On certain Gram matrices and their associated series

Werner Ehm

Abstract

We derive formulae for Gram matrices arising in the Nyman–Beurling reformulation of the Riemann hypothesis. The development naturally leads upon series of the form $S(x) = \sum_{n\geq 1} R(nx)$ and their reciprocity relations. We give integral representations of these series; and we present decompositions of the quadratic forms associated with the Gram matrices along with a discussion of the components' properties.

1 Introduction

In complex variable terms, the Nyman–Beurling criterion for the Riemann hypothesis [RH] (cf. [17, 7]) amounts to the condition that the Mellin transform, 1/s, of the indicator function of the unit interval can be approximated in $L^2(\Re(s) = 1/2, |ds|)$ by functions of the form $\sum_{n \leq N} a_n \theta_n^s \zeta(s)/s$, where $\zeta(s)$ is the Riemann zeta function, $\theta_n \in (0, 1]$, and the coefficients a_n may be taken to be real-valued. The criterion was significantly strengthened by Báez–Duarte [1, Theorem 1.3] who showed that one may take $\theta_n = 1/n$, so that it suffices to consider Dirichlet polynomials times $\zeta(s)/s$ as the approximating functions. Let

$$d_q^2(N) \equiv d_q^2(N; a_1, \dots, a_N) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\Re(s) = 1/2} \left| 1 - \sum_{n \le N} a_n \, n^{-s} \, \zeta(s) \, \right|^2 \frac{|ds|}{|s|^{2q}} \quad (q = 1, 2). \tag{1}$$

For q = 1, $d_q^2(N)$ represents the (squared) approximation error in Báez–Duarte's criterion which tells us that *RH* is true if and only if

$$\liminf_{N \to \infty} \inf_{a_1, \dots, a_N} d_a^2(N; a_1, \dots, a_N) = 0.$$
(2)

The case q = 2 will be dealt with in parallel as a variation of Báez–Duarte's criterion. Initially, the equivalence to RH is only known for q = 1, yet as is easily seen, it likewise holds for q = 2. A potential merit of the choice q = 2 might lie in the stronger downweighting of the squared error in (1).

On expanding the square and noting that $\bar{s} = 1 - s$ on the critical line one obtains the decomposition

$$d_q^2(N; a_1, \dots, a_N) = C^{(q)} - 2\sum_{n \le N} a_n F_n^{(q)} + \sum_{m,n \le N} a_m a_n G_{m,n}^{(q)}$$
(3)

where for q = 1, 2

$$C^{(q)} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Re(s)=1/2} \frac{ds}{s^q (1-s)^q} = q, \qquad (4)$$

$$F_n^{(q)} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Re(s)=1/2} n^{-s} \frac{\zeta(s)}{s^q (1-s)^q} \, ds \,, \tag{5}$$

$$G_{m,n}^{(q)} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Re(s)=1/2} m^{-s} n^{-(1-s)} \frac{\zeta(s)\zeta(1-s)}{s^q(1-s)^q} \, ds \,. \tag{6}$$

Concerning the Dirichlet polynomials $\sum_{n \leq N} a_n n^{-s}$, Bettin, Conrey, and Farmer [6] have shown that the (array of) coefficients $\lambda_{n,N} = \mu_n(1 - \log n/\log N)$, $1 \leq n \leq N$, μ the Möbius function, enjoy an optimality property. If RH holds and the sums $\sum_{|\Im \rho| \leq T} |\zeta'(\rho)|^{-2}$ involving the critical zeros ρ of $\zeta(s)$ satisfy a certain condition, then these coefficients are optimal in the sense that the related approximation error achieves the (unconditional) lower bound established by Báez–Duarte et al. [2] and later refined by Burnol [8]. With these coefficients the limit of the mixed term in (3) is readily evaluated.

Proposition 1.1 $\lim_{N\to\infty} \sum_{n\leq N} \lambda_{n,N} F_n^{(q)} = q \quad (q=1,2).$

Consequently, for both q = 1 and q = 2, RH is equivalent to the condition that the quadratic forms $\sum_{m,n\leq N} \lambda_{m,N} \lambda_{n,N} G_{m,n}^{(q)}$ converge to q as $N \to \infty$. This assigns special interest to the Gram matrices $G_{m,n}^{(q)}$, and we will focus on these objects in the following. Finally, in Section 8 we derive decompositions of the associated quadratic forms and conclude with a tentative discussion of their components' asymptotic behavior, to be illustrated in an appendix by numerical computations.

2 Basic evaluation of Gram kernels

We will consider, slightly more generally, Gram kernels $G_{u,v}^{(q)}$ defined by

$$G_{u,v}^{(q)} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\Re(s)=1/2} u^{-s} v^{-(1-s)} \frac{\zeta(s)\zeta(1-s)}{s^q(1-s)^q} \, ds \qquad (u,v>0).$$
(7)

To state our evaluation of the integral (7) we introduce some notation. Let $H(x) = \sum_{1 \le k \le x} 1/k$ (x > 0)denote the harmonic sum function, and $\{x\} = x - \lfloor x \rfloor$ the fractional part of x, where $\lfloor x \rfloor$ is the largest integer $\le x$. Moreover, $\gamma_0 \equiv \gamma$, γ_1 denote the first two Stieltjes constants appearing in the Laurent series expansion of $1/\zeta(s)$. The convergence and continuity in x of the functions $S_1(x), S_2(x)$ appearing below, here called 'Müntz type series' (e.g., [21, Ch 2]), is guaranteed by Proposition 2.1.

Theorem 2.1 CASE q = 1. Let $K = (\log 2\pi - \gamma + 1)/2$, and put $S_1(x) = \sum_{k \ge 1} R_1(kx)$ where

$$R_1(x) = \log x + \gamma - H(x) - \frac{\{x\} - 1/2}{x} \quad (x > 0).$$
(8)

Then

$$G_{u,v}^{(1)} = \frac{1}{v} \left(K + \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{v}{u} \right) + \frac{1}{u} S_1(v/u) \qquad (u, v > 0).$$
(9)

 $CASE \ q = 2$. Let

$$K_1 = (\log 2\pi - \gamma + 2)/2, \quad K_2 = \left(1 - \frac{\gamma}{2}\right)\log 2\pi + \frac{1}{4}\log^2 2\pi + \frac{\pi^2}{48} - \frac{\gamma^2}{4} - \gamma - \gamma_1 + \frac{3\pi^2}{48} - \frac{\gamma^2}{4} - \frac{\gamma}{4} - \gamma - \gamma_1 + \frac{3\pi^2}{48} - \frac{\gamma^2}{4} - \frac{\gamma}{4} - \frac{\gamma}{4}$$

and put $S_2(x) = \sum_{k \ge 1} R_2(kx)$ where

$$R_{2}(x) = \frac{1}{x} \left(\frac{1}{2} \log 2\pi + 1 + \frac{1}{2} \log x \right) + (2 - \gamma) \log x - \frac{1}{2} \log^{2} x + 2\gamma + \gamma_{1} - 3$$

$$+ \frac{1}{x} \sum_{\ell \le x} \left[\left(1 + \frac{x}{\ell} \right) \log \frac{x}{\ell} + 2 \left(1 - \frac{x}{\ell} \right) \right] \quad (x > 0).$$
(10)

Then

$$G_{u,v}^{(2)} = \frac{1}{v} \left(K_2 + K_1 \log \frac{v}{u} + \frac{1}{4} \log^2 \frac{v}{u} \right) + \frac{1}{u} S_2(v/u) \qquad (u,v>0).$$
(11)

The expression (9) is equivalent to a formula given by Báez–Duarte, Balazard, Landreau, and Saias [3] in their Proposition 90. However, our proof using straightforward residue calculus is more simple. The connection between the two expressions is detailed in Section 4.

For the proof we need some facts about the functions R_q and S_q to be established in Section 7, and about relevant residues.

Proposition 2.1 The functions R_q , q = 1, 2 are continuous in the range x > 0. As $x \to \infty$,

$$R_1(x) = \frac{B_2(\{x\})}{2x^2} + \frac{B_3(\{x\})}{3x^3} + O(x^{-4}), \qquad (12)$$

$$R_2(x) = -\frac{B_4(\{x\})}{24x^4} + O(x^{-5})$$
(13)

where $B_2(t) = t^2 - t + 1/6$, $B_3(t) = t^3 - 3t^2/2 + t/2$, $B_4(t) = t^4 - 2t^3 + t^2 - 1/30$ are Bernoulli polynomials. The series $S_q(x)$ converge absolutely for every x > 0, are continuous in x, and as $x \to \infty$ we have $S_1(x) = O(x^{-2})$ and $S_2(x) = O(x^{-4})$.

