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Abstract

Bounds on the tails of the zeta function $\zeta(s)$, and in particular explicit bounds, are needed for applications, notably for integrals involving $\zeta(s)$ on vertical lines or other paths going to infinity.

An explicit version of the traditional “convexity bound” has long been known (Backlund 1918 [4]). To do better, one must either provide explicit versions of subconvexity bounds, or give explicit bounds on means of $\zeta(s)$. Here we take the second road, bounding weighted $L^2$ norms of tails of $\zeta(s)$.

Two approaches are followed, each giving the better result on a different range. One of them is inspired by the proof of the standard mean value theorem for Dirichlet polynomials (Montgomery 1971 [24]). The main technical idea is the use of a carefully chosen smooth approximation to $\mathbf{1}_{[0,1]}$ so as to eliminate off-diagonal terms. The second approach, superior for large $T$, is based on classical lines, starting with an approximation to $\zeta(s)$ via Euler-Maclaurin.

Both bounds give main terms of the correct order for $0 < \sigma \leq 1$ and are strong enough to be of practical use in giving precise values for integrals when combined with (rigorous) numerical integration.

We also present bounds for the $L^2$ norm of $\zeta(s)$ in $[1, T]$ for $0 \leq \sigma \leq 1$.

1 Introduction

1.1 Motivation

Say we want to compute a line integral from $\sigma - i\infty$ to $\sigma + i\infty$ involving the zeta function. Such integrals arise often in work in number theory, as inverse Mellin transforms. To give a “real-world” example, the second author had to estimate the double sum $D_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2}(y) = \sum_{d \leq y} \sum_{l \leq y/d} \log \left( \frac{y}{dl} \right)$, and others of the same kind, during his work on [13]. Now, it is not hard to show that

$$D_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2}(y) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\sigma-i\infty}^{\sigma+i\infty} \frac{\zeta(s+\alpha_1)\zeta(s+\alpha_2)}{s^2} y^s ds$$
for $\sigma > 1$. Say $0 < \alpha_1 \alpha_2 < 1$. Shifting the line of integration to the left, we obtain main terms coming from the poles at $s = 1 - \alpha_2$ and $s = 1 - \alpha_2$, and, as a remainder term, the integral
\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{R_\beta} \frac{\zeta(s + \alpha_1)\zeta(s + \alpha_2)}{s^2} y^s ds,
\]
where $R_\beta$ is some contour to the left of the poles going from $\beta - i\infty$ to $\beta + i\infty$, say.

It is now possible to do rigorous numerical integration on bounded contours in the complex plane, using, for instance, the ARB package [17]. It then remains to bound the integral
\[
\int_{\beta + iT}^{\beta + i\infty} \frac{|\zeta(s + \alpha_1)|^2}{|s|^2} ds,
\]
the integral from $\beta - i\infty$ to $\beta - iT$ having the same absolute value. By Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, the problem reduces to that of giving explicit bounds for the integral
\[
\int_{\beta + iT}^{\beta + i\infty} \frac{|\zeta(s + \alpha_1)|}{|s|^2} ds.
\]
(1.1)

Finding such bounds is the main subject of this paper.

**Aims.** We would like to give a bound that decreases rapidly with $T$, as then we can choose a moderate $T$, thus reducing the cost of the numerical computation needed to obtain a given error bound. We would also like to be able to take $\beta$ as small as possible, since the term $|y^s| = y^\beta$ is evidently small when $\beta$ is smaller.

### 1.2 Methods and results

Convexity bounds on $\zeta(s)$ have been known explicitly for more than 100 years [4]. Since convexity bounds are of the form $\zeta(\sigma + it) = O \left( t^{1-\sigma} \log(t) \right)$ for $0 \leq \sigma \leq 1$, they suffice to show that (1.1) converges for $0 < \sigma \leq 1$. There is also an explicit subconvexity bound (that is, a bound with a better exponent than $1 - \sigma^2$) when $\frac{1}{2} \leq \sigma \leq 1$ due to K. Ford [7].

We should, however, aim to produce better results in the $L^2$ norm than can be obtained from $L^\infty$ bounds, that is, bounds on all values of $\zeta(s)$ like the ones above. For one thing, the Mellin transform is an $L^2$-isometry, and for another, non-explicit bounds on the $L^2$-norm of $\zeta(\sigma + it)$ are completely classical ([18, Vol. 2, 806–819, 905–906], [9], [11], [20]; see the introduction to [14] for an exposition). The natural expectation would be to obtain explicit, unconditional $L^2$ results for $\sigma > 0$ with the right decay, even though $L^\infty$ bounds with the right decay remain unproven (Lindelöf hypothesis). That expectation turns out to be correct.

The following is our main result. It collects in a simplified form the results from Theorem 3.1 and Theorem 4.6.

**Theorem 1.1.** Let $0 < \sigma \leq 1$. Then, the integral $\int_T^\infty \left| \frac{\zeta(\sigma + it)}{\sigma + it} \right|^2 dt$ is bounded as follows

(1) if $\sigma = 1$, by
\[
\frac{\pi^2}{6} \cdot \frac{1}{T} + 28.06 \cdot \frac{\log(T)}{T^2}
\]
for $T \geq 200$.
(2) if $\frac{1}{2} < \sigma < 1$, by

$$\frac{3\pi \zeta(2\sigma)}{5} \cdot \frac{1}{T} + \left(18.85 - \frac{0.61}{\sigma - \frac{1}{2}}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{T^{2\sigma}} \quad \text{for } T \geq 200,$$

$$\zeta(2\sigma) \cdot \frac{1}{T} + \frac{12.13}{(\sigma - \frac{1}{2})(1 - \sigma)} \cdot \frac{1}{T^{2\sigma}} \quad \text{for } T \geq 4;$$

(3) if $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$, by

$$\frac{3\pi}{5} \cdot \frac{\log(T)}{T} + 7.72 \cdot \frac{1}{T} \quad \text{for } T \geq 200,$$

$$\frac{\log(T)}{T} + 18.67 \cdot \frac{1}{T} \quad \text{for } T \geq 244728;$$

(4) if $0 < \sigma < \frac{1}{2}$, by

$$\left(\frac{0.5}{\sigma} + \frac{0.95}{\frac{1}{2} - \sigma} + 5.62\right) \cdot \frac{1}{T^{2\sigma}} - 0.66\zeta(2\sigma) \cdot \frac{1}{T} \quad \text{for } T \geq 200,$$

$$\frac{\zeta(2 - 2\sigma)}{2\sigma(2\pi)^{1-2\sigma}} \cdot \frac{1}{T^{2\sigma}} + \frac{37.7}{\sigma (\frac{1}{2} - \sigma)} \cdot \frac{1}{T} \quad \text{for } T \geq 4.$$

In each pair of bounds above, the second one is stronger for large $T$ and fixed $\sigma$. The first set of bounds in each pair in cases (2), (3), (4) was found using an approach that involved approximating $(\sigma + it)^{-1}$ by the Mellin transform of a continuous function $(3)$. This result is explained in Theorem 3.1. The second set of bounds and the single bound in case (1) are proved by means of Theorem 4.6, whose proof is based on mean-value theorems – themselves involving a mixture of techniques: smoothing functions and Hilbert’s inequality (as in [24]) – and the functional equation.

General remarks. There are two contrasting approaches, or instincts, perhaps, one may follow when wanting to prove an explicit result. One – stemming in part from a desire to stay as far as possible from simply working out the constants in known proofs – consists in trying to work out from scratch an explicit approach that is as direct as possible, using the basic insights of existing work but not much more than that. Explicit work can be concise, possibly even elegant, and such features ought to lead to good constants.

A second approach is to “use store-bought”: there are plenty of results in the literature that have been carefully optimized to some extent and in some sense, even if they do not specify explicit constants. One can surely hope to obtain good results at least some of the time by making them explicit. If a mixture of approaches seems to be needed, so much the better; if what we really want is good constants, then that, not concision, is what we should keep in mind. Whatever complicated expressions we obtain can be simplified in the final stage.

There is no one “right” choice to be made among these two approaches, or at least neither is always the better one. We would say we have tried to follow the first one in (3) and the second one in (4). As we have already seen, each of the two sets of bounds we
obtain is better in a different range. See also §5 for a numerical comparison between the items of each pair.

Our work following the second approach is based on explicit bounds on the $L^2$ norm of the restriction of $\zeta(\sigma + it)$ to a vertical segment. We derive these bounds, which we are about to state, using classical tools: mean value theorems and the functional equation.

**Theorem 1.2.** Let $0 \leq \sigma \leq 1$ and $T \geq 4$. Then, the integral $\int_1^T |\zeta(\sigma + it)|^2 \, dt$ is bounded from above as follows

1. if $\sigma = 1$, by
   \[ \frac{\pi^2}{6} \cdot T + 18.34 \cdot \sqrt{T}; \]
2. if $\frac{1}{2} < \sigma < 1$, by
   \[ \zeta(2\sigma) \cdot T + \frac{5.95}{(\sigma - \frac{1}{2})(1 - \sigma)} \cdot \max\{T^{2-2\sigma}, \sqrt{T}\}; \]
3. if $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$, by
   \[ T \log(T) + 7.85 \cdot T + 19.9 \cdot \sqrt{T \log(T)}; \]
4. if $0 < \sigma < \frac{1}{2}$, by
   \[ \frac{\zeta(2 - 2\sigma)}{(2\pi)^{1-2\sigma}(2 - 2\sigma)} \cdot T^{2-2\sigma} + \frac{18.85}{\sigma (\frac{1}{2} - \sigma)} \cdot T; \]
5. if $\sigma = 0$, by
   \[ \frac{\pi}{24} \cdot T^2 + 9.3 \cdot T \log(T). \]

A more precise form of these upper bounds, as well as lower bounds, can be found in Theorem 4.3 and Theorem 4.5.

The error terms presented in Theorem 1.2 are not to be considered optimal at all: versions of these bounds with the correct coefficient for the error term of higher order exist in the literature, though then there is a non-explicit lower-error term. For $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$, estimates of this kind have been given by Ingham [14], Titchmarsh [30], Atkinson [3] and Balasubramanian [5] (see also Heath-Brown [12] for an $L^2$ estimate of the lower error term, and Good [8] for a lower bound on the order of the same term). For $\frac{1}{2} < \sigma < 1$, an analogous estimate is due to Matsumoto [21], later extended by Matsumoto and Meurman [22] to $\frac{1}{2} < \sigma < 1$.

It would seem feasible to improve on Theorem 1.2 by starting from Atkinson’s formula for $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$, or Matsumoto-Meurman’s for $\frac{1}{2} < \sigma < 1$, estimating all terms while foregoing cancellation. One could then deduce a bound for $0 < \sigma < \frac{1}{2}$ by the functional equation, as in Theorem 1.5 here. For $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$, yet another possibility would be to attempt to make the work of Titchmarsh or Balasubramanian explicit.

A good exposition of these alternative procedures – in their current non-explicit versions – can be found in [22, §1]. They are based on the approximate functional equation, or the Riemann-Siegel formula, which is closely related.

For the sake of rigor, we have used interval arithmetic throughout, implemented by ARB [17], which we used via Sage.
2 Classical foundations revisited

2.1 $O$ and $O^*$ notation

When we write $f(x) = O(g(x))$ as $x \to a$ ($a = \pm \infty$ is allowed) for a real valued function $g$ such that $g > 0$ in a neighborhood of $a$ and a real or complex valued function $f$, we mean that there is an independent constant $C$ such that $|f(x)| \leq Cg(x)$ in that neighborhood. We write $f(x) = O^*(h(x))$ as $x \to a$ to indicate that $|f(x)| \leq h(x)$ in a neighborhood of $a$. Therefore, as $x \to a$, $f(x) = O(g(x))$ if and only if $f(x) = O^*(Cg(x))$ for some constant $C > 0$.

2.2 Bernoulli polynomials

We define the Bernoulli polynomials $B_k : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ inductively: $B_0(x) = 1$ and for $k \geq 1$, $B_k(x)$ is determined by $B'_k(x) = kB_{k-1}(x)$ and $\int_0^1 B_k(x) = 0$. The $k$-th Bernoulli number $b_k$ corresponds to the constant term of $B_k(x)$. We have for example that $B_1(x) = x - \frac{1}{2}$ and $B_2(x) = x^2 - x + \frac{1}{6}$.

The Bernoulli polynomials appear naturally when studying some important functions such as $\zeta$ or when dealing in a more general framework with the Euler-Maclaurin summation formula. In what comes ahead, we will need a uniform bound for them on the interval $[0, 1]$. The following is a well-known result; see [26, Cor. B.4] and [26, Exer. B.5(e)] (Lehmer).

Lemma 2.1. We have $\max_{x \in [0, 1]} |B_1(x)| = \frac{1}{2}$. For $k \geq 1$, $\max_{x \in [0, 1]} |B_{2k}(x)| = |b_{2k}|$ and $\max_{x \in [0, 1]} |B_{2k+1}(x)| < \frac{3^{2k+1}}{(2\pi)^k}$. In general, for every $k \geq 2$,

$$\max_{x \in [0, 1]} |B_k(x)| \leq \frac{2\zeta(k)k!}{(2\pi)^k}. \quad (2.1)$$

2.3 Euler-Maclaurin summation formula

Theorem 2.2 (Euler-Maclaurin). Let $K$ be a positive integer. Let $X < Y$ be two real numbers such that the function $f : [X, Y] \to \mathbb{C}$ has continuous derivatives up to the $K$-th order on the interval $[X, Y]$. Then

$$\sum_{n < X \leq Y} f(n) = \int_X^Y f(x)dx + S(K) - \frac{(-1)^K}{K!} \int_X^Y B_K([x])f^{(K)}(x)dx, \quad (2.2)$$

where

$$S(K) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \frac{(-1)^k}{k!} \left( B_k([Y])f^{(k-1)}(Y) - B_k([X])f^{(k-1)}(X) \right), \quad (2.3)$$

and $B_k : [0, 1] \to \mathbb{R}$ is the $k$-th Bernoulli polynomial.

The reader may refer to [26, Appendix B] for a proof and further discussion.
Corollary 2.3. Let $X \geq 1$ be an arbitrary real number. Let $K$ be a positive integer. For every $s = \sigma + it \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\sigma > 1 - K$ and $s \neq 1$, we have

$$
\zeta(s) = \sum_{n \leq X} \frac{1}{n^s} + \frac{X^{1-s}}{s-1} + \frac{1}{2X^s} + \sum_{k=2}^{K} \frac{a_k(s)B_k\{X\}}{k!X^{s+k-1}} - \frac{A_K(s)}{K!} \int_{X}^{\infty} \frac{B_K\{X\}}{x^{s+k}} \, dx,
$$

where $a_k(s) = s(s+1)...(s+k-2)$, for $k \geq 2$, and $A_K(s) = s(s+1)...(s+K-1)$.

Proof. Let $f(x) = x^{-s}$. Suppose first that $\sigma > 1$. We have then that, for every $1 \leq k \leq K$, $\lim_{Y \to \infty} f^{(k-1)}(Y) = 0$ and, by making $Y \to \infty$ in Theorem 2.2, that

$$
\sum_{n > X} \frac{1}{n^s} = \frac{X^{1-s}}{s-1} + \frac{1}{2X^s} + \sum_{k=2}^{K} \frac{s(s+1)...(s+k-2)B_k\{X\}}{k!X^{s+k-1}} - \frac{\sigma(s+1)...(s+K-1)}{K!} \int_{X}^{\infty} \frac{B_K\{X\}}{x^{s+k}} \, dx.
$$

For a general value $s$, the function expressed in the above right hand side is indeed analytic in the set $\{s \in \mathbb{C}| \sigma > 1 - K\} \setminus \{1\}$ (as the Bernoulli polynomials have bounded argument). Furthermore, as $X$ is fixed, $s \to \sum_{n \leq X} \frac{1}{n^s}$ is analytic and hence, by analytic continuation, that function above equals the analytic function $\zeta(s) - \sum_{n \leq X} \frac{1}{n^s}$ inside the same punctured half-plane. \qed

As a matter of fact, Corollary 2.3 shows how to extend $\zeta$ analytically from $\{s \in \mathbb{C}| \sigma > 1\}$ onto the set $\{s \in \mathbb{C}| \sigma > 1 - K\} \setminus \{1\}$.

We may extend Theorem 2.2 to a broader class of functions than $O^K$. Notice that the following formulation also improves slightly on a constant value: it replaces the factor $\frac{1}{12}$, coming from a direct application of Theorem 2.2 for $K = 2$, with a factor of $\frac{1}{16}$.

Lemma 2.4 (Improved Euler-Maclaurin summation formula of second order). Let $f : [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{C}$ be a continuous, piecewise $C^1$ function such that $f$, $f'$, $f''$ are in $L^1([0, \infty))$. Then

$$
\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f(n) = \int_{0}^{\infty} f(x) \, dx - \frac{f(0)}{2} - \lim_{t \to 0^+} \frac{f(t)}{16} + O^*(\frac{1}{16||f''||_1}). \tag{2.4}
$$

We mean $f''$ (and thus $||f''||_1$) in the sense of distributions (or measures), so that $||f''||_1$ stands for the total variation of the function $f'$ on the interval $[0, \infty)$. Of course, if $f$ is $C^2$ or even piecewise $C^2$, this clarification is unnecessary: the total variation of $f'$ then equals the $L^1$ norm of the function $f''$.

