

THE FOURTH MOMENT OF THE HURWITZ ZETA FUNCTION

WINSTON HEAP AND ANURAG SAHAY

ABSTRACT. We prove a sharp upper bound for the fourth moment of the Hurwitz zeta function $\zeta(s, \alpha)$ on the critical line when the shift parameter α is irrational and of irrationality exponent strictly less than 3. As a consequence, we determine the order of magnitude of the $2k$ th moment for all $0 \leq k \leq 2$ in this case. In contrast to the Riemann zeta function and other L -functions from arithmetic, these grow like $T(\log T)^k$. This suggests, and we conjecture, that the value distribution of $\zeta(s, \alpha)$ on the critical line is Gaussian.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ be a fixed shift parameter. The Hurwitz zeta function is defined by

$$\zeta(s, \alpha) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{1}{(n + \alpha)^s}$$

for $\Re(s) > 1$, and can be extended to a meromorphic function on \mathbb{C} with a simple pole at $s = 1$. In this paper, we are interested in the value distribution of $\zeta(s, \alpha)$ on the critical line. As we shall see, this can depend heavily on the Diophantine nature of the shift parameter α .

The case of rational α is relatively well understood. When $\alpha = 1$, we get back the usual Riemann zeta function: $\zeta(s, 1) = \zeta(s)$, and an easy calculation shows that $\zeta(s, \frac{1}{2}) = (2^s - 1)\zeta(s)$. When $\alpha = a/q$ with $q > 2$, the orthogonality of Dirichlet characters implies that

$$(1) \quad \zeta(s, \frac{a}{q}) = \frac{q^s}{\varphi(q)} \sum_{\chi \bmod q} \overline{\chi(a)} L(s, \chi),$$

giving a connection to Dirichlet L -functions. In these cases, the typical fluctuations of the underlying L -functions at large height are determined in accordance with Selberg's central limit theorem [52, 58]. This gives a log-normal distribution: for fixed V ,

$$\frac{1}{T} \text{meas} \left(\left\{ t \in [T, 2T] : \frac{\log |\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it)|}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \log \log T}} \geq V \right\} \right) \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_V^\infty e^{-x^2/2} dx$$

as $T \rightarrow \infty$ where meas denotes Lebesgue measure.

Going beyond typical fluctuations, larger values are determined by the moments [47]. Here, the Keating–Snaith conjecture [36] predicts that for real $k > 0$

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_T^{2T} |\zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + it)|^{2k} dt \sim c_k (\log T)^{k^2}$$

with an explicitly given constant c_k (see also [13, 14, 15, 17]). This conjecture is only known in the classical cases of $k = 1, 2$ due to Hardy–Littlewood [25] and Ingham [33], respectively – in general the conjecture is wide open. However, recently a great deal of progress has been made on the order, especially under the assumption of the Riemann Hypothesis (RH). It is now known that

$$\frac{1}{T} \int_T^{2T} |\zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + it)|^{2k} dt \asymp (\log T)^{k^2}$$

for all real $k \geq 0$ on RH [26, 30, 55] (and unconditionally for $0 \leq k \leq 2$, [28]). Although we have stated these results for the Riemann zeta function, they are known (or expected) to hold for any ‘reasonable’ L -function i.e. those coming from arithmetic and in the Selberg class, say. Furthermore, finite sets of L -functions that satisfy Selberg’s orthonormality conjecture behave independently at the scale of the central limit theorem [9, 53], but conjecturally show slight dependence coming from the Euler product at the scale of moments [27]. Thus, for such L -functions (in particular for Dirichlet L -functions), the joint value distribution on the critical line is well understood, at least conjecturally. This gives satisfactory answers for distributional questions about the Hurwitz zeta function for rational shifts α , as carried out in [51].

When α is irrational, the behaviour of the Hurwitz zeta function is more mysterious and the lack of connection with L -functions allows many peculiarities to arise. Perhaps most notable – and in fact this also holds for any rational $\alpha \neq 1, \frac{1}{2}$ – is that there is no Euler product and consequently the Riemann Hypothesis fails quite spectacularly. It is classical [12, 16] that for any fixed $\delta > 0$ and $\alpha \neq 1, \frac{1}{2}$, $\zeta(s, \alpha)$ vanishes infinitely often in the strip $1 < \Re(s) < 1 + \delta$ and a similar result is known for substrips of the critical strip [23, 59] when α is transcendental or rational (see [43] for recent progress on the difficult case of algebraic irrational).

Nevertheless, since $\zeta(s, \alpha)$ possesses a functional equation one may expect various analytic aspects to be shared with the usual L -functions. In particular, one may expect a Lindelöf Hypothesis to hold up to, and on, the critical line [22]. It is therefore of interest to see how the lack of Euler product affects large values of $\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it, \alpha)$ for individual¹ irrational α .

Much work has gone into understanding the value distribution in the strip $1/2 < \sigma < 1$. Here, it is known that for all α , $\zeta(s, \alpha)$ possesses a limiting distribution for

¹Much of the past literature [1, 6, 34, 35, 39, 48, 60, 61] on the Lindelöf Hypothesis and mean values for $\zeta(s, \alpha)$ focuses on taking a mean-value over α for fixed s , a topic we do not pursue here.

large t [19, 20, 44] – an aspect shared by the usual zeta function. An analogue of Voronin’s famous universality theorem for $\zeta(s)$ is also known to hold here when α is rational or transcendental [7, 23]. Considerable effort has gone into aspects of this universality; see [2, 4, 20, 43, 45] for a slice of the relevant literature. Unfortunately, universality of $\zeta(s, \alpha)$ for a fixed algebraic irrational α remains open, although interesting progress has been made recently [43, 56] (see also [2] for discussions about this difficult problem).

On the critical line much less is known and the distribution is undetermined for irrational α . However, some moments are accessible. A result of Rane [49] states that for all $0 < \alpha \leq 1$,

$$(2) \quad \int_0^T |\zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, \alpha)|^2 dt = T \log T + T(c(\alpha) + \gamma - 1 - \log 2\pi) + O(T^{1/2} \log T)$$

where

$$c(\alpha) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \left(\sum_{n \leq N} \frac{1}{n + \alpha} - \log N \right).$$

See also [46, 57] for further improvements. Note that the above formula does not depend on any Diophantine properties of α and holds for rationals and irrationals alike.

Naturally, the fourth moment is more difficult. For rational α , on utilising formula (1) the leading term in the fourth moment was given by the second author in [51] (see also [2]). Here it was shown that for $1 \leq a < q$ with $(a, q) = 1$ and fixed $q \geq 3$,

$$(3) \quad \int_0^T |\zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, \tfrac{a}{q})|^4 dt \sim \frac{T(\log T)^4}{2\pi^2 q} \prod_{p|q} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p+1}\right).$$

This is smaller than the fourth moment of the Riemann zeta function which suggests a greater degree of cancellation. Furthermore, the main term here fluctuates very heavily depending on the denominator q , even for rationals that are close to each other. One may wonder then, with a view towards rational approximations of irrational α , about the uniformity of this result with respect to q and if the moments are *much* smaller when α is irrational. Our main result shows that this is indeed the case.

Theorem 1. *Suppose $0 < \alpha < 1$ is irrational with irrationality exponent $\mu(\alpha) < 3$. Then for large T we have*

$$\int_T^{2T} |\zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, \alpha)|^4 dt \ll T(\log T)^2.$$

We recall that the *irrationality exponent* $\mu(\alpha)$ of a real number α is defined as the supremum of the set of real numbers μ for which there exist infinitely many rational

numbers p/q such that

$$0 < |\alpha - p/q| < 1/q^\mu.$$

The irrationality exponent of rationals is 1 whereas $\mu(\alpha) \geq 2$ for irrational α . A famous theorem of Roth [50] gives that $\mu(\alpha) = 2$ for all algebraic irrationals whilst many transcendental numbers also have $\mu(\alpha) = 2$. Indeed, in the Lebesgue sense almost all real numbers have $\mu(\alpha) = 2$ and so, in particular, Theorem 1 holds for generic irrational α . The Liouville numbers provide examples of reals with $\mu(\alpha) = \infty$ and there exist many² so-called *very well approximable numbers* satisfying $\mu(\alpha) > 2$, see [32, 42].

Since the fourth moment is proportional to the second moment squared, an application of Hölder's inequality allows one to immediately determine the order of all lower moments.

Corollary 2. *Suppose $0 < \alpha < 1$ is irrational with $\mu(\alpha) < 3$. Then for real $0 \leq k \leq 2$ and large T we have*

$$\int_T^{2T} |\zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, \alpha)|^{2k} dt \asymp T(\log T)^k.$$

Theorem 1 and Corollary 2 may seem surprising from two perspectives. For those familiar with moment problems for L -functions from arithmetic, these results suggest that the Hurwitz zeta function is not log-normal, unlike the Riemann zeta function and other L -functions. A moment's reflection will convince the reader, however, that this is not too surprising: the Hurwitz zeta function has no Euler product, and the Euler product is crucially important for log-normality. On the other hand, those familiar with the Hurwitz zeta function may be surprised that these results are able to deal with all algebraic irrationals (as they have $\mu(\alpha) = 2$) but are not able to deal with all transcendental numbers (as those with $\mu(\alpha) \geq 3$ are not covered by our theorem). This is in contrast to work on Voronin universality or zero distributions, where the rational and transcendental cases are much easier, while the algebraic irrational case is harder (and, indeed, often open; see, for example, [2, 43, 56]). As we explain further at the end of this introduction, the reason behind our restriction on α is essentially that the off-diagonal terms are difficult to control with sufficient uniformity when α is very well approximable.

Theorem 1 naturally raises the question of asymptotics. We have some speculations in this regard. For transcendental α , the numbers $\log(n + \alpha)$ are linearly independent which suggests that the $(n + \alpha)^{-it}$ may act as independent random variables. This would entail Gaussian behaviour and accordingly one could expect the fourth moment to be $\sim 2T(\log T)^2$, in view of Rane's result (2). One can interpret this expectation as saying that the leading term in the fourth moment arises from what are essentially

²admittedly Lebesgue measure zero, but of full Hausdorff dimension.

diagonal terms in the approximate functional equation. Indeed, if the $(n + \alpha)^{-it}$ were purely orthogonal then we would expect

$$(4) \quad \int_T^{2T} |\zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, \alpha)|^4 dt \sim T \sum_{\substack{(n_1 + \alpha)(n_2 + \alpha) = \\ (n_3 + \alpha)(n_4 + \alpha) \\ n_j \leq T}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(n_1 + \alpha)(n_2 + \alpha)(n_3 + \alpha)(n_4 + \alpha)}}.$$

For irrational α the solutions of the given equation are simply the diagonals³ $n_1 = n_3$, $n_2 = n_4$ and $n_1 = n_4$, $n_2 = n_3$ which leads to the asymptotic

$$2T \left(\sum_{n \leq T} \frac{1}{n + \alpha} \right)^2 \sim 2T(\log T)^2.$$

Similarly, for higher moments one may expect that

$$(5) \quad \int_T^{2T} |\zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, \alpha)|^{2k} dt \sim T \sum_{\underline{n} \in D_k(T)} \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^{2k} (n_j + \alpha)^{1/2}}$$

where

$$D_k(T) = \left\{ (n_j)_{j=1}^{2k} \in \mathbb{N}^{2k} : \prod_{i=1}^k (n_i + \alpha) = \prod_{j=k+1}^{2k} (n_j + \alpha), \ n_j \leq T \right\}.$$

For α transcendental or algebraic of degree $d \geq k$ it is fairly easy to see that $D_k(T)$ consists of just permutations, giving $|D_k(T)| \sim k! T^k$. When $d < k$, there may exist solutions not arising from permutations, however, in [29] (see also [10]) it was shown that these contribute $\ll T^{k-d+1+\epsilon}$ and so one retains this asymptotic for $|D_k(T)|$. The effect of these extra solutions on the weighted sum in (5) is not clear, and the behaviour of the off-diagonals in higher moments is also not clear, especially with regards to dependence on $\mu(\alpha)$. Based on these considerations we make the following conjecture.

Conjecture 1. *Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ be an irrational number. Then for algebraic α of degree $d \geq k$ and transcendental α satisfying $\mu(\alpha) = 2$ we have*

$$\int_T^{2T} |\zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, \alpha)|^{2k} dt \sim k! T(\log T)^k$$

as $T \rightarrow \infty$.

³Here we should distinguish between the “harmonic” diagonals $(n_1 + \alpha)(n_2 + \alpha) = (n_3 + \alpha)(n_4 + \alpha)$ which lead to a non-oscillating sum and the “Diophantine” diagonals which are the permuted solutions $\{n_1, n_2\} = \{n_3, n_4\}$ of this equation.

