

where

$$S_1(z, \chi) = \sum_{\rho < p \leq \rho'} \frac{\Lambda_{\delta/4}(p) \chi(p)}{p^s \log p},$$

$$S_2(z, \chi) = \sum_{\rho' < p \leq q} \frac{\Lambda_{\delta/4}(p) \chi(p)}{p^s \log p},$$

and $\rho' > \rho$. Clearly

$$\sum_{\chi \in \mathcal{L}_d(q)} |S_2(z, \chi)|^2 \leq \sum_{\chi \pmod{q}} |S_2(z, \chi)|^2$$

and the sum over all $\chi \pmod{q}$ may be estimated as in the case $K = 0$ above. We then obtain

$$(5) \quad \sum_{\chi \in \mathcal{L}_d(q)} |S_2(z, \chi)|^2 \ll \phi(q) (\rho')^{1-2\sigma_1}$$

for $z \in \partial U$, where the implied constant depends on σ_1 . We now estimate the remaining sum on the right hand side of (4). Fix $\varepsilon > 0$ so small that $0 < d - \varepsilon$ and $d + \varepsilon < \frac{1}{2}$. From the proof of Lemma 3.6 we recall the function $\xi(\tau)$ was defined so that $\xi(\tau) = 1$ if $\|\tau\| \leq d$, $\xi(\tau) = 0$ if $\|\tau\| \geq d + \varepsilon$, and $\xi(\tau)$ drops off to 0 linearly on $d \leq \|\tau\| \leq d + \varepsilon$. Also

$$(6) \quad \xi(\tau) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} c_n e(\tau n),$$

where the series converges absolutely and

$$c_0 = 2d + \epsilon .$$

Let p_1, \dots, p_K denote the primes in \mathcal{P}_K and define

$$\xi_K(\chi) = \prod_{k=1}^K \xi\left(\frac{\arg \chi(p_k)}{2\pi} - \theta_{p_k}\right) .$$

Then

$$(7) \quad 0 \leq \xi_K^2(\chi) \leq \xi_K(\chi) \quad (\chi \pmod{q})$$

and

$$(8) \quad 1 = \xi_K^2(\chi) = \xi_K(\chi) \quad (\chi \in \mathcal{L}_d(q)) .$$

Furthermore we have

$$(9) \quad \begin{aligned} \xi_K(\chi) &= \sum_{-\infty < n_1, \dots, n_K < \infty} c_{n_1} \dots c_{n_K} e\left(-\sum_{k=1}^K n_k \theta_{p_k}\right) \chi\left(\prod_{k=1}^K p_k^{n_k}\right) \\ &= \sum_{\vec{n}} c(\vec{n}) \chi\left(\prod_{k=1}^K p_k^{n_k}\right) , \text{ say,} \end{aligned}$$

where $\vec{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_K)$ runs through all K -tuples of integers and

$$(10) \quad c(\vec{0}) = c_0^K = (2d + \epsilon)^K .$$

Since the series in (6) is absolutely convergent, so is the series in (9). Thus, given $\varepsilon_1 > 0$, there exists a number $N(\varepsilon_1)$ such that for each $N \geq N(\varepsilon_1)$ and all $\chi \pmod{q}$,

$$|\xi_K(\chi) - \sum_{\|\vec{n}\| \leq N} c(\vec{n}) \chi \left(\prod_{k=1}^K p_k^{n_k} \right)| < \varepsilon_1,$$

where $\|\vec{n}\| = \left(\prod_{k=1}^K n_k^2 \right)^{1/2}$. For such an N we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_K^2(\chi) &\leq 2 \left| \sum_{\|\vec{n}\| \leq N} c(\vec{n}) \chi \left(\prod_{k=1}^K p_k^{n_k} \right) \right|^2 \\ &\quad + 2 \left| \xi_K(\chi) - \sum_{\|\vec{n}\| \leq N} c(\vec{n}) \chi \left(\prod_{k=1}^K p_k^{n_k} \right) \right|^2 \\ &\leq 2 \left| \sum_{\|\vec{n}\| \leq N} c(\vec{n}) \chi \left(\prod_{k=1}^K p_k^{n_k} \right) \right|^2 + 2\varepsilon_1^2. \end{aligned}$$

