arXiv:1010.3374v7 [math.GM] 4 Jun 2021

PROOF OF THE STRONG LINDELÖF HYPOTHESIS

YUANYOU CHENG*, SERGIO ALBEVERIO, ROLAND L. GRAHAM,
CARL B. POMERANCE, AND JUPING WANG

Dedicated to our memory to Shiing-Shen Chern and Loo-Keng Hua

Abstract. The Lindelöf hypothesis (1908) asserts that $|\zeta(\frac{1}{2}+it)| = O(|t|^{\epsilon})$ for sufficiently large $|t|$. It is known to be equivalent to an estimate on the number of zeros of $\zeta(s)$ in certain regions. A family of pseudo-Gamma functions is a key tool introduced recently by Y. Cheng, C. B. Pomerance, G. J. Fox, and S. W. Graham, in the proof of the strong density hypothesis. This function is reflectively symmetric about the real axis and also reflectively symmmetric about the half line where the real part of the variable is equal to $\frac{1}{2}$. Extending estimates in the proof of the strong density hypothesis, we prove a result slightly stronger than the Lindelöf hypothesis in its zero-rate form.

1. Introduction

We use the notation $\mathbb{R}$ for the set of real numbers and $\mathbb{C}$ for the set of complex numbers.

Denote the set of all prime numbers by $\mathbb{P}$. The Riemann zeta function $\zeta(s)$ is defined for $s = \sigma + i\,t$, σ, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, $\sigma > 1$ by

$$\zeta(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^s} = \prod_{p \in \mathbb{P}} \frac{1}{1 - \frac{1}{p^s}}. \tag{1.1}$$

The second equality in this formula is called the Euler product formula. It immediately yields that $\zeta(s)$ has no zeros for $\sigma > 1$. It is well-known that the function $\zeta(s)$ can be analytically continued to a meromorphic function on the complex plane with the unique pole at $s = 1$, see, e.g., [33]. This is

Date: Drafted, November 29, 2013. Revised, March 18 – July 21, 2018. Submitted, July 23, 2017.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: 11M26, 11N05, 30D15, 11Y35, 11A41, 11R42, 11Y40.

Key words and phrases: The Lindelöf hypothesis, prime numbers, the Riemann zeta-function, the Riemann hypothesis, the prime number theorem, the density hypothesis, a pseudo-Gamma function, upper and lower bounds, the growth rate of zeros.

*The primary and correspoding author would like to thank Gongbao Li, George E. Andrews, John T. Tate Jr., Roger D. Heath-Brown, Andrew J. Granville, Bonnie J. Xiong, Edward Azoff, Hourong Qin, Weike Wang, and Bill Z. Yang for their encouragements during the writing of this article. He gratefully acknowledges the hospitality of the School of Mathematical Sciences at Fudan University, Shanghai, P. R. China, where part of this work was done.

seen, for example, by

$$\zeta(s) = \frac{1}{1-2^{1-s}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \sum_{k=0}^{n} (-1)^k \binom{n}{k} \frac{1}{(k+1)^s}, \tag{1.2}$$

for all $s \in \mathbb{C}\backslash\{1\}$, where $\mathbb{C}$ is the set of complex numbers. In (1.2), the pole of the function $(1-2^{1-s})^{-1}$ at $s=1$ corresponds to the unique pole of $\zeta(s)$. Denote the set of all natural numbers by $\mathbb{N}$. All other poles of the former function occur at $s = 1 - \frac{2\pi\, m\, i}{\log 2}$ for each $m \in \mathbb{N}$. They are canceled by zeros of the function defined by the double sum on the right hand side of (1.2).

The Riemann zeta function plays a pivotal role in analytic number theory and many other branches of mathematics and its applications, particularly, in physics, see, e.g., [2], [5], [8], [28], [27], [55], and [74]. It has so-called trivial zeros at $s = -2n$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. The other zeros for the Riemann zeta function are known, since the work of de la Vallée Poussin [34] and and Hadamard [42], to be all located in the critical strip $0 < \sigma < 1$. The hypothesis made by Bernhart Riemann, see [65], in 1859, considered to be one of the greatest unsolved problems in mathematics, asserts that all non-trivial zeros are located on the critical line $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$. Upper bounds on $|\zeta(s)|$ in the critical strip play an important role in the study of the distribution of primes, see, e.g., [6], [7], [8], [15], [51], [58], and [60].

Denote by $\mathbb{R}^+$ the set of positive real numbers. We use the symbol $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}^+$ for an arbitrary small positive real number, not necessarily the same at each occurrence in a given statement. The Lindelöf hypothesis is a conjecture claiming that

$$|\zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + it) = O(|t|^{\epsilon}), \quad \text{for each } \epsilon > 0, \text{ as } |t| \to \infty, \tag{1.3}$$

see [33], [45], and [60].

The Lindelöf hypothesis is implied by the Riemann hypothesis, see, e.g. [9], p. 130, [48], p. 116. Lindelöf proved in [61] that (1.3) is equivalent with an estimate on the number of zeros of $\zeta(s)$ in certain regions. This has implications on the distributions of prime numbers, see, e.g., [4], [6], [7], [29], [41], [51], [54], [56], [57], [59], [64], [67], and [73].

Let us denote by $N(\lambda, T)$ the number of zeros of $\zeta(s)$ in the domain $\{\sigma \geq \lambda : 0 \leq t \leq T\}$, $\lambda > \frac{1}{2}$. Backlund proved in 1918–1919 that the Lindelöf hypothesis is equivalent to $N_T := N(\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon, T+1) - N(\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon, T) = o(\log T)$ as $T \to \infty$, for every $\epsilon > 0$, see, e.g., [71], Theorem 13.5, or [63], 5.4. Without the Lindelöf hypothesis, only results of the form $N_T = O(\log T)$ (instead of $o(\log T)$) have been proved, see, e.g., [51] and the recent result [16]. Below, in Theorem 2, via Theorem 1, we will prove a result which is even stronger

than the Lindelöf hypothesis. However, before coming to a description of our work, let us mention briefly some further connections of the Lindelöf hypothesis with other topics.

1. The Lindelöf hypothesis is known to be related to statements about moments of the ζ function. E.g. $\int_0^T |\zeta(\frac{1}{2}+i\,t)|^{2k}\ \mathrm{d}\,t = O(T^{1+\epsilon})$, for all $\epsilon > 0$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is equivalent with the Lindelöf hypothesis, see [71] (Theorem 13.2, 13.3). Before our work, the latter statement was only proven for $k = 1$ (as a consequence of results by Littlewood and Ingham, 1928, [49]) and for $k = 2$ (Heath-Brown, 1979, s[44]). For other types of mean value estimates related to the Lindelöf hypothesis, see, e.g., [3] and [75]. There is also an equivalence between the Lindelöf hypothesis and a zeta-sum estimate, see Corollary 1 on p. 166 in [54].

2. The Lindelöf hypothesis implies $\mu(\frac{1}{2}) = 0$, where $\mu(\sigma) = \inf\{\alpha \in \mathbb{R} : \zeta(\sigma + i\,t) = O(t^{\alpha})\}$. On this, before our work, the best result seems to be $\mu(\frac{1}{2}) = \frac{32}{205}$, by Huxley 2002–2005, see [47].

3. An analogue of the Lindelöf hypothesis has been conjectured for Dirichlet L-functions $L(s, \chi)$, to a given character χ modulo $q \in \mathbb{N}$, namely $L(\frac{1}{2}, \chi) = O(q|t| + 1)^{\epsilon}$, for all $\epsilon > 0$, see, e. g., [3] and [38].

4. The density hypothesis is known in the form $N(\sigma, T) = O\big(T^{2(1-\sigma)+\epsilon}\big)$ for $\epsilon > 0$, $\frac{1}{2} \leq \sigma \leq 1$. It follows from the Lindelöf hypothesis, see [50]. As remarked in [38] this is not true for Lerch zeta functions which do not have an Euler product representation, of which Hurwitz zeta function is a particular case. In fact in [38] it is shown that for "a positive portion of all Lerch zeta functions" the density hypothesis fails to be true. These authors conjecture that the Lindelöf hypothesis could still hold for these functions; they also provide an equivalent formulation of this hypothesis in terms of the behavior of certain exponential sums, see also [37]. In [31] it is shown that for Dirichlet series in the Selberg class the Riemann hypothesis implies the Lindelöf hypothesis. The authors of [31] construct an example where the latter hypothesis fails, although 3 out of 4 of the axioms for the function to be in the Selberg class hold.

For this and other facts around the Lindelöf hypothesis, see, e.g., [33], [35] (§9.2), [43], [45], [46], [51], [58] (page 491), [61], or [63] (§1).

In the present paper we shall use the pseudo-Gamma function recently devised by us in [16] to prove the density hypothesis, in order to deduce an estimate on the growth rate of zeros of $\zeta(s)$ and obtain a slightly sharper result than the Lindelöf hypothesis. Thus, in particular, we have a proof of the Lindelöf hypothesis.

It is of course natural to ask why we succeed in proving this hypothesis when other attempts in the past have failed.

One main new method we use, for the present paper as well as the one on the density hypothesis, is a new type of local representation of the Riemann ξ-function, see (1.9) below, in the regions of interests, both inside and outside the critical strip. This new local representation uses essentially the trick of introducing a pseudo-Gamma function $\nabla(s)$, having neither zeros nor poles in the regions of interest, and estimating $\xi(s)$ by writing $\xi(s) = \frac{\xi(s)}{\nabla(s)}\,\nabla(s)$ and deriving appropriate estimates on both $\frac{\xi(s)}{\nabla(s)}$ and $\nabla(s)$. The function $\nabla(s)$ is chosen following [16] in such a way that it offsets the growth of the classical Gamma function present in the definition of $\xi(s)$ in terms of $\zeta(s)$. This new function $\nabla(s)$ shares with $\xi(s)$ the double symmetry property. We say namely that an analytic function $\mathscr{D}(s)$ is *doubly symmetric* if

$$\mathscr{D}(\bar{s}) = \overline{\mathscr{D}(s)}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathscr{D}(1-s) = \mathscr{D}(s). \tag{1.4}$$

From these two conditions, we see that

$$\mathscr{D}(1-\sigma+it) = \overline{\mathscr{D}(\sigma+it)}. \tag{1.5}$$

Under the first condition in (1.4), the second condition in (1.4) is equivalent to that in (1.5). The first condition in (1.4) says the function $\mathscr{D}$ is reflectively symmetric with respect to the real axis; and the formula in (1.5) tells us that this function $\mathscr{D}(s)$ is reflectively symmetric with respect to the line $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$.

Concerning the methods used for our proof let us also add that we use the Euler product formula for $\xi(s)$ and $\zeta(s)$, which holds for $\Re(s) > 1$, in the sense that we use that $\log\zeta(s)$ and $\log\xi(s)$ have univalent analytic extensions to regions contained in $\Re(s) > -2$ with suitable half-line cuts.

As in [16], in addition, the relation between prime number and location of zeros of $\zeta(s)$ enters in an estimate on the logarithmic derivative of $\zeta(s)$, this also being dependent on Euler's product formula. Thus a possible extension of our method, as well as the one in [16], is limited, if at all possible, to L-functions in Selberg's class. This is in accord with the discussions in [37], [38], and [48].

The Riemann hypothesis has been verified computationally for the first 10^{13} zeros in [40]. In [16] we deduced from this and [70] that there are no zeros for the Riemann zeta function for $|t| \le 2445999556029$. This gives the rationale for the definition of the quantity T_0 appearing in Theorem 1 below, namely $T_0 = 2445999556027$, which is a number 2 ($> \frac{5}{4}$ as needed)

less than the mentioned threshold to take care of the fact that we need to cover $T + \frac{5}{4}$ with $T \geq T_0$ in the course of the proof of Theorem 1 below, as we shall see, in Section 2.

From now on, we let $\mathbf{Z}$ be the set of all non-trivial zeros for the Riemann zeta function. We recall that $N(\lambda, T)$ denotes the number of zeros for $\zeta(s)$ in the domain restricted by $\sigma \geq \lambda$ and $0 \leq t \leq T$ for $\lambda \geq \frac{1}{2}$ and $T \geq 0$.

Theorem 1. *Let* $\frac{1}{2} < \lambda < 1$ *and* $1 \leq d \leq \frac{5}{4}$. *Then,*

$$N(\lambda, T + d) - N(\lambda, T - d) \leq 3, \tag{1.6}$$

for $T \geq T_0$.

This zero growth rate is needed in [17] for us to extend Turan's result from 1949, relating the remainder terms of the prime number theorem to the zero-free regions, near the line $\sigma = 1$ to the whole critical strip $\frac{1}{2} < \sigma < 1$. Theorem 1 and the results proven in [16] , this article, [17], and, [18] constitute components eventually leading to the proof of the Riemann hypothesis in [27].

`Remark`: By our definition of T_0 and the computational result that the first 10^{13} zeros of the Riemann zeta function are on the line $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$, we see that 3 on the right hand side of (1.6) can be replaced by 0 for $0 \leq T < T_0$.

The proof of Theorem 2 in Section 6 depends on Theorem 1 above. This result is also a major component in the proof of the Riemann hypothesis in [27].

Theorem 2. *The Lindelöf hypothesis is valid, in the precise sense that for each* $\epsilon > 0$ *and each pair* $\check{\epsilon}$ *and* $\hat{\epsilon}$ *in the interval* $\left(0, \frac{1}{100}\right)$, *we have* $|\zeta(s)| \leq |t|^{\epsilon}$ *for* $s = \sigma + i\,t$ *with any* $\frac{1}{2} \leq \sigma < 1$ *and* $|t| \geq \tilde{T}$, *where*

$$\tilde{T} = \max\left\{T_0^{45}, e^{e^{-\frac{2\log\epsilon}{\check{\epsilon}}}}, e^{e^{\frac{-\log\check{\epsilon}+\log(1.543)}{0.223\,\hat{\epsilon}}}}\right\}. \tag{1.7}$$

We shall prove Theorem 2 in Section 6 from our Theorem 1, combined essentially with methods adapted from the literature, see, e.g., [4], [53], [63], and [71].

Let us note here that Theorem 2 is not directly needed in the sequence of articles [10], [21], [13], [14], [15], [16], [18], and [17], leading to the proof of the Riemann hypothesis in [27]. However, Theorem 1, as a first step to a proof of the Lindelöf hypothesis, or more precisely its strong version given in Theorem 2, is critical to that goal too. We need the result from Theorem 1 for us to extend Turán's result with the analytical versions on the zero-free regions from the algebraic versions of the prime number theorem, see [17].

We shall use above Theorem 1 to extend a result of Turán in 1949, see [72], on the analytic implication of the remainder terms in the prime number theorem in [17], which is pivotal to complete the proof of the Riemann hypothesis in [27] by the estimate on the density and Lemma 2.1 (c) and (d) in [16]. This is in line with the strategy of using an analytic-algebraic approach to accomplish the task of proving the Riemann hypothesis, see, e.g. [30].

For a brief explanation why this kind of results may be proved after many fails in the past century, one may also read our comments at the beginning of Section 3 in [23], before we give the proofs of Propositions 1 and 2 below.

We give the proof of Theorem 1 from Proposition 1 and Proposition 2 in Section 2; we present the proofs of Proposition 1 and 2 in Section 5.

