

The method of Pintz for the Ingham question about the connection of distribution of ζ -zeros and order of the error in the PNT in the Beurling context *

Szilárd Gy. Révész

July 5, 2022

Abstract

We prove two results, generalizing long existing knowledge regarding the classical case of the Riemann zeta function and some of its generalizations. These are concerned with the question of Ingham who asked for optimal and explicit order estimates for the error term $\Delta(x) := \psi(x) - x$, given any zero-free region $\mathcal{D}(\eta) := \{s = \sigma + it \in \mathbb{C} : \sigma := \Re s \geq 1 - \eta(t)\}$. In the classical case essentially sharp results are due to some 40 years old work of Pintz.

Here we consider a given a system of Beurling primes \mathcal{P} , the generated arithmetical semigroup \mathcal{G} and the corresponding integer counting function $\mathcal{N}(x)$, and the corresponding error term $\Delta_{\mathcal{P}}(x) := \psi_{\mathcal{P}}(x) - x$ in the PNT of Beurling, where $\psi_{\mathcal{P}}(x)$ is the Beurling analog of $\psi(x)$. First we prove that if the Beurling zeta function $\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}$ does not vanish in $\mathcal{D}(\eta)$, then the extension of Pintz' result holds: $|\Delta_{\mathcal{P}}(x)| \leq x \exp((1 + \varepsilon)\omega_{\eta}(\log x))$ ($x > x_0(\varepsilon)$), where $\omega_{\eta}(y) := \mathcal{L}(\eta)(y)$ is the naturally occurring Legendre transform of $\eta(t)$, introduced into the field by Ingham.

In the second part we prove a converse: if $\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}$ has an infinitude of zeroes in the given domain, then analogously to the classical case, $|\Delta_{\mathcal{P}}(x)| \geq x \exp((1 - \varepsilon)\omega_{\eta}(\log x))$ holds "infinitely often". This also shows that both main results are sharp apart from the arbitrarily small $\varepsilon > 0$. Moreover, we prove both main results in an even sharper form (also due to subsequent work of Pintz in the classical case), with strong localization of x -values of high oscillation and a domain-free description of the effect through an ω -function (introduced by Pintz) which depend directly on the distribution of ζ -zeroes.

The classical results of Pintz used many facts about the Riemann zeta function. Recently we worked out a number of analogous results—including some construction of quasi-optimal integration paths, a Riemann-von Mangoldt type formula, a Carlson-type density theorem and a Turán type local density theorem—for the Beurling context, too. These, together with Turán's power sum theory, all play some indispensable role in deriving the main results of the paper.

MSC 2000 Subject Classification. Primary 11M41; Secondary 11F66, 11M36, 30B50, 30C15.

Keywords and phrases. *Beurling zeta function, analytic continuation, arithmetical semigroups, Knopfmacher's Axiom A, Beurling prime number theorem, zero of the Beurling zeta function, oscillation of remainder term, Mellin transform.*

Author information. Alfréd Rényi Institute of Mathematics
Reáltanoda utca 13-15, 1053 Budapest, Hungary
revesz.szilard@renyi.hu

*Supported in part by Hungarian National Foundation for Scientific Research, Grant # K-119528 and K-132097

1 Introduction

In the Beurling's theory of generalized integers and primes, \mathcal{G} is a unitary, commutative semigroup, with a countable set \mathcal{P} of indecomposable generators, called the *primes* of \mathcal{G} , which freely generate¹ the whole of \mathcal{G} .

Moreover, there is a *norm* $|\cdot| : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ so that the following hold. First, the image of \mathcal{G} , $|\mathcal{G}| \subset \mathbb{R}_+$ is *discrete*, i.e. any finite interval of \mathbb{R}_+ can contain the norm of only a finite number of elements of \mathcal{G} ; thus the function

$$\mathcal{N}(x) := \#\{g \in \mathcal{G} : |g| \leq x\} \quad (1)$$

exists as a finite, nondecreasing, right continuous, nonnegative integer valued function on \mathbb{R}_+ . Second, the norm is multiplicative, i.e. $|g \cdot h| = |g| \cdot |h|$; it follows that for the unit element e of \mathcal{G} $|e| = 1$, and that all other elements $g \in \mathcal{G}$ have norms strictly larger than 1.

We will assume the so-called "*Axiom A*" of Knopfmacher, see pages 73-79 of [29].

Definition 1. \mathcal{N} satisfies Axiom A – more precisely, Axiom A(κ, θ) with the constants $\kappa > 0$ and $0 < \theta < 1$ – if we have² for the remainder term $\mathcal{R}(x) := \mathcal{N}(x) - \kappa(x - 1)$ the estimate

$$|\mathcal{R}(x)| \leq Ax^\theta \quad (\kappa, A > 0, 0 < \theta < 1 \text{ constants, } x \geq 1 \text{ arbitrary}). \quad (2)$$

The Beurling zeta function is defined as the Mellin transform of $\mathcal{N}(x)$, i.e.

$$\zeta(s) := \zeta_{\mathcal{G}}(s) := \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{N})(s) := \int_1^\infty x^{-s} d\mathcal{N}(x) = \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \frac{1}{|g|^s}. \quad (3)$$

If only $\mathcal{N}(x) = O(x^C)$, the series converges absolutely and locally uniformly in the halfplane $\Re s > C + 1$, moreover, its terms can be rearranged to provide the *Euler product formula*

$$\zeta_{\mathcal{G}}(s) = \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} \left(\frac{1}{1 - |p|^{-s}} \right). \quad (4)$$

In particular, if $\mathcal{N}(x) = O(x^{1+\varepsilon})$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$, then $\zeta_{\mathcal{G}}$ is absolutely convergent in $\Re s > 1$, it cannot vanish there—as is clear from (4)—moreover, $|\zeta(s)| \geq 1/\zeta(\sigma)$ ($\sigma := \Re s$). Furthermore, under Axiom A it admits a meromorphic, essentially analytic continuation $\kappa \frac{1}{s-1} + \int_1^\infty x^{-s} d\mathcal{R}(x)$ up to $\Re s > \theta$ with only one, simple pole at 1. For an analysis of the finer behavior of the number of primes $\pi_{\mathcal{P}}(x) := \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}; |p| \leq x} 1$ —as in the classical case of $\mathcal{G} = \mathbb{N}$ —the location of the zeroes of $\zeta(s)$ in the "critical strip" $\theta < \Re s \leq 1$ is decisive, as we will see.

The Beurling zeta function (3) can be used to express the generalized von Mangoldt function

$$\Lambda(g) := \Lambda_{\mathcal{G}}(g) := \begin{cases} \log |p| & \text{if } g = p^k, k \in \mathbb{N} \text{ with some prime } p \in \mathcal{G} \\ 0 & \text{if } g \in \mathcal{G} \text{ is not a prime power in } \mathcal{G} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

¹In exact terms this means that any element $g \in \mathcal{G}$ can be uniquely written (up to order of terms) in the form $g = p_1^{k_1} \cdots p_m^{k_m}$: two (essentially) different such expressions are necessarily different as elements of \mathcal{G} , while each element has its (essentially) own unique prime decomposition.

²The usual formulation uses the more natural version $\mathcal{R}(x) := \mathcal{N}(x) - \kappa x$. However, our version is more convenient with respect to the initial values at 1, as we here have $\mathcal{R}(1 - 0) = 0$. All respective integrals of the form \int_1^∞ will be understood as integrals from $1 - 0$, and thus we can avoid considering endpoint values in the partial integration formulae. Alternatively, we could have taken also $\mathcal{N}(x)$ left continuous, and integrals from 1 in the usual sense: also with this convention we would have $\mathcal{R}(1) = 0$.

as coefficients of the logarithmic derivative of the zeta function

$$-\frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(s) = \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \frac{\Lambda(g)}{|g|^s}. \quad (6)$$

The Beurling theory of generalized primes investigates the summatory function

$$\psi(x) := \psi_{\mathcal{G}}(x) := \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}, |g| \leq x} \Lambda(g). \quad (7)$$

The asymptotic relation $\psi(x) \sim x$ is equivalent to say that $\pi(x) := \sum_{p \in \mathcal{P}, p \leq x} 1$ satisfies $\pi(x) \sim \text{li}(x) := \int_2^x du/\log u$ or $\pi(x) \sim x/\log x$, and is thus termed as *the Prime Number Theorem* (PNT). Equivalently, we can also formulate this by use of the "error term in the prime number formula", for which the standard notation is

$$\Delta(x) := \Delta_{\mathcal{G}}(x) := \psi(x) - x. \quad (8)$$

Then PNT is thus the statement that $\Delta(x) = o(x)$. The so-called "Chebyshev bounds" $x \ll \psi(x) \ll x$ mean that there are constants $0 < c < C < \infty$ with $cx \leq \psi(x) \leq Cx$. Much study was devoted to describe, what conditions are necessary resp. sufficient for PNT or the Chebyshev bounds to hold in the generality of Beurling systems [66, 67, 72, 15, 14]. [3, 25, 7, 11, 16, 69, 70]. Another much studied question, which simply does not arise in the classical case, is density and asymptotics of $\mathcal{N}(x)$ [13, 27, 9]. Still another direction, going back to Beurling himself, is the study of analogous questions in case the assumption of Axiom A is weakened to e.g. an asymptotic condition on $\mathcal{N}(x)$ with a product of x and a sum of powers of $\log x$, or sum of powers of $\log x$ perturbed by almost periodic polynomials in $\log x$, or $N(x) - cx$ periodic, see [3], [72], [18], [48].

There are other studies related to the Beurling PNT in the literature. In particular, some rough (as compared to our knowledge in the prime number case) estimates and equivalences were worked out in the analysis of the connection between ζ -zero distribution and the behavior of the error term $\Delta(x)$. One of the deep results in this direction is the extension of the classical oscillation result $\pi(x) - \text{li}(x) = \Omega_{\pm}(\sqrt{x} \log \log \log x / \log x)$ of Littlewood [31] to the Beurling context [26]. Further, so-called (α, β) systems and (α, β, γ) systems were defined [34], with these parameters denoting the "best possible" exponents in estimating the error terms $\mathcal{R}(x)$, $\Delta(x)$ and the summatory function $M_{\mathcal{G}}(x)$ of the Beurling version of the Möbius function $\mu_{\mathcal{G}}(g)$; in particular, it is known that the two largest of these three parameters have to be at least $1/2$ and must match [21], [34]. Oscillation order of the generalized Möbius summatory function and even more general arithmetical functions are also treated up to recent times [19, 16, 10, 5, 42].

The interest in the Beurling theory was greatly boosted by a construction of Diamond, Montgomery and Vorhauer [12]. They basically showed that under Axiom A the Riemann hypothesis may still fail; moreover, nothing better than the most classical [65] zero-free region and error term of

$$\zeta(s) \neq 0 \quad \text{whenever} \quad s = \sigma + it, \quad \sigma > 1 - \frac{c}{\log t}, \quad (9)$$

and

$$\psi(x) = x + O(x \exp(-c\sqrt{\log x})) \quad (10)$$

follows from (2) at least if $\theta > 1/2$.

Therefore, e.g. Vinogradov estimates and many other stuff cannot hold in this generality, and for Beurling zeta functions only a restricted variety of arguments can be implemented.

After the Diamond-Montgomery-Vorhauer paper [12], better and better examples were constructed for arithmetical semigroups with very "regular" and very "irregular" behavior and zero- or prime distribution, see e.g. [1], [6], [12], [21], [71]. For an analysis of these directions as well as for much more information the reader may consult the monograph [17].

In sum, in contrast with the classical natural number system, when it is generally believed that the Riemann Hypothesis holds true, in the generality of arithmetical semigroups many different scenarios occur. It is all the more natural to extend the questions, originally posed in the classical case by Littlewood [30] and of Ingham [23], what *explicit, effective* conclusions can be drawn for the oscillation of the error term $\Delta(x)$ from the existence of a given ζ -zero, or from the existence of an infinitude of ζ -zeroes within a given domain, and, conversely, what can be the best order estimates assuming a given zero-free region. However, to date, only a few attempts were made to *generally* describe the intimate correspondence between the location of the zeros of the Beurling zeta function ζ on the one hand and order estimates or oscillation results for the remainder term $\Delta(x)$ on the other hand.

In the classical case of the Riemann zeta function the problem of Littlewood was first answered by Turán [63], based on his celebrated power sum method [62], [60]. The Turán result then was sharpened in several steps [56], [28], [35], [47], and were extended to various more general contexts, in particular to the case of prime ideals of algebraic number fields, see [58, 55, 44, 47]. These effective results also furnished some localizations, where the large oscillations should occur, while related works [40, 41, 52, 38] produced various versions where the sharpness of the estimate was a little bit sacrificed in exchange for sharper localizations, a trade-off so characteristic in these results.

Let us describe in more detail the development around Ingham's problem, as it will be our main topic here for the Beurling case. We start with upper bounds following from localization of the set of zeroes of the Riemann ζ function. Denote by $\eta(t) : (0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1/2]$ a nonincreasing function and consider the domain

$$\mathcal{D}(\eta) := \{s = \sigma + it \in \mathbb{C} : \sigma > 1 - \eta(t), t > 0\}. \quad (11)$$

Ingham defined the function ω_η formally³ as

$$\omega_\eta(x) := \min_{t>1} \eta(t) \log x + \log t = \min_{v:=\log t>0} \eta(e^v)u + v, \quad (12)$$

also writing in the last form the logarithmic variables $v := \log t$ and $u := \log x$. It will be called Ingham's function corresponding to η . With this, Ingham showed the following [23].

Theorem 1 (Ingham). *Assume that for the Riemann zeta function $\zeta(s) \neq 0$ in the domain (11) i.e. for $\Re s \geq 1 - \eta(t)$, where $s = \sigma + it$ and η is a strictly decreasing continuously differentiable function with $1/\eta(t) = O(\log t)$ and $\eta'(t)$ tending to 0 with $t \rightarrow \infty$.*

Then we have $|\Delta(x)| = O(x \exp(-(1/2 - \varepsilon)\omega_\eta(x)))$.

While in the opposite direction there were several results [64], [57], but it was Pintz who observed that Ingham's Theorem 1 involves a loss⁴ of a factor 1/2 in the exponent, so that to have both ways sharp results one needs to improve upon that, too. Subsequently he indeed could prove the improved result in [36], while allowing more general functions than Ingham could.

³This can as well be expressed by means of the classical Legendre transform of a function:

$$\min_{v:=\log t>0} \eta(e^v)u + v = \min_{w:=\phi(v):=-\eta(e^v)} -wu + \phi^{-1}(w) = -\sup_w wu - \phi^{-1}(w) =: -\mathcal{L}(\phi^{-1})(u).$$

⁴In view of the necessary technicalities, we shall explain later in the sequel why one should optimally expect $\approx x \exp(\omega_\eta(x))$ in Theorem 1.

Theorem 2 (Pintz). *Let η be a continuous decreasing function. If there $\zeta(s) \neq 0$ in $\mathcal{D}(\eta)$, then for arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$ we have $\Delta(x) = O(x \exp(-(1 - \varepsilon)\omega_\eta(x)))$.*

Coming to results in the opposite direction, i.e. to lower estimation of the oscillation order of $\Delta(x)$ corresponding to assumption on penetration of zeroes into (11), first effective results in this direction were also obtained by Turán [64] in the log power case and then Stas [57] for general curves. Later, these results were sharpened and extended to various cases, in particular to prime ideal distribution [59], [28]. For the natural number system, the optimal result was then achieved by Pintz in [36].

Theorem 3 (Pintz). *Conversely, assume that there is an infinite sequence of zeroes within the domain (11), where $\eta(t)$ is a continuously differentiable strictly convex function.*

Then we have for any $\varepsilon > 0$ the oscillation $\Delta(x) = \Omega(x \exp(-(1 + \varepsilon)\omega_\eta(x)))$.