Proposition 2.2 Let r > 0, and for q = 1, 2 put

$$\begin{split} f(s) &= r^s \, \frac{\zeta(s)\zeta(1-s)}{s^q(1-s)^q} \,, \qquad g(s) = r^s \, \frac{\zeta(s)}{s^q(1-s)^q} \,, \\ h(s) &= r^s \, \frac{\zeta(1-s)}{s^q(1-s)^q} \,, \qquad k(s) = r^s \, \frac{1}{s^q(1-s)^q} \,. \end{split}$$

Let K, K_1, K_2 be as defined above. The residues of the functions f, g, h, k at s = 0, 1 are the following. CASE q = 1.

$$\operatorname{Res}_{f}(0) = K + \frac{1}{2} \log r \qquad \operatorname{Res}_{f}(1) = -r \left(K - \frac{1}{2} \log r \right)$$
$$\operatorname{Res}_{g}(0) = -\frac{1}{2} \qquad \operatorname{Res}_{g}(1) = r \left(1 - \gamma - \log r \right)$$
$$\operatorname{Res}_{h}(0) = - \left(1 - \gamma + \log r \right) \qquad \operatorname{Res}_{h}(1) = \frac{r}{2}$$
$$\operatorname{Res}_{k}(0) = 1 \qquad \operatorname{Res}_{k}(1) = -r$$

 $CASE \ q = 2$.

$$\operatorname{Res}_{f}(0) = K_{2} + K_{1} \log r + \frac{1}{4} \log^{2} r \qquad \operatorname{Res}_{f}(1) = -r \left(K_{2} - K_{1} \log r + \frac{1}{4} \log^{2} r \right)$$

$$\operatorname{Res}_{g}(0) = -\frac{1}{2} \left(\log 2\pi + 2 + \log r \right) \qquad \operatorname{Res}_{g}(1) = r \left(3 - 2\gamma - \gamma_{1} + (\gamma - 2) \log r + \frac{1}{2} \log^{2} r \right)$$

$$\operatorname{Res}_{h}(0) = -3 + 2\gamma + \gamma_{1} + (\gamma - 2) \log r - \frac{1}{2} \log^{2} r \qquad \operatorname{Res}_{h}(1) = \frac{r}{2} \left(\log 2\pi + 2 - \log r \right)$$

$$\operatorname{Res}_{k}(0) = 2 + \log r \qquad \operatorname{Res}_{k}(1) = -r \left(2 - \log r \right)$$

Proof of Theorem 2.1. Throughout the following, integration along vertical lines $\Re(s) = c$ is understood to go upwards from $c - i\infty$ to $c + i\infty$ and is simply denoted as \int_c . It is known [12, Sect. 9.2] that for fixed $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$ and every $\epsilon > 0$ one has for $|t| \to \infty$

$$\zeta(\sigma + it) = \begin{cases} O(|t|^{1/2-\sigma}) & \text{if } \sigma < 0\\ O(|t|^{(1-\sigma)/2+\epsilon}) & \text{if } 0 \le \sigma \le 1\\ O(1) & \text{if } \sigma > 1. \end{cases}$$

Consequently, the integral (7) stays absolutely convergent when the line of integration is shifted to any line $\Re(s) = c \notin \{0, 1\}$ such that, respectively, -1/2 < c < 3/2 if q = 1, or -5/2 < c < 7/2 if q = 2. Furthermore, the horizontal contributions to the contour integral at large imaginary values are negligible.

We now consider the case q = 1. Shifting the line of integration at first to $\Re(s) = -1/4 \equiv c_{-}$, say, we obtain

$$G_{u,v}^{(1)} = \frac{1}{v} \left(K + \frac{1}{2} \log(v/u) \right) + J(c_{-}), \tag{14}$$

where the first term is $\operatorname{Res}\left(u^{-s}v^{-(1-s)}\frac{\zeta(s)\zeta(1-s)}{s(1-s)}\right)\Big|_{s=0}$, the residue of the integrand at s=0, and

$$J(c_{-}) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{c_{-}} u^{-s} v^{-(1-s)} \frac{\zeta(s)\zeta(1-s)}{s(1-s)} ds$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{c_{-}} \sum_{k \ge 1} u^{-s} (kv)^{-(1-s)} \frac{\zeta(s)}{s(1-s)} ds$$

$$= \sum_{k \ge 1} \frac{1}{kv} J_{k}(c_{-}), \qquad (15)$$

with

$$J_k(c_-) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{c_-} (kv/u)^s \frac{\zeta(s)}{s(1-s)} \, ds.$$

The interchange of summation and integration at (15) is allowed because the inner sum is absolutely convergent and integrable, and the last sum converges, too; see below.

We next shift to the line $\Re(s) = 5/4 \equiv c_+$. Picking up (minus) the residues of $(kv/u)^s \frac{\zeta(s)}{s(1-s)}$ at zero and one, then expanding $\zeta(s)$ we similarly get

$$J_k(c_{-}) = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{kv}{u} \left(1 - \log \frac{kv}{u} - \gamma \right) + \sum_{\ell \ge 1} J_{k,\ell}(c_{+})$$
(16)

where

$$J_{k,l}(c_+) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{c_+} \left(\frac{kv}{\ell u}\right)^s \frac{ds}{s(1-s)} ds$$

Here sum and integral may be interchanged because the sum in (16) is finite: $J_{k,l}(c_+)$ vanishes if $kv/(\ell u) < 1$, or $\ell > kv/u$. For $\ell \le kv/u$ it equals $1 - \frac{kv}{\ell u}$. Collecting terms one obtains

$$\frac{1}{kv}J_k(c_-) = \frac{1}{kv}\left[\frac{1}{2} - \frac{kv}{u}\left(1 - \log\frac{kv}{u} - \gamma\right) + \sum_{1 \le \ell \le kv/u}\left(1 - \frac{kv}{\ell u}\right)\right]$$
$$= \frac{1}{u}\left[\frac{u}{2kv} - \left(1 - \log\frac{kv}{u} - \gamma\right) + \left\lfloor\frac{kv}{u}\right\rfloor\frac{u}{kv} - H(kv/u)\right]$$
$$= \frac{1}{u}\left[\log\frac{kv}{u} + \gamma - H(kv/u) + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \left\{\frac{kv}{u}\right\}\right)/\frac{kv}{u}\right]$$
$$= \frac{1}{u}R_1(kv/u).$$

Now by Proposition 2.1 the sum $\sum_{k\geq 1} \frac{1}{kv} J_k(c_-)$ is convergent, which settles the interchange at (15). But $J(c_-) = u^{-1} \sum_{k\geq 1} R_1(kv/u) = u^{-1} S_1(v/u)$, so (9) follows from (14). The case q = 2 can be treated along exactly the same lines. Only the respective residues differ. \Box

3 Further representations, reciprocity relations

The following proposition points out that the kernel $G^{(2)}$ is in fact a scale average of the kernels $G^{(1)}_{u,v}$. The integral representation of the latter is well-known (e.g., [3, p. 38], [5, p. 5714]).

Proposition 3.1 For any u, v > 0

$$G_{u,v}^{(1)} = \frac{1}{uv} \int_0^\infty \{tu\} \{tv\} \frac{dt}{t^2}.$$
(17)

$$G_{u,v}^{(2)} = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 G_{ux,vy}^{(1)} \, dx \, dy \,. \tag{18}$$

Proof. We follow Conrey and Myerson [9], making use of some facts about Mellin transforms. Putting technicalities aside, if $\widehat{f}(s) = \int_0^\infty f(x) x^{s-1} dx$ denotes the Mellin transform of a function f on $(0,\infty)$, then the Mellin transform of the function $\mathcal{I}f(x) = f(1/x)/x$ is $\widehat{f}(1-s)$, and the Mellin transform of the (multiplicative) convolution $f * \mathcal{I} f$ is $\widehat{f}(s) \widehat{f}(1-s)$. In particular, if $f(x) = \{1/x\}$, which has the Mellin transform

$$\widehat{f}(s) = \int_0^\infty \left\{ \frac{1}{x} \right\} \, x^{s-1} \, dx = -\frac{\zeta(s)}{s} \,, \tag{19}$$

then Mellin inversion gives

$$G_{u,v}^{(1)} = \frac{1}{v} \left(f * \mathcal{I}f \right) (u/v) = \frac{1}{v} \int_0^\infty \frac{\{x\}}{x} \left\{ \frac{x}{u/v} \right\} \frac{dx}{x} = \frac{1}{uv} \int_0^\infty \{tu\} \{tv\} \frac{dt}{t^2}$$

As for q = 2, note first that the Mellin transform of the indicator function χ of the unit interval is $\widehat{\chi}(s) = 1/s$, so that the Mellin transform of the convolution $h = \chi * \{1/\cdot\}$ is $-\zeta(s)/s^2$. Thus, Mellin inversion as above gives, after some calculation,

$$G_{u,v}^{(2)} = \frac{1}{v} (h * \mathcal{I}h)(u/v) = \frac{1}{uv} \int_0^\infty \int_0^1 \{tux\} \, \frac{dx}{x} \int_0^1 \{tvy\} \, \frac{dy}{y} \, \frac{dt}{t^2}$$

By Fubini this may also be written as

$$G_{u,v}^{(2)} = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 \int_0^\infty \frac{\{tux\}}{ux} \,\frac{\{tvy\}}{vy} \,\frac{dt}{t^2} \,dx \,dy = \int_0^1 \int_0^1 G_{ux,vy}^{(1)} \,dx \,dy$$

which completes the proof.

Incidentally, (17), (18) show that the kernels $G_{u,v}^{(q)}$ are symmetric in u, v, which is not obvious from Theorem 2.1. Manifestly symmetric expressions can be obtained by convex combination of $G^{(q)}$ and its transpose.