Before we state Propositions 1 and 2, we recall the definition of the classical Euler Gamma function $\Gamma(s)$, the Riemann xi-function $\xi(s)$, and the functional equation for the Riemann zeta-function. The Euler Gamma function may be defined by

$$\frac{1}{\Gamma(s)} = s\, e^{\gamma_0 s} \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \Big(1+\tfrac{s}{n}\Big) e^{-\frac{s}{n}}, \tag{1.8}$$

where $\gamma_0 = \lim_{n\to\infty}\big(1+\frac{1}{2}+\frac{1}{3}+\ldots+\frac{1}{n}-\log n\big) \approx 0.577215$ is the Euler-Mascheroni gamma constant. Let

$$\xi(s) = \pi^{-\frac{s}{2}}\, \xi_G(s)\, \xi_Z(s), \tag{1.9}$$

with

$$\xi_G(s) = \tfrac{s}{2}\,\Gamma\big(\tfrac{s}{2}\big) \quad \text{and} \quad \xi_Z(s) = (s-1)\,\zeta(s). \tag{1.10}$$

A symmetric form of the functional equation for $\zeta(s)$ is expressed as

$$\pi^{-\frac{1-s}{2}}\,\Gamma\big(\tfrac{1-s}{2}\big)\,\zeta(1-s) = \pi^{-\frac{s}{2}}\,\Gamma\big(\tfrac{s}{2}\big)\,\zeta(s), \tag{1.11}$$

for all $s \in \mathbb{C}$ including two simple poles at $s=0$ and $s=1$ of the functions on both sides. For this see, e.g., [71].

For convenience, we use the notation $f(x) \trianglelefteq g(x)$ for the statement $|f(x)| \le g(x)$ for all $x \ge x_0$ with a fixed positive number x_0, for $f(x)$ resp. $g(x)$, a complex resp. positive valued function of $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, we use the notation $\mathbf{U}(\mathcal{U})$ to denote a simple connected open region that contains $\mathcal{U}$, where $\mathcal{U}$ is a simple continuous curve.

Proposition 1. *Let T, x, Y, and Y_1 be real numbers satisfying $T \ge T_0$, $\frac{1}{2} < x < 1$ or $x = 2$, and $0 < Y_1 - Y < \frac{1}{2}$. Also, assume that $T - \frac{1}{4} < Y \le T + \frac{1}{4}$ and let $T - \frac{1}{4} < Y_1 \le T + \frac{1}{4}$ be such that $x \ne \beta$, $Y \ne \gamma$, and $Y_1 \ne \gamma$ for any $\rho = \beta + i\,\gamma \in \mathsf{Z}$ with $\frac{1}{2} < \beta < 1$ and $0 < \gamma < T+1$. Let $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{H}_1$*

be the closed horizontal line segments from $s = x + i\,Y$ *to* $s = \frac{1}{2} + i\,Y$ *and from* $s = x + i\,Y_1$ *to* $s = \frac{1}{2} + i\,Y_1$, *respectively. We also let* $\mathcal{V}$ *be the closed vertical line segment from* $s = x$ *to* $s = x + i\,Y_1$. *Suppose that there are no zeros of* $\zeta(s)$ *in some simple connected open regions* $\mathbf{U}(\mathcal{H})$, $\mathbf{U}(\mathcal{H}_1)$, *and* $\mathbf{U}(\mathcal{V})$, *respectively, such that the union* $\mathbf{U}(\mathcal{H}) \cup \mathbf{U}(\mathcal{H}_1) \cup \mathbf{U}(\mathcal{V})$ *is a simple connected open region in which* $\log \xi(s)$ *is univalently defined and such that* $\log \xi(x) \in \mathbb{R}$. *Then, with* $\Im$ *denoting the imaginary part,*

$$\begin{aligned} &\Im\Big(\big[\log \xi\big(\tfrac{1}{2} + i\,Y_1\big) - \log \xi(x + i\,Y_1)\big] \\ &- \big[\log \xi\big(\tfrac{1}{2} + i\,Y\big) - \log \xi(x + i\,Y)\big]\Big) \trianglelefteq 2\pi. \end{aligned} \tag{1.12}$$

Proposition 2. *Let* T, X, y_1, y_2 *be real numbers satisfying* $T \geq T_0$, $\frac{1}{2} < X < 1$, *and* $2 < y_2 - y_1 < 3$. *Also, assume that* $T - \frac{1}{4} < y_1 \leq T + \frac{1}{4}$ *and let* $T - \frac{1}{4} < y_2 \leq T + \frac{1}{4}$ *be such that* $X \neq \beta$, $y_1 \neq \gamma$, *and* $y_2 \neq \gamma$ *for any* $\rho = \beta + i\,\gamma \in \mathsf{Z}$ *with* $\frac{1}{2} < \beta < 1$ *and* $0 < \gamma < T + 1$. *Let* $\mathcal{V}$ *and* $\mathcal{V}_0$ *be the closed vertical line segments from* $s = X$ *to* $s = X + i\,y_2$ *and from* $s = 2$ *to* $s = 2 + i\,y_2$, *respectively. Also, we let* $\mathcal{H}_0$ *be the closed horizontal line segment from* $s = X$ *to* $s = 2$. *Suppose that there are no zeros of* $\zeta(s)$ *in some simple connected open regions* $\mathbf{U}(\mathcal{V})$, $\mathbf{U}(\mathcal{V}_0)$, *and* $\mathbf{U}(\mathcal{H}_0)$, *respectively, such that the union* $\mathbf{U}(\mathcal{V}) \cup \mathbf{U}(\mathcal{V}_0) \cup \mathbf{U}(\mathcal{H}_0)$ *is a simple connected open region in which* $\log \xi(s)$ *is univalently defined and such that* $\log \xi(X) \in \mathbb{R}$. *Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} &\Im\Big(\big[\log \xi\big(2 + i\,y_2\big) - \log \xi\big(2 + i\,y_1\big)\big] \\ &- \big[\log \xi(X + i\,y_2) - \log \xi(X + i\,y_1)\big]\Big) \trianglelefteq 2\pi. \end{aligned} \tag{1.13}$$

2. Representation of the number of zeros of the Riemann zeta function

In this section, we express the function occuring in Theorem 1, namely, $N(\lambda, T + d) - N(\lambda, T - d)$ with $\frac{1}{2} < \lambda < 1$ and $1 \leq d \leq \frac{5}{4}$, as the sum of the imaginary parts for the logarithmic function of $\xi(s)$, evaluated at certain points, see (3.9) near the end of this section.

As in Section 1, we denote $\rho = \beta + i\gamma$ with β, $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ for $\rho \in \mathbf{Z}$. We define

$$\mathbf{Z}_T = \big\{\rho \in \mathbf{Z} : 0 < \beta < 1,\ |\gamma| \leq T + 2\big\}, \tag{2.1}$$

noting here that this $\mathbf{Z}_T$ is actually a set function of T. We also define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}_R &= \big\{(\beta_1, \beta_2) : \beta_1 \neq \beta_2, \beta_k = \Re(\rho_k),\ \rho_k \in \mathsf{Z}_T, k = 1, 2\big\}, \\ \mathbf{W}_I &= \big\{(\gamma_3, \gamma_4) : \gamma_3 \neq \gamma_4, \gamma_k = \Im(\rho_k),\ \rho_k \in \mathsf{Z}_T, k = 3, 4\big\}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

with $\Re(z)$ resp. $\Im(z)$ for $z \in \mathbb{C}$ standing for real resp. imaginary part of z. We then take a real number η sufficiently small such that

$$0 < \eta < \min \begin{cases} \min\{\frac{1}{4}, \lambda - \frac{1}{2}\}, \\ \inf\{|\beta_1 - \beta_2| : (\beta_1, \beta_2) \in \mathbf{W}_R\}, \\ \inf\{|\gamma_3 - \gamma_4| : (\gamma_3, \gamma_4) \in \mathbf{W}_I\}. \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

We first define two real numbers X_0 and Y_0 before we describe our full geometrical setting. Let $\mathscr{V} = \{\beta : \lambda - \eta \le \beta < \lambda, \rho = \beta + i\gamma \in \mathbf{Z}_T\}$. If there are no zeros of $\zeta(s)$ in $\mathscr{V}$, we let $X_0 = \lambda - \eta$; otherwise, we let $X_0 = \sup\{\beta : \beta \in \mathscr{V}\}$. Similarly, we let $\mathscr{H} = \{\rho : T < \gamma \le T + \eta,\ \rho = \beta + i\gamma \in \mathbf{Z}_T\}$. If $\mathscr{H}$ is empty, we set $Y_0 = T + \eta$; otherwise, we set $Y_0 = \inf\{\gamma : \rho \in \mathscr{H}\} - \eta$.

From the choice of X_0 and Y_0 with the definition of η, we see that $\frac{1}{2} < \lambda - \eta \le X_0 < \lambda$ and $T < Y_0 \le T + \eta$. Also, we see that there are no zeros for the Riemann zeta-function in the regions $\{s \in \mathbb{C} : X_0 < \sigma < X_0 + \eta,\ |t| < Y_0\}$ and $\{s \in \mathbb{C} : Y_0 - \eta < |t| < Y_0\}$. The last set is actually the union of two separated rectangular strips; the intersection of the last mentioned two sets and the previous one consists of two squares $\{s \in \mathbb{C} : X_0 < \sigma < X_0 + \eta,\ Y_0 - \eta < |t| < Y_0\}$, which are symmetric with respect to the real axis. Then, we define $X = X_0 + \frac{\eta}{2}$, $Y = Y_0 - \frac{\eta}{2}$, and $Y_1 = Y_0 - \frac{\eta}{4}$. We remark that $\lambda - \frac{\eta}{2} \le X < \lambda + \frac{\eta}{2}$, $T - \frac{\eta}{4} < Y < Y_1 \le T + \frac{3\eta}{4}$ with $Y_1 - Y = \frac{\eta}{4}$.

Now, let $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ be as in Proposition 1. Moreover, let $\mathcal{H}_0$ be the closed horizontal line segment from $s = X$ to $s = 2$, let $\mathcal{V}_1$ be the closed vertical line segment from the point $s = 2$ to $s = 2 + Y_1\, i$, and let $\mathcal{H}_2$ be the closed horizontal line segment from the point $2 + Y_1\, i$ to the point $s = \frac{1}{2} + Y_1\, i$.

Also, we take

$$0 < \delta < \tfrac{\eta}{6}, \tag{2.4}$$

and define

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Q}_1 &= \{s \in \mathbb{C} : \tfrac{1}{2} - \delta < \sigma < 2 + \delta,\ Y_1 - \delta < t < Y_1 + \delta\}. \\ \mathbf{Q}_2 &= \{s \in \mathbb{C} : 2 - \delta < \sigma < 2 + \delta,\ -\delta < t < Y_1 + \delta\}, \\ \mathbf{Q}_3 &= \{s \in \mathbb{C} : X - \delta < \sigma < 2 + \delta,\ -\delta < t < \delta\}, \\ \mathbf{Q}_4 &= \{s \in \mathbb{C} : X - \delta < \sigma < X + \delta,\ -\delta < t < Y + \delta\}, \\ \mathbf{Q}_5 &= \{s \in \mathbb{C} : \tfrac{1}{2} - \delta < \sigma < X + \delta,\ Y - \delta < t < Y + \delta\}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

We see that the segments $\mathcal{H}_2$, $\mathcal{V}_1$, $\mathcal{H}_0$ (with $\mathcal{H}_2$, $\mathcal{V}_1$, and $\mathcal{H}_0$ defined in the paragraph before (2.4)), $\mathcal{V}$, and $\mathcal{H}$ (with $\mathcal{V}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ defined in Proposition 1) are contained in the simple connected open sets $\mathbf{Q}_1$, $\mathbf{Q}_2$, $\mathbf{Q}_3$, $\mathbf{Q}_4$, $\mathbf{Q}_5$, respectively.

Let us set

$$\mathbf{Q} = \bigcup_{j=1}^{5} \mathbf{Q}_j, \tag{2.6}$$

similar to the definition of $\mathbf{Q}$ in (5.14) from [16]. Then, we have that $\mathcal{H} \cup \mathcal{V} \cup \mathcal{H}_0 \cup \mathcal{V}_1 \cup \mathcal{H}_2$ is contained in the simple connected open region $\mathbf{Q}$ defined by (2.6). We remark here that $\mathbf{Q}_1$, $\mathbf{Q}_2$, $\mathbf{Q}_3$, $\mathbf{Q}_4$, and $\mathbf{Q}_5$ may be used as $\mathbf{U}(\mathcal{H}_2)$, $\mathbf{U}(\mathcal{V}_1)$, $\mathbf{U}(\mathcal{H}_0)$, $\mathbf{U}(\mathcal{V})$, and $\mathbf{U}(\mathcal{H})$, respectively, in the statements occuring in Proposition 1 and 2.

Finally, with η in above (2.3) satisfying (5.1) in [16] because of the restriction on δ in (2.4), we let $\mathrm{Log}_\lambda\, \xi(s)$ be the univalent analytic continuation of the functioin $\log \xi(s)$ in the open region $\mathbf{Q}$ defined in the above (2.6) and we get

$$\begin{aligned}
D_1 &= \mathrm{Log}_\lambda\, \xi\big(\tfrac{1}{2} + Y_1\, i\big) - \log_\lambda\, \xi\big(2 + Y_1\, i\big),\\
D_2 &= \mathrm{Log}_\lambda\, \xi(2 + Y\, i) - \log_\lambda\, \xi(2),\\
D_3 &= \mathrm{Log}_\lambda\, \xi(X) - \log_\lambda\, \xi(X + Y\, i),\\
D_4 &= \mathrm{Log}_\lambda\, \xi(X + Y\, i) - \log_\lambda\, \xi(\tfrac{1}{2} + Y\, i),\\
\tilde{E} &= \log_\lambda\, \xi\big(2 + Y_1\, i\big) - \log_\lambda\, \xi(2 + Y\, i),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.7}$$

see Figure 1. Here D_1 is contained in Q_1, D_2 is contained in Q_3, and D_{j+2} is contained inside $\mathbf{Q}_j$ for $j = 3$ and 4 along the route of $\mathcal{H}_2$, $\mathcal{V}_1$, $\mathcal{H}_0$, $\mathcal{V}$, and $\mathcal{H}$, respectively, taken along the counter-clockwise direction.

The following Proposition 3 is Proposition 6 as proven in [16] with (5.18) referring to (5.17), with D_3 in the present article being D_5 in [16], D_4 in this article being D_6, and $\tilde{E}$ being $D_2/2\pi$ in that article, and, recalling D_3 defined in (5.17) in [16] is not needed in the formula (5.18) in [16] for our consideration as stated in Proposition 3 as whose value is real, with the upper bound concerning $\tilde{E}$ presented after Proposition 6 in [16], recalling that the estimate $|D_2| \le 1$ in [16] can be reached by choosing η subject to (2.3) to be sufficiently small, in accord with the η used in [16] in this regard.

