} := \{ \Re(s) > \frac{n+n}{d} \} \) and has a meromorphic continuation to \( \mathbb{C} \) with at most simple
poles located in the set $P(P, Q)$ defined in Lemma 3. Moreover, for any $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $Y(P_a, Q_a; s)$ is regular at $s = -N$ and its value is given by

$$Y(P_a, Q_a; -N) = \sum_{\beta \subseteq \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{|\alpha| \leq n} \sum_{u \in V(\alpha)} \frac{(-1)^{|\alpha| - N}(|\alpha| - 1 - N)!N!}{d! \beta!} \times \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} K_i(P; Q; N; \alpha, u, \beta) \right) \prod_{i=1}^{n} (1 + a_i)^{s_1(u) + \beta_i}.$$

Proof of Proposition 3

Fix $a \in [0, \infty)^n$ and set $b = (b_1, \ldots, b_n)$ where $b_i = a_i + 1$ ($i = 1, \ldots, n$). First we remark that there exist $C_1, C_2$ and $C_3 > 0$ such that

$$|Q(x)| \leq C_1|x|^q \quad \text{and} \quad C_2|x|^d \leq P(x) \leq C_3|x|^d \quad \text{for all} \quad x \in [1, \infty)^n.$$

Then, since $Q_a(x)P_a^{-s}(x) \ll |x|^{q - dRs}$ and if $\Re s > (n + q)/d$ then $q - d\Re s < -n$, we see that $Y(P_a, Q_a; s)$ converges absolutely in $D$.

Set for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$,

$$V_i = \{x \in (0, \infty)^n \mid x_j < x_i \text{ for all } j \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \setminus \{i\}\}.$$

Shifting $x$ to $x + 1$ in the definition integral of $Y(P_a, Q_a; s)$, we find that for any $s \in D$:

$$Y(P_a, Q_a; s) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} Y_i(b; s) \quad \text{where} \quad Y_i(b; s) := \int_{V_i} Q_b(x)P_b^{-s}(x) \, dx. \quad (34)$$

We also use the notation, for all $i = 1, \ldots, n$,

$$H_k(\hat{y}(i); b) = \sum_{\gamma \subseteq \mathbb{N}_0 \mid |\gamma| = k} \frac{b^\gamma}{\gamma!} \partial^{\gamma} P(\hat{y}(i))) \quad \text{for all} \quad k = 1, \ldots, d$$

and

$$H(\hat{y}(i); b) = (H_1(\hat{y}(i); b), \ldots, H_d(\hat{y}(i); b)).$$

We will first study $Y_n(b; s)$. The Taylor expansion implies that for any $s \in D$:

$$Y_n(b; s) = \sum_{\beta \subseteq \mathbb{N}_0 \mid |\beta| \leq q} \frac{b^\beta}{\beta!} Y_n(b; \beta; s) \quad \text{where} \quad Y_n(b; \beta; s) := \int_{V_n} (\partial^{\beta} Q(x))P_b^{-s}(x) \, dx, \quad (35)$$

because $\partial^{\beta} Q(x) = 0$ if $|\beta| > q$. 
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Fix $\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$ such that $|\beta| \leq q$. Consider the blowing up

$$\varphi_n : (0, 1)^{n-1} \times (0, \infty) \to V_n,$$

defined by

$$\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \ldots, y_n) \mapsto \varphi_n(\mathbf{y}) = (y_1 y_n, \ldots, y_{n-1} y_n; y_n).$$

Since this is a map onto $V_n$ and its Jacobian is $y_n^{n-1}$, we get that for any $s \in \mathcal{D}$:

$$Y_n(b; \beta; s) = \int_{(0,1)^{n-1} \times (0,\infty)} (\partial^\beta Q(\varphi_n(\mathbf{y}))) P_b^{-s}(\varphi_n(\mathbf{y})) y_n^{n-1} \, d\mathbf{y}.$$  (36)

(Here, it is to be noted that $\partial^\beta Q(\varphi_n(\mathbf{y}))$ does not mean the derivative in $\mathbf{y}$; it means to substitute $\varphi_n(\mathbf{y})$ in place of $x$ into $\partial^\beta Q(x)$.) Since $\partial^\beta Q(x)$ is also homogeneous, we obtain

$$Y_n(b; \beta; s) = \int_{(0,1)^{n-1} \times (0,\infty)} (\partial^\beta Q(\hat{\mathbf{y}}(n))) P_b^{-s}(\varphi_n(\mathbf{y})) y_n^{g-|\beta|+n-1} \, d\mathbf{y}.  \tag{36}$$

Again applying the Taylor formula we see that for any $\mathbf{y} \in (0, 1)^{n-1} \times (0, \infty)$

$$P_{\hat{\mathbf{b}}}(\varphi_n(\mathbf{y})) = P(\varphi_n(\mathbf{y}) + \mathbf{b}) = \sum_{\gamma \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} \frac{\mathbf{b}^{\gamma}}{\gamma!} \partial^\gamma P(\varphi_n(\mathbf{y})) = \sum_{\gamma \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} \frac{\mathbf{b}^{\gamma}}{\gamma!} \gamma^d \partial^\gamma P(\hat{\mathbf{y}}(n))$$

$$= y_n^d P(\hat{\mathbf{y}}(n)) + \sum_{k=1}^{d} y_n^{d-k} H_k(\hat{\mathbf{y}}(n); \mathbf{b}). \tag{37}$$