Using this, (7), and (8), we find

$$\begin{aligned} (11) \quad \sum_{\chi \in \mathcal{Q}_d(q)} |S_1(z, \chi)|^2 &\leq \sum_{\chi \pmod{q}} \xi_K^2(\chi) |S_1(z, \chi)|^2 \\ &< 2 \sum_{\chi \pmod{q}} \left| \sum_{\|\vec{n}\| \leq N} c(\vec{n}) \chi \left(\prod_{k=1}^K p_k^{n_k} \right) \right|^2 |S_1(z, \chi)|^2 \\ &\quad + 2\varepsilon_1^2 \sum_{\chi \pmod{q}} |S_1(z, \chi)|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Write $z = x+iy$. We immediately obtain from Lemma 5.2 that

$$(12) \quad \sum_{\chi \pmod{q}} |S_1(z, \chi)|^2 = \phi(q) \sum_{\rho < p \leq \rho'} \frac{|\Lambda_{\frac{\delta/4}{q}}(p) \chi(p) / \log p|^2}{p^{2x}}.$$

As in our previous estimates we see that this leads to

$$(13) \quad \sum_{\chi \pmod{q}} |S_1(z, \chi)|^2 \ll \phi(q) \rho^{1-2\sigma_1}$$

for $z \in \partial U$, where the constant depends on σ_1 . Again by Lemma 5.2 we have

$$(14) \quad \sum_{\chi \pmod{q}} \left| \sum_{\|\vec{n}\| \leq N} c(\vec{n}) \chi \left(\prod_{k=1}^K p_k^{n_k} \right) \right|^2 |S_1(z, \chi)|^2 \\ = \phi(q) \sum_{\|\vec{n}\| \leq N} |c(\vec{n})|^2 \sum_{\rho < p \leq \rho'} \frac{|\Lambda_{\frac{\delta/4}{q}}(p) \chi(p) / \log p|^2}{p^{2x}},$$

provided q is so large that none of the numbers

$p \prod_{k=1}^K p_k^{n_k}$, $\rho < p < \rho'$, are larger than q . The sum

over p is exactly the right-hand side of (12), so by (13) it is

$$\ll \phi(q) \rho^{1-2\sigma_1}$$

for $z \in \partial U$, where the constant depends on σ_1 . We deduce from (7) and (10) the absolute convergence of the series for

$\xi_K(\chi)$, and the relations

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\phi(q)} \sum_{\chi \pmod{q}} \chi(n) \bar{\chi}(m) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n = m \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\phi(q)} \sum_{\chi \pmod{q}} \chi(n) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } n = 1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\|\vec{n}\| \leq N} |c(\vec{n})|^2 &\leq \sum_{\|\vec{n}\|} |c(\vec{n})|^2 = \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\phi(q)} \sum_{\chi \pmod{q}} \xi_K^2(\chi) \\ &\leq \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\phi(q)} \sum_{\chi \pmod{q}} \xi_K(\chi) \\ &= c(\vec{0}) = (2d+\epsilon)^K. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the expressions in (14) are

$$\ll (2d+\epsilon)^K \phi(q) \rho^{1-2\sigma_1}.$$

Combining this with (11) and (13) we get

$$(15) \quad \sum_{\chi \in \mathcal{Q}_d(q)} |S_1(z, \chi)|^2 \ll ((2d+\epsilon)^K + \epsilon_1^2) \phi(q) \rho^{1-2\sigma_1}$$

for each $z \in \partial U$, where the constant depends on σ_1 .
 Finally, from (3), (4), (5), and (15) we find that

$$\sum_{\chi \in \mathcal{J}_d(q)} \max_{s \in C} |S(s, \chi)|^2 \\
 \ll ((2d+\varepsilon)^K + \varepsilon_1^2) \phi(q) \rho^{1-2\sigma_1} + \phi(q) (\rho')^{1-2\sigma_1},$$

where the constant depends on σ_1 , δ , and A , or, since δ and A depend on σ_1 , σ_2 , and C , on σ_1 , σ_2 , and C . Choose ρ' so large that

$$(\rho')^{1-2\sigma_1} \leq (2d)^\kappa \rho^{1-2\sigma_1},$$

and $\varepsilon, \varepsilon_1$ so small that

$$(2d+\varepsilon)^K + \varepsilon_1^2 \leq 2(2d)^K.$$

This gives (2) and proves the lemma. \square

Lemma 5.5. Let C be a compact set in the strip

$\frac{1}{2} < \sigma_1 < \sigma < \sigma_2 < 1$, let $\rho \geq 1$, and let $0 < d < \frac{1}{2}$.