Let

$$\begin{aligned}
D_1' &= \mathrm{Log}_\lambda\, \xi\big(\tfrac{1}{2} + Y_1\, i\big) - \log_\lambda\, \xi\big(X + Y_1\, i\big),\\
D_1'' &= \mathrm{Log}_\lambda\, \xi\big(X + Y_1\, i\big) - \log_\lambda\, \xi\big(2 + Y_1\, i\big),\\
\tilde{E}_1 &= \tfrac{1}{2\pi}\big(D_1' + D_4\big), \quad \tilde{E}_2 = \tfrac{1}{2\pi}\big(D_1'' + D_2 + D_3\big),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

We refer to Figure 2, seeing that $D_1 = D_1' + D_1''$. Furthermore, $\tilde{E}_1$ are represented by those two short parallel horizontal routes from $1/2 + Y_1 i$ to $X + Y_1 i$ and from $X + Y i$ to $1/2 + Y i$ and $\tilde{E}_2$ is represented by the rectanglar route on the rectangle with vertices on $X + Y_1\, i$, $2 + Y_1 i$, 2, and X, with two




FIGURE 1. Diagram for (2.7) and Proposition 3

short line segments from $x+Y_1\,i$ to $x+Y\,i$ for $x = X$ and 2 (corresponding to $\tilde{E}$ removed, but the values of $\mathrm{Log}_\lambda(X+Y_1 i)$ and $\mathrm{Log}_\lambda(X+Y i)$ possibly differ when the distance $Y_1 - Y$ tends to 0 as they come from the different sides of the route inside the open region $\mathbf{Q}$ because the corresponding rectangular route, if closed, may encircle a region in which the function $\xi(s)$ has zeros. With the separation by $\tilde{E}_1$ and $\tilde{E}_2$, which represents the left part and the right part on the line $\Re(s) = X$, respectively, colored in red and blue in Figure 1, it would be a little easier for us to draw the graphs in explaning in the next step.

Proposition 3. *The function* $\mathrm{Log}_\lambda\,\xi(s)$ *is univalently defined in the region* $\mathbf{Q}$ *and we have*

$$\begin{aligned} N(\lambda, T) &= \Im\big[\tfrac{1}{2\pi}\big(D_1 + D_2 + D_3 + D_4 + \tilde{E}\big)\big], \\ &= \Im\big(\tilde{E}_1 + \tilde{E}_2 + \tilde{E}\big), \end{aligned} \tag{2.9}$$

with $|\tilde{E}| \le \frac{1}{1000}$. □

We remark here that all the above variables $\mathbf{Z}_T$, η, X_0, Y_0, X, Y, Y_1, $\mathcal{H}_2$, $\mathcal{V}_1$, $\mathcal{H}_0$, $\mathcal{V}$, and $\mathcal{H}$, as well as D_j for $j \in \{1,2,3,4\}$ and the set variables $\mathbf{Q}_j$ for $j = 1, 2, 4, 5$, are either functions or set valued functions of t for $t = T-d$, T, or $T+d$. For convenience, we shall write $\eta(t) = \eta$ and $\mathbf{Q}(t) = \mathbf{Q}$, and so on, as well as $\mathbf{Z}(t) = \mathbf{Z}_t$. One may notice that $\mathbf{Z}(T-d) \subseteq \mathbf{Z}(T+d)$ by the definition (2.1) of $\mathbf{Z}(T) := \mathbf{Z}_T$ as a set valued function of T.

3. Growth rate of zeros

Now, we notice that from the restriction on η in (2.3) it follows that $\eta(T+d)$ is more restricted than $\eta(T-d)$, since replacing T by $T+d$ in (2.2) increases both $\mathbf{W}_R$ and $\mathbf{W}_I$ as sets, as the inf in (2.3) decreases. For convenience, we may choose the same value η such that η satisfies the condition for $\eta(T+d)$, or the condition in (2.3) with $T+d$ in place of T. Thus, we may actually choose the same X_0 acting as $X_0(T+d)$ and $X_0(T-d)$, and the same X as $X(T+d)$ and $X(T-d)$. Moreover, we choose the same δ, as defined in (2.4) and looked upon as a function for both $\delta(T+d)$ and $\delta(T-d)$. We remark here that (2.4), i.e., $0 < \delta < \frac{\eta}{6}$, is always assumed to hold and we may take δ as sufficiently small when it is needed.

From now on, we denote $T_1 = T-d$ and $T_2 = T+d$, for brevity. Correspondingly, we use the short notation $\mathcal{H}_0(T_1)$, $\mathbf{Q}(T_2)$, and so on. For instance, we have $D_1(T_j) = \mathrm{Log}_\lambda \xi[\frac{1}{2} + Y_1(T_j)\, i] - \mathrm{Log}_\lambda \xi[2 + Y_1(T_j)\, i]$ for $j = 1$ and 2. Especially, it is straightforward to see that $\tilde{E}_1(T_j)$ for $j = 1$ and 2 corresponding to $\frac{1}{2\pi}\big(D_1'(T_j) + D_4'\big)$, one may refer to Figure 2, see (A) and (B). In order to clearly illustrate the situation concerning $\tilde{E}_2\big(T_j\big)$, we need to use the concept of Riemann surface.

Recalling Proposition 3 with the second result in (2.9) with (2.8) plus the estimate on $\tilde{E}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &N(\lambda, T+d) - N(\lambda, T-d) \\ &= \Im\big[\big(\tilde{E}_1(T_2) + \tilde{E}_2(T_2)\big) - \big(\tilde{E}_1(T_1) + \tilde{E}_2(T_1)\big] + \ddot{E}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

with $\ddot{E} := \frac{1}{2\pi}\big[\tilde{E}(T_2) - \tilde{E}(T_1)\big] \trianglelefteq \frac{1}{1000\pi}$, where the expression in the first parentheses is evaluated in $\mathbf{Q}(T_2)$ and that in the second parenthese is done in $\mathbf{Q}(T_1)$, corresponding to $\mathbf{Q}$ defined in (2.6), with $T = T_j$ for $j = 1$ and 2, respectively. We have drawn Figure 2 with (A), (B), and (C) mainly for this sake. The point $\mathbf{D}$ shown in all these three graphs in the figure has to be clarified to be two copies on two different sheets of the Riemann surface below.

This point $\mathbf{D}$ is intersection of two line segments which give rise to the contribution by $D_1'(T_1)$ and $D_1''(T_1)$. Note that $\mathbf{D}$ is not on the line segment represented by $D_3(T_2)$. The segment giving rise to the contribution $D_3(T_2)$ does pass this point $\mathbf{D}$ from another sheet of the Riemann surface explained below, cf. (C) in Figure 2, as we must regard $\mathbf{Q}(T_2)$ and $\mathbf{Q}(T_1)$ as belonging to two sheets of the Riemann surface $\mathfrak{G}$, which contains two copies of a sufficiently small neighborhood around the point $\mathbf{D}$ in (3.4). We have drawn (A) and (C) separatedly in order to elucidate this Riemann surface with $\mathbf{D}$ shown in all three sub-graphs. Also, the three line segments as components of $\tilde{E}_2$ are shown on the right side of Figure 1, which give rise to $\tilde{E}_2(T_j)$ shown in (C) of Figure 2 for each of $j = 1$ and 2 in red and blue color, respectively (with a slight shifting in order for us to visualize them clearly) and correponding to the three terms in $\tilde{E}_2$ defined in (2.8). In fact, the line segment corresponding to $D_k(T_1)$ is a subset of the line segment corresponding to $D_k(T_2)$ for both $k = 2$ and 3 (where the red colored line segments should be inside the blue colored line segment, though, we have drawn $D_k(T_j)$ for $j = 1$ and 2 slightly apart for the sake of visibility for $k = 2$ and 3). It is easy to see that

$$\tilde{E}_1(T_2) - \tilde{E}_1(T_1) = \big[D_1'(T_2) - D_1'(T_2)\big] + \big[D_1''(T_2) - D_1''(T_1)\big], \tag{3.2}$$

but we should emphasize that the expression inside the first parentheses on the right hand side is evaluated in the open region $\mathbf{Q}(T_1)$ and that the term inside the second parentheses on the right hand side is evaluated in the open region $\mathbf{Q}(T_2)$, each of which is a branch of the univalent function $\mathrm{Log}_\lambda\,\xi(s)$ defined in [16] and extended to be a univalent function in the Riemann surface $\mathfrak{G}$ defined in (3.4) below. Also, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &2\pi i\big[\tilde{E}_2(T_2) - \tilde{E}_2(T_1)\big] \\ &= \big[D_1''(T_2) + D_3(T_2) + D_4(T_2)\big] - \big[D_1''(T_1) + D_3(T_1) + D_4(T_1)\big] \\ &= \big[D_1''(T_2) - D_1''(T_1)\big] + \big[D_3(T_2) - D_3(T_2)\big] + \big[D_4(T_2) - D_4(T_1)\big]. \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

We should emphasize that this is a crucial point, as we have $\mathrm{Log}_\lambda\,\xi(s)$ uniquely defined in $\mathbf{Q}(T_1)$ and $\mathbf{Q}(T_2)$ as in [16]. We emphasize that these two open regions both include the neighhood of the line segment from X to 2, so that the function $\mathrm{Log}_\lambda\,\xi(s)$ is uniquely defined on $\mathfrak{G}$ as it is uniquely defined on both $\mathbf{Q}(T_1)$ and $\mathbf{Q}(T_2)$.

From what we explained above, we have $\mathbf{Q}_2(T_1) \subseteq \mathbf{Q}_2(T_2)$ but $\mathbf{Q}_2(T_1) \neq \mathbf{Q}_2(T_2)$, $\mathbf{Q}_3(T_1) = \mathbf{Q}_3(T_2)$, $\mathbf{Q}_4(T_1) \subseteq \mathbf{Q}_4(T_2)$ but $\mathbf{Q}_4(T_1) \neq \mathbf{Q}_4(T_2)$. Since we do not assume the validity of the Riemann hypothesis, there might be zeros of the $\xi(s)$ in the region we would like to consider, this is a point

we have to be careful with. We notice, looking at Figure 2, that the union $\mathbf{Q}(T_1) \cup \mathbf{Q}(T_2)$ (with $\mathbf{Q}_j$ for $j = 1$ and 2 given rise from $\mathbf{Q}$) should be regarded as a two sheeted Riemann surface $\mathfrak{G}$ (instead of the plain union $\mathbf{Q}(T_1) \cup \mathbf{Q}(T_2)$), "re"-defined below for clarification, instead of the open set $\mathbf{Q}$, as the closed square

$$\mathscr{O} := \{s = \sigma + it : \ X - \delta < \sigma < X + \delta, \text{ and } Y_1(T_1) - \delta < t < Y_1(T_1) + \delta\}$$

belongs to $\mathbf{Q}_1(T_1)$ as well as to $\mathbf{Q}_4(T_2)$, noting that $Y_1(T_1) + \delta < Y(T_2) - \delta$ from the restriction of δ in (2.4) and from the choice of η in (2.3); they are on two different sheets of this closed square on a Riemann surface $\mathfrak{G}$, which is described clearly in what follows.




FIGURE 2. Diagram for (2.9), (3.1), and (3.4) – the black dot pointed by $\mathbf{D}$ is on both E_2 and E_4, which are on different sheets of the Riemann surface.

We denote

$$\mathfrak{G} = \mathscr{Q}_1 \cup \mathscr{Q}_2, \quad \text{noting that } \mathbf{Q}_2(T_1) \cup \mathbf{Q}_3 \cup \mathbf{Q}_4(T_1) = \mathscr{Q}_1 \cap \mathscr{Q}_2, \tag{3.4}$$

with

$$\mathscr{O}_1 \subseteq \mathbf{Q}_1(T_1) \subseteq \mathscr{Q}_1, \quad \mathscr{O}_2 \subseteq \mathbf{Q}_4(T_2) \subseteq \mathscr{Q}_2,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{Q}_1 &= \mathbf{Q}_1(T_1) \cup \mathbf{Q}_2(T_1) \cup \mathbf{Q}_3(T_1) \cup \mathbf{Q}_4(T_2) \cup \mathbf{Q}_5(T_1),\\ \mathscr{Q}_2 &= \mathbf{Q}_1(T_2) \cup \mathbf{Q}_2(T_2) \cup \mathbf{Q}_3(T_2) \cup \mathbf{Q}_4(T_2) \cup \mathbf{Q}_5(T_2).\end{aligned}$$

Then, $\mathscr{O}$ is a Riemann surface with two components $\mathscr{O}_1$ and $\mathscr{O}_2$. We should imagine cutting out $\mathscr{O}$ from both $\mathbf{Q}_1(T_1) \subseteq \mathbf{Q}(T_1)$ and $\mathbf{Q}_4(T_2) \subseteq \mathbf{Q}(T_2)$ and paste $\mathscr{O}_1$ and $\mathscr{O}_2$ back to $\mathbf{Q}_1(T_1)$ and $\mathbf{Q}_4(T_2)$ in the same way that $\mathscr{O}$ was cut out, respectively. With this redefined $\mathbf{Q}_1(T_1)$ and $\mathbf{Q}_4(T_2)$, we are going to simplify the situation by considering the union of $\mathscr{O}_1$ and $\mathscr{O}_2$ in (3.4). One may look at Figure 2 in which the black dot $\mathbf{D}$ in (B) is supposed to be on both E_2 and E_4, by our explanation with (A), (B), and (C). However, the line segments corresponding to these two quantities are on different sheets of the Riemann surface, see Figure 2, as described in (3.4) above.

For clarification, we may make another copy of $\mathbf{Q}(T_1)$, denoted by $\tilde{\mathbf{Q}}(T_1)$, which is the doubly reflective image of $\mathbf{Q}(T_1)$ along with the real axis; that is, $s = 1 - x - yi \in \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}(T_1) \subseteq \mathbb{C}$ if and only if $x + yi \in \mathbf{Q}(T_1)$, noting that $D(1 - x - yi) = D(x + yi)$ for any function $D(s)$ which is the doubly reflectively symmetric. Then, we denote $\tilde{\mathfrak{G}} = \tilde{\mathbf{Q}}(T_1) \cup \mathbf{Q}(T_2)$. It is straightforward for us to see that $\tilde{\mathfrak{G}}$ is a simple connected open region on $\mathbb{C}$.

Now, we see that we should replace $\mathbf{Q}(T_1) \cup \mathbf{Q}(T_2)$, both of which are given rise from $\mathbf{Q}$ defined in (2.6), by $\mathfrak{G}$, or regard $\mathbf{Q}(T_1) \cup \mathbf{Q}(T_2)$ as $\mathfrak{G}$, where $\mathfrak{G}$ is the union defined in (3.4) and $\mathfrak{G}$ is homeomorphic to the simple connected open region $\tilde{\mathfrak{G}}$ on the complex plane $\mathbb{C}$. This Riemann surface has two sheets, one is $\mathscr{Q}_1$ and the other one is $\mathscr{Q}_2$, each of which as a set coincides with the original $\mathbf{Q}(T_1)$ and $\mathbf{Q}(T_2)$. In this Riemann surface $\mathfrak{G}$, the function $\log \xi(s)$ is well-defined and univalent. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}&N(\lambda, T+d) - N(\lambda, T-d)\\ &= \big[\Im D_1(T_2) + \Im D_2(T_2) + \Im D_3(T_2)\Im D_3(T_2) + \Im D_5(T_2)\big]\\ &\quad - \big[\Im D_1(T_1) + \Im D_2(T_1) + \Im D_3(T_1)\Im D_3(T_1) + \Im D_5(T_1)\big],\end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

along the routes $\mathcal{H}_2(T_2)$, $\mathcal{H}_2(T_1)$, $\mathcal{V}_1(T_2)$, $\mathcal{V}_1(T_1)$, $\mathcal{H}_0(T_2)$, $\mathcal{H}_0(T_1)$, $\mathcal{V}(T_2)$, $\mathcal{V}(T_1)$, and $\mathcal{H}(T_2)$, $\mathcal{H}(T_1)$ inside the simple connected open region $\mathbf{Q}(T_1) \cup \mathbf{Q}(T_2)$.

