ON LANDAU–SIEGEL ZEROS AND HEIGHTS OF SINGULAR MODULI

CHRISTIAN TÁFULA

Abstract. Let $D < 0$ be a fundamental discriminant, $\chi_D$ the Dirichlet character associated to $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D})$, and $\tau_D := i\sqrt{|D|}/2$ if $D \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$ or $\tau_D := (-1 + i\sqrt{|D|})/2$ if $D \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$. Based on the work of Granville–Stark [10], and a theorem of Duke [5] on the uniform distribution of Heegner points, we show that

$$\text{ht}(j(\tau_D)) = 6 \left( \sum_{0 < \text{Re}(\varrho) < 1 \atop L(\varrho, \chi_D) = 0} \frac{1}{\varrho} \right) + C + o(1)$$

as $D \to -\infty$, where $j$ is the $j$-invariant function, $\text{ht}$ is the absolute logarithmic Weil height, and $C \approx 11.511550\ldots$. From that, we measure the effect of the largest real zero of $L(s, \chi_D)$ (say, $\beta_D$) to the growth of $\text{ht}(j(\tau_D))$, allowing us to obtain, from the uniform $abc$-conjecture for number fields, the estimate

$$\beta_D \leq 1 - \frac{10/(5 - \sqrt{5}) + o(1)}{\log(|D|)}$$

where $10/(5 - \sqrt{5}) \approx 3.618033\ldots$.
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0. INTRODUCTION

For a negative fundamental discriminant $D \in \mathbb{Z}$, write $h(D)$ for the class number of $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D})$ (cf. Section 1 for definitions). In Granville–Stark [10] it is shown that, as $D \to -\infty$ through negative fundamental discriminants, it holds

$$(\pi/3 + o(1)) \sum_{D \text{ red.}}^{(D)} 1/a \leq \frac{h(D) \log(|D|)}{|D|} = \left( \frac{\pi/3 + O\left(\frac{\log \log(|D|)}{\log(|D|)}\right)}{1 + \frac{2}{\log(|D|)} L(1, \chi_D)} \right) \sum_{D \text{ red.}}^{(D)} 1/a.$$
where the estimate on the left is conditional on a uniform formulation of the abc-conjecture for number fields (cf. Conjecture 5.1 (iii)), and \( \sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} \) runs through reduced binary quadratic forms \( Q(x, y) = ax^2 + bxy + cy^2 \) of discriminant \( D \). The presence of the logarithmic derivative of the \( L\)-function \( L(s, \chi_D) \) at \( s = 1 \) in this estimate allows one to deduce the non-existence of “Siegel zeros” for the Dirichlet character \( \chi_D \), which stands for the Kronecker symbol \( \chi_D := (D : \cdot) \). Taking a slightly different approach on the ordering of results but still following the general strategy of Granville–Stark’s paper, we will derive an equivalent formulation of the LHS estimate for arithmetic heights and conductors (cf. Subsection 1.6). Besides the different approach on the ordering of results but still following the general strategy of Granville–Stark’s paper, we will derive an equivalent formulation of the LHS estimate different approach on the ordering of results but still following the general strategy of Granville–Stark’s paper, we will derive an equivalent formulation of the LHS estimate in terms of the summation \( \sum_{\varrho} \varrho^{-1} \) running through the non-trivial zeros of \( L(s, \chi_D) \), allowing for concrete asymptotic upper bounds for “Siegel zeros” to be derived from “made-to-measure” versions of uniform \( abc \), in the sense of certain weakest possible versions still yielding the same estimates by virtue of the same methods.

The central ingredient of this approach is the height of \( j(\tau_D) \), where \( j \) is the classical Klein \( j \)-invariant function, and \( \tau_D \) is the usual generator of the imaginary quadratic field \( \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D}) \); that is, \( \tau_D := i \sqrt{|D|}/2 \) if \( D \equiv 0 \pmod{4} \), and \( \tau_D := (-1+i \sqrt{|D|})/2 \) if \( D \equiv 1 \pmod{4} \). This quantity will allow us to tie together \( h(D) \), \( L(1, \chi_D)/L(1, \chi_D) \) and \( \sum_{\varrho} \varrho^{-1} \) in a fashion that “isolates” the effect of a possible sequence of real zeros of \( L(s, \chi_D) \) that get closer and closer to \( 1 \) (the “Siegel zeros” — cf. Conjecture 2.2).

Writing \( \tau_Q := (-b + \sqrt{|D|})/2a \) for the Heegner point associated to the reduced binary quadratic form \( Q(x, y) = ax^2 + bxy + cy^2 \) with fundamental discriminant \( D < 0 \), our first result is the following:

**Theorem A** (Three estimates for \( \text{ht}(j(\tau_D)) \)). As \( D \to -\infty \) through fundamental discriminants, it holds:

\[
(*) \quad \text{ht}(j(\tau_D)) = \frac{2\pi}{h(D)} \left( \sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} \text{Im}(\tau_Q) \right) + \kappa_1 + o(1)
\]

\[
(**) \quad = 3 \log(|D|) + 6 \frac{L'(1, \chi_D)}{L(1, \chi_D)} + \kappa_2 + o(1)
\]

\[
(* *) \quad = 6 \left( \sum_{0 < \text{Re}(\varrho) < 1 \atop L(\varrho, \chi_D) = 0} \frac{1}{\varrho} \right) + \kappa_3 + o(1),
\]

where \( \kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3 \in \mathbb{R} \) are constants, given by:

- \( \kappa_1 := \frac{3}{\pi} \int_{\mathfrak{f}} \log \left( \frac{\max\{|j(z+iy)| : 1\}}{\exp(2\pi y)} \right) dy^2 dx dy \approx -0.068692 \ldots \) (cf. Lemma 3.11)
- \( \kappa_2 := 6 + 18\pi^{-1} \left( \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{\sin(2\pi n/3)}{n^2} \right) + 12^2 \text{Im}(F(\omega)) - 6\gamma + \kappa_1 \approx 6.345713 \ldots \)
- \( \kappa_3 := 3 \log(\pi) + 3\gamma + \kappa_2 \approx 11.511550 \ldots \)

with \( \omega := e^{2\pi i/3} \) and \( F(z) \) as defined in (3.15) (cf. Lemma 3.7).

Notice that, in contrast to Granville–Stark [10], we are using logarithmic notation for arithmetic heights and conductors (cf. Subsection 1.6). Besides the different presentation, the fundamental difference from the work of Granville–Stark is our use of Duke’s theorem (cf. Lemma 3.4), making it possible to arrive at the much more precise error term of \( o(1) \) in all three estimates, despite it being ineffective (cf. Remark 3.9). Thus, by noting that \( \text{Im}(\tau_Q) = \sqrt{|D|}/2a \), the RHS of Granville–Stark’s
formula as presented at the start can be strengthened through a simple combination of (\(\ast\)) and (\(\ast\ast\)). In fact, we derive three corollaries from (\(\ast\)), (\(\ast\ast\)) and (\(\ast\ast\ast\)):

**Corollary A.1** (Three corollaries from Theorem A). As \(D \to -\infty\) through fundamental discriminants, the following hold:

(i) \(h(D) = \left(\frac{\pi}{3} + O\left(\frac{1}{\log(|D|)}\right)\right)\left(1 + \frac{2}{\log(|D|)} \frac{L'(1, \chi_D)}{L(1, \chi_D)}\right)^{-1} \sqrt{|D|} \left(\sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} \frac{1}{a}\right)\),

(ii) \(L'(1, \chi_D) = \frac{\pi}{2} \left(\frac{\ht(j(\tau_D))}{3 \log(|D|)} - 1\right) \left(h(D) \log(|D|)\right) - \left(\frac{\pi \kappa_2}{6} + o(1)\right) \frac{h(D)}{\sqrt{|D|}}\),

(iii) \(\sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} \frac{1}{a} = \left(\frac{3}{\pi} + \frac{(\kappa_2 - \kappa_1) / \pi + o(1)}{\log(|D|)}\right) \frac{h(D) \log(|D|)}{\sqrt{|D|}} + \frac{6}{\pi^2} L'(1, \chi_D)\);

where \(\kappa_1, \kappa_2\) are as in Theorem A.

On the other hand, the LHS of Granville–Stark’s formula as presented at start becomes equivalent to the assertion:

\[
\limsup_{D \to -\infty} \frac{\ht(j(\tau_D))}{\log(|D|)}^{(\text{U-abc})} \leq 3.
\]

Writing \(\beta_D\) for the largest real zero of \(L(s, \chi_D)\), when (\(\ast\ast\ast\)) is viewed in combination with \(\sum_{\theta} \theta^{-1} = (1 - \beta_D)^{-1} + \Theta(\log(|D|))\) (cf. Corollary 2.6), it says that in a certain sense the growth of \(\ht(j(\tau_D))\) encodes the “Siegel zero”. The following puts that more precisely, and it is a consequence of Theorem A and Corollary A.1.

**Theorem B** (“\(\ht(j(\tau_D))\) encodes \(\beta_D\)”). Let \(D \to -\infty\) through negative fundamental discriminants. Then, we have two sets of equivalent statements.

I. (“No Siegel zeros” if \(\chi_D(-1) = -1\) The following are equivalent:

I.(i). \(\limsup_{D \to -\infty} \frac{\ht(j(\tau_D))}{\log(|D|)} < +\infty;\)

I.(ii). \(\frac{1}{1 - \beta_D} = O(\log(|D|))\); (cf. Conjecture 2.2)

I.(iii). \(h(D) \gg \sqrt{|D|} \left(\sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} \frac{1}{a}\right)\).

II. (Existence of \(\lim \ht(j(\tau_D))/\log(|D|))\) The following are equivalent:

II.(i). \(\lim_{D \to -\infty} \frac{\ht(j(\tau_D))}{\log(|D|)} = 3;\)

II.(ii). \(\frac{L'(1, \chi_D)}{L(1, \chi_D)} = o(\log(|D|));\)

II.(iii). \(h(D) \sim \pi \frac{\sqrt{|D|}}{3 \log(|D|)} \left(\sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} \frac{1}{a}\right).\)
We write “$\chi_D(-1) = -1$” in the statement of item I only to reinforce that $D < 0$, for $\chi_D(-1) = D/|D|$ for every fundamental discriminant. The quantity “$\sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} 1/a$” is reminiscent from the “$h(D)^{-1} \sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} \text{Im}(\tau_Q)$” in Theorem A, and it also appears more often in the literature (cf. [10, 8, 12]), despite being slightly more delicate to be dealt with directly. An important feature of it is the fact that $\sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} 1/a \gg 1$, because every negative fundamental discriminant has at least one reduced form $Q = (a, b, c)$ with $a = 1$: the principal form (cf. (1.1)).

Having such quantities tied to the value of $\text{ht}(j(\tau_D))$ makes the Siegel zeros problem amenable to the methods of Diophantine geometry; more precisely, to the $abc$-conjecture for number fields. Under two weakened forms of the uniform $abc$-conjecture that implies Theorem B.I, we show that Theorem B.I may be obtained with explicit values.

**Theorem C** (Uniform $abc \implies$ “no Siegel zeros” for $D < 0$). The following hold:

- The O-weak uniform $abc$-conjecture for number fields (cf. Conjecture 5.1(i)) implies “no Siegel zeros” for $L(s, \chi_D)$ with $D < 0$ (cf. Theorem B.I).
- The weak uniform $abc$-conjecture for number fields (cf. Conjecture 5.1(ii)) implies that $(1 - \beta_D)^{-1} < 0.2764 \log(|D|) + o(\log(|D|))$ as $D \to -\infty$.

We start off with two preliminary sections: Section 1 gathers the fundamental concepts, notation and definitions that shall be used throughout the paper, whilst in Section 2 we recall the minimum necessary facts about quadratic concepts, notation and definitions that shall be used throughout the paper. In Subsection 2.4 we present a lower bound for the summation $\sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} \text{Im}(\tau_Q)$ (cf. Lemma 3.6). In Section 4 we prove Corollary A.I by measuring the contribution of $\beta_D$ to the auxiliary number-theoretical quantities $h(D)$, $L'(1, \chi_D)$, and $\sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} 1/a$: first by translating the estimates for $\sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} \text{Im}(\tau_Q)$ (cf. Lemma 4.1), and then by expanding upon Granville–Stark’s original estimates. Finally, in Section 5 we prove Theorem C by following closely the argument of Granville–Stark, using their estimate for the root-discriminant of $Q(\sqrt{D}, \gamma_2(\tau_D), \gamma_3(\tau_D))$ (cf. Lemma 5.2) together with a “strong enough” version of the uniform $abc$-conjecture that implies Theorem B.I.

Some remarks regarding the nature of Theorems A, B, and C are in order.

- First, it is known that, under the Generalized Riemann Hypothesis (GRH), it holds $L'(1, \chi_D)/L(1, \chi_D) = O(\log \log(|D|))$ (cf. Ihara et al [11]), implying, from Theorem

---

1“Auxiliary” w.r.t. the main quantities in Theorem A: $\text{ht}(j(\tau_D))$, $L'(1, \chi_D)/L(1, \chi_D)$, $\sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} 1/a$. 

---
For the convenience of the reader, we recall some definitions and results that shall be used in this paper, along with the notations and conventions we shall adopt.

1.1. \textit{L-functions.} For an integer \(q \geq 1\), a Dirichlet character \(\chi \pmod{q}\) is a completely multiplicative arithmetic function \(\chi : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}\) whose restriction to its support factors through \((\mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z})^\times\) as a homomorphism to the unit circle. If \(\chi : (\mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z})^\times \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^\times\) is trivial, then \(\chi\) is said to be principal, and is denoted by \(\chi_0 \pmod{q}\); otherwise, it is non-principal. A Dirichlet character is primitive if there is no \(d \mid q\) for which \(\chi\) factors through \((\mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z})^\times \rightarrow (\mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z})^\times\). Note that this implies that \(\chi_0 \pmod{1}\) (i.e., the “1” function \(1 : \mathbb{Z} \ni n \rightarrow 1 \in \mathbb{C}\)) is the unique principal primitive character, inducing all other principal characters modulo \(q\) for \(q \geq 2\). For that reason, whenever we speak of primitive characters, it is to be assumed we are talking about non-principal primitive characters (i.e., \(q \geq 2\)). Finally, a real Dirichlet character satisfies \(\chi = \overline{\chi}\), a condition which implies \(\chi^2 = \chi_0\).

The Dirichlet \(L\)-function of a Dirichlet character \(\chi \pmod{q}\) is defined as the meromorphic extension of \(L(s, \chi) := \sum_{n \geq 1} \chi(n)n^{-s}\). An infinite sum \(\sum_\theta\) over the non-trivial zeros \(\theta = \beta + i\gamma\) of an \(L\)-function should be understood as \(\lim_{T \to +\infty} \sum_{\theta, |\gamma| \leq T}\). For \(\sigma > 1\), Dirichlet \(L\)-functions have an Euler product, which is the expansion \(L(s, \chi) = \prod_p (1 - \chi(p)p^{-s})^{-1}\), where the product runs through the positive rational primes. Generally, one restricts one’s attention to primitive characters, instead of
Dirichlet characters in general, because the Euler product of characters of the latter type differ from those of the former by only finitely many terms.\footnote{If \( \chi \pmod{q} \) factors through \((\mathbb{Z}/d\mathbb{Z})^*\) as \( \chi' \pmod{d} \) for some \( d \mid q \), then \( \chi(p) = \chi'(p) \) for all but finitely many primes \( p \), which are those \( p \) for which \( p \mid q \) but \( p \nmid d \), implying \( \chi(p) = 0 \neq \chi'(p) \).}

1.2. Quadratic forms. A \((\text{binary})\) quadratic form is a polynomial \( Q \in \mathbb{Z}[x, y] \) of the form \( Q(x, y) = ax^2 + bxy + cy^2 \), which we denote simply by \( Q = (a, b, c) \). We write \( \text{disc}(Q) := b^2 - 4ac \) for its \textit{discriminant}, which is always congruent to 0 or 1 modulo 4. Two quadratic forms \( Q_1, Q_2 \) of same discriminant are called \textit{equivalent} if \( Q_1(x, y) = Q_2(\alpha x + \beta y, \gamma x + \delta y) \) for some \( (\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta) \in \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \). A quadratic form \( Q = (a, b, c) \) is called \textit{primitive} if \( \gcd(a, b, c) = 1 \), and \textit{positive-definite} \textit{(resp. negative-definite)} if \( Q(x, y) \geq 0 \) (resp. \( Q(x, y) \leq 0 \)) for every \( x, y \in \mathbb{Z} \). For each discriminant \( D \in \mathbb{Z} \), there are only finitely many equivalence classes of quadratic forms with discriminant \( D \), and we define the \textit{class number of} \( D \) as

\[
h^+(D) := \begin{cases} 
\text{Number of equivalence classes of primitive quadratic forms with disc}(Q) = D, & \text{if } D > 0; \\
\text{Number of equivalence classes of positive-definite primitive quadratic forms with disc}(Q) = D, & \text{if } D < 0.
\end{cases}
\]

For every \( D \equiv 0 \text{ or } 1 \pmod{4} \), there is at least one form with discriminant \( D \), the so-called \textit{principal form}:

\[
Q_{1, D}(x, y) := \begin{cases} 
x^2 - \frac{D}{4}y^2 & \text{if } D \equiv 0 \pmod{4}, \\
x^2 + xy + \frac{1-D}{4}y^2 & \text{if } D \equiv 1 \pmod{4};
\end{cases}
\]

thus, \( h^+(D) \) is always a positive integer. For further information about binary quadratic forms, cf. Part II of Zagier \cite{26}.

1.3. Reduced forms with negative discriminant. When \( D < 0 \), we say that \( Q = (a, b, c) \) with \( \text{disc}(Q) = D \) is \textit{reduced} if \( -a < b \leq a < c \) or \( 0 \leq b \leq a = c \); thus, if \( Q \) is reduced then it holds \( a \leq \sqrt{|D|}/3 \). A summation over reduced quadratic forms with discriminant \( D < 0 \) will be denoted by \( \sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} \). Under the usual action of \( \text{PSL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \), every quadratic form of discriminant \( D \) is equivalent to a single reduced form.\footnote{Given \( M := \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & \beta \\ \gamma & \delta \end{pmatrix} \in \text{PSL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \), the usual action on the set of quadratic forms with fixed discriminant \( D \) is given by \( Q(x, y) \mapsto Q'(x, y) =: Q(Mx + My, \gamma x + \delta y) \).} For each quadratic form \( Q \) of discriminant \( D < 0 \) is associated a \textit{Heegner point}, which is the complex number

\[
\tau_Q := \frac{-b + i\sqrt{|D|}}{2a} \in \mathfrak{h},
\]

where \( \mathfrak{h} := \{ z \in \mathbb{C} \mid \text{Im}(z) > 0 \} \) denotes the upper half-plane. Note that \( \tau_Q \) is a zero of \( Q(x, 1) \), and \( Q \) is reduced if and only if \( \tau_Q \in \mathscr{F} \), where \( \mathscr{F} \) is the \textit{fundamental domain}

\[
\mathscr{F} := \left\{ z \in \mathfrak{h} \mid |z| \geq 1, \ -\frac{1}{2} \leq \text{Re}(z) \leq 0 \right\} \cup \left\{ z \in \mathfrak{h} \mid |z| > 1, \ 0 < \text{Re}(z) < \frac{1}{2} \right\}.
\]
For the principal form $Q_{1, D}$, we write

\[ \tau_D := \tau_{Q_{1, D}} = \begin{cases} \frac{i\sqrt{|D|}}{2} & \text{if } D \equiv 0 \pmod{4}, \\ -\frac{i+\sqrt{|D|}}{2} & \text{if } D \equiv 1 \pmod{4}. \end{cases} \]

Reduced quadratic forms $Q$ of negative discriminant are positive-definite, thus, the representation function $r_Q(n) := |\{(x, y) \in \mathbb{Z} \mid Q(x, y) = n\}|$ is well-defined, and we write $Z_Q(s) := \sum_{n \geq 1} r_Q(n)n^{-s}$ for the Epstein zeta function of $Q$.