Proof. As $f$ has bounded total variation, $f(x)$ converges to a real number $R$ as $x \to \infty$. If $R$ were non-zero, then $f$ could not be in $L^1$; thus $\lim_{x \to \infty} f(x) = 0$. By the same reasoning, using the facts that $f'$ is differentiable and that $f'$, $f''$ are in $L^1$, we obtain that $\lim_{x \to \infty} f'(x) = 0$.
Let $F(x)$ be a differentiable function with $F'(x) = x - \frac{1}{2}$. Then $\int_0^1 F'(x)dx = 0$, $F(0) = F(1)$, and so, by integration by parts,

$$\int_{n-1}^n f(x)dx = \int_0^1 f(x + n - 1) \left(x - \frac{1}{2}\right)' dx$$

$$= \frac{f(n)}{2} - \frac{f(n - 1)}{2} - \int_0^1 f'(x + n - 1) \left(x - \frac{1}{2}\right) dx$$

$$= \frac{f(n)}{2} - \frac{f(n - 1)}{2} - \int_{n-1}^n f'(x)F'\{x\}dx$$

We can assume without loss of generality that $f'$ is continuous at the positive integers, as shifting $f$ to the left by a very small amount changes both sides of (2.4) by a very small amount. Hence, again by integration by parts,

$$\int_{n-1}^n f(x)dx = \frac{f(n)}{2} - \frac{f(n - 1)}{2} - (f'(n) - f'(n - 1))F(0) + \int_{n-1}^n f''(x)F'\{x\}dx$$

where we write $f'(0)$ for $\lim_{t\to 0^+} f'(t)$. Therefore, $\int_0^n f(x)dx$ equals

$$\sum_{k=1}^n f(k) - \frac{f(n)}{2} + \frac{f(0)}{2} - f'(n)F(0) + f'(0)F(0) + \int_0^n f''(x)F'\{x\}dx.$$ 

By using the fact that $\lim_{n\to\infty} f(n) = \lim_{n\to\infty} f'(n) = 0$, we obtain finally that

$$\sum_{n=1}^\infty f(n) = \int_0^\infty f(x)dx - \frac{f(0)}{2} - f'(0)F(0) + \mathcal{O}\left(\int_0^\infty |f''(x)||F'\{x\}|dx\right).$$

It remains to choose an optimal function, that is, to choose $F$ such that $F'(x) = x - \frac{1}{2}$ and such that $\max_{x\in[0,1]} |F(x)|$ is minimal. It is not difficult to see that we should take $F(x) = \frac{1}{2}(x^2 - x + \frac{1}{8})$, in which case $F(0) = \frac{1}{10}$ and $\max_{x\in[0,1]} |F(x)| = \frac{1}{10}$. \qed

### 2.4 The Mellin transform

Let $f : [0,\infty) \to \mathbb{C}$. Its Mellin transform is defined as $\mathcal{M}f(s) = \int_0^\infty x^s f(x)x^{s-1}dx$ for all $s$ such that the integral above converges absolutely. It is a Fourier transform up to changing variables, so a version of Plancherel’s identity holds, namely

$$\int_0^\infty |f(x)|^2 x^{2\sigma-1} dx = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^\infty |\mathcal{M}f(\sigma+i\tau)|^2 d\tau, \quad (2.5)$$

provided that $f(x)x^{\sigma - \frac{1}{2}}$ is in $L^2([0,\infty))$ and $f(x)x^{\sigma - 1}$ is in $L^1([0,\infty))$.

In particular, we have that $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{1}_{[0,a]})(s) = \frac{\pi}{as}$, where $\mathbb{1}_S$ denotes the indicator function of a set $S$. Considering now $f(x) = \sum_{n=1}^\infty a_n \mathbb{1}_{(0,1/n]}(x)$, where $A(s) = \sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{a_n}{ns}$ is a Dirichlet series converging (not necessarily absolutely) in the half-plane $\{s \in \mathbb{C} | \Re(s) > \sigma_c\}$, we observe that

$$\mathcal{M}f(s) = \sum_{n=1}^\infty \int_0^\infty a_n \mathbb{1}_{(0,1/n]}(x)x^{s-1}dx = \sum_{n=1}^\infty a_n \int_0^{1/n} x^{s-1}dx = \frac{A(s)}{s},$$

where $A(s)$ converges to $\infty$ as $s$ tends to $\sigma_c$. Therefore, the right-hand side converges absolutely and uniformly in $\mathbb{C}$, as desired.
in the set \( \{ s \in \mathbb{C} | \Re(s) > \max\{0, \sigma_c\} \} \). As the above holds for every Dirichlet series, we have, for the function \( J(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{I}_{(0,1/n]}(x) = \left\lfloor \frac{1}{x} \right\rfloor \), the equality
\[
\mathcal{M}J(s) = \frac{\zeta(s)}{s},
\] (2.6)
which is valid for the set \( \{ s \in \mathbb{C} | \Re(s) > 1 \} \). Moreover, for a general function \( f \), the function \( \tilde{f} : x \mapsto f(nx) \) has Mellin transform \( \mathcal{M}\tilde{f}(s) = \frac{\mathcal{M}f(s)}{s} \) for all \( s \) in the domain of definition of \( \mathcal{M}f \). Thus, for every well-defined function \( F(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f(nx) \), by considering
\[
h(x) = \left\lfloor \frac{1}{x} \right\rfloor - F(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{I}_{(0,1/n]}(x) - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f(nx),
\]
we obtain
\[
\mathcal{M}F(s) = \mathcal{M}f(s) \cdot \zeta(s),
\] (2.7)
\[
\mathcal{M}h(s) = \left( \frac{1}{s} - \mathcal{M}f(s) \right) \zeta(s),
\] (2.8)
for all \( s \) in the domain of definition of \( \mathcal{M}f \) such that \( \Re(s) > 1 \).

We see now an explicit formulation of a specific class of Mellin transforms.

**Lemma 2.5.** For every \( a \in \mathbb{R}, j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} \) and \( s \in \mathbb{C} \) such that \( \Re(s) > 0 \), we have
\[
\mathcal{M} ((a-x)^j \mathbb{I}_{(0,a]}(x)) (s) = \frac{j!a^{s+j}}{s(s+1)\ldots(s+j)}. \] (2.9)

**Proof.** By definition, \( \mathcal{M} ((a-x)^j \mathbb{I}_{(0,a]}(x)) (s) = \int_{0}^{a} (a-x)^j x^{s-1} dx \); we proceed by induction on \( j \). For \( j = 0 \), we have \( \int_{0}^{a} (a-x)^j x^{s-1} dx = \frac{a^s}{s+1} \). For \( j = 1 \), we have \( \int_{0}^{a} (a-x)^j x^{s} dx = \frac{a^{s+1}}{(s+1)(s+2)} \), for every complex number \( s \) with strictly positive real part.

Suppose that \( \int_{0}^{a} (a-x)^j x^{s-1} dx = \frac{j!a^{s+j}}{s(s+1)\ldots(s+j)} \) for every \( s \in \mathbb{C} \) such that \( \Re(s) > 0 \). Then
\[
\int_{0}^{a} (a-x)^{j+1} x^{s-1} dx = a \int_{0}^{a} (a-x)^j x^{s-1} dx - \int_{0}^{a} (a-x)^j x^{s} dx
= \frac{j!a^{s+1+j}}{s(s+1)\ldots(s+j)} - \frac{j!a^{s+1+j}}{(s+1)\ldots(s+1+j)}
= \frac{j!a^{s+1+j}}{s(s+1)\ldots(s+j+1)},
\]
whence the result. \( \square \)

Finally, we describe how the Mellin transform behaves under derivation. For \( f \) continuous and piecewise continuously differentiable with compact support, integration by parts gives us
\[
\mathcal{M}f'(s) = -(s-1)\mathcal{M}f(s-1). \] (2.10)
2.5 The Gamma function

The Gamma function $\Gamma$ is defined for all $s \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\Re(s) > 0$ as $\Gamma : s \mapsto \int_0^\infty t^{s-1}e^{-t}dt$. This function can be extended meromorphically to $\mathbb{C}$, with poles on the set \{0, −1, −2, −3, \ldots\} and vanishing nowhere. Where well-defined, it satisfies the relationship $\Gamma(s+1) = s\Gamma(s)$, so one says that $\Gamma$ extends the factorial function to the complex numbers. Moreover, this function is closely related to the $\zeta$ function by means of the functional equation, valid for all $s \in \mathbb{C}\{0,1\}$,

$$\zeta(s) = 2(2\pi)^{s-1} \sin \left(\frac{\pi s}{2}\right) \Gamma(1-s)\zeta(1-s).$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.11)

**Theorem 2.6 (Stirling’s formula, explicit form).** Let $0 < \theta < \pi$. Let $s \in \mathbb{C}\{(-\infty,0]$, such that $|\arg(s)| \leq \pi - \theta$, where the function $\arg$ corresponds to the principal argument of $s$. Then

$$\Gamma(s) = \sqrt{2\pi s^{-\frac{3}{2}}}e^{-s}e^{O^*(\frac{\theta}{s})},$$

where $F = F_\theta = \frac{1}{12\sin^2\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)}$.

**Proof.** Since $\Gamma(s)$ has neither zeroes nor poles in the simply connected domain $\mathbb{C}\{(-\infty,0]$, $\log(\Gamma(s))$ is a well-defined analytic function on $\mathbb{C}\{(-\infty,0]$. By [2, Thm. 1.4.2] (which follows from the Weierstrass product for $\Gamma(s)$ and the Euler-Maclaurin summation formula) with $m = 1$,

$$\log(\Gamma(s)) = \frac{1}{2}\log(2\pi) + \left(\frac{s}{2} - s\right)\log(s) - s + \mu(s),$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.12)

where $\log$ is the principal branch of the logarithm, defined again on $\mathbb{C}\{(-\infty,0]$ and $\mu(s) = \frac{1}{12\pi^2} - \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\pi \frac{B_2(s)}{\pi^2 + s^2}dx$. Moreover, as explained in [29, §2.4.4], $\mu$ can be expressed as a Gudermannian series so that, for all $s \in \mathbb{C}\{(-\infty,0]$,

$$|\mu(s)| \leq \frac{1}{12\cos^2\left(\frac{1}{2}\arg(s)\right)}\frac{1}{|s|}. \hspace{1cm} (2.13)$$

Now, if $|\arg(s)| \leq \pi - \theta$, then $\cos\left(\frac{1}{2}\arg(s)\right) = \cos\left(\frac{1}{2}\arg(s)\right) \leq \sin\left(\frac{\pi - \theta}{2}\right)$. Thus, upon exponentiating both sides of (2.12) and implementing the final bound for $|\theta|$, we derive the result. \hfill $\square$

**Corollary 2.7 (Rapid decay of $\Gamma$ in non-negative vertical strips).** Let $T \geq 1$ and $\sigma \geq 0$. Then, for every complex number $s = \sigma + it$ such that $|t| \geq T$,

$$|\Gamma(\sigma + it)| \leq \sqrt{2\pi t}\frac{t^{\sigma - \frac{1}{2}}}{e^{\frac{1}{2}t^2}} e^{O^*(\frac{\theta}{t})},$$

where $G_\sigma = \frac{t^3}{\pi} + \frac{e^2}{2} |\sigma - \frac{1}{2}|^2 + \frac{1}{4}$.

**Proof.** As $s$ is such that $|\arg(s)| \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$, we use Theorem 2.6 with $\theta = \frac{\pi}{2}$, and obtain

$$\Re(\log(\Gamma(s))) = \Re\left(\frac{1}{2}\log(2\pi) + \left(\sigma + it - \frac{1}{2}\right)\log(\sigma + it) - (\sigma + it) + O^*\left(\frac{1}{6T}\right)\right)$$

$$= \log(2\pi) + \left(\sigma - \frac{1}{2}\right) \log(\sigma^2 + t^2) - t \arg(\sigma + it) - \sigma + O^*\left(\frac{1}{6T}\right).$$
As \(\log(1+x) \leq x\) for all \(x \geq 0\), we have that \(\log(\sigma^2 + t^2) = 2\log(|t|) + O^*(\frac{\sigma^3}{T^2})\). Observe that \(\arg(\sigma + it) = \arctan\left(\frac{t}{\sigma}\right) = \int_0^t \frac{dx}{\sqrt{1+x^2}} = \int_0^{\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{1+\sigma^2}}} - \int_{\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{1+\sigma^2}}}^{\infty} \frac{dx}{\sqrt{1+x^2}} = \int_0^{\infty} \frac{dx}{1+x^2} - \int_0^\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{1+\sigma^2}} dx = \pm \frac{\pi}{2} - \frac{\pi}{2} + O^*(\frac{\sigma^3}{T^2})\), where the sign \(\pm\) corresponds to the sign of \(t\). Putting everything together, we obtain that \(\Re(\log(\Gamma(s)))\) equals
\[
\frac{1}{2}\log(2\pi) + \left(\sigma - \frac{1}{2}\right)\log(|t|) - \frac{\pi|t|}{2} + O^*(\left(\frac{\sigma^3}{3} + \frac{\sigma^2}{2} + \frac{\sigma}{2}\right) \frac{1}{T^2} + \frac{1}{6T}).
\]
As \(\frac{1}{T} \leq \frac{1}{2}\), the above error term can thus be compressed to \(O^*(\frac{\sigma^3}{T^2})\). By exponentiating the above equation, we obtain the result. \(\square\)

2.6 Bounds on some sums

Lemma 2.8. For any \(X \geq 1\) we have
\[
\log(X) + \gamma - \frac{2}{3X} \leq \sum_{n \leq X} \frac{1}{n} \leq \log(X) + \gamma + \frac{1}{2X},
\]
where \(\gamma\) is the Euler-Mascheroni constant. The constant \(-\frac{2}{3}\) in the lower bound can be improved to \(-\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{120}\) if one is restricted to values \(X \geq C\) for a given constant \(C \geq 1\).

Proof. By applying Theorem 2.2 with \(K = 2\) to the function \(x \mapsto x^{-1}\), we obtain
\[
\sum_{1 < n \leq X} \frac{1}{n} = \log(X) - B_1((X)) - \frac{1}{2} - B_2((X)) + \frac{1}{12} - \int_1^X \frac{B_2((x))}{x^3} dx.
\]
Therefore
\[
\sum_{n \leq X} \frac{1}{n} = \log(X) + \frac{7}{12} - \int_1^\infty \frac{B_2((x))}{x^3} dx + R(X),
\]
where \(R(X) = -B_1((X)) - \frac{B_2((X))}{2X^2} + \int_X^\infty \frac{B_2((x))}{x^3} dx\). By (2.1), \(B_1\) and \(B_2\) are bounded functions on \([0, 1]\) and hence \(R(X) = O(\frac{1}{X})\) and the improper integral above is convergent. We conclude that \(\gamma = \lim_{X \to \infty} \frac{1}{X} \sum_{n \leq X} \frac{1}{n} - \log(X) = \frac{7}{12} - \int_1^\infty \frac{B_2((x))}{x^3} dx\).

On the other hand, as \(\max |B_2((x))| = \frac{1}{6}\), we have that \(R(X) \leq \frac{1}{2X} - \frac{(X)}{X} + \frac{(X)}{2X^2} - \frac{1}{6X^2} \leq \frac{1}{2X} - \frac{1}{6X^2} \leq \frac{1}{X} \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{6C}\right)\), as \(1 - \frac{1}{2X} \geq 0\), and also that, for every \(X \geq C\) with \(C \geq 1\),
\[
R(X) \geq \frac{1}{2X} - \frac{(X)}{X} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2X}\right) - \frac{1}{6X^2} \geq -\frac{1}{2X} - \frac{1}{6X^2} \geq -\frac{1}{X} \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{6C}\right),
\]
as \(\frac{(X)}{X} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2X}\right) \leq \frac{1}{X}\). When we take \(C = 1\), we obtain \(-\frac{2}{3X}\) as a lower bound, whence the result. \(\square\)
Lemma 2.9. Let \( \alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+ \setminus \{1\} \) and \( X \geq 0 \). Then

\[
\sum_{n \leq X} \frac{1}{n^\alpha} = \zeta(\alpha) - \frac{1}{(\alpha - 1)X^{\alpha-1}} + O^* \left( \frac{1}{2X^\alpha} \right).
\]

Proof. By definition of \( \zeta(s) \) for \( \Re(s) > 1 \), and by analytic continuation for all \( s \neq 1 \) with \( \Re(s) > 0 \),

\[
-\zeta(s) + \frac{1}{(s-1)X^{s-1}} + \sum_{n \leq X} \frac{1}{n^s} = \sum_{n=1}^\infty \left( \frac{1}{([X] + n)^s} - \int_{n-1}^n \frac{dx}{(X+x)^s} \right).
\]

Clearly \( ([X] + n)^{-\alpha} \leq (X + n - 1)^{-\alpha} \) and by convexity of \( t \mapsto \frac{1}{t^\alpha} \),

\[
\int_{n-1}^n \frac{dx}{(X+x)^\alpha} \leq \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{(X+n-1)^\alpha} + \frac{1}{(X+n)^\alpha} \right).
\]

Hence

\[
\sum_{n=1}^\infty \left( \frac{1}{([X] + n)^\alpha} - \int_{n-1}^n \frac{dx}{(X+x)^\alpha} \right) \leq \sum_{n=1}^\infty \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{(X+n-1)^\alpha} - \frac{1}{(X+n)^\alpha} \right) \leq \frac{1}{2X^\alpha}.
\]

The constant \( \frac{1}{2} \) in the error term in the lemma above is tight for \( X \to \infty \).

2.7 Further results

Lemma 2.10. Let \( s = \sigma + it \). Suppose that \( X \geq 1 \), \( s \neq 1 \), \( 0 < \sigma \leq 1 \) and \( |t| \leq X \). Then

\[
\zeta(s) = \sum_{n \leq X} \frac{1}{n^s} + X^{1-s} + O^* \left( \frac{D}{X^\sigma} \right),
\]

where \( D = \frac{5}{6} \). The constant \( D \) can be improved if one is restricted to values \( X \geq C \) for a given integer \( C \geq 1 \), so that \( \lim_{C \to \infty} D = \frac{7}{12} + \frac{\gamma}{2\pi(C+1)} \leq 0.59756 \).