In particular, we expect the asymptotic to hold for almost all α in the measure-theoretic sense. If one makes an additional average in the α -aspect (concretely, over $\alpha \in [1, 2]$), then the above was conjectured by Andersson in an unpublished part of his thesis [3], where he also proved his conjecture for $k = 2$. Thus, Theorem 1 can be seen as removing the averaging in Andersson's work, albeit at the cost of showing only an upper bound instead of an asymptotic. We discuss the difficulties in proving the $k = 2$ case of Conjecture 1 in §7.

Since Conjecture 1 speculates that $\zeta(s, \alpha)$ has the moments of a complex Gaussian with mean 0 and variance $\log T$, we acquire the following conjecture regarding the distribution of $\zeta(s, \alpha)$ on the critical line.

Conjecture 2. *Let $S \subset \mathbb{C}$ be Borel. Then for large T and almost all $0 < \alpha < 1$ we have*

$$\frac{1}{T} \text{meas} \left\{ t \in [T, 2T] : \frac{\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it, \alpha)}{\sqrt{\log T}} \in S \right\} \sim \frac{1}{2\pi} \iint_S e^{-(x^2+y^2)/2} dx dy.$$

Thus, unlike the case for $\zeta(s, 1) = \zeta(s)$, we expect $\zeta(s, \alpha)$ to be normal instead of log-normal for generic α . It would be interesting to understand, at least conjecturally, the finer aspects of the distribution such as large deviations and maximal values. For the Riemann zeta function, the behaviour of the tails are unclear although it has been speculated that they remain (essentially) log-normal up to the maximum [5] which, through using various random models, has been conjectured [18] to satisfy

$$\max_{t \in [T, 2T]} |\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it)| = \exp((1 + o(1)) \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \log T \log \log T}).$$

The random matrix theory and random Euler product models of [18] do not appear to have any immediate analogues for the Hurwitz zeta function (this is certainly true of the latter model when α is irrational). For such questions, it may be more appropriate to model the $(n + \alpha)^{-it}$ by independent random variables (in a similar fashion to [5]) however the robustness of this model is unclear at the extremes. At any rate, given the distribution in Conjecture 2 it seems possible that the true maximum of the Hurwitz zeta function could be markedly smaller than that of the Riemann zeta function for generic α ; it would be interesting to make this precise.

There exist several cousins of the Hurwitz zeta function which have also been the subject of intensive study in their value distribution. Most notable are the dual to the Hurwitz zeta function, namely the periodic zeta function,

$$P(s, \lambda) = \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{e(\lambda n)}{n^s},$$

and the more general Lerch zeta function

$$L(s, \alpha, \lambda) = \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{e(\lambda n)}{(n + \alpha)^s}$$

where as usual $e(x) = e^{2\pi i x}$ (for an overview, see [20]). Again, these are defined initially in $\Re(s) > 1$ and extend to functions on \mathbb{C} that are holomorphic except for a possible simple pole at $s = 1$ which only occurs if $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}$. The periodic zeta function $P(s, \alpha)$ is related to $\zeta(s, \alpha)$ by a functional equation; see (8) and, as with $\zeta(s, \alpha)$, it can be related to L -functions when α is a rational with no such relation likely when α is irrational. Through similar considerations to the above, on the critical line one might expect Gaussian-like behaviour for these functions also. In fact, by a short argument with the functional equation, the $2k$ th moment of $P(1/2 + it, \alpha)$ is equal to that of $\zeta(1/2 + it, \alpha)$ up to a negligible error. Theorem 1 thus also implies the order of magnitude for low moments of $P(s, \alpha)$.

Corollary 3. *Suppose $0 < \alpha < 1$ is irrational with $\mu(\alpha) < 3$. Then for $0 \leq k \leq 2$ and large T we have*

$$\int_T^{2T} |P(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, \alpha)|^{2k} dt \asymp T(\log T)^k.$$

Previously, the fourth moment of $P(s, \alpha)$ in the strip $1/2 < \sigma < 1$ was computed for *all* irrational α by Laurinćikas–Šiaučiūnas [41] where an asymptotic with leading term $c(\sigma, \alpha)T$ was given. The constant $c(\sigma, \alpha)$ implicitly contains some Diophantine information on α , although the influence is mild. Clearly, the distinction between rational and irrational cases becomes more pronounced on the half-line (it follows from (3) and (14) that for rational $\alpha = a/q$ the fourth moment on the critical line is $\sim c_q T(\log T)^4$). It is likely that our methods also generalise to the Lerch zeta function under irrationality and Diophantine assumptions on either α or λ , in which case we would similarly expect moments of size $T(\log T)^k$ and a Gaussian distribution. Currently, the second moment is known for $1/2 \leq \sigma < 1$ and all $0 < \alpha, \lambda < 1$ due to Garunkštis–Laurinćikas–Steuding [21].

We end this introduction with an explanation of the Diophantine assumptions on α in our results. Since the harmonics $(n + \alpha)^{-it}$ are not truly orthogonal at our scale, (4) is an oversimplification. In particular, when dealing with the off-diagonal terms in the mean value

$$\int_T^{2T} \left| \sum_{n \leq T} \frac{1}{(n + \alpha)^{1/2 + it}} \right|^4 dt,$$

it can happen that $(n_1 + \alpha)(n_2 + \alpha) \neq (n_3 + \alpha)(n_4 + \alpha)$ but that $(n_1 + \alpha)(n_2 + \alpha) - (n_3 + \alpha)(n_4 + \alpha)$ is still very close to zero. In the case of the usual zeta function ($\alpha = 1$) this difference is at worst 1, and for $\alpha = a/q$ at worst $1/q$, but for irrational

α it can be arbitrarily close to zero. Thus, there are potentially many off-diagonal terms with no oscillation, each term giving a contribution of size $\approx \int_T^{2T} 1 dt = T$. These worst cases occur when

$$\alpha \approx \frac{n_1 n_2 - n_3 n_4}{n_3 + n_4 - n_1 - n_2}$$

and so in order for them to not contribute a main term, we require α to not have too many good quality rational approximations. This naturally leads to assumptions on $\mu(\alpha)$. It is unclear whether the particular condition $\mu(\alpha) < 3$ is a technical limitation of our method or whether one should expect genuinely different behaviour for certain α which have larger irrationality exponent, $\mu(\alpha) = 3$ or 4, say.

When dealing with the off-diagonals, we will use our Diophantine assumptions on α to bound sums of reciprocals of fractional parts such as

$$\sum_{n \leq N} \frac{1}{\|n\alpha\|^\eta},$$

for $0 < \eta < 1$ which will arise naturally upon throwing away some possible cancellation. The order of these sums was worked out comprehensively by Kruse [38], and this indicates that weakening or removing the assumption that $\mu(\alpha) < 3$ will require a different treatment that exploits this cancellation that we neglected.

Notation. We use asymptotic notation $\ll, \gg, O(\cdot), o(\cdot), \sim, \asymp$ that is standard in analytic number theory. In particular, we use the Vinogradov notation $A \ll B$ interchangeably with the Bachmann-Landau notation $A = O(B)$ for the inequality $|A| \leq CB$, where C is some large unspecified constant and B is positive. The quantities A and B will typically depend on some parameters and the range in which the inequalities hold should be clear from context. Asymptotic statements may involve an arbitrarily small parameter $\epsilon > 0$, which may vary from occurrence to occurrence. To distinguish arbitrary epsilons from fixed ones, we shall use ε for the latter in the proof of Lemma 2. Implicit constants may depend on α throughout and ϵ wherever it appears, but will be uniform in other parameters unless specified via subscripts. The parameter

$$\tau := \sqrt{t/2\pi}$$

will appear throughout the paper. Finally we use the standard notation for additive characters, $e(t) := e^{2\pi i t}$.

Acknowledgements. We thank Steve Gonek and Trevor Wooley for useful discussions on these topics. AS is partially supported through Purdue University start-up funding available to Trevor Wooley.

2. PRELIMINARIES ON DIOPHANTINE APPROXIMATION

We first recall a few basic properties of continued fraction expansions. These can be found in many sources e.g. see [11, 40]. Let

$$\alpha = [a_0; a_1, a_2, \dots] = a_0 + \frac{1}{a_1 + \frac{1}{a_2 + \frac{1}{\ddots}}},$$

be the continued fraction expansion of α , and let

$$\frac{p_k}{q_k} = [a_0; a_1, \dots, a_k],$$

be the principal convergents of α . We call a_k the partial quotients of α . An induction gives the following recursions

$$\begin{aligned} p_{k+1} &= a_{k+1}p_k + p_{k-1} \\ q_{k+1} &= a_{k+1}q_k + q_{k-1} \end{aligned}$$

and note the second of these implies $a_{k+1} \leq q_{k+1}/q_k$.

A consequence of Dirichlet's approximation theorem is that for irrational α there exist infinitely many p, q such that

$$\left| \alpha - \frac{p}{q} \right| < \frac{1}{q^2}.$$

The principal convergents form a sequence of best possible approximations to α in the sense that q_k is the smallest integer $q > q_{k-1}$ such that $\|q\alpha\| < \|q_{k-1}\alpha\|$ where here and throughout

$$\|x\| = \min_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} |x - n|$$

is the distance of x to the nearest integer. They also satisfy the inequalities

$$\frac{1}{2q_k q_{k+1}} < \left| \alpha - \frac{p_k}{q_k} \right| < \frac{1}{q_k q_{k+1}}$$

from which the following formula for the irrationality exponent can be deduced

$$\mu(\alpha) = 1 + \limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log q_{k+1}}{\log q_k}.$$

See Theorem 1 of [54]. Note that our condition $\mu(\alpha) < 3$ implies there exists some δ such that for large q_k ,

$$(6) \quad q_{k+1} \ll q_k^{2-\delta}.$$

In other words, the denominators in our rational approximations do not grow too rapidly. This will be the form in which we make use of our condition $\mu(\alpha) < 3$.

We now state our main lemma on sums of reciprocals of fractional parts. The order of these sums was worked out fairly comprehensively by Kruse [38] although we can also recommend the memoir [8] for an exposition of this topic and further interesting results including explicit bounds.

Lemma 1. *Suppose α is irrational with $\mu(\alpha) < 3$. Then,*

$$\sum_{h \leq N} \frac{1}{\|h\alpha\|^{1/2}} \ll N$$

Proof. This follows from [38, Theorem 1]. Specifically, plugging $t = 1/2$ in [38, Equation 73], and rewriting in our notation, one has

$$\sum_{h \leq N} \frac{1}{\|h\alpha\|^{1/2}} \asymp N + N^{1/2} a_{K+1}^{1/2},$$

where $K = K(N)$ is the largest integer such that $q_K \leq N < q_{K+1}$. But $a_{K+1} \leq q_{K+1}/q_K \ll q_K \leq N$ with the second inequality following by (6). The result then follows. \square

We will also be required to demonstrate cancellation in the bilinear sum

$$\sum_{h \leq y} \sum_{k \leq x} e(-\alpha dhk),$$

where any power savings in both x and y will suffice. To this end, we have the following.

Lemma 2. *Suppose α is irrational with $\mu(\alpha) \leq 3 - \delta$ for a given $\delta > 0$. Then,*

$$(7) \quad \sum_{h \leq x} \sum_{k \leq y} e(-\alpha dhk) \ll d(xy)^{1-\delta/5}.$$

uniformly in $d \geq 1$.

Proof. In this proof, every occurrence of $\varepsilon > 0$ is the same and sufficiently small. At the end, we will choose a value for ε . Without loss of generality we may assume $x \leq y$. For $\varepsilon > 0$ let $\ell = \ell(xy, \varepsilon)$ be the minimal integer such that $q_\ell > (xy)^{1/2+\varepsilon}$. We note that

$$x < (xy)^{1/2+\varepsilon} < q_\ell \ll q_{\ell-1}^{2-\delta} \ll (xy)^{1-\delta/2+2\varepsilon},$$

by (6) and then the minimality of ℓ .