1.4. Number fields. For a number field $K/\mathbb{Q}$, we write $\Delta_K$ for its discriminant, $\text{rd}_K := |\Delta_K|^{1/[K: \mathbb{Q}]}$ for its root-discriminant, and $\mathcal{O}_K$ for its ring of integers. An element $\alpha \in K^\times$ is called totally positive if $\sigma(\alpha) > 0$ for all real embeddings $\sigma : K \to \mathbb{R}$. A fractional ideal of $K$ is a finitely generated $\mathcal{O}_K$-module contained in $K$, and a principal fractional ideal generated by a totally positive element is called totally positive. We shall write:

- $J_K :=$ group of fractional ideals of $K$;
- $P_K :=$ group of principal fractional ideals of $K$;
- $P_K^+ :=$ group of totally positive principal fractional ideals of $K$;
- $\text{Cl}_K := J_K/P_K$ for the wide class group of $K$;
- $\text{Cl}_K^+ := J_K/P_K^+$ for the narrow class group of $K$;
- $h(K) := |\text{Cl}_K|$ (wide class number), $h^+(K) := |\text{Cl}_K^+|$ (narrow class number).

When $[K : \mathbb{Q}] = 2$, we say that $K/\mathbb{Q}$ is a quadratic number field. For such fields, if $\Delta_K = D$ then $K = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D})$; if $D > 0$, we say $K$ is real quadratic, and if $D < 0$ we say it is imaginary quadratic. If $D \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$, then it holds $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D})} = \mathbb{Z}[\sqrt{D}/2]$, and if $D \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ it holds $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D})} = \mathbb{Z}[-1 + \sqrt{D}/2]$. The possible values of discriminants of quadratic number fields are called fundamental discriminants, and are explicitly described by the set of integers $D \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying either

- $D \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$, and $D$ is square-free; or
- $D \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$, $D/4 \equiv 2$ or $3 \pmod{4}$, and $D/4$ is square-free.

For a fundamental discriminant $D \neq 1$, write $\text{PrimQuad}(D)/\sim$ for the set of equivalence classes of primitive quadratic forms $Q = (a, b, c)$ with $\text{disc}(Q) = D$ (positive-definite, if $D < 0$). Then, we have the bijective correspondence

\[ \text{PrimQuad}(D)/\sim \leftrightarrow \text{Cl}^+_{\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D})} \]

\[ [Q = (a, b, c)] \mapsto \left[ \mathbb{Z} + \mathbb{Z} \frac{-b + \sqrt{D}}{2a} \right] \]

hence, $h^+(D) = h^+(\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D}))$ (cf. §10 of Zagier [26]). Thus, for a fundamental discriminant $D \neq 1$, we shall write $h(D) := h(\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D}))$. If $D < 0$, then $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D})$ is totally imaginary, meaning that every non-zero element is “vacuously” totally positive, and hence $h(D) = h^+(D)$. If $D > 0$, then

\[ h^+(D) = \begin{cases} h(D) & \text{if there is } \varepsilon \in \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D})}^\times \text{ such that } N_{\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D})/\mathbb{Q}}(\varepsilon) = -1, \\ 2h(D) & \text{otherwise}. \end{cases} \]
1.5. Complex multiplication. For \( \tau \) in the upper half-plane \( \mathfrak{h} \), write \( q = q_\tau := e^{2\pi i \tau} \). The \( q \)-expansion of Klein’s \( j \)-invariant function has the form

\[
(1.4) \quad j(\tau) := \frac{1 + 240 \sum_{n \geq 1} \left( \sum_{d \mid n} d^3 \right) q^n}{q \prod_{n \geq 1} (1 - q^n)^24} = 1 + \sum_{n > 0} c(n) q^n,
\]

with \( c(0) = 744, c(1) = 196884 \) and \( c(n) \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} e^{4\pi \sqrt{n}} n^{-3/4} \) (cf. Remark 7.4.4 at Chapter 1, p. 61 of Silverman [20]). This is the unique modular function w.r.t. \( \text{SL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \) of weight \( 0 \), holomorphic in \( \mathfrak{h} \), satisfying the boundary conditions \( j(e^{2\pi i/3}) = 0, j(i) = 1728 \), and having simple pole at \( i\infty \) (meaning that the map \( \{q \in \mathbb{C} | |q| < 1\} \ni q \mapsto j(\tau) \in \mathbb{C} \) has a simple pole at the origin). The values assumed by \( j(\tau) \) (or any other modular function) when \( \tau \in \mathfrak{h} \) is an irrational quadratic number (i.e., \( \left[ \mathbb{Q}(\tau) : \mathbb{Q} \right] = 2 \)) are called singular moduli.

For a negative fundamental discriminant \( D \), write \( H_D \) for the Hilbert class field of \( \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D}) \), which is the maximal unramified abelian extension of \( \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D}) \). Then, it holds (cf. Theorem 4.3, Chapter II, p. 122 of Silverman [20]):

- \( H_D = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D}, j(\tau_D)) \),
- \( \left[ H_D : \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D}) \right] = \left[ \mathbb{Q}(j(\tau_D)) : \mathbb{Q} \right] = h(D) \),
- \( \{j(\tau_D) \mid Q \text{ reduced, disc}(Q) = D \} \subseteq \mathbb{Q}(j(\tau_D)) \) is a complete set of \( \text{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}} / \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D})) \)-conjugates of \( j(\tau_D) \),
- \( j(\tau_D) \) is an algebraic integer (cf. Section II.6 of Silverman [20]).

Finally, following Granville–Stark [10], we work with the modular functions \( \gamma_2, \gamma_3 \), related to the \( j \)-invariant by the identities

\[
(1.5) \quad j(\tau) = \gamma_2(\tau)^3 = \gamma_3(\tau)^2 + 1728.
\]

When \( \gcd(D, 6) = 1 \), one has \( \gamma_2(\tau_D), \gamma_3(\tau_D) \in H_D \) (cf. Section 17, §72 of Weber [24]), but this does not hold in general. However, writing \( \widetilde{H}_D := H_D(\gamma_2(\tau_D), \gamma_3(\tau_D)) \), it does hold in general that \( \text{rd}_{\widetilde{H}_D} \leq 6|\sqrt{D}| \), for all fundamental discriminants \( D < 0 \) (cf. Lemma 1 of Granville–Stark [10]).

1.6. Heights and conductors. Following Vojta [23], for a number field \( K / \mathbb{Q} \), let \( \mathcal{M}_K \) denote a set of normalized valuations of \( K \) satisfying the product formula \( \prod_{v \in \mathcal{M}_K} \|x\|_v = 1 \) for every \( x \in K^\times \), and write \( \mathcal{M}_K^\text{non} \) for the subset of the non-archimedean valuations. We define the (absolute) logarithmic (Weil) height of a point in the projective \( n \)-space \( [x_0 : \ldots : x_n] \in \mathbb{P}_K^n \) as

\[
\text{ht} ([x_0 : \ldots : x_n]) := \frac{1}{[K : \mathbb{Q}]} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{M}_K} \log \max\{\|x_0\|_v, \ldots, \|x_n\|_v\},
\]

and we define the logarithmic conductor as

\[
\mathfrak{f}_K ([x_0 : \ldots : x_n]) := \frac{1}{[K : \mathbb{Q}]} \sum_{v \in \mathcal{M}_K^\text{non}} f_v \log(p_v),
\]

where \( p_v^{f_v} \) is the cardinality of the residue field at \( v \). Note that the definitions above do not depend on the choice of coordinates for \( [x_0 : \ldots : x_n] \in \mathbb{P}_K^n \); that is,
\( \text{ht}([x_0 : \ldots : x_n]) = \text{ht}([cx_0 : \ldots : cx_n]) \) and \( f_K([x_0 : \ldots : x_n]) = f_K([cx_0 : \ldots : cx_n]) \) for any \( c \in K^\times \). Moreover, the height does not depend on the choice of the base field (provided it contains \( x_0, \ldots, x_n \)), however, the conductor does. For \( x \in K^\times \), we write \( \text{ht}(x) := \text{ht}([x : 1]) \) for short. Finally, if \( \alpha \in \mathbb{Q}^\times \) is an algebraic integer, then it follows from the product formula that
\[
(1.6) \quad \text{ht}(\alpha) = \frac{1}{|A|} \sum_{\alpha^* \in A} \log \max\{|\alpha^*|, 1\},
\]
where \( A \) is a complete set of \( \text{Gal}(\mathbb{Q}/\mathbb{Q}) \)-conjugates of \( \alpha \).

2. Quadratic Dirichlet \( L \)-functions

2.1. Real primitive Dirichlet characters. The problem of Siegel zeros springs from the study of zero-free regions of \( L \)-functions of real primitive Dirichlet characters \( \chi \pmod{q} \). These characters can be written in terms of the Kronecker symbol, which may be described as follows. Let \( a \in \mathbb{Z} \) an integer and \( p \geq 3 \) an odd prime. Define
\[
(\frac{a}{2}) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } a \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{8} \\ -1, & \text{if } a \equiv \pm 3 \pmod{8} \\ 0, & \text{if } a \equiv 0 \pmod{8} \end{cases} \quad (\frac{a}{p}) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } a \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p} \text{ and } \exists k \in \mathbb{Z}^\times \mid k^2 \equiv a \pmod{p} \\ -1, & \text{if } a \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p} \text{ and } \not\exists k \in \mathbb{Z}^\times \mid k^2 \equiv a \pmod{p} \\ 0, & \text{if } a \equiv 0 \pmod{p} \end{cases}
\]
as well as
\[
(\frac{a}{1}) := 1, \quad (\frac{a}{0}) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } a = \pm 1 \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}, \quad (\frac{a}{-1}) := \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } a \geq 0 \\ -1, & \text{if } a < 0 \end{cases}.
\]
Thus, in general, given \( k \in \mathbb{Z} \) a integer, we define the Kronecker symbol
\[
(\frac{a}{k}) := (\frac{a}{u}) \prod_{p\mid |k|} (\frac{a}{p})^{v_p(k)}
\]
where \( v_p(k) := \max\{\ell \in \mathbb{N} \mid p^\ell \mid k\} \), and \( u := k/|k| \) is the sign of \( k \) when \( k \neq 0 \), with \( u = 0 \) otherwise. This can be seen as an extension of the Jacobi symbol (as well as the Legendre symbol) to all integers.\(^4\) Then, we may define the quadratic Dirichlet characters:
\[
\chi_D : \mathbb{Z} \longrightarrow \{-1, 0, 1\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}, \quad k \longmapsto (\frac{D}{k})
\]
where \( D \in \mathbb{Z} \) is a fundamental discriminant. For the sake of completeness, we include a short proof of the fact that the \( \chi_D \) are not only, indeed, real primitive Dirichlet characters modulo \( |D| \), but also a complete list of such characters.

Lemma 2.1 (Satz 4, §5 of Zagier \cite{26}). Every real primitive Dirichlet character is of the form \( \chi_D \pmod{|D|} \) for some fundamental discriminant \( D \in \mathbb{Z} \).

\(^4\)The Legendre symbol is just the Kronecker symbol at \( \frac{1}{2} \) restricted to \( (a|p) \), with \( a \in \mathbb{Z} \) and \( p \) an odd positive prime. Similarly, the Jacobi symbol is the same but restricted to \( (a|n) \), with \( a \in \mathbb{Z} \) and \( n \) an odd positive integer.
Proof. Let $\chi \pmod{q}$ be such a Dirichlet character. By the Chinese remainder theorem, if $q = p_1^{e_1} \cdots p_k^{e_k}$ is the prime factorization of $q$, then there must be $\chi_1 \pmod{p_1^{e_1}}, \ldots, \chi_k \pmod{p_k^{e_k}}$ satisfying $\chi = \chi_1 \cdots \chi_k$, and thus making the following diagram commute:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
(Z/q\mathbb{Z})^\times & \overset{\sim}{\longrightarrow} & (Z/p_1^{e_1}\mathbb{Z})^\times \times \cdots \times (Z/p_k^{e_k}\mathbb{Z})^\times \\
\chi & \longleftarrow & \chi_1 \times \cdots \times \chi_k
\end{array}
\]

It is clear that $\chi$ is primitive if and only if $\chi_1, \ldots, \chi_k$ are all primitive. Hence, we only need to analyse characters $\chi \pmod{p^r}$, with $p$ prime and $r \geq 1$.

- **Case 1**: $p$ odd.

  It is well-known that $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^\times$ is cyclic, thus, let $x$ be a generator of this group. If $\chi$ is a real non-principal character, then we must have $\chi(x) = -1$. Therefore, since non-zero squares in $\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ are all of the form $x^{2k} \pmod{p}$ for some $1 \leq k \leq (p-1)/2$, the value $\chi(n)$ must coincide with the Legendre symbol $(n/p)$. When $r > 1$, since, by Hensel’s lemma, an integer $N$ is a square modulo $p$ if and only if it is a square modulo $p^r$, we deduce that a real character modulo $p^r$ cannot be primitive, for it factors through $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^\times$ either as $\chi_0 \pmod{p}$ or as $(n/p)$.

- **Case 2**: $p = 2$.

  Since $(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^\times$ is trivial, the only character modulo 2 is the principal one. When $r = 2$, we have $(\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z})^\times \simeq \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$, and for $r = 3$ it holds $(\mathbb{Z}/8\mathbb{Z})^\times \simeq \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$. There is only one primitive Dirichlet character modulo 4 ($\xi_4$), and two modulo 8 ($\xi_8, \xi_8''$), all of which are listed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n \pmod{4}$</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\xi_4$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$n \pmod{8}$</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\xi_8$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\xi_8''$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For $r \geq 4$, we claim that all real characters factor through $(\mathbb{Z}/8\mathbb{Z})^\times$. One can show by induction that $3^{2^{r-3}} \equiv 2^{r-1} + 1 \pmod{2^r}$, and thus $\text{ord}_{2^r}(3) = 2^{r-2}$. This implies that every $x \in (\mathbb{Z}/2^r\mathbb{Z})^\times$ may be written uniquely as $x \equiv 3^a (2^{r-1} - 1)^b \pmod{2^r}$, with $0 \leq a < 2^{r-2}$ and $b = 0, 1$. Hence, if $\chi \pmod{2^r}$ is a real primitive character, then there are three possibilities:

\[
\begin{align*}
\chi(3) &= -1, \quad \chi(2^{r-1} - 1) = -1 \quad \implies \quad \chi = \xi_4 \\
\chi(3) &= -1, \quad \chi(2^{r-1} - 1) = +1 \quad \implies \quad \chi = \xi_8 \\
\chi(3) &= +1, \quad \chi(2^{r-1} - 1) = -1 \quad \implies \quad \chi = \xi_8''
\end{align*}
\]

By the definition of the Kronecker symbol, one checks, using the laws of quadratic reciprocity, that $\xi_4(n) = (-4|n)$, $\xi_8(n) = (8|n)$, $\xi_8''(n) = (-8|n)$ and $(n|p) = (p^*|n)$, where $p^* := (-1)^{(p-1)/2}p$ for an odd prime $p$. Moreover, analysing [2.1] reveals that, whenever $\gcd(a, b) = 1$, we have $(a|n) (b|n) = (ab|n)$. Therefore, all real primitive...
Dirichlet characters may be written as \((D|n)\), where the factors of \(D\) consist of
\(-4, 8\) or \(-8\) and \(\{p^* | p\ \text{is an odd prime}\}\)
which describe exactly the fundamental discriminants, and thus the \(\chi_D\).

The characters \(\chi_D\) encode non-trivial information about the arithmetic of \(\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D})\), as showcased, for instance, by the following relation (cf. Theorem 8.5, Chapter 1 of Neukirch [18]):

\[
\left( \frac{D}{p} \right) = \begin{cases} 
1, & \text{if and only if } (p) \text{ splits completely in } \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D}); \\
-1, & \text{if and only if } (p) \text{ is inert in } \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D}); \\
0, & \text{if and only if } (p) \text{ ramifies in } \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D}).
\end{cases}
\]

One can, moreover, verify that \(\zeta_K(s) = \zeta(s)L(s,\chi_D)\) directly from their Euler products, where \(\zeta_K(s) := \sum_{\mathfrak{a} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K} [\mathcal{O}_K : \mathfrak{a}]^{-s} = \prod_{\mathfrak{p} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K} (1 - [\mathcal{O}_K : \mathfrak{p}]^{-s})^{-1}\) is the Dedekind zeta function of \(K = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D})\), with \(\mathfrak{a} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_K\) ranging through the non-zero integral ideals of \(K\), and \(\mathfrak{p}\) through the prime ones.

2.2. Zero-free regions: the Landau–Siegel zero. The classical zero-free regions for \(L\)-functions of primitive Dirichlet characters on the critical strip are attributed to Gronwall and Titchmarsh (cf. Chapter 14, p. 93 of Davenport [4]).

Classical zero-free region of \(L(s,\chi)\). There is an effectively computable absolute constant \(c_0 > 0\) such that, for every complex character \(\chi \pmod{q}\), the function \(L(s,\chi)\) has no zeros in the region defined by:

\[
\sigma = \sigma + it \mid \sigma \geq \begin{cases} 
1 - \frac{c_0}{\log(q)} & \text{if } |t| \leq 1, \\
1 - \frac{c_0}{\log(q|t|)} & \text{if } |t| > 1.
\end{cases}
\]

When \(\chi\) is a non-principal real character, the only possible zero of \(L(s,\chi)\) in this region is a simple real zero.

The possible simple zero in this region for when \(\chi\) is a primitive real character (one of the \(\chi_D\)s, by Lemma 2.1) is what is called the Landau–Siegel zero, or simply Siegel zero, due to the work of both Landau and Siegel in trying to rule out such possibility. In 1935, Siegel showed that, for every \(\varepsilon > 0\) there is \(C(\varepsilon) \in \mathbb{R}_+\) such that

\[
\sigma > 1 - C(\varepsilon)|D|^{-\varepsilon} \implies L(\sigma,\chi_D) \neq 0.
\]

Despite being asymptotically stronger than other known bounds, this estimate has the drawback of being ineffective, i.e., the proof gives no way to actually compute \(C(\varepsilon)\). Many classical problems, such as listing quadratic fields of a given class number, depend, however, on effective bounds on the zero-free regions of \(L(s,\chi_D)\). In 1951, for example, T. Tatuzawa [22] provided a way to obtain an “almost” effective version of Siegel’s estimate, in which the given computable constant might fail for at most one \(L(s,\chi_D)\); this was enough for P. J. Weinberger [25] to show that there is at most

\footnote{Cf. Chapter 21 of Davenport [4].}
one more *idoneal number* other than the list of 65 given by Gauss showing the importance of effective estimates to zero-free regions. Under GRH, Gauss’ list is known to be complete.