Proof. For \( X \geq C \) and \( |t| \leq X \), we have \( \frac{|t|}{X} \leq \sqrt{1+\frac{t^2}{X^2}} \leq \sqrt{1+\frac{1}{X}} \leq 1 + \frac{1}{2X} \). Apply Corollary 2.3 with \( K = [X] + 2 \geq C + 2 \). We have

\[
\left| \sum_{k=2}^K \frac{a_k(s)B_k([X])}{k!X^{\sigma+k-1}} \right| \leq \sum_{k=2}^K \frac{|a_k(s)|}{k!X^{\sigma+k-1}} \leq \frac{2\zeta(k)|a_k(s)|}{(2\pi)^kX^{k-1}},
\]

\[
\left| -\frac{A_K(s)}{K!} \int_X^\infty \frac{B_K([X])}{x^{\sigma+K}} \, dx \right| \leq \frac{|A_K(s)|}{(\sigma + K - 1)K!X^{\sigma+K-1}}.
\]
For $2 \leq k \leq K - 1$, the ratio of two consecutive addends in the sum above is
\[
\frac{2\zeta(k+1)|a_{k+1}(s)|}{(2\pi)^{k+1}X^k} \leq \frac{2|s|\zeta(2)}{(2\pi)^2X} + \frac{2|s(s+1)|\zeta(3)}{(2\pi)^3X^2} \sum_{k=3}^{\infty} Q_{C^3}^k
\]
\[
\leq \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{C^2}} \left( \frac{1}{12} + \frac{\zeta(3)}{4\pi^3(1 - Q_C)} \sqrt{1 + \frac{2}{C^2}} \right).
\]
\[
(2.14)
\]
On the other hand
\[
\frac{|A_K(s)|}{(\sigma + K - 1)K!X^{K-1}} \leq \frac{2\zeta(K)|s(s+1)\ldots(s+K-1)|}{(2\pi)^KX^{K-1}}
\]
\[
\leq \frac{2\zeta(C+2)|s|}{2\pi \cdot (\sigma + K - 1)} \left( \frac{1}{2\pi} \left( \frac{|s|}{X} + \frac{K - 1}{X} \right) \right)^{K-1}
\]
\[
\leq \frac{\zeta(C+2)|s|}{\pi X} \left( \frac{1}{2\pi} \left( \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{C^2}} + \frac{1}{C} \right) \right)^{K-1}
\]
\[
\leq \frac{\zeta(C+2)}{\pi(2\pi)^{C+1}} \left( \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{C^2}} + \frac{1}{C} \right)^{C+1},
\]
\[
(2.15)
\]
where we have used that $\frac{1}{2\pi} \left( \sqrt{1 + \frac{1}{C^2}} + \frac{1}{C} \right) < 1$ for $C \geq 1$ and that $K - 1 \geq C + 1$.

All in all, the error constant coming from Corollary 2.3 is equal to $\frac{1}{2}$ plus the expressions coming from (2.14) and (2.15). In general, the expression is a decreasing function on $C$, satisfying $D < \frac{1}{2}$ for $C = 1$ and tending to the limit in the statement as $C \to \infty$.

The following is a mean-value estimate. It may be more common to see mean-value estimates where the error term is $O((X \sum_{n \leq X} |a_n|^2)$ (as in [23 Thm. 6.1]), rather than $O(\sum_{n \leq X} n|a_n|^2)$ (as in [23 Cor. 3]). The estimate here can be preferable (even vastly preferable) if $|a_n|$ decreases as $n$ increases.

**Proposition 2.11.** For any $X, T > 0$ and any sequence of complex numbers $\{a_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ we have
\[
\int_0^T \left| \sum_{n \leq X} a_n e^{int} \right|^2 dt = \left( T + \frac{E}{2} \right) \sum_{n \leq X} |a_n|^2 + O^* \left( E \sum_{n \leq X} n|a_n|^2 \right),
\]
where $E$ can be chosen to be equal to $2\pi \sqrt{1 + \frac{4}{\pi^2}} \leq 8.26495$. 
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Proof. We use the main theorem in [27], which improves on [25, Cor. 2] (the theorem states $C = \frac{4}{\pi}$, which yields $E = \frac{8}{3}\pi$, but it is proved with a lower $C$ that yields our $E$). We apply it then as in [25, Cor. 3], with a numerical improvement given by $\log^{-1} \left( \frac{n+1}{n} \right) < n + \frac{1}{2}$, proved directly by calculus. See also [3] Satz 4.4.3 for a precedent explicit result that used $15n$ instead of $\frac{4}{\pi} (n + \frac{1}{2})$.

If $\{a_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ is a real sequence then the error term factor may be improved to $E_2$. As pointed out in [28, Lemma 6.5], there is a cancellation of a term that allows one to gain a factor of 2 inside the error term.

Lemma 2.12. For any $1 < \sigma < 2$ we have

$$\frac{1}{\sigma - 1} < \zeta(\sigma) < \frac{1}{\sigma - 1} + \zeta(2) - 1.$$  

The lower bound holds also for $0 < \sigma < 1$.

Proof. The Laurent expansion of $\zeta$ is

$$f(\sigma) = \zeta(\sigma) - \frac{1}{\sigma - 1} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n \gamma_n}{n!} (\sigma - 1)^n \quad (2.16)$$

where the $\gamma_n$ are the Stieltjes constants. For the upper bound, it suffices to prove that $f'(\sigma)$ is positive for $\sigma \in (1, 2)$, so that $f(\sigma) < f(2)$: one can use

$$f'(\sigma) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{n+1} \gamma_{n+1}}{n!} (\sigma - 1)^n > -\gamma_1 - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{|\gamma_{n+1}|}{n!},$$

compute the first 10 constants directly and then use the bound $|\gamma_n| \leq \frac{n!}{2^n}$ (for $n \geq 1$) given by Lavrik in [19, Lemma 4], so that $\sum_{n=10}^{\infty} \frac{|\gamma_{n+1}|}{n!} \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=11}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} < 10^{-2}$. The lower bound is even simpler to obtain: in order to prove that $f(\sigma) > 0$ for $0 < \sigma < 2$ and $\sigma \neq 1$, we compute directly $\gamma_0 = \gamma$ and then we bound the absolute value of the rest of the series in (2.16) by using again Lavrik’s estimations.

Lemma 2.13. Let $A, B \geq 0$. Then, for any $\rho > 0$,

$$(A + B)^2 \leq (1 + \rho) A^2 + \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\rho} \right) B^2,$$

$$(A - B)^2 \geq (1 - \rho) A^2 + \left( 1 - \frac{1}{\rho} \right) B^2.$$

Note that the inequalities are tight when $\rho = \frac{B}{A}$.

Proof. Expand the square. By the arithmetic-geometric mean inequality, $2|AB| = 2(\sqrt{|A|}\cdot\sqrt{|B|}) \leq \rho A^2 + B^2.$
3 The first approach: a mean value theorem with smoothing

We begin by bounding in Proposition 3.2 the $L^2$ norm of a function of the form $t \mapsto ((\sigma + it)^{-1} - G(\sigma + it))\zeta(\sigma + it)$, where $G$ is the Mellin transform of a function $g : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We choose secondly $g$ so that $G(\sigma + it)$ is close to 0 for $|t| \geq T$, while keeping the aforementioned $L^2$ bound small.

The astute reader will feel the uncertainty principle lurking here. It is a manifestation of that principle that will keep any choice of $g$ from being too good in both respects, and will ultimately keep the constant in front of the main term from being optimal. We can nevertheless try to do our best.

To simplify matters, we could decide to bound the tails of $G$ in terms of $|g''|_1$, thus being able to choose $g$ optimally. That choice will turn out to be particularly simple – essentially a characteristic function, made continuous by a linear transition from 1 to 0; we examine this choice in 3.3, although the final bounds we obtain in this section will not be based on it. Soon thereafter, and along the aforementioned ideas, we choose to work with a piecewise polynomial, called also $g$, and compute its Mellin transform $G$ explicitly (as we do in 3.3), yielding better results for $\sigma \geq \frac{3}{4}$, as there is no longer need to assume that the tails of $G$ are bounded in terms of $|g''|_1$.

Our final estimates are as follows.

**Theorem 3.1.** Let $0 < \sigma \leq 1$ and $T \geq T_0 = 200$. Then

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \left( \int_{\sigma - i\infty}^{\sigma - iT} + \int_{\sigma + iT}^{\sigma + i\infty} \right) \left| \frac{\zeta(s)}{s} \right|^2 ds < \frac{3\zeta(2\sigma)}{\pi} \cdot \frac{1}{T} + \left( \frac{c_{111}}{\sigma} + \frac{c_{112}}{2\sigma + 1} \right)
\]

\[+ \frac{c_{113}}{\sigma + 1} - \frac{c_{114}}{2\sigma - 1} \cdot \frac{1}{T^{2\sigma}} + c_{12+} \cdot \frac{1}{T^{2\sigma + 1}} \]

if $\frac{1}{2} < \sigma \leq 1$,

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \left( \int_{\sigma - i\infty}^{\sigma - iT} + \int_{\sigma + iT}^{\sigma + i\infty} \right) \left| \frac{\zeta(s)}{s} \right|^2 ds < \frac{3}{5} \cdot \frac{\log(T)}{T} + c_{21+} \cdot \frac{1}{T} + c_{22+} \cdot \frac{1}{T^2} \]

if $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$, and

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \left( \int_{\sigma - i\infty}^{\sigma - iT} + \int_{\sigma + iT}^{\sigma + i\infty} \right) \left| \frac{\zeta(s)}{s} \right|^2 ds < \left( \frac{c_{311}}{\sigma + 1} + \frac{c_{312}}{2\sigma + 1} + \frac{c_{313}}{\sigma + 1} + \frac{c_{314}}{1 - 2\sigma} \right) \cdot \frac{1}{T^{2\sigma}}
\]

\[+ c_{30+} \zeta(2\sigma) \cdot \frac{1}{T} + c_{32+} \cdot \frac{1}{T^{2\sigma + 1}} \]

if $0 < \sigma < \frac{1}{2}$, where the coefficients can be chosen as

- $c_{11i} = \kappa^i \kappa_{11i}$, $(i = 1, 2, 3, 4)$, $\kappa = 27.8821$, $\kappa_{12+} = 0.30016$,
- $c_{12+} = \kappa^i \kappa_{12+}$,
- $c_{31i} = c_{11i}$, $(i = 1, 2, 3)$, $\kappa_{112} = 0.15659$, $c_{21+} = 2.4476$,
- $c_{314} = \kappa^i \kappa_{314}$, $\kappa_{113} = 0.00979$, $c_{314} = 1.1361$,
- $c_{32+} = c_{12+}$, $\kappa_{114} = 0.07407$, $c_{32+} = 0.39113$. 
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We have chosen $T_0 = 200$ for simplicity. In actual fact, $T_0 = 192$ is the least $T$ for which we are able to reach $\frac{3}{5}$ as a main term coefficient.

### 3.1 Square mean of $\frac{\zeta(s)}{s}$ on the tails: the basic estimate

Let us first give a bound valid for a function $g$ that satisfies a number of general conditions. The proof is in parts close to, and in fact inspired by, proofs of classical main value theorems, such as [24, Thm. 6.1] (see in particular the exposition in [16, Thm. 9.1]).

There are differences all the same. First, in a mean-value theorem, we typically work with a finite sum $\sum_{n \leq X} a_n n^s$, and obtain a bound that contains a term proportional to $X$, whereas here we work directly with $\zeta$ and thus with an infinite sum.

The second main difference is in part a matter of taste: the proof in [16, Thm. 9.1] (or [24, Thm. 6.1]) majorizes the characteristic function of a vertical interval by a continuous function of compact support, and then uses the decay in the inverse Mellin transform to bound the contribution of off-diagonal terms. On the vertical line, we choose to work with a function of the form $1 - G(s)$, where $G$ is the Mellin transform of a function $g$ satisfying certain properties. As a consequence, off-diagonal terms vanish, outside an initial interval $[0, \delta]$ that makes a small contribution.

**Proposition 3.2.** Let $g : [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous, piecewise $C^1$ function such that $g$ and $g'$ have bounded total variation. Assume that (a) $\int_0^\infty g(t)dt = 1$, (b) $0 \leq g(t) \leq 1$ for all $t$, (c) $g(t) = 1$ for $0 \leq t \leq 1 - \delta$ and $g(t) = 0$ for $t \geq 1 + \delta$, where $0 < \delta \leq \frac{1}{4}$, (d) $g(1 + t) = 1 - g(1 - t)$ for $0 \leq t \leq \delta$.

Let $I(\sigma) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\sigma-i\infty}^{\sigma+i\infty} \frac{1}{s} G(s) \left|\zeta(s)\right|^2 ds$, \hspace{1cm} (3.1)

where $G$ is the Mellin transform of $g$. Then, for any $\sigma > 0$,

$$I(\sigma) \leq c(\sigma, \alpha) \cdot \delta^\sigma + 2 \beta \delta \cdot \left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
\zeta(2\sigma) - \frac{\delta^{2\sigma-1}}{2\sigma-1} + \frac{\delta^{\beta\sigma}}{2(1-\beta\sigma)} & \text{if } \sigma \neq \frac{1}{2}, \\
\log \left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \gamma + \frac{\delta}{\sigma(1-\sigma)} & \text{if } \sigma = \frac{1}{2},
\end{array} \right. \hspace{1cm} (3.2)$$

where $\alpha = \frac{\delta}{16} \int_0^\infty |g''(t)| dt$, $\beta = \frac{\delta}{3} \int_0^{1+\delta} |g(y)|^2 dy$ and $c(\sigma, \alpha) = \frac{1}{8\sigma} + \frac{\alpha}{2\sigma+1} + \frac{\alpha^2}{2\sigma+2}$.

Here, as always, $g''$ is to be understood as a distribution, and thus $\int_0^\infty |g''(t)| dt$ equals the total variation of $g'$ on $(0, \infty)$.

**Proof.** Since $g$ is bounded, $G(s)$ is well-defined when $\Re(s) > 0$. For $\Re(s) > 1$, we know from (2.7) that $G(s)\zeta(s)$ is the Mellin transform of the function $x \mapsto \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} g(nx)$ (notice that by (c) this function is well-defined for $x > 0$) and from (2.6) that $\frac{\zeta(s)}{s}$ is the Mellin transform of the function $x \mapsto \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{1}_{(0,1/n)}(x)$.

Let

$$h(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( \mathbb{1}_{[0,1/n]}(x) - g(nx) \right) = \left[ \frac{1}{x} \right] - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} g(nx). \hspace{1cm} (3.3)$$

Then

$$\mathcal{M}h(s) = \left( \frac{1}{s} - G(s) \right) \zeta(s), \hspace{1cm} (3.4)$$
for $\Re(s) > 1$. From one hand, by (3.6), $h$ is bounded, and thus $\mathcal{M}h(s)$ is well-defined for $\Re(s) > 0$. On the other hand, by condition (a), $G(1) = 1$ and thus the right side of (3.4) is holomorphic for $\Re(s) > 0$. Hence, by analytic continuation, (3.4) holds for $\Re(s) > 0$ and therefore, by (2.5),

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\sigma-i\infty}^{\sigma+i\infty} \frac{1}{s} G(s)^2 \frac{d|\zeta(s)|^2 ds}{ds} = \int_0^\infty |h(x)|^2 x^{2s-1} dx,$$

for any $s \in \mathbb{C}$ with $\Re(s) > 0$, provided that the integral on the right side converges. Bounding the integral on the right will suffice to derive the result.

Let us first find an upper bound for the value of $|h(x)|$ that will be used for small values of $x$ (namely, $x \leq \delta$). Using Lemma (2.4) and recalling that $g(0) = 1$, $g(1) = 0$, we obtain that

$$\sum_{n=1}^\infty g(nx) = \int_0^\infty g(tx) dt - \frac{1}{2} + O^* \left( \frac{1}{16} \int_0^\infty |g''(tx)|^2 dt \right)$$

By putting the above equality inside (3.3), we obtain for any $x \geq 0$ that

$$|h(x)| = \left| \frac{1}{x} - \frac{x}{2} + O^* \left( \frac{x}{16} \int_0^\infty |g''(t)| dt \right) \right| \leq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{x}{16} \int_0^\infty |g''(t)| dt,$$

since $\left| |t| - t + x \right| \leq \frac{x}{2}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

For $x > \delta$, we bound $h$ in another way: by its definition and condition (c)

$$h(x) = \sum_{nx \leq 1} (1 - g(nx)) - \sum_{1 < nx \leq 1 + \delta} g(nx)$$

When $x > 2\delta$, there is at most one integer $n$ such that $nx \in [1 - \delta, 1 + \delta]$, since $\frac{1+\delta}{x} - \frac{1-\delta}{x} = \frac{2\delta}{x} < 1$. For the same reason, when $\delta < x \leq 2\delta$, there can be at most one integer $n$ (call it $n_{0,x}$) such that $nx \in [1 - \delta, 1]$ and at most one integer $n$ (call it $n_{1,x}$) such that $nx \in [1, 1 + \delta]$. Since $0 \leq g(t) \leq 1$ for all $t$, we know that $1 - g(nx) \geq 0$ and $-g(nx) \leq 0$, and so the two non-zero terms in (3.7) have opposite sign. Hence

$$|h(x)| \leq \max \{|1 - g(n_{0,x})|, |g(n_{1,x})|\}.$$

(Some readers will recognize that the argument here is closely related to a standard trick from harmonic analysis: if we multiply a function $f$ by an approximation $g$ to the characteristic function of an interval, chosen so that the transform $\hat{g}$ has small compact support, then the support of $\hat{f} \cdot \hat{g}$ is at most slightly larger than the support of $\hat{f}$, and
thus, if we consider functions $f_1, f_2$ such that the supports of $\hat{f}_1, \hat{f}_2$ are disjoint and at a non-negligible distance from each other, then $f_1 \cdot \hat{g}, f_2 \cdot \hat{g}$ also have disjoint supports. The same basic idea appears, for example, in Selberg’s derivation of the large sieve).