Now, we let

$$
\begin{aligned}
E_1 &= \operatorname{Log}_\lambda \xi\big[\tfrac{1}{2} + Y_1(T_2)\, i\big] - \operatorname{Log}_\lambda \xi\big(2 + Y_1(T_2)\, i\big),\\
E_2 &= \operatorname{Log}_\lambda \xi\big(\tfrac{1}{2} + Y_1(T_1)\, i\big) - \operatorname{Log}_\lambda \xi\big(2 + Y_1(T_1)\, i\big),\\
E_3 &= \operatorname{Log}_\lambda \xi(2 + Y_1(T_2)\, i) - \operatorname{Log}_\lambda \xi\big(2 + Y_1(T_1)\big),
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.6}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
E_4 &= \operatorname{Log}_\lambda \xi(X + Y(T_2)\, i) - \operatorname{Log}_\lambda \xi\big(X + Y(T_1)\big),\\
E_5 &= \operatorname{Log}_\lambda \xi\big[X + Y(T_2)\, i\big) - \operatorname{Log}_\lambda \xi\big(\tfrac{1}{2} + Y(T_2)\, i\big),\\
E_6 &= \operatorname{Log}_\lambda \xi\big[X + Y(T_1)\, i\big) - \operatorname{Log}_\lambda \xi\big(\tfrac{1}{2} + Y(T_1)\, i\big).
\end{aligned}
$$

Here, the differences $E_1 - E_2$, $E_3 - E_4$, and $E_5 - E_6$ are considered in the region $\mathbf{Q}$ on the Riemann surface $\mathfrak{G}$ with two sheets, respectively.

We notice that $E_3 = E_3^{(+)} + E_3^{(0)} - E_3^{(-)}$ with

$$
\begin{aligned}
E_3^{(+)} &= \operatorname{Log}_\lambda \xi(2 + Y_1(T_2)\, i) - \operatorname{Log}_\lambda \xi\big(2 + Y(T_2)\big),\\
E_3^{(0)} &= \operatorname{Log}_\lambda \xi(2 + Y(T_2)\, i) - \operatorname{Log}_\lambda \xi\big(2 + Y(T_1)\big),\\
E_3^{(-)} &= \operatorname{Log}_\lambda \xi(2 + Y_1(T_1)\, i) - \operatorname{Log}_\lambda \xi\big(2 + Y(T_1)\big),
\end{aligned}
$$

see Figure 2. Also, we get

$$
D_3(T_2) - D_3(T_1) = E_3^{(+)} + E_3^{(0)} = E_3^{(+)} + E_3 - E_3^{(-)},
\tag{3.7}
$$

and

$$
E_4 = D_4(T_2) - D_4(T_1).
\tag{3.8}
$$

From the above, we conclude from (3.5) that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&N(\lambda, T + d) - N(\lambda, T - d)\\
&= \frac{1}{2\pi}\big[(\Im E_1 - \Im E_2) + (\Im E_3 - \Im E_4) + (\Im E_5 - \Im E_6)\big],
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.9}
$$

the values being taken along the segments described above inside the simple connected open region $\mathbf{Q}(T_1) \cup \mathbf{Q}(T_2)$, where E_j for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, 6$, are defined in (3.6).

However, $E_3^{(\pm)} \to 0$ as $\delta \to 0$; hence, we may assume that δ introduced in (2.4) is sufficiently small such that $|E_3^{(\pm)}| < \frac{1}{2}$. Thus, $|E_3 - E_4| < |E_3^{(0)} - E_4| + 1$. Proposition 1 implies that $|\Im E_1 - \Im E_2| \le 2\pi$ and $|\Im E_5 - \Im E_6| \le 2\pi$ and Proposition 2 with $y_2 = Y(T_2)$ and $y_1 = Y(T_1)$ implies that $|\Im E_3^{(0)} - \Im E_4| \le 2\pi$. To prove Theorem 1 from Propositions 1 and 2, it suffices we use (3.9) to see that, using the estimates (1.12), (1.13), and Propositions 1 and 2, to get $N(\lambda, T + d) - N(\lambda, T - d) \le 3$, noting that $\frac{6\pi+1}{2\pi} \le 3.16$ and that the expression on the left hand side in the above inequality is a positive integer.

We conclude that Theorem 2 is valid, once Propositions 1 and 2 are proven in the section after the next section.

4. More estimates via pseudogamma functions

For the proofs of Proposition 1 and 2 in [16] and hence Theorem 1 in [23] we use in an essential way the new method involving the pseudo-Gamma function $\nabla(s)$ we introduced in [16], which amounts in exploiting the doubly symmetry property of the Riemann ξ-function and the function $\nabla(s)$, to counteract the "unwanted" effect caused by the magnitude of the classical Euler Gamma function entering the estimate of the Riemann ξ-function, and thus also on the Riemann zeta function $\zeta(s)$.

For these estimates we also use that our pseudo-Gamma function, whose definition depends essentially on a large parameter $R > 0$, is free of zeros and poles in the regions of interest. Let us also mention that in our proofs we also make use of the Euler product representation of the functions $\xi(s)$ and $\zeta(s)$, through the logarithmic derivatives of these functions.

The main part of the following Lemma 1 and Lemma 3 is quoted from Proposition 4 in [16]; the estimate in (4.6) below is from the remark after (6.4) in [16] in the proof of Proposition 2 in Section 6 of [16].

From now on, we let $T_0 = 2445999556027$. We also let $T \geq T_0$ and $2T - 1 < R \leq 2T + 1$.

The pseudo-Gamma function in [16] is defined in (3.4.29) of [16], by

$$\nabla(s) = \omega\Big(\tfrac{W_2-1/2}{W_1-1/2}\Big)^q \Big[\prod_{k=1}^{2^{K+1}} \mathscr{P}(k;s)\Big]^{\frac{q}{2^{K+1}}} \tag{4.1}$$

where

$$\mathscr{P}(k;s) = \frac{(s-\frac{1}{2}) - e^{\frac{i\,k\pi}{2K}}(W_1 - \frac{1}{2})}{(s-\frac{1}{2}) - e^{\frac{i\,k\pi}{2K}}(W_2 - \frac{1}{2})}. \tag{4.2}$$

with $W_1 = 3R + R^{1/4} + \frac{1}{2}$, $W_2 = 3R + \frac{1}{2}$, $\grave{\gamma} = 0.3674$, where $\omega = \xi(1/2)$ with $\xi(1/2) > 0.497$ as in (4.6) from [16], $\Omega = \frac{47.545}{\xi(1/2)}$, and

$$q = \frac{(R+10)\log(R/2) + 4\log\Omega}{4\,\grave{\gamma}\,R^{1/4}},$$

$$K = \left\lfloor \frac{\log\big[\frac{10}{27}(15 + \frac{4}{R^{3/4}})R^{1/4} + \frac{2}{3R^{3/4}}\big] + 2\log R}{\log 2} \right\rfloor.$$

It is obvious that $\nabla(s)$ is reflectively symmetric about the real axis as well as about the line $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$; and $\nabla(\frac{1}{2}) = \xi(1/2)$, from the above definition.

In the following lemma, we quote the main part of Proposition 4 from [16].

Lemma 1. *For the pseudo-Gamma function defined in (4.1), we have*

$$\omega\,\Omega\,\big(\tfrac{R}{2}\big)^{\frac{R+\alpha}{4}} < |\nabla(s)| < \omega\big[\Omega\,\big(\tfrac{R}{2}\big)^{\frac{R+\alpha}{4}}\big]^{1+\frac{\acute{\gamma}-\grave{\gamma}}{\grave{\gamma}}}, \tag{4.3}$$

on the circle $|s-\frac{1}{2}|=R$, *where* $\grave{\gamma}=0.3674$ *and* $\acute{\gamma}:=0.3677$. □

We need the following result from Lemma 6 in [16].

Lemma 2. *Let* $\nabla(s)$ *be the pseudo-Gamma function defined in* (4.1) *with the choice of* $\omega=\xi(1/2)$, $\Omega=\frac{47.545}{\xi(1/2)}$ *and* $\alpha=10$ *and let* $R\geq 2T-1$ *with* $T\geq T_0$, *where* T_0 *is defined as above. Then,* $\nabla(u)$ *is a monotonously increasing function of* $u\in(1/2,2]$ *and*

$$\omega\leq\nabla(u)\leq R^{\frac{1}{4.408\,R}}\leq\big(1+10^{-11}\big)\omega, \tag{4.4}$$

for $\frac{1}{2}\leq u\leq 2$. □

The following lemma is Lemma 7 from [16], when one takes account a remark in the proof of Proposition 2 after (7.6) in Section 7 in [16].

Lemma 3. *Let* $T\geq T_0$ *and* $2T-1<R<2T+1$ *with* T_0 *defined in Section 1, at the end of the last but one paragraph before the Main Theorem. Suppose that there are no zeros for the Riemann xi-function* $\xi(s)$ *on the circle* $\big|s-u\big|=R$, *with* $\frac{1}{2}<u\leq 2$. *Then the function* $\mathbf{B}(s):=\frac{\xi(s)}{\nabla(s)}$ *in* (4.7) *is analytic inside any circle* $|s-u|=R+\varepsilon$, *with* $\frac{1}{2}<u\leq 2$ *and sufficiently small* $\varepsilon>0$, *and satisfies the following upper bound*

$$\mathbf{B}(s)\trianglelefteq b_0, \tag{4.5}$$

with $b_0=1.0132$, *on the circle* $\big|s-u\big|=R$ *with* $\omega=\xi(1/2)$, $\Omega=47.545/\xi(1/2)$, $\alpha=10$, *entering* q *after* (4.1). *The pseudo-Gamma function* $\nabla(s)$ *in the definition of* $\mathbf{B}(s)$ *is defined in* (4.1). *Furthermore, we have*

$$\xi(u)>\xi\big(\tfrac{1}{2}\big)>0.497, \tag{4.6}$$

for $\frac{1}{2}<u\leq 2$. □

These results are indispensable in proving the zero growth rate in Theorem 2 in [23], which is slightly stronger than the Lindelöf hypothesis.

We also need another lemma, stated below as Lemma 4. Let η be defined as in (2.3) in [23] and let $\frac{1}{2}<X<1$ and $T-\frac{\eta}{4}<Y<Y_1<T+\frac{3\eta}{4}$. We recall the definition of $\mathbf{B}(s)$ in Lemma 3 and set

$$\mathbf{C}(s)=\tfrac{\nabla(3/2+s)}{\nabla(X-1/2+s)},\quad \mathbf{D}(s)=\tfrac{\nabla(s+iY_1)}{\nabla(s+iY)}, \tag{4.7}$$

where, the variables X, Y, and Y_1 are the same as those used in Section 2 in [23].

Lemma 4. *Let $T \geq T_0$ with T_0 defined in Section 1, $2T-1 < R \leq 2T+1$, $\omega = \xi(1/2)$, $\Omega = \frac{47.545}{\xi(1/2)}$, and $\alpha = 10$. Also, let $\sigma_0 = \frac{5}{4}$, $T - \frac{3}{2} < t_0 \leq T + \frac{3}{2}$, and $s_0 = \sigma_0 + i\, t_0$. For the function $\mathbf{B}(s)$ defined in Lemma 3, we have*

$$\frac{\mathbf{B}(s)}{\mathbf{B}(1/2)} \trianglelefteq 1.014, \quad \frac{\mathbf{B}(s)}{\mathbf{B}(\sigma_0)} \trianglelefteq 1.014, \tag{4.8}$$

on the circle $|s - \frac{1}{2}| = R$ and $|s - \sigma_0| = R$, respectively. For the functions $\mathbf{C}(s)$ and $\mathbf{D}(s)$, we have

$$\frac{\mathbf{C}(s)}{\mathbf{C}(s_0)} \trianglelefteq T^{\frac{11}{T^{1/4}}}, \quad \frac{\mathbf{D}(s)}{\mathbf{D}(s_0)} \trianglelefteq T^{\frac{11}{T^{1/4}}}, \tag{4.9}$$

on the circle $|s - s_0| = 1$. Moreover, we have

$$\frac{\mathbf{B}(s-i(Y_1-Y))}{\mathbf{B}(1/2)} \trianglelefteq 1.015, \quad \frac{\mathbf{B}(s-i(Y_2-Y_1))}{\mathbf{B}(\sigma_0)} \trianglelefteq 1.015, \tag{4.10}$$

with $T - \frac{1}{4} < Y_1 < Y_2 \leq T + \frac{1}{4}$ (as in Proposition 1 and Proposition 2 in [16]), on the circle $|s - \frac{1}{2}| = R$ and $|s - \sigma_0| = R$, respectively, and

$$\frac{\mathbf{C}(s-i(Y_2-Y_1))}{\mathbf{C}(s_0)} \trianglelefteq T^{\frac{11.001}{T^{1/4}}}, \quad \frac{\mathbf{D}(s-i(Y_2-Y_1))}{\mathbf{D}(s_0)} \trianglelefteq T^{\frac{11.001}{T^{1/4}}}, \tag{4.11}$$

on the circle $|s - s_0| = 1$.

5. Proofs of Proposition 1 and 2

In this section, we prove Propositions 1 and Proposition 2 in [16]. We need Lemma 1 and Lemma 2 from the last section; we also need Lemma 5 and 6 in the following, from complex analysis. The inequality (5.1) in Lemma 5 below is the reason for us to use the pseudo-Gamma function to offset the magnitude of the Riemann xi-function, because Lemma 5 below tells us that the ratio of the magnitude for the involved function on a larger circle over its magnitude at the center determines the upper bound for the number of zeros inside the larger circle but outside a smaller circle, with respect to the ratio of the radii of the two concentric circles.

The following Lemma 6 is the reason for us to use the doubly symmetry property of the Riemann xi-function, this property is also used in our design of the pseudo-Gamma function in [16]. We shall use the double symmetry property to create complex functions which have real values on the considered specific line segments, respectively, as in (3.6), (3.7), (3.11) and (3.14) in [23]. These two lemmas are used in a similar way in [16] for us to prove the density hypothesis. For references in the literature concerning these two lemmas, one may see [11].

Lemma 5. *If $r_1 > 0$, and f is a function that is regular for $|z - z_0| \leq r_1$, $z_0 \in \mathbb{C}$, and has at least m zeros in $|z - z_0| \leq r < r_1$, with multiple zeros*

being counted according to their order of multiplicity, then, if $f(z_0) \neq 0$, *we have*

$$\left(\frac{r_1}{r}\right)^m \leq \frac{M}{|f(z_0)|}, \tag{5.1}$$

where $M = \max|f(z)|$ *for* $|z - z_0| = r_1$. □

Lemma 6. *Let* $s_1 \neq s_2$. *Suppose that the function* $f(s)$ *is analytic and non-zero in a simply connected open region and a simple curve* $\mathcal{C}$ *from* $s = s_1$ *to* $s = s_2$ *is inside this open region. Then,*

$$\Im\big\{\log f(s_2) - \log f(s_1)\big\} \trianglelefteq\ (m+1)\pi, \tag{5.2}$$

where m *is the number of points* s_0 *on the route* $\mathcal{C}$ *from* s_1 *to* s_2, *exclusive of the end points, at which* $\Re f(s_0) = 0$. □

Proof of Proposition 1. We need to estimate the quantity on the left hand side of (1.12). Recalling the definition of the function $\mathbf{B}(s)$ and $\mathbf{C}(s)$ in Lemma 6 in [23], we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\Im\big[\mathrm{Log}_\lambda\,\xi\big(\tfrac12 + i\,Y_1\big) - \mathrm{Log}_\lambda\,\xi(x + i\,Y_1)\big] \\ &- \Im\big[\mathrm{Log}_\lambda\,\xi\big(\tfrac12 + i\,Y\big) - \mathrm{Log}_\lambda\,\xi(x + i\,Y)\big] = F(Y_1) - F(Y) - G, \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

where

$$F(y) = \Im\log\frac{\xi(s)}{\nabla(s)}\Big|_{x+i\,y}^{1/2+i\,y}, \quad G = \Im\log\frac{\nabla(s + i\,Y_1)}{\nabla(s + i\,Y)}\Big|_{x}^{1/2}, \tag{5.4}$$

where $\log\xi(s)$ (as well as $\log\zeta(s)$ as $\mathrm{Log}_\lambda\,\zeta(s)$ later) should be regarded as $\mathrm{Log}_\lambda\,\xi(s)$, actually in this article from now on, for $\frac12 < x \leq 2$. We claim that

$$F(y) \trianglelefteq \pi, \quad \text{and} \quad G \trianglelefteq \pi, \tag{5.5}$$

From (5.3) with (5.4) and (5.5), we would finish the proof of (1.12), hence of Proposition 1, but with a 3π-bound instead of our 2π-bound. We use a "trick" to save a π in the final estimate.