Following Iwaniec [12], the largest real zero of \( L(s, \chi_D) \) occurs, conjecturally, at \( s = 0 \) if \( D > 0 \), and at \( s = -1 \) if \( D < 0 \). The character \( \chi_D \) is called *exceptional* when it has a “Siegel zero”, as defined earlier. Although the statement of the classical zero-free region refers to a zero in a specific region, the presence of \( c_0 \) makes it difficult to give a clear-cut definition of exceptional character, which is why “Siegel zero” generally appears in quotation marks. Hence, it is commonplace to work with a slightly more amenable statement, as in Granville–Stark [10]. Writing

\[
\beta_D := \max \{ \beta \in \mathbb{R} \mid L(\beta, \chi_D) = 0 \},
\]

we consider the following:

**Conjecture 2.2** ("No Siegel zeros"). As \(|D| \to +\infty\), it holds:

\[
\frac{1}{1 - \beta_D} = O(\log(|D|)).
\]

Conjecturally, we expect to have \((1 - \beta_D)^{-1} = 1\) if \( D > 0 \), or \(1/2\) if \( D < 0\), for all fundamental discriminants \( D \in \mathbb{Z} \). In trying to rule out the existence of such zeros, one generally aims to measure what is often called its *contribution* to other number-theoretical quantities that reflect on the behavior of \( L(s, \chi_D) \), such as the class number \( h(D) \), the logarithmic derivative \( \frac{L'(1, \chi_D)}{L(1, \chi_D)} \) and, more directly, the summation \( \sum \varrho^{-1} \), which runs through all non-trivial zeros. We shall return to this point in Section 4.

### 2.3. Logarithmic derivative of \( L(s, \chi_D) \) as \( s \to 1^+ \)

As stated in p. 515 of Granville–Stark [10], there is a precise relationship between \( \sum \varrho^{-1} \) and the logarithmic derivative of \( L(s, \chi_D) \) at \( s = 1 \) (cf. Equation (17), Chapter 12, p. 83 of Davenport [4]). For our purposes, however, a slightly coarser estimate will be sufficient, constituting Lemma 2.3. As done previously, we include a short proof, remarking the dependency on other canonical statements. Lemma 2.3 follows from two well-known results, the first of which is the holomorphicity of the completed \( L \)-function \( \xi \).

**Functional equation of \( L(s, \chi) \) (Eqs. (13), (14), Ch. 9, p. 71 of Davenport [4]).** Let \( \chi \mod q \) be a primitive character, and define

\[
\xi(s, \chi) := \left( \frac{\pi}{q} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}(s+a_\chi)} \Gamma\left( \frac{1}{2}(s + a_\chi) \right) \cdot L(s, \chi),
\]

where \( a_\chi := \frac{1}{2}(1 - \chi(-1)) \). Then, \( \xi(s, \chi) \) is an entire function that satisfies

\[
\xi(1 - s, \chi) = \frac{i^{a_\chi} \sqrt{q}}{\tau(\chi)} \xi(s, \chi),
\]

where \( \tau \) is the Gauss sum \( \tau(\chi) = \sum_{m=1}^{q} \chi(m)e^{2\pi im/q} \).

---

6A number \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) is called *idoneal* (or *convenient*) when every odd number \( m \) relatively prime to \( n \) satisfying \( m = x^2 + ny^2 \) for exactly one pair of integers \( x, y \geq 0 \) is prime. For a discussion on this problem in the context of genus theory of binary quadratic forms, refer to Section 3 of Cox [2].
From this formula, one can observe that the zeros of \( L \) inside of the critical strip \( \{ s = \sigma + it \in \mathbb{C} \mid 0 < t < 1 \} \) are symmetric about the line \( \text{Re}(s) = 1/2 \), i.e., if \( \sigma \) is in the critical strip, then \( L(\sigma, \chi) = 0 \) if and only if \( L(1 - \sigma, \chi) = 0 \). Outside of the strip, the fact that \( L(s, \chi) \neq 0 \) for \( \text{Re}(s) > 1 \) follows directly from Euler’s product formula, and \( L(s, \chi) \neq 0 \) for \( \text{Re}(s) = 1 \) follows from the classical Mertens’ argument based on \( 2(1 + \cos(\theta))^2 \geq 0 \) (see Chapters 13–14 of Davenport [4] for details), for all primitive characters \( \chi \). From the holomorphicity of \( \xi \) and the reflection property, it follows that the only zeros of \( L(s, \chi) \) outside the critical strip are located at the poles of \( \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{2}(s + a_\chi)\right) \), all of which are simple poles, those being: \( s \in 2\mathbb{Z}_{\leq 0} \) if \( \chi(-1) = 1 \), and \( s \in 2\mathbb{Z}_{\leq -1} \) if \( \chi(-1) = -1 \). These are the so-called trivial zeros. The functional equation, then, implies that the trivial zeros of \( L(s, \chi) \) must be simple, and thus, the zeros \( \xi(s, \chi) \) are exactly the non-trivial zeros of \( L(s, \chi) \), in the critical strip.

The second result is Hadamard’s canonical representation for entire functions of order 1. Given an entire function \( f : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C} \), its order is defined as

\[
\text{ord}(f) := \inf \{ \alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mid |f(z)| = O(e^{\alpha|z|^n}) \text{ as } |z| \to +\infty \}.
\]

Then, we have the following.

**Hadamard factorization for** \( \text{ord}(f) = 1 \) (cf. Chapter 11 of Davenport [4]). Let \( f : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C} \) be an entire function of order 1, and suppose that \( z = 0 \) is a zero of order \( m \in \mathbb{N} \). Then, letting \((z_n)_{n \geq 1}\) be the sequence of nonzero zeros of \( f \) (repeated according to multiplicity), there are constants \( A, B \in \mathbb{C} \) such that

\[
(2.4) \quad f(z) = z^m e^{A + Bz} \prod_{n \geq 1} \left(1 - \frac{z}{z_n}\right) e^{z/z_n}.
\]

This factorization comes in useful, for \( \xi(s, \chi) \) is an order 1 entire function, for every primitive character \( \chi \pmod{q} \). To see how this is the case, start by noticing that, by partial summation, from \( L(s, \chi) = \sum_{n \geq 1} \chi(n)n^{-s} \) (for \( \text{Re}(s) > 1 \)) we obtain

\[
L(s, \chi) = s \int_1^\infty \left(\sum_{m \leq x} \chi(m)\right) x^{-s-1} \, dx,
\]

which is valid for \( \text{Re}(s) > 0 \). Since \( \chi \) is non-principal, we have \( \sum_{m = 0}^{N+q} \chi(m) = 0 \) for every \( N \in \mathbb{N} \), therefore \( \left| \sum_{m \leq x} \chi(m) \right| \leq q \) for every \( x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 1} \). It follows that \( |L(s, \chi)| \leq q \) for \( \text{Re}(s) > 0 \). Thus, letting \( |s| \to +\infty \) in \( \text{Re}(s) \geq 1/2 \), we have

\[
|\xi(s, \chi)| = \frac{\pi^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\text{Re}(s)+a_\chi)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{2}(s + a_\chi)\right)} q^{1/2}(\text{Re}(s)+a_\chi) \cdot |\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{2}(s + a_\chi)\right)|
\]

\[
\ll q^{\frac{1}{2}(|s|+3)} \cdot e^{(|s|+\frac{1}{2}) \log(|s|)},
\]

which follows easily from Stirling’s formula for the Gamma function. By the functional equation and the fact that \( |\tau(\chi)| = \sqrt{q} \) (cf. Eq. (5), Chapter 9, p. 66 of Davenport [4]), this implies that \( \text{ord}(\xi(s, \chi)) \leq 1 \). To see that \( \text{ord}(\xi(s, \chi)) \geq 1 \), is suffices to analyse \( \xi(\sigma, \chi) \) for \( \sigma \in \mathbb{R}_{>1} \) as \( \sigma \to +\infty \). From the integral formula for \( L(s, \chi) \) above, one deduces that there is \( \varepsilon > 0 \) for which \( |L(\sigma, \chi)| \geq \varepsilon/q \) (e.g., for \( \varepsilon = |\chi(m)| \neq 0 \) for some \( m \in \mathbb{N} \)), and then by an argument analogous to the one used to deduce the upper bound, one arrives at a similar lower bound.

Armed with these facts, the following result is a direct consequence.
Lemma 2.3. As $|D| \to +\infty$ and $\varepsilon \to 0^+$, it holds

$$
\sum_{0 < \Re(\rho) < 1 \atop L(\rho, \chi_D) = 0} \frac{1}{\varrho + \varepsilon} = \frac{1}{2} \log(|D|) + O(\varepsilon^{-1})
$$

where the implied constant is absolute. Moreover,

$$
\sum_{0 < \Re(\rho) < 1 \atop L(\rho, \chi_D) = 0} \frac{1}{\varrho} = \frac{L'(1, \chi_D)}{L(1, \chi_D)} + \frac{1}{2} \log(|D|) + M_D,
$$

where

$$
M_D := \begin{cases} 
- \log(\pi)/2 - \gamma/2 - \log(2) & \text{if } D > 0, \\
- \log(\pi)/2 - \gamma/2 & \text{if } D < 0.
\end{cases}
$$

Proof. Taking the logarithmic derivative of the functional equation of $L(s, \chi_D)$ yields

$$
\frac{\xi'(s, \chi_D)}{\xi(s, \chi_D)} = -\frac{1}{2} \log\left(\frac{\pi}{|D|}\right) + \frac{1}{2} \Gamma'(\frac{1}{2}(s + a_{\chi_D})) + \frac{L'(s, \chi_D)}{L(s, \chi_D)}
$$

and, since $\chi_D$ is a real character,

$$
\frac{\xi'(s, \chi_D)}{\xi(s, \chi_D)} = -\frac{\xi'(1-s, \chi_D)}{\xi(1-s, \chi_D)},
$$

therefore, for $1 \leq \sigma \leq 2$, as $|D| \to +\infty$ we have

$$
\frac{\xi'(\sigma, \chi_D)}{\xi(\sigma, \chi_D)} = \frac{L'(\sigma, \chi_D)}{L(\sigma, \chi_D)} + \frac{1}{2} \log(|D|) + O(1).
$$

where the implied constant is absolute w.r.t. $\sigma$ in this range.

As discussed just before the statement of this lemma, $\xi(s, \chi_D)$ is an entire function of order 1, and hence, it has a representation of the form (2.4). Taking the logarithmic derivative of this representation, we get that there is $B_{\chi_D} \in \mathbb{C}$ such that

$$
\frac{\xi'(s, \chi_D)}{\xi(s, \chi_D)} = B_{\chi_D} + \sum_{0 < \Re(\rho) < 1 \atop L(\rho, \chi_D) = 0} \frac{1}{\varrho + \varepsilon} = \sum_{0 < \Re(\rho) < 1 \atop L(\rho, \chi_D) = 0} \frac{1}{\varrho}.
$$

The number $B_{\chi_D}$ is obtained simply by setting $s$ to 0, hence:

$$
B_{\chi_D} = \frac{\xi'(0, \chi_D)}{\xi(0, \chi_D)} = -\frac{\xi'(1, \chi_D)}{\xi(1, \chi_D)}.
$$

Since the zeros in the critical strip are symmetric about the line $\Re(s) = 1/2$, it follows that $\xi'(1, \chi_D)/\xi(1, \chi_D) = \sum_{\varrho} 1/\varrho$, and thus

$$
\frac{\xi'(s, \chi_D)}{\xi(s, \chi_D)} = \sum_{0 < \Re(\rho) < 1 \atop L(\rho, \chi_D) = 0} \frac{1}{s - \varrho} = \sum_{0 < \Re(\rho) < 1 \atop L(\rho, \chi_D) = 0} \frac{1}{s - 1} + \varrho.
$$

Putting (2.9) and (2.7) together, setting $s = \sigma = 1$, and checking that

$$
\frac{1}{2} \Gamma'(1/2) = -\frac{\gamma}{2} - \log(2) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{2} \Gamma'(1) = -\frac{\gamma}{2},
$$

we have

$$
\frac{\xi'(1, \chi_D)}{\xi(1, \chi_D)} = -\frac{\xi'(1, \chi_D)}{\xi(1, \chi_D)}.
$$
our second claim (Eq. (2.6)) follows. For our first claim (Eq. (2.5)), note that we have \( L'(s, \chi_D)/L(s, \chi_D) = -\sum_{n \geq 1} \Lambda(n) \chi_D(n)n^{-s} \) for \( \text{Re}(s) > 1 \), where \( \Lambda \) denotes von Mangoldt’s function, which may be deduced by routine calculations. Thus, since

\[
\left| \frac{L'(1 + \varepsilon, \chi_D)}{L(1 + \varepsilon, \chi_D)} \right| \leq -\frac{\zeta'(1 + \varepsilon)}{\zeta(1 + \varepsilon)} = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + O(1)
\]

as \( \varepsilon \to 0^+ \), (2.5) follows from combining (2.9) and (2.8).

\[\Box\]

2.4. Isolating the Siegel zero. One of the most direct approaches to dealing with the zeros of \( L(s, \chi_D) \) is by estimating the sum of their reciprocals, namely, \( \sum_\varrho \varrho^{-1} \).

As remarked in the previous subsection, the completed \( L \)-function \( \xi(s, \chi) \) is an entire function of order 1, for every Dirichlet character \( \chi \). From that, it can be deduced that \( L(s, \chi) \) has infinitely many non-trivial zeros, and \( \sum_\varrho |\varrho^{-1}| \) converges for every \( \varepsilon > 0 \), while \( \sum_\varrho |\varrho^{-1}| \) diverges (cf. Eqs. (4), (5) in Chapter 12 of Davenport [4]). The summation \( \sum_\varrho \varrho^{-1} \), however, does converge conditionally, with its evaluation being understood as the principal-value summation:

\[
\sum_{0 < \text{Re}(\varrho) < 1 \atop L(\varrho, \chi) = 0} \frac{1}{\varrho} := \lim_{T \to +\infty} \left( \sum_{\beta + i\gamma \mid |\gamma| \leq T \atop L(\beta + i\gamma, \chi) = 0} \frac{1}{\beta + i\gamma} \right),
\]

where \( \varrho = \beta + i\gamma \). In order to isolate the potential Siegel zero by using \( \sum_\varrho \varrho^{-1} \), we will estimate the summation \( \sum'_\varrho \varrho^{-1} \), where the primed sigma denotes a summation without the largest real zero \( \beta_D \) of \( L(s, \chi_D) \). As Lemma 2.3(ii) and Theorem A.4 relates \( \sum_\varrho \varrho^{-1} \) to other quantities, the effect of a potential zero near \( s = 1 \) can be measured, at least asymptotically, once explicit estimates for \( \sum'_\varrho \varrho^{-1} \) are established. For that aim, consider the following pairing function:

\[
(2.10) \quad \Pi_\xi(s) := \frac{1}{s + \xi} + \frac{1}{\overline{s} + \overline{\xi}} + \frac{1}{1 - s + \xi} + \frac{1}{1 - \overline{s} + \overline{\xi}},
\]

defined for \( s, \xi \in \mathbb{C} \) such that \( \xi \neq s, \overline{s}, 1 - s, 1 - \overline{s} \).

Lemma 2.4. Let \( s = \sigma + it \in \mathbb{C} \) be such that \( 0 < \sigma < 1 \), and write \( \tilde{s} := \sigma(1 - \sigma) \). If \( \xi \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \), then \( \Pi_\xi(s) \in \mathbb{R} \), and we have

\[
\frac{\Pi_\xi(s)}{1 + 2\xi} - 2 \left( \frac{1 - 2\tilde{s} - (1 + \xi) - t^2}{\tilde{s}^2 + (1 - 2\tilde{s})t^2 + t^4} \right) \frac{\xi(1 + \xi)}{1 + t^2} \leq \Pi_0(s) \leq \left( 1 + \frac{\xi}{\min\{\sigma, 1 - \sigma\}} \right) \Pi_\xi(s).
\]

In particular, if \( \xi \geq (\sqrt{5} - 1)/2 \), then \( \Pi_0(s) > \Pi_\xi(s)/(1 + 2\xi) \).

Proof. We prove the inequalities separately, starting with the upper bound for \( \Pi_0(s) \), on the right-hand side. Since for any \( z = x + iy \in \mathbb{C} \) we have \( 1/z + 1/z = 2x/(x^2 + y^2) \), if \( \xi \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \) then \( \Pi_\xi(s) \in \mathbb{R} \), for every \( s \in \mathbb{C} \). If \( 0 < \sigma < 1 \), then, for \( \delta > -1 \) we have

\[
\frac{\sigma}{\sigma^2 + t^2} \leq (1 + \delta) \frac{\sigma + \xi}{(\sigma + \xi)^2 + t^2} \iff \delta \geq \xi \left( \frac{\sigma - t^2/(\sigma + \xi)}{(\sigma + \xi)^2 + t^2} \right).
\]

\[\text{Note that, conjecturally, } \beta_D = 0 \text{ if } D > 0 \text{ and } \beta_D = -1 \text{ if } D < 0, \text{ meaning that it does not appear in } \sum_\varrho \varrho^{-1} \text{ anyway.}\]
Since \( t^2 \geq 0 \), it suffices to take \( \delta := \xi/\sigma \). Hence, as
\[
\frac{\Pi_\xi(s)}{2} = \frac{\sigma + \xi}{(\sigma + \xi)^2 + t^2} + \frac{1 - \sigma + \xi}{(1 - \sigma + \xi)^2 + t^2},
\]
the inequality on the right-hand side of the statement of the lemma follows.

For the left-hand side inequality, start by writing \( \bar{\sigma}_\xi := (\sigma + \xi)(1 - \sigma + \xi) = \bar{\sigma} + \xi(1 + \xi) \). Thus, for every \( s, \xi \in \mathbb{C} \), it holds:
\[
\Pi_\xi(s) = 2 \left( \frac{\sigma + \xi}{(\sigma + \xi)^2 + t^2} + \frac{1 - \sigma + \xi}{(1 - \sigma + \xi)^2 + t^2} \right)
= 2 \left( \frac{\bar{\sigma}_\xi + t^2}{\bar{\sigma}_\xi^2 + ((1 + 2\xi)^2 - 2\bar{\sigma}_\xi)t^2 + t^4} \right) (1 + 2\xi)
= 2 \left( \frac{\bar{\sigma}_\xi + (1 + \bar{\sigma}_\xi)t^2 + t^4}{(1 + 2\xi)^2 + 2\bar{\sigma}_\xi t^2 + t^4} \right) (1 + 2\xi)
= 2 \left( 1 + \frac{\bar{\sigma}_\xi(1 - \bar{\sigma}_\xi) + (3\bar{\sigma}_\xi - 4\xi(1 + \xi))t^2}{\bar{\sigma}_\xi^2 + ((1 + 2\xi)^2 - 2\bar{\sigma}_\xi)t^2 + t^4} \right) (1 + 2\xi),
\]
(2.11)

Viewing the expressions in the fractions inside the parenthesis of (2.11) as polynomials in \( t^2 \), one checks that
\[
\bar{\sigma}_\xi(1 - \bar{\sigma}_\xi) = \bar{\sigma}(1 - \bar{\sigma}) + \xi(1 + \xi)(1 - 2\bar{\sigma} - \xi(1 + \xi)),
3\bar{\sigma}_\xi - 4\xi(1 + \xi) = 3\bar{\sigma} - \xi(1 + \xi),
\bar{\sigma}_\xi^2 = \bar{\sigma}^2 + \xi(1 + \xi)(2\bar{\sigma} + \xi(1 + \xi)),
(1 + 2\xi)^2 - 2\bar{\sigma}_\xi = 1 - 2\bar{\sigma} + 2\xi(1 + \xi),
\]
from where, after suitable rearrangement, we deduce that
\[
(2.12) \quad \Pi_\xi(s) = 2 \left( 1 + \frac{\bar{\sigma}(1 - \bar{\sigma}) + 3\bar{\sigma}t^2 + \xi(1 + \xi)(1 - 2\bar{\sigma} - \xi(1 + \xi) - t^2)}{\bar{\sigma}_\xi^2 + ((1 + 2\xi)^2 - 2\bar{\sigma}_\xi)t^2 + t^4} \right) (1 + 2\xi).
\]
Under the assumption \( 0 < \sigma < 1 \), it holds
\[
\xi(1 + \xi)(2\bar{\sigma} + \xi(1 + \xi) + 2t^2) \geq 0;
\]
thus, comparing the expressions of \( \Pi_0(s) \) and \( (1 + 2\xi)^{-1}\Pi_\xi(s) \) according to (2.12), we deduce the left-hand side inequality of the lemma by substituting the denominator of \( (1 + 2\xi)^{-1}\Pi_\xi(s) \) and carrying out the calculation.