Proposition 3.2

$$G_{u,v}^{(1)} = \frac{1}{u+v} \left[2K + \frac{v}{u} S_1(v/u) + \frac{u}{v} S_1(u/v) \right],$$
(20)

$$G_{u,v}^{(2)} = \frac{1}{u+v} \left[2K_2 + \frac{1}{2} \log^2 \frac{v}{u} + \frac{v}{u} S_2(v/u) + \frac{u}{v} S_2(u/v) \right],$$
(21)

$$G_{u,v}^{(1)} = \frac{1}{2} \left[K\left(\frac{1}{v} + \frac{1}{u}\right) + \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{v} - \frac{1}{u}\right) \log \frac{v}{u} + \frac{S_1(u/v)}{v} + \frac{S_1(v/u)}{u} \right],\tag{22}$$

$$G_{u,v}^{(2)} = \frac{1}{2} \left[\left(K_2 + \frac{1}{4} \log^2(v/u) \right) \left(\frac{1}{v} + \frac{1}{u} \right) + K_1 \left(\frac{1}{v} - \frac{1}{u} \right) \log \frac{v}{u} + \frac{S_2(u/v)}{v} + \frac{S_2(v/u)}{u} \right].$$
(23)

Proof. The particular choice $\frac{v}{u+v}G_{u,v}^{(q)} + \frac{u}{u+v}G_{v,u}^{(q)}$ deletes the respective second terms in (9), (11) and gives the first two expressions. The second pair is obtained by taking equal weights 1/2 each. \Box

By equating (9) and (20) (or (22)) and setting r = v/u, it is possible to represent $S_1(1/r)$ in terms of $S_1(r)$ and known quantities, and analogously for $S_2(1/r)$. This readily yields the following reciprocity formulae.

Corollary 3.1 [Reciprocity relations] For every r > 0

$$S_1(1/r) = rS_1(r) + K(1-r) + \frac{1}{2}(1+r)\log r, \qquad (24)$$

$$S_2(1/r) = rS_2(r) + K_2(1-r) + K_1(1+r)\log r + \frac{1}{4}(1-r)\log^2 r.$$
(25)

Putting these findings together one can obtain yet another representation of the kernel $G^{(2)}$ akin to (22) which we state here without proof.

Theorem 3.1 With $K_1 = K + 1/2$ as defined in Theorem 2.1 we have

$$G_{u,v}^{(2)} = K_1\left(\frac{1}{v} + \frac{1}{u}\right) + \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1}{v} - \frac{1}{u}\right)\log\frac{v}{u} + \frac{1}{v}\int_{u/v}^{\infty}\frac{S_1(r)}{r}\,dr + \frac{1}{u}\int_{v/u}^{\infty}\frac{S_1(r)}{r}\,dr\,.$$
 (26)

4 Comparison with representations from the literature

The case q = 2 does not seem to have been considered before, so we focus on q = 1. As noted earlier the expression (9) for $G_{m,n}^{(1)}$ appears in a different form already in [3, Proposition 90]. It reads

$$A(r) = K + \frac{1}{2}\log r - r \int_{r}^{\infty} \varphi_{1}(t) \frac{dt}{t^{2}} \quad (r > 0).$$
(27)

Here $A(r) = \int_0^\infty \{xr\}\{x\} \frac{dx}{x^2}$, r > 0 denotes the 'autocorrelation' of the fractional parts functions $\{x\} = x - \lfloor x \rfloor$ and $\{xr\}$, and $\varphi_1(t)$, t > 0 is defined almost everywhere as

$$\varphi_1(t) = \sum_{k \ge 1} (\{kt\} - 1/2)/k \,. \tag{28}$$

Since by (17) one has $A(n/m)/n = G_{m,n}^{(1)}$, we may write (27) as

$$G_{m,n}^{(1)} = \frac{1}{n} \left(K + \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{n}{m} \right) - \frac{1}{m} \int_{n/m}^{\infty} \varphi_1(t) \frac{dt}{t^2} \,,$$

whence by comparison with (9) it must hold that

$$S_1(r) = -\int_r^\infty \varphi_1(t) \,\frac{dt}{t^2}, \quad r = n/m.$$
⁽²⁹⁾

For a direct proof of (29) valid for all r > 0 see Proposition 5.1.

Let us point out that given (29), the reciprocity relation for S_1 is also immediate from (27) via the corresponding reciprocity relation A(r) = rA(1/r) for the autocorrelation function A (which latter is just a change of variables).

In [3, Proposition 88] and [3, Proposition 89] the authors also gave alternative representations of the autocorrelation function A, namely

$$A(r) = \frac{1-r}{2} \log r + \frac{1+r}{2} (\log 2\pi - \gamma) - \varphi_1(r) - r\varphi_1(1/r),$$

valid for such r > 0 where the series $\varphi_1(r)$ converges, and

$$A(r) = \frac{1-r}{2} \log r + \frac{1+r}{2} \left(\log 2\pi - \gamma \right) - \frac{\pi}{2m} \left(V(n,m) + V(m,n) \right), \tag{30}$$

valid for rational r = n/m such that n and m have no common divisor. Here

$$V(n,m) = \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \left\{ \frac{kn}{m} \right\} \cot\left(\frac{\pi k}{m}\right)$$

is a 'Vasyunin sum'. Such sums appeared at first in Vasyunin's [22] evaluation of a closely related Gram matrix, and are now being studied on their own right due to their reciprocity properties and connections with Eisenstein series; see e.g. [5, 15]. In passing, the relations (27), (30) along with (29) can be used to show that the Vasyunin term $-\pi(V(n,m) + V(m,n))/(mn)$ can be written in terms of our Müntz type series as $S_1(n/m)/m + S_1(m/n)/n$ plus known functions.

Báez–Duarte et al. also determined the exact value of $A(1) = G_{1,1}^{(1)}$, which is $G_{1,1}^{(1)} = \log 2\pi - \gamma$; see [3, Proposition 87]. Since $G_{1,1}^{(1)} = K + S_1(1)$ and $K = (\log 2\pi - \gamma + 1)/2$ it follows that $S_1(1) = (\log 2\pi - \gamma - 1)/2$. For an independent evaluation of $S_1(1)$ see Proposition 6.1.

5 Integral representations of the series S_q

We begin by giving an independent proof of the representation of S_1 obtained indirectly in Section 4.

Proposition 5.1

$$S_1(r) = -\int_r^\infty \varphi_1(t) \, \frac{dt}{t^2} \,, \quad r > 0.$$
 (31)

Proof. We first show that

$$R_1(x) = -\int_x^\infty (\{t\} - 1/2) \,\frac{dt}{t^2}, \quad x > 0.$$
(32)

By its definition, $R_1 = f + g$ where

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{2x} + \log x + \gamma - 1, \qquad g(x) = -H(x) + \frac{\lfloor x \rfloor}{x}.$$

Clearly g(x) = 0 for $x \le 1$, while for $1 \le n < x < n + 1$ we have g(x) = -H(n) + n/x, hence $g'(x) = -n/x^2 = -\lfloor x \rfloor/x^2$. Now $f'(x) = -\frac{1}{2x^2} + \frac{1}{x}$, so $R'_1(x) = -\frac{1}{2x^2} + \frac{1}{x} - \frac{\lfloor x \rfloor}{x^2} = \frac{x - \lfloor x \rfloor - 1/2}{x^2}$, and the representation (32) follows by integration. Indeed, R_1 is continuous (Proposition 2.1); and a possible integration constant must vanish because both sides of (32) tend to zero as $x \to \infty$. The representation (31) then follows from

$$S_1(r) = -\sum_{k \ge 1} \int_{kr}^{\infty} (\{t\} - 1/2) \frac{dt}{t^2} = -\int_r^{\infty} \sum_{k \ge 1} \frac{\{kx\} - 1/2}{k} \frac{dx}{x^2}.$$
 (33)

It remains to justify the interchange of summation and integration. For differentiable h and any x we have

$$\left| \int_{x}^{x+1} (\{t\} - 1/2) h(t) dt \right| \le \frac{1}{2} \sup_{x \le t \le x+1} |h'(t)|$$

Thus if m denotes the smallest integer >= kr we have

$$\left| \int_{kr}^{\infty} (\{t\} - 1/2) \frac{dt}{t^2} \right| \leq \frac{1}{2(kr)^2} + \sum_{n \geq m} \left| \int_{n}^{n+1} (\{t\} - 1/2) \frac{dt}{t^2} \right| \leq \frac{1}{2(kr)^2} + \sum_{n \geq m} n^{-3} = O((kr)^{-2}),$$

which establishes the absolute convergence of the first series in (33). Each term in the last series, denoted $\varphi_1(x)$, is periodic with period 1, hence so is $\varphi_1(x)$. The formal Fourier series expansion is

$$\varphi_1(x) = \sum_{k \ge 1} \frac{\{kx\} - 1/2}{k} = -\sum_{k \ge 1} \sum_{n \ge 1} \frac{\sin 2\pi nkx}{\pi nk} = -\sum_{m \ge 1} \frac{d(m)}{\pi m} \sin 2\pi mx$$

where d(m) denotes the divisor function (which counts all pairs of natural numbers whose product equals m). Now $\sum_{m\geq 1} \frac{d(m)^2}{m^2}$ is convergent because $d(m) = O(m^{\epsilon})$ for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$ [13, Theorem 315]. Therefore $\varphi_1 \in L^2(0,1)$, and the existence of the last integral in (33) follows by Cauchy-Schwarz,

$$\int_{1}^{\infty} |\varphi_{1}(x)| \frac{dx}{x^{2}} = \sum_{n \ge 1} \int_{n}^{n+1} |\varphi_{1}(x)| \frac{dx}{x^{2}} \le \sum_{n \ge 1} \left(\int_{0}^{1} \varphi_{1}(x)^{2} dx \int_{n}^{n+1} x^{-4} dx \right)^{1/2} < \infty;$$

clearly also, $\int_r^1 |\varphi_1(x)| \frac{dx}{x^2} < \infty$ for every 0 < r < 1. The last part draws on [3, Section 7].

The case q = 2 can be treated similarly.

