

Prime Number Theorem with Remainder Term

Shuhao Song and Bowen Yao

March 17, 2025

Abstract

We have formalized the proof of the Prime Number Theorem with remainder term. This is the first formalized version of PNT with an explicit error term.

There are many useful results in this AFP entry.

First, the main result, prime number theorem with remainder:

$$\pi(x) = \text{Li}(x) + O\left(x \exp\left(-\sqrt{\log x}/3653\right)\right)$$

Second, the zero-free region of the Riemann zeta function:

$$\zeta(\beta + i\gamma) \neq 0 \text{ when } \beta \geq 1 - \frac{1}{952320} (\log(|\gamma| + 2))^{-1}$$

Moreover, we proved a revised version of Perron's formula, together with the zero-free region we can prove the main result.

Contents

1 Auxiliary library for prime number theorem	2
1.1 Zeta function	2
1.2 Logarithm derivatives	2
1.3 Lemmas of integration and integrability	4
1.4 Lemmas on asymptotics	5
1.5 Lemmas of <i>floor</i> , <i>ceil</i> and <i>nat_powr</i>	6
1.6 Elementary estimation of <i>exp</i> and <i>ln</i>	6
1.7 Miscellaneous lemmas	6
2 Implication relation of many forms of prime number theorem	7
3 Some basic theorems in complex analysis	9
3.1 Introduction rules for holomorphic functions and analytic functions	9
3.2 Factorization of analytic function on compact region	10
3.2.1 Auxiliary propositions for theorem <i>analytic_factorization</i>	11
3.3 Schwarz theorem in complex analysis	11
3.4 Borel-Carathéodory theorem	12
3.5 Lemma 3.9	12
4 Zero-free region of zeta function	13
5 Perron's formula	21
6 Estimation of the order of $\frac{\zeta'(s)}{\zeta(s)}$	24

7 Deducing prime number theorem using Perron's formula

26

```

theory PNT_Notation
imports
  Prime_Number_Theorem.Prime_Counting_Functions
begin

definition PNT_const_C1 ≡ 1 / 952320 :: real

abbreviation nat_powr
  (infixr `nat'_powr` 80)
where
  n nat_powr x ≡ (of_nat n) powr x

bundle pnt_syntax
begin
notation PNT_const_C1 (`C1`)
notation norm (`||_||`)
notation Suc (`_+` [101] 100)
end

end
theory PNT_Remainder_Library
imports
  PNT_Notation
begin
unbundle pnt_syntax

```

1 Auxiliary library for prime number theorem

1.1 Zeta function

```

lemma pre_zeta_1_bound:
  assumes 0 < Re s
  shows ‖pre_zeta 1 s‖ ≤ ‖s‖ / Re s
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma zeta_pole_eq:
  assumes s ≠ 1
  shows zeta s = pre_zeta 1 s + 1 / (s - 1)
  ⟨proof⟩

definition zeta' where zeta' s ≡ pre_zeta 1 s * (s - 1) + 1

lemma zeta'_analytic:
  zeta' analytic_on UNIV
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma zeta'_analytic_on [analytic_intros]:
  zeta' analytic_on A ⟨proof⟩

lemma zeta'_holomorphic_on [holomorphic_intros]:
  zeta' holomorphic_on A ⟨proof⟩

lemma zeta_eq_zeta':
  zeta s = zeta' s / (s - 1)

```

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *zeta'_1 [simp]*: $\text{zeta}' 1 = 1$ $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *zeta_eq_zero_iff_zeta'*:
 shows $s \neq 1 \implies \text{zeta}' s = 0 \iff \text{zeta} s = 0$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *zeta'_eq_zero_iff*:
 shows $\text{zeta}' s = 0 \iff \text{zeta} s = 0 \wedge s \neq 1$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *zeta_eq_zero_iff*:
 shows $\text{zeta} s = 0 \iff \text{zeta}' s = 0 \vee s = 1$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

1.2 Logarithm derivatives

definition *logderiv f x* \equiv $\text{deriv } f x / f x$

definition *log_differentiable*

 (**infixr** $\langle \text{log}'_{\text{differentiable}} \rangle$ 50)

where

$f \text{ log_differentiable } x \equiv (\text{f field_differentiable } (\text{at } x)) \wedge f x \neq 0$

lemma *logderiv_prod'*:
 fixes $f :: 'n \Rightarrow 'f \Rightarrow 'f :: \text{real_normed_field}$
 assumes $\text{fin}: \text{finite } I$
 and $\text{lder}: \bigwedge i. i \in I \implies f i \text{ log_differentiable } a$
 shows $\text{logderiv} (\lambda x. \prod i \in I. f i x) a = (\sum i \in I. \text{logderiv} (f i) a) \text{ (is ?P)}$
 and $(\lambda x. \prod i \in I. f i x) \text{ log_differentiable } a \text{ (is ?Q)}$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *logderiv_prod*:
 fixes $f :: 'n \Rightarrow 'f \Rightarrow 'f :: \text{real_normed_field}$
 assumes $\text{lder}: \bigwedge i. i \in I \implies f i \text{ log_differentiable } a$
 shows $\text{logderiv} (\lambda x. \prod i \in I. f i x) a = (\sum i \in I. \text{logderiv} (f i) a) \text{ (is ?P)}$
 and $(\lambda x. \prod i \in I. f i x) \text{ log_differentiable } a \text{ (is ?Q)}$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *logderiv_mult*:
 assumes $f \text{ log_differentiable } a$
 and $g \text{ log_differentiable } a$
 shows $\text{logderiv} (\lambda z. f z * g z) a = \text{logderiv} f a + \text{logderiv} g a \text{ (is ?P)}$
 and $(\lambda z. f z * g z) \text{ log_differentiable } a \text{ (is ?Q)}$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *logderiv_cong_ev*:
 assumes $\forall_F x \text{ in nhds } x. f x = g x$
 and $x = y$
 shows $\text{logderiv } f x = \text{logderiv } g y$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *logderiv_linear*:
 assumes $z \neq a$
 shows $\text{logderiv} (\lambda w. w - a) z = 1 / (z - a)$
 and $(\lambda w. w - z) \text{ log_differentiable } a$

$\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *deriv_shift*:

assumes *f field_differentiable at (a + x)*
 shows $\text{deriv}(\lambda t. f(a + t)) x = \text{deriv} f(a + x)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *logderiv_shift*:

assumes *f field_differentiable at (a + x)*
 shows $\text{logderiv}(\lambda t. f(a + t)) x = \text{logderiv} f(a + x)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *logderiv_inverse*:

assumes $x \neq 0$
 shows $\text{logderiv}(\lambda x. 1/x) x = -1/x$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *logderiv_zeta_eq_zeta'*:

assumes $s \neq 1$ $\zeta s \neq 0$
 shows $\text{logderiv} \zeta s = \text{logderiv} \zeta' s - 1/(s-1)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *analytic_logderiv [analytic_intros]*:

assumes *f analytic_on A \wedge z \in A \implies f z $\neq 0$*
 shows $(\lambda s. \text{logderiv} f s)$ *analytic_on A*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