It follows that

$$
\int_0^\infty |h(x)|^2 x^{2\sigma - 1} dx \leq \int_0^\delta |h(x)|^2 x^{2\sigma - 1} dx + \sum_{n \leq \frac{1}{2}} \int_{\max\{\frac{1}{4}, \delta\}}^{1 + \delta} |1 - g(nx)|^2 x^{2\sigma - 1} dx 
+ \sum_{n \leq n_1} \int_{\max\{\frac{1}{4}, \delta\}}^{1 + \delta} |g(nx)|^2 x^{2\sigma - 1} dx.
$$

(3.8)

Setting $y = nx$ and changing the order of summation, we get

$$
\sum_{n \leq \frac{1}{2}} \int_{\max\{\frac{1}{4}, \delta\}}^{1 + \delta} |1 - g(nx)|^2 x^{2\sigma - 1} dx = \int_{1 - \delta}^{1} \left( \sum_{n \leq \frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{n^{2\sigma}} \right) |1 - g(y)|^2 y^{2\sigma - 1} dy,
$$

and, similarly,

$$
\sum_{n \leq n_1} \int_{\max\{\frac{1}{4}, \delta\}}^{1 + \delta} |g(nx)|^2 x^{2\sigma - 1} dx = \int_{1}^{1 + \delta} \left( \sum_{n \leq \frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{n^{2\sigma}} \right) |g(y)|^2 y^{2\sigma - 1} dy.
$$

Using (3.6) in the first integral on the right hand side of (3.8) we obtain

$$
\int_0^\delta |h(x)|^2 x^{2\sigma - 1} dx \leq \delta^{2\sigma} \cdot \left( \frac{1}{8\sigma} + \frac{\alpha}{2\sigma + 1} + \frac{\alpha^2}{2(\sigma + 1)} \right),
$$

(3.9)

where $\alpha = \alpha_{\delta, \sigma} = \frac{\delta}{10 - \frac{\delta}{2} \int_0^\infty |g''(t)| dt}$.

As for the remaining terms, we just use the bounds

$$
\sum_{n \leq \frac{1}{2}} \frac{1}{n^{2\sigma}} \leq \begin{cases} 
\zeta(2\sigma) + \frac{1}{1 - 2\sigma} + \frac{x^{-2\sigma}}{2} & \text{if } \sigma \neq \frac{1}{2}, \\
\log(x) + \gamma + \frac{1}{2\sigma} & \text{if } \sigma = \frac{1}{2},
\end{cases}
$$

which we obtain from Lemmas 2.8 and 2.9, valid for $x \geq 1$ (for $\delta \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $y \geq 1 - \delta$ we certainly have $\frac{1}{2} \geq 1$). Thus, the second and third terms on the right side of (3.8) add up to at most

$$
\zeta(2\sigma) \left( \int_{1 - \delta}^{1} |1 - g(y)|^2 y^{2\sigma - 1} dy + \int_{1}^{1 + \delta} |g(y)|^2 y^{2\sigma - 1} dy \right)
+ \frac{\delta^{2\sigma - 1}}{1 - 2\sigma} \left( \int_{1 - \delta}^{1} |1 - g(y)|^2 dy + \int_{1}^{1 + \delta} |g(y)|^2 dy \right)
+ \frac{\delta^{2\sigma}}{2} \left( \int_{1 - \delta}^{1} |1 - g(y)|^2 dy + \int_{1}^{1 + \delta} |g(y)|^2 dy \right),
$$

(3.10)
if $0 < \sigma \leq 1$ with $\sigma \neq \frac{1}{2}$, and

$$
\left( \int_{1-\delta}^1 |1 - g(y)|^2 \log \left( \frac{y}{\delta} \right) dy + \int_{1}^{1+\delta} |g(y)|^2 \log \left( \frac{y}{\delta} \right) dy \right) \\
+ \gamma \left( \int_{1-\delta}^1 |1 - g(y)|^2 dy + \int_{1}^{1+\delta} |g(y)|^2 dy \right) \\
+ \frac{\delta}{2} \left( \int_{1-\delta}^1 |1 - g(y)|^2 dy + \int_{1}^{1+\delta} |g(y)|^2 dy \right),
$$

(3.11)

if $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$.

When $\frac{1}{2} \leq \sigma \leq 1$, as the functions $f(y) = y^{2\sigma-1}$ and $f(y) = \log \left( \frac{y}{\delta} \right)$ are concave, we have by condition (d) that

$$
\int_{1-\delta}^1 |1 - g(y)|^2 f(y) dy + \int_{1}^{1+\delta} |g(y)|^2 f(y) dy \\
= \int_{1}^{1+\delta} |g(y)|^2 (f(2 - y) + f(y)) dy \leq 2f(1) \int_{1}^{1+\delta} |g(y)|^2 dy.
$$

(3.12)

In the first line of (3.10), if $\sigma < \frac{1}{2}$, as $\zeta(2\sigma) < 0$ and $f(y) = y^{2\sigma-1}$ is convex, we employ the following lower bound

$$
\int_{1-\delta}^1 |1 - g(y)|^2 f(y) dy + \int_{1}^{1+\delta} |g(y)|^2 f(y) dy \geq 2f(1) \int_{1}^{1+\delta} |g(y)|^2 dy.
$$

(3.13)

To estimate the integrals in (3.10), (3.11) that have $\frac{dy}{y}$ in the integrand, we just use the fact that $y \mapsto y^{-1}$ is convex, so that for all $0 \leq t \leq \delta$,

$$(1 - t)^{-1} + (1 + t)^{-1} \leq (1 - \delta)^{-1} + (1 + \delta)^{-1} = \frac{2}{1 - \delta^2}.
$$

Consider now $\beta = \beta_{g, \delta} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{1}^{1+\delta} |g(y)|^2 dy$. Putting together (3.9), the cases (3.10) and (3.11) and the estimates (3.12) and (3.13), we finally obtain the following upper bounds for $\int_{0}^{\infty} |h(x)|^2 x^{2\sigma-1} dx$

$$
2\beta \left( \delta \zeta(2\sigma) - \frac{\delta^{2\sigma}}{2\sigma - 1} + \frac{\delta^{2\sigma+1}}{2(1 - \delta^2)} \right) + \delta^{2\sigma} \left( \frac{1}{8\sigma} + \frac{\alpha}{2\sigma + 1} + \frac{\alpha^2}{2(\sigma + 1)} \right),
$$

(3.14)

if $0 < \sigma \leq 1$ with $\sigma \neq \frac{1}{2}$, and, if $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$,

$$
2\beta \left( \delta \log \left( \frac{1}{\delta} \right) + \gamma \delta + \frac{\delta^2}{2(1 - \delta^2)} \right) + \delta \left( \frac{1}{4} + \frac{\alpha}{2} + \frac{\alpha^2}{3} \right).
$$

(3.15)

□
Note that for $0 < \sigma < \frac{1}{2}$ the leading term in (3.14) is of order $\delta^{2\sigma}$, as in such case, $\zeta(2\sigma) < 0$. Also, observe that the bound for $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$ is what is obtained from (3.14) if we let $\sigma \to \frac{1}{2}^-$ or $\sigma \to \frac{1}{2}^+$. 

**Remarks.** Let us take a look back at the proof of Proposition 3.2 to see why we proceeded as we did. We started from the fact that $\frac{\tilde{\zeta}(s)}{s}$ is the Mellin transform of $x \mapsto \lfloor \frac{x}{2} \rfloor$. We are interested in the behavior of $\frac{\tilde{\zeta}(s)}{s}$ in the critical strip $0 < \Re(s) \leq 1$. Now, $\frac{\tilde{\zeta}(s)}{s}$ has a pole at $s = 1$, and the Mellin transform is an isometry only in the region where the integral defining it converges, that is, in this case, for $\Re(s) > 1$. The solution is to choose an approximation $f$ to $x \mapsto \lfloor \frac{x}{2} \rfloor$, its Mellin transform $F$ having a pole with residue 1 at $s = 1$ and being analytic for $\Re(s) > 0$, $s \neq 1$. Then $h(x) = \lfloor \frac{x}{2} \rfloor - f(x)$ has a well-defined Mellin transform throughout $\Re(s) > 0$. In consequence, we can use isometry to evaluate

$$
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\sigma - i\infty}^{\sigma + i\infty} \left| \frac{\zeta(s)}{s} - F(s) \right|^2 \, ds
$$

(3.16)

for $\sigma > 0$: it is equal to the $L^2$ norm of $h(x)x^{\sigma - \frac{1}{2}}$ on $[0, \infty)$. We will later bound

$$
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \left( \int_{\sigma - i\infty}^{\sigma - iT} + \int_{\sigma + iT}^{\sigma + i\infty} \right) \left| \frac{\zeta(s)}{s} \right|^2 \, ds
$$

using our estimates on the expression in (3.16).

Our choice of $f$ in the proof of Proposition 3.2 is of the form $f(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} g(nx)$ with $g$ continuous. Then $F(s) = G(s)\zeta(s)$. We understand that $g$ ought to be chosen so that, for $\Re(s) = \sigma$, $G$ is an approximation to the function taking the value $\frac{1}{2}$ for $\Im(s) \leq T$ and 0 for $\Im(s) > T$: the integral in (3.16) is then close to that which we want to approximate, namely, the integral of $\left| \frac{\tilde{\zeta}(s)}{s} \right|^2$ on the segments given by $\Re(s) = \sigma$, $|\Im(s)| > T$. At the same time, if $G$ were a very good approximation to that function, the transition from $\frac{1}{2}$ to 0 would be very rapid; then $g$, being the inverse transform of $G$, would have slow decay, and $f$ would likely be a poor and unwieldy approximation to $\lfloor \frac{x}{2} \rfloor$. As already said, this tension between two sources of error can be seen as a form of the uncertainty principle.

Our requirement that $g$ be compactly supported — and, in fact, that $g(t) = 1$ for $t \leq 1 - \delta$ and $g(t) = 0$ for $t \geq 1 + \delta$ — is somewhat restrictive, in that it implies that $G$ cannot decay extremely rapidly. On the other hand, our requirements on $g$ simplified the proof of Proposition 3.2 greatly, in that they all but annihilated off-diagonal terms: for $x \geq 2\delta$, the sum $f(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} g(nx)$ contains only one term, so does its square.

### 3.2 An “optimal” choice of $g$

We will choose a $g$ that satisfies the properties required in Proposition 3.2 but before doing so we must understand what we have to optimize.

We would like to bound the integral

$$
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\sigma - iT}^{\sigma + iT} \left| \frac{\zeta(s)}{s} \right|^2 \, ds
$$

(3.17)

where $I(\sigma)$ and $G(s)$ are as in Proposition 3.2 and $\Re(s) = \sigma$. 
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Proposition 3.2 gives us a bound on $I(\sigma)$, while for the denominator we can write

$$
\inf_{|\Im(s)| \geq T} |1 - G(s)| \geq 1 - \frac{1}{T} \sup_{|\Im(s)| \geq T} \frac{|G(s)s(s + 1)|}{T} \geq 1 - \frac{1}{T} \int_0^\infty |g''(x)|x^{\sigma + 1} dx,
$$

(3.18)

where the second inequality comes from applying (2.10) twice. From the conditions on $g$ in Proposition 3.2 we have $g'' = 0$ outside $[1 - \delta, 1 + \delta]$ and $g''(1 + x) = -g''(1 - x)$ for $x \in [0, \delta)$. Since $x \mapsto x^{\sigma + 1}$ is convex in $x$ for $\sigma \geq 0$ and $(1 + \delta)^{\sigma + 1} + (1 - \delta)^{\sigma + 1}$ is increasing in $\sigma \geq 0$, we see that

$$(1 + x)^{\sigma + 1} + (1 - x)^{\sigma + 1} \leq (1 + \delta)^2 + (1 - \delta)^2 = 2 + 2\delta^2,$$

and so

$$
1 - \frac{1}{T} \int_0^\infty |g''(x)|x^{\sigma + 1} dx \geq 1 - \frac{1 + \delta^2}{T} |g''|.
$$

(3.19)

We focus only on the main terms in the bound of $I(\sigma)$ given in Proposition 3.2. Introduce an auxiliary function $\eta : [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ defined so that $g(1 + x) = \frac{\eta(\frac{x}{2})}{2}, g(1 - x) = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \eta(\frac{x}{2})$. Then we have $\beta = \frac{1}{4} |\eta|^2_2, |g''|_1 = \frac{3}{8} |\eta''|_1$, and so $\alpha = \frac{1}{16} |\eta''|_1$. The main terms for $\delta$ small are

$$
\frac{|\eta|^2_2 \zeta(2\sigma) \delta}{2 \left(1 - \frac{3\sigma}{4}\right)^2 |\eta''|_1^2} \quad \text{for } \frac{1}{2} < \sigma \leq 1,
$$

$$
\frac{|\eta|^2_2 \delta \log \left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)}{2 \left(1 - \frac{3\sigma}{4}\right) |\eta''|_1^2} \quad \text{for } \sigma = \frac{1}{2},
$$

$$
\frac{\left(\frac{|\eta|^2_2}{2(1 - 2\sigma)} + \frac{|\eta|^2_2}{8\sigma} + \frac{|\eta''|_1^2}{16(2\sigma + 1)} + \frac{|\eta''|_1^2}{512(2\sigma + 1)}\right) \delta^{2\sigma}}{(1 - \frac{3\sigma}{4})^2 |\eta''|_1^2} \quad \text{for } 0 < \sigma < \frac{1}{2}.
$$

We will choose $\delta$ so as to minimize them. For $\frac{1}{2} < \sigma \leq 1$, the minimum of $\frac{|\eta|^2_2 \zeta(2\sigma) \delta}{2 \left(1 - \frac{3\sigma}{4}\right)^2 |\eta''|_1^2}$ is at $x = 3a$. Therefore we let $\delta = 3|\eta''|_1 T^{-1}$ so that the main term becomes

$$
\frac{3\zeta(2\sigma)}{2T (1 - \frac{3\sigma}{4})^2 |\eta''|_1^2 |\eta|^2_2}.
$$

For $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$ we let $\delta = 3|\eta''|_1 T^{-1}$, out of simplicity. Then $\log \left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) = \log(T) + \log \left(\frac{2}{|\eta''|_1}\right)$, the term with $\log(T)$, which will be the main term in $T$, contributing

$$
\frac{3\log(T)}{2T (1 - \frac{3\sigma}{4})^2 |\eta''|_1^2 |\eta|^2_2}.
$$

For $0 < \sigma < \frac{1}{2}$, the minimum of $\frac{|\eta|^2_2}{2(1 - 2\sigma)}$ is reached at $x = \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sigma}\right) a$, so that we can choose $\delta = \left(1 + \frac{1}{\sigma}\right)|\eta''|_1 T^{-1}$. The main term in this case is at most

$$
\frac{\left(1 + \frac{1}{\sigma}\right)^{2\sigma}}{T^{2\sigma} (1 - \frac{4}{1 + \frac{1}{\sigma}})^2} \left(\frac{|\eta''|^2_1 |\eta|^2_2}{2(1 - 2\sigma)} + \frac{|\eta''|^2_1}{8\sigma} + \frac{|\eta''|^2_1}{16(2\sigma + 1)} + \frac{|\eta''|^2_1}{512(2\sigma + 1)}\right).
$$

(3.20)

In all cases, we conclude that we have to select $\eta$ so that the factor $|\eta''|_1^2 |\eta|^2_2$ (or, for $0 < \sigma < \frac{1}{2}$, the first term in (3.20) is minimal.)
Corollary 3.4 (to Proposition 3.2). Let \( b, \eta \) and \((\text{total variation}|\eta\text{ inside that interval where the previous } \eta\text{ interval } [a, b] \eta\text{ interval})\) and \((b, \eta\text{(b)})\). Since \( \eta \) diminishes in that interval, so does \( |\eta|_{\eta} \), and since there is a point inside that interval where the previous \( \eta \) had the same derivative as that segment, the total variation \( |\eta''|_1 \) of \( \eta' \) does not increase. If \( \eta \) is convex in some \([a, b] \), we can extend the tangents in \( a^+ \) and \( b^- \) (the values \( \eta'(a^+) = \lim_{t \to a^+} \eta'(t) \), \( \eta'(b^-) = \lim_{t \to b^-} \eta'(t) \), since \( \eta \) is non-differentiable only at finitely many points and \( \eta' \) is of bounded variation). As \( \eta \) is decreasing, the tangents meet inside \([a, b] \), and we replace \( \eta \) with the two resulting segments; \( |\eta|_2 \) diminishes as in the previous case. As for \( \eta' \), it has been replaced inside \([a, b] \) by a staircase function with two levels, one at \( \eta'(a^+) \) and one at \( \eta'(b^-) \); \( |\eta''|_1 \) is left unchanged.

Now \( \eta \) in \([0, 1] \) consists of a finite set of segments. The same argument as above gives a replacement of \( \eta \) by a convex set of segments. By applying it again, \( \eta \) in \([0, 1] \) is now made of two segments, joining \((0, 1) \) to \( P \) and then \( P \) to \((1, 0) \), for some point \( P \in [0, 1]^2 \). The application of the argument one last time, now to an interval starting just to the left of \( P \), and going up to \( 1 + \varepsilon \) for some \( \varepsilon > 0 \), gives the function \( \eta_0 \) described in the statement. \[ \square \]

Thanks to Lemma 3.3 we can assume that \( \eta(x) \) is simply the function given by \( \eta(x) = 1 - x \) for \( 0 \leq x \leq 1 \), and by \( \eta(x) = 0 \) for \( x \geq 1 \); the other functions \( \eta_0 \) described in the statement of Lemma 3.3 are just dilations of this one, and can thus be covered by the fact that we can choose \( \delta \) as we wish.

Corollary 3.4 (to Proposition 3.2). Let \( 0 < \sigma \leq 1, T > \max \{3, 1 + \frac{1}{\sigma}\} \). Then

\[
\frac{1}{2\pi i} \left( \int_{\sigma-i\infty}^{\sigma+i\infty} + \int_{\sigma+iT}^{\sigma+i\infty} \right) \left| \frac{\zeta(s)}{s} \right|^2 ds \leq \rho_{\sigma,T},
\]

where

\[
c_0(\kappa) = \kappa^2 \left( c' + \frac{\kappa}{12T(1 - \frac{\kappa}{3})} \right), \quad c_1(\kappa) = \frac{\kappa^2}{6(2\sigma - 1)},
\]

\[
c_2 = \frac{\log(3) - \gamma}{2}, \quad c_3 = \frac{(\sigma + 1)\zeta(2\sigma)}{6\sigma},
\]

\[
c' = \frac{1}{8\sigma} + \frac{1}{16(2\sigma + 1)} + \frac{1}{512(\sigma + 1)}, \quad \rho_{\sigma,T} = \begin{cases} \frac{9}{4(1 - \frac{\kappa T}{\pi^2})}, & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} \leq \sigma \leq 1, \\ \frac{(1+\kappa)^2}{(\frac{T}{2\pi^2})^2}, & \text{if } 0 < \sigma < \frac{1}{2}. \end{cases}
\]
Notice that $c_0(\kappa)$ and $c_3$ go to $\infty$ when $\sigma \to 0$. Observe also that the numerical optimization in §3.3 on which Theorem 3.1 is based, yields results that are asymptotically guaranteed to be stronger than the ones above only for $\sigma \geq \frac{1}{2}$: the main coefficient of Corollary 3.4 turns out to be better when $\sigma > 0$ is rather close to 0, starting from around $\sigma = 0.044$, although not yet reaching the asymptotically correct value proved later in Theorem 4.6.

