

A Smoothing Identity, a Displacement Sum Rule, and Finite-Height Laws for the Value Register of the Riemann Zeta Function

Ondřej Dvořák¹

¹*Independent researcher, Děčín, Czech Republic. on.dvorak@email.cz*

AI assistance: Large language models were used for computation, proof drafting, proof checking, literature consultation, cross-verification, editing, and manuscript preparation. The mathematical arguments were drafted and checked by these models, including repeated blind refereeing by independent model instances; **the author has not independently verified every proof.** The author originated and directed the research programme, made the methodological and editorial decisions, reviewed the manuscript, and accepts responsibility for presenting this material. The paper is written so that every claim can be checked from what is printed and deposited, without trust in either the author or the models.

Abstract

Let $S_N(s) = \sum_{n \leq N} n^{-s}$ and χ the factor of the functional equation $\zeta(s) = \chi(s)\zeta(1-s)$. Call the integer interval $G_k = (x_{k+1}, x_k)$ between consecutive saddle abscissae $x_\nu = t/2\pi\nu$ the k -th packet, and the average of S_N over it the packet centroid $\langle S \rangle_k$. A smoothing identity (Theorem 1 with Lemma 2.2; machinery under two labelled classical inputs, no priority claimed) gives $\zeta - \langle S \rangle_k = \chi(s)P_k(s) + \chi(s)O(t^{-1/2+\varepsilon})$, $P_k(s) = \sum_{m \leq k} m^{s-1}$, uniformly on compact σ -subsets of $(0, 1)$. Reflected, the zeros of $\zeta(s) - \chi(s)P_k(s)$ are the zeros of the Hurwitz zeta $\zeta(w, k+1)$. For these we prove a Littlewood-type displacement sum rule (Proposition 2): for $k \geq 2$ and T_1 above a threshold in k alone, evaluated here for $k \leq 3$, $\sum_{\nu \in (T_1, T_2]} (u_\nu - \frac{1}{2}) = \frac{T_2 - T_1}{4\pi} \log(k+1) + O_k(\log T_2)$, confirmed by a census whose pre-recorded deficits (four windows) close to $\leq 0.6\%$. We report finite-height measurements with window, bar and instrument: 1-point displacements of ζ over seven windows in $t \in [200, 100090]$, window means fit $c = 1.023 \pm 0.011$; spacing of $\zeta(w, 2)$ and $\zeta(w, 3)$ zero ordinates against matched controls; exact coil-regime laws; an aperture-crop law for close zero pairs; a resonance register; a threshold ladder with closed-form constant; a conditional Kac–Rice crossing-density theorem at fixed $\sigma > 1$; and costings of two positivity routes (Li; restricted-support Weil), both negative. Weil and Li positivity are equivalences of the Riemann Hypothesis, not reductions of it. No result in this paper decides the location of any zero of ζ , and nothing here is evidence for or against the Riemann Hypothesis in either direction.

MSC 2020: 11M06, 11M26, 11M35, 11Y35, 41A60. **Keywords:** Riemann zeta function, Hurwitz zeta function, a -points, partial sums, stationary phase, Littlewood’s lemma, spacing statistics, Davenport–Heilbronn function.

(This note is manuscript apparatus and sits outside the abstract field; it must not be pasted into it. An earlier version’s abstract ran to 4,700 characters — well past arXiv’s 1,920-character field limit — carrying an itemised inventory that is §0’s job; it was cut to the present form, and every figure and caveat it carried is in §0 and at the sites.)

Contents

§0 Reader’s guide: what is claimed, used, and not claimed · §1 Objects: the walk, the packets and centroids; $F_k = \zeta(\cdot, k + 1)$ and the census population; the Davenport–Heilbronn function; the five instruments · §2 Theorem 1, the smoothing identity, with its proof and its status (machinery; priority not claimed) · §3 Proposition 2, the displacement sum rule at $k \geq 2$, with Lemmas 3.1–3.3 and the Hurwitz-parameter question answered in print · §4 The census closure, with its deficits recorded in advance · §5 The displacement census of the 1-points, and the $\sqrt{\log \log t}$ question answered in print · §6 Spacing statistics, and the deduplication question answered in print · §7 The shape of the displacement law · §8 The error factor of Theorem 1 and the walk past the last saddle: the Fresnel-endpoint prediction; the coil radius law; the slope defect and the exact mirror split; the per-coil winding, measured; the winding classifier; the axis estimator; the window budget; the reality criterion · §9 Exact finite-height laws of the value register: the aperture-crop law; the origin-approach census; the carrier freeze; the aligned-Euler stem and the Euler-product gate; the zero-gap spectral measurement; $\arg \zeta'$ at the zeros; derivative-witness locality at the counterexample · §10 The prime-side register: a per-population support law; a ladder of thresholds on the wing function; the $\sigma > 1$ crossing-density theorem · §11 Two positivity registers, priced: how far a published proxy departs from the literal Li sequence at a certified zero; and the support-length cost of restricted-support Weil positivity · §12 What the author takes all this to mean, said once, with its hedge · §13 Positioning: the conceded objects and their owners · §14 References.

§0. Reader’s guide, and what is and is not claimed

This paper collects, in one place, the results of a computational and analytic programme on the geometry of partial sums of ζ . It is written to be read by an analytic number theorist with no access to any other document of the programme. Every object is defined at first use; every statistic is printed with the t -window it was measured on, the bar it was tested against, and the instrument that produced it. Results are numbered in one global sequence — Theorem 1, Proposition 2, Propositions 4–7, Lemmas 8–9, Theorem 10, with §8.5 accounting for the vacated 3 — while section-local lemmas, corollaries and remarks carry section-dotted numbers (Lemma 2.2, Corollary 2.3, Lemmas 3.1–3.3, the Remarks); the two schemes are disjoint by format, and a dotted number never refers to the global sequence. **One qualification on that last promise, made once here and repeated at every site where it applies:** a small number of the statistics below were produced in closed form, or inside a single high-precision working session, rather than by a standing script writing a standing data file. Where that is so it is said at the point of use, and the statement is then reproducible from the recipe printed beside it rather than by rerunning a filed instrument. Statistics whose provenance predates this apparatus and cannot be certified are not carried in this paper at all; where one was cut, the site says so.

Claimed as new mathematics. Proposition 2 (§3) and the census that confirms it (§4); the finite-height measurements of §§5–11, each in the exact scope stated there; together with the elementary propositions and lemmas of §§8–10 — Propositions 4–7 and Lemmas 8–9 — and the conditional Theorem 10 of §10.3, each claimed at the strength stated at its own site and with its concessions printed there. (*An earlier version of this list carried only the first two clauses, so the paper’s seven other stated results — four propositions, two lemmas, one conditional theorem — were outside its own claim taxonomy; a version after that miscounted them as six.*) **One exception to the words “finite-height” is flagged here rather than left to be noticed: §11.2 is not a finite-height measurement, because the register it measures carries no height at all.**

Its scope statement is a support range and a discretisation ladder in place of a t -window, and it says so at its own head.

The caveat that governs the first of those, carried here at the claim site and not only at §3.5. *The author has **not** read Steuding, Value-Distribution of L -Functions, LNM 1877, ch. 7 first-hand; that citation is via secondary sources. The Garunkštis–Steuding paper [GS07] was read first-hand, and what it supplies is exactly the boundary in question: it defines the Hurwitz parameter on $(0, 1]$, no statement of its sum rule at $\alpha > 1$ was located in the author’s search, and whether its proof runs unchanged at $\alpha > 1$ is the open question. (An earlier version of this sentence said the Garunkštis–Steuding sum-rule statement, like the book chapter, was known only through secondary sources; that contradicted §14’s status line and understated the author’s access at exactly the point where this caveat matters.) The finding, from a read of all four of ch. 7’s sections (the sums-over- c -values and Riemann–von Mangoldt sections at proof level): **the chapter’s standing hypothesis is a Riemann-type functional equation — axioms (1)–(3) of the Selberg class, with the Euler product explicitly not used — which the Hurwitz zeta $\zeta(s, k+1)$ does not satisfy, so no theorem there reaches the $k \geq 2$ objects. Its sums over c -values (Theorem 7.1 there: $\sum_{\beta_c > b} (\beta_c - b) \ll T$ unconditionally, $O(T \log T)$ under Lindelöf) are constant-target upper bounds, not the moving-target asymptotic identity of Proposition 2. And the case $c = 1$ — exactly the $k = 1$ object this paper concedes, since $\zeta(s, 2) = \zeta(s) - 1$ — is excluded from every numbered theorem of the chapter and handled in a closing remark (normalise by $q^s/a(q)$, “one gets analogous results”), with details deferred to that author’s Epstein-zeta papers. The paper’s $\log(k+1)$ constant is the structural analogue of that remark’s normalisation read at $q = k+1$: the same classical method family — Littlewood’s lemma plus a normalising factor, which §3 uses and attributes — stated in no theorem there. What remains unread first-hand on this boundary: Lekkerkerker 1955 and Perelli 1982, which ch. 7 cites beside its Riemann–von Mangoldt formula as treating “other classes of Dirichlet series” — located, not read, and a priori functional-equation-based. The $k \geq 2$ claim is still read as “new as far as the search reaches”, with the search now including the chapter that was its largest named gap. Accordingly the claim above should be read throughout as “new as far as an admittedly incomplete search reaches”, and §3.5 sets out in full why a referee should be suspicious of exactly this boundary. The same caveat governs the firstness claim of §5 and the one in §6.2, where it is repeated at each site.***

Used but not claimed. Theorem 1 (§2) enters this paper as *motivation and machinery*: it is what identifies F_k as the object worth censusing, and Corollary 2.3 is the bridge from centroid zeros to F_k zeros. **Proposition 2 and its proof are independent of it:** they are statements about the zeros of the Hurwitz zeta $\zeta(\cdot, k+1)$, an entire-function-theoretic object defined without reference to Theorem 1, and nothing in §§3–4 uses Theorem 1 or its error term — Lemma 3.2 uses only the functional equation, and Corollary 2.3 is likewise pure functional equation. (An earlier version of this paragraph said Lemma 3.2 and the sum rule *depend* on Theorem 1; that overstated the dependency in a way that ran against the paper’s own §2.7, which is the correct account, and needlessly discounted the one result claimed as new.) **No priority is claimed for Theorem 1, and two of its three components are located in print.** (i) The main term χP_k is the approximate functional equation read at *bounded dual length*: the identity $\sum_{x < n \leq N} n^{-s} = \chi(s) \sum_{t/2\pi N < \nu \leq t/2\pi x} \nu^{s-1}$ is displayed by Titchmarsh [T86], §4.12, p. 78, attributed there to Hardy–Littlewood and to Siegel, and Theorem 4.15 there admits bounded y explicitly; Fokas–Lenells [FL22], ch. 5, point at that same page and give an all-orders version of the identity in an adjacent, non-overlapping range of the dual length. (ii) The **error at a single sharp cutoff, including a closed form for the oscillating factor**, is O’Sullivan [OS22], Theorem 2.1, whose hypotheses

($\alpha, \beta \geq 1$ and $\lambda = \sqrt{\alpha/\beta} \geq 1$, with an implied constant independent of λ) contain the regime used here, and whose leading object is a normalised Mordell integral of the two fractional parts. **What this paper claims of Theorem 1 is therefore component (iii) alone: the packet average — the average of $\zeta - S_N$ over all the integers N filling one packet G_k — together with the endpoint weights it produces, exactly 1 at $\nu = k$ and 0 at $\nu = k + 1$ (Remark 2.1, Lemma 2.2).** For that component the author located no source; the search behind that statement is four web queries on one surface together with three first-hand primaries (Titchmarsh §§4.11–4.15; O’Sullivan §§1.1–1.3, Theorems 1.5 and 2.1, Proposition 2.4 and §7.1 — the locators of §14’s status line, an earlier version here said “entire”, which overstated the read; Fokas–Lenells §§1.2–1.3 and ch. 5), and it explicitly excludes Ivić, Edwards, Karatsuba–Voronin, Berry, Siegel 1932 and Gabcke 1979, none of which was consulted first-hand. A reader who recognises even (iii) as known should treat §2 as an exposition of a known lemma in the normalisation this paper needs. Two closely neighbouring objects that a first pass over the same chapter did *not* catch — the packet step law and the naming of the prefactor χ — are conceded to Titchmarsh §4.12 and, behind it, to van der Corput (§13); the main term above is the third object taken off that same page.

Not claimed at all. (i) Anything about the Riemann Hypothesis — including, and stated separately because §11 is where a reader will look for it, any *reduction* of it. Weil positivity and Li positivity are **equivalences** of the hypothesis; §11 measures what two routes through them cost and nothing else, and no assembly of finite positivity statements in this paper is offered as progress in either direction. (ii) The $-\sigma/2$ law for the general- s Riemann–Siegel remainder, which the programme measured before identifying it and which belongs to Siegel, Gabcke and Arias de Reyna; it is omitted from this paper entirely. (iii) An explicit functional form for the oscillating factor Φ_k of Theorem 1: §8 identifies its *mechanism* by a parameter-free prediction and reports the fit quality, and that is the whole of the claim. **No closed form for Φ_k is proved here, and none is claimed as new:** at a single sharp cutoff a closed form is already in print, as a Mordell integral of the two fractional parts (O’Sullivan [OS22], Thm 2.1), and §8.2’s prediction is an independent, parameter-free reconstruction of the same mechanism under the packet average, reported as a fit and not as a theorem. (iv) The objects listed in §13, every one of which this programme reached independently and every one of which is somebody else’s; they are named there because naming them is the cheapest and most informative thing an author can do for a referee.

A word on the record. The measurements below were produced over a long programme with an explicit falsifier-and-erratum discipline, and that discipline caught real errors — after filing, which is the honest way to put it. Two consequences are visible in this text and are deliberate. First, every number printed here has been re-verified against its instrument for this paper; claims that could not be so re-verified are absent, whatever their standing elsewhere. **One exception is flagged rather than absorbed:** §11.2’s two crossing lengths and its two driving depths, with the stability readings that go with them, are banked readings of the fourth instrument, taken after that instrument’s own correction and not re-measured for this paper; what was redone here is the arithmetic built on them, which is printed in full at the point of use — together with the definition of the driving depth itself, so that both what was measured and what was computed from it can be checked without anything being re-measured. Second, where a result was corrected, narrowed or withdrawn, the *narrowed* statement is what appears, in the main text, at the point of use, and never in an appendix.

Data availability. The census ledgers behind §§4–7, the certified counterexample ledger of §1.3, the second construction’s certified zero list of §11.2, and the computational instruments (I1), (I2), (I4) and the (I5) evaluator family of §1.4 are packaged for public deposit. *An earlier version of this sentence named (I1) and (I2) only and neither off-line-zero list; the deposit as described here is the deposit as assembled.* **The package is assembled rather than promised: it is deposited**

so as to resolve at posting, and its persistent identifier is printed at this point in the posted version rather than left for later — an earlier version of this sentence said only that it “will be linked at submission”, which is not a form a reader at posting time can use. **A copy of this file carrying no identifier at this point is a pre-posting draft and is not the posted version**, which is said here so that the distinction cannot be lost between the two. The certified zero data used as (I3) is a public dataset in its own right and is not redeposited with them. That package states, in its own words, every statistic in this paper that it could not trace to a standing script together with the data file that script wrote; those statements are exactly the ones flagged in the text below as closed-form or single-session.

§1. Objects

1.1 The functional-equation factor, partial sums, packets, centroids

Throughout, $s = \sigma + it$ with $t > 0$, and

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

with the Stirling asymptotic

$$\chi(s) = \left(\frac{2\pi}{t}\right)^{s-1/2} e^{i(t+\pi/4)} (1 + O(1/t)) \quad (t \rightarrow \infty),$$

uniformly on compact σ -sets. All zeros and poles of χ lie on the real axis, and $|\chi(\frac{1}{2} + it)| = 1$.

For s in the critical strip $0 < \sigma < 1$ the partial sums

$$S_N(s) = \sum_{n=1}^N n^{-s}$$

trace a spiral in the plane as N increases. The spiral is not uniform. Write

$$x_\nu := \frac{t}{2\pi\nu}$$

for the ν -th *saddle abscissa*: when N crosses x_ν , the ν -th term of the Fourier expansion of the sawtooth $\psi(x) = \{x\} - \frac{1}{2}$ appearing in the exact truncation formula (§2.2) passes through a stationary point, and the running sum swings direction. Successive saddle crossings divide the integers into *packets*; the k -th packet is the interval

$$G_k := (x_{k+1}, x_k), \quad |G_k| = \frac{t}{2\pi k(k+1)},$$

inside which the running sum describes one coherent arc of a Cornu-type spiral driven by the single dominant frequency $\nu = k$. The *packet centroid* of the k -th arc and its offset from ζ are

$$\begin{aligned} \langle S \rangle_k(s) &:= \frac{1}{|G_k \cap \mathbb{Z}|} \sum_{N \in G_k} S_N(s), \\ \text{off}_k^{\text{unif}}(s) &:= \zeta(s) - \langle S \rangle_k(s). \end{aligned}$$

Two averages appear in this paper and they are given two symbols, because an earlier version gave them one. The display above is the **uniform** packet average, written $\text{off}_k^{\text{unif}}$; the proof of Theorem 1 runs on a **smooth** weight supported in the middle third of G_k , whose offset is written off_k^ω and defined at §2.1. Theorem 1 is stated for off_k^ω and Lemma 2.2 transfers it to $\text{off}_k^{\text{unif}}$, which is the object measured in §§4–8.

1.2 The comparison function F_k , the census population, and a -points

Write

$$P_k(s) := \sum_{m \leq k} m^{s-1}, \quad F_k(w) := \zeta(w) - S_k(w).$$

Theorem 1, extended to the uniform average by Lemma 2.2, says $\text{off}_k^{\text{unif}} = \chi P_k + \chi O(t^{-1/2+\varepsilon})$, so the zeros of the centroid are, to leading order, the zeros of $\zeta(s) - \chi(s)P_k(s)$; by the functional equation these are the points where $\zeta(w) = S_k(w)$ in the reflected variable

$$w = \overline{1-s} = (1-\sigma) + it.$$

Thus the population censused in this paper is

$$\{w = u + iv : F_k(w) = 0\}, \quad F_k(w) = \zeta(w) - S_k(w).$$

We record at once the elementary identity

$$F_k(w) = \zeta(w) - \sum_{m \leq k} m^{-w} = \zeta(w, k+1)$$

the Hurwitz zeta function at integer parameter $\alpha = k+1$; it follows from $\zeta(w, \alpha+1) = \zeta(w, \alpha) - \alpha^{-w}$ iterated from $\alpha = 1$. This identity is used in earnest in §3.5, where it generates the first question a referee should ask about Proposition 2.

Given $a \in \mathbb{C}$, an a -point of ζ is a solution of $\zeta(s) = a$. At $k = 1$ we have $S_1(w) \equiv 1$, so the zeros of F_1 are exactly the 1-points of ζ , studied since Levinson [L75] and carrying mean density $(1/2\pi) \log(t/4\pi)$ per unit height — **the a -point density at $a = 1$, which is the exceptional value**, and *smaller* than ζ 's own zero density $(1/2\pi) \log(t/2\pi)$, which is what every $a \neq 1$ gives. **An earlier version of this clause called $(1/2\pi) \log(t/4\pi)$ “the classical a -point density” and “distinct from” ζ 's own; the first is false at every $a \neq 1$ and the second misdescribes the relation, and both are corrected here.** The mechanism is this paper's own bookkeeping, the same one §4.1 states for general k : as $\sigma \rightarrow +\infty$ one has $\zeta(s) - a \rightarrow 1 - a$, a non-zero constant, so the right-hand edge of a counting rectangle contributes no argument change; only at $a = 1$ does $\zeta(s) - 1 \sim 2^{-s}$ contribute the further $-T \log 2$ that turns the 2π into 4π . Checked directly for this paper by an argument-principle winding count of $\zeta(s) - a$ around $[-1, 5] \times [100, 200]$ — instrument (I2) at 20 working digits — with 6000 nodes per vertical side and 900 per horizontal side, largest phase step between consecutive nodes 0.24 rad, which satisfies the $\pi/4$ adequacy criterion of §9.4 with a factor 3.3 to spare (an earlier version printed the step with no criterion attached and named no instrument): the counts are 50 at $a = 2$, 50 at $a = \frac{1}{2}$ and 39 at $a = 1$, against the two predictions $\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{100}^{200} \log(t/2\pi) dt = 50.191$ and $\frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{100}^{200} \log(t/4\pi) dt = 39.159$. Both densities are used below and are always named; every use in this paper is at $a = 1$. For $k \geq 2$, $S_k(w) = 1 + 2^{-w} + \dots + k^{-w}$ varies with position and the root family is not an a -point family for any constant a .

Each root $w_\rho = u_\rho + iv_\rho$ has *signed displacement*

$$d\sigma_\rho := \sigma_\rho^* - \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2} - u_\rho, \quad \sigma_\rho^* := 1 - u_\rho.$$

This is the sign convention of the census: $d\sigma > 0$ on the side $\sigma^* > \frac{1}{2}$, i.e. $u_\rho < \frac{1}{2}$. Note that $u_\rho - \frac{1}{2}$ and $d\sigma_\rho$ are opposite in sign; the sum rule's natural variable is $u_\rho - \frac{1}{2} = -d\sigma_\rho$. We keep both and always say which.

The roots with $u \in [0, 1]$ (equivalently $\sigma^* \in [0, 1]$) form the *strip family*. Roots with $u > 1$ (equivalently $\sigma^* < 0$) form a second family, confined on the right by Lemma 3.1 below; it exists for every k , it carries most of the sum rule's budget, and it is excluded from every distributional statistic in §§5–7 because it is a different population.

1.3 The Davenport–Heilbronn function

Several measurements below are calibrated against a Dirichlet series that satisfies a Riemann-type functional equation and *has* zeros off its critical line. Put

$$\xi = \frac{\sqrt{10 - 2\sqrt{5}} - 2}{\sqrt{5} - 1} = 0.284079\dots,$$

and let f be the Davenport–Heilbronn function: the periodic Dirichlet series of period 5 with coefficient tuple

$$(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, a_5) = (1, \xi, -\xi, -1, 0),$$

$$f(s) = \sum_{n \geq 1} a_n n^{-s} = 5^{-s} \left(\zeta(s, \tfrac{1}{5}) + \xi \zeta(s, \tfrac{2}{5}) - \xi \zeta(s, \tfrac{3}{5}) - \zeta(s, \tfrac{4}{5}) \right),$$

a degree-one element of the extended Selberg class of conductor 5 whose functional-equation factor has modulus 1 on $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$. Since the coefficients are supported on residues prime to 5 and $a_{5-n} = -a_n$, f decomposes as $f = c_+ L(s, \psi) + c_- L(s, \bar{\psi})$ with ψ an odd character modulo 5 and $c_{\pm}$ determined by finite linear algebra — **the character is written ψ here and wherever it recurs (§10.1), because χ is the functional-equation factor of §1.1 and an earlier version used the one letter for both. (A *different*, even character modulo 5 carries the same glyph at §13.2, pinned there by $\psi(2) = -1$; an earlier version’s “wherever it recurs (§10.1, §13.2)” identified the two, which is false — they differ in parity — and §8.6’s register now separates them.)** An earlier version of *this* sentence said “ ψ throughout this paper”, a universal claim that was false in both directions that matter: ψ is also §1.1’s sawtooth $\{x\} - \frac{1}{2}$, the central object of Theorem 1’s proof two subsections earlier, and the digamma function in Remark 3.2a and §11.2 — four meanings, now carried in §8.6’s symbol note where they belong — — two independent Euler products, and no Euler product for f itself. Davenport and Heilbronn [DH36] proved that f has zeros with $\sigma > 1$; Cassels [C61] showed that it also has zeros off the critical line inside the strip.

A source-status statement, made once. The author has not obtained the 1936 original first-hand; the existence theorem is cited from secondary sources. Accordingly **no ruling in this paper rests on the published counterexample data.** Every statement below that uses f uses the author’s own first-party computations. The certified ledger consists of 193 off-line zero pairs (386 quartet members with $t > 0$, one pair $\sigma, 1 - \sigma$ per ordinate) spanning

$$t \in [85.699348, 3992.648801], \quad \sigma \in [0.10225, 0.89775],$$

each located and refined so that the residual at the refined point satisfies $|f| \leq 2.39 \times 10^{-28}$ across all 386 members (median 6.9×10^{-29} , minimum 1.2×10^{-30}), and each paired with its functional-equation partner at $1 - \sigma$ and the same ordinate, the pairing checked by evaluation at the ledger’s own refined register, where the recorded partner residuals are $|f| \leq 1.62 \times 10^{-15}$ (median 8.2×10^{-17}) — 386/386 partner checks passed. **The register of those two figures is stated because a deposit reader will recompute at the stored double-precision coordinates and must not read the mismatch as a defect: at the stored partner coordinates direct evaluation returns the same double-coordinate cap as the members themselves — up to 7.4×10^{-12} , measured for this version — and residuals at the 10^{-17} scale are arithmetically unreachable there, since the cap is $|f'|$ times the absolute double-precision spacing of the ordinate (next paragraph).** One bookkeeping fact about the ledger is stated here because every residual figure in this subsection depends on it: the refinement is carried

at high working precision, but the *coordinates* the ledger stores are IEEE doubles, so the residual attached to a member certifies the refinement, not the stored coordinate pair. Evaluating f at a stored double-precision coordinate pair returns a residual many orders above the refinement register, and the difference is arithmetic bookkeeping and nothing else. **Measured for this version, with an evaluator independent of every producing instrument, across all 386 members: median 2.1×10^{-13} , maximum 7.4×10^{-12} (at $t = 2887.9$). An earlier version said “of order 10^{-15} ”, glossed by “ $|f'|$ is of order 1, so sixteen significant digits cap the achievable residual near 10^{-16} ”; that is the low-ordinate reading only. The cap is $|f'(\rho)|$ times the absolute double-precision spacing of the stored ordinate, and both factors grow along the ledger — $|f'|$ spans 1.26 to 35.7 across the members, and the double-precision spacing of the ordinate reaches $2^{-41} = 4.547 \times 10^{-13}$ on $[2048, 4096)$, the ledger’s top binade — an upper bound over the ledger, not a constant: the span $[85.699, 3992.649]$ crosses six binades and the spacing at the low end is $2^{-46} = 1.42 \times 10^{-14}$ (an earlier version wrote “ 8.9×10^{-13} at $t \approx 4000$ ” — the next binade’s spacing, first attained at $t \geq 4096$, and even that inexactly: it is $2^{-40} = 9.09 \times 10^{-13}$; a version after that printed the top-binade spacing as holding “for the entire ledger”, which contradicted the growth clause of this very sentence) — so the stored-coordinate residual is t -dependent and reaches the 10^{-12} scale at the window’s top. What the re-verification certifies is unchanged and is the point: every stored pair Newton-refines to a genuine zero, maximum refined residual 6.5×10^{-37} , maximum refinement move 4.2×10^{-13} — within the ledger’s top-binade double spacing $2^{-41} = 4.5 \times 10^{-13}$, the largest spacing any member’s stored ordinate carries — 386 of 386. Wherever a ledger member is displayed below it is displayed at a precision at which its printed residual is the residual **at the printed coordinates**. The evaluator itself was validated separately at a pinned literature zero, where it returns $|f| = 2.9 \times 10^{-24}$. **An earlier version of this sentence read “certified by two independent evaluation routes to $|f| \leq 3 \times 10^{-31}$ (both routes 4×10^{-31})”; that is superseded and corrected here.** It was not parseable as printed, neither figure is reproducible from the ledger, and the two routes are not comparably tight: the refinement route and the partner-evaluation route differ by roughly twelve orders of magnitude on the medians (12.1; 12.8 on the maxima), as the two ranges just given show. **The window is stated here in the form it has on the ledger, and it is one ledger with no second dataset behind it.** 28 of the 193 ordinates (56 quartet members) lie below $t = 1000$ and none lies above $t = 4000$; the $T = 4000$ per-population sums of §§9.7 and 10.1 therefore run over all 386 members, sub-1000 ordinates included.**

The zero count is cross-checked against the Riemann–von Mangoldt formula for a degree-one element of the extended Selberg class of conductor $q = 5$, in the form actually used:

$$N_f(T) = \frac{T}{2\pi} \log \frac{qT}{2\pi e} + O(\log T),$$

$$\left. \frac{T}{2\pi} \log \frac{5T}{2\pi e} \right|_{T=4000} = 4498.107,$$

against 4112 on-line + 386 quartet members = 4498 found: a deviation of 0.0024% on the main term. **The quotient is printed here from the unrounded main term, because the rounded one does not reproduce it:** $4498.10734 - 4498 = 0.10734$, and $0.10734/4498.10734 = 2.386 \times 10^{-5}$, i.e. 2.39×10^{-5} ; an earlier version wrote this as $0.107/4498.107$, whose literal value is 2.379×10^{-5} . **An earlier figure of “4496 predicted, 0.044%” is superseded and is corrected here in the main text**, since it is not reproducible from the displayed formula; the comparison above is the one of record. The $O(\log T)$ term is not evaluated, so this is a consistency check on the ledger and not a completeness certificate for it.

One certified off-line zero used repeatedly below — the lowest ordinate in the ledger — is, refined for this paper from the ledger’s stored coordinates by Newton’s method on the evaluator of instrument (I2) at 60-digit working precision (this re-refinement is the first of the single-session statements flagged in §0 and §1.4, and it is flagged here at its site as promised there),

$$s = 0.808517182456637385553351960607 + 85.6993484853775921719292677089 i,$$

$$|f(s)| = 5.2 \times 10^{-29} \text{ at the thirty digits printed, } |f'(s)| = 1.2558.$$

The figure 1.9×10^{-27} that stood here in an earlier version corresponds to nothing and is withdrawn. The ledger’s own entry for this member records $|f| = 2.13 \times 10^{-30}$ at its internally refined point — inside the maximum 2.39×10^{-28} quoted above — while at the sixteen-digit coordinates that earlier version printed the residual is 2.7×10^{-15} , which is the arithmetic just described and not a defect of the zero. The refinement moved 2.2×10^{-15} from those sixteen-digit coordinates and, continued past thirty digits, drives $|f|$ below 10^{-59} ; thirty digits are printed because that is where the printed residual sits inside the ledger’s stated maximum with room to spare. Instrument (I2); the same evaluator, at the same normalisation of ξ , produces every other figure in this subsection. The same posture applies to the density theorem of Kaczorowski–Kulas, which the author has likewise not read first-hand and on which nothing here depends. Wherever this paper says that some invariant “does not separate ζ from the counterexample”, the counterexample is this f , the evidence is the first-party data just described, and the statement is about the objects and windows named there and nothing more.

1.4 Instruments and data statement

Five instruments produce the numbers in this paper. (*An earlier version of this sentence said “four” above a list of five — the head count had not been moved when (I5) was declared.*)

(I1) The census evaluator. Euler–Maclaurin evaluation of ζ with $N = \max(100, \lceil t \rceil)$ Dirichlet terms and 12 Bernoulli correction pairs, Kahan-compensated summation, IEEE double precision. This gives float64 accuracy for $t \leq 60000$ and approaches the double-precision floor ($\sim 10^{-10}$) near $t = 10^5$. Roots of F_k are located by Newton’s method seeded on a grid with steps $\Delta t = 0.5$, $\Delta u = 0.2$ in the box $u \in [-0.5, 1.5]$; duplicate roots within tolerance 10^{-4} **in both coordinates** are merged. Before each census window the evaluator is validated against a reference table: 15/15 value matches and 12/12 Newton convergences on the low-range table ($t \leq 8000$), 12/12 and 12/12 on the high-range table ($t \in [15000, 100000]$). The census dataset was frozen on 2026-07-08 and no window has been added since. One further use at a second term count is declared here because the reproducibility statement promises the term counts: §10.3’s ray census runs the same Euler–Maclaurin scheme at $N = \lceil 0.22t \rceil + 60$ terms and 12 Bernoulli pairs — a count set for its range, stated again at its site.

(I2) High-precision probes. Arbitrary-precision evaluations, at **working precisions between 20 and 60 decimal digits — quoted at the uses where printed digits depend on them** (§1.2 at 20, Remark 2.1 at 25–30, §8.3 at 30, §8.7’s recomputed table at 30, §8.9 at 30, §9.7’s near-line resolution at 50, §10.2’s rung recomputation at 50 and its double-pinning at 30, §11.1 at 40 and 49, §1.3’s re-refinement at 60); at the remaining uses (§§8.4–8.6, §8.8, §9.1, §9.4, §10.1, §11.2’s list verification, §1.3’s for-this-version co-ordinate measurements) the working precision was not individually banked, and each figure there is reproducible from its printed recipe at any precision meeting its printed digits — an earlier version promised the precision “quoted individually at each use”, which those sites refuted, for the close-pair, stem, wing-function-ladder (§10.2), counterexample

and positivity computations of §§9–11, for the refinements of §1.3, for §1.2’s argument-principle winding count, and throughout §8 — the closed-form checks of §8.3 (30 digits), the winding and classifier measurements of §§8.4–8.6, the axis-estimator floors of §8.7, the sign-change scan of §8.8 (precision not individually banked; its own text cites §9.7’s 50-digit run, which is §9.7’s figure), the resonance verification of §8.9 (30 digits), and Remark 2.1 (25–30 digits). *An earlier version gave the range as 30 to 50 digits, which excluded two of this instrument’s own uses at both ends; the corrected 25–60 still excluded a third — §1.2’s winding count at 20 digits — in the very sentence written to fix exactly that class of error; and the use list itself omitted the whole of §8, seven declared uses, in the sentence that claimed the list was audited. The range now stated was set by auditing every printed use; a further audit for this version moved §9.7, §10.2 and §11.1 — five printed precisions in three sections, all inside the stated range — from neither list into the quoted-at-use list, so the previous audit’s own completeness claim failed in the same way a third time. A fourth instance, corrected in this version: the list credited §8.8 with a banked 50-digit precision that §8.8’s own text disclaims — the 50 digits are §9.7’s, and the one figure had been counted at two sites.* Residuals are likewise quoted at each use. The float64 range of (I1) does not bound them.

(I3) Certified zero data. For statements at heights beyond the reach of (I1) we use the Platt-certified zeros of ζ [Pl] — 103.8 billion zeros to height 3.061×10^{10} — of which a contiguous block of 2.85 billion up to height 10^9 was held locally. **Two separate guarantees travel with that data and an earlier version of this sentence ran them together.** *Completeness* of the list within its range is certified by Turing’s method, which bounds $\int S$ over an interval and so rules out unlisted zeros; *arithmetic precision* of each listed ordinate is a separate matter, and the distributed data carries each ordinate to an absolute accuracy of 2^{-101} . Neither statement implies the other. **The ceiling is printed as 3.061×10^{10} and not as 3×10^{10} , because the two do not carry the same count:** the Riemann–von Mangoldt formula gives $N(3 \times 10^{10}) = 1.0164 \times 10^{11}$, so a bank of 103.8 billion zeros reaches to 3.061×10^{10} and an earlier version paired the round height with the true count. The local reader was validated by byte checksums and by reproducing reference zeros to 3×10^{-9} .

(I4) The positivity-form assembly. Used only in §11.2. The pole, archimedean and arithmetic blocks of the Weil explicit-formula functional at restricted support are assembled exactly on N grid points — the arithmetic block being a *finite* sum, since the support restriction caps it at $n \leq e^L$ — giving a real symmetric matrix M_F ; the reading is the generalised-eigenvalue minimum $\mu_F(L) = \min_{\varphi} W_F(\varphi) / \langle \varphi, \varphi \rangle_G$ with the norm pinned at $G = I$ (condition number exactly 1), and the support length at which the sign changes is bracketed by bisection in L . Discretisation ladder to $N = 4096$, and to $N = 8192$ wherever a reading was contested. Before any ladder is run the assembly is closed against the zero-side sum $\sum_{\rho} h(\gamma_{\rho})$ to ten significant digits, and an independent second implementation reproduces the assembled values to 1.1×10^{-14} . This instrument carries no height: no t enters it at any stage (§11.2).

(I5) The crossing-density functional evaluator. Used only in §10.3. The Kac–Rice functional $\rho(\sigma)$ is evaluated by the two-dimensional characteristic-function assembly §10.3 specifies at its point of use — per-prime curves sampled at 2^{14} points, the joint density of (A, B) accumulated on a 2048^2 lattice with the stated box margins, the exact product over $p \leq 2000$, a single Gaussian factor standing in for $2000 < p \leq 10^6$ — with the convergence ladder and the accuracy bounds printed there. **An earlier version left this machinery outside the instrument list altogether: it is none of (I1)–(I4), so the paper carried an undeclared fifth instrument under a promise that every statistic names its producer. It is declared here, and §10.3’s body names it at each point of use; the corollaries’ computed margins are among the closed-form/single-session statements flagged in §0, their recipes printed**

with them, and they say so at the site — an earlier version of this sentence claimed the corollaries themselves named (I5), which they did not. Deposit status: the evaluator family is deposited with the §10.3 data; no single end-to-end script isolates the $\rho(\sigma)$ computation, and that gap is recorded in the deposit’s own gap list rather than papered over.

Every measured statistic below either names which of (I1)–(I5) produced it, or belongs to the closed-form/single-session class flagged in §0 — the ten entries below, together with the boundary classes enumerated after them, which additionally include §3.1’s bisection roots, Remark 3.1a’s numerical offsets, Remark 3.2a’s threshold scan (the computation §4.4’s tested-as-proved claim rests on) — an earlier version also listed §10.3’s corollary computations in this clause, double-counting the ninth of the ten entries below — with the printed recipe standing in the key’s place. *(An earlier version asserted the key half universally, three sentences after its own (I5) entry had documented the flag class as keyless; a promise and its counterexample cannot share a paragraph.)* The one measured statistic that could certify neither key nor recipe was cut from the paper rather than carried under a guessed key (§9.6 item 3 says so at the site). **Ten entries below were produced in closed form or inside a single working session**, in the sense flagged in §0 — **the count is of entries, and five of them (the third, fourth, eighth, ninth and tenth) name more than one statistic apiece — the ninth and the tenth each name three — so the number of statistics involved is larger than ten; an earlier version of this sentence counted the entries and called them statistics, two later versions undercounted the plural entries, and the seventh — which then named §8.7’s axis offset and bracket half-width — dropped to a single qualitative reading when those two decimals were cut under this paper’s provenance standard:** §1.3’s re-refinement of the ledger’s lowest zero, carried out for this paper from the ledger’s stored coordinates at 60-digit working precision rather than by a standing script; Remark 2.1’s three-point centroid-weight check; §6.1’s per-family-normalised fractions, its six suppression factors, and the exact-Gaudin reference row, including the two standard deviations recomputed there (*§6.1’s own provenance paragraph lists the same three items; an earlier version of this entry omitted the six factors and the two lists disagreed*); §8.3’s per-cell relative errors — re-run in full over all eighteen cells for this version, with every cell printed at the site (an earlier version of this entry also listed the crude constant $c \leq 20$, which §8.3 states as an analytic bound, not a computed statistic; it is removed from the entry); §8.4’s analytic band constant δ_{LSQ} ; the sixty-one-zero half of §8.5’s winding measurement; §8.7’s reading at the counterexample zero; §8.9’s numerical spot checks; §10.3’s two-component identification, its truncated (H2) margin and its sign-change census, all three run for this paper; and §11.2’s exponent, prefactor and cost extrapolation, which are arithmetic on four banked constants — two crossing lengths and two driving depths — and are worked through in full at the point of use. Each is marked as such where it appears. **The boundary of the list, stated so the count is auditable — two classes share the one-off character but need no flag, and are not counted here:** evaluations whose formula and output are both displayed where they occur (§4.3’s quadrature integrals; §9.5’s recomputed classical comparands; §3.1’s bisection roots; Remarks 3.1a and 3.2a’s scans, each printed with its recipe), where the display *is* the whole computation; and recomputations of deposited data by recipes printed at their sites (§5’s recomputed columns and fits, which rebuild from the deposited census roots together with the printed full-precision midpoint vector; §1.3’s and §11.2’s for-this-version re-verifications), reproducible from the deposit together with print. *(An earlier version gave one ground for both classes — “the display is the whole computation” — which is false of the second.)*

§2. Theorem 1: the smoothing identity (machinery; priority not claimed)

Theorem 1 (under the two standard inputs (E1)–(E2) below). Fix $k \geq 1$, a compact $[\sigma_0, \sigma_1] \subset (0, 1)$, and $\varepsilon > 0$. Assume: (E1) the truncated stationary-phase expansion of §2.4(i)–(ii) — the main-term coefficient with its uniform $O(t^{-1})$ error, and the Fresnel-tail size $(\kappa_\nu d_\nu)^{-1}$ — for the amplitudes $\frac{s}{2\pi i\nu} x^{-\sigma-1}$; (E2) the repeated-integration-by-parts bounds, with summation over ν , for the negative and distant frequencies (§2.3, §2.4(iii)) on $[N, \infty)$. Then, uniformly for $\sigma \in [\sigma_0, \sigma_1]$, the smooth-weight centroid offset off_k^ω of §2.1 satisfies

$$\text{off}_k^\omega(s) = \chi(s)P_k(s) + \chi(s)O_{k,\sigma_0,\sigma_1,\varepsilon}\left(t^{-1/2+\varepsilon}\right),$$

where the error, written as $\chi(s)t^{-1/2}\Phi_k$, carries an oscillating factor $\Phi_k \ll_{k,\varepsilon} t^\varepsilon$ whose dominant part has phase depending on $\{t/2\pi k\}$ and $\{t/2\pi(k+1)\}$ (§2.5). (E1) and (E2) are standard applications of the exponential-integral lemmas of [T86], ch. IV; their hypothesis checks are elementary for these amplitudes but are not written out here — §2.6 states this in full. An earlier version stated the theorem without displaying the two inputs in its hypotheses, leaving the conditional character to §2.6 alone; a reader taking the theorem environment at face value would have over-read it, and the inputs are now part of the statement.

The centroid offset is not zero; it equals $\chi(s)P_k(s)$ to leading order — a sum of k terms with χ -proportional weight. Equivalently $\langle S \rangle_k(s) = \zeta(s) - \chi(s)P_k(s) + \chi(s)O(t^{-1/2+\varepsilon})$.

2.0 What in Theorem 1 is classical, said before the proof rather than after it

The reader should have the attribution before the argument, so it is placed here.

The main term is the approximate functional equation at bounded dual length. With $N \asymp t/2\pi k$ the dual length is $t/2\pi N \in (k, k+1)$, so $\chi(s)P_k(s)$ is exactly the χ -side sum of the approximate functional equation with its second cutoff held bounded. The identity behind it, $\sum_{x < n \leq N} n^{-s} = \chi(s) \sum_{t/2\pi N < \nu \leq t/2\pi x} \nu^{s-1}$, is displayed by Titchmarsh [T86], §4.12, p. 78, credited there to Hardy–Littlewood and to Siegel, and his Theorem 4.15 states the approximate functional equation for $0 < \sigma \leq 1$ with **both** cutoffs bounded below by a fixed positive constant — the bounded- y case is admitted explicitly. Fokas–Lenells [FL22], ch. 5, quote that page verbatim and give an all-orders version of the same identity; their range requires the dual length to grow at least like $\sqrt{t}$, so it does not cover the bounded regime here, and that gap is stated rather than left for a referee.

The error at a single sharp cutoff, with a closed form for the oscillating factor, is also in print. O’Sullivan [OS22], Theorem 2.1, expands $\zeta(s) - \sum_{n \leq \alpha} n^{-s} - \chi(s) \sum_{n \leq \beta} n^{s-1}$ for all $\alpha, \beta \geq 1$ with $t = 2\pi\alpha\beta$, in terms of derivatives of a normalised Mordell integral of $\{\alpha\}$ and $\{\beta\}$, with an implied constant independent of $\lambda = \sqrt{\alpha/\beta}$ whenever $\lambda \geq 1$. Here $\alpha = N$, $\beta \in (k, k+1)$ and $\lambda \asymp \sqrt{t/2\pi}/k \geq 1$, so his hypotheses contain this setting; relative to χ his error is $O_k(t^{-N/6})$, which **equals** $t^{-1/2}$ at $N = 3$ and is smaller from $N = 4$ on. An earlier version wrote “smaller than $t^{-1/2}$ already at $N = 3$ ”, where $t^{-3/6} = t^{-1/2}$ exactly. So both the size of Theorem 1’s error and a closed form for the object §2.5 calls Φ_k exist in the literature **at a sharp cutoff**.

What is offered as this paper’s own is the third component only. No source was located for the *average* of $\zeta - S_N$ over all the integers filling one packet, nor for the endpoint-weight

statement it produces — weight exactly 1 at $\nu = k$ and exactly 0 at $\nu = k+1$, the half of the Fresnel mass missing at a saddle-aligned sharp cutoff being restored over one transition width (Remark 2.1, Lemma 2.2). Every located treatment fixes the cutoff and expands; none averages it. That is a statement about a search of the breadth set out in §0 and about nothing else. The proof below is written out in full regardless, because the normalisation this paper needs is not the one in any of the three sources.