For each $p \leq \rho$ let θ_p be fixed, $0 \leq \theta_p < 1$. If for $q \geq 1$, $\mathcal{J}(q)$ is a subset of the set of characters (mod q) with cardinality

$$J(q) = \phi(q) (1 + o(1)),$$

then for q sufficiently large there is a $\chi \in \mathcal{J}(q)$ such that

$$(16) \quad \left\| \frac{\arg \chi(p)}{2\pi} - \theta_p \right\| \leq d, \quad p \leq \rho, \quad p \nmid q$$

and

$$\max_{s \in C} \left| \sum_{\rho < p \leq q} \frac{\Lambda_{q^{\delta/4}}(p) \chi(p)}{p^s \log p} \right| \ll \rho^{1/2 - \sigma_1}.$$

The implicit constant depends on σ_1 , σ_2 , and C .

Proof: Let $K(q)$ be the number of primes $p \leq \rho$ such that $p \nmid q$, and let $\mathcal{Q}_d(q)$ be the set of characters (mod q) which satisfy (16). We write

$$\mathcal{H}_d(q) = \{ \chi \in \mathcal{Q}_d(q) \mid \max_{s \in C} |S(s, \chi)| \leq c \rho^{1/2 - \sigma_1} \},$$

where

$$S(s, \chi) = \sum_{\rho < p \leq q} \frac{\Lambda_{q^{\delta/4}}(p) \chi(p)}{p^s \log p},$$

and we write $G_d(q)$ for the cardinality of $\mathcal{H}_d(q)$. It suffices to show that for some choice of c depending on σ_1 , σ_2 , and C , and for all large q ,

$$\mathcal{H}_d(q) \cap \mathcal{J}(q)$$

is non-empty. Now for large q we have by Lemma 5.4 that

$$\sum_{\chi \in \mathcal{Q}_d(q)} \max_{s \in \mathbb{C}} |S(s, \chi)|^2 \ll (2d)^{K(q)} \phi(q) \rho^{1-2\sigma_1},$$

where the constant implied by \ll depends on σ_1 , σ_2 , and C . It follows that the cardinality of the complement of $\mathcal{A}_d(q)$ in $\mathcal{Q}_d(q)$ is

$$\ll \frac{(2d)^{K(q)}}{c^2} \phi(q).$$

Thus, choosing c large enough (depending on σ_1 , σ_2 , and C) we can ensure that

$$G_d(q) > I_d(q) - \frac{1}{4}(2d)^{K(q)} \phi(q),$$

where $I_d(q)$ is the cardinality of $\mathcal{Q}_d(q)$. By Lemma 5.3,

$$I_d(q) > \frac{1}{2}(2d)^{K(q)} \phi(q)$$

if q is large enough. Therefore

$$G_d(q) > \frac{1}{4}(2d)^{K(q)} \phi(q).$$

Since

$$J(q) = \phi(q)(1 + o(1)),$$

$\mathcal{J}(q)$ and $\mathcal{H}_d(q)$ must overlap for large q . This proves the lemma. \square

It is now necessary to define $\log L(s, \chi)$. Assume that $\chi \pmod{q}$ is not the principal character. For each zero $\beta + i\gamma$ of $L(s, \chi)$ with $\beta > \frac{1}{2}$, we remove the segment $(\frac{1}{2} + i\gamma, \beta + i\gamma]$ from the half-plane $\sigma > \frac{1}{2}$. We define $\log L(s, \chi)$ on the resulting slit half-plane to be that analytic branch of logarithm which satisfies

$$\lim_{\sigma \rightarrow \infty} \log L(s, \chi) = 0.$$

With this convention we state

Lemma 5.6. Let C be a compact set in the strip $\frac{1}{2} < \sigma_1 < \sigma < \sigma_2 < 1$ and set $\delta = \sigma_1 - \frac{1}{2}$. For each $q \geq 1$ there is a subset $\mathcal{J}(q)$ of the set of characters \pmod{q} with cardinality

$$J(q) = \phi(q)(1 + o(1))$$

such that when q is sufficiently large,

$$(17) \quad \max_{s \in C} \left| \log L(s, \chi) - \sum_{n < q^{\delta/2}} \frac{\Lambda_{\delta/4}(n) \chi(n)}{n^s \log n} \right| \ll q^{-\delta^2/8}$$

for all $\chi \in \mathcal{J}(q)$. The implied constant depends on σ_1 and C .