1.3 Lemmas of integration and integrability

lemma *powr_has_integral*:

fixes *a b w :: real*
 assumes *Hab: a \leq b and Hw: w > 0 \wedge w \neq 1*
 shows $((\lambda x. w \text{ powr } x) \text{ has_integral } w \text{ powr } b / \ln w - w \text{ powr } a / \ln w)$ {a..b}
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *powr_integrable*:

fixes *a b w :: real*
 assumes *Hab: a \leq b and Hw: w > 0 \wedge w \neq 1*
 shows $(\lambda x. w \text{ powr } x)$ *integrable_on {a..b}*
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *powr_integral_bound_gt_1*:

fixes *a b w :: real*
 assumes *Hab: a \leq b and Hw: w > 1*
 shows $\text{integral } \{a..b\} (\lambda x. w \text{ powr } x) \leq w \text{ powr } b / |\ln w|$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *powr_integral_bound_lt_1*:

fixes *a b w :: real*
 assumes *Hab: a \leq b and Hw: 0 < w \wedge w < 1*
 shows $\text{integral } \{a..b\} (\lambda x. w \text{ powr } x) \leq w \text{ powr } a / |\ln w|$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *set_integrableI_bounded*:

fixes *f :: 'a \Rightarrow 'b :: {banach, second_countable_topology}*
 shows $A \in \text{sets } M$

```

 $\implies (\lambda x. \text{indicator } A x *_R f x) \in \text{borel\_measurable } M$ 
 $\implies \text{emeasure } M A < \infty$ 
 $\implies (\text{AE } x \text{ in } M. x \in A \longrightarrow \text{norm } (f x) \leq B)$ 
 $\implies \text{set\_integrable } M A f$ 
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma integrable_cut':
fixes a b c :: real and f :: real ⇒ real
assumes a ≤ b b ≤ c
and Hf: ∀x. a ≤ x ⇒ f integrable_on {a..x}
shows f integrable_on {b..c}
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma integration_by_part':
fixes a b :: real
and f g :: real ⇒ 'a :: {real_normed_field, banach}
and f' g' :: real ⇒ 'a
assumes a ≤ b
and ∀x. x ∈ {a..b} ⇒ (f has_vector_derivative f' x) (at x)
and ∀x. x ∈ {a..b} ⇒ (g has_vector_derivative g' x) (at x)
and int: (λx. f x * g' x) integrable_on {a..b}
shows ((λx. f' x * g x) has_integral
      f b * g b - f a * g a - integral{a..b} (λx. f x * g' x)) {a..b}
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma integral_bigo:
fixes a :: real and f g :: real ⇒ real
assumes f_bound: f ∈ O(g)
and Hf: ∀x. a ≤ x ⇒ f integrable_on {a..x}
and Hf': ∀x. a ≤ x ⇒ (λx. |f x|) integrable_on {a..x}
and Hg': ∀x. a ≤ x ⇒ (λx. |g x|) integrable_on {a..x}
shows (λx. integral{a..x} f) ∈ O(λx. 1 + integral{a..x} (λx. |g x|))
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma integral_linepath_same_Re:
assumes Ha: Re a = Re b
and Hb: Im a < Im b
and Hf: (f has_contour_integral x) (linepath a b)
shows ((λt. f (Complex (Re a) t) * i) has_integral x) {Im a..Im b}
⟨proof⟩

```

1.4 Lemmas on asymptotics

```

lemma eventually_at_top_linorderI':
fixes c :: 'a :: {no_top, linorder}
assumes h: ∀x. c < x ⇒ P x
shows eventually P at_top
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma eventually_le_imp_bigo:
assumes ∀F x in F. ‖f x‖ ≤ g x
shows f ∈ O[F](g)
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma eventually_le_imp_bigo':
assumes ∀F x in F. ‖f x‖ ≤ g x

```

```

shows ( $\lambda x. \|f x\|) \in O[F](g)$ 
 $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

```

lemma le_imp_bigo:
assumes  $\bigwedge x. \|f x\| \leq g x$ 
shows  $f \in O[F](g)$ 
 $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

```

lemma le_imp_bigo':
assumes  $\bigwedge x. \|f x\| \leq g x$ 
shows ( $\lambda x. \|f x\|) \in O[F](g)$ 
 $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

```

lemma exp_bigo:
fixes  $f g :: real \Rightarrow real$ 
assumes  $\forall_F x \text{ in } at\_top. f x \leq g x$ 
shows ( $\lambda x. \exp(f x)) \in O(\lambda x. \exp(g x))$ 
 $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

```

lemma ev_le_imp_exp_bigo:
fixes  $f g :: real \Rightarrow real$ 
assumes  $hf: \forall_F x \text{ in } at\_top. 0 < f x$ 
and  $hg: \forall_F x \text{ in } at\_top. 0 < g x$ 
and  $le: \forall_F x \text{ in } at\_top. \ln(f x) \leq \ln(g x)$ 
shows  $f \in O(g)$ 
 $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

```

lemma smallo_ln_diverge_1:
fixes  $f :: real \Rightarrow real$ 
assumes  $f_{ln}: f \in o(\ln)$ 
shows  $\lim_{x \rightarrow at\_top} x * \exp(-f x) :> at\_top$ 
 $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

```

lemma ln_ln_asymp_pos:  $\forall_F x :: real \text{ in } at\_top. 0 < \ln(\ln x)$   $\langle proof \rangle$ 
lemma ln_asymp_pos:  $\forall_F x :: real \text{ in } at\_top. 0 < \ln x$   $\langle proof \rangle$ 
lemma x_asymp_pos:  $\forall_F x :: real \text{ in } at\_top. 0 < x$   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

1.5 Lemmas of *floor*, *ceil* and *nat_powr*

```

lemma nat_le_self:  $0 \leq x \implies \text{nat}(\text{int } x) \leq x$   $\langle proof \rangle$ 
lemma floor_le:  $\bigwedge x :: real. \lfloor x \rfloor \leq x$   $\langle proof \rangle$ 
lemma ceil_ge:  $\bigwedge x :: real. x \leq \lceil x \rceil$   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

```

lemma nat_lt_real_iff:
 $(n :: nat) < (a :: real) = (n < \text{nat}(\lceil a \rceil))$ 
 $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

```

lemma nat_le_real_iff:
 $(n :: nat) \leq (a :: real) = (n < \text{nat}(\lfloor a \rfloor + 1))$ 
 $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

```

lemma of_real_nat_power:  $n \text{ nat\_powr} (\text{of\_real } x :: complex) = \text{of\_real} (n \text{ nat\_powr } x)$  for  $n x$ 
 $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

```

lemma norm_nat_power:  $\|n \text{ nat\_powr} (s :: complex)\| = n \text{ powr} (\text{Re } s)$ 
 $\langle proof \rangle$ 

```

1.6 Elementary estimation of \exp and \ln

```
lemma ln_when_ge_3:  
  1 < ln x if 3 ≤ x for x :: real  
(proof)
```

```
lemma exp_lemma_1:  
  fixes x :: real  
  assumes 1 ≤ x  
  shows 1 + exp x ≤ exp (2 * x)  
(proof)
```

```
lemma ln_bound_1:  
  fixes t :: real  
  assumes Ht: 0 ≤ t  
  shows ln (14 + 4 * t) ≤ 4 * ln (t + 2)  
(proof)
```

1.7 Miscellaneous lemmas

```
abbreviation fds_zeta_complex :: complex fds ≡ fds_zeta
```

```
lemma powr_mono_lt_1_cancel:  
  fixes x a b :: real  
  assumes Hx: 0 < x ∧ x < 1  
  shows (x powr a ≤ x powr b) = (b ≤ a)  
(proof)
```