2.1 Setup

Fix a weight $\omega \in C_c^\infty(G_k)$ with $\text{supp } \omega$ contained in the middle third of G_k , $\int \omega = 1$, $\omega^{(j)} \ll_j |G_k|^{-j}$, and set the discrete normalisation $\bar{\omega}(N) = \omega(N) / \sum_{M \in \mathbb{Z}} \omega(M)$. The smooth-weight centroid offset — the object Theorem 1 is stated for — is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{off}_k^\omega(s) &= \zeta(s) - \sum_N \bar{\omega}(N) S_N(s) = \sum_N \bar{\omega}(N) T_N(s), \\ T_N(s) &:= \sum_{n > N} n^{-s}, \end{aligned}$$

the tail T_N being defined for $0 < \sigma < 1$ by analytic continuation from $\sigma > 1$ (equivalently Abel regularisation); all identities below are exact identities of the continuations.

2.2 Step 1 — exact truncation formula

For integer $N \geq 1$ and $\sigma > 0$, Stieltjes integration of x^{-s} against $d[x] = dx - d\psi(x)$, $\psi(x) := \{x\} - \frac{1}{2}$, gives

$$T_N(s) = \underbrace{\frac{N^{1-s}}{s-1}}_{(a)} - \underbrace{\frac{1}{2}N^{-s}}_{(b)} - \underbrace{s \int_N^\infty \psi(x) x^{-s-1} dx}_{(c)}.$$

Terms (a) and (b) are error-sized relative to χ : with $N \asymp t/k$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|N^{1-s}/(s-1)|}{|\chi(s)|} &\asymp k^{\sigma-1} t^{-1/2}, \\ \frac{|N^{-s}|}{|\chi(s)|} &\asymp k^\sigma t^{-1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

both uniform on $[\sigma_0, \sigma_1]$. Every main term therefore comes from (c).

2.3 Step 2 — Poisson expansion of the ψ -integral

Insert $\psi(x) = -\sum_{\nu \geq 1} \frac{\sin 2\pi\nu x}{\pi\nu}$ into (c):

$$(c) = \sum_{\nu \geq 1} \frac{s}{2\pi i \nu} \int_N^\infty (e(\nu x) - e(-\nu x)) x^{-s-1} dx = \sum_{\nu \geq 1} (I_\nu(N) - I_{-\nu}(N)).$$

Justification of the interchange (dominated convergence). The termwise integration holds for each fixed N ; no smoothing in N is needed at this step. Let $\psi_V(x) := -\sum_{\nu \leq V} \frac{\sin 2\pi\nu x}{\pi\nu}$. (i) $\psi_V(x) \rightarrow \psi(x)$ at every non-integer x (Dirichlet's convergence theorem for the piecewise- C^1 function ψ); the exceptional integers are a null set for dx . (ii) $|\psi_V(x)| \leq 4$ uniformly in V and x : at integer x every term vanishes; otherwise, with $\|x\|$ the distance from x to the nearest integer and

$\nu_0 := \lceil 1/\|x\| \rceil$, each term with $\nu \leq \nu_0$ is at most $2\|x\|$ in modulus (from $|\sin 2\pi\nu x| \leq 2\pi\nu\|x\|$), so these contribute at most $2\|x\|\nu_0 \leq 2 + 2\|x\| \leq 3$; for $\nu_0 < \nu \leq V$, the geometric-sum bound $|\sum_{\nu \leq M} e(\nu x)| \leq 1/(2\|x\|)$ gives $|\sum_{\nu_0 < \nu \leq M} \sin 2\pi\nu x| \leq 1/\|x\|$, and partial summation against the decreasing weights $1/(\pi\nu)$ bounds their contribution by $(1/\pi)(1/\|x\|)(\nu_0 + 1)^{-1} \leq 1/\pi$. The dominating function is $4x^{-\sigma-1}$, integrable on (N, ∞) because $\sigma \geq \sigma_0 > 0$. Dominated convergence gives $\int_N^\infty \psi x^{-s-1} dx = \lim_V \int_N^\infty \psi_V x^{-s-1} dx$, and each $\int_N^\infty \psi_V x^{-s-1} dx$ is the finite sum $\sum_{\nu \leq V}$ of absolutely convergent integrals. The ν -series is thus summed as the limit of its symmetric partial sums; the estimates below show that the negative-frequency sum and the class-(iii) sum converge absolutely, so no rearrangement issue arises downstream.

The phase of $I_{\pm\nu}$ is $\varphi_{\pm\nu}(x) = \pm 2\pi\nu x - t \log x$, with $\varphi'_{\pm\nu}(x) = \pm 2\pi\nu - t/x$. For the negative frequencies $\varphi'_{-\nu} \leq -2\pi\nu$ on $x > 0$: no stationary point, and repeated integration by parts yields $\sum_\nu |I_{-\nu}(N)| = |\chi(s)| O_k(t^{-1/2})$. The positive frequency ν has the unique saddle $x_\nu = t/2\pi\nu$, with $\varphi''_\nu(x_\nu) = t/x_\nu^2 > 0$.

2.4 Step 3 — saddle classification and endpoint weights

For $N \in \text{supp } \bar{\omega}$ (middle third of G_k) the saddles split into three classes.

(i) **Captured saddles $\nu \leq k$: full weight, and the identity that creates P_k .** Here $x_\nu \geq x_k > N$, so the saddle lies inside the integration range at distance $\geq |G_k|/3$ from the endpoint. Stationary phase at x_ν with amplitude $\frac{s}{2\pi i\nu} x^{-\sigma-1}$ — **the factor x^{-it} was already absorbed into the phase φ_ν at §2.3 and must not be carried a second time in the amplitude; §8.2 writes the same object the same way, and an earlier version of this line printed x^{-s-1} here, which is a different integrand** — using $2\pi\nu x_\nu = t$ and $s/it = 1 + O(1/t)$, gives

$$I_\nu(N) = \left(\frac{2\pi}{t}\right)^{s-\frac{1}{2}} \nu^{s-1} e^{i(t+\pi/4)} (1 + \mathcal{F}_\nu(N) + O(t^{-1})),$$

whence, by the Stirling asymptotic for χ ,

$$I_\nu(N) = \chi(s) \nu^{s-1} (1 + \mathcal{F}_\nu(N)) + \chi(s) O(t^{-1}) \quad (1 \leq \nu \leq k).$$

Here $\mathcal{F}_\nu(N)$ is the **Fresnel-truncation defect**: the deficit of the half-line Fresnel integral cut at distance $d_\nu = |x_\nu - N|$ from its critical point, of size $(\kappa_\nu d_\nu)^{-1}$ with Fresnel scale $\kappa_\nu = \sqrt{\varphi''_\nu(x_\nu)} = \sqrt{t}/x_\nu$ (the size follows from one integration by parts on the Fresnel tail, $\int_D^\infty e^{iy^2} dy = O(1/D)$ — the dummy is y , not u , which §1.2 reserves for $\text{Re } w$ throughout §§1–7). For N in the middle third the distance estimate is taken in **two cases**, because the uniform bound $d_\nu \geq |G_k|/3$ alone does not support the conclusion at small ν : substituted at $\nu = 1$ it gives $x_1/(\sqrt{t} d_1) \leq 3k(k+1)/\sqrt{t} \asymp k^2/\sqrt{t}$, not $k/\sqrt{t}$. For $\nu < k$ use instead $d_\nu \geq x_\nu - x_k = x_\nu(1 - \nu/k)$, whence $x_\nu/(\sqrt{t} d_\nu) \leq 1/(\sqrt{t}(1 - \nu/k)) \leq k/\sqrt{t}$, since $1 - \nu/k \geq 1/k$; for $\nu = k$ use $d_k \geq |G_k|/3$, whence $x_k/(\sqrt{t} d_k) \leq 3(k+1)/\sqrt{t}$. In both cases

$$|\mathcal{F}_\nu(N)| \ll \frac{x_\nu}{\sqrt{t} d_\nu} \ll_k \frac{1}{\sqrt{t}},$$

and since every constant in Theorem 1 is O_k , nothing downstream changes. **An earlier version drew the bound $\ll k/\sqrt{t}$ from the uniform estimate alone, which does not support it; the two-case estimate above is what does.**

(ii) **Ejected saddle $\nu = k+1$: weight zero.** Now $x_{k+1} < N$, the saddle lies outside $[N, \infty)$ at distance $d_{k+1} \geq |G_k|/3$; only the Fresnel tail survives:

$$I_{k+1}(N) = \chi(s)(k+1)^{s-1} \mathcal{F}_{k+1}(N) + \chi(s) O(t^{-1}), \quad |\mathcal{F}_{k+1}(N)| \ll k t^{-1/2}.$$

(iii) **Distant frequencies** $\nu \geq k+2$. $|\varphi'_\nu| \geq 2\pi(\nu - (k+1))(1+o(1))$ on $[N, \infty)$; non-stationary integration by parts and summation over ν give a total $\chi(s)O_k(t^{-1/2})$.

Summing (i)–(iii) and averaging over N with $\bar{\omega}$:

$$\text{off}_k^\omega(s) = \chi(s) \sum_{\nu \leq k} \nu^{s-1} + \chi(s)t^{-1/2}\Phi_k = \chi(s)P_k(s) + \chi(s)t^{-1/2}\Phi_k,$$

with $\Phi_k \ll_{k,\varepsilon} t^\varepsilon$; the t^ε absorbs the unexhibited ν -summation losses, the next-order stationary-phase corrections, and (under the uniform weight) the logarithm of Lemma 2.2.

Remark 2.1 (endpoint weight $w_k = 1$). In the sharp-cutoff picture with truncation placed exactly at the saddle, $N = x_k$, the frequency- k term carries only half the Fresnel mass, $\mathcal{F}_k \rightarrow -\frac{1}{2}$. Sweeping the truncation point across G_k restores the missing half over one Fresnel transition width $\kappa_k^{-1} \asymp \sqrt{t}/k$, and under the centroid average the endpoint frequencies emerge with weights exactly 1 ($\nu = k$) and 0 ($\nu = k+1$). The geometric verification — Newton on the $\text{off}_2^{\text{unif}}$ centroid returning $w_2 = 1$ with finite- t error 0.067/0.035/0.016 at $t \approx 500/1250/5000$ — measures this endpoint weight at $k = 2$, and its decay with t is consistent with the theorem's $t^{-1/2}$. **An earlier version attached to that sentence the fitted exponent 0.504, which belongs to a different measurement on a different object — the $k = 1$ regression specified below. The two are separated here: the three-point w_2 check is a $k = 2$ measurement with no fitted exponent of its own, the 24-height regression is a $k = 1$ measurement, and neither is a check on the other; what both are consistent with is the $t^{-1/2}$ law under the Φ_k wobble of §2.5. No 24-height fit on the $k = 2$ object exists. The 24 heights are specified here so the fit can be rebuilt:** they are geometrically spaced from $t = 300$ to $t = 60000$ with common ratio $200^{1/23} = 1.2590552$, i.e. 300, 377.72, 475.57, ..., 37849.63, 47654.78, 60000. **An earlier version printed that ratio as 1.25893, which does not generate the endpoints printed beside it: $300 \cdot 1.25893^{23} = 59862.89$, not 60000, so a reader rebuilding the grid from it would have got a different set of 24 heights, in the one passage whose declared purpose is that the fit be rebuildable. The grid members were and are correct; the ratio is corrected here, and $200^{1/23} = 1.25905523\dots$ is what reproduces them.** No number downstream changes; the regressed quantity is $|\text{off}_1^{\text{unif}}(s)/\chi(s) - P_1(s)|$ at $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$, and a least-squares fit of its logarithm against $\log t$ over those 24 points returns exponent 0.5039 — the evaluation is instrument (I1)'s double-precision Euler–Maclaurin scheme, and the script and its data file are in the deposit (an earlier version of this remark named no instrument for either of its two measurements). The three-value w_2 check is one of the closed-form/single-session statements flagged in §0 and §1.4: it was run on instrument (I2) at 25–30 digit working precision and no standing script writes it. **The three values just displayed do not by themselves exhibit the fitted exponent, and the discrepancy is stated here rather than left to be found:** taken pairwise they give local decay exponents 0.71 (from $t \approx 500$ to 1250) and 0.56 (from 1250 to 5000), not 0.504. The fitted 0.504 is a regression over all 24 heights, and the scatter of local two-point exponents about it is precisely the ± 0.3 – 0.4 log-scale wobble of the oscillating factor Φ_k recorded in §2.5. A pure power law read off any two heights will not reproduce the exponent, and §2.5 says why.

Lemma 2.2 (Uniform-weight extension). *Theorem 1 holds for $\text{off}_k^{\text{unif}}$, with the same error order $t^{-1/2+\varepsilon}$: that is, for the literal uniform average over all integers $N \in G_k$ — the object measured in §§4–8.*

Proof (given the Fresnel-defect input of §2.4). The proof above uses the smooth weight $\bar{\omega}$ supported in the middle third of G_k , placing every N at distance $\geq |G_k|/3$ from both saddle abscissae and bounding every Fresnel defect by $O(k/\sqrt{t})$. Under the uniform

weight, the endpoint frequencies $\nu \in \{k, k+1\}$ see integers at all distances d from the saddle. Integers within the Fresnel transition width $\kappa_k^{-1} \asymp \sqrt{t}/k$ of either endpoint contribute defects $\mathcal{F}_\nu(N) = O(1)$; there are at most $O(\sqrt{t}/k)$ such integers near each endpoint, while the total count in G_k is $|G_k| \asymp t/k^2$, so their share of the average is $O(k/\sqrt{t}) \cdot O(1) \cdot \chi(s) = \chi(s)O(t^{-1/2})$ — the same order as the middle-third estimate. An integer at larger distance d from the saddle carries a defect of size $(\kappa_k d)^{-1} = x_k/(\sqrt{t}d)$; averaging over d from κ_k^{-1} up to $|G_k|$ costs

$$\frac{1}{|G_k|} \sum_{\kappa_k^{-1} \leq d \leq |G_k|} \frac{x_k}{\sqrt{t}d} \ll \frac{x_k}{\sqrt{t}|G_k|} \log(\kappa_k |G_k|) \ll \frac{k}{\sqrt{t}} \log t,$$

which is absorbed by the t^ε of the theorem (and is where that ε is spent under the uniform weight). The interior frequencies are unchanged. $\square$

Lemma 2.2 is load-bearing for everything measured in this paper, and it is stated as a lemma for that reason: the object of §§4–7 is the uniform average, not the smooth one.

2.5 Step 4 — error assembly and the fractional-part wobble

The dominant error is the pair of endpoint Fresnel defects $\mathcal{F}_k, \mathcal{F}_{k+1}$. Their phases are $\varphi_\nu(N) - \varphi_\nu(x_\nu) \approx \frac{1}{2}\varphi''_\nu(x_\nu)(N - x_\nu)^2 \pmod{2\pi}$, evaluated at integers N ; the offset of the integer lattice from the saddles is exactly $\{x_k\} = \{t/2\pi k\}$ and $\{x_{k+1}\} = \{t/2\pi(k+1)\}$. Hence

$$E_k(s) = \chi(s) t^{-1/2} \Phi_k(t; \{t/2\pi k\}, \{t/2\pi(k+1)\}),$$

$\Phi_k \ll_{k,\varepsilon} t^\varepsilon$ oscillating.

Φ_k must be carried as an oscillating factor and **not** absorbed into a smaller power of t : the measured residual wobble of ± 0.3 – 0.4 in log scale is this factor, and any fit forcing a pure power law through it misestimates the exponent. The mechanism behind Φ_k is identified — not solved — in §8.

2.6 Step 5 — uniformity in σ , and the status of the proof

Every σ -dependence above enters through the bounded continuous factors $k^{\sigma-1}$, k^σ , the exact ratios $x_\nu^{-\sigma}(t/2\pi)^\sigma = \nu^\sigma$ (in which the σ -dependence cancels against the χ -normalisation), and the $O(1/t)$ correction to s/it ; on the compact $[\sigma_0, \sigma_1]$ all are uniformly bounded, and the leading stationary-phase constant is σ -independent. Thus the implied constant in $O(t^{-1/2+\varepsilon})$ is uniform on the compact, and the error is χ -proportional with σ -independent ratio. $\blacksquare$

Status of the proof, stated plainly. Two classes of estimate above are used in their standard form rather than proved from first principles: **(i)** the truncated stationary-phase expansion of §2.4(i)–(ii) — the main-term coefficient with its uniform $O(t^{-1})$ error, and the Fresnel-tail size $(\kappa_\nu d_\nu)^{-1}$ — and **(ii)** the repeated-integration-by-parts bounds, with summation over ν , for the negative frequencies (§2.3) and the distant frequencies (§2.4(iii)), on the infinite range $[N, \infty)$. Both are standard applications of the exponential-integral (van der Corput / stationary-phase) lemmas of [T86], ch. IV; the hypotheses required there are elementary for the amplitudes $\frac{s}{2\pi i \nu} x^{-\sigma-1}$ (*an earlier version of this paragraph carried the exponent $-s-1$ that §2.4 corrects — the factor x^{-it} is already in the phase*), but the verifications are not written out here, and the t^ε in the theorem absorbs the unexhibited summation losses. A reader requiring a fully self-contained proof should treat Theorem 1's error term as resting on these two standard inputs. **What the census of §§4–7 confirms independently is the main term and the zero correspondence, and that is all**

it confirms. §4 sums displacements against Proposition 2, §5 reports $|d\sigma| \log t$, §6 reports gap statistics and §7 reports skew; none of them measures an exponent, a proportionality constant or an oscillating factor. The error exponent (fitted 0.504 over the 24 heights specified in Remark 2.1, on the $k = 1$ residual $|\text{off}_1^{\text{unif}}/\chi - P_1|$ — not on the $k = 2$ weight check printed beside it there), the χ -proportionality and the oscillating prefactor are measured in Remark 2.1 and in §§8.1–8.2, on different grids (240 heights on $t \in [3000, 3 \times 10^5]$, and the 24-height grid above), and an earlier version of this paragraph attributed all four to §§4–7, which was wrong. (A loose consistency observation carried here in earlier versions — an error/ χ ratio varying by $\leq 5.7\%$ between two σ values — is cut: its window, sample size and instrument were never carried, nothing depends on it, and this paper does not print statistics it cannot specify.)

2.7 The zero correspondence, and what it does and does not give

Corollary 2.3 (Zero correspondence). *Since F_k has real Dirichlet coefficients, $F_k(w) = 0 \Leftrightarrow F_k(\bar{w}) = 0$. The census records roots $w_\rho = (1 - \sigma^*) + it^*$ with $t^* > 0$, i.e. $w_\rho = \overline{1 - s}$ for $s = \sigma^* + it^*$. Dividing by $\chi(s)$ and applying the functional equation, the zeros of the leading expression $\zeta(s) - \chi(s)P_k(s)$ at $s = \sigma + it$, $t > 0$, correspond exactly to roots $w = (1 - \sigma) + it$ of $F_k(w) = 0$.*

This exact correspondence is what identifies the census population, and it is all that §§3–7 need:

Proposition 2 and the census are statements about the zeros of F_k , an entire-function-theoretic object defined without reference to Theorem 1.

The zeros of the centroid $\langle S \rangle_k$ itself differ from these by the error term, and here the honest statement is weaker. At a centroid zero the reflected equation reads $F_k(w) = \delta(w)$ with $\delta := E_k/\chi$, so $|\delta| \ll_{k,\varepsilon} t^{-1/2+\varepsilon}$ by Theorem 1. If w_0 is a simple root of F_k and $r > 0$ is such that the disk $|w - w_0| \leq r$ contains no other root of F_k and $\min_{|w-w_0|=r} |F_k| > \sup_{|w-w_0|\leq r} |\delta|$, then Rouché’s theorem gives exactly one zero of the perturbed equation in that disk, and to first order its displacement from w_0 is $\delta(w_0)/F'_k(w_0)$. **These hypotheses — simplicity, separation, and the lower bound on the circle — are not verified here for the census populations, and they can fail exactly where $|F'_k|$ is small, which is the regime that drives the displacement statistics of §5.** The first-order reading $|d\sigma| \approx |\delta|/|F'_k|$ is therefore a working approximation, supported by the measured correlation $\text{Corr}(|d\sigma|, 1/|F'_2|) = 0.58$, monotone from Q1 to Q3 of $|F'_2|$, on the $k = 2$ census of $t \in [3000, 8000]$ — $n = 4175$ strip roots, instrument (I1); recomputed for this version from the deposited census, which carries $|F'_2|$ per root: 0.5815, quartile means of $|d\sigma|$ 0.207/0.082/0.076 from Q1 to Q3 (an earlier version printed the figure with no window, n or instrument, and “the $k = 2$ census” alone is ambiguous between this paper’s two $k = 2$ windows) — not a proved bound. No claim of this paper rests on it.

§3. Proposition 2: the displacement sum rule

Standing assumptions. $k \geq 1$ fixed; $T_1 < T_2 =: T$ with

$$T_1 \geq \max\{2\pi(k+2), 4a(k)\},$$

where $a(k)$ is the *anchor abscissa* defined in the proof of Lemma 3.3 below — a finite quantity depending on k alone, for which $a \leq 2k + 3$ suffices on the G -side, while on the H -side it rests on the unevaluated threshold $B_0(k)$ of Lemma 3.2(4). **The second condition is a narrowing introduced in this version:** the written-out proof of Lemma 3.3(2)–(3) needs the counting discs to stay in the upper half-plane, and $T_1 \geq 2\pi(k+2)$ alone does not guarantee that once $B_0(k)$ is

large. In an earlier version this condition was left as an open proviso — $B_0(k)$ rested on an unevaluated absolute constant, and whether §4's windows satisfy the hypothesis was written as conditional. The constants are evaluated in this version (Remark 3.2a): $B_0(1) = 16$, $B_0(2) = 34$, $B_0(3) = 51$, so with $a(k) = B_0(k)$ on the H -side the hypothesis reads $T_1 \geq 64, 136, 204$ at $k = 1, 2, 3$ — and every sum-rule window of §4 satisfies it outright ($T_1 = 1000$ and 3000 across §4's $k \leq 3$ windows, against thresholds of at most 204; an earlier version's parenthetical cited " $T_1 = 200$ ", which is a §5 displacement-census window, not a sum-rule window — the two window families are distinct and the hypothesis is needed on §4's). On the G -side $a \leq 2k + 3$ holds as before and is dominated by the H -side values. At every evaluated k the second branch of the max dominates the first outright — $4a(k) = 64, 136, 204$ against $2\pi(k + 2) \leq 31.5$ for $k \leq 3$ — so the first branch cannot bind there; it is retained because $a(k)$'s definition is Ψ -dependent in general and the display is stated for all k . Roots are the zeros $\rho = u_\rho + iv_\rho$ of $F_k(w) = \zeta(w) - S_k(w)$, strip family and outer family together. Define

$$D_k(T_1, T_2) := \sum_{\substack{F_k(\rho)=0 \\ v_\rho \in (T_1, T_2]}} \left(u_\rho - \frac{1}{2}\right).$$

Proposition 2. *Let $k \geq 1$ (the sum rule is proved for all $k \geq 1$; what is claimed as this paper's is the $k \geq 2$ case — see the paragraph below the proof) and let $T_1 < T_2$ satisfy $T_1 \geq \max\{2\pi(k + 2), 4a(k)\}$, with $a(k)$ the anchor abscissa above. Then*

$$D_k(T_1, T_2) = \frac{T_2 - T_1}{4\pi} \log(k + 1) + O_k(\log T_2).$$

(The hypothesis is carried inside the statement rather than left in the paragraph above it; an earlier version stated the display alone.)

What is claimed, and where the boundary lies. The case $k = 1$ is not claimed. The $k = 1$ statement is the classical displacement sum rule for the 1-points of ζ , available by Selberg's route and printed for the Hurwitz zeta by Steuding [St07] and by Garunkštis–Steuding [GS07]; the $2^s(\zeta - 1)$ normalisation that produces it is likewise theirs. **What is claimed here is the law at $k \geq 2$** , i.e. the value $\log(k + 1)$ of the constant for $\zeta(\cdot, k + 1)$ at integer parameter $k + 1 \geq 3$, together with the proof route below. §3.5 states, in full, the reason a referee should be suspicious of that boundary and exactly what the author has and has not read.

3.1 Right normalisation and analytic confinement

Lemma 3.1. *Let $G(w) := (k + 1)^w F_k(w)$. For $u > 1$,*

$$G(w) = 1 + \sum_{m \geq k+2} \left(\frac{k+1}{m}\right)^w,$$

$$|G(w) - 1| \leq \Sigma_k(u) := \sum_{m \geq k+2} \left(\frac{k+1}{m}\right)^u.$$

Σ_k is continuous and strictly decreasing on $(1, \infty)$ with $\Sigma_k(1+) = \infty$, $\Sigma_k(\infty) = 0$; let $u^*(k)$ be the unique solution of $\Sigma_k(u) = 1$. Then: 1. (Confinement.) F_k has no zeros with $u > u^*(k)$. Numerically $u^*(1) = 2.424$, $u^*(2) = 3.118$, $u^*(3) = 3.811$ (bisection on $\Sigma_k(u) = 1$ to six significant figures — 2.42411, 3.11798, 3.81147 — displayed values

rounded, not truncated: truncation of $u^*(2)$ would read 3.117). 2. (Right anchor.) $|G(B+it) - 1| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ for all $B \geq u^*(k) + c_k$, where c_k is the least $c \geq 0$ with $\Sigma_k(u^*(k) + c) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ (finite, since Σ_k is continuous and strictly decreasing to 0); and, for such B , $\int_{T_1}^{T_2} |\log |G(B+it)|| dt \leq 2(T_2 - T_1)\Sigma_k(B) \rightarrow 0$ as $B \rightarrow \infty$ for each fixed $T_1 < T_2$ (an earlier version claimed this uniformly in T_1, T_2 , which the display itself refutes — at fixed B the bound is unbounded in $T_2 - T_1$; §3.4 consumes only the fixed-window limit, and the uniformity that IS needed there, in B along the horizontal edges, is Lemma 3.3(2)’s). (The two clauses are ordered so that the first licenses the second: the integral bound uses $|\log(1+z)| \leq 2|z|$, which needs $|z| \leq \frac{1}{2}$; an earlier version stated the integral bound first and independently of the condition that makes the estimate applicable.)

Proof. The series identity is the Dirichlet expansion of F_k for $u > 1$ (valid by absolute convergence for $\operatorname{Re} w > 1$); the bound is the triangle inequality; $F_k(w) = 0$ forces $|G - 1| \geq 1$, i.e. $\Sigma_k(u) \geq 1$, i.e. $u \leq u^*(k)$; (2) is $|\log(1+z)| \leq 2|z|$ for $|z| \leq \frac{1}{2}$. $\square$

Remark 3.1a (asymptotics of $u^*(k)$; not used in any proof). Numerically $u^*(k) - k$ decreases by a near-constant increment per unit k (-0.3061 to -0.3068 over $k = 1, \dots, 12$, converging to $\ln 2 - 1 = -0.306853\dots$ by $k \approx 30$). This matches the heuristic $u^*(k) \sim (k+1) \ln 2$: writing $K = k+1$ and $u = cK$, the geometric limit of $\Sigma_k(cK)$ as $K \rightarrow \infty$ is $1/(e^c - 1)$, so $\Sigma_k = 1$ forces $c = \ln 2$ at leading order (the $O(1/K)$ correction is not bounded rigorously). The confinement bound crosses $u = k$ between $k = 5$ and $k = 6$ (offsets $+0.198$ and -0.109 ; linearly interpolated crossing 5.645). **That interpolation is the one carried by the rounded offsets just printed; from the unrounded $+0.1980745$ and -0.1086939 it is 5.6457.** The difference is immaterial — the remark is not used in any proof — and is stated so that neither figure has to be guessed at. The proof uses $u^*(k)$ exactly; the numerics of §4 use $k \leq 3$.

3.2 Left normalisation: the reflected comparison function

Lemma 3.2. Let $H(w) := \chi(w)F_k(1-w)$. Then: 1. $H(w) = \zeta(w) - \chi(w)P_k(w)$ — the centroid’s leading expression: the reflected comparison function of the sum rule is ζ minus Theorem 1’s main term. 2. H is analytic on $\{u \geq \frac{1}{2}, T_1 < v \leq T_2\}$ (the pole of ζ at $w = 1$ and all zeros and poles of χ lie on the real axis), and χ is non-vanishing there; hence the zeros of H in that half-strip are exactly $w = 1 - \bar{\rho}$ for roots ρ with $u_\rho < \frac{1}{2}$ (the reflection $\rho \mapsto 1 - \bar{\rho}$ preserves the ordinate v_ρ ; since F_k has real Dirichlet coefficients, $\bar{\rho}$ is a root whenever ρ is, so conjugation is an involution on the root set and the multiset of real parts is unchanged), with $\operatorname{Re} w - \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2} - u_\rho$. 3. (Line identity — exact, not asymptotic.) $|H(\frac{1}{2}+it)| = |F_k(\frac{1}{2}+it)|$ for all t , since $|\chi(\frac{1}{2}+it)| = 1$ and $F_k(\bar{w}) = \overline{F_k(w)}$ (real Dirichlet coefficients), so $|F_k(\frac{1}{2}-it)| = |F_k(\frac{1}{2}+it)|$. 4. (Right anchor.) For $u = B$ and $t \in (T_1, T_2]$: $|H(B+it) - 1| \leq 2^{1-B} + (t/2\pi)^{1/2}(2\pi k/t)^B(1+o(1))$, which is $\leq \frac{1}{2}$ once $B \geq B_0(k, T_1)$ — a threshold independent of T_2 and nonincreasing in T_1 , so that $B_0(k) := B_0(k, 2\pi(k+2))$ serves for every admissible T_1 — and $\int_{T_1}^{T_2} |\log |H(B+it)|| dt \rightarrow 0$ as $B \rightarrow \infty$. In particular every root satisfies $u_\rho \geq 1 - B_0$, so the left family is finite and fully captured for $B \geq B_0$.

Proof. (1): $F_k(1-w) = \chi(1-w)\zeta(w) - \sum_{m \leq k} m^{w-1}$; multiply by $\chi(w)$ and use $\chi(w)\chi(1-w) = 1$. (2): $\chi(w) = 2^w \pi^{w-1} \sin(\pi w/2) \Gamma(1-w)$ has zeros at the non-positive even integers and poles at the positive odd integers — at positive even integers the $\Gamma(1-w)$ pole cancels the sine zero — all real (an earlier version wrote “zeros at even integers and poles at positive integers”, which miscounts both sets; §1.1’s statement, that all zeros and poles of χ are real, is the fact the proof uses and

is unchanged). (4): Write $H - 1 = (\zeta(w) - 1) - \chi(w)P_k(w)$ and bound the two pieces on $u \geq 3$, $t \in (T_1, T_2]$. Dirichlet tail: $|\zeta(B + it) - 1| \leq \sum_{n \geq 2} n^{-B} \leq 2^{-B} + \int_2^\infty x^{-B} dx = 2^{-B}(1 + \frac{2}{B-1}) \leq 2^{1-B}$ for $B \geq 3$. Second piece: $|P_k(B + it)| \leq \sum_{m \leq k} m^{B-1} \leq k^B$, and the Stirling asymptotic $|\chi(B + it)| = (t/2\pi)^{1/2-B}(1 + O(1/t))$ — valid as $t \rightarrow \infty$ at fixed B , which is the regime of the displayed $(1 + o(1))$ — gives the stated two-term bound. The two claims that need uniformity in B (the threshold B_0 , and the vanishing of the anchor integral as $B \rightarrow \infty$) we derive instead from an unconditional bound. The reflection formula rewrites $\chi(w) = 2^{w-1}\pi^w/(\cos(\pi w/2)\Gamma(w))$; for $u \geq 3$ and $t \geq T_1 \geq 2\pi(k+2)$ we have $|\cos(\pi w/2)| \geq \sinh(\pi t/2) \geq 0.49e^{\pi t/2}$, while writing $u = x + m$ with $x \in [2, 3)$, $m = \lfloor u \rfloor - 2$, the recursion $|\Gamma(u + it)| = |\Gamma(x + it)| \prod_{j=0}^{m-1} |x + j + it| \geq |\Gamma(x + it)|(\lfloor u \rfloor - 1)!$ and Stirling on the fixed strip $x \in [2, 3]$ ($|\Gamma(x + it)| \geq c_0 t^{3/2} e^{-\pi t/2}$, c_0 absolute, $t \geq 6\pi$) give, with an absolute constant C ,

$$|\chi(u + it)P_k(u + it)| \leq C \frac{(2\pi k)^{\lfloor u \rfloor + 1}}{t^{3/2}(\lfloor u \rfloor - 1)!} \quad (u \geq 3, t \geq T_1),$$

a bound that decreases geometrically at successive integers once $\lfloor u \rfloor \geq 4\pi k$ and tends to 0 super-exponentially, uniformly in $t \geq T_1$ and in T_2 . Choose $B_0 = B_0(k, T_1) \geq 3$ so that this bound is $\leq \frac{1}{4}$ for all $u \geq B_0$ (the displayed bound is decreasing in t , so the choice made at $T_1 = 2\pi(k+2)$ serves for every larger T_1 : B_0 may be taken to depend on k alone); then $|H(u + it) - 1| \leq 2^{1-u} + \frac{1}{4} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ on $\{u \geq B_0, T_1 < t \leq T_2\}$, so $H \neq 0$ there. Since F_k has real coefficients, a root ρ with $u_\rho < \frac{1}{2}$ and $v_\rho \in (T_1, T_2]$ yields the zero $1 - \bar{\rho}$ of H at ordinate v_ρ with $\operatorname{Re}(1 - \bar{\rho}) = 1 - u_\rho$; hence $1 - u_\rho \leq B_0$, i.e. $u_\rho \geq 1 - B_0$. Finally, on $|H - 1| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ we have $|\log |H|| \leq 2|H - 1|$, so $\int_{T_1}^{T_2} |\log |H(B + it)|| dt \leq 2(T_2 - T_1)(2^{1-B} + C(2\pi k)^{\lfloor B \rfloor + 1}/(T_1^{3/2}(\lfloor B \rfloor - 1)!)) \rightarrow 0$ as $B \rightarrow \infty$. $\square$

Remark 3.2a (the threshold made effective; added in this version). An earlier version left the absolute constants of Lemma 3.2(4) unevaluated, which left Proposition 2 without a single window known to satisfy its hypothesis (see §4.4's earlier disclaimer). They evaluate in two lines. From $|\Gamma(it)|^2 = \pi/(t \sinh \pi t)$ and the recursion, $|\Gamma(2 + it)| = t\sqrt{1 + t^2} \sqrt{\pi/(t \sinh \pi t)}$ exactly, so

$$\frac{|\Gamma(2 + it)|}{t^{3/2}e^{-\pi t/2}} = \frac{\sqrt{1 + t^2}}{t} \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{1 - e^{-2\pi t}}} \geq \sqrt{2\pi} \quad (t > 0),$$

and $\operatorname{Re} \psi(x + it) > 0$ for $x \geq 2$, $t \geq 6\pi$ makes $|\Gamma(x + it)|$ increasing in x on $[2, 3]$; hence $c_0 = \sqrt{2\pi}$ serves, and with $|\cos(\pi w/2)| \geq 0.49 e^{\pi t/2}$ the displayed bound holds with $C = 1/(0.98\sqrt{2\pi}) \leq 0.408$. Evaluating $C(2\pi k)^{n+1}/(T_1^{3/2}(n-1)!) \leq \frac{1}{4}$ at the minimal $T_1 = 2\pi(k+2)$ over integer floors n , and using that the ratio of consecutive terms is $2\pi k/n < 1$ beyond $n = 2\pi k$ so the sequence decreases past its peak: the largest violating floor is $n = 15, 33, 50$ for $k = 1, 2, 3$ (checked term by term through the peak and beyond), giving

$$B_0(1) = 16, \quad B_0(2) = 34, \quad B_0(3) = 51.$$

Hence $a(k) = B_0(k)$ on the H -side (these dominate both the G -side $a \leq 2k + 3$ and the confinement abscissae $u^*(k)$), and the standing hypothesis of §3 reads $T_1 \geq 64, 136, 204$ for $k = 1, 2, 3$.

3.3 Horizontal edges and zero counting

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\Psi \in \{G, H\}$ and $B \geq B_0$. 1. $|\Psi(\sigma + it)| \ll_k t^A$ on $[\frac{1}{4}, B] \times [T_1 - a(k) - 1, T_2 + a(k) + 1]$ for an absolute constant A ($A = 1$ suffices), uniformly in B ; and $|\Psi(B + it)| \geq \frac{1}{2}$ for $t \in (T_1, T_2]$ — the lower bound is asserted on the uncollared ordinate range only, which is all the proof of (2)–(3) consumes (the counting discs are centred at*

ordinates $\geq T_1$): an earlier version asserted it on the collared range too, where Lemma 3.2(4)'s Stirling input ($t \geq 6\pi$) is not guaranteed near the minimal standing assumption. (The strip is taken down to $\sigma = \frac{1}{4}$ rather than $\frac{1}{2}$ only so that the counting discs of (2)–(3) fit inside it, and the ordinate range is stated with the $(a(k) + 1)$ -collar for the same reason: (3)'s disc is centred at ordinate $T + \frac{1}{2}$ with radius $\sqrt{(a - \frac{1}{2})^2 + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{8}}$, so at the horizontal edges the discs reach at most $\frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{8(a - \frac{1}{2})} \leq 0.18$ beyond the ordinate window for every $a \geq 3$ — inside the collar with room. **An earlier version stated part (1) on $[\frac{1}{4}, B] \times [T_1, T_2]$ and then consumed it outside that range in (2)–(3); a version after that widened the collar to exactly $a(k)$, which the disc of (3) still exceeds (0.13 at $a = 16$); a version after that printed the excess bound as 0.14, which fails on the G -side anchors $a = 4, 5, 6$, where it reads 0.161, 0.153, 0.148 — the closed form above is exact.** The standing assumption $T_1 \geq 4a(k)$ keeps the collared region inside $\{\operatorname{Im} w > 0\}$ (its floor $T_1 - a(k) - 1 \geq 3a(k) - 1 > 0$), where Ψ is analytic and the convexity bound applies, so the bound is true there and the proof is unchanged. For the right edge the same care is recorded: the discs of (2)–(3) reach real part $2a - \frac{1}{4}$, which exceeds B whenever $B < 2a$, so (1) is read with $B \geq 2a$ — no loss, since $B \rightarrow \infty$ in the assembly and $|\Psi - 1| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ holds beyond $u = a$ in any case.) 2. (Edge bound.) Along either horizontal side $t = T_j$: $\arg \Psi(\sigma + iT_j) \ll_k \log T$ for $\sigma \in [\frac{1}{2}, a(k)]$, with $a(k)$ the anchor abscissa of the proof (which exceeds $u^*(k)$ for G and $B_0(k)$ for H), while for larger σ , $|\arg \Psi| \ll \Sigma_k(\sigma)$ resp. $|H - 1|$, integrable in σ uniformly in B . Hence the horizontal contributions to Littlewood's lemma are $O_k(\log T)$, uniformly in B . 3. (Counting.) $N_{F_k}(T + 1) - N_{F_k}(T) \ll_k \log T$, where $N_{F_k}(T)$ counts the roots with $0 < v_\rho \leq T$. 4. (Contour hygiene.) If a zero of F_k lies on an edge of the rectangle, translate T_j by at most 1 to a zero-free ordinate; by (3) and by confinement ($\frac{1}{2} < u_\rho \leq u^*(k)$ on the right of the line by Lemma 3.1(1), and $1 - B_0 \leq u_\rho < \frac{1}{2}$ on the left by Lemma 3.2(4), with $B_0 = O_k(1)$), each root crossed by the moved edge contributes $O_k(1)$ to the displacement sum, so the induced change in D_k is $O_k(\log T)$.

Proof. An earlier version of this paper invoked parts (2)–(3) as “the standard Jensen–Borel–Carathéodory apparatus ... used in its standard form”, without writing the argument out. Since Proposition 2 is the one result this paper claims as new mathematics, the argument is written out here.

(1). For $u \geq u^*(k)$ (resp. $u \geq B_0$ for H) we have $|\Psi - 1| \leq 1$ by Lemmas 3.1–3.2, uniformly in B . On the remaining strip $\frac{1}{4} \leq u \leq u^*(k) + 1$ (resp. $\frac{1}{4} \leq u \leq B_0$) the Dirichlet-polynomial factors $(k + 1)^w$ and $P_k(w)$ are $O_k(1)$; $|\chi(u + it)| = (t/2\pi)^{1/2-u}(1 + O(1/t)) \ll t^{1/4}$ for $u \geq \frac{1}{4}$ by Stirling; and $|\zeta(u + it)| \ll t^{1/2} \log t$ by the classical convexity bound. Hence $|\Psi| \ll_k t$ and $A = 1$ suffices on $[\frac{1}{4}, B]$. The lower bound $|\Psi(B + it)| \geq \frac{1}{2}$ is Lemma 3.1(2) resp. Lemma 3.2(4).

A zero-counting lemma (Jensen). If f is analytic on $|z - z_0| \leq R$, $|f| \leq M$ there and $|f(z_0)| \geq m > 0$, then for $0 < r < R$ the number of zeros of f in $|z - z_0| \leq r$ is at most $\log(M/m)/\log(R/r)$. Indeed, writing $n(\tau)$ for the number of zeros in $|z - z_0| \leq \tau$, Jensen's formula gives

$$\int_0^R n(\tau) \frac{d\tau}{\tau} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \log |f(z_0 + Re^{i\theta})| d\theta - \log |f(z_0)| \leq \log \frac{M}{m},$$

while $\int_0^R n(\tau) d\tau/\tau \geq n(r) \log(R/r)$ because n is non-decreasing. $\square$

The anchor abscissa $a(k)$. For $\Psi = G$ let a be the least integer ≥ 3 with $\Sigma_k(a) \leq \frac{1}{2}$; since $\Sigma_k(u) \leq \int_{k+1}^\infty ((k+1)/x)^u dx = (k+1)/(u-1)$ for $u > 1$, the choice $a \leq 2k+3$ is admissible.

For $\Psi = H$ let $a = \max\{3, \lceil B_0(k) \rceil\}$. In both cases $a = a(k)$ depends on k alone, $a > u^*(k)$ resp. $a \geq B_0(k)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi(a + it) - 1| &\leq \frac{1}{2} \quad \text{for } t \geq T_1, \quad \text{so} \\ |\Psi(a + it)| &\geq \frac{1}{2}, \quad \text{Re } \Psi(a + it) \geq \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

The standing assumption $T_1 \geq 4a(k)$ guarantees that every disc below, whose radius is at most a , stays inside $\{\text{Im } w > 0\}$ — where Ψ is analytic, the pole of ζ at $w = 1$ and all zeros and poles of χ being real — and inside the strip $\text{Re } w \geq \frac{1}{4}$ of part (1).

(2) Edge bound. Fix $T = T_j \geq T_1$ and put $\Phi(z) := \Psi(z + iT)$, analytic on $|z - a| \leq R_2 := a - \frac{1}{4}$ (leftmost real part $a - R_2 = \frac{1}{4}$; and $R_2 < a \leq T_1/4 < T$, so $\text{Im}(z + iT) > 0$ throughout). Set

$$g(z) := \frac{1}{2} [\Phi(z) + \overline{\Phi(\bar{z})}].$$

The disc is centred at the *real* point a , hence invariant under $z \mapsto \bar{z}$, so g is analytic on it; and $g(\sigma) = \text{Re } \Psi(\sigma + iT)$ for real σ . By (1), $|g| \leq M \ll_k T$ on the disc, while $|g(a)| = \text{Re } \Psi(a + iT) \geq \frac{1}{2}$. With $r_2 := a - \frac{1}{2}$ we have $\log(R_2/r_2) = \log(1 + \frac{1/4}{a-1/2}) \geq \frac{1}{8(a-1/2)} \gg_k 1$, so the Jensen lemma bounds the number ν of zeros of $\text{Re } \Psi(\sigma + iT)$ on $\sigma \in [\frac{1}{2}, a]$ — all of which lie in $|z - a| \leq r_2$ — by

$$\nu \leq \frac{\log(2M)}{\log(R_2/r_2)} \ll_k \log T.$$

Between two consecutive such zeros $\text{Re } \Psi$ has constant sign, so Ψ stays in an open half-plane and $\arg \Psi$ stays in an interval of length π ; therefore $|\arg \Psi(\sigma + iT) - \arg \Psi(a + iT)| \leq (\nu + 1)\pi$ on $[\frac{1}{2}, a]$. Since $|\Psi(a + iT) - 1| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ gives $|\arg \Psi(a + iT)| \leq \arcsin \frac{1}{2} = \pi/6$, we get $\arg \Psi(\sigma + iT) \ll_k \log T$ on $[\frac{1}{2}, a]$, uniformly in B because a does not depend on B . For $\sigma > a$ the bound $|\Psi - 1| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ gives $|\arg \Psi| \leq \frac{\pi}{2} |\Psi - 1| \leq \frac{\pi}{2} \Sigma_k(\sigma)$ resp. $\frac{\pi}{2} |H - 1|$, and

$$\int_a^\infty \Sigma_k(\sigma) d\sigma = \sum_{m \geq k+2} \frac{((k+1)/m)^a}{\log(m/(k+1))} \ll_k 1,$$

uniformly in B , with the corresponding estimate for H from the super-exponentially decreasing bound of Lemma 3.2(4). Hence the horizontal contributions to Littlewood's lemma are $O_k(\log T)$, uniformly in B .

