



HAL
open science

Proof of some conjectures on the mean-value of Titchmarsh series-II

R Balasubramanian, K Ramachandra

► **To cite this version:**

R Balasubramanian, K Ramachandra. Proof of some conjectures on the mean-value of Titchmarsh series-II. Hardy-Ramanujan Journal, 1991, Volume 14 - 1991, pp.1 - 20. 10.46298/hrj.1991.121 . hal-01104764

HAL Id: hal-01104764

<https://hal.science/hal-01104764>

Submitted on 19 Jan 2015

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Hardy-Ramanujan Journal
Vol.14 (1991) 1-20

PROOF OF SOME CONJECTURES ON THE MEAN-VALUE
OF TITCHMARSH SERIES-II

BY

R. BALASUBRAMANIAN AND K. RAMACHANDRA

§ 1. INTRODUCTION. One of the crowning achievements in the Theory of TITCHMARSH SERIES (introduced by the second of us [R]₁) is the following theorem discovered by R. Balasubramanian and K. Ramachandra [BR].

THEOREM 1. Let $\{a_n\}(n = 1, 2, 3, \dots)$ be a sequence of complex numbers and $\{\lambda_n\}(n = 1, 2, 3, \dots)$ a sequence of real numbers with $a_1 = \lambda_1 = 1$ and $\frac{1}{C} \leq \lambda_{n+1} - \lambda_n \leq C(n = 1, 2, 3, \dots)$ where C is a positive constant. Let $H \geq 10$ be a real parameter and $|a_n| \leq (nH)^A$ where A is a positive integer constant. Suppose that $F(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n \lambda_n^{-s}, (s = \sigma + it)$, can be continued from $\sigma \geq A + 2$ analytically in $\{\sigma \geq 0, 0 \leq t \leq H\}$. Assume that (for some $K \geq 30$) there exist T_1, T_2 with $0 \leq T_1 \leq H^{\frac{1}{8}}, H - H^{\frac{1}{8}} \leq T_2 \leq H$, such that $|F(\sigma + iT_1)| + |F(\sigma + iT_2)| \leq K$ uniformly in $\sigma \geq 0$. Then for all

$H \geq (4C)^{9000A^2} + 520000A^2 \log \log K$ there holds

$$(a) \int_0^H |F(it)|^2 dt \geq \sum_{n \leq \alpha H} (H - (3C)^{1000A} H^{\frac{7}{8}} - 130000A^2 \log \log K - 100C^2 n) |a_n|^2,$$

where $\alpha = (200C^2)^{-1} 2^{-8A-20}$. Also, there holds,

$$(b) \quad \frac{1}{H} \int_0^H |F(it)| dt \geq 1 - \frac{C_1}{H^{\frac{1}{8}}} - \frac{C_2 \log \log K}{H}$$

where C_1 and C_2 are effectively computable positive constants depending only on A and C .

REMARK 1. In (a) the case $a_1 = 1$ and $a_n = 0$ for $n > 1$ shows that it is not possible to replace the RHS by $(1 + \epsilon)$ times its present form. Also the example $F(it) = \zeta(\sigma + it + iT)$ where σ is a large negative constant and H is a large constant times T , shows that in the most general case we cannot have $\alpha > \frac{1}{2\pi}$ and RHS replaced by $\beta H \sum_{n \leq \alpha H} (1 - \frac{n}{\alpha H}) |a_n|^2$ (where $\beta > 0$ is any absolute constant).

REMARK 2. (b) is our second main theorem and (a) our third main theorem in [BR]. This theorem covers every possible application to the Riemann zeta-function on its mean square lower bounds and also to Ω theorems (except the Ω theorem for $\zeta(\sigma + it)$ ($\frac{1}{2} < \sigma < 1$) of H.L. Montgomery [M]). However another important result on TITCHMARSH SERIES is [R]₃. (This covers some very important applications to $\zeta(1 + it)$ and so on). Having reached our goal thus, we now turn to the question "How much can we relax the conditions on TITCHMARSH SERIES $F(s)$ and still prove worthwhile results?" Of course our results are of interest for their own sake and we do not envisage any fresh applications from the results of the present paper. (We have proved five main theorems on TITCHMARSH SERIES in [BR] by R. Balasubramanian and K. Ramachandra and [R]₃ by K. Ramachandra). Our sixth main theorem is

SIXTH MAIN THEOREM. Let $0 \leq \epsilon < 1, C \geq 1, D \geq 1, E = \frac{1}{1-\epsilon}, a_1 = \lambda_1 = 1, \frac{1}{C} \leq \lambda_{n+1} - \lambda_n \leq C$ (for $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$) and for $n \geq 2$ let $|a_n| \leq$

$\text{Exp}\{(DH^\epsilon - 100C - 1)\log \lambda_n\}$, ($H \geq 10$). Let $F(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n \lambda_n^{-s}$ (convergent absolutely in $\sigma \geq DH^\epsilon$) admit an analytic continuation in $\{\sigma \geq 0, 0 \leq t \leq H\}$. Assume that there exist T_1, T_2 with $0 \leq T_1 \leq \frac{1}{8}H, \frac{7}{8}H \leq T_2 \leq H$, such that $|F(\sigma + iT_1)| + |F(\sigma + iT_2)| \leq K$ (where $K \geq 30$ holds uniformly in $\sigma \geq 0$). Let finally $H \geq \max\{(100D \log \log K)^E, 100D(100DE)^{3E}\}$. Then there holds

$$200 \int_0^H |F(it)| dt \geq H.$$

Our next main theorem is as follows

SEVENTH MAIN THEOREM. Let $0 \leq \epsilon < 1, C \geq 1, D \geq 2560C^2, E = \frac{1}{1-\epsilon}, a_1 = \lambda_1 = 1, \frac{1}{C} \leq \lambda_{n+1} - \lambda_n \leq C$ (for $n = 1, 2, 3, \dots$) and for $n \geq 2$ let $|a_n| \leq \text{Exp}\{(DH^\epsilon - 100C - 1)\log \lambda_n\}$. We assume

$$H \geq \max\{(256 D \log \log K)^E, (24000C^6 DE)^{3E}\}$$

where $F(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n \lambda_n^{-s}$ has the properties stated in the sixth main theorem and with K defined exactly as in the sixth main theorem. Then there holds

$$\frac{10^8}{H} \int_0^H |F(it)|^2 dt \geq \sum_{n \leq M_1} |a_n|^2$$

where $M_1 = [(8000C^6 D)^{-1} H^{1-\epsilon}]$.