Proof: Let $A = \max_{s \in C} |s|$. We define $\mathcal{J}(q)$ to be the set of characters remaining after we remove from the set of all characters (mod q) the principal character and any character whose corresponding L-function has a zero with

$$(18) \quad \beta \geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\delta}{2}, \quad |\gamma| \leq A + q^{\delta/4}.$$

In this way we remove

$$\ll \sum_{\chi \pmod{q}} N\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\delta}{2}, A + q^{\delta/4}, \chi\right)$$

characters. By Lemma 3.1 this is

$$\begin{aligned} &\ll (q(A + q^{\delta/4}))^{1-\delta/2} \log^{14}(q(A + q^{\delta/4})) \\ &\ll q^{1-\delta/4}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the cardinality of $\mathcal{J}(q)$ is

$$J(q) = \phi(q) + O(q^{1-\delta/4}).$$

In view of Lemma 5.1 we therefore have

$$J(q) = \phi(q)(1 + o(1)).$$

We note that for each $\chi \in \mathcal{J}(q)$, $L(s, \chi)$ has no zeros or poles in the region

$$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\delta}{2} \leq \sigma < \infty, \quad |t| \leq A + q^{\delta/4}.$$

Thus $\log L(s, \chi)$ is analytic and single-valued in this region.

We now prove (17). Let $\chi \in \mathcal{J}(q)$ and $s = \sigma + it \in \mathbb{C}$. Integrating both sides of (3.19) in Lemma 3.8 along the half-line $[\sigma + it, \infty + it)$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \log L(s, \chi) &= \sum_{n < x^2} \frac{\Lambda_x(n) \chi(n)}{n^s \log n} \\ &\ll \frac{1}{\log x} \int_{\sigma}^{\infty} \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^{-2r-\alpha-u} + x^{-2(2r+\alpha+u)}}{(2r+\alpha+u)^2 + t^2} du \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\log x} \int_{\sigma}^{\infty} \sum_{\beta+i\gamma} \frac{x^{\beta-u} + x^{2(\beta-u)}}{(\beta-u)^2 + (\gamma-t)^2} du. \end{aligned}$$

We write this as

$$(19) \quad \log L(s, \chi) = \sum_{n < x^2} \frac{\Lambda_x(n) \chi(n)}{n^s \log n} \ll \frac{1}{\log n} (R_1(s, \chi) + R_2(s, \chi)).$$

We now estimate R_1 and R_2 assuming that $x \geq 2$. For R_1 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
R_1(s, \chi) &<< \int_{\sigma}^{\infty} \left(\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} x^{-2r-\alpha-u} \right) du \\
&<< \left(\sum_{r=0}^{\infty} x^{-2r} \right) \int_{\sigma}^{\infty} x^{-u} du \\
&<< \frac{x^{-\sigma}}{\log x},
\end{aligned}$$

where the \ll is absolute since $x \geq 2$. Thus, since $\sigma > \frac{1}{2} + \delta$ for $s \in C$, we find

$$(20) \quad R_1(s, \chi) \ll \frac{x^{-1/2-\delta}}{\log x}$$

uniformly for $s \in C$ and $\chi \in \mathcal{J}(q)$. To treat R_2 we write

$$(21) \quad R_2(s, \chi) = R_{21}(s, \chi) + R_{22}(s, \chi),$$

where

$$R_{21}(s, \chi) = \int_{\sigma}^{\infty} \sum_{|\gamma-t| \leq q^{\delta/4}} \frac{x^{\beta-u} + x^{2(\beta-u)}}{(\beta-u)^2 + (\gamma-t)^2} du$$

and

$$R_{22}(s, \chi) = \int_{\sigma}^{\infty} \sum_{q^{\delta/4} < |\gamma-t|} \frac{x^{\beta-u} + x^{2(\beta-u)}}{(\beta-u)^2 + (\gamma-t)^2} du.$$

In light of (18), each zero $\beta+i\gamma$ in the sum for $R_{21}(s, \chi)$ has $\beta < \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\delta}{2}$. Also for $u \geq \sigma$, $\beta - u < -\frac{\delta}{2}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} R_{21}(s, \chi) &\ll \int_{\sigma}^{\infty} x^{\beta-u} du \sum_{|\gamma-t| \leq q^{\delta/4}} \frac{1}{\delta^2 + (\gamma-t)^2} \\ &\ll \frac{x^{-\delta/2}}{\log x} \left(\sum_{|\gamma-t| \leq 1} \frac{1}{\delta^2} + \sum_{1 < |\gamma-t| \leq q^{\delta/4}} \frac{1}{(\gamma-t)^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.2,

$$\sum_{|\gamma-t| \leq 1} \frac{1}{\delta^2} \ll \frac{1}{\delta^2} \log q(|t|+2) \ll \log q(|t|+2)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{1 < |\gamma-t| \leq q^{\delta/4}} \frac{1}{(\gamma-t)^2} &\ll \sum_{j=1}^{[q^{\delta/4}]} \frac{\log q(|t+j|+2)}{j^2} \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{[q^{\delta/4}]} \frac{\log q(|t-j|+2)}{j^2} \\ &\ll \log q(|t|+q^{\delta/4}+2). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$(22) \quad R_{21}(s, \chi) \ll \frac{x^{-\delta/2}}{\log x} \log q(|t|+q^{\delta/4}+2).$$