(3) Counting. Fix $T \geq T_1$ and put $\Phi(z) := \Psi(z + i(T + \frac{1}{2}))$. Let

$$r_3 := \sqrt{(a - \frac{1}{2})^2 + \frac{1}{4}}, \quad R_3 := r_3 + \frac{1}{8}.$$

The closed rectangle $[\frac{1}{2}, a] \times [T, T + 1]$ is contained in $|z - a| \leq r_3$, its farthest points being the two left corners, at distance exactly r_3 . For $a \geq 3$ one has $r_3 \leq a - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{8(a-1/2)} \leq a - 0.45$, so $a - R_3 \geq 0.45 - 0.125 > \frac{1}{4}$ and the disc lies in the strip of part (1); and $R_3 < a \leq T_1/4 < T + \frac{1}{2}$, so it lies in the upper half-plane. Since $\log(R_3/r_3) \geq \frac{1}{16r_3} \gg_k 1$ and $|\Phi(a)| \geq \frac{1}{2}$, the Jensen lemma gives

$$\#\{\text{zeros of } \Psi \text{ in } [\frac{1}{2}, a] \times [T, T + 1]\} \leq \frac{\log(2M)}{\log(R_3/r_3)} \ll_k \log T.$$

Now let ρ be a root of F_k with $v_\rho \in (T, T + 1]$. If $u_\rho \geq \frac{1}{2}$ then $u_\rho \leq u^*(k) < a$ by Lemma 3.1(1), so ρ is a zero of G in the rectangle. If $u_\rho \leq \frac{1}{2}$ then, by Lemma 3.2(2),(4), $1 - \bar{\rho}$ is a zero of H at the same ordinate with $\text{Re}(1 - \bar{\rho}) = 1 - u_\rho \in [\frac{1}{2}, B_0] \subseteq [\frac{1}{2}, a]$, so it lies in the rectangle for H .

Multiplicities are preserved because χ and $(k+1)^w$ are non-vanishing there. Summing the two counts, $N_{F_k}(T+1) - N_{F_k}(T) \ll_k \log T$.

(4) is immediate from (3) and the two confinement bounds. $\square$

What this does and does not settle. The constants above are explicit in $a(k)$ and in the implied constant of part (1), so parts (2)–(3) are now derived rather than imported. **The operating tolerance $\pm O(\log T)$ quoted in §4 is still a working figure**, because the constant is not evaluated numerically anywhere in this paper; what has changed is that it is no longer resting on an unwritten argument. This is the classical route behind $\arg \zeta(\sigma + iT) \ll \log T$ and $N(T+1) - N(T) \ll \log T$ ([T86], ch. IX), specialised to G and H .

3.4 Proof of Proposition 2

Apply Littlewood’s lemma [Li24] to G on $R_B = [\frac{1}{2}, B] \times [T_1, T_2]$ (the *horizontal* edges zero-free by Lemma 3.3(4), which is a statement about those edges only; the left edge $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$ may carry roots and is handled separately in Remark 3.4 below). By Lemma 3.1(1) **all** roots with $u_\rho > \frac{1}{2}$ lie in R_B :

$$2\pi \sum_{u_\rho > 1/2} (u_\rho - \tfrac{1}{2}) = \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \log |G(\tfrac{1}{2} + it)| dt - \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \log |G(B + it)| dt + O_k(\log T),$$

and on the line

$$\log |G(\tfrac{1}{2} + it)| = \log |F_k(\tfrac{1}{2} + it)| + \tfrac{1}{2} \log(k+1).$$

Apply Littlewood’s lemma to H on the same rectangle; by Lemma 3.2(2),(4) its zeros there are in bijection with **all** roots $u_\rho < \frac{1}{2}$, with distance to the left edge $\frac{1}{2} - u_\rho$:

$$2\pi \sum_{u_\rho < 1/2} (\tfrac{1}{2} - u_\rho) = \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \log |H(\tfrac{1}{2} + it)| dt - \int_{T_1}^{T_2} \log |H(B + it)| dt + O_k(\log T),$$

and by the exact line identity, $\log |H(\frac{1}{2} + it)| = \log |F_k(\frac{1}{2} + it)|$ pointwise.

Subtract the two displays and let $B \rightarrow \infty$ (both right-anchor integrals vanish by Lemmas 3.1(2), 3.2(4); the horizontal bounds are uniform in B):

$$2\pi D_k(T_1, T_2) = \frac{T_2 - T_1}{2} \log(k+1) + O_k(\log T_2). \quad \blacksquare$$

Remark 3.4 (why the rule is “free”). The two line integrals $\int \log |F_k(\frac{1}{2} + it)| dt$ cancel *identically* — no estimate of the line integral, no information about the value distribution of F_k on the line, is used. The entire displacement budget is the normalisation asymmetry between the two ends of the strip: $(k+1)^{-w}$ on the right against χ on the left. Roots exactly on $u = \frac{1}{2}$ contribute 0 to both sides (apply Littlewood’s lemma on $[\frac{1}{2} + \delta, B]$ and on its reflected counterpart, and let $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$).

Remark 3.5 (numerical consequences, used in §4). With $\Delta T = T_2 - T_1$:

$$\begin{aligned} D_1[3000, 8000] &= 275.8, \\ D_1[1000, 1500] &= 27.6, \\ D_2[3000, 8000] &= 437.1, \\ D_2[1000, 1500] &= 43.7, \\ D_3[1000, 1500] &= 55.2. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.6 (the outer family, and an explicitly unproved heuristic). For $u > 1$, $F_k(w) = \sum_{m \geq k+1} m^{-w} = (k+1)^{-w} G(w)$ with G as in Lemma 3.1, and after the constant term the slowest-rotating term of G is $((k+1)/(k+2))^w$, whose phase completes one revolution over the vertical period $2\pi / \log \frac{k+2}{k+1}$ (15.5 at $k = 1$, 21.8 at $k = 2$). One root per revolution of the slowest phase is the generic expectation for such a balance, and that is the sole origin of this scale. **It is not a derived density and we do not prove it:** at the relevant u the remaining tail of G is comparable to the $(k+2)$ -term (by the definition of $u^*(k)$ the full tail sums to 1 there), so no two-term reduction is available, and an actual asymptotic vertical density for the outer family would require a mean-motion analysis of the almost periodic function G in the sense of Jessen–Tornehave [JT45], which we have not carried out. The scale enters this paper only as a mechanism-level reading; **every quantitative statement about the outer family in §4 sums measured roots and does not use the formula.**

3.5 The open point about Proposition 2, and where its boundary lies

The obvious objection to Proposition 2 is stated here rather than left to be raised:

“ $F_k(w) = \zeta(w, k+1)$ exactly. Garunkštis and Steuding prove a Littlewood-type sum rule for the Hurwitz zeta $\zeta(s, \alpha)$, and Steuding’s Value-Distribution of L -Functions (Lecture Notes in Mathematics 1877), ch. 7, carries the signed total. Why is the $\log(k+1)$ above not their theorem read at $\alpha = k+1$?”

The answer has three parts and the third is a limitation, not a rebuttal.

1. **The printed statements are at $0 < \alpha \leq 1$.** The Hurwitz-zero literature the author has consulted — Davenport–Heilbronn [DH36] and Cassels [C61] at statement level, Spira [Sp76] first-hand, together with the standard treatments; §14 records which is which, and an earlier version of this clause said “has read” of all of them — is written for $0 < \alpha \leq 1$, where the phenomenology is qualitatively *opposite* to what is measured here at $k \geq 2$: zeros dense in σ , including $\sigma > 1$, rather than critical-line clustering. The elementary transport $\zeta(s, \alpha+1) = \zeta(s, \alpha) - \alpha^{-s}$ moves between parameters at the cost of one Dirichlet term and is used in this paper (§1.2) in the direction $\alpha = 1 \rightarrow \alpha = k+1$; whether the *proofs* at $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ run unchanged at $\alpha > 1$ is exactly the question, and it is a question about their proofs, not their hypotheses.
2. **At $k = 1$ the programme concedes the sum rule outright**, to the Selberg route and to Steuding and Garunkštis–Steuding, and does so at first use (§3, opening). Nothing in this paper claims the $k = 1$ law.
3. **The limitation.** The author has now read Steuding, *Value-Distribution of L -Functions*, LNM 1877, ch. 7 first-hand — earlier versions carried it as unread, the citation via secondary sources, and called obtaining it the single most valuable outstanding check on this paper; the finding of the read is stated below in place of the old caveat. The Garunkštis–Steuding paper [GS07] *was* read first-hand, and what it supplies is exactly the boundary in question: it defines the Hurwitz parameter on $(0, 1]$, no statement of its sum rule at $\alpha > 1$ was located in the author’s search, and whether its proof runs unchanged at $\alpha > 1$ is the open question. (An earlier version of this sentence said the Garunkštis–Steuding sum-rule statement, like the book chapter, was known only through secondary sources; that contradicted §14’s status line and understated the author’s access at exactly the point where

this caveat matters.) The finding, from a read of all four of ch. 7's sections (the sums-over- c -values and Riemann–von Mangoldt sections at proof level): **the chapter's standing hypothesis is a Riemann-type functional equation — axioms (1)–(3) of the Selberg class, with the Euler product explicitly not used — which the Hurwitz zeta $\zeta(s, k+1)$ does not satisfy, so no theorem there reaches the $k \geq 2$ objects. Its sums over c -values (Theorem 7.1 there: $\sum_{\beta_c > b} (\beta_c - b) \ll T$ unconditionally, $O(T \log T)$ under Lindelöf) are constant-target upper bounds, not the moving-target asymptotic identity of Proposition 2. And the case $c = 1$ — exactly the $k = 1$ object this paper concedes, since $\zeta(s, 2) = \zeta(s) - 1$ — is excluded from every numbered theorem of the chapter and handled in a closing remark (normalise by $q^s/a(q)$, "one gets analogous results"), with details deferred to that author's Epstein-zeta papers. The paper's $\log(k+1)$ constant is the structural analogue of that remark's normalisation read at $q = k+1$: the same classical method family — Littlewood's lemma plus a normalising factor, which §3 uses and attributes — stated in no theorem there. What remains unread first-hand on this boundary: Lekkerkerker 1955 and Perelli 1982, which ch. 7 cites beside its Riemann–von Mangoldt formula as treating "other classes of Dirichlet series" — located, not read, and a priori functional-equation-based. The $k \geq 2$ claim is still read as "new as far as the search reaches", with the search now including the chapter that was its largest named gap. What is offered in any case is the proof of §§3.1–3.4, which is self-contained and does not depend on who else has run it.**

This is the paper's general posture on priority and it is stated once here: **an absence from the author's reading certifies a search, never an absence from the literature.** §13 lists the objects on which that search has already come back positive.

§4. The census closure, with its deficits recorded in advance

Proposition 2 is a statement about *all* roots of F_k in a height window, including the outer family at $u > 1$. The census that tests it was run in two stages, and **the deficits the second stage had to recover were computed from Proposition 2 and recorded before the patch census was run.** That ordering is the author's own internal record: there is no external timestamp, no third party, and the same author stands on both sides of it. **The word "pre-registration" is therefore not used for it here,** and an earlier version of this section that did use it borrowed a governance structure this census does not have. What the ordering does supply is real and is stated exactly: the four deficits are deterministic consequences of Proposition 2 given the frozen first-stage census, so they could not have been tuned to the patch outcome after the fact.

4.1 The original box and the diagnosis

The original census box was $u \in [-0.5, 1.5]$, with seeds placed only inside that box, and an acceptance cutoff at $u = 2.0$: roots found with $u > 2.0$ were excluded. The k -th outer family, governed at its outer edge by the balance of $(k+1)^{-w}$ against the tail $\sum_{m \geq k+2} m^{-w}$, reaches further right as k grows, because $(k+1)^{-w}$ decays more slowly in u . On the original box, $k = 1$ closed to -2.9% while $k \geq 2$ showed deficits of 17–38%.

Two mechanisms, not one, and the earlier account of the $k = 1$ case is corrected here. At $k \geq 2$ the missing points are high- u , high-displacement roots — each carrying $u - \frac{1}{2} \approx 1.2$ – 2.4 , the upper end being §4.2's $k = 3$ patch maximum $u = 2.93$ — and the operative exclusion is the acceptance cutoff, which bit harder at larger k ; the patch maxima of §4.2 ($u = 2.47$ at $k = 2$, 2.93

at $k = 3$) lie above 2.0 and confirm it. **At $k = 1$ the same account is wrong:** the six missing roots sit at $u \in [1.71, 1.78]$ (§4.2, §4.3), i.e. *below* the old cutoff, so the cutoff never saw them. What excluded them is the **seeding box**: seeds were placed only in $u \in [-0.5, 1.5]$, and no seed lay within Newton's basin of a root above 1.5. The $k = 1$ miss is therefore a seeding-box effect and not a cutoff effect. The closure arithmetic of §4.3 is unaffected — the patch window $u \in [1.4, k + 2.1]$ re-seeds and recovers the same roots either way — but the mechanism sentence was wrong for one of the four cases and is corrected here rather than in an erratum.

An alternative explanation — roughly 362 missing *in-box* roots, near-critical-line points with small $|F'_2|$ — fails on the counting density. **The figure 362 is stated here rather than left unsourced: it is $4804 - 4442$, the $k = 1$ in-box total for this window minus the $k = 2$ one, i.e. the arithmetic of exactly the k -independence hypothesis the rest of this paragraph refutes.** The expected count per unit height is $\frac{1}{2\pi} \log \frac{t}{2\pi(k+1)}$, **not** k -independent — and it counts **all** roots of F_k at that height, in the box and outside it alike, which is the reading used again at §6.1. (The k -dependence enters through the leading Dirichlet coefficient $(k+1)^{-w}$ of F_k , exactly as the classical a -point density $(1/2\pi) \log(t/4\pi)$ reflects the leading coefficient 2^{-w} at $k = 1$; the formula is used here as a counting normalisation and its asymptotic is not proved in this paper.) Correctly:

- $k = 2, t \in [3000, 8000]$: $\int_{3000}^{8000} \frac{1}{2\pi} \log \frac{t}{6\pi} dt = 4487.5$ expected, against 4442 found **in the box**, a shortfall of 45.5 — and the patch census of §4.2 then found exactly 45 roots above the box on that window;
- $k = 3, t \in [1000, 1500]$: $\int_{1000}^{1500} \frac{1}{2\pi} \log \frac{t}{8\pi} dt = 310.4$ expected against 299 found in the box, a shortfall of 11.4 — and the patch found exactly 11.

*An earlier version printed these as “ $\approx 4480, \sim 38$ ” and “ $\approx 309, \sim 10$ ”, which do not follow from the displayed formula; the integrals above are the values of record. A second correction is made here, and it strengthens the paragraph rather than weakening it. An earlier version read the two shortfalls as “ ~ 46 missing **in-box**” and “ ~ 11 missing *in-box*”, which mislabelled them: the formula is the all-root density, so the shortfalls are the count of roots lying outside the box, and those roots are the patch populations of §4.2, already tabulated there. **There is therefore no in-box deficit at all:** on the two windows where both sides are printed the counting formula is satisfied by in-box + patch to 0.54 and 0.35 of a root respectively (§4.3 prints all three such windows). The in-box hypothesis is refuted outright — the counting normalisation leaves no room for a missing in-box population of any size, let alone 362 — and the deficit is accounted for by the few points of large displacement outside the box: the 45 patch roots at mean $(u - \frac{1}{2}) = 1.656$ carry +74.5 against the 74.7 shortfall the sum rule leaves.*

4.2 The analytic confinement window

Lemma 3.1(1) makes the repaired window an *analytic* statement rather than a guess: every root satisfies $u \leq u^*(k)$, with

$$u^*(1) = 2.424, \quad u^*(2) = 3.118, \quad u^*(3) = 3.811,$$

each strictly below the patch ceiling $k + 2.1$ ($= 3.1, 4.1, 5.1$). The patch window $u \in [1.4, k + 2.1]$, overlapping the original box on $[1.4, 1.5]$, is therefore provably complete on the right, with margin. The data agree: observed patch maxima $u = 1.78$ ($k = 1$), 2.47 ($k = 2$), 2.93 ($k = 3$) sit well below both $u^*(k)$ and the ceiling — no roots near the ceiling for any k .

Completeness on the left, which the census box also needs and which an earlier version left unaddressed. D_k is a sum over *all* roots and a root missed on the left carries a large **negative** $u_\rho - \frac{1}{2}$, so the left edge $u = -0.5$ is exactly as load-bearing as the right ceiling. The only left confinement stated in §3 is $u_\rho \geq 1 - B_0(k)$ with B_0 unevaluated, which is far weaker than the box edge actually used. On §4's windows the gap is closed outright, by two lines of Lemma 8 (§9.4). Lemma 8's inequality $|\zeta(u + it)| \geq |\chi(u + it)| \zeta(2(1 - u))/\zeta(1 - u)$ holds for all $u \leq 0$; the numerical step below needs the stronger range $u \leq -\frac{1}{2}$ **and** $t \geq 1000$, and is stated on it:

$$|\zeta(u + it)| \geq |\chi(u + it)| \frac{\zeta(2(1 - u))}{\zeta(1 - u)} \geq 0.46 \left(\frac{t}{2\pi}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}-u} \quad (u \leq -\frac{1}{2}, t \geq 1000),$$

the second step because $\zeta(2(1 - u))/\zeta(1 - u)$ increases to 1 as u decreases and equals $\zeta(3)/\zeta(3/2) = 0.46014$ at $u = -\frac{1}{2}$ — **on $(-\frac{1}{2}, 0]$ it drops below 0.46 and vanishes at $u = 0$, so an earlier version's “for $u \leq 0$ and any real t ” was false on exactly that sub-range and at small t , where the Stirling form of $|\chi|$ is an asymptotic and not an inequality; the box edge sits at $u = -0.5$, so the corrected range is the one the argument uses — and because $|\chi(u + it)| = (t/2\pi)^{1/2-u}(1 + O(1/t))$ — applied here only on the compact range $1 - B_0(k) \leq u \leq -\frac{1}{2}$ (with $B_0(k) \leq 51$ for $k \leq 3$, Remark 3.2a), where §1.1's statement of the asymptotic, uniform on compact σ -sets, covers the use; roots with $u < 1 - B_0$ are excluded unconditionally by Lemma 3.2(4), so the compact range is all this display is asked to cover. An earlier version invoked the asymptotic on the unbounded range $u \leq -\frac{1}{2}$, outside its stated uniformity — with the $O(1/t)$ harmless at $t \geq 1000$. Against it, $|S_k(u + it)| \leq \sum_{m \leq k} m^{-u} \leq k k^{-u}$, so for $k \leq 3$ and $1 - B_0(k) \leq u \leq -\frac{1}{2}$,**

$$\frac{0.46 (t/2\pi)^{1/2-u}}{3 \cdot 3^{-u}} \geq \frac{0.46}{3} \left(\frac{t}{2\pi}\right)^{1/2} \left(\frac{t}{6\pi}\right)^{-u} \geq 14 \quad (t \geq 1000),$$

both factors being increasing as u falls and as t rises, so the margin of more than an order of magnitude at the worst corner absorbs the $O(1/t)$ in Stirling with room to spare. Hence $F_k = \zeta - S_k$ has **no root with $u \leq -\frac{1}{2}$** at any $t \geq 1000$ for $k \leq 3$ — on $1 - B_0(k) \leq u \leq -\frac{1}{2}$ by the display, and at $u < 1 - B_0(k)$ unconditionally by Lemma 3.2(4)'s super-exponential bound: at the numbers, $|\zeta| \geq 73.2$ against $|S_3| \leq 1 + \sqrt{2} + \sqrt{3} = 4.15$ at $u = -\frac{1}{2}$, $t = 1000$, and the ratio only grows as u falls or t rises within the covered range. **The census box is therefore provably complete on the left as well as on the right, on every window of §4.**

case	patch n	patch u range	mean $(u - \frac{1}{2})$	$u^*(k)$	ceiling $k + 2.1$
$k = 1, t \in [3000, 8000]$	6	[1.71, 1.78]	1.244	2.424	3.1
$k = 2, t \in [1000, 1500]$	5	[2.03, 2.34]	1.672	3.118	4.1
$k = 2, t \in [3000, 8000]$	45	[2.01, 2.47]	1.656	3.118	4.1
$k = 3, t \in [1000, 1500]$	11	[2.12, 2.93]	1.952	3.811	5.1

Instrument: (I1). Windows as printed in the table.

4.3 The recorded deficits, and the closure

Proposition 2 fixed the deficits, and they were recorded, *before* the patch census was run (§4, opening, on the qualification that carries): the sum rule predicted per-window shortfalls of 7.9, 8.3, 74.7, 21.2. The patch census over $u \in [1.4, k + 2.1]$ then returned:

window	patch n	patch $\Sigma(u - \frac{1}{2})$	predicted deficit	total $\Sigma(u - \frac{1}{2})$	D_k predicted	residual	%
$k = 1, [3000, 8000]$	6	+7.47	7.9	275.40	275.8	-0.40	-0.1%
$k = 2, [1000, 1500]$	5	+8.36	8.3	43.78	43.7	+0.08	+0.2%
$k = 2, [3000, 8000]$	45	+74.51	74.7	436.89	437.1	-0.21	-0.05%
$k = 3, [1000, 1500]$	11	+21.47	21.2	55.51	55.2	+0.31	+0.6%

(Rounding provenance for the residual column: residuals are taken against the two-decimal D_k shown; against the unrounded D_k of Remark 3.5’s formula — 275.7945, 43.7124, 437.1239, 55.1589 — they read -0.39, +0.07, -0.23, +0.35, moving no percentage at the printed precision. The recorded-deficit column keeps the values as pre-recorded, which were computed against the two-decimal D_k ; against unrounded D_k the fourth would read 21.1, and it is not restated because a pre-registered number is a historical record.)

The fifth window, $k = 1$ on $t \in [1000, 1500]$, closed **without any patch** at -7.3% of $D_1 = 27.6$ (residual ≈ 2.0). That residual sits within an assumed operating tolerance of $\pm O(\log T) \approx \pm 10$; since the constant in Lemma 3.3’s bound is not evaluated explicitly, **this is a working figure and not a derived one**, and the window is printed as found rather than as a success. It is consistent: at $k = 1$ the truncation bites least ($u^*(1) \approx 2.4$ barely exceeds the old 2.0 cutoff — six roots in 5000 units of height on $[3000, 8000]$, and none detectable above noise in the short window).

All five windows close within tolerance; the four patched windows close within 0.6% of D_k .

A second closure, on the count rather than on the displacement, printed because it is cheaper and stronger than anything else in this section. The counting normalisation of §4.1 predicts the *all-root* count of F_k on a window, and the census supplies that count as in-box + patch. On the three windows where both sides are available:

window	$\int \frac{1}{2\pi} \log \frac{t}{2\pi(k+1)} dt$	in-box	patch	total	difference
$k = 1, [3000, 8000]$	4810.20	4804	6	4810	0.20
$k = 2, [3000, 8000]$	4487.54	4442	45	4487	0.54
$k = 3, [1000, 1500]$	310.35	299	11	310	0.35

The density integral is matched to under one root in every window where both sides print. Two consequences are worth separating. The counting statement is evidence that the census is *complete* on these windows in the sense the sum rule needs — no population of any size is missing from either side of the box — and it is independent of the displacement closure above, which tests the *weights* rather than the count. Neither is a proof of completeness: the counting formula’s asymptotic is not proved in this paper (§4.1) and the $O(\log T)$ term is not evaluated, so a coincidence of a few roots either way is not excluded by it. *Instrument: (I1); integrals evaluated in closed quadrature for this paper.*

Anatomy at $k = 1, t \in [3000, 8000]$. Strip family ($u \in [0, 1]$): +79.41. Outer family, already in the original box: +188.52. Outer family, patch: +7.47. Total 275.40 against $D_1 = 275.8$. **One population the two named families would not cover is reported empty rather than left unmentioned: the census box reaches to $u = -0.5$ and §4.2’s left-completeness bound excludes only $u \leq -\frac{1}{2}$, so a root with $-\frac{1}{2} < u < 0$ would belong to neither family and to no anatomy row. None exists in the data: measured for this version across every census file ($k = 1$ at all seven windows, $k = 2$ at two, $k = 3$ at one), no root has $u < 0$, the recorded minimum being $u = 0.1637$.** The outer family carries 195.99, i.e. 71.2% of the census total ($195.99/275.40 = 0.7117$; an earlier printing of 71.3% was an arithmetic slip and is corrected here). The strip net +79 is real, not ≈ 0 : the sum rule constrains the *total* displacement, not the strip alone.

The census reported here is final; no further windows were surveyed, and the dataset was frozen before this paper was written.

4.4 What the closure does and does not establish

The match between the deficits recorded in advance and the census outcome ($\leq 0.6\%$ residuals on the four patched windows) is independent confirmation that the census recovers what **Proposition 2** predicts, rather than a calibration artefact. **An earlier version of this paragraph had to say “the formula of Proposition 2” rather than “the proposition”:** $B_0(k)$ was unevaluated, no window was known to satisfy the hypothesis, and the comparison was conditional by this section’s own disclaimer — a version before that had overclaimed in the other direction. **Remark 3.2a closes the question from the proof’s own ingredients:** with $B_0(1, 2, 3) = 16, 34, 51$ the hypothesis reads $T_1 \geq 64, 136, 204$, every window of §4 satisfies it outright, and the census is a test of the proposition as proved. The sentence “the proof’s applicability at these T_1 awaits a numerical $B_0(k)$ ” is superseded by that computation. **The proposition’s correctness rests on the proof of §3, not on this match.** Conversely, the census is not a proof of anything the proof does not already give, and the fifth window’s -7.3% is inside a tolerance whose constant is not evaluated.

§5. The displacement census of the 1-points of ζ

This section reports what is, as far as the author’s search reaches, the first numerical census of a -point displacements of ζ at any a . It concerns $k = 1$, i.e. $F_1(w) = \zeta(w) - 1$, whose zeros are the 1-points of ζ in the reflected variable.

5.1 Windows

Seven strip windows were surveyed with instrument (I1); n counts strip-family roots ($u \in [0, 1]$) only.

window in t	n (strip)	t_{mid}	$c = \langle d\sigma \cdot \log t^* \rangle$	sample sd	standard error	sd $ d\sigma $
[200, 800]	318	520	1.033	0.682	0.038	0.1104
[1000, 1500]	335	1255	0.950	0.664	0.036	0.0931
[3000, 8000]	4561	5570	1.024	0.802	0.012	0.0935
[15000, 15100]	109	15051	1.026	0.917	0.088	0.0953
[30000, 30100]	116	30050	0.953	0.835	0.078	0.0810
[60000, 60100]	129	60050	0.991	0.940	0.083	0.0854
[99990, 100090]	134	100040	1.101	0.941	0.081	0.0817

The t_{mid} column is the mean root ordinate $\langle t_\rho^* \rangle$ of the window’s strip-family population, rounded to the nearest integer — a population statistic, not the arithmetic midpoint of the window in t : the two differ by up to 70 on the wide windows (5570 against 5500 on [3000, 8000]; 520 against 500 on [200, 800] — an earlier version printed “up to 30”, missing the larger window’s 70, the extreme case), and a reader rebuilding §5.2’s fit from its recipe phrase alone would otherwise have evaluated $\log t$ at the wrong point. Recomputed for this version from the deposited censuses, all seven printed values reproduce under this definition; an earlier version left the column undefined. The c column is the per-root statistic $\langle |d\sigma_\rho| \cdot \log t_\rho^* \rangle$, averaged over the strip-family roots of the window; the *sample sd* column is the sample standard deviation of that same per-root quantity, and the *standard error* is $\text{sd}/\sqrt{n}$. **The last two columns were absent from an earlier version of this table, which stated that the dispersions were not carried. They are recoverable from the census roots and are recomputed and printed here, so that the fit of §5.2 can**

be checked against something other than the author’s word. **The last column, $\text{sd}|d\sigma|_i$, is the input the midpoint recipe of §5.2 weights by** ($\text{SE}_i = (\text{sd}|d\sigma|_i/\sqrt{n_i}) \cdot \log t_{\text{mid},i}$): it is the dispersion of the *undamped* displacement, a different quantity from the *sample sd* column beside it, and the two coincide in information only where $\log t^*$ is effectively constant. **An earlier version did not carry this column, and stated the consequence at §5.2 — that the two filed χ^2 values were not rebuildable from the table alone. The column is printed now (at four decimals; full precision is in the deposit), and the filed fits are rebuildable from this table together with §5.2’s printed route gaps** — the table’s c column is the per-root statistic, and the midpoint vector the fit runs on is recovered from it by adding those gaps; a version of this sentence that said “from this table” alone overstated it by exactly that step.

5.2 The plateau

The normalised displacement $x_\rho = |d\sigma_\rho| \cdot \log t_\rho^*$ has window *means* that collapse across all seven windows; its dispersion does not: the sample sd of x_ρ grows from 0.66–0.68 at the two lowest windows to 0.94 at the three highest (§5.1’s sd column), a $\approx 40\%$ growth at essentially fixed mean, and no constancy of shape is claimed. **An earlier version wrote “collapses across all seven windows (Kolmogorov–Smirnov $p \geq 0.45$)” with no test design stated. The tests were rerun for this version from the census roots, and the design is printed with the result: all 21 pairwise two-sample Kolmogorov–Smirnov tests on x_ρ , uncorrected for multiplicity; 8 of the 21 pairs return $p \geq 0.45$, 20 of 21 return $p \geq 0.05$, and the minimum is $p = 0.032$, at $[200, 800]$ against $[60000, 60100]$; the largest sd-contrast pair, $[1000, 1500]$ against $[60000, 60100]$, returns $p = 0.61$. The blanket “ $p \geq 0.45$ ” is withdrawn; what the tests support is mutual consistency at conventional levels on 20 of 21 pairs, means constant, dispersion growing.** Fitting a constant model over the seven window means gives

$$c = 1.023 \pm 0.011 \quad (\chi^2/\text{dof} = 6.46/6),$$

consistent with c independent of t across this range. A free-exponent fit $c \propto (\log t)^{1-\alpha}$ yields $\alpha = 0.954 \pm 0.090$, consistent with $\alpha = 1$ at 0.5σ . The model $c \propto \sqrt{\log \log t}$ was filed as rejected within this range; **the filed rejection statistic does not survive recomputation and is withdrawn** — see the second disclosure below for the recomputed statistics of record, and §5.3 for the statement of record. The model comparison is exactly these two fits and nothing else.

Caveat printed with the fit: the highest- t window sits nearest the stated precision floor of (I1) and carries this fit’s largest single value (1.101); that proximity has not been separately ruled out as a contributor.

Where the filed fit comes from, and what reproduces. The three statistics above were recomputed for this paper from the census roots. The constant-model fit reproduces exactly, under one specific and now-stated recipe: form each window’s statistic as $c_i = \langle |d\sigma| \rangle_i \cdot \log t_{\text{mid},i}$, with $\text{SE}_i = (\text{sd}|d\sigma|_i/\sqrt{n_i}) \cdot \log t_{\text{mid},i}$ — that is, with $\log t$ evaluated at the tabulated t_{mid} — §5.1’s strip-family mean ordinate, not the window’s arithmetic midpoint in t (the recipe is still called the *midpoint recipe* below; the name is kept, and this is its definition) — rather than at each root. Inverse-variance weighting then gives

$$c = 1.0233 \pm 0.0105, \quad \chi^2/\text{dof} = 6.459/6 \quad (p = 0.37),$$

against the filed 1.023 ± 0.011 and $6.46/6$ — agreement to every printed digit, both routes computed from the census roots at full precision; a rebuild from §5.1’s rounded table reproduces them to

the ± 0.1 tolerance stated below, not digit-for-digit. The free-exponent fit likewise reproduces: $\alpha = 0.951 \pm 0.090$ against the filed 0.954 ± 0.090 .

What a reader cannot rebuild from §5.1’s table alone, printed here rather than left to be discovered. The weights that recipe uses are $SE_i = (sd|d\sigma|_i/\sqrt{n_i}) \cdot \log t_{\text{mid},i}$, and $sd|d\sigma|_i$ is *not* the table’s sample-sd column, which is the dispersion of $|d\sigma_\rho| \log t_\rho^*$. Substituting the table’s standard errors in their place recovers both central values and both bars to three decimals — 1.0234 ± 0.0105 on the midpoint statistic and 1.0178 ± 0.0105 on the per-root one, the fourth decimal shifting by at most one unit — but returns $\chi^2 = 6.668$ and 5.832 in place of the 6.459 and 5.791 printed here — because at the two wide windows the two dispersions differ and, stated for reproducibility, because those two values are what the *printed three-decimal* window means return under the rounded SE column: 6.668 requires the **entire** midpoint vector read at three decimals *with the* $[1000, 1500]$ *entry read as the table’s* 0.950 — its three-decimal rounding is 0.951 and its full-precision value 0.9509 (first disclosure below) — while substituting the 0.950 into the otherwise full-precision vector returns 6.619 , and the full-precision substitution returns 6.522 and 5.834 . (*An earlier version said the* $[1000, 1500]$ *entry alone carried the difference, which the* 6.619 *refutes.*) **So the two χ^2 values of record are reproducible from the census roots and from the deposit exactly; from §5.1’s table together with the route gaps they are reproducible to within the table’s own rounding — about ± 0.13 in χ^2 — and not to the printed three decimals.** For a reader who wants the three decimals without the deposit, the full-precision midpoint vector is printed here once: $c^{\text{mid}} = (1.04522, 0.95086, 1.02955, 1.02599, 0.95333, 0.99072, 1.10056)$, with which the fits above reproduce to every printed digit. (An earlier version did not carry the sd column and said so here; a version after that said the values were reproducible “from §5.1’s table itself”, eliding both the route-gap step and the rounding tolerance — the tolerance is now stated and the vector supplied, so the repaired statistic meets the standard its own withdrawal sentence sets.) Nothing about the plateau moves: the substitution shifts p from 0.374 to 0.353 on the midpoint route and from 0.447 to 0.442 on the per-root one, and both central values and both bars are unchanged to every printed digit.

Two disclosures follow from that recomputation, and both narrow this section. *First*, the midpoint recipe is not the per-root statistic tabulated in §5.1. Recomputed from the census roots for this version, the route gap $\langle |d\sigma| \rangle_i \log t_{\text{mid},i} - \langle |d\sigma_\rho| \log t_\rho^* \rangle_i$ is $+0.0125$ at $t \in [200, 800]$ and $+0.0052$ at $t \in [3000, 8000]$ — the two wide windows, where the midpoint route gives 1.045 and 1.030 against the table’s 1.033 and 1.024 — then $+7.9 \times 10^{-4}$ at $t \in [1000, 1500]$, and below 10^{-5} at each of the four 100-wide windows. **An earlier version said the two routes agree to within 10^{-4} at all five non-wide windows.** That is true only of the four 100-wide ones: $t \in [1000, 1500]$ is 500 wide, its gap is an order of magnitude larger, and its two route values 0.9509 (midpoint) and 0.9501 (per-root) sit on opposite sides of a three-decimal rounding boundary — 0.951 against 0.950 ; §5.1’s single c column is the per-root statistic and shows 0.950 (*an earlier version said the table “shows 0.950 for both”, which its one column cannot do*). The filed fit is unaffected: it was computed on the full-precision midpoint vector, and its $\chi^2 = 6.459$ reproduces exactly from the census roots. Run on the per-root statistic of §5.1 instead, the constant model gives $c = 1.018 \pm 0.011$ with $\chi^2/\text{dof} = 5.791/6$ ($p = 0.45$). **Both routes are printed; the filed 1.023 is the midpoint one.** *Second, and more seriously: the $\sqrt{\log \log t}$ rejection does not reproduce.* Under the identical midpoint recipe, a $\sqrt{\log \log t}$ shape with free normalisation returns $\chi^2/\text{dof} = 10.644/6$, i.e. $p = 0.10$ — and $9.265/6$ ($p = 0.16$) on the per-root statistic. The recomputed figures still favour the constant model, but $p = 0.10$ is **not a rejection at any conventional level.** **A withdrawal made in an earlier version is itself withdrawn here, and the correction runs against this paper rather than against its sources.** Earlier versions printed the source record’s filed

statistic $\chi^2/\text{dof} = 28.05/6$ beside these, could not reproduce it under any weighting reconstructed at the time — every such reconstruction returned $\chi^2/6$ between 9.2 and 10.9 — and withdrew it as a wrong number. **That was a register conflation, and the reconstructions were all of the wrong shape.** The source record states the model it rejects, and it is not the one tested above: it is $c \propto \log \log t$, without the square root. Fitted here with a single free normalisation under the identical midpoint recipe, on the same seven windows rebuilt from the deposited census, that shape returns $\chi^2/\text{dof} = 28.054/6$, reproducing the filed figure to five significant figures on the same pipeline that returns 6.465/6 for the constant model and 10.654/6 for the square-root shape. Swept over strip-selection, arithmetic-versus-geometric window midpoint and both variance conventions, the $\log \log t$ fit stays within 27.3–28.2 and the $\sqrt{\log \log t}$ fit within 9.8–10.7: **the two shapes differ by a factor of about 2.6 and no convention brings either near the other.** Both statements are therefore true and neither contradicts the other — a $\log \log t$ growth law is rejected, and a $\sqrt{\log \log t}$ shape is not — and it is the square-root shape that bears on the classical law, since that law is $0.564\sqrt{\log \log t}$. **The filed 28.05/6 is restored as correct, reproducible and derivable from its own printed recipe; the sentence calling it a wrong number was itself the error, and none of this paper’s own statistics moves.** The recomputed 10.644/6 and 9.265/6 remain the statistics of record for the square-root shape, and §5.3’s statement of record is set accordingly.

5.3 The open point about the plateau

“Selberg and Tsang give $\langle |d\sigma| \rangle \cdot \log t \sim (1/\sqrt{\pi})\sqrt{\log \log t}$, which grows without bound. Over $t \in [200, 10^5]$, $\sqrt{\log \log t}$ moves very little. A constant fits that range by construction. What does the census exclude that the classical law does not already predict?”

The classical law is the statement of record and this paper does not contest it. Unconditionally, $\langle |d\sigma| \rangle \cdot \log t \sim (1/\sqrt{\pi})\sqrt{\log \log t} = 0.564\sqrt{\log \log t}(1 + o(1))$ (Selberg [Se92]; Tsang [Ts84]). It is not a constant, and this paper concedes the mean displacement law in full at §13.

The range, printed. An elementary evaluation of $\sqrt{\log \log t}$ at the census endpoints:

t	$\log \log t$	$\sqrt{\log \log t}$	$0.564\sqrt{\log \log t}$
200	1.667389	1.291274	0.728
3000	2.080237	1.442303	0.813
8000	2.195801	1.481824	0.836
100090	2.443548	1.563185	0.882

Across the whole census range the classical law’s predicted value rises by a factor 1.2106, i.e. by 21.1%. This is a real, monotone rise and it is not negligible relative to the ± 0.011 error on c ; it is what gives a shape comparison over this range any content at all. **But it is only 21%, and the honest statement is the narrow one — narrower now than when it was first filed:**

The level comparison, which the table above makes computable and which is printed here rather than left for a referee to do. The classical law read *with its own constant* predicts 0.728, 0.813, 0.836 and 0.882 at $t = 200, 3000, 8000, 100090$. The measured plateau $c = 1.023$ exceeds those by 40.5%, 25.8%, 22.4% and 16.0% respectively; at the seven tabulated t_{mid} ordinates of §5.1 ($t_{\text{mid}} = 520, 1255, 5570, 15051, 30050, 60050, 100040$) the excess of $c = 1.023$ over the classical value falls monotonically through 34.0%, 29.4%, 23.6%, 20.6%, 18.7%, 17.1%, 16.0%. **So the data sit 16–40% above the classical law at its own normalisation, monotonically closing with height across the whole census range.** The natural reading is the one the asymptotic statement already allows: $0.564\sqrt{\log \log t}(1 + o(1))$ constrains the *limit*, the $o(1)$ is

unquantified, and at $t \leq 10^5$ a 16–40% multiplicative gap that shrinks monotonically is exactly what a large, slowly decaying $o(1)$ looks like. **No inconsistency with the classical law is claimed and none is implied**; what is claimed is the plateau’s value on its window. A free-normalisation fit of the classical shape returns $K = 0.698$ (per-root) and 0.701 (midpoint; an earlier version’s 0.702 was the rounded-vector value — the full-precision midpoint vector returns 0.701 under both weighting routes) against the classical 0.564, which is the same 24% statement in the other register.

Statement of record. $c = 1.023 \pm 0.011$ is a *finite-height plateau*, measured on $t \in [200, 100090]$, of a quantity whose asymptotic law is $0.564\sqrt{\log \log t}(1+o(1))$, and which sits 16–40% above that law read at its own constant across the census range. Within this range a constant fits at $\chi^2/\text{dof} = 6.46/6$ ($p = 0.37$; recomputed here at $6.459/6$, §5.2). A $\sqrt{\log \log t}$ shape with free normalisation fits *less well*, but **it is not rejected**: $\chi^2/\text{dof} = 10.644/6$, i.e. $p = 0.10$. **The source record’s $\chi^2/\text{dof} = 28.05/6$ is a rejection of a different shape, $c \propto \log \log t$ without the square root; it reproduces at $28.054/6$ on the pipeline used here and is correct as filed. An earlier version of this paper withdrew it as irreproducible, which was a register conflation between the two shapes and is itself withdrawn (§5.2). The census range does not discriminate the two shapes — not asymptotically, and, on the recomputed statistics, not within the range either. No asymptotic conclusion is drawn, and no conclusion about the classical shape is drawn.**

What is offered as new is therefore: the census itself; the plateau value 1.023 ± 0.011 with its bars; the cross-window collapse; and, in §5.4, everything at $k \geq 2$, for which no classical counterpart is known to the author at all.

5.4 The k -dependence of the plateau, and the displacement split

For $k = 2$ and $k = 3$ the constant increases mildly: on $t \in [1000, 1500]$, $c(k = 2) = 1.079 \pm 0.046$ and $c(k = 3) = 1.197 \pm 0.049$ (instrument (I1)). The increase has a mechanical explanation rather than being a new free parameter: $|d\sigma|$ is proportional to $1/|F'_k(w)|$ at first order (Corollary 2.3), and a regression of $|d\sigma|$ on $1/|F'_2|$ over the $k = 2$ census of $t \in [3000, 8000]$ ($n = 4175$ strip roots, instrument (I1) — the same window, count and instrument as §2.7’s statement of this figure; both sites carried none of the three in an earlier version) gives $\text{Corr}(|d\sigma|, 1/|F'_2|) = 0.58$ with a monotone decrease from Q1 to Q3 of $|F'_2|$ (quartile means $0.207/0.082/0.076$, recomputed for this version from the deposited census). As noted in §2.7, the first-order reading is a working approximation, not a proved bound.

The signed split across the critical line $u = \frac{1}{2}$ is diagnostic and is predicted by Proposition 2. **The two splits below were filed with neither window nor n ; they are recomputed here, and they turn out to be measured on populations of different scope, which is now said rather than left to be reverse-engineered.**

- **$k = 1$, pooled over all seven windows of §5.1, $n = 5702$ strip roots.** The fraction with $\sigma^* > \frac{1}{2}$ — equivalently $u < \frac{1}{2}$ — is $2813/5702 = 49.33\%$ ($z = -1.01$, $p = 0.31$; the count is printed because the rounded percentage alone does not pin the z); the complementary fraction with $u > \frac{1}{2}$ is 50.7%. This is consistent with 50/50 pooled and at every window individually: the per-window fractions with $u > \frac{1}{2}$ are 0.541, 0.499, 0.505, 0.532, 0.474, 0.465, 0.545 on $n = 318, 335, 4561, 109, 116, 129$ and 134 roots, with $|z| \leq 1.47$ throughout (the largest is 1.4623, at the first window; an earlier version printed ≤ 1.46 , which the same window exceeds).

An earlier version attached the figure 49.3% to the label “ $u > \frac{1}{2}$ ”; the figure is right and the label was on the wrong variable, as the sign of its own z shows.

- **$k = 2$, the single window $t \in [3000, 8000]$, $n = 4175$ strip roots.** The fraction with $u > \frac{1}{2}$ is $2290/4175 = 54.85\%$ ($z = +6.27$, $p = 3.7 \times 10^{-10}$) — equivalently 45.15% of the σ^* -values exceed $\frac{1}{2}$ — a highly significant departure from symmetry. Pooling the second $k = 2$ window $t \in [1000, 1500]$ ($n = 300$, fraction $159/300 = 53.00\%$, $z = +1.04$) into it moves the pooled figure only to $2449/4475 = 54.73\%$ ($z = +6.32$), so the effect is not an artefact of the choice of scope; but the figure printed above is the single-window one. *An earlier version rounded these fractions to 54.9% and 54.7%, which do not reproduce the z -scores printed beside them; the counts are given above so that neither figure has to be trusted.*

The two bullets are therefore a pooled seven-window population and a single-window population, compared side by side. The comparison is still informative — the $k = 1$ split is null at every individual window as well as pooled, so no choice of scope makes it significant — but the asymmetry of scope is a defect of the original filing and is printed here rather than repaired by silently re-pooling.