§ 2. PROOF OF THE SIXTH MAIN THEOREM. We begin with some lemmas. We put $B = DH^\epsilon$.

LEMMA 2.1. For $\sigma \geq B$, we have $|F(s) - 1| \leq \frac{1}{100}$.

PROOF. We observe that $\lambda_n \geq 1 + \frac{n-1}{C}$ and hence, for $\sigma \geq B, |a_n \lambda_n^{-\sigma}| \leq \left(1 + \frac{n-1}{C}\right)^{-100C-1}$ and so

$$\begin{aligned} |F(s) - 1| &\leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left\{ C^{100C+1} (n+C)^{-100C-1} \right\} \\ &\leq C^{100C+1} \int_0^{\infty} (u+C)^{-100C-1} du = \frac{1}{100}. \end{aligned}$$

LEMMA 2.2. *Let $z = x + iy$ be a complex variable with $|x| \leq \frac{1}{4}$. Then for all y we have, $|Exp((Sin z)^2)| \leq e^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq 2$. Moreover if $|y| \geq 2$, we have,*

$$|Exp((Sin z)^2)| \leq e^{\frac{1}{2}} (ExpExp |y|)^{-1} \leq 2(ExpExp |y|)^{-1}.$$

PROOF. See Lemma 2.2.1 of the previous paper I of this series by us [BR].

LEMMA 2.3. *Let $B_0 > 0, k$ and σ real with $0 < |\sigma| \leq B_0$. Then, we have,*

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |Exp\left(\text{Sin}^2\left(\frac{ik - \sigma - iu_1}{4B_0}\right)\right) \frac{du_1}{ik - \sigma - iu_1}| \leq 12 + 4 \log \frac{B_0}{|\sigma|}.$$

PROOF. See Lemma 2.2.2 of the paper referred to in the proof of Lemma 2.2.

LEMMA 2.4. *Put $s_0 = B + it_0$ where $B = DH^\epsilon$. Then subject to $\frac{1}{4}H \leq t_0 \leq \frac{3}{4}H$, we have,*

$$F(s_0) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int F(w) X^{w-s_0} Exp\left(\text{Sin}^2\left(\frac{w-s_0}{4B}\right)\right) \frac{dw}{w-s_0}, \quad (2.1)$$

the contour being the (anti-clockwise) boundary of the rectangle bounded by the lines $Re w = 0, Re w = 2B, Im w = T_1, Im w = T_2$.

PROOF. Follows by Cauchy's theorem.

LEMMA 2.5. *Let I_1, I_2 be the integrals over the horizontal boundaries in (2.1) and J_1 that over the left vertical boundary and J_2 that over the right vertical boundary. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} (|I_1| + |I_2|) dt_0 \\ & \leq 2 \cdot \frac{H}{2} \cdot \left\{ \frac{1}{2\pi} K(X^B + X^{-B}) \frac{8}{H} \cdot 2 \cdot \left(ExpExp \frac{H}{32B}\right)^{-1} \cdot 2B \right\}, \quad (2.2) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} |J_1| dt_0 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \left\{ \int_0^H |F(iv)| \int_{(t_0)} X^{-B} |Exp\left(\text{Sin}^2\left(\frac{iv-B-it_0}{4B}\right)\right)| \left| \frac{dt_0 dv}{iv-B-it_0} \right| \right\} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \left(\int_0^H |F(iv)| dv \right) X^{-B} \cdot 12, \quad (2.3) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} |J_2| dt_0 \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \left(H \cdot \frac{101}{100} \right) X^B \cdot 12 \leq 2H X^B, \quad (2.4)$$

provided $H \geq 64B$ i.e. $H \geq 64DH^\epsilon$ holds for the validity of (2.2). We have employed (t_0) to mean integration over $-\infty < t_0 < \infty$.

PROOF. Follows by Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3.

LEMMA 2.6. Let X be chosen by $X^B = X^{DH^\epsilon} = \frac{1}{5}$ and let $H \geq (64D)^E$. Then, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{H}{2} \left(\frac{99}{100} \right) &\leq \int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} |F(s_0)| dt_0 \leq \frac{2H}{5} + 10 \int_0^H |F(iv)| dv \\ &\quad + 30DH^\epsilon K \left(\text{ExpExp} \frac{H^{1-\epsilon}}{32D} \right)^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.5)$$

PROOF. Follows from Lemma 2.5 on observing that

$$2 \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) \left(\frac{1}{2\pi} \right) \left(\frac{26}{5} \right) (8)(2)(2) \leq 30.$$

We can now complete the proof of the sixth main theorem with the help of (2.5). Let $H \geq (64D)^E$ so that $H^{1-\epsilon}(32D)^{-1} \geq 2$ and so $\text{ExpExp} \frac{H^{1-\epsilon}}{32D} \geq \left(\text{ExpExp} \frac{H^{1-\epsilon}}{64D} \right)^2$. Let $\text{ExpExp} \frac{H^{1-\epsilon}}{64D} \geq \max(K, 30DH)$ i.e. $H \geq (64D \log \log K)^E$ and since $\text{Exp} \frac{H^{1-\epsilon}}{64D} \geq \frac{1}{n!} \left(\frac{H^{1-\epsilon}}{64D} \right)^n$ for all integers $n \geq 1$,

$$\left(\frac{H^{1-\epsilon}}{64D} \right)^{2E} \cdot \frac{1}{(3E)^{3E}} \geq 30 DH$$

would suffice to secure what we want. This requires

$$H \geq 30D \left(\frac{3(64D)^{\frac{2}{3}}}{1-\epsilon} \right)^{3E},$$

which is secured by

$$H \geq 30D(48DE)^{3E}.$$

Hence under the condition $H \geq \max((64D \log \log K)^E, 30D(48DE)^{3E})$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^H |F(iv)| dv &\geq \frac{H}{10} \left(\frac{99}{200} - \frac{2}{5} \right) - \frac{1}{10} \\ &\geq \frac{H}{112} \text{ if } H \geq 20000. \end{aligned}$$

The last condition is clearly satisfied by the condition $H \geq 300(48 DE)^{3E}$ imposed already. So we get better constants in lower bounds for H . In the theorem we have rounded off these constants.