This result then was extended to prime ideal distribution, too [45].

The present work is part of a series. In [50] we proved a number of technical auxiliary results including the Riemann-von Mangoldt formula (24). In [49] we worked out three theorems on the distribution of zeroes of the Beurling zeta function in the critical strip, two of them proving to be crucial in our present work. The first one is a Carlson-type density estimate for zeroes in the critical strip, see Theorem 7, for which we needed two additional assumptions, to be described below in Subsection 3.4. This forces us to assume these here, too. Second, we extended to the Beurling case a classic local density type estimate of Turán, see Lemma 9. Next, in [51] we dealt with the problem of Littlewood in the Beurling case, and obtained the following.

Theorem 4. *Let $\zeta(\rho_0) = 0$ with $\rho_0 = \beta_0 + i\gamma_0$ and $\beta_0 > \theta$, $\gamma_0 > 0$. Then for arbitrary $0 < \varepsilon < 0.1$ and $\log Y > Y_0(\varepsilon, \rho_0) := \max \left\{ \frac{5 \log \frac{1}{\beta_0 - \theta}}{\beta_0 - \theta}, \frac{\log(8/\varepsilon)}{\beta_0 - \theta}, \frac{40}{\varepsilon^2 \gamma_0^4}, \log |\rho_0|, A_9 \right\}$, there exists an x in the interval*

$$I := \left[Y, Y^{A_{10} \frac{\log(\gamma_0 + 5)}{(\beta_0 - \theta)^2}} \right], \quad (13)$$

such that

$$|\Delta(x)| > \left(\frac{\pi}{2} - \varepsilon \right) \frac{x^{\beta_0}}{|\rho_0|}. \quad (14)$$

Interestingly, the best constant in (14) is indeed $\pi/2$. To construct counterexamples, however, required the full strength of the recent sharpening [5] by Broucke and Vindas of the Diamond, Montgomery and Vorhauer method.

Here we generalize the above results of Pintz in the direct and converse Ingham problem to the Beurling case, assuming Axiom A and the two further conditions in Subsection 3.4.

Theorem 5. *Let the arithmetical semigroup \mathcal{G} satisfy Axiom A, Condition B and Condition G, too. Assume that $\eta(t) : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \theta)$ is a nonincreasing function. If $\mathcal{D}(\eta)$ is free of zeroes of the Beurling zeta function $\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}$, then for arbitrary $\varepsilon > 0$ we have $\Delta_{\mathcal{P}}(x) = O(x \exp(-(1 - \varepsilon)\omega_\eta(x)))$.*

Theorem 6. *Conversely, let us assume that there are infinitely many zeroes of $\zeta_{\mathcal{P}}$ within the domain (11), where $\eta(t)$ is convex in logarithmic variables (i.e. $\eta(e^v)$ is convex).*

Then we have for any $\varepsilon > 0$ the oscillation estimate $\Delta_{\mathcal{P}}(x) = \Omega(x \exp(-(1 + \varepsilon)\omega_\eta(x)))$.

Remark 1. This is slightly stronger than Theorem 3 of Pintz, for he requires $\eta'(t)$ increasing, while here we need only $\frac{d}{dv}(\eta(e^v)) = \eta'(e^v)e^v = \eta'(t) \cdot t$ increasing. In the most interesting special cases of $\eta(t) = c \log^p(\log t) \log^q t$, with $q < 0$ and $p \in \mathbb{R}$, these conditions are both satisfied, however.

On our way towards answering the Ingham question, we will need a result similar to Theorem 4 but with a much better localization for the occurring value of x . Basically, instead of (13) we need an interval of the type $[X^{1-\varepsilon}, X]$. That we can get at the expense of some restrictions on the zero considered and a slight loss in the oscillation magnitude obtained, see Theorem 10 below. This corresponds to Theorem 2 of [35] in the classical case.

In fact, we will prove some even stronger statements than the above Theorems 5 and 6, whose formulation needs further explanations and technicalities and whence they will be discussed in due course in the sequel only, see in particular the end of Section 4. These correspond to recent⁵ advances of Pintz [38] in the classical case.

We need to mention another direction here, which seem to originate from a paper by Knapowsky [28] in the classical case. Namely, from similar assumptions he obtained a lower estimate for the mean value $D(x) := \int_1^x |\Delta(u)| du$, too. Also this was improved to a very sharp, essentially optimal form by Pintz [40] [41] [38], but here we cannot extend his results to the Beurling case. The main reason is that he used Vinogradov estimates heavily, while we found surpassing that part of the argument very hard, essentially not working. To the essentially weaker result on $D(x)$, what we can obtain in the general Beurling context, we may return later. However, already here we employed certain finer calculus and estimates at some steps, than merely necessary for the proofs of our statements here, in the good hope that these finer estimates will be of use in further investigations—in particular concerning $D(x)$. Also we discussed some other "aggregate quantities" like $Z_a(x)$ and $W_a(x)$ to be defined in the sequel, and estimated $S(x) := \max_{[1,x]} |\Delta(x)|$, too. For "direct" Ingham type theorems with these see in particular Theorem 9 and the following discussion.

2 Some auxiliary lemmas

Lemma 1. *For $a > 0$, $b \in \mathbb{C}$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$, we have*

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{c-i\infty}^{c+i\infty} e^{as^2+bs} ds = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi a}} \exp\left(-\frac{b^2}{4a}\right). \quad (15)$$

Proof. This directly computable formula is taken – as in [47] – from [35], formula (10.2). \square

Lemma 2. *The following estimates hold true.*

- (i) For any $B \geq 1/2$,

$$\int_B^\infty e^{-x^2} dx < e^{-B^2}.$$

- (ii) For any $0 \leq \lambda \leq 2$ and $B \geq 1$ we have

$$\int_B^\infty x^\lambda e^{-x^2} dx < B^{\lambda-1} e^{-B^2}.$$

- (iii) For any $\lambda \geq 1$, $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $x \geq 1$ we have

$$\log^\lambda x \leq e^{\lambda/\alpha + \lambda^2} x^\alpha.$$

The proofs are easy direct calculations. For (i) and (iii) see also [47].

⁵Note that these surfaced decades later than his above cited original achievements.

Lemma 3 (Continuous form of the Second Main Theorem of Turán's Power Sum Theory). *If $0 < H < K$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $w_j \in \mathbb{C}$ ($j = 1, \dots, n$) are arbitrary complex numbers with $\Re w_1 = 0$, then we have*

$$\max_{H \leq M \leq K} \Re \left(\sum_{\ell=1}^n e^{i w_\ell M} \right) \geq \left(\frac{K-H}{8eK} \right)^n.$$

For the proof see [62] or [60].

3 Auxiliary results on the Beurling ζ function

Here we collect some basic estimates and technical lemmas on the behavior of the Beurling ζ function. Most of them are well-known, see, e.g., [29] or [2] or [17]. In [50] we elaborated on their proofs only for the explicit handling of the arising constants in these estimates. However, the Riemann-von Mangoldt formula in Proposition 1 and the Carlson type density estimate Theorem 7 were first given in [50] and [49], respectively.

3.1 Estimates for the number of zeros of ζ

In general in this paper we will use with arbitrary $a, \alpha \in [0, 1)$ and $0 < R < T$ the notations

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}(a; T) &:= \{\rho = \beta + i\gamma : \Re \rho = \beta \geq a, |\gamma| \leq T\}, \\ \mathcal{Z}(a, \alpha; T) &:= \{\rho = \beta + i\gamma : \Re \rho = \beta \in [a, \alpha), |\gamma| \leq T\}, \\ \mathcal{Z}(a; R, T) &:= \{\rho = \beta + i\gamma : \Re \rho = \beta \geq a, R < |\gamma| \leq T\}, \\ \mathcal{Z}(a, \alpha; R, T) &:= \{\rho = \beta + i\gamma : \Re \rho = \beta \in [a, \alpha), R < |\gamma| \leq T\}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

That is, e.g., $\mathcal{Z}(a; T)$ and $\mathcal{Z}(a; R, T)$ are the set of Beurling zeta zeroes in the rectangle $[a, 1] \times [-iT, iT]$ and $[a, 1] \times [-iT, -iR] \cup (iR, iT]$, respectively. Their number plays an essential role in the study of the Beurling zeta function: the standard notations for them are $N(a, T) := \#\mathcal{Z}(a; T)$ and $N(a; R, T) := \#\mathcal{Z}(a; R, T)$.

Lemma 4. *Let $\theta < b < 1$ and consider any height $T \geq 5$. Then the number of zeta-zeros $N(b, T)$ in the rectangle $\mathcal{Z}(b; T)$ satisfies*

$$N(b, T) \leq \frac{1}{b-\theta} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} T \log T + \left(2 \log(A + \kappa) + \log \frac{1}{b-\theta} + 3 \right) T \right\}. \quad (17)$$

Lemma 5. *Let $\theta < b < 1$ and consider any heights $T > R \geq 5$.*

Then the number of zeta-zeros $N(b, R, T)$ in the rectangle $\mathcal{Z}(b, R, T)$ satisfies⁶

$$N(b, R, T) \leq \frac{1}{b-\theta} \left\{ \frac{4}{3\pi} (T-R) \left(\log \left(\frac{11.4(A + \kappa)^2}{b-\theta} T \right) \right) + \frac{16}{3} \log \left(\frac{60(A + \kappa)^2}{b-\theta} T \right) \right\}. \quad (18)$$

In particular, for the zeroes between $T-1$ and $T+1$ we have for $T \geq 6$

$$N(b, T-1, T+1) \leq \frac{1}{(b-\theta)} \left\{ 6.2 \log T + 6.2 \log \left(\frac{(A + \kappa)^2}{b-\theta} \right) + 24 \right\}. \quad (19)$$

⁶This statement and the results of the forthcoming Lemmas 7 and 8 are slightly corrected in view of a calculation error detected in their original proofs. The corrections result only in the change of some coefficients and were explained in somewhat more detail in [49].

3.2 The logarithmic derivative of the Beurling ζ

Lemma 6. *Let $z = a + it_0$ with $|t_0| \geq e^{5/4} + \sqrt{3} = 5.222\dots$ and $\theta < a \leq 1$. With $\delta := (a - \theta)/3$ denote by S the (multi)set of the ζ -zeroes (listed according to multiplicity) not farther from z than δ . Then we have*

$$\left| \frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(z) - \sum_{\rho \in S} \frac{1}{z - \rho} \right| < \frac{9(1 - \theta)}{(a - \theta)^2} \left(22.5 + 14 \log(A + \kappa) + 14 \log \frac{1}{a - \theta} + 5 \log |t_0| \right). \quad (20)$$

Furthermore, for $0 \leq |t_0| \leq 5.23$ an analogous estimate (without any term containing $\log |t_0|$) holds true:

$$\left| \frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(z) + \frac{1}{z - 1} - \sum_{\rho \in S} \frac{1}{z - \rho} \right| \leq \frac{9(1 - \theta)}{(a - \theta)^2} \left(34 + 14 \log(A + \kappa) + 18 \log \frac{1}{a - \theta} \right). \quad (21)$$

Lemma 7. *For any given parameter $\theta < b < 1$, and for any finite and symmetric to zero set $\mathcal{A} \subset [-iB, iB]$ of cardinality $\#\mathcal{A} = n$, there exists a broken line $\Gamma = \Gamma_b^{\mathcal{A}}$, symmetric to the real axis and consisting of horizontal and vertical line segments only, so that its upper half is*

$$\Gamma_+ = \bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \{[\sigma_{k-1} + it_{k-1}, \sigma_{k-1} + it_k] \cup [\sigma_{k-1} + it_k, \sigma_k + it_k]\},$$

with $\sigma_j \in [\frac{b+\theta}{2}, b]$, ($j \in \mathbb{N}$), $t_0 = 0$, $t_1 \in [4, 5]$ and $t_j \in [t_{j-1} + 1, t_{j-1} + 2]$ ($j \geq 2$) and satisfying that the distance of any \mathcal{A} -translate $\rho + i\alpha$ ($i\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$) of a ζ -zero ρ from any point $s = t + i\sigma \in \Gamma$ is at least $d := d(t) := d(b, \theta, n, B; t)$ with

$$d(t) := \frac{(b - \theta)^2}{4n \left(12 \log(|t| + B + 5) + 51 \log(A + \kappa) + 31 \log \frac{1}{b - \theta} + 113 \right)}. \quad \text{!!!!} \quad (22)$$

Moreover, the same separation from translates of ζ -zeros holds also for the whole horizontal line segments $H_k := [\frac{b+\theta}{2} + it_k, 2 + it_k]$, $k = 1, \dots, \infty$, and their reflections $\overline{H}_k := [\frac{b+\theta}{2} - it_k, 2 - it_k]$, $k = 1, \dots, \infty$, and furthermore the same separation holds from the translated singularity points $1 + i\alpha$ of ζ , too.

Lemma 8. *For any $0 < \theta < b < 1$ and symmetric to \mathbb{R} translation set $\mathcal{A} \subset [-iB, iB]$, on the broken line $\Gamma = \Gamma_b^{\mathcal{A}}$, constructed in the above Lemma 7, as well as on the horizontal line segments $H_k := [a + it_k, 2 + it_k]$ and \overline{H}_k , $k = 1, \dots, \infty$ with $a := \frac{b+\theta}{2}$, we have uniformly for all $\alpha \in \mathcal{A}$*

$$\left| \frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(s + i\alpha) \right| \leq n \frac{1 - \theta}{(b - \theta)^3} \left(10 \log(|t| + B + 5) + 60 \log(A + \kappa) + 42 \log \frac{1}{b - \theta} + 140 \right)^2. \quad (23)$$

3.3 A Riemann-von Mangoldt type formula of prime distribution with zeroes of the Beurling ζ

We denote the set of ζ -zeroes, lying to the right of Γ , by $\mathcal{Z}(\Gamma)$, and denote $\mathcal{Z}(\Gamma, T)$ the set of those zeroes $\rho = \beta + i\gamma \in \mathcal{Z}(\Gamma)$ which satisfy $|\gamma| \leq T$. The next statement is Theorem 5.1 from [50].

Proposition 1 (Riemann–von Mangoldt formula). *Let $\theta < b < 1$ and $\Gamma = \Gamma_b^{\{0\}}$ be the curve defined in Lemma 7 for the one-element set $\mathcal{A} := \{0\}$ with t_k denoting the corresponding set of abscissae in the construction. Then for any $k = 1, 2, \dots$, and $4 \leq t_k$ we have*

$$\psi(x) = x - \sum_{\rho \in \mathcal{Z}(\Gamma, t_k)} \frac{x^\rho}{\rho} + O\left(\frac{1-\theta}{(b-\theta)^3} \left(A + \kappa + \log \frac{x+t_k}{b-\theta}\right)^3 \left(\frac{x}{t_k} + x^b\right)\right), \quad (24)$$

with the implied O -constant an effective, absolute constant which does not depend on \mathcal{G} .

3.4 A density theorem for ζ -zeros close to the 1-line

In [49] we used two additional assumptions to prove a density theorem on the zeroes of the Beurling zeta function. One is that the norm would actually map to the natural integers.

Definition 2 (Condition B). *We say that Condition B is satisfied, if $|\cdot| : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, that is, the norm $|g|$ of any element $g \in \mathcal{G}$ is a natural number.*

As is natural, we will write $\nu \in |\mathcal{G}|$ if there exists $g \in \mathcal{G}$ with $|g| = \nu$. Under Condition B we can introduce the arithmetical function $G(\nu) := \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}, |g|=\nu} 1$, which is then an arithmetical function on \mathbb{N} . The next condition is a kind of "average Ramanujan condition" for the Beurling zeta function.