Now,

$$\left| \alpha - \frac{p_\ell}{q_\ell} \right| < \frac{1}{q_\ell^2} < \frac{1}{(xy)^{1+2\varepsilon}}$$

and hence

$$\sum_{h \leq x} \sum_{k \leq y} e(-\alpha dhk) = \sum_{h \leq x} \sum_{k \leq y} e(-dhk \frac{p_\ell}{q_\ell}) + O(d(xy)^{1-2\varepsilon})$$

since $|e(X) - 1| \ll X$ uniformly in X . The latter sum may be decomposed as

$$\left[\sum_{\substack{h \leq x \\ q_\ell | dh}} + \sum_{\substack{h \leq x \\ q_\ell \nmid dh}} \right] \sum_{k \leq y} e(-dhk \frac{p_\ell}{q_\ell}) \ll y \sum_{\substack{h \leq x \\ q_\ell | dh}} 1 + \sum_{\substack{h \leq x \\ q_\ell \nmid dh}} \frac{1}{\|dh p_\ell / q_\ell\|}.$$

The first sum on the right is $\ll dxy/q_\ell \ll d(xy)^{1/2-\varepsilon}$. Letting $d^* = d/(d, q_\ell)$ and $q_\ell^* = q_\ell/(d, q_\ell)$ the second sum may be written as

$$\sum_{\substack{h \leq x \\ q_\ell \nmid dh}} \frac{1}{\|h p_\ell d^* / q_\ell^*\|} = \sum_{g | q_\ell^*} \sum_{\substack{h \leq x \\ (h, q_\ell^*) = g \\ q_\ell \nmid dh}} \frac{1}{\|(h/g) \cdot \frac{p_\ell d^*}{q_\ell^*/g}\|}$$

and as h/g varies between 1 and q_ℓ^*/g we see that each congruence class modulo q_ℓ^*/g is hit at most once by $(h/g)p_\ell d^*$ by coprimality. Therefore, since $x < q_\ell$, this sum is

$$\ll \sum_{g | q_\ell^*} \left[\mathbb{1}_{x \leq q_\ell^*/g} \sum_{1 \leq n \leq x} \frac{1}{n/(q_\ell^*/g)} + \mathbb{1}_{x > q_\ell^*/g} \frac{x}{q_\ell^*/g} \sum_{1 \leq n \leq q_\ell^*/g} \frac{1}{n/(q_\ell^*/g)} \right] \ll q_\ell d(q_\ell) \log q_\ell,$$

which is $\ll q_\ell^{1+\varepsilon} \ll (xy)^{1-\delta/2+3\varepsilon}$ (here, $d(n)$ is the divisor function). Thus, combining the above estimates,

$$\sum_{h \leq x} \sum_{k \leq y} e(-\alpha dhk) \ll d(xy)^{1-2\varepsilon} + (xy)^{1-\delta/2+3\varepsilon}.$$

Setting $\varepsilon = \delta/10$, we conclude the lemma. □

3. APPROXIMATE FUNCTIONAL EQUATION

In this section we derive a smoothed form of the basic approximate functional equation. Let

$$\chi(s) = \pi^{1/2-s} \frac{\Gamma((1-s)/2)}{\Gamma(s/2)},$$

which is the factor appearing in the functional equation of the Riemann zeta function $\zeta(s) = \chi(s)\zeta(1-s)$. Note that $|\chi(\frac{1}{2} + it)| = 1$.

Lemma 3. *Let $G(z)$ be an entire, even, function satisfying $|G(z)| \ll_C e^{-\Im(z)^2}$ for $\Re(z) \leq C$ and $\overline{G(z)} = G(\bar{z})$. Then, for any $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ and $t \geq 1$ we have*

$$\zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, \alpha) = \sum_{m \geq 0} \frac{w_t(m + \alpha)}{(m + \alpha)^{1/2+it}} + \chi(\tfrac{1}{2} + it) \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{e(-n\alpha)}{n^{1/2-it}} w_t(n) + O(t^{-1/2})$$

where

$$w_t(x) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{1-i\infty}^{1+i\infty} (\tau/x)^s G(s) \frac{ds}{s}.$$

Proof. We start from the contour integral

$$I = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{1-i\infty}^{1+i\infty} \zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + it + s, \alpha) \tau^s G(s) \frac{ds}{s}.$$

Shifting the contour to $\Re(s) = -1$ we pick up poles at $s = 0$ and $s = -1/2 - it$. Due to the rapid decay of $G(s)$, the latter pole contributes $O(e^{-At})$. Thus,

$$I = \zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, \alpha) + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{-1-i\infty}^{-1+i\infty} \zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + it + s, \alpha) \tau^s G(s) \frac{ds}{s} + O(e^{-At}).$$

In this last integral we let $s \mapsto -s$ and apply the functional equation for the Hurwitz zeta function [37, Equation 2] in the form

$$(8) \quad \zeta(1 - z, \alpha) = \frac{\chi(1 - z)}{2 \cos(\frac{\pi z}{2})} \left[e^{-\frac{\pi i z}{2}} P(z, \alpha) + e^{\frac{\pi i z}{2}} P(z, -\alpha) \right]$$

where $P(s, \alpha)$ is the periodic zeta function from the introduction, given by

$$P(s, \alpha) = \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{e(n\alpha)}{n^s},$$

when $\Re(s) > 1$. The integral then becomes

$$\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{1-i\infty}^{1+i\infty} \chi(\tfrac{1}{2} + it - s) Q(t, s, \alpha) \tau^{-s} G(s) \frac{ds}{s},$$

where $Q(t, s, \alpha)$ is given by

$$\frac{\exp(-\frac{\pi}{2}(\frac{i}{2} + t + is)) P(\frac{1}{2} - it + s, \alpha) + \exp(\frac{\pi}{2}(\frac{i}{2} + t + is)) P(\frac{1}{2} - it + s, -\alpha)}{2 \cos(\frac{\pi}{2}(\frac{1}{2} - it + s))}.$$

Now, for large t and $\Re(s) = 1$, we see that

$$(9) \quad Q(t, s, \alpha) = P(\tfrac{1}{2} - it + s, -\alpha) + O(e^{-\pi t + \pi|s|})$$

since $P(\frac{1}{2} - it + s, \pm\alpha)$ is bounded in this region and

$$\frac{\exp(-\frac{\pi}{2}(\frac{i}{2} + t + is))}{2 \cos(\frac{\pi}{2}(\frac{1}{2} - it + s))} \ll e^{-\pi t + \pi|s|}, \quad \frac{\exp(\frac{\pi}{2}(\frac{i}{2} + t + is))}{2 \cos(\frac{\pi}{2}(\frac{1}{2} - it + s))} = 1 + O(e^{-\pi t + \pi|s|})$$

uniformly in $\Im(s)$. Due to the rapid decay of $G(s)$ and since $\chi(\frac{1}{2} + it - s) = O(|s|)$ on $\Re(s) = 1$, the error term of (9) contributes $\ll e^{-At}$.

Next, using Stirling's formula, we truncate the integral at height $\Im(s) = \pm C\sqrt{t}$ for some sufficiently large C at the cost of an error $\ll e^{-At}$. Then, using Stirling's formula again,

$$\tau^{-s}\chi(\tfrac{1}{2} + it - s) = \tau^s\chi(\tfrac{1}{2} + it)(1 + O(\tfrac{1+|s|^2}{t})).$$

The error term here contributes

$$\ll t^{-1/2} \sum_{m \geq 1} \frac{1}{m^{3/2}} \ll t^{-1/2}$$

and re-extending the integrals also gives an acceptable error.

Putting this together, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, \alpha) &= \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{1-i\infty}^{1+i\infty} \left\{ \zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + it + s, \alpha) + \right. \\ &\quad \left. \chi(\tfrac{1}{2} + it)P(\tfrac{1}{2} - it + s, -\alpha) \right\} \tau^s G(s) \frac{ds}{s} + O(t^{-1/2}) \end{aligned}$$

We can now unfold the Hurwitz zeta function and the periodic zeta function as generalised Dirichlet series and interchange the order of integration and summation to conclude the lemma. □

Note that the proof above does not require $\overline{G(z)} = G(\bar{z})$. However, making this assumption ensures that the weight $w_t(x)$ is real, which will be used crucially in the sequel. The prototypical choice for the kernel is $G(z) = e^{z^2}$.

By shifting the line of integration in the weights $w_t(x)$ to $\Re(s) = \pm A$ for some $A > 1$, we find that

$$(10) \quad w_t(x) = \begin{cases} 1 + O((x/\sqrt{t})^A) & \text{if } x \leq \tau \\ O((\sqrt{t}/x)^A) & \text{if } x > \tau. \end{cases}$$

Accordingly, we may restrict the sums in Lemma 3 to $m, n \leq T^{1/2+\epsilon}$ if necessary. In a similar way we find that

$$(11) \quad t^j \frac{d^j}{dt^j} w_t(x) \ll \min(x/\sqrt{t}, \sqrt{t}/x)^A.$$

These estimates will be used throughout.

4. STATEMENT OF MAIN PROPOSITIONS AND PROOFS OF THEOREM 1, COROLLARY 2, AND COROLLARY 3

In the rest of the paper, the majority of work will be in proving the following two fourth moment asymptotics.

Proposition 4. *Let $\Phi(t)$ be a smooth non-negative function of compact support in $[1/2, 5/2]$ with derivatives satisfying $\Phi^{(j)}(t) \ll_j T^\epsilon$ for all fixed $j \geq 0$. Then for large T and irrational α satisfying $\mu(\alpha) < 3$, we have*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{w_t(n + \alpha)}{(n + \alpha)^{1/2+it}} \right|^4 \Phi(t/T) dt = \frac{\hat{\Phi}(0)}{2} T(\log T)^2 + O(T(\log T)^{5/3}).$$

Proposition 5. *Under the same conditions we have*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{e(-n\alpha)}{n^{1/2-it}} w_t(n) \right|^4 \Phi(t/T) dt = \frac{\hat{\Phi}(0)}{2} T(\log T)^2 + O(T \log T).$$

We now show how to deduce our main results from the above propositions.

Proof of Theorem 1. Take Φ to satisfy the conditions of Proposition 4 whilst majorising the characteristic function of the interval $[1, 2]$ so that

$$\int_T^{2T} |\zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, \alpha)|^4 dt \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, \alpha)|^4 \Phi(t/T) dt.$$

Write

$$S_1 = \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{1}{(n + \alpha)^{1/2+it}} w_t(n + \alpha), \quad S_2 = \chi(\tfrac{1}{2} + it) \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{e(-n\alpha)}{n^{1/2-it}} w_t(n)$$

so that by Lemma 3,

$$\zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, \alpha) = S_1 + S_2 + O(t^{-1/2}).$$

Taking the absolute fourth power and expanding gives

$$(12) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} |\zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, \alpha)|^4 \Phi(t/T) dt = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(|S_1|^4 + 4|S_1|^2|S_2|^2 + |S_2|^4 + 4\Re S_1^2 \overline{S_1 S_2} + 2\Re S_1^2 \overline{S_2}^2 + 4\Re S_1 S_2 \overline{S_2}^2 \right) \Phi(t/T) dt + E(T)$$

where

$$E(T) \ll \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(|S_1|^3 + |S_2|^3 + |S_1||S_2|^2 + |S_1|^2|S_2| \right) \Phi(t/T) \frac{dt}{t^{1/2}}.$$

By Propositions 4 and 5 along with Hölder's inequality we find

$$(13) \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} |S_1|^2 |S_2|^2 \Phi(t/T) dt \ll T(\log T)^2, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}} |S_i| |S_j|^3 \Phi(t/T) dt \ll T(\log T)^2$$

and similarly

$$E(T) \ll \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} \Phi(t/T) \frac{dt}{t^2} \right)^{1/4} \left[\max_{j \in \{1, 2\}} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} |S_j|^4 \Phi(t/T) dt \right)^{3/4} \right] \ll T^{1/2} (\log T)^{3/2}.$$

Theorem 1 then follows. \square

Proof of Corollary 2. For the upper bound, Hölder's inequality gives for any $0 \leq k \leq 2$,

$$\int_T^{2T} |\zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, \alpha)|^{2k} dt \leq T^{1-k/2} \left(\int_T^{2T} |\zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, \alpha)|^4 dt \right)^{k/2} \ll T(\log T)^k.$$

By Rane's bound (2), for $k \geq 1$ we have

$$T \log T \sim \int_T^{2T} |\zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, \alpha)|^2 dt \leq T^{1-1/k} \left(\int_T^{2T} |\zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, \alpha)|^{2k} dt \right)^{1/k}$$

whilst for $0 \leq k \leq 1$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} T \log T &\ll \left(\int_T^{2T} |\zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, \alpha)|^{2k} dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2-k}} \left(\int_T^{2T} |\zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, \alpha)|^4 dt \right)^{\frac{1-k}{2-k}} \\ &\ll \left(\int_T^{2T} |\zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, \alpha)|^{2k} dt \right)^{\frac{1}{2-k}} (T \log^2 T)^{\frac{1-k}{2-k}} \end{aligned}$$

and rearranging gives the lower bound. \square

Proof of Corollary 3. By an argument similar to (9) with $s = 0$ along with the bound $P(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, \alpha) \ll t$, which follows in the usual way by Stieltjes integration, one has that

$$\zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, \alpha) = \chi(\tfrac{1}{2} + it) P(\tfrac{1}{2} - it, -\alpha) + O(te^{-\pi t}).$$

Whence,

$$(14) \quad \int_T^{2T} |P(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, \alpha)|^{2k} dt = (1 + O(e^{-0.04T})) \int_T^{2T} |\zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, \alpha)|^{2k} dt + O(e^{-6kT})$$

since the χ -factor has modulus 1 and the contribution to the integral from those t for which $\zeta(\tfrac{1}{2} + it, \alpha) \ll e^{-3.1T}$, say, is clearly negligible. The result follows by Corollary 2. \square

5. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4

5.1. Diagonal terms. Expanding the fourth power and pushing the integral through the sum we find

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{w_t(n + \alpha)}{(n + \alpha)^{1/2 + it}} \right|^4 \Phi(t/T) dt \\ = \sum_{n_j \geq 0} \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^4 (n_j + \alpha)^{1/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\frac{(n_1 + \alpha)(n_2 + \alpha)}{(n_3 + \alpha)(n_4 + \alpha)} \right)^{-it} \Phi(t/T) w_t^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{n}) dt. \end{aligned}$$

where

$$w_t^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{n}) = w_t(n_1 + \alpha)w_t(n_2 + \alpha)w_t(n_3 + \alpha)w_t(n_4 + \alpha)$$

for convenience.