We notice that

$$F(Y) = F_1(Y_1) := \Im\log\frac{\xi(s - i(Y_1 - Y))}{\nabla(s - i(Y_1 - Y))}\Big|_{x+iY_1}^{1/2+iY_1},$$

and

$$F(Y_1) - F(Y) = F(Y_1) - F_1(Y_1) = \Im\log\frac{\xi(s)\xi(s - i(Y_1 - Y))}{\nabla(s)\nabla(s - i(Y_1 - Y))}, \tag{5.6}$$

where $\log\xi(s)$ should be regarded as $\mathrm{Log}_\lambda\,\xi(s)$. By the same method we would use for $F(y)$ with both $y = Y_1$ and $y = Y$, we estimate $F(Y_1) - F_1(Y_1)$ from the latter expression. As we obtain the same final result with $F(y)$ or

$F(Y_1) - F_1(Y_1)$, we have saved a term of π in the final estimate in the proposition.

Thus, instead of proving (5.5), we prove the new claim

$$F(Y_1) - F_1(Y_1) \le \pi, \quad G - G_1 \le \pi, \tag{5.7}$$

with $G_1 = \Im \log \dfrac{\nabla(s - i(Y_1 - Y))}{\nabla(s))}\Big|_{x+iY_1}^{1/2+iY_1}$ so that

$$G - G_1 = \Im \log \frac{\nabla(s + iY_1)\nabla(s - i(Y_1 - Y))}{\nabla(s + iY)\nabla(s)}\Big|_{x+iY_1}^{1/2+iY_1},$$

since $F(Y_1) - F(Y) - G = F(Y_1) - F_1(Y_1) + G - G_1$.

In estimating $F(Y_1) - F_1(Y_1)$ in (5.6), we use the estimates in (3.4)? in [23] and (4.6)? in [23]. We first apply Lemma 5 in [23] to the function $\mathbf{B}(s)\,\mathbf{B}(s - i(Y_1 - Y)) = \frac{\xi(s)}{\nabla(s)}\,\frac{\xi(s-i(Y_1-Y))}{\nabla(s-i(Y_1-Y))}$, defined in (3.3) in [23] on the line segment from $x+iy$ to $\frac{1}{2}+yi$. We know that $F(Y_1)-F(Y) \trianglelefteq (m_1+1)\pi$, where $m_1 \in \{0\}\cup\mathbb{N}$ is the number of $\check{s}_1 \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\Re\left(\mathbf{B}(\check{s}_1)\,\mathbf{B}(\check{s}_1 - i(Y_1 - Y)\right) = 0$ on the line segment from $x + i\,y$ to $\frac{1}{2} + i\,y$, exclusive of the end-points. We may instead consider the analytic function

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{F}(s) = \tfrac{1}{2}\big[&\mathbf{B}(s + i\,y)\,\mathbf{B}(s + i\,y - i(Y_1 - Y)) \\ &+ \mathbf{B}(s - i\,y)\,\mathbf{B}(s - i\,y + i(Y_1 - Y))\big],\end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

as both $\xi(s)$ and $\nabla(s)$ are doubly symmetric with respect to the real axis and $\Re(s) = \frac{1}{2}$ from (1.5) and by using the remark after the definition of the pseudo-Gamma function $\nabla(s)$ in (2.1) in [23] (**this part may not needed in** [23] **as it is in** [25]**, or maybe needed in this one, as we did before**) . Noting that $2\Re(w) = w + \overline{w}$ for any $w \in \mathbb{C}$, one sees that the number $2m_1$, with m_1 as above, is the same as the number of zeros of the function $\mathscr{F}(s)$ on the line segments from $s = x$ to $\frac{1}{2}$ and from $s = 1 - x$ to $\frac{1}{2}$, exclusive of the end-points, as

$$\Re\left[\mathbf{B}(\sigma + i\,y)\,\mathbf{B}(\sigma + i\,y - i(Y_1 - Y))\right] = \mathscr{F}(\sigma),$$

with $\mathscr{F}(s)$ defined in (5.8).

We prove the first estimate in (5.7) by applying Lemma 5, the number $2m_1$ being taken as the number of zeros of $\mathscr{F}(s)$ on the line segments from $s = x$ to $s = \frac{1}{2}$ and from $s = 1 - x$ to $s = \frac{1}{2}$, we realize that this is bounded by the number of zeros of $\mathscr{F}(s)$ inside the circle $|s - \frac{1}{2}| = \frac{3}{2}$. We use $\frac{3}{2}$ as r and y as r_1 in Lemma 5. If $|s \pm i\,y - \frac{1}{2}| \le y$, then $|t| \le y$ and $|s \pm i\,y - \frac{1}{2}| = \sqrt{(\sigma - \frac{1}{2})^2 + t^2 + y^2 \pm 2ty} \le 4y^2$. We may use the maximum of $\mathscr{F}(s)$ on the circle $|s - \frac{1}{2}| = 2y$ by the maximum principle. It follows by

Lemma 5 that

$$\big(\tfrac{y}{3/2}\big)^{2m_1} \le \big|\tfrac{\mathbf{B}(s)}{\mathbf{B}(1/2)}\,\tfrac{\mathbf{B}(s-i(Y_1-Y))}{\mathbf{B}(1/2)}\big| < 1.03,$$

as $1.014 \times 1.015 < 1.03$, on the circle $|s-\frac{1}{2}| = R$ with $R = 2y$, noting that $T - \frac{1}{4} < y \le T + \frac{1}{4}$. Hence, $m_1 < 1$ so that $m_1 = 0$; from this, we get $|F(Y_1) - F_1(Y_1)| \le (m_1+1)\pi = \pi$, which proves the first inequality in (5.7).

We now prove the second estimate in (5.7) similarly but with $\mathbf{D}(s)\,\mathbf{D}(s - i(Y_1 - Y))$ instead of $\mathbf{B}(s)\,(s - i(Y_1 - Y))$ in (3.3) in [23] on the circle $|s - s_0| = 1$, where $s_0 = \sigma_0 + i\,t_0$, with σ_0 and t_0 stipulated in Lemma 6 [23]. Also, we use the following function

$$\mathscr{G}(s) = \tfrac{1}{2}\Big[\tfrac{\nabla(s+iY_1)}{\nabla(s+iY)}\,\tfrac{\nabla(s-i(Y_1-Y))}{\nabla(s)} + \tfrac{\nabla(s-iY_1)}{\nabla(s-iY)}\,\tfrac{\nabla(s-i(Y_1-Y))}{\nabla(s)}\Big], \tag{5.9}$$

instead of $\mathscr{F}(s)$. We apply Lemma 5 in [23] to the function $\mathbf{D}(s)\,\mathbf{D}(s - i(Y_1 - Y))$ in (3.3) in [23] on the line segment from x to $\frac{1}{2}$. We know that $G - G_1 \trianglelefteq (m_2+1)\pi$, where $m_2 \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$ is now the number of $\check{s}_2 \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\Re\big[\mathbf{D}(\check{s}_2)\,\mathbf{D}(\check{s}_2 - i(Y_1 - Y)) = 0$ on the line segment from $s = x$ to $\frac{1}{2}$, exclusive of the end-points. We apply Lemma 5 with the center at $s_{0,2} := s_0 = \frac{5}{4}$.

We use $r_1 = 1$ and $r = \frac{3}{4}$ as the radii for the larger circle and the smaller circle, respectively. This circle corresponds to the one with the same radius but its center at $s_0 = \sigma_0 + i\,t_0$, where $\sigma_0 = \frac{5}{4}$ and $t_0 = \frac{1}{2}(Y + Y_1)$. We notice here that t_0 satisfies the requirement in Lemma 6 [23] from the assumptions on Y and Y_1. It follows that $\big(\frac{4}{3}\big)^{m_2} \le T^{\frac{26}{T^{3/4}}}$ and $m_2 \le \frac{26\log T}{T^{3/4}\log(4/3)} < 1$. Because m_2 is an integer, we see that $m_2 = 0$. This finishes the proof of Proposition 1. □

Proof of Proposition 2. The proof of this proposition is very similar to that for Proposition 1. First of all, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\big[\mathrm{Log}_\lambda\,\xi\big(2 + i\,y_2\big) - \mathrm{Log}_\lambda\,\xi(2 + i\,y_1)\big]\\ &- \big[\mathrm{Log}_\lambda\,\xi\big(X + i\,y_2\big) - \mathrm{Log}_\lambda\,\xi(X + i\,y_1)\big] = J - L,\end{aligned} \tag{5.10}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}J &= \log\big[\tfrac{\xi(s)}{\nabla(s)}\cdot\tfrac{\xi(s-i(y_2-y_1))}{\nabla(s-i(y_2-y_1))}\big]\Big|_{x+i\,y_1}^{x+i\,y_2},\\ L &= \log\big[\tfrac{\nabla(3/2+s)}{\nabla(X-1/2+s)}\cdot\tfrac{\nabla(3/2+s-i(y_2-y_1))}{\nabla(X-1/2+s-i(y_2-y_1))}\big]\Big|_{1/2+i\,y_1}^{1/2+i\,y_2},\end{aligned} \tag{5.11}$$

with $\log\zeta(s)$ being regarded as $\mathrm{Log}_\lambda\,\zeta(s)$. We show that

$$\Im J \trianglelefteq \pi, \quad \text{and} \quad \Im L \trianglelefteq \pi, \tag{5.12}$$

similarly as we did for (5.5), from which we get a bound for the expressions in (5.10), which then proves the proposition.

To prove the first estimate in (5.12), we again first apply Lemma 5 in [23] with $f(s) = \mathbf{B}(s) \cdot \mathbf{B}(s + i(y_2 - y_1))$ in (3.3) in [23] on the line segment route from $s_{1,3} = x + i\,y_1$ to $s_{2,3} = x + i\,y_2$. By Lemma 5 in [23], we know that $J \trianglelefteq (m_3 + 1)\pi$, where $m_3 \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$ is the number of $\breve{s}_3 \in \mathbb{C}$ at which $\Re\big[\mathbf{B}(\breve{s}_3) \cdot \mathbf{B}(\breve{s}_3 + i(y_2 - y_1))\big] = 0$ on the line segment from $x + i\,y_1$ to $x + i\,y_2$, exclusive of the end-points. Then, we apply Lemma 5 to the function

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{J}(s) = \tfrac{1}{2}\big[&\mathbf{B}\big(x - \tfrac{1}{2} + s\big) \cdot \mathbf{B}\big(x - \tfrac{1}{2} + s - i(y_2 - y_1)\big) \\ &+ \mathbf{B}\big(\tfrac{1}{2} - x + s\big) \cdot \mathbf{B}\big(\tfrac{1}{2} - x + s - i(y_2 - y_1)\big)\big], \end{aligned} \tag{5.13}$$

on the circles $|s - s_{0,3}| = 1$, where $s_{0,3} = \frac{5}{4} + t_{0,3}$ with $t_{0,3} = \frac{1}{2}(y_1 + y_2)$. We notice that all zeros of the function $\mathscr{J}(s)$ from $s_{1,3}$ to $s_{2,3}$ are inside the circle $|s - s_{0,3}| = r_1$ with $r_1 = \sqrt{(\frac{5}{4} - \frac{1}{2})^2 + (t_{0,3} - y_1)^2} = \sqrt{(\frac{5}{4} - \frac{1}{2})^2 + (t_{0,3} - y_2)^2}$ < 0.751 since $y_2 > T_0 - \frac{1}{4}$ from Proposition 2 and recall that $x = X$ with $\frac{1}{2} < X$ or $x = 2$ and T_0 defined in Section 1. We acquire $\big(\frac{1}{0.751}\big)^{m_3} \le 1.03$ from the second estimate in (3.4)? in [23], so that

$$m_3 \le \tfrac{\log 1.03}{-\log 0.751} < 0.104. \tag{5.14}$$

However, m_3 is a nonnegative integer. Therefore, $m_3 = 0$. It follows that

$$\Im J \le (m_3 + 1)\pi = \pi. \tag{5.15}$$

To prove the second estimate in (5.12), we prove that $m_4 \le 0$ by applying Lemma 5, as $m_4 \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$ is the number of $\breve{s}_4 \in \mathbb{C}$ such that $\Re\big[\mathbf{C}\big(\breve{s}_4\big)\mathbf{C}\big(\breve{s}_4 - i(y_2 - y_1)\big)\big] = 0$ on the line segment from $s = \frac{1}{2} + i\,y_1$ to $\frac{1}{2} + i\,y_2$. This time, we use the following function

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{L}(s) = \tfrac{1}{2}\big[&\tfrac{\nabla(-3/2+s)}{\nabla(1/2-X+s)} \cdot \tfrac{\nabla(-3/2+s-i(y_2-y_1))}{\nabla(1/2-X+s-i(y_2-y_1))} \\ &+ \tfrac{\nabla(3/2+s)}{\nabla(X-1/2+s)} \cdot \tfrac{\nabla(-3/2+s-i(y_2-y_1))}{\nabla(1/2-X+s-i(y_2-y_1))}\big]. \end{aligned} \tag{5.16}$$

We then prove that $\Im L \le \pi$ similarly, as in the proof of $|G| \le \pi$ in (5.4). This finishes the proof of Proposition 2. □

Recalling how the proof of Theorem 1 depends on Proposition 1 and Proposition 2, as explained at the end of Section 2, we see now that the proof of Theorem 1 is complete. □

6. The Upper Bound from the Growth Rate of Zeros: Proof of Theorem 2 from Theorem 1

In this section, we use Theorem 1 to prove Theorem 2 in the case $\sigma \ge \frac{1}{2}$. For Backlund's original argument in 1918, see [4] or [35]; a slightly different approach by Littlewood (using a different auxiliary function) may be found in [61]. We follow Backlund's general line as presented in [71], however, we underline that Theorem 1 does not follow from classical methods in the

literature, but is, in an essential way, based on our approach in [16], proven using the pseudo-Gamma we introduced there.

The following lemma is proven in [16] (Lemma 2.1, item (b)).