The sixth main theorem is completely proved.

§ 3. PROOF OF THE SEVENTH MAIN THEOREM.

The proof of this theorem is more involved. It consists of four steps. Step III deals with a convexity question and we prove a convexity theorem of independent interest. In all there are ten lemmas and the tenth is essentially the theorem with sharper constants than those in the theorem. In the theorem we have rounded off the constants.

STEP I. We put $B = DH^\varepsilon$, $s_0 = \frac{4}{\log H} + it_0$, where $\frac{1}{4}H \leq t_0 \leq \frac{3}{4}H$. Since $F(s)$ converges absolutely in $\sigma \geq B$, we have, with $Y = H^{\log \log H}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{Re w=2B} F(w) Y^{w-s_0} \text{Exp} \left(\text{Sin}^2 \left(\frac{w-s_0}{8B} \right) \right) \frac{dw}{w-s_0} \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{a_n}{\lambda_n^{s_0}} \Delta \left(\frac{Y}{\lambda_n}, B, s_0 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

where

$$\Delta \left(\frac{Y}{\lambda_n}, B, s_0 \right) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{Re w=2B} \left(\frac{Y}{\lambda_n} \right)^{w-s_0} \text{Exp} \left(\text{Sin}^2 \left(\frac{w-s_0}{8B} \right) \right) \frac{dw}{w-s_0}.$$

For brevity we sometimes write Δ for $\Delta \left(\frac{Y}{\lambda_n}, B, s_0 \right)$. Initially we set $H \geq 100$, $D \geq 2560C^2$ for some reasons to follow. We begin with

LEMMA 3.1. *We have,*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{(a)} \quad & |\Delta| \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \left(\frac{Y}{\lambda_n} \right)^{2B} \cdot 12, \\ \text{(b)} \quad & |\Delta - 1| \leq \frac{1}{2\pi} \left(\frac{\lambda_n}{Y} \right)^{2B} \cdot 12. \end{aligned}$$

REMARK. We use (a) for $\lambda_n \geq Y$ and (b) for $\lambda_n \leq Y$, although both are valid whether $\lambda_n \geq Y$ or not.

PROOF. For (a) we move the line of integration to $Re w = 2B + \frac{4}{\log H}$. For (b) we move the line of integration to $Re w = -2B + \frac{4}{\log H}$. In both the

cases we use Lemma 2.3 with $B_0 = 2B$. The only condition that we need is $2B > 1 + \frac{4}{\log H}$ which is clearly satisfied.

LEMMA 3.2. *We have, if $Y^2 \geq 10C$,*

$$\left| \sum_{\lambda_n \geq Y^2} \frac{a_n}{\lambda_n^{s_0}} \Delta \right| \leq \frac{1}{100} C^{100C} \left(\frac{Y^2}{C} - 2C \right)^{-100C}.$$

PROOF. By (a) of Lemma 3.1 we have, since $\sqrt{\lambda_n} \geq Y$ and so $|\Delta| \leq 2\lambda_n^{-B}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LHS} &\leq 2 \sum_{\lambda_n \geq Y^2} \frac{|a_n|}{\lambda_n^B} \leq 2 \sum_{\lambda_n \geq Y^2} \lambda_n^{-100C-1} \\ &\leq \sum_{nC \geq Y^2} \left(1 + \frac{n-1}{C}\right)^{-100C-1} \leq C^{100C+1} \sum_{\substack{n \geq \frac{Y^2}{C} \\ nC \geq Y^2}} (C+n-1)^{-100C-1} \\ &\leq C^{100C+1} (100C)^{-1} \left(\left[\frac{Y^2}{C}\right] - 2 + C\right)^{-100C}, \text{ since } Y^2 \geq 10C, \\ &\leq C^{100C} \left(\frac{Y^2}{C} - 2C\right)^{-100C}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the lemma completely.

In the LHS of (3.1) we would like to cut off the portions $Im w \leq T_1, Im w \geq T_2$ and move the line of integration in the rest to $Re w = 0$. The horizontal bits contribute two terms the sum of whose absolute values is

$$\leq 2 \cdot \frac{1}{2\pi} K \cdot Y^{2B} \cdot 2B \cdot 2 \left(ExpExp \frac{H}{64B}\right)^{-1} \cdot \frac{8}{H}, \text{ if } H \geq (128D)^E.$$

Also the infinite vertical bits do not together exceed in absolute value

$$\begin{aligned} &2 \cdot \frac{1}{2\pi} \cdot \frac{101}{100} Y^{2B} \left(ExpExp \frac{H}{128B}\right)^{-1} \times \\ &\int_{Im(w-s_0) \geq \frac{H}{8}} \left| Exp \left(Sin^2 \left(\frac{w-s_0}{8B} \right) \right) \right|^{\frac{1}{2}} \left| \frac{dw}{w-s_0} \right|. \text{ Since for } H \geq (128D)^E, \\ &Exp \left| Sin^2 \left(\frac{w-s_0}{8B} \right) \right| = \left| Exp \left(\frac{1}{2} Sin^2 \left(\frac{w-s_0}{8B} \right) \right) \right|^2 \\ &\leq \left| Exp \left(Sin^2 \left(\frac{w-s_0}{8B} \right) \right) \right|^{\frac{1}{2}} \left| Exp \left(Sin^2 \left(\frac{w-s_0}{8B} \right) \right) \right|^{\frac{1}{2}} \text{ and } \left| Exp \left(Sin^2 \left(\frac{w-s_0}{8B} \right) \right) \right|^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \left(ExpExp \frac{H}{64B} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq \left(ExpExp \frac{H}{128H} \right)^{-1}. \text{ Also putting } Im w = v, \\ &\left| Exp \left(Sin^2 \left(\frac{w-s_0}{8B} \right) \right) \right|^{\frac{1}{2}} < \left(ExpExp \frac{|v-t_0|}{8B} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq (\text{Exp} \left| \frac{v-t_0}{16B} \right|)^{-1} \text{ and } \int_0^\infty \text{Exp} \left(-\frac{v}{16B} \right) dv = 16B.$$