Proposition 5.2 Let

$$V(x) = x \{H(x) - \log x - \gamma + 2\} - \frac{1}{2} \log x + \sum_{n \le x} \log n - \lfloor x \rfloor (1 + \log x) - \frac{1}{2} \log 2\pi - \frac{1}{2}.$$
 (34)

Then for r > 0,

$$S_2(r) = \int_r^\infty S_1(t) \left(\frac{1}{t} - \frac{1}{r}\right) dt,$$
 (35)

$$\int_{r}^{\infty} S_{1}(t) dt = \sum_{n \ge 1} \frac{V(nr)}{n} \,.$$
(36)

Proof. The formula

$$\int_{1}^{\infty} \left(\{x\} - 1/2\right) \frac{dx}{x} = \frac{1}{2} \log 2\pi - 1, \tag{37}$$

needed below is certainly known. A proof can be based on the well-known relation [21, p. 14]

$$-\frac{\zeta(s)}{s} = \frac{1}{1-s} + \frac{1}{2s} + \int_{1}^{\infty} \left(\{x\} - 1/2\right) x^{-1-s} dx \qquad (\Re(s) > -1).$$

Expanding $\frac{\zeta(s)}{s} + \frac{1}{1-s} + \frac{1}{2s}$ at s = 0, then letting s tend to zero gives (37). We now will show that

$$V(x) = \int_{x}^{\infty} R_1(t) dt.$$
(38)

The function V(x) from (34) is continuous, and for x not an integer its derivative equals

$$V'(x) = H(x) - \log x - \gamma + 2 - 1 - \frac{1}{2x} - \frac{\lfloor x \rfloor}{x} = H(x) - \log x - \gamma + \frac{x - \lfloor x \rfloor - 1/2}{x}$$

= $-R_1(x)$

which is continuous itself. Therefore $V(x) = V(1) - \int_1^\infty R_1(t) dt + \int_x^\infty R_1(t) dt$. Now by Fubini

$$\begin{split} \int_{1}^{\infty} R_{1}(t) \, dt &= -\int_{1}^{\infty} \int_{t}^{\infty} (\{u\} - 1/2) \, \frac{du}{u^{2}} \, dt = -\int_{1}^{\infty} \left(\int_{1}^{u} \, dt \right) \left(\{u\} - 1/2\right) \frac{du}{u^{2}} \\ &= -\int_{1}^{\infty} (u - 1) \left(\{u\} - 1/2\right) \frac{du}{u^{2}} = \int_{1}^{\infty} (\{u\} - 1/2) \, \frac{du}{u^{2}} - \int_{1}^{\infty} (\{u\} - 1/2) \, \frac{du}{u} \\ &= -R_{1}(1) - \left(\frac{1}{2} \log 2\pi - 1\right) = \frac{1}{2} - \gamma - \frac{1}{2} \log 2\pi + 1 = \frac{3}{2} - \gamma - \frac{1}{2} \log 2\pi \\ &= V(1) \,, \end{split}$$

wherein we have used (37). Thus, the integration constant $V(1) - \int_1^\infty R_1(t) dt$ vanishes, and (38) is established. The relation (36) then follows by an (admissible) interchange of summation and integration, taking into account the definition of S_1 .

Differentiation of $R_2(x)$ as defined in (10) gives $R'_2(x) = V(x)/x^2$, whence on arguing as previously,

$$R_2(x) = -\int_x^\infty V(t) \frac{dt}{t^2} = \int_x^\infty V(t) \left(\frac{1}{t}\right)' dt = \int_x^\infty R_1(t) \frac{dt}{t} - \frac{V(x)}{x}.$$
 (39)

Using this relation along with the definitions of S_2 and S_1 we obtain

$$S_{2}(r) + \sum_{n \ge 1} \frac{V(nr)}{nr} = \sum_{n \ge 1} \int_{nr}^{\infty} R_{1}(x) \frac{dx}{x} = \sum_{n \ge 1} \int_{r}^{\infty} R_{1}(nt) \frac{dt}{t} = \int_{r}^{\infty} S_{1}(t) \frac{dt}{t}$$
(40)
a view of (36) implies (35).

which in view of (36) implies (35).

We conclude this section by stating yet another representation of $S_1(r)$ without proof.

Proposition 5.3

$$S_1(r) = -\frac{1}{r} \int_1^\infty \left(\{xr\} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \lfloor x \rfloor \frac{dx}{x^2}, \quad r > 0.$$
(41)

Together with Proposition 5.1 this yields the peculiar identity

$$\int_{1}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{k \ge 1} \frac{\{kxr\} - \frac{1}{2}}{k} \right) \frac{dx}{x^2} = \int_{1}^{\infty} \left(\{xr\} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \lfloor x \rfloor \frac{dx}{x^2}.$$
(42)

6 The constants $S_q(1)$

In view of (9), (11), an exact evaluation of $G_{1,1}^{(q)}$ is possible if $S_q(1)$ can be calculated explicitly. For q = 1 this was achieved in [3, Proposition 87]. Here is an independent evaluation.

Proposition 6.1

$$S_1(1) = (\log 2\pi - \gamma - 1)/2.$$
(43)

Proof. Recall that $S_1(x) = \sum_{n \ge 1} R_1(nx)$ where

$$R_1(x) = \log x + \gamma - H(x) - \frac{x - \lfloor x \rfloor - 1/2}{x} \quad (x > 0).$$

We have

$$\sum_{n \le N} H(n) = \sum_{n \le N} \sum_{k \le n} \frac{1}{k} = \sum_{k \le N} \frac{1}{k} \sum_{k \le n \le N} 1 = \sum_{k \le N} \frac{1}{k} (N - k + 1)$$
$$= (N + 1) H(N) - N.$$

Using the well-known expansion for the harmonic series and Stirlings's formula,

$$H(N) = \log N + \gamma + \frac{1}{2N} + O(N^{-2}),$$
$$\sum_{n \le N} \log n = N \log N - N + \frac{1}{2} \log N + \frac{1}{2} \log 2\pi + O(N^{-1}),$$

we get

$$\begin{split} \sum_{n \le N} R_1(n) &= \sum_{n \le N} \log n + N\gamma - (N+1) H(N) + N + \frac{1}{2} H(N) \\ &= N \log N - N + \frac{1}{2} \log N + \frac{1}{2} \log 2\pi + O(N^{-1}) + N\gamma + N \\ &- (N + \frac{1}{2}) \left(\log N + \gamma + \frac{1}{2N} + O(N^{-2}) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \log 2\pi - \frac{1}{2}\gamma - \frac{1}{2} + O(N^{-1}) \,. \end{split}$$

Letting N tend to infinity completes the proof.

Unfortunately, this simple approach does not work when q = 2. At least we can state the following.

Proposition 6.2

$$S_2(1) = \int_1^\infty \frac{S_1(r)}{r} \, dr - \int_1^\infty S_1(r) \, dr = K_2 - 2K_1 - 2\int_1^\infty S_1(r) \, dr \,. \tag{44}$$

Proof. The first relation is immediate from (35). Putting u = v = 1 in (21) and (26), respectively, we obtain

$$G_{1,1}^{(2)} = K_2 + S_2(1) = 2K_1 + 2\int_1^\infty \frac{S_1(r)}{r} dr$$

whence the second relation follows by equating the two expressions for $S_2(1)$.

A numerical evaluation based on the rapidly converging series $\sum_{n\geq 1} V(n)/n$ (which by (36) is equal to $\int_1^\infty S_1(r) dr$) gives the approximative values

$$S_2(1) \doteq 0.000643, \quad G_{1,1}^{(2)} \doteq 3.270465.$$

In the case q = 1,

$$S_1(1) \doteq 0.130331, \quad G_{1,1}^{(1)} \doteq 1.260661.$$

7 Ancillary proofs

7.1 Proof of Proposition 1.1

Integrating over large half circles to the right of the line $\Re s = 1$ one finds that $F_n^{(q)}$ equals minus the residue of $n^{-s} \zeta(s)/(s(1-s))^q$ at s = 1, so that by Proposition 2.2

$$F_n^{(1)} = \frac{1}{n} \left(\gamma - 1 - \log n \right), \quad F_n^{(2)} = \frac{1}{n} \left(-\frac{1}{2} \log^2 n + (\gamma - 2) \log n + 2\gamma + \gamma_1 - 3 \right).$$

Furthermore, the limits of the summatory functions $L_{\mu,k}(x) = \sum_{n \le x} \frac{\mu(n)}{n} \log^k n, \ k \le 2$ are known: one has

$$\lim_{x \to \infty} L_{\mu,0}(x) = 0, \qquad (45)$$

$$\lim_{x \to \infty} L_{\mu,1}(x) = -1, \qquad (46)$$

$$\lim_{x \to \infty} L_{\mu,2}(x) = -2\gamma.$$
(47)

Thus with $\lambda_{n,N} = \mu_n (1 - \log n / \log N) \equiv \lambda_n$ and $L_{\mu,k} \equiv L_k$ it follows that

$$\sum_{n \le N} \lambda_n F_n^{(1)} = \sum_{n \le N} (\gamma - 1 - \log n) \frac{\mu_n}{n} \left(1 - \frac{\log n}{\log N} \right)$$
$$= (\gamma - 1) L_0(N) - (\gamma - 1) \frac{L_1(N)}{\log N} - L_1(N) + \frac{L_2(N)}{\log N}$$

tends to 1 as $N \to \infty$, which settles the case q = 1. In the case q = 2

$$\sum_{n \le N} \lambda_n F_n^{(2)} = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{n \le N} \left(1 - \frac{\log n}{\log N} \right) \frac{\mu_n \log^2 n}{n} + (\gamma - 2) \sum_{n \le N} \left(1 - \frac{\log n}{\log N} \right) \frac{\mu_n \log n}{n} + (2\gamma + \gamma_1 - 3) \sum_{n \le N} \left(1 - \frac{\log n}{\log N} \right) \frac{\mu_n}{n} = -\frac{1}{2} \left[L_2(N) - \frac{L_3(N)}{\log N} \right] + (\gamma - 2) \left[L_1(N) - \frac{L_2(N)}{\log N} \right] + (2\gamma + \gamma_1 - 3) \left[L_0(N) - \frac{L_1(N)}{\log N} \right]$$

converges to $-\frac{1}{2}(-2\gamma) - (\gamma - 2) = 2$, as claimed, provided that $L_3(N)/\log N$ tends to zero. Indeed, integration/summation by parts gives

$$\frac{L_3(N)}{\log N} = L_2(N) - \frac{1}{\log N} \int_1^N L_2(t) \frac{dt}{t} = L_2(N) + 2\gamma - \frac{1}{\log N} \int_1^N (L_2(t) + 2\gamma) \frac{dt}{t},$$
(48)

and since $L_2(N) + 2\gamma$ tends to zero as $N \to \infty$, so does its logarithmic mean.