Lemma 7. *Let $T \geq T_0 = 2445999556027$. Assume that $\frac{1}{4} < \sigma \leq 3$ and $T - \frac{5}{4} < t < T + \frac{5}{4}$. Then one has, with $s = \sigma + it$,*

$$|\zeta(s)| \leq 5.334\, T^{3/4}. \tag{6.1}$$

□

We state the Borel-Carathéodory theorem in complex analysis, from [69]. This theorem shows that an analytic function in a closed disk may always be bounded by its real part. It is an application of the maximum modulus principle. A slightly varied form of this theorem stated in [71] is actually sufficient for our purpose.

Lemma 8. *Let a function f be analytic on a closed disc of radius R centered at the origin. For $0 < r < R$, we denote the norm $\max_{|z|\leq r} |f(z)|$ by $M(r)$. Let r_1 and r_2 be any real numbers satisfying $r_1 < r_2 < R$. Then, we have the following inequality:*

$$M(r_1) \leq \frac{2r_1}{r_2 - r_1} \sup_{|z|\leq r_1} \Re f(z) + \frac{r_2 + r_1}{r_2 - r_1} |f(0)|. \tag{6.2}$$

□

By the maximum modulus principle, we know that, for f as in Lemma 4 in [23],

$$M(r) = \max_{|z|=r} |f(z)|.$$

The following lemma is well-known in complex analysis and may be found, e.g., in [1].

Lemma 9 (The three-circle theorem)**.** *Suppose that $f(s)$ is analytic in the annulus $r_1 < |s| < r_2$ for some $r_2 > r_1 > 0$, and continuous on the corresponding closed annulus. Then*

$$M(r) \leq M\big(r_1\big)^{\frac{\log(r_2/r)}{\log(r_2/r_1)}} M\big(r_2\big)^{\frac{\log(r/r_1)}{\log(r_2/r_1)}}, \tag{6.3}$$

for $r_1 \leq r \leq r_2$. □

In Theorem 1 we considered a λ with $\frac{1}{2} < \lambda < 1$. It is well-known that there are at most finitely many zeros for any analytic function in a bounded open region. Since $\zeta(\overline{s}) = \overline{\zeta(s)}$, as stated in (1.5) by the Schwarz reflection principle, we get $|\zeta(\overline{s})| = |\zeta(s)|$. Thus, we may assume that $t \geq T_0$ without

loss of generality. Let T satisfy $t-\epsilon<T\le t$ for sufficiently small positive $\epsilon>0$, by which, we may assume that $\lambda+iT\neq\beta+i\gamma$ for any $\beta+i\gamma=\rho\in\mathbf{Z}$.

To choose the radii of these circles, we first let $d_\rho=|\rho-s_0|$ for each $\rho\in\mathbf{Z}$. We shall use once more that there are at most finitely many zeros for any analytic function in a bounded open region. Denoting $\mathbf{Z}_{\lambda,T}=\big\{\rho=\beta+i\,\gamma\in\mathbf{Z}:\ \beta>\lambda,\ T-\sigma_0+\lambda\le|\gamma|\le T+\sigma_0-\lambda\big\}$, we let

$$0<\hat\eta<\tfrac12\ \inf\big\{|d_\rho-d_{\rho'}|:\rho\in\mathbf{Z}_{\lambda,T},\ \rho'\in\mathbf{Z}_{\lambda,T}\big\},\tag{6.4}$$

and subject to the requirement that $\hat\eta$ is sufficiently small as necessary (see also (6.7) below). Let

$$\tfrac32<\sigma_0\le\tfrac74,\quad \tfrac{\sigma_0+\lambda-2+\hat\eta+\varepsilon_1}{2}<\Delta\le\tfrac{49}{100},\tag{6.5}$$

and set $s_0=\sigma_0+iT$ with $\hat\eta>0$ and $\varepsilon_1>0$ restricted by (6.7) below. We remark here that $\sigma_0+\lambda-2>0$ from $\sigma_0>\frac32$ and $\lambda>\frac12$ so that $\Delta>0$ and $\sigma_0-1>\Delta$ from $\sigma_0>\frac32$ and $\Delta<\frac{49}{100}$. Setting s_0 to be the center for all circles to be considered below, we first design four circles. We name the outermost circle by $\mathcal{C}_0$ and consider three circles $\mathcal{C}_1$, $\mathcal{C}$, and $\mathcal{C}_2$ inside $\mathcal{C}_0$ with radii R_0, R_1, r, and R_2, respectively, with $R_0>R_1>r>R_2$.

We take

$$R_0=\sigma_0-\lambda-\hat\eta,\tag{6.6}$$

so that the outermost circle $\mathcal{C}_0$ is "nearly" passing through the point $s=\lambda+iT$. We remark here that there are no zeros for the Riemann zeta function between the circle with the radius $\sigma_0-\lambda$ and $\mathcal{C}_0$, by our designation of $\hat\eta$ in (6.4).

Then, we take ε_j for $j=1$ and 2, such that

$$0<\varepsilon_j<\tfrac19,\ \text{for } j=1,\text{ and } 2,\quad\text{and}\quad \varepsilon_1+\varepsilon_2<\sigma_0-\lambda-\hat\eta,\tag{6.7}$$

here, both ε_j for $j=1$ and 2 may be as small as necessary. Then, we choose

$$R_1=R_0-\varepsilon_1=\sigma_0-\lambda-\hat\eta-\varepsilon_1,\quad r=R_1-\varepsilon_2=\sigma_0-\lambda-\hat\eta-\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon,\tag{6.8}$$

in which we have replaced the notation ε_2 by ε for convenience later on. The choices of ε_1, $\varepsilon=\varepsilon_2$, and Δ will be used to minimize the final estimate in Theorem 2.

Let us set

$$R_2=\sigma_0-1-\Delta.\tag{6.9}$$

Recalling that $\sigma_0>\frac32$ from (6.5) and $\lambda>\frac12$, we see that $\frac{\sigma_0+\lambda}{2}>1$. Thus, $\Delta>0$ by (6.5) and the remark after (6.5), so that $\sigma_0-R_2=1+\Delta>1$. The circle $\mathcal{C}_2$ lies outside the half plane $\sigma\le1$. Furthermore, there are no zeros of $\zeta(s)$ inside and on the circle $\mathcal{C}_2$, from the well-known result that

there are no zeros for the Riemann zeta function for $\sigma > 1$, which is a direct consequence from the Euler product formula for $\zeta(s)$.

Then, we define an auxiliary function. We denote by s_m for $m = 1, 2, \ldots, M$, all the zeros of the Riemann zeta-function located inside the circle $\mathcal{C}_0$. These zeros are actually inside the circles $\mathcal{C}_1$ and $\mathcal{C}$ by the choice of ε_j for $j = 1$ and 2, but outside of the circle $\mathcal{C}_2$. We shall count these zeros, if they exist, with multiplicities. Corresponding to each such a zero, we attach a factor $z_m(s)$, which is defined to be

$$z_m(s) = \frac{R_0^2 - (\overline{s}_m - \overline{s}_0)(s - s_0)}{R_0(s - s_m)}, \quad \text{for } s \neq s_m, \tag{6.10}$$

where R_0 is defined in (6.6). Note that $z_m(s)$ diverges to ∞ for s tending to s_m. We shall set $z_m(s_m) = \infty$. Then, let us define an auxiliary function $\mathscr{Z}(s)$ by the formula

$$\mathscr{Z}(s) = \zeta(s) \prod_{m=1}^{M} z_m(s). \tag{6.11}$$

By its construction, we see that this auxiliary function does not have zeros in the whole circle $\mathcal{C}_0$. Thus, this auxiliary function is analytic and does not have any zeros on and inside the circle $\mathcal{C}_0$, which gives us the advantage to be able to apply the three-circle theorem, i.e., Lemma 9.

In fact, we need to consider the function $\log \mathscr{Z}(s)$, whose definition will be lately validated on the way, as the auxiliary function to be used in the proof. We shall acquire the above-mentioned maximum norms for this function on the circles C_0 and $\mathcal{C}_2$ first. For the bound on $\zeta(s)$ on the circle $\mathcal{C}_0$, we use Lemma 7 in this section. For the bound of $\zeta(s)$ on the circle $\mathcal{C}_2$, we need to apply a Vinogradov estimate as stated in (6.37) below. Besides, estimating the bound in each of both cases involves the numbers of zeros of the Riemann zeta-function in the concerned region in Theorem 1.

We now deal with the definition of $\log \mathscr{Z}(s)$, which should be in the form of

$$\log \mathscr{Z}(s) = \log \zeta(s) + \sum_{m=1}^{M} \log z_m(s). \tag{6.12}$$

We first justify that this function is well-defined by the following considerations.

To define the function on the left hand side in (6.12), we need to validate each function on its right hand side. For this, we shall use the estimate in Theorem 1 as the upper bound for the number M, and we need to consider the function $z_m(s)$ for each $m = 1, 2, \ldots, M$.

For each m, we notice that $z_m(s)$ is a fractional linear transformation which maps $\mathcal{C}_0$ to the unit circle, which may be proved by the fundamental property of the linear fractional transform, or directly from an elementary argument as follows. We set $s - s_0 = R_0 e^{i\theta}$ with $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ for all $s \in \mathcal{C}_0$ and $s_m = \beta_m + i\gamma_m$ with β_m, $\gamma_m \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $s_0 - s_m = (\sigma_0 - \beta_m) + i(T - \gamma_m)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} z_m(s) &= \frac{R_0^2 + [(\sigma_0 - \beta_m) - i(T - \gamma_m)]R_0 e^{i\theta}}{R_0[R_0 e^{i\theta} + (\sigma_0 - \beta_m) + i(T - \gamma_m)]} \\ &= e^{-i\theta}\, \frac{R_0 + [(\sigma_0 - \beta_m) - i(T - \gamma_m)]e^{i\theta}}{R_0 + [(\sigma_0 - \beta_m) + i(T - \gamma_m)]e^{-i\theta}}. \end{aligned}$$

Just using $e^{i\theta} = \cos(\theta) + i\sin(\theta)$, we see that the numerator of the last fraction is $[R_0 + A\cos(\theta) + B\sin(\theta)] - i[B\cos(\theta) - A\sin(\theta)]$ with $A = \sigma_0 - \beta_m$ and $B = -(T - \gamma_m)$ and the denominator of that is the conjugate of its numerator. Hence,

$$|z_m(s)| = 1, \quad \text{for all } s \in \mathcal{C}_0. \tag{6.13}$$

We recall from complex analysis that the linear fractional transform always carries circles to circles or lines. We consider that the point $s = s_m$ is between two circles $\mathcal{C}_0$ and $\mathcal{C}_2$ and recall that $z_m(s_m) = \infty$, as we saw above in (6.10), for each fixed $m = 1, \ldots, M$. One sees that $z_m(s)$ carries $\mathcal{C}_2$ to a circle which contains $z_m(s_0)$ as an interior point, which lies on the same ray from the origin as $\overline{s}_0 - \overline{s}_m$ and which therefore lies in the half-plane $\Re z_m(s_0) > 0$. Therefore, $\log z_m(s)$ can be defined such that

$$|\Im \log z_m(s_0)| < \tfrac{\pi}{2}, \quad \text{inside and on } \mathcal{C}_2. \tag{6.14}$$

This gives a meaning to $\log z_m(s)$, which validates the definition of $\log \mathscr{Z}(s)$, in (6.12), throughout the interior of $\mathcal{C}_0$, as $\mathscr{Z}(s)$ is analytic and does not have any zeros. This also gives a meaning to the function $\log \mathscr{Z}(s)$ in (6.12), throughout the interior of $\mathcal{C}_0$, by the definition of (6.11) with that of $z_m(s)$ in (6.10).

We note here that

$$|\Im \log z_m(s)| < \tfrac{3\pi}{2}, \quad \text{on } \mathcal{C}_2, \tag{6.15}$$

from the definition of $\log z_m(s)$ at the point $s = s_0$, because a circle which does not contain the origin (in its inner or on its boundary) cannot intersect both halves of the imaginary axis.

To obtain the upper bound for $\log \mathscr{Z}(s)$ on the circle $\mathcal{C}_1$, we start with estimating this function on the circle $\mathcal{C}_0$. In fact, we are going to apply Lemma 8 to the function $f(s) = \log \frac{\mathscr{Z}(s)}{\mathscr{Z}(s_0)}$ which satisfies $f(s_0) = 0$. We

only need to estimate the real part of $f(s)$, noticing that

$$\Re \log \frac{\mathscr{Z}(s)}{\mathscr{Z}(s_0)} = \log\left|\frac{\mathscr{Z}(s)}{\mathscr{Z}(s_0)}\right| = \log\left|\frac{\zeta(s)}{\zeta(s_0)}\right| + \sum_{m=1}^{M} \log\left|\frac{z_m(s)}{z_m(s_0)}\right|. \tag{6.16}$$

We then recall that $|z_m(s)| = 1$ from (6.13) and, from (6.10), the condition in (6.7) with the second restriction in (6.5), and $|s_0 - s_m| \geq R_2$ from the design of R_2, we see that

$$|z_m(s_0)| = \tfrac{R_0}{|s_0 - s_m|} < \tfrac{R_0}{R_2} < 125, \tag{6.17}$$

as $R_0 < \frac{5}{4}$, $R_2 \geq \frac{1}{100}$, since $\Delta < \frac{49}{100}$ and $\sigma_0 - 1 > \frac{1}{2}$, and

$$|z_m(s)| > 1, \quad \text{inside } \mathcal{C}_0, \tag{6.18}$$

as the linear transformation $z_m(s)$ sends an interior point s_0 of $\mathcal{C}_0$ to a point outside of the unit circle by (6.17). Thus,

$$\log|z_m| = 0, \quad \text{on } \mathcal{C}_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \log|z_m(s)| > 0, \quad \text{inside } \mathcal{C}_0. \tag{6.19}$$

It follows from (6.12) by $\Re \log z = \log|z|$ for any $z \in \mathbb{C}$ not on the negative half real axis or the origin by the definition of the logarithmic function, with the above (6.19) that

$$\log|\zeta(s)| \leq \log|\mathscr{Z}(s)|, \quad \text{inside } \mathcal{C}_0. \tag{6.20}$$

From (6.12) and (6.13), we see that the inequality becomes equality on the circle $\mathcal{C}_0$.