The diagonal terms, i.e. those for which $(n_1 + \alpha)(n_2 + \alpha) = (n_3 + \alpha)(n_4 + \alpha)$, contribute

$$\mathcal{I}_D := \sum_{\substack{(n_1+\alpha)(n_2+\alpha) \\ = (n_3+\alpha)(n_4+\alpha)}} \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^4 (n_j + \alpha)^{1/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \Phi(t/T) w_t^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{n}) dt$$

and since for irrational α the only solutions of the given equation are $n_1 = n_3, n_2 = n_4$ and $n_1 = n_4, n_2 = n_3$, this is

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(2 \left(\sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{w_t(n + \alpha)^2}{(n + \alpha)} \right)^2 - \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{w_t(n + \alpha)^4}{(n + \alpha)^2} \right) \Phi(t/T) dt$$

by symmetry.

By (10),

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{w_t(n + \alpha)^2}{(n + \alpha)} &= \sum_{0 \leq n \leq \sqrt{t/2\pi} - \alpha} \frac{1}{(n + \alpha)} + O\left(\sum_{0 \leq n \leq \sqrt{t/2\pi} - \alpha} \frac{(n + \alpha)^{A-1}}{t^{A/2}} \right) \\ &\quad + O\left(\sum_{n \geq \sqrt{t/2\pi} - \alpha} \frac{t^{A/2}}{(n + \alpha)^{A+1}} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \log(t/2\pi) + O(1). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, $\sum_{n \geq 0} w_t(n + \alpha)^4 (n + \alpha)^{-2} \ll 1$ and so

$$\mathcal{I}_D = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} (\log(t/2\pi) + O(1))^2 \Phi(t/T) dt = \frac{\hat{\Phi}(0)}{2} T (\log T)^2 + O(T \log T).$$

It remains to show that the off-diagonal terms contribute at most $\ll T(\log T)^{5/3}$.

5.2. Off diagonal terms: initial cleaning. In this subsection we perform some fairly standard procedures; first restricting the off-diagonals to the “close” off-diagonals and then applying Taylor expansions of the summands.

The off diagonal terms are given by

$$\mathcal{I}_O := \sum_{\substack{n_j \geq 0 \\ (n_1+\alpha)(n_2+\alpha) \\ \neq (n_3+\alpha)(n_4+\alpha)}} \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^4 (n_j + \alpha)^{1/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\frac{(n_1 + \alpha)(n_2 + \alpha)}{(n_3 + \alpha)(n_4 + \alpha)} \right)^{-it} \Phi(t/T) w_t^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{n}) dt.$$

We divide this sum into three cases, depending on whether $\max(n_1, n_2)$ is greater than, less than, or equal to $\max(n_3, n_4)$.

The lattermost case contributes a lower order term; to see this, by symmetry it suffices to bound

$$\sum_{\substack{0 \leq n_2, n_4 \leq n_1 \\ n_2 \neq n_4}} \frac{1}{(n_1 + \alpha)(n_2 + \alpha)^{1/2}(n_4 + \alpha)^{1/2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(1 + \frac{h}{n_4 + \alpha}\right)^{-it} \Phi(t/T) w_t^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{n}) dt,$$

where $h = n_2 - n_4$ and where $w_t^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{n}) = w_t(n_1 + \alpha)^2 w_t(n_2 + \alpha) w_t(n_4 + \alpha)$. Integrating by parts j times using (11), we find

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(1 + \frac{h}{n_4 + \alpha}\right)^{-it} \Phi(t/T) w_t^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{n}) dt \ll_j \frac{T}{|T \log(1 + \frac{h}{n_4 + \alpha})|^j}.$$

Thus, if $h/(n_4 + \alpha) \gg T^{-1+\epsilon}$, then the above quantity is $\ll T^{-A}$ on taking j large enough and hence such terms may be omitted. For the remaining terms, without losing generality we only bound the terms with $h > 0$. The close diagonal condition $h \ll (n_4 + \alpha)T^{-1+\epsilon}$ implies that $n_2 + \alpha = (n_4 + \alpha)(1 + O(T^{-1+\epsilon}))$. Recalling that the weights restrict to $n_j \leq T^{1/2+\epsilon}$ and estimating the integral trivially, we get that this sum is

$$\ll T \sum_{\substack{0 \leq n_4 \leq n_1 \leq T^{1/2+\epsilon} \\ 0 < h \leq \frac{(n_4 + \alpha)}{T^{1-\epsilon}}}} \frac{1}{(n_1 + \alpha)(n_4 + \alpha)} \ll T^{1/2+\epsilon}.$$

We remark here that a similar argument shows that terms with $n_j = 0$ can be safely ignored, and so we can assume $n_j \geq 1$.

Now, returning to \mathcal{I}_O , the terms with $\max(n_1, n_2) < \max(n_3, n_4)$ are seen to be conjugates of those with $\max(n_1, n_2) > \max(n_3, n_4)$ due to the symmetry $(n_1, n_2) \leftrightarrow (n_3, n_4)$. Pairing these terms together, we get

$$\Re \left(\sum_{\substack{n_j \geq 1 \\ \max(n_3, n_4) > \max(n_1, n_2) \\ (n_1 + \alpha)(n_2 + \alpha) \neq (n_3 + \alpha)(n_4 + \alpha)}} \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^4 (n_j + \alpha)^{1/2}} \times \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\frac{(n_1 + \alpha)(n_2 + \alpha)}{(n_3 + \alpha)(n_4 + \alpha)} \right)^{-it} \Phi(t/T) w_t^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{n}) dt \right).$$

We now let

$$(n_1 + \alpha)(n_2 + \alpha) - (n_3 + \alpha)(n_4 + \alpha) = h_1 + h_2 \alpha$$

with

$$(15) \quad h_1 = n_1 n_2 - n_3 n_4, \quad h_2 = n_1 + n_2 - n_3 - n_4$$

and note that $h_1 \ll T^{1+\epsilon}$ and $h_2 \ll T^{1/2+\epsilon}$.

We restrict again to close off-diagonals. Integrating by parts j times using (11) we see that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp \left(it \log \left(1 + \frac{h_1 + h_2 \alpha}{(n_3 + \alpha)(n_4 + \alpha)} \right) \right) \Phi(t/T) w_t^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{n}) dt \ll_j \frac{T}{|T \log(1 + \frac{h_1 + h_2 \alpha}{(n_3 + \alpha)(n_4 + \alpha)})|^j}.$$

Thus, if $(h_1 + h_2 \alpha)/(n_3 + \alpha)(n_4 + \alpha) \gg T^{-1+\epsilon}$ then the above quantity is $\ll T^{-A}$ on taking j large enough, and so we may omit such terms. For the remaining terms we apply the expansions

$$\begin{aligned} \log \left(\frac{(n_1 + \alpha)(n_2 + \alpha)}{(n_3 + \alpha)(n_4 + \alpha)} \right) &= \frac{h_1 + h_2 \alpha}{(n_3 + \alpha)(n_4 + \alpha)} + O(T^{-2+\epsilon}) \\ \left(\frac{(n_1 + \alpha)(n_2 + \alpha)}{(n_3 + \alpha)(n_4 + \alpha)} \right)^{-it} &= \exp \left(-it \frac{h_1 + h_2 \alpha}{(n_3 + \alpha)(n_4 + \alpha)} \right) + O(T^{-1+\epsilon}) \\ (n_1 + \alpha)(n_2 + \alpha) &= (n_3 + \alpha)(n_4 + \alpha)(1 + O(T^{-1+\epsilon})). \end{aligned}$$

The errors acquired from these approximations are

$$\ll \sum_{\substack{n_j \geq 1 \\ \max(n_3, n_4) > \max(n_1, n_2) \\ 0 < |h_1 + h_2 \alpha| \ll \frac{(n_3 + \alpha)(n_4 + \alpha)}{T^{1-\epsilon}}}} \frac{1}{(n_3 + \alpha)(n_4 + \alpha)} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\Phi(t/T) |w_t^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{n})|}{T^{1-\epsilon}} dt.$$

Pushing the sum inside, recalling by (10) that w_t restricts the sums to $n_j \leq T^{1/2+\epsilon}$ and computing the integral, this is

$$\ll T^\epsilon \sum_{\substack{1 \leq n_j \leq T^{1/2+\epsilon} \\ 0 < |h_1 + h_2 \alpha| \ll \frac{(n_3 + \alpha)(n_4 + \alpha)}{T^{1-\epsilon}} \\ h_1 = n_1 n_2 - n_3 n_4 \\ h_2 = n_1 + n_2 - n_3 - n_4}} \frac{1}{(n_3 + \alpha)(n_4 + \alpha)}.$$

We allow h_1, h_2, n_3, n_4 to vary freely. There are $\ll T^{1/2+\epsilon}$ choices for h_2 . After fixing that, there are $\ll (n_3 + \alpha)(n_4 + \alpha)/T^{1-\epsilon}$ choices for h_1 . Then, there are $\ll T^{1/2+\epsilon}$ choices for n_3, n_4 . Finally, applying a divisor bound on the constraint $n_1 n_2 = h_1 + n_3 n_4$ gives that there are $\ll T^\epsilon$ choices for n_1 and n_2 . Note that it is not possible that $h_1 + n_3 n_4 = 0$, since we have discarded the terms with $n_1 = 0$ or $n_2 = 0$. We see thus that the above sum is $\ll T^{1/2+\epsilon}$, which is good enough.

Thus far we have

$$\mathcal{I}_O = \Re \left(\sum_{\substack{n_j \geq 1 \\ \max(n_3, n_4) > \max(n_1, n_2) \\ 0 < |h_1 + h_2 \alpha| \ll \frac{(n_3 + \alpha)(n_4 + \alpha)}{T^{1-\epsilon}}}} \frac{1}{(n_3 + \alpha)(n_4 + \alpha)} \times \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp \left(it \frac{h_1 + h_2 \alpha}{(n_3 + \alpha)(n_4 + \alpha)} \right) \Phi(t/T) w_t(\underline{n}) dt \right) + O(T^{1/2+\epsilon})$$

Integrating by parts, the main term here is the negative of the imaginary part of

$$\sum_{\substack{n_j \geq 1 \\ \max(n_3, n_4) > \max(n_1, n_2) \\ 0 < |h_1 + h_2 \alpha| \ll \frac{(n_3 + \alpha)(n_4 + \alpha)}{T^{1-\epsilon}}}} \frac{1}{h_1 + h_2 \alpha} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp \left(it \frac{h_1 + h_2 \alpha}{(n_3 + \alpha)(n_4 + \alpha)} \right) \frac{d}{dt} (\Phi(t/T) w_t^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{n})) dt.$$

Note that $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{d}{dt} (\Phi(t/T) w_t^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{n})) dt = 0$ due to the compact support of Φ . Subtracting this from inner integral and pushing the sum through, we now focus on

$$\mathcal{I}' := \sum_{\substack{n_j \geq 1 \\ \max(n_3, n_4) > \max(n_1, n_2) \\ 0 < |h_1 + h_2 \alpha| \ll \frac{(n_3 + \alpha)(n_4 + \alpha)}{T^{1-\epsilon}}}} \frac{1}{h_1 + h_2 \alpha} \left\{ \exp \left(it \frac{h_1 + h_2 \alpha}{(n_3 + \alpha)(n_4 + \alpha)} \right) - 1 \right\} w_t^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{n}).$$

The purpose of this subtraction is to emulate the unsmoothed integral $\int_T^{2T} \exp(iHt) dt = (e^{2iHT} - e^{iHT})/iH$ which more visibly has a finite limit when $H \rightarrow 0$. This is required since $h_1 + h_2 \alpha$ can become arbitrarily small (depending on Diophantine properties of α).

We will show in the next subsection that for $t \asymp T$ and $\mu(\alpha) < 3$, $\mathcal{I}' \ll T(\log T)^{5/3}$. Replacing $w_t^{\mathcal{I}}(\underline{n})$ here by $\frac{d}{dt} w_t(\underline{n})$ can be dealt in a similar way using (11) with the resultant bound having a factor of T^{-1} compared with the above bound for \mathcal{I}' .

