

## 114. A Note on the Mean Value of the Zeta and L-functions. V

By Yoichi MOTOHASHI

Department of Mathematics, College of Science and Technology,  
Nihon University, Tokyo

(Communicated by Kunihiko KODAIRA, M. J. A., Dec. 12, 1986)

1. In the previous note of this series we showed an alternative approach to Atkinson's formula. Here we return to the original argument of Atkinson [1], and exploit its ability in the context of the problem dealt by Balasubramanian, Conrey and Heath-Brown [2]. Motivated by Iwaniec [3], they considered the asymptotic evaluation of

$$I(T, A) = \int_0^T \left| \zeta\left(\frac{1}{2} + it\right) A\left(\frac{1}{2} + it\right) \right|^2 dt,$$

where

$$A(s) = \sum_m a(m)m^{-s}$$

and  $a(m)$  vanishes for  $m > M$ . The main term of the integral is

$$T \sum_{k,l} \frac{a(k)\bar{a}(l)}{[k, l]} \left( \log \frac{T(k, l)^2}{2\pi kl} + 2\gamma - 1 \right),$$

and denoting the error-term by  $E(T, A)$ , they proved, among other things, that

$$E(T, A) \ll T(\log T)^{-B} + M^2 T^\epsilon$$

for any fixed  $B, \epsilon > 0$  whenever  $\log M \ll \log T$ ,  $a(m) \ll m^\epsilon$ . Thus  $I(T, A)$  is asymptotically equal to the main-term when  $M < T^{(1/2) - \epsilon}$ .

Their argument is highly technical, and centers upon a subtle estimation of integrals arising from a Mellin transform of the  $\Gamma$ -factor in the functional equation for  $\zeta(s)$ . In contrast with this, as we shall show below, a simple modification of Atkinson's argument yields a quite accessible proof of the above as well as the following new estimate:

**Theorem.**

$$E(T, A) \ll T^{1/3} M^{4/3} T^\epsilon.$$

**Remark.** (i) Assertions (B) and (C) stated in [2, Theorem 1] can also be proved by refining our argument.

(ii) Our result contains  $E(T) \ll T^{1/3 + \epsilon}$ .

(iii) The mean square of  $E(T, A)$  may be considered. And we stress that in application to the problem of the distribution of the zeros of  $\zeta(s)$  as was done in [2] a good mean value estimate of  $E(T, A)$  is enough.

(iv) The  $\chi$ -analogue of our result can be obtained by combining the present note with [4, II].

2. Now we shall show an outline of our argument. The details will be given elsewhere.