The ellipticity of $P$ imply that

$$P(\hat{\mathbf{y}}(n)) = P(y_1, \ldots, y_{n-1}, 1) > 0 \text{ for all } (y_1, \ldots, y_{n-1}) \in [0, 1]^{n-1}. \tag{38}$$

Therefore, we deduce from the compacity of $[0, 1]^{n-1}$ that

$$B = B(P; \mathbf{b}) := \sup_{(y_1, \ldots, y_{n-1}) \in [0,1]^{n-1}} \sum_{k=1}^{d} \left| \frac{H_k(\hat{\mathbf{y}}(n); \mathbf{b})}{P(\hat{\mathbf{y}}(n))} \right| < \infty. \tag{39}$$

Set $A = A(P; \mathbf{b}) = 2B(P; \mathbf{b}) + 2 \geq 2$, and divide the integral on the right-hand side of (36) as

$$Y_n(b; \beta; s) = \int_{(0,1)^{n-1} \times (A,\infty)} + \int_{(0,1)^{n-1} \times (0,A)}$$

$$= Y_n^A(b; \beta; s) + Y_n^A(b; \beta; s), \text{ say.} \tag{40}$$
We first consider the integral \( Y_n^A(b; \beta; s) \). For all \( y = (y_1, \ldots, y_n) \in [0, 1]^{n-1} \times [A, \infty) \), it follows that

\[
\left| \sum_{k=1}^{d} y_k \frac{H_k(\hat{y}(n); b)}{P(\hat{y}(n))} \right| \leq \frac{B}{y_n} \leq \frac{B}{A} < \frac{1}{2}.
\]  

(41)

Now recall the elementary identity

\[
(1 + X_1 + \cdots + X_d)^{-s} = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^d} (-s)^{|\alpha|} \frac{|\alpha|!}{\alpha!} X_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots X_d^{\alpha_d} \quad (|X_1 + \cdots + X_d| < 1). \]  

(42)

Applying this to (37) and using the upper bound (41) we find that for any compact subset \( K \) of \( \mathbb{C} \), we have

\[
P_b(\varphi_n(y))^{-s} = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^d} (-s)^{|\alpha|} \frac{|\alpha|!}{\alpha!} X_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots X_d^{\alpha_d} \quad (|X_1 + \cdots + X_d| < 1). \]  

(43)

whose convergence is uniform in \( s \in K \) and in \( y \in [0, 1]^{n-1} \times [A, \infty) \). The uniformity of the convergence implies that for any \( s \in D = \{ \Re(s) > \frac{\alpha}{\beta} \} \), we can substitute (43) into the definition of \( Y_n^A(b; \beta; s) \) and carry out the termwise integration. We then obtain

\[
Y_n^A(b; \beta; s) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^d} (-s)^{|\alpha|} \frac{|\alpha|!}{\alpha!} A^{-ds-q-n-|\beta|} d s + \sum_{k=1}^{d} k \alpha_k - q - n + |\beta| R(\alpha; s),
\]  

(44)

where

\[
R(\alpha; s) := \int_{(0,1)^{n-1}} P(\hat{y}(n))^{-s-|\alpha|} \partial^\beta Q(\hat{y}(n)) \mathbf{H}(\hat{y}(n); b)^\alpha \, dy_1 \cdots dy_{n-1}.
\]

The function \( s \mapsto R(\alpha; s) \) is clearly holomorphic in the whole complex plane \( \mathbb{C} \). Moreover, the bound (39) implies \( |H_k(\hat{y}(n); b)| \leq B|P(\hat{y}(n))| \), so for any compact subset \( K \) of \( \mathbb{C} \), we have uniformly in \( \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^d \) and \( s \in K \),

\[
R(\alpha; s) \leq_{K,P,Q} B^{|\alpha|} < \left( \frac{A}{2} \right)^{|\alpha|}
\]

(similar to (41)). Therefore, the last member of (44) defines a meromorphic function in \( \mathbb{C} \) with at most simple poles located in the set \( \mathcal{P}_0(P, Q) := \{ \frac{n+q-k}{d} \mid k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \} \).

That is, \( Y_n^A(b; \beta; s) \) has the meromorphic continuation (given explicitly by the last member of (44)) to the whole complex plane \( \mathbb{C} \) with at most simple poles located in the set \( \mathcal{P}_0(P, Q) \).
Now let $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$. We consider the situation at $s = -N$. The denominators of the terms in the sum (44) correspond to $\alpha \in I_N(\beta)$ are 0 at $s = -N$, so this point is a possible pole. However, if $\alpha \in I_N(\beta)$, then $|\alpha| > N$ because

$$dN < dN + n + (q - |\beta|) = \sum_{k=1}^{d} k\alpha_k \leq d \sum_{k=1}^{d} \alpha_k = d|\alpha|.$$ 

Hence $\left( \frac{(-s)}{|\alpha|} \right)_{|s|=-N} = 0$. Therefore $s = -N$ is not a pole of $Y^A_\alpha(b; \beta; s)$, and hence we conclude that possible poles of $Y^A_\alpha(b; \beta; s)$ are located only on $\mathcal{P}(P, Q)$.