Proof. As per the discussion above, we let

$$g(t) = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{for } 0 < t \leq 1 - \delta, \\
\frac{1}{2} - \frac{t-1}{2\delta} & \text{for } 1 - \delta \leq t \leq 1 + \delta, \\
0 & \text{for } t > 1 + \delta.
\end{cases}$$

It is clear that $|g''|_1 = \frac{1}{2}$; hence, $\alpha = \frac{1}{16}$ and $\beta = \frac{1}{12}$, for $\alpha$ and $\beta$ as in the statement of Proposition 3.2. We also let $\delta = \frac{3}{T}$ if $\frac{1}{2} \leq \sigma \leq 1$ and $\delta = \frac{1+\sigma^{-1}}{2}$ if $0 < \sigma < \frac{1}{2}$. Then, by (3.18) and (3.19),

$$\inf_{|t||s| \geq \sigma} |1 - G(s)| \geq 1 - \begin{cases} 
\frac{1}{16} \left(1 + \frac{9}{T^2}\right) & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} \leq \sigma \leq 1 \\
\frac{1}{12} \left(1 + \frac{(1+\sigma^{-1})^2}{\sigma^2}\right) & \text{if } 0 < \sigma < \frac{1}{2},
\end{cases}$$

The bound in (3.2) now reads as follows. Write $c(\sigma)$ for $\frac{1}{8\sigma} + \frac{1}{19(2\sigma+1)} + \frac{1}{12(\sigma+1)}$. Then $I(\sigma)$ is at most

$$\frac{1}{2T} \left(\zeta(2\sigma) - \frac{1}{T^{2\sigma-1} 2\sigma - 1} \right) + \left(c(\sigma) + \frac{1}{4T (1 - \frac{9}{T^2})}\right) \frac{3^{2\sigma}}{T^{2\sigma}},$$

if $\sigma > \frac{1}{2}$,

$$\frac{1}{2T} \left(\log \frac{T}{3} + \gamma\right) + \left(c(\sigma) + \frac{1}{4T (1 - \frac{9}{T^2})}\right) \frac{3}{T},$$

if $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$, and

$$\frac{1 + \frac{1}{2}}{6T} \left(\frac{T^{1-2\sigma}}{(1-2\sigma)(1+\frac{1}{2})^{1-2\sigma}} + \zeta(2\sigma)\right) + \left(c(\sigma) + \frac{1 + \frac{1}{2}}{12T (1 - \frac{9}{T^2})}\right) \frac{(1 + \frac{1}{2})^{2\sigma}}{T^{2\sigma}},$$

if $0 < \sigma < \frac{1}{2}$. Note that $c\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) = \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{12} + \frac{1}{38} = \frac{217}{380}$. \hfill $\Box$

### 3.3 A better choice of $g$ for $\Re(s) \in \left[\frac{1}{2}, 1\right]$

The choice of $g$ in §3.2 is optimal only once we commit ourselves to bounding $|1 - G(s)|$ as in (3.18). Alternatively, we can choose $g$ from a class of functions whose Mellin transforms
$G(s)$ we can compute explicitly. We can then optimize $g$ within that class. Consider, for instance, $g : [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ such that $g$ is given by a polynomial in the interval $[1 - \delta, 1 + \delta]$, where the transition from 1 to 0 occurs. So that the conditions in Proposition 3.2 are fulfilled, we ask for

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} 1 + \sum_{k=0}^{n} a_k (1 + \delta - x)^k (1 - x)^{(1 - \delta)} k \frac{1 + \delta - x}{\delta x + 1} & \text{if } x < 1 - \delta, \\ \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } 1 - \delta \leq x \leq 1 + \delta, \\ 0 & \text{if } x > 1 + \delta, \end{cases} \quad (3.21)$$

for some appropriate parameters $n, \delta$ and a sequence $\{a_k\}_{k=0}^{n}$. This choice in turn will allow us to give the Mellin transform of such $g$ explicitly, according to Lemma 2.3.

**Lemma 3.5.** Let $g : [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R}$ be a function of the form (3.21). Suppose that (a) $a_0 = \frac{1}{2}$ and $a_1 = -\frac{1}{2}$, (b) for every $0 \leq k \leq n$ the coefficient $a_k$ has sign $(-1)^k$, (c) for every $0 \leq k < n$ we have $|a_{k+1}| \leq \frac{2k+1}{2k+3} |a_k|$. Then $g$ is continuously differentiable on $(0, \infty)$ and $0 \leq g \leq 1$ everywhere.

While having $g$ be continuously differentiable at $1 - \delta$ and $1 + \delta$ is not required by Proposition 3.2, it is certainly helpful.

**Proof.** Each of the three pieces in which $g$ is split by (3.21) is continuously differentiable, so we just have to check the property for the points $1 - \delta$ and $1 + \delta$. We have $g(1 \pm \delta) = \frac{1}{2} \mp a_0$ and setting $a_0 = \frac{1}{2}$ makes it so that $g(1 - \delta) = 1$, $g(1 + \delta) = 0$, implying the continuity of $g$. Supposing that $a_0 = \frac{1}{2}$, we also obtain $\lim_{x \to 1^-} g'(1 \pm x) = -\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2a_1}{4} = -\frac{1}{4}$ and having $a_1 = -\frac{1}{2}$ makes it so that this limit becomes 0, thus giving us the continuity of the first derivative of $g$.

To prove that $0 \leq g \leq 1$ in the interval $[1 - \delta, 1 + \delta]$, it is sufficient to show that $g'(x) \leq 0$ in that interval. If we substitute $\varepsilon = 1 - x$, we have

$$g'(x) = -\frac{1}{2} - \sum_{k=1}^{n} a_k \frac{(\varepsilon^2 - \delta^2)^k - 1}{\delta^{2k+1}} ((2k + 1)(\varepsilon^2 - \delta^2) + 2k\delta^2)$$

$$= \left( -\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2\delta^2}{4} \right) - \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} a_k \frac{(\varepsilon^2 - \delta^2)^k}{\delta^{2k+1}} (2k + 1)$$

$$- \sum_{k=2}^{n} a_k \frac{(\varepsilon^2 - \delta^2)^{k-1}}{\delta^{2k-1}} 2k - \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} a_k \frac{(\varepsilon^2 - \delta^2)^{k-1}}{\delta^{2k-1}} 2k - a_n \frac{(\varepsilon^2 - \delta^2)^n}{\delta^{2n+1}} (2n + 1)$$

$$= -\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{(\varepsilon^2 - \delta^2)^k}{\delta^{2k+1}} ((2k + 1)a_k + (2k + 2)a_{k+1}) - a_n \frac{(\varepsilon^2 - \delta^2)^n}{\delta^{2n+1}} (2n + 1).$$

Since we are working in $[1 - \delta, 1 + \delta]$ we have $\varepsilon^2 - \delta^2 \leq 0$. To ensure that the product $a_n(\varepsilon^2 - \delta^2)^n$ in the last term is not negative, it is sufficient to ask for $a_n$ to have sign $(-1)^n$. We can now proceed backwards by induction on the terms in the sum. Indeed, supposing that $(-1)^{k+1} a_{k+1} \geq 0$, in order to have $(\varepsilon^2 - \delta^2)^k ((2k + 1)a_k + (2k + 2)a_{k+1}) \geq 0$ it is enough to ask that $(-1)^k a_k \geq 0$ and $(2k + 1)|a_k| \geq (2k + 2)|a_{k+1}|$.

Computing the parameter $\beta$ in Proposition 3.2 is routine.
Lemma 3.6. Let \( g : [0, \infty) \to \mathbb{R} \) be a function of the form \([3.21]\) such that \( a_0 = \frac{1}{2} \).
Define \( \beta = \frac{1}{3} J_1^{1+\delta} |g(x)|^2 dx \). Then

\[
\beta = \sum_{i=0}^{4n+2} \frac{(-1)^i}{i+1} \sum_{j=0}^i b_{n,j} b_{n,i-l},
\]

where

\[
b_{n,j} = \sum_{k=0}^j 2^{2k-j} \left( \binom{2k+1-j}{k-j} + \binom{2k+1-j}{j-k} \right) a_k
\]

for \( 1 \leq j \leq 2n+1 \) and \( b_{n,j} = 0 \) for \( j = 0 \) or \( j > 2n+1 \).

Proof. We substitute \( y = 1+\delta - x \) inside the definition of \( g(x) \). Then, for \( 1-\delta \leq x \leq 1+\delta \),

\[
g(x) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{a_k}{\delta^{2k+1}} y^k (y-\delta)(y-2\delta)^k
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=0}^n \sum_{i=0}^k \left( (-1)^{k-i} \binom{k}{i} \frac{a_k}{\delta^{2k+1+i}} y^{k+i+1} - (-1)^{k-i} \binom{k}{i} \frac{a_k}{\delta^{2k+1+i}} y^{k+i} \right).
\]

Inside the sums, we substitute \( j = k+i+1 \) in the first term and \( j = k+i \) in the second term, we shift one summation symbol outside, with the new index \( j \), and we uniformize the range of each of the inner sums (note that their extra or missing terms are indeed 0). We obtain

\[
g(x) = \frac{1}{2} + \sum_{j=0}^{2n+1} \frac{y^j}{\delta^j} \sum_{k=0}^n (-1)^{2k+1-j} 2^{2k+1-j} \binom{k}{j-k-1} a_k
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2} + \sum_{j=0}^{2n+1} (-1)^{j+1} \frac{y^j}{\delta^j} \sum_{k=0}^n 2^{2k-j} \left( \binom{k}{j-k} + \binom{k}{j-k} \right) a_k.
\]

For \( 1 \leq j \leq 2n+1 \), we just define \( b_{n,j} \) to be as in the statement. For \( j = 0 \), we include in the definition of \( b_{n,0} \) the term \( \frac{1}{2} \) that was outside the sums, so that \( b_{n,0} = \frac{1}{2} - \sum_{k=0}^n 2^{2k} \left( \binom{k}{j-k-1} + \binom{k}{j-k} \right) a_k = \frac{1}{2} - a_0 = 0 \). Therefore

\[
g(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{2n+1} (-1)^{j+1} b_{n,j} \frac{y^j}{\delta^j} \tag{3.22}
\]

Imposing also \( b_{n,j} = 0 \) for \( j > 2n+1 \), we finally get

\[
\int_1^{1+\delta} |g(x)|^2 dx = \int_0^\delta \left( \sum_{j=0}^{2n+1} (-1)^{j+1} b_{n,j} \frac{y^j}{\delta^j} \right)^2 (-dy)
\]

24
\[
= \int_0^{4n+2} \sum_{i=0}^g \left( \sum_{l=0}^i (-1)^{l+i} b_{n,l} b_{n,i-l} \right) y^i \left| \frac{\alpha}{\sigma} \right| dy
\]
\[
= \sum_{i=0}^{4n+2} \left( \sum_{l=0}^i (-1)^{l+i} b_{n,l} b_{n,i-l} \right) \frac{\delta^{i+1}}{(i+1)\delta^i},
\]
which gives \( \beta \).

In order to choose \( \delta \) and \( g \) optimally, we need to detect first what to minimize.

**Proposition 3.7.** If \( 0 < \sigma \leq 1 \), then \( \frac{1}{2\pi} \left( \int_{\sigma-i\infty}^{\sigma+i\infty} \left| \frac{\zeta(s)}{s} \right|^2 ds \right) \) is bounded from above by quantities whose main terms are

\[
2\zeta(2\sigma) r \sum_{i=0}^{4n+2} \frac{(-1)^i}{i+1} \sum_{l=0}^i b_{n,l} b_{n,i-l} \left( 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{2n+1} \frac{2^j b_{n,l}}{r^j} \right)^2 \frac{1}{T} \left( 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{2n+1} \frac{2^j b_{n,l}}{r^j} \right)^2 \log(T) \frac{\log(T)}{T} \frac{1}{T^{2\sigma}} \frac{1}{T^{2\sigma}} \left( 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{2n+1} \frac{2^j b_{n,l}}{r^j} \right)^2
\]

where \( g \) is any polynomial of the form \( (3.21) \), for any choice of \((n,r,\{a_l\}_{k=0}^\infty)\) such that \( 0 < r \leq \frac{T}{2}, n \geq 1, \{a_l\}_{k=0}^\infty \) satisfies the conditions of Lemma 3.6, the \( b_{n,j} \) are defined as in Lemma 3.6, \( \alpha \) is defined as in Proposition 3.6, and the expression inside the square in the denominator is positive.

**Proof.** Recall inequality \( 3.17 \). By Lemma 3.5, all the conditions are met so that we can derive a bound (depending on \( \delta \)) for its numerator \( I(\sigma) \) as given in Proposition 3.2.

Let us concentrate on its denominator. For \( x \in [1 - \delta, 1 + \delta] \), we write \( g(x) \) as in \( 3.22 \), where \( y = 1 + \delta - x \). We proceed similarly for \( z = 1 - \delta - x \). Observe that, since \( g(x) = 0 \) for all \( x > 1 + \delta \) and \( g = 1 \) in \([0, 1 - \delta]\),

\[
g = \sum_{j=0}^{2n+1} (-1)^{j+1} b_{n,j} \frac{y^j}{\delta^j} I_{[0,1+\delta]} - \sum_{j=1}^{2n+1} b_{n,j} \frac{z^j}{\delta^j} I_{[0,1-\delta]}, \tag{3.24}
\]

where the \( b_{n,j} \) are as in Lemma 3.6. Now, \( g \) is written as linear combination of expressions as in \( 2.30 \) with \( a = 1 \pm \delta \), and, by Lemma 2.5, its Mellin transform is

\[
G(s) = \sum_{j=1}^{2n+1} \frac{\partial^j b_{n,j}((-1)^{j+1}(1+\delta)^{s+j} - (1-\delta)^{s+j})}{\delta^j s(s+1)\ldots(s+j)}.
\]

Furthermore, we have \(|s+1|, \ldots, |s+j| > |\Im(s)|^j \), and \( \sigma + j \leq j + 1 \) implies that \(|(1+\delta)^{s+j} \pm (1-\delta)^{s+j}| \leq (1+\delta)^{j+1} + (1-\delta)^{j+1} \), since the left hand side is an increasing
function of $\sigma$. These two facts imply that

$$\inf_{|\Omega(s)| \geq T} |1 - G(s)| \geq 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{2n+1} \frac{j! |b_{n,j}|}{\delta T^j} \sum_{i=0}^{\lfloor \frac{j}{2} \rfloor} 2^{j+1} \frac{j+1}{2i} \delta^{2i}. \quad (3.25)$$

We want $\delta$ to be small, so as to keep the upper bound in (3.22) small, but not too small, since we require the right hand expression of (3.25) to be positive and bounded away from 0.

The terms $\delta^j T^j$ in (3.25) tell us that we cannot afford more than taking $\delta = \frac{1}{r}$, which we choose, for some $0 < r \leq \frac{1}{2}$ large enough (depending only on $n$) to make the right hand side of (3.25) positive. Therefore, all conditions requested in the above paragraph hold. Let $D_{\min}$ be the square of the expression on the right of (3.25), so that $\inf_{|\Omega(s)| \geq T} |1 - G(s)|^2 \geq D_{\min}$.

Now, the substitution $\delta = \frac{1}{r}$ in the bounds (3.2) makes evident that the obtained main terms, as $T \to \infty$, are of order $\frac{1}{T^j}, \frac{\log(T)}{T^j}, \frac{\log(T)}{r^j}$ for $\frac{1}{2} < \sigma \leq 1$, $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$, $0 < \sigma < \frac{1}{2}$, respectively. Moreover, thanks to the definitions of $\alpha$, $\beta$, implemented for a function $g$ of the form (3.21), it is the choice of $\{a_k\}_{k=0}^n$ and of $r$ that will determine the optimal constants in front of these main terms.

We derive the result once we put everything together and set aside the summands of order $\frac{1}{T^j}$ that come from the inner sum defining $\sqrt{T_{\min}}$.

**Proof of Theorem 3.7** We derive first a bound for $\frac{1}{2\pi i} \left( \int_{\sigma-i\infty}^{\sigma+i\infty} \frac{|\xi(s)|^2}{s} \, ds \right)$ as presented in Proposition 3.4. As aforementioned, it is the choice of $n, a_k, 0 \leq i \leq n$ and $r$ that suffices to optimize those main terms in each case. For simplicity, we set ourselves within a particular range, where the optimization process and the consequent choice of parameters is performed according to (3.25) only for $\sigma \geq \frac{1}{2}$, the same choice being used for the remaining cases: in particular, Theorem 3.1 is guaranteed to be asymptotically stronger than Corollary 3.4 only for $\sigma \geq \frac{1}{2}$. The optimizing choice is accomplished as follows.

For $n = 2, 3$, we determine by computer all possibilities for coefficients of $g$ satisfying the conditions in Lemma 3.3 with precision $10^{-n-1}$. We then proceed inductively for larger $n$: given an optimized $g = g_i$, for a certain $n$, a better $g = g_{n+1}$ with $n + 1$ is found as follows: start with the set of coefficients provided by the optimal $g$, attaching $a_n = 0$ as a new variable, and compute the first bound in (3.25), for any fixed $\frac{1}{2} < \sigma \leq 1$ (in fact, $\sigma$ does not participate in our analysis), by adding $\tilde{x}$ to the tuple $\tilde{a} = (a_2, \ldots, a_n)$ ($a_0, a_1$ being fixed) for every $\tilde{x} \in \{(0, \pm 10^{-n-1})\}^{n-1}$ such the conditions of Lemma 3.3 hold. We thus determine an optimal $\tilde{x}$, call it $\tilde{x}_*$, and compute the first bound in (3.25) with $\tilde{a}_* = \tilde{a} + j \tilde{x}_*$, $j \geq 1$, as long as we encounter improvements, until we stop and consider the last tuple $\tilde{a}_* = \tilde{a} + (j + 1) \tilde{x}_*$, that produces an improvement on (3.25) (meaning that $\tilde{a}_* + (j + 1) \tilde{x}_*$ does not). We repeat the described process starting with $\tilde{a}_*$ rather than $\tilde{a}$ until we find an optimized set of coefficients $a_2, \ldots, a_n$ for which no increment $\tilde{x}$ produces any improvement; this final $(a_2, \ldots, a_n)$ will define $g_{n+1}$.