Definition 3 (Condition G). *We say that Condition G is satisfied, if with a certain $p > 1$ we have for the function*

$$F_p(X) := \frac{1}{X} \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}; |g| \leq X} G(|g|)^p = \frac{1}{X} \sum_{\nu \in |\mathcal{G}|; \nu \leq X} G(\nu)^{1+p} = \frac{1}{X} \int_1^X G^p(x) d\mathcal{N}(x) \quad (25)$$

the property that

$$\log F_p(X) = o(\log X) \quad (X \rightarrow \infty), \quad (26)$$

that is, for any fixed $\varepsilon > 0$ $F_p(X) = O(X^\varepsilon)$.

Note that in case $\log G(\nu) = o(\log \nu)$, i.e. when for all $\varepsilon > 0$ we have $G(\nu) = O(\nu^\varepsilon)$, then Condition G is automatically satisfied. Even this stronger $O(\nu^\varepsilon)$ order estimate is proved for many important cases, see e.g. 2.4. Theorem and 2.5. Corollary of [29].

There are many natural examples of the above condition. For a discussion see the original book of Knopfmacher or Section 3.1 of [49]. The main result of [49] was the following Carlson-type density theorem, proved following the methods in [37] and [39].

Theorem 7. *Assume that \mathcal{G} satisfies besides Axiom A also Conditions B and G, too. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a constant $C = C(\varepsilon, \mathcal{G})$ such that for all $\alpha > (1 + \theta)/2$ we have*

$$N(\alpha, T) \leq CT^{\frac{6-2\theta}{1-\theta}(1-\alpha)+\varepsilon}. \quad (27)$$

3.5 A Turán type local density theorem for ζ -zeros close to the boundary of the zero-free region

Recall that for arbitrary $\tau > 0$ and $\theta < \sigma < 1$, we denoted the set of zeroes in the rectangle $Q_{\sigma, h}(\tau) := [\sigma, 1] \times [i(\tau-h), i(\tau+h)]$ as $\mathcal{Z}(\sigma; \tau-h, \tau+h)$, and their number as $N(\sigma, \tau-h, \tau+h)$.

Lemma 9. *Let $(1 + \theta)/2 < b \leq 1$, $2 \leq h$ and $\tau > \max(2h, \tau_0)$ where $\tau_0 = \tau_0(\theta, A, \kappa)$ is a large constant depending on the given parameters of $\zeta(s)$.*

If $\zeta(s)$ does not vanish in the rectangle $\sigma \geq b$, $|t - \tau| \leq h$, that is if $\mathcal{Z}(b; \tau-h, \tau+h) = \emptyset$, then for any r with $15 \frac{\log \log \log \tau}{\log \log \tau} < r < \frac{b-\theta}{10}$ we have

$$\nu := N(b-r; \tau-r, \tau+r) \ll r \log \tau, \quad (28)$$

with an implied absolute constant not depending on \mathcal{G} .

4 Upper estimate on $\Delta(x)$ —Proof of Theorem 5

To start with, let us define

$$\theta_0 := \max(\theta, \sup\{\theta < \beta < 1 : \exists \gamma \in \mathbb{R}, \text{ s.t. for } \rho := \beta + i\gamma \text{ we have } \zeta(\rho) = 0\}).$$

Below in (29) a new auxiliary function ω will be introduced, and it will be easily seen that we have $\omega_\eta(x) \leq \omega(x)$. Also, in Lemma 10 it will be easily seen that we have $\omega_\eta(x) \leq \omega(x) \sim (1 - \theta_0) \log x$ if $\theta_0 < 1$. These show us that in case $\theta_0 < 1$ we are to prove only $\Delta(x) = O(x^{\theta_0 + \varepsilon})$ for all $\varepsilon > 0$. So we will start here with explaining how this follows easily from the Riemann-von Mangoldt formula in Proposition 1 for $\theta_0 < 1$.

First, if $\theta_0 = \theta$, then we choose $b := \theta_0 + \varepsilon/2$. According to the construction in Lemma 7 there is a curve $\Gamma := \Gamma_b^{\{0\}}$ whose points stay in the strip $a := \frac{b+\theta}{2} \leq \Re s \leq b$: by assumption, on this curve and to the right of it there are simply no zeroes of ζ . Therefore, the Riemann-von Mangoldt type formula of Proposition 1 reduces to the error term, so that with t_k of the order x we get $\Delta(x) = O_\varepsilon(\log^3 x x^b) = O_\varepsilon(x^{\theta_0 + \varepsilon})$, as needed.

For other intermediate values $\theta < \theta_0 < 1$, we either work out the analogous constructions of Proposition 7 and Lemma 1 with $a' := \frac{b+\theta_0}{2}$, and then the proof is the same, with no zeroes to the right of Γ' , or use the below argument. Regarding the first possibility, we can remark that as long as \mathcal{G} satisfies Axiom A with θ as the main parameter, it also satisfies Axiom A with any $\theta' \geq \theta$ in place of it; so that we can refer to the said Lemmas, but used with $\theta' := \theta_0$ instead. That is, we can reduce the case to the already settled one of $\theta_0 = \theta$ via setting $\theta' = \theta_0$.

Nevertheless, in the following we will describe here the direct argument, for two reasons. First, in some later calculus—in particular for the case of $\theta_0 = 1$ —the proof will as well be analogous. Moreover, here we want to prove a sharper statement, too. For its formulation, let us introduce for any $a > \theta$ and $x \geq 1$ the notations⁷

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_a(x) &:= \inf_{\substack{\zeta(\rho)=0, \rho=\beta+i\gamma \\ a < \Re \rho = \beta}} \log \frac{x}{x^\beta / |\rho|} = \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{Z}(a; \infty)} (1 - \beta) \log x + \log |\rho|, \\ \omega(x) &:= \inf_{\substack{\zeta(\rho)=0, \rho=\beta+i\gamma \\ \theta < \Re \rho = \beta}} \log \frac{x}{x^\beta / |\rho|} = \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{Z}(\theta; \infty)} (1 - \beta) \log x + \log |\rho|, \\ \tilde{\omega}(x) &:= \inf_{\substack{\zeta(\rho)=0, \rho=\beta+i\gamma \\ \theta < \Re \rho = \beta, \gamma > 1}} \log \frac{x}{x^\beta / \gamma} = \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{Z}(\theta; \infty) \setminus \mathcal{Z}(\theta, 1)} (1 - \beta) \log x + \log \gamma. \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

A standard analysis of a few properties of these ω functions is in order here.

Lemma 10. *If $\theta < \theta_0 \leq 1$, then $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\omega_a(x)}{\log x} = 1 - \theta_0$. If $\omega(x)$ is meaningful—i.e. $\theta > 0$ or at least $s = 0$ is not a limit point of zeros of $\zeta(s)$ —then also $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\omega(x)}{\log x} = 1 - \theta_0$.*

Denoting $\tilde{\theta}_0 := \max(\theta, \sup\{\theta < \beta < 1 : \exists \gamma \geq 1, \text{ s.t. for } \rho := \beta + i\gamma \text{ we have } \zeta(\rho) = 0\})$, the analogous statement holds with $\tilde{\omega}(x)$, too: if $\theta < \tilde{\theta}_0 \leq 1$, then $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\tilde{\omega}(x)}{\log x} = 1 - \tilde{\theta}_0$.

Also, these infima are always attained, whenever exist; and the zeroes with attainment tend to $\theta_0 + i\infty$ with $x \rightarrow \infty$, unless $\Re s = \theta_0$ contains a zero, in which case for $x > x_0$ the particular zero with $\rho_0 = \theta_0 + i\gamma_0$ and minimal possible γ_0 provides the said infimum, always.

Further properties of ω , ω_a and $\tilde{\omega}$ are

1. $\omega(x)$ is an increasing function of x ;

⁷Note that we do not consider the Beurling zeta function on and behind the line $\Re s = \theta$, where a meromorphic (or at least some meaningful, e.g. continuous) extension of $\zeta(s)$ is not guaranteed by Axiom A. Whenever we speak of ζ -zeroes, we always mean zeroes with $\beta = \Re \rho > \theta$.

2. $\omega(x)$ is a concave function of x ;

3. For any $\varepsilon > 0$ and large enough $x > x_0(\varepsilon)$ for all $\sqrt{x} < y < x$ we have
 $\omega(x) - (1 - \theta_0 - \varepsilon) \log(x/y) \leq \omega(y) \leq \omega(x)$.

4. If $\theta_0 = 1$, then $\omega(x)$ is a slowly varying function in the sense that

$$-\varepsilon |\log(y/x)| \leq |\omega(y) - \omega(x)| \leq \varepsilon |\log(y/x)| \quad (\sqrt{x} \leq y \leq x^2, x > x_0(\varepsilon)). \quad (30)$$

5. If $y < z$ then $\tilde{\omega}(y) < \tilde{\omega}(z) < \tilde{\omega}(y) \cdot \frac{\log z}{\log y}$. Some similar inequalities hold for ω , too.

Proof. If $\theta = 0$ and $s = 0$ is a limit point of zeroes of $\zeta(s)$, then ω is $-\infty$ and we are to use ω_a only. In the following let us exclude this degenerate case and write ω also for ω_a and $\tilde{\omega}$, the proofs being valid in all cases. Of course, if we use a parameter $a > 0$, then this should be chosen with $a < \theta_0$; and if there are no zeros ($\theta = \theta_0$) then there remains nothing to analyse. Note also that once the convergence of zeroes to $s = \theta = 0$ is excluded, we cannot have arbitrarily small values of $|\rho|$ by definition of ω, ω_a .

So assume that $\rho_0 = \beta_0 + i\gamma_0$ is a zero of ζ (with $\beta \geq a$, if ω stands for ω_a and with $\gamma \geq 1$ by definition of $\tilde{\omega}$, if ω stands for $\tilde{\omega}$). Then $\omega(x) \leq (1 - \beta_0) \log x + \log |\rho_0| =: \omega(\rho_0; x)$, given that the definition is the infimum of such expressions. Now, for any zero $\rho = \beta + i\gamma$ to provide smaller value we must necessarily have $\log |\rho| < \omega(\rho_0, x)$. Regarding ω_a it immediately follows that there are only finitely many zeroes to be considered, whence the infimum is attained as a minimum. For ω it can happen in principle that there are infinitely many zeroes merging to the boundary line $\Re s = \theta$. However, zeroes with $\beta < \beta_0$ and $\gamma > \gamma_0$ will never provide smaller $\omega(\rho; x)$. For the zeros with $\beta < \beta_0 - \delta$, where $\delta > 0$ is a given small quantity, we can estimate that $\omega(\rho, x) - \omega(\rho_0; x) > \delta \log x + \log |\rho| - \log |\rho_0|$. Recall that by assumption $\log |\rho|$ is bounded from below, and therefore for any zeroes with $\beta < \beta_0 - \delta$ and for large enough values of x the $\delta \log x$ excess produces a positive difference. Also the finitely many zeroes in the rectangle $[\beta_0 - \delta, \beta] \times i[0, \gamma]$ (or $[\beta_0 - \delta, \beta] \times i[1, \gamma]$ in case of $\tilde{\omega}$) will provide smaller values of $\omega(\rho; x)$ ($\tilde{\omega}(x)$, resp.) for large enough x unless $\beta = \beta_0$ - in which case the zero with smallest imaginary part takes over. In all, for large enough x we can be sure that no zero with $\beta < \beta_0$ or $\log \gamma > \log x + \log \gamma_0$ can provide smaller values, whence taking the infimum for any given x is a minimization which runs over a finite set of zeroes only. It follows that the infimum is always a minimum and is attained by some zero.

Further, if two zeroes are such that $\beta_2 > \beta_1$, then it is clear that for large enough x $\omega(\rho_2; x) < \omega(\rho_1; x)$. That is, the sequence of extremal zeroes cannot stabilize unless there are no other zeroes with larger real part, i.e. if θ_0 is attained. In that case, clearly the zero with minimal imaginary part is extremal from one point on—and ever after. Otherwise, if we pick a zero $\rho_0 = \beta_0 + i\gamma_0$, with $\beta_0 > \theta_0 - \delta$, then the zeroes with $\beta < \theta_0 - 2\delta$ are all superseded by this one for large enough x —hence the sequence of extremal zeroes will have real values tending to θ_0 .

Such a zero ρ_0 already gives that $\omega(x) \leq \omega(\rho_0; x) = (1 - \beta_0) \log x + \log |\rho_0| \leq (1 - \theta_0 + \delta) \log x + \log |\rho_0|$, whence $\limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \omega(x) / \log x \leq (1 - \theta_0 + \delta)$. Therefore, $\limsup_{x \rightarrow \infty} \omega(x) / \log x \leq 1 - \theta_0$. However, the absolute values for all zeroes ρ are bounded below by some number, say $\delta > 0$, (recall the excluded cases and our choice of considering only ω_a , if need be), and the real parts are at most θ_0 , again, so that $\omega(\rho; x) \geq (1 - \theta_0) \log x + \log \delta$. All in all we get also for the liminf, whence also for the limit, that $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \omega(x) / \log x = 1 - \theta_0$.

It follows that for $\theta_0 < 1$ we have $\omega(x) \sim (1 - \theta_0) \log x$, while for $\theta_0 = 1$ $\omega(x) = o(\log x)$. The analogous assertions with $\tilde{\omega}$ are seen the same way.

The points 1. and 2. are easy to see directly from the definitions.

Assume that $\sqrt{x} < y < x$. Let ρ_0 be such that $\omega(\rho_0, y) = \omega(y)$. If x , and hence y is large enough, the extremal zeroes have real parts close to θ_0 , whence we can assume

$1 - \beta_0 < 1 - \theta_0 + \varepsilon$. Then we have $\omega(y) = (1 - \beta_0) \log y + \log |\rho_0| = (1 - \beta_0) \log(y/x) + (1 - \beta_0) \log(x) + \log |\rho_0| > -(1 - \theta_0 + \varepsilon) \log(x/y) + \omega(x)$. Thus the assertion in the third point of the statement follows. In particular, if $\theta_0 = 1$, then the slowly varying type estimate (30) in the fourth point follows, too.

Finally, let us come to the last point. Take ρ_0 such that $\omega(\rho_0, y) = \omega(y)$ i.e. $\omega(y) = (1 - \beta_0) \log y + \log |\rho_0|$. By definition as the minimum of such expressions, $\omega(z) \leq \omega(\rho_0, z) = (1 - \beta_0) \log z + \log |\rho_0|$. This yields, as above, $\omega(z) - \omega(y) \leq (1 - \beta_0)(\log z - \log y)$. Now we estimate the occurring $(1 - \beta_0)$. In fact, $\omega(y) = \omega(\rho_0, y) = (1 - \beta_0) \log y + \log |\rho_0|$, so, if $|\rho_0| \geq 1$, then we have $(1 - \beta_0) \log y \leq \omega(y)$. From here we get $\omega(z) - \omega(y) \leq (1 - \beta_0) \leq \frac{\omega(y)}{\log y} (\log z - \log y)$ and $\omega(z) \leq \omega(y) \frac{\log z}{\log y}$. In general, whether for the extremal zero ρ_0 for y the absolute value $|\rho_0|$ can stay below 1 or not, we get $\omega(z) \leq (\omega(y) - \log |\rho_0|) \frac{\log z}{\log y}$. In particular, when $|\rho| \geq \delta > 0$ is a fixed lower bound for all zeroes, then $\omega(z) \leq (\omega(y) + \log(1/\delta)) \frac{\log z}{\log y}$, and when $\Re \rho < \theta_0$ for all zeroes (and therefore the extremal zero ρ_0 for x tends to $\theta_0 + i\infty$ with $x \rightarrow \infty$), we have $\omega(z) \leq \omega(y) \frac{\log z}{\log y}$ for large enough y, z . Similarly, given that in the definition of $\tilde{\omega}$ we assume a priori that $\gamma \geq 1$, we necessarily have $\tilde{\omega}(z) \leq \tilde{\omega}(y) \frac{\log z}{\log y}$, always. \square

In this work we will denote

$$S(X) := \sup_{1 \leq x \leq X} |\Delta_{\mathcal{P}}(x)|, \quad W_a(x) := \sup_{\substack{\zeta(\rho)=0, \rho=\beta+i\gamma \\ a < \Re \rho = \beta, |\gamma| < x}} \frac{x^\beta}{|\rho|}, \quad W(x) := \sup_{\substack{\zeta(\rho)=0, \rho=\beta+i\gamma \\ \theta < \Re \rho = \beta, |\gamma| < x}} \frac{x^\beta}{|\rho|}. \quad (31)$$

Clearly, $\omega(x) := \log W(x)$ and $\omega_a(x) := \log W_a(x)$. Further, we will write

$$Z_a(x) := \sum_{\substack{\zeta(\rho)=0, \rho=\beta+i\gamma \\ a < \Re \rho = \beta, |\gamma| < x}} \frac{x^\beta}{|\rho|}, \quad Z(x) := \sum_{\substack{\zeta(\rho)=0, \rho=\beta+i\gamma \\ \theta < \Re \rho = \beta, |\gamma| < x}} \frac{x^\beta}{|\rho|}. \quad (32)$$

Note that the first sum extends over $\mathcal{Z}(a; x)$, and the second one over $\mathcal{Z}(\theta, x)$.