Using the fact that for any $n \geq \beta$, we have

$$
\left( \frac{-s}{|\alpha|} \right) \sim \frac{(-1)^{|\alpha|-N}!(|\alpha| - 1 - N)!}{|\alpha|!} (s + N) \quad \text{as } s \to -N,
$$

we deduce then from (44) that

$$
Y^A_\alpha(b; \beta; -N) = - \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{N}_0 \setminus \{0\}} \left( -s \right)^{|\alpha|-N} \frac{|\alpha|!}{|\alpha|!} \frac{A^{dN-\sum_{k=1}^{d} k\alpha_k + q+n-|\beta|}}{dN + q + n - \sum_{k=1}^{d} k\alpha_k - |\beta|} R(\alpha, -N)
\begin{align*}
&+ \sum_{\alpha \in I_N(\beta)} (-1)^{|\alpha|-N}!(|\alpha| - 1 - N)! R(\alpha, -N). \tag{45}
\end{align*}
$$

Next consider $Y^A_\alpha(b; \beta; -N)$. Since $P$ is elliptic and $q \geq |\beta|$, we see that $Y^A_\alpha(b; \beta; s)$ is holomorphic in the whole complex plane $\mathbb{C}$, and for any $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$
Y^A_\alpha(b; \beta; -N) = \int_{(0,1)^{n-1} \times (0, A)} \partial^\beta Q(\hat{y}(n)) \, P^N_b(\varphi_n(y)) \, y_n^{-|\beta|+n-1} \, dy. \tag{46}
$$

Furthermore, it follows from (37) and (12) that

$$
P^N_b(\varphi_n(y)) = \left( y_n^d P(\hat{y}(n)) + \sum_{k=1}^{d} y_n^{d-k} H_k(\hat{y}(n); b) \right)^N
\begin{align*}
&= \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{N}_0 \setminus \{0\}} \left( \frac{N}{|\alpha|} \right) |\alpha|! \frac{A^{dN-\sum_{k=1}^{d} k\alpha_k} P^{N-|\alpha|}}{\alpha!} \frac{|\alpha|^{-|\beta|+n-1}}{H(\hat{y}(n); b)^{\alpha}}. \tag{47}
\end{align*}
$$

Combining (37) and (47) we obtain for any $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$,

$$
Y^A_\alpha(b; \beta; -N) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{N}_0 \setminus \{0\}} \left( \frac{N}{|\alpha|} \right) |\alpha|! \frac{A^{dN-\sum_{k=1}^{d} k\alpha_k + q+n-|\beta|}}{\alpha!} \frac{1}{dN + q + n - \sum_{k=1}^{d} k\alpha_k - |\beta|} R(\alpha, -N). \tag{48}
$$
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As a conclusion, (35), (45) and (48) imply that

\[ Y_n(b; \beta; s) = \sum_{\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0 \cap |\beta| \leq q} \frac{b^n}{\beta!} Y_n(b; \beta; s) = \sum_{\beta \in \mathbb{N}_0 \cap |\beta| \leq q} \frac{b^n}{\beta!} \left( Y_n^A(b; \beta; s) + Y_n^A(b; \beta; s) \right) \]

has a meromorphic continuation to \( \mathbb{C} \) with at most simple poles located on the set \( \mathcal{P}(P, Q) \) and that for any \( N \in \mathbb{N}_0 \),

\[ Y_n(b; \beta; -N) = \sum_{\alpha \in I_N(\beta)} \frac{(-1)^{|\alpha| - N} N! (|\alpha| - 1 - N)!}{d \alpha!} R(\alpha, -N), \quad (49) \]

because the first term on the right-hand side of (45) is cancelled with the right-hand side of (48).

By a simple permutation of the variables, we deduce from the previous argument that for any \( i = 1, \ldots, n \), \( Y_i(b; s) \) has a meromorphic continuation to \( \mathbb{C} \) with at most simple poles located in the set \( \mathcal{P}(P, Q) \) and that for any \( N \in \mathbb{N}_0 \)

\[ Y_i(b; \beta; -N) = \sum_{\alpha \in I_N(\beta)} \frac{(-1)^{|\alpha| - N} N! (|\alpha| - 1 - N)!}{d \alpha!} \times \int_{(0,1)^{n-1}} P(\hat{y}(i))^{N-|\alpha|} (\partial^\alpha Q(\hat{y}(i))) H(\hat{y}(i); b)^\alpha \prod_{k=1, k \neq i}^n dy_k, \quad (50) \]

To end the proof of Proposition 3, it suffices to remark that for any \( i = 1, \ldots, n \):

\[ H(\hat{y}(i); b)^\alpha = \prod_{k=1}^d \left( \sum_{\gamma \in \Delta_k} \frac{b^\gamma \partial^\gamma P(\hat{y}(i))}{\gamma!} \right)^{\alpha_k} \]

\[ = \prod_{k=1}^d \left[ \sum_{u_k(\gamma) \in \Delta_k \cap (0, n+1), |u_k| = \alpha_k} \frac{\alpha_k!}{u_k!} \prod_{\gamma \in \Delta_k} \left( \frac{b^\gamma \partial^\gamma P(\hat{y}(i))}{\gamma!} \right)^{u_k, \gamma} \right] \]

\[ = \sum_{u=(u_1, \ldots, u_d) \in V(\alpha)} \prod_{k=1}^d u_k! \prod_{k=1}^d \left[ \prod_{\gamma \in \Delta_k} \left( \frac{\partial^\gamma P(\hat{y}(i))}{\gamma!} \right)^{u_k, \gamma} \right] \times b^{\sum_{k=1}^d \sum_{\gamma \in \Delta_k} u_k, \gamma} \]

\[ = \sum_{u \in V(\alpha)} P^i_{\alpha, u}(\hat{y}(i)) b^{\vartheta(u)}. \]
Substituting this into (50), and combining with (34), we obtain the assertion of Proposition 3.