From these we acquire

$$\mathcal{I}_O \ll \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\frac{1}{T} |\Phi'(t/T)| \cdot T(\log T)^{5/3} + |\Phi(t/T)| (\log T)^{5/3} \right) dt \ll T(\log T)^{5/3},$$

as desired to finish the proof of the proposition.

We record at this point the trivial observation

$$(16) \quad \exp(itx) - 1 \ll \min(1, T|x|),$$

for $t \asymp T$ and uniformly in x which shall be used in the sequel.

5.3. Parametrising solutions to the off-diagonal equations. It remains to bound \mathcal{I}' . Since \mathcal{I}' is invariant under swapping $n_3 \leftrightarrow n_4$, without loss of generality we can add the hypothesis $n_4 \leq n_3$ to the sum. Thus, we have that $n_1, n_2 < n_3$. We now find parametrised solutions to (15) and express our sum over n_j in terms of these parameters.

Fix h_1, h_2 , and n_3 and set $k = n_3 - n_1$. We get from (15) that

$$(17) \quad n_2 = h_2 + n_4 + k, \quad n_4 = n_3 - h_2 - k + \frac{n_3 h_2 - h_1}{k}.$$

This tells us that $k \mid h_2 n_3 - h_1$ and $k \geq 1$. Relabelling $n_3 \mapsto n$; rearranging the sum with h_1, h_2, n outside and k inside; and setting

$$n^* = n - k - h_2 + (nh_2 - h_1)/k,$$

we find that it suffices to bound

$$\sum_{n \geq 1} \sum_{\substack{k \mid nh_2 - h_1 \\ 0 < |h_1 + h_2 \alpha| \ll \frac{(n+\alpha)^2}{T^{1-\epsilon}}}} \frac{1}{h_1 + h_2 \alpha} \left\{ \exp \left(it \frac{h_1 + h_2 \alpha}{(n + \alpha)(n^* + \alpha)} \right) - 1 \right\} W_{\mathcal{I},t}(h_1, h_2, n, k),$$

where, for brevity,

$$(18) \quad W_{\mathcal{I},t}(h_1, h_2, n, k) = w_t(n + k + \alpha) w_t(n + \frac{nh_2 - h_1}{k} + \alpha) \\ \times w_t(n + \alpha) w_t(n - k - h_2 + \frac{nh_2 - h_1}{k} + \alpha).$$

We rearrange the innermost sum in terms of the greatest common divisor $g = (k, h_2)$. Clearly, the divisibility constraint $k \mid nh_2 - h_1$ ensures that $g \mid h_1$ as well. Replacing (k, h_1, h_2) with (gk, gh_1, gh_2) and pulling the sum over g out, we get

$$\sum_{1 \leq g \ll T^\epsilon} \frac{1}{g} \sum_{n \geq 1} \sum_{\substack{k \mid nh_2 - h_1 \\ 0 < |h_1 + h_2 \alpha| \ll \frac{(n+\alpha)^2}{gT^{1-\epsilon}} \\ (k, h_2) = 1}} \frac{1}{h_1 + h_2 \alpha} \\ \times \left\{ \exp \left(igt \frac{h_1 + h_2 \alpha}{(n + \alpha)(n_g^* + \alpha)} \right) - 1 \right\} W_{\mathcal{I},t}(gh_1, gh_2, n, gk)$$

where

$$(19) \quad n_g^* = n - gk - gh_2 + (nh_2 - h_1)/k.$$

We divide the above sum into three cases:

- h_1 and h_2 have the same sign.
- h_1 and h_2 have opposite signs and $|h_1 + h_2 \alpha| \geq \frac{1}{2g}$.
- h_1 and h_2 have opposite signs and $|h_1 + h_2 \alpha| < \frac{1}{2g}$.

5.4. Denominator case I: same sign. We deal with $h_1, h_2 \geq 0$, noting that a similar argument works for $h_1, h_2 \leq 0$. The constraint $|h_1 + h_2\alpha| \ll (n + \alpha)^2 g^{-1} T^{-1+\epsilon}$ now implies that in fact $h_1, h_2 \ll g^{-1} T^\epsilon$. Thus by (16), such terms trivially contribute

$$\begin{aligned} &\ll \sum_{1 \leq g \ll T^\epsilon} \frac{1}{g} \sum_{h_1, h_2 \ll \frac{T^\epsilon}{g}} \frac{1}{h_1 + h_2\alpha} \sum_{n \geq 1} \sum_{\substack{k | nh_2 - h_1 \\ (k, h_2) = 1}} |W_{\mathcal{I},t}(gh_1, gh_2, n, gk)| \\ &\ll \sum_{1 \leq g \ll T^\epsilon} \frac{1}{g} \sum_{h_1, h_2 \ll \frac{T^\epsilon}{g}} \frac{1}{h_1 + h_2\alpha} \sum_{\substack{k \ll T^{1/2+\epsilon} \\ (k, h_2) = 1}} \sum_{n \equiv \overline{h_2} h_1 \pmod{k}} |W_{\mathcal{I},t}(gh_1, gh_2, n, gk)| \\ &\ll \sum_{1 \leq g \ll T^\epsilon} \frac{1}{g} \sum_{h_1, h_2 \ll \frac{T^\epsilon}{g}} \frac{1}{h_1 + h_2\alpha} \sum_{\substack{k \ll T^{1/2+\epsilon} \\ (k, h_2) = 1}} \frac{T^{1/2+\epsilon}}{k} \ll T^{1/2+\epsilon}, \end{aligned}$$

which is good enough. Here we have used $1 \leq k \leq n \ll T^{1/2+\epsilon}$, and the estimate $W_{\mathcal{I},t} \ll \mathbf{1}_{n \leq T^{1/2+\epsilon}}$.

5.5. Denominator case II: opposite signs, large denominator. We now turn to $h_1 \geq 0, h_2 \leq 0$ and $|h_1 + h_2\alpha| \geq 1/(2g)$. As before, the argument for $h_1 \leq 0, h_2 \geq 0$ and $|h_1 + h_2\alpha| \geq 1/(2g)$ is similar. Thus, relabelling $h_2 \mapsto -h_2$, and using (16), we now have both $h_1, h_2 \geq 0$, and the sum to control is

$$\sum_{1 \leq g \ll T^\epsilon} \frac{1}{g} \sum_{\substack{h_1, h_2 \geq 0 \\ \frac{1}{2g} < |h_1 - h_2\alpha| \ll \frac{T^\epsilon}{g}}} \frac{1}{|h_1 - h_2\alpha|} \sum_{n \geq 1} \sum_{\substack{k | nh_2 + h_1 \\ (k, h_2) = 1}} |W_{\mathcal{I},t}(gh_1, -gh_2, n, gk)|.$$

We can quickly exclude the case $h_2 = 0$ since this contributes $\ll T^{1/2+\epsilon}$ on applying the divisor bound $d(h_1) \ll T^\epsilon$ and applying, say, (20) below for the sum over n .

Recall that in our previous notation $n_1 = n - gk \geq 0$, and hence $k \leq n/g$. Further, by (17),

$$0 \leq n_2 = n \left(1 - \frac{gh_2}{gk}\right) - \frac{gh_1}{gk} \leq n \left(1 - \frac{h_2}{k}\right),$$

whence $h_2 \leq k$. Thus, swapping the order of summation,

$$\sum_{g \ll T^\epsilon} \frac{1}{g} \sum_{\substack{h_1 \geq 0, h_2 \geq 1 \\ \frac{1}{2g} < |h_1 - h_2\alpha| \ll \frac{T^\epsilon}{g}}} \frac{1}{|h_1 - h_2\alpha|} \sum_{\substack{k \geq h_2 \\ (k, h_2) = 1}} \sum_{\substack{n \equiv -\overline{h_2} h_1(k) \\ n \geq gk}} |W_{\mathcal{I},t}(gh_1, -gh_2, n, gk)|.$$

Now, using (10) and recalling the definition of $W_{\mathcal{I},t}$ in (18),

$$(20) \quad W_{\mathcal{I},t}(gh_1, -gh_2, n, gk) \ll w_t(n + \alpha) \ll \mathbf{1}_{n+\alpha \leq \tau} + \mathbf{1}_{n+\alpha > \tau} \left(\frac{\tau}{n+\alpha}\right)^3.$$

Hence,

$$\sum_{\substack{n \equiv -\overline{h_2}h_1 \pmod{k} \\ n \geq gk}} |W_{\mathcal{I},t}| \ll \mathbb{1}_{k \leq \tau/g} \left(\frac{\tau}{k}\right) + \mathbb{1}_{k > \tau/g} \left(\frac{\tau^3}{g^2 k^3}\right)$$

where in the sum over $n + \alpha > \tau$ we have written $1 = \mathbb{1}_{k \leq \tau/g} + \mathbb{1}_{k > \tau/g}$ and for the first term summed over $n > \tau - \alpha$ and for the second summed over $n \geq gk$. Performing the sum over k in a similar fashion, we are left with bounding

$$\tau \sum_{g \leq T^\epsilon} \frac{1}{g} \sum_{\substack{h_1 \geq 0, h_2 \geq 1 \\ \frac{1}{2g} < |h_1 - h_2\alpha| \leq \frac{T^\epsilon}{g}}} \frac{1}{|h_1 - h_2\alpha|} \left(\mathbb{1}_{h_2 \leq \tau/g} \left(\log\left(\frac{\tau}{gh_2}\right) + 1\right) + \mathbb{1}_{h_2 > \tau/g} \left(\frac{\tau}{gh_2}\right)^2 \right).$$

Pulling the sum over h_2 out this is

$$\begin{aligned} & \tau \sum_{g \leq T^\epsilon} \frac{1}{g} \sum_{h_2 \geq 1} \left(\mathbb{1}_{h_2 \leq \tau/g} \left(\log\left(\frac{\tau}{gh_2}\right) + 1\right) + \mathbb{1}_{h_2 > \tau/g} \left(\frac{\tau}{gh_2}\right)^2 \right) \sum_{\substack{h_1 \geq 0 \\ \frac{1}{2g} < |h_1 - h_2\alpha| \leq \frac{T^\epsilon}{g}}} \frac{1}{|h_1 - h_2\alpha|} \\ & \ll \tau \sum_{g \leq T^\epsilon} \frac{1}{g} \sum_{h_2 \geq 1} \left(\mathbb{1}_{h_2 \leq \tau/g} \left(\log\left(\frac{\tau}{gh_2}\right) + 1\right) + \mathbb{1}_{h_2 > \tau/g} \left(\frac{\tau}{gh_2}\right)^2 \right) (g + \log T) \\ & \ll \tau \sum_{g \leq T^\epsilon} \frac{1}{g} \cdot \frac{\tau}{g} \cdot (g + \log T) \ll \tau^2 \log T \ll T \log T \end{aligned}$$

since $\sum_{m \leq x} \log(x/m) \ll x$.

5.6. Denominator case III: opposite signs, small denominator. It is here that our assumptions on the Diophantine properties of α begin to play a role in the moments. We shall use Lemma 1 to control these sums.

We consider $|h_1 + h_2\alpha| < 1/(2g)$ and again restrict our attention to $h_1 \geq 0$, $h_2 \leq 0$ relabelling $h_2 \mapsto -h_2$. Recall that $k \geq 1$ so that $g = (k, h_2) \geq 1$ and hence $|h_1 - h_2\alpha| = \|h_2\alpha\|$ arising from the unique choice $h_1 = \lfloor h_2\alpha \rfloor$ - the closest integer to $h_2\alpha$. Thus as h_2 varies h_1 is fixed. Renaming h_2 as h it suffices to show that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{1 \leq g \leq T^\epsilon} \frac{1}{g} \sum_{\substack{n, h \geq 1 \\ \|h\alpha\| < \frac{1}{2g}}} \sum_{\substack{k | nh + \lfloor h\alpha \rfloor \\ (k, h) = 1}} \frac{1}{\|h\alpha\|} \\ & \quad \times \left\{ \exp \left(i g t \frac{\|h\alpha\|}{(n + \alpha)(n_{g,-}^* + \alpha)} \right) - 1 \right\} W'_{\mathcal{I},t}(g, h, n, k) \\ & \ll T(\log T)^{5/3}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$W'_{\mathcal{I},t}(g, h, n, k) = W_{\mathcal{I},t}(g \lfloor h\alpha \rfloor, -gh, n, gk)$$

and, after transforming (19),

$$n_{g,-}^* = n - g(k - h) - (nh + \lfloor h\alpha \rfloor)/k.$$

As argued before, $h \leq k \leq n/g$. Further, note that $h = k$ if and only if $n_2 = 0$, and hence as noted in the beginning of this section, such terms can be ignored. The same applies to the case $n = gk$ since we had $n_1 = n - gk$. Swapping the order of summation,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{1 \leq g \ll T^\epsilon} \frac{1}{g} \sum_{\substack{h \geq 1 \\ \|h\alpha\| < \frac{1}{2g}}} \frac{1}{\|h\alpha\|} \sum_{\substack{k > h \\ (h,k)=1}} \sum_{\substack{n \equiv -\bar{h}\lfloor h\alpha \rfloor \pmod k \\ n > gk}} \left\{ \exp \left(igt \frac{\|h\alpha\|}{(n + \alpha)(n_{g,-}^* + \alpha)}\right) - 1 \right\} \\ & \quad \times W'_{\mathcal{I},t}(g, h, n, k), \end{aligned}$$

Guided by (16) and $n_{g,-}^* \leq n$, we divide the innermost sum into the cases $n \leq (gt\|h\alpha\|)^{1/2}(\log t)^{1/3}$ and $n > (gt\|h\alpha\|)^{1/2}(\log t)^{1/3}$ and call the resulting sums \mathcal{I}_1 and \mathcal{I}_2 respectively.