```
abbreviation mangoldt_real :: _ ⇒ real ≡ mangoldt
```

```
abbreviation mangoldt_complex :: _ ⇒ complex ≡ mangoldt
```

```
lemma norm_fds_mangoldt_complex:  
  ∀n. ‖fds_nth (fds mangoldt_complex) n‖ = mangoldt_real n (proof)
```

```
lemma suminf_norm_bound:  
  fixes f :: nat ⇒ 'a :: banach  
  assumes summable g  
  and ∀n. ‖f n‖ ≤ g n  
  shows ‖suminf f‖ ≤ (∑ n. g n)  
(proof)
```

```
lemma C1_gt_zero: 0 < C1 (proof)
```

```
unbundle no pnt_syntax
```

```
end
```

```
theory Relation_of_PNTs
```

```
imports
```

```
  PNT_Remainder_Library
```

```
begin
```

```
unbundle pnt_syntax
```

```
unbundle prime_counting_syntax
```

2 Implication relation of many forms of prime number theorem

```

definition rem_est :: real ⇒ real ⇒ real ⇒ _ where
rem_est c m n ≡ O(λ x. x * exp (-c * ln x powr m * ln (ln x) powr n))

definition Li :: real ⇒ real where Li x ≡ integral {2..x} (λx. 1 / ln x)
definition PNT_1 where PNT_1 c m n ≡ ((λx. π x - Li x) ∈ rem_est c m n)
definition PNT_2 where PNT_2 c m n ≡ ((λx. θ x - x) ∈ rem_est c m n)
definition PNT_3 where PNT_3 c m n ≡ ((λx. ψ x - x) ∈ rem_est c m n)

lemma rem_est_compare_powr:
fixes c m n :: real
assumes h: 0 < m m < 1
shows (λx. x powr (2 / 3)) ∈ rem_est c m n
⟨proof⟩

lemma PNT_3_imp_PNT_2:
fixes c m n :: real
assumes h: 0 < m m < 1 and PNT_3 c m n
shows PNT_2 c m n
⟨proof⟩

definition r1 where r1 x ≡ π x - Li x for x
definition r2 where r2 x ≡ θ x - x for x

lemma piRepresentByTheta:
fixes x :: real
assumes 2 ≤ x
shows π x = θ x / (ln x) + integral {2..x} (λt. θ t / (t * (ln t)^2))
⟨proof⟩

lemma Li_integrate_by_part:
fixes x :: real
assumes 2 ≤ x
shows
(λx. 1 / (ln x)^2) integrable_on {2..x}
Li x = x / (ln x) - 2 / (ln 2) + integral {2..x} (λt. 1 / (ln t)^2)
⟨proof⟩

lemma thetaIntegrable:
fixes x :: real
assumes 2 ≤ x
shows (λt. θ t / (t * (ln t)^2)) integrable_on {2..x}
⟨proof⟩

lemma r1_represent_by_r2:
fixes x :: real
assumes Hx: 2 ≤ x
shows (λt. r2 t / (t * (ln t)^2)) integrable_on {2..x} (is ?P)
r1 x = r2 x / (ln x) + 2 / ln 2 + integral {2..x} (λt. r2 t / (t * (ln t)^2)) (is ?Q)
⟨proof⟩

lemma exp_integral_asymp:
fixes f f' :: real ⇒ real

```

```

assumes cf: continuous_on {a..} f
  and der:  $\lambda x. a < x \implies \text{DERIV } f x :> f' x$ 
  and td:  $((\lambda x. x * f' x) \longrightarrow 0)$  at_top
  and f_ln:  $f \in o(\ln)$ 
shows  $(\lambda x. \text{integral}\{a..x\} (\lambda t. \exp(-f t))) \sim[\text{at\_top}] (\lambda x. x * \exp(-f x))$ 
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma x_mul_exp_larger_than_const:
  fixes c :: real and g :: real  $\Rightarrow$  real
  assumes g_ln:  $g \in o(\ln)$ 
  shows  $(\lambda x. c) \in O(\lambda x. x * \exp(-g x))$ 
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma integral_bigo_exp':
  fixes a :: real and f g g' :: real  $\Rightarrow$  real
  assumes f_bound:  $f \in O(\lambda x. \exp(-g x))$ 
  and Hf:  $\lambda x. a \leq x \implies f \text{ integrable\_on } \{a..x\}$ 
  and Hf':  $\lambda x. a \leq x \implies (\lambda x. |f x|) \text{ integrable\_on } \{a..x\}$ 
  and Hg: continuous_on {a..} g
  and der:  $\lambda x. a < x \implies \text{DERIV } g x :> g' x$ 
  and td:  $((\lambda x. x * g' x) \longrightarrow 0)$  at_top
  and g_ln:  $g \in o(\ln)$ 
shows  $(\lambda x. \text{integral}\{a..x\} f) \in O(\lambda x. x * \exp(-g x))$ 
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma integral_bigo_exp:
  fixes a b :: real and f g g' :: real  $\Rightarrow$  real
  assumes le:  $a \leq b$ 
  and f_bound:  $f \in O(\lambda x. \exp(-g x))$ 
  and Hf:  $\lambda x. a \leq x \implies f \text{ integrable\_on } \{a..x\}$ 
  and Hf':  $\lambda x. b \leq x \implies (\lambda x. |f x|) \text{ integrable\_on } \{b..x\}$ 
  and Hg: continuous_on {b..} g
  and der:  $\lambda x. b < x \implies \text{DERIV } g x :> g' x$ 
  and td:  $((\lambda x. x * g' x) \longrightarrow 0)$  at_top
  and g_ln:  $g \in o(\ln)$ 
shows  $(\lambda x. \text{integral}\{a..x\} f) \in O(\lambda x. x * \exp(-g x))$ 
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma integrate_r2_estimate:
  fixes c m n :: real
  assumes hm:  $0 < m < 1$ 
  and h:  $r_2 \in \text{rem\_est } c m n$ 
shows  $(\lambda x. \text{integral}\{2..x\} (\lambda t. r_2 t / (t * (\ln t)^2))) \in \text{rem\_est } c m n$ 
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma r2_div_ln_estimate:
  fixes c m n :: real
  assumes hm:  $0 < m < 1$ 
  and h:  $r_2 \in \text{rem\_est } c m n$ 
shows  $(\lambda x. r_2 x / (\ln x) + 2 / \ln 2) \in \text{rem\_est } c m n$ 
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma PNT_2_imp_PNT_1:
  fixes l :: real
  assumes h:  $0 < m < 1$  and PNT_2 c m n

```

```

shows PNT_1 c m n
⟨proof⟩

theorem PNT_3_imp_PNT_1:
  fixes l :: real
  assumes h : 0 < m m < 1 and PNT_3 c m n
  shows PNT_1 c m n
  ⟨proof⟩

hide_const (open) r1 r2
unbundle no prime_counting_syntax and no pnt_syntax

end
theory PNT_Complex_Analysis_Lemmas
imports
  PNT_Remainder_Library
begin
unbundle pnt_syntax

```

3 Some basic theorems in complex analysis

3.1 Introduction rules for holomorphic functions and analytic functions