By taking $n = 6$, our parameters are

$$a_0 = \frac{1}{2}, \quad a_1 = -\frac{1}{4}, \quad a_3 = -\frac{533639}{10000000}, \quad a_5 = -\frac{1483}{2000000}.$$
\[ a_2 = \frac{3}{16}, \quad a_4 = \frac{10139}{1250000}, \quad a_6 = \frac{37}{1000000} \quad (3.26) \]

\( r = 5.28035 \) and \( T \geq T_0 = 200. \)

Consider \( D_{\text{min}} \) and let
\[
D_{\text{max}} = \left( 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{2n+1} \frac{2j!|b_{n,j}|}{r^j} \left( 1 + \frac{j+1}{2} \frac{r^2}{T^2} + \ldots \right) \right)^2,
\]
so that, recalling again Proposition \( 3.7 \), \( \sup_{|\Im(s)| \geq T}|1 - G(s)|^2 \leq D_{\text{max}}. \)

Given the choice in \( (3.26) \), we have
\[
\alpha = 0.12496..., \quad \beta = \frac{5173290592354408399}{114081581250000000000},
\]
\( D_{\text{min}} > 0.79831, \quad D_{\text{max}} < 1.22439. \)

Hence, the coefficient of the leading term \( \frac{1}{T} \) in the case of \( \frac{1}{2} < \sigma \leq 1 \) becomes
\[
\frac{2\beta \zeta(2\sigma)r}{D_{\text{min}}}, \quad \text{with} \quad \frac{2\beta r}{D_{\text{min}}} < 0.5999 \leq \frac{3}{5}, \quad (3.27)
\]
and the coefficients of the smaller terms \( \frac{1}{T^2}, \frac{1}{T^3} \) are bounded as follows
\[
\kappa := 27.8821 \ni r^2 + [0, 10^{-5}],
\]
\[
c_{111} := \kappa^\sigma \kappa_{111} := \kappa^\sigma \cdot 0.15659 > \frac{\kappa^{2\sigma}}{8D_{\text{min}}},
\]
\[
c_{112} := \kappa^\sigma \kappa_{112} := \kappa^\sigma \cdot 0.15655 > \frac{\alpha r^{2\sigma}}{D_{\text{min}}},
\]
\[
c_{113} := \kappa^\sigma \kappa_{113} := \kappa^\sigma \cdot 0.00079 > \frac{\alpha^2 r^{2\sigma}}{2D_{\text{min}}},
\]
\[
c_{114} := \kappa^\sigma \kappa_{114} := \kappa^\sigma \cdot 0.07407 < \kappa^\sigma \cdot \frac{2\beta (1 - 10^{-5})}{D_{\text{max}}} \leq \frac{2\beta r^{2\sigma}}{D_{\text{max}}},
\]
\[
c_{122} := \kappa^\sigma \kappa_{122} := \kappa^\sigma \cdot 0.30016 > \frac{\beta r^{2\sigma + 1}}{(1 - \frac{r^2}{T^2}) D_{\text{min}}},
\]
where the numbers \( c_{ijk} \) are the ones given in the statement.

In the case of \( \sigma = \frac{1}{2} \), the coefficient of the leading term \( \log(T) \) is, as in \( (3.27) \), bounded by \( \frac{1}{3} \), while the lower order terms \( \frac{1}{T}, \frac{1}{T^2} \) have their coefficients bounded as follows
\[
c_{21} := 2.4476 > \frac{r}{D_{\text{min}}} \left( 2\beta \gamma + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{\alpha}{2} + \frac{\alpha^2}{3} \right), \quad c_{22} := 1.58493 > \frac{\beta r^2}{D_{\text{min}}},
\]
Finally, in the case of \( 0 < \sigma < \frac{1}{2} \), the coefficients are bounded in the same way as in the case of \( \frac{1}{2} < \sigma \leq 1 \), with exception of the two that multiply terms whose sign has changed, namely
\[
c_{314} := \kappa^\sigma \kappa_{314} := \kappa^\sigma \cdot 0.11361 > \frac{2\beta r^{2\sigma}}{D_{\text{min}}}, \quad c_{30} := 0.39113 < \frac{2\beta r}{D_{\text{max}}},
\]
\[ \square \]
Remarks. The coefficient $\frac{1}{2} = 0.6$ appearing in the case $\frac{1}{2} \leq \sigma \leq 1$ is a nice but artificial threshold that the authors have set, $n = 6$ being the smallest value for which it could be reached for some choice of parameters $a_k$. These parameters, together with $r$ and $T_0$, were then determined by our choice of threshold and $n$ through computer calculations, as already described during the proof.

The chosen threshold could have been improved by choosing a larger $n$ than $n = 6$, albeit very slightly; computer investigations up to $n = 9$ did not manage to give less than 0.596. Nevertheless, the correct value in that very case, as given in Theorem 1.1 and suggested for example by the asymptotics in Theorems 7.2 and 7.3 in [31], should have been $\frac{1}{2} = 0.3183...$.

In [3] we obtain such a coefficient. However, for small values of $T$, the estimations in Theorem 3.1 coming from our work in this section are better, whence its importance.

4 The second approach: Euler-Maclaurin and a standard mean-value theorem

Rather than working directly with $\zeta$ as in §3, we work with its $L^2$ mean through a finite truncation, as given in Lemma 2.10. We will thus obtain not only bounds of the integral of $t \mapsto |\zeta(\sigma + it)|^2$ on the tails but also mean square asymptotic expressions for $\zeta$.

4.1 General bounds

We start by providing bounds for the integral of $|\zeta(s)|^2$ with general extrema. We follow two similar paths, according to whether in Lemma 2.10 the index $X$ of the sum is chosen to be a constant (as in Proposition 4.1) or dependent on $t$ (as in Proposition 4.2): the two choices are advantageous in different situations, as it will be observed in the next subsections.

Proposition 4.1. Let $\frac{1}{2} \leq \sigma \leq 1$ and $T_1, T_2$ be real numbers such that $1 \leq T_1 \leq T_2$. Then, for any $\rho > 0$, $\int_{T_1}^{T_2} |\zeta(\sigma + it)|^2 dt$ is at most

$$\begin{align*}
(1 + \rho) & \left( (T_2 - T_1 + \frac{E}{2}) f_{1,1}(\sigma, T_2) + Ef_{1,2}(\sigma, T_2) \right) \\
& + \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\rho} \right) \left( T_2^{2-2\sigma} \left( \frac{1}{T_1} - \frac{1}{T_2} \right) + \frac{D^2(T_2 - T_1)}{T_2^{2\sigma}} + 2DT_2^{1-2\sigma} \log \left( \frac{T_2}{T_1} \right) \right)
\end{align*}$$

(4.1)

where

$$
\begin{align*}
& f_{1,1}(\sigma, T) = \begin{cases} 
\log(T) + \gamma + \frac{1}{2T} & \text{if } \sigma = \frac{1}{2}, \\
\zeta(2\sigma) - \frac{1}{2(2\sigma-1)T^{2\sigma-2}} + \frac{1}{2T} & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} < \sigma \leq 1,
\end{cases} \\
& f_{1,2}(\sigma, T) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{T^{2-2\sigma}}{2(1-\sigma)} & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} \leq \sigma < 1, \\
\log(T) + \gamma + \frac{1}{2T} & \text{if } \sigma = 1,
\end{cases}
\end{align*}
$$
and the constants $D$ and $E$ are as in Lemma 2.14. with $C = [T_2]$, and as in Proposition 2.11 respectively. Moreover, for any $-1 < \rho < 0$, $\int_{T_1}^{T_2} |\zeta(\sigma + it)|^2 dt$ is bounded from below by the expression in (4.1) where $f_{1,1}^+, f_{1,2}^+$ are replaced respectively by

$$
f_{1,1}^+(\sigma, T) = \begin{cases} 
\log(T) + \gamma - \frac{1}{2\pi} - \frac{1}{2(1-\sigma)} & \text{if } \sigma = \frac{1}{2}, \\
(2\sigma - 1)\log(T) + \gamma - \frac{1}{2\pi} & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} < \sigma \leq 1,
\end{cases}
$$

$$
f_{1,2}^+(\sigma, T) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{T^2}{2(1-\sigma)} + \zeta(2\sigma - 1) - \frac{1}{2\pi} & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} \leq \sigma < 1, \\
\log(T) + \gamma - \frac{1}{2\pi} & \text{if } \sigma = 1.
\end{cases}
$$

Proof. Let $T_1, T_2$ be as in the statement. We start with Lemma 2.10, namely, for any $X \geq T_2$, we have the following upper bound inequality

$$
\int_{T_1}^{T_2} |\zeta(\sigma + it)|^2 dt \leq \int_{T_1}^{T_2} (|\zeta(t)| + |R(t)|)^2 dt, \tag{4.2}
$$

where

$$
Z(t) = \sum_{n \leq X} \frac{1}{n^s}, \quad R(t) = \left| \frac{X^{1-s}}{s-1} + \frac{D}{X^\sigma} \right|,
$$

with $s = \sigma + it$. We also obtain a lower bound inequality for the expression above by writing $|Z(t)| - |R(t)| \leq |\zeta(\sigma + it)|$. Hence, by Lemma 2.13 for any $\rho > 0$,

$$
\int_{T_1}^{T_2} (|\zeta(t)| - |R(t)|)^2 dt \geq (1 + \rho) \int_{T_1}^{T_2} |\zeta(t)|^2 dt + \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\rho} \right) \int_{T_1}^{T_2} |R(t)|^2 dt,
$$

and for any $-1 < \rho < 0$,

$$
\int_{T_1}^{T_2} (|\zeta(t)| - |R(t)|)^2 dt \geq (1 + \rho) \int_{T_1}^{T_2} |\zeta(t)|^2 dt + \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\rho} \right) \int_{T_1}^{T_2} |R(t)|^2 dt.
$$

Applying Proposition 2.11 with $T = T_2 - T_1$ and $a_n = \frac{1}{n^{\sigma+1}}$, we see that

$$
\int_{T_1}^{T_2} |Z(t)|^2 dt = \left( T_2 - T_1 + \frac{E}{2} \right) \sum_{n \leq X} |a_n|^2 + O^* \left( E \sum_{n \leq X} n |a_n|^2 \right), \tag{4.3}
$$

If $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$, we use Lemma 2.8 for the first term and $\sum_{n \leq X} 1 = |X| \leq X$ for the second. If $\frac{1}{2} < \sigma < 1$ we use Lemma 2.9 for both terms and the inequality $\zeta(2\sigma - 1) + \frac{1}{2X^{2\sigma}} < \zeta(0) + \frac{1}{2} = 0$. If $\sigma = 1$ we use Lemma 2.9 for the first and Lemma 2.8 for the second. This analysis gives the following inequalities:

$$
\int_{T_1}^{T_2} |Z(t)|^2 dt < \left( T_2 - T_1 + \frac{E}{2} \right) \left( \log(X) + \gamma + \frac{1}{2X} \right) + EX
$$

if $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$,

$$
\int_{T_1}^{T_2} |Z(t)|^2 dt < \left( T_2 - T_1 + \frac{E}{2} \right) \left( \zeta(2\sigma) - \frac{1}{(2\sigma - 1)X^{2\sigma-1}} + \frac{1}{2X^{2\sigma}} \right) + \frac{EX^{2-2\sigma}}{2(1-\sigma)}
$$
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if \( \frac{1}{2} < \sigma < 1 \), and

\[
\int_{T_1}^{T_2} |Z(t)|^2 dt < \left(T_2 - T_1 + \frac{E}{2}\right) \left(\zeta(2) - \frac{1}{X} + \frac{1}{2X^2}\right) + E \left(\log(X) + \gamma + \frac{1}{2X}\right)
\]

if \( \sigma = 1 \). Analogous lower bound inequalities can be deduced respectively, using the same lemmas.

As for the second term in (4.2),

\[
\int_{T_1}^{T_2} |R(t)|^2 dt = \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \left|\frac{X^{1-s}}{s-1}\right|^2 + \frac{D^2}{X^{s\gamma}} \left|\frac{X^{1-s}}{s-1}\right| dt. \tag{4.4}
\]

Thanks to our condition \( \rho > -1 \) for the lower bound, and as we want non-trivial lower bounds, with \( R(t) \) being smaller in magnitude than \( Z(t) \), it suffices to have only an upper bound for (4.4). Hence, in order to bound the expression on the above right side, we observe that

\[
\int_{T_1}^{T_2} \left|\frac{X^{1-s}}{s-1}\right|^2 dt \leq X^{2-2\sigma} \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \frac{dt}{t^2} = X^{2-2\sigma} \left(\frac{1}{T_1} - \frac{1}{T_2}\right).
\]

For the second term we simply have \( \int_{T_1}^{T_2} D^2 X^{-2\sigma} dt = (T_2 - T_1) D^2 X^{-2\sigma} \), while the third one is bounded as

\[
\int_{T_1}^{T_2} \frac{2D}{X^\sigma} \left|\frac{X^{1-s}}{s-1}\right| dt \leq 2DX^{1-2\sigma} \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \frac{dt}{t} = 2DX^{1-2\sigma} \log \left(\frac{T_2}{T_1}\right).
\]

We obtain then

\[
\int_{T_1}^{T_2} |R(t)|^2 dt \leq X^{2-2\sigma} \left(\frac{1}{T_1} - \frac{1}{T_2}\right) + \frac{D^2(T_2 - T_1)}{X^{2\sigma}} + 2DX^{1-2\sigma} \log \left(\frac{T_2}{T_1}\right).
\]

Putting everything together, and imposing \( X = T_2 \) in order to minimize the various terms that arise (\( X < T_2 \) is not possible, by the conditions in Lemma 2.10), we obtain the result in the statement.

**Proposition 4.2.** Let \( \frac{1}{2} \leq \sigma \leq 1 \) and \( T_1, T_2 \) be real numbers such that \( 1 \leq T_1 \leq T_2 \). Then, for any \( \rho > 0 \), \( \int_{T_1}^{T_2} |\zeta(\sigma + it)|^2 dt \) is at most

\[
(1 + \rho) \left(f_{2,1}^+(\sigma, T_1, T_2) + Ef_{2,2}^+(\sigma, T_2)\right) + \left(1 + \frac{1}{\rho}\right)f_{2,3}^+(\sigma, T_1, T_2), \tag{4.5}
\]

where

\[
f_{2,1}^+(\sigma, T_1, T_2) = \begin{cases}
T_2 \log(T_2) - T_1 \log(T_1) - (1 - \gamma)(T_2 - T_1) \\
\quad + \frac{1}{2}(\log(T_2) - \log(T_1)) & \text{if } \sigma = \frac{1}{2}, \\
\zeta(2\sigma)(T_2 - T_1) & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} < \sigma \leq 1,
\end{cases}
\]
We start with the bound in Lemma 2.10. For $s \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\sigma > 1/2$, we have

\[
\frac{f_{2,2}^+(\sigma, T_2)}{T_2^2} \leq \left( \frac{\log(T_2) + \frac{\rho}{2} + \frac{1}{4\sigma}}{2(1-\sigma)} \right) \frac{1}{1-\sigma}^2 + \frac{1}{4\sigma^2} \quad \text{if } \frac{1}{2} < \sigma < 1,
\]

and the constants $D$ and $E$ are as in Lemma 2.10 with $C = [T_2]$ and as in Proposition 2.11, respectively. Moreover, for any $-1 < \rho < 0$, $\int_{T_1}^{T_2} |\zeta(s + it)|^2 dt$ is bounded from below by the expression in (4.5) where $f_{2,1}^+, f_{2,2}^+, f_{2,3}^+$ are replaced respectively by

\[
f_{2,1}^-(\sigma, T_1, T_2) = \begin{cases} T_2 \log(T_2) - T_1 \log(T_1) - (1 - \gamma)(T_2 - T_1), \\ -\frac{\rho}{2} (\log(T_2) - \log(T_1)), \end{cases}
\]

if $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$,

\[
f_{2,2}^-(\sigma, T_2) = -f_{2,2}^+(\sigma, T_2),
\]

and

\[
f_{2,3}^-(\sigma, T_1, T_2) = f_{2,3}^+(\sigma, T_1, T_2).
\]

**Proof.** We start with the bound in Lemma 2.10. For $s = \sigma + it$ and $X = t$, by the triangle inequality we get

\[
\int_{T_1}^{T_2} |\zeta(s + it)|^2 dt = \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \left| \sum_{n \leq t} \frac{1}{n^{\sigma+it}} \right|^2 dt + O^\nu \left( 2 \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \left| \sum_{n \leq t} \frac{1}{n^{\sigma+it}} \right| \left| \frac{t^{1-s}}{s-1} \right| dt \right) 
\]

\[
+ 2D \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \left| \sum_{n \leq t} \frac{1}{n^{\sigma+it}} \right| t^{-\sigma} dt + \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \left| \frac{1}{s-1} \right|^2 \left| t^{1-s} \right| dt 
\]

\[
+ 2D \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \left| \frac{1}{s-1} \right|^2 \left| t^{1-s} \right| dt + D^2 \int_{T_1}^{T_2} t^{-2\sigma} dt. \quad (4.6)
\]

The second and third term in (4.6) can be treated using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and reduced to the other integrals in the expression. Observe that the integrands $\left| \frac{1}{n^{\sigma+it}} \right|^2$ are both bounded from above by $t^{-2\sigma}$, so that all of their integrals are bounded by $\frac{1}{\sigma^2}$ if $\frac{1}{2} < \sigma \leq 1$ and by $\log \left( \frac{T_2}{T_1} \right)$ if $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$. Using then Lemma 2.13 we get

\[
\int_{T_1}^{T_2} |\zeta(s + it)|^2 dt \leq (1 + \rho) \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \left| \sum_{n \leq t} \frac{1}{n^{\sigma+it}} \right|^2 dt + \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\rho} \right) f_{2,3}^+(\sigma, T_1, T_2), \quad (4.7)
\]

and an analogous lower bound inequality for $-1 < \rho < 0$.
We want now to estimate the first term in (4.7), namely we want bounds for the integral \( \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \left| \sum_{n \leq t} a_n e^{i\lambda_n t} \right|^2 dt \), where in our case \( a_n = \frac{1}{n} \in \mathbb{R}^+ \) and \( \lambda_n = -\log(n) \).