Thus the contribution from the infinite vertical bits do not exceed
 (since in $\text{Im}(w - s_0) \geq \frac{H}{8}, |w - s_0| \geq \frac{H}{8}$)

$$2 \cdot \frac{1}{2\pi} \cdot \frac{101}{100} Y^{2B} \left(\text{ExpExp} \frac{Y}{128B} \right)^{-1} 16B \cdot \frac{8}{H} \text{ (by Lemma 2.1). Thus we have}$$

LEMMA 3.3. *We have, with some θ 's not necessarily the same ones, with $|\theta| \leq 1$*

$$\begin{aligned} F(s_0) &= \sum_{\lambda_n \leq Y^2} \frac{a_n}{\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}} \Delta + \frac{\theta}{100} C^{100C} \left(\frac{Y^2}{C} - 2C \right)^{-100C} \\ &+ \theta \cdot 2 \cdot \frac{1}{2\pi} \cdot K \cdot Y^{2B} 4B \cdot 2 \cdot \left(\text{ExpExp} \frac{Y}{128B} \right)^{-1} \frac{8}{H} \\ &+ \frac{\theta}{2\pi} \int_{\substack{T_1 \leq \text{Im } w \leq T_2 \\ \text{Re } w = 0}} |F(w) Y^{w-s_0}| \text{Exp} \left(\text{Sin}^2 \left(\frac{w-s_0}{8B} \right) \right) \left\| \frac{dw}{w-s_0} \right\| \\ &\text{provided } H \geq (256D)^E. \end{aligned}$$

PROOF. Follows since $K \geq 30$ from the arguments preceding the lemma.

LEMMA 3.4. *We have,*

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{\lambda_n \leq Y^2} \frac{a_n}{\lambda_n^{\frac{1}{2}}} \Delta \right|^2 &\leq 16 \left\{ |F(s_0)|^2 + \frac{1}{10000} C^{200C} \left(\frac{Y^2}{C} - 2C \right)^{-200C} \right\} \\ &+ \left(\frac{128}{2\pi} \right)^2 K^2 Y^{4B} B^2 \left(\text{ExpExp} \frac{H}{128B} \right)^{-2} \frac{1}{H^2} \\ &\left\{ + \frac{Y^{-\frac{8}{\log H}}}{(2\pi)^2} \int_{\substack{T_1 \leq \text{Im } w \leq T_2 \\ \text{Re } w = 0}} |F(w)|^2 \text{Exp} \left(\text{Sin}^2 \left(\frac{w-s_0}{8B} \right) \right) \left\| \frac{dw}{w-s_0} \right\| J \right\} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$J = \int_{\substack{-\infty \leq \text{Im } w \leq \infty \\ \text{Re } w = 0}} \left| \text{Exp} \left(\text{Sin}^2 \left(\frac{w-s_0}{8B} \right) \right) \right| \left\| \frac{dw}{w-s_0} \right\|.$$

We have used $H \geq (256D)^E$ and $Y^2 \geq 10C$. Also since $\frac{4}{\log H} \leq 2B$ we have $J \leq 12 + 4 \log(2B \log H)$ by Lemma 2.3, with $B_0 = 2B$. In the last but one integral note that $|w - s_0| \geq \frac{4}{\log H}$.

PROOF. Follows from Lemma 3.3.

STEP II. In this step we obtain a lower bound for

$$\int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} |\varphi(s_0)|^2 dt_0 \text{ where } \varphi(s_0) = \sum_{\lambda_n \leq Y^2} \frac{a_n}{\lambda_n^{s_0}} \Delta$$

and $Y = H^{\log \log H}$. Put $\sigma_0 = \frac{4}{\log H}$ and $M_1 = \left\lceil \frac{H^{1-\varepsilon}}{8000C^6 D} \right\rceil$ and assume that $H^{1-\varepsilon} \geq 24000C^6 D$. Also we put

$$A(s_0) = \sum_{m \leq M_1} \left(\frac{a_m}{\lambda_m^{s_0}} \Delta \right), B(s_0) = \sum_{Y^2 \geq \lambda_n \geq M_1+1} \left(\frac{a_n}{\lambda_n^{s_0}} \Delta \right)$$

and assume $H \geq \text{Exp}(e^e)$ so that $\log \log H \geq e$. To start with observe that $|\Delta| \leq 3$ and that

$$|\varphi(s_0)|^2 \geq |A(s_0)|^2 + 2\text{Re}(A(s_0)\overline{B(s_0)}).$$

Hence by putting $\lambda = u_1 + u_2 + \dots + u_r$ where $0 \leq u_j \leq U, j = 1, 2, 3, \dots, r$ and $2rU \leq \frac{1}{2}H$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} |\varphi(s_0)|^2 dt_0 &\geq U^{-r} \int_0^U du_r \dots \int_0^U du_1 \int_{\frac{H}{4}+\lambda}^{\frac{3H}{4}-U_r+\lambda} |\varphi(s_0)|^2 dt_0 \\ &\geq I_1 + \text{Re}(2I_2), \end{aligned}$$

where $I_1 = \int_{\frac{H}{4}+rU}^{\frac{3H}{4}-rU} |A(s_0)|^2 dt_0$ and

$$I_2 = U^{-r} \int_0^U du_r \dots \int_0^U du_1 \int_{\frac{H}{4}+\lambda}^{\frac{3H}{4}-rU+\lambda} A(s_0)\overline{B(s_0)} dt_0.$$

By a well-known theorem of H.L. Montgomery and R.C. Vaughan we have

$$I_1 \geq \sum_{m \leq M_1} \left(\frac{H}{2} - 2rU - 100C^2 m \right) |a_m|^2 \lambda_m^{2\sigma_0} |\Delta|^2.$$

We now assume that $\frac{H}{4} \geq 2rU + 100C^2 M_1$, so that we can replace the quantity in the common bracket here by the lower bound $\frac{1}{4}H$. Note that for $n \leq M_1$

$$|\Delta| \geq 1 - 6 \left(\frac{\lambda_n}{Y} \right)^{2B} \geq 1 - 6 \left(\frac{CM_1}{H^e} \right)^{DH^e} \geq 1 - 6 \left(\frac{1}{H} \right)^{DH^e}$$