The mechanism is the sum rule together with the outer family’s finite capacity. The total signed budget $D_k = (\Delta T/4\pi) \log(k+1)$ grows with k , while each outer-family point contributes $u_\rho - \frac{1}{2} \approx 0.79$ on average, and the outer family thins as k grows (Remark 3.6, heuristic). **The per-point figure is the paper’s own §4 arithmetic and an earlier version got it wrong by 58%:** at $k = 1$, $t \in [3000, 8000]$ the outer family is $4810 - 4561 = 249$ roots carrying $+195.99$ (§4.3’s anatomy: 188.52 in-box $+ 7.47$ patch), mean 0.787 ; 243 of the 249 lie below $u = 1.4$ (the patch census is complete on $[1.4, 3.1]$ and holds six roots), so the range 1.2 – 2.0 and the mean 1.244 that earlier version attached to the outer family belong to the **six patch points alone** (unrounded patch sum 7.4661 , mean $7.4661/6 = 1.244$, §4.2’s value; the two-decimal sum reads $7.47/6 \approx 1.245$), not to the population of 249 — §4.1’s neighbouring sentence about the *patch* roots was correct and had been generalised to a population 40 times larger. The correction moves no measured statement in this subsection — the absorption figure and the splits below are measured directly, not derived from the per-point mean. At $k = 1$ the outer family absorbs 71.2% of the census total (§4.3, measured), leaving the strip nearly balanced; at $k = 2$ the strip inherits a positive remainder. **The quantitative statements here are the measured 71.2% and the measured splits; the thinning of the outer family with k is the unproved heuristic of Remark 3.6 and is used only as a reading.**

§6. Spacing statistics of the F_1 and F_2 zero ordinates

6.1 The measurement

Nearest-neighbour gaps Δt_ρ between consecutive strip-family roots (sorted by v_ρ) are rescaled by the local mean density of the respective family — $(1/2\pi) \log(t/2\pi(k+1))$, i.e. $(1/2\pi) \log(t/4\pi)$ at $k = 1$ and $(1/2\pi) \log(t/6\pi)$ at $k = 2$, and $(1/2\pi) \log(t/2\pi)$ for the Riemann-zero control. **Every row of the table below is computed on the single window $t \in [3000, 8000]$ — the same window used for the control, so that the comparison is like-for-like — with the density evaluated at the earlier endpoint of each gap and the first gap of the window dropped.** Instrument (I1); $n = 4559$ gaps at $k = 1$, 4173 at $k = 2$, 5359 for the control. **The control’s zeros were not located by (I1):** they are read from Odlyzko’s published table of the first 100,000 zero ordinates [Od87], given to nine decimal places, and cross-validated against the (I3) certified packs to 5×10^{-9} . What

the control shares with the F_k families is therefore the *gap pipeline* — same unfolding constant convention, same boundary trim, same first-gap drop — and not the root-finding stage; §6.2 says what that does and does not protect against.

Two normalisations are printed, and the second is the one to read. The density constants just quoted are the *all-root* densities of each F_k family, whereas the sample is the *strip family alone*. The strip family is the smaller population, so the constant is systematically too large and the rescaled gaps come out systematically long. The diagnostic is the mean rescaled gap, which a correct constant places at 1: on this window it reads 0.99997 for the control — which uses all of its zeros and therefore needs no correction — but 1.0547 at $k = 1$ and 1.0744 at $k = 2$. **The excess is accounted for at both indices by the strip share of the all-root population, and the denominator that does it is the all-root total, in-box plus patch, of §4.2–§4.3 and not the in-box total alone.** On this window the all-root totals are $4804 + 6 = 4810$ at $k = 1$ and $4442 + 45 = 4487$ at $k = 2$, so the strip shares are $4561/4810 = 0.94823$ and $4175/4487 = 0.93047$, with reciprocals 1.0546 and 1.0747 against the measured 1.0547 and 1.0744 — both excesses accounted for to between 1 and 3×10^{-4} . (Computed instead as density integral over gap count, §4.3’s integrals give $4810.20/4559 = 1.0551$ and $4487.54/4173 = 1.0754$, the same picture.) *An earlier version divided by the in-box totals 4804 and 4442 while calling them the all-root totals, which left reciprocals 1.0533 and 1.0640 and, at $k = 2$, “about one percentage point of the excess unexplained”.* **There is no such residual:** the missing percentage point is the 45 patch roots, and the statement is corrected here in the main text rather than in an erratum. The correction in both cases is to renormalise each family to its own unit sample mean. It shortens the rescaled gaps, hence **raises** $\text{frac} < 0.5$ and **lowers** $\text{frac} > 2$: the uncorrected rows were biased at both indices in the direction of the effect this section claims.

distribution	frac < 0.5	std	frac > 2	mean rescaled gap
Poisson	0.394	1.000	0.135	1
GUE, exact (Gaudin)	0.1131	0.4243	0.0177	1
Riemann zeros (control), density constant as filed	0.0896	0.3947	0.0138	0.99997
1-points ($k = 1$), density constant as filed	0.0160	0.3616	0.0140	1.0547
$k = 2$ family, density constant as filed	0.0201	0.3688	0.0098	1.0744
Riemann zeros (control), per-family normalised	0.0894	0.3947	0.0138	1
1-points ($k = 1$), per-family normalised	0.0189	0.3429	0.0039	1
$k = 2$ family, per-family normalised	0.0271	0.3432	0.0010	1

Provenance of the normalised register, stated once. The as-filed rows of the table are written by the standing statistics script of instrument (I1). The **per-family-normalised** rows, the six suppression factors below, and the exact-Gaudin row are derived from those outputs by the arithmetic printed in this subsection — renormalisation to unit sample mean, and Nyström evaluation of the sine-kernel determinant — rather than by a further standing script; they are among the closed-form/single-session statements flagged in §0, and the recipe printed here is what makes them reproducible.

Rounding provenance, stated so that every factor below is reproducible. The table rounds to four decimals; all factors quoted in this section and in §6.2 are computed from the unrounded sample values

$$\underbrace{0.0895689}_{\text{control, as filed}},$$

$$\underbrace{0.0893824}_{\text{control, normalised}},$$

$$\begin{array}{c}
\underbrace{0.0160123,}_{k=1, \text{ as filed}} \\
\underbrace{0.0201294,}_{k=2, \text{ as filed}} \\
\\
\underbrace{0.0188637}_{k=1, \text{ normalised}} , \\
\underbrace{0.0270788}_{k=2, \text{ normalised}} , \\
\\
\underbrace{0.1130554}_{\text{GUE, exact}}.
\end{array}$$

A reader who recomputes from the *rounded* table entries instead will get values differing in the second decimal place (for instance $0.1130554/0.0189 = 5.98$ against the 5.99 printed below). **The control's own normalisation is immaterial and the row is printed only so that the reader can see that:** its mean rescaled gap is 0.99997, and renormalising moves its frac < 0.5 from 0.0895689 to 0.0893824, a relative change of 0.2%. Each register is nevertheless compared strictly within itself — as-filed against as-filed, normalised against normalised — and never across.

The GUE row, and a correction to it made here in the main text. The row is the *exact* (Gaudin) nearest-neighbour spacing distribution of the unitary ensemble, not a surmise: with $E(0; s) = \det(I - K_s)$ the Fredholm determinant of the sine kernel $K(x, y) = \sin \pi(x - y)/\pi(x - y)$ on an interval of unfolded length s , the spacing law has $F(s) = 1 + E'(0; s)$, and Nyström evaluation on Gauss–Legendre nodes (stable to ten digits over quadrature orders 40–120) gives

$$F(0.5) = 0.1130554, \quad 1 - F(2) = 0.0177104, \quad \text{std} = 0.4242569.$$

The two standard deviations in this paragraph were recomputed from scratch for this version and one of them moved; both are printed here at the precision they reproduce at. The exact-Gaudin standard deviation follows from $\langle s^2 \rangle = 2 \int_0^\infty E(0; s) ds$ (integrating $s^2 E''$ by parts twice against $\int p = \int sp = 1$), which returns $\langle s^2 \rangle = 1.17999388$ and $\text{std} = \sqrt{\langle s^2 \rangle - 1} = 0.42425685$, invariant under Gauss–Legendre order 200–800 on the outer integral and Nyström order 60–240 on the determinant; **an earlier version printed 0.4242567, wrong in the seventh digit against a claim of ten-digit stability, and it is corrected to 0.4242569 here.** The first two values reproduce as printed (0.11305539 and 0.01771044, stable across Nyström orders 40–240). See Mehta, *Random Matrices*, for the Gaudin distribution and the sine-kernel determinant. For orientation the Wigner surmise $p(s) = (32/\pi^2)s^2 e^{-4s^2/\pi}$ gives 0.111 9997, 0.017 0501 and 0.422 0157, i.e. 0.1120, 0.0171 and 0.4220 — close, but the exact values are what is printed above. **The Wigner standard deviation is checkable in closed form and was checked:** $\int_0^\infty s^2 p(s) ds = 3\pi/8$ **exactly, so** $\text{std} = \sqrt{3\pi/8 - 1} = 0.4220156930$; **an earlier version printed 0.422 0164, also wrong in the seventh digit, and it too is corrected.** Neither standard deviation enters any factor quoted anywhere in this paper, so nothing else in §6 changes. **Since this section makes rounding provenance a named issue, the rule is stated: every rounding in this paper is round-half-away-from-zero on the decimal expansion,** which is what turns 0.0170501 into 0.0171 and not into 0.0170; the unrounded value is printed alongside so that the choice cannot change any factor quoted. **An earlier version of this row read 0.090 / 0.42 / 0.010. Its first and third entries were wrong — 0.090 is not a GUE value at all but a restatement of the empirical control — and every sentence in this section that was calibrated against them has been rewritten below.**

The control is not GUE-consistent, and that is an expected finite-height effect rather than a defect of the pipeline. The control uses Riemann zeros on $t \in [3000, 8000]$ processed through the identical pipeline (same normalisation, same boundary trim). Against the exact GUE row it carries a small-gap deficit of 20.8% (0.0896 against 0.1131) *and* an upper-tail deficit of 22.1% (0.0138 against 0.0177; the deficit computed from the unrounded 0.0177104, per this section’s rounding-provenance rule — an earlier version’s 22.0% came from the rounded pair), with a standard deviation 7.0% narrower (0.3947 against 0.4243). Deficits of the same size at both ends, together with a narrower spread, are the signature of a distribution compressed relative to GUE, not of a small-gap-specific anomaly; at $t \sim 5 \times 10^3$ the zeros of ζ are not expected to have reached the GUE limit, and this is the size of the gap at this height. **The consequence for this section is stated plainly: the control is an empirical reference at this height, not a stand-in for GUE, and the two comparisons are reported separately below and never merged.**

The comparison, in both registers, with all six factors printed to three decimals. On the **per-family normalised** rows the 1-points suppress small gaps relative to the control by a factor 4.738 and the $k = 2$ family by a factor 3.301; relative to the exact GUE row the same two families give 5.993 and 4.175. On the **density constants as filed**, the two control-relative factors are 5.594 and 4.450. Every one of these six numbers is the quotient of two of the unrounded values displayed above, and no factor in this paper mixes the two registers. **Figures of 6 and 4.5 appeared in an earlier version of this section. They were computed against the control on the uncorrected density constant, and they are superseded by the six numbers just given.**

The large-gap tail is reported as found, and the earlier reading of it is withdrawn. On the uncorrected constant the $k = 1$ tail $\text{frac} > 2$ was indistinguishable from the control (0.0140 against 0.0138) and the $k = 2$ tail was 0.0098; the sentence “the large-gap tail is identical across families” was already false at $k = 2$ and was withdrawn. Under the per-family normalisation the tail deficit is larger and present at both indices: 0.0039 at $k = 1$ and 0.0010 at $k = 2$, against 0.0138 for the control and 0.0177 for exact GUE. **The honest description of the measurement is therefore a two-sided narrowing of the spacing distribution** — standard deviations 0.343 at both indices against 0.395 for the control and 0.4243 for GUE — **and not a small-gap deficit alone.** At $k = 2$ the tail is a factor 1.81 below the exact GUE value even before the normalisation is corrected ($0.0177104/0.0098 = 1.807$; an earlier version printed 1.80, against this paper’s own round-half-away rule), so the earlier remark that 0.0098 is “close to the GUE value” was calibrated against the wrong number and is withdrawn.

One further population, printed so that no row is ambiguous. The pooled seven-window value of $\text{frac} < 0.5$ at $k = 1$ is 0.0165 on $n = 5688$ gaps on the density constant as filed, and 0.0199 under the per-family normalisation (pooled mean rescaled gap 1.0582) — a *different* population from the single-window table above, and both are correct for what they are.

6.2 The two known weaknesses of the spacing statistics, in full

This is the most attackable result in the paper, and both of its known weaknesses are printed here rather than defended.

The zero-finder is Newton on a $\Delta t = 0.5$ grid with a deduplication tolerance of 10^{-4} in both coordinates. Small gaps are precisely the population a deduplication tolerance destroys. The decisive check is the small-gap statistic as a function of that tolerance.

Caveat 1, closed in this version — the direct sweep has now been run, and the tolerance does not bite. An earlier version said the sweep had not been run and bounded the artefact channel analytically instead (the bound is retained below as corroboration). The run, on the window with the thinnest margin: the $k = 2$ census on $t \in [3000, 8000]$ was re-run with instrument (I1)’s exact scheme and seed grid, recording **every raw accepted Newton root with no deduplication at all** — 41,720 raw roots — and the merge was then applied at four tolerances spanning four decades, 10^{-6} , 10^{-5} , 10^{-4} (the census value) and 10^{-3} , in the finder’s own scan order. **The outcome is identical at all four tolerances:** total roots 4442, strip roots 4175, $\text{frac} < 0.5 = 0.0201$, $\text{frac} < 0.25 = 0.0034$, and the smallest unfolded gap, to every digit compared — and the 10^{-4} column reproduces the banked census exactly, root count for root count. The mechanism is visible in the data, and the two merge roles are separated here because a reader could reasonably ask what removed $41,720 - 4442 = 37,278$ raw roots if “no merge fires”: the raw pool carries about 9.4 Newton hits per accepted root — neighbouring seeds converging to the same root, with pairwise distances at the Newton convergence floor, orders below the smallest tested tolerance — and those coincident hits merge identically at every tolerance, which is why the totals cannot depend on it. What never fires, at any tested tolerance, is a merge between **distinct** roots: the closest strip pair in t (the 2.5×10^{-4} of item 3) is separated by 0.374 in u , and deduplication requires closeness in **both** coordinates; the next-closest pair in t is 0.030 away. What the sweep cannot address — a seed grid too coarse to ever produce two Newton hits on genuinely distinct nearby roots — is the separate channel that check (i) below addresses by grid refinement. The two checks that were already on record are retained: (i) refining the seed grid from $\Delta t = 0.5$ to 0.25 on $t \in [1000, 1500]$ left $\text{frac} < 0.5$ unchanged ($\Delta = 0.0000$) and found zero extra strip points; (ii) the Riemann-zero control, computed on the same **gap pipeline**, returns the empirical Riemann-zero spacing distribution at this height — a within-pipeline reference and **not** a GUE certificate.

How far the control’s protection reaches, restated correctly. An earlier version of this paragraph described the control as sharing “the same grid, same Newton, same 10^{-4} merge”. **That is false and is corrected here.** As §6.1 states, the control’s ordinates are read from a published table; they never enter the root-finder and they never enter the merge. What the control therefore shares is the *gap pipeline* — the same unfolding convention, the same boundary trim, the same first-gap drop — and nothing of the root-finding stage. **The consequence is stated plainly: the control certifies nothing whatever about the deduplication channel**, and the analytic bound of the next paragraph is the sole defence there. The control’s remaining limitation is unchanged: it does not share the *gap scale*, since its mean spacing and its small-gap population are not the F_k families’.

The analytic bound on the merge channel. What the sweep would probe can be bounded without running it, because the merge acts on the gap sequence in exactly one way. Two roots are merged only if they agree to 10^{-4} in **both** coordinates; if roots X, A, B, Y are consecutive in t and A, B merge, the gap sequence XA, AB, BY becomes XM, MY , so precisely one gap — the one of raw size $< 10^{-4}$ — is deleted, and its two neighbours move by at most 10^{-4} . **The only gaps a merge can destroy are those already below the tolerance.** Three consequences, in increasing strength:

1. *Scale.* In the unfolded coordinate of §6.1 the merge window has size $10^{-4} \cdot \log(t/2\pi(k+1))/2\pi$. Over $t \in [3000, 8000]$ this runs 8.71×10^{-5} to 1.03×10^{-4} at $k = 1$, 8.07×10^{-5} to 9.63×10^{-5} at $k = 2$, and 9.82×10^{-5} to 1.14×10^{-4} for the control. The largest value anywhere in the window is a factor 4.4×10^3 below the $s = 0.5$ threshold at which the claimed deficit is measured.
2. *Mass.* To raise the $k = 1$ figure from the measured 0.0160 to the control’s 0.0896 by deletion

alone, the merge would have had to destroy 369 gaps from a true sample of 4928 — that is, the unduplicated population would have to carry 7.5% of its mass inside $[0, 1.03 \times 10^{-4}]$. Under Poisson, the least repulsive reference on §6.1’s table, that mass is 1.03×10^{-4} : the requirement exceeds it by a factor 7.3×10^2 . Under any level-repelling reference with $p(s) \sim (\pi^2/3)s^2$ near the origin the mass is 1.2×10^{-12} and the factor is 6×10^{10} .

3. *Ledger check, offered for completeness and not as evidence.* On the delivered ledger no two consecutive strip roots on this window are closer than 4.3×10^{-3} in t at $k = 1$ or 2.5×10^{-4} at $k = 2$ — 43 and 2.5 times the tolerance respectively — so there is no pile-up immediately above the merge threshold of the kind a biting tolerance produces. **The two margins are not alike and the thin one is said to be thin: a factor 43 is a clearance, a factor 2.5 is not far from where a biting tolerance would sit, and this item’s own logic — a biting tolerance produces a pile-up just above threshold — is weakest exactly at $k = 2$.** This is a statement about the surviving ledger and says nothing directly about what was removed from the raw finder output.

Caveat 1b — the thinning bias, measured rather than argued. The F_k samples are strip families, obtained by deleting the outer-family roots from the ordinate sequence; deleting a root merges two consecutive gaps, which changes the *shape* of the gap distribution and not only its mean, and §6.1’s only correction is a rescaling to unit sample mean. A rescaling to unit mean cannot correct a change of shape, whatever the mean does; **that is the whole of the premise here, and it needs no residual in §6.1 to stand.** *An earlier version opened this caveat by citing “the residual percentage point unexplained at $k = 2$ in §6.1” as evidence that the rescaling is incomplete. That residual was an artefact of an in-box denominator and does not exist (§6.1); the sentence is deleted, and the measurement below — which is what the caveat actually rests on — is unchanged by its deletion.* **The direction and size of the bias are measured here by running the control through the same deletion.** Ordinates were deleted from the control uniformly at random at the two rates the deletion was matched to when the check was run — 5.06% at $k = 1$ and 6.01% at $k = 2$, the complements of the in-box strip shares 4561/4804 and 4175/4442 — and the survivors were passed through the identical pipeline and renormalised to unit sample mean, over 1000 independent draws. Measured, instrument (I1):

control	frac < 0.5	std	frac > 2
full, per-family normalised	0.0894	0.3947	0.0138
thinned 5.06% (1000 draws)	0.1003 ± 0.0014	0.4392	0.0290
thinned 6.01% (1000 draws)	0.1013 ± 0.0014	0.4471	0.0309

(the $\pm$ is the standard deviation of the statistic across draws, not a standard error of the mean.)

The result is printed as found, and it runs against the effect this section claims, not with it. Random thinning at these rates moves the control *toward* Poisson at every index — small gaps up by about a fifth, standard deviation up, upper tail up by a factor of two — because deleting a point of a repulsive process merges two short gaps into one long one and leaves the survivors less regular. Measured against the thinned control rather than the full one, the suppression factors of §6.1 would read 5.317 at $k = 1$ and 3.741 at $k = 2$ instead of 4.738 and 3.301 — **computed, as this subsection requires everywhere else, from the unrounded inputs 0.100296 and 0.101296 against 0.0188637 and 0.0270788; an earlier version printed 5.319 and 3.740, which the table’s own rounded entries 0.1003 and 0.1013 do not reproduce.** **The thinning bias is therefore bounded and signed: correcting for it would enlarge the reported effect, so the figures printed in §6.1 and below are the conservative ones, and they are the ones**

carried. **The rates as run are also the conservative choice**, and that is printed rather than left to be noticed: matched instead to the all-root strip shares of §6.1 the rates would be 5.18% and 6.95% rather than 5.06% and 6.01%, and the table’s own trend in the rate is upward, so a rerun at the higher rates would move the thinned control further from the F_k families and not closer. Three limits on this check are part of it: the rates as run are the in-box ones just described; the deletion in the F_k case is *not* random — it selects on u , not on ordinate — so this bounds the bias only under the assumption that the deleted set is uncorrelated in ordinate with the survivors; and the check is a measurement on one window and one control, not a theorem about thinned point processes.

What this does and does not settle. Items 1 and 2 convert the caveat from “the sweep was not run” into a quantitative statement: the deduplication channel is separated from the scale of the claim by at least three orders of magnitude, and from its required probability mass by between two and eleven orders depending on the reference law assumed. **The tolerance sweep on the raw, pre-merge finder output has now been run — Caveat 1 above carries it in full — so the bound above is corroboration of a measured invariance rather than a substitute for the measurement.** (An earlier version said here that the sweep had not been run and that a referee who wanted it was entitled to it; the author ran it, and the statistic is flat across four decades of tolerance.) Caveat 1b closes the *thinning* channel by measurement; the merge channel is closed by the sweep and items 1–3 together.

Caveat 2 — the novelty search behind “first of its kind” is incomplete in a specific, named place. The author located no spacing statistics for a -points of ζ — any a , any height, theorem, conjecture or numerics — and no a -point pair correlation. The nearest analogue located is the spacing rigidification of ξ' -zeros (Farmer–Gonek [FGL14]; Farmer–Rhoades [FR05]), whose mechanism does not transfer as stated and does not predict the observed tail behaviour. **Steuding, Value-Distribution of L -Functions, LNM 1877, ch. 7 — earlier versions carried it here as the same unread source as in §3.5 — has now been read first-hand (§0, §3.5, §14): its content is sums over c -values, Riemann–von Mangoldt-type formulae, Nevanlinna theory and uniqueness theorems for the functional-equation class, and it contains no spacing or gap statistic of the kind measured here.** A second thread, the “regularity of the graph” heuristic of Garunkštis–Steuding [GS14], is likewise unresolved against this measurement. **If either carries a -point spacing statistics, the firstness claim in this section fails and only the measurement stands.** The measurement stands regardless.

What is claimed, after both caveats. On $t \in [3000, 8000]$, with instrument (I1) and the **per-family normalisation** of §6.1, the F_1 and F_2 zero ordinates have $\text{frac} < 0.5$ equal to 0.0189 and 0.0271 against 0.0894 for a Riemann-zero control run through the same pipeline on the same window — factors 4.738 and 3.301. On the **density constants as filed** the same three numbers are 0.0160, 0.0201 and 0.0896, giving factors 5.594 and 4.450; §6.1 says why the normalised register is the one to read, and the rounding provenance of all six factors is printed there. That comparison is internal to one instrument and one window and does not depend on any literature question. The separate comparison against the exact GUE row of §6.1 — factors 5.993 and 4.175 — is a comparison against a limit law that the control itself does not attain at this height, and it is reported as such and never merged with the previous one.

§7. The shape of the displacement law

The distribution of $x = d\sigma \cdot \log t$ (signed displacement times $\log t$, with $d\sigma = \sigma^* - \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2} - u$) has negative skew throughout the census: pooled skew over the seven windows of §5.1 is

$$-0.713,$$

of which 38% $((0.713 - 0.443)/0.713 = 37.9\%$; an earlier version said “about 40%”) is attributable to boundary points near $u \rightarrow 1$ (i.e. $\sigma^* \rightarrow 0$, where $d\sigma \rightarrow -\frac{1}{2}$ mechanically). After trimming $u > 0.9$, the residual pooled skew is

$$-0.443,$$

statistically significant in the large windows and growing at high t — with the caveat, printed by the source and repeated here, that n is small above $t = 15000$ (see §5.1: 109, 116, 129, 134). The left tail of $d\sigma$ is the heavier one: more roots lie with σ^* far below $\frac{1}{2}$, equivalently u_ρ far above $\frac{1}{2}$, than the reverse. This is the same side as the sum rule’s budget, since $D_k > 0$ means net displacement at $u > \frac{1}{2}$, i.e. $d\sigma < 0$.

What is conceded and what is claimed. The *qualitative* one-sidedness has a classical counterpart, **conditional on RH**: a one-sided Gaussian tail at scale $\sqrt{\log \log T} / \log T$ on one side of the line with excursions on the other side confined to a strictly smaller scale, and Selberg’s conjectured asymptotic 3/4–1/4 split (Selberg [Se92]; Tsang [Ts84]); that classical picture also anticipates growth of the skew with height. All of that is conceded (§13). **What is claimed here is the pair of coefficients -0.713 and -0.443 and the boundary-trim decomposition that connects them**, measured unconditionally on the seven windows above with instrument (I1). One caution travels with the comparison: the classical statements are phrased for the abscissa u_ρ while the measured skew is in $d\sigma = \frac{1}{2} - u_\rho$, and the identification of the heavy sides under that sign reversal is a bookkeeping step the author has done but does not re-verify here. A qualitative literature comparison at most — and, since the measurement is unconditional and the classical statement is conditional, in no direction evidence about RH.

§8. The error factor of Theorem 1, and the walk past the last saddle

Theorem 1 leaves Φ_k as a bounded oscillating factor. This section reports what is known about it and about the third regime of the same walk — the region $M > x_1 = t/2\pi$, past the last saddle, where the partial sums close into coils around ζ . Both are measurements; no closed form for Φ_k is proved or claimed anywhere in this paper.

8.1 The measured factor

Define the measured error factor directly from Theorem 1, on the literal uniform centroid of §1.1:

$$\Phi_k^{\text{meas}}(s) := \left(\frac{\text{off}_k^{\text{unif}}(s)}{\chi(s)} - P_k(s) \right) t^{1/2}.$$

Evaluated with instrument (I1) for ζ and an exact log-gamma evaluation of χ , the factor is bounded and oscillating, with medians between 0.8 and 1.9 over $k = 1, \dots, 8$. **Window and sample size, absent from an earlier version of this subsection:** the medians are taken on $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$ over $t \in [3000, 3 \times 10^5]$, on a grid of 240 heights (232 usable at some k , after excluding packets with

fewer than eight integers). The instrument controls quoted with the run — truncation control 1.8×10^{-9} and functional-equation control 2.4×10^{-9} , both orders below the signal — are maxima pooled over 439 control rows drawn from that grid together with a second grid of 90 heights on $t \in [2 \times 10^4, 2 \times 10^5]$ at $\sigma \in \{0.3, 0.5, 0.7\}$.

Models in the two fractional parts alone are refuted. Theorem 1 locates the phases of the two endpoint defects at $\{t/2\pi k\}$ and $\{t/2\pi(k+1)\}$, so the natural first model is a harmonic one in those two variables. Every figure in this subsection is measured on instrument (I1)’s evaluation scheme, on §8.1’s grid, with §8.1’s per-run self-checks ($1.8 \times 10^{-9}/2.4 \times 10^{-9}$) as its validation — stated here once for the whole table, since an earlier version named no instrument in this subsection. A direct two-phase fit to Φ_k returns $R^2 = 0.027$ — the median over $k = 2, \dots, 8$ on the same $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$, $t \in [3000, 3 \times 10^5]$ grid of 240 heights used above. A windowed single-phase fit to the proxy $\lambda_k(t) = \log(|G_k^-|/|G_k^+|)$ (the log-ratio of the two half-gaps of the packet about the truncation point) returns median $R^2 = 0.179$, again over $k = 2, \dots, 8$; here “windowed” means twelve narrow windows of length 10 in t , centred at $t_{\text{mid}} \in \{3000, 5000, 8000, 12000, 20000, 28000, 40000, 55000, 73800, 10^5, 1.5 \times 10^5, 2 \times 10^5\}$ with 200 grid points each, the fit being the three-parameter model median $\lambda_k = c + \alpha \sin(t_{\text{mid}}/k) + \beta \cos(t_{\text{mid}}/k)$ across window medians. **The lock threshold of 0.6 — median $R^2 \geq 0.6$ over $k = 2, \dots, 8$ — was declared before the run**, together with the requirement of at least nine distinct narrow windows; both fits fall far short of it, which is the content of this paragraph. **That ordering carries exactly the qualification §4 attaches to its own: it is the author’s internal record, there is no external timestamp and no third party, and the word “pre-registration” is not used for it here.** What it supplies is that the threshold is not a post-hoc description of the outcome — and since both fits miss it by a wide margin, nothing in this paragraph would change if the threshold were discarded entirely. The reason is visible in the proof: the factor carries explicit t through the Fresnel scale $\kappa_\nu = \sqrt{t}/x_\nu$, which no model in the fractional parts alone can supply.

8.2 A parameter-free Fresnel-endpoint prediction

The prediction is written out here in full so that it can be reproduced without any further document. Keep the notation of §2. For each frequency ν put

$$g_\nu(x) = \frac{s}{2\pi i \nu} x^{-\sigma-1},$$

$$\text{Full}_\nu = g_\nu(x_\nu) e^{i\varphi_\nu(x_\nu)} \sqrt{2\pi/\varphi''_\nu(x_\nu)} e^{i\pi/4},$$

$$w_\nu(N) = \text{sign}(N - x_\nu) \sqrt{\varphi_\nu(N) - \varphi_\nu(x_\nu)},$$

$$\rho(w) = \frac{1}{2} \text{erfc}(w e^{-i\pi/4}),$$

and approximate each positive-frequency integral by the *uniform Fresnel* form $I_\nu(N) \approx \text{Full}_\nu \cdot \rho(w_\nu(N))$ for $\nu = 1, \dots, k+8$, with the negative frequencies $\nu = 1, \dots, 12$ carried at first order as boundary terms, and the terms (a), (b) of §2.2 carried exactly. Averaging over $N \in G_k$ and rescaling as in §8.1 gives a prediction for Φ_k containing **no fitted parameter of any kind**.

Regressing the measurement on the prediction at $\sigma = 0.5$ for $k = 1, \dots, 8$, on the 240-height grid $t \in [3000, 3 \times 10^5]$ of §8.1, gives the table below. **The grid is wider than the certified scope, and the table now says so row by row: an earlier version’s table advertised the whole grid as its own window — a set strictly containing the cells the scope paragraph below refutes ($k \leq 3$ on $[3 \times 10^4, 10^5]$) and the wholly uncertified range $t \in (10^5, 3 \times 10^5]$ — so its headline statistics averaged certified, refuted and uncertified cells without saying**

so. The whole-grid figures are kept, labelled as diagnostics; no certified-scope median is banked, and none is invented here.

quantity	value
grid (the diagnostics below run over all of it)	$t \in [3000, 3 \times 10^5]$, 240 log-spaced heights, $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$
certified scope	$t \in [3000, 30000]$ at all $k \leq 8$; $[3 \times 10^4, 10^5]$ at $k \geq 4$ only
refuted / uncertified cells inside the grid	$k \leq 3$ on $[3 \times 10^4, 10^5]$ refuted (residual flat at ≈ 0.076); $(10^5, 3 \times 10^5]$ uncertified at every k
median R^2 over $k = 1, \dots, 8$ — whole-grid diagnostic	0.993
per- k range of R^2 — whole-grid diagnostic	0.985–1.000
regression slope $ b_1 $ — whole-grid diagnostic	0.973–1.011 (with $\arg b_1 \approx 0$)
free parameters in the prediction	0
parameters fitted in the comparison	1 (the complex slope b_1)
residual	0.5–7%, growing like $k^{1.3}$ – $k^{1.6}$

Instruments for this table, stated at the table because §1.4’s promise applies to it: the measurement side is (I1) on §8.1’s grid, with §8.1’s per-run self-checks as its validation; the prediction column is the closed form displayed above, evaluated directly (elementary and erfc evaluations, no ζ value entering); the regression fits the one complex slope by least squares. An earlier version named an instrument only in the model-refutation paragraph below, leaving this table — the subsection’s headline — uncovered.

The two parameter counts are separated because they are different statements and an earlier version of this table ran them together under “fitted parameters | 0”. The *prediction* contains no fitted parameter: it is written out in full above and evaluated. The *comparison* is a linear regression of measurement on prediction and therefore fits one complex slope, which is the $|b_1|$ row. That the slope is not decorative is proved by the scope paragraph immediately below: beyond $k = 9$ the shape agreement survives at $R^2 = 1.000$ while $|b_1|$ falls away, so shape and amplitude are separately scored and only shape survives.

Scope, which travels with the claim and is not a footnote. The prediction is certified on $t \in [3000, 30000]$ for all $k \leq 8$, and for $k \geq 4$ on $[3 \times 10^4, 10^5]$; **on $[3 \times 10^4, 10^5]$ at $k \leq 3$ it is refuted**, the residual going flat at ≈ 0.076 in the units of Φ_k . Beyond $k = 9$ an amplitude gate fails ($|b_1|$ falls to 0.791/0.758/0.730 at $k = 12/16/20$) even though the *shape* agreement remains at $R^2 = 1.000$ to $k = 20$; the decline is attributed to tail depth in the evaluator, since at $k = 8$ raising the working precision moves $|b_1|$ from 0.85 to 0.91.

Replacing the uniform-Fresnel step by exact quadrature over $\nu \leq k + 1$ (quadrature error $\leq 8.5 \times 10^{-10}$) collapses the residual to 0.099/0.144/0.201 at $k = 2/5/8$ with $R^2 = 1.000$, and the per- ν defect then scales like $1/\nu$ — the far-field bias of the uniform error-function form. **The exact-kernel floor is not reached and the residual’s ultimate size is open.** What is claimed is exactly this: within the certified scope, the residual is attributable to artefacts of the prediction instrument, and no residual structure attributable to ζ is detectable at the precision measured. The *functional form* of Φ_k remains open and is not claimed here in any form.

8.3 Past the last saddle: the coil radius law

Beyond the last saddle $x_1 = t/2\pi$ there are no more stationary points, and the partial sums spiral onto ζ . Write the tail walk

$$D_M(s) := S_M(s) - \zeta(s), \quad u := t/M.$$

A notation warning, made at the point of definition because it bites at §8.6. The letter u has already been used, throughout §§1–7, for the real part of the reflected variable $w = u + iv$. **That use ends at §7.** From here to the end of §8, u means t/M and nothing else — a dimensionless band coordinate running over $(2\pi/6, 2\pi/2.5) = (1.047, 2.513)$, never a real part. The reuse is deliberate (it is the standard variable for this profile) and is declared rather than removed; every occurrence of u in §§8.3–8.8 is t/M , and wherever it enters an inequality below its numerical range is printed with it. On the band $M \in [2.5x_1, 6x_1]$ — equivalently $u \in (2\pi/6, 2\pi/2.5)$ — the Euler–Maclaurin tail for D_M converges geometrically with ratio $(u/2\pi)^2 \leq 0.161$ (measured 0.157–0.160 **at the slowest-converging edge of the band**, $M = 2.5x_1$; the ratio falls to $(1/6)^2 = 0.028$ at the other edge, $M = 6x_1$, so 0.157–0.160 is an edge value and an earlier version’s “across the band” was wrong), and summing it gives the closed form

$$|D_M(s)| = \frac{M^{1-\sigma}}{|s-1|} \cdot \frac{u/2}{\sin(u/2)} \cdot \left(1 + \frac{\theta c}{t}\right), \quad |\theta| \leq 1.$$

Two features are worth naming. The shape factor $(u/2)/\sin(u/2)$ is the modulus of the Bernoulli generating function $iu/(e^{iu} - 1)$ — the tail’s own generating function, read as a profile in u ; and its pole at $u = 2\pi$ is the last packet, i.e. the boundary $M = x_1$ at which the coil regime begins.

Verification, re-run in full for this version. **An earlier version rested on a banked nine-cell comparison whose particulars could not be recovered — which nine of the eighteen possible cells, and their per-cell errors, were never banked — and whose aggregate decay factor (≈ 15 from $t = 10^3$ to 2×10^4) sat unresolved below the closed form’s own $O(1/t)$ prediction. That banked comparison is superseded by a fresh run of all eighteen cells, printed per cell here.** The coordinate set is $\sigma \in \{0.3, 0.5, 0.7\}$, $t \in \{1000.3, 20000.4\}$, $u \in \{1.25, 1.79, 2.51\}$ (equivalently $M = \text{round}(t/u)$); instrument (I2) at 30 working digits. The relative errors of the closed form against $\zeta - S_M$ are, at $t = 1000.3$ and in the cell order (σ, u) lexicographic: 3.54, 3.74, 1.40, 2.29, 1.95, 1.10, 1.04, 0.16, 3.61 (units 10^{-4}); at $t = 20000.4$: 1.77, 1.87, 0.69, 1.14, 0.97, 0.57, 0.52, 0.08, 1.82 (units 10^{-5}). **The per-cell error constant $t \cdot (\text{rel. err.})$ agrees at the two heights to within 3.7% (worst cell 0.110033 vs 0.114002; 3.61% of the smaller, 3.48% of the larger — the convention is stated because the printed cells let a reader redo it) — 0.016 to 0.374 across the nine (σ, u) cells, four of the nine agreeing to the third decimal — and the decay ratios lie in $[19.30, 20.29]$ against the full t -ratio 19.994, so the $O(1/t)$ law is confirmed at that precision cell by cell, and the measured $c \leq 0.38$ replaces the banked “ $\lesssim 0.4$ ” with its per-cell breakdown. (An earlier version of this sentence claimed third-decimal equality in every cell and the full t -ratio in every cell; five of the nine cells, formed from this version’s own two printed lists, refute both claims at the printed precision — the worst cell by ratio is the sixth, 19.298.) The banked ≈ 15 did not reproduce and is withdrawn; the crude analytic bound $c \leq 20$ stands, loose against the measurement by a factor 53–1250 depending on the cell (20/0.374 to 20/0.016), and remains the weakest quantitative element of this subsection, printed as such.** The fresh run is a for-this-version computation in the sense flagged in §0 and §1.4, with its recipe fully printed above. The slope measurements of §8.4, taken on the same band, are at $t = 10^3$ and $t = 2 \times 10^4$.

What is conceded here. The step angle and step length of the coil, the asymptotic circle at $\sigma = 1$, and the fact that the walk's index is an integer at zeros are Nickel's [Ni13] and Reglade's [Re19]; they are not claimed. What is offered is the closed-form radius with its shape factor, the identification of the pole with the last packet, and the band on which the tail provably converges.

8.4 The slope defect, and an exact mirror split

In log-log coordinates the radius law of §8.3 has slope $(1 - \sigma) + \delta(u)$ with

$$\delta(u) = -1 + \frac{u}{2} \cot \frac{u}{2},$$

which is a function of u alone: **independent of σ and of the side of the line**. Two consequences, one measured and one exact.

Measured. A least-squares slope over the band $M/x_1 \in [2.5, 6]$ returns

$$\delta_{\text{LSQ}}(2.5, 6) = -0.250778,$$

a closed-form evaluation of the displayed $\delta(u)$ over the band rather than a measurement — one of the closed-form statements flagged in §0 — against measurements -0.2507 and -0.2506 at $t = 2 \times 10^4$ and -0.248 at $t = 10^3$ — the residual difference being the predicted $O(1/t)$ drift. *An earlier version added “the sampling nuance on the band constant is $\pm 2.6 \times 10^{-3}$ ” with no recipe for “sampling nuance”; no reconstruction reproduces it (the natural candidate — least squares uniform in M rather than in $\log M$ — moves the constant by 1.30×10^{-2} , five times that figure), and it is withdrawn as underivable. What is claimed is the $\log M$ -uniform least-squares value -0.250778 , which is exact against its printed recipe.* Instrument (I2).

Exact. Because δ does not depend on σ , the two members of a mirror pair σ and $1 - \sigma$ have log-log slopes $(1 - \sigma) + \delta$ and $\sigma + \delta$, so the **pair-slope difference is exactly $1 - 2\sigma$** , with the coil geometry cancelling identically. At $\sigma = 0.3$ the predicted difference is 0.4 and the measured values are 0.3993 and 0.3999 .

8.5 The per-coil winding, measured

Measurement (per-coil winding about the origin). *(An earlier version numbered this “Measurement 3”, the only numbered measurement in the paper — a residue of an external numbering scheme, removed for the same reason this subsection declares its proposition-numbering gap internal.) On the coil band, at a zero of ζ , the tail walk completes each coil with winding number -1 about the origin. Instrument (I2), 128/128: - 61 zeros — 34 with $t \in [1000, 1042]$ and 27 with $t \in [74000, 74018]$ — return per-coil winding in $[-0.9999, -0.9963]$; - 67 zeros — all zeros of Z with $t \in [3000, 3040]$ (39) and $t \in [50000, 50020]$ (28) — return per-coil winding in $[-1.01, -0.95]$.*

The two sets were run at different tolerances and their ranges are printed separately for that reason; the pooled statement is 128/128 inside $[-1.01, -0.95]$. The 67-zero half is written by a standing script; the 61-zero half is one of the single-session statements flagged in §0, computed with the same winding routine but not preserved as a standing run.

This slot previously held a proposition, and the demotion is explained here rather than left silent. The earlier statement derived “each coil winds exactly -1 about the origin, with no hypothesis on the shape of the coil” from the assertion that the bearing of the tail walk

satisfies $d(\text{bearing})/d \log M = -t + u/2 < 0$ and is therefore strictly monotone in $\log M$. **That inference does not hold, and the conclusion as worded is refuted by this paper's own data.** Monotonicity of the bearing controls the *turning number* of the curve — the winding of its tangent direction — and not the winding of the curve about a *point*: a small circle traversed far from the origin has strictly monotone bearing and winds 0 about the origin. The phantoms of §8.6 are exactly such curves: they obey the same bearing law and wind 0, which is precisely why the classifier of §8.6 separates them from zeros at all. A correct proposition therefore needs a hypothesis putting the origin inside the coil — on this band that would be supplied by the radius law of §8.3 together with the convergence of the walk to ζ — i.e. exactly the shape hypothesis the earlier wording claimed to have removed. Separately, the formula $-t + u/2$ was asserted rather than derived, and no derivation of it is offered here.

What is carried forward is therefore the measurement and not a proof. The winding $= -1$ statement is used below, in §8.6 and §8.8, as a measured regularity with the test sets and windows printed above, and every claim resting on it is a claim about those windows. No general theorem about the winding of coils is asserted anywhere in this paper. The numbering of Propositions 4–7 below is unchanged, so this paper contains no Proposition 3; **the gap is deliberate and internal to this text, and nothing outside this paper is referred to by it.**

8.6 Winding as a ζ -free classifier, and its honest boundary

The winding measurement of §8.5 turns the winding number of one coil about the **origin** into a classifier that evaluates no ζ and has no tunable threshold: $w = -1$ keeps the candidate, $w = 0$ dismisses it, anything else is flagged.

Two symbols used throughout §§8.6–8.8 are defined here, at first use, because an earlier version used both without definition.

The seed function Δ . Let $N_{\text{RS}}(t) = \lfloor \sqrt{t/2\pi} \rfloor$ be the Riemann–Siegel transition vertex, write $T(s) = S_{N_{\text{RS}}(t)}(s)$ for the partial sum there and $z = \zeta(s)$, and put

$$\Delta(s) := |T(s) - z| - |T(s)| = \frac{|z|^2 - 2 \operatorname{Re}(\bar{z} T(s))}{|T(s) - z| + |T(s)|},$$

the second expression being the elementary identity $a^2 - b^2 = (a - b)(a + b)$, the denominator vanishing only where $T(s)$ and $z = \zeta(s)$ vanish simultaneously (so the identity is valid even at zeros of T when $\zeta(s) \neq 0$). So $\Delta = 0$ says that the transition vertex is equidistant from the origin and from $\zeta(s)$. A Δ -*crossing* is a sign change of $t \mapsto \Delta(\sigma + it)$ at fixed σ ; each evaluation costs one partial sum of length $\sqrt{t/2\pi}$, whence the $O(\sqrt{t})$ below.

The coil radius $\rho(\cdot)$, and how it differs from §8.3's radius law. For a band vertex M ,

$$\rho(M) := \frac{M^{1-\sigma}}{|s-1|},$$

so that $\rho(2.5x_1) \asymp (2.5t/2\pi)^{1-\sigma}/t \asymp t^{-\sigma}$, which is the scaling quoted below. **This is *not* $|D_M|$ of §8.3:** the closed form there carries the extra shape factor $(u/2)/\sin(u/2)$, equal to 1.321 at the band edge $M = 2.5x_1$, and $\rho(\cdot)$ as used in §§8.6–8.8 omits it. The two therefore differ by that factor, and every “gain” and every exclusion-band radius below is computed with the shape factor absent. An earlier version wrote ρ for both objects without saying so; carrying the shape factor into §8.7 would raise the largest gain printed there from 8.5×10^7 to 1.1×10^8 , so the version used is the smaller and the statement is the conservative one.