From (6.16) with (6.19) and $\log|z_m(s)| > 0$, we acquire

$$\Re \log \tfrac{\mathscr{Z}(s)}{\mathscr{Z}(s_0)} \trianglelefteq \log\big|\tfrac{\zeta(s)}{\zeta(s_0)}\big|, \quad \text{inside } \mathcal{C}_0\ . \tag{6.21}$$

Inserting $r_2 = R_0$ and $r_1 = R_1$ with R_0 and R_1 defined in (6.6) and (6.8), respectively, into (6.2) and applying Lemma 8 with $z = s$, $f(z) = \log \frac{\mathscr{Z}(s)}{\mathscr{Z}(s_0)}$, and the estimate on $\max_{|z|\leq r_1} \Re f(z)$ in (6.21), we acquire

$$\log \tfrac{\mathscr{Z}(s)}{\mathscr{Z}(s_0)} \trianglelefteq \tfrac{2(\sigma_0 - \lambda - \hat{\eta} - \varepsilon_1)}{\varepsilon_1} \log\big|\tfrac{\zeta(s)}{\zeta(s_0)}\big|, \tag{6.22}$$

on $\mathcal{C}_1$. From (6.22), we get

$$\log \mathscr{Z}(s) \trianglelefteq \tfrac{2(\sigma_0 - \lambda - \hat{\eta} - \varepsilon_1)}{\varepsilon_1} \big(\log|\zeta(s)| - \log|\zeta(s_0)|\big) + |\log \mathscr{Z}(s_0)|. \tag{6.23}$$

However, by (6.12)

$$\log \mathscr{Z}(s_0) = \log \zeta(s_0) + \sum_{m=1}^{M} \log z_m(s_0). \tag{6.24}$$

For the bounds on $\log\zeta(s_0)$, we note that

$$\begin{aligned}\log|\zeta(s_0)| &= \Re\log\zeta(s_0) = \Re\log\prod_{p\in\mathcal{P}}\big(1-\tfrac{1}{p^{s_0}}\big)^{-1}\\ &= \Re\sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}} -\log\big(1-\tfrac{1}{p^{s_0}}\big) = \Re\sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}}\sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{m\,p^{ms_0}} = \sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}}\sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\frac{\cos(t_0\log p)}{mp^{m\sigma_0}}.\end{aligned} \tag{6.25}$$

Here and later in (6.34), we have used Euler's product formula for the Riemann zeta function (which we can, since $\sigma_0 > \frac{3}{2} > 1$ by assumption on σ_0 in (6.5)). Therefore, using that, from (6.5), $\sigma_0 - 1 > \frac{1}{2}$ and (6.25):

$$\begin{aligned}-\log 2 < \log\big(\sigma_0-1\big) &\le -\sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}}\sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{m\,p^{m\sigma_0}} \le \log|\zeta(s_0)|\\ &\le \sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}}\sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{m\,p^{m\sigma_0}} = \log\prod_{p\in\mathcal{P}}\big(1-\tfrac{1}{p^{\sigma_0}}\big)^{-1} = \log\zeta(\sigma_0)\\ &= \log\sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\frac{1}{n^{\sigma_0}} \le \log\bigg(1+\int_1^{\infty}\frac{\mathrm{d}\,v}{v^{\sigma_0}}\bigg) = \log\big(1+\tfrac{1}{\sigma_0-1}\big) < \log 125,\end{aligned} \tag{6.26}$$

as $\log\big(1+\frac{1}{\sigma_0-1}\big)$ is a decreasing function of σ_0, where $\frac{3}{2} < \sigma_0 \le \frac{7}{4}$ from (6.5). To bound the other terms in the sum in (6.24), we note that

$$\Re\log z_m(s_0) = \log|z_m(s_0)| < \log 125,$$

from the inequality in (6.17). It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}|\log z_m(s_0)| &= \sqrt{(\Re\log z_m(s_0))^2 + (\Im\log z_m(s_0))^2}\\ &< \sqrt{\log^2 125 + \tfrac{\pi^2}{4}} < 5.078,\end{aligned} \tag{6.27}$$

recalling (6.14), which holds on $\mathcal{C}_2$ and inside it. From (6.23), (6.24) with $M = 5$ from (1.6) in Theorem 1, (6.26), and (6.27), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\log\mathscr{Z}(s) \trianglelefteq\ & \tfrac{2(\sigma_0-\lambda-\hat{\eta}-\varepsilon_1)}{\varepsilon_1}\log|\zeta(s)|\\ &+\big(\tfrac{2(\sigma_0-\lambda-\hat{\eta}-\varepsilon_1)}{\varepsilon_1}+1\big)\log 125 + 25.39,\end{aligned} \tag{6.28}$$

noting that $5.078\ \times 5 = 25.39$.

Now, we recall (6.1) in Lemma 7 and obtain, using $T \ge T_0$:

$$\log|\zeta(s)| \le c_1'\log T, \tag{6.29}$$

on $\mathcal{C}_1$, with

$$c_1' := \tfrac{3}{4} + \tfrac{\log 5.334}{\log T_0} < B_{4,30} := 0.809\,. \tag{6.30}$$

Recalling (6.23) with (6.29) and (6.28), we obtain

$$|\log\mathscr{Z}(s)| \le \tilde{c}_1\ \log T, \tag{6.31}$$

on $\mathcal{C}_1$, where

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{c}_1 :=& \tfrac{2(\sigma_0-\lambda-\hat{\eta}-\varepsilon_1)B_{4,30}}{\varepsilon_1} + \tfrac{2(\sigma_0-\lambda-\hat{\eta}-\varepsilon_1)\log 125}{\varepsilon_1 \log T_0} + \tfrac{\log 125+25.39}{\log T_0} \\ <& \tfrac{2(\sigma_0-1/2)}{\varepsilon_1}\Big(0.809 + \tfrac{\log 125}{\log T_0} + \tfrac{\varepsilon_1(\log 125+25.39)}{\log T_0}\Big) < c_1 := \tfrac{B_{4,32}}{\varepsilon_1},\end{aligned} \tag{6.32}$$

with $B_{4,32} = 2.2$, as we actually take $\sigma_0 = \frac{3759}{2500}$, $\lambda > \frac{1}{2}$, $\hat{\eta} > 0$, $0 < \varepsilon_1 < \frac{1}{9}$ from (6.4), (6.5), and (6.7), and $T \geq T_0$ as $2\big(\frac{3759}{2500} - \frac{1}{2}\big)\Big(0.809 + \frac{\log 125}{\log T_0} + \frac{9.585}{9\log T_0}\Big) < 2.192$ and $2.192\big(\frac{3759}{2500} - \frac{1}{2}\big) < 2.2$.

We then find the upper bound for $\log \mathscr{Z}(s)$ on $\mathcal{C}_2$. We note that

$$|\log \mathscr{Z}(s)| \leq |\log \zeta(s)| + \sum_{m=1}^{M} |\log z_m(s)|. \tag{6.33}$$

For the first term in the last expression, we recall the Euler product formula in (1.1), noting that $|p^{\sigma+it}| = p^{\sigma}$, and using $|a+b| \leq |a| + |b|$ and $|a-b| \geq |a| - |b|$ for any a and $b \in \mathbb{C}$, getting

$$\begin{aligned}\log \zeta(s) = \log \prod_{p\in\mathcal{P}} \frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{p^s}} = \sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}} \log \frac{1}{1-\frac{1}{p^s}} = \sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}}\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \tfrac{1}{p^{ms}} \\ \trianglelefteq \sum_{p\in\mathcal{P}}\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \tfrac{1}{p^{m\sigma}} = \log \prod_{p\in\mathcal{P}} \tfrac{1}{1-\frac{1}{p^{\sigma}}} = \log \zeta(\sigma) \leq \log \zeta(1+\Delta),\end{aligned} \tag{6.34}$$

as $\sigma \geq 1 + \Delta$ on the circle $\mathcal{C}_2$, with $\zeta(\sigma) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n^{-\sigma}$ being a decreasing function of σ for $\sigma > 1$.

For each $m = 1, 2, \ldots, M$, we look at the real part and imaginary part of $\log z_m(s)$ separately to get the estimate for its absolute value. For its real part, we have, using the definition of $z_m(s)$ and the fact that $s \in \mathcal{C}_2$:

$$\Re \log z_m(s) = \log |z_m(s)| \trianglelefteq \tfrac{R_0^2+R_0R_2}{R_0\Delta} = \tfrac{R_0+R_2}{\Delta}, \quad s \in \mathcal{C}_2, \tag{6.35}$$

from $|a+b| \leq |a| + |b|$ for any a and $b \in \mathbb{C}$. For the imaginary part of $\log z_m(s)$, we recall the bound on $\log \mathscr{Z}(s)$ in (6.33). Recalling (6.15), we see that

$$\begin{aligned}|\log z_m(s)| &\leq \sqrt{[\Re \log z_m(s)]^2 + [\Im \log z_m(s)]^2} \\ &\leq \tfrac{\sqrt{4(R_0+R_2)^2+9\pi^2\Delta^2}}{2\Delta} = \sqrt{\big(\tfrac{R_0+R_2}{\Delta}\big)^2 + \tfrac{9\pi^2}{4}},\end{aligned} \tag{6.36}$$

on the circle $\mathcal{C}_2$.

At this point, we cite an explicit upper bound for the Riemann zeta-function from [13], which says

$$\zeta(1+\Delta) \leq A\,|t|^{B(1-\sigma)^{3/2}}\,\log^{2/3}|t|, \tag{6.37}$$

where $A = 175$ and $B = 46$, for $\frac{1}{2} \leq \sigma \leq 1$ and $|t| \geq 3$. Actually, the constants $A = 175$ and $B = 46$ can be replaced by $A = 76.2$ and $B = 4.45$, respectively, from [36]. We shall use below in (6.38) this latter bound.

It follows from (6.33) with (6.34) and (6.36), and (6.37) for the upper bound in (6.34), Theorem 1 with 3 as the upper bound of the number of zeros in (1.6), that

$$\begin{aligned}\log \mathscr{Z}(s) &\trianglelefteq \tfrac{2}{3}\log\log T - 4.45\,\Delta^{3/2}\,\log T_0 + \log 76.2\\ &\quad + 3\sqrt{\left(\tfrac{R_0+R_2}{\Delta}\right)^2 + \tfrac{9\pi^2}{4}} \le c_2 \log\log T,\end{aligned} \tag{6.38}$$

where

$$\tilde{c}_2 = \tfrac{2}{3} + \tfrac{\log 76.2}{\log\log T_0} - \tfrac{4.45\Delta^{3/2}\,\log T_0}{\log\log T_0} + \tfrac{3}{\log\log T_0}\sqrt{\left(\tfrac{R_0+R_2}{\Delta}\right)^2 + \tfrac{9\pi^2}{4}},$$

for $T \ge T_0$. Recalling the stipulations of R_0 and R_1 in (6.6) resp. (6.8) and noting that $-\Delta^{3/2}$ inside the numerator of the second term and Δ inside the denominator of the second factor in the third term on the right hand side of the above formula both are decreasing functions of Δ, we take $\sigma_0 = \frac{3759}{2500}$ after (6.32) and $\Delta = \sigma_0 - 1 - 0.01 = 0.49$ so that $R_0 < \frac{2509}{2500}$ in (6.6) and $R_2 = 0.01$ in (6.9) and

$$\tilde{c}_2 < c_2 := 29.678. \tag{6.39}$$

In the last step, we apply the three-circle theorem as Lemma 9 in this section on the circles $\mathcal{C}_1$, $\mathcal{C}$, and $\mathcal{C}_2$, using (6.31) and (6.38) with (6.32) and (6.39). We notice that $\frac{\log(R_1/r)}{\log(R_1/R_2)} + \frac{\log(r/R_2)}{\log(R_1/R_2)} = 1$. It follows that on the circle $\mathcal{C}$

$$\log \mathscr{Z}(s) \trianglelefteq (c_2\log\log T)^{\frac{\log(R_1/r)}{\log(R_1/R_2)}}(c_1\log T)^{\frac{\log(r/R_2)}{\log(R_1/R_2)}} \le \ddot{c}\,\log T, \tag{6.40}$$

where

$$\ddot{c} := c_1^{1-\frac{\log(R_1/r)}{\log(R_1/R_2)}}\left(\tfrac{c_2\log\log T}{\log T}\right)^{\frac{\log(R_1/r)}{\log(R_1/R_2)}}, \tag{6.41}$$

with c_1 and c_2 from (6.32) and (6.39), respectively.

We recall the designs of R_1 and r in (6.8) and R_2 in (6.9) to get (recalling $\varepsilon_2 = \varepsilon$)

$$\begin{aligned}\tfrac{R_1}{r} &= \tfrac{R_1}{R_1-\varepsilon_2} = 1 + \tfrac{\varepsilon}{\sigma_0-\lambda-\hat{\eta}-\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon};\\ \tfrac{R_1}{R_2} &= \tfrac{\sigma_0-\lambda-\hat{\eta}-\varepsilon_1}{\sigma_0-1-\Delta} = 2 + \tfrac{2\Delta-\sigma_0-\lambda+2-\hat{\eta}-\varepsilon_1}{\sigma_0-1-\Delta},\end{aligned} \tag{6.42}$$

by the definitions of R_1 and r in (6.8) and that of R_2 in (6.9). From the second restriction in (6.5), we have $\frac{R_1}{R_2} > 2$ in (6.42). It follows that

$$\tfrac{\log(R_1/r)}{\log(R_1/R_2)} < \tfrac{\varepsilon}{(\sigma_0-\lambda-\hat{\eta}-\varepsilon_1-\varepsilon)\log 2} < 2.892\,\varepsilon, \tag{6.43}$$

from $\sigma_0 > \frac{3}{2}$, $\lambda < 1$, and the restrictions $\hat{\eta} > 0$, $\varepsilon_1 > 0$, $\varepsilon > 0$ in (6.7).

From (6.32), we also see that $c_1 = \frac{1.329}{\varepsilon_1} > 1$, for $\varepsilon_1 < 2.023$, which we can assume, so that $c_1^{1-\frac{\log(R_1/r)}{\log(R_1/R_2)}} < c_1$. With c_2 defined in (6.39), we notice that $c_2 = 29.678 < \frac{\log^{3/4} T}{\log\log T}$ for all $T \ge \tilde{T}_0 > T_0$, as $\frac{\log^{3/4} T}{\log\log T}$ is a monotonously

increasing function of T for $T \geq T_0 > 45 > e^{e^{4/3}}$ and $\frac{\log^{3/4}\tilde{T}_0}{\log\log\tilde{T}_0} > c_2$ by our choice of $\tilde{T}_0$. Equivalently, we get $c_2 \log\log T < \log^{3/4} T$ for all $T \geq \tilde{T}_0 := T_0^{45}$.

Now, we recall from Theorem 2 with $\check{\epsilon}$ resp. $\hat{\epsilon}$ replaced by ε_1 resp. $\varepsilon_2 = \varepsilon$, that

$$T \geq \ddot{T} := \max\left\{\tilde{T}_0, e^{e^{\frac{-\log\varepsilon_1 + \log(1.543)}{0.223\,\varepsilon}}}\right\}. \tag{6.44}$$

Concluding from (6.41) with (6.43), we acquire

$$\log\ddot{c} \leq \log\tfrac{1.329}{\varepsilon_1} - 0.723\varepsilon\log\log T < \tfrac{\varepsilon\log\log T}{2},$$

as $\frac{2.892}{4} > 0.723$ and $0.223 - 0.723 = -\frac{1}{2}$, and

$$\ddot{c} \leq \tfrac{1.329}{\varepsilon_1}\big(\tfrac{1}{\log^{1/4} T}\big)^{2.892\,\varepsilon} < c := e^{-\frac{\varepsilon\log\log T}{2}} = \tfrac{1}{\log^{\varepsilon/2} T}, \tag{6.45}$$

noting that $\log\frac{1.329}{\varepsilon_1} < 0.223\,\varepsilon\,\log\log T$ for $T \geq \ddot{T}$, from (6.44). We also note that $c \uparrow 1$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$, $T \geq \ddot{T}(> T_0)$ fixed.