7.2 Proof of Proposition 2.1

Let $b = \lfloor x \rfloor = x - \{x\}$, $\epsilon = \{x\}/x$. By the known expansion of the harmonic series one has for $x \to \infty$ $\log x + \gamma - H(x)$ $= \log x - \log b - (2b)^{-1} + (12b^2)^{-1} + O(b^{-4}) = \log \frac{x}{b} - \frac{1}{2x} \frac{x}{b} + \frac{1}{12x^2} \left(\frac{x}{b}\right)^2 + O(x^{-4})$ $= -\log(1-\epsilon) - \frac{1}{2x} \frac{1}{1-\epsilon} + \frac{1}{12x^2} \frac{1}{(1-\epsilon)^2} + O(x^{-4})$ $= \epsilon + \frac{\epsilon^2}{2} + \frac{\epsilon^3}{3} - \frac{1}{2x} \left(1 + \epsilon + \epsilon^2\right) + \frac{1}{12x^2} (1 + 2\epsilon) + O(x^{-4})$ $= \frac{\{x\} - 1/2}{x} + \frac{1}{2x^2} \left(\{x\}^2 - \{x\} + 1/6\right) + \frac{1}{6x^3} \left(2\{x\}^3 - 3\{x\}^2 + \{x\}\right) + O(x^{-4}).$

Rearranging terms gives (12). The corresponding result for R_2 can be obtained by very tedious calculations using the expansions for the harmonic series and Stirling's formula up to terms of order $O(x^{-5})$, as well as the expansion

$$\sum_{k \le b} \frac{\log k}{k} = \frac{1}{2} \log^2 b + \gamma_1 + \frac{\log b}{2b} + \frac{1 - \log b}{12b^2} + \frac{6 \log b - 11}{720b^4} + O(b^{-5})$$

which can be derived by Euler-Maclaurin summation.

(Jump) discontinuities of R_1 , R_2 could occur at the natural numbers only. One readily checks that the left-hand and the right-hand limits are identical, so the R_q are continuous everywhere. Continuity of S_1 , S_2 then ensues from the locally uniform convergence of the series. As for the latter, recall that $R_q(kx) = O((kx)^{-2q})$, which also implies the tail estimates $S_q(x) = O(x^{-2q})$ (q = 1, 2).

8 Asymptotics of the quadratic forms: Some tentative steps

8.1 Decomposition of the quadratic forms

Towards a potentially useful decomposition of the quadratic forms $Q_N^{(q)} = \sum_{n \leq N} a_m a_n G_{m,n}^{(q)}$ based on Theorem 2.1 we introduce for fixed, initially arbitrary coefficients a_n and $j = \overline{0}, 1, \ldots$ the expressions

$$L_j(N) \equiv L_{a,j}(N) = \sum_{n \le N} \frac{a_n}{n} \log^j n,$$

$$M_j(N) \equiv M_{a,j}(N) = \sum_{n \le N} a_n \log^j n,$$

$$E^{(q)}(N) \equiv E_a^{(q)}(N) = \sum_{m \le N} \frac{a_m}{m} \left(\sum_{n \le N} a_n S_q(n/m) - R_q(1/m) \right).$$

The last term is defined with a view to the Möbius inversion formula $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mu_n S_q(n/m) = R_q(1/m)$. Estimation of the inversion error $E^{(q)}(x)$ is a major challenge; we set it aside. Henceforth we focus on the L (andau)- and M (ertens)-type partial sums, and write $\sum_{n=1}^{\prime} L$ to denote $\sum_{n=1}^{N} L$.

CASE q = 1. Using (9) we may write

$$Q_N^{(1)} = \sum_{m,n}' \left(K + \frac{1}{2} \log n - \frac{1}{2} \log m \right) a_m \frac{a_n}{n} + \sum_m' \frac{a_m}{m} \left(\sum_n' a_n S_1(n/m) \right)$$

= $\left(\sum_m' a_m \right) \left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_n' \frac{a_n \log n}{n} + K \sum_n' \frac{a_n}{n} \right] - \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_m' a_m \log m \right) \left(\sum_n' \frac{a_n}{n} \right)$
+ $\sum_m' \frac{a_m}{m} R_1(1/m) + \sum_m' \frac{a_m}{m} \left(\sum_n' a_n S_1(n/m) - R_1(1/m) \right)$
= $M_0(N) \left(\frac{1}{2} L_1(N) + K L_0(N) \right) - \frac{1}{2} M_1(N) L_0(N) + \sum_n' \frac{a_m}{m} R_1(1/m) + E^{(1)}(N)$

Now $R_1(x) = \frac{1}{2x} + \log x + \gamma - 1$ for $x \le 1$, so

$$\sum_{m}' \frac{a_{m}}{m} R_{1}(1/m) = \sum_{m}' \frac{a_{m}}{m} \left(\frac{m}{2} - \log m\right) + (\gamma - 1) \sum_{m}' \frac{a_{m}}{m}$$
$$= \frac{1}{2} M_{0}(N) - L_{1}(N) + (\gamma - 1) L_{0}(N),$$

whence

$$Q_N^{(1)} = M_0(N) \left(KL_0(N) + \frac{1}{2} \{ L_1(N) + 1 \} \right) - \frac{1}{2} M_1(N) L_0(N) + (\gamma - 1) L_0(N) - L_1(N) + E^{(1)}(N) .$$
(49)

CASE q = 2. Using the representation (11),

$$G_{m,n}^{(2)} = \frac{1}{n} \left(K_2 + K_1 \log \frac{n}{m} + \frac{1}{4} \log^2 \frac{n}{m} \right) + \frac{1}{m} S_2(n/m) \,,$$

we similarly get

$$\begin{aligned} Q_N^{(2)} &= \sum_{m,n}' \left(K_2 + K_1 \log n - K_1 \log m + \frac{1}{4} \log^2 n - \frac{1}{2} \log m \log n + \frac{1}{4} \log^2 m \right) a_m \frac{a_n}{n} \\ &+ \sum_m' \frac{a_m}{m} \left(\sum_n' a_n S_2(n/m) \right) \\ &= \left(\sum_m' a_m \right) \left[K_2 \sum_n' \frac{a_n}{n} + K_1 \sum_n' \frac{a_n}{n} \log n + \frac{1}{4} \sum_n' \frac{a_n}{n} \log^2 n \right] \\ &+ \left(\frac{1}{4} \sum_m' a_m \log^2 m - K_1 \sum_m' a_m \log m \right) \left(\sum_n' \frac{a_n}{n} \right) - \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_m' a_m \log m \right) \left(\sum_n' \frac{a_n}{n} \log n \right) \\ &+ \sum_m' \frac{a_m}{m} R_2(1/m) + \sum_m' \frac{a_m}{m} \left(\sum_n' a_n S_2(n/m) - R_2(1/m) \right) \\ &= M_0(N) \left(K_2 L_0(N) + K_1 L_1(N) + \frac{1}{4} L_2(N) \right) + L_0(N) \left(\frac{1}{4} M_2(N) - K_1 M_1(N) \right) - \frac{1}{2} L_1(N) M_1(N) \\ &+ \sum_m' \frac{a_m}{m} R_2(1/m) + E^{(2)}(N) \,. \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$R_2(x) = \frac{1}{x} \left(\frac{1}{2} \log 2\pi + 1 + \frac{1}{2} \log x \right) + (2 - \gamma) \log x - \frac{1}{2} \log^2 x + 2\gamma + \gamma_1 - 3$$

for $x \leq 1$ and $\frac{1}{2}\log 2\pi + 1 = K_1 + \frac{\gamma}{2}$, the fourth term equals

$$\sum_{m}^{\prime} \frac{a_{m}}{m} R_{2}(1/m) = \sum_{m}^{\prime} \frac{a_{m}}{m} \left[m \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \log 2\pi + 1 - \frac{1}{2} \log m \right\} - (2 - \gamma) \log m - \frac{1}{2} \log^{2} m + 2\gamma + \gamma_{1} - 3 \right] \\ = M_{0}(N) \left(K_{1} + \frac{\gamma}{2} \right) - \frac{1}{2} M_{1}(N) - (2 - \gamma) L_{1}(N) - \frac{1}{2} L_{2}(N) + (2\gamma + \gamma_{1} - 3) L_{0}(N) .$$

Thus, putting things together we obtain

$$Q_N^{(2)} = M_0(N) \left(K_2 L_0(N) + K_1 \{ L_1(N) + 1 \} + \frac{1}{4} \{ 2\gamma + L_2(N) \} \right) - \frac{1}{2} M_1(N) \left(2K_1 L_0(N) + L_1(N) + 1 \right) + \frac{1}{4} M_2(N) L_0(N) + \left(2\gamma + \gamma_1 - 3 \right) L_0(N) + \frac{1}{2} \left(2\gamma L_1(N) - L_2(N) \right) - 2L_1(N) + E^{(2)}(N) .$$
 (50)

The rationale behind the arrangement of the single terms in these decompositions is twofold. Suppose the coefficients a_n are chosen such that the limits (45), (46), (47) hold also if $L_{\mu,j}$ is replaced by $L_{a,j}$. Then the expressions

$$(\gamma - 1)L_{a,0}(N) - L_{a,1}(N)$$
 and $(2\gamma + \gamma_1 - 3)L_{a,0}(N) + \frac{1}{2}(2\gamma L_{a,1}(N) - L_{a,2}(N)) - 2L_{a,1}(N),$

converge to 1 and to 2, respectively, that is, to the desired limit values of the quadratic forms $Q_N^{(q)}$.