```

lemma holomorphic_on_shift [holomorphic_intros]:
  assumes f holomorphic_on ((λz. s + z) ` A)
  shows (λz. f (s + z)) holomorphic_on A
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma holomorphic_logderiv [holomorphic_intros]:
  assumes f holomorphic_on A open A ∧z. z ∈ A ⇒ f z ≠ 0
  shows (λs. logderiv f s) holomorphic_on A
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma holomorphic_glue_to_analytic:
  assumes o: open S open T
    and hf: f holomorphic_on S
    and hg: g holomorphic_on T
    and hI: ∀z. z ∈ S ⇒ z ∈ T ⇒ f z = g z
    and hU: U ⊆ S ∪ T
  obtains h
  where h analytic_on U
    ∧z. z ∈ S ⇒ h z = f z
    ∧z. z ∈ T ⇒ h z = g z
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma analytic_on_powr_right [analytic_intros]:
  assumes f analytic_on s
  shows (λz. w powr f z) analytic_on s
  ⟨proof⟩

```

3.2 Factorization of analytic function on compact region

```

definition not_zero_on (infixr 'not'_zero'_on' 46)
  where f not_zero_on S ≡ ∃z ∈ S. f z ≠ 0

```

```

lemma not_zero_on_obtain:
  assumes f not_zero_on S and S ⊆ T
  obtains t where f t ≠ 0 and t ∈ T
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma analytic_on_holomorphic_connected:
  assumes hf: f analytic_on S
  and con: connected A
  and ne: ξ ∈ A and AS: A ⊆ S
  obtains T T' where
    f holomorphic_on T f holomorphic_on T'
    open T open T' A ⊆ T S ⊆ T' connected T
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma analytic_factor_zero:
  assumes hf: f analytic_on S
  and KS: K ⊆ S and con: connected K
  and ξK: ξ ∈ K and ξz: f ξ = 0
  and nz: f not_zero_on K
  obtains g r n
  where 0 < n 0 < r
    g analytic_on S g not_zero_on K
    ⋀ z. z ∈ S ⇒ f z = (z - ξ) ^ n * g z
    ⋀ z. z ∈ ball ξ r ⇒ g z ≠ 0
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma analytic_compact_finite_zeros:
  assumes af: f analytic_on S
  and KS: K ⊆ S
  and con: connected K
  and cm: compact K
  and nz: f not_zero_on K
  shows finite {z ∈ K. f z = 0}
  ⟨proof⟩

```

3.2.1 Auxiliary propositions for theorem analytic_factorization

```

definition analytic_factor_p' where
  ⟨analytic_factor_p' f S K ≡
  ∃ g n. ∃ α :: nat ⇒ complex.
    g analytic_on S
    ⋀ (forall z ∈ K. g z ≠ 0)
    ⋀ (forall z ∈ S. f z = g z * (prod k < n. z - α k))
    ⋀ α ‘{.. < n} ⊆ K⟩

```

```

definition analytic_factor_p where
  ⟨analytic_factor_p F ≡
  ∀ f S K. f analytic_on S
  → K ⊆ S
  → connected K
  → compact K
  → f not_zero_on K
  → {z ∈ K. f z = 0} = F
  → analytic_factor_p' f S K⟩

```

```

lemma analytic_factorization_E:

```

```

shows analytic_factor_p {}

⟨proof⟩

lemma analytic_factorization_I:
  assumes ind: analytic_factor_p F
  and ξni: ξ ∉ F
  shows analytic_factor_p (insert ξ F)
⟨proof⟩

```

A nontrivial analytic function on connected compact region can be factorized as a everywhere-non-zero function and linear terms $z - s_0$ for all zeros s_0 . Note that the connected assumption of K may be removed, but we remain it just for simplicity of proof.

```

theorem analytic_factorization:
  assumes af: f analytic_on S
  and KS: K ⊆ S
  and con: connected K
  and compact K
  and f not_zero_on K
  obtains g n and α :: nat ⇒ complex where
    g analytic_on S
    ⋀z. z ∈ K ⇒ g z ≠ 0
    ⋀z. z ∈ S ⇒ f z = g z * (Π k< n. (z - α k))
    α ‘ {.. < n} ⊆ K
⟨proof⟩

```

3.3 Schwarz theorem in complex analysis

```

lemma Schwarz_Lemma1:
  fixes f :: complex ⇒ complex
  and ξ :: complex
  assumes f holomorphic_on ball 0 1
  and f 0 = 0
  and ⋀z. \|z\| < 1 ⇒ \|f z\| ≤ 1
  and \|ξ\| < 1
  shows \|f ξ\| ≤ \|ξ\|
⟨proof⟩

```

```

theorem Schwarz_Lemma2:
  fixes f :: complex ⇒ complex
  and ξ :: complex
  assumes holf: f holomorphic_on ball 0 R
  and hR: 0 < R and nz: f 0 = 0
  and bn: ⋀z. \|z\| < R ⇒ \|f z\| ≤ 1
  and ξR: \|ξ\| < R
  shows \|f ξ\| ≤ \|ξ\| / R
⟨proof⟩

```

3.4 Borel-Caratheodory theorem

Borel-Caratheodory theorem, from book *Theorem 5.5, The Theory of Functions, E. C. Titchmarsh*

```

lemma Borel_Caratheodory1:
  assumes hr: 0 < R 0 < r r < R
  and f0: f 0 = 0
  and hf: ⋀z. \|z\| < R ⇒ Re(f z) ≤ A
  and holf: f holomorphic_on (ball 0 R)

```

and $zr: \|z\| \leq r$
shows $\|f z\| \leq 2*r/(R-r) * A$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *Borel_Caratheodory2*:

assumes $hr: 0 < R 0 < r r < R$
and $hf: \bigwedge z. \|z\| < R \implies \operatorname{Re}(f z - f 0) \leq A$
and $holf: f \text{ holomorphic_on } (\text{ball } 0 R)$
and $zr: \|z\| \leq r$
shows $\|f z - f 0\| \leq 2*r/(R-r) * A$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

theorem *Borel_Caratheodory3*:

assumes $hr: 0 < R 0 < r r < R$
and $hf: \bigwedge w. w \in \text{ball } s R \implies \operatorname{Re}(f w - f s) \leq A$
and $holf: f \text{ holomorphic_on } (\text{ball } s R)$
and $zr: z \in \text{ball } s r$
shows $\|f z - f s\| \leq 2*r/(R-r) * A$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

3.5 Lemma 3.9

These lemmas are referred to the following material: Theorem 3.9, *The Theory of the Riemann Zeta-Function*, E. C. Titchmarsh, D. R. Heath-Brown.

lemma *lemma_3_9_beta1*:

fixes $f M r s_0$
assumes $zl: 0 < r 0 \leq M$
and $hf: f \text{ holomorphic_on ball } 0 r$
and $ne: \bigwedge z. z \in \text{ball } 0 r \implies f z \neq 0$
and $bn: \bigwedge z. z \in \text{ball } 0 r \implies \|f z / f 0\| \leq \exp M$
shows $\|\log \operatorname{derivative} f 0\| \leq 4 * M / r$
and $\forall s \in \text{cball } 0 (r / 4). \|\log \operatorname{derivative} f s\| \leq 8 * M / r$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *lemma_3_9_beta1'*:

fixes $f M r s_0$
assumes $zl: 0 < r 0 \leq M$
and $hf: f \text{ holomorphic_on ball } s r$
and $ne: \bigwedge z. z \in \text{ball } s r \implies f z \neq 0$
and $bn: \bigwedge z. z \in \text{ball } s r \implies \|f z / f s\| \leq \exp M$
and $hs: z \in \text{cball } s (r / 4)$
shows $\|\log \operatorname{derivative} f z\| \leq 8 * M / r$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

lemma *lemma_3_9_beta2*:

fixes $f M r$
assumes $zl: 0 < r 0 \leq M$
and $af: f \text{ analytic_on cball } 0 r$
and $f0: f 0 \neq 0$
and $rz: \bigwedge z. z \in \text{cball } 0 r \implies \operatorname{Re} z > 0 \implies f z \neq 0$
and $bn: \bigwedge z. z \in \text{cball } 0 r \implies \|f z / f 0\| \leq \exp M$
and $hg: \Gamma \subseteq \{z \in \text{cball } 0 (r / 2). f z = 0\}$
shows $-\operatorname{Re}(\log \operatorname{derivative} f 0) \leq 8 * M / r + \operatorname{Re}(\sum_{z \in \Gamma} 1 / z)$
 $\langle proof \rangle$