As an easy warm-up, let us prove a straightforward assertion with these notations.

Proposition 2. *Assume that \mathcal{G} satisfies Axiom A and that $\theta_0 = \theta$, i.e. the Beurling zeta function has no zeroes in the halfplane of meromorphic extension $\Re s > \theta$. Then for all $a > \theta$ and $x \geq 1$ we obviously have $Z_a(x), W_a(x) = 0$ —in fact, also $Z(x) = W(x) = 0$ —while for the error term in the PNT it holds*

$$D(x) \leq S(x) \ll x^\theta \log^6(x+1), \quad (33)$$

with an effective implied constant in the Vinogradov symbol depending only on A and κ .

Proof. We refer to the Riemann-von Mangoldt formula Proposition 1 with $b := \theta + \frac{1}{\log(x+1)}$ and make use that there are no zeroes at all. This yields

$$\Delta(x) \leq \left| \sum_{\rho \in \mathcal{Z}(\Gamma, t_k)} \frac{x^\rho}{\rho} \right| + O_{A, \kappa} \left(\frac{1}{(b-\theta)^3} \log^3 \frac{2x}{b-\theta} x^b \right) \ll_{A, \kappa} 0 + x^\theta \log^6(x+1). \quad (34)$$

Taking maximum on the interval $[1, x]$ then gives the second part of the assertion, while $D(x) \leq S(x)$ is obvious. \square

Remark 2. Arriving at the natural boundary of analytic investigations when we reach $\Re s = \theta$, more refined results are not available in this case. It can in principle happen that the Beurling integers do not satisfy better error terms than Axiom A with some given

$\theta \in (0, 1)$, but the PNT still holds with much better error terms, see e.g. [10], [5], [71]; therefore in this generality one cannot state that e.g. $\Delta(x)$ would be $\Omega(x^{\theta-\varepsilon})$. All our investigation is focused onto the relation between distribution of zeroes and oscillation of $\Delta(x)$; but when there are no zeroes, we only know upper estimates and cannot state anything about Ω -results.

Remark 3. When $\theta_0 > \theta$, and there are zeroes of $\zeta(s)$ in the critical strip, it still may be impossible to handle the limiting expressions $W(x), Z(x)$. Indeed, if $\theta = 0$ and $s = 0$ is a limit point of zeroes of $\zeta(s)$, then $W(x) = \infty$, and if $0 \leq \theta \leq 1$ arbitrary, but there are too many zeroes close to the boundary line $\Re s = \theta$, then $Z(x)$ can still diverge to $+\infty$. Note that $N(a, T)$ can be of the order $(\theta - a)^{-3}$ —at least we could not prove any better estimate. So instead of elaborating on various cases, in the following we will prefer considering $Z_a(x)$. Nevertheless, it should be clear that $W_a(x) \leq W(x)$ and $Z_a(x) \leq Z(x)$, whence in case the right hand sides reach $+\infty$, all upper estimates remain valid with them.

Lemma 11. *Let $\theta < a < \alpha \leq \theta_0 \leq 1$, $x \geq 1$ arbitrary, and consider any subset \mathcal{Z} of the zeroes of the Beurling zeta function in the rectangle $[a, \alpha] \times [-ix, ix]$. Then we have*

$$\sum_{\rho \in \mathcal{Z}} \frac{x^\beta}{|\rho|} \ll \frac{x^\alpha}{a - \theta} \left(\frac{1}{a} \log \frac{1}{(a - \theta)} + \log \frac{1}{(a - \theta)} \log x + \log^2 x \right) \leq \frac{x^\alpha}{(a - \theta)a} \log^2 \frac{x + 1}{(a - \theta)}. \quad (35)$$

The implied constant depends only on A and κ .

Proof. Referring to Lemma 4 and a small partial integration furnish

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\rho \in \mathcal{Z}} \frac{x^\beta}{|\rho|} &\leq \frac{x^\alpha}{a} N(a, 5) + x^\alpha \int_5^x \frac{1}{t} dN(a, t) = \frac{x^\alpha N(a, 5)}{a} + x^\alpha \left\{ \left[\frac{1}{t} N(a, t) \right]_5^x + \int_5^x \frac{N(a, t)}{t^2} dt \right\} \\ &\leq x^\alpha \left\{ \frac{N(a, 5)}{a} + \frac{N(a, x)}{x} + \int_5^x \frac{N(a, t)}{t^2} dt \right\} \\ &\ll x^\alpha \left\{ \frac{\log \frac{1}{(a - \theta)}}{a(a - \theta)} + \frac{1}{a - \theta} \left(\left(\log x + \log \frac{1}{a - \theta} \right) + \int_5^x \frac{\log t + \log \frac{1}{a - \theta}}{t} dt \right) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 1. *Assume $\theta < \theta_0 < 1$, and let $x \geq 1$ be arbitrary. Then we have*

$$|\Delta(x)| \ll \frac{1 - \theta}{(\theta_0 - \theta)^3} \log^3 \frac{x + 1}{\theta_0 - \theta} x^{\frac{\theta + 2\theta_0}{3}} + \frac{1}{(\theta_0 - \theta)\theta_0} \log^2 \frac{x + 1}{\theta_0 - \theta} x^{\theta_0} \quad (36)$$

The implied constant depends only on A and κ .

Proof. We apply Proposition 1 with $b := \frac{2\theta_0 + \theta}{3}$ and picking some $t_k \in [x, x + 5]$. (By construction of Γ in Lemma 7, such a t_k exists.) This furnishes

$$|\Delta(x)| \ll \left| \sum_{\rho \in \mathcal{Z}(\Gamma, t_k)} \frac{x^\rho}{\rho} \right| + O \left(\frac{1 - \theta}{(\theta_0 - \theta)^3} \log^3 \frac{x + 1}{\theta_0 - \theta} x^b \right). \quad (37)$$

Here the O term is the first expression on the right hand side of the asserted final estimate, so the proof hinges upon the estimation of the sum over the zeroes in $\mathcal{Z}(\Gamma, t_k)$. Recall that by construction of Γ with $a := \frac{b + \theta}{2} = \frac{2\theta + \theta_0}{3}$ these zeroes form a subset of those in the rectangle $[a, 1] \times [-it_k, it_k]$. Given that there are no zeroes with $\Re \rho > \theta_0$, actually $\mathcal{Z}(\Gamma, t_k) \subset \left[\frac{2\theta + \theta_0}{3}, \theta_0 \right] \times [-i(x + 5), i(x + 5)]$. Therefore, for the sum over the zeroes belonging to $\mathcal{Z}(\Gamma, t_k)$ we can apply the above Lemma 11 leading to the proof of the assertion. □

Corollary 2. *Let $\theta < \theta_0 \leq 1$ and let $\theta < \alpha < \theta_0$ and $x \geq 1$ be arbitrary. Then we have*

$$D(x) \leq S(x) \leq Z_\alpha(x+5) + O\left(\frac{1-\theta}{(\alpha-\theta)^3} \log^3 \frac{x+1}{\alpha-\theta} x^\alpha\right). \quad (38)$$

Moreover, we also have

$$Z_\alpha(x) \ll \frac{1}{(\alpha-\theta)\alpha} \log^2 \frac{x+1}{\alpha-\theta} x^{\theta_0}. \quad (39)$$

The implied constants depend only on A and κ .

Proof. The first inequality of (38) is trivial. For the second it suffices to prove $|\Delta(x)| \leq Z_\alpha(x+5) + O\left(\frac{1-\theta}{(\alpha-\theta)^3} \log^3 \frac{x+1}{\alpha-\theta} x^\alpha\right)$, because the functions appearing here on the right hand side are monotonically increasing. This is completely analogous to (37), with the only difference that we choose $b = \alpha$ and will therefore encounter a sum over zeroes lying in $\mathcal{Z}(\Gamma, t_k) \subset [\frac{\alpha+\theta}{2}, \theta_0] \times [-i(x+5), i(x+5)]$, while the error term is the expression on the far right of (38). Now, $\mathcal{Z}(\Gamma, t_k)$ contains all zeroes in $\mathcal{Z}(\alpha, t_k)$, plus a subset of zeroes from $\mathcal{Z}(\frac{\alpha+\theta}{2}, \alpha; t_k) := \mathcal{Z}(\frac{\alpha+\theta}{2}; t_k) \setminus \mathcal{Z}(\alpha; t_k)$, which is the set of all zeroes in $[\frac{\alpha+\theta}{2}, \alpha] \times [-it_k, it_k]$. So, for our set $\mathcal{Z}^* := \mathcal{Z}(\Gamma, t_k) \setminus \mathcal{Z}(\alpha; t_k) \subset [\frac{\alpha+\theta}{2}, \alpha] \times [-it_k, it_k]$ Lemma 11 applies with $a = \frac{\alpha+\theta}{2}$, and we get for its contribution

$$\sum_{\rho \in \mathcal{Z}^*} \frac{t_k^\beta}{|\rho|} \ll \frac{1}{(\alpha-\theta)\alpha} \log^2 \frac{t_k+1}{\alpha-\theta} t_k^\alpha \ll \frac{1}{(\alpha-\theta)\alpha} \log^2 \frac{x+1}{\alpha-\theta} x^\alpha.$$

The estimation of $Z_\alpha(x)$ is even easier using the same Lemma 11. \square

Collecting the above results, we can summarize the state of the matter as follows.

Theorem 8. *Assume $\theta \leq \theta_0 \leq 1$. Then we trivially have $|\Delta(x)|, D(x) \leq S(x)$, while for $S(x)$ it holds*

$$S(x) \leq \begin{cases} x^\theta \log^6(x+1) & \text{if } \theta = \theta_0; \\ Z_\alpha(x) + O\left(\frac{1-\theta}{(\alpha-\theta)^3} \log^3 \frac{x+1}{\alpha-\theta} x^\alpha\right) \ll \frac{1-\theta}{(\alpha-\theta)^3} \log^3 \frac{x+1}{\alpha-\theta} x^{\theta_0} & \text{if } \theta < \alpha < \theta_0. \end{cases} \quad (40)$$

Corollary 3. *Assume $\theta < \theta_0 < 1$. Then we have*

$$|\Delta(x)|, D(x) \leq S(x) \leq Z_{\frac{\theta+\theta_0}{2}}(x) + O\left(\frac{1}{(\theta_0-\theta)^3} \log^3 \frac{x+1}{\theta_0-\theta} x^{\frac{\theta_0+\theta}{2}}\right) \ll x \exp(-(1-\varepsilon)\omega(x)).$$

The above estimates are satisfactory if $\theta_0 < 1$. However, if $\theta_0 = 1$, (39) and (40) provide only a weak estimate, even weaker than the straightforward direct estimation $|\Delta(x)| \ll x \log x$. More importantly, to obtain an $\ll x \exp(-(1-\varepsilon)\omega(x)) = W(x)(x/W(x))^\varepsilon$ upper estimate, in case $\theta_0 < 1$ the above bounds more than sufficient given that $\omega(x) \sim (1-\theta_0) \log x$ (and in fact $\omega(x) > (1-\theta_0) \log x$), so that the allowed extra error term $(x/W(x))^\varepsilon$ provides a room as large as a small power⁸ of x . But if $\theta_0 = 1$, $\omega(x)$ can be of much smaller order of magnitude, and the estimates need to be much finer. E.g. in the Diamond-Montgomery-Vorhauer paper [12] there was constructed a zero distribution where $\omega(x)$ is as low as $\sqrt{\log x}$, a much smaller exponent which cannot be controlled so easily.

To improve on this, we need to invoke the Carlson-type density theorem, too. So let us turn to the somewhat more delicate case when $\theta_0 = 1$. Recall that $\Re s = 1$ is free of zeroes, thus if $\theta_0 = 1$, then we must have an infinitude of zeroes with $\rho_k = \beta_k + i\gamma_k$ and $\beta_k \rightarrow 1$, resulting in $\omega(x) \leq \min_k (1 - \beta_k) \log x + \log \gamma_k = o(\log x)$ ($x \rightarrow \infty$). Nevertheless, the well-known zero-free region $\sigma > 1 - c/\log(|t|+2)$ implies that for any zero $1 - \beta > c/\log(|\gamma|+2)$, whence $\omega(x) \geq 2\sqrt{(1-\beta) \log x \log(|\gamma|+2)} \gg \sqrt{\log x} \rightarrow \infty$.

⁸In other words, consider that $\log(x \exp(-(1-\varepsilon)\omega(x))) \sim (1-(1-\varepsilon)(1-\theta_0)) \log x = (\theta_0 + \varepsilon(1-\theta_0)) \log x$.