The second ingredient for the proof of Theorem 4 is the following result by E. Friedman and A. Pereira, which is a clever use of a Raabe-type formula. Applying Lemma 5 to \( P_a, Q_a \) we see that both \( Y(P_a, Q_a; s) \) and \( Z(P_a, Q_a; s) \) converge absolutely in \( \{ \Re(s) > \frac{n+q}{d} \} \) and have meromorphic continuation to \( \mathbb{C} \) with at most simple poles located in the set

\[
\left\{ \frac{n+q-k}{d}, \ k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \right\} \setminus (-\mathbb{N}_0).
\]

**Lemma 6.** (Friedman and Pereira [11], Proposition 2.2)

For any \( N \in \mathbb{N}_0 \), \( a \in [0, \infty)^n \mapsto Y(P_a, Q_a; -N) \) and \( a \in [0, \infty)^n \mapsto Z(P_a, Q_a; -N) \) are polynomials in \( a \). If we write

\[
Y(P_a, Q_a; -N) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} c_{\alpha} a^\alpha = \sum_{\alpha} c_{\alpha} \prod_{i=1}^{n} a_i^{\alpha_i},
\]

then

\[
Z(P, Q; -N) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} c_{\alpha} \prod_{i=1}^{n} B_{\alpha_i},
\]

where the \( B_k \) are the classical Bernoulli numbers defined by (4).

We need in fact the following version of Lemma 6.

**Lemma 7.** If we write

\[
Y(P_a, Q_a; -N) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} d_{\alpha} \prod_{i=1}^{n} (1 + a_i)^{\alpha_i},
\]

then

\[
Z(P, Q; -N) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} d_{\alpha} \prod_{i=1}^{n} \tilde{B}_{\alpha_i}.
\]

**Proof of Lemma 7**

First we remark that

\[
Y(P_a, Q_a; -N) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} d_{\alpha} \prod_{i=1}^{n} (1 + a_i)^{\alpha_i} = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} d_{\alpha} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}_0} \left( \prod_{i=1}^{n} \left( \frac{\alpha_i}{k_i} \right) \prod_{i=1}^{n} a_i^{k_i} \right)
\]
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Lemma 6 then implies that

\[
Z(P, Q; -N) = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}} \left( \sum_{\alpha \geq k} d_{\alpha} \prod_{i=1}^{n} \binom{\alpha_i}{k_i} \right) \prod_{i=1}^{n} a_{k_i}.
\]

(51)

Since it is well known that

\[
\sum_{k=0}^{\alpha} \binom{\alpha}{k} B_k = (-1)^{\alpha} B_\alpha = \tilde{B}_\alpha,
\]

(52)

we see that the right-hand side of (51) is equal to

\[
\sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n} d_{\alpha} \prod_{i=1}^{n} \tilde{B}_{\alpha_i}.
\]

This ends the proof of Lemma 7. \(\square\)

Theorem 4 follows clearly from Proposition 3 and Lemma 7. \(\square\)

8 Proof of Theorem 3

Consider for any \(j = 1, \ldots, n\) a polynomial \(P_j \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \ldots, X_j]\) in \(j\) variables. Assume that the assumptions (6), (7) hold. Assume also that for all \(j = 1, \ldots, n - 1\) the polynomial \(P_j\) satisfies the assumption (\(H_0S\)) and that the polynomial \(P_n\) is elliptic and homogeneous of degree \(d \geq 1\).

As mentioned in the Introduction,

\[
\zeta_n(s; \mathcal{P}) = \sum_{m_1, \ldots, m_n \geq 1} \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^{n} P_j(m_1, \ldots, m_j)^{s_j}}
\]

converges absolutely in the domain \(\mathcal{D}_n(\mathcal{P})\) (defined by (10)), and has the meromorphic continuation to the whole space \(\mathbb{C}^n\). Fix \(\delta_1, \ldots, \delta_n > 0\) such that (9) holds. Fix \(N = (N_1, \ldots, N_n) \in \mathbb{N}_0^n\) and set

\[
\sigma_0 := \frac{1}{\delta_n} \max \left\{ n + 1 - j + \sum_{i=j}^{n} \delta_i N_i \mid j \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \right\}.
\]
Define for $t \in \mathbb{C}$
\[ \psi_{N,P}(t) := \zeta_n(-N + te_n; P) = \zeta_n((-N_1, \ldots, -N_{n-1}, -N_n + t); P). \]
It follows from the above that $\psi_{N,P}(t)$ converges absolutely in $\{\Re(t) > \sigma_0\}$ and has a meromorphic continuation to the whole complex plane $\mathbb{C}$.