```

theorem lemma_3_9_beta3:
  fixes f M r and s :: complex
  assumes zl:  $0 < r \leq M$ 
  and af:  $f$  analytic_on  $cball s r$ 
  and f0:  $f s \neq 0$ 
  and rz:  $\bigwedge z. z \in cball s r \implies \operatorname{Re} z > \operatorname{Re} s \implies f z \neq 0$ 
  and bn:  $\bigwedge z. z \in cball s r \implies \|f z / f s\| \leq \exp M$ 
  and hg:  $\Gamma \subseteq \{z \in cball s (r / 2). f z = 0\}$ 
  shows  $-\operatorname{Re} (\log \operatorname{deriv} f s) \leq 8 * M / r + \operatorname{Re} (\sum_{z \in \Gamma} 1 / (z - s))$ 
⟨proof⟩

```

```
unbundle no pnt_syntax
```

```

end
theory Zeta_Zerofree
imports
  PNT_Complex_Analysis_Lemmas
begin
unbundle pnt_syntax

```

4 Zero-free region of zeta function

```
lemma cos_inequality_1:
```

```
  fixes x :: real
  shows  $3 + 4 * \cos x + \cos(2 * x) \geq 0$ 
⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma multiplicative_fds_zeta:
```

```
  completely_multiplicative_function (fds_nth fds_zeta_complex)
⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma fds_mangoldt_eq:
```

```
  fds_mangoldt_complex = -(fds_deriv fds_zeta / fds_zeta)
⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma abs_conv_abscissa_log_deriv:
```

```
  abs_conv_abscissa (fds_deriv fds_zeta_complex / fds_zeta) \leq 1
⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma abs_conv_abscissa_mangoldt:
```

```
  abs_conv_abscissa (fds_mangoldt_complex) \leq 1
⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma
```

```
  assumes s:  $\operatorname{Re} s > 1$ 
  shows eval_fds_mangoldt:  $\operatorname{eval\_fds} (\operatorname{fds\_mangoldt}) s = -\operatorname{deriv} \zeta s / \zeta s$ 
    and abs_conv_mangoldt:  $\operatorname{fds\_abs\_converges} (\operatorname{fds\_mangoldt}) s$ 
⟨proof⟩
```

```
lemma sums_mangoldt:
```

```
  fixes s :: complex
  assumes s:  $\operatorname{Re} s > 1$ 
  shows  $(\lambda n. \operatorname{mangoldt} n / n \operatorname{nat\_powr} s) \operatorname{has\_sum} -\operatorname{deriv} \zeta s / \zeta s \{1..\}$ 
⟨proof⟩
```

```

lemma sums_Re_logderiv_zeta:
  fixes σ t :: real
  assumes s: σ > 1
  shows ((λn. mangoldt_real n * n nat_powr (-σ) * cos (t * ln n))
    has_sum Re (- deriv zeta (Complex σ t) / zeta (Complex σ t))) {1..}
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma logderiv_zeta_ineq:
  fixes σ t :: real
  assumes s: σ > 1
  shows 3 * Re (logderiv zeta (Complex σ 0)) + 4 * Re (logderiv zeta (Complex σ t))
    + Re (logderiv zeta (Complex σ (2*t))) ≤ 0 (is ?x ≤ 0)
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma sums_zeta_real:
  fixes r :: real
  assumes 1 < r
  shows (∑ n. (n+) powr -r) = Re (zeta r)
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma inverse_zeta_bound':
  assumes 1 < Re s
  shows ‖inverse (zeta s)‖ ≤ Re (zeta (Re s))
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma zeta_bound':
  assumes 1 < Re s
  shows ‖zeta s‖ ≤ Re (zeta (Re s))
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma zeta_bound_trivial':
  assumes 1 / 2 ≤ Re s ∧ Re s ≤ 2
    and |Im s| ≥ 1 / 11
  shows ‖zeta s‖ ≤ 12 + 2 * |Im s|
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma zeta_bound_gt_1:
  assumes 1 < Re s
  shows ‖zeta s‖ ≤ Re s / (Re s - 1)
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma zeta_bound_trivial:
  assumes 1 / 2 ≤ Re s and |Im s| ≥ 1 / 11
  shows ‖zeta s‖ ≤ 12 + 2 * |Im s|
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma zeta_nonzero_small_imag':
  assumes |Im s| ≤ 13 / 22 and Re s ≥ 1 / 2 and Re s < 1
  shows zeta s ≠ 0
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma zeta_nonzero_small_imag:
  assumes |Im s| ≤ 13 / 22 and Re s > 0 and s ≠ 1
  shows zeta s ≠ 0
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma inverse_zeta_bound:
  assumes  $1 < \operatorname{Re} s$ 
  shows  $\|\operatorname{inverse}(\zeta s)\| \leq \operatorname{Re} s / (\operatorname{Re} s - 1)$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma deriv_zeta_bound:
  fixes  $s :: \text{complex}$ 
  assumes  $Hr: 0 < r$  and  $Hs: s \neq 1$ 
  and  $hB: \bigwedge w. \|s - w\| = r \implies \|\operatorname{pre_zeta} 1 w\| \leq B$ 
  shows  $\|\operatorname{deriv} \zeta s\| \leq B / r + 1 / \|s - 1\|^2$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma zeta_lower_bound:
  assumes  $0 < \operatorname{Re} s$   $s \neq 1$ 
  shows  $1 / \|s - 1\| - \|s\| / \operatorname{Re} s \leq \|\zeta s\|$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma logderiv_zeta_bound:
  fixes  $\sigma :: \text{real}$ 
  assumes  $1 < \sigma$   $\sigma \leq 23 / 20$ 
  shows  $\|\operatorname{logderiv} \zeta \sigma\| \leq 5 / 4 * (1 / (\sigma - 1))$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma Re_logderiv_zeta_bound:
  fixes  $\sigma :: \text{real}$ 
  assumes  $1 < \sigma$   $\sigma \leq 23 / 20$ 
  shows  $\operatorname{Re}(\operatorname{logderiv} \zeta \sigma) \geq -5 / 4 * (1 / (\sigma - 1))$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