To state our second motive for the above decompositions it is convenient to introduce some notation. Here again we temporarily omit the reference to a and simply write $L_j = L_{a,j}$, $M_j = M_{a,j}$ etc.

$$P_0^{(1)}(N) = M_0(N) \left[L_0(N) + \frac{1}{2} \left\{ L_1(N) + 1 \right\} \right], \qquad P_1^{(1)}(N) = M_1(N) L_0(N),$$

$$P_0^{(2)}(N) = M_0(N) \left[K_2 L_0(N) + K_1 \left\{ L_1(N) + 1 \right\} + \frac{1}{4} \left\{ 2\gamma + L_2(N) \right\} \right],$$

$$P_1^{(2)}(N) = M_1(N) \left[2K_1 L_0(N) + L_1(N) + 1 \right], \qquad P_2^{(2)}(N) = M_2(N) L_0(N).$$

The point is that in these products the factors of the terms $M_j(N)$ are compositions of terms $L_j(N)$ that appear in centered form only: $L_0(N) \equiv \overline{L}_0(N)$, $L_1(N) + 1 \equiv \overline{L}_1(N)$, $L_2(N) + 2\gamma \equiv \overline{L}_2(N)$ converge to zero each. This will not suffice to make the products $P_j^{(q)}(N)$ asymptotically negligible. However, a new prospect may emerge from the empirical observation that in case of the Möbius coefficients, $a_n = \mu_n$, the sequences $\overline{L}_j(N)$, $M_j(N)$, $N \geq 1$ exhibit an extremely high correlation across different j. In fact, the suitably rescaled expressions $\widetilde{L}_j(N) = \overline{L}_j(N)/\log^j N$, $\widetilde{M}_j(N) = M_j(N)/\log^j N$ are visibly almost indistinguishable for different j; see Appendix, Fig. 2. One may therefore expect that their differences are much reduced. Indeed, Fig. 3 shows a massive size reduction when passing to the latter.

An idea how this observation might be put to use is to ask for coefficients a_n which are such that the raw quantities $\overline{L}_{a,j}(N)$, $M_{a,j}(N)$ built with the coefficients a_n mimic the behavior of the differences

$$\Delta \overline{L}_{\mu,j}(N) = \overline{L}_{\mu,j}(N) - \overline{L}_{\mu,j+1}(N) / \log N , \qquad \Delta M_{\mu,j}(N) = M_{\mu,j}(N) - M_{\mu,j+1}(N) / \log N$$
(51)

built with the Möbius coefficients μ_n . The next subsection answers this question in the affirmative.

8.2 Choice of the coefficients

We begin by introducing some notation. Let $\kappa(s) = 1/\zeta(s)$, and put

$$\eta_j = (-1)^j \kappa^{(j)}(2) = \sum_{n \ge 1} \frac{\mu_n}{n^2} \log^j n, \ j = 0, 1, \dots$$

Recall that for given coefficients $a_n = a_{n,N}$ we denote

$$M_{a,j}(N) = \sum_{n=1}^{\prime} a_{n,N} \log^{j} n, \quad L_{a,j}(N) = \sum_{n=1}^{\prime} \frac{a_{n,N}}{n} \log^{j} n \quad \left(\sum_{n=1}^{\prime} \sum_{n\leq N}\right) \text{ and } \\ \overline{L}_{a,j}(N) = L_{a,j}(N) + \ell_{j} \quad (j = 0, 1, \ldots), \quad \text{where} \quad \ell_{0} = 0, \ \ell_{1} = 1, \ \ell_{2} = 2\gamma, \ \ell_{3} = 6(\gamma^{2} + \gamma_{1}).$$

We construct the searched-for coefficients $a_{n,N}$ as a modification $\nu_{n,N}$ of the Levinson-Selberg coefficients $\lambda_{n,N} = \mu_n \left(1 - \log n / \log N\right)$, to wit,

$$\nu_{n,N} = \mu_n \left(1 - \frac{1}{\log N} \left[\log n + a \frac{\log n}{n} + \frac{b}{n} \right] \right) - \frac{c}{n \log N}$$
(52)

with certain constants a, b, c.

Proposition 8.1 Suppose that the constants a, b, c satisfy the system of equations

$$a\eta_1 + b\eta_0 + c\zeta(2) = 1$$

$$a\eta_2 + b\eta_1 - c\zeta'(2) = 2\gamma$$

$$a\eta_3 + b\eta_2 + c\zeta''(2) = 6(\gamma^2 + \gamma_1).$$

Then for j = 0, 1, 2

$$\overline{L}_{\nu,j}(N) = \Delta \overline{L}_{\mu,j}(N) + O(N^{-1}\log^j N),$$

$$M_{\nu,j}(N) = \Delta M_{\mu,j}(N) + O(\log^j N).$$
(53)
(54)

Proof. It suffices to consider one of the three cases j = 0, 1, 2. E.g., for j = 1 we get

$$\overline{L}_{\nu,1}(N) = L_{\nu,1}(N) + 1 = \sum_{n}^{\prime} \frac{\nu_{n,N}}{n} \log n + 1$$

$$= L_{\mu,1}(N) + 1 - \frac{1}{\log N} \left[\sum_{n}^{\prime} \frac{\mu_n \log^2 n}{n} + a \sum_{n}^{\prime} \frac{\mu_n \log^2 n}{n^2} + b \sum_{n}^{\prime} \frac{\mu_n \log n}{n^2} + c \sum_{n}^{\prime} \frac{\log n}{n^2} \right]$$

$$= \overline{L}_{\mu,1}(N) - \frac{1}{\log N} \left[L_{\mu,2}(N) + a\eta_2 + b\eta_1 - c\zeta'(2) + O(N^{-1}\log^2 N) \right],$$

using the straightforward estimate $\sum_{n>N} n^{-2} \log^j n = O(N^{-1} \log^j N)$ and the definition of the η_j s. By the second equation of the system the last line reduces to $\overline{L}_{\mu,1}(N) - \overline{L}_{\mu,2}(N) / \log N + O(N^{-1} \log N)$,

which completes the proof of (53) for j = 1. The *M*-terms can be dealt with analogously. If j = 2, say, then

$$\begin{split} M_{\nu,2}(N) &= \sum_{n}' \nu_{n,N} \log^2 n \\ &= M_{\mu,2}(N) - \frac{1}{\log N} \left[\sum_{n}' \mu_n \log^3 n + a \sum_{n}' \frac{\mu_n \log^3 n}{n} + b \sum_{n}' \frac{\mu_n \log^2 n}{n} + c \sum_{n}' \frac{\log^2 n}{n} \right] \\ &= M_{\mu,2}(N) - \frac{1}{\log N} \left[M_{\mu,3}(N) + a L_{\mu,3}(N) + b L_{\mu,2}(N) + O(\log^3 N) \right] \\ &= M_{\mu,2}(N) - \frac{M_{\mu,3}(N)}{\log N} + O(\log^2 N) \,, \end{split}$$

the latter since $L_{\mu,3}(N) = o(\log N)$; cf. end of proof of Proposition 1.1.

Remarks. 1. A Taylor expansion of $\frac{1}{\zeta(s)}$ at s = 1 suggests that $\lim_{N\to\infty} L_{\mu,3}(N) = -6(\gamma^2 + \gamma_1)$, yet a corresponding reference is not known to this author. In fact, our argument goes without this convergence. 2. The limits $\lim_{N\to\infty} L_{\nu,j}(N)$, j = 0, 1, 2 clearly are identical to those of $L_{\mu,j}(N)$. Likewise, Proposition 1.1 continues to hold if the coefficients $\lambda_{n,N}$ are replaced by $\nu_{n,N}$.

3. Explicitly known in the above system of equations are only the entries $\zeta(2) = \pi^2/6$ and $\eta_0 = 1/\zeta(2)$. Numerical evaluation yields the approximative solution

$$a \doteq -2.116586, \quad b \doteq -0.407487, \quad c \doteq 0.312679.$$

If q = 1, only the cases j = 0, 1 are of interest, and one may omit one of the additional entries in (52); the last one, say. The values of the solution a, b of the reduced system then differ, of course.

4. The centering of the *L*-terms as achieved by the additional terms in (52) is essential for the remarkable match stated in (53). The Levinson-Selberg coefficients $\lambda_{n,N}$ would not do. This is different with the *M*-terms, which are relatively little affected by such a modification.

8.3 Estimating the *L*-and *M*-terms: Two notes

The approach sketched above hinges on good estimates for the *L*-and *M*-terms. Until present these seem to be very far away. Let us nonetheless give a brief account of two methods that have been applied in this context. Throughout the sequel the coefficients a_n of the *L*-and *M*-terms are supposed to be given by the Möbius function, $a_n = \mu(n)$. In return, our target objects will be the differences $\Delta \overline{L}_{\mu}$, ΔM_{μ} which by Proposition 8.1 may serve as approximations to \overline{L}_{ν} , M_{ν} .