First, note that
\[
\int_{T_1}^{T_2} \left| \sum_{n \leq t} a_n e^{i\lambda_n t} \right|^2 dt = \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \left( \sum_{n \leq t} a_n e^{i\lambda_n t} \right) \left( \sum_{n \leq t} a_n e^{i\lambda_n t} \right) dt
\]
\[
= \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \sum_{n \leq t} a_n \overline{a_n} dt + \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \sum_{l \neq r} a_l \overline{a_r} e^{i(\lambda_l - \lambda_r) t} dt. \tag{4.8}
\]

If \( \frac{1}{2} < \sigma \leq 1 \), the first integral in (4.8) is
\[
\int_{T_1}^{T_2} |a_n|^2 dt = \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \left( \zeta(2\sigma) - \frac{t^{1-2\sigma}}{2\sigma - 1} + O^* \left( \frac{1}{2t^{2\sigma}} \right) \right)
\]
by Lemma 2.9, so that
\[
\zeta(2\sigma)(T_2 - T_1) - \frac{T_2^{2-2\sigma} - T_1^{2-2\sigma}}{2(1-\sigma)(2\sigma - 1)} - \frac{T_2^{1-2\sigma} - T_1^{1-2\sigma}}{2(2\sigma - 1)}
\leq \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \sum_{n \leq t} |a_n|^2 dt \leq \zeta(2\sigma)(T_2 - T_1), \tag{4.9}
\]
using that \( \frac{t^{1-2\sigma}}{2\sigma - 1} \geq t^{-2\sigma} \) (under our conditions for \( \sigma, t \)), and we can extract an analogous lower bound.

If \( \sigma = \frac{1}{2} \), the first integral is bounded from above as
\[
\int_{T_1}^{T_2} \sum_{n \leq t} |a_n|^2 dt \leq \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \left( \log(t) + \gamma + \frac{1}{2t} \right) dt
\]
\[
= T_2 \log(T_2) - T_1 \log(T_1) - (1 - \gamma)(T_2 - T_1)
\]
\[
+ \frac{1}{2} \left( \log(T_2) - \log(T_1) \right), \tag{4.10}
\]
by Lemma 2.9, from which we can derive an analogous lower bound.

As for the second integral in (4.8), consider first \( T_1, T_2 \) integers for simplicity: we make use of the fact that a sum for \( l, r \leq t \) is the same as a sum for \( l, r \leq |t| \) and get
\[
\int_{T_1}^{T_2} \sum_{l, r \leq t \atop l \neq r} a_l \overline{a_r} e^{i(\lambda_l - \lambda_r) t} dt = \left( \int_{T_1}^{T_1+1} + \ldots + \int_{T_2-1}^{T_2} \right) \sum_{l, r \leq t \atop l \neq r} a_l \overline{a_r} e^{i(\lambda_l - \lambda_r) t} dt
\]
\[
= \sum_{j=t}^{T_2-1} \sum_{l, r \leq j \atop l \neq r} a_l \overline{a_r} e^{i(\lambda_l - \lambda_r)(j+1) - e^{i(\lambda_l - \lambda_r)j}} i(\lambda_l - \lambda_r) \]
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Theorem 4.3. Let statement. 2.9 and \( \sum \) improving on Montgomery and Vaughan [25, (1.7)] and obtain

\[
\sum_{\lambda_i, \lambda_r \neq \lambda_f \in T_1} a_i \frac{e^{i(\lambda_i - \lambda_r)T} - e^{i(\lambda_i - \lambda_r)T}}{\lambda_i - \lambda_r}.
\]

(4.11)

The above second fraction is always bounded in absolute value by 2, while the first one is bounded by \( \frac{a_{T_1}}{|\lambda_i - \lambda_f|} \). For \( T_1, T_2 \) generic, we have to consider two additional integrals \( \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \); we obtain however the same bound as in (4.11), with the summation going up to \( [T_2] \) and with \( T_1 \) replaced by \( [T_1] \). Subsequently, we can use Preissmann’s improvement [27] on Montgomery and Vaughan [25] (1.7) and obtain

\[
\left| \int_{T_1}^{T_2} a_i \frac{e^{i(\lambda_i - \lambda_r)T}}{\lambda_i - \lambda_r} dt \right| \leq E \sum_{n \leq T_2} \frac{|a_n|^2}{\min_{n' \neq n} |\lambda_n - \lambda_{n'}|},
\]

(4.12)

where \( E \) is as in Proposition 2.11, the denominator being bounded from above by the inequality \( \log \left( \frac{\lambda_{T_1}}{\lambda_{T_2}} \right) > (n + \frac{1}{2})^{-1} \) for \( n \geq 1 \). Finally, by recurring to Lemmas 2.8 and 2.9 and \( \sum_{n \leq T_2} 1 \leq T_2 \) in the right hand side of (4.12), we obtain \( \int_{T_1}^{T_2}(\sigma, T_2) \) as in the statement.

4.2 Mean value estimates of \( \zeta(s) \) for \( \Re(s) \in \left[ \frac{1}{2}, 1 \right] \)

**Theorem 4.3.** Let \( T \geq T_0 = 4 \). Then

\[
\int_1^T \left| \zeta \left( \frac{1}{2} + it \right) \right|^2 dt \leq T \log(T) + 7.84217 \cdot T + 19.89904 \cdot \sqrt{T} \log(T),
\]

\[
\int_1^T \left| \zeta \left( \frac{1}{2} + it \right) \right|^2 dt \geq T \log(T) - 8.68774 \cdot T - 5.21518 \cdot \sqrt{T} \log(T).
\]

Moreover, for \( \frac{1}{2} < \sigma < 1 \),

\[
\int_1^T |\zeta(\sigma + it)|^2 dt \leq \zeta(2\sigma)T + C^+(\sigma) \cdot \max \{ T^{2-2\sigma}, \sqrt{T} \}
\]

\[
\int_1^T |\zeta(\sigma + it)|^2 dt \geq \zeta(2\sigma)T - C^-(\sigma) \cdot \max \{ T^{2-2\sigma}, \sqrt{T} \}
\]

with

\[
C^+(\sigma) = \frac{7.44602}{1 - \sigma} - \frac{8.57634}{2\sigma - 1} + 1.24281
\]

\[
C^-(\sigma) = \frac{0.70046}{(1 - \sigma)(2\sigma - 1)} - \frac{4.13248}{1 - \sigma} + \frac{5.52185}{2\sigma - 1} + 1.7842.
\]
Finally, \[
\int_1^T |\zeta(1 + it)|^2 \, dt \leq \pi^2 / 6 \, T + \pi \sqrt{2} / 3 \sqrt{T} + 22.23757 \cdot \log(T)
\]
\[
\int_1^T |\zeta(1 + it)|^2 \, dt \geq \pi^2 / 6 \, T - \pi \sqrt{2} / 3 \sqrt{T} + 0.20288 \cdot \log(T).
\]

Proof. We substitute \( T_1 = 1 \) inside either Proposition 4.1 or Proposition 4.2, according to which one gives us the best result. Our choice of \( \rho \) for the upper bound will be the square root of the ratio between the leading terms of the expressions multiplying \( 1 + 1/\rho \) and \( 1 + \rho \) respectively, the same choice with a negative sign corresponding to the lower bound. Such choice will be very close to the optimal one highlighted by Lemma 2.13, but simpler and easier to handle.

For \( \frac{1}{2} \leq \sigma < 1 \), Proposition 4.2 is the better alternative, as \( \rho \) will be qualitatively smaller than in Proposition 4.1 and the second order terms will be of smaller order (the error terms arising in the alternative case being of order \( T \sqrt{\log(T)} \) and \( T^{\frac{1}{2} - \sigma} \)). For \( \sigma = \frac{1}{2} \), we set \( \rho = \frac{1 + D}{\sqrt{2}} \) (where \( D \) is as in the proof of Lemma 2.10 choosing \( C = \lceil T_0 \rceil \)) and by imposing \( T \geq T_0 \) we merge all lower order terms into two terms; the condition \( T_0 = 4 \) is employed to make sure that \( \sqrt{T} \log(T) \) is indeed the second highest error term and that we actually get \( -\rho > -1 \), in order to apply Proposition 4.2 in the lower bound correctly.

Finally, when \( \sigma = 1 \), the better alternative is Proposition 4.1, the error terms obtained through these two theorems being qualitatively the same, but worse constants arising by Proposition 4.2. We set then \( \rho = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\zeta(2)}} \) and, by imposing \( T \geq T_0 \) in order to simplify the second order terms, we conclude the result.

4.3 Extension of asymptotic formulas

We prove here a proposition that will allow us to extend the asymptotic formulas in the previous subsection to the case \( \sigma < \frac{1}{2} \), via the functional equation (2.11): it is essentially an instance of integration by parts that requires some additional conditions to be performed correctly.

Proposition 4.4. Let \( I = [a_0, a_1] \) be an interval of the real line (\( a_i = \pm \infty \) is allowed). Let \( Z : I \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \) be an integrable function such that, for every \( T_1, T_2 \in I \) with \( T_1 \leq T_2 \), we have the following inequalities

\[
F(T_1, T_2) - r^-(T_1, T_2) \leq \int_{T_1}^{T_2} Z(t) \, dt \leq F(T_1, T_2) + r^+(T_1, T_2),
\]  

(4.13)

where \( F, r^+ \) and \( r^- \) are non-negative real functions, such that \( F \) is differentiable and, for every pair \( T_1, T_2 \in I \), \( F(T_2, T_2) = F(T_1, T_1) = 0 \).

Let \( f : I \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \) be a differentiable function such that \( f' \) is integrable satisfying either \( f' \geq 0 \) or \( f' \leq 0 \) and such that either \( f(a_0) = 0 \) or \( f(a_1) = 0 \). We have the following
cases.

(i) If \( f(a_0) = 0 \) (so \( f' \geq 0 \)) and \( \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \int_{a_0}^{T_2} |f'(u)| Z(t) du \) \( d \) \( dt \) converges for every \( T_1, T_2 \in \mathbb{I} \) with \( T_1 \leq T_2 \), then

\[
\int_{T_1}^{T_2} f(t) Z(t) dt \leq \int_{a_0}^{T_2} \left( -f(u) \frac{\partial F(u, T_2)}{\partial u} + f'(u) r^+(u, T_2) \right) du,
\]

\[
\int_{T_1}^{T_2} f(t) Z(t) dt \geq \int_{a_0}^{T_2} \left( -f(u) \frac{\partial F(u, T_2)}{\partial u} - f'(u) r^-(u, T_2) \right) du.
\]

(ii) If \( f(a_1) = 0 \) (so \( f' \leq 0 \)) and \( \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \int_{0}^{a_1} |f'(u)| Z(t) du \) \( d \) \( dt \) converges for every \( T_1, T_2 \in \mathbb{I} \) with \( T_1 \leq T_2 \) and \( \lim_{u \to a_1} f(u) F(T_1, u) = 0 \), then

\[
\int_{T_1}^{T_2} f(t) Z(t) dt \leq \int_{T_1}^{a_1} \left( f(u) \frac{\partial F(T_1, u)}{\partial u} - f'(u) r^+(T_1, u) \right) du,
\]

\[
\int_{T_1}^{T_2} f(t) Z(t) dt \geq \int_{T_1}^{a_1} \left( f(u) \frac{\partial F(T_1, u)}{\partial u} + f'(u) r^-(T_1, u) \right) du.
\]

Proof. As \( f' \) is integrable, so is \( |f| \). Suppose first that \( f(a_0) = 0 \); by the Fundamental Theorem of Calculus, for every \( t \in [T_1, T_2] \), \( f(t) = \int_{a_0}^{t} f'(u) du \). Then

\[
\int_{T_1}^{T_2} f(t) Z(t) dt = \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \int_{a_0}^{t} f'(u) Z(t) du \] \( d u \).

Observe that, under the above conditions, \( \mathbb{1}_{[a_0, t]}(u) \mathbb{1}_{[t, T_2]}(u) = \mathbb{1}_{[a_0, T_2]}(u) \). Since the double integral \( \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \int_{a_0}^{T_2} |f'(x)| Z(t) dx \) \( d t \) converges, by Fubini’s Theorem, we can exchange the order of integration in the above equation and obtain

\[
\int_{T_1}^{T_2} f(t) Z(t) dt = \int_{a_0}^{T_2} f'(u) \int_{u}^{T_2} Z(t) dt du
\]

\[
\leq \int_{a_0}^{T_2} f'(u) (F(u, T_2) + r^+(u, T_2)) du
\]

\[
= - \int_{a_0}^{T_2} f(u) \frac{\partial F(u, T_2)}{\partial u} du + \int_{a_0}^{T_2} f'(u) r^+(u, T_2) du,
\]

where we have used integration by parts in the last step. We also derive the following lower bound

\[
- \int_{a_0}^{T_2} f(u) \frac{\partial F(u, T_2)}{\partial u} du - \int_{a_0}^{T_2} f'(u) r^-(u, T_2) du.
\]

Case (ii) is obtained by proceeding in a similar manner as above, keeping in mind that \( f(t) = - \int_{a_1}^{T_2} f'(u) du \) for \( t \in [T_1, T_2] \) and \( \mathbb{1}_{[t, a_1]}(u) = \mathbb{1}_{[T_1, u]}(t) \mathbb{1}_{[T_1, a_1]}(u) \), and then using Fubini’s Theorem and integration by parts. Here, the condition \( \lim_{u \to a_1} f(u) F(T_1, u) = 0 \) is employed so as to make sure that if \( a_1 = \infty \), integration by parts is well-performed. \( \square \)
The sign condition on \( f' \) in Proposition 4.4 is not necessary; under the other conditions, one can derive an analogous result by writing \( f' = f'_+ - f'_- \), where \( f_\pm = \max\{\pm f', 0\} \). In that case, the \( a \in \mathbb{I} \) such that \( f(a) = 0 \) need not necessarily be an extremum of \( \mathbb{I} \), and if \( T_1 < a < T_2 \), one can derive bounds by applying case (i) to \( \int_{a}^{T_2} f(t)Z(t)dt \) and case (ii) to \( \int_{T_1}^{a} f(t)Z(t)dt \).

Inequalities like (4.13) approximate \( \int_{T_1}^{T_2} Z(t)dt \) by \( F(T_1, T_2) \), for all \( T_1 \leq T_2 \) in a given interval, if we can assure that \( \max\{r^+(T_1, T_2), r^-(T_1, T_2)\} \) is of lower magnitude than \( F(T_1, T_2) \). If, under the conditions given in the above theorem, we additionally suppose that \( u \mapsto F(u, T_2) \) is decreasing and \( u \mapsto F(T_1, u) \) is increasing, then we can interpret that \( \int_{T_1}^{T_2} Z(t)dt \) and \( F(T_1, T_2) \) are behaving similarly. Unsurprisingly, those very conditions assure that \( u \mapsto -\frac{\partial F(u, T_2)}{\partial u} \) and \( u \mapsto \frac{\partial F(T_1, u)}{\partial u} \) are non-negative and that, for every well-behaved non-negative function \( f \), \( \int_{T_1}^{T_2} f(t)Z(t)dt \) is asymptotic to \( -\int_{a}^{T_2} f(u)\frac{\partial F(u, T_2)}{\partial u}du \) or to \( \int_{T_1}^{a} f(u)\frac{\partial F(T_1, u)}{\partial u}du \), depending on the cases in Proposition 4.4 and provided that in each one of those cases the absolute value of remaining integrals involving \( r^+ \) and \( r^- \) is of lower magnitude.

### 4.4 Mean value estimates of \( \zeta(s) \) for \( \Re(s) \in [0, \frac{1}{2}) \): using the functional equation

Thanks to Proposition 4.4, we are going to give asymptotic formulas for the integral of \( |\zeta(\sigma + it)|^2 \) in the case \( 0 \leq \sigma < \frac{1}{2} \).