Using $h \ll T^{1/2+\epsilon}$ together with (16) we get

$$\mathcal{I}_1 \ll \sum_{1 \leq g \ll T^\epsilon} \frac{1}{g} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq h \ll T^{1/2+\epsilon} \\ \|h\alpha\| < \frac{1}{2g}}} \frac{1}{\|h\alpha\|} \sum_{\substack{k > h \\ (k,h)=1}} \sum_{\substack{n \equiv -\bar{h}\lfloor h\alpha \rfloor \pmod k \\ gk < n \leq (gt\|h\alpha\|)^{1/2}(\log t)^{1/3}}} 1.$$

Note that the innermost sum is empty unless $k \leq (t\|h\alpha\|/g)^{1/2}(\log t)^{1/3}$, whence, performing the sum over n ,

$$\mathcal{I}_1 \ll T^{1/2}(\log T)^{1/3} \sum_{1 \leq g \ll T^\epsilon} \frac{1}{\sqrt{g}} \sum_{\substack{1 \leq h \ll T^{1/2+\epsilon} \\ \|h\alpha\| < \frac{1}{2g}}} \frac{1}{\|h\alpha\|^{1/2}} \sum_{h < k \leq (t\|h\alpha\|/g)^{1/2}(\log t)^{1/3}} \frac{1}{k}.$$

Again, the innermost sum is empty unless $h < (t\|h\alpha\|/g)^{1/2}(\log t)^{1/3} < t^{1/2}(\log t)^{1/3}/g^{3/2}$, and thus,

$$\mathcal{I}_1 \ll T^{1/2}(\log T)^{4/3} \sum_{1 \leq g \ll T^\epsilon} \frac{1}{\sqrt{g}} \sum_{1 \leq h \leq t^{1/2}(\log t)^{1/3}/g^{3/2}} \frac{1}{\|h\alpha\|^{1/2}} \ll T(\log T)^{5/3}$$

by Lemma 1.

For \mathcal{I}_2 , we use the other half of (16) to find

$$\mathcal{I}_2 \ll T \sum_{1 \leq g \ll T^\epsilon} \sum_{\substack{h \geq 1 \\ \|h\alpha\| < \frac{1}{2g}}} \sum_{\substack{k > h \\ (h,k)=1}} \sum_n^* \frac{1}{(n + \alpha)(n_{g,-}^* + \alpha)} W'_{\mathcal{I},t}(g, h, n, k),$$

where \star denotes the constraints

$$n \equiv -\bar{h}\lfloor h\alpha \rfloor \pmod k,$$

$$\max(gk, (gt\|h\alpha\|)^{1/2}(\log t)^{1/3}) < n \leq T^{1/2+\epsilon}.$$

Now, since $n_{g,-}^* = n - g(k - h) - (nh + \lfloor h\alpha \rfloor)/k$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} n_{g,-}^* + \alpha &= (1 - \frac{h}{k})(n + \alpha) - g(k - h) - (\lfloor h\alpha \rfloor - h\alpha)/k \\ &\geq \frac{k-h}{k}(n + \alpha - gk) - \frac{1}{2k} \geq \frac{k-h}{2k}(n + \alpha - gk) \end{aligned}$$

since $k - h \geq 1$ and $n + \alpha - gk \geq 1 + \alpha \geq 1$. Also, \star implies

$$\frac{1}{n + \alpha} \ll \frac{1}{\sqrt{g}} \cdot \frac{1}{T^{1/2}(\log T)^{1/3}} \cdot \frac{1}{\|h\alpha\|^{1/2}}.$$

Inserting these bounds above, we get

$$\mathcal{I}_2 \ll \frac{T^{1/2}}{(\log T)^{1/3}} \sum_{1 \leq g \ll T^\epsilon} \frac{1}{\sqrt{g}} \sum_{\substack{h \geq 1 \\ \|h\alpha\| < \frac{1}{2g}}} \frac{1}{\|h\alpha\|^{1/2}} \sum_{\substack{k > h \\ (h,k)=1}} \frac{k}{k-h} \sum_n^* \frac{1}{(n-gk)} W'_{\mathcal{I},t}(g, h, n, k),$$

By (20) we have

$$W'_{\mathcal{I},t} \ll \mathbb{1}_{n+\alpha \leq \tau} + \mathbb{1}_{n+\alpha > \tau} \left(\frac{\tau}{n+\alpha}\right)^3.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_n^* \frac{1}{(n-gk)} W'_{\mathcal{I},t} &= \left[\sum_{gk < n \leq 2gk}^* + \sum_{n > 2gk}^* \right] \frac{1}{(n-gk)} W'_{\mathcal{I},t} \\ &\ll \frac{\log T}{k} \left(\mathbb{1}_{k \leq \tau/g} + \mathbb{1}_{k > \tau/g} \left(\frac{\tau}{gk}\right)^3 \right) \end{aligned}$$

where in the first sum here, we have used $(n + \alpha) \asymp gk$, while in the second we have computed the logarithmic sum when $n + \alpha \leq \tau$ and for $n + \alpha > \tau$ trivially bounded $(n - gk)^{-1} \leq (2n)^{-1}$ and applied $1 = \mathbb{1}_{k \leq \tau/g} + \mathbb{1}_{k > \tau/g}$, summing over $n \gg \tau$ in the first term and $n \gg gk$ in the second. The log-factors arising in this process can always be replaced by $\log T$, since we have $gk \leq T^{1/2+\epsilon}$ as entailed by the weights.

The sum over k can be performed similarly, to get

$$\sum_{\substack{k > h \\ (k,h)=1}} \frac{1}{k-h} \left(\mathbb{1}_{k \leq \tau/g} + \mathbb{1}_{k > \tau/g} \left(\frac{\tau}{gk}\right)^3 \right) \ll \log T \left(\mathbb{1}_{h \leq \tau/g} + \mathbb{1}_{h > \tau/g} \left(\frac{\tau}{gh}\right)^3 \right).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_2 &\ll T^{1/2}(\log T)^{5/3} \sum_{1 \leq g \ll T^\epsilon} \frac{1}{\sqrt{g}} \sum_{\substack{h \geq 1 \\ \|h\alpha\| < \frac{1}{2g}}} \frac{1}{\|h\alpha\|^{1/2}} \left(\mathbb{1}_{h \leq \tau/g} + \mathbb{1}_{h > \tau/g} \left(\frac{\tau}{gh}\right)^3 \right) \\ &\ll T(\log T)^{5/3}, \end{aligned}$$

by partial summation and Lemma 1.

6. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 5

6.1. **Diagonal terms.** Let

$$\mathcal{J} = \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{e(-n\alpha)}{n^{1/2-it}} w_t^{\mathcal{J}}(n) \right|^4 \Phi(t/T) dt.$$

Expanding the fourth power we find

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J} &= \sum_{n_j \geq 1} \frac{e(-\alpha(n_1 + n_2 - n_3 - n_4))}{\sqrt{n_1 n_2 n_3 n_4}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\frac{n_1 n_2}{n_3 n_4} \right)^{it} w_t^{\mathcal{J}}(\underline{n}) \Phi(t/T) dt \\ &= \mathcal{J}_D + \mathcal{J}_O \end{aligned}$$

where $w_t^{\mathcal{J}}(\underline{n}) = \prod_{j=1}^4 w_t(n_j)$, \mathcal{J}_D is the sum with $n_1 n_2 = n_3 n_4$ and \mathcal{J}_O is the remaining off-diagonal sum. \mathcal{J}_D can be further decomposed into the sum for which $n_1 + n_2 = n_3 + n_4$, and that for which $n_1 + n_2 \neq n_3 + n_4$. In the first case $\{n_1, n_2\}$ is a permutation of $\{n_3, n_4\}$ and thus we find

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}_D &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(2 \left(\sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{w_t(n)^2}{n} \right)^2 - \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{w_t(n)^4}{n^2} \right) \Phi(t/T) dt \\ &\quad + \sum_{\substack{n_1 n_2 = n_3 n_4 \\ n_1 + n_2 \neq n_3 + n_4}} \frac{e(-\alpha(n_1 + n_2 - n_3 - n_4))}{\sqrt{n_1 n_2 n_3 n_4}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} w_t^{\mathcal{J}}(\underline{n}) \Phi(t/T) dt. \end{aligned}$$

By a calculation similar to that in §5.1, the first term on the right is

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{w_t(n)^2}{n} \right)^2 \Phi(t/T) dt &= 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\frac{1}{2} \log(t/2\pi) + O(1) \right)^2 \Phi(t/T) dt \\ &= \frac{\hat{\Phi}(0)}{2} T (\log T)^2 + O(T \log T) \end{aligned}$$

whilst the second term is clearly $O(T)$. The third term is quite delicate and here we have the following lemma.

Lemma 6. *Suppose α is an irrational with $\mu(\alpha) < 3$. Then*

$$\sum_{\substack{n_1 n_2 = n_3 n_4 \\ n_1 + n_2 \neq n_3 + n_4}} \frac{e(-\alpha(n_1 + n_2 - n_3 - n_4))}{\sqrt{n_1 n_2 n_3 n_4}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} w_t^{\mathcal{J}}(\underline{n}) \Phi(t/T) dt = c \hat{\Phi}(0) T + O(T/(\log T)^\epsilon)$$

where

$$c = c_T = \sum_{d \leq (\log T)^{4+\epsilon}} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} \sum_{m, \ell \geq 1} \frac{1}{m\ell} \int_1^\infty \int_1^\infty \frac{1}{(m+y)^2(\ell+x)^2} \left(\sum_{h \leq y} \sum_{k \leq x} e(-\alpha d h k) \right) dx dy$$

which satisfies $c_T \ll \log \log T$.

Proof. We push the sum through the integral and reparametrize the sum.

Let $m_1 = (n_1, n_3)$ and $m_2 = (n_2, n_4)$. Then $m_1 m_2$ divides both sides of $n_1 n_2 = n_3 n_4$. Dividing throughout, we see that it must be the case that

$$\frac{n_1}{(n_1, n_3)} = \frac{n_4}{(n_2, n_4)}, \quad \frac{n_2}{(n_2, n_4)} = \frac{n_3}{(n_1, n_3)}.$$

Calling the former ℓ_1 and the latter ℓ_2 , we see that the solutions to $n_1 n_2 = n_3 n_4$ are uniquely parametrized by

$$\begin{aligned} n_1 &= m_1 \ell_1, & n_2 &= m_2 \ell_2, \\ n_3 &= m_1 \ell_2, & n_4 &= m_2 \ell_1, \end{aligned}$$

with $(\ell_1, \ell_2) = 1$. Furthermore, $n_1 + n_2 - n_3 - n_4 = (m_1 - m_2)(\ell_1 - \ell_2)$, and so the constraint $n_1 + n_2 \neq n_3 + n_4$ is equivalent to $m_1 \neq m_2$ and $\ell_1 \neq \ell_2$. The sum then becomes,

$$\sum_{\substack{m_j, \ell_j \geq 1 \\ m_1 \neq m_2, \ell_1 \neq \ell_2 \\ (\ell_1, \ell_2) = 1}} \frac{e(-\alpha(m_1 - m_2)(\ell_1 - \ell_2))}{m_1 m_2 \ell_1 \ell_2} W_{\mathcal{J}, t}(m_1, m_2, \ell_1, \ell_2)$$

with

$$W_{\mathcal{J}, t}(m_1, m_2, \ell_1, \ell_2) = \prod_{j, k \in \{1, 2\}} w_t(m_j \ell_k).$$

Using $\mathbf{1}_{(\ell_1, \ell_2) = 1} = \sum_{d | \ell_1, d | \ell_2} \mu(d)$, and interchanging the order of summation, the above sum can be written as

$$\sum_{d \geq 1} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} \sum_{\substack{m_j, \ell_j \geq 1 \\ m_1 \neq m_2, \ell_1 \neq \ell_2}} \frac{e(-\alpha d(m_1 - m_2)(\ell_1 - \ell_2))}{m_1 m_2 \ell_1 \ell_2} W_{\mathcal{J}, t}(m_1, m_2, d\ell_1, d\ell_2),$$

by replacing ℓ_j with $d\ell_j$. Now, setting $h = m_1 - m_2$, $k = \ell_1 - \ell_2$, $m = m_2$, and $\ell = \ell_2$ and spending the symmetries $m_1 \leftrightarrow m_2$ and $\ell_1 \leftrightarrow \ell_2$, this simplifies to

$$4\Re \sum_{d \geq 1} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} \sum_{h, k, m, \ell \geq 1} \frac{e(-\alpha d h k)}{m \ell (m + h)(\ell + k)} W'_{\mathcal{J}, t}(d, h, k, m, \ell)$$

where

$$W'_{\mathcal{J}, t}(d, h, k, m, \ell) = w_t(dm\ell) w_t(d(m + h)\ell) w_t(dm(\ell + k)) w_t(d(m + h)(\ell + k)).$$

Since the weights restrict $h, k, m, \ell \ll T^{1/2+\epsilon}$ the inner sum is trivially $\ll (\log T)^4$ and so we may restrict the outer sum to $d \leq (\log T)^{4+\epsilon}$ at the cost of $O((\log T)^{-\epsilon})$.