(if $H \geq 12$) $\geq \frac{1}{2}$ and that $\lambda_n^{-2\sigma} > (M_1 C)^{-\frac{8}{\log H}} > e^{-8}$. Thus with $M_1 = [H^{1-\epsilon}(8000C^6D)^{-1}]$ and $H \geq 12C$, we have,

$$I_1 \geq \frac{H}{16} + \frac{H}{16} e^{-8} \sum_{2 \leq n \leq M_1} |a_n|^2.$$

Now we turn to I_2 . We have

$$|I_2| \leq U^{-r} \sum_{\substack{m \leq M_1, n \geq M_1+1 \\ \lambda_n \leq Y^2}} \left\{ |a_m| |a_n| \left(\log \frac{\lambda_n}{\lambda_m} \right)^{-r-1} \Delta_m \Delta_n 2^{r+1} \right\}$$

(where we have written Δ_m and Δ_n with an obvious meaning namely the Δ 's associated with λ_m and λ_n)

$$\leq U^{-r} \left(\sum_{m \leq M_1} |\Delta_m a_m| \right) \left(\sum_{\substack{n \geq M_1+1 \\ \lambda_n \leq Y^2}} |\Delta_n a_n| \left(\log \frac{\lambda_n}{\lambda_{M_1}} \right)^{-r-1} \right) 2^{r+1}.$$

Here the m -sum is

$$\leq 3 \text{Exp}(DH^\epsilon) \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_n^{-100C-1} \leq \frac{303}{100} \text{Exp}(DH^\epsilon)$$

by Lemma 2.1. The n -sum is

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq 3 \sum_{\lambda_{M_1} < \lambda_n \leq Y^2} |a_n| \left(\log \frac{\lambda_n}{\lambda_{M_1}} \right)^{-r-1} \\ &\leq 3 \sum_{\lambda_{M_1} < \lambda_n \leq 2\lambda_{M_1}} |a_n| \left(\log \frac{\lambda_{M_1+1}}{\lambda_{M_1}} \right)^{-r-1} \\ &\quad + 3 \text{Exp}(DH^\epsilon) \sum_{\lambda_n > 2\lambda_{M_1}} \lambda_n^{-100C-1} (\log 2)^{-r-1} \\ &\leq 3 \text{Exp}(DH^\epsilon) \sum_{\lambda_{M_1} < \lambda_n \leq 2\lambda_{M_1}} \lambda_n^{-100C-1} (M_1 C^2)^{r+1} \\ &\quad + 3 \text{Exp}(DH^\epsilon) 2^{r+1} \sum_{\lambda_n > 2\lambda_{M_1}} \lambda_n^{-100C-1} \quad (\text{since } \log \frac{\lambda_{M_1+1}}{\lambda_{M_1}} \geq (C^2 M_1)^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \frac{3}{100} (2C)^{2r+2} \text{Exp}(DH^\epsilon) \left(\frac{H^{1-\epsilon}}{8000C^4D} \right)^{(r+1)}$$

(if $M_1 \geq 2$, i.e. if $H \geq (24000C^6D)^E$)

Here we have used Lemma 2.1.

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} |2I_2| &\leq \frac{303}{100} \cdot 2 \cdot \text{Exp}(2DH^\epsilon) \cdot \frac{3}{100} (8C^2)^{r+1} U^{-r} \left(\frac{H^{1-\epsilon}}{8000C^4D} \right)^{r+1} \\ &\leq \text{Exp}(2DH^\epsilon) \left(\frac{H}{8000C^2D} \right) \left(\frac{H^{1-\epsilon}}{1000UC^2D} \right)^r. \end{aligned}$$

We have to satisfy $\frac{H}{4} \geq 2rU + 100C^2M_1$ and by the definition of M_1 (viz. $M_1 = [H^{1-\epsilon}(8000C^6D)^{-1}]$) this is satisfied if $U = \frac{H^{1-\epsilon}}{300C^2D}$, $r = [4DH^\epsilon]$ and $\frac{H}{4} \geq \frac{H}{75C^2} + \frac{H}{100}$ which is clearly satisfied. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} |2I_2| &< \frac{H}{4000C^2D} \text{Exp}(2DH^\epsilon - 3DH^\epsilon) \\ &< \frac{H}{32}. \end{aligned}$$

Of course $M_1 \geq 2$ requires $H \geq (24000C^6D)^E$. Collecting we have the following result.

Let $\varphi(s_0) = \sum_{\lambda_n \leq Y^2} (a_n \lambda_n^{-s_0} \Delta)$ where $Y = H^{\log \log H}$ and Δ is as explained in Step I. Then

$$\int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} |\varphi(s_0)|^2 dt_0 \geq \frac{H}{32} + \frac{H}{16} e^{-8} \sum_{2 \leq n \leq M_1} |a_n|^2$$

where $M_1 = [H^{1-\epsilon}(8000C^6D)^{-1}]$ provided $H \geq (24000C^6D)^E$ and $D \geq 2560C^2$.

STEP III. (CONVEXITY). We begin by stating a convexity theorem of R.M. Gabriel [G]. Let $z = x + iy$ be a complex variable. Let D_0 be a closed rectangle with sides parallel to the axes and let L be the closed line segment parallel to the y -axis which divides D_0 into 2 equal parts. Let D_1 and D_2 be the two congruent rectangles into which D_0 is divided by L . Let K_1 and K_2 be the boundaries of D_1 and D_2 (with the line L excluded). Let $f(z)$ be

analytic in the interior of D_0 and continuous on the boundary of D_0 . Then, we have,

$$\int_L |f(z)|^q dz \leq \left(\int_{K_1} |f(z)|^q dz \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{K_2} |f(z)|^q dz \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where $q > 0$ is any real number.