1. MacLeod type identities and Möbius inversion. Our presentation follows M. Balazard's "Remarques élementaires" [4]. His starting point is the following basic observation.

[4, Eq. (6)] Let f(n) be an arithmetic function, $F(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} f(n)$, and suppose that $\phi(x)$ is absolutely continuous for $x \geq 1$. Then

$$\Phi(x) \equiv \sum_{n \le x} f(n)\phi(x/n) = \int_{1}^{x} F(x/t) \,\phi'(t) \,dt + F(x)\phi(1) \quad (x \ge 1).$$
(55)

The proposition allows to derive bounds for the function $\Phi(x)$ in terms of bounds on the function F(x). Producing related identities of interest requires some ingenuity; e.g. [4, 10, 20]. Balazard works with identities involving the fractional part function due to MacLeod [16], and with Möbius inversion. Here we take the functions $R_1(x)$, $R_2(x)$ defined in Theorem 2.1 as our starting points. The two propositions below are closely related to, respectively, Balazard's [4] Proposition 10 and to Ramaré's [19] Theorem 1.7 and Lemma 5.1; see also F. Daval [10, Chapitre 6].

Proposition 8.2 Let $\phi_1(x) = xR_1(x)$, and set $\Phi_1(x) = \sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n)\phi_1(x/n)$. Then

$$(1-\gamma)L_0(x) - \frac{1}{2}\frac{M_0(x)}{x} = \Delta \overline{L}_0(x)\log x - \frac{\Phi_1(x)}{x} + \frac{1}{x} \qquad (x \ge 1).$$
(56)

Proof. Let us begin by recalling the formula (8),

$$R_1(x) = \log x + \gamma - H(x) - \frac{\{x\} - 1/2}{x} = \log x + \gamma - 1 - H(x) + \frac{\lfloor x \rfloor + 1/2}{x}.$$

Let $w(x) = (x - 1)(x \ge 1)$, where $(x \in A)$ denotes the indicator function of A, and put $W(x) = \sum_{n \le x} w(x/n)$. Then

$$W(x) = \sum_{n \le x} \left(\frac{x}{n} - 1\right) (x/n \ge 1) = xH(x) - \lfloor x \rfloor = x \log x + (\gamma - 1)x + 1/2 - xR_1(x).$$

Möbius inversion gives, for $x \ge 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} x - 1 &= \sum_{n \le x} \mu(n) W(x/n) \\ &= \sum_{n \le x} \mu(n) \frac{x}{n} \log \frac{x}{n} + (\gamma - 1) \sum_{n \le x} \mu(n) \frac{x}{n} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n \le x} \mu(n) - \sum_{n \le x} \mu(n) \phi_1(x/n) \\ &= L_0(x) x \log x - x \left(L_1(x) + 1 \right) + x + (\gamma - 1) x L_0(x) + \frac{1}{2} M_0(x) - \Phi_1(x) \,. \end{aligned}$$

Subtracting x, then dividing by x we get

$$-\frac{1}{x} = \Delta \overline{L}_0(x) \log x + (\gamma - 1)L_0(x) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{M_0(x)}{x} - \frac{\Phi_1(x)}{x},$$

which is (56).

Proposition 8.3 Let $\phi_2(x) = xR_2(x)$, and set $\Phi_2(x) = \sum_{n \le x} \mu(n)\phi_2(x/n)$. Moreover, let $C_1 = 2\gamma + \gamma_1 - 3$, $C_2 = \frac{1}{2}\log 2\pi + 1$. Then

$$C_1 L_0(x) + C_2 \frac{M_0(x)}{x} = \frac{\log x}{2} \left(\Delta \overline{L}_0(x) \log x - \Delta \overline{L}_1(x) - \frac{\Delta M_0(x)}{x} \right) - (2 - \gamma) \Delta \overline{L}_0(x) \log x + \frac{\Phi_2(x)}{x} + O\left(\frac{\log x}{x}\right) \qquad (x \ge 1).$$
(57)

Proof. Let $W(x) = \sum_{n \le x} w(x/n)$ where $w(x) = (1+x) \log x + 2 - 2x$. The representation (10) of $R_2(x)$ can then be rewritten as

$$W(x) = \frac{x}{2}\log^2 x - (2-\gamma)x\log x - (2\gamma+\gamma_1-3)x - \frac{1}{2}\log x - \frac{1}{2}\log 2\pi - 1 + xR_2(x).$$

Möbius inversion gives, for $x \ge 1$,

$$\begin{split} w(x) &= \sum_{n \le x} \mu(n) W(x/n) = x \sum_{n \le x} \frac{\mu(n)}{n} \left[\frac{1}{2} \log^2 \frac{x}{n} - (2 - \gamma) \log \frac{x}{n} - C_1 \right] \\ &\quad -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{n \le x} \mu(n) \log \frac{x}{n} - C_2 \sum_{n \le x} \mu(n) + \sum_{n \le x} \mu(n) \phi_2(x/n) \\ &= \frac{x}{2} \left\{ L_0(x) \log^2 x - 2L_1(x) \log x + L_2(x) \right\} - (2 - \gamma) x \left\{ L_0(x) \log x - L_1(x) \right\} \\ &\quad -C_1 x L_0(x) - \frac{1}{2} M_0(x) \log x + \frac{1}{2} M_1(x) - C_2 M_0(x) + \Phi_2(x) \\ &= \frac{x}{2} \left\{ L_0(x) \log^2 x - \overline{L}_1(x) \log x - \overline{L}_1(x) \log x + \overline{L}_2(x) + 2 \log x - 2\gamma \right\} \\ &\quad - (2 - \gamma) x \left\{ L_0(x) \log x - \overline{L}_1(x) + 1 \right\} - \frac{1}{2} \Delta M_0(x) \log x - C_1 x L_0(x) - C_2 M_0(x) + \Phi_2(x) \end{split}$$

After division by x this becomes

$$\log x - 2 + O\left(\frac{\log x}{x}\right) = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \Delta \overline{L}_0(x) \log^2 x - \Delta \overline{L}_1(x) \log x \right\} + \log x - \gamma - (2 - \gamma) \Delta \overline{L}_0(x) \log x - 2 + \gamma - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\Delta M_0(x)}{x} \log x - C_1 L_0(x) - C_2 \frac{M_0(x)}{x} + \frac{\Phi_2(x)}{x} \right\}.$$

With the appropriate cancellations we get

$$O\left(\frac{\log x}{x}\right) = \frac{\log x}{2} \left(\Delta \overline{L}_0(x) \log x - \Delta \overline{L}_1(x) - \frac{\Delta M_0(x)}{x}\right) - (2 - \gamma) \Delta \overline{L}_0(x) \log x - C_1 L_0(x) - C_2 \frac{M_0(x)}{x} + \frac{\Phi_2(x)}{x},$$

and the claim follows.

Other identities follow by linear combination. For example, if one subtracts equation (57) from equation (56) multiplied by $(C1 + C2)/(1/2 - \gamma)$, the left-hand side becomes a multiple of $L_0(x) - M_0(x)/x$, which quantity is a central study object in [4]. By similar linear combinations one can delete the term L_0 at the left, thus isolating the term M_0 ; and vice versa. (Recall that $M_0(x)$ is the Mertens function.) Estimates for the terms $\Phi_q(x)$ can be obtained as described in [4]. Proposition 2.1 combined with, respectively, (32) and (39), (38) entails

$$|\phi_1'(x)| = O(1/x), \qquad |\phi_2'(x)| = O(1/x^2) \qquad (x \to \infty).$$

An application of (55) in turn yields the bounds

$$|\Phi_1(x)| \le A_1\left(\int_1^x \frac{|M_0(t)|}{t} \, dt + |R_1(1) \, M_0(x)|\right), \quad |\Phi_2(x)| \le A_2\left(\frac{1}{x} \int_1^x |M_0(t)| \, dt + |R_2(1) \, M_0(x)|\right)$$

where A_1, A_2 are finite constants, and $R_1(1) = \gamma - 1/2$, $R_2(1) = C_1 + C_2 \doteq .000554$. Improved estimates can be derived by skillful variations of the identity (55), cf. [4, 19, 10, 11]. The motive for the present choice was to feature the link leading from the functions R_1, R_2 to the difference terms $\Delta \overline{L}_j, \Delta M_j$.

The literature on the matter touched on here is vast. We may once more point to the work of Balazard [4], Ramaré [19], and Daval [10] for references and valuable accounts of the history of the subject. Recently, Ramaré and Zuniga-Alterman [20] unified the matter by substituting the factors n^{-1} and $n^0 \equiv 1$ figuring in the definition of the *L*- and *M*-terms, respectively, by the general factor n^{-s} , where *s* is a complex parameter. See also the earlier paper [18] as well as [11].