Consider also the zeta function
\[ t \mapsto Z(P_n, \prod_{j=1}^{n} P_j^{N_j}; t) := \sum_{m_1, \ldots, m_n \geq 1} \frac{\prod_{j=1}^{n} P_j(m_1, \ldots, m_j)^{N_j}}{P_n(m_1, \ldots, m_n)^{t}} \]
in one variable $t$ and set $\nu_1 := n + q_N = n + \sum_{j=1}^{n} N_j \deg(P_j)$. Lemma [5] implies that $Z(P_n, \prod_{j=1}^{n} P_j^{N_j}; t)$ converges absolutely in $\{\Re(t) > \nu_1/\deg P_n\}$ and has the meromorphic continuation to the whole $t$-plane with at most simple poles located on the set
\[ \mathcal{P}(N; P) := \left\{ \frac{\nu_1 - k}{\deg P_n} \mid k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \right\} \setminus (-N_0). \]

We have for any $t \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\Re(t) > \max\{\sigma_0, \nu_1/\deg P_n\}$,
\[ \psi_{N,P}(t) = \sum_{m_1, \ldots, m_n \geq 1} \frac{1}{\left( \prod_{j=1}^{n} P_j(m_1, \ldots, m_j)^{-N_j} \right) P_n(m_1, \ldots, m_n)^{-N_n + t}} \]
\[ = \sum_{m_1, \ldots, m_n \geq 1} \frac{\prod_{j=1}^{n} P_j(m_1, \ldots, m_j)^{N_j}}{P_n(m_1, \ldots, m_n)^{t}} = Z(P_n, \prod_{j=1}^{n} P_j^{N_j}; t), \]
and hence we deduce by analytic continuation that
\[ \psi_{N,P}(t) = Z(P_n, \prod_{j=1}^{n} P_j^{N_j}; t) \quad \text{for all} \quad t \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathcal{P}(N; P). \]

It follows that there exists $\eta = \eta(N, P) > 0$ such that
\[ \psi_{N,P}(t) = Z(P_n, \prod_{j=1}^{n} P_j^{N_j}; t) \quad \text{for all} \quad t \in D^*(0, \eta) = \{t \in \mathbb{C}; \ 0 \leq |t| < \eta\}, \]
because $t = 0$ is not included in $\mathcal{P}(N; P)$. Theorem [4] implies then that
\[ \zeta^n_{-N}(N; P) := \lim_{t \to 0} \zeta_n((-N_1, \ldots, -N_{n-1}, -N_n + t); P) = \lim_{t \to 0} \psi_{N,P}(t) \]
exists and is given by
\[ \zeta^n_{-N}(N; P) = Z(P_n, \prod_{j=1}^{n} P_j^{N_j}; 0). \]
We conclude the assertion of Theorem [3] by using the expression of $Z(P_n, \prod_{j=1}^{n} P_j^{N_j}; 0)$ given by Theorem [4] \qedsymbol
9 Examples of transcendental values

We already mentioned in Section 2 (Corollary 4) that some special values of the power-sum zeta-function \( \zeta_n(s; P) \) are transcendental. The same phenomenon is therefore expected for more general zeta-function \( \zeta(s; P) \). It is surely difficult to prove the transcendency in general, but at least we can present some examples. The first example, essentially due to Pierrette Cassou-Noguès, gives a transcendental values at the origin.

**Example 1:** Let \( P = (P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4) \) with \( P_1 \in \mathbb{R}[X_1], P_2 \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, X_2], P_3 \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, X_2, X_3] \) satisfying \( (H_0S) \) and \( P_4 = X_1^3 + X_2^3 + X_3^3 + X_4^3. \)

Consider \( \zeta_4(s; P) \). We have for \( N = 0 = (0, 0, 0, 0) \):

\[
\zeta_4^e(0; P) := \lim_{t \to 0} \zeta_4(te^4; P) = Z(P_4, 0),
\]

where \( Z(P_4, s) \) is the meromorphic continuation of the one variable Dirichlet series

\[
s \mapsto \sum_{m_1, \ldots, m_4 \geq 1} \frac{1}{P_4(m_1, \ldots, m_4)^s}.
\]

Pierrette Cassou-Noguès [2] proved that

\[
Z(P_4, 0) = -\frac{8}{9} B_4 \Gamma(1/3)^3 + B_1^4 = \frac{4}{135} \Gamma(1/3)^3 + \frac{1}{16}.
\]

By using the already quoted result of Chudnovsky that \( \Gamma(1/3) \) is a transcendental number, it follows that \( Z(P_4, 0) \) is a transcendental number. Therefore from (53) we deduce that \( \zeta_4^e(0; P) \) is also a transcendental number.

Next we consider the individual period integral (16), and give an example whose value is transcendental.

**Example 2:** Let \( P = (P_1, P_2, P_3) \) with \( P_1 = X_1, P_2 = X_1 + X_2 \) and \( P_3 = X_1^2 + 2X_1X_2 + X_2^2 + X_3^2 \). Then \( n = 3 \) and \( d = \deg P_3 = 2 \). We consider the value of \( \zeta_3(s; P) \) at the point \(-N\), where \( N = (1, 1, 0) \). Then \( Q_N = X_1(X_1 + X_2) \) and \( q_N = \deg Q_N = 2 \).