(See Theorem 2 in the appendix to [R]₂ for a proof). We now slightly extend this as follows. Consider the rectangle $0 \leq x \leq (2^n + 1)a$ (where n is a non-negative integer and a is a positive number), and $0 \leq y \leq R$. Let I_x denote the integral $\int_0^R |f(z)|^q dy$ where as before $z = x + iy$. Let Q_α denote the maximum of $|f(z)|^q$ on $\{0 \leq x \leq \alpha, y = 0, R\}$. Then we have as a first application of the theorem of Gabriel.

$$I_a \leq (I_0 + 4aQ_{2a})^{\frac{1}{2}} (I_{2a} + 4aQ_{2a})^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

We prove by induction that if $b_m = 2^m + 1$, then

$$I_a \leq (I_0 + 2^{2(m+1)}aQ_{ab_m})^{\frac{1}{2}} (I_a + 2^{2(m+1)}aQ_{ab_m})^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^{m+1}}} (I_{ab_m} + 2^{2(m+1)}aQ_{ab_m})^{\frac{1}{2^{m+1}}}.$$

We have as a first application of Gabriel's theorem this result with $m = 0$. Assuming this to be true for m we prove it with m replaced by $m + 1$. We apply Gabriel's Theorem to give the bound for I_{ab_m} in terms of I_a and $I_{ab_{m+1}}$. We have

$$I_{ab_m} \leq (I_a + 2b_{m+1}aQ_{ab_{m+1}})^{\frac{1}{2}} (I_{ab_{m+1}} + 2ab_{m+1}Q_{ab_{m+1}})^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

since as we can easily check $b_{m+1} = b_m + b_m - 1$. We add $2^{2(m+1)} a Q_{ab_m}$ to both sides and use that for $A > 0, B > 0, Q > 0$ we have

$$\sqrt{AB} + Q \leq \sqrt{(A+Q)(B+Q)}$$

which on squaring both sides reduces to a consequence of $(\sqrt{A} - \sqrt{B})^2 \geq 0$. Thus

$$I_{ab_m} + 2^{2(m+1)} a Q_{ab_m} \leq \left(I_a + a \left(2b_{m+1} + 2^{2(m+1)} \right) Q_{ab_{m+1}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(I_{ab_{m+1}} + a \left(2b_{m+1} + 2^{2(m+1)} \right) Q_{ab_{m+1}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

Now $2b_{m+1} + 2^{2(m+1)} \leq 2^{2(m+2)}$ i.e. $2(2^{m+1} + 1) \leq 3 \cdot 2^{2(m+1)}$ which is true. Since $\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^{m+1}} + \frac{1}{2^{m+2}} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^{m+2}}$ the induction is complete and the required result is proved. We state it as a

CONVEXITY THEOREM. For $m = 0, 1, 2, \dots, n$ we have

$$I_a \leq \left(I_0 + 2^{2(m+1)} a Q_{ab_m} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(I_a + 2^{2(m+1)} a Q_{ab_m} \right)^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^{m+1}}} \times \left(I_{ab_m} + 2^{2(m+1)} a Q_{ab_m} \right)^{\frac{1}{2^{m+1}}}$$

STEP IV. (FINAL DEDUCTION).

We now go back to Lemma 3.4. We have $Y \geq H^2$, and so if $H \geq 10C^2$,

$$\frac{C^{200C}}{10000} \left(\frac{H^2}{C} - 2C \right)^{-200C} \leq \frac{C^{200C}}{10000} (8HC)^{-200C} \leq \frac{(8)^{-200C}}{10000} \frac{1}{H^2} \leq \frac{8^{-200}}{10000} \frac{1}{H^2},$$

since $\frac{H^2}{C} - 2C \geq H \left(\frac{H}{C} - 2C \right) \geq 8HC$. Let

$$\left(\frac{128}{2\pi} \right)^2 Y^{4B} B^2 \left(\text{ExpExp} \frac{H}{128B} \right)^{-1} \leq \frac{1}{16}$$

and

$$K^2 \left(\text{ExpExp} \frac{H}{128B} \right)^{-1} \leq 1.$$

The second is satisfied if (note $B = DH^\epsilon$)

$$H \geq (256D \log \log K)^E.$$

The first is satisfied if

$$\text{ExpExp} \left(\frac{H^{1-\epsilon}}{256D} \right) \geq 88BY^{2B} = 88DH^\epsilon H^{2DH^\epsilon \log \log H}.$$

This is satisfied (since $88DH^\epsilon H^{2DH^\epsilon \log \log H} \leq e^{H^2+H^3} \leq e^{2H^3}$) if

$$\text{ExpExp} \left(\frac{H^{1-\epsilon}}{256D} \right) \geq \text{Exp}(H^4)$$

i.e. if $\text{Exp} \frac{H^{1-\epsilon}}{256D} \geq H^4$. This is satisfied if $\text{Exp} \frac{H^{1-\epsilon}}{1024D} \geq H$ which is implied by $\left(\frac{H^{1-\epsilon}}{1024D}\right)^{\frac{1}{(3E)^{3E}}} \geq H$ which is implied by $H \geq (3072DE)^{3E}$. Thus by Lemma 4 and Lemma 2.3 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{H}{32} + \frac{H}{16} e^{-8} \left(\sum_{2 \leq n \leq M_1} |a_n|^2 \right) &\leq 16 \int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} |F(s_0)|^2 dt_0 + \\ + \frac{2}{H} + \frac{16}{(2\pi)^2} (\log H)^{-8} (12 + 16 \log H)^2 &\int_{\substack{T_1 \leq \text{Im } w \leq T_2 \\ \text{Re } w = 0}} |F(w)|^2 |dw|. \end{aligned}$$

Now

$$\frac{16(\log H)^{-8}}{(2\pi)^2} (12 + 16 \log H)^2 \leq \frac{16}{36} (\log H)^{-6} (28)^2 \leq 1$$

if $(\log H)^3 \geq \frac{(28)(6)}{4}$ i.e. if $H \geq 6$. Also if $\frac{H}{32 \times 33} \geq \frac{2}{H}$ i.e. if $H \geq 8\sqrt{33}$ then the result in question becomes

$$\frac{H}{33} + \frac{H}{16} e^{-8} \left(\sum_{2 \leq n \leq M_1} |a_n|^2 \right) \leq 16 \int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} |F(s_0)|^2 dt_0 + \int_{T_1}^{T_2} |F(iv)|^2 dv.$$

If $\int_{T_1}^{T_2} |F(iv)|^2 dv \geq \frac{H}{33 \times 17} + \frac{H}{16 \times 17} e^{-8} \left(\sum_{2 \leq n \leq M_1} |a_n|^2 \right)$ it follows that

$$\int_0^H |F(iv)|^2 dv \geq \frac{e^{-8}}{16 \times 17} \left(H \sum_{n \leq M_1} |a_n|^2 \right). \text{ Otherwise it follows that}$$

$$\int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} |F(s_0)|^2 dt_0 \geq \frac{H}{33 \times 17} + \frac{H}{16 \times 17} e^{-8} \left(\sum_{2 \leq n \leq M_1} |a_n|^2 \right).$$

Starting from this we now deduce a lower bound for $\int_0^H |F(iv)|^2 dv$. We do this in a series of Lemmas.