The other uses of ρ , and of A and B , flagged together so that no reader has to guess. The letter ρ denotes: a zero of F_k or of a Dirichlet series in §§1–7 and §§9–11; the error-function profile $\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{erfc}(we^{-i\pi/4})$ in §8.2; the coil radius just defined in §§8.6–8.8; a crossing density in §10.3; and, as ρ_{on} , a measured suppression ratio in §10.1 — **five uses, not the four an earlier version of this note listed**. The same courtesy is owed for two capitals the earlier versions did not police at all. A denotes: the growth exponent of Lemma 3.3(1); the aligned-Euler stem $\zeta(2\sigma)/\zeta(\sigma)$ of §9.4; the Meissel–Mertens constant $\sum_{n \geq 2} (\mu(n)/n) \log \zeta(n) = M - \gamma$ of §10.2; the phase function of §10.3; and the archimedean block $A_F(\varphi)$ of §11.2. B denotes: the right abscissa of §3; the band of integers $M \in [2.5x_1, 6x_1]$ in §8.7’s estimator — **a fifth use, inside the very range this note governs, which an earlier version of the note omitted**; the parity quantity $N(W) - N_0(W)$ of §8.8; the reciprocal stem $1/A$ of §9.4; and the velocity field dA/dt of §10.3. One more family is added rather than left to be tripped over: ϑ is the Riemann–Siegel theta of §8.8 (and §9.6) and the per-prime angle of §10.3 (whose displays are written in ϑ uniformly; an earlier version’s second display slipped to θ there), while θ is the fixed angle $t \log \frac{3}{2}$ of §8.9, the torus coordinate θ_p of §10.3 and the torus point $\theta(t) = (-t \log p)_p$ there (two objects under one glyph in one subsection; an earlier version of this note counted seven objects while enumerating six, the point being the missing seventh), the bounded error parameter $|\theta| \leq 1$ of §8.3’s closed form, and the angular integration variable of Lemma 3.3’s Jensen displays — two glyphs, seven objects, and §10.3 uses both glyphs at once. ψ carries four meanings — the sawtooth $\{x\} - \frac{1}{2}$ of §1.1 and §§2.2–2.3, the odd character mod 5 of §1.3/§10.1, the *even* (quadratic) character mod 5 of §13.2, pinned there by $\psi(2) = -1$ (an earlier version merged the two characters into one “odd” entry covering §13.2, mis-stating the parity of §13.2’s character: 2 is a quadratic non-residue mod 5 and $5 \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$, so $\psi(2) = -1$ forces the even Legendre character, while §1.3’s odd characters carry $\psi(2) = \pm i$), and the digamma function of Remark 3.2a and §11.2 — *an entry earlier versions of this note omitted even while §1.3 carried a (false, now corrected) universal claim about the glyph*. **This register is, by design, a list of the families most likely to mislead — not a census of every reused letter (an earlier version claimed completeness, which a list of this kind cannot honestly claim): single-letter reuse at this length is pervasive, every glyph is defined at its point of use, and the latest audit adds two more families here.** W is §8.8’s window rectangle (with its numbered windows W_1, W_2, W_3), §10.2–§10.3’s wing function $W(\sigma)$ — whose reduced form $W_3(\sigma)$ in §10.3’s Corollary (ii) shares glyph *and* subscript with §8.8’s window W_3 , the same configuration as ρ/ρ_{on} and flagged for exactly that reason — and §11.2’s Weil functional $W_F(\varphi)$. T is the height of §§3–4 and §§9–11, the tail $T_N(s)$ of §§2.1–2.2, and §8.6’s own transition-vertex partial sum $T(s) := S_{N_{\text{RS}}(t)}(s)$, defined above this very register. Beyond these, $D, M, g, h, L, \alpha, \beta, E$ and the coefficient label a_n each carry more than one meaning across distant sections; each is defined where it is used, and this list does not claim to exhaust them. Φ is Theorem 1’s oscillating factor Φ_k (§2, §8.1–§8.2, §13.3) and, locally, the shifted auxiliary $\Phi(z) := \Psi(z + iT)$ inside Lemma 3.3’s proof — two objects, the second confined to that proof; φ is the stationary phase φ_ν of §§2.3–2.4 and §8.2 and the Weil test function φ (transform $\hat{\varphi}$) of §11.2. S is the partial sum $S_N/S_M/S_k$ from §1.1 through §8.9, the argument-counting function $S(t)$ of §9.6, the on-line resonance sum S_{on} of §10.1, and the per-prime variances S_g, S_h of §10.3. δ is §2.7’s ratio E_k/χ , §3.4’s limit variable, §8.4’s slope defect $\delta(u)$, §9.1’s offset $\sigma - \frac{1}{2}$, and §11.2’s $\delta_\rho = \beta - \frac{1}{2}$ and δ_{drive} . Lowercase c carries §1.3’s $c_\pm$, §3.1’s c_k , §5.2’s plateau constant, §8.3’s error constant, §8.9’s c_{12}, c_{13}, c_{23} , §10.2’s arcsine coefficients c_m and seam constant c , and §11.2’s prefactor — each defined at its use, none carried across subsections; capital C is §9.1’s well curvature and §10.2’s ladder constant. N is a Dirichlet cutoff (§§1–2, §8), a zero count $N(W)/N_{F_k}(T)/N_f(T)$ (§3.3, §1.3, §8.8), and a grid size (§11.2); $\Sigma_k(u)$ of §3.1 shares its capital with the number variance $\Sigma^2(L)$ of §9.5; and lowercase b is §8.2’s regression slope b_1 , §8.7’s model depth, §10.2’s third-order coefficient, and §10.3’s Kac–Rice integration variable. And within §8.7

itself, B is the band of integers while B_{2j} are the Bernoulli numbers, in adjacent lines of one display — the same subscript-sharing configuration as ρ/ρ_{on} . **Each is defined where it is used, and the pairs sharing a subsection under one glyph are ρ/ρ_{on} in §10.1 and B/B_{2j} in §8.7** (an earlier version said the first pair was the only one); they are collected here because a referee reading out of order is entitled to the list.

Here a *candidate* is a point produced by the **coarse seed stage** — a Δ -crossing scan at the Riemann–Siegel transition vertex, of cost $O(\sqrt{t})$ per evaluation, which generates the raw candidate pool that the $O(t)$ winding test then confirms or rejects — and a *phantom* is a candidate that is not a zero. Measured, instrument (I2), with every test set and window printed:

test	test set and t -window	result
$w = -1$	the 128 zeros of the per-coil	128/128
keeps	winding measurement, §8.5	
$w = 0$	the phantom pool: 474	474/474 dismissed, including all 15 with
dismisses	distinct phantoms — 298	classification margin below 0.05; over two
	filed, being every off-line	rounds these were evaluated 772 times in all,
	Δ -crossing on $t \in [1000, 1100]$,	772/772 with $ w \leq 6.4 \times 10^{-4}$
	$[5000, 5050]$, $[20000, 20040]$,	
	$[100000, 100015]$, each on the	
	four σ -legs	
	$\{0.30, 0.42, 0.58, 0.70\}$,	
	together with 176 fresh ones	
	on $t \in [3000, 3080]$ and	
	$[50000, 50040]$ on the same	
	four legs, all bisected to	
	$ \Delta(t_0) \leq 10^{-12}$	
fresh	every zero of Z with	67/67
data,	$t \in [3000, 3040]$ and	
keeps	$t \in [50000, 50020]$	
deviation	10 zeros per window on	measured deviations 3.66×10^{-3} , 7.4×10^{-4} ,
decay	$t \in [1000, 1100]$, $[5000, 5060]$,	1.85×10^{-4} , decaying like $1/t$ — the measured
	$[20000, 20060]$	decay and its three values are the row's whole
		content; the asserted inequality an earlier
		version compared them to is dismissed in the
		note directly below (<i>one earlier cell said “a</i>
		<i>$\times 2.9$ headroom”, the comparison read the</i>
		<i>wrong way round; a later one printed the</i>
		<i>violation inside the cell; this version keeps the</i>
		<i>table to what is measured</i>)

The inequality removed from the last row is dismissed here, once: against it the measurements are a violation, not a headroom, and an earlier version had the comparison the wrong way round. In the bound $|\varepsilon| \leq u/2t$ the symbol u is §8.3's band coordinate t/M , so on the band $M \in [2.5x_1, 6x_1]$ it runs over $(2\pi/6, 2\pi/2.5) = (1.047, 2.513)$. Taking the most generous admissible value $u = 2\pi/2.5 = 2.5133$, the bound evaluates to

$$1.257 \times 10^{-3} \ (t = 1000), \quad 2.513 \times 10^{-4} \ (t = 5000), \quad 6.283 \times 10^{-5} \ (t = 20000),$$

against the measured 3.66×10^{-3} , 7.4×10^{-4} , 1.85×10^{-4} . **The measurements exceed the bound by factors 2.91, 2.94 and 2.94 — at every height, with an almost constant ratio, hence systematically rather than by scatter; at the other band edge $u = 2\pi/6$ the factor is about 7.** The bound $|\varepsilon| \leq u/2t$ rests on the same bearing law that §8.5 demotes and

is asserted here and not derived; the near-constant excess factor is what one expects from an asserted bound missing a constant, not from a failure of the measured decay, and the measured $1/t$ decay itself is unaffected. **What the row establishes is therefore the $1/t$ decay of the deviation with its three measured values; the inequality as written does not hold on this data and is not claimed.**

The boundary is printed with the classifier, because it is what the classifier does not do. Below the coil radius $\rho(2.5x_1) \sim t^{-\sigma}$ the construction is constitutionally blind: the usable band shrinks with height and never closes, so no absolute statement follows from it, and none is made. More importantly for what this paper is about: **keep/dismiss tracks the value of the function and σ plays no role in it.** Re-anchored at a solution the classifier keeps at every σ — 10/10 over $\sigma \in \{0.30, 0.42, 0.50, 0.58, 0.70\}$ at both anchors $t_0 \in \{1000.3, 20000.4\}$, with re-anchored windings between -0.999815 and -0.996308 , σ -identical to six digits; and run on the Davenport–Heilbronn function of §1.3 it **keeps that function’s genuine off-line zero** ($w = -0.967$ at the certified zero of §1.3, whose thirty-digit coordinates and residual $|f| = 5.2 \times 10^{-29}$ are printed there) while dismissing its non-zeros. The constructions of §§8.6–8.7 do not separate ζ from f at any point tested, and §12 says what the author takes that to mean. **No statement about instruments in general is made here: the evidence is a finite set of measurements at the named points above, and an earlier version of this sentence read “a line-selective instrument cannot be built this way”, which is an unrestricted impossibility claim that finite measurement cannot support.**

8.7 A ζ -free axis estimator, and what in it is not the author’s

The estimator, written out, since every term of the paragraph below is defined by it. Let $x_1 = t/2\pi$ and let the band B be the set of integers $M \in [2.5x_1, 6x_1]$ of §8.3; each such integer is a **band vertex**. At a vertex subtract the a-priori Euler–Maclaurin coil model of depth b ,

$$\text{model}_b(M) = \frac{M^{1-s}}{s-1} - \frac{1}{2}M^{-s} + \sum_{j=1}^b \frac{B_{2j}}{(2j)!} (s)_{2j-1} M^{-s-2j+1},$$

with B_{2j} the Bernoulli numbers and $(s)_r = s(s+1)\cdots(s+r-1)$, and average over the band:

$$\hat{C}_b(s) = \frac{1}{|B|} \sum_{M \in B} [S_M(s) + \text{model}_b(M)],$$

with S_M **inclusive of M** (§1.1’s convention), so that $\text{model}_b(M)$ is the Euler–Maclaurin *tail* $\zeta - S_M$ truncated at depth b and the sum estimates ζ vertex by vertex. **An earlier version printed this display with two sign errors — $+\frac{1}{2}M^{-s}$ in the model, and $S_M - \text{model}_b$ in the combination — under which the display computes $2S_M - \zeta - M^{-s}$, roughly five orders of magnitude from ζ on this band, and defines nothing in the paragraph below. The errors were in the display alone. A version after that pinned the band as $M \in [[2.5x_1], [6x_1]]$ while keeping a table measured under an unpinned endpoint convention that the pin does not reproduce — its true-zero floors sat 2–10% off what the pinned recipe returns. The table below is therefore recomputed under the pinned band, for this version, so that every figure in it comes out of the display above exactly as printed — the standard the rest of this paper holds its statistics to, met here last. No value of ζ enters $\hat{C}_b$; that is the sense in which the estimator is ζ -free. Depth 4 means $b = 4$, i.e. four Euler–Maclaurin correction terms carried in the model at each vertex. A **floor** is the calibration residual $|\hat{C}_b(s) - \zeta(s)|$, with**

ζ evaluated separately at high precision and used only to score the estimator, never inside it. A **gain** is the ratio $\rho(2.5x_1)/|\hat{C}_b(s) - \zeta(s)|$ of the single-vertex exclusion-band radius of §8.6 to that same residual.

Measured, instrument (I2) at 30 working digits (this version’s recomputation under the pinned band), on three point classes — and the classes sit at different ordinates, which an earlier version of this paragraph ran together. The test set is:

class	points	depth-4 floor $ \hat{C}_4 - \zeta $
true zeros	$\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$ at $t = 236.5242, 541.8474, 999.7916$ (the 100th, 300th and 649th zeros, each at <i>its own</i> ordinate)	$3.96 \times 10^{-8},$ $1.18 \times 10^{-8},$ 4.74×10^{-9}
non-zeros	$\sigma \in \{0.3, 0.5, 0.7\}$ at $t \in \{1000.3, 20000.4\}$ — six cells	8.73×10^{-12} to 1.54×10^{-8}
phantoms	$\sigma = 0.3$ at $t \approx 1002.08, 1002.72, 1004.43$ (filed candidate ordinates)	$1.55\text{--}1.57 \times 10^{-8}$

So a single pooled floor range (8.7×10^{-12} – 4.0×10^{-8} under the pinned band; earlier versions quoted 8.7×10^{-12} – 3.6×10^{-8}) would span **two different classes**: its lower end is the non-zero cell at $\sigma = 0.7, t = 20000.4$, and its upper end is the true zero at $t \approx 236.5$. **The gain range 4.3×10^6 to 8.5×10^7 is measured on the six non-zero cells only**; the three true zeros give gains of 1.0, 2.3 and 4.2×10^6 , i.e. below the bottom of that range, and pooling the two would misstate both. Likewise, the **depth ladder** at the 100th zero, in the statistics this subsection defines and under the pinned band, is: floors $1.10 \times 10^{-4}, 1.07 \times 10^{-5}, 1.59 \times 10^{-6}, 3.96 \times 10^{-8}$ at depths $b = 0, 1, 2, 4$, i.e. gains $3.7 \times 10^2, 3.8 \times 10^3, 2.6 \times 10^4, 1.0 \times 10^6$ — a depth ladder, not a height ladder (an earlier phrasing “rising with height” attributed a ladder to the two ordinates and was wrong). (*Earlier versions printed here four “separation” figures — $1.0 \times 10^4, 1.3 \times 10^5, 9.4 \times 10^5, 4.0 \times 10^7$ — with “separation” defined nowhere; no combination of this subsection’s defined quantities reconstructs them, so by the standard §10.1 applies to its own unevaluable statistics they are withdrawn and replaced by the defined ladder above, recomputed for this version.*) The estimator carries its own ζ -free error bar (the band half-width tracks the true error within a factor 2–4) and reads $|\zeta|$ to 0.02–0.04%. At a true zero the bracket contains the origin; at non-zeros it misses by 7–10 orders.

Concession, at first use. The closed-form *first-order* ζ -free construction is **Reglade [Re19], Thm 2.3 / eq. (44)**, and the author re-derived it first-hand and found that it simply *is* the leading Euler–Maclaurin tail correction $\zeta \approx S_N + N^{1-s}/(s-1)$, whose residual is exactly the next Euler–Maclaurin term $N^{-\sigma}/2$ (agreement to five figures, decay exponent $N^{-\sigma}$). The ζ -free centre-estimate *concept* is Nickel’s [Ni13]. What is retained as the author’s: the higher-order model at depth 4, the measured floors, the internal ζ -free error bar, the bracket-contains-origin decision rule, and the line-blindness below. **No measured quantity changes under this concession.**

Line-blindness, again. At the certified off-line zero of the Davenport–Heilbronn function the estimator reads bracket-contains-origin. (*Earlier versions printed the one-off evaluation’s two decimals here — an axis offset and a bracket half-width. That evaluation was made once, at the point of use, after rescaling the band by the counterexample’s period 5, with no standing script; the decimals are cut under this paper’s provenance standard, and the qualitative reading, which is all the section uses, stands on §8.6’s reproducible classifier measurement at the same zero — $w = -0.967$, kept.*) The instrument sees a zero; it does not see which side of the line the zero is on.

8.8 The window budget

Let W be a closed rectangle in the critical strip, symmetric about $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$, with horizontal sides free of zeros of ζ . Let $N(W)$ be the number of zeros of ζ in W counted with multiplicity, and let $N_0(W)$ be the number of sign changes of $Z(t) = e^{i\vartheta(t)}\zeta(\frac{1}{2} + it)$ on the critical-line segment of W . Put

$$B(W) := N(W) - N_0(W).$$

Proposition 4 (parity). *(On the numbering, said at the first proposition a reader meets after the gap: this paper contains no Proposition 3; the gap is deliberate and internal to this text — §8.5 — and nothing outside this paper is referred to by it.)* $B(W)$ is a non-negative even integer. Consequently an odd value of $N(W) - N_0(W)$ certifies an instrument error and nothing else.

Proof. An on-line zero of multiplicity m contributes m to $N(W)$ and $m \bmod 2$ to $N_0(W)$, since Z is real on the line and changes sign there exactly when m is odd; the difference $m - (m \bmod 2)$ is even and non-negative. An off-line zero ρ of multiplicity m in W is accompanied in W by $1 - \bar{\rho}$ of the same multiplicity, because ζ has real Dirichlet coefficients and satisfies $\zeta(s) = \chi(s)\zeta(1-s)$ — so zeros occur in quadruples $\rho, \bar{\rho}, 1-\rho, 1-\bar{\rho}$ (the two ingredients Lemma 3.2(2) spells out; real coefficients alone give only $\bar{\rho}$, at negative ordinate, outside W) — and W is symmetric about the line; the pair contributes $2m$ to $N(W)$ and 0 to $N_0(W)$. Summing gives the claim. $\square$

Proposition 5 (zero level). $B(W) = 0$ if and only if every zero of ζ in W lies on the critical line **and is simple**.

Proof. By the accounting above, $B(W) = \sum_{\text{on-line}} (m - (m \bmod 2)) + \sum_{\text{off-line pairs}} 2m$, a sum of non-negative terms; it vanishes iff every off-line term is absent and every on-line multiplicity satisfies $m = m \bmod 2$, i.e. $m \in \{0, 1\}$. $\square$

Proposition 5 is strictly stronger than “no off-line zeros in W ”: an on-line double zero also costs 2.

An instrument check on the sign-change side, and it is not an application of Propositions 4 or 5. A gated acceptance procedure with five clauses was run — on instrument (I2); the one working precision individually on record is the 50 digits at which the four near-line candidates of §9.7 below were resolved, and the remaining runs’ precisions were not individually banked, which is said here rather than implied otherwise (an earlier version named no instrument and no precision in this subsection) — on the three windows

$$W_1 = (1000, 1100], \quad W_2 = (5000, 5060], \quad W_3 = (20000, 20060],$$

and passed every clause on all three, accepting 81, 64 and 78 sign changes of Z , against the ϑ -expectations $\Delta\vartheta/\pi = 81.4601, 63.8398, 77.0352$.

What that procedure does and does not do, stated before the clauses rather than after them. Every one of the five clauses below is a check on $N_0(W)$ — the sign changes of Z on the critical-line segment — and on the polishing of the candidates that realise them. **Nothing in the procedure computes $N(W)$.** Since $B(W) = N(W) - N_0(W)$, the procedure therefore exhibits **no** value of $B(W)$, demonstrates no instance of Proposition 4 or Proposition 5, and decides no zero count: clause 2 compares an integer count against the real number $\Delta\vartheta/\pi$ with a 5% tolerance, which on W_3 admits both 77 and 78 and so cannot pin an integer. **An earlier version of this paragraph described the accepted counts as “exactly the true counts”; that**

identification is imported from outside the procedure, it is not established by any clause in it, and it is withdrawn here. Getting $N(W)$ would require a Turing-method bound on $\int S$ over the window, or an argument-principle count around it. **Neither is run in this paper, and no such instrument is offered here.** What the run establishes is exactly this: on these three windows the sign-change scan is internally consistent, its candidates polish to the stated rung, none is left unclassified, and the count it returns is within 5% of the ϑ -expectation. **Nothing about the location of any zero of ζ follows from it.** The five clauses are specified here rather than named:

1. **Grid pitch.** A fresh sign-change scan of Z at pitch $h = 0.01$ on W_1, W_2 and $h = 0.008$ on W_3 , with the post-hoc verification that $h \leq \frac{1}{3}$ of the minimal gap between accepted crossings in the window.
2. **Count against the ϑ -expectation.** The accepted count agrees with $\Delta\vartheta/\pi$ (ϑ the Riemann–Siegel theta function) to within 5%.
3. **Polish rung.** Every accepted candidate is polished by Newton/bisection to the 10^{-12} rung: successive iterates satisfy $|t_{\text{new}} - t_{\text{prev}}| \leq 10^{-12}$ and the sign bracket is confirmed at that separation.
4. **No unresolved band candidates.** Every candidate is classified against the exclusion band $|\zeta| < \rho_1 := \rho(2.5x_1)$ and the flag band $[\rho_1, 1.1\rho_2]$ with $\rho_2 := \rho(6x_1)$; anything falling inside the flag band is printed as FLAGGED, and the clause requires that no candidate is left unclassified.
5. **Strict, graze-free candidate ledger with its timetable.** The directions of consecutive accepted Z -crossings must alternate strictly, a *graze* — a local minimum of $|Z|$ touching zero without a sign change at pitch h — being recorded as a FLAG with expected count 0; and the *timetable* is a recomputed in-window list of danger ordinates, with the check that no accepted candidate lies within 0.05 of one.

The winding rider of §8.6 was fired on 10 evenly spaced accepted candidates per window, requiring per-coil winding in $[-1.001, -0.95]$, and passed 30/30. **The acceptance band is narrower than the $[-1.01, -0.95]$ that §8.5’s pooled measurement records for genuine zeros: as calibrated, a genuine zero returning a per-coil winding in $[-1.01, -1.001)$ would have been rejected by this clause. None was — the 30/30 stands as measured — and the band’s provenance beyond the run itself is not on record; the calibration discrepancy is disclosed here rather than reconciled.** The scope is exactly these three finite windows and the sign-change register alone; nothing follows about any other window, nothing follows about $N(W)$ or $B(W)$, and nothing follows about the Riemann Hypothesis.

Concession, and a check a referee should run. The parity half is folklore, stated parenthetically by Booker [Bk06]; rectangle counting of this kind is Backlund’s and Titchmarsh’s, and the use of Z ’s sign changes against a zero count is Turing’s [Tu53]. What is claimed is the window-frame formulation above and the contrapositive certificate (odd mismatch $\Rightarrow$ instrument error), together with the biconditional of Proposition 5 — **as propositions, and not as anything this paper has applied:** no window in this paper carries a value of $B(W)$. **The author cites [Bk06] and [Tu53] from secondary sources and has not read either first-hand;** both propositions are one restatement away from standard practice in that literature, and a referee should treat the claim of novelty here as the weakest in the paper. The mathematics above is elementary and stands on its own either way.

8.9 A finite, exact reality criterion on the critical line

For $M \geq 2$ define the χ -free, functional-equation-symmetric pair product

$$\Pi_M(s) := S_M(s) S_M(1-s).$$

Proposition 6. *For every integer $M \geq 2$ and all $s = \sigma + it$,*

$$\operatorname{Im} \Pi_M(\sigma + it) = \sum_{1 \leq m < n \leq M} (mn)^{-\sigma} (n^{2\sigma-1} - m^{2\sigma-1}) \sin(t \log(n/m)).$$

Consequently: 1. $\operatorname{Im} \Pi_M(\frac{1}{2} + it) = 0$ for all t and all M , every coefficient vanishing identically; indeed $\Pi_M = |S_M|^2 \geq 0$ on the line. 2. For $\sigma \neq \frac{1}{2}$ every coefficient is non-zero and all of them carry the sign of $2\sigma - 1$. Grouping the terms by distinct frequency therefore leaves a trigonometric polynomial in t with finitely many distinct positive frequencies and no vanishing coefficient. Coincident frequencies carry same-signed coefficients and reinforce rather than cancel (the first such coincidence, $\log(2/1) = \log(4/2)$, requires $M \geq 4$; at the $M \in \{2, 3\}$ of part (3) the three frequencies $\log 2$, $\log 3$, $\log \frac{3}{2}$ are pairwise distinct). In particular, for fixed $\sigma \neq \frac{1}{2}$ the function $t \mapsto \operatorname{Im} \Pi_M(\sigma + it)$ is real-analytic and not identically zero, so its zeros are isolated. 3. Fix $t \neq 0$. Then $\operatorname{Im} \Pi_2(s) = \operatorname{Im} \Pi_3(s) = 0$ holds if and only if $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$; the joint test at $M \in \{2, 3\}$ is thus a **complete** criterion with no exceptional ordinates other than $t = 0$. **The hypothesis $t \neq 0$ cannot be dropped:** at $t = 0$ every sine in the display vanishes, so $\operatorname{Im} \Pi_M(\sigma) = 0$ at every σ and every M , and the biconditional fails there.

Proof. Expanding, $\Pi_M = \sum_{m,n \leq M} m^{-\sigma} n^{\sigma-1} (n/m)^{it}$, whose imaginary part is $\sum_{m,n} m^{-\sigma} n^{\sigma-1} \sin(t \log(n/m))$. The diagonal vanishes and the terms (m, n) and (n, m) combine into $(m^{-\sigma} n^{\sigma-1} - n^{-\sigma} m^{\sigma-1}) \sin(t \log(n/m)) = (mn)^{-\sigma} (n^{2\sigma-1} - m^{2\sigma-1}) \sin(t \log(n/m))$, which is the display. (1) is $n^0 - m^0 = 0$. In (2), the coefficient sign statement is the strict monotonicity of $x \mapsto x^{2\sigma-1}$ in the relevant direction; the rest is immediate, since a finite sum of same-signed non-zero reals is non-zero, and a non-zero real trigonometric polynomial is real-analytic with isolated zeros.

For (3), fix $t \neq 0$ and suppose $\sigma \neq \frac{1}{2}$; we derive a contradiction. At $M = 2$ the sum has the single term $c_{12} \sin(t \log 2)$ with $c_{12} = 2^{-\sigma} (2^{2\sigma-1} - 1) \neq 0$ by (2), so $\operatorname{Im} \Pi_2 = 0$ forces $t \log 2 = j\pi$ for some $j \in \mathbb{Z}$, and $j \neq 0$ because $t \neq 0$. **At $M = 3$ the vanishing of $\operatorname{Im} \Pi_3$ does not force any individual term to vanish**, so the argument proceeds by collapsing the sum instead. The three coefficients are

$$\begin{aligned} c_{12} &= 2^{-\sigma} (2^{2\sigma-1} - 1), \\ c_{13} &= 3^{\sigma-1} - 3^{-\sigma}, \\ c_{23} &= 2^{-\sigma} 3^{\sigma-1} - 2^{\sigma-1} 3^{-\sigma}. \end{aligned}$$

Write $\theta := t \log \frac{3}{2}$. Since $\log 3 = \log 2 + \log \frac{3}{2}$ we have $t \log 3 = j\pi + \theta$, hence $\sin(t \log 3) = (-1)^j \sin \theta$, while $\sin(t \log 2) = 0$ kills the first term. Therefore

$$\operatorname{Im} \Pi_3 = ((-1)^j c_{13} + c_{23}) \sin \theta,$$

and $\operatorname{Im} \Pi_3 = 0$ requires either $\sin \theta = 0$ or $(-1)^j c_{13} + c_{23} = 0$.

Case $\sin \theta = 0$. Then $\theta = \ell\pi$ for some $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ — the integer is written ℓ and not i , which is the imaginary unit throughout this proposition. Dividing by $t \log 2 = j\pi$ with $j \neq 0$ gives $j \log \frac{3}{2} = \ell \log 2$, i.e. $3^j = 2^{\ell+j}$, impossible for $j \neq 0$ by unique factorisation.

Case $\sin \theta \neq 0$, j even. The condition reads $c_{13} + c_{23} = 0$. By (2) both coefficients are non-zero and both carry the sign of $2\sigma - 1$, so their sum is non-zero. Contradiction.

Case $\sin \theta \neq 0$, j odd. The condition reads $c_{23} - c_{13} = 0$, and here an argument is genuinely needed, because c_{13} and c_{23} both vanish at $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$ and their difference is not covered by the sign statement of (2). Put $x := \sigma - \frac{1}{2}$. Substituting $3^{\sigma-1} = 3^{-1/2}3^x$, $3^{-\sigma} = 3^{-1/2}3^{-x}$, $2^{-\sigma} = 2^{-1/2}2^{-x}$, $2^{\sigma-1} = 2^{-1/2}2^x$ into the two displays and collecting gives the exact identity

$$\sqrt{3}(c_{23} - c_{13}) = \sqrt{2} \sinh(x \log \frac{3}{2}) - 2 \sinh(x \log 3),$$

using $(3/2)^x - (2/3)^x = 2 \sinh(x \log \frac{3}{2})$ and $3^x - 3^{-x} = 2 \sinh(x \log 3)$. For $x > 0$ we have $0 < \log \frac{3}{2} < \log 3$, and $\sinh$ is strictly increasing and positive on $(0, \infty)$, so $0 < \sinh(x \log \frac{3}{2}) < \sinh(x \log 3)$; combined with $\sqrt{2} < 2$ the right-hand side is strictly negative. Hence $c_{23} - c_{13} < 0$ for every $\sigma > \frac{1}{2}$. Both c_{13} and c_{23} are odd under $\sigma \mapsto 1 - \sigma$, directly from their displays, so $c_{23} - c_{13}$ is odd about $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$ and is therefore strictly positive for every $\sigma < \frac{1}{2}$. In particular $c_{23} - c_{13} \neq 0$ whenever $\sigma \neq \frac{1}{2}$. Contradiction.

All cases being impossible, $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$; the converse is (1). $\square$

Verified numerically to 10^{-29} , instrument (I2) — implied and unnamed in an earlier version; a spot check at an ordinate where $M = 2$ is blind — **at $\sigma = 0.6$, $t = 100\pi/\log 2$ ($j = 100$, even), the pair an earlier version omitted, so that the check could not in fact be repeated “from the displayed formula” as claimed; it can now** — returns $|\operatorname{Im} \Pi_2| < 10^{-29}$ at 30-digit working precision — an exact analytic zero, whose residual is precision- and implementation-dependent; an earlier version printed one implementation’s 2.4×10^{-30} as if it were a reproducible value — while $\operatorname{Im} \Pi_3 = 0.16$ (re-verified for this version: 0.16022, and $(c_{13} + c_{23}) \sin \theta$ agrees to all digits computed). **These spot checks are among the single-session statements flagged in §0:** Proposition 6 is proved above, and the checks were made once at 30-digit working precision from the displayed formula, which is all that is needed to repeat them. The two identities on which the repaired proof of (3) turns — the collapse $\operatorname{Im} \Pi_3 = ((-1)^j c_{13} + c_{23}) \sin \theta$ at $t \log 2 = j\pi$, and the closed form $\sqrt{3}(c_{23} - c_{13}) = \sqrt{2} \sinh(x \log \frac{3}{2}) - 2 \sinh(x \log 3)$ — were additionally checked against direct evaluation at both parities of j and across $\sigma \in [-2, 5]$, agreeing to machine precision. That reflection implies reality on the line is standard, and the one-spiral conjugate symmetry behind it is Nickel’s; what is claimed is the closed form, the sign structure, and the completeness of the joint two-index test. The criterion tests the abscissa of an arbitrary point s from S_2 and S_3 ; it locates no zero of ζ or of any other function, and nothing about the Riemann Hypothesis follows from it. **Two hypotheses are load-bearing and are stated with the proposition rather than buried in it.** $M \geq 2$: at $M = 1$ the double sum is empty and $\operatorname{Im} \Pi_1 \equiv 0$ at every σ , so the criterion is vacuous there. And $t \neq 0$ in part (3), for the reason given in the statement — an earlier version of this proposition asserted the biconditional “for all s ”, which is false on the real axis, and asserted at $M = 3$ that the term $(1, 3)$ must vanish separately, which does not follow from the vanishing of a three-term sum; **both defects are corrected above, in the statement and in the proof.**

§9. Exact finite-height laws of the value register

The measurements of this section concern $|\zeta|$ on vertical rays $\sigma = \text{const}$ and the geometry of close pairs of critical-line zeros. All of them are finite-height statements; none of them is an asymptotic claim, and none of them bears on the Riemann Hypothesis.

9.1 The aperture-crop law

Let γ_{mid} be the midpoint of a close pair of critical-line zeros of half-separation h , and consider $|\zeta|$ on the ray $\sigma = \frac{1}{2} + \delta$, $\delta > 0$, with $u = t - \gamma_{\text{mid}}$ — **a third meaning for u , flagged with the same notice §8.3 gave the second: from here to the end of §9.1, u is this local ordinate offset and nothing else; it is neither §1’s real part nor §8’s t/M .**

Proposition 7 (crop law of the two-zero local model). *Model the pair by $\zeta(s) \approx C \cdot (s - \rho_+)(s - \rho_-)$ with $\rho_{\pm} = \frac{1}{2} + i(\gamma_{\text{mid}} \pm h)$ and C constant. Then: (a) $|\zeta'(\rho_{\pm})| = 2h|C|$ — both zeros carry the same derivative magnitude, and $|C| = |\zeta'|/2h$ is the curvature of the on-line well (C itself is the complex leading coefficient; every “curvature” figure in §§9.1–9.3 is its modulus). (b) **Thread regime** ($\delta < h$): the floor of $|\zeta|$ on the ray is $2h|C|\delta = |\zeta'|\delta$, attained at $u = \pm\sqrt{h^2 - \delta^2}$; that is, the floor location d satisfies*

$$d^2 + \delta^2 = h^2$$

(c) **Miss regime** ($\delta > h$): the floor is $|C|(\delta^2 + h^2) \approx |C|\delta^2$, attained at $u = 0$ ($d = 0$): the deep on-line dip is cropped — invisible from the ray. (d) The crossover is exactly at $\delta = h$.

Proof. (a): $\zeta'(\rho_{\pm}) = C(\rho_{\pm} - \rho_{\mp}) = \pm 2ihC$. (b)–(d): on the ray,

$$|\zeta|^2 = |C|^2(\delta^2 + (u - h)^2)(\delta^2 + (u + h)^2) = |C|^2[(\delta^2 + u^2 + h^2)^2 - 4u^2h^2],$$

whose u -derivative vanishes where $4u(\delta^2 + u^2 - h^2) = 0$. For $\delta < h$ the minima sit at $u^2 = h^2 - \delta^2$, where $|\zeta|^2 = 4|C|^2\delta^2h^2$; for $\delta \geq h$ the only minimum is at $u = 0$, where $|\zeta| = |C|(\delta^2 + h^2)$. $\square$

The geometric content is that the ordinate offset d of the off-line floor **re-measures the on-line half-gap**: a transverse measurement recovers a longitudinal one.

Scope. Proposition 7 is exact for the model; the linearisation in the thread regime is exact at first order in δ . For ζ itself, what follows are measurements of how closely, and over what range of h , real close pairs match it.

Measurement (census heights, $t \leq 7.5 \times 10^4$; instruments (I1),(I2)). Thirty-two census rows — thirty decile-selected pairs plus two carrier pairs retained by name from the record-approach census — with $h \in [0.0074, 0.275]$ — a $\sim 37\times$ range — across nine σ -columns. **The selection is stated exactly, since “nine log-spaced deciles” (an earlier wording) names ten bins and does not divide thirty evenly:** the design range $[0.007, 0.45]$ was cut into **nine** log-spaced bins — nine bins, hence ten edges, at common ratio $(0.45/0.007)^{1/9} = 1.5881869$ and edges 0.007, 0.011117, 0.017656, 0.028042, 0.044535, 0.070730, 0.112333, 0.178406, 0.283342, 0.45 — and the thirty decile-selected pairs are distributed over them, so the bins are not equally occupied and no per-bin count is uniform. The thirty-two rows carry thirty-two distinct values of h , listed in the deposit; the smallest is 0.007351, which sits in the first bin, and the largest is 0.274636. **The top bin $[0.283342, 0.45]$ is empty, and that is stated rather than glossed:** an earlier version of this sentence read “no bin is empty”, which is false against the printed maximum, since $0.274636 < 0.283342$. **Why the design range was set at 0.45 rather than at the observed maximum is not on record, and it is not reconstructed here** — a gap in this paper’s own standard, printed as one, alongside the unidentified carrier pairs named below. The measured range in h is therefore $[0.007351, 0.274636]$, a factor 37.4, and that — not the design range — is the range every statement below is made on. **The two carrier pairs are not identified individually in the source record and are**

therefore not named here — a gap in this paper’s own standard, printed as one rather than filled by guesswork. Crossover location: $\delta^*/h \in [0.971, 1.051]$, 32/32 **within that band**. The law is local. **The word “exact” belongs to Proposition 7 and to the model, not to ζ , and an earlier version of this sentence attached it to the tight pairs, immediately above a 23% deviation measured at exactly those pairs; that wording is withdrawn.** Here the *residual slope* is the ordinary-least-squares slope in the regression $d^2 = \text{const} + \text{slope} \cdot \delta^2$, taken over the ray offsets with $|\delta| < h$, where $\delta = \sigma - \frac{1}{2}$ and $d = |t^* - \gamma_{\text{mid}}|$ is the offset of the floor’s location from the pair midpoint; the crop law $d^2 + \delta^2 = h^2$ predicts slope exactly -1 . Measured, the residual slope is -1.23 for the tightest pairs, degrading to -0.50 by $h = 0.129$ and plateauing at -0.5 to -0.7 out to the widest pair at $h = 0.275$. The measured thread slope is 0.915 (floor $\propto \delta$) against a miss slope rising to 1.55 (floor $\propto \delta^2$), switching at $\delta = h$.

All three slope predictions are scored to the same standard here, which an earlier version did not do. The model predicts residual slope -1 , thread slope 1 and miss slope 2 . Measured: -1.23 at the tightest pairs, a 23% deviation, degrading further with h ; 0.915 , an 8–9% deviation; and 1.55 , a 22.5% shortfall. **All three are reported as found and none of the three is resolved here**, and the earlier practice of flagging only the smallest of them is corrected. **What survives cleanly is the crossover collapse δ^*/h — 32/32 here and 36/36 below — and that is what the abstract carries.**

Measurement (extreme heights; instrument (I2)). Thirty-six pairs at $t \in [10^8, 10^9]$ (three δ -bands $\times$ six pairs $\times$ two packs): 36/36 with $\delta^*/h \in [0.85, 1.15]$, median 1.018 , regime structure reproduced. **The acceptance band at extreme height is markedly wider than at census height (0.85–1.15 against 0.971–1.051), and that widening is part of the measurement, not a rounding of it.**

The open point about the crop law.

The two-zero local model $\zeta(s) \approx C(s - \rho_+)(s - \rho_-)$ is not the author’s, and neither is it neutral ground: it is precisely the model from which **Dueñez, Farmer and coauthors [DFetal10]** derive their close-pair results. The author has already conceded to that source, on exactly this model and as an *algebraic identity* rather than an asymptotic agreement, a separate close-pair identity of his own and the constant $\pi/4$ that goes with it; and the same programme’s rediscovery of $\pi/4$ is conceded jointly to that paper and to Stopple. **The thread/miss crossover of Proposition 7 is another consequence of the same two-line calculus on the same model, and the author’s failed search for it must therefore be treated as suspect rather than as clean.** Concretely: a referee should check [DFetal10] §6 beyond eq. (6.16), and Stopple’s Lehmer-pair paper [Sto15] §6, for the floor location and the crossover, before treating Proposition 7 as new. Proposition 7’s proof is two lines and is offered for completeness, not for priority; **what the author is confident is his own is the measurement** — the 32/32 and 36/36 collapses, the $37\times$ range in h , the five-decade reach, and the reported 8–9% thread-slope deviation.

9.2 The origin-approach census on vertical rays

For a fixed σ let the *crossings* be the ordinates at which $\text{Im} \zeta(\sigma + it) = 0$, and define the record approach

$$m_T(\sigma) := \min\{|\zeta(\sigma + it)| : \text{Im} \zeta(\sigma + it) = 0, t \leq T\}.$$

On the base window $t \in [10, 10^4]$, with 72,840 crossings and instrument (I1), $m(\sigma)$ is strictly monotone in σ (Spearman 1.0000) across the columns $\sigma = 0.55, 0.60, \dots, 0.95$:

$$0.0175, 0.0409, 0.0715, 0.0939, 0.1190, 0.1465, 0.1757, 0.2060, 0.2368,$$

the values just displayed being the crossing-restricted minima defined above, i.e. minima of $|\zeta|$ taken over the solutions of $\text{Im } \zeta = 0$ only. The *continuous* minima of $|\zeta|$ over the same window and the same σ -columns — the unrestricted infimum on the ray, computed on the same grid — are smaller, at

$$0.0174, 0.0395, 0.0693, 0.0918, 0.1164, 0.1427, 0.1706, 0.1994, 0.2288,$$

by the ratios ≤ 1.04 recorded two paragraphs below. **The distinction is stated here because §9.3 quotes the second list and an earlier version left a reader to infer that the two columns were the same statistic at different heights. They are the same statistic at the same height, restricted and unrestricted;** extended thereafter to the census ceiling $T = 74920.83$ by direct evaluation, and beyond it **by a screen rather than by direct evaluation**, as set out in the next paragraph.

How instrument (I3) is used past the directly evaluated range, and what that costs. (I3) supplies certified zero *ordinates*, not values of $|\zeta|$ on rays, so the reach to 10^9 is obtained in two stages and is a screen, not a census. *Stage one* streams the nearest-neighbour gaps of the certified ordinates over the whole local bank — 2.85×10^9 gaps — and ranks them by *normalised* gap; the tightest normalised gap found anywhere in the bank is 3.1×10^{-4} , at $\gamma \approx 3.9 \times 10^8$. (Ranking by normalised rather than raw gap is load-bearing: an absolute-aperture screen was run first and is superseded, because a fixed absolute half-separation becomes relatively wider as the mean spacing shrinks, so it does not select tight pairs at height.) *Stage two* stratifies those gaps into six normalised-gap bands inside each height-decade window from 10^6 to 10^9 , plus a validation window, samples up to 4000 pairs per band, evaluates at each sampled pair the well curvature $|C| = |\zeta'|/2h$ of the two-zero local model of §9.1, and then refines only the three lowest- C candidates per window on a grid of step (gap)/400, where $|\zeta|$ itself is finally computed. About 8.8×10^5 pairs entered the curvature census and about 10^5 were drawn in the stratified pass, of which some 2.1×10^4 lie in the decade nearest 10^9 .

The model assumption, printed with the procedure. The reduction from “record approach on a ray” to “tight zero pair” is the near-waist form $m(\sigma) \rightarrow C_{\min} \cdot (\sigma - \frac{1}{2})^2$ — the assumption that record approaches at σ near $\frac{1}{2}$ are governed by the tightest close pairs through §9.1’s curvature. The smallest curvature observed anywhere in the screen is $C_{\min} \approx 2.22$. **That figure is a sample minimum over a carrier-limited pool and is explicitly not a rigorous floor bound;** it is carried here as a measured discriminator and as nothing more.

Where the evaluated range ends and the screened range begins. $m_T(\sigma)$ is directly evaluated on $t \in [10, 10^4]$ and to the census ceiling $T = 74920.83$; the cumulative record was then carried contiguously over $t \in [74920, 2.7 \times 10^6]$ and is $|\zeta'|$ -intractable beyond roughly 10^6 zeros. **Every statement in this section and the next that reaches to 10^9 is therefore a screened statement**, and is written “as screened” wherever it appears: it means that no event found by the screening instruments just described beats the incumbent, not that no such event exists.

Two controls travel with the census. Restricting to crossings rather than to all t costs almost nothing: crossing minima and continuous minima agree to ratios ≤ 1.04 . And beyond $\sigma = 1$ — on the same base window $t \in [10, 10^4]$, same crossings, instrument (I1) — **no measured value of $|\zeta(\sigma + it)|$ at $\sigma = 1.05$ or 1.15 fell below the classical Euler-product floor $\inf_t |\zeta(\sigma + it)| = \zeta(2\sigma)/\zeta(\sigma)$: zero violations against $\zeta(2.1)/\zeta(1.05) = 0.0758091607$ and $\zeta(2.3)/\zeta(1.15) = 0.1974470162$.** Those two displayed numbers are the classical bar itself ([T86], ch. VIII), evaluated, not a measured infimum — the floor is a $t \rightarrow \infty$ limit and the window’s measured minima sit well above it — so the control tests the evaluator’s sign against a theorem and nothing else; it is

a positive control on the instrument, not a result. *(An earlier version printed the bar in the slot where a reading belongs, with no window, saying the instrument “reproduces the floor exactly” — a finite window cannot measure a Kronecker limit, and the sentence now says what the control does.)*

9.3 The carrier law and its measured freeze

The quantity $m_T(\sigma)$ descends only at record close-pair events, so it is natural to ask which pair holds the record and for how long. Measured with instruments (I1) and (I3):

For $\sigma \geq 0.75$ the record is held by a **single** triple of zero ordinates,

$$\gamma = 7563.18, \quad 7563.52, \quad 7563.77,$$

from $T = 10^4$ all the way to the census ceiling $T = 74920.83$, and — **as screened**, in the exact sense fixed in §9.2 — no event found in the certified data out to 10^9 beats it. *(§9.2’s screen evaluates pairs, so the triple enters it as its two adjacent pairs — gaps 0.338 and 0.249 against a local mean spacing ≈ 0.89 — and the record is reported for the configuration; an earlier version did not say how a triple meets a pairwise screen.)* The reach past $t = 2.7 \times 10^6$ rests entirely on the two-stage normalised-gap screen of §9.2 and on its $C_{\min}$ model assumption, and not on a contiguous evaluation. The record values freeze at

$$m = 0.1164, 0.1427, 0.1706, 0.19940, 0.2288 \quad \text{at } \sigma = 0.75, 0.80, 0.85, 0.90, 0.95,$$

these being the continuous minima of §9.2 and not its crossing-restricted column; the crossing-restricted column at the same $T = 10^4$ reads 0.1190, 0.1465, 0.1757, 0.2060, 0.2368, exceeding them by the ratios 1.022, 1.027, 1.030, 1.033 and 1.035, which is precisely the ≤ 1.04 crossing-versus-continuous ratio §9.2 reports as one of its two controls. **The ratios are quoted to three decimals because that is the precision the four- and five-decimal columns above support:** recomputed from those columns as printed they read 1.0223, 1.0266, 1.0299, 1.0331, 1.0350, against an earlier version’s 1.0229, 1.0264, 1.0301, 1.0329, 1.0349, and the fourth decimal is inside the rounding of the inputs either way. **Nothing descends between $T = 10^4$ and the ceiling: the two columns differ by the choice of statistic, not by height,** and the single triple holds the record in both registers from $T = 10^4$ onward.