We choose one of the period integrals on the right-hand side of (17) and evaluate its value. The vectors \( \alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \) and \( \beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3) \) should satisfy \( |\beta| \leq q_N = 2 \) and \( \alpha_1 + 2\alpha_2 + |\beta| = q_N + n = 5 \). We choose \( \beta = (2, 0, 0) \) and \( \alpha = (1, 1) \).

Next we write \( \Delta_1^3 = \{\gamma(11), \gamma(12), \gamma(13)\} \) and \( \Delta_2^3 = \{\gamma(21), \ldots, \gamma(26)\} \), where

\[
\begin{align*}
\gamma(11) &= (1, 0, 0), \quad \gamma(12) = (0, 1, 0), \quad \gamma(13) = (0, 0, 1), \\
\gamma(21) &= (2, 0, 0), \quad \gamma(22) = (0, 2, 0), \quad \gamma(23) = (0, 0, 2), \\
\gamma(24) &= (1, 1, 0), \quad \gamma(25) = (1, 0, 1), \quad \gamma(26) = (0, 1, 1).
\end{align*}
\]
Then \( V(\alpha) \) is the set of vectors \( u = (u_1, u_2) \) with 
\[
  u_1 = (u_{1,\gamma(11)}, u_{1,\gamma(12)}, u_{1,\gamma(13)}), \\
  u_2 = (u_{2,\gamma(21)}, \ldots, u_{2,\gamma(26)}),
\]
and
\[
  \sum_{j=1}^{3} u_{1,\gamma(1j)} = \alpha_1 = 1, \\
  \sum_{j=1}^{6} u_{2,\gamma(2j)} = \alpha_2 = 1.
\]

We choose \( u \) where 
\[
  u_{1,\gamma(11)} = u_{2,\gamma(21)} = 1 \text{ and all other components are 0.}
\]

Now we compute the integral \( K_3(P_3; Q_N; 0; \alpha, u, \beta) \). First, we find that 
\[
  P_3(\hat{y}(3)) - |\alpha| = (y_1^2 + 2y_1y_2 + y_2^2 + 1)^{-2}.
\]
Secondly, since 
\[
  Q_N(\hat{y}(3)) = y_1(y_1 + y_2),
\]
we have
\[
  \partial^3 Q_N(\hat{y}(3)) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_1^2} y_1(y_1 + y_2) = 2.
\]
Thirdly,
\[
  P^3_{\alpha, u}(\hat{y}(3)) = \frac{1}{2!} \frac{\partial}{\partial y_1} P_3(\hat{y}(3)) \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y_1^2} P_3(\hat{y}(3)) = 2(y_1 + y_2).
\]
Therefore
\[
  K_3(P_3; Q_N; 0; \alpha, u, \beta) = 4 \int_0^1 \int_0^1 ((y_1 + y_2)^2 + 1)^{-2} (y_1 + y_2) dy_1 dy_2.
\]
Putting \( y_1 + y_2 = z \) we see that the right-hand side is
\[
  = 4 \int_0^1 dy_2 \int_{y_2}^{y_2 + 1} \frac{z}{(z^2 + 1)^2} dz = 2 \int_0^1 \left( \frac{1}{y_2^2 + 1} - \frac{1}{(y_2 + 1)^2 + 1} \right) dy_2
\]
\[
  = 2(2 \arctan 1 - \arctan 2) = 2 \left( \frac{\pi}{2} - \arctan 2 \right) = 2 \arctan \frac{1}{2}.
\]

If \( \xi := \arctan(1/2) \) is an algebraic number, then \( \tan \xi \) is a transcendental number by
the classical Lindemann-Weierstrass theorem. However \( \tan(\arctan(1/2)) = 1/2 \) is obviously not transcendental. Therefore \( \xi \) is, and hence \( K_3(P_3; Q_N; 0; \alpha, u, \beta) \)
is a transcendental number.

10 Some relations among Bernoulli numbers

As we mentioned in the introduction, in our previous paper \[9\], we proved an explicit 
formula for \( \zeta^\theta(-N; \gamma; b) \) (the generalized Euler-Zagier type) in terms of \( N, \theta \) and
Bernoulli numbers \( B_n \). Since our \( \zeta_n(s; P) \) includes \( \zeta_n(s; \gamma; b) \) as special examples,
Theorem 3 in the present paper also gives an explicit expression for \( \zeta^n(-N; \gamma; b) \). The arguments in those two papers are methodologically similar (both based on a kind of Raabe-type formula), but not exactly the same, and consequently, the two expressions are different. Comparing these two expressions, we find some non-trivial relations among Bernoulli numbers.

**Example 3:** The case of the Riemann zeta-function \( \zeta(s) \). Applying Theorem 1 in [9], for any \( N \in \mathbb{N}_0 \) we obtain

\[
\zeta(-N) = -\frac{1}{N+1} B_{N+1} - \sum_{\alpha=0}^{N} \binom{N}{\alpha} \frac{1}{N+1-\alpha} B_{\alpha}. \tag{54}
\]

On the other hand, let apply Theorem 3 to \( \zeta(s) \). Then \( n=1 \), \( P=P_1 \) with \( P_1(X_1) = X_1 \), \( d=1 \), \( Q_N = X_1^N \), \( q_N = N \). Therefore the possible values of \( \beta \) in the formula \((17)\) are \( \beta = 0, 1, \ldots, N \), and for each \( \beta \), \( \alpha \) is determined by \( \alpha + \beta = N+1 \).