Proposition 3. Assume $\theta_0 = 1$. If $a > \theta$ and $\varepsilon > 0$ then for sufficiently large $x > x_0(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon)$ we have

$$Z_a(x) \ll_{a, \varepsilon, \mathcal{G}} x \exp(-(1 - \varepsilon)\tilde{\omega}(x)). \quad (41)$$

Proof. Put $\varepsilon' := \varepsilon/K$, where K is a large constant to be chosen later, and put also $\alpha := 1 - 4\varepsilon'$ and $\alpha_0 := \max\{\beta := \Re\rho : \zeta(\rho) = 0, |\gamma| = |\Im\rho| \leq 5\}$, pointing out that $\alpha_0 < 1$, too. We can assume that ε is so small that $\alpha_0 < \alpha$. We write similarly as above,

$$\begin{aligned} Z_a(x) &= \sum_{\rho \in \mathcal{Z}(a, x) \setminus \mathcal{Z}(\alpha, x)} \frac{x^\beta}{|\rho|} + Z_\alpha(x) \ll \frac{x^a}{(a - \theta)a} \log^2 \frac{x + 1}{a - \theta} + \frac{N(\alpha, 5)}{\alpha} x^{\alpha_0} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\rho \in \mathcal{Z}(\alpha; e^n, e^{n+1})} \frac{x^\beta}{|\rho|} \\ &\ll \frac{x^\alpha \log^2 \frac{1}{a - \theta}}{(a - \theta)a} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} N(\alpha; e^n, e^{n+1}) \max_{\rho = \beta + i\gamma \in \mathcal{Z}(\alpha, e^n, e^{n+1})} \frac{x}{\exp((1 - \beta) \log x + \log |\rho|)} \\ &\ll \frac{x^\alpha \log^2 \frac{1}{a - \theta}}{(a - \theta)a} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} N(\alpha; e^{n+1}) x \exp(-(\inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{Z}(\alpha, e^n, e^{n+1})} (1 - \beta) \log x + \log |\rho|)). \end{aligned}$$

Here the first term gives only an $O(x^{1 - \varepsilon'})$ error term. For the sum over zeroes close to $\Re s = 1$, we appeal to the Carlson-type density estimate Theorem 7 with our fixed $\varepsilon' > 0$. This leads to $N(\alpha; e^{n+1}) \ll \exp((\frac{6 - 2\theta}{1 - \theta}(1 - \alpha) + \varepsilon')(n + 1))$. Also, for the inf inside the sum first we can separate a part and then the inf can be extended to all zeroes:

$$\begin{aligned} &\inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{Z}(\alpha, e^n, e^{n+1})} (1 - \beta) \log x + \log \gamma \\ &\geq K\varepsilon' \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{Z}(\alpha, e^n, e^{n+1})} \log \gamma + (1 - K\varepsilon') \inf_{\rho \in \mathcal{Z}(\alpha, e^n, e^{n+1})} (1 - \beta) \log x + \log \gamma \\ &\geq K\varepsilon' n + (1 - K\varepsilon') \tilde{\omega}(x). \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

In all we find with choosing $K := 4\frac{6 - 2\theta}{1 - \theta} + 2$ the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} Z_a(x) &\ll_a x^{1 - \varepsilon'} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} N(\alpha, e^{n+1}) x \exp(-K\varepsilon' n - (1 - K\varepsilon') \tilde{\omega}(x)) \\ &\ll_{\varepsilon', \mathcal{G}} x^{1 - \varepsilon'} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \exp\left(\left(\frac{6 - 2\theta}{1 - \theta} 4\varepsilon' + \varepsilon'\right)(n + 1) - K\varepsilon' n\right) x \exp(-(1 - \varepsilon)\tilde{\omega}(x)) \\ &\leq x^{1 - \varepsilon'} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{K\varepsilon'} \exp(-\varepsilon' n) x \exp(-(1 - \varepsilon)\tilde{\omega}(x)) \\ &\ll_\varepsilon x^{1 - \varepsilon'} + x \exp(-(1 - \varepsilon)\tilde{\omega}(x)) \ll x \exp(-(1 - \varepsilon)\tilde{\omega}(x)). \end{aligned}$$

□

Theorem 9. If $\theta_0 = 1$, then we still have for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and sufficiently large $x > x_0(\varepsilon, \mathcal{G})$ the inequalities

$$D(x) \leq S(x) \leq (1 + o_{\mathcal{G}}(1)) Z_\alpha(x) \ll_{\varepsilon, \mathcal{G}} x \exp(-(1 - \varepsilon)\omega(x)). \quad (43)$$

Corollary 4. If $\eta : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, 1/2]$ is a function such that the domain (11) is free of zeroes of the Beurling ζ function, then we have $D(x) \leq S(x) \ll x \exp(-(1 - \varepsilon)\omega_\eta(x))$.

Proof. Observe that for any fixed particular root ρ of ζ we have $\omega(\rho, x) = (1 - \beta_0) \log x + \log \gamma \geq \eta(\gamma) \log x + \log \gamma \geq \omega_\eta(x)$ as the latter is a minimum of such expressions with γ allowed to run over all values of $t > 1$, irrespective of being a concrete ordinate of a zero ρ or not. Therefore, the same holds also for the minimum taken over all zeroes, i.e. $\omega(x) \geq \omega_\eta(x)$. Consequently, the assertion follows from Theorem 9 if $\theta_0 = 1$ and from Proposition 2 and Corollary 3 for $\theta_0 = \theta$ or $\theta < \theta_0 < 1$, respectively. □

Here it becomes clear why the Ingham type "direct" theorem of Pintz formulated with the function ω is stronger than any result with a zero-free domain and boundary function η .

Also note that Corollary 4 implies the above stated Theorem 5 *with arbitrary boundary functions* η , assuming neither continuity nor monotonicity.

This is in particular useful if we consider that there were studies related to such boundary functions. Namely, in the classical case it was studied in detail, see e.g. [61, 43], what consequences can be drawn from knowing RH to hold *up to a certain given height* (which is already a known fact for quite high ordinates). Now, such a condition could be described by setting $\eta(t) := 1/2$ for $0 \leq t \leq T$ and then just putting $\eta(t) = 1$, or perhaps $\eta(t) = c/\log t$ or anything known for a zero-free domain: in Corollary 4 we do not need continuity or monotonicity.

Also we can discuss here what the result of Theorem 9 means. It basically says that from the series in the Riemann-von Mangoldt formula (24), however divergent, we can estimate the order of magnitude of $\Delta(x)$. It is clear in this direction that the total sum of absolute values of terms i.e. $Z(x)$ should bound $\Delta(x)$ —and whence also $D(x)$ and $S(x)$ —from above, but it is less immediate that this upper bound is still below (almost) $x \exp(\omega(x))$. The meaning of this last term is, however, clear: that stands for the largest term of the Riemann-von Mangoldt sum. Therefore, the results show that in fact this Riemann-von Mangoldt sum—in spite of divergence!—behave quite regularly in the sense that the order of the total sum is about the magnitude of the largest term of the series. That is a well-known behavior in e.g. entire functions—but it holds also for this divergent series, which might be somewhat surprising. The analysis of the "converse Ingham type theorems" to follow below will show, however, that the strong connection between largest term and total sum will prevail also in lower estimations, that is $\Delta(x)$ will be shown to oscillate frequently about as large as the total sum (which is already known to be bounded by about the largest term of the series).

Obviously $\Delta(x)$ cannot *always* be as large, given that we expect it changing signs often, therefore being small around such sign changes; yet the finding that *frequently it reaches about* $x \exp(-\omega(x))$, while the total absolute value sum $Z_a(x)$ of the Riemann-von Mangoldt series is *always at most that magnitude*, is remarkable.

Recall that all these were explored by Pintz in the classical case and here we only succeeded to extend some of his results to the Beurling case.

5 The weighted average of $\Delta_{\mathcal{P}}(x)$ and its upper estimate

In this argument we will assume that x is large enough, and that $\rho_0 = \beta_0 + i\gamma_0$ is a ζ -zero, which is close to optimal for $\omega(x)$: more precisely⁹ $\omega(\rho_0, x) := (1 - \beta_0) \log x + \log \gamma_0 < \omega(x) + 1$, an unimportant constant deficiency. This flexibility in possibly preferring some close-by zero instead of the actual extremal one we need here for ensuring another, somewhat more convenient property: we assume that $(\beta_0, 1] \times i[\gamma_0 - 3, \gamma_0 + 3]$ is zero-free, so that ρ_0 is a kind of locally borderline zero. To see that our assumptions can be met, consider a truly extremal zero ρ_1 . If $(\beta_1, 1] \times i[\gamma_1 - 3, \gamma_1 + 3]$ is zero-free, then we are done: $\rho_0 := \rho_1$. If not, then we find another zero with $\beta_2 > \beta_1$ and $\gamma_1 < \gamma_2 \leq \gamma_1 + 3$. (Note that $\gamma_2 < \gamma_1$ is impossible, for then $\omega(\rho_2, x) < \omega(\rho_1, x)$, contradicting to the definition of ρ_1 . However, in the forthcoming later steps it can happen that the values of γ_j are not strictly increasing, even if $\gamma_j > \gamma_0$, always.) We keep continuing the process: either the process ends before k steps, or we have $\rho_k = \beta_k + i\gamma_k$, $\beta_k > \beta_{k-1} > \dots > \beta_1$, $\gamma_k < \gamma_1 + 3k$. However, the

⁹Recall that here we assume that $\theta_0 = 1$, whence we have that it is not attained. Therefore, when $x \rightarrow \infty$, also for the corresponding extremal zero we have $\rho \rightarrow 1 + i\infty$. Therefore, from here on we do not distinguish between writing $\omega(x)$ with $\log |\rho|$ or $\tilde{\omega}(x)$ with $\log \gamma$. The difference is only $\log(|\rho|/\gamma) = \frac{1}{2} \log(1 + \beta^2/\gamma^2) < \frac{1}{2}\gamma^{-2}$, a negligible term in all estimates.

Carlson Density Theorem says that the number of zeroes $N(1 - \varepsilon, T) = o(T)$, whence for a small, fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, and large enough x so that $\gamma_1 > T_0(\varepsilon)$, we obtain that the above process cannot produce more than $N(1 - \varepsilon, \gamma_1 + 3k) = o(\gamma_1 + 3k)$ zeroes. Therefore $k = o(\gamma_1 + 3k)$ and thus $k = o(\gamma_1)$ and $\log \gamma_1 < \log \gamma_k < \log(2\gamma_1) < \log \gamma_1 + \log 2$, as needed. Then indeed $\omega(\rho_k, x) = (1 - \beta_k) \log x + \log \gamma_k < (1 - \beta_1) \log x + \log \gamma_1 + 1 = \omega(x) + 1$, so that the terminal element ρ_k of the above construction is good for ρ_0 with the claimed properties.

In the following we will often write $\omega := \omega(\rho_0, x)$, and use without repeated explanations the fact that $0 \leq \omega(x) - \omega < 1$, so that we can handle ω as the extremal value.

We use the Dirichlet-Mellin transform of $\Delta(x)$, i.e. the in $\Re s > \theta$ meromorphic function

$$H(s) := -\frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(s) - \frac{s}{s-1} = \int_1^\infty x^{-s} d\Delta(x) = -\int_1^\infty \Delta(x) dx^{-s} = s \int_1^\infty \Delta(x) x^{-s-1} dx. \quad (44)$$

Further, we define with certain constant parameters L, M to be specified later,

$$\begin{aligned} U := U(\rho_0) &:= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{(2)} H(s + \rho_0) e^{Ls^2 + Ms} ds \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{(2)} \left(-\int_1^\infty \Delta(x) \frac{d}{dx} (x^{-s-\rho_0}) dx \right) e^{Ls^2 + Ms} ds \\ &= -\int_1^\infty \Delta(x) \frac{d}{dx} \left\{ x^{-\rho_0} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{(2)} e^{Ls^2 + (M-\log x)s} ds \right\} dx \\ &= -\int_1^\infty \Delta(x) \frac{d}{dx} \left\{ x^{-\rho_0} \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi L}} \exp\left(-\frac{(\log x - M)^2}{4L}\right) \right\} dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi L}} \int_1^\infty \frac{\Delta(x)}{x} x^{-\rho_0} \left\{ \frac{\log x - M}{2L} + \rho_0 \right\} \exp\left(-\frac{(\log x - M)^2}{4L}\right) dx, \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

where the order of the integrations and the derivation were changed and the integral formula of Lemma 1 was applied.

For the following we set a few parameters, whose value will be specified more precisely only later, but here we already tell about their approximate order of magnitude. Namely, we set $\ell \in (0, 1)$ a fixed constant, $0 < \varepsilon' < \varepsilon$ a sufficiently small number, $\delta := 3\varepsilon'^2 < 0.01(1 - \theta)$ (so that in particular $\varepsilon' < \sqrt{(1 - \theta)/300}$). Further, we introduce with these set quantities also the parameters

$$\varepsilon' \omega \leq m \leq \varepsilon' \log x, \quad \log x - 2m \leq M \leq \log x - m, \quad L := \ell M. \quad (46)$$

Now let us split the integral for U to four parts as

$$U_0 := \int_1^{\sqrt{x}}, \quad U_1 := \int_{\sqrt{x}}^q, \quad U_2 := \int_q^x, \quad U_3 := \int_x^\infty \quad \text{with } q := \exp(M - m). \quad (47)$$

Note that here the interval $[q, x]$ of integration for U_2 is a subset of $[x \exp(-3m), x]$.

For the general estimation of $\psi(x)$ and $\Delta(x)$, we have the obvious estimates

$$\begin{aligned} (0 \leq) \psi(x) &\leq \sum_{g \in \mathcal{G}, |g| \leq x} \log x = \mathcal{N}(x) \log x \leq (A + \kappa)x \log x & (x \geq 1), \\ |\Delta(x)| &\leq A' x \log x + 1 \quad \text{where } A' := \max(1, A + \kappa) & (x \geq 1). \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

This we will use for U_0 only, while for the most part we want to estimate more finely, so that we will apply the above Theorem 9 with ε' in place of ε and assuming $\sqrt{x} > x_0(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon')$.

For the interval $[x, \infty)$ we have $\omega(u) > \omega(x)$ by monotonicity, whence

$$\frac{|\Delta(u)|}{u^{1+\beta_0}} \ll \frac{u \exp(-(1-\varepsilon')\omega(u))}{u^{1+\beta_0}} \leq \exp(-(1-\varepsilon')\omega(x))u^{1-\beta_0} \frac{1}{u} \quad (u > x).$$

Thus with the notation $Q := \exp(M+m) < x$ the quantity U_3 can be estimated as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} |U_3| &\ll \frac{\exp(-(1-\varepsilon')\omega(x))}{\sqrt{\pi L}} \int_x^\infty u^{1-\beta_0} \exp\left(-\left(\frac{\log u - M}{2\sqrt{L}}\right)^2\right) \left(\frac{\log u - M}{2L} + |\rho_0|\right) \frac{du}{u} \\ &\ll \frac{e^{-(1-\varepsilon')\omega} x^{1-\beta_0} |\rho_0|}{\sqrt{\pi L}} \int_x^\infty \exp\left((\log u - \log x)(1-\beta_0) - \left(\frac{\log u - M}{2\sqrt{L}}\right)^2\right) \left(\frac{\log u - M}{2L|\rho_0|} + 1\right) \frac{du}{u} \\ &\ll \frac{e^{\varepsilon'\omega}}{\sqrt{L}} \int_Q^\infty \exp\left((\log u - M)(1-\beta_0) - \left(\frac{\log u - M}{2\sqrt{L}}\right)^2\right) \left(\frac{\log u - M}{2L|\rho_0|} + 1\right) \frac{du}{u} \\ &= 2e^{\varepsilon'\omega} \int_{\frac{m}{2\sqrt{L}}}^\infty \exp\left((1-\beta_0)2\sqrt{L}y - y^2\right) \left(\frac{y}{\sqrt{L}|\rho_0|} + 1\right) dy \quad (49) \\ &\ll e^{\varepsilon'\omega} \int_{\frac{m}{2\sqrt{L}}}^\infty \exp\left(\frac{\omega}{\log x} 2\sqrt{L}y - y^2\right) \left(2y - \frac{\omega}{\log x} 2\sqrt{L}\right) dy \leq e^{\varepsilon'\omega + \omega m / \log x - m^2 / 4L}. \end{aligned}$$

Here in the last but one step we wrote in the obvious $(1-\beta_0) \leq \omega / \log x$ and estimated $\frac{y}{\sqrt{L}|\rho_0|} + 1 \leq 2y - \frac{\omega}{\log x} 2\sqrt{L}$, which certainly holds if $m > 4\sqrt{L}$ and $m > 8\omega L / \log x$ holds simultaneously, given that $y \geq \frac{m}{2\sqrt{L}}$ and $|\rho_0| > 1/\sqrt{L}$.