Unfolding the integrals in the weights we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{h,k,m,\ell \geq 1} \frac{e(-\alpha dhk)}{m\ell(m+h)(\ell+k)} W_{\mathcal{J},t}(d, h, k, m, \ell) \\ &= \frac{1}{(2\pi i)^4} \int_{(c)^4} \sum_{h,k,m,\ell \geq 1} \frac{e(-\alpha dhk)}{(m+h)^{1+s_1+s_3} m^{1+s_2+s_4} (\ell+k)^{1+s_1+s_4} \ell^{1+s_2+s_3}} \\ & \quad \times \prod_{j=1}^4 \left(\frac{\tau}{d} \right)^{s_j} G(s_j) \frac{ds_j}{s_j} \end{aligned}$$

where we have taken $c = 1/\log T$ which is allowed by the absolute convergence of the sum in the integrand.

Consider the sum over h and k , initially in the region $\Re(s_j) > 0$. By partial summation this is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{h,k \geq 1} \frac{e(-\alpha dhk)}{(m+h)^{1+s_1+s_3} (\ell+k)^{1+s_1+s_4}} = \sum_{h \geq 1} \frac{1}{(m+h)^{1+s_1+s_3}} \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{e(-\alpha dhk)}{(\ell+k)^{1+s_1+s_4}} \\ (21) \quad &= \sum_{h \geq 1} \frac{1}{(m+h)^{1+s_1+s_3}} \cdot (1+s_1+s_4) \int_1^\infty \frac{1}{(\ell+x)^{2+s_1+s_4}} \left(\sum_{k \leq x} e(-\alpha dhk) \right) dx \\ &= (1+s_1+s_3)(1+s_1+s_4) \\ & \quad \times \int_1^\infty \int_1^\infty \frac{1}{(m+y)^{2+s_1+s_3} (\ell+x)^{2+s_1+s_4}} \left(\sum_{\substack{h \leq y \\ k \leq x}} e(-\alpha dhk) \right) dx dy. \end{aligned}$$

Now, by Lemma 2, α satisfies (7) for some $\delta > 0$, implying that the integral in (21) converges absolutely for $\Re(s_1+s_3), \Re(s_1+s_4) > -\delta/8$ and represents an analytic function in this region. Further, we see that the integrand of the multiple contour integral is analytic for $\Re(s_1+s_2+s_3+s_4) > -\delta/8$ as well.

We now shift the s_1 integral to the line with $\Re(s_1) = -\delta/40$, say, picking a pole up at $s_1 = 0$. By (21) and (7) the integral over the new line contributes $\ll (\tau/d)^{-\delta/40}$, which results in a negligible contribution. We then progressively shift the remaining integrals to the line with $\Re(s_j) = -\delta/40$ picking up a simple pole at $s_j = 0$ each time and obtaining a negligible error in the process. The residues lead to the contribution

$$c_T = \sum_{d \leq (\log T)^{4+\epsilon}} \frac{\mu(d)}{d^2} \sum_{m,\ell \geq 1} \frac{1}{m\ell} \int_1^\infty \int_1^\infty \frac{1}{(m+y)^2 (\ell+x)^2} \left(\sum_{h \leq y} \sum_{k \leq x} e(-\alpha dhk) \right) dx dy$$

and so the result follows by noting that (7) implies

$$c_T \ll \sum_{d \leq (\log T)^{4+\epsilon}} \frac{1}{d} \ll \log \log T$$

□

6.2. Off-diagonals. The off-diagonal sum is given by

$$\mathcal{J}_O = \sum_{n_1 n_2 \neq n_3 n_4} \frac{e(-\alpha(n_1 + n_2 - n_3 - n_4))}{\sqrt{n_1 n_2 n_3 n_4}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(\frac{n_1 n_2}{n_3 n_4} \right)^{it} w_t^{\mathcal{J}}(\underline{n}) \Phi(t/T) dt.$$

Write $h = n_1 n_2 - n_3 n_4 \neq 0$. Then similarly to §5, we may restrict to $|h| \ll n_3 n_4 / T^{1-\epsilon}$ since otherwise integrating by parts using (11) gives a negligible error. We then apply the expansions

$$\begin{aligned} \log \left(\frac{n_1 n_2}{n_3 n_4} \right) &= \frac{h}{n_3 n_4} + O(T^{-2+\epsilon}) \\ \left(\frac{n_1 n_2}{n_3 n_4} \right)^{it} &= \exp \left(it \frac{h}{n_3 n_4} \right) (1 + O(T^{-1+\epsilon})) \\ n_1 n_2 &= n_3 n_4 (1 + O(T^{-1+\epsilon})). \end{aligned}$$

The error terms acquired when applying these are

$$\ll \frac{1}{T^{1-\epsilon}} \sum_{\substack{n_1 n_2 - n_3 n_4 = h \\ h \ll n_3 n_4 / T^{1-\epsilon}}} \frac{1}{n_3 n_4} \int_{\mathbb{R}} |w_t^{\mathcal{J}}(\underline{n}) \Phi(t/T)| dt \ll T^\epsilon$$

where in the second inequality we have let h, n_3, n_4 range freely and used a divisor bound for the number of solutions of $n_1 n_2 = n_3 n_4 + h$, similar to §5. Therefore

$$\mathcal{J}_O = \sum_{\substack{n_1 n_2 - n_3 n_4 = h \\ h \ll n_3 n_4 / T^{1-\epsilon}}} \frac{e(-\alpha(n_1 + n_2 - n_3 - n_4))}{n_3 n_4} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp \left(it \frac{h}{n_3 n_4} \right) w_t^{\mathcal{J}}(\underline{n}) \Phi(t/T) dt + O(T^\epsilon).$$

Lemma 7. *We have*

$$\mathcal{J}_O \ll T \log T$$

for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. Integrating by parts we acquire the main term

$$\frac{1}{i} \sum_{\substack{n_1 n_2 - n_3 n_4 = h \\ h \ll n_3 n_4 / T^{1-\epsilon}}} \frac{e(-\alpha(n_1 + n_2 - n_3 - n_4))}{h} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \exp \left(it \frac{h}{n_3 n_4} \right) \frac{d}{dt} (w_t^{\mathcal{J}}(\underline{n}) \Phi(t/T)) dt$$

Let us first consider the term involving the derivative of $\Phi(t/T)$. Pushing the sum through the integral we acquire the sum

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{0 \neq h \ll T^\epsilon} \frac{1}{h} \sum_{\substack{n_1 n_2 - n_3 n_4 = h \\ n_3 n_4 \gg |h| T^{1-\epsilon}}} e(-\alpha(n_1 + n_2 - n_3 - n_4)) \exp\left(it \frac{h}{n_3 n_4}\right) w_t^{\mathcal{J}}(\underline{n}) \\ & \ll \sum_{0 \neq h \ll T^\epsilon} \frac{1}{|h|} \sum_{\substack{n_1 n_2 - n_3 n_4 = h \\ n_3 n_4 \gg |h| T^{1-\epsilon}}} |w_t(n_1) w_t(n_2) w_t(n_3) w_t(n_4)|. \end{aligned}$$

We remove the variable n_4 by writing this as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{0 \neq |h| \ll T^\epsilon} \frac{1}{|h|} \sum_{n_2, n_3} |w_t(n_2) w_t(n_3)| \sum_{\substack{n_1 n_2 \equiv h \pmod{n_3} \\ n_1 n_2 \gg |h| T^{1-\epsilon} + h}} |w_t(n_1) w_t(\frac{n_1 n_2 - h}{n_3})| \\ & = \sum_g \sum_{0 \neq |h| \ll T^\epsilon} \frac{1}{|h|} \sum_{(n_2, n_3)=1} |w_t(g n_2) w_t(g n_3)| \sum_{\substack{g n_1 n_2 \equiv h \pmod{g n_3} \\ g n_1 n_2 \gg |h| T^{1-\epsilon} + h}} |w_t(n_1) w_t(\frac{g n_1 n_2 - h}{g n_3})|. \end{aligned}$$

The inner sum is empty unless $g \mid h$ and hence this becomes

$$\sum_g \frac{1}{g} \sum_{0 \neq |h| \ll T^\epsilon / g} \frac{1}{|h|} \sum_{(n_2, n_3)=1} |w_t(g n_2) w_t(g n_3)| \sum_{\substack{n_1 \equiv \overline{n_2} h \pmod{n_3} \\ n_1 n_2 \gg |h| T^{1-\epsilon} + h}} |w_t(n_1) w_t(\frac{n_1 n_2 - h}{n_3})|$$

where we have cancelled a factor of g in the congruence condition and inverted n_2 modulo n_3 .

Consider the sum with $n_2 < n_3$. By (10) this gives a contribution

$$\begin{aligned} & \ll \sum_g \frac{1}{g} \sum_{0 \neq |h| \ll T^\epsilon / g} \frac{1}{|h|} \sum_{n_3} |w_t(g n_3)| \sum_{n_2 < n_3} \sum_{n_1 \equiv \overline{n_2} h \pmod{n_3}} |w_t(n_1)| \\ & \ll \sum_g \frac{1}{g} \sum_{0 \neq |h| \ll T^\epsilon / g} \frac{1}{|h|} \sum_{n_3} |w_t(g n_3)| \sum_{n_2 < n_3} \sum_{n_1 \equiv \overline{n_2} h \pmod{n_3}} (\mathbf{1}_{n_1 \leq \tau} + \mathbf{1}_{n_1 > \tau} (\frac{\tau}{n_1})^2) \\ & \ll \tau \sum_g \frac{1}{g} \sum_{0 \neq |h| \ll T^\epsilon / g} \frac{1}{|h|} \sum_{n_3} (\mathbf{1}_{n_3 \leq \tau / g} + \mathbf{1}_{n_3 > \tau / g} (\frac{\tau}{g n_3})^2) \\ & \ll T \log T \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the case of $n_2 > n_3$ can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\ll \sum_g \frac{1}{g} \sum_{0 \neq |h| \ll T^\epsilon/g} \frac{1}{|h|} \sum_{n_3} |w_t(gn_3)| \sum_{n_2 > n_3} |w_t(gn_2)| \sum_{n_1 \equiv \overline{n_2}h \pmod{n_3}} |w_t(\frac{n_1 n_2 - h}{n_3})| \\
&\ll \sum_g \frac{1}{g} \sum_{0 \neq |h| \ll T^\epsilon/g} \frac{1}{|h|} \sum_{n_3} |w_t(gn_3)| \sum_{n_2 > n_3} (\mathbb{1}_{n_2 \leq \tau/g} + \mathbb{1}_{n_2 > \tau/g} (\frac{\tau}{gn_2})^2) \cdot (\frac{\tau}{n_2}) \\
&\ll \tau \sum_g \frac{1}{g} \sum_{0 \neq |h| \ll T^\epsilon/g} \frac{1}{|h|} \sum_{n_3} (\mathbb{1}_{n_3 \leq \tau/g} (\log(\frac{\tau}{gn_3}) + 1) + \mathbb{1}_{n_3 > \tau/g} (\frac{\tau}{gn_3})^2) \\
&\ll T \log T
\end{aligned}$$

where the first line follows from applying (10), since $(\tau n_3 + h)/n_2 = (1 + o(1))\tau n_3/n_2$, and the last line follows from the fact that $\sum_{m \leq x} \log(x/m) \ll x$. Thus, for the term involving the derivative of $\Phi(t/T)$ we acquire a contribution

$$\ll \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{T} |\Phi'(t/T)| \cdot T \log T dt \ll T \log T.$$

For the terms involving $d/dt(w_t(n_j))$ we apply (11) appropriately. This gives us the requisite factor of T^{-1} along with the same quality bounds that have been applied for $|w_t(n_j)|$ throughout. The result then follows. \square

7. CONCLUDING REMARKS

We outline here some difficulties in upgrading Theorem 1 to an asymptotic. The arguments from §§5-6 can be adapted to prove the following proposition.