locale zeta_bound_param =
  fixes  $\vartheta \varphi :: \text{real} \Rightarrow \text{real}$ 
  assumes zeta_bn':  $\bigwedge z. 1 - \vartheta(\operatorname{Im} z) \leq \operatorname{Re} z \implies \operatorname{Im} z \geq 1 / 11 \implies \|\zeta z\| \leq \exp(\varphi(\operatorname{Im} z))$ 
  and  $\vartheta_{\text{pos}}: \bigwedge t. 0 < \vartheta t \wedge \vartheta t \leq 1 / 2$ 
  and  $\varphi_{\text{pos}}: \bigwedge t. 1 \leq \varphi t$ 
  and  $\operatorname{inv}_{\vartheta}: \bigwedge t. \vartheta t / \vartheta t \leq 1 / 960 * \exp(\varphi t)$ 
  and  $\operatorname{mooth}_{\vartheta}: \operatorname{antimono} \vartheta$  and  $\operatorname{mono}_{\varphi}: \operatorname{mono} \varphi$ 

begin
  definition region ≡ { $z. 1 - \vartheta(\operatorname{Im} z) \leq \operatorname{Re} z \wedge \operatorname{Im} z \geq 1 / 11$ }
  lemma zeta_bn:  $\bigwedge z. z \in \text{region} \implies \|\zeta z\| \leq \exp(\varphi(\operatorname{Im} z))$ 
  ⟨proof⟩
  lemma  $\vartheta_{\text{pos}}': \bigwedge t. 0 < \vartheta t \wedge \vartheta t \leq 1$ 
  ⟨proof⟩
  lemma  $\varphi_{\text{pos}}': \bigwedge t. 0 < \varphi t$  ⟨proof⟩
end

locale zeta_bound_param_1 = zeta_bound_param +
  fixes  $\gamma :: \text{real}$ 
  assumes  $\gamma_{\text{cnd}}: \gamma \geq 13 / 22$ 
begin
  definition  $r$  where  $r \equiv \vartheta(2 * \gamma + 1)$ 
end

locale zeta_bound_param_2 = zeta_bound_param_1 +
  fixes  $\sigma \delta :: \text{real}$ 

```

```

assumes  $\sigma_{\text{cnd}}: \sigma \geq 1 + \exp(-\varphi(2 * \gamma + 1))$ 
and  $\delta_{\text{cnd}}: \delta = \gamma \vee \delta = 2 * \gamma$ 
begin
definition  $s$  where  $s \equiv \text{Complex } \sigma \delta$ 
end

context zeta_bound_param_2 begin
declare dist_complex_def [simp] norm_minus_commute [simp]
declare legacy_Complex_simps [simp]

lemma cball_lm:
assumes  $z \in \text{cball } s r$ 
shows  $r \leq 1 |Re z - \sigma| \leq r |Im z - \delta| \leq r$ 
 $1 / 11 \leq Im z Im z \leq 2 * \gamma + r$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma cball_in_region:
shows  $\text{cball } s r \subseteq \text{region}$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma Re_s_gt_1:
shows  $1 < Re s$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma zeta_analytic_on_region:
shows zeta analytic_on region
⟨proof⟩

lemma zeta_div_bound:
assumes  $z \in \text{cball } s r$ 
shows  $\|\zeta z / \zeta s\| \leq \exp(3 * \varphi(2 * \gamma + 1))$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma logderiv_zeta_bound:
shows  $Re(\logderiv \zeta s) \geq -24 * \varphi(2 * \gamma + 1) / r$ 
and  $\bigwedge \beta. \sigma - r / 2 \leq \beta \implies \zeta(\text{Complex } \beta \delta) = 0 \implies$ 
 $Re(\logderiv \zeta s) \geq -24 * \varphi(2 * \gamma + 1) / r + 1 / (\sigma - \beta)$ 
⟨proof⟩
end

context zeta_bound_param_1 begin
lemma zeta_nonzero_region':
assumes  $1 + 1 / 960 * (r / \varphi(2 * \gamma + 1)) - r / 2 \leq \beta$ 
and  $\zeta(\text{Complex } \beta \gamma) = 0$ 
shows  $1 - \beta \geq 1 / 29760 * (r / \varphi(2 * \gamma + 1))$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma zeta_nonzero_region:
assumes  $\zeta(\text{Complex } \beta \gamma) = 0$ 
shows  $1 - \beta \geq 1 / 29760 * (r / \varphi(2 * \gamma + 1))$ 
⟨proof⟩
end

context zeta_bound_param begin
theorem zeta_nonzero_region:

```

```

assumes zeta (Complex β γ) = 0 and Complex β γ ≠ 1
shows 1 - β ≥ 1 / 29760 * (ϑ (2 * |γ| + 1) / φ (2 * |γ| + 1))
⟨proof⟩
end

lemma zeta_bound_param_nonneg:
fixes ϑ φ :: real ⇒ real
assumes zeta.bn': ∀z. 1 - ϑ (Im z) ≤ Re z ⇒ Im z ≥ 1 / 11 ⇒ \|zeta z\| ≤ exp (φ (Im z))
and ϑ_pos: ∀t. 0 ≤ t ⇒ 0 < ϑ t ∧ ϑ t ≤ 1 / 2
and φ_pos: ∀t. 0 ≤ t ⇒ 1 ≤ φ t
and inv_ϑ: ∀t. 0 ≤ t ⇒ φ t / ϑ t ≤ 1 / 960 * exp (φ t)
and mov: ∀x y. 0 ≤ x ⇒ x ≤ y ⇒ ϑ y ≤ ϑ x
and moφ: ∀x y. 0 ≤ x ⇒ x ≤ y ⇒ φ x ≤ φ y
shows zeta_bound_param (λt. ϑ (max 0 t)) (λt. φ (max 0 t))
⟨proof⟩

```

```

interpretation classical_zeta_bound:
zeta_bound_param λt. 1 / 2 λt. 4 * ln (12 + 2 * max 0 t)
⟨proof⟩

```

```

theorem zeta_nonzero_region:
assumes zeta (Complex β γ) = 0 and Complex β γ ≠ 1
shows 1 - β ≥ C₁ / ln (|γ| + 2)
⟨proof⟩

```

```
unbundle no pnt_syntax
```

```

end
theory PNT_Subsummable
imports
  PNT_Remainder_Library
begin
unbundle pnt_syntax

```

```

definition has_subsum where has_subsum f S x ≡ (λn. if n ∈ S then f n else 0) sums x
definition subsum where subsum f S ≡ ∑ n. if n ∈ S then f n else 0
definition subsummable (infix <subsummable> 50)
where f subsummable S ≡ summable (λn. if n ∈ S then f n else 0)

```

```

syntax _subsum :: pttrn ⇒ nat set ⇒ 'a ⇒ 'a
  ((2 ∑ ‘_ ∈ (_)./_) [0, 0, 10] 10)
syntax_consts _subsum == subsum
translations
  ∑ ‘x ∈ S. t => CONST subsum (λx. t) S

```

```

syntax _subsum_prop :: pttrn ⇒ bool ⇒ 'a ⇒ 'a
  ((2 ∑ ‘_ | (_)./_) [0, 0, 10] 10)
syntax_consts _subsum_prop == subsum
translations
  ∑ ‘x | P. t => CONST subsum (λx. t) {x. P}

```

```

syntax _subsum_ge :: pttrn ⇒ nat ⇒ 'a ⇒ 'a
  ((2 ∑ ‘_ ≥ _./_) [0, 0, 10] 10)
syntax_consts _subsum_ge == subsum
translations

```