Let us see the analogous case of the estimation of U_1 . Here we use the monotonicity of $\omega(u)$, the inequalities $\omega(u) \leq \omega(\rho_0, u) \leq \omega(\rho_0, x) = \omega \leq \omega(x) + 1$ and also the end estimate on slow variation from Lemma 10 in the form $\omega(x) - \omega(u) \leq \frac{\omega(u)}{\log u} (\log x - \log u)$. As now $\sqrt{x} \leq u \leq q$, we can write $\frac{\omega(u)}{\log u} (\log x - \log u) \leq \frac{\omega}{\frac{1}{2}\log x} (\log x - \log u) \leq 6\frac{\omega}{\log x} (M - \log u)$, because $\log x - M \leq 2m = 2(M - \log q) \leq 2(M - \log u)$, whence $\log x - \log u \leq 3(M - \log u)$. Thus an application of Theorem 9 (with ε' and correspondingly sufficiently large x) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|\Delta(u)|}{u^{\beta_0}} |\rho_0| &\leq \exp(-(1-\varepsilon')\omega(u))u^{1-\beta_0} |\rho_0| = e^{\varepsilon'\omega(u)} \exp(\omega(\rho_0, u) - \omega(u)) \\ &\leq e^{\varepsilon'\omega} \exp(\omega(\rho_0, x) - \omega(u)) \leq e^{\varepsilon'\omega} \exp(\omega(x) + 1 - \omega(u)) \\ &\leq e^{1+\varepsilon'\omega} \exp\left(\frac{\omega(u)}{\log u} (\log x - \log u)\right) \leq 3e^{\varepsilon'\omega} \exp\left(6\frac{\omega}{\log x} (M - \log u)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Using this and recalling $q = e^{M-m}$ we infer the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} |U_1| &\leq \frac{3e^{\varepsilon'\omega}}{2\sqrt{\pi L}} \int_{\sqrt{x}}^q \exp\left(6\frac{\omega}{\log x} (M - \log u) - \frac{(\log u - M)^2}{4L}\right) \left\{\frac{M - \log u}{2L|\rho_0|} + 1\right\} \frac{du}{u} \\ &\ll e^{\varepsilon'\omega} \int_{m/2\sqrt{L}}^\infty \exp\left(6\frac{\omega}{\log x} 2\sqrt{L}y - y^2\right) \left\{\frac{y}{\sqrt{L}|\rho_0|} + 1\right\} dy \quad (50) \\ &\leq e^{\varepsilon'\omega} \int_{m/2\sqrt{L}}^\infty \exp\left(12\sqrt{L}\frac{\omega}{\log x} y - y^2\right) \left\{2y - 12\sqrt{L}\frac{\omega}{\log x}\right\} dy \\ &= \exp(\varepsilon'\omega + 6\omega m / \log x - m^2 / 4L). \end{aligned}$$

Here we have substituted $y := (M - \log u) / 2\sqrt{L}$ and applied the similar to the above conditions $|\rho_0| \geq 2/\sqrt{L}$, $m > 4\sqrt{L}$ and $m > 24L\omega / \log x$ to get $\frac{y}{\sqrt{L}|\rho_0|} + 1 \leq 2y - 12\sqrt{L}\omega / \log x$.

For small values of u we do not have the asymptotic estimate of Theorem 9, so for the interval $[1, \sqrt{x}]$ we simply use (48) together with the assumptions $\log x \geq 5L \geq 20\sqrt{L}$ (the

last part coming from assuming $L \geq 4$) and $M \geq 0.95 \log x$ (equivalent to $\varepsilon' < 0.025$, as $M \geq \log x - 2m \geq (1 - 2\varepsilon') \log x$). These provide

$$\begin{aligned}
|U_0| &\ll \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \int_1^{\sqrt{x}} u^{1-\beta_0} (\log u + 1) |\rho_0| \left\{ \frac{M - \log u}{2L|\rho_0|} + 1 \right\} \exp\left(-\frac{(M - \log u)^2}{4L}\right) \frac{du}{u} \\
&\leq x^{1-\beta_0} |\rho_0| \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \int_1^{\sqrt{x}} 3(M - \log u) \frac{M - \log u}{L} \exp\left(-\frac{(M - \log u)^2}{4L}\right) \frac{du}{u} \\
&\ll e^\omega \int_{(M - \log \sqrt{x})/2\sqrt{L}}^\infty y^2 e^{-y^2} dy \leq e^\omega \frac{\log x}{\sqrt{L}} \exp(-0.05 \log^2 x/L) \ll e^{\omega - 0.04 \log^2 x/L},
\end{aligned} \tag{51}$$

applying in the last line the condition $M \geq 0.95 \log x$ and the estimate of Lemma 2 (ii) with $\lambda = 1$ and $B = (M - \log \sqrt{x})/2\sqrt{L} \geq 0.2 \log x/\sqrt{L} \geq 4$, this last estimate being equivalent to the above assumption $\log x \geq 20\sqrt{L}$, and entailing also $20 \leq \log x/\sqrt{L} \leq 0.05 \log^2 x/L \leq \exp\left(\frac{\log 20}{20} (0.05 \log^2 x/L)\right) \leq \exp(0.0075 \log^2 x/L)$. In all we are led to

$$|U| \leq |U_2| + O\left(e^{\omega - 0.04 \log^2 x/L} + e^{\varepsilon' \omega + 6\omega m / \log x - m^2/4L}\right). \tag{52}$$

Regarding U_2 , we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
|U_2(\rho_0)| &\leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi L}} \int_q^x \frac{|\Delta(u)|}{u^{1+\beta_0}} \left(|\rho_0| + \frac{|\log u - M|}{2L} \right) \exp\left(-\frac{(M - \log u)^2}{4L}\right) du \\
&\leq \left(1 + \frac{2m}{2L|\rho_0|}\right) \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi L}} \int_{M-m}^{\log x} \frac{|\Delta(e^v)| |\rho_0|}{e^{\beta_0 v}} \exp\left(-\frac{(M - v)^2}{4L}\right) dv \\
&\ll \max_{\xi=e^v \in [q, x]} \frac{|\Delta(\xi)|}{\xi^{\beta_0}/|\rho_0|} \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi L}} \int_{M-m}^{\log x} \exp\left(-\frac{(M - v)^2}{4L}\right) dv \leq \max_{\xi=e^v \in [q, x]} \frac{|\Delta(\xi)|}{\xi^{\beta_0}/|\rho_0|},
\end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

under the same assumption that $m \ll |\rho_0|L$.

These upper estimates will be compared to the lower estimation of the next section.

6 Lower estimate of U by contour integration and power sum theory

In the second part we calculate U by using the first form in (45). More precisely, we are to transfer the line of integration of $U = U(\rho_0)$ with $\rho_0 = \beta_0 + i\gamma_0$ from $(\sigma = 2)$ to a new contour $\Gamma - \beta_0$, with Γ lying in the strip $1 - 3\delta \leq \Re s \leq 1 - \delta$, where $\delta > 0$ is a small parameter, to be chosen later in such a way that $\frac{1+\theta}{2} < 1 - 3\delta$ i.e. $\delta < \frac{1-\theta}{6}$. Note that ρ_0 is a close-to-extremal zero for a large value of x , and $\theta_0 = 1$ implies that β_0 has to be arbitrarily close to 1, whence for x large enough we certainly have $\beta_0 > 1 - \delta$.

The integrand, $H(s + \rho_0) \exp(Ls^2 + Ms)$, is meromorphic between $\Re s = 2$ and $\Gamma - \beta_0$, and if the new contour avoids all singularities of $\frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(s)$, then the Residue Theorem can be applied. To ascertain that the contour avoids zeroes and the pole of H , we recall that once a Beurling system satisfies Axiom A with a certain value of $\theta < 1$, then it satisfies the same also with any other value $\theta' \in (\theta, 1)$. Therefore, to construct Γ we will apply the construction of Lemma 7 but with the translation set $\mathcal{A} := \{-i\gamma_0, 0, \gamma_0\}$, with the Axiom A related parameter value $\theta' := 1 - 3\delta$, and with the additional parameter $b := 1 - \delta$. This will furnish a contour which indeed lies in the prescribed strip $a := 1 - 2\delta \leq \Re s \leq b := 1 - \delta$, avoids all singularities of H , and satisfies the estimates of Lemmas 7 and 8. (In fact, the constants in the estimations of these Lemmas will not depend on δ because a moment's thought reveals that in the proof of the related estimates in [50] we can still appeal to the

known estimates for the number of ζ -zeroes, available in the previous lemmas up to the whole strip $\theta < \Re s \leq 1$; so we still have these Lemmas with constants depending on θ and κ only.)

The transition of the contour of integration can be done easily due to the estimates of Lemma 8 and the uniform bound $|e^{Ls^2+Ms}| = O_{L,M}(e^{-Lt^2})$ holding uniformly in the strip $-1 \leq \sigma \leq 2$ and $s = \sigma + it$. By an application of the Residue Theorem we thus find after the change of the integration path

$$U(\rho_0) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma-\beta_0} H(s + \rho_0) e^{Ls^2+Ms} ds + \sum_{\rho}^{\star} \exp(L(\rho - \rho_0)^2 + M(\rho - \rho_0)), \quad (54)$$

where the \star indicates that exactly those zeroes of the Beurling zeta function are taken into account (and then according to multiplicity) for which $\rho - \rho_0$ lie to the right of the new contour $\Gamma - \beta_0$, that is, for which $\rho - i\gamma_0$ is to the right of $\Gamma - i\gamma_0$. Recall that the singularities of $H(s + \rho_0)$ are exactly at translates $\rho - \rho_0$ of zeroes ρ of ζ with residues according to multiplicity; and that by construction all translated ζ -zeroes $\rho - \rho_0$ avoid points $s - \beta_0 = \sigma - \beta_0 + it$ of the curve $\Gamma - \beta_0$ —that is, all vertically translated zeroes $\rho - i\gamma_0$ avoid the points $s = \sigma + it$ of the curve Γ —by at least $d := d(t) := d(b, \theta, n, \gamma_0; t)$ given in (22).

Here the integral—which we will denote by $S_0 = S_0(\rho)$ henceforth—can be estimated by Lemma 8 as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} |S_0(\rho_0)| &= \left| \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma-\beta_0} H(s + \rho_0) e^{Ls^2+Ms} ds \right| & (55) \\ &\leq \int_{\Gamma-\beta_0} A_1 \log^2(|t| + \gamma_0 + 5) \exp(L((\beta_0 - a)^2 - t^2) + M(b - \beta_0)) |ds| \\ &\leq A_2 e^{L(\beta_0 - a)^2 + M(b - \beta_0)} \int_{\Gamma-\beta_0} \log^2(|t| + \gamma_0 + 5) \exp(-Lt^2) |ds| \\ &\leq A_2 e^{4L\delta^2 + M(1 - \delta - \beta_0)} \int_{\Gamma-\beta_0} \log^2(|t| + \gamma_0 + 5) \exp(-Lt^2) |ds|, \end{aligned}$$

constants A_1, A_2, \dots explicitly depending only on the parameters A, κ and θ from Axiom A.

By construction, the broken line Γ consists of horizontal line segments H_k of length $\leq \frac{1}{2}(b - \theta') = \delta$ at height t_k , and vertical segments the horizontal projection of which covers the imaginary axis exactly (apart from endpoints). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\Gamma-\beta_0} \log^2(|t| + \gamma_0 + 5) \exp(-Lt^2) |ds| \\ &\leq 2 \int_0^\infty \log^2(t + \gamma_0 + 5) e^{-Lt^2} dt + \delta \sum_{k=1}^\infty \log^2(t_k + \gamma_0 + 5) e^{-Lt_k^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Using the standard Vinogradov notation \ll for explicit numerical constants only, for the integral here we easily see

$$\int_0^\infty = \int_0^{\gamma_0+5} + \int_{\gamma_0+5}^\infty \leq \log^2(2\gamma_0 + 10) \int_0^\infty e^{-t^2} dt + \int_5^\infty \log^2(2t) e^{-t^2} dt \ll \log^2(\gamma_0 + 5).$$

Recalling that by construction $t_1 \geq 4$ and $t_k \geq t_{k-1} + 1$, ($k \geq 2$), we get a similar estimate for the sum. Therefore,

$$\int_{\Gamma-\beta_0} \log^2(|t| + \gamma_0 + 5) \exp(-Lt^2) |ds| \ll \log^2(\gamma_0 + 5).$$

Collecting the above estimates and taking into account $M < \log x$, the definition of ω and that γ_0 is large, hence $\log^2(\gamma_0 + 5) < \gamma_0$, we are led to

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Gamma_{-\beta_0}} H(s + \rho_0) e^{Ls^2 + Ms} ds \right| &\leq A_3 \log^2(\gamma_0 + 5) e^{4L\delta^2 - \delta M + (1-\beta_0) \log x} \\ &\leq A_3 e^{4L\delta^2 - \delta M + (1-\beta_0) \log x + \log \gamma_0} = A_3 e^{4L\delta^2 - \delta M + \omega}. \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

Next we see to the estimations of the various parts of the right hand side sum of (54). Keeping the notation $a = \frac{b+\theta'}{2} = 1 - 2\delta$ used in the construction of Γ let us write

$$\begin{aligned} S_1(\rho_0) &:= \sum_{\rho; |\Im \rho - \gamma_0| \geq 3}^* \exp(L(\rho - \rho_0)^2 + M(\rho - \rho_0)) \\ &\leq \sum_{n=3}^{\infty} e^{L(\beta_0 - a)^2 - Ln^2 + M(1-\beta_0)} \{N(a, \gamma_0 - n - 1, \gamma_0 - n) + N(a, \gamma_0 + n, \gamma_0 + n + 1)\} \\ &\leq e^{L(\beta_0 - a)^2 + M(1-\beta_0)} \sum_{n=3}^{\infty} e^{-n^2 L} (A_4 + A_5 \log(\gamma_0 + n)) \\ &\leq A_6 \log(\gamma_0 + 5) e^{4L\delta^2 + M(1-\beta_0) - 9L} \leq A_6 e^{\log \gamma_0 + (1-\beta_0) \log x - 8L} \leq A_6 e^{\omega - 8L}, \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

referring to Lemma 5 in the third line and then calculating similarly as we did above for the sum $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \log^2(t_n + v\gamma_0 + 5) e^{-mt_n^2}$ and in (56).

For the contribution of the remaining zeroes with $|\Im \rho - \gamma_0| \leq 3$ in the full sum of residues, let us recall that by construction $(\beta_0, 1] \times i[\gamma_0 - 3, \gamma_0 + 3]$ is zero-free. In other words, $\Re(\rho - \rho_0) \leq 0$, always. Using this we can apply a refined estimation for zeroes in a middle range distance from ρ_0 as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} S_2(\rho_0) &:= \sum_{\rho; 4\delta \leq |\Im \rho - \gamma_0| \leq 3}^* \exp(L(\rho - \rho_0)^2 + M(\rho - \rho_0)) \\ &\leq \sum_{n=4}^{3/\delta} e^{L((\beta_0 - a)^2 - n^2 \delta^2)} \{N(a, \gamma_0 - (n+1)\delta, \gamma_0 - n\delta) + N(a, \gamma_0 + n\delta, \gamma_0 + (n+1)\delta)\} \\ &\leq e^{L(\beta_0 - a)^2} \sum_{n=4}^{3/\delta} e^{-n^2 L} (A_4 + A_5 \log(\gamma_0 + 5)) \leq A_6 \log \gamma_0 e^{(1-a)^2 L - 16\delta^2 L} = A_6 e^{\log \log \gamma_0 - 7\delta^2 L}. \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

Combining (54), (56), (57) and (58) and taking into account also (52), we are led to

$$|U_2| \geq |S_3| - A_7 \left\{ e^{\varepsilon' \omega + 6\omega m / \log x - m^2 / 4L} + e^{\omega - 0.04 \log^2 x / L} + e^{\log \log \gamma_0 - 7\delta^2 L} + e^{4L\delta^2 + \omega - \delta M} + e^{\omega - 8L} \right\}, \quad (59)$$

where $S_3 := S_3(\rho_0)$ is defined as

$$S_3 := \sum_{\rho; |\Im \rho - \gamma_0| < 4\delta}^* \exp(L(\rho - \rho_0)^2 + M(\rho - \rho_0)).$$

Let us denote the number of ζ -zeroes in the circle $D(r) := \{s : |s - \rho_0| \leq r\}$ as $\nu(r)$. Given that all zeroes in S_3 are to the right of Γ , therefore have $\Re \rho \geq a = 1 - 2\delta$, it is clear that $D(5\delta)$ covers all the zeroes in the sum for S_3 . If a parameter $r_0 \geq \frac{15 \log \log \log \gamma_0}{\log \log \gamma_0}$ is given, then according to the Turán-type Lemma 9 we have¹⁰ the estimate $\nu(r) \leq A_8 r \log(\gamma_0 + 5)$ for any $r_0 < r < 5\delta$.