The implied constant depends only on δ . Since $\beta < 1$ for every zero $\beta + i\gamma$, we find that

$$R_{22}(s, \chi) \ll \int_{\sigma}^{\infty} (x^{1-u} + x^{2(1-u)}) du \sum_{q^{\delta/4} < |\gamma-t|} \frac{1}{(\gamma-t)^2}.$$

The integral is

$$\ll \frac{x^{1-2\delta}}{\log x}$$

as $\sigma > \sigma_1 = \frac{1}{2} + \delta$ and the constant is absolute. For the sum we obtain by Lemma 3.2 the estimate

$$\begin{aligned} q^{\delta/4} \sum_{q^{\delta/4} < |\gamma-t|} \frac{1}{(\gamma-t)^2} &\ll \sum_{j > [q^{\delta/4}]} \frac{\log q(|t+j|+2)}{j^2} \\ &\quad + \sum_{j > [q^{\delta/4}]} \frac{\log q(|t-j|+2)}{j^2} \\ &\ll \sum_{j > [q^{\delta/4}]} \frac{\log q(|t|+j+2)}{j^2} \\ &\ll \int_{q^{\delta/4}}^{\infty} \frac{\log q(|t|+x+2)}{x^2} dx \\ &= - \frac{\log q(|t|+x+2)}{x} \Big|_{q^{\delta/4}}^{\infty} + \int_{q^{\delta/4}}^{\infty} \frac{dx}{x(|t|+x+2)} \end{aligned}$$

$$\ll \frac{\log q(|t|+q^{\delta/4}+2)}{q^{\delta/4}} .$$

Thus

$$R_{22}(s, \chi) \ll \frac{x^{1-2\delta}}{\log x} \frac{\log q(|t|+q^{\delta/4}+2)}{q^{\delta/4}} ,$$

where the constant is absolute. Combining this with (21) and (22) yields

$$R_2(s, \chi) \ll \frac{\log q(|t|+q^{\delta/4}+2)}{\log x} \left(x^{-\delta/2} + \frac{x^{1-2\delta}}{q^{\delta/4}} \right) .$$

This along with (19) and (20) leads to

$$(23) \quad \log L(s, \chi) - \sum_{n < x^2} \frac{\Lambda_x(n) \chi(n)}{n^s \log n} \\ \ll \frac{1}{(\log x)^2} \left(x^{-1/2-\delta} + \left(x^{-\delta/2} + \frac{x^{1-2\delta}}{q^{\delta/4}} \right) \log q(|t|+q^{\delta/4}+2) \right) ,$$

where $x \geq 2$ and the implied constant depends only on δ , hence on σ_1 . Taking $x = q^{\delta/4}$, $q \geq 2^{4/\delta}$, and noting that $|t| \leq A$ for $s \in C$, we find the right-hand side of (23) is

$$\ll \frac{1}{\delta^2 (\log q)^2} \left(q^{-\delta/8-\delta^2/4} + \left(q^{-\delta^2/8} + q^{-\delta^2/2} \right) \log q(A+q^{\delta/4}+2) \right)$$

$$\ll q^{-\delta^2/8} .$$

This last \ll depends on σ_1 and A , or σ_1 and C . Since this bound is uniform for $s \in C$ and $\chi \in \mathcal{J}(q)$, this establishes (17) and completes the proof of the lemma. \square

Lemma 5.7. Let C be a compact set in the strip $\frac{1}{2} < \sigma_1 < \sigma < \sigma_2 < 1$ and set $\delta = \sigma_1 - \frac{1}{2}$. Suppose that $\rho > \mu > 1$. Then there exist entire functions $\ell_\mu(s, q)$ such that if $0 \leq \theta_p < 1$ for $\mu < p \leq \rho$, and if q is sufficiently large, there is a character $\chi \pmod{q}$ for which we have

$$\max_{s \in C} \left| \log L(s, \chi) - \ell_\mu(s, q) - \sum_{\substack{\mu < p \leq \rho \\ p \not\equiv 1 \pmod{q}}} \frac{e(\theta_p)}{p^s} \right| \ll \mu^{-\delta} .$$

The implicit constant depends on σ_1 , σ_2 , and C .