```

 $\sum' x \geq n. t \Rightarrow CONST\ subsum\ (\lambda x. t) \{n..\}$ 

lemma has_subsum_finite:
  fixes  $f : finite F \Rightarrow has\_subsum f F (sum f F)$ 
  assumes  $F$ 
  shows  $has\_subsum (\lambda n. if n \in F then f n else 0) A (sum f (F \cap A))$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma has_subsum_If_finite_set:
  assumes  $F$ 
  shows  $has\_subsum (\lambda n. if n \in F then f n else 0) A (sum f (F \cap A))$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma has_subsum_If_finite:
  assumes  $\{n \in A. p n\}$ 
  shows  $has\_subsum (\lambda n. if p n then f n else 0) A (sum f \{n \in A. p n\})$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma has_subsum_univ:
   $f \text{ sums } v \Rightarrow has\_subsum f UNIV v$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma subsumI:
  fixes  $f : nat \Rightarrow 'a :: \{t2\_space, comm\_monoid\_add\}$ 
  shows  $has\_subsum f A x \Rightarrow x = subsum f A$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma has_subsum_summable:
   $has\_subsum f A x \Rightarrow f \text{ subsummable } A$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma subsummable_sums:
  fixes  $f : nat \Rightarrow 'a :: \{comm\_monoid\_add, t2\_space\}$ 
  shows  $f \text{ subsummable } S \Rightarrow has\_subsum f S (subsum f S)$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma has_subsum_diff_finite:
  fixes  $S : 'a :: \{topological\_ab\_group\_add, t2\_space\}$ 
  assumes  $finite F has\_subsum f A S F \subseteq A$ 
  shows  $has\_subsum f (A - F) (S - sum f F)$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma subsum_split:
  fixes  $f : nat \Rightarrow 'a :: \{topological\_ab\_group\_add, t2\_space\}$ 
  assumes  $f \text{ subsummable } A finite F F \subseteq A$ 
  shows  $subsum f A = sum f F + subsum f (A - F)$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma has_subsum_zero [simp]:
   $has\_subsum (\lambda n. 0) A 0 \langle proof \rangle$ 
lemma zero_subsummable [simp]:
   $(\lambda n. 0) \text{ subsummable } A \langle proof \rangle$ 
lemma zero_subsum [simp]:
   $(\sum 'n \in A. 0 :: 'a :: \{comm\_monoid\_add, t2\_space\}) = 0 \langle proof \rangle$ 

lemma has_subsum_minus:
  fixes  $f : nat \Rightarrow 'a :: real\_normed\_vector$ 
  assumes  $has\_subsum f A a has\_subsum g A b$ 
  shows  $has\_subsum (\lambda n. f n - g n) A (a - b)$ 
  ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma subsum_minus:
  assumes f subsummable A g subsummable A
  shows subsum f A - subsum g A = ( $\sum_{n \in A} f n - g n :: 'a :: \text{real\_normed\_vector}$ )
  (proof)

lemma subsummable_minus:
  assumes f subsummable A g subsummable A
  shows ( $\lambda n. f n - g n :: 'a :: \text{real\_normed\_vector}$ ) subsummable A
  (proof)

lemma has_subsum_uminus:
  assumes has_subsum f A a
  shows has_subsum ( $\lambda n. - f n :: 'a :: \text{real\_normed\_vector}$ ) A (- a)
  (proof)

lemma subsum_uminus:
  f subsummable A  $\implies$  - subsum f A = ( $\sum_{n \in A} - f n :: 'a :: \text{real\_normed\_vector}$ )
  (proof)

lemma subsummable_uminus:
  f subsummable A  $\implies$  ( $\lambda n. - f n :: 'a :: \text{real\_normed\_vector}$ ) subsummable A
  (proof)

lemma has_subsum_add:
  fixes f :: nat  $\Rightarrow$  'a :: real_normed_vector
  assumes has_subsum f A a has_subsum g A b
  shows has_subsum ( $\lambda n. f n + g n$ ) A (a + b)
  (proof)

lemma subsum_add:
  assumes f subsummable A g subsummable A
  shows subsum f A + subsum g A = ( $\sum_{n \in A} f n + g n :: 'a :: \text{real\_normed\_vector}$ )
  (proof)

lemma subsummable_add:
  assumes f subsummable A g subsummable A
  shows ( $\lambda n. f n + g n :: 'a :: \text{real\_normed\_vector}$ ) subsummable A
  (proof)

lemma subsum_cong:
  ( $\bigwedge x. x \in A \implies f x = g x$ )  $\implies$  subsum f A = subsum g A
  (proof)

lemma subsummable_cong:
  fixes f :: nat  $\Rightarrow$  'a :: real_normed_vector
  shows ( $\bigwedge x. x \in A \implies f x = g x$ )  $\implies$  (f subsummable A) = (g subsummable A)
  (proof)

lemma subsum_norm_bound:
  fixes f :: nat  $\Rightarrow$  'a :: banach
  assumes g subsummable A  $\bigwedge n. n \in A \implies \|f n\| \leq g n$ 
  shows  $\|\text{subsum } f A\| \leq \text{subsum } g A$ 
  (proof)

```

```

lemma eval_fds_subsum:
  fixes f :: 'a :: {nat_power, banach, real_normed_field} fds
  assumes fds_converges f s
  shows has_subsum ( $\lambda n. \text{fds\_nth } f n / \text{nat\_power } n s$ ) {1..} (eval_fds f s)
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma fds_abs_subsummable:
  fixes f :: 'a :: {nat_power, banach, real_normed_field} fds
  assumes fds_abs_converges f s
  shows ( $\lambda n. \| \text{fds\_nth } f n / \text{nat\_power } n s \|$ ) subsummable {1..}
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma subsum_mult2:
  fixes f :: nat  $\Rightarrow$  'a :: real_normed_algebra
  shows f subsummable A  $\Rightarrow$  ( $\sum_{x \in A} f x * c$ ) = subsum f A * c
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma subsummable_mult2:
  fixes f :: nat  $\Rightarrow$  'a :: real_normed_algebra
  assumes f subsummable A
  shows ( $\lambda x. f x * c$ ) subsummable A
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma subsum_ge_limit:
  lim ( $\lambda N. \sum n = m..N. f n$ ) = ( $\sum_{n \geq m} f n$ )
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma has_subsum_ge_limit:
  fixes f :: nat  $\Rightarrow$  'a :: {t2_space, comm_monoid_add, topological_space}
  assumes (( $\lambda N. \sum n = m..N. f n$ )  $\longrightarrow l$ ) at_top
  shows has_subsum f {m..} l
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma eval_fds_complex:
  fixes f :: complex fds
  assumes fds_converges f s
  shows has_subsum ( $\lambda n. \text{fds\_nth } f n / n \text{ nat\_powr } s$ ) {1..} (eval_fds f s)
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma eval_fds_complex_subsum:
  fixes f :: complex fds
  assumes fds_converges f s
  shows eval_fds f s = ( $\sum_{n \geq 1} \text{fds\_nth } f n / n \text{ nat\_powr } s$ )
    ( $\lambda n. \text{fds\_nth } f n / n \text{ nat\_powr } s$ ) subsummable {1..}
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma has_sum_imp_has_subsum:
  fixes x :: 'a :: {comm_monoid_add, t2_space}
  assumes (f has_sum x) A
  shows has_subsum f A x
  ⟨proof⟩

unbundle no pnt_syntax

end

```

```

theory Perron_Formula
imports
  PNT_Remainder_Library
  PNT_Subsummable
begin
unbundle pnt_syntax

```

5 Perron's formula

This version of Perron's theorem is referenced to: *Perron's Formula and the Prime Number Theorem for Automorphic L-Functions*, Jianya Liu, Y. Ye

A contour integral estimation lemma that will be used both in proof of Perron's formula and the prime number theorem.