Finally, if \( \xi \geq (\sqrt{5} - 1)/2 \), then \( 1 - \xi(1 + \xi) \leq 0 \), with equality holding only if \( \xi = (\sqrt{5} - 1)/2 \). That means that, for \( \xi \) in this range, \( \Pi_0(s) - \Pi_\xi(s)/(1 + 2\xi) \) is bounded from below by a strictly positive number, concluding the proof. \( \square \)

**Proposition 2.5** (Bounds for \( \sum' 1/\vartheta \)). The following hold:

(i) \( \limsup_{|D| \to +\infty} \log(|D|)^{-1} \left( \sum'_{0 < \text{Re}(\vartheta) < 1, \text{L}(e \lambda_D) = 0} \frac{1}{\vartheta} \right) < +\infty \).
(ii) \( \liminf_{|D| \to +\infty} \frac{\log(|D|)^{-1}}{D \text{ fund. disc.}} \left( \sum_{0 < \Re(\varrho) < 1} \frac{1}{\varrho} \right) \geq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{5}} \) \((\approx 0.223606 \ldots)\),

where "\( \sum' \)" denotes a summation without the largest real zero \( \beta_D \) of \( L(s, \chi_D) \).

Proof. Since \( \chi_D \) is a real character, it holds \( L(\overline{s}, \chi_D) = \overline{L(s, \chi_D)} \) for every \( s \in \mathbb{C} \); moreover, from the functional equation of \( L(s, \chi_D) \) discussed at the beginning of Subsection 2.3, the non-trivial zeros of \( L(s, \chi_D) \) are symmetric about the line \( \Re(s) = 1/2 \). Hence, if \( \varrho = \beta + i\gamma \) is a zero of \( L(s, \chi_D) \) with \( 0 < \beta < 1 \), then so are \( \overline{\varrho}, 1 - \varrho, \) and \( 1 - \overline{\varrho} \). This implies that, in the notation of (2.10), for every \( \epsilon \geq 0 \) we have

\[
\sum'_{0 < \Re(\varrho) < 1} \frac{1}{\varrho + \epsilon} = \frac{1}{4} \sum'_{0 < \Re(\varrho) < 1} \Pi(\varrho),
\]

which will be our starting point. We prove the items separately.

- Item (i): If \( |t| > 3/2 \), then

\[
\frac{\sigma}{\sigma^2 + t^2} < \frac{\sigma + \epsilon}{(\sigma + \epsilon)^2 + t^2}
\]

for every \( 0 < \sigma < 1 \) and \( 0 < \epsilon < 1 \); thus, we focus on \( \varrho = \beta + i\gamma \) with \( |\gamma| \leq 3/2 \). By Lemma 2.4, for every \( 0 < \epsilon < 1 \), it holds

\[
\Pi_0(\varrho) \leq \left( 1 + \frac{\epsilon}{\min\{\beta, 1 - \beta\}} \right) \Pi(\varrho).
\]

From the estimate of the zero-free regions of \( L(s, \chi_D) \) in (2.3), if we ignore the potential Siegel zero, we have \( \beta > c_0/\log(\frac{3}{2}|D|) \). Taking \( \delta > 0 \) and choosing

\[
\epsilon = \epsilon(D) := \delta \frac{c_0}{\log(\frac{3}{2}|D|)},
\]

it follows from (2.13) and by Lemma 2.3(i) that

\[
\limsup_{|D| \to +\infty} \frac{\log(|D|)^{-1}}{D \text{ fund. disc.}} \left( \sum_{0 < \Re(\varrho) < 1} \frac{1}{\varrho} \right) \leq \frac{1}{2}(1 + \delta) + \frac{C}{\delta},
\]

for some absolute constant \( C \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \), thus proving item (i).

- Item (ii): Taking \( \epsilon \geq (\sqrt{5} - 1)/2 \), by Lemma 2.4 we have

\[
\sum_{0 < \Re(\varrho) < 1} \frac{1}{\varrho} = \frac{1}{4} \left( \sum_{0 < \Re(\varrho) < 1} \Pi(\varrho) \right)
\]

The proof for this item is inspired by an argument attributed to U. Vorhauer used in estimating the term \( B(\chi) \) appearing in Equation (17) at Chapter 12, p. 83 of Davenport [4]. Although we were unable to find the original source, the argument is outlined in Exercise 8, Section 10.2 of Montgomery–Vaughan [17].
\[
> \frac{1}{4(1 + 2\varepsilon)} \left( \sum_{0 < \text{Re}(\varrho) < 1} \Pi_{\varepsilon}(\varrho) \right) = \frac{1}{1 + 2\varepsilon} \left( \sum_{0 < \text{Re}(\varrho) < 1} \frac{1}{\varrho + \varepsilon} \right).
\]

Then, since \(\log(|D|)^{-1}(1 - \beta_D + \varepsilon)^{-1} \to 0\) as \(|D| \to +\infty\) for every fixed \(\varepsilon > 0\) (in particular, for \(\varepsilon = (\sqrt{5} - 1)/2\)), from Lemma 2.3(i) it follows that

\[
\liminf_{D \to -\infty \atop \text{fund. disc.}} \frac{\sum'_{0 < \text{Re}(\varrho) < 1} \frac{1}{\varrho}}{\log(|D|)} \geq \liminf_{D \to -\infty \atop \text{fund. disc.}} \frac{\sum'_{0 < \text{Re}(\varrho) < 1} \frac{1}{\varrho + (\sqrt{5} - 1)/2}}{\sqrt{5} \log(|D|)}
\]

\[
= \liminf_{D \to -\infty \atop \text{fund. disc.}} \frac{\sum_{0 < \text{Re}(\varrho) < 1} \frac{1}{\varrho + (\sqrt{5} - 1)/2}}{\sqrt{5} \log(|D|)} = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{5}},
\]

thus concluding the proof. \(\square\)

**Remark (Limitations).** It is worth noting that this approach is intrinsically limited by the growth order of \(L'(1, \chi)/L(1, \chi)\) for \(\chi \pmod{q}\), which, under GRH, is known to be \(O(\log \log(q))\) (cf. Ihara et al. [11]). Thus, under GRH (cf. Lemma 2.3(ii)):

\[
\sum'_{0 < \text{Re}(\varrho) < 1} \frac{1}{\varrho} = \frac{1}{2} \log(|D|) + O(\log \log(|D|)).
\]

Assuming only the validity of the above estimate, however, would a priori only allow us to conclude that \((1 - \beta_D)^{-1} = O(\log \log(|D|))\) (not even \(O(1)\!\)), showcasing the narrow scope of this method.

An immediate qualitative consequence of Proposition 2.5 is the following:

**Corollary 2.6.** As \(|D| \to +\infty\) through fundamental discriminants, it holds:

\[
\sum_{0 < \text{Re}(\varrho) < 1} \frac{1}{\varrho} = \frac{1}{1 - \beta_D} + \Theta(\log(|D|)).
\]

### 3. Three estimates for \(ht(j(\tau_D))\)

In this section, we shall prove the three estimates \((\ast)\), \((\ast\ast)\), and \((\ast\ast\ast)\), stated in Theorem A at the Introduction. In order to do that, we will need to work out a more precise version of formula (5) from Goldfeld [8], which constitutes Proposition 3.8. The three estimates, then, will follow from the combination of (2.6) in Lemma 2.3, Proposition 3.8 and Lemma 3.11 (which is just Equation (\ast) re-stated). Central among our calculations will be the Fourier expansion of the classical real analytic Eisenstein series (cf. Section II.3, p. 82 of Siegel [19])

\[
E(z, s) = \sum_{m,n=-\infty \atop m,n \neq 0}^{+\infty} \frac{y^s}{|m + nz|^{2s}},
\]
defined for \( z = x + iy \) in the upper half-plane \( y > 0 \), and \( s = \sigma + it \) with \( \sigma > 1 \). This function is the simplest example of a “non-holomorphic modular function”, meaning it is invariant under modular transformations \( z \mapsto z^* = (az + b)/(cz + d) \) for \( \left[ \begin{array}{cc} a & b \\ c & d \end{array} \right] \in \text{PSL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) \), and thus \( E(z, s) = E(z^*, s) \).

Remark. Some sources consider slightly modified versions of this function, such as divided by 2, or with the pair \((m, n)\) running through relatively prime integers (equivalent to considering \( \zeta(2s)^{-1} E(z, s) \)), or multiplied by \( \pi^{-s} \Gamma(s) \) (see [3.4]). As we are following Siegel [19], we stick to his convention, although we change the notation from \( f \) to \( E \).

3.1. A Kronecker’s limit formula analogue. Start by considering the following two formulas (cf. Eqs. (15), (12) at Chapter 6 of Davenport [4]):

\[
(3.2) \quad h(D) = \frac{\sqrt{|D|}}{2\pi} L(1, \chi_D), \\
(3.3) \quad \sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} Z_Q(s) = w_D \zeta(s) L(s, \chi_D),
\]

the first of which is Dirichlet’s class number formula, where

\[
w_D = \begin{cases} 
2 & \text{if } D < -4, \\
4 & \text{if } D = -4, \\
6 & \text{if } D = -3;
\end{cases}
\]

and the second has to do with the Epstein zeta function \( Z_Q(s) \) of a reduced quadratic form of fundamental discriminant \( D < 0 \), defined in Subsection 1.3. The connection between \( E \) and the quadratic \( L \)-functions associated with negative fundamental discriminants comes from (3.3), which is a classical theorem of Dirichlet (cf. Eq. (4) from Goldfeld [8]). More precisely, we have the following.

Lemma 3.1. Let \( D < 0 \) be a fundamental discriminant. Then, it holds:

\[
w_D \zeta(s) L(s, \chi_D) = \frac{2^s}{|D|^{s/2}} \sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} E(\tau_Q, s).
\]

Proof. Recalling that \( \tau_Q = (-b + i\sqrt{|D|})/2a \), we have

\[
E(\tau_Q, s) = \frac{|D|^{s/2}}{2^s} \sum_{m,n=-\infty \atop m,n \neq 0}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{a^s|m - n\tau_Q|^{2s}} = \frac{|D|^{s/2}}{2^s} \sum_{m,n=-\infty \atop m,n \neq 0}^{+\infty} \frac{1}{Q(m,n)^s} = \frac{|D|^{s/2}}{2^s} Z_Q(s),
\]

where \( Q = (a,b,c) \), with \( c := (b^2 - D)/4a \). The lemma then follows from (3.3). \( \square \)

Remark. From this point on, the methods used to deal with the imaginary quadratic and the real quadratic cases start to veer a lot from one another (cf. Eq. (7) from...
showcasing their contrasting nature more than what has been used up to Section 2. Generally speaking, reasons for such divergence abound, but in our case two culprits might be pinpointed:

- Quadratic forms of positive discriminant are indefinite, and have infinitely many automorphs;
- No complete analogue of the classical theory of complex multiplication (CM) for imaginary quadratic fields is yet known for real quadratic fields. (A far-reaching relatively recent proposal of a theory of singular moduli for real quadratic fields, enjoying strong parallels with classical singular moduli with respect to their multiplicative structure, can be found in Darmon–Vonk [3].)

Henceforth, we deal exclusively with the imaginary quadratic case, i.e., $D < 0$.

Some calculations involving Epstein zeta functions translate and generalize with relative ease for the real analytic Eisenstein series. This is the case for the Fourier expansion of $Z_Q(s)$ as given by the Chowla–Selberg formula (cf. Eqs. (5), (6) of [1]), which we state for $E(z,s)$, following the notation of Stopple (cf. p. 867 of [21]).

**Fourier expansion of $E(z,s)$**. The following holds:

$$
\frac{\Gamma(s)}{\pi^{s-\frac{1}{2}}} E(z, s) = \mathcal{T}(z, s) + \mathcal{T}(z, 1 - s) + \mathcal{U}(z, s),
$$

where:

$$
\mathcal{T}(z, s) := \frac{2 \Gamma(s)}{\pi^{s-\frac{1}{2}}} \zeta(2s)y^s,
$$

$$
\mathcal{U}(z, s) := \frac{4\sqrt{y}}{\pi^{s-\frac{1}{2}}} \sum_{n \geq 1} \left( n^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_{1-2s}(n) \cos(2\pi nx) K_{s-\frac{1}{2}}(2\pi ny) \right),
$$

with functions $\sigma_w(n)$, $K_w(z)$ being, for $w \in \mathbb{C}$,

- the divisor function $\sigma_w(n) = \sum_{m|n} m^w$;
- the K-Bessel function (or modified Bessel function of the 2nd kind)$^{10}$

$$
K_w(z) = \int_0^{+\infty} \cosh(wt) e^{-z \cosh(t)} dt, \quad \text{Re}(z) > 0.
$$

**Remark.** To recover the original statement in Chowla–Selberg [1] from the one given here, one needs to perform a change of variables ($t \mapsto \log(u)$) in the K-Bessel function as defined above, and then use the reflection formula for $\zeta$ on the expansion

---

$^9$The equation in question is present in a different form in the second display formula at page 88 of Siegel [19], where the ideal class group of $Q(\sqrt{D})$ with $D > 0$ is considered in the wide sense. In Goldfeld’s paper [8], however, these are considered in the narrow sense; thus, it is necessary to multiply $\zeta(s)L(s, \chi_D)$ by a factor $c_D$, depending on the sign of the norm of its fundamental unit (i.e., $c_D := 1$ if $t^2 - Du^2 = -4$ has a solution $(t, u) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, and $c_D := 2$ otherwise.). Cf. Aufgabe 5, p. 72 of Zagier [26].

$^{10}$The K-Bessel function is defined as the unique solution to

$$
\frac{d^2 f}{dz^2} + \frac{1}{z} \frac{df}{dz} - \left( 1 + \frac{u^2}{z^2} \right) f = 0
$$

which tends to 0 as $z \to +\infty$ through the real numbers. This particular expansion appears in, for example, formula (5.10.23) at Chapter 5, p. 119 of Lebedev [16].
of the term $\mathcal{T}(z, 1 - s)$ — cf. Eq. (3) from Goldfeld\textsuperscript{[8]}\textsuperscript{11}. Although Chowla–Selberg’s original proof deals only with $\mathbb{Z}_Q(s)$, this can easily be remedied, since

$$g^s|m - nz|^{-2s} = (\alpha m^2 + \beta mn + \gamma n^2)^{-s}$$

for all $z = x + iy \in \mathbb{H}$, with $\alpha = 1/y$, $\beta = -2x/y$, and $\gamma = (x^2 + y^2)/y$, which can be substituted in Eq. (8), §2 of Chowla–Selberg\textsuperscript{[11]}, from where the remaining calculations may be carried out accordingly.

The value of $\mathcal{T}(z, s) + \mathcal{T}(z, 1 - s)$ in this expansion is dominant, with $\mathcal{U}$ being asymptotically negligible along the regimes we are going to be working on, as we will show. For $z \in \mathbb{H}$ fixed, the function $E(z, s)$ exhibits a simple pole with residue $\pi$ at $s = 1$, and the asymptotic expansion of $E$ as $s \to 1$ is generally termed Kronecker’s first limit formula (cf. Chapter 20, §4 of Lang\textsuperscript{[15]}). We consider, however, a slightly different expression which follows from Chowla–Selberg’s formula, not involving Dedekind’s Eta function (cf. Remark 3.3).

Lemma 3.2 ("Kronecker’s limit formula"). In the notation of (3.4), for $z = x + iy$ in the upper half-plane $y > 0$, it holds

$$E(z, s) = \frac{\pi}{s - 1} + \frac{\pi^2}{3}y - \pi \log(y) + \sqrt{\pi} \mathcal{U}(z, 1) + 2\pi(\gamma - \log(2)) + O(s - 1)$$

as $s \to 1$, where $\gamma \approx 0.577\ldots$ is Euler–Mascheroni’s constant.