LEMMA 3.5. *Let $|\sigma| \leq 2B, 0 \leq T_1 \leq \frac{H}{8}, \frac{7H}{8} \leq T_2 \leq H, H \geq 64B$. Then, we have,*

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} |F(\sigma + it)|^2 dt \\ &\leq \frac{1}{B} \int_{T_1}^{T_2} dv \left(\int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} |F(\sigma + iv)| \left| \text{Exp} \left(\text{Sin}^2 \left(\frac{iv - it_0}{8B} \right) \right) \right| dt_0 \right) \end{aligned}$$

PROOF. Consider the contribution of the RHS from $\frac{H}{4} \leq v \leq \frac{3H}{4}$. The integral with respect to t_0 is

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} \text{Exp}(-\sinh^2(\frac{v-t_0}{8B})) dt_0 &= \int_{v-\frac{3H}{4}}^{v-\frac{H}{4}} \text{Exp}(-\sinh^2 \frac{u}{8B}) du \\ &\geq \int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{H}{4}} \text{Exp}(-\sinh^2 \frac{u}{8B}) du \text{ (since } v - \frac{3H}{4} \leq 0 \text{ and } v - \frac{H}{4} \geq 0 \text{ and their} \\ &\text{difference is } \frac{1}{2}H) \end{aligned}$$

$$= 8B \int_0^{\frac{H}{32B}} \text{Exp}(-\sinh^2 u) du \geq 8B \text{Exp}(-\sinh^2 1) \geq B$$

(since $\sinh^2 1 \leq \frac{e^2 - 2 + e^{-2}}{4} \leq \frac{9 - 2 + 1}{4} = 2$ and $e^{-2} > \frac{1}{8}$). The lemma is completely proved.

We now apply the convexity theorem with $q = 2$, $f(z) = F^2(z) \text{Exp}(\text{Sin}^2(\frac{z-s_0}{8B}))$ (where $s_0 = a + it_0$, $a = \frac{4}{\log H}$) to the rectangle bounded by the lines $x = 0$, $x = (2^n + 1)a$, $y = T_1$, $y = T_2$ and choose n such that $B \leq x \leq 2B$, ($B = DH^\epsilon$), i.e. $\frac{B}{a} - 1 \leq 2^n \leq \frac{2B}{a} - 1$ (observe that $\frac{2B}{a} - 1 > 2(\frac{B}{a} - 1)$). We need an upper bound for $2^{2(n+1)}a$ which is plainly $a \cdot 4 \cdot (\frac{2B}{a})^2 \leq 4(\log H)D^2 H^{2\epsilon} \leq H^4$ (if $H \geq 4D^2$).

Also $Q_{ab_n} \leq K^2 \max | \text{Exp}(\text{Sin}^2(\frac{z-s_0}{8B})) |$, where the maximum is taken over $0 \leq x \leq 2B$, $y = T_1$, $y = T_2$ and hence (with the condition $\frac{H}{4} \leq t_0 \leq \frac{3H}{4}$, $\frac{H}{8} \cdot \frac{1}{8B} \geq 2$ i.e. $H \geq (16D)^B$) we have

$$2^{2(m+1)}aQ_{ab_m} \leq K^2 H^4 \left(\text{ExpExp} \frac{H^{1-\epsilon}}{64D} \right)^{-1} \leq \frac{1}{H^2}$$

under the conditions imposed at the beginning of this step. Hence by our convexity theorem we obtain

$$I_a \leq \left(I_0 + \frac{1}{H^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(I_a + \frac{1}{H^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^{n+1}}} \left(I^* + \frac{1}{H^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}}$$

where I^* is the integral over $x = (2^n + 1)a$ fixed already. All the integrals contain a parameter t_0 . Now we integrate with respect to t_0 in $\frac{H}{4} \leq t_0 \leq \frac{3H}{4}$ and get by Hölder's inequality,

LEMMA 3.6 We have,

$$\int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} I_a dt_0 \leq \left(\int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} \left(I_0 + \frac{1}{H^2} \right) dt_0 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} \left(I_a + \frac{1}{H^2} \right) dt_0 \right)^{\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2^{n+1}}}$$

$$\times \left(\int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} \left(I^* + \frac{1}{H^2} \right) dt_0 \right)^{\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}}$$

LEMMA 3.7. *We have,*

$$\int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} I^* dt_0 \leq 100BH.$$

PROOF. LHS does not exceed (by Lemmas 2.1 and 2.2)

$$\int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} dt_0 \left(\int_{T_1}^{T_2} \left(\frac{101}{100} \right) | \text{Exp} \left(\text{Sin}^2 \left(\frac{a^* + iy - a - it_0}{8B} \right) \right) | dy \right)$$

(where $a^* = (2^n + 1)a (\leq 2B)$)

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \frac{101}{100} \left(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} | \text{Exp} \left(\text{Sin}^2 \left(\frac{a^* + iy - a - it_0}{8B} \right) \right) | dt_0 \right) dy \\ &\leq \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \frac{101}{100} (64B + 32B) \leq 100BH, \end{aligned}$$

by breaking the last but one integral into $|y - t_0| \leq 16B$ (from which the contribution is $64B$) and using over the remaining portion

$$\int \dots \leq 4 \int_0^{\infty} \left(\text{ExpExp} \left(\frac{u}{8B} \right) \right)^{-1} du \leq 32B.$$

This proves the lemma completely.