Also \( V(\alpha) = \{\alpha\} \), \( g(u) = \alpha \), \( \hat{y} = y_1 \) and \( \hat{y}(1) = (1) \). Since \( \partial P_1(X_1) = 1 \) and \( \partial \beta Q_N(X_1) = (N)^{\beta} X_1 \), we have \( P_1(\hat{y}(1)) = 1 \), \( (P_1)^{\alpha,u}(\hat{y}(1)) = 1 \), and \( \partial \beta Q(\hat{y}(1)) = (N)^{\beta} \), and hence the period \( K_1(P_1; Q_N; 0; \alpha, u, \beta) = (N)^{\beta} \). Therefore

\[
\zeta(-N) = \sum_{\beta=0}^{N} \frac{(-1)^{N+1-\beta}(N-\beta)!}{\beta!(N+1-\beta)!} (N)^{\beta} B_{N+1}
\]

\[
= \frac{B_{N+1}}{N+1} + \sum_{\beta=1}^{N} \frac{(-1)^{\beta}}{\beta!} N(N-1) \cdots (N-\beta+1) B_{N+1}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{N+1} \sum_{\beta=0}^{N} (-1)^{\beta} \binom{N+1}{\beta} B_{N+1}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{N+1} \left( \sum_{\beta=0}^{N+1} (-1)^{\beta} \binom{N+1}{\beta} - (-1)^{N+1} \right) B_{N+1} = \frac{(-1)^{N}}{N+1} B_{N+1}, \tag{55}
\]

which coincides with the well-known classical expression of \( \zeta(-N) \). Comparing \((54)\) and \((55)\), we obtain

\[
-B_{N+1} - \sum_{\alpha=0}^{N} \binom{N}{\alpha} \frac{N+1}{N+1-\alpha} B_{\alpha} = (-1)^{N} B_{N+1},
\]

which implies the known but non-trivial formula \((52)\).
The consequence of Theorem 1 in [9] is then:

With notations of [9], we have \( \zeta(\underbrace{2}_{\text{under the notation of the present paper}}) \). Therefore we just state the case \( N = (N_1, N_2) \) (\( N_1, N_2 \in \mathbb{N}_0 \)). In [9] we consider the general directional limit \( \lim_{t \to 0} (-N_1 + t\theta_1, -N_2 + t\theta_2) \), but in the present paper we only consider the case \( \theta_1 = 0 \), that is \( \zeta^2_{\gamma}(-N; P) \) under the notation of the present paper. Therefore we just state the case \( \theta_1 = 0 \). With notations of [9], we have \( \zeta_2(s; P) = \zeta_2(s; \gamma; b) \) with \( \gamma = (1, 1) \) and \( b = (0, 1) \). The consequence of Theorem 1 in [9] is then

\[
\zeta^2_{\gamma}(-N; P) = \sum_{l=0}^{N_1} \sum_{k_1 \geq l, k_2 \geq 0} \frac{(N_1 + N_2 + 2 - l)!}{(k_1 - l)! k_2! (N_1 + N_2 + 2 - k_1 - k_2)!} \times \left( \frac{N_1}{l} \right) \left( \frac{N_1 + N_2 + 1 - l}{N_2} \right)^{-1} \frac{(N_1 + N_2 + 1 + l)!}{(N_2 + 1)!} \frac{B_{k_1} B_{k_2}}{(N_1 + N_2 + 2 - l)(l - N_1 - 1)} \\
+ \sum_{l=0}^{N_1} \sum_{k_1 \geq l, k_2 \geq 0} \frac{k_1 + k_2 \leq N_2 + 1 + l}{(k_1 - l)! k_2! (N_2 + 1 + l - k_1 - k_2)!} \times \left( \frac{N_1}{l} \right) \frac{B_{k_1} B_{k_2}}{(N_2 + 1)(N_1 + 1 - l)} \\
+ \sum_{l_1=0}^{N_1} \sum_{l_2=0}^{N_2} \sum_{k_1 \geq l_1, k_2 \geq 0} \frac{k_1 + k_2 \leq l_1 + l_2}{(k_1 - l_1)! k_2! (l_1 + l_2 - k_1 - k_2)!} \times \left( \frac{N_1}{l_1} \right) \left( \frac{N_2}{l_2} \right) \frac{B_{k_1} B_{k_2}}{(N_1 + N_2 + 2 - l_1 - l_2)(N_2 + 1 + l_2)}.
\]

Next we apply Theorem 3 to \( \zeta_2(s; P) \). Then \( n = 2, d = 1, Q_N = X_1^{N_1} (X_1 + X_2)^{N_2}, q_N = N_1 + N_2, \) so \( \beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2) \) should satisfy \( \beta_1 + \beta_2 \leq N_1 + N_2 \) and \( \alpha = N_1 + N_2 + 2 - \beta_1 - \beta_2 \). It follows that \( \Delta^2 = \{\gamma(11), \gamma(12)\} \) with \( \gamma(11) = (1, 0) \) and \( \gamma(12) = (0, 1) \). The set \( V(\alpha) \) can be parametrized as

\[
V(\alpha) = \{ u_l = (\alpha - l, l) \mid 0 \leq l \leq \alpha \}.
\]