Proof. We need to calculate $\mathcal{T}(z, s)$, $\mathcal{T}(z, 1 - s)$ and $\mathcal{U}(z, s)$ as $s \to 1$. Since

$$\zeta(s) = \frac{1}{s - 1} + \gamma + O(s - 1),$$

$$\Gamma(1 - s) = \frac{1}{1 - s} - \gamma + O(s - 1),$$

knowing the special values

$$\zeta(0) = -\frac{1}{2}, \quad \Gamma(1) = 1, \quad \zeta(2) = \frac{\pi^2}{6},$$

$$\Gamma'(1) = -\gamma, \quad \zeta'(0) = -\frac{\log(2\pi)}{2},$$

we may calculate it as follows. For the first one, we have

$$\mathcal{T}(z, 1) = \frac{\pi^{3/2}}{3} y.$$  

For the second one, it holds

$$\frac{\zeta(2 - 2s)}{\pi^{1-s}} y^{1-s} = -\frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2} + \sqrt{\pi} \left( \log(2) + \frac{1}{2} \log(y) + \frac{1}{2} \log(\pi) \right) (s - 1) + O((s - 1)^2),$$

hence, we have

$$\mathcal{T}(z, 1 - s) = \frac{2}{\pi^{1-s}} \frac{\Gamma(1 - s)}{\zeta(2 - 2s)} y^{1-s}$$

\textsuperscript{11}Notice that there is a typographical inaccuracy in equation (3) from [8], where it should read “$4\pi^s \sqrt{\gamma}/\Gamma(s)$” instead of “$4\pi \sqrt{\gamma}/\Gamma(s)$".
\[
\left( \frac{1}{1 - s} - \gamma \right) \frac{2 \zeta(2 - 2s)}{\pi^{\frac{1}{2} - s}} \pi^{1-s} + O(s - 1)
\]
\[
= \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{s - 1} - \sqrt{\pi} \left( 2 \log(2) + \log(y) + \log(\pi) \right) + \gamma \sqrt{\pi} + O(s - 1).
\]
\tag{3.8}

For the last one, from (3.5), by performing the change of variables \( t \mapsto \cosh^{-1} (u) = \log(u + \sqrt{u^2 - 1}) \) and noticing that \( \log(u + \sqrt{u^2 - 1}) \leq \sqrt{u^2 - 1} \) for every \( u \geq 1 \), it becomes a simple calculus exercise to deduce

\[
K_{1/2}(x) = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \frac{e^{-x}}{\sqrt{x}}, \quad \frac{d}{ds} K_w(x) \bigg|_{w=1/2} \leq \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2\sqrt{2}} \frac{e^{-x}}{x^{\sqrt{x}}},
\]
for any real \( x > 0 \). Therefore, for \( z = x + iy \) in the upper half-plane, we have

\[
U(z, 1) = \frac{4\sqrt{y}}{\pi^{\frac{1}{2}}} \sum_{n \geq 1} \left( \sqrt{n} \sigma_{-1}(n) \cos(2\pi nx) K_{1/2}(2\pi ny) \right)
\]
\[
= 2\sqrt{\pi} \sum_{n \geq 1} \left( \cos(2\pi nx) e^{2\pi ny} \sigma_{-1}(n) \right),
\]
\tag{3.9}

as well as

\[
\frac{d}{ds} U(z, s) \bigg|_{s=1} = \frac{4\sqrt{y}}{\pi^{\frac{1}{2}}} \sum_{n \geq 1} \left( \frac{d}{ds} \left( n^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \right) \sigma_{-1}(n) \cos(2\pi nx) K_{1/2}(2\pi ny) +
\]
\[
+ \sqrt{n} \frac{d}{ds} \left( \sigma_{-2s}(n) \right) \bigg|_{s=1} \cos(2\pi nx) K_{1/2}(2\pi ny) +
\]
\[
+ \sqrt{n} \sigma_{-1}(n) \cos(2\pi nx) \frac{d}{ds} \left( K_{s-\frac{1}{2}}(2\pi ny) \right) \bigg|_{s=1}
\]
\[
\leq 2\sqrt{\pi} \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{\cos(2\pi nx)}{e^{2\pi ny}} \left( \sigma_{-1}(n) \log(n) - 2 \left( \sum_{m|n} \frac{\log(m)}{m} \right) +
\right.
\]
\[
\left. + \frac{1}{4\pi y} \sigma_{-1}(n) \right). \tag{3.10}
\]

Fixing \( y > 0 \), the function \( e^{2\pi ny} \) will grow much faster than \( \log(n)^2 \) as \( n \to +\infty \), therefore both (3.9) and (3.10) converge absolutely. Finally, putting

\[
\frac{\pi^{s-\frac{1}{2}}}{\Gamma(s)} = \sqrt{\pi} + \sqrt{\pi} \left( \log(\pi) + \gamma \right) (s - 1) + O((s - 1)^2),
\]

together with (3.7) and (3.8) yields the claim of the lemma. \( \Box \)

Remark 3.3 (Dedekind \( \eta \) function). For \( z = x + iy \in \mathfrak{h} \), the Dedekind Eta function is defined as

\[
\eta(z) := q^{1/24} \prod_{k \geq 1} (1 - q^k),
\]
where \( q := e^{2\pi i z} \). It appears in the expansion of \( E(z, s) \) at \( s = 1 \) through the function we called \( \mathcal{U}(z, s) \). Indeed, from (3.9), we have

\[
\mathcal{U}(z, 1) = 2\sqrt{\pi} \sum_{n \geq 1} \left( \frac{\cos(2\pi nx)}{e^{2\pi ny}} \sigma_1(n) \right) = 2 \sqrt{\pi} \Re \left( \sum_{n \geq 1} q^n \sigma_1(n) \right)
\]

\[
= 2 \sqrt{\pi} \Re \left( \sum_{d \geq 1} \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{q^{dk}}{d} \right) = -2 \sqrt{\pi} \Re \left( \sum_{k \geq 1} \log(1 - q^k) \right)
\]

\[
= -2 \sqrt{\pi} \sum_{k \geq 1} \log(|1 - q^k|) = -2 \sqrt{\pi} \log(|\eta(z)|) - \frac{\pi \sqrt{\pi}}{6} y.
\]

In order to make the calculations in Subsection 3.3 slightly simpler, however, we keep the notation \( \mathcal{U}(z, 1) \).

3.2. Equidistribution of Heegner points. As mentioned in Section 1 to each reduced binary quadratic form \( Q = (a, b, c) \) of discriminant \( D < 0 \) there corresponds a Heegner point \( \tau_Q = (-b + \sqrt{D})/2a \in \mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathfrak{h} \). Letting \( D < 0 \) be a fundamental discriminant, consider the set of \( h(D) \) Heegner points of reduced forms

\[
(3.11) \quad \Lambda_D := \{ \tau_Q \mid Q \text{ reduced bin. quad. form with } \text{disc}(Q) = D \} \subseteq \mathcal{F}.
\]

Following Duke [5], consider the probability space \( (\mathcal{F}, \Sigma, \mu) \), where:

- \( \mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathfrak{h} \) is the fundamental domain;
- \( \Sigma \) is the usual \( \sigma \)-algebra of Lebesgue measurable sets inherited from \( \mathbb{R}^2 \supseteq \mathfrak{h} \);
- \( \mu \) is the measure induced by \( \text{d}\mu := \frac{3}{\pi} \text{d}x \text{d}y \) for \( z = x + iy \in \mathcal{F} \), so that \( \mu(\mathcal{F}) = 1 \).

Endowing the upper half-plane with its usual hyperbolic geometry, so that geodesics are circle arcs perpendicular to the \( x \)-axis and straight vertical semi-lines, we can state the following:

**Duke’s Theorem** (Original formulation — cf. Theorem 1, p. 75 of Duke [5]). *Let \( \Omega \subseteq \mathcal{F} \) be a convex set (in the hyperbolic sense) with a piecewise smooth boundary. Then, there is a real number \( \delta = \delta(\Omega) > 0 \) such that*

\[
(3.12) \quad \frac{|\Lambda_D \cap \Omega|}{|\Lambda_D|} = \mu(\Omega) + O(|D|^{-\delta})
\]

*as \( D \to -\infty \) through negative fundamental discriminants, where implied constant, although ineffective, depends only on \( \delta \) and \( \Omega \).*

Since hyperbolic convex subsets of \( \mathfrak{h} \) constitute a basis for the usual topology inherited from \( \mathbb{R}^2 \supseteq \mathfrak{h} \)[12] this is a type of uniform distribution result, for it says that the discrete counting measure induced by the \( \Lambda_D \) converges weakly to \( \mu \) in \( \mathcal{F} \). However, it is not an equidistribution result in the usual sense (cf. [9]), for the sets of Heegner points \( \Lambda_D \) do not constitute a sequence; that is, it does not necessarily hold \( \Lambda_D \subseteq \Lambda_D' \) for fundamental discriminants \( D' < D < 0 \). These are, however, equidistributed as a pseudosequence (Definition 3.2), which is the subject of Appendix 2. Under this formulation, we have an analogous statement to the integral criterion for equidistributed sequences, but for equidistributed pseudosequences (Definition

---

[12]Indeed, for any \( p \in \mathcal{F} \) and a small \( \varepsilon > 0 \), consider the region enclosed by the four geodesics

\[
A_{\pm \varepsilon} := \{ z \in \mathfrak{h} \mid \Re(z) = \Re(p) \pm \varepsilon \}
\]

and

\[
B_{\pm \varepsilon} := \{ z \in \mathfrak{h} \mid |z - \Re(p)| = \Im(p) \pm \varepsilon \}.
\]
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α.4). Considering then \( \mathcal{H} = (\Lambda_D)_{D < 0 \text{ fund. disc.}} \) as a pseudosequence, the following is a direct consequence of Duke’s theorem and Theorem α.10.

**Lemma 3.4** (Duke’s theorem — Integral formulation). Let \( f : \mathcal{F} \to \mathbb{C} \) be a function such that \( f(x + iy)/y^2 \) is Riemann-integrable in \( \mathcal{F} \) (considering it as a subset of \( \mathbb{R}^2 \)). Then, it holds:

\[
\lim_{D \to -\infty} \left( \frac{1}{h(D)} \sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} f(\tau_Q) \right) = \frac{3}{\pi} \int_{\mathcal{F}} f(x + iy) \frac{dxdy}{y^2}.
\]

**Remark 3.5** (Lower bounds for \( h(D) \)). To see that \( \mathcal{H} = (\Lambda_D)_{D < 0 \text{ fund. disc.}} \) fits the definition of pseudosequence given at Definition α.2, one has to have \( |\Lambda_D| \to +\infty \) as \( D \to -\infty \). This was first conjectured by Gauss, and proved by Deuring–Heilbronn in 1934 (cf. the end of Section 2 from Iwaniec [12]). In 1935, Landau performed a finer analysis of the same method and was able to show that \( h(D) \gg_{\varepsilon} |D|^{1/2 - \varepsilon} \), and later that same year, Siegel proved his celebrated ineffective estimate \( h(D) \gg_{\varepsilon} |D|^{1/2 - \varepsilon} \).

Both Landau’s and Siegel’s approach involve dealing with the largest real zero of \( L(s, \chi_D) \) (hence the name Landau–Siegel zero), and a proof of Siegel’s theorem, together with its historical context, may be found in Chapter 21 of Davenport [4].

3.3. The summation \( \sum_Q \text{Im}(\tau_Q) \). As a direct consequence of Lemma 3.2, we can derive an exact formula for the logarithmic derivative of \( L(s, \chi_D) \) at \( s = 1 \) in terms of the Heegner points associated to reduced quadratic forms \( Q = (a, b, c) \) with discriminant \( D < 0 \). Then, by using Lemma 3.4 formulation of Duke’s theorem, we arrive at a finer version of formula (5) from Goldfeld [5], as mentioned at the beginning of this section.

**Lemma 3.6.** If \( D < 0 \) is a negative fundamental discriminant, then, in the notation of (3.4), the following holds:

\[
\frac{L'(1, \chi_D)}{L(1, \chi_D)} = \frac{\pi}{3} \frac{1}{h(D)} \left( \sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} \text{Im}(\tau_Q) \right) - \frac{1}{h(D)} \left( \sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} \log \left( \text{Im}(\tau_Q) \right) \right) + \\
\frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \frac{1}{h(D)} \left( \sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} U(\tau_Q, 1) \right) - \frac{1}{2} \log(|D|) + (\gamma - \log(2)).
\]

**Proof.** We start from the observation that, from (3.6), we have

\[
(3.13) \quad \lim_{s \to 1} \left( w_D \zeta(s)L(s, \chi_D) - w_D \frac{L(1, \chi_D)}{s - 1} \right) = w_D \left( \gamma L(1, \chi_D) + L'(1, \chi_D) \right).
\]

Now, from Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2 as \( s \to 1 \), we have

\[
w_D \zeta(s)L(s, \chi_D) = \frac{2^s}{|D|^{s/2}} \sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} E(\tau_Q, s) = \frac{2^s}{|D|^{s/2}} \sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} \left( \frac{\pi}{s - 1} + \frac{\pi^2}{3} \text{Im}(\tau_Q) - \pi \log \left( \text{Im}(\tau_Q) \right) \right) + \\
\frac{\pi^2}{2} \sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} \frac{1}{s - 1} + \frac{\pi^3}{3} \sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} \log \left( \text{Im}(\tau_Q) \right) + \\
\frac{\pi^4}{4} \sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} \log^2 \left( \text{Im}(\tau_Q) \right) + \ldots
\]

\[
= \frac{2^s}{|D|^{s/2}} \sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} \left( \frac{\pi}{s - 1} + \frac{\pi^2}{3} \text{Im}(\tau_Q) - \pi \log \left( \text{Im}(\tau_Q) \right) \right) + \\
\frac{\pi^2}{2} \sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} \frac{1}{s - 1} + \frac{\pi^3}{3} \sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} \log \left( \text{Im}(\tau_Q) \right) + \\
\frac{\pi^4}{4} \sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} \log^2 \left( \text{Im}(\tau_Q) \right) + \ldots
\]
\[ \frac{\pi^2}{3} \frac{2^s}{|D|^{s/2}} \left( \sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} \text{Im}(\tau_Q) \right) - \frac{2^s \pi}{|D|^{s/2}} \left( \sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} \log \left( \text{Im}(\tau_Q) \right) \right) \\
+ \frac{2^s \sqrt{\pi}}{|D|^{s/2}} \left( \sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} \mathcal{U}(\tau_Q, 1) \right) + \frac{2^s \pi h(D)}{|D|^{s/2}} \frac{1}{s-1} + \\
+ \frac{2^s \pi h(D)}{|D|^{s/2}} (2\gamma - 2 \log(2)) + O(s-1). \]

From Dirichlet’s class number formula \[3.2\], it holds \( w_D L(1, \chi_D) = 2 \pi h(D)/\sqrt{|D|} \), hence, it follows that

\[ \left( \frac{2^s \pi h(D)}{|D|^{s/2}} - w_D L(1, \chi_D) \right) \frac{1}{s-1} = \frac{2^s \pi h(D)}{\sqrt{|D|}} \left( \log(2) - \frac{1}{2} \log(|D|) \right) + O(s-1), \]

and thus,

\[ \lim_{s \to 1} \left( w_D \zeta(s) L(s, \chi_D) - w_D \frac{L(1, \chi_D)}{s-1} \right) = \]

\[ \frac{2\pi^2}{3 \sqrt{|D|}} \left( \sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} \text{Im}(\tau_Q) \right) - \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{|D|}} \left( \sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} \log \left( \text{Im}(\tau_Q) \right) \right) + \\
+ \frac{2\sqrt{\pi}}{\sqrt{|D|}} \left( \sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} \mathcal{U}(\tau_Q, 1) \right) + \frac{2\pi h(D)}{\sqrt{|D|}} \left( 2\gamma - \log(2) - \frac{1}{2} \log(|D|) \right). \]

Finally, putting \[3.13\] together with \[3.14\], the original claim follows by dividing both sides by \( w_D L(1, \chi_D) = 2 \pi h(D)/\sqrt{|D|} \) and suitably rearranging it. \( \square \)

Next, by using Duke’s Theorem as in Lemma \[3.4\] we can calculate the small terms in the expansion we obtained in Lemma \[3.6\] relatively explicitly, in terms of some special functions.

**Lemma 3.7.** For \( x \in \mathbb{R}_{<0} \), write \( \text{Ei}(x) := \int_{-\infty}^{x} e^t / t \, dt \) for the exponential integral function, and consider

\[ F(z) := \frac{1}{2\pi} \sum_{n \geq 1} \left( \text{Ei}(2\pi inz) - \text{Ei}(2\pi in(z-1)) \right) \sigma_{-1}(n), \]

for \( z = x + iy \in \mathfrak{h} \). Then, writing \( \omega := e^{2\pi i/3} = (-1 + i\sqrt{3})/2 \), the following hold:

\[ (i) \lim_{D \to -\infty} \frac{1}{h(D)} \left( \sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} \log \left( \text{Im}(\tau_Q) \right) \right) = 1 - \log(2) + \frac{3}{\pi} \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{\sin(2\pi n/3)}{n^2} ; \]

\[ (ii) \lim_{D \to -\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi} h(D)} \left( \sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} \mathcal{U}(\tau_Q, 1) \right) = -24 \text{Im}(F(\omega)). \]
Proof. Note that \( \int_{x} \ldots dxdy = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left( \int_{-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} \ldots dx \right) dy - \int_{\frac{1}{2}}^{1} \left( \int_{-\sqrt{1-y^2}}^{\sqrt{1-y^2}} \ldots dx \right) dy. \) With this observation, we prove the items separately.

- **Item (i):** Using that \( \int \cot(\vartheta) \, d\vartheta = \log(\sin(\vartheta)) \) and \( \int \cot(\vartheta)^2 \, d\vartheta = -\vartheta - \cot(\vartheta) \) (omitting the integration constants), we have:

\[
\frac{3}{\pi} \int_{x} \log(y) \, \frac{dxdy}{y^2} = \frac{6}{\pi} \int_{x}^{\infty} \left( \int_{0}^{\frac{1}{2}} \log(y) \, dx \right) \, dy - \frac{6}{\pi} \int_{x}^{1} \left( \int_{0}^{\sqrt{1-y^2}} \log(y) \, dy \right) \, dx
\]

\[
= \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{\pi} \left( \log \left( \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \right) + 1 \right) - \frac{6}{\pi} \int_{x}^{1} \log(y) \, \frac{1 - y^2}{y^2} \, dy
\]

\[
= \frac{2\sqrt{3}}{\pi} \left( \log \left( \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \right) + 1 \right) - \frac{6}{\pi} \int_{\pi}^{\pi} \log(\sin(\vartheta)) \, \cot(\vartheta)^2 \, d\vartheta
\]

(3.16)

\[
= 1 + \frac{3}{\pi} \int_{\frac{\pi}{3}}^{\frac{2\pi}{3}} \log(\sin(\vartheta)) \, d\vartheta.
\]

Since \( \sin(-i \log(\xi)) = i(1 - \xi^2)/2\xi, \) making the substitution \( \xi := e^{i\vartheta} \) yields:

\[
\int_{\frac{\pi}{3}}^{\frac{2\pi}{3}} \log(\sin(\vartheta)) \, d\vartheta = -i \int_{\Gamma} \left( \log \left( \frac{1 - \xi^2}{2} \right) + \log \left( \frac{i}{\xi} \right) \right) \frac{d\xi}{\xi}
\]

\[
= i \log(2) \, \log(e^{\pi i/3}) + \frac{1}{2\vartheta} \left( \text{Li}_2(e^{2\pi i/3}) - \text{Li}_2(e^{4\pi i/3}) \right)
\]

\[
= -\frac{\pi}{3} \log(2) + \text{Im}(\text{Li}_2(\omega)),
\]

where \( \omega := e^{2\pi i/3}, \) \( \Gamma := \{ e^{i\vartheta} \mid \vartheta \in [\pi/3, 2\pi/3] \}, \) and \( \text{Li}_2(z) := \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{z^n}{n^2} \) is the dilogarithm function.