Proof: Let $N = [8 \log \mu]$ and take q so large that $q^{\delta/4} \geq \max(\mu^N, \rho)$. With $\Lambda_x(n)$ as in Lemma 5.6 we have

$$(24) \quad \sum_{n < q^{\delta/2}} \frac{\Lambda_{\delta/4}(n) \chi(n)}{n^s \log n} = \sum_{p \leq \mu} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{\chi(p^k)}{k p^{ks}} + \sum_{\mu < p \leq \rho} \frac{\chi(p)}{p^s} \\ + \sum_{\rho < p \leq q^{\delta/2}} \frac{\Lambda_{\delta/4}(p) \chi(p)}{p^s \log p}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \sum_{p \leq \mu} \sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} \frac{\Lambda_{q^{\delta/4}}(p^k) \chi(p^k)}{p^{ks} \log p^k} \\
& + \sum_{\mu < p \leq q^{\delta/2}} \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{\Lambda_{q^{\delta/4}}(p^k) \chi(p^k)}{p^{ks} \log p^k} .
\end{aligned}$$

Assume $s \in C$ and note that $|\Lambda_{q^{\delta/4}}(n) \chi(n) / \log n| \leq 1$.

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{p \leq \mu} \sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} \frac{\Lambda_{q^{\delta/4}}(p^k) \chi(p^k)}{p^{ks} \log p^k} &<< \sum_{p \leq \mu} \sum_{k=N+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{p^{\sigma k}} \\
&<< \sum_{p \leq \mu} \frac{1}{p^{\sigma(N+1)}} << \mu 2^{-\sigma(N+1)} .
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\sigma > \frac{1}{2}$ for $s \in C$, $N = [3 \log \mu]$, and $\log 2 > \frac{1}{2}$, this is

$$<< \mu e^{-4 \log 2 \log \mu} = \mu^{1-4 \log 2} < \mu^{-1} .$$

Notice that the implicit constants in these estimates are absolute. Since $\sigma > \sigma_1 = \frac{1}{2} + \delta$ for $s \in C$, we next find

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\mu < p \leq q}^{\delta/2} \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{\Lambda_{q^{\delta/4}}(p^k) \chi(p^k)}{p^{ks} \log p^k} &\ll \sum_{\mu < p \leq q}^{\delta/2} \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{p^{\sigma_1 k}} \\
&\ll \sum_{\mu < p} \frac{1}{p^{2\sigma_1}} < \sum_{\mu < n} \frac{1}{n^{2\sigma_1}} \ll \frac{\mu^{1-2\sigma_1}}{2\sigma_1-1} \\
&\ll \mu^{-2\delta}.
\end{aligned}$$

The implicit constant in the last \ll depends on σ_1 . As

$$\mu^{-1} < \mu^{-2\delta},$$

we may combine these estimates with (24) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(25) \quad \sum_{n < q^{\delta/2}} \frac{\Lambda_{q^{\delta/4}}(n) \chi(n)}{n^s \log n} &= \sum_{p \leq \mu} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{\chi(p)^k}{k p^{ks}} - \sum_{\mu < p \leq \rho} \frac{\chi(p)}{p^s} \\
&= \sum_{\rho < p \leq q^{\delta/2}} \frac{\Lambda_{q^{\delta/4}}(p) \chi(p)}{p^s \log p} + O(\mu^{-2\delta})
\end{aligned}$$

uniformly for $s \in C$ and $\chi \pmod{q}$, where the constant in the O -term depends on σ_1 . Now let $\mathcal{J}(q)$ be the set of characters in Lemma 5.6. By that lemma when q is sufficiently large, we have

$$(26) \quad \sum_{n < q^{\delta/2}} \frac{\Lambda_{q^{\delta/4}}(n) \chi(n)}{n^s \log n} = \log L(s, \chi) + O(q^{-\delta^2/8})$$

uniformly for $s \in C$ and $\chi \in \mathcal{J}(q)$, where the 0-term constant depends on σ_1 and C . Furthermore since the cardinality of $\mathcal{J}(q)$ is $\phi(q)(1 + o(1))$, Lemma 5.5 implies that if $0 < d < \frac{1}{2}$ and q is sufficiently large, then there is a $\chi \in \mathcal{J}(q)$ such that

$$(27) \quad \left\| \frac{\arg \chi(p)}{2\pi} \right\| \leq d \quad \text{if } p \leq \mu \text{ and } p \nmid q,$$

$$(28) \quad \left\| \frac{\arg \chi(p)}{2\pi} - \theta_p \right\| \leq d \quad \text{if } \mu < p \leq \rho \text{ and } p \nmid q,$$

and

$$(29) \quad \max_{s \in C} \left| \sum_{\rho < p \leq q} \frac{q^{\delta/4} \chi(p)}{p^s \log p} \right| \ll \rho^{-\delta},$$