2. Perron's formula. Let us briefly comment on this approach on the basis of the example

$$\Delta \overline{L}_1(N) \log N = \sum_n' \frac{\mu_n \log n}{n} \log \frac{N}{n} + \log N - 2\gamma.$$
(58)

We essentially follow Bettin et al. [6]. The Dirichlet series associated with the coefficients $n^{-1}\mu_n \log n$ is $\zeta'(s+1)/\zeta(s+1)^2$. The appropriate Perron's formula thus is

$$2\pi i \sum_{n}^{\prime} \frac{\mu_n \log n}{n} \log \frac{N}{n} = \int_c \frac{N^{w-1} \zeta^{\prime}(w)}{(w-1)^2 \zeta(w)^2} \, dw = \int_c \frac{N^{w-1}}{(w-1)^2} \left[\log N - \frac{2}{w-1} \right] \frac{1}{\zeta(w)} \, dw \tag{59}$$

where again \int_c denotes integration upwards the vertical line from $c - i\infty$ to $c + i\infty$, and c > 1. Let $G_N(w)$ denote the integrand at the right-hand side of (59). "Now we move the path of integration to $\Re w = -2M - 1$ for some large integer M" [6] to obtain, formally at least,

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{c} G_{N}(w) \, dw = \operatorname{Res} \left[G_{N}(w) \right]_{w=1} + \sum_{\rho} \operatorname{Res} \left[G_{N}(w) \right]_{w=\rho} + \sum_{n \ge 1} \operatorname{Res} \left[G_{N}(w) \right]_{w=-2n} \tag{60}$$

where the second and the third sum of residues extend over the critical zeros ρ , and the trivial zeros $-2, -4, \ldots$ of ζ , respectively. The residue Res $G_N(w)|_{w=1} = -\log N + 2\gamma$ cancels the offset in (58). For v a simple zero of the zeta function, the residue

Res
$$G_N(w)\Big|_{w=v} = \frac{N^{v-1}}{\zeta'(v) (v-1)^2} \left[\log N - \frac{2}{v-1}\right] \qquad (v \neq 1).$$

Using this formula along with a well-known expression for $1/\zeta'(-2n)$, the last sum in (60) can be shown to be of the order $O(N^{-3} \log N)$ [6], so if we assume that all ζ -zeros are simple we obtain

$$\Delta \overline{L}_1(N) \log N = \sum_{\rho} \frac{N^{\rho-1}}{\zeta'(\rho) (1-\rho)^2} \left[\log N + \frac{2}{1-\rho} \right] + O\left(\frac{\log N}{N}\right).$$

This is essentially $N^{-1} \log N$ times the sum of residues $\sum_{\rho} \frac{N^{\rho}}{\zeta'(\rho) \rho^2}$ dealt with in [6].

References

- L. Báez–Duarte (2003). A strenghtening of the Nyman–Beurling criterion for the Riemann hypothesis. Rendiconti Mat. Accad. Lincei 14 5–11.
- [2] L. Báez–Duarte, M. Balazard, B. Landreau, E.Saias (2000). Notes sur la fonction ζ de Riemann, 3. Adv. Math. 149 130–144.
- [3] L. Báez-Duarte, M. Balazard, B. Landreau, E.Saias (2005). Étude de l'autocorrelation multiplicative de la fonction 'partie fractionnaire'. *Ramanujan J.* 9 215–240. Citations refer to arXiv:math.NT/0306251v1.
- [4] M. Balazard (2012). Remarques élementaires sur la fonction de Möbius. hal-00732694, arXiv:1209.3577v1.
- [5] S. Bettin and J. B. Conrey (2013). A reciprocity formula for a cotangent sum. Int. Math. Res. Not. 24 5709–5726.
- [6] S. Bettin, J. B. Conrey, D. W. Farmer (2013). An optimal choice of Dirichlet polynomials for the Nyman-Beurling criterion. Proc. Steklov Inst. Math., suppl. 2 280 S30-S36. arXiv:1211.5191v1.
- [7] A. Beurling (1955). A closure problem related to the Riemann Zeta-function. Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. 41 312– 314.
- [8] J.-F. Burnol (2002). A lower bound in an approximation problem involving the zeros of the Riemann zeta function. Adv. Math. 170 56–70.
- [9] J. B. Conrey and G. Myerson (2000). On the Balazard-Saias criterion for the Riemann hypothesis. arXiv:0002254.
- [10] F. Daval (2019). Identités intégrales et estimations explicites associées pour les fonctions sommatoires liées à la fonction de Möbius et autres fonctions arithmétiques. PhD thesis, Univ. Lille 1, available at https://www.theses.fr/2019LILUI059.
- [11] F. Daval (2024). Sur la somme de Möbius $\sum_{n \leq x} \mu(n) n^{-s}$ autour de s = 1 et des sommes dérivés, première étude. arXiv:2404.15520.
- [12] H. M. Edwards (1974). Riemann's zeta function. Academic Press.
- [13] G. H. Hardy and E. M. Wright (2008). An introduction to the theory of numbers. Sixth edition, revised by D.R. Heath-Brown and J. H. Silverman. Oxford University Press.
- [14] B. Landreau and F. Richard (2002). Le critère de Beurling and Nyman pour l'hypothèse de Riemann: aspects numériques. Experimental Math. 11 349–360.
- [15] J. Lewis and D. Zagier (2019). Cotangent sums, quantum modular forms, and the generalized Riemann hypothesis. *Res. Math. Sci* **6**, no. 1, Paper no. 4.
- [16] R. A. MacLeod (1994). A curious identity for the Möbius function. Utilitas Math. 46 91–95.
- [17] B. Nyman (1950). On some groups and semigroups of translations. Thesis, Univ. Uppsala.
- [18] 0. Ramaré (2013). Some elementary explicit bounds for two modifications of the Möbius function. Functiones et Approximatio 49 229-240.
- [19] 0. Ramaré (2015). Explicit estimates of several summatory functions involving the Möbius function. Math. Comp. 84 1359–1387.
- [20] O. Ramaré and S. Zuniga-Alterman (with an appendix by M. Balazard) (2023). Möbius function and primes: An identity factory with applications. arXiv:2312.05138.
- [21] E. C. Titchmarsh (1986). The theory of the Riemann zeta function. Second edition, revised by D. R. Heath-Brown. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- [22] V. I. Vasyunin (1996) On a biorthogonal system related with the Riemann hypothesis. St. Petersburg Math. J. 7 405–419.

E-mail address: wernehm@web.de

Appendix

In this appendix we present some plots for illustration. Figure 1 depicts the functions R_q , S_q , q = 1, 2. For $x \ge 3/4$, the series $S_q(x) = \sum_n R_q(nx)$ is largely dominated by its first term, $R_q(x)$. At a finer scale $S_1(x)$ exhibits myriads of little spikes occurring at rational x. The left-hand boundary behavior of $S_q(x)$ follows from Proposition 2.1 on making use of the reciprocity relations (Corollary 3.1): as $x \to 0$



Figure 1. Left: Functions $R_1(x)$ (dashed) and $S_1(x)$ (solid) plotted vs. x in the range $1/4 \le x \le 4$. Right: Same for R_2, S_2 .

Figure 2 demonstrates the strong correlation phenomenon mentioned at the end of Section 8.1. The traces of the rescaled L- and M-terms $\widetilde{L}_j(N) = \overline{L}_j(N)/\log^j N$, $\widetilde{M}_j(N) = M_j(N)/\log^j N$ dovetail almost perfectly.



Figure 2. Left: $\widetilde{L}_{\mu,j}(N)$ plotted vs. N for j = 0 (blue), j = 1 (green), j = 2 (red) in the range $10^4 \le N \le 10^7$ at every 500-th data point. (This does not affect the picture's general features.) Right: Same for $\widetilde{M}_{\mu,j}(N)$.

Figure 3 highlights the massive reduction of the deflections when passing to the differences of the rescaled terms $\Delta \widetilde{L}_j(N) = \widetilde{L}_j(N) - \widetilde{L}_{j+1}(N)$ etc. Surprisingly, the nearly perfect congruence apparent in Figure 2 even extends to these differences, with one exception. The course of $\Delta \widetilde{M}_{\mu,0}(N)$ in the right panel deviates from the hardly distiguishable $\Delta \widetilde{M}_{\mu,1}(N)$, $\Delta \widetilde{M}_{\mu,2}(N)$. The shift vanishes if the former is replaced by $\Delta \widetilde{M}_{\mu,0}(N) + \pi^2/6$ (not shown). In accordance with Proposition 8.1 the courses of the rescaled *L*-terms $\widetilde{L}_{\nu,j}(N)$ built with the coefficients $\nu_{n,N}$ are visibly indistinguishable from the differences $\Delta \widetilde{L}_{\mu,j}(N)$ shown in Figure 3, left panel. This applies also to the corresponding *M*-terms.

Figure 4 addresses the question to what extent the L-factors can downsize the M-factors in the products figuring in the decompositions (49), (50). The results look encouraging. We specifically consider



the ultimately relevant sums of the product terms built with coefficients $\nu_{n,N}$,

Figure 3. Traces of $\Delta \widetilde{L}_{\mu,j}(N)$ (left) and $\Delta \widetilde{M}_{\mu,j}(N)$ (right); otherwise as in Fig. 2.



Figure 4. Traces of $P_{\nu}^{(q)}(N)$ in the range $10^4 \le N \le 10^7$ at every 500-th data point.

Figure 5 compares scaled distances $d_q(N)$ (cf. (1)) computed with the mollified Möbius coefficients $\lambda_{n,N} = \mu_n(1 - \log n/\log N)$ to those computed with the coefficients $\nu_{n,N}$. In the case q = 1 it is known that under RH the distance (or approximation error) $d_1(N)$ cannot tend to zero faster than $O(1/\sqrt{\log N})$, which is believed to be the correct rate; see [2, 8, 14]. The picture at the right suggests a possibly faster decay rate when q = 2. However, this is weak evidence given the modest range of N. Note that the error for the ν -coefficients is persistently smaller than the one for the λ -coefficients.



Figure 5. $d_1(N)\sqrt{\log N}$ (left) and $d_2(N)\log N$ (right) plotted vs. $N \in [400, 4000]$. Solid: coefficients $\nu_{n,N}$; dashed: coefficients $\lambda_{n,N}$.