Then, putting this together with (3.16), we deduce item (i) by applying Lemma 3.4 and by observing that, for every \( \vartheta \in (-\pi, \pi), \) it holds \( \text{Im}(\text{Li}_2(e^{i\vartheta})) = \sum_{n \geq 1} \sin(n\vartheta)/n^2. \)

- **Item (ii):** From Equation (3.9) in Lemma 3.2 for \( z = x + iy \in \mathfrak{h} \) we have:

(3.17)

\[
\mathcal{U}(z, 1) = 2\sqrt{\pi} \, \text{Re} \left( \sum_{n \geq 1} e^{2\pi i n z} \sigma_{-1}(n) \right).
\]

Writing \( \xi = \cos(\vartheta) + i \sin(\vartheta), \) it holds

\[
\int_{x} e^{2\pi i \xi} \, dxdy = -\frac{1}{2\pi in} \int_{x}^{1} \left[ e^{2\pi i \xi} \right]_{x=-\sqrt{1-y^2}}^{x=\sqrt{1-y^2}} \, dy
\]

\[
= -\frac{1}{2\pi in} \int_{\frac{\pi}{3}}^{\frac{2\pi}{3}} e^{2\pi i \xi} \cos(\vartheta) \, d\vartheta
\]

\[
= -i \int_{\frac{\pi}{3}}^{\frac{2\pi}{3}} e^{2\pi i \xi} (\cot(\vartheta) + i) \, d\vartheta = -i \int_{\Gamma} e^{2\pi i \xi} \left( \frac{2\xi}{\xi^2 - 1} \right) \, d\xi,
\]
where $\Gamma := \{ e^{i\vartheta} \mid \vartheta \in [\pi/3, 2\pi/3]\}$. Since $2\xi/(\xi^2 - 1) = (\xi - 1)^{-1} + (\xi + 1)^{-1}$,

$$-i \int_R e^{2\pi i \xi} (\frac{2\xi}{\xi^2 - 1}) \, d\xi = -i \left( \int_{R-1} e^{2\pi i \xi} \frac{d\xi}{\xi} + \int_{R+1} e^{2\pi i \xi} \frac{d\xi}{\xi} \right) = -i \left( \text{Ei}(2\pi i (-\frac{3}{2} + i\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2})) - \text{Ei}(2\pi i (-\frac{3}{2} + i\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2})) \right) + i \left( \text{Ei}(2\pi i (-\frac{1}{2} + i\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2})) - \text{Ei}(2\pi i (-\frac{1}{2} + i\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2})) \right) = 2 \text{Im} \left( \text{Ei}(2\pi i (\omega - 1)) \right) - 2 \text{Im} \left( \text{Ei}(2\pi i \omega) \right),$$

which is a real number. Thus, putting this together with (3.17), in order for us to apply Lemma 3.4 to prove item (ii), it suffices to show the convergence of (3.15).

Taking $z = x + iy \in \mathbb{H}$ with $x < 0$, for every $n \geq 1$ we have

$$|\text{Ei}(2\pi i z) - \text{Ei}(2\pi i (z - 1))| = \left| \int_z^{z-1} e^{2\pi i \xi} \frac{d\xi}{\xi} \right| \leq e^{-2\pi ny} \frac{1}{|z|},$$

and hence, $|F(z)| \leq (2\pi|z|)^{-1} \sum_{n \geq 1} e^{-2\pi ny} \sigma_1(n)$, which clearly converges. \hfill \Box

The following, then, is a direct consequence of Lemmas 3.6 and 3.7.

**Proposition 3.8.** As $D \to -\infty$ through fundamental discriminants, it holds:

$$\frac{L'(1, \chi_D)}{L(1, \chi_D)} = \frac{\pi}{3h(D)} \left( \sum_{Q \text{ red.}} \sigma_1^{(D)} \text{Im}(\tau_Q) \right) - \frac{1}{2} \log(|D|) + C + o(1),$$

where $C := -1 - 3\pi^{-1} \left( \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{\sin(2\pi n/3)}{n^2} \right) - 24 \text{Im}(\omega) + \gamma \approx -1.069067 \ldots$, for $\omega$ and $F$ as in Lemma 3.7.

**Remark 3.9 (Ineffectiveness).** Note that the error term of $o(1)$ in Proposition 3.8 is not effective, for the rate of convergence to the constants in Lemma 3.7 is controlled by Duke’s Theorem in Lemma 3.4, which is not effective. Therefore, all further results which use this estimate (e.g., Theorem B) are also ineffective.

**Remark 3.10 (A Tauberian Duke’s Theorem?).** Armed only with Lemma 3.4, we cannot derive a meaningful estimate for the summation in Proposition 3.8. That is because $1/t$ is locally integrable, but not integrable in $\mathcal{F}$. Heuristically, however, since $\text{Im}(\tau_Q) \leq \sqrt{|D|}/2$ for every $\tau_Q \in \Lambda_D$, it is not entirely unsound to expect:

$$\frac{1}{h(D)} \left( \sum_{Q \text{ red.}} \sigma_1^{(D)} \text{Im}(\tau_Q) \right) \sim \frac{3}{\pi} \int_1^{\sqrt{|D|}} \frac{dt}{t}, \quad (\text{as } D \to -\infty)$$

which, from Proposition 3.8 would imply $L'(1, \chi_D)/L(1, \chi_D) = o(\log(|D|))$, exactly as conjecturally expected (cf. Theorem B). In order to deduce a similar estimate from some variation of Duke’s theorem, we would need either an effective version (i.e., computable constants in (3.12) or some sort of Tauberian version (e.g., an asymptotic version of Lemma 3.4) for locally integrable $f$ under the condition $|f(\sigma + it)| = O(t)$) of such statement, which appears to be considerably harder than the original problem of “no Siegel zeros” (as in Conjecture 2.2).
3.4. Proof of Theorem A. We are now ready to prove the three estimates (\(\ast\), \(\ast\ast\), and \(\ast\ast\ast\)). The main technicality, besides Proposition 3.8, is the integrality of \(j(\tau_D)\) mentioned in Subsection 1.3 as well as the fact that its Galois conjugates are given by \(\{j(\tau_Q)\mid \tau_Q \in \Lambda_D\}\), where \(\Lambda_D\) is as in (3.11). Thus, the value of \(\text{ht}(j(\tau_D))\) may be calculated through (1.6), allowing us to derive the following (cf. Equation (7), p. 514 of Granville–Stark [10]):

**Lemma 3.11 (Eq. (\(\dagger\))).** As \(D \to -\infty\) through fundamental discriminants, it holds:

\[
\text{ht}(j(\tau_D)) = \frac{2\pi}{h(D)} \left( \sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} \text{Im}(\tau_Q) \right) + \kappa_1 + o(1),
\]

where \(\kappa_1 := -0.068692\ldots\), and the \(o(1)\) is ineffective.

**Proof.** For a reduced quadratic form \(Q = (a, b, c)\) with \(\text{disc}(Q) = D < 0\), let \(q_Q := e^{2\pi i \tau_Q}\), so that \(|1/q_Q| = e^{-2\pi \text{Im}(\tau_Q)}\). Since from (1.6) we have

\[
\text{ht}(j(\tau_D)) = \frac{1}{h(D)} \sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} \log \max\{|j(\tau_Q)|, 1\},
\]

we can write:

\[
\text{ht}(j(\tau_D)) = \frac{2\pi}{h(D)} \left( \sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} \text{Im}(\tau_Q) \right) = \frac{1}{h(D)} \left( \sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D)} \log \left( \frac{\max\{|j(\tau_Q)|, 1\}}{e^{2\pi \text{Im}(\tau_Q)}} \right) \right).
\]

Thus, in order to prove the lemma, it suffices, in view of Duke’s theorem as in Lemma 3.4 to estimate the integral

\[
(3.18) \quad \frac{3}{\pi} \int_{\mathcal{F}} \log \left( \max \{ |j(z)| \cdot |q|, |q| \} \right) \frac{dxdy}{y^2},
\]

where \(z = x + iy\) and \(q := e^{2\pi i z}\). We will prove the convergence of (3.18) in three steps, and then we will estimate its value numerically. Recall the \(q\)-expansion of the \(j\)-invariant in (1.4):

\[
j(z) = \left( 1 + 240 \sum_{n \geq 1} \left( \sum_{d|n} d^3 \right) q^n \right)^3 = \frac{1}{q} \prod_{n \geq 1} (1 - q^n)^{24} = 1 + \sum_{n \geq 0} c(n) q^n,
\]

where \(z \in \mathbb{h}\), with \(c(0) = 744\), \(c(1) = 196884\). Then, we have the following:

- **Assertion 1:** For every \(n \geq 1\), it holds \(0 \leq c(n) < e^{4\pi \sqrt{n}}\).

  Since \((1 - q^n)^{-1} = \sum_{k \geq 0} q^{nk}\), it is clear from the quotient expression of \(j(z)\) that the \(c(n)\) are nonnegative. To show the upper bound, we use the fact that \(j\) is a modular function of weight 0 for \(SL_2(\mathbb{Z})\). For every \(0 < t < 1\), we have \(j(it) = j(it)\). Thus, in terms of the \(q\)-expansion, rearranging this equality yields:

\[
\sum_{n \geq 0} c(n) \left( \frac{e^{2\pi n/t} - e^{2\pi nt}}{e^{2\pi n(t+t^{-1})}} \right) = e^{2\pi /t} - e^{2\pi t}.
\]

For \(n = 1\), we have \(c(1) = 196884 < 286751 < e^{4\pi}\). Since the \(c(n)\) are nonnegative, for \(n \geq 2\) it holds

\[
c(n) \leq \left( \frac{e^{2\pi /t} - e^{2\pi t}}{e^{2\pi n/t} - e^{2\pi nt}} \right) e^{2\pi nt(1-t^{-2})}.
\]
Taking \( t = t(n) := 1 / \sqrt{n} \), it follows that

\[
c(n) \leq \left( \frac{e^{2\pi \sqrt{n}} - e^{2\pi / \sqrt{n}}}{e^{2\pi n \sqrt{n}} - e^{2\pi \sqrt{n}}} \right) e^{2\pi \sqrt{n}(1+n)}
\]

\[
= \left( \frac{1 - e^{-2\pi \sqrt{n}(1-n^{-1})}}{1 - e^{-2\pi \sqrt{n}(n-1)}} \right) e^{4\pi \sqrt{n}} < e^{4\pi \sqrt{n}},
\]

as intended.

• Assertion 2: \( \left| \frac{3}{\pi} \int_{\mathcal{F} \cap \{ \text{Im}(z) \geq 16 \}} \log \left( \max \{|j(z)| \cdot |q|, \ |q| \} \right) / y^2 \, dx \, dy \right| < 10^{-21} \).

For \( y \geq 4 \), we have \( 4\pi \sqrt{k - 2\pi ky} \leq -\pi ky \) for every \( k \geq 1 \). Thus, by Assertion 1, for \( y \geq 4 \) it holds

\[
|j(z)| \cdot |q| \leq 1 + \sum_{n \geq 0} c(n)|q|^{n+1}
\]

\[
\leq 1 + \sum_{n \geq 0} e^{4\pi \sqrt{n+1} - 2\pi(n+1)y} \leq 1 + \sum_{n \geq 1} e^{-\pi ny}.
\]

By partial summation,

\[
\sum_{n \geq 1} e^{-\pi ny} = \pi y \int_{1}^{+\infty} \left\lfloor t \right\rfloor e^{-\pi ty} \, dt
\]

\[
= \pi y \int_{1}^{+\infty} t e^{-\pi ty} \, dt = \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\pi y} \right) e^{-\pi y}.
\]

Hence, as \( \log(1 + t) \leq t \) for all \( t \geq 0 \), we have

\[
\left| \frac{3}{\pi} \int_{\mathcal{F} \cap \{ \text{Im}(z) \geq 16 \}} \log \left( \max \{|j(z)| \cdot |q|, \ |q| \} \right) / y^2 \, dx \, dy \right| \leq \frac{3}{\pi} \int_{16}^{+\infty} \frac{1 + (\pi y)^{-1}}{y^2 e^{\pi y}} \, dy
\]

\[
\leq \frac{3}{\pi} \int_{16}^{+\infty} \frac{1 + \pi y}{y^2 e^{\pi y}} \, dy
\]

\[
= \frac{3}{\pi} \frac{1}{16 e^{16\pi}}.
\]

Then, since \( e^{4\pi} > 10^5 \), we have \( e^{16\pi} > 10^{20} \) and \( 16\pi / 3 > 10 \), yielding Assertion 2.

• Assertion 3: \( \frac{3}{\pi} \int_{\mathcal{F}} \log \left( \max \{|j(z)| \cdot |q|, \ |q| \} \right) / y^2 \, dx \, dy \approx -0.068692 \ldots \)

For \( \sqrt{3}/2 \leq y < 16 \), by Assertion 1 we have

\[
|j(z)| \cdot |q| \leq 1 + \sum_{n \geq 0} c(n)|q|^{n+1}
\]

\[
\leq 1 + \sum_{n \geq 0} e^{-\pi (n+1) \left( \sqrt{3} - 4 / \sqrt{n+1} \right)} < A,
\]

for some constant \( A \in \mathbb{R}_+ \), and thus,

\[
-32\pi \leq \log \left( \max \{|j(z)| \cdot |q|, \ |q| \} \right) \leq \log(A),
\]

which, together with Assertion 2, implies that \( \text{(3.18)} \) converges. Furthermore, by Assertion 2, in order to obtain a computational estimate of \( \text{(3.18)} \) with 20 decimal
places of accuracy, it suffices to estimate
\[
\frac{3}{\pi} \int_{\mathcal{F} \cap \{\text{Im}(z) < 16\}} \log \left( \max \{|j(z)|, |q|, |q|\} \right) \frac{dx dy}{y^2}
\]
with 20 decimal places of accuracy. Using Python’s mpmath library, the first 6 decimal places are the following: \(3.18 \approx -0.068692\ldots\)

\[\square\]

**Proof of Theorem A.** Estimate \((\ast)\) is just Lemma 3.11. From Proposition 3.8, we get \((\ast\ast)\) from \((\ast)\). Finally, using (2.6) from Lemma 2.3 we deduce \((\ast\ast\ast)\) from \((\ast\ast)\).

\[\square\]

4. Contribution of the Siegel zero

In this section, we return to the point made at the end of Subsection 2.2, on measuring the effect a potential real zero of \(L(s, \chi_D)\) “close enough” to 1 (in the sense of Conjecture 2.2) would have on certain number-theoretic quantities. In Theorem A, we worked with the quantities

\[\text{ht}(j(\tau_D)), \quad \frac{1}{h(D)} \sum_{Q \text{ red.} (D)} \text{Im}(\tau_Q), \quad \frac{L'(1, \chi_D)}{L(1, \chi_D)}, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{0 < \text{Re}(\rho) < 1} \frac{1}{\rho}.\]

For Corollary A.1 and Theorem B we will deal with the following auxiliary quantities, which are slightly more difficult to be related directly to \(\text{ht}(j(\tau_D))\):

- The *class number* of \(Q(\sqrt{D})\), which satisfies \(h(D) = -\frac{w_D}{2|D|} \sum_{n=1}^{|D|} \chi_D(n) n^{13}\)
- The *derivative* of \(L(s, \chi_D)\) at \(s = 1\), given by \(L'(1, \chi_D) = -\sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{\chi_D(n) \log(n)}{n}\);
- The *summation* \(\sum_{Q \text{ red.}} \frac{1}{a}\), equivalent to the quantity \(\sum_{Q \text{ red.}} Q(1,0)^{-1}\).

Estimates for the values of \(h(D)\) and \(L'(1, \chi_D)\) generally require quite involved approaches. One way to gauge the problem is by observing their expressions in terms of \(\chi_D\), which changes sign relatively erratically, allowing only crude estimates to be obtained from partial summation, such as the classical estimate \(|L'(\sigma, \chi)| = O(\log(q)^2)|\) for \(\chi \pmod q\) primitive and \(0 \leq 1 - \sigma \ll \log(q)^{-1}\) (cf. Eq. (11) and its proof, Chapter 14, pp. 95–96 of Davenport [4]).

The problem with the summation \(\sum_{Q \text{ red.}} (D) 1/a\), on the other hand, is that its averaged counterpart in Theorem A(4) is easier to be conceptualized (e.g., in the framework of Lemma 3.4), making this quantity difficult to be disentangled from the value of \(h(D)\). The simple estimate \(\sum_{Q \text{ red.}} (D) 1/a \gg 1\), however, does prove useful in view of Theorem B.I.(iii), which effectively expands upon the classical result that “no Siegel zeros” for negative discriminants implies \(h(D) \gg \sqrt{|D|}/\log(|D|)\) as \(D \to -\infty\), due to Hecke [14] (cf. Remark 3.5).

\[\text{13}\text{Cf. Eqs. (15) and (17), Chapter 6 of Davenport [4].}\]
\[\text{14}\text{Cf. Eq. (8) and its proof, pp. 287–290 of Landau [14].}\]
4.1. Proof of Corollary A.1. We start with a lemma.

**Lemma 4.1** (A lower bound for \( \text{ht}(j(\tau_D)) \)). As \( D \to -\infty \) through fundamental discriminants, it holds:

\[
\liminf_{D \to -\infty} \frac{\text{ht}(j(\tau_D))}{\log(|D|)} \geq \frac{3\sqrt{5}}{5}
\]

**Proof.** Immediate from Theorem [A.\( \frac{3\ast}{\ast} \)] and Proposition 2.5 (ii). \( \square \)

**Proof of Corollary A.1.** We prove the items separately.

- **Item (i):** From Theorem [A.\( \frac{3\ast}{\ast} \)], multiplying both sides by \( h(D)/\text{ht}(j(\tau_D)) \) yields

\[
h(D) = \frac{\pi}{3} \frac{3 \log(|D|)}{\text{ht}(j(\tau_D))} \sqrt{|D|} \left( \sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D) \frac{1}{a}} \right) + \frac{h(D)}{\text{ht}(j(\tau_D))}(\kappa_1 + o(1))
\]

Then, from Theorem [A.\( \frac{3\ast}{\ast} \)] one checks that

\[
\frac{3 \log(|D|)}{\text{ht}(j(\tau_D))} = \left( 1 - \frac{\kappa_2 + o(1)}{\text{ht}(j(\tau_D))} \right) \left( 1 + \frac{2}{\log(|D|)} \frac{L'(1, \chi_D)}{L(1, \chi_D)} \right)^{-1},
\]

and thus, it follows that

\[
h(D) = \left( \frac{\pi}{3} + \frac{\kappa_1 - \frac{\pi}{3} \kappa_2 + o(1)}{\text{ht}(j(\tau_D))} \right) \left( 1 + \frac{2}{\log(|D|)} \frac{L'(1, \chi_D)}{L(1, \chi_D)} \right)^{-1} \sqrt{|D|} \left( \sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D) \frac{1}{a}} \right).
\]

Since it follows from Lemma 4.1 that \( \text{ht}(j(\tau_D)) \gg \log(|D|) \), it holds \( O(\text{ht}(j(\tau_D))^{-1}) = O(\log(|D|)^{-1}) \), which implies the estimate from item (i).

- **Item (ii):** Rearranging Theorem [A.\( 3\ast \)], we have

\[
\frac{L'(1, \chi_D)}{L(1, \chi_D)} = \frac{1}{6} \text{ht}(j(\tau_D)) - \frac{1}{2} \log(|D|) - \frac{\kappa_2}{6} + o(1).
\]

From that, since Dirichlet’s class number formula (3.2) states that \( L(1, \chi_D) = \pi h(D)/\sqrt{|D|} \) for \( D < -4 \), multiplying both sides above by this quantity yields

\[
L'(1, \chi_D) = \frac{\pi}{2} \left( \text{ht}(j(\tau_D)) \right) \frac{h(D) \log(|D|)}{3 \log(|D|)} \frac{1}{\sqrt{|D|}} - \left( \frac{\pi \kappa_2}{6} + o(1) \right) h(D) \frac{1}{\sqrt{|D|}},
\]

which is exactly item (ii).