¹⁰For the applicability of the Lemma recall $\delta < 0.01(1 - \theta)$ i.e. $5\delta < 0.05(1 - \theta) \leq 0.1(\beta_0 - \theta)$ given that $\beta_0 > (1 + \theta)/2$.

Here we cut the sum S_3 into two parts, and estimate the part with zeroes not closer to ρ_0 than r_0 as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} R &:= \sum_{\substack{\rho; r_0 \leq |\rho - \rho_0| < 5\delta}}^* |\exp(L(\rho - \rho_0)^2 + M(\rho - \rho_0))| \\ &\leq \int_{r_0}^{5\delta} \max_{s \in \partial D(r)} \exp(L((\beta - \beta_0)^2 - (t - \gamma_0)^2) - M(\beta_0 - \beta)) d\nu(r). \end{aligned}$$

Here the inner function is $\Phi(r) := \exp(\max_{0 \leq u \leq r; u^2 + v^2 = r^2} \{L(u^2 - v^2) - Mu\})$ so that $\varphi(r) := \log \Phi(r) = \max_{0 \leq u \leq r} (L(2u^2 - r^2) - Mu) = -r^2 L + \max_{0 \leq u \leq r} (2Lu^2 - Mu)$. This last maximum is a maximum of a convex function, whence is attained at some of the end-points: at 0 it attains zero, at r it is $2Lr^2 - Mr$, and we get $\Phi(r) = \exp(-Lr^2 + \max(0, 2Lr^2 - Mr))$. Obviously, if we only assume that $L \leq M$, then for $r \leq 5\delta < 1/2$ we will always have $2Lr^2 - Mr < 0$, whence the maximum is 0 here. This yields

$$\begin{aligned} R &\leq \int_{r_0}^{5\delta} \exp(-Lr^2) d\nu(r) = [\exp(-Lr^2)(\nu(r) - \nu(r_0))]_{r_0}^{5\delta} + \int_{r_0}^{5\delta} 2Lr \exp(-Lr^2)(\nu(r) - \nu(r_0)) dr \\ &\ll \exp(-25L\delta^2) \delta \log(\gamma_0 + 5) + \int_{r_0}^{5\delta} 2Lr \exp(-Lr^2) \log(\gamma_0 + 5) r dr \\ &\ll \log \gamma_0 \left\{ \delta e^{-25L\delta^2} + \int_{r_0}^{\infty} Lr^2 \exp(-Lr^2) dr \right\} \leq \log \gamma_0 \left\{ \delta e^{-25L\delta^2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \int_{r_0\sqrt{L}}^{\infty} u^2 e^{-u^2} du \right\} \\ &\ll \log \gamma_0 \left\{ \delta e^{-25L\delta^2} + r_0 e^{-Lr_0^2} \right\} < e^{\log \log \gamma_0 - Lr_0^2}, \end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

using in the last line Lemma 2 (ii) (applicable with $B := r_0\sqrt{L}$ because $r_0\sqrt{L} \geq 1$).

There remains the part P of S_3 with the remaining zeroes $|\rho - \rho_0| \leq r_0$ (and to the right of Γ). Their number is $n \ll r_0 \log(\gamma_0 + 5)$. Now, P can be written as a sum of pure powers (i.e. without coefficients), where the general term takes the form

$$\exp(L(\rho - \rho_0)^2 + M(\rho - \rho_0)) = \exp(M(\ell(\rho - \rho_0)^2 + (\rho - \rho_0))) = e^{M\lambda(\rho)},$$

with $\lambda(\rho) := \ell(\rho - \rho_0)^2 + (\rho - \rho_0)$ and $\ell := L/M$. In the following we will fix ℓ as a constant, i.e. take L and M to be constant multiples of each other, with M varying in $[\log x - 2m, \log x - m]$, but ℓ fixed. Out of terms of P there is one, belonging to ρ_0 , which must be exactly 1. Therefore, Turán's Second Main Theorem of the Power Sum Theory, Lemma 3 above, gives that in the interval given for M there is a choice of the value of this parameter which furnishes

$$|P| \geq \exp\left(-\log\left(\frac{8e \log x}{m}\right) \cdot A_9 r_0 \log(\gamma_0 + 5)\right) \tag{61}$$

and consequently in view of (60)

$$|S_3| \geq \exp\left(-\log\left(\frac{8e \log x}{m}\right) \cdot A_9 r_0 \log(\gamma_0 + 5)\right) - A_{10} \exp(\log \log \gamma_0 - r_0^2 L). \tag{62}$$

7 Choice of parameters and proof of the theorems

As a key step towards the oscillation result on $\Delta(x)$, we first deduce the following intermediate result.

Theorem 10. *Let $0 < \varepsilon < 0.01(1 - \theta)$ arbitrary. Assume Axiom A, Conditions B and G, $\theta_0 = 1$. If $x > x_0(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon)$ and ρ_1 is the extremal ζ -zero for x (i.e. $\omega(\rho_1, x) = \omega(x)$), then there exists some $\xi \in [x^{1-\varepsilon}, x]$ such that $|\Delta(\xi)| \geq \xi^{\beta_1}/|\rho_1|^{1+\varepsilon}$.*

Remark 4. One would think that the result should hold for *any* zero, once it holds for the extremal one. However, ρ_1 is extremal *only* for x , while it is not clear what would be the right comparison with the extremal zero *right* for ξ . Below in our main result we establish such a comparison—at the expense of a loss of $e^{\varepsilon\omega(\xi)}$, slightly exceeding the mere $|\rho|^\varepsilon$ loss here. That is quite satisfactory, yet we should admit that the plausible variant here for arbitrary zeros we could not prove.

Proof. As $\theta_0 = 1$, $\Re\rho = \theta_0$ is not attained by any zero. Therefore, as $x \rightarrow \infty$, the extremal zeroes in $\tilde{\omega} \approx \omega$ satisfy " $\rho \rightarrow 1 + i\infty$ ", as is discussed in Lemma 10. Thus we can assume γ_1 to be sufficiently large whenever $\gamma_1 = \Im\rho_1$ for an x -extremal ρ_1 with large enough x .

Recall from the above argument that we replaced the extremal zero ρ_1 by some possibly different ρ_0 with $\gamma_1 \leq \gamma_0 \leq (1 + o(1))\gamma_1$ and $\beta_0 \geq \beta_1$, and such that $\omega(\rho_0, x) \leq \omega(x) + 1$. Obviously, it suffices then to prove the assertion for this possibly changed zero ρ_0 , for $\beta_0 \geq \beta_1$ and $|\rho_0| = |\rho_1|(1 + o(1))$ entails $\frac{\xi^{\beta_0}}{|\rho_0|^{1+\varepsilon}} \geq \frac{\xi^{\beta_1}}{[(1+o(1))|\rho_1|]^{1+\varepsilon}} \geq \frac{\xi^{\beta_1}}{|\rho_1|^{1+2\varepsilon}}$, say.

We apply the results of the calculations of the above Sections 5 and 6 with the parameters

$$\varepsilon' < \delta^2, \quad \ell := \frac{1}{8} \text{ (i.e. } L := \frac{1}{8}M), \quad m := \varepsilon' \log x, \quad r_0 := 3\varepsilon'^2. \quad (63)$$

Given that $\gamma_0 = (1 + o(1))\gamma_1$, we certainly know that $\gamma_0 \rightarrow \infty$, thus for large enough x the above choice of $r_0 = 3\varepsilon'^2$ exceeds $15 \log \log \log \gamma_0 / \log \log \gamma_0$, whence is admissible. Similarly, as $\omega \in [\omega(x), \omega(x) + 1]$ and $\omega(x)/\log x \rightarrow (1 - \theta_0) = 0$, we certainly have $\gamma_0 \leq \omega = o(\log x)$. So, for large enough x we also have $\log \gamma_0 \leq \omega \leq \frac{1}{3}\varepsilon'^3 \log x$. Further, from $\gamma_0 \rightarrow \infty$ it also follows that for large enough γ_0 —that is, for large enough x —we necessarily have $\log \log \gamma_0 < \varepsilon' \log \gamma_0$, and in particular even $r_0^2 L \geq \varepsilon'^4 \log x \geq \varepsilon' \log \gamma_0 > \log \log \gamma_0 > 1$.

With the above choice of parameters the conditions that $m \leq |\rho_0|L$, that $m > 4\sqrt{L}$, $m > 24L\omega/\log x$, $M \geq 0.95 \log x$ and that $\log x \geq 20\sqrt{L}$ are obviously met, thus from (59) we are led to

$$\begin{aligned} |U_2| &\geq |S_3| - A_7 \left\{ e^{7\varepsilon'\omega - \varepsilon'^2 \log^2 x / 4L} + e^{\omega - 0.3 \log x} + e^{\varepsilon' \log \gamma_0 - 7\varepsilon' L} + e^{\omega + 4\delta^2 L - \delta M} + e^{-7L} \right\} \\ &\geq |S_3| - A_7 \left\{ e^{7\varepsilon'\omega - 2\varepsilon'^2 \log x} + e^{\omega - 0.3 \log x} + e^{-6\varepsilon' L} + e^{\omega + \delta^2 M - \delta M} + e^{-7L} \right\} \\ &\geq |S_3| - A_7 \left\{ e^{-\varepsilon'^2 \log x} + e^{-\omega} + e^{-6\varepsilon'\omega} + e^{\omega - 2\delta^2 M} + e^{-7L} \right\} \\ &\geq |S_3| - O\left(e^{-2\varepsilon'\omega} + e^{-\omega} + e^{-6\varepsilon'\omega} + e^{\omega - \varepsilon' \log x} + e^{-7\omega}\right) = |S_3| - O(e^{-2\varepsilon'\omega}) = |S_3| - O(\gamma_0^{-2\varepsilon'}). \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

Further, substituting our parameter choices into (62) yields

$$\begin{aligned} |S_3| &\geq \exp\left(-\log\left(\frac{8e}{\varepsilon'}\right) \cdot A_9 3\varepsilon'^2 2 \log \gamma_0\right) - A_{10} \exp(\log \log \gamma_0 - 9\varepsilon'^4 L) \\ &\geq e^{-\varepsilon' \log \gamma_0} - A_{10} e^{\varepsilon' \log \gamma_0 - \varepsilon'^4 \log x} \geq e^{-\varepsilon' \log \gamma_0} - A_{10} e^{\varepsilon' \log \gamma_0 - 3\varepsilon' \log \gamma_0} \geq \gamma_0^{-\varepsilon'} - O(\gamma_0^{-2\varepsilon'}). \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

Collecting (53), (64) and (65) finally leads to

$$\max_{\xi \in [q, x]} \frac{|\Delta(\xi)|}{\xi^{\beta_0}/|\rho_0|} \geq \gamma_0^{-\varepsilon'} \left(1 - O(\gamma_0^{-\varepsilon'})\right),$$

proving the assertion if ε' is chosen sufficiently smaller than ε . \square

Now we are in the position to infer the second main result of the present study.

Theorem 11. *Assume Axiom A, Conditions B and G, $\theta_0 = 1$. If $0 < \varepsilon < 0.01(1 - \theta)$ is arbitrary and if $x > x_0(\mathcal{G}, \varepsilon)$, then there exists some $\tilde{x} \in [x^{1-\varepsilon}, x]$ such that $|\Delta(\tilde{x})| \geq \tilde{x} \exp(-(1 + \varepsilon)\omega(\tilde{x}))$.*

Proof. We apply the above Theorem 10: there is a $\tilde{x} \in [x^{1-\varepsilon}, x]$ such that

$$|\Delta(\tilde{x})| \geq \frac{\tilde{x}^{\beta_1}}{|\rho_1|^{1+\varepsilon}} = \frac{\tilde{x}}{\tilde{x}^{1-\beta_1}|\rho_1|^{1+\varepsilon}} \geq \frac{\tilde{x}}{(\tilde{x}^{1-\beta_1}|\rho_1|)^{1+\varepsilon}} \geq \frac{\tilde{x}}{(x^{1-\beta_1}|\rho_1|)^{1+\varepsilon}} = \frac{\tilde{x}}{\exp((1 + \varepsilon)\omega(x))}. \quad (66)$$

Next we want to compare $\omega(x)$ and $\omega(\tilde{x})$ in the exponent. That is, we write

$$|\Delta(\tilde{x})| \geq \frac{\tilde{x} \exp(-(1 + \varepsilon)\omega(\tilde{x}))}{\exp((1 + \varepsilon)(\omega(x) - \omega(\tilde{x})))}. \quad (67)$$

We can write in the denominator according to point 5 of Lemma 10 that $\omega(x) - \omega(\tilde{x}) \leq \omega(\tilde{x}) \frac{\log x - \log \tilde{x}}{\log \tilde{x}} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon} \omega(\tilde{x})$, and that gives $|\Delta(x)| \geq \tilde{x} \exp(-\frac{1+\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon} \omega(\tilde{x}))$, which is obviously sufficient as ε was arbitrary. \square

Contrary to the upper estimations in the direct direction of Ingham type theorems, here in the converse direction the analogous results with the Ingham function $\eta(t)$ are not so immediate. The reason is that we have seen that if η is to bound a domain $D(\eta)$ free of zeroes, then $\omega(x) \geq \omega_\eta(x)$. However, when η is a curve with $D(\eta)$ containing an infinitude of zeroes, then no direct comparison of the two functions ω and ω_η is available. What we will do in the below proof is a pointwise comparison, to our favor, along a sequence, defined geometrically and indirectly by the outstanding sequence of zeroes ρ_k .

Proof of Theorem 6. So let us assume now that ρ_k is a sequence of zeroes in the domain (11), bounded by $\eta(t)$. We assume that $\eta(t)$ is convex in logarithmic variables, and also that $\theta_0 = 1$ (all other cases being similar and even simpler). Also we can drop from the sequence all ρ_k which are not extreme points of the convex hull (also interpreted in logarithmic variables!) $H := \text{con}((\mathcal{C} \setminus D(\eta)) \cup (\cup_{k=1}^{\infty} \{\rho_k\}))$. Indeed, if there were only a finite number of ρ_k being extreme points, then asymptotically by $\eta(t) \rightarrow 0$ for $t > t_0$ we would have no ρ_k in $D(\eta)$ at all.

Now if ρ_k is an extreme point then there exists a supporting line of the convex hull, i.e. a line L with defining equation $u = a + bv$, where $v := \log t$ is the logarithmic variable for $\eta(t) = \eta(e^v)$, such that it passes through the point $\rho_k := \beta_k + iv_k$, where $v_k := \log \gamma_k$, while it goes fully outside the convex hull H otherwise.