```

lemma perron_aux_3':
fixes f :: complex ⇒ complex and a b B T :: real
assumes Ha: 0 < a and Hb: 0 < b and hT: 0 < T
  and Hf: ∀t. t ∈ {−T..T} ⇒ ‖f (Complex b t)‖ ≤ B
  and Hf': (λs. f s * a powr s / s) contour_integrable_on (linepath (Complex b (−T)) (Complex b T))
shows ‖1 / (2 * pi * i) * contour_integral (linepath (Complex b (−T)) (Complex b T)) (λs. f s * a powr s / s)‖
  ≤ B * a powr b * ln (1 + T / b)
⟨proof⟩

```

```

locale perron_locale =
fixes b B H T x :: real and f :: complex fds
assumes Hb: 0 < b and hT: b ≤ T
  and Hb': abs_conv_abscissa f < b
  and hH: 1 < H and hH': b + 1 ≤ H and Hx: 0 < x
  and hB: (∑ ‘n ≥ 1. ‖fds_nth f n‖ / n nat_powr b) ≤ B
begin
definition r where r a ≡
  if a ≠ 1 then min (1 / (2 * T * |ln a|)) (2 + ln (T / b))
  else (2 + ln (T / b))
definition path where path ≡ linepath (Complex b (−T)) (Complex b T)
definition img_path where img_path ≡ path_image path
definition σ_a where σ_a ≡ abs_conv_abscissa f
definition region where region = {n :: nat. x − x / H ≤ n ∧ n ≤ x + x / H}
definition F where F (a :: real) ≡
  1 / (2 * pi * i) * contour_integral path (λs. a powr s / s) − (if 1 ≤ a then 1 else 0)
definition F' where F' (n :: nat) ≡ F (x / n)

lemma hT': 0 < T ⟨proof⟩
lemma cond: 0 < b b ≤ T 0 < T ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma perron_integrable:
assumes (0 :: real) < a
shows (λs. a powr s / s) contour_integrable_on (linepath (Complex b (−T)) (Complex b T))
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma perron_aux_1':
fixes U :: real
assumes hU: 0 < U and Ha: 1 < a
shows ‖F a‖ ≤ 1 / pi * a powr b / (T * |ln a|) + a powr − U * T / (pi * U)
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma perron_aux_1:
  assumes Ha:  $1 < a$ 
  shows  $\|F a\| \leq 1 / pi * a^{\text{powr } b} / (T * |\ln a|)$  (is  $_ \leq ?x$ )
  (proof)

lemma perron_aux_2':
  fixes  $U :: \text{real}$ 
  assumes hU:  $0 < U$   $b < U$  and Ha:  $0 < a \wedge a < 1$ 
  shows  $\|F a\| \leq 1 / pi * a^{\text{powr } b} / (T * |\ln a|) + a^{\text{powr } U} * T / (pi * U)$ 
  (proof)

lemma perron_aux_2:
  assumes Ha:  $0 < a \wedge a < 1$ 
  shows  $\|F a\| \leq 1 / pi * a^{\text{powr } b} / (T * |\ln a|)$  (is  $_ \leq ?x$ )
  (proof)

lemma perron_aux_3:
  assumes Ha:  $0 < a$ 
  shows  $\|1 / (2 * pi * i) * \text{contour\_integral path } (\lambda s. a^{\text{powr } s} / s)\| \leq a^{\text{powr } b} * \ln(1 + T / b)$ 
  (proof)

lemma perron_aux':
  assumes Ha:  $0 < a$ 
  shows  $\|F a\| \leq a^{\text{powr } b} * r a$ 
  (proof)

lemma r_bound:
  assumes Hn:  $1 \leq n$ 
  shows  $r(x / n) \leq H / T + (\text{if } n \in \text{region} \text{ then } 2 + \ln(T / b) \text{ else } 0)$ 
  (proof)

lemma perron_aux:
  assumes Hn:  $0 < n$ 
  shows  $\|F' n\| \leq 1 / n \text{nat\_powr } b * (x^{\text{powr } b} * H / T)$ 
     $+ (\text{if } n \in \text{region} \text{ then } 3 * (2 + \ln(T / b)) \text{ else } 0)$  (is  $?P \leq ?Q$ )
  (proof)

definition a where  $a n \equiv \text{fds\_nth } f n$ 

lemma finite_region: finite region
  (proof)

lemma zero_notin_region:  $0 \notin \text{region}$ 
  (proof)

lemma path_image_conv:
  assumes  $s \in \text{img\_path}$ 
  shows  $\text{conv\_abscissa } f < s + 1$ 
  (proof)

lemma converge_on_path:
  assumes  $s \in \text{img\_path}$ 
  shows  $\text{fds\_converges } f s$ 
  (proof)

```

```

lemma summable_on_path:
  assumes s ∈ img_path
  shows (λn. a n / n nat_powr s) subsummable {1..}
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma zero_notin_path:
  shows 0 ∉ closed_segment (Complex b (- T)) (Complex b T)
  ⟨proof⟩

lemma perron_bound:
  
$$\left\| \sum 'n \geq 1. a n * F' n \right\| \leq x powr b * H * B / T$$

  
$$+ 3 * (2 + ln(T / b)) * (\sum n \in region. \|a n\|)$$

  ⟨proof⟩

lemma perron:
  (λs. eval_fds f s * x powr s / s) contour_integrable_on path
  
$$\|sum\_upto a x - 1 / (2 * pi * i) * contour\_integral path (\lambda s. eval\_fds f s * x powr s / s)\|$$

  
$$\leq x powr b * H * B / T + 3 * (2 + ln(T / b)) * (\sum n \in region. \|a n\|)$$

  ⟨proof⟩
end

theorem perron_formula:
  fixes b B H T x :: real and f :: complex fds
  assumes Hb: 0 < b and hT: b ≤ T
  and Hb': abs_conv_abscissa f < b
  and hH: 1 < H and hH': b + 1 ≤ H and Hx: 0 < x
  and hB: ( $\sum 'n \geq 1. \|fds\_nth f n\| / n nat\_powr b$ ) ≤ B
  shows (λs. eval_fds f s * x powr s / s) contour_integrable_on (linepath (Complex b (-T)) (Complex b T))
  
$$\|sum\_upto (fds\_nth f) x - 1 / (2 * pi * i) *$$

  
$$contour\_integral (linepath (Complex b (-T)) (Complex b T)) (\lambda s. eval\_fds f s * x powr s / s)\|$$

  
$$\leq x powr b * H * B / T + 3 * (2 + ln(T / b)) * (\sum n | x - x / H \leq n \wedge n \leq x + x / H.$$

  \|fds_nth f n\|
  ⟨proof⟩

theorem perron_asymp:
  fixes b x :: real
  assumes b: b > 0 ereal b > abs_conv_abscissa f
  assumes x: 0 < x x ∉ ℑ
  defines L ≡ (λT. linepath (Complex b (-T)) (Complex b T))
  shows ((λT. contour_integral (L