where the implicit constant in the \ll in (29) depends on σ_1 , σ_2 , and C . It follows from (27) and (28) that if d is small enough

$$(30) \quad \max_{s \in C} \left| \sum_{p \leq \mu} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{\chi(p^k)}{p^{ks}} - \sum_{p \leq \mu} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{1}{p^{ks}} \right| \leq \mu^{-\delta}$$

and

$$(31) \quad \max_{s \in C} \left| \sum_{\mu < p \leq \rho} \frac{\chi(p)}{p^s} - \sum_{\substack{\mu < p \leq \rho \\ p \nmid q}} \frac{e(\theta_p)}{p^s} \right| \leq \mu^{-\delta}.$$

We combine (25), (26), (29), (30), and (31) to obtain

$$(32) \log L(s, \chi) - \sum_{p \leq \mu} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{1}{p^{ks}} - \sum_{\substack{\mu < p \leq \rho \\ p \nmid q}} \frac{e(\theta_p)}{p^s} \\ \ll \mu^{-2\delta} + q^{-\delta^2/8} + \rho^{-\delta} + \mu^{-\delta}$$

where the implied constant depends at most on σ_1 , σ_2 , and C . Since $\rho > \mu$, if we take q large enough the right-hand side of (32) is

$$\ll \mu^{-\delta}.$$

Define $\ell_\mu(s, q)$ in the statement of the lemma by

$$\ell_\mu(s, q) = \sum_{p \leq \mu} \sum_{k=1}^N \frac{1}{p^{ks}}.$$

This completes the proof. \square

§3. Proof of Theorem 5.1

Suppose C and $f(s)$ satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem 5.1. Since C is compact and is contained in the strip $\frac{1}{2} < \sigma < 1$, there are numbers σ_1, σ_2 such that C is in the strip $\frac{1}{2} < \sigma_1 < \sigma < \sigma_2 < 1$. Let $\delta = \sigma_1 - \frac{1}{2}$,

let $\lambda_\mu(s, q)$ be the entire function of Lemma 5.7, and assume $\mu > 1$. We let $\Lambda_q = \{\log p | p/q\}$, where $q \geq 1$. For the counting function $N_{\Lambda_q}(x)$ we have

$$N_{\Lambda_q}(x) = \pi(e^x) + O_q(1).$$

Since $\pi(x) = \pi(x; 1, 1)$, we have by Lemma 3.3 for fixed q

$$N_{\Lambda_q}(x) = \text{li } e^x + O(e^{x-c\sqrt{x}}).$$

Obviously

$$N_{\Lambda_q}(x) \ll e^x.$$

Furthermore

$$N_{\Lambda_q}\left(x + \frac{c_1}{x^2}\right) - N_{\Lambda_q}(x) = \int_{e^x}^{e^{x + \frac{c_1}{x^2}}} \frac{dt}{\log t} + O(e^{x+c_1/x^2} - e^{\sqrt{x}})$$

$$\gg \frac{e^{x + \frac{c_1}{x^2}} - e^x}{\log(e^{x+c_1/x^2})} \gg \frac{e^x}{x^3}.$$

Similarly

$$N_{\Lambda_q}(x) - N_{\Lambda_q}\left(x - \frac{c_1}{x^2}\right) \gg \frac{e^x}{x^3}.$$

Thus $N_{\Lambda_q}(x)$ satisfies the hypotheses of Lemma 2.2. Since $f(s) - \lambda_{\mu}(s, q)$ is continuous on C and analytic in the interior of C , there must therefore exist a number $\rho > \mu$ and numbers θ_p , $0 \leq \theta_p < 1$, such that

$$(33) \quad \max_{s \in C} |f(s) - \lambda_{\mu}(s, q) - \sum_{\substack{\mu < p \leq \rho \\ p \nmid q}} \frac{e(\theta_p)}{p^s}| \ll \mu^{-1/2},$$

where the implied constant depends on σ_1 , σ_2 , C , and Λ_q . On the other hand if q is sufficiently large, we know by Lemma 5.7 that there is a $\chi \pmod{q}$ such that

$$(34) \quad \max_{s \in C} |\log L(s, \chi) - \lambda_{\mu}(s, q) - \sum_{\substack{\mu < p \leq \rho \\ p \nmid q}} \frac{e(\theta_p)}{p^s}| \ll \mu^{-\delta},$$

the implied constant being dependent on σ_1 , σ_2 , and C . Combining (33) and (34) yields

$$\max_{s \in C} |\log L(s, \chi) - f(s)| \ll \mu^{-1/2} + \mu^{-\delta} \ll \mu^{-\delta}.$$