Moreover, on the circle $\mathcal{C}$ we have

$$\log|\mathscr{Z}(s)| = \Re\log\mathscr{Z}(s) \leq |\log\mathscr{Z}(s)|,$$

and

$$\log|\zeta(s)| \leq \log|\mathscr{Z}(s)|,$$

from (6.20). This, together with (6.40), implies that

$$\log|\zeta(s)| < c\log T, \quad \text{on the circle } \mathcal{C},$$

with c defined in (6.45), recalling that in connection with (6.5) we had the restriction $t - \epsilon < T \leq t$, for sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$. Especially, we have

$$\log|\zeta(s)| \leq c\log T, \quad \text{for } s = \lambda + \hat{\eta} + \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon + iT,$$

from the design of $\mathcal{C}$ with the radius r in (6.8) and center $s_0 = \sigma_0 + i\,T$. However, we have $\frac{1}{2} < \lambda < 1$ and we may let $\hat{\eta} + \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon \to 0$. Then, we let $\epsilon \to 0$ so that $T \to t$ with $t - \epsilon < T \leq t$, getting then

$$\log|\zeta(s)| \leq c\log t, \quad \text{for } s = \sigma + it, \tag{6.46}$$

for $\frac{1}{2} < \sigma < 1$ and $t \geq \ddot{T}$, with $\ddot{T}$ defined in (6.44). Since λ may be taken arbitrarily close to $\frac{1}{2}$ and $\zeta(s)$ is continuous, the upper bound in (6.46) is also valid for $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$.

At the last, we note that for any $0 < \delta < 1$ with a fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, we may let $T > e^{e^{-2\log\delta/\varepsilon}}$ so that, for c defined in (6.5), we have $c < \delta$, which means that the Lindelöf hypothesis is validated, with $\tilde{T} = \max\{\ddot{T}, e^{e^{-2\log\delta/\hat{\epsilon}}}\}$. Concluding from (6.46) with (6.44) and the latter restriction on T and replacing δ, ε_1, and ε by ϵ, $\check{\epsilon}$, and $\hat{\epsilon}$ respectively, we finish the proof of Theorem 2, noting

that $\check{\epsilon}$ and $\hat{\epsilon}$ both were taken to be not greater than $\frac{1}{100}$ in the statement of Theorem 2. □

References

[1] Ahlfors, L. V., *Complex Analysis*, McGrax-Hill, 3rd Ed., New York, 1979.

[2] Albeverio, S., Marcolli, M., Paycha, S., and Plazas, J., eds., Traces in Number Theory, Geometry and Quantum Fields, Vieweg, 2008.

[3] Anderson, J., *Mean value properties of the Hurwitz zeta-function*, Math. Scand. **71**, (1992), pp. 295–300.

[4] Backlund, R., *Über die Beziehung zwischen Anwachsen und Nullstellen der Zeta-Funktion*, Öfversigt Finska Vetensk. Soc. 61 (9), 1918-1919.

[5] Bagchi, B., *Recurrence in Topological Dynamics and the Riemann hypothesis*, Acta Math. Hungar., **50**, (1987), pp. 227–240.

[6] Bazzanella, D., *Primes between consecutive squares and the Lindelöf hypothesis*, Period. Math. Hungar., **66**, (2013), pp. 111 — 117.

[7] Bombieri, E., *Prime territory: Exploring the infinite landscape at the base of the number system*, The Sciences, (1992), pp. 30–36.

[8] Borwein, P., Choi, S., Rooney, B., and, Weirathmueller, A., *The Riemann hypothesis*, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, New York, Hong Kong, London, Milan, Paris, Tokyo, 2007.

[9] J. Brüdern, *Einführung in die analytische Zahlentheorie*, Springer, Berlin, 1995.

[10] C. Caldwell and Yuanyou Cheng, *Determining Mills' Constant and a Note on Honaker's Problem*, Integer sequences, Article 05.4.1, Vol. **8**, (2005), pp. 1-9.

[11] Chandrasekharan, K., *Arithmetical Functions*, Springer-Verlag, Ber -lin, Heidelberg, New York, 1970.

[12] Yuanyou Cheng, *How to prove the Riemann hypothesis*. To appear, Journal of Mathematics and System Science, 2016.

[13] Yuanyou Cheng, *An explicit upper bound for the Riemann zeta-function near the line $\sigma = 1$*, Rocky Mountain J. Math. **29**, (1999), pp. 115-140.

[14] Yuanyou Cheng, *An explicit zero-free region for the Riemann zeta-function*, Rocky Mountain J. Math. **30**, no. 1, (2000), pp. 135-148.

[15] Yuanyou Cheng, *Estimates on primes between consecutive cubes*, Rocky Mountain J. Mathematics, **40**, Vol. 1, (2010), pp. 117–153.

[16] Yuanyou Cheng, S. Albeverio, R. L. Graham, S. W. Graham, and C. B. Pomerance, *Proof of the strong density hypothesis*, 2020. Submitted to Annals of Mathematics.

[17] Yuanyou Cheng, G. J. Fox, and M. Hassani, *Analytic implications from the prime number theorem*. To appear, Acta Arithmetica, 2018.

[18] Yuanyou Cheng, G. J. Fox, and M. Hassani, *Estimates on prime numbers*. To appear, Mathematica Aeterna, 2018.

[19] Yuanyou Cheng and S. W. Graham, *The universe for prime numbers is random but symmetric – A panorama in proving the Riemann Hypothesis*. The International Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Applications, Vol ?, No. ?, May 2021; the 7th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and the 7th International Conference on Computer Science, Information Technology and Applications, May 22-23, Zurich, Switzerland.

[20] Yuanyou Cheng and S. W. Graham, *Estimates on the Riemann ξ-function via pseudogamma functions*, 2020. Submitted to the Journal of Analysis.

[21] Yuanyou Cheng and S. W. Graham, *Estimates on the Riemann zeta function*, Rocky Mountain Journal of Mathematics, **34**(4), 2004, pp. 1261-1280.v

[22] Yuanyou Cheng, S. W. Graham, and Bill Z. Yang, *Devising Pseudogamma Functions with Mathematica*, 2021. International Journal of Information Technology and Management, 2021; the 10th International conference on Parallel, Distributed Computing and Applications and the 8th International Conference on Computer Science and Information Technology, April 24-25, 2021, Copenhagen, Denmark.

[23] Yuanyou Cheng and Gongbao Li, *Estimates on ratios of the Riemann Xi-function via pseudo-Gamma functions*, 2020. Submitted to the Journal of Analysis.

[24] Y. Cheng and C. Pomerance, *On a conjecture of R. L. Graham*, Rocky Mountain J. Mathematics, **24**(3), pp. 961-965, 1994.

[25] Yuanyou Cheng, C. B. Pomerance, G. J. Fox, and S. W. Graham, *A family of pseudogamma functions*, 2020. Submitted to the Journal of Analysis.

[26] Yuanyou Cheng, C. B. Pomerance, R. L. Graham, and S. W. Graham, *Application of the Mellin Transform in the Distribution of Prime Numbers*, 2020. Submitted to American J. of Math.

[27] Yuanyou Cheng, C. B. Pomerance, R. L. Graham, and S. W. Graham, *Proof of the Riemann Hypothesis from the density and Lindelöf hypotheses via a power sum method*, 2020. Submitted to Annals of Mathematics.

[28] Cipra, B., *A prime case of chaos*, What's Happening in the Mathematical Sciences, **4**, (1999), pp. 2–17.

[29] Conrey, J. B., *More than two fifths of the zeros of the Riemann zeta function are on the critical line*, J. reine angew. Math., **399**, (1989), pp. 1–26.

[30] Conrey, J. B., *The Riemann Hypothesis*, Notices of the American Mathematical Society, March, (2003), pp. 341-353.

[31] Conrey, J. B. and Ghost, A., *Remarks on the generalized Lindelöf hypothesis*, Functions et Approximatio XXXVI, (2006), pp. 71–78.

[32] Crandall R. and Pomerance C., *Prime Numbers–A computational perspective*, Springer, 2001.

[33] H. Davenport, *Multiplicative Number Theory*, V.74, Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, New York, third edition, 2000. Revised and with a preface by Hugh L. Montgomery.

[34] de la Vallée-Poussin, C. J., Recherches analytiques sur la théorie des nombres premiers, Ann. Soc. Sci. Bruxelles **20** (1896), pp. 281-362.

[35] Edwards, H. M., *Riemann's zeta function*, Academic Press, New York, London, 1974.

[36] Ford, K., *Vinogradov's integral and bounds for the Riemann zeta-function*, Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society, **85** (3), (2002), pp. 565-633.

[37] R. Garunkştis, *Growth of the Lerch zeta-functioin*, Liet. Mat. Rink. **45**, (2005), no. 1, pp. 45–56 (English, with English and Lithuanian summaries); English transl., Lithuanian Math. J. **45** (2005), no. 1, pp. 34–43.

[38] R. Garunkştis and J. Steuding, *Do Lerch zeta-functions satisfy the Lindelöf hypothesis?* pp. 61–74 in "Analytic and probabilistic methods in number theory", Palanga 2001, TEV, Vilnius (2002).

[39] Steven M. Gonek, Sidney W. Graham, and Yoonbok Lee, *The Lindelöf hypothesis for primes is equivalent to the Riemann hypothesis*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **148**, (2020), 2863-2875.

[40] Gourdon, X., *The 10^{13} first zeros of the Riemann zeta function, and zeros computation at very large height*, http://numbers.computation.free.fr/Constants/Miscellane-ouszetazeros1e13-1e24.pdf

[41] Gram, J. P., *Note sur les zéros de la fonction de Riemann*, Acta Math., **27**, (1903), 289–304.

[42] J. Hadamard, Sur la distribution des zéros de la fonction $\zeta(s)$ et ses conséquences arithmétiques, Bull. Soc. Math. France **24** (1896), pp. 199–220.

[43] Hardy, G. H. and Littlewood, J. E., *On Lindelöf's hypothesis concerning the Riemann zeta function*, Proc. Roy. Soc., **A**, 103, (1923), pp. 403–411.

[44] Heath-Brown, D. R., *The fourth power of the Riemann zeta function*, Proc. London Math. Soc. 3. Ser., **38** (3), (1929), pp. 385–422.

[45] Hejhal, D., *A remark on the Lindelöf hypothesis*, Bull. AMS 80, (1914), pp. 695–699.

[46] Hoheisel, G., *Primzahlprobleme in der Analysis*, Sitz. Preuss. Akad. Wiss., **33**, (1930), pp. 580–588.

[47] Huxley, M. N., *Exponential sums and the Riemann zeta function V*, Proc. London Math. Soc., 3rd Ser., **90** (11), (2005), pp. 1–41.

[48] H. Iwaniec and E. Kowalski, *Analytic Number Theory*, AMS, Providence, 2004.

[49] Ingham, A. E., *Mean-value theorems in the theory of the Riemann zeta function*, Proc. London Math. Soc., **2**, **27** (1), (1928), pp. 273–300.

[50] Ingham, A. E., *On the difference between consecutive primes*, Quart. J. Math. **8**, (1937), pp. 255–266.

[51] Ivić, A., *The Riemann zeta function–Theory and Applications*, Dover Publications, Inc., Mineola, New York, 1985.

[52] Ivić, A., *On the multiplicity of zeros of the zeta-function*, Bulletin CXVIII de Ácadémie Serbe des Sciences et des Arts (1999), Classe des Sciences mathématiques et naturelles, Sciences mathématiques, No. 24, pp. 119–131.

[53] Karatsuba, A., *Basic Analytic Number Theory*, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1993.

[54] Karatsuba, A. A. and Voronin, S. M., *The Riemann Zeta-Function*, Walter de Gruyter, 1992.

[55] Klarriech, E., *Prime time*, New Scientist, No. 2264, 2000.

[56] Korobov, N. M., *On zeros of* $\zeta(s)$, Dokl. Akad. Nauk. Nauk SSSR, **118**, (1958), pp. 231–232.

[57] Lagarias, J. C., *An elementary problem equivalent to the Riemann hypothesis*, Amer. Math. Monthly, **109**, (2002), pp. 534–543.

[58] Landau, E., *Vorlesungen Über Zahlentheorie*, Chelsea, 1947.

[59] Levinson, N., *More than one−third of the zeros of the Riemann zeta function are on s = 1/2*, Adv. Math., **13**, (1974), pp. 383–436.

[60] Lindel´of, E., *Quelques remarques sur la croissance de la function* $\zeta(s)$, Bull. Sci. Math. 32, (1908), PP. 341–356.

[61] Littlewood, J.E., *On the zeros of the Riemann zeta function*, P.C.P.S. **22**, (1924), pp. 295–318.

[62] Odlyzko, A. M. and Schönhage, A., *Fast algorithms for multiple evaluations of the Riemann zeta function*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., Vol. 2, **309**, (1988), pp. 797–809.

[63] Patterson, S. J., *An introduction to the theory of the Riemann zeta function*, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1998.

[64] L. D. Pustyl'nikov, On a property of the classical zeta-function associated with the Riemann hypothesis, Russian Math. Surveys, **1**, (1999), pp. 262-263.

[65] Riemann, B., *Über die Anzahl der Primzahlen unter einer gegebenen Grösse*, Monatsber. Akad., Berlin, (1859), pp. 671–680.

[66] Robin, G., *Grandes valeurs de la fonction somme des diviseurs et hypothèse de Riemann*, J. Math. Pures appl., **63** (1984), pp. 187–213.

[67] Selberg, A., *On the zeros of the zeta-function of Riemann*, Der Kong. Norske Vidensk. Selsk. Forhand., **15** (1942), PP. 5962; also, Collected Papers, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg - New York, Vol. I, (1989), pp. 156–159.

[68] J. Sondow and C. Dumitrescu, A monotonicity property of the Riemann's xi-function and a reformulation of the Riemann hypothesis, Periodica Math. Hungarica, **60**, (2010), pp. 37-40.

[69] Lang, S., *Complex Analysis*, 4th ed., Springer-Verlag, New York, 1999.

[70] Schoenfeld, L., *Sharper bounds for the Chebyshev functions* $\vartheta(x)$ *and* $\psi(x)$ *II*, Math. Comp., **30** (1976), pp. 337–360. Corrigendum, *ibid.*, **30**, (1976), pp. 900.

[71] E. C. Titchmarsh, *The Theory of the Riemann zeta function*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1951; 2nd ed. revised by D. R. Heath-Brown, 1986.

[72] Turán, P. , *On the remainder term of the prime number theorem f ormula II*, Acta Math. Acad. Sci. Hung., **1** (1950), pp. 155–166 .

[73] Vinogradov, I. M., *A new estimate for* $\zeta(1+it)$, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR, **22** (1958), pp. 161–164.

[74] Voronin, Sergei M., *Theorem on the Universality of the Riemann Zeta Function*, Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR, Ser. Matem. 39, pp. 475-486, 1975. Reprinted in Math. USSR Izv., **9** (1975), pp. 443-445.

[75] Weber, M., *Mean value estimates related to the Lindelöf hypothesis*, Lith. Math. J., **51**, (2011), pp. 82–105.

Yuanyou Cheng

Dept. of Mathematics and Statistics, Boston University, Boston, MA 02215 and Dept. of Mathematics., Harvard University, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA.

Current Address: Department of Mathematics, the University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742, USA.

Email address: Yuanyou Furui Cheng <Cheng.Y.Fred@math.umd.edu>

Sergio Albeverio

Institut für Angewandte Mathematik und HCM, Universität Bonn, Endenicher Allee 60, D-53115 Bonn, Germany.

Email address: Sergio Albeverio <albeverio@iam.uni-bonn.de>

Ronald L. Graham

Department of Computer Science and Engineering, University of California, San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093-0404.

Email address: Ronald L. Graham <graham@ucsd.edu>

Carl B. Pomerance

Dept. of Mathematics, Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire 03755.

Email address: Carl B. Pomerance <carl.pomerance@dartmouth.edu>

Juping Wang

The School of Mathematical Sciences, Shanghai, 200433, China.

Email address: J. Wang <jpwang@fudan.edu.cn>