Then \( g(u_l) = (g_1(u_l), g_2(u_l)) \) with \( g_1(u_l) = \alpha - l \) and \( g_2(u_l) = l \), and we obtain

\[
\zeta^2_{\gamma}(-N; P) = \ ...
\]
We also obtain an expression for $K_1(P_2; Q_N; 0; \alpha, \mathbf{u}_i, \beta)$. First we see that if $\beta_2 > N_2$ then $\partial^\beta Q_N = 0$, and if $\beta_2 \leq N_2$ then

$$
\partial^\beta Q_N = (N_2)_{\beta_2} \sum_{j=\max\{0, \beta_1-N_1\}}^{\min\{\beta_1, N_2-\beta_2\}} \left(\frac{\beta_1}{j}\right) (N_1)_{\beta_1-j} (N_2 - \beta_2)_j X_1^{N_1-\beta_1+j} (X_1 + X_2)^{N_2-\beta_2-j}.
$$

Next, since $\partial^{(1)} P_2 = \partial^{(2)} P_2 = 1$, we have

$$
(P_2)^{\alpha}_{\alpha, \mathbf{u}_i}(\hat{Y}(i)) = \frac{\alpha!}{(\alpha-l)!l!} = \left(\frac{N_1 + N_2 + 2 - \beta_1 - \beta_2}{l}\right).
$$

Therefore

$$
K_1(P_2; Q_N; 0; \alpha, \mathbf{u}_i, \beta)
= \left(\frac{N_1 + N_2 + 2 - \beta_1 - \beta_2}{l}\right)^{(N_2)_{\beta_2}} \sum_{j=\max\{0, \beta_1-N_1\}}^{\min\{\beta_1, N_2-\beta_2\}} \left(\frac{\beta_1}{j}\right) (N_1)_{\beta_1-j} (N_2 - \beta_2)_j
\times \int_0^1 (1 + y_2)^{-\alpha + N_2-\beta_2-j} dy_2,
$$

and the last integral is

$$
= \int_0^1 (1 + y_2)^{-N_1-2+\beta_1-j} dy_2 = \frac{1 - 2^{-N_1-1+\beta_1-j}}{N_1 + 1 + j - \beta_1}.
$$

We also obtain an expression for $K_2(P_2; Q_N; 0; \alpha, \mathbf{u}_i, \beta)$, almost the same as (58), the only difference is that the corresponding integral factor is

$$
\int_0^1 (1 + y_1)^{-N_1-2+\beta_1-j} y_1^{-\beta_1+j} dy_1 = \frac{2^{-N_1-1+\beta_1-j}}{N_1 + 1 + j - \beta_1}.
$$

Therefore

$$
K_1(P_2; Q_N; 0; \alpha, \mathbf{u}_i, \beta) + K_2(P_2; Q_N; 0; \alpha, \mathbf{u}_i, \beta)
= \left(\frac{N_1 + N_2 + 2 - \beta_1 - \beta_2}{l}\right)^{(N_2)_{\beta_2}} \sum_{j=\max\{0, \beta_1-N_1\}}^{\min\{\beta_1, N_2-\beta_2\}} \left(\frac{\beta_1}{j}\right) (N_1)_{\beta_1-j} (N_2 - \beta_2)_j
$$
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\[
\frac{1}{N_1 + 1 + j - \beta_1} = \left( N_1 + N_2 + 2 - \beta_1 - \beta_2 \right) (N_2)_{\beta_2} \sum_{j=\max\{0,\beta_1-N_1\}}^{\min\{\beta_1, N_2-\beta_2\}} \binom{\beta_1}{j} (N_1)_{\beta_1-j-1}(N_2 - \beta_2)_j,
\]

which with (57) implies
\[
\zeta^{(2)}_N(-N; P) = \sum_{\beta_1, \beta_2 \geq 0} \sum_{l=0}^{N_1+N_2+2-\beta_1-\beta_2} \frac{(-1)^{N_1+N_2+2-\beta_1-\beta_2}(N_1 + N_2 + 1 - \beta_1 - \beta_2)!}{(N_1 + N_2 + 2 - \beta_1 - \beta_2)!\beta_1!\beta_2!} \times \left( N_1 + N_2 + 2 - \beta_1 - \beta_2 \right) (N_2)_{\beta_2} \sum_{j=\max\{0,\beta_1-N_1\}}^{\min\{\beta_1, N_2-\beta_2\}} \binom{\beta_1}{j} (N_1)_{\beta_1-j-1}(N_2 - \beta_2)_j \bar{B}_{N_1+N_2+2-\beta_2-1} \bar{B}_{\beta_2+1}. \tag{59}
\]

Comparing (56) and (59), we obtain

**Proposition 4.** The right-hand side of (56) is equal to the right-hand side of (59). This identity gives a non-trivial relation among Bernoulli numbers.

Using the known data of the values of Bernoulli numbers, we can check, for instance, that both (56) and (59) gives \(\zeta^{(2)}_N(0; P) = 5/12\), which agrees with the known “reverse” value. However the authors do not know whether the identity obtained in Proposition 4 is essentially new, or can be deduced from known formulas.

For each multiple zeta-function \(\zeta_n(s; P)\), we can argue as above and can obtain certain (more and more complicated) identity among Bernoulli numbers.
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