LEMMA 3.8. *We have,*

$$\int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} I_a^* dt_0 \leq 56100 \int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} I_a dt_0$$

and

$$\int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} I_a dt_0 \geq B \int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} |F(\sigma + it_0)|^2 dt_0 \geq \frac{BH}{561}.$$

PROOF. The first part of the second inequality follows from Lemma 3.5. Its second part follows from our assumption preceding Lemma 3.5. By Lemma 3.7, LHS of the first part is $\leq 100BH \leq 56100 \int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} I_a dt_0$. This completes the proof of the lemma.

Now $\int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} \left(I^* + \frac{1}{H^2} \right) dt_0 \leq 56100 \int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} \left(I_a + \frac{1}{H^2} \right) dt$ as is shown by Lemma 3.8 and so by Lemma 3.6

$$\int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} I_a dt_0 \leq \left(\int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} \left(I_0 + \frac{1}{H^2} \right) dt_0 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} \left(I_a + \frac{1}{H^2} \right) dt_0 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} (56100)^{\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}}.$$

Also by the second part of Lemma 3.8, we have

$$\int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} \frac{1}{H^2} dt_0 \leq H^{-1} = \frac{561}{BH^2} \cdot \frac{BH}{561} \leq \frac{561}{BH^2} \int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} I_a dt_0 \leq 10^{-3} \int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} I_a dt_0$$

under the conditions imposed on H . Note that $(56100)^{\frac{1}{2^{n+1}}} \leq (56100)^{\frac{1}{D}} \leq 2^{\frac{1}{4}}$ since $D \geq 2560$. Thus since $(1 + 10^{-3})^{\frac{1}{2}} 2^{\frac{1}{4}} \leq \sqrt{2}$ we obtain

LEMMA 3.9. *We have,*

$$\int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} I_a dt_0 \leq 2 \left(\int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} I_0 dt_0 + \frac{1}{H} \right) \leq 192B \int_0^H |F(iv)|^2 dv + \frac{2}{H}.$$

PROOF. The second part of the inequality follows exactly as in the proof of Lemma 3.7.

From Lemma 3.8 it follows that

$$\int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} I_a dt_0 \geq B \int_{\frac{H}{4}}^{\frac{3H}{4}} |F(\sigma + it_0)|^2 dt_0 \geq \frac{BH}{33 \times 17} + \frac{BH}{16 \times 17} e^{-8} \sum_{2 \leq n \leq M_1} |a_n|^2.$$

Thus by Lemma 3.9 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^H |F(iv)|^2 dt &\geq \frac{H}{192 \times 17} \left\{ \frac{1}{33} + \frac{e^{-8}}{16} \sum_{2 \leq n \leq M_1} |a_n|^2 \right\} - \frac{1}{96DH} \\ &\geq \frac{H}{192 \times 17} \left\{ \frac{1}{34} + \frac{e^{-8}}{16} \sum_{2 \leq n \leq M_1} |a_n|^2 \right\} \end{aligned}$$

provided $96H^2 \geq 192 \times 17 \times 33 \times 34$ i.e. $H^2 \geq 2 \times 17 \times 33 \times 34$. This is satisfied if $H \geq 34 \times 6$ which is clearly satisfied by the conditions imposed on H .

Collecting we obtain

LEMMA 3.10. *Under the conditions on H, ε and D imposed already, we have,*

$$\int_0^H |F(iv)|^2 dv \geq \frac{He^{-8}}{16 \times 17 \times 192} \sum_{n \leq M_1} |a_n|^2.$$

where $M_1 = \left[\frac{H^{1-\varepsilon}}{8000C^6D} \right]$. Note $\frac{e^{-8}}{16 \times 17 \times 192} > 10^{-8}$. All the required conditions on H, ε, C, D are satisfied by

$$D \geq 2560C^2, H \geq \max \left\{ (256D \log \log K)^E, (24000 C^6 D E)^{3E} \right\}.$$

This proves the seventh main theorem completely.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT. We would like to acknowledge here some difficult copying help given to us by A. Sankaranarayanan and K. Soundararajan.

FINAL REMARK.

PROVE OR DISPROVE THE FOLLOWING CONJECTURE

For all N -tuples of complex numbers a_1, a_2, \dots, a_N with $a_1 = 1$ and for all $N \geq H \geq 10000$,

$$\frac{1}{H} \int_0^H \left| \sum_{n \leq N} a_n n^{it} \right|^2 dt \geq (\log H)^{-10000} \sum_{n \leq H^{1/10}} |a_n|^2.$$

REFERENCES

- [BR] R. BALASUBRAMANIAN AND K. RAMACHANDRA, *Proof of some conjectures on the mean-value of Titchmarsh series-I*, Hardy-Ramanujan J., vol. 13 (1990), 1-20.
- [G] R.M. GABRIEL, *Some results concerning the integrals of moduli of regular functions along certain curves*, J.L.M.S., 2 (1927), 112-117.
- [M] H.L. MONTGOMERY, *Extreme values of the Riemann zeta-function*, Comment. Math. Helv., 52 (1977), 511-518.
- [R]₁ K. RAMACHANDRA, *Progress towards a conjecture on the mean-value of Titchmarsh series*, Recent progress in analytic number theory vol. 1, ed. H. Halberstam and C. Hooley, F.R.S., Academic Press, London, New-York, Toronto, Sydney, San-Francisco, (1981), 303-318.
- [R]₂ K. RAMACHANDRA, *A brief summary of some results in the analytic theory of numbers/Addendum*, Number Theory, Proceedings, Mysore, ed. K. Alladi, Springer Verlag - lecture notes 938, (1981), 106-122.
- [R]₃ K. RAMACHANDRA, *Proof of some conjectures on the mean-value of Titchmarsh series with applications to Titchmarsh's phenomenon*, Hardy-Ramanujan J., vol. 13 (1990), 21-27.

ADDRESS OF THE AUTHORS

- 1) PROFESSOR R. BALASUBRAMANIAN
MATSCIENCE
THARAMANI P.O.
MADRAS 600 113
TAMILNADU
INDIA

- 2) PROFESSOR K. RAMACHANDRA
SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS
TATA INSTITUTE OF FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH
HOMI BHABHA ROAD
COLABA
BOMBAY 400 005
INDIA

(MANUSCRIPT COMPLETED ON 19.10.1990).