Here we can interpret geometrically, what $\omega(x) = \omega(\rho^*, x)$ means. Take the straight line ℓ passing through the point $(1, 0)$ and of slope ξ in the (u, v) -plane, where the abscissa u contains the real part values (β -values) and the ordinate $v = \log \gamma$ correspond to the imaginary parts. Its equation is $v = \xi(u - 1)$, or $\xi(1 - u) + v = 0$. In the (u, v) -plane, the line ℓ is to the right of the above defined convex domain H . Substituting the coordinates of any point in the normal form of L furnishes the distance of that point from ℓ ; so that minimizing over all ρ_k corresponds to finding the least distance from ℓ . Correspondingly, the line ℓ^* passing through $\beta^* + iv^*$ and parallel to ℓ with the minimal distance from ℓ is just a supporting line to H . That is, $\omega(\rho^*, x) = \omega(x)$ also means that all points of H , in particular all points on the curve $\mathcal{C} := \partial \mathcal{D}(\eta)$ defined by $((1 - \eta(v), v))$, will have to be further off. The distance to the left from ℓ is positive, and ρ^* provides the least such positive distance as compared to all points of H ; in particular it provides a smaller (not larger) value than minimizing over all points of \mathcal{C} . It follows that $\omega_\eta(x) \leq \omega(\rho^*, x) = \omega(x)$. This is not a general equation, it is conditional to the property that ρ^* is extremal to the given value

of x , but it holds for arbitrary values of x to which there is a supporting line through some of the ρ . As said, we already know that there is an infinitude of ρ_k being extreme points of the convex hull H , therefore there is an infinite sequence of $\xi_k = \log x_k$ values for which the lines with slopes ξ_k and passing through ρ_k provide supporting lines to H . With that sequence of x_k we therefore have that $\omega(x_k) = \omega(\rho_k, x_k)$, and also that $\omega(x_k) \leq \omega_\eta(x_k)$. It is clear that these slopes are tending to infinity, therefore also $x_k = e^{\xi_k} \rightarrow \infty$.

Here we can apply Theorem 11 (with $x := x_k$), more precisely its proof, where in the first step we have got (66). We obtain an infinitude of $\widetilde{x}_k \in [x_k^{1-\varepsilon}, x_k]$ values, for which $|\Delta(\widetilde{x}_k)| \geq \widetilde{x}_k \exp(-(1 + \varepsilon)\omega(x_k)) \geq \widetilde{x}_k \exp(-(1 + \varepsilon)\omega_\eta(x_k))$, the last step being clarified above.

Finally, we can note that ω_η satisfies similar properties as ω —the proofs are the same as in Lemma 10. That means that we can argue as above in the end of the proof of Theorem 11, finally deriving $|\Delta(\widetilde{x}_k)| \geq \exp(-\frac{1+\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon}\omega(\widetilde{x}_k))$. \square

References

- [1] AL-MAAMORI, F.; HILBERDINK, T. W. An example in Beurling’s theory of generalised primes. *Acta Arith.* **168** (2015), no. 4, 383–396.
- [2] T. BEKEHERMES, *Allgemeine Dirichletreihen und Primzahlverteilung in arithmetische Halbgruppen*, Dissertation zur Erlangung des Grades eines Doktors, Technischen Universität Clausthal, 2003.
- [3] A. BEURLING, Analyse de la loi asymptotique de la distribution des nombres premiers généralisés I. *Acta Math.* **68** (1937), 255–291.
- [4] F. BROUCKE, Note on a conjecture of Bateman and Diamond concerning the abstract PNT with Malliavin-type remainder, ArXiv preprint no. arXiv:2012.06220, see at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2012.06220v1>.
- [5] F. BROUCKE, J. VINDAS, A new generalized prime random approximation procedure and some of its applications, ArXiv preprint no. arxiv:arXiv:2102.08478, see at <https://arxiv.org/abs/arXiv:2102.08478v1>.
- [6] F. BROUCKE, G. DEBRUYNE and J. VINDAS, Beurling integers with RH and large oscillation. *Adv. Math.* **370** (2020), Article no. 107240, 38 pp.
- [7] G. DEBRUYNE and J. VINDAS, On PNT equivalences for Beurling numbers. *Monatsh. Math.* **184** (2017), no. 3, 401–424.
- [8] G. DEBRUYNE and J. VINDAS, On general prime number theorems with remainder. (English summary) *Generalized functions and Fourier analysis*, 79–94, in: Oper. Theory Adv. Appl., **260**, Adv. Partial Differ. Equ. (Basel), Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2017.
- [9] G. DEBRUYNE and J. VINDAS, On Diamond’s L^1 criterion for asymptotic density of Beurling generalized integers. *Michigan Math. J.* **68** (2019), no. 1, 211–223.
- [10] G. DEBRUYNE, H. DIAMOND and J. VINDAS, $M(x) = o(x)$ estimates for Beurling numbers. *J. Théor. Nombres Bordeaux* **30** (2018), no. 2, 469–483.
- [11] DEBRUYNE, G.; SCHLAGE-PUCHTA, J.-C.; VINDAS, J., Some examples in the theory of Beurling’s generalized prime numbers. *Acta Arith.* **176** (2016), no. 2, 101–129.

- [12] H. G. DIAMOND, H. L. MONTGOMERY and U. VORHAUER, Beurling primes with large oscillation, *Math. Ann.*, **334** (2006) no. 1, 1–36.
- [13] H. G. DIAMOND, When do Beurling generalized integers have a density?, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **295** (1977), p. 22–39.
- [14] DIAMOND, H. G.; ZHANG, WEN-BIN, Optimality of Chebyshev bounds for Beurling generalized numbers. *Acta Arith.* **160** (2013), no. 3, 259–275.
- [15] DIAMOND, H. G.; ZHANG, WEN-BIN, Chebyshev bounds for Beurling numbers. *Acta Arith.* **160** (2013), no. 2, 143–157.
- [16] DIAMOND, H. G.; ZHANG, WEN-BIN, Prime number theorem equivalences and non-equivalences. *Mathematika* **63** (2017), no. 3, 852–862.
- [17] DIAMOND, H. G.; ZHANG, WEN-BIN, *Beurling generalized numbers*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 213. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2016. xi+244 pp.
- [18] HILBERDINK, T. W. Generalised prime systems with periodic integer counting function. *Acta Arith.* **152** (2012), no. 3, 217–241.
- [19] HILBERDINK, T. W. Ω -results for Beurling’s zeta function and lower bounds for the generalised Dirichlet divisor problem. *J. Number Theory* **130** (2010), no. 3, 707–715.
- [20] HILBERDINK, T. W.; LAPIDUS, M. L. Beurling zeta functions, generalised primes, and fractal membranes. *Acta Appl. Math.* **94** (2006), no. 1, 21–48.
- [21] HILBERDINK, T. W. Well-behaved Beurling primes and integers. *J. Number Theory* **112** (2005), no. 2, 332–344.
- [22] A. E. INGHAM, *The distribution of prime numbers*, Cambridge University Press, 1932.
- [23] A. E. INGHAM, A note on the distribution of primes. *Acta Arith.* **1** (1936), 201–211.
- [24] D. JOHNSTON, Improving bounds on prime counting functions by partial verification of the Riemann hypothesis, ArXiv preprint no. arXiv:2109.02249, see at <https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.02249>.
- [25] KAHANE, J.-P., Le rôle des algebres A de Wiener, A^∞ de Beurling et H^1 de Sobolev dans la théorie des nombres premiers généralisés, *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* **48**(3) (1998) 611–648.
- [26] KAHANE, J. P., Un théoreme de Littlewood pour les nombres premiers de Beurling. (French) [A Littlewood theorem for Beurling primes] *Bull. London Math. Soc.* **31** (1999), no. 4, 424–430.
- [27] KAHANE, J.-P., Conditions pour que les entiers de Beurling aient une densité. *J. Théor. Nombres Bordeaux* **29** (2017), no. 2, 681–692.
- [28] S. KNAPOWSKI On the mean values of certain functions in prime number theory, *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar.* **10** (1959), 375–390.

- [29] J. KNOPFMACHER, *Abstract analytic number theory*, North Holland & Elsevier, Amsterdam–Oxford & New York, 1975. (Second edition: Dover Books on Advanced Mathematics. Dover Publications, Inc., New York, 1990. xii+336 pp.)
- [30] J. E. LITTLEWOOD, Mathematical notes (12). An inequality for a sum of cosines, *J. London Math. Soc.* **12** (1937), 217–222.
- [31] J. E. LITTLEWOOD, Sur la distribution des nombres premiers, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris* **158** (1914) 1869–1872.
- [32] H. L. MONTGOMERY, *Topics in multiplicative number theory*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, **227**, Springer, 1971.
- [33] M. J. MOSSINGHOF, T. S. TRUDGIAN, Improving bounds on prime counting functions by partial verification of the Riemann hypothesis, *J. Number Theory* **157** (2015), 329–349.
- [34] NEAMAH, A. A.; HILBERDINK, T. W. The average order of the Möbius function for Beurling primes. *Int. J. Number Theory* **16** (2020), no. 5, 1005–1011.
- [35] J. PINTZ, On the remainder term of the prime number formula. I. On a problem of Littlewood, *Acta Arith.* **36** (1980), 341–365.
- [36] J. PINTZ, On the remainder term of the prime number formula. II. On a theorem of Ingham, *Acta Arith.* **37** (1980), 209–220.
- [37] J. PINTZ, Elementary methods in the theory of L -functions IX. Density theorems *Acta Arith.* **XLIX** (1980), 387–394.
- [38] J. PINTZ Distribution of the zeros of the Riemann zeta function and oscillations of the error term in the asymptotic law of the distribution of prime numbers. (Russian) *Tr. Mat. Inst. Steklova* **296** (2017), Analiticheskaya i Kombinatornaya Teoriya Chisel, 207–219. English version published in *Proc. Steklov Inst. Math.* **296** (2017), no. 1, 198–210.
- [39] J. PINTZ, Some new density theorems for Dirichlet L -functions. *Number theory week 2017, Banach Center Publ.*, **118**, 231–244. Polish Acad. Sci. Inst. Math., Warsaw, 2019. See also at <https://arxiv.org/abs/1804.05552>.
- [40] PINTZ, J., Oscillatory properties of the remainder term of the prime number formula. *in: Studies in pure mathematics*, 551–560, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1983.
- [41] PINTZ, J., On the remainder term of the prime number formula and the zeros of Riemann’s zeta-function. *in: Number theory, Noordwijkerhout 1983 (Noordwijkerhout, 1983)*, 186–197, *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*, **1068**, Springer, Berlin, 1984.
- [42] PINTZ, J., On the mean value of arithmetic error terms, *Math. Pann.*, to appear. See in "Online First" at <https://akjournals.com/view/journals/314/aop/article-10.1556-314.2022.00007/article-10.1556-314.2022.00007.xml>.
- [43] D. J. PLATT AND T. S. TRUDGIAN. The error term in the prime number theorem. ArXiv preprint no. arXiv:1809.03134, see at <https://arxiv.org/abs/1809.03134v2>.

- [44] SZ. GY. RÉVÉSZ, Irregularities in the distribution of prime ideals. I, *Studia Sci. Math. Hungar.* **18** (1983), 57–67.
- [45] SZ. GY. RÉVÉSZ, Irregularities in the distribution of prime ideals. II, *Studia Sci. Math. Hungar.* **18** (1983), 343–369.
- [46] SZ. GY. RÉVÉSZ, On a theorem of Phragmén, *Complex analysis and applications '85, (Proceedings of the conference held in Varna, Bulgaria, 1985)*, Publ. House Bulgar. Acad. Sci. Sofia, 1986, p. 556–568.
- [47] SZ. GY. RÉVÉSZ, Effective oscillation theorems for a general class of real-valued remainder terms, *Acta Arith.* **XLIX** (1988), 482–505.
- [48] SZ. GY. RÉVÉSZ, On Beurling's prime number theorem, *Periodica Math. Hungar.* **28** (1994), no. 3, 195–210.
- [49] SZ. GY. RÉVÉSZ, Density theorems for the Beurling zeta function. To appear in *Mathematika*. ArXiv preprint no. arXiv:2012.09045, see at <https://arxiv.org/abs/arXiv:2012.09045>.
- [50] SZ. GY. RÉVÉSZ, A Riemann-von Mangoldt-type formula for the distribution of Beurling primes. *Mathematica Pannonica* **27 N.S. 1** no. 2, 204–232.
- [51] SZ. GY. RÉVÉSZ, Oscillation of the remainder term in the prime number theorem of Beurling, "caused by a given ζ -zero". ArXiv preprint no. arXiv:2012.09045, see at <https://arxiv.org/abs/arXiv:2012.09045>.
- [52] J.-C. SCHLAGE-PUCHTA, Oscillations of the error term in the prime number theorem. *Acta Math. Hungar.* **156** (2018), no. 2, 303–308.
- [53] J.-C. SCHLAGE-PUCHTA and J. VINDAS, The prime number theorem for Beurling's generalized numbers. New cases, *Acta Arith.* **133**(3) (2012) 293–324.
- [54] E. SCHMIDT, Über die Anzahl der Primzahlen unter gegebener Grenze, *Math. Ann.* **57** (1903), 195–204.
- [55] W. STAŚ, Über eine Anwendung der Methode von Turán auf die Theorie des Restgliedes im Primidealsatz, *Acta Arith.* **5** (1959), 179–195.
- [56] W. STAŚ, Über die Abschätzung des Restgliedes im Primzahlsatz, *Acta Arith.* **5** (1959), 427–434.
- [57] W. STAŚ, Über die Umkehrung eines Satzes von Ingham, *Acta Arith.* **6** (1961), 435–446.
- [58] W. STAŚ, K. WIERTELAK, Some estimates in the theory of functions represented by Dirichlet's series, *Funct. Approx. Comment. Math.* **1** (1974), 107–111.
- [59] W. STAŚ, K. WIERTELAK, A comparison of certain remainders connected with prime ideals in ideal classes mod f , *Funct. Approx. Comment. Math.* **4** (1976), 99–107.
- [60] SÓS, V. T. AND TURÁN, P., On some new theorems in the theory of diophantine approximations, *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar.* **6** (1955), 241–255.
- [61] T. S. TRUDGIAN, Updating the error term in the prime number theorem. *Ramanujan J.*, **39**(2), 225–234 (2016).

- [62] P. TURÁN, *On a new method of analysis and its applications*, Wiley-Interscience, New York, 1984.
- [63] P. TURÁN, On the remainder term of the prime-number formula, I, *Acta Math. Acad. Hungar.* **1** (1950), 48–63.
- [64] P. TURÁN, On the remainder-term of the prime number formula. II, *Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hungar.* **1** (1950), 155–160.
- [65] LA VALLÉE POUSSIN, CH.-J. DE , Sur la fonction $\zeta(s)$ de Riemann ... *Memoaire couronnés .. de Belgique*, **59** No 1 (1899), 1–74.
- [66] J. VINDAS, Chebyshev estimates for Beurling’s generalized prime numbers. I, *J. Number Theory* **132** (2012) 2371–2376.
- [67] VINDAS, J., Chebyshev upper estimates for Beurling’s generalized prime numbers. *Bull. Belg. Math. Soc. Simon Stevin* **20** (2013), no. 1, 175–180.
- [68] ZHANG, WEN-BIN, Exact Wiener-Ikehara theorems. *Acta Arith.* **187** (2019), no. 4, 357–380.
- [69] ZHANG, WEN-BIN, Extensions of Beurling’s prime number theorem. *Int. J. Number Theory* **11** (2015), no. 5, 1589–1616.
- [70] ZHANG, WEN-BIN, A proof of a conjecture of Bateman and Diamond on Beurling generalized primes. *Monatsh. Math.* **176** (2015), no. 4, 637–656.
- [71] ZHANG, WEN-BIN, Beurling primes with RH and Beurling primes with large oscillation. *Math. Ann.* **337** (2007), no. 3, 671–704.
- [72] WEN-BIN ZHANG, Chebyshev type estimates for Beurling generalized prime numbers. II. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **337** (1993), no. 2, 651–675.