- **Item (iii):** Combining Theorem [A.\( \frac{3\ast}{\ast} \)] and [\( \ast \ast \)], we have

\[
\frac{2\pi}{h(D)} \sum_{Q \text{ red.}}^{(D) \frac{\sqrt{|D|}}{2a}} = 3 \log(|D|) + 6 \frac{L'(1, \chi_D)}{L(1, \chi_D)} + (\kappa_2 - \kappa_1) + o(1).
\]
Multiplying both sides by \( h(D)/\pi \sqrt{|D|} = L(1, \chi_D)/\pi^2 \) for \( D < -4 \) (again, by (3.2)), we deduce

\[
\sum_{Q \text{ red}} (D) \frac{1}{a} = \frac{3}{\pi} h(D) \log(|D|) + \frac{6}{\pi^2} L'(1, \chi_D) + \left( \frac{\kappa_2 - \kappa_1}{\pi} + o(1) \right) \frac{h(D)}{\sqrt{|D|}}
\]

\[
= \left( \frac{3}{\pi} + \frac{(\kappa_2 - \kappa_1)/\pi + o(1)}{\log(|D|)} \right) \frac{h(D) \log(|D|)}{\sqrt{|D|}} + \frac{6}{\pi^2} L'(1, \chi_D),
\]

as required, completing the proof. \( \square \)

**Remark.** As can be noticed by the proof just presented, there is nothing particularly special about the estimates we chose to put in Corollary A.1 that set them apart from similar statements that could also be deduced directly from Theorem A. The same, in a certain sense, could be said about the items in Theorem B. Apart from Corollary A.1(i), which presents a direct improvement to Granville–Stark’s original estimate, the other two were chosen so that the proof of Theorem B could be streamlined.

4.2. Proof of Theorem B. With Corollary A.1 in hand, the proof of Theorem B will be relatively short.

**Proof of Theorem B.** We prove the equivalences separately.

- **I.(i) \iff I.(ii) and II.(i) \iff II.(ii):** From Theorem A(∗∗∗), we have

\[
\limsup_{D \to -\infty} \frac{\text{ht}(j(\tau_D))}{\log(|D|)} = 6 \limsup_{D \to -\infty} \frac{\log(|D|)^{-1}}{D \text{ fund. disc.}} \left( \sum_{0 < \text{Re}(\varrho) < 1} \frac{1}{\varrho} \right).
\]

From Proposition 2.5(i), we know that the limit superior on the RHS is finite if and only if \((1 - \beta_D)^{-1} = O(\log(|D|))\), implying that I.(i) \iff I.(ii). The second equivalence follows immediately from Theorem A(∗∗).

- **I.(i) \iff I.(iii) and II.(ii) \iff II.(iii):** From Theorem A(∗∗) and Lemma 4.1, we have

\[
1 + \frac{2}{\log(|D|)} \frac{L'(1, \chi_D)}{L(1, \chi_D)} = \frac{\text{ht}(j(\tau_D))}{3 \log(|D|)} + O\left( \frac{1}{\log(|D|)} \right) \gg 1,
\]

therefore both equivalences follow from Corollary A.1(i), concluding the proof. \( \square \)

5. Estimating \( \text{ht}(j(\tau_D)) \) with \( ABC \)

Having proved Theorem B, we now have access to important aspects of \( h(D) \) and \( \beta_D \) through \( \text{ht}(j(\tau_D)) \). We will not delve deep into the theory of heights; instead, we shall just reproduce Granville–Stark’s [10] approach under the finer estimates of Theorems A and B with the largest deviation from their methods being the two alternative “made-to-measure” statements of the \( abc \)-conjecture. After describing some of the aspects of \( abc \), we prove Theorem C and in order to illustrate the accuracy of the currently conjectural upper bounds for \( \text{ht}(j(\tau_D)) \), we present a plot of the values of \( \text{ht}(j(\tau_D))/3 \log(|D|) \) for \( -D \geq -10^6 \) (cf. Figure 5.4).
The abc-conjecture. Following Vojta [23], the classical abc-conjecture, also known as Masser–Oesterlé conjecture, states that for a triple \( a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z} \) of coprime integers satisfying \( a + b = c \), it holds

\[
\max \{|a|, |b|, |c|\} \ll \varepsilon \left( \prod_{p|abc} p \right)^{1+\varepsilon},
\]

where the implied constant depends only on \( \varepsilon > 0 \). Several important results in number theory are known to follow from this statement, including a very short proof of an asymptotic version of Fermat’s last theorem (cf Example 5.5.2, p. 71–72 of [23]). In the context of Diophantine geometry, this statement is best understood as part of the far-reaching general scheme provided by Vojta’s General Conjecture (cf. Conjecture 5.2.6, pp. 63–64 of Vojta [23]). In full generality, the abc-conjecture can then be extended for arbitrary global fields. As the function field case was proved in 1984 by R. C. Mason with effectively computable constants, we state only the number field (abbreviated NF) case, which will be more than sufficient for our purposes. Recalling the definitions given at Subsection 1.6, consider the following:

The abc-conjecture for NFs (Plain form, p. 84 of Vojta [23]). Let \( K/\mathbb{Q} \) denote a number field. For every \( \varepsilon > 0 \), there is a constant \( C^+ = C^+(K, \varepsilon) \) such that, for any \( a, b, c \in K \) with \( a + b + c = 0 \), the following holds:

\[
\text{ht}([a:b:c]) - (1 + \varepsilon)f_K([a:b:c]) < C^+(K, \varepsilon).
\]

Remark. As remarked in Granville–Stark [10], we expect \( C^+(K, \varepsilon) \) to get larger as the field \( K/\mathbb{Q} \) grows larger; in other words, \( C^+(K, \varepsilon) \leq C^+(L, \varepsilon) \) whenever \( K \subseteq L \). Hence, the conjecture is most tight when \( K = \mathbb{Q}(a, b) \).

The applications we are interested in revolve around not only the existence of \( C^+(K, \varepsilon) \), but estimates of it in terms of the root-discriminant \( \text{rd}_K := |\Delta_K|^{1/[K:Q]} \), where \( \Delta_K \) is discriminant of \( K/\mathbb{Q} \). Despite seemingly more natural to consider an estimate for \( C^+(K, \varepsilon) \) in terms of \([K:Q]\) instead of \( \text{rd}_K \), this runs into the problem of having infinitely many number fields of same degree, and thus any formulation in this direction would be imposing much stronger bounds on the growth of \( C^+ \). By the Hermite–Minkowski Theorem we know that for any fixed \( M > 0 \) there are only finitely many number fields with \( \Delta_K \leq M \), and also

\[
\text{rd}_K \geq \frac{\pi}{4} \left( \frac{n}{\sqrt{n!}} \right)^2,
\]

where \( n = [K:Q] \). Moreover, from Stirling’s formula, it follows that \( n/\sqrt{n!} \sim e \) (Euler’s constant), hence, \( \log(\text{rd}_K) \gg 1 \) uniformly as \( n \to +\infty \). Thus, we consider two uniform formulations of the abc-conjecture for number fields, the \( O \)-weak and the weak, both weaker than Granville–Stark’s abc, which we also state for comparison.

**Conjecture 5.1** (Uniform abcs). Let \( K/\mathbb{Q} \) be a number field \( \varepsilon > 0 \). Then:

(i) (O-weak uniform abc) \( C^+(K, \varepsilon) = O_\varepsilon(\log(\text{rd}_K)) \).

15cf. Appendix ABC in Chapter 5 of Vojta [23] for details and references, and also a diagram relating abc to other conjectures.

16cf. Theorem 2.16 at Chapter III, p. 218 of Neukirch [18].
Moreover, the implied constants in (i) and (iii) depend only on $\varepsilon$. In Granville–Stark’s paper, it is remarked that a finer analysis of Lemma 5.2 may reduce this factor of 6; however, for our purposes, this factor plays little role. Perhaps more commonly used, as in Elkies [6] and Granville–Stark [10], is the multiplicative formulation of the $abc$-conjecture, where (5.1) becomes

\[
\text{Ht}(\lbrack a : b : c \rbrack) < C^\times(K, \varepsilon) \tilde{F}_K([a : b : c])^{1+\varepsilon},
\]

with

\[
\text{Ht}(\lbrack x_0 : \ldots : x_n \rbrack) := \exp(\text{ht}(\lbrack x_0 : \ldots : x_n \rbrack)),
\]

\[
\tilde{F}_K([x_0 : \ldots : x_n]) := \exp(\tilde{f}_K([x_0 : \ldots : x_n])),
\]

and, consequently, $C^\times(K, \varepsilon) := \exp(C^+(K, \varepsilon))$. In this notation, the uniform versions of $abc$ in Conjecture 5.1 take the following form:

- **(Weak U-abc)** $C^\times(K, \varepsilon) = \text{rd}_K^{O(1)}$;
- **(Weak U-abc)** $C^\times(K, \varepsilon) \leq \text{rd}_K^{1+F(\varepsilon)+G_\varepsilon(K)}$, where $F, G_\varepsilon$ are positive real-valued functions satisfying $F(\varepsilon) \to 0^+$ and $G_\varepsilon(K) \to 0$ as $K \to +\infty$;
- **(Granville–Stark’s U-abc)** $C^\times(K, \varepsilon) = O_\varepsilon(\text{rd}_K^{1+\varepsilon})$.

5.2. **Proof of Theorem C.** We start by briefly recalling some facts mentioned at Subsection 1.5. For a negative fundamental discriminant $D$, write $H_D$ for the Hilbert class field of $\mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D})$, which is given by $H_D = \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D}, j(\tau_D))$ and satisfies the identity $[H_D : \mathbb{Q}(\sqrt{D})] = [\mathbb{Q}(j(\tau_D)) : \mathbb{Q}] = h(D)$. Consider, moreover, the modular functions $\gamma_2, \gamma_3$, related to the $j$-invariant by the identities $\gamma_2(\tau)^3 = j(\tau)$ and $\gamma_3(\tau)^2 = j(\tau) - 1728$ (cf. (1.5)), so that

\[
\gamma_3(\tau)^2 - \gamma_2(\tau)^3 + 1728 = 0,
\]

for every $\tau \in \mathfrak{h}$. Writing $\tilde{H}_D := H_D(\gamma_2(\tau_D), \gamma_3(\tau_D))$, we have the following:

**Lemma 5.2** (Lemma 1, p. 513 of Granville–Stark [10]). For every fundamental discriminant $D < 0$, it holds $\text{rd}_{\tilde{H}_D} \leq 6\sqrt{|D|}$.

**Remark.** In Granville–Stark’s paper, it is remarked that a finer analysis of Lemma 5.2 may reduce this factor of 6; however, for our purposes, this factor plays little role.
role, for it would be sufficient to have \( \text{rd}_H \ll \varepsilon |D|^{1/2 + \varepsilon} \) as \( D \to -\infty \). Finer concrete estimates for \( \text{rd}_H \) would, however, be indeed properly suited for computable bounds to zero-free regions of \( L(s, \chi_D) \) assuming effective versions of uniform \( abc \).

**Lemma 5.3.** Assuming the plain form of the \( abc \)-conjecture for number fields (i.e., only that \( \mathcal{C}^+(K, \varepsilon) \) exists), for every \( \varepsilon > 0 \) it holds:

\[
\text{ht}(j(\tau_D)) < \frac{6}{1 - 5\varepsilon} \mathcal{C}^+(\tilde{H}_{D, \varepsilon}).
\]

**Proof.** The calculations that follow are entirely analogous to those present in the proof of Theorem 1, p. 513 of Granville–Stark [10]. From the definitions of height and conductor given at Subsection 1.6, as well as the modular functions \( \gamma_2, \gamma_3 \), we have

\[
f_K \left( [\gamma_2(\tau_D)^3 : \gamma_3(\tau_D)^2 : 1728] \right) \leq f_K \left( [\gamma_2(\tau_D) : 1] \right) + f_K \left( [\gamma_3(\tau_D) : 1] \right) + f_K \left( [1728 : 1] \right) \\
\leq \text{ht}(\gamma_2(\tau_D)) + \text{ht}(\gamma_3(\tau_D)) + \text{ht}(1728) \\
= 1/3 \text{ht}(\gamma_2(\tau_D)^3) + 1/2 \text{ht}(\gamma_3(\tau_D)^2) + \text{ht}(1728) \\
\leq 5/6 \text{ht} \left( [\gamma_2(\tau_{-d})^3 : \gamma_3(\tau_{-d})^2 : 1728] \right).
\]

Then, from the relation (5.2), we may apply the \( abc \)-conjecture as in (5.1), yielding

\[
\text{ht} \left( [\gamma_2(\tau_D)^3 : \gamma_3(\tau_D)^2 : 1728] \right) < \frac{6}{1 - 5\varepsilon} \mathcal{C}^+(\tilde{H}_{D, \varepsilon}).
\]

Since \( j = \gamma_3^3, j - 1728 = \gamma_2^2 \), and \( \text{ht}(j(\tau_D)) \leq \text{ht} ([j(\tau_D) : j(\tau_D) - 1728 : 1728]) \), the claim of the lemma follows. \( \square \)

**Proof of Theorem C.** We divide the proof into two parts.

- **Assuming \( O \)-weak \( U \)-abc:** From Lemma 5.2, this implies

\[
\mathcal{C}^+(\tilde{H}_{D, \varepsilon}) \ll \log(|D|),
\]

which, by Lemma 5.3, implies \( \text{ht}(j(\tau_D)) \ll \log(|D|) \), yielding Theorem B.I.(i).

- **Assuming Weak \( U \)-abc:** From Lemma 5.2, this implies

\[
\mathcal{C}^+(\tilde{H}_{D, \varepsilon}) \leq \frac{1 + f(\varepsilon)}{2} \log(|D|) + o(\log(|D|))
\]

as \( D \to -\infty \), for every fixed \( \varepsilon > 0 \), where \( f \) is some positive real function satisfying \( f(\varepsilon) \to 0 \) as \( \varepsilon \to 0^+ \). Applying Lemma 5.3, it follows that, for every \( \varepsilon > 0 \),

\[
\text{ht}(j(\tau_D)) \leq 3 \left( \frac{1 + f(\varepsilon)}{1 - 5\varepsilon} \right) \log(|D|) + o(\log(|D|)),
\]

hence,

\[
\limsup_{D \to -\infty} \frac{\text{ht}(j(\tau_D))}{\log(|D|)} \leq 3 \left( \frac{1 + f(\varepsilon)}{1 - 5\varepsilon} \right).
\]
Since this holds for every \( \varepsilon > 0 \) and \( f(\varepsilon) \xrightarrow{\varepsilon \to 0^+} 0 \), we conclude that this limit superior is bounded from above by 3. Consequently, by Theorem [A.\( \ast \ast \ast \)], it follows that

\[
\limsup_{D \to -\infty} \log(|D|)^{-1} \left( \sum_{0 < \text{Re}(\rho) < 1 \atop L(\rho, \chi_D) = 0} \frac{1}{\theta} \right) \leq \frac{1}{2},
\]

which, in conjunction with Proposition 2.5(ii), implies that

\[
\limsup_{D \to -\infty} \frac{\log(|D|)^{-1}}{1 - \beta_D} \leq \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{5}} = \frac{5 - \sqrt{5}}{10} \approx 0.276393 \ldots,
\]

concluding our proof.

\[\square\]

Figure 5.4. Values of \( \text{ht}(j(\tau_D)) / 3 \log(|D|) \) for negative fundamental discriminants \( D \) with \( |D| \leq 10^6 \). Note that, under GRH, this is \( 1 + O(\log \log(|D|) / \log(|D|)) \), explaining its apparently flat aspect.

Appendix \( \alpha \). Equidistribution of pseudosequences

In this appendix, we formulate the general framework used to interpret Duke’s theorem in the form of Lemma 3.4. Our goal is not generality per se, but a general enough concept to provide a smooth interchangeability between Lemma 3.4 and the original formulation of Duke’s theorem, in the spirit of the following equivalence:

A sequence \( (\alpha_n)_{n \geq 1} \subseteq [0, 1] \) is equidistributed in \([0, 1]\) if, and only if, for every complex-valued Riemann-integrable function \( f : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{C} \), it holds

\[
\lim_{N \to +\infty} N^{-1} \sum_{n=1}^{N} f(\alpha_n) = \int_{0}^{1} f(x) \, dx.\ (\text{cf. p. 4 of Granville–Rudnick [9].})
\]

Nothing in this appendix is essentially new mathematics: a pseudosequence is defined as a modest generalization of triangular arrays (cf. Definition 2.2 and Remark
Remark α.1 (Notation/Conventions). In this appendix, we shall deal exclusively with probability spaces of the type \((Ω, M, μ)\), where:

- \(Ω\) is a locally compact Hausdorff topological space;
- \(M\) is the completion of its Borel σ-algebra;
- \(μ\) is a complete regular Borel probability measure in \((Ω, M)\), meaning that
  - (Probability) \(μ(Ω) = 1\),
  - (Complete) \(μ(Z) = 0\) if \(Z \subseteq E\) for some Borel set with \(μ(E) = 0\),
  - (Regular) For every \(E ∈ M\), it holds
    \[
    μ(E) = \sup\{μ(K) \mid E \supseteq K \text{ compact} ∈ M\} = \inf\{μ(U) \mid E \subseteq U \text{ open} ∈ M\}.
    \]

The functions for which the integral criterion in Theorem α.10 are going to apply are the ones in \(L^1(Ω) \cap C_{a.e.}(Ω)\), where:

- \(L^1(Ω) := L^1(Ω, μ)/N\) is the complex \(L^1\)-space, where \(L^1(Ω, μ)\) is the set of absolutely \(μ\)-integrable complex-valued functions in \((Ω, M, μ)\), and \(N\) is the set of complex-valued functions that vanish a.e. in \(Ω\).
- \(C_{a.e.}(Ω)\) is the set of almost everywhere continuous complex-valued functions.

We denote the indicator function of an event \(E ∈ \mathcal{F}\) by \(1_E\), random variable is abbreviated \(r.v.,\) and almost everywhere (meaning “for all but a set of measure 0”) is abbreviated \(a.e.\). Lastly, a \(μ\)-continuity set in \((Ω, M, μ)\) is a measurable set \(E ∈ M\) such that \(μ(∂E) = 0\).

α.1. Pseudosequences and pseudoseries. We start with a definition.

**Definition α.2** (Pseudosequences and pseudoseries). A pseudosequence is an ordered array of sequences \(A = (A_n)_{n ∈ \mathbb{N}}\) satisfying the following properties:

(i) For each \(n ∈ \mathbb{N}\), the sequence \(A_n = (a_1^{(n)}, a_2^{(n)}, \ldots)\) has finitely many terms;
(ii) \(|A_n| → +∞\) as \(n → +∞\).

If each \(A_n \subseteq \mathbb{R}\) (resp. \(\mathbb{C}\)), we say that \(A\) is a real (resp. complex) pseudosequence, and we call the sequence \(\left(\sum_{ω ∈ A_n} ω\right)_{n ∈ \mathbb{N}}\) the pseudoseries associated with \(A\). We define the summation of the pseudoseries of \(A\) as \(\lim_{n → +∞} \left(\sum_{ω ∈ A_n} ω\right)\).

**Remark α.3** (General examples). To illustrate the idea behind this definition, we consider some examples of pseudosequences and pseudoseries.