**Theorem 4.5.** If \( 0 < \sigma < \frac{1}{2} \) and \( T \geq T_0 = 4 \), then

\[
\int_1^T |\zeta(\sigma + it)|^2 dt \leq \frac{\zeta(2 - 2\sigma)}{(2\pi)^{1 - 2\sigma}(2 - 2\sigma)} T^{2 - 2\sigma} + L^+(\sigma) T,
\]

\[
\int_1^T |\zeta(\sigma + it)|^2 dt \geq \frac{\zeta(2 - 2\sigma)}{(2\pi)^{1 - 2\sigma}(2 - 2\sigma)} T^{2 - 2\sigma} - L^-(\sigma) T,
\]

where

\[
L^+(\sigma) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{1 - 2\sigma}} \left( \frac{45.33876}{\sigma} + \frac{54.25956}{1 - 2\sigma} + 26.9013 \right),
\]

\[
L^-(\sigma) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{1 - 2\sigma}} \left( \frac{37.07382}{\sigma} + \frac{52.56085}{1 - 2\sigma} + 19.95395 \right).
\]

If \( \sigma = 0 \) and \( T \geq T_0 = 4 \), then

\[
\int_1^T |\zeta(it)|^2 dt \leq \frac{\pi}{24} T^2 + 3.98664 \cdot T \log(T) + 7.36493 \cdot T,
\]

\[
\int_1^T |\zeta(it)|^2 dt \geq \frac{\pi}{24} T^2 - 0.12432 \cdot T \log(T) - 7.36493 \cdot T.
\]

**Proof.** Consider \( \sigma \) such that \( 0 \leq \sigma < \frac{1}{2} \). By using the functional equation (2.11) of \( \zeta \) and knowing that \( |\zeta(s)| = |\zeta(\overline{s})|, |\Gamma(s)| = |\Gamma(\overline{s})| \), we readily see that

\[
\int_1^T |\zeta(\sigma + it)|^2 dt = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{2 - 2\sigma}} \int_1^T \left| 2 \sin \left( \frac{\pi s}{2} \right) \Gamma(1 - \sigma + it) \zeta(1 - \sigma + it) \right|^2 dt \tag{4.14}
\]
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Let \( s = \sigma + it \) with \( t \geq 1 \). For every complex number \( z \) we have the identity \( |\sin(z)|^2 = \cosh^2(3z) - \cos^2(\Re(z)) \) (combine 4.5.7 and 4.5.54 in [1]). Hence

\[
|\sin \left( \frac{\pi s}{2} \right)|^2 = e^{\pi t} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{e^{\pi t}} \left( 2 + \frac{1}{e^{\pi t}} - 4 \cos^2 \left( \frac{\pi \sigma}{2} \right) \right) \right) = \frac{e^{\pi t}}{4} \left( 1 + O^* \left( \frac{2}{e^{\pi t}} \right) \right),
\]

(4.15)
since \( \frac{1}{2} < \cos^2 \left( \frac{\pi \sigma}{2} \right) \leq 1 \) for the choice of \( \sigma \). Moreover, using Corollary 2.7,

\[
|\Gamma(1 - \sigma + it)| = \sqrt{2\pi t} \left| \frac{1}{e^{\pi t}} \right| e^{\pi t} e^{O^* \left( \frac{G_{1-\sigma}}{t} \right)},
\]

where \( G_{1-\sigma} = \frac{(1-\sigma)^2}{4} + \frac{(1-\sigma)^2}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} = \frac{3}{4} \). We then verify that

\[
E^{\Omega(\frac{2}{e^{4} \pi t})} = 1 + O^* \left( \frac{K_1}{t} \right), \quad \text{where} \quad K_1 = e^{\frac{t}{4}} - 1, \quad \text{as} \quad t(e^{\frac{t}{4}} - 1) \quad \text{is decreasing for} \quad t \geq 1.
\]

This observation, alongside (4.15), allows us to derive in (4.14) that

\[
\int_1^T |\zeta(\sigma + it)|^2 dt = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{1-2\sigma}} \int_1^T t^{1-2\sigma} |\zeta(1 - \sigma + it)|^2 \left( 1 + O^* \left( \frac{K_2}{t} \right) \right) dt,
\]

where \( K_2 \) is defined through the following chain of inequalities

\[
\left( 1 + \frac{2}{e^{\pi t}} \right) \left( 1 + \frac{K_1}{t} \right) = 1 + \frac{2K_1}{t} + \frac{K_1^2}{t^2} + \frac{2}{e^{\pi t}} + \frac{4K_1}{te^{\pi t}} + \frac{2K_1^2}{t^2 e^{\pi t}} \\
\quad \leq 1 + \left( \frac{2K_1}{t} + \frac{2}{e^{\pi t}} + \frac{4K_1}{e^{\pi t}} + \frac{2K_1^2}{e^{\pi t}} \right) \frac{1}{t} = 1 + \frac{K_2}{t},
\]

as \( \frac{1}{e^{\pi t}} \leq \frac{1}{t} \) and since \( \frac{\pi t}{2} \) is increasing for \( t \geq 1 \). We conclude that

\[
\int_1^T |\zeta(\sigma + it)|^2 dt = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{1-2\sigma}} \int_1^T t^{1-2\sigma} |\zeta(1 - \sigma + it)|^2 dt \\
+ O^* \left( \frac{K_2}{(2\pi)^{1-2\sigma}} \int_1^T t^{1-2\sigma} \frac{|\zeta(1 - \sigma + it)|^2 dt}{t^{2\sigma}} \right).
\]

(4.16)

In order to estimate the integrals above, recall Proposition 4.4; we can derive bounds for them by recurring to the bounds of \( \int_1^T |\zeta(1 - \sigma + it)|^2 dt \) given in Theorem 4.3 and the functions \( t \mapsto t^{1-2\sigma} \), \( t \mapsto t^{-2\sigma} \), respectively. This approach, while simpler, produces a noticeable lost of accuracy in second order terms, as according to cases (i), (ii), there is an inevitable integration on the variable \( u \) that is needed on the corresponding remainders \( r^\pm \), which themselves are here independent of \( u \). One can do better by studying \( \int_1^T |\zeta(1 - \sigma + it)|^2 dt \) for \( 1 - \sigma \in \left( \frac{1}{2}, 1 \right) \) and \( 1 \leq u \leq T \).

We proceed then as in the proof of Theorem 4.3 and with the general bound given in Proposition 4.1. We select \( \rho = \frac{T^{\sigma - \frac{1}{8}}}{\sqrt{\zeta(2 - 2\sigma)u}} \): the variable \( u \) in its denominator is why Proposition 4.1 is a better choice than Proposition 4.2, as it allows us to use Proposition 4.4 non-trivially, opposite to the choice of \( \rho \) given by Proposition 4.2 which depends
solely on $T$. Afterwards, we merge second order terms according to either $u \geq 1$ or $u \leq T$, recalling Lemma 2.12 and that $T \geq T_0$. The final bounds are

\[
\int_u^T |\zeta(1 - \sigma + it)|^2 dt \leq \zeta(2 - 2\sigma)(T - u) + r^+(u, T),
\]

\[
\int_u^T |\zeta(1 - \sigma + it)|^2 dt \geq \zeta(2 - 2\sigma)(T - u) - r^-(u, T),
\]

(4.17)

where

\[
r^\pm(u, T) = \begin{cases} 
2\sqrt{\zeta(2 - 2\sigma)} \left( \frac{T^{1-\sigma}}{\sqrt{u}} + \frac{D\sqrt{\pi}}{T^{\frac{1}{2} - \sigma}} \log \left( \frac{T}{u} \right) \right) + N^\pm(\sigma)T^{2\sigma} & \text{if } 0 < \sigma < \frac{1}{2}, \\
\pi \sqrt{\frac{2T}{3\sigma}} + W^\pm \log(T) & \text{if } \sigma = 0,
\end{cases}
\]

(4.18)

As per the remark above, the terms that appear with variable $u$ in the definition of $r^\pm(u, T)$ are exactly those that otherwise would have given larger error terms if we had just taken $r^\pm$ independent of $u$.

We further verify by (4.17) that the conditions of Proposition 4.4 are met with the increasing function $f(t) = t^{1-2\sigma} - 1$, $Z(t) = |\zeta(1 - \sigma + it)|^2$ and $a_0 = 1$ (we cannot use $f(t) = t^{1-2\sigma}$ directly as (4.17) is only valid for $u \geq 1$). We split the integral as

\[
\int_1^T t^{1-2\sigma}|\zeta(1 - \sigma + it)|^2 dt = \int_1^T (t^{1-2\sigma} - 1)|\zeta(1 - \sigma + it)|^2 dt + \int_1^T |\zeta(1 - \sigma + it)|^2 dt,
\]

and the second integral is already bounded by (4.17). For the first, we thus apply Proposition 4.4(i) using the bound in (4.17) as

\[
\int_1^T (t^{1-2\sigma} - 1)|\zeta(1 - \sigma + it)|^2 dt 
\leq \int_1^T (u^{1-2\sigma} - 1)|\zeta(2 - 2\sigma) + (1 - 2\sigma)u^{-2\sigma} \left( 2\sqrt{\zeta(2 - 2\sigma)} T^{\frac{1}{2} + \sigma} u^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) + 2 \sqrt{\zeta(2 - 2\sigma)} DT^{\frac{1}{2} - \sigma} u^{\frac{1}{2}} \log \left( \frac{T}{u} \right) + N^+(\sigma)T^{2\sigma} ) du 
\leq \int_0^T u^{-2\sigma} \zeta(2 - 2\sigma) + (1 - 2\sigma) \left( 2\sqrt{\zeta(2 - 2\sigma)} T^{\frac{1}{2} + \sigma} u^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) + N^+(\sigma)T^{2\sigma} ) du + \int_1^T 2 \sqrt{\zeta(2 - 2\sigma)} DT^{\frac{1}{2} - \sigma} u^{\frac{1}{2}} \log \left( \frac{T}{u} \right) - \zeta(2 - 2\sigma) du 
= \frac{\zeta(2 - 2\sigma)}{2 - 2\sigma} T^{2-2\sigma} + 4 \sqrt{\zeta(2 - 2\sigma)} T + N^+(\sigma)T
\]
\[ + (1 - 2\sigma)2\sqrt{\zeta(2 - 2\sigma)}D^{T1-\sigma - T\sigma - \frac{1}{2}}(\frac{T}{2 - 2\sigma}) - \zeta(2 - 2\sigma)(T - 1). \]

Notice that in one occasion in the second inequality we have used the simplification \( f'(u) = (1 - 2\sigma)u^{-2\sigma} < (1 - 2\sigma)w^{-\sigma} \), so as to shift a pole arising at \( \sigma = \frac{1}{2} \), upon integration on the variable \( u \), towards \( \sigma = \frac{1}{2} \); the bounds will now be finite on the variable \( \sigma \) in the range \((0, \frac{1}{2})\) that we are analyzing. At any rate, a bound concerning solely the \( \sigma \) variable does keep the magnitude on the variable \( T \), so there is no loss of accuracy in that matter.

We proceed similarly for the lower bound (a term \(-\frac{\zeta(2 - 2\sigma)}{2 - 2\sigma}\) emerging in that case from the approximations) and for the case \( \sigma = 0 \). Using also Lemma 2.12 and \( \frac{\zeta(2 - 2\sigma)}{(2 - 2\sigma)^{2}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \), we obtain

\[
\int_{1}^{T} t^{1-2\sigma}|\zeta(1 - \sigma + it)|^{2} dt \leq \frac{\zeta(2 - 2\sigma)}{2 - 2\sigma}T^{2-2\sigma} + S^{+}(\sigma, T),
\]
\[
\int_{1}^{T} t^{1-2\sigma}|\zeta(1 - \sigma + it)|^{2} dt \geq \frac{\zeta(2 - 2\sigma)}{2 - 2\sigma}T^{2-2\sigma} - S^{-}(\sigma, T),
\]
where

\[
S^{+}(\sigma, T) = \begin{cases} 
\left( \frac{16.5399}{\sigma} + \frac{17.2084}{1 - 2\sigma} + 19.59757 \right) T & \text{if } 0 < \sigma < \frac{1}{2}, \\
W^+ T \log(T) + 2\pi \sqrt{\frac{T}{4}} & \text{if } \sigma = 0,
\end{cases}
\]
\[
S^{-}(\sigma, T) = \begin{cases} 
\left( \frac{3.26495}{\sigma} + \frac{15.5006}{1 - 2\sigma} + 12.65021 \right) T & \text{if } 0 < \sigma < \frac{1}{2}, \\
W^- T \log(T) + 2\pi \sqrt{\frac{T}{4}} & \text{if } \sigma = 0.
\end{cases}
\]

Finally, concerning the error term of \( \frac{\zeta(s)}{s} \), conditions of Proposition 4.4 are not met with \( f(t) = t^{-2\sigma} \) and \( 0 < \sigma < \frac{1}{2} \). Therefore we apply the weaker bound \( t^{-2\sigma} < 1 \); as we only aim to have an error term of order \( T \), this choice suffices for our needs. We recall then Theorem 4.3 with \( 1 - \sigma \) instead of \( \sigma \) and derive the result.

4.5 Square mean of \( \frac{\zeta(s)}{s} \) on the tails: asymptotically sharp bounds

We will use the bounds for \( \zeta(s) \) given in the previous sections and the machinery of Proposition 4.4 to retrieve upper bounds for \( \frac{\zeta(s)}{s} \).

**Theorem 4.6.** Let \( T \geq T_{0} = 4 \); let \( L^{+}, N^{+} \) be as in Theorem 4.3 and let \( D \) be defined as in Lemma 2.10 with \( C = \lceil T_{0} \rceil \). Then \( \int_{T}^{\infty} \frac{\zeta(s)^{2}}{s^{2}} ds \) is bounded from above by

\[
\frac{\zeta(2 - 2\sigma)}{2\sigma(2\pi)^{1-2\sigma}} \cdot \frac{1}{T^{2\sigma}} + 2L^{+}(\sigma) \cdot \frac{1}{T} \quad \text{if } 0 < \sigma < \frac{1}{2},
\]
\[
\log(T) \cdot \frac{1}{T} + 17.68433 \cdot \frac{1}{T} + 39.29126 \cdot \frac{\log(T)}{T^{2}} \quad \text{if } \sigma = \frac{1}{2},
\]
\[
\zeta(2\sigma) \cdot \frac{1}{T} + \left( 2N^{+}(1 - \sigma) + (D + 4)\sqrt{\zeta(2\sigma)} \right) \cdot \frac{1}{T^{2\sigma}} \quad \text{if } \frac{1}{2} < \sigma < 1,
\]
\[
\frac{\sigma^{2}}{6} \cdot \frac{1}{T} + 25.04878 \cdot \frac{\log(T)}{T^{2}} + 15.94452 \cdot \frac{1}{T^{2}} \quad \text{if } \sigma = 1.
\]
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Proof. All the conditions of Proposition 4.4 are verified by taking \( T_1 = T \geq 1, T_2 = \infty \), \( f(t) = \frac{1}{\sigma^2 + t^2} \) (decreasing for \( t \geq 1 \)) and \( a_1 = \infty \).

We apply case (ii) of the proposition and the simplifications \( u^2 < \sigma^2 + u^2 \) and \( -\omega J_0 - (\sigma^2 + u^2)\omega < 2u^{-3} \) to obtain

\[
\int_T^\infty \frac{|\zeta(s)|^2}{|s|^2} \, dt < \int_T^\infty \left( \frac{1}{u^2} \frac{\partial F(T, u)}{\partial u} + 2 \frac{u}{u^2} r^+(T, u) \right) \, du,
\]

for appropriate choices of \( F \) and \( r^+ \), which are taken as follows.

For \( \sigma < \frac{1}{2} \), we use Theorem 4.5, paired with the trivial observation that the integral of \( |\zeta(s)|^2 \, dt \) in \([T, u]\) is bounded by the same integral in \([1, u]\). For \( \sigma = \frac{1}{2} \), we recall Theorem 4.3 with the same observation. Finally, when \( \frac{1}{2} < \sigma \leq 1 \), we rather use the upper bound given by (4.17) (with \( \sigma \) replaced by \( 1 - \sigma \)).

When \( \sigma = 0 \), observe by Proposition 4.4 that the main term of \( \int_T^\infty \frac{|\zeta(s)|^2}{|s|^2} \, dt \) is \( \pi^2 \frac{1}{12} \int_T^\infty \frac{u}{\sigma^2 + u^2} \, du = \pi^2 \cdot \frac{1}{12} \log(\sigma^2 + u^2) \bigg|_T^\infty = \infty \), so that that integral is divergent.

## 5 Numerical considerations

In case (1) of Theorem 1.1, only the bound from Theorem 4.6 is shown, since it is always stronger than the one from Theorem 3.1. In case (3), the threshold 244728 is where the second bound becomes better than the first; mind that the constant 18.67 is the result of a calculation that depends on the threshold itself, namely, on how the third order term in Theorem 4.6 is being absorbed.

In case (2), \( T = 590 \) is the lowest integer at which for at least one \( \sigma \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1) \) the second bound becomes strictly better than the first. Indeed, this threshold is achieved in the whole \( \sigma \in [0.922, 0.926] \). For other values of \( \sigma \), the initial integer \( T \) become higher; we report them in the table below for all \( \sigma \in \frac{1}{100} \mathbb{N} \cap (\frac{1}{2}, 1) \). Considering the two more refined bounds given in Theorems 3.1 and 4.6, we also perform a comparison of thresholds for \( \sigma \in \frac{1}{100} \mathbb{N} \cap (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{4}{3}) \); it turns out that Theorem 4.6 is better than Theorem 3.1 starting from a much lower \( T \).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( \sigma )</th>
<th>Threshold for Thm. 1.1</th>
<th>( \sigma )</th>
<th>Threshold for Thms. 3.1, 4.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>352356132263088480</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>&gt;10^{-40}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>697348116</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>218949227265880768513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>951010</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1566611725095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>37868</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>95107257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>5907</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>186207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1863</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>1665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>&lt;200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>&lt;200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>&lt;200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In case (4), the lowest integer at which for at least one \( \sigma \in (0, \frac{1}{2}) \) the second bound is stricter than the first is less than 200, so that the first would not be valid anyway given the condition on \( T \) inherited from Theorem 3.1. We write in the table below the...
integer thresholds $T$ either between the bounds of the main theorem or between those in Theorems 3.1 and 4.6. As in the previous case, the more precise bounds give lower thresholds (although more moderately).

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
\sigma & \text{Threshold for Thm. 1.1} & \text{Threshold for Thms. 3.1, 4.6} \\
\hline
0.05 & <200 & <200 \\
0.1 & 266 & <200 \\
0.15 & 463 & 230 \\
0.2 & 1101 & 636 \\
0.25 & 4162 & 2712 \\
0.3 & 34886 & 24878 \\
0.35 & 1454298 & 234170294 \\
0.4 & 3592735197 & 2345975294 \\
0.45 & 15818538360716224640 & 41341871153784131585 \\
\hline
\end{array}$$

No particular meaning should be attached to lower digits of the larger entries of the two tables above, given that we are working with bounds with a limited number of significative digits.

As a last remark, mind that the loss of precision in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 with respect to Theorems 3.1, 4.6, 4.3 and 4.5 may be quite significant, especially for $\sigma \notin \{0, \frac{1}{2}, 1\}$. In §1, the exposition of results favored simplicity, provided that it showed the correct asymptotical behavior of the main terms and the correct order of the error terms for $T \to \infty$ and $\sigma$ tending to $0, \frac{1}{2}, 1$. Readers committed to obtain sharper numerical bounds are advised and encouraged to rely on the stronger estimates given in §3 and §4.
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