Proposition 8. *Under the same conditions as Proposition 4,*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| \sum_{n \geq 0} \frac{w_t(n + \alpha)}{(n + \alpha)^{1/2 + it}} \right|^2 \left| \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{e(-n\alpha)}{n^{1/2 - it}} w_t(n) \right|^2 \Phi(t/T) dt = \frac{\hat{\Phi}(0)}{4} T(\log T)^2 + O(T(\log T)^{5/3}).$$

In fact, the proof of this is slightly more straightforward than that of Proposition 4, since the analogue of (15) is simpler,

$$h_1 = n_1 n_2 - n_3 n_4, \quad h_2 = n_2 - n_4.$$

Since Proposition 4 and 5 are sufficient for Theorem 1 due to the first application of Hölder's inequality in (13), however, we leave the details to the reader.

On combining Propositions 4, 5, and 8 with (12), we see that one could prove an asymptotic of the shape

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it, \alpha)|^4 \Phi(t/T) dt \sim 2\hat{\Phi}(0) T(\log T)^2,$$

from which the unsmoothed fourth moment could be deduced, provided one could show

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(4\Re S_1^2 \overline{S_1 S_2} + 2\Re S_1^2 \overline{S_2^2} + 4\Re S_1 S_2 \overline{S_2^2} \right) \Phi(t/T) dt = o(T(\log T)^2).$$

It is well known that achieving the required cancellation from such terms can be difficult due to the presence of the χ^2 factors from the functional equation. Their rapid oscillation leads to long sums after applying the method of stationary phase, and these require very precise control with respect to the Diophantine properties of α . Equivalently, one may apply a Heath-Brown [31] type approximate functional equation in which there are no cross terms or χ factors, but in which the sums are longer, and then one encounters the same difficulties in the off-diagonals. As a compromise, we work with shorter sums but must sacrifice an asymptotic when applying Hölder's inequality in (13).

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Andersson, *Mean value properties of the Hurwitz zeta-function*, Math. Scand. **71**(2) (1992), 295–300, .
- [2] J. Andersson, *On questions of Cassels and Drungilas-Dubickas*, preprint, [arXiv:1606.02524v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/1606.02524v1).
- [3] J. Andersson, *Summation formulae and zeta functions*, Stockholm University, 2006, Ph.D. thesis.
- [4] J. Andersson, *Universality of the Hurwitz zeta-function on the half plane of absolute convergence*, preprint, [arXiv:2008.04709v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/2008.04709v1).
- [5] M. Aymone, W. Heap, J. Zhao, *Partial sums of random multiplicative functions and extreme values of a model for the Riemann zeta function*, J. London Math. Soc. **103** no. 4 (2021), 1618–1642.
- [6] R. Balasubramanian, *A note on Hurwitz's zeta-function*, Ann. Acad. Sci. Fenn. Ser. A I Math. **4**(1) (1979), 41–44.
- [7] B. Bagchi, *The statistical behaviour and universality properties of the Riemann zeta function and other allied Dirichlet series*, Indian Statistical Institute, Calcutta, 1981, Ph.D. Thesis.
- [8] V. Beresnevich, A. Haynes, S. Velani, *Sums of reciprocals of fractional parts and multiplicative Diophantine approximation*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **263** (2020), no. 1276, 1–77.
- [9] E. Bombieri and D. A. Hejhal, *On the distribution of zeros of linear combinations of Euler products*, Duke Math. J. **80**(3) (1995), 821–862.
- [10] J. Bourgain, M. Z. Garaev, S. V. Konyagin, I. E. Shparlinski, *Multiplicative congruences with variables from short intervals*, J. Anal. Math. **124** (2014), 117–147.
- [11] J. W. S. Cassels, *An Introduction to Diophantine Approximation*, Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics and Mathematical Physics No. 45, Cambridge University Press, New York, 1957.
- [12] J. W. S. Cassels, *Footnote to a note of Davenport and Heilbronn*, J. London Math. Soc. **36** (1961), 177–184.
- [13] J. B. Conrey, D. W. Farmer, J. P. Keating, M. O. Rubinstein, N. C. Snaith, *Integral moments of L-functions*, Proc. London Math. Soc. **91** no. 3 (2005), 33–104.
- [14] J. B. Conrey, A. Ghosh, *A conjecture for the sixth power moment of the Riemann zeta-function*, Int. Math. Res. Not. **15** (1998) 775–780.

- [15] J. B. Conrey, S. M. Gonek, *High moments of the Riemann zeta function*, Duke Math. J. **107** (2001) 577–604.
- [16] H. Davenport and H. Heilbronn, *On the Zeros of Certain Dirichlet Series*, J. London Math. Soc. **11**(3) (1936), 181–185.
- [17] A. Diaconu, D. Goldfeld, and J. Hoffstein, *Multiple Dirichlet series and moments of zeta and L -functions*, Compositio Math. **139** (2003), 297–360.
- [18] D. W. Farmer, S. M. Gonek, C. P. Hughes, *The maximum size of L -functions*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **609** (2007), 215–236.
- [19] R. Garunkštis, A. Laurinćikas, *On the Lerch zeta function*, Liet. Mat. Rink. **36** no. 4 (1996), 423–434.
- [20] R. Garunkštis, A. Laurinćikas, *The Lerch zeta function*, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 2002.
- [21] R. Garunkštis, A. Laurinćikas, J. Steuding, *On the mean square of Lerch zeta-functions*, Arch. Math. **80** (2003), 47–60.
- [22] R. Garunkštis, J. Steuding, *Does the Lerch zeta-function satisfy the Lindelf hypothesis?*, Analytic and probabilistic methods in Number Theory, Proc. 3rd Palanga Conf., A. Dubickas et al. (Eds.), Vilnius (2002), 61–74.
- [23] S. M. Gonek, *Analytic properties of zeta and L -functions*, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1979, Ph.D. Thesis.
- [24] S. M. Gonek, *Mean values of the Riemann zeta function and its derivatives*, Invent. Math. **75** (1984), 123–141.
- [25] G. H. Hardy, J. E. Littlewood, *Contributions to the theory of the Riemann zeta-function and the theory of the distribution of primes*, Acta Arith. **41** (1918), 119–196.
- [26] A. Harper, *Sharp conditional bounds for moments of the Riemann zeta function*, preprint, [arXiv:1305.4618](https://arxiv.org/abs/1305.4618).
- [27] W. Heap, *Moments of the Dedekind zeta function and other non-primitive L -functions*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **170**(1) (2021), 191–219.
- [28] W. Heap, M. Radziwiłł, K. Soundararajan, *Sharp upper bounds for fractional moments of the Riemann zeta function*, Q. J. Math. **70** no. 4 (2019), 1387–1396.
- [29] W. Heap, A. Sahay, T. D. Wooley, *A paucity problem associated with a shifted integer analogue of the divisor function*, J. Number Theory, **242** (2023), 660–668.
- [30] W. Heap and K. Soundararajan, *Lower bounds for moments of zeta and L -functions revisited*, Mathematika, **68**(1) (2022), 1–14.
- [31] D. R. Heath-Brown, *The fourth power moment of the Riemann zeta function*, Proc. London. Math. Soc. **38** no. 3 (1979), 385–422.
- [32] A. Hone, J. Varona, *Continued fractions and irrationality exponents for modified Engel and Pierce series*, Monatsh. Math. **190** (2019), 501–516.
- [33] A. E. Ingham, *Mean-value theorems in the theory of the Riemann zeta function*, Proc. London Math. Soc. **27** (1926), 273–300.
- [34] S. Kanemitsu, Y. Tanigawa, M. Yoshimoto, *Structural elucidation of the mean square of the Hurwitz zeta-function*, J. Number Theory, **120**(1) (2006), 101–119.
- [35] M. Katsurada and K. Matsumoto, *Explicit formulas and asymptotic expansions for certain mean square of Hurwitz zeta-functions III*, Compositio Math. **131**(3) (2002), 239–266.
- [36] J. P. Keating, N. C. Snaith, *Random matrix theory and $\zeta(1/2 + it)$* , Comm. Math. Phys. **214** (2000) 57–89.

- [37] M. Knopp and S. Robins, *Easy proofs of Riemann's functional equation for $\zeta(s)$ and of Lipschitz summation*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **129**(7) (2001), 1915–1922.
- [38] A. H. Kruse, *Estimates of $\sum_{k=1}^N k^{-s} \langle k\alpha \rangle^{-t}$* , Acta Arith. **12** (1966/1967), 229–261.
- [39] A. Kumchev, *A note on the $2k$ -th mean value of the Hurwitz zeta function*, Bull. Austral. Math. Soc. **60**(3) (1999), 403–405.
- [40] S. Lang, *Introduction to Diophantine approximations*, 2nd edition, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.
- [41] A. Laurinćikas, D. Šiaučiūnas, *On the fourth power moment of the function $\zeta_\lambda(s)$* , Integral Transforms and Special Functions, **18** no. 9 (2007), 629–638.
- [42] J. Levesley, C. Salp, S. Velani, *On a problem of K. Mahler: Diophantine approximation and Cantor sets*, Math. Ann. **338** (2007), 97–118.
- [43] M. Mine, *New developments toward the Gonek Conjecture on the Hurwitz zeta-function*, preprint, [arXiv:2305.01262v2](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.01262v2).
- [44] M. Mine, *The Density Function for the Value-Distribution of the Lerch Zeta-Function and Its Applications*, Michigan Math. J. **69** no. 4 (2020), 849–889.
- [45] H. Mishou, *The joint value-distribution of the Riemann zeta function and Hurwitz zeta functions*, Liet. Mat. Rink. **47**(1) (2007), 62–80.
- [46] M. J. Narlikar, *On the mean square value of Hurwitz zeta function*, Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. (Math. Sci.) **90** no. 3 (1981), 195–212.
- [47] M. Radziwiłł, *Large deviations in Selberg's central limit theorem*, preprint, [arxiv:1108.5092v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/1108.5092v1).
- [48] V. V. Rane, *On Hurwitz zeta function*, Math. Ann. **264**(2) (1983), 147–151.
- [49] V. V. Rane, *On the mean square value of Dirichlet L -series*, J. London Math. Soc. **21** no. 2 (1980), 203–215.
- [50] K. F. Roth, *Rational approximation of algebraic numbers*, Mathematika **2** (1955), 1–20; Corrigendum, Mathematika **2** (1955), 168.
- [51] A. Sahay, *Moments of the Hurwitz zeta function on the critical line*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **174**(3) (2023), 631–661.
- [52] A. Selberg, *Contributions to the theory of the Riemann zeta-function*, Arch. Math. Naturvid. **48** no.5 (1946), 89–155.
- [53] A. Selberg, *Old and new conjectures and results about a class of Dirichlet series*, Proceedings of the Amalfi Conference on Analytic Number Theory (Maiori, 1989), Univ. Salerno, Salerno, 1992, 367–385.
- [54] J. Sondow, *Irrationality measures, irrationality bases, and a theorem of Jarník*, lecture given at Journées Arithmétiques XXIII, Graz, 2003. Preprint available at [arxiv:0406300v1](https://arxiv.org/abs/0406300v1).
- [55] K. Soundararajan, *Moments of the Riemann zeta function*, Ann. Math. **170** (2009), 981–993.
- [56] A. Sourmelidis, J. Steuding, *On the value-distribution of Hurwitz zeta-functions with algebraic parameter*, Constr. Approx. **55** (2022), no. 3, 829860.
- [57] Z. Tao., *On the mean square of Dirichlet L -functions*, Acta. Math. Sinica, **8** no. 2 (1992), 204–224.
- [58] K. M. Tsang, *The distribution of values of the Riemann zeta function*, Princeton University, 1984, Ph.D. Thesis.
- [59] S. M. Voronin, *The zeros of zeta-functions of quadratic forms*, Trudy Mat. Inst. Steklov. **142** (1976), 135–147, 269.
- [60] Y. Wang, *On the $2k$ th mean value of Hurwitz zeta-function*, Acta Math. Hungar. **74**(4) (1997), 301–307.
- [61] W. P. Zhang, *On the Hurwitz zeta-function*, Northeast. Math. J. **6**(3) (1990), 261–267.

Email address: `winstonheap@gmail.com`

Email address: `anuragsahay@purdue.edu`