- Any sequence \((α_n)_{n ≥ 1}\) may be written canonically as a pseudosequence, as \(A = (A_1, A_2, \ldots)\) with \(A_n = (α_k)_{k=1}^n\). In this sense, pseudosequences constitute a natural generalization of sequences.
- Triangular arrays, such as Pascal’s triangle and Farey sequences, are natural instances of pseudosequences. A triangular array is defined as a doubly indexed sequence \((T(n, m))_{n,m=0}^∞\) where the size of the \(n\)-th row \(R_n := (T(n, m))_{m=0}^n\) is a
strictly increasing function of $n$. Thus, we may write the associated pseudosequence as $T := (R_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$. As an example, Pascal’s triangle is obtained by setting $T(n, m) := \binom{n}{m}$, so that its pseudosequence $T := (R_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is given by

$R_0 = \{1\}, \ R_1 = \{1, 1\}, \ R_2 = \{1, 2, 1\}, \ R_3 = \{1, 3, 3, 1\}, \ R_4 = \{1, 4, 6, 4, 1\} \ldots$

- **Weighted averages** can be associated with pseudosequences as follows. Let $(x_k)_{k \geq 1}$ be a real sequence, and $(w_k)_{k \geq 1}$ a sequence of non-negative real numbers (the weights). Consider the weighted average of the first $n$ terms of $(x_k)_{k \geq 1}$, given by

$$S_n := \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{n} w_k x_k}{\sum_{k=1}^{n} w_k}.$$  

Writing $W_n := \sum_{k=1}^{n} w_k$, we may consider the pseudosequence $X := (X_1, X_2, \ldots)$ with $X_n := (W_{n-1}^{-1} w_k x_k)_{k=1}^{n}$. This way, the sequence $(S_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is the pseudosequences of $X$. Notice that, apart from the case where $W_n = 1$ for every $n$, the sequence $(S_n)_{n \geq 1}$ is not the series of $(w_k x_k)_{k \geq 1}$. Comparing $(w_k x_k)_{k \geq 1}$ and $X = (X_1, X_2, \ldots)$ makes clear the key point of this example, which is that pseudosequences, as opposed to usual series, allow the weights to change dynamically.

- **Riemann sums** provide one of our initial motivations for the concept of both pseudosequences and pseudoseries. Recall that, for a function $f : [0, 1]^n \to \mathbb{R}$ and a partition $P = \{I_1, \ldots, I_m\}$ into non-overlapping rectangular parallelograms^18 the upper (resp. lower) Riemann sum of $f$ in the partition $P$ is defined as

$$\overline{\mathcal{R}}_f(P) := \sum_{I_j \in P} \left( \sup_{x \in I_j} f(x) \right) \text{vol}(I_j), \quad \text{(resp. } \underline{\mathcal{R}}_f(P) \text{)}.$$

A partition $Q = \{J_1, \ldots, J_p\}$ is called finer than $P$ if $Q \neq P$ and, for each $J_k \in Q$, there is $I_k \in P$ with $J_k \subseteq I_k$, and we denote this by $P \triangleright Q$. This relation induces a partial order on the set $\operatorname{Part}([0, 1]^n)$ of all admissible partitions of $[0, 1]^n$. Since any two partitions $P, Q$ admit a common refinement $P \vee Q := \{I \cap J \mid I \in P, J \in Q\}$, the poset $(\operatorname{Part}([0, 1]^n), \triangleright)$ is upward directed. The upper (resp. lower) Riemann integral of $f$ in $[0, 1]^n$ is defined as the limit of the net $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_f : \operatorname{Part}([0, 1]^n) \to \mathbb{R}$ (resp. $\underline{\mathcal{R}}_f$). A function is called Riemann-integrable if both $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_f(P)$, $\underline{\mathcal{R}}_f(P)$ exist and are equal, in which case we write $\int f := \lim \overline{\mathcal{R}}_f(P) = \lim \underline{\mathcal{R}}_f(P) \in \mathbb{R}$ for the Riemann-integral of $f$.

Although $\operatorname{Part}([0, 1]^n)$ has no countable coinitial subset, if $f : [0, 1]^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is integrable, then any sequence of partitions $(P_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\max_{I \in P_n} \text{vol}(I) \to 0$ as $n \to +\infty$ satisfies $\lim_{n \to \infty} \overline{\mathcal{R}}_f(P_n) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \underline{\mathcal{R}}_f(P_n) = \int f$. In fact, it is a standard result in Real Analysis that, given any such sequence of partitions, the following are equivalent:

- There is $C \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\lim_{n \to \infty} \overline{\mathcal{R}}_f(P_n) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \underline{\mathcal{R}}_f(P_n) = C$;
- $f : [0, 1]^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is Riemann-integrable and $\int f = C$.

Finally, for a Riemann-integrable $f : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}$ and sequence of partitions $(P_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $\max_{I \in P_n} \text{vol}(I) \to 0$ as $n \to +\infty$, note that $\sum_{I \in P_n} (\sup_{x \in I} f(x)) \text{vol}(I)$ as $n \to +\infty$ cannot be considered as a series in general; however, it fits exactly

---

^18That is, each $I_j$ is a product of $n$ non-trivial intervals $[a_1, b_1] \times \cdots \times [a_n, b_n]$ with $a_k, b_k \in [0, 1]$, the interior of the $I_j$s are mutually disjoint, and $\bigcup_{j=1}^{n} I_j = [0, 1]^n$. 
into the definition of the pseudoseries associated to the pseudosequence $A = (A_1, A_2, \ldots)$ with $A_n = \left( (\sup_{x \in I} f(x)) \text{ vol}(I) \right)_{I \in \mathcal{P}_n}$. This idea is in close connection with equidistributed sequences (compare with the case where $\mathcal{P}_n \succ \mathcal{P}_{n+1}$, $\forall n \geq 1$, for example), which is the notion we intend to extend to pseudosequences.

Remark (On generality). Notice that we did not specify an underlying set or space in the definition of pseudosequence. The reason is to have a definition as general as any definition of sequence. Thus, for example, a real pseudosequence $A = (A_1, A_2, \ldots)$ is a pseudosequence where each $A_n$ is a finite real sequence, and so forth. By tweaking conditions (i) and (ii) or altering the set which $A$ is being indexed by, one may consider all sorts of restrictions and generalizations (such as “pseudo-nets”, finite pseudosequences, etc.); however, as we will only make use of the definition we have given, we omit such distinctions (e.g., finite vs. infinite pseudosequences) and work solely with the “infinite, indexed by $\mathbb{N}$, $|A_n| \to +\infty$” case. For the more general case where the $|A_n|$s can be infinite in the context of equidistribution, cf. Section 3.3 of Kuipers–Niederreiter [13] on equi-uniform distribution.

One could argue that the definition of pseudosequence is slightly ad hoc, for given a pseudosequence $A = (A_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $A_n = (a^{(n)}_{k})_{k=1}^{\infty}$, we could naturally associate to it the sequence

$$
\bigcup A := \left( a^{(1)}_1, a^{(1)}_2, \ldots, a^{(1)}_{|A_1|}, a^{(2)}_1, a^{(2)}_2, \ldots, a^{(2)}_{|A_2|}, \ldots, a^{(n)}_1, a^{(n)}_2, \ldots, a^{(n)}_{|A_n|}, \ldots \right),
$$

which we call the concatenation of $A$. This set, however, is best understood as simply a set, and not as a sequence; a pseudosequence $A$ being equidistributed does not necessarily imply that $\bigcup A$ is equidistributed as a sequence (cf. Remark α.8).

x.2. Pseudosequences in probability spaces. We shall follow closely the setup from Chapter 3 of Kuipers–Niederreiter [13], the main difference being that, besides dealing with pseudosequences instead of sequences, we work with locally compact instead of compact spaces (cf. Remark α.1). Our initial definition of equidistribution for pseudosequences is the following:

Definition α.4 (Equidistribution). Let $A = (A_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a pseudosequence in $\Omega$. We say that $A$ is equidistributed as pseudosequence in $(\Omega, \mathcal{M}, \mu)$ if

$$
\lim_{n \to +\infty} \frac{|A_n \cap E|}{|A_n|} = \mu(E)
$$

for every continuity set $E \in \mathcal{M}$.

Viewing sequences as particular types of pseudosequences, as done in Remark α.3, this definition agrees with the usual one. To put this definition in the broader, well-established context of weak convergence of measures, we need the definition of counting measure. First, however, we define weak convergence.

Definition α.5 (Weak convergence — cf. Notes at Section 3.1, pp. 177–178 of [13]). Let $(\nu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of regular probability measures in $(\Omega, \mathcal{M})$. We say that the sequence of $\nu_n$s converges weakly to a regular probability measure $\nu$ in $(\Omega, \mathcal{M})$ if

$$
\lim_{n \to +\infty} \nu_n(E) = \nu(E)
$$

for every $\nu$-continuity set $E \in \mathcal{M}$, and we denote it by $\nu_n \Rightarrow \nu$. 
For each element \( \omega \in \Omega \), we associate to it a point measure \( \delta_\omega \), defined for every subset \( E \subseteq \Omega \), with \( \delta_\omega(E) = 1 \) if \( \omega \in E \), and \( \delta_\omega(E) = 0 \) if \( \omega \notin E \). These are regular probability measures in \( \Omega \), and since \( \Omega \) is locally compact Hausdorff, so are the counting measures \( \delta_F \) associated with finite multisets\(^{19}\) \( F \subseteq \Omega \), defined by

\[
\delta_F := \frac{1}{|F|} \sum_{\omega \in F} \delta_\omega.
\]

Thus, we may associate a sequence of measures to a pseudosequence as follows:

**Definition 2.6 (Associated measures).** Let \( A = (A_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) be a pseudosequence in \( \Omega \). Then, its associated sequence of counting measures is given by \( \mathcal{M}_A = (\mu_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \), where \( \mu_n := \delta_{A_n} \) for each \( n \in \mathbb{N} \).

Having these definitions at hand, our discussion up until here may be summarized as follows: a pseudosequence \( A = (A_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) in \( (\Omega, \mathcal{M}, \mu) \) is equidistributed if \( \delta_{A_n} \Rightarrow \mu \).

Before establishing the integral criterion, some remarks are in order.

**Remark 2.7 (Infinite divisibility).** A notion closely related to measures associated to pseudosequences and their distributions may be found in the literature of infinitely divisible r.v.s. Following Chapter IX of Feller [7], a r.v. \( X \) (in some probability space) is called infinitely divisible if, for every \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), there are \( k_n \) independent, identically distributed r.v.s \( X_{n,1}, \ldots, X_{n,k_n} \) such that \( X = \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} X_{n,i} \), for some \( k_n \geq n \).

Alternatively, consider a triangular array \( (X_{n,m})_{n,m=1}^{\infty} \), where the \( n \)-th row, given by \( (X_{n,m})_{m=1}^{k_n} \), consists of independent, identically distributed r.v.s. Assume, moreover, that \( (X_{n,m})_{n,m=1}^{\infty} \) is uniformly asymptotically negligible, meaning that

\[
\forall \varepsilon > 0, \lim_{n \to +\infty} \max_{1 \leq i \leq k_n} \Pr(|X_{n,i}| > \varepsilon) = 0.
\]

Then, writing \( S_n := \sum_{i=1}^{k_n} X_{n,i} \) for the sum of the \( n \)-th row, we have that if the sequence \( (S_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \) converges weakly to some r.v. \( X \), then \( X \) is infinitely divisible (cf. Theorem in Section XVII.7, p. 585 of Feller [7]).\(^{20}\) Additionally, every infinitely divisible r.v. can be obtained as the weak limit of row sums of triangular array in which the \( n \)-th row consists of independent, identically distributed r.v.s (cf. Theorem 2 in Section IX.5, p. 303 of Feller [7]). Such characterization appears in the context of wide generalizations of the *central limit theorem* and the *law of rare events* (cf. Examples (a)–(c) in Section IX.1, pp. 291–292 of Feller [7]).

**Remark 2.8 (Counterexample).** In order to draw a meaningful distinction between pseudosequences and sequences in the context of equidistribution, it is interesting to have an example of an equidistributed pseudosequence \( A \) whose concatenation \( \bigcup A \) is not an equidistributed sequence. The simplest example is the pseudosequence of rationals in \( [0,1] \) with denominator \( 2^n \), as in

\[
Q = (R_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, \quad R_n := \{k/2^n \mid 1 \leq k \leq 2^n \}.
\]

Clearly, for any \( 0 \leq a \leq b \leq 1 \), it holds \( \lim_{n \to +\infty} |R_n \cap [a,b]|/|R_n| = b - a \), and thus \( Q \) is equidistributed in \( [0,1] \) as pseudosequence. However, if we consider its

\(^{19}\)A *multiset* is a set that allows multiple instances of an element.

\(^{20}\)Note that Feller uses the term *null-array* instead of *uniformly asymptotically negligible*. 

concatenation
\[ \bigcup Q = (1, 1/2, 1, 4/2, 2/4, 3/4, 1, 1/8 \ldots), \]
the interval \([0, 1/4]\) provides a counterexample. Indeed, note that the \((2^N - 1)\)-th term of \(\bigcup Q\) is always 1 for every \(N \geq 1\), and the \(k\)-th term is always less than or equal to \(1/4\) for every \(2^N \leq k < 2^N + 2^{N-2}\) and \(N \geq 2\). Hence, writing \(\bigcup Q = (q_1, q_2, \ldots)\), we have
\[
\lim_{n \to +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} q_k \in [0, 1/4] \neq 0 \quad \text{for } N \leq 2
\]
and each \(0 = f_{\omega, j} = \text{a.e.}\), we have
\[
\partial E = \text{integrable, there are at most countably many } N \text{ for every } 2^N \leq k < 2^N + 2^{N-2} \text{ and } N \geq 2, \text{ if, it holds for } f
\]
it suffices to prove the claim for \(f \in \mathcal{L}\), thus, we may assume WLOG that \(f\) is real-valued. Furthermore, writing \(f = f_+ - f_-\), where \(f_+ := \max\{f(\omega), 0\}\) and \(f_- := -\min\{f(\omega), 0\}\), it suffices to prove the claim for \(f_+, f_-\); hence, we may assume WLOG that \(f\) is nonnegative. Since \(f\) is bounded, after a linear transformation \(af + b\) for \(a, b \in \mathbb{R}\) with \(a \neq 0\), we can assume that \(0 \leq f(\omega) < 1\) for every \(\omega \in \Omega\).

For each \(\alpha \in [0, 1]\), define the sets \(E_\alpha := \{\omega \in \Omega \mid f(\omega) > \alpha\}\). Since \(f\) is continuous a.e., we have \(\partial E_\alpha \subseteq \{\omega \in \Omega \mid f(\omega) = \alpha\} \cup Z_\alpha\) for some \(Z_\alpha \subseteq \Omega\) with \(\mu(Z_\alpha) = 0\); thus, since \(f\) is integrable, there are at most countably many \(\alpha \in [0, 1]\) for which \(\mu(\partial E_\alpha) > 0\). Consequently, for every \(\varepsilon > 0\), we can take a finite real sequence \(0 = \alpha_0 < \alpha_1 < \ldots < \alpha_N = 1\) such that, for all \(0 \leq k < N\), it holds \(\alpha_{k+1} - \alpha_k < \varepsilon/2\) and each \(F_k := E_{\alpha_k}\) is a continuity set. Define, based on this sequence, the function
\[
g(\omega) := \sum_{\ell=0}^{N-1} (\alpha_{\ell+1} - \alpha_\ell) \mathbb{1}_{F_\ell}(\omega)
\]
From the definition of equidistribution, the statement of this lemma holds for indicator functions, and hence \(\lim_n A_n^{-1} \sum_{\omega \in A_n} g(\omega) = \int_\Omega g \, d\mu\). Since \(|f| < 1\), for every \(\omega \in \Omega\) there is \(0 \leq k \leq N\) such that \(\alpha_k \leq f(\omega) < \alpha_{k+1}\), and so
\[
\left| \sum_{\ell=0}^{N-1} (\alpha_{\ell+1} - \alpha_\ell) \mathbb{1}_{F_\ell}(\omega) - f(\omega) \right| = \left| \sum_{\ell=0}^{k} (\alpha_{\ell+1} - \alpha_\ell) - f(\omega) \right| = |\alpha_{k+1} - f(\omega)| < \varepsilon/2,
\]
implicating that \(|g - f| < \varepsilon/2\). With that, we derive
\[
\lim_{n \to +\infty} \left( \frac{1}{|A_n|} \sum_{\omega \in A_n} (f(\omega) - g(\omega)) \right) - \int_\Omega (f - g) \, d\mu < \varepsilon,
\]
thus, since the lemma is true for \( g \), and \( \varepsilon > 0 \) was arbitrary, the lemma must also be true for \( f \), completing the proof.

Thus, recalling once again the conditions of Remark \( \alpha.1 \), we have:

**Theorem \( \alpha.10 \) (Integral criterion). The following are equivalent:**

(i) \( A = (A_1, A_2, \ldots) \) is equidistributed as a pseudosequence in \((\Omega, \mathcal{M}, \mu)\).

(ii) For every \( f \in L^1(\Omega) \cap C_{a.e.}(\Omega) \), it holds \( \lim_{n \to +\infty} A_n^{-1} \sum_{\omega \in A_n} f(\omega) = \int_{\Omega} f \, d\mu \).

**Proof.** Since the indicator function \( 1_E \) of any \( \mu \)-continuity set \( E \in \mathcal{M} \) is integrable, it is clear that (ii) \( \implies \) (i). For the other direction, take \( f \in L^1(\Omega) \) and define the sets \( E_M := \{ \omega \in \Omega \mid |f(\omega)| > M \} \) for each \( M \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \). By the same argument used in Lemma \( \alpha.9 \), at most countably many \( M \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \) are such that \( \mu(\partial E_M) > 0 \); thus, writing \( \Omega_M := \Omega \setminus E_M \), we can always take \( M \) such that \( \Omega_M \) is a continuity set. For such \( M \), defining

\[
f_M(\omega) := \begin{cases} f(\omega) & \text{if } \omega \in \Omega_M, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}
\]

we deduce from Lemma \( \alpha.9 \) that

\[
(\alpha.1) \quad \int_{\Omega} f \, d\mu = \lim_{M \to +\infty} \int_{\Omega} f_M \, d\mu = \lim_{M \to +\infty} \lim_{n \to +\infty} \frac{1}{|A_n|} \left( \sum_{\omega \in A_n \cap \Omega_M} f(\omega) \right)
\]

For every \( \varepsilon > 0 \), there is \( N_0 \in \mathbb{N} \) such that, for every \( n, M \geq N_0 \) it holds

\[
\left| \int_{\Omega} (f - f_M) \, d\mu \right| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \quad \left| \frac{1}{|A_n|} \left( \sum_{\omega \in A_n \cap \Omega_M} f(\omega) \right) - \int_{\Omega} f_M \, d\mu \right| < \frac{\varepsilon}{2},
\]

and thus,

\[
\left| \int_{\Omega} f \, d\mu - \frac{1}{|A_n|} \left( \sum_{\omega \in A_n \cap \Omega_M} f(\omega) \right) \right| < \varepsilon,
\]

from where it follows that the limits in (\( \alpha.1 \)) commute, yielding

\[
(\alpha.2) \quad \int_{\Omega} f \, d\mu = \lim_{n \to +\infty} \lim_{M \to +\infty} \frac{1}{|A_n|} \left( \sum_{\omega \in A_n \cap \Omega_M} f(\omega) \right).
\]

Finally, since \( A_n \) is finite for every \( n \in \mathbb{N} \), it is clear that

\[
\lim_{M \to +\infty} \frac{1}{|A_n|} \left( \sum_{\omega \in A_n \cap \Omega_M} f(\omega) \right) = \frac{1}{|A_n|} \sum_{\omega \in A_n} f(\omega),
\]

hence, (\( \alpha.2 \)) proves the theorem. \( \square \)
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