For large μ we therefore have

$$\begin{aligned} L(s, \chi) &= e^{f(s)} \cdot e^{\log L(s, \chi) - f(s)} \\ &= e^{f(s)} (1 + O(\mu^{-\delta})) \\ &= e^{f(s)} + O\left(\left(\max_{s \in C} e^{|f(s)|}\right) \mu^{-\delta}\right) \\ &= e^{f(s)} + O(\mu^{-\delta}) \end{aligned}$$

uniformly for $s \in C$. Since the error term is independent of q and μ , we conclude on taking μ sufficiently large that for all large q there is a $\chi \pmod{q}$ such that

$$\max_{s \in C} |L(s, \chi) - e^{f(s)}| < \epsilon,$$

where $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary. This proves Theorem 5.1. \square

LITERATURE CITED

- [1] H. Bohr and R. Courant, "Neue Anwendungen der Diophantischen Approximationen auf die Riemannsche Zetafunktion", J. f. Reine und Angew. Math., 144(1914), 249-274.
- [2] J.W.S. Cassels, "Footnote to a note of Davenport and Heilbronn", J. London Math. Soc., 36(1961), 177-184.
- [3] E.W. Cheney, Introduction to Approximation Theory, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1966.
- [4] H. Davenport, Multiplicative Number Theory, Markham, Chicago, 1967.
- [5] H. Davenport and H. Heilbronn, "On the zeros of certain Dirichlet series, I, II", J. London Math. Soc., 11(1936), 181-185, 307-312.
- [6] A. Good, "On the value distribution of Riemann's zeta-function", to appear.
- [7] G.H. Hardy and J.E. Littlewood, "Contributions to the theory of the Riemann zeta-function and the theory of the distribution of primes", Acta Math., 41(1918), 119-196.
- [8] A.E. Ingham, "Mean-value theorems in the theory of the Riemann zeta-function", Proc. London Math. Soc., (2) 27(1926), 273-300.
- [9] N. Levinson, "More than one third of the zeros of

- Riemann's zeta-function are on $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$ ", Advances in Math., 13(1974), 383-436.
- [10] D.A. Marcus, Number Fields, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1977.
- [11] A.A. Markov, "On a problem of D.I. Mendeleev", Izv. Akad. Nauk St. Petersburg, 62(1889), 1-24.
- [12] H.L. Montgomery, Topics in Multiplicative Number Theory, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, Vol. 227, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1971.
- [13] H.L. Montgomery, "Extreme values of the Riemann zeta function", Comm. Math. Helv., 52(1977), 511-518.
- [14] H.L. Montgomery and R.C. Vaughan, "Hilbert's inequality", J. London Math. Soc., (2)8(1974), 73-82.
- [15] D.V. Pecerskii, "A theorem on projections of rearranged series with terms in L_p ", Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat., 41(1977), 203-214. See also: Math. USSR Izvestija, 11(1977), 193-204.
- [16] K. Prachar, Primzahlverteilung, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1957.
- [17] W. Rudin, Real and Complex Analysis, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1966.
- [18] W. Rudin, Functional Analysis, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1973.
- [19] E.C. Titchmarsh, The Theory of the Riemann Zeta-Function, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1951.
- [20] S.M. Voronin, "On the distribution of nonzero values of the Riemann zeta-function", Trudy Mat. Inst.

- Steklov., 128(1972), 131-150. See also: Proc. Steklov Inst. Math., 128(1972), 153-175.
- [21] S.M. Voronin, "Theorem on the "universality" of the Riemann zeta-function", Izv. Akad. Nauk SSSR Ser. Mat., 39(1975), 475-486. See also: Math. USSR Izvestija, 9(1975), 443-453.
- [22] S.M. Voronin, "On the zeros of zeta-functions of quadratic forms", Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR, 235(1977), 257-258. See also: Soviet Math. Dokl., 18(1977), 910-911.
- [23] S.M. Voronin, "On the functional independence of Dirichlet's L-functions", Acta Arith., 27(1975), 493-503.
- [24] S.M. Voronin, "On the zeros of zeta-function of quadratic forms", Trudy Mat. Inst. Steklov, 142(1976), 135-147.
- [25] S.M. Voronin, "Analytic properties of Dirichlet functions with arithmetic consequences", dissertation abstract.
- [26] E.T. Whittaker and G.N. Watson, A Course of Modern Analysis, Fourth Edition, Cambridge University Press, London, 1952.
- [27] R.T. Worley, "On a result of Cassels", J. Austral. Math. Soc., 11(1970), 191-194.