Two scope statements are part of the claim. First, **the law is limited to $\sigma \geq 0.75$:** at $\sigma \leq 0.70$ the record still descends (the ceiling carrier there is $\gamma \approx 60666.22$; an earlier version attached a “ $|\zeta'|$ -rank” to it, a statistic defined nowhere in this paper, cut here by the standard §10.1 applies), and the carrier stream over the whole range runs 4292/7563/19140/21325/60666. Second, **“no break below 10^9 ” is a no-counterexample-found statement over a finite and, past $t = 2.7 \times 10^6$, only screened reach — not a proved bound.** The classical mean value $\zeta(2\sigma)$ underlying the floor is conceded; what is claimed is the carrier law and the measured freeze, on the evaluated range directly and on the screened range as screened.

9.4 The aligned-Euler stem, and a construction that does separate ζ from the counterexample

Define the **aligned-Euler stem**

$$A(\sigma) := \frac{\zeta(2\sigma)}{\zeta(\sigma)},$$

$$B(\sigma) := \frac{1}{A(\sigma)} = \frac{\zeta(\sigma)}{\zeta(2\sigma)}.$$

For $\sigma > 1$, $A(\sigma)$ is the exact radial floor of the value region — the anti-aligned prime configuration — by the classical result quoted in §9.2. Both continue meromorphically. Two elementary facts are proved and are used below.

Lemma 8. *For $\sigma \leq 0$ and all real t ,*

$$|\zeta(\sigma + it)| \geq |\chi(\sigma + it)| \cdot \frac{\zeta(2(1 - \sigma))}{\zeta(1 - \sigma)}.$$

Proof. The functional equation gives $|\zeta(\sigma + it)| = |\chi(\sigma + it)| |\zeta(1 - \sigma - it)|$, and $1 - \sigma \geq 1$, so the classical Euler-product floor applies to the second factor. $\square$

The bound is vacuous exactly at the strip edge: at $\sigma = 0$ the right-hand side is 0 because $\zeta(1) = \infty$. For $\sigma < 0$ it grows without bound in t , since $|\chi(\sigma + it)| = (t/2\pi)^{1/2-\sigma}(1 + O(1/t))$. **The proof dies exactly at the strip edge, and that is the point of stating it.**

Lemma 9. *The only real root of B in $0 < \sigma < 1$ is $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$. Proof.* $B(\frac{1}{2}) = 0$ because $\zeta(2\sigma)$ has its pole there; and $\zeta < 0$ throughout $(0, 1)$, so B has no other real zero in the strip. $\square$

Note carefully which factor carries which feature: **the root at $\frac{1}{2}$ belongs to B ; A has its pole there.**

A correction the author makes in the main text. It is tempting to read the in-strip continuation of A as asking for a positive pointwise floor for $|\zeta|$ on rays inside the strip. **That is false, not open:** by Bohr–Courant [BC14], $\inf_t |\zeta(\sigma + it)| = 0$ on every ray with $\frac{1}{2} < \sigma \leq 1$ — the cited theorem’s own range; nothing below invokes the statement at $\sigma \leq \frac{1}{2}$, and every use of this correction in this paper is at $\sigma > \frac{1}{2}$ (*an earlier version wrote “on every ray inside the strip”, wider than the theorem cited for it*). **A source-status note belongs with that sentence, because it is a correction made in the main text on the strength of a cited theorem:** the 1914 original has not been obtained, and the statement quoted — that for $\frac{1}{2} < \sigma \leq 1$ the values $\zeta(\sigma + it)$ are dense in $\mathbb{C}$, whence the infimum is 0 — is the standard one, taken at statement level from secondary sources. It is the only unread source in this paper on which a main-text correction rests, and §14 records the status. Nothing here weakens the correction, which is classical and not in dispute; a referee who wants it underwritten at first hand should read the original. What is actually open is *attainment* — the finite-height **rate** at which the infimum is approached. An earlier formulation of this programme’s Lemma 1 asked for the false thing; the corrected statement is the one printed here.

Measured crossing abscissa (instruments (I1),(I3)). The rising floor $m_T(\sigma)$ of §9.2 crosses the falling $|A(\sigma)|$ at a single migrating abscissa $\sigma^*(T)$, which — over §9.2’s directly evaluated range $T \in [10, 10^4]$ and to the census ceiling $T = 74920.83$ — moves monotonically from 0.877 and then **stalls at** 0.90007, held there by the carrier freeze of §9.3 (the T at which the value 0.877 is attained was not individually banked; the range just stated is the window the migration was measured on, which §0’s promise requires at this site). At a crossing the ratio $m/|A|$ is 1 by definition; what an earlier version printed here as “0.99901 at the crossing” is in fact the ratio at $\sigma = 0.90$, namely $m(0.9)/|A(0.9)| = 0.19940/0.1995978 = 0.999009$, and it is relabelled accordingly. **$|A(0.9)|$ is printed to seven digits because six are needed to carry the quotient:** $|A(0.9)| = \zeta(1.8)/\zeta(0.9) = 0.1995978$, and an earlier version printed the truncation 0.199598 beside a six-digit ratio of 0.999008, which is the quotient of the rounded input rather than of the exact one. The near-coincidence at $\sigma = 0.9$ is therefore $m(0.9) = 0.19940$ against $|A(0.9)| = 0.19960$, i.e. 0.1% —

one statement, printed once. In principle $\sigma^* \rightarrow 1$; the height at which the freeze breaks is bounded only below, at $> 10^9$ as **screened** in the sense of §9.2.

The Euler-product gate. Run the same construction on the Davenport–Heilbronn function of §1.3. **An earlier version printed here a measured claim about f ’s stem — a flat level near 1.1, never crossed, with a margin interval $[-1.09, -0.86]$ — carried by two symbols, A_f and m_f , defined nowhere in this paper, with no σ -range, no t -window, no crossing convention and no instrument key. The figures are withdrawn under the provenance standard of §0 — the treatment §8.7 gives its undefined “separation” figures and §10.1 its unspecified statistics — and no measured in-strip claim about f ’s stem is made here, because the claim’s own objects were the undefined symbols: $A(\sigma) = \zeta(2\sigma)/\zeta(\sigma)$ does not transfer to f by substitution, f having no Euler product, and no transferred definition is on record.** What stands on the f side is analytic, and the asymmetry is the point: ζ ’s pole at $s = 1$ seeds the stem’s pole at $\frac{1}{2}$ together with a steep crossing, while f is entire and supplies no such seed. Underneath, the reason the stem exists at all for ζ is that the Euler product keeps $\sigma > 1$ zero-free — so this construction uses multiplicativity at step one, which is exactly what every construction elsewhere in this paper fails to do.

Rigorous footing for the counterexample side, instrument (I2): f is certified zero-free in $\sigma \in (1.001, 1.2]$ for $t \leq 51900$ by an argument-principle count over 519/519 **Nyquist-safe boxes** — rectangular contours on which the unwrapped phase of f is sampled adaptively, every inter-sample phase step being bisected until it falls below $\pi/4$, so that the winding number is unambiguous. The bound was met in every box by construction of the refinement loop, with worst achieved step 0.665 rad against the $\pi/4 = 0.785$ rad target.

Status, printed with the result. This is the first formulation in the programme that passes the counterexample by construction rather than by measurement. It is **suggestive and not decisive**, and it is not promoted further here: the carry-over of the stem’s meaning into the strip is an open construction, and by the Bohr–Courant correction above the naive in-strip target does not exist. What is claimed: Lemmas 8 and 9, the in-strip continuation as an object, the measured $\sigma^*(T)$ with its stall, and — on the f side — the certified zero-free boxes above together with the pole-versus-entire asymmetry, which is classical; the withdrawn stem figures are not claimed. The $\sigma > 1$ floor itself is conceded to Titchmarsh.

9.5 The zero-gap process, measured in the spectral register

A ledger of 99,999 consecutive nearest-neighbour gaps of the zeros of ζ at census heights — up to the census ceiling $T = 74920.83$ — was unfolded to unit mean (residual $|\text{mean} - 1| = 4.47 \times 10^{-7}$; lag-1 autocorrelation -0.357 , Pearson on adjacent unfolded gaps, -0.358 on ranks — recomputed for this version from the deposited zero list, where seven estimator and unfolding variants all return -0.357 to -0.358 ; an earlier version printed a range reaching -0.42 “across estimators”, naming none, and that endpoint, which did not reproduce under any variant tried, is withdrawn — so a short gap is repaid immediately). On this ledger, instrument (I3):

- **the structure factor of the gap process is suppressed by $10^{6.88}$ on the band $f \in (10^{-5}, 4 \times 10^{-3}]$ in cycles per gap, and the baseline is stated: it is the same ledger with the gap order destroyed.** Randomly permuting the 99,999 gaps — the same multiset, the order destroyed — and recomputing the mean spectral power over that band gives 0.15812, against 2.068×10^{-8} for the same ledger in its true order; the ratio is $7.646 \times 10^6 = 10^{6.8834}$, displayed as $10^{6.88}$ in the headline and in the closing claim — the two-decimal rounding of the same exponent, used at both of those sites so that one figure travels (an earlier version

printed $10^{6.884}$, the exponent rounded from the already-rounded mantissa, and carried two- and three-decimal forms side by side). **The band is printed in the headline because an earlier version stated the figure as holding “below $f \approx 0.05$ ”, which is a band a factor of 12.5 wider at the top than the one the ratio was computed on;** §0 promises every statistic the window it was measured on, and this is that window. *A second control, described as “an independent uniform-noise sequence at the ledger’s own scale” and reported at 3.6×10^{-22} on the same band, stood here in an earlier version as the evidence that 2.068×10^{-8} is a real plateau rather than a floor of the estimator. **Its generative recipe — which sequence, at which scale, under which estimator normalisation — is not on record, and the figure cannot be reconstructed from anything printed here; it is twenty-one orders below the shuffle, where a white-noise control at the ledger’s own scale would sit at the shuffle’s own order. It is withdrawn rather than defended.** With it goes the plateau-versus-estimator-floor statement, which is **left open:** nothing printed here distinguishes a real low-frequency plateau at 2.068×10^{-8} from an estimator floor, and settling it needs a control whose expected level is derivable. The suppression ratio against the shuffle is unaffected, and it is what is claimed. So the suppression is a statement about the sequence, measured against its own shuffle, and not against any theoretical law;*

- over $f \in [3 \times 10^{-4}, 5 \times 10^{-3}]$ the low-frequency spectrum of the **gap sequence** is flat, with spectral slope $\beta_{\text{low}} = 0.039$ at power level $\bar{S}_{\text{low}} = 2.05 \times 10^{-8}$. **An earlier version compared this level against “the GUE structure-factor ramp $S(k) = k/2$ ” under two candidate frequency conventions and printed a suppression range for each. Both comparisons are withdrawn, for two independent reasons, each fatal on its own. First, the quoted classical form was wrong:** the sine-kernel structure factor is $S(k) = |k|/2\pi$ for $|k| \leq 2\pi$ — equivalently $S(f) = |f|$ with f in cycles per mean spacing — re-derived for this version from $S(k) = 1 - \int (\frac{\sin \pi r}{\pi r})^2 e^{-ikr} dr$ and confirmed numerically; the printed $k/2$ is too large by a factor π on the convention the section used, so *neither* printed range was the GUE comparison it claimed to be. *Second, and deeper:* the measured object is a periodogram of the gap sequence indexed by gap number, while the structure factor is a property of the point process in the position variable; the gap sequence is a first difference of the position-fluctuation sequence, so its low-frequency spectrum carries an extra factor of order $(2\pi f)^2$ relative to the register the GUE ramp lives in, and no derivation linking the two registers was ever given. A cross-register comparison is not scoreable and is not re-attempted here. **What is claimed is what survives both withdrawals and bullet 1’s open question: the gap-sequence spectrum’s flatness over the stated band (spectral slope $\beta_{\text{low}} = 0.039$), and the suppression by $10^{6.88}$ against the same ledger’s own shuffle — a same-register, internally defined ratio. The level itself is NOT claimed: $\bar{S}_{\text{low}} = 2.05 \times 10^{-8}$ on $[3 \times 10^{-4}, 5 \times 10^{-3}]$ is the same quantity, on an overlapping band, as the 2.068×10^{-8} on $(10^{-5}, 4 \times 10^{-3})$ whose status — plateau versus estimator floor — bullet 1 declares open, and a level that cannot be distinguished from an instrument floor cannot be part of a claim (an earlier version claimed “at the stated level” in this very sentence).;**
- **the number variance is saturated.** The measured $\Sigma^2(L)$ was taken on a coarse ladder $L = 0.5, 1, 2, 4, 8, 13, 20, 32, 50, 80, 128, 200, 320, 500, 800, 1280, 2000, 3200, 5000$ and a fine ladder $L = 6, 6.5, \dots, 30$, and it is flat: a least-squares regression of Σ^2 on $\log L$ returns slope 0.013 over the coarse ladder and 0.004 restricted to $L \geq 8$, against the GUE slope

$1/\pi^2 = 0.1013$, while the GUE value itself grows without bound. The GUE number variance is, exactly, the sine-kernel expression $\Sigma_{\text{GUE}}^2(L) = L - 2 \int_0^L (L-r) \left(\frac{\sin \pi r}{\pi r}\right)^2 dr$, with large- L form $\frac{1}{\pi^2} (\log 2\pi L + \gamma + 1) + O(1/L)$; it passes through 0.454 at $L \approx 2.9$ (exact sine-kernel value 0.45370; the asymptotic form gives 0.45390 there). **An earlier version printed the constant with a spurious $-\pi^2/8$ — the orthogonal-ensemble ($\beta = 1$) term, which does not belong in the unitary formula — and the value 0.328 it quoted at $L \approx 2.9$ is that shifted form's — which evaluates to 0.3289, i.e. 0.329 under this paper's rounding rule, so the earlier version under-rounded even the erroneous value — low by exactly $1/8$ at every L .** The measured levels are printed here so the comparison is scoreable (an earlier version carried only the two regression slopes, no level): recomputed for this version from the same 99,999-gap ledger by disjoint-window counts, $\Sigma^2 = 0.50$ at $L = 2$, 0.52 at $L = 8$, 0.57 at $L = 20$, 0.46 at $L = 50$, 0.48 at $L = 200$. **Read against those levels the corrected comparand does two different things, and a sentence in an earlier version (“the correction only widens the gap”) conflated them: at $L \approx 2.9$ the measured level (≈ 0.50) in fact sits *near* the corrected GUE value 0.454 — nearer than to the erroneous 0.328 — while the saturation contrast, which is what this bullet claims, is that the GUE curve grows without bound (1.21 by $L = 5000$) and the measured ladder does not move: the claim is the absence of growth, not a gap at any single L .** An earlier version also reported this as a single figure $\hat{\Delta}$ against the then-printed comparand. That figure is not reproducible from the banked ladder, and it is withdrawn outright rather than left standing — the same treatment §9.5 gives its irreproducible noise control and §5.2 gives its irreproducible rejection statistic; the flatness statement above is what the section uses and is reproducible.

An apparent even- L resonance in an earlier reading was an estimator artefact and was killed by randomised starts; it is not part of the result.

The phenomenon is prior art and is so reported. Berry [Be88] conjectured the below-GUE number-variance saturation; Lugar, Milinovich and Quesada-Herrera [LMQ22] proved the deviation in the number-variance register under RH and a pair-correlation hypothesis; Torquato [To18], §9, classified the zeros as Class-II hyperuniform with the GUE ramp on the theory side. All three were read first-hand. **What is claimed here is narrow: the direct structure-factor measurement on zero data, in the spectral register, with the numbers above.** None of those three papers computes a structure factor on zero data.

9.6 Three readings of $\arg \zeta'$ at the zeros

A withdrawal first. The author previously believed that no census of $\arg \zeta'(\frac{1}{2} + i\gamma)$ existed. It does: **Stoppie [Sto20]** censused $\arg \zeta'$ at 5×10^6 zeros with $\gamma \approx 2.6\text{--}5.0 \times 10^6$ and established its non-uniformity. **The firstness claim is withdrawn.** What survives, verified absent from that paper:

1. *Concentration read as a circular resultant.* The concentration of $\arg \zeta'$ is read as the modulus of the circular resultant of the sample.
2. *Height-resolved erosion.* The resultant erodes with height: 0.844 at the first census edge ($\gamma \leq 100$, $n = 29$ zeros), 0.6555 at $\gamma \leq 10^4$ ($n = 10,142$), and 0.6137 over the full bank, which is $\gamma \leq 74,920.83$ with $n = 100,000$ zeros (instrument (I3)). Stoppie reports one window and no such curve.

3. *A third item is cut rather than printed.* Earlier versions carried here a measured spread of $\arg \zeta'(\rho_n)$ about the argument-counting function, with a deficit against a classical bar and two correlation figures. The evaluation layer behind those measurements predates this paper's instrument register: no precision route for it is separately banked, and no key from (I1)–(I5) can be assigned to it without guessing. A measured statistic whose provenance cannot be certified does not meet the standard this paper holds its statistics to, so the item is cut here rather than carried under a guessed key. (The exact functional-equation identity that underlies it — $\arg f'(\rho_n) - \pi S_f(\gamma_n) \equiv \text{const}$ for the class, by differentiating $Z(t) = e^{i\vartheta(t)} f(\frac{1}{2} + it)$ at a simple zero — is elementary and class-general, hence blind to the counterexample and carrying no zero-location content; nothing in this paper depends on it.)

9.7 Derivative-witness locality at the counterexample's off-line events

At each of the 193 certified off-line zero pairs of the Davenport–Heilbronn function ($t \in [85.699, 3992.649]$, the full ledger of §1.3, sub-1000 ordinates included), a zero of f' appears to the left of $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$. Measured, instrument (I2): the correspondence is a bijection — 193 defects against 193 left-of-line derivative zeros, **zero false positives and zero misses** — and the pairing is local to a

$$\text{median } \Delta t = 0.005$$

against a mean spacing of order 1. Four candidates once left undetermined near the line were resolved at 50 working digits and all four lie to the *right* of $\frac{1}{2}$ (with $|\text{Re} - \frac{1}{2}|$ between 4.8×10^{-5} and 6.1×10^{-4} , residuals $\sim 10^{-35}$), which accounts for an earlier over-read of 197.

Concession, at first use, and it is mandatory. That a derivative zero is paired with a departure event, with the sides specified, is printed in **Garunkštis–Šimėnas [GS15], §2** and in **Garunkštis [G19]**; the count-level statement for this class is Garunkštis's, and behind it stands Speiser's criterion and the Levinson–Montgomery estimate [LM74] $N_1^-(T) = N^-(T) + O(\log T)$. **None of that is claimed.** What is claimed is the *locality constant*: $\Delta t \approx 0.005$ against a mean spacing of order 1 is far sharper than the $O(\log T)$ that the count-level theorem permits, and that constant appears in neither paper.

§10. The prime-side register

10.1 A per-population support law

Let g be a Dirichlet series with a Riemann-type functional equation, and define its coefficient function Λ_g by $-g'/g(s) = \sum_{n \geq 2} \Lambda_g(n)n^{-s}$. For an integer $x \geq 2$ and a height T form the **resonance sum over the zeros**

$$R_g(x, T) := \sum_{\substack{g(\rho)=0 \\ \rho=\beta+i\gamma, \ 0 < \gamma \leq T}} x^\rho,$$

so that an on-line zero contributes $x^{1/2+i\gamma}$, of modulus $\sqrt{x}$, and an off-line quartet contributes $x^{\beta+i\gamma} + x^{1-\beta+i\gamma}$ at the same ordinate. Landau's classical estimate predicts

$$R_g(x, T) = -\frac{T}{2\pi} \Lambda_g(x) + (\text{lower order}).$$

Applied to the Davenport–Heilbronn function f of §1.3, the two-character decomposition $f = c_+ L(s, \psi) + c_- L(s, \bar{\psi})$ of §1.3 makes Λ_f supported not only on prime powers but **on integers that**

are not prime powers, through the interference of the two characters: $\Lambda_f(6) \neq 0$ and $\Lambda_f(12) \neq 0$, while $\Lambda_f(10) = 0$ exactly and Λ_f vanishes at every x divisible by 5 — the reason is one clause: the coefficient series of f is supported on n coprime to 5, and that support is closed under the Dirichlet convolutions generating $-f'/f$. Explicitly, from $a_n \log n = \sum_{de=n} a_d \Lambda_f(e)$ with the period-five coefficients of §1.3: $\Lambda_f(6) = (1 + \xi^2) \log 6$ and $\Lambda_f(12) = -\xi(1 + \xi^2) \log 12$, so the two non-vanishing claims are checkable from the coefficients alone, without any deposit. This is the register’s reading of multiplicativity: ζ **provably cannot resonate at an x that is not a prime power; for f , Λ_f provably does not vanish at the named non-prime-power cells, and the resonance there is measured** — the “must” is a finite computation about Λ_f plus Landau’s asymptotic, whose lower-order terms are not evaluated here, so at $T = 4000$ the matched values (0.980, 1.036) are evidence and not proof, and an earlier version’s “provably must” overstated exactly that step. *The distinction is “prime power” and not “composite”, and the wording matters: $\Lambda_\zeta(x) = \log p$ is non-zero at the composite prime powers $x \leq 30$, which are 4, 8, 9, 16, 25, 27 — an earlier version of this list omitted 16 — so a version of this sentence phrased with “composite” in place of “not a prime power” — as an earlier version of this paragraph was — is false as it stands. The measurements below are unaffected, since every cell they name is either a prime power or is divisible by a second prime.*

What is measured (instrument (I2), on the full certified ledger of §1.3, sub-1000 ordinates included). At $T = 4000$ the individual non-prime-power ratios (measured over predicted, sign included) are 0.980 at $x = 6$ and 1.036 at $x = 12$ — both **divisible by two distinct primes**, hence outside the support of Λ_ζ ; an earlier version called them “both products of two distinct primes”, which is false of $12 = 2^2 \cdot 3$ and is not the property the argument needs — and the predicted exact null at $x = 10$ lands inside the noise band. All six predicted silences at $5 \mid x$ ($x = 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30$) appear as deep nulls, a factor 13 to 77 below the noise RMS, and the phases lock to $\{0, \pi\}$ within 0.023 rad. **There are no free parameters anywhere in this comparison.**

*A summary statistic over “all ten powered composite cells with $x \leq 30$ ”, at maximum deviation 2.4%, stood at the head of this paragraph in an earlier version. The class of cells that phrase denotes is not specified in any source the author can point to, so the statistic is not evaluable as printed; it is **cut here rather than restated**, and the individually named cells above are unaffected.*

The ladder in T , with its statistic defined at first use. Write $S_{\text{on}}(x, T) = \sqrt{x} \sum_{0 < \gamma \leq T} x^{i\gamma}$, the sum over the on-line zero ordinates of f up to T , with $n_{\text{on}}(T)$ terms. The suppression ratio is

$$\rho_{\text{on}}(x, T) := \frac{|S_{\text{on}}(x, T)|}{\sqrt{n_{\text{on}}(T)} x},$$

the sum’s modulus against its random-phase root-mean-square — the level $\sqrt{n_{\text{on}}(T)} x$ that a sum of n_{on} uncorrelated unit phases times $\sqrt{x}$ would have — so $\rho_{\text{on}} = 1$ is the noise level, and “noise RMS” and “noise band” above and below mean exactly this denominator. The printed value at each T is the median of $\rho_{\text{on}}(x, T)$ over the six silent $x \in \{5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30\}$. *An earlier version used ρ_{on} , “noise RMS” and “noise band” without definition — in the very paragraph that cuts two neighbouring statistics for exactly that failure; the definition above is the deposited instrument’s, verbatim.* For f at $T \in \{500, 1000, 2000, 4000\}$ the median suppression at silent x is $\rho_{\text{on}} = 0.1646/0.1614/0.1450/0.2358$ — **not monotone: the last rung rises by 63% against the third, which is flagged here rather than left to be noticed, and is not explained.** The three lower rungs fall and the top one does not, on a four-point ladder with no error bar attached to any rung, so **no trend in T is claimed for this quantity at all**; what the ladder is printed for is that every rung is a suppression. For ζ at $T \in \{4000, 10000, 30000, 74920\}$ the value match holds on 7/7 prime-power cells at all four rungs — **the seven cells being named here, since the paragraph above**

cuts two other statistics precisely for failing to name their class: $x = 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9$ — with the non-prime-power silence *deepening* from 0.0225 to 0.0085 by $T = 74920$. A *sixteen-rung invariant*, the “closure quotient — the quartet share of the on-line residue”, was reported here at $[0.958, 1.025]$, 16/16. Neither “on-line residue” nor “closure quotient” is defined in any source the author can point to, so that statement too is **cut rather than restated**.

Two supersessions, printed here rather than elsewhere. (i) A graded cell for quartet silence was scored against an on-line-register bar that does not apply to it; that grading is superseded and is not restated — an earlier version replaced it with a “law” stated against a “fifth-percentile null”, a bar defined nowhere, and that replacement is cut by the same standard as the statistics above. (ii) The gloss “the quartets carry about half” is superseded, and **no figure for the share — single or range — is carried anywhere in this paper**: the share’s defining phrase is the one the preceding paragraph records as unlocatable, so an earlier version’s “7% to 94%” range fell to exactly the standard that cut the sixteen-rung statistic, and it is cut with it.

Concession, printed with the law. The per-function Landau / explicit-formula resonance register is classical — Landau (1911/12) for the total sum, Gonek for uniformity, Fujii under RH, and Kaczorowski–Languasco–Perelli [KLP00], which is the derivative of the explicit formula. All of that constrains the total over the full zero set and is conceded in full. **What is claimed is the per-population instantiation:** that the law holds separately on each population of the zero set (on-line zeros; off-line quartet members) rather than only in aggregate, on the author’s own certified lists, together with the resulting separation content. **The author notes that this is a claim of granularity against a conceded object, and that granularity claims are the class this programme has most often lost.** No prior Landau-type census on the Davenport–Heilbronn zero set was located.

10.2 A ladder of thresholds on the wing function, and its seam

For $\sigma > 1$ let $P(s) = \sum_p p^{-s}$ be the prime zeta function, let c_m be the Taylor coefficients of the arcsine, $\arcsin z = \sum_{m \geq 0} c_m z^{2m+1}$ with $c_0 = 1$, $c_1 = 1/6$, $c_2 = 3/40$, and define the **wing function**

$$W(\sigma) := \sum_p \arcsin p^{-\sigma} \quad (\sigma > 1).$$

Two of its level points are named in the literature: $W = \pi/2$ at $\sigma^{**} = 1.192347$, and $W = \pi$ at $\sigma^\dagger = 1.033908072362924$. **The two literature names are kept clear of the ladder indices introduced in the next paragraph, because an earlier version of this subsection called the second of them σ_1 while the ladder’s own σ_1 is the first — one symbol carrying two incompatible values two paragraphs apart.** Under the ladder definition below the two literature points *are* rungs 1 and 2 of the ladder, and saying so strengthens the subsection at no cost: recomputed for this version at 50 working digits, the first three rungs are

$$\sigma_1 = 1.1923473371861932, \quad \sigma_2 = 1.03390807236292391, \quad \sigma_3 = 1.00682329174606977,$$

so $\sigma^{**} = \sigma_1$ and $\sigma^\dagger = \sigma_2$. This matters downstream twice: the identity $C_2 = \beta C^2$ below is a statement about rung $k = 2$, and §10.3’s Corollary (i) is about the level $W = \pi$, i.e. about σ_2 and not about σ_1 .

The ladder. Define σ_k by $W(\sigma_k) = k\pi/2$. Then, measured with instrument (I2),

$$\sigma_k - 1 \sim C e^{-k\pi/2},$$

$$C = \exp\left(\underbrace{\sum_{n \geq 2} \frac{\mu(n)}{n} \log \zeta(n)}_{=:A} + \sum_{m \geq 1} c_m P(2m+1)\right) = 0.753169266704793,$$

double-pinned by two independent 30-digit evaluations differing by 2×10^{-13} , with successive rung ratios approaching $e^{\pi/2} = 4.810477$ by $k = 8$. **The constant A in that exponent is classical:** $A = M - \gamma$, the Meissel–Mertens constant minus Euler’s, and that identity is not new.

The seam, and the function h that organises it. Expanding W past $\sigma = 1$ separates a logarithmic singularity from a regular remainder, and that remainder is a function in its own right. Define

$$h(s) := \log((s-1)\zeta(s)) + \sum_{k \geq 2} \frac{\mu(k)}{k} \log \zeta(ks) + \sum_{m \geq 1} c_m P((2m+1)s),$$

which is analytic at $s = 1$: the first term removes the pole of ζ , the second is the Möbius-weighted prime-zeta reconstruction of log of the Euler product, and the third is the arcsine correction. Then W_{cont} has, at the seam,

$$\text{Re } W_{\text{cont}}(\sigma) = \log \frac{1}{|\sigma-1|} + c + \beta(\sigma-1) + \frac{h''(1)}{2}(\sigma-1)^2 + O((\sigma-1)^3),$$

with $c = h(1)$, $\beta = h'(1)$, and $h''(1) = -2.277716366247248$ — so the three constants of the expansion are the first three Taylor coefficients of one analytic function and not three independent measurements. Explicitly,

$$c = -0.283465286663079,$$

$$\beta = \gamma_E + \sum_{k \geq 2} \mu(k) \frac{\zeta'(k)}{\zeta(k)} + \sum_{m \geq 1} c_m (2m+1) P'(2m+1) = 1.24478699824623,$$

the three components of β being 0.577215664901533, 0.755366610831688 and -0.0877952774869883 . Three independent routes to (c, β) — a direct seam fit, the derivation chain, and a Stieltjes/Mertens register — agree at the print-truncation floor, 2.1×10^{-17} and 2.6×10^{-15} .

One identity between the seam and the ladder, stated because a reader will otherwise find it unaided. The seam constant c and the ladder constant C are not independent:

$$\boxed{c = \log C}$$

verified to all printed digits ($\log C = -0.283465286663079$). The one-line derivation is forced by the definitions: at the seam $\text{Re } W_{\text{cont}}(\sigma) = \log \frac{1}{\sigma-1} + c + O(\sigma-1)$, so solving $W(\sigma_k) = k\pi/2$ to leading order gives $\log \frac{1}{\sigma_k-1} = k\pi/2 - c$, i.e. $\sigma_k - 1 = e^c e^{-k\pi/2}$; comparing with $\sigma_k - 1 \sim C e^{-k\pi/2}$ gives $C = e^c$. **The three routes to (c, β) above therefore agree on c and on C jointly, and a reader should not count C as a fourth independent determination.**

The identity that ties the two together. The second-rung constant of the ladder is not independent:

$$C_2 = \beta C^2 = 0.706122782449265,$$

printed as an identity, with the two prior measurements (a Richardson extrapolation at the seam giving 1.244787, within 1.4×10^{-9} of β ; a per- k strip value 0.7061227, within 1.2×10^{-7} of βC^2) reclassified as confirmations of it. The third order was verified by Newton rungs $k = 4, \dots, 9$ at 50 working digits (residuals $\leq 10^{-46}$): the residual after two terms, rescaled by $e^{3k\pi/2}$, converges

monotonically onto bC^3 (an earlier version printed the rescaling as $e^{k\pi}$, under which the residual tends to 0, not to bC^3 — the exponent is that of the third power of $q = Ce^{-k\pi/2}$, as the free-fit exponent 3.000126 beside it always said), where

$$b := \frac{3}{2}\beta^2 + \frac{1}{2}h''(1) = 1.185383823, \quad bC^3 = 0.5064502,$$

b being the third-order coefficient assembled from the same two Taylor data $\beta = h'(1)$ and $h''(1)$ that already appear in the seam expansion — so it introduces no new constant. The convergence is cleanest at $k = 8$ within 5.0×10^{-7} and finest usable at $k = 9$ within 3.6×10^{-5} ($k = 10$ is register-floor limited and excluded), with a free-fit exponent of 3.000126 against the predicted 3. Zero fitted parameters.

The weight arithmetic, and a second, independent reading of it. Define

$$a_n := \sum_{k(2m+1)=n} \frac{\mu(k) c_m}{k},$$

one arithmetic shared by the pole images and by every zero's images. The first values are

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 &= 1, \\ a_2 &= -\frac{1}{2}, \\ a_3 &= -\frac{1}{6}, \\ a_4 &= 0, \\ a_5 &= -\frac{1}{8}, \\ a_6 &= +\frac{1}{12}, \\ a_7 &= -\frac{11}{112}. \end{aligned}$$

The same weights are read a second time, independently, off the imaginary part on the real axis:

$$\operatorname{Im} W_{\text{cont}}(\sigma) = \pi \sum_{n < 1/\sigma} a_n,$$

giving π on $(\frac{1}{2}, 1)$; $\pi/2$ on $(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{2})$; then $\pi/3$ on *both* $(\frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{3})$ and $(\frac{1}{5}, \frac{1}{4})$ — one value in two consecutive windows, because $a_4 = 0$, so the second window is an independent read of $\mu(4) = 0$; then $5\pi/24$ on $(\frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{5})$ and $7\pi/24$ on $(\frac{1}{7}, \frac{1}{6})$, including the predicted **non-monotone** step from $5/24$ up to $7/24$ forced by $a_6 > 0$. Verified across five windows.

Concessions, and they are extensive. The arcsine curve W as *one object*, with its prime-zeta expansion and its convexity, is **not the author's**: it is Arias de Reyna–Brent–van de Lune's [AdRBvdL] as a study, and it appears sixty years earlier in [T86], §11.6, p. 300 of the 1951 first edition, verified against the page image; $\sigma^{**} = 1.192347$ is van de Lune's [vdL83]. The seam expansion as Laurent bookkeeping, the closed form at the seam and the α -register identity are Kawalec's [Kw26], an arXiv preprint carrying no journal reference; the singularity skeleton of $P(s)$ is Glaisher's, Landau–Walfisz's and Fröberg's; and, as noted above, $A = M - \gamma$ is classical. **What survives as the author's is the ladder, not the rungs**: the threshold law $\sigma_k - 1 \sim Ce^{-k\pi/2}$ with C derived, the identity $C_2 = \beta C^2$, the a_n arithmetic, and the imaginary-part register above. That is the whole of the claim, and the fact that the object underneath it changed owner twice in the course of this work is stated here rather than left for a referee to find.

10.3 The density of sign changes of $\operatorname{Im} \zeta$ at fixed $\sigma > 1$

For $\sigma > 1$ the Euler product gives $\arg \zeta(\sigma + it) = A(\theta(t))$, where $\theta(t) = (-t \log p)_p$ runs on the infinite torus $\mathbb{T} = \prod_p S^1$ under the Kronecker flow $\theta_p \mapsto \theta_p - t \log p$, and

$$A(\theta) := \sum_p g_p(\theta_p), \quad g_p(\vartheta) := -\arg(1 - p^{-\sigma} e^{i\vartheta}).$$

Since $|g_p| \leq \arcsin p^{-\sigma}$ with equality attained, $\sup_{\mathbb{T}} |A| = W(\sigma)$, the wing function of §10.2 — the two sections share one object. Write $B := dA/dt$ along the flow and let $\mathfrak{f}$ be the joint density of (A, B) under Haar measure.

Theorem 10 (crossing density; conditional — see the status note below). *For fixed $\sigma > 1$ the density of sign changes of $\operatorname{Im} \zeta(\sigma + it)$ per unit t exists and equals the Kac–Rice functional*

$$\rho(\sigma) = \sum_{|k|\pi \leq W(\sigma)} \int |b| \mathfrak{f}(k\pi, b) db.$$

Ingredients of the proof. (a) The phase representation: $\operatorname{Im} \zeta(\sigma + it) = 0 \iff A \in \pi\mathbb{Z}$, and the summation range is finite because $|A| \leq W(\sigma)$. (b) Unique ergodicity of the Kronecker flow on $\mathbb{T}$, from the $\mathbb{Q}$ -linear independence of $\{\log p\}$, which converts the time average into the Haar average. (c) Absolute continuity of the joint law of (A, B) , via van der Corput estimates. **(d)** A self-contained upper bound, which removes the need to import a stationary Rice identity: A extends to the complex-time strip $|\operatorname{Im} t| < \sigma - 1$ as the analytic function $\frac{1}{2i} [\log \zeta(\sigma + it) - \overline{\log \zeta(\sigma + i\bar{t})}]$ — the Schwarz-reflection combination, available because $\operatorname{Re}(\sigma + it) > 1$ throughout that strip, where ζ is zero-free and has real Dirichlet coefficients; A itself is harmonic in t , not analytic, and is this function’s restriction to real t (an earlier version wrote “ A extends analytically”, which skips the construction that makes the statement true) — with a uniform bound; $A - k\pi$ is then bounded and analytic on each unit interval, so Jensen’s formula bounds its zero count by $C(\eta) \log(2W/m_j)$; a dyadic-shell decomposition together with (b) gives a finite mean crossing count $\sum_j C(\eta)(j+1) \|\mathfrak{f}_A\|_{\infty} 2^{1-j} < \infty$, and the excess of the crossing count over the step count tends to 0 as the step tends to 0.

Status of (c) and (d), stated plainly. The bounded-density / absolute-continuity ingredient (c) and the no-tangency step inside (d) are **used in the form stated and are not proved here**. This paper prints Theorem 10 with that dependence visible rather than buried: a reader who wants an unconditional statement should read Theorem 10 as conditional on (c) and on the no-tangency step.

Evaluated densities, with the method, the truncation and the accuracy that an earlier version omitted. The functional gives

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(\sigma) &= 0.368469, \\ &0.334734, \\ &0.262710, \\ &0.228426 \quad \text{at } \sigma = 1.05, 1.15, 1.5, 2.0. \end{aligned}$$

How — this is instrument (I5) of §1.4, declared there and used only here; an earlier version ran it undeclared. The joint density $\mathfrak{f}$ is built through its Fourier transform, exploiting the fact that

under Haar measure the prime coordinates are independent, so the characteristic function of (A, B) factorises over p . For each prime p the exact per-prime curve

$$\begin{aligned}\vartheta &\mapsto (g_p(\vartheta), h_p(\vartheta)), \\ g_p(\vartheta) &= \arctan \frac{p^{-\sigma} \sin \vartheta}{1 - p^{-\sigma} \cos \vartheta}, \\ h_p(\vartheta) &= -\log p \cdot \frac{p^{-\sigma} (\cos \vartheta - p^{-\sigma})}{1 - 2p^{-\sigma} \cos \vartheta + p^{-2\sigma}},\end{aligned}$$

is sampled at 2^{14} equally spaced ϑ and binned onto a 2048×2048 lattice covering $[-A_{\max}, A_{\max}] \times [-B_{\max}, B_{\max}]$, with $A_{\max} = 1.10 W(\sigma) + 6\sqrt{S_g}$ and $B_{\max} = 1.30(\sum_p \log p \cdot p^{-\sigma} / (1 - p^{-\sigma}) + 6\sqrt{S_h})$; the two-dimensional discrete Fourier transform of each histogram is that prime's characteristic function, and the transforms are multiplied.

Truncation. The product is taken **exactly over** $p \leq 2000$. The remaining primes $2000 < p \leq 10^6$ are carried as a single Gaussian factor $\exp(-\frac{1}{2}(\hat{a}^2 S_g + \hat{b}^2 S_h))$, where $(\hat{a}, \hat{b})$ are the Fourier variables dual to (A, B) — written with hats so that neither collides with u or v elsewhere in this paper — and with $S_g = \sum_p \frac{1}{2} \text{Li}_2(p^{-2\sigma})$ and $S_h = \sum_p (\log p)^2 \frac{1}{2} p^{-2\sigma} / (1 - p^{-2\sigma})$ evaluated exactly over that range (78,195 primes). The tail beyond 10^6 is bounded by the integral comparison of the next paragraph and is below 3×10^{-8} at $\sigma = 1.05$. Inverting the transform gives $\mathfrak{f}$, and $\rho(\sigma) = \sum_{|k| \leq W} \int |b| \mathfrak{f}(k\pi, b) db$ is then a one-dimensional quadrature on the b -lattice.

Accuracy, at digit level. The relevant control is a convergence ladder in the four discretisation parameters, each varied by a factor of two: halving the lattice to 1024^2 moves ρ by at most 2.1×10^{-4} relative; halving the θ -sampling to 2^{13} by at most 3.5×10^{-5} ; widening the box margins from $(1.10, 1.30)$ to $(1.65, 1.95)$ by at most 3.2×10^{-4} ; and halving the exact prime cutoff from 2000 to 1000 by at most 3.2×10^{-4} . The largest single deviation anywhere on that ladder is 3.2×10^{-4} relative. **What that bounds is the contribution of those four discretisations and nothing else, and the sentence is now stated in exactly that form:** an earlier version read it as certifying the four values to about four significant figures, which is a stronger statement than a convergence ladder in four named parameters can support, and which the census below does not corroborate. The sixth printed digit is not certified, no independent check at the four-figure level is offered here, and none is claimed. The wrap-around indicator, the largest modulus of the transform on the lattice boundary, is 2.5×10^{-94} , 3.3×10^{-73} , 1.3×10^{-31} and 4.7×10^{-15} at the four σ above, so aliasing is nowhere the limiting error.

The independent census, with the scope §0 promises — and a supersession. An earlier version reported a direct census of the sign changes of $\text{Im} \zeta$ on the same four rays returning 0.366567, 0.337337, 0.262462, 0.228428, and printed four signed deviations +0.52%, −0.77%, +0.094%, −0.001% against the functional's values. **That census carried no t -window, no grid pitch and no crossing count, in a paper whose §0 promises all three at every site; its scope is not recoverable — the packaged deposit records a script and a summary log for it but no window, pitch or count — so it is superseded here by a census run afresh for this paper with its scope printed, and the four signed percentages are withdrawn.**

Scope of the census run here. Sign changes of $\text{Im} \zeta(\sigma + it)$ are located by sign change on a uniform t -grid of pitch 0.02, with ζ evaluated by Euler–Maclaurin at $N = \lceil 0.22t \rceil + 60$ Dirichlet terms and 12 Bernoulli correction pairs in IEEE double precision — the scheme of instrument (I1) at a term count set for this range — validated against a 25-digit reference at 24 cells spread over the whole range, worst absolute error 2.6×10^{-8} . Two **disjoint** windows are scanned, $t \in [10, 10010]$ and $t \in [10010, 20010]$, each of length 10^4 . Grid convergence was established first: on $t \in [10, 2010]$, at each of the four σ separately, the crossing count is *identical* across all four pitches 0.04, 0.02,

0.01 and 0.005 — the four per- σ counts being 749, 687, 521 and 455, one per σ and each unchanged under pitch refinement — so no crossings are being missed and the counts below are exact for the windows scanned.

σ	count, $t \in [10, 10010]$	count, $t \in [10010, 20010]$	ρ , window 1	ρ , window 2	ρ , pooled	window-to-window spread	functional's $\rho(\sigma)$	pooled deviation
1.05	3668	3669	0.36680	0.36690	0.36685	0.03%	0.368469	-0.44%
1.15	3374	3329	0.33740	0.33290	0.33515	1.34%	0.334734	+0.12%
1.50	2626	2643	0.26260	0.26430	0.26345	0.65%	0.262710	+0.28%
2.00	2284	2281	0.22840	0.22810	0.22825	0.13%	0.228426	-0.08%

What the census supports, and what it does not. Pooled over the two windows the census agrees with the functional to better than half a percent at every σ . But the census's own window-to-window spread reaches 1.34% at $\sigma = 1.15$ and 0.65% at $\sigma = 1.5$ — as large as, or larger than, the deviations being measured. **A census on windows of this length therefore cannot adjudicate the fourth significant figure of $\rho(\sigma)$, and the honest form of the cross-check is the coarse one: at all four rays the census and the functional agree to better than 0.5%, against a census window bar of order 1%.** No signed percentage is printed here to any finer precision, and the cross-check tightens the ladder in neither direction.

One feature of the comparison is printed because it is coherent rather than scatter, and it is left open. At $\sigma = 1.05$ the two disjoint windows agree with each other to 0.03% and both sit about 0.44% *below* the functional; at $\sigma = 1.5$ the same coherence appears with the opposite sign. Whether that is finite-window drift in the census or a systematic in the evaluation of the functional — the single Gaussian factor standing in for $2000 < p \leq 10^6$ being the obvious candidate, since halving the *exact* cutoff tests the split point but not the Gaussian form — **is not settled here, and no re-examination of the functional's quadrature or of its Gaussian tail factor has been carried out for this paper.** It is named as the open point it is. This census is one of the closed-form/single-session statements flagged in §0 and §1.4: it was written and run for this paper rather than by a standing script, and the recipe just printed is what makes it reproducible.

Corollaries (*provenance for every computed figure in the two items below: the closed-form/single-session class flagged in §0 and §1.4, each recipe printed at its use — stated here once because an earlier version left the corollaries outside both the instrument keys and the flag*).

(i) Above the ladder's σ_2 — the abscissa where $W = \pi$, namely $\sigma^\dagger = 1.033908072362924$ in the notation of §10.2 — only the level $k = 0$ survives and the sum has a single branch. (An earlier version wrote σ_1 here, in the literature sense, inside a corollary to a section that had defined σ_1 the other way; §10.2 now keeps the two registers apart.) (ii) **Exact quantisation above a computed abscissa σ_0 .** Write $W_3(\sigma) := \sum_{p \geq 3} \arcsin p^{-\sigma}$ for the wing function with the $p = 2$ factor removed. Two conditions are imposed:

(H1) $W_3(\sigma) < \arcsin 2^{-\sigma}$ — the $p \geq 3$ block cannot by itself carry A across a level, so every level crossing requires the $p = 2$ term; **(H2)** the $p = 2$ clock dominates the flow speed on the window that (H1) leaves open,

$$\log 2 \cdot \inf_J |g'_2| > \sum_{p \geq 3} \log p \cdot \sup |g'_p|,$$

$$J := \{\theta_2 : |g_2(\theta_2)| \leq W_3(\sigma)\},$$

the weights $\log p$ being the flow speeds of the individual coordinates in $B = dA/dt$.

Where both hold, every crossing is slaved to the $p = 2$ clock alone, so that

$$\rho(\sigma) = \frac{\log 2}{\pi} \quad \text{exactly for } \sigma > \sigma_0,$$

a terminal law rather than an asymptote. **The window J has two components, and the binding one is named here.** $J = \{\theta_2 : |g_2(\theta_2)| \leq W_3(\sigma)\}$ splits into a component about $\theta_2 = 0$ and a component about $\theta_2 = \pi$, and the screen's answer depends on which is used. **The π -component is the binding one**, which is what the mechanism predicts — two crossings per period of the $p = 2$ clock is exactly what produces $\rho = \log 2/\pi$ — and it is stated rather than left to be discovered. Recomputed for this version by sieving to $X = 2 \times 10^6$: taking $\inf_J |g'_2|$ at the edges of the π -component puts the last flip at $2.91 \rightarrow 2.92$, i.e. $\sigma_0 = 2.92$; taking it at the centre of that same component, where $|g'_2(\pi)| = 2^{-\sigma}/(1 + 2^{-\sigma})$, moves the crossing to $\sigma = 2.8130$, which is the 2.814 the centre-value screen returns on a grid of pitch 10^{-3} . The $\theta_2 \approx 0$ component crosses below 2.70 under either reading and is therefore never binding. **“Edge-corrected” names how $\inf_J |g'_2|$ is taken:** at both edges of the binding component rather than at its centre. Throughout, (H2) is the binding condition and (H1) is slack — at $\sigma = 2.92$ the (H1) slack $\arcsin 2^{-\sigma} - W_3(\sigma)$ is 7.73×10^{-2} , two orders above the (H2) margin computed next.

The truncation, and a bound on the tail it omits. (H2)'s right-hand side is an infinite sum over primes, evaluated above only up to X ; an earlier version left that silent. The omitted tail is bounded in two lines. Differentiating $g_p(\vartheta) = -\arg(1 - p^{-\sigma}e^{i\vartheta})$ gives $g'_p(\vartheta) = \operatorname{Re}[p^{-\sigma}e^{i\vartheta}/(1 - p^{-\sigma}e^{i\vartheta})]$, hence $\sup_{\vartheta} |g'_p| \leq p^{-\sigma}/(1 - p^{-\sigma})$. Since $x \mapsto (\log x)x^{-\sigma}$ is decreasing for $x \geq 3$ when $\sigma > 1$, comparison with the integral gives

$$\sum_{p > X} \log p \cdot \sup |g'_p| \leq \frac{1}{1 - X^{-\sigma}} \int_X^\infty (\log x) x^{-\sigma} dx = \frac{X^{1-\sigma}}{1 - X^{-\sigma}} \left(\frac{\log X}{\sigma - 1} + \frac{1}{(\sigma - 1)^2} \right),$$

which at $X = 2 \times 10^6$ and $\sigma = 2.92$ evaluates to 6.25×10^{-12} .

That margin is carried here, and it closes the gap. An earlier version said the margin was not carried, so that what was established was the truncated criterion together with a tail bound and a reader wanting an unconditional σ_0 needed one further number. **The number is supplied.** Recomputed for this version by sieving the primes to $X = 2 \times 10^6$ (148,933 of them) and evaluating $\sup_{\vartheta} |g'_p| = p^{-\sigma}/(1 - p^{-\sigma})$ exactly at each — the supremum being attained at $\vartheta = 0$, directly from the closed form for g'_p above — at $\sigma = 2.92$ and with the infimum taken at the edges of the binding π -component:

$$\log 2 \cdot \inf_J |g'_2| = 0.074398, \quad \sum_{3 \leq p \leq X} \log p \cdot \sup_{\vartheta} |g'_p| = 0.073819,$$

so the truncated margin is

$$\log 2 \cdot \inf_J |g'_2| - \sum_{3 \leq p \leq X} \log p \cdot \sup_{\vartheta} |g'_p| = 5.78 \times 10^{-4},$$

which exceeds the tail bound 6.25×10^{-12} by a factor 9.3×10^7 . (*Rounding provenance, per this paper's practice: the two displayed inputs are six-decimal roundings; the margin is computed unrounded, 5.781×10^{-4} — four significant figures; a fifth depends on the W_3 tail truncation and is not pinned, and an earlier version printed 5.7810 — and the difference of the rounded displays agrees with it at the printed precision.*) **(H2) therefore holds unconditionally at $\sigma = 2.92$, and the screen behind Corollary (ii) is no longer conditional on the truncation.** The corollary's status is otherwise unchanged: it still rests on Theorem 10, whose ingredients (c) and (d) are used in the form stated and not proved here. σ_0 **remains a computed sufficient threshold and not a sharp one:** below it the corollary says nothing, and no claim is made that the terminal

law fails there. This computation and the component identification above are among the closed-form/single-session statements flagged in §0 and §1.4; the recipe is printed with them and is the whole of what is needed to repeat them.

*(A third corollary carried in earlier versions — a “cost of dropping unique factorisation” read off an alternative model’s overprediction factors — is cut rather than restated: its gloss mis-identified the model (under Haar measure the prime coordinates are independent **because of** the $\mathbb{Q}$ -linear independence of $\{\log p\}$, ingredient (b) above, so independence is what the exact functional derives from unique factorisation, not what discarding it would produce), and its factors carried no recipe, no σ -set and no instrument — the same standard on which §10.1 cuts its own unevaluable statistics.)*

Concession, printed with the theorem. The engine underneath is the mean-motion school: Bohl, Weyl and Bohr, then Jessen–Tornehave [JT45], and Borchsenius–Jessen [BJ48], whose Theorems 13–14 give mean motions of $\arg(\zeta - x)$ on every line $\sigma > \frac{1}{2}$ and the zero-frequencies in every strip. Both of the latter were read first-hand. **What is claimed is the fixed-line crossing statistic** — sign changes rather than net winding, one line rather than a strip — **its Kac–Rice form, the threshold σ_0 , and the terminal law $\log 2/\pi$** , none of which is present there.

§11. Two positivity registers, priced

Both subsections below concern *positivity* criteria — Li’s in §11.1, Weil’s in §11.2 — and both report the same kind of finding: not that a criterion fails, but what it costs to use one. **The point that governs the whole section is made once here and again inside each subsection: Weil positivity and Li positivity are *equivalences* of the Riemann Hypothesis, not reductions of it.** Establishing positivity at finitely many indices, or at a finite support length, decides nothing; assembling such statements proves nothing; and measuring how the cost of the assembly grows is a statement about a method and never about a zero. Nothing in §11 locates, excludes or constrains any zero of any function, and nothing in it is progress toward the hypothesis in either direction.

11.1 How far a published proxy departs from the literal Li sequence at a certified zero

The Li coefficients of a function with a Riemann-type functional equation are

$$\lambda_n = \sum_{\rho} \left[1 - \left(1 - \frac{1}{\rho} \right)^n \right], \quad \text{with}$$

$$\left| 1 - \frac{1}{\rho} \right|^2 = 1 - \frac{2\beta - 1}{|\rho|^2},$$

both due to **Bombieri–Lagarias** [BL99] and conceded here in full. The mechanism is immediate from the second display: for an off-line pair, the member with $\beta < \frac{1}{2}$ has $|1 - 1/\rho| > 1$ and its contribution grows, driving $\lambda_n \rightarrow -\infty$ at a rate of about $(\frac{1}{2} - \beta)/|\rho|^2$ per index. An off-line zero must therefore announce itself as a sign change of λ_n at some finite index n_c .

The published prediction. Voros [Vo] gives $n_c \gtrsim T^{1+2/\delta}$, computed on a *deformed proxy sequence*. Here T is the ordinate of the off-line zero and $\delta := \beta - \frac{1}{2}$ is its horizontal offset from the critical line — the half-width of the departure, not the full quartet width $2\beta - 1$. The definition is load-bearing and an earlier version left it implicit: at the zero used below, $\beta = 0.80851718\dots$ and $T = 85.69934849\dots$, so $\delta = 0.30851718\dots$ and $(1 + 2/\delta) \log_{10} T = 14.4637384$; reading δ as $2\beta - 1$ instead would give 8.198 and collapse the whole comparison. $\delta = \beta - \frac{1}{2}$ is the reading used throughout this section. It is essential to state his own hedge and to stay inside

it: he introduces the proxy as the simpler object to analyse and to compute, and **nowhere in that source claims it to be term-wise identical to the literal λ_n . That last clause is an assertion about what a source does not say, so its warrant is stated with it:** it is made about the one work cited here as [Vo], which was read first-hand for this comparison, and about nothing else — not about the author’s wider corpus, on which no claim is made. The stronger assertion — that the two sequences are provably not identical — would be the present author’s, and it is **not** made. On the proxy, the prediction is $n \approx 100$ for one Davenport–Heilbronn zero and $n \approx 3 \times 10^{14}$ for another; the latter is the author’s own first certified quartet (§1.3). An elementary amplitude-against-bulk estimate straight from the Bombieri–Lagarias identity puts the crossing at $\approx 3.5 \times 10^5$ instead.

The computation, instrument (I2). The off-line contribution was computed exactly from the certified quartets with no model; the on-line contribution from the certified zero list; and the remaining tail was carried through the Riemann–von Mangoldt counting function as a **bounded band, not a point estimate**, so that the result is a two-sided bracket rather than a single number. The literal sequence’s crossing is bracketed at

$$n = 523,722 \text{ (positive side),} \quad n = 1,000,000 \text{ (negative side),}$$

i.e. near the elementary estimate and not near the proxy’s. **Both endpoints are determined sign statements and neither is a computational ceiling:** at $n = 523,722$ the two-sided tail band places the total between $+5.877 \times 10^9$ and $+5.976 \times 10^9$, and at $n = 10^6$ between two endpoints that agree to the five significant figures printed, both reading -2.9968×10^{18} — **so the repeated figure above is a band narrower than its own printed precision and not a typographical duplication**, and the whole band lies strictly on one side at each end, at working precisions 40 and 49 decimal digits respectively. **The round-looking upper endpoint is therefore a genuine determined sign change and not the point at which the computation stopped**, and the bracket is two-sided in the strict sense.

The statement of record, in exactly this form. *For a certified Davenport–Heilbronn zero, the proxy sequence and the literal Li sequence place the crossing at least eight orders of magnitude apart. The proxy value behind that statement is printed here rather than left implicit:* reproducing Voros’s law at this zero gives $n_{\text{proxy}} = 10^{14.4637} = 2.909 \times 10^{14}$, and measured against the bracket’s upper end $n = 10^6$ this is

$$\log_{10}(2.909 \times 10^{14}/10^6) = 8.46 \text{ orders,}$$

with **at least 8** being the claim. *An earlier version also quoted “8.93 orders from the nominal crossing”. That figure divides the same proxy value by $n = 338,030$ — the value the paragraph below supersedes — so it is not a statement about the literal sequence at all, and it is withdrawn here. Only the 8.46 figure, measured against the bracket, is carried.* The proxy does not track the literal sequence in the small-offset regime, and that gap is the finding. This is not a statement that a published law is wrong; it is a statement about how far the proxy departs from the object it stands in for, in a regime the source did not claim it to cover.

An adjacent line of work, named so that this subsection’s scope is not read wider than it is. Li-type criteria for Dirichlet series with real coefficients — including variants adapted to zero-free regions and to the extended class, and including work on functions that violate the hypothesis — are a developed literature in their own right; **Bucur, Ernvall-Hytönen, Odžak and Smajlović [BEOS]** are one line of it, located by the literature search printed at §11.2. **Nothing in this subsection is a contribution to that literature, and no novelty is claimed in the Li register at all.** No criterion is proposed here, none is sharpened, none is proved, and

no zero-free region is derived. What is claimed is one comparison and its scope statement is the sentence of record below: a published proxy sequence set against the literal sequence of [BL99], evaluated at one certified off-line zero of one function. **[BEOS] has not been read first-hand and nothing here rests on its content**; it is named because a reader working in that register would otherwise have to check for themselves that this subsection is not competing with it.

A correction to the author’s own earlier reading, printed here. An earlier value $n_c = 338,030$, quoted as “the literal crossing”, is superseded: it was the first sign change of the exactly banked part inside a censored window, and λ_n is resolvedly positive at larger n . The bracket above is the corrected result.

On the rest of that line of work, what of it appears here, and why the rest does not. The author has run a wider set of computations on positivity functionals evaluated at certified counterexamples. **One part of it appears in this paper, at §11.2, and the rest does not — and one located source settles both dispositions.** That source is Ismail [Is26], a public, dated, DOI-bearing deposit that evaluates the Weil explicit-formula quadratic form built from the Davenport–Heilbronn coefficients at that function’s genuine off-line zeros, measuring it negative there against a ζ control that stays positive, and confirming the same statement spectrally as a Morse index moving from 0 to 2. It was located by the literature search printed at §11.2 and read first-hand. **Whatever else that work is, it is a prior evaluation of the kind the omitted material would have claimed as first of its kind, so that material is not first of its kind and is omitted for that reason** — the class-detection reading, and the comparison of four objects’ positivity-margin magnitudes, appear nowhere in this paper and no firstness is claimed for either. What §11.2 does print is the one object that source does not contain: the scaling, in the off-line depth, of the support length at which restricted-support positivity fails. The present subsection is unaffected by all of this and is the exception for a third reason: its novelty rests on a *citation*, not on a search — it compares a specific published computation with the literal object that computation stands in for, and that computation is named. Nothing in §11.1 is a claim about the Weil functional, about positivity, or about who evaluated what first.

11.2 The price of the restricted-support positivity register

The ceiling this subsection sits under, said before anything else. Weil’s positivity criterion is an *equivalence* of the Riemann Hypothesis, not a reduction of it, exactly as Li’s is. A positivity statement at a finite support length decides nothing; assembling such statements proves nothing; and a measurement of how the cost of that assembly grows with the thing being detected is a statement about a method and never about a zero. **Nothing in this subsection locates, excludes or constrains any zero of any function, nothing in it is progress toward the hypothesis in either direction, and what is reported is a negative with a price attached to it.** The subsection is here because the price is measurable and has not, as far as the search printed below reaches, been measured.

The object. Let F be a Dirichlet series of degree one with a Riemann-type functional equation, conductor q and parity κ , and let Λ_F be its coefficient function, $-F'/F(s) = \sum_{n \geq 2} \Lambda_F(n)n^{-s}$, as in §10.1. For a real even test function φ supported in $[-L/2, L/2]$ write $g = \varphi \star \tilde{\varphi}$, supported in $[-L, L]$, and $h = |\hat{\varphi}|^2 \geq 0$. The Weil explicit-formula functional at support length L is

$$W_F(\varphi) = P_F(\varphi) + A_F(\varphi) - 2 \sum_{2 \leq n \leq e^L} \frac{\Lambda_F(n)}{\sqrt{n}} g(\log n),$$

$$A_F(\varphi) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int h(r) \left[\log \frac{q}{\pi} + \operatorname{Re} \psi \left(\frac{\frac{1}{2} + \kappa + ir}{2} \right) \right] dr,$$

with P_F the pole term — absent when F is entire, as the Davenport–Heilbronn function of §1.3 is — and ψ the digamma function. **Restricting the support makes the arithmetic side a finite sum**, over $n \leq e^L$: the object evaluated is exact, not truncated, and that is the feature the whole subsection turns on. Every term is quadratic in φ , so on N grid points $W_F(\varphi) = \varphi^\top M_F \varphi$ with M_F real symmetric, and positivity at support length L is the statement $\lambda_{\min}(M_F) \geq 0$. The quantity actually read is

$$\mu_F(L) := \min_{\varphi} \frac{W_F(\varphi)}{\langle \varphi, \varphi \rangle_G}, \quad G = I,$$

the norm being pinned so that its condition number is exactly 1. **The sign of μ_F is basis-independent; its magnitude is not, and no magnitude of μ_F is used anywhere in this paper.**

Concession, at first use, and it is mandatory. The criterion is **Weil’s** (1952). The *restricted-support parametrisation* — reading positivity as a function of the support length of the test function, which is the parametrisation of every statement below — is **Yoshida’s** (1992). The qualitative statement that the form is positive definite once the support is small enough is Yoshida’s and **Bombieri’s**. **None of those originals has been obtained first-hand.** Each is cited from secondary sources at a tier no better than a paraphrase — the same posture §1.3 takes towards Davenport–Heilbronn 1936 — and accordingly no numeric threshold is attributed to any of them here, none of them is quoted, and every framing sentence in this subsection should be read as resting on that level of access. The Li-coefficient identities of §11.1 remain Bombieri–Lagarias’s, and the evaluation of this same functional at a certified counterexample is Ismail’s [Is26]; both are conceded again below at the points where they bite.

The t -window, and why this subsection has none. §0 promises every statistic the t -window it was measured on. This one has no t in it. The support length L is the register’s only parameter, the arithmetic side is a finite sum over integers $n \leq e^L$, and no height enters at any stage — **height-uniformity is exactly what this register has and what every other instrument in this paper lacks**, and it is the reason the register is worth measuring at all. What takes the window’s place as a scope statement is the support range, the discretisation ladder and the evidence band, printed next.

Instrument (I4), and four scope pins, two of which exclude readings from evidence. The numbers below come from the fourth instrument of §1.4. With them travel:

1. **The evidence band begins at $L = \log 2 = 0.693147$.** Below that the arithmetic sum is empty — there is no prime with $\log p < \log 2$ — so the form is pole-plus-archimedean and non-negative *by construction*, for every F alike. **Every reading at $L < \log 2$ is therefore a disclosure and is excluded from evidence:** it cannot fail, so it cannot serve as a control. The second prime enters at $\log 3 = 1.098612$.
2. **The dependence on L is not a discretisation convergence.** $\lambda_{\min}(M_F)$ is genuinely a function of L and is not an approximation to an $L = \infty$ limit; reading it as one would conflate two registers. The convergence that *is* a convergence is the one in the grid size N , and it is laddered separately.
3. **A rung whose reading falls past working precision is reported unresolved, never as a small positive number.** A value read against a floor cannot distinguish *converged and small* from *decaying to zero*; only the exponent in N can, and it costs an extra rung.
4. **The instrument was corrected during this work and the corrected values are the ones printed.** An indexing defect built the arithmetic block of M_F at exactly twice its

correct size, which voided every eigenvalue in two earlier tables of this programme; those tables are withdrawn, the assembly was rebuilt, and an independent second implementation reproduces the rebuilt values to 1.1×10^{-14} . This is stated here for the same reason §§4.1, 6.1, 8.5 and 9.5 state their own corrections in the main text.

What is measured. Two constructions with certified off-line zeros, and ζ as a control:

object	certified off-line zeros	reading
ζ (control — a finite non-negative reading is not evidence about any zero, §11.2's <i>Not claimed</i> list)	none known	$\mu(L) \geq 0$ at every rung of $L \in [0.8, 8.0]$
the Davenport–Heilbronn function f of §1.3	193 certified quartets, depths $\delta = \beta - \frac{1}{2}$ spanning $[0.0159, 0.3978]$	sign change at $L_c \in [3.67539, 3.67656]$, i.e. $L_c = 3.67598$
f_2 , a second period-five Dirichlet series of conductor 5, satisfying a Riemann-type functional equation and carrying no Euler product — defined in full immediately below this table; an earlier version used this row's description as the object's only specification	23 certified off-line zeros, largest real part $\beta = 2.3455$, all at $t \leq 400$	sign change at $L_c = 1.12205$, bracketed in $[1.12125, 1.12250]$

The second construction, defined at the same level of completeness as f (§1.3). With $\xi = 0.284079 \dots$ the Davenport–Heilbronn parameter of §1.3, let f_2 be the periodic Dirichlet series of period 5 with coefficient tuple

$$(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, a_5) = (1, -\frac{1}{\xi}, +\frac{1}{\xi}, -1, 0),$$

$$f_2(s) = \sum_{n \geq 1} a_n n^{-s} = 5^{-s} \left(\zeta(s, \frac{1}{5}) - \frac{1}{\xi} \zeta(s, \frac{2}{5}) + \frac{1}{\xi} \zeta(s, \frac{3}{5}) - \zeta(s, \frac{4}{5}) \right).$$

The tuple is again real, supported on residues prime to 5, with $a_{5-n} = -a_n$, so f_2 decomposes over the two odd characters modulo 5 exactly as f does in §1.3, with different constants $c_{\pm}$, and carries no Euler product of its own. The requirement that a real tuple of this antisymmetric form satisfy a Riemann-type functional equation of conductor 5 has exactly two real solutions in the parameter — the Davenport–Heilbronn value ξ and $-1/\xi$; f is the first branch and f_2 is the second, and the check is the same finite linear algebra that produces the decomposition. **The construction is not new here and is not this programme's:** it is in print as eq. (8), in §4, p. 2048, of Balanzario–Sánchez-Ortiz [BSO07] (§13's two locators into the same paper — eq. (5)/Thm 1/§3 — are for the deformation family and the two-endpoint display, different objects) — the same paper to which §13 already concedes the two-endpoint family display — together with a selective published list of its zeros with $\sigma > 1$. What is first-party here is the certified list the table row uses: 23 zeros, every one with $\beta > 1$ (smallest 1.0562), largest $\beta = 2.3455$ at $t = 99.861$, all at $t \leq 400$. The deposited list stores double-precision coordinates and, per entry, the residual at that entry's internally refined point (columns $(\sigma, t, |f_2|)$): the recorded residuals satisfy $|f_2| \leq 8.51 \times 10^{-26}$, with 19 of the 23 below 10^{-30} . As with the ledger of §1.3, the recorded residual certifies the refinement and not the stored pair: direct evaluation at the stored coordinates returns 1.8×10^{-16} to 4.1×10^{-14} , the double-coordinate cap. Every stored point Newton-refines to a genuine zero of the series displayed above —

maximum refined residual 5.1×10^{-39} , maximum refinement move 2.6×10^{-14} , 23 of 23 — measured for this version with an evaluator built directly on the Hurwitz-zeta form above and independent of every producing instrument. Instrument (I2) — the independence claimed is of provenance (the evaluator shares nothing with the run that produced the stored list), not of class: it is an arbitrary-precision probe inside (I2)’s declared 20–60-digit range, and (I2)’s §1.4 use list (“counterexample and positivity computations of §§9–11”) covers it; an earlier version left these six figures keyless behind the independence sentence. The list itself is a banked artefact of the programme’s earlier work. Both off-line-zero lists — this one and the 193-quartet Davenport–Heilbronn ledger of §1.3 — are included in the deposit (§0), as is instrument (I4).

Both crossings are bracketed by bisection to 0.0012 in L ; the ladder runs to $N = 4096$, and to $N = 8192$ where a reading was contested. **The two reported L_c are not the same kind of number and are distinguished here rather than left to be assumed:** 3.67598 is the midpoint of its bracket [3.67539, 3.67656], whereas 1.12205 is the banked reading of §0 — the value carried from the instrument’s own converged run — which the bisection bracket [1.12125, 1.12250] contains but does not equal, that bracket’s midpoint being 1.121875. Nothing below changes materially if that midpoint is used instead: the exponent moves by 8.9×10^{-5} , to 0.680091 on the ratio of record 5.7264 (an earlier version printed “ 9.5×10^{-5} , to 0.680097”, which reproduces on neither rounding convention; the recomputed figures are these), well inside the sensitivity printed with it below. **A structural asymmetry of the two anchors is stated here rather than left to be noticed: at the lower anchor $e^{L_c} = 3.071$, so the arithmetic block’s range $2 \leq n \leq e^L$ contains exactly two integers ($n = 2, 3$) and the crossing sits only 0.023 above the $\log 3 = 1.0986$ threshold at which the second term switches on, while at the upper anchor $e^{L_c} = 39.49$ the range contains thirty-eight. The lower crossing’s location is therefore governed by the support ladder’s step at $\log 3$ as much as by the construction’s off-line depth — a scope fact of the same standing as the depth-population caveat printed below. No firstness whatever is claimed for these three readings.** An evaluation of this same functional, built from the Davenport–Heilbronn coefficients and measured at that function’s genuine off-line zeros against a ζ control, is in public print — Ismail [Is26], located by the search recorded below and read first-hand — and nothing here is claimed against it. What *is* offered is the object that source does not contain, and it is the next display.

The depth that enters the law is *not* the largest certified depth in the table above, and the definition is given in full before the law is stated. Reading “the off-line depth driving the crossing” as each construction’s maximum certified depth would give 1.8455 and 0.3978, ratio 4.6393, and a different exponent; that reading is wrong, and it is named here because the table invites it. What the law uses is a *weighted* depth, defined as follows. Fix a construction and evaluate at its own crossing $L = L_c$. Let φ be the minimising test function of the generalised eigenproblem there, $\hat{\varphi}$ its Fourier transform, and let $\rho = \beta + i\gamma$ run over that construction’s banked certified off-line zeros, with $\delta_\rho = \beta - \frac{1}{2}$. The zero side of the Weil form splits over those zeros as one real contribution apiece,

$$C(\rho) := 4 \operatorname{Re}[\hat{\varphi}(\gamma - i\delta_\rho)^2],$$

and the **driving depth** is the $|C|$ -weighted mean of δ_ρ taken over the **negative** contributions only:

$$\delta_{\text{drive}} := \frac{\sum_{C(\rho) < 0} |C(\rho)| \delta_\rho}{\sum_{C(\rho) < 0} |C(\rho)|}.$$

It is the depth that is actually pushing the form negative at the crossing, weighted by how hard each zero pushes — a measured quantity, and deliberately not the $\delta_{\max}$ proxy, because the weight $|C|$ falls off exponentially in δL and the maximum is not where the mass is. **Scope, binding:** each

attribution runs over that construction's own banked off-line list on a finite window — $t \leq 4000$ for the Davenport–Heilbronn ledger, $t \leq 400$ for the second construction's list (an earlier version said “ $t \leq 4000$ in both cases”, which is true only as a common upper bound; the pin is now exact per list) — and every statement below is a statement about those two lists and nothing more.

Measured. $\delta_{\text{drive}} = 1.76215$ for the second period-five construction and 0.30773 for the Davenport–Heilbronn function; the ratio of record is 5.7264 . **The rounding provenance is printed because a reader will redo the quotient:** the two five-decimal values just given divide to 5.72629 , a rounding difference in the inputs, and the exponent below is 0.680002 on the ratio of record against 0.680010 on the printed five-decimal pair — the same 0.6800 either way, and nothing downstream distinguishes them. **The driving depth is stable in L , which is what makes it a property of the construction rather than of the test function:** read at the crossing and again at three further support lengths within each construction, the readings agree to better than 3% — they span 1.714 – 1.789 for f_2 and 0.3077 – 0.3085 for the Davenport–Heilbronn function, i.e. deviations of at most 2.5% and 0.2% about their means (*an earlier version wrote “the first” and “the second” here in the opposite sense to the table above, and the caveat below did the same; the ordinals are gone*).

A stated caveat on the two depth populations, printed at the law rather than after it. The two lists are not like with like in β : the list behind $\delta_{\text{drive}} = 1.76215$ carries no depth below 0.5562 — every one of its zeros has $\beta > 1$, the smallest being $\beta = 1.0562$ (an earlier version said “no depth below 0.49 ”, a stale bound loose by an unexplained margin against the list it describes) — while the Davenport–Heilbronn list is the 193 strip quartets with $\delta \in [0.0159, 0.3978]$ and no $\sigma > 1$ zero at all. **The two populations are therefore complementary in β , not comparable:** whatever shallow off-line zeros the first construction may have, none is on the list its driving depth was computed from, and the comparison between the two depths is a comparison between one deep population and one shallow one. **The omission is bounded rather than argued:** injecting synthetic shallow zeros at $\delta \sim U(0.01, 0.50)$ into f_2 's list moves δ_{drive} by -0.01% at 193 injected zeros and by -0.58% at 10,000 — twenty-six times the 386-member Davenport–Heilbronn strip population (an earlier version said “twenty times the comparable strip count”, naming no denominator; $10,000/386 = 25.9$) — because the $|C|$ -weighting is exponential in δL and the deep population dominates by about three orders. It is a real specification defect with a measured and negligible numerical consequence, and it is printed as both.

The two-point law, and the exponent — “law” in the interpolation sense only: two anchor constructions, disjoint in depth, fix the two parameters exactly, and the caveat paragraph above and the extrapolation caveat below bound what that supports. The support length at which restricted-support positivity fails scales with the driving depth as

$$L_c \approx c \delta_{\text{drive}}^{-\alpha}, \quad \alpha = 0.6800, \quad c = 1.6494$$

Two measured pairs determine two parameters exactly, so there is no residual and no consistency check to be had, and none is offered. What is checkable is the definition above, the stability just printed, and the exclusion of $\alpha = 1$ at item 3, which does not use the fitted exponent at all. **The recipe is printed in full so that the arithmetic can be redone without any further document, and it was redone for this version** — this arithmetic is the tenth of the single-session statements flagged in §0 and §1.4, flagged here at its site as promised there.

1. *The exponent, from the two measured pairs.* With the two crossing lengths 1.12205 and 3.67598 and the two driving depths in the ratio 5.7264 ,

$$\alpha = \frac{\log(3.67598/1.12205)}{\log 5.7264} = \frac{\log 3.276129}{\log 5.7264} = \frac{1.186662}{1.745087} = 0.680002.$$

The value of record is $\alpha = 0.6800$ and it is an *exact two-point determination*, not a fit with a residual: there is no error bar on it in the statistical sense, and an earlier version printed one (± 0.0001). What can be propagated is arithmetic sensitivity, and it is printed instead of a bar: carrying the two bisection brackets $[1.12125, 1.12250]$ and $[3.67539, 3.67656]$ through the same quotient, on the ratio of record 5.7264, moves α over $[0.67968, 0.68050]$, i.e. by $\pm 4 \times 10^{-4}$ — four times wider than the withdrawn bar — and the depth ratio’s own rounding contributes a further 10^{-5} (on the five-decimal quotient 5.72629 the same bracket reads $[0.67969, 0.68051]$; an earlier version printed that variant here while using the ratio of record two paragraphs earlier, a silent convention switch, pinned now to the ratio of record throughout).

2. *The prefactor.* $c = L_c \delta_{\text{drive}}^\alpha$ is one constant common to both pairs, and its value of record is $c = 1.6494$. Evaluated at $\alpha = 0.680002$ the two pairs give 1.649384 (the f_2 pair) and 1.649406 (the Davenport–Heilbronn pair, at its bracket-midpoint crossing 3.67598), agreeing to 1.3×10^{-5} relative; at the exponent that the two pairs determine exactly they agree identically. **That agreement is forced by the construction and is not evidence of anything:** with α fitted from the ratio of the same two pairs, c is the same number twice up to rounding. *An earlier version presented that agreement as an internal-consistency check “checkable from the printed numbers alone” and reported it at 5×10^{-6} . The quantity it exhibited is independent of c — the prefactor cancels identically from the ratio it forms — so it tested nothing, and the claim is withdrawn rather than defended.*
3. *The exclusion of $\alpha = 1$, which is a genuine test and is the one place a measurement can fail.* At $\alpha = 1$ the same depth ratio would force the second crossing at $1.12205 \times 5.7264 = 6.4253$. The Davenport–Heilbronn form is instead resolved **negative** at $L = 3.67656$, the upper end of its own bisection bracket — a factor 1.748 below what $\alpha = 1$ requires — and resolved **positive** at the lower end 3.67539. The exclusion therefore rests on a directly measured sign at a support length far below the required one, and not on the fitted exponent; it is two-sided in that the crossing is bracketed on both sides rather than bounded from one. *An earlier version reported this as “ $\alpha = 1$ excluded two-sidedly by 75%”, which reads as a confidence statement; it is not one, and the arithmetic above is what is meant.*
4. *The cost.* The arithmetic side of W_F carries e^{L_c} terms. At $\delta_{\text{drive}} = 4.4 \times 10^{-6}$ — **a scale illustration, not a derived quantity: an earlier version glossed this depth as “the off-line depth a direct search already resolves at height 10^9 working at radius 10^{-10} ”, but no instrument or window in this paper produces that figure (§9.2’s screened reach reports a normalised gap and a curvature floor, not an off-line depth resolution), so the gloss is withdrawn and the depth is carried as what it is: a depth of the order at which a modern direct search operates, chosen to price the route, with nothing downstream depending on its exact value —**

$$\begin{aligned}\delta_{\text{drive}}^{-0.6800} &= 4389.87526, \\ L_c &= 1.6494 \times 4389.87526 = 7240.66, \\ \log_{10} e^{L_c} &= \frac{7240.66}{\log 10} = 3144.6,\end{aligned}$$

i.e. about 10^{3145} terms. *(An earlier version rounded the display’s first factor to 4389.88 and printed the product of the rounded factor, 7240.67; the display now carries the unrounded factor*

and its product, per this paper's own rounding-provenance practice — nothing downstream moves, and both readings give 3144.6.) Carrying the bracket-induced sensitivity of item 1 through, $\alpha = 0.6800 \pm 0.0004$ gives L_c between 7205.0 and 7276.5 and a term count between 10^{3129} and 10^{3160} . **The width of that interval is not the point and is not claimed to be:** at the tightest reading and at the loosest the answer is the same answer, and the caveat below says what that answer is worth.

The extrapolation caveat, which is part of the claim and not a footnote. The law is *fitted* at driving depths of order 10^{-1} and 10^0 — for scale, the smallest certified off-line depth anywhere on the ledger of §1.3 is 1.59×10^{-2} — and it is *evaluated* at $\delta_{\text{drive}} = 4.4 \times 10^{-6}$ — 4.8 and 5.6 orders of magnitude below the two fitted depths 0.30773 and 1.76215, and 3.6 orders below the ledger minimum just quoted. (An earlier version said “four to five orders”, which is roughly right against the fitted depths and wrong against the ledger minimum cited beside it for scale; the three baselines are now each named with their own distance.) **The figure 10^{3145} is therefore an extrapolation of a fitted power law and not a measurement.** Nothing here establishes that the law continues to hold at that depth; the ± 0.0004 sensitivity is arithmetic sensitivity inside the fitted range, not a bar on the extrapolation; and the two-point character of the fit is itself a limitation, since two pairs determine a line through two points and cannot test its shape. What the extrapolation supports is a statement about orders of magnitude and about a direction — the cost is stretched-exponential in $1/\delta$, and no revision of α inside or near its measured bar brings the term count within reach of any computation — and it is claimed at exactly that strength and no more.

A correction of record, printed here rather than in an erratum. An earlier reading of this exponent gave an interval of width 0.37 instead of the pinned value above; it was obtained by reading a converged positive gap as an approach to a crossing, which is the failure mode scope pin 3 exists to prevent, and the two-sided exclusion of $\alpha = 1$ replaces an earlier one-sided argument. **The cost figures computed from that superseded interval spanned some sixty orders of magnitude at the depth used here, they are not reproducible from the corrected exponent by the recipe above, and they are withdrawn and reprinted nowhere in this paper.** The figures of record are the ones in the display above.

The literature search behind this subsection, printed in full rather than summarised — including the place where it failed. Two absence questions stand behind the material above. Each is filed as a search of stated breadth; **an absence from a search certifies the search and never the literature**, which is this paper's standing posture (§3.5).

Search A — had the Weil functional previously been evaluated on a literal Riemann-Hypothesis-violating element of the extended Selberg class, as opposed to a synthetic injection of off-line zeros into an otherwise compliant zero set? Surfaces: a general web search engine; direct retrieval of preprints from the arXiv; and, at the final pass, direct retrieval from a public data repository. Queries, verbatim.

Run of 29 July 2026:

1. Davenport-Heilbronn function Weil explicit formula positivity violation
2. Weil explicit formula Davenport-Heilbronn function numerical test positivity fails counterexample
3. "Selberg class" OR "Davenport-Heilbronn" "Weil functional" OR "Weil quadratic form" eigenvalue negative numerical

Run of 30 July 2026:

4. Weil explicit formula quadratic form evaluated Davenport-Heilbronn counterexample numerical
5. Weil positivity criterion tested RH-violating Selberg class element negative eigenvalue
6. site:arxiv.org "Davenport-Heilbronn" "Weil" positivity quadratic form negative

Run of 1 August 2026:

7. Weil explicit formula positivity criterion evaluated counterexample "Davenport-Heilbronn" zeta function violating Riemann hypothesis test function positivity fails

Run of 3 August 2026:

8. "Off-Line Zeros of the Riemann xi-Function" "Lifetime-Deficit Dictionary" Weil Positivity
9. "Lifetime-Deficit Dictionary for Weil Positivity" "Interference-Channel Negative Control"
10. "Off-Line Zeros of the Riemann xi-Function" "Constraint Network" "Frozen-Field Bounds" arxiv
11. "supply-envelope calibration" "Davenport-Heilbronn" Weil positivity "resonance demand"
12. Weil explicit formula quadratic form evaluated Davenport-Heilbronn counterexample numerical positivity
13. "Davenport-Heilbronn" Weil quadratic form negative eigenvalue numerical computation off-line zero test function

Outcome: Search A did not fail, and its negative result governs what is and is not printed above. Ismail [Is26] performs exactly that evaluation: it builds the Weil form with the Davenport–Heilbronn coefficients, deletes the pole term (that function being entire), replaces the archimedean density accordingly, and measures the resulting quadratic form negative at both of that function’s genuine off-line zeros against a ζ control that stays positive, confirming the same statement spectrally as a Morse index moving from 0 to 2. The document was reached only after a direct fetch of one copy was refused, by way of the repository holding the deposit, and was then validated and read first-hand. **Consequently no first-of-kind claim about evaluating this functional at a certified counterexample appears anywhere in this paper**, and the class-detection reading and the comparison of positivity-margin magnitudes across objects, which this programme also produced, are omitted from it entirely. Two false-friend hazards were recorded en route and are printed because they will cost the next searcher the same time: the string “Davenport–Heilbronn” collides with the Davenport–Heilbronn theorem of algebraic number theory, and query 9’s phrases collide with established usages in clinical psychology and in epidemiology.

Search B — has any numeric support length at which restricted-support positivity ceases to be provable been published? This is the absence question the exponent above depends on: it is why $\alpha = 0.6800$ has nothing in print to be compared against. Surfaces as above. Queries, verbatim.

Run of 29 July 2026:

1. Bombieri "Remarks on Weil's quadratic functional in the theory of prime numbers"
2. Weil explicit formula positivity criterion Riemann hypothesis restricted support test function
3. Bombieri Rendiconti Lincei 2000 "Weil's quadratic functional" full text pdf download
4. Bombieri "Weil's quadratic functional" pdf full text IAS home page
5. "Bombieri" "quadratic functional" theorem "positive definite" support interval statement cite
6. "Yoshida" 1992 "explicit formula" positivity paper title journal Weil

Run of 30 July 2026:

7. "Weil's criterion" numeric support length threshold positivity provable crossover
8. "restricted support" Weil positivity "provable" beyond fails threshold numeric length
9. Bombieri Yoshida Weil quadratic functional explicit numeric bound sufficiently small support

Run of 3 August 2026:

10. Weil positivity criterion tested on RH-violating Selberg class element numerical sign change support length
11. the arXiv abstract page of the 2026 preprint *High-Precision Approximation of Riemann Zeros via the Truncated Weil Form* — fetched as an abstract only, therefore not read at any usable tier, and not used
12. Bucur Ernvall-Hytonen Odzak Smajlovic Li coefficients functions violating Riemann hypothesis Davenport-Heilbronn
13. "restricted support" Weil positivity explicit formula largest support length positivity provable fails numeric threshold Bombieri Yoshida
14. critical support length Weil quadratic form positivity breaks scaling with off-line zero depth power law exponent numerical

Outcome: nothing located, on that breadth. Every characterisation returned is the qualitative one — the form is positive definite provided the support interval is small enough — with no number ever attached to “small enough”. The search additionally survived first-hand contact with the one document Search A located, which is the document a referee is most likely to raise against it: [Is26] fixes its prime cutoff and sweeps a Gaussian window width and a spectral window, and it has no support length, no crossing length L_c , and no scaling of a positivity-failure length in off-line depth; the single exponent it does report belongs to a different object. **The**

breadth explicitly excludes, every one of them unobtained at any tier better than a secondary source’s paraphrase: Weil 1952; Yoshida 1992; Bombieri’s own text; Li 1997; and Ki–Kim–Lee 2009. As everywhere else in this paper, that certifies a search and not an absence, and a reader who knows of such a number should treat this subsection’s law as having a published counterpart it has failed to find.

What is claimed, exactly, and what is not. *Claimed:* the definition of the driving depth and its measured stability in L ; the exponent $\alpha = 0.6800$ as an exact two-point determination, with the arithmetic sensitivity ± 0.0004 printed beside it rather than a statistical bar; the exclusion of $\alpha = 1$ against a directly measured sign; the two crossing lengths with their brackets; the prefactor $c = 1.6494$, which two pairs fix exactly and against which no consistency check exists; and the cost extrapolation, at the strength the caveat above fixes for it. *Not claimed:* positivity for ζ at any support length in a sense surviving a limit — each non-negative reading above is a finite realisation on a stated grid, at a stated ladder, inside a stated evidence band, and none of them is evidence about any zero; any first evaluation of this functional at a counterexample; anything about the magnitude of μ_F , which is basis-dependent and unused; and anything whatever about the location of any zero of ζ or of any other function. The calibration this register carries certifies detection of a violation *of the shape the counterexamples have*, and nothing else.

The verdict, and it is the same one §11.1 reaches from the other side. Restricted-support Weil positivity is a **structural** register and not a computational one. It is height-uniform, which is what every other instrument in this paper is not; and it charges for that uniformity in support length, at a rate this measurement prices and that the price puts out of reach. Both halves of §11 are therefore negatives, both are priced, and neither is progress toward the Riemann Hypothesis in either direction.

§12. What the author takes all this to mean, said once

This section is interpretation. **It states no result, it is not used anywhere above, and nothing in the paper depends on it.** Two sentences below read as general statements; both are scoped to the constructions of this paper and are marked as such at the point of use, an earlier version having typeset one of them as an unrestricted negative while this paragraph declared the section claim-free.

Read together, the measurements of §§8–10 have a common shape. Every exact object produced above — the reality criterion of §8.9, the winding classifier of §8.6, the axis estimator of §8.7, the mirror split of §8.4, the crop law of §9.1 — is an *equality inherited from the functional equation*. (An earlier version’s list carried a sixth item, the needle identity of §9.6: that identity is class-general and conceded at §13.1, and §9.6 cut its counterexample measurement, so it is removed both from this list and from the measured clauses that follow.) The Davenport–Heilbronn function shares that functional equation and has certified off-line zeros. Consequently, and as measured here rather than merely argued: the winding classifier keeps its genuine off-line zero (§8.6), and the axis estimator reads bracket-contains-origin there (§8.7). (An earlier version added a third clause here, about the close-pair constant, resting on work outside this paper; it is dropped — §0 promises a text complete without any other document.) **No invariant of the kind built in this paper separated ζ from the counterexample at any point tested, and the reason appears to be the one just given: each of them is determined by a symmetry the counterexample also carries.** Read as a general statement, that is close to a tautology — an invariant determined by a symmetry class cannot distinguish two members of the class — and it is offered as one rather than typeset as a discovery. What is *not* tautological, and is what the measurements above supply,

is that every exact construction this paper produced turned out to be of exactly that kind. The one construction in this paper built to separate them — the Euler-product gate of §9.4 — draws on multiplicativity at step one; what separates on the f side is now the analytic pole-versus-entire asymmetry alone, §9.4’s measured stem figures having been withdrawn there under the provenance standard, and it is suggestive rather than decisive.

The hedge comes first, because it is the important half and because a sentence read out of order should be the hedge and not the thesis. What follows is **not established, and the author does not claim it.** It is not a theorem about the space of proofs; it is a description of the shape of one programme’s own failures. A spectral argument, or any argument that is not per-event, bypasses the ledger entirely. Stripped of its instrumentation, what follows is the classical lesson of 1936 — that the functional equation and real coefficients alone cannot force the zeros onto the line, so anything that does must draw on more — restated, quantified, and measured, and the novelty, such as it is, lies in the calibration and not in the conclusion. (An earlier version glossed the lesson as “a proof of the Riemann Hypothesis must use the Euler product”, which is stronger than the 1936 theorem: Davenport–Heilbronn exhibit what the functional equation cannot do, not what a proof must use.) **Nothing in this paper is evidence for or against the Riemann Hypothesis in either direction.**

With that said first: the natural extrapolation is a thesis about what the constructions in this paper were missing — that the missing object is not merely “multiplicativity-aware” but an *inequality carried by the positivity of local data*, per event and class-separating; and that the two classically available objects of that shape — the zero-free region, and Lemma 8 above — both stall. **The author’s reading is that closing either stall would require an input of a kind neither construction supplies; that reading is a description of where two attempts ran out and is not a proved equivalence, no such equivalence is established anywhere in this paper, and it should not be read as one.**

§13. Positioning: what this programme reached independently, and who reached it first

The list below is long on purpose. Every object in it was arrived at independently in the course of this work and every one of them turned out to be somebody else’s; each was conceded in writing at the time, and none of them is claimed anywhere in this paper. The author’s reason for printing the whole list rather than a summary is practical: it tells a referee exactly what has already been checked, and it removes the cheapest reason to reject.

An empirical note that the author regards as the most useful sentence in this section. Of the concessions below, **not one came from a search that returned a hit.** Every single one came from re-reading a source that was already in hand — in several cases a source cited elsewhere in the same document for a different statement, and twice from the same chapter of the same book. Two objects were lost inside one chapter of Titchmarsh on a first pass and recovered only on a third. This is why §§3.5 and 6.2 name the unread sources rather than asserting an absence, and why §2 declines to claim priority for Theorem 1 at all.

13.1 Conceded objects

Object	Owner
Leading term of the general- s Riemann–Siegel remainder	Siegel 1932; Gabcke 1979; Arias de Reyna 2011
Mean a -point displacement law $0.564\sqrt{\log \log t}$, growing	Selberg; Tsang
Displacement sum rule at $k = 1$; the $2^s(\zeta - 1)$ normalisation	Selberg route; Steuding; Garunkštis–Steuding
Left-heaviness of the displacement law under RH	classical; Selberg’s $3/4$ – $1/4$
Coil step angle and length; asymptotic circle; integer index at zeros; the ζ -free centre-estimate concept	Nickel 2013; Reglade 2019 Thm 2.2; the curlicue literature; Signerska-Rynkowska
First-order closed-form ζ -free axis estimator	Reglade 2019 Thm 2.3 / eq. (44) — it <i>is</i> the leading Euler–Maclaurin tail correction
Rectangle counting; the Turing method; quadrant/tangent tests; the Lehmer graze; Speiser sheets; the pendant	Backlund; Titchmarsh; Turing; Garunkštis–Steuding; Lehmer; Speiser; Nickel
Window-budget parity as folklore	Booker 2006
Reflection $\Rightarrow$ reality; conjugate-region symmetry in one spiral	standard; Nickel 2015
First census of $\arg \zeta'(\frac{1}{2} + i\gamma)$ and its non-uniformity	Stopple 2020, 5×10^6 zeros
Denseness; the limiting value-distribution measure and its density; universality	Bohr–Courant 1914; Bohr–Jessen 1930/32; Jessen–Wintner 1935; Voronin 1975
Lehmer pairs; the closest observed pair; $\pi/4$; $\min \zeta' \sim T^{-1/3}$; the distribution of $\log \zeta' $	Lehmer 1956; van de Lune–te Riele–Winter 1986; Dueñez–Farmer et al. 2010 / Stopple; Gonek (via Ng 2008); Hejhal 1989
Zero-gap hyperuniformity as a phenomenon; below-GUE variance saturation	Torquato 2018, §9; Berry 1988; Lugar–Milinovich–Quesada–Herrera 2022
$\inf_t \zeta(\sigma + it) = \zeta(2\sigma)/\zeta(\sigma)$ for $\sigma > 1$	Titchmarsh, ch. VIII
Speiser’s criterion; the rigorous direction; $N_1^- = N^- + O(\log T)$; the local count equality for the extended class, including Davenport–Heilbronn	Speiser 1935; Spira; Levinson–Montgomery 1974; Garunkštis(–Šimėnas) 2019
Existence of Davenport–Heilbronn off-line zeros; the 34 published ones (4 in Spira 1994 + 30 new in Balanzario–Sánchez-Ortiz 2007, all for f itself — the <i>fifteen</i> $\sigma > 1$ zeros §14’s [BSO07] row records are that paper’s list for the <i>second</i> construction f_2 , a different series, and the two counts do not add)	Davenport–Heilbronn 1936; Spira 1994; Balanzario–Sánchez-Ortiz 2007
The Landau / explicit-formula resonance register over the full zero set	Landau 1911/12; Gonek; Fujii; Kaczorowski–Languasco–Perelli 2000
The heat-kernel explicit formula; completeness certification in print	Riemann–von Mangoldt/Weil; Turing 1953; Büthe 2015
The seam expansion as Laurent bookkeeping; the closed form at the seam; the α -register identity	Kawalec 2026 [Kw26] (preprint, unrefereed)
The singularity skeleton of $P(s)$	Glaisher 1891; Landau–Walfisz 1920; Fröberg 1968

Object	Owner
Two-constituent decomposition with the anti-alignment device; $\sigma > 1$ zeros forced without an Euler product; $\sigma^* = 2.3822861089\dots$	Davenport–Heilbronn 1936; Cassels 1961; Gonek 1981; Bombieri–Mueller 2008; Bombieri–Ghosh 2011; Booker–Thorne 2014; Righetti 2016 [Ri16] and Righetti 2017
The mean-motion engine behind the crossing theorem of §10.3	Bohl–Weyl–Bohr; Jessen–Tornehave 1945; Borchsenius–Jessen 1948
The $\sigma > 1$ value region and its sharp radii	Bohr–Jessen; Titchmarsh; Apostol; Kershner 1936
Cramér’s zero-built dual and its prime-power poles	Cramér 1919; Kaczorowski–Languasco–Perelli
The needle’s mechanism, $\arg f'(\rho_n) - \pi S_f(\gamma_n) \equiv \text{const}$ $\text{Re}(F'/F)(\frac{1}{2} + iT) = -\frac{1}{2} \log(qT/2\pi) + O(1/T^2)$ on the line $\xi_{DH} = \tan \alpha$; the trichotomy theorems for the extended class	functional-equation-mechanical and class-general (§9.6) Garunkštis(–Šimėnas) 2019 classical; Kaczorowski–Perelli; Kaczorowski–Kulas; Garunkštis–Šimėnas
The convex functional-equation-preserving family $f_\tau = (1 - \tau)f_0 + \tau f_1$, zero persistence, collision before departure	Balanzario–Sánchez-Ortiz 2007, eq. (5), Thm 1, §3
The zero-velocity ODE $\partial \rho / \partial \tau = -(\partial f / \partial \tau) / (\partial f / \partial \rho)$ and the argument that the real part is stationary	Garunkštis–Šimėnas 2015; Balanzario–Sánchez-Ortiz
Non-negative trigonometric-polynomial optimisation for the zero-free constant $A = \sum_{n \geq 2} (\mu(n)/n) \log \zeta(n) = M - \gamma$ as an identity	Rosser–Schoenfeld $\rightarrow$ Ford $\rightarrow$ Mossinghoff–Trudgian
The three-distance interleaving pattern	classical Meissel–Mertens
Large-deviation treatment of ζ ’s value distribution as a register	classical Hattori–Matsumoto; Lamzouri
$\lambda_n = \sum_{\rho} [1 - (1 - 1/\rho)^n]$; $ 1 - 1/\rho ^2 = 1 - (2\beta - 1)/ \rho ^2$	Bombieri–Lagarias 1999
The precedent of a Li-type test on Davenport–Heilbronn	Voros
The positivity criterion of §11.2	Weil 1952
The restricted-support parametrisation of that criterion — positivity read as a function of the support length of the test function — and the qualitative statement that the form is positive definite once the support is small enough	Yoshida 1992; Bombieri, <i>Remarks on Weil’s quadratic functional in the theory of prime numbers</i>
Evaluation of the Weil quadratic form built from the Davenport–Heilbronn coefficients, at that function’s genuine off-line zeros, with a ζ control and a spectral (Morse-index) confirmation	Ismail [Is26]
$\Lambda \geq 0$ unconditionally $\zeta(s + it_k) \rightarrow \zeta(2s)/\zeta(s)$ along a Kronecker sequence with $p^{-it_k} \rightarrow -1$	Rodgers–Tao 2020 Arias de Reyna–van de Lune 2012
The head bound $\sigma_0 = 1.7286$	Spira 1966 $\rightarrow$ Borwein–Fee–Ferguson–van der Waal 2007
Linear growth of the tail boundary	Spira 1976
The two-arm reading of the Riemann–Siegel formula	Berry 2013; Berry–Keating 1999

Object	Owner
The Wronskian collision criterion	Dyakonov 2013 (folklore, in his own words)
The three-vector state	Nickel 2013/2015; Kapitonets 2019
The packet step law, block = $ \chi \cdot m^{s-1}$	Titchmarsh §4.12 (1951) ← van der Corput, Math. Ann. 87 (1922), Satz 1, p. 43
Theorem 1's main term χP_k : the approximate functional equation at bounded dual length	[T86] §4.12, p. 78 (Hardy–Littlewood; Siegel), Thm 4.15 admitting bounded y ; independently [FL22] ch. 5, all orders, in a non-overlapping range [OS22] Thm 2.1, whose $\lambda \geq 1$ hypothesis contains this paper's regime; anticipated by Siegel 1932 §4 per that source
Theorem 1's error at a <i>sharp</i> cutoff, and a closed form for the oscillating factor as a Mordell integral of the two fractional parts	Nickel 2015 §7
The chain of local centres, one per block	Nickel 2013 §5 and 2015 §5
$ \chi = 1$ only at $\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$, as an amplitude statement	Nickel 2015 §11 and 2013
The condition-count argument — the frame the whole obstruction reading rests on	Conclusions, with his own statement that he cannot close it classical (Bohr; Bohr–Bohnenblust–Hille); it carries no proper name and none should be attached to it
$\sigma = \frac{1}{2}$ as the $\mathcal{H}^2$ abscissa for Dirichlet series	Titchmarsh §11.6, p. 300, 1951 first edition (verified at the page image); Arias de Reyna–Brent–van de Lune as owners of the curve <i>as a study</i> ; σ^{**} is van de Lune 1983
The arcsine curve $W(\sigma) = \sum_p \arcsin p^{-\sigma}$ as one object; $\sigma^{**} = 1.192347$	

13.2 Five further findings, treated as concessions

These were located in print late and their formal disposition was left open; the author treats all five as conceded, which is the conservative reading.

#	What is in print	Where	What it reaches
1	Davenport–Heilbronn's $\sigma > 1$ existence theorem quoted for “a real number $\alpha > 0$ ” with no upper restriction, so integer $\alpha = k + 1 \geq 3$ may sit inside it	Chatterjee–Gun, arXiv:1407.8319	The statement that the zero distribution of $\zeta(w, \alpha)$ at integer $\alpha \geq 3$ is unstudied. That statement is therefore not made in this paper , and the settling act — reading Davenport–Heilbronn 1936 itself — has not been performed

#	What is in print	Where	What it reaches
2	The specific one-parameter family with ζ at one endpoint, verbatim: $f(s, \tau) = (1-\tau)(1+\sqrt{5}\cdot 5^{-s})\zeta(s) + \tau L(s, \psi)$, $\psi \bmod 5$, $\psi(2) = -1$ (the even quadratic character — a different character from §1.3’s odd ψ ; §8.6’s register separates the two)	Garunkštis–Šimėnas 2015 §2; Garunkštis 2019; and Balanzario–Sánchez-Ortiz 2007 §3 prints both endpoints on one page	A construction this programme had reserved as its own
3	The Speiser-witness-at-the-collision reading, with the derivative-zero trajectory printed and its sides specified	Garunkštis–Šimėnas 2015 §2; the collision-forced-by-the-functional-equation argument re-dated to Balanzario–Sánchez-Ortiz 2007 §3	Narrows §9.7 to the locality constant alone, which is what §9.7 claims
4	“Dubickas et al., Lemma 8”, cited by Garunkštis–Šimėnas for the persistence step	Garunkštis–Šimėnas 2015 §2	An antecedent the author has not examined
5	The three-vector state verbatim, with the isosceles/general-triangle magnitude condition	Kapitonets 2019 §2.9, eqs. (67)–(68), (90)–(92), read first-hand	The three-vector state, already conceded above

13.3 Two objects this paper deliberately does not contain

The Riemann–Siegel $-\sigma/2$ law. The programme measured, before identifying it, that the general- s Riemann–Siegel remainder obeys $|R(s)| = (t/2\pi)^{-\sigma/2} F(p)(1 + o(1))$ with $p = \{\sqrt{t/2\pi}\}$ and F bounded, oscillating and σ -independent. It is the leading term of the classical expansion ([Si32]; [Ga79]; [AdR11], in whose formulation the leading coefficient is σ -independent by construction). It is the most beautiful measurement in this work and it is somebody else’s result, so it is not in this paper at all.

An explicit form for Φ_k . A functional form for Theorem 1’s oscillating factor has been stated as a target elsewhere in this programme and has never been proved here. It is not used anywhere above, nothing in this paper depends on it, and it is mentioned here for two reasons: so that no reader mistakes §8.2 for it — §8.2 identifies a mechanism and reports a fit, and that is all it does — and so that the located prior is named in the same breath. **At a single sharp cutoff a closed form is already in print**, as a normalised Mordell integral of $\{\alpha\}$ and $\{\beta\}$ ([OS22], Thm 2.1), in a regime that contains this paper’s. Nothing here improves on it, competes with it, or is claimed against it.

§14. References

[AdR11] J. Arias de Reyna, *High precision computation of Riemann’s zeta function by the Riemann–Siegel formula, I*, Math. Comp. **80** (2011), no. 274, 995–1009.

[AdRBvdL] J. Arias de Reyna, R. P. Brent, J. van de Lune, *A note on the real part of the Riemann zeta-function*, arXiv:1112.4910. *The title is corrected here against the title page of the copy actually read: arXiv:1112.4910 is “A note on the real part...”, while “On the sign of the real part...” — the title an earlier version of this entry printed against this identifier — is the same three authors’ companion paper, arXiv:1205.4423, which is a different work and is not used here.*

The object §10.2 and §13.1 concede to this entry, the arcsine curve W with its prime-zeta expansion and its convexity, is in §§1–2 of arXiv:1112.4910.

[AdRvdL12] J. Arias de Reyna, J. van de Lune, *Some bounds and limits in the theory of Riemann’s zeta function*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **396** (2012), 199–214; arXiv:1107.5134. *An earlier version of this entry carried the title “On the exact location of the non-trivial zeros of Riemann’s zeta function”, which matches no paper the author can locate; the entry above is the 2012 Arias de Reyna–van de Lune paper actually held, and it is the one behind the §13.1 concession.*

[BSO07] E. P. Balanzario, J. Sánchez-Ortiz, *Zeros of the Davenport–Heilbronn counterexample*, Math. Comp. **76** (2007), 2045–2049.

[BEOS] A. Bucur, A.-M. Ernvall-Hytönen, A. Odžak, L. Smajlović, *Variants of the Li-type criteria for the GRH. Bibliographically incomplete, and printed incomplete rather than guessed*, on the same footing as [Me]: the work was located, as a Springer chapter, by the literature search behind §11.2, and no volume, editor, page range or year was obtained. **It has not been read first-hand and nothing in this paper rests on its content.** It is cited once, at §11.1, for scope only — to name the Li-criterion line of work that §11.1 is *not* contributing to.

[Be88] M. V. Berry, *Semiclassical formula for the number variance of the Riemann zeros*, Nonlinearity **1** (1988), 399–407.

[BK99] M. V. Berry, J. P. Keating, *The Riemann zeros and eigenvalue asymptotics*, SIAM Rev. **41** (1999), 236–266.

[BJ] H. Bohr, B. Jessen, *Über die Werteverteilung der Riemannschen Zetafunktion I, II*, Acta Math. **54** (1930), 1–35; **58** (1932), 1–55.

[BC14] H. Bohr, R. Courant, *Neue Anwendungen der Theorie der Diophantischen Approximationen auf die Riemannsche Zetafunktion*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **144** (1914), 249–274.

[BL99] E. Bombieri, J. C. Lagarias, *Complements to Li’s criterion for the Riemann hypothesis*, J. Number Theory **77** (1999), 274–287.

[Bk06] A. R. Booker, *Turing and the Riemann hypothesis*, Notices Amer. Math. Soc. **53** (2006), 1208–1211.

[BT14] A. R. Booker, F. Thorne, *Zeros of L -functions outside the critical strip*, Algebra Number Theory **8** (2014), 2027–2042.

[BJ48] V. Borchsenius, B. Jessen, *Mean motions and values of the Riemann zeta function*, Acta Math. **80** (1948), 97–166.

[BFFvdW07] P. Borwein, G. Fee, R. Ferguson, A. van der Waall, *Zeros of partial sums of the Riemann zeta function*, Experiment. Math. **16** (2007), 21–40.

[C61] J. W. S. Cassels, *Footnote to a note of Davenport and Heilbronn*, J. London Math. Soc. **36** (1961), 177–184.

[CG14] T. Chatterjee, S. Gun, *On the zeros of generalized Hurwitz zeta functions*, arXiv:1407.8319.

[DH36] H. Davenport, H. Heilbronn, *On the zeros of certain Dirichlet series*, J. London Math. Soc. **11** (1936), 181–185.

[DFetal10] E. Dueñez, D. W. Farmer, S. Froehlich, C. P. Hughes, F. Mezzadri, T. Phan, *Roots of the derivative of the Riemann zeta function and of characteristic polynomials*, Nonlinearity **23** (2010), 2599–2621.

[FGL14] D. W. Farmer, S. M. Gonek, Y. Lee, *Pair correlation of the zeros of the derivative of the Riemann ξ -function*, J. London Math. Soc. (2) **90** (2014), no. 1, 241–269; arXiv:0803.0425 (2008, as Farmer–Gonek). §6.2 refers to this work as “Farmer–Gonek”, which is the two-author preprint; the published version carries the third author and is the entry of record.

[FR05] D. W. Farmer, R. C. Rhoades, *Differentiation evens out zero spacings*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **357** (2005), 3789–3811.

- [FL22] A. S. Fokas, J. Lenells, *On the asymptotics to all orders of the Riemann zeta function and of a two-parameter generalization of the Riemann zeta function*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **275** (2022), no. 1351; arXiv:1201.2633. (Read first-hand: abstract, §§1.2–1.3, ch. 5.)
- [Ga79] W. Gabcke, *Neue Herleitung und explizite Restabschätzung der Riemann–Siegel-Formel*, Dissertation, Georg-August-Universität zu Göttingen, 1979. DOI 10.53846/goediss-5113.
- [G19] R. Garunkštis, *Zeros of the extended Selberg class zeta-functions and of their derivatives*, arXiv:1904.03123 (2019); to appear in Turkish J. Math. An earlier version of this entry carried the title “On the Speiser equivalent for the Riemann hypothesis in the extended Selberg class”. That is a variant of the title of [GS15] and belongs to a different, earlier paper; the 2019 item used in §9.7 and §13.1 is the one above.
- [GS15] R. Garunkštis, R. Šimėnas, *On the Speiser equivalent for the Riemann hypothesis*, Eur. J. Math. **1** (2015), 337–350.
- [GS07] R. Garunkštis, J. Steuding, *On the distribution of zeros of the Hurwitz zeta-function*, Math. Comp. **76** (2007), no. 257, 323–337. DOI 10.1090/S0025-5718-06-01882-5. This is the Garunkštis–Steuding item behind the $k = 1$ concession of §3 and §3.5. It defines the Hurwitz parameter as lying in $(0, 1]$ — a definitional restriction, and exactly the boundary §3.5 turns on.
- [GS14] R. Garunkštis, J. Steuding, *On the roots of the equation $\zeta(s) = a$* , Abh. Math. Semin. Univ. Hambg. **84** (2014), 1–15; arXiv:1011.5339. This is the item carrying the “regularity of the graph” heuristic that §6.2 names as unresolved against its measurement.
- [He89] D. A. Hejhal, *On the distribution of $\log |\zeta'(\frac{1}{2} + it)|$* , in Number Theory, Trace Formulas and Discrete Groups, Academic Press (1989), 343–370.
- [Is26] M. Ismail, *Off-line zeros of the Riemann ξ -function: a constraint network, an exactly solvable collision model, an energy–budget divergence, and a lifetime–deficit dictionary with negative controls*, version 18.4, dated 23 July 2026, 69 pp.; deposited 29 July 2026, DOI 10.5281/zenodo.21679490. Not peer-reviewed and not on the arXiv; the deposit is open access and carries a persistent identifier. Read first-hand: §§21–24 and §§28–32. Cited at §11.1 and §11.2. An earlier circulated title of the same document differs from the one above, and a direct fetch of the copy under that earlier title is refused; the deposit named here is the reachable copy.
- [JT45] B. Jessen, H. Tornehave, *Mean motions and zeros of almost periodic functions*, Acta Math. **77** (1945), 137–279.
- [JW35] B. Jessen, A. Wintner, *Distribution functions and the Riemann zeta function*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **38** (1935), 48–88.
- [KLP00] J. Kaczorowski, A. Languasco, A. Perelli, *A note on Landau’s formula*, Funct. Approx. Comment. Math. **28** (2000), 173–186.
- [Ka19] V. Kapitonets, *Analysis of the Riemann zeta function*, arXiv:1910.08363.
- [Kw26] A. Kawalec, *On the series expansion of the prime zeta function about $s = 1$ and its coefficients*, arXiv:2603.21535 [math.NT], submitted 23 March 2026. Preprint; no journal reference. Cited in §10.2 and §13.1, where “Kawalec 2026” previously appeared with no locatable entry.
- [Le56] D. H. Lehmer, *On the roots of the Riemann zeta-function*, Acta Math. **95** (1956), 291–298.
- [LM74] N. Levinson, H. L. Montgomery, *Zeros of the derivatives of the Riemann zeta-function*, Acta Math. **133** (1974), 49–65.
- [L75] N. Levinson, *Almost all roots of $\zeta(s) = a$ are arbitrarily close to $\sigma = 1/2$* , Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA **72** (1975), 1322–1324.
- [Li24] J. E. Littlewood, *On the zeros of the Riemann zeta-function*, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **22** (1924), 295–318.
- [LMQ22] M. Lugar, M. B. Milinovich, E. Quesada-Herrera, *On the number variance of zeta zeros and a conjecture of Berry*, arXiv:2211.14918.

[Me] M. L. Mehta, *Random Matrices*. **Bibliographically incomplete, and printed incomplete rather than guessed:** the author holds the attribution — this is the standard monograph for the Gaudin nearest-neighbour distribution and the sine-kernel Fredholm determinant — but has not verified an edition, publisher or year first-hand, and prints none. Nothing in §6.1 depends on the entry: the three exact GUE values there are computed first-hand by Nyström evaluation of the determinant, by the recipe printed with them, and Mehta is named as where a reader will find the distribution rather than as the source of a number.

[Ni13] G. H. Nickel, *Geometry of the Riemann zeta function*, arXiv:1310.6396 [math.CV] (2013). *Author initials and title corrected from an earlier version of this entry, which paraphrased both.*

[Ni15] G. H. Nickel, *Symmetry in partial sums of n^{-s} (or, critical line zeros of ζ are easy)*, arXiv:1507.07631 [math.CV] (2015). *Same correction as [Ni13].*

[Od87] A. M. Odlyzko, *On the distribution of spacings between zeros of the zeta function*, Math. Comp. **48** (1987), no. 177, 273–308. *The control of §6.1 is the author’s published table of the first 100,000 zero ordinates to nine decimal places, produced by and distributed with that computation. Cited from the bibliographic record rather than from a first-hand reading of the paper; the ordinates themselves were cross-validated against the certified packs of (I3) to 5×10^{-9} , which is what §6.1 relies on.*

[OS22] C. O’Sullivan, *A generalization of the Riemann–Siegel formula*, second revision dated 23 June 2022, 38 pp.; arXiv:1811.01130. *Preprint; no journal reference located. Read first-hand: §§1.1–1.3, Theorem 1.5, Theorem 2.1, Proposition 2.4, §7.1. Theorem 2.1 is the source cited at §§0, 2.0 and 8 for the sharp-cutoff error of Theorem 1 and for the closed form of the oscillating factor.*

[Pl] D. J. Platt, *Isolating some non-trivial zeros of zeta*, Math. Comp. **86** (2017), 2449–2467. (Certified zero data as distributed by the LMFDB.)

[Re19] U. Reglade, *A geometrical summation method for the Riemann zêta function*, arXiv:1903.10853 (2019). *Author initial and title corrected from an earlier version of this entry.*

[Ri16] M. Righetti, *Zeros of combinations of Euler products for $\sigma > 1$* , Monatsh. Math. **180** (2016), no. 2, 337–356; arXiv:1412.6331. *This entry was labelled “[Ri17]” in an earlier version, against its own printed year; the label is corrected to match the publication. A second Righetti item of 2017, cited by name in §13.1 for the two-constituent/anti-alignment frame, is a distinct work for which the author holds the attribution but not the bibliographic data, and it is therefore listed among the attributions carried by author and year at the end of this section rather than given a numbered entry here.*

[RT20] B. Rodgers, T. Tao, *The de Bruijn–Newman constant is non-negative*, Forum Math. Pi **8** (2020), e6.

[Se92] A. Selberg, *Old and new conjectures and results about a class of Dirichlet series*, in Proceedings of the Amalfi Conference on Analytic Number Theory (Maiori, 1989), Univ. Salerno (1992), 367–385.

[Si32] C. L. Siegel, *Über Riemanns Nachlaß zur analytischen Zahlentheorie*, Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte der Mathematik, Astronomie und Physik, Abt. B: Studien **2** (1932), 45–80. English translation: E. Barkan, D. Sclar, arXiv:1810.05198.

[Sp66] R. Spira, *Zeros of sections of the zeta function. I*, Math. Comp. **20** (1966), 542–550; *II*, Math. Comp. **22** (1968), 163–173.

[Sp76] R. Spira, *Zeros of Hurwitz zeta functions*, Math. Comp. **30** (1976), 863–866.

[Sp94] R. Spira, *Some zeros of the Titchmarsh counterexample*, Math. Comp. **63** (1994), 747–748.

[Sto15] J. Stopple, *Lehmer pairs revisited*, arXiv:1508.05870 (v1 24 August 2015, v2 11 October 2015), 21 pp. *This is the “Stopple’s Lehmer-pair paper” that §9.1 asks a referee to check at its §6, and it is a different item from [Sto20].*

[Sto20] J. Stopple, *Notes on $\log(\zeta'(\rho))$* , arXiv:2007.08008.

[St07] J. Steuding, *Value-Distribution of L-Functions*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **1877**, Springer, 2007.

[T86] E. C. Titchmarsh, *The Theory of the Riemann Zeta-Function*, 2nd ed., revised by D. R. Heath-Brown, Oxford University Press, 1986. (First edition, Oxford, 1951; §11.6, p. 300 is cited at the first edition.)

[To18] S. Torquato, *Hyperuniform states of matter*, Phys. Rep. **745** (2018), 1–95; arXiv:1801.06924. The zeta-zero classification used in §9.5 is §9, “1D hyperuniform patterns derived from random matrices and the zeta function”. *An earlier version of this list carried this item as “[TKK18]”, merging two distinct works into one garbled line and attaching a three-author name list to a single-author review. The entry above is the work actually read and used, and the in-text attribution in §9.5 and §13.1 has been corrected to match it.*

[Ts84] K.-M. Tsang, *The Distribution of the Values of the Riemann Zeta-Function*, Ph.D. thesis, Princeton University, 1984.

[Tu53] A. M. Turing, *Some calculations of the Riemann zeta-function*, Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) **3** (1953), 99–117.

[vdC22] J. G. van der Corput, *Zahlentheoretische Abschätzungen*, Math. Ann. **87** (1922), 39–65 (Satz 1, p. 43).

[vdL83] J. van de Lune, *Some observations concerning the zero-curves of the real and imaginary parts of Riemann’s zeta function*, Math. Centrum Amsterdam, 1983.

[vdLrRW86] J. van de Lune, H. J. J. te Riele, D. T. Winter, *On the zeros of the Riemann zeta function in the critical strip. IV*, Math. Comp. **46** (1986), 667–681.

[Vo] A. Voros, *From asymptotic to closed forms for the Keiper/Li approach to the RH*, arXiv:2204.01036. *Preprint; read first-hand. This is the source of §11.1’s proxy law $n_c \gtrsim T^{1+2/\delta}$ and of both proxy values quoted there, $n \approx 100$ and $n \approx 3 \times 10^{14}$, each confirmed at the source. An earlier version of this entry cited instead Zeta Functions over Zeros of Zeta Functions (Lecture Notes of the Unione Matematica Italiana **8**, Springer, 2010) — a different work, which the author has not obtained or read. The law compared against in §11.1 is the one in the preprint named here, and the entry is corrected to it rather than left pointing at a book whose relevant content the author cannot vouch for. No finer locator inside the preprint is on record; see the reading-status table below.*

Sources cited but not read first-hand by the author. Any sum-rule statement at $\alpha > 1$, none having been located to read — [GS07] itself is first-hand, below, and restricts to $(0, 1]$ (*Steuding [St07] ch. 7 stood at the head of this list in every earlier version; it has been read and now appears in the first-hand list below, with the finding at §0 and §3.5*); Selberg [Se92]; Tsang [Ts84]; Borwein et al. [BFFvdW07]; Farmer–Rhoades [FR05]; Farmer–Gonek–Lee [FGL14]; Booker [Bk06]; Turing [Tu53]; Davenport–Heilbronn [DH36]; Odlyzko [Od87]; Mehta [Me]. Each is cited from a secondary source or from a bibliographic record, and every claim in this paper that touches one of them says so at the point of use (§§1.3, 3.5, 6.1, 6.2, 8.8, 9.1). **Read first-hand and used as such:** Titchmarsh [T86] §§4.11–4.15 and §11.6; O’Sullivan [OS22]; Fokas–Lenells [FL22] ch. 5; Ismail [Is26] §§21–24 and 28–32; Steuding [St07] ch. 7, all four sections, §§7.1–7.2 at proof level; Garunkštis–Steuding [GS07]; Stopple [Sto15], [Sto20]; Jessen–Tornehave [JT45]; Borchsenius–Jessen [BJ48]; Berry [Be88]; Torquato [To18]; Lugar–Milinovich–Quesada–Herrera [LMQ22]; Kapitonets [Ka19]; Nickel [Ni13], [Ni15]; Reglade [Re19].

Attributions carried by author, year and locator rather than by a numbered entry.

Apostol; Backlund; Berry 2013; Bohl; Bohr–Bohnenblust–Hille; Bombieri–Ghosh; Bombieri–Mueller; B’uthe; Cramér; Dubickas et al.; Dyakonov; Ford; Fr’oberg; Fujii; Glaisher; Gonek; Hattori–Matsumoto; Kaczorowski–Kulas; Kaczorowski–Perelli; Kershner; Lamzouri; Landau; Landau–Walfisz; Ki–Kim–Lee 2009; Li 1997; Meissel–Mertens; Mossinghoff–Trudgian; Ng; Righetti 2017; Rosser–Schoenfeld; Signerska–Rynkowska; Speiser; Voronin; Weil 1952; Weyl; Yoshida 1992. *Four of these — Weil 1952 (the origin of the positivity criterion), Yoshida 1992 (the origin of the restricted-support parametrisation), Li 1997, and Ki–Kim–Lee 2009 — are used only in §11.2, where their status is stated again at the point of use: none has been obtained at any tier better than a secondary source’s paraphrase. Bombieri’s Remarks on Weil’s quadratic functional in the theory of prime numbers (Rendiconti Lincei; the two secondary records consulted print the year as 2000 and as 2001 respectively, and the primary was never obtained) is in the same position and is named at §11.2 for the same reason. Each of these does appear in §13 as a concession, and nothing in this paper is claimed against any of them; full bibliographic data are not printed where the author holds only the attribution and the locator shown. An earlier version of this list also contained **Kalmár** and **Sathe**, together with the same assertion that every name in it appears in §13. They do not: the objects they own — Kalmár’s composition constant and Sathe’s constant — are conceded elsewhere in this programme but appear nowhere in this paper, so the two names were carried over from a longer programme-level list in error. They are removed here rather than given §13 rows for objects the paper never uses.*

Attributions of record that rest on unrefereed sources, said here rather than left to be noticed. An earlier version of this paragraph listed six entries as carrying “no journal, volume or venue”; locators have since been supplied for all of them above, and the list of genuinely unrefereed items is now the following. [Ni13], [Ni15] (Nickel), [Re19] (Reglade), [Kw26] (Kawalec), [OS22] (O’Sullivan) and [Sto15] (Stoppa) are preprints with no journal reference — [OS22] is cited here from the author’s own hosted revision, which is the copy read; [G19] (Garunkštis) is an arXiv preprint recorded as accepted for publication but cited here from the preprint. [AdRvdL12] and [KLP00] are refereed journal articles and are no longer in this category. Several concessions of record in §13 — the coil step law and the ζ -free centre-estimate concept, the first-order axis estimator, the three-vector state, and the seam closed form — rest on the unrefereed items. **The author has read them first-hand where §13 says so, but a reader should know that their status is not that of a refereed result, and that a concession made to an unrefereed source is a concession made on the strength of its content alone.** No claim in this paper is strengthened by declining any of them, since each is conceded rather than used.

The reading-status apparatus, completed here, and an earlier version of this paragraph was false. That version read “Two entries whose reading status the two lists above do not record” and named [DFetal10] and [Kw26]. **The true figure was twenty, and it is twenty-three in this version:** of the forty-six entries now cited by bracket key in the body, the two lists above cover twenty-three; [DFetal10] and [Kw26] are the two that paragraph caught; **eighteen further body-cited entries carried no recorded status at all** — including two on which the body makes a claim about what a source does or does not say; two more, [Pl] and [BEOS], are cited by key for the first time in a recent version and are given statuses here with the rest; **and one more, [BSO07], became bracket-cited at §11.2 when the second construction was attributed to its source, while this apparatus still listed it among the never-cited — the count below it was stale by one and the entry carried no status row. Both are corrected here, and the incident is exactly the failure mode this paragraph documents: an edit that cites must move the apparatus in the same edit.** The completion is printed below as one line per entry, which is the form a referee can check. **The default here is *not read first-hand*, and it has been applied strictly: an entry is listed as read first-hand only**

where the author holds a positive record of having read the text, and an abstract, a search snippet or another author’s quotation of a source is not such a record.

entry	reading status	what the status rests on
[AdR11] Arias de Reyna 2011	not read first-hand	Cited at statement level, via [OS22] §1.3, which names it for the any-vertical-strip case. It appears only at §13.3, in a paragraph whose entire content is that the object concerned is somebody else’s and is deliberately absent from this paper.
[AdRBvdL] Arias de Reyna–Brent–van de Lune	read first-hand, in part	The paper’s introduction and §2 read first-hand; §2 is where the arcsine curve W , its prime-zeta expansion and its convexity are set out, which is exactly what §10.2 and §13.1 concede to it. The rest of the paper was not read. See the corrected entry above for the title.
[BC14] Bohr–Courant 1914	not read first-hand	The 1914 original has not been obtained; the density statement is taken at statement level from secondary sources. §9.4, which is the one place a main-text correction rests on it, now says so at the point of use.
[BL99] Bombieri–Lagarias	read first-hand	Read from a copy hosted by one of its authors; the identity $ 1 - 1/\rho ^2 = 1 - (2\beta - 1)/ \rho ^2$ conceded at §11.1 was in addition re-derived independently.
[C61] Cassels 1961	not read first-hand	Statement level, from secondary sources. §3.5 lists it among the $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ Hurwitz literature; that sentence is corrected there to say <i>consulted</i> rather than <i>read</i> .
[G19] Garunkštis 2019	read first-hand, with a stated limitation	Read from the author’s own posted copy. The displayed formulas render cleanly in that copy and part of the surrounding prose does not, so the count-level statement §9.7 concedes to it is conceded on the strength of a partly unreadable prose passage; a referee checking that concession should do so at a rendered page image. Printed as a limitation rather than absorbed.

entry	reading status	what the status rests on
[GS14] Garunkštis–Steuding 2014	not read first-hand	Abstract level only; the published version is paywalled. This is exactly why §6.2 records its “regularity of the graph” heuristic as <i>unresolved against this measurement</i> rather than as ruled out.
[GS15] Garunkštis–Šimėnas 2015	read first-hand	Full text, from the authors’ own posted copy; §2 is the section §9.7 and §13.2 concede to.
[Ga79] Gabcke 1979	not read first-hand	Not obtained. Used only at §13.3, in the same absent-object paragraph as [AdR11].
[KLP00] Kaczorowski–Languasco–Perelli	read first-hand	The authors’ own final preprint, whose head note records the journal appearance; the Landau-formula statements §10.1 concedes to it were read there.
[L75] Levinson 1975	not read first-hand	Statement level; the theorem is quoted from secondary sources. §1.2 uses it only to say that 1-points have been studied since Levinson, which is an attribution of subject and not of a statement.
[LM74] Levinson–Montgomery 1974	not read first-hand	Statement level, as the reference of [GS15] and [G19]. §9.7 concedes to it the estimate $N_1^-(T) = N^-(T) + O(\log T)$ at that tier.
[Li24] Littlewood 1924	not read first-hand	The 1924 paper has not been obtained. This is the entry a referee should weigh most carefully, since §3.4 — the paper’s one claimed theorem — is executed with Littlewood’s lemma. What §3.4 uses is the lemma in its standard textbook form, stated in full where it is used and applied to an explicit rectangle; nothing in the proof depends on anything in the 1924 paper beyond that statement, and the citation is an attribution of the lemma and not an appeal to an unread argument.
[Ri16] Righetti 2016	not read first-hand	Abstract level only. It appears once, in a §13.1 concession row alongside six other owners of the same object.

entry	reading status	what the status rests on
[Si32] Siegel 1932	not read first-hand	Not obtained. Named at §13.3 and, via [OS22], at §13.1 as the anticipator of the unequal-length generalisation; both are attributions carried at that tier.
[Sp76] Spira 1976	read first-hand	All four pages read first-hand, and Theorem 1 together with its hypothesis on the Hurwitz parameter re-read at a rendered page image after a text-layer transcription of the same page proved unreliable. §13.1's linear-growth concession rests on that reading.
[Vo] Voros	read first-hand	Read first-hand, and both proxy values quoted at §11.1 ($n \approx 100$ and $n \approx 3 \times 10^{14}$) were confirmed at the source. The entry above is corrected to the item actually read; the reading is what licenses §11.1's statement about what that source does and does not claim, and §11.1 now scopes that statement to the item read. No finer locator than the work itself is on record. That gap is only partly closed here: the item is a short preprint rather than a book, so the law is locatable in it by a reader, but no section number is printed because none was recorded.
[vdL83] van de Lune 1983	not read first-hand	The Mathematisch Centrum report has not been obtained. $\sigma^{**} = 1.192347$ is attributed to it on the strength of [AdRBvdL]'s citation of it, which <i>was</i> read first-hand; the attribution is therefore secondary and is marked as such here and at §13.1.
[BSO07] Balanzario–Sánchez-Ortiz	read first-hand	All five pages (pp. 2045–2049), including §4's display of the second construction and its selective published list of fifteen $\sigma > 1$ zeros; the author's record transcribes the paper's thirty-zero f_1 list verbatim and its Theorem 1 with the Rouché proof, and the read was repeated against rendered page images. §11.2's attribution sentence rests on this record.

entry	reading status	what the status rests on
[DFetal10] Dueñez–Farmer et al.	not read first-hand	Unchanged from the earlier paragraph, and the reason is worth repeating: the part §9.1 asks a referee to check — §6 beyond eq. (6.16) — is precisely the part not read here, so the entry is not placed in the first-hand list on the strength of this paper’s own record.
[Kw26] Kawalec 2026	not read first-hand	Unchanged: an unrefereed preprint, listed among the unrefereed items above.
[Pl] Platt	not read first-hand	The paper itself has not been read; what this paper uses is the <i>dataset</i> it produced, as distributed, validated locally by byte checksums and by reproducing reference zeros to 3×10^{-9} (§1.4). The completeness and precision guarantees quoted at §1.4 are taken at statement level.
[BEOS] Bucur–Ernvall-Hytönen– Odžak–Smajlović	not read first-hand	Located bibliographically by the search of §11.2 and not obtained; see the entry above, which is deliberately incomplete rather than guessed. Nothing in this paper rests on its content , and its single citation at §11.1 is a scope statement about what that subsection does not claim.

[Is26] is read first-hand and is recorded as such in its own entry. **Every entry cited by bracket key in the body now carries a status**, in one of the two lists above or in this table.

A related count, corrected while the above was checked — and corrected again in this version. Seventeen entries in this list are never cited by bracket key in the body: [AdRvdL12], [BFFvdW07], [BJ], [BK99], [BT14], [CG14], [He89], [JW35], [Ka19], [Le56], [Me], [Ni15], [RT20], [Sp66], [Sp94], [vdC22], [vdLtRW86]. (*An earlier version counted eighteen and included [BSO07]; that entry is bracket-cited at §11.2 and now carries its status row above.*) **Every one of them is nevertheless used:** each is named by author and year in §13, or — for [Me] at §6.1 — by author at the point where its object is used. *A nineteenth, [Pl], was in the same position in an earlier version, which invoked Platt at §1.4 and in the data statement by name only; it now carries its key at §1.4.* The pruning test applied in the note below is therefore *cited or used nowhere at all* $\Rightarrow$ prune, and it is that test, not a bracket-key count, that [Mo73] and [Mo83] failed.

Two entries removed, and a correction to that note. [Mo73] (Montgomery, pair correlation) and [Mo83] (Montgomery, zeros of approximations) stood in an earlier version of this list and are cited nowhere in the body of this paper; they are pruned rather than retro-fitted with a citation. **An earlier version of this note also listed [Od87] (Odlyzko) as pruned for the same reason. That was wrong:** §6.1 sources the spacing control’s ordinates from Odlyzko’s published table, so the paper’s headline spacing comparison rests on it, and the entry is restored

above and cited at that site. The pruning test itself stands; it was applied to that entry with the wrong answer.

Data and reproducibility statement

The census dataset behind §§4–7 was frozen on 2026-07-08 and no window has been added to it since; the census is final as reported. The five instruments are specified in §1.4 to the level needed to rebuild them: (I1) is Euler–Maclaurin evaluation with the stated term count, Bernoulli depth, summation scheme and validation gate, plus Newton on the stated grid with the stated merge tolerance; (I2) is arbitrary-precision evaluation, at the working precisions quoted at the uses §1.4 enumerates and, at the remaining uses §1.4 names, at any precision meeting the printed digits (an earlier version of this clause repeated the universal “quoted at each use” promise that §1.4 itself withdraws); (I3) is the Platt-certified zero data distributed by the LMFDB, with the local validation described; (I4) is the positivity-form assembly of §11.2 — exact assembly of the pole, archimedean and finite arithmetic blocks of the Weil functional at restricted support on N grid points, generalised-eigenvalue minimum in the pinned norm $G = I$, sign change bracketed by bisection in L — with its correction history stated in §1.4 and its assembled values reproduced by an independent second implementation to 1.1×10^{-14} ; (I5) is the crossing-density functional evaluator of §10.3, specified there at its point of use to the sampling, lattice, cutoff and tail level, with its convergence ladder and accuracy bounds printed beside it. **An earlier version of this paragraph said “the three instruments” and listed (I1)–(I3), against §1.4’s then-current count of four (§1.4 now declares five, with its own correction note at its head); the omission removed exactly the instrument behind §11.2’s fitted law from the reproducibility guarantee, and is corrected here.** Every statistic above prints the window it was measured on.

Data availability, restated here from §0 so that it is where a reader looks for it. The census ledgers behind §§4–7, the certified counterexample ledger of §1.3, the second construction’s certified zero list of §11.2, and the instruments (I1), (I2), (I4) and the (I5) evaluator family are packaged for public deposit, assembled so as to resolve at posting with its persistent identifier printed there (*an earlier version of this restatement dropped (I5) that §0’s own list carries — the two paragraphs describe one deposit and now agree*); the certified zero data used as (I3) is a public dataset in its own right and is not redeposited. The ten entries listed in §1.4 as closed-form or single-session are flagged as such both here and at each point of use, and the deposit says the same of them in its own words; each is reproducible from the recipe printed beside it rather than by rerunning a filed script. **One particular the deposit explicitly cannot supply is named here as well as there:** §9.1’s two carrier pairs, which were never banked. **One submission mechanics note, repeated here because it is load-bearing at posting time: the arXiv abstract field takes the Abstract’s first paragraph only — the parenthetical note beneath it and the MSC/keyword lines are not part of the field and must not be pasted into it.** (*An earlier version of this sentence also named §8.3’s superseded nine-cell comparison; that listing was stale — the live §8.3 verification is the eighteen-cell run whose complete recipe and every per-cell value are printed at the site, so it needs nothing from the deposit at all.*)

Nothing in this work decides the location of any zero of the Riemann zeta function, and no result here is progress toward a proof of the Riemann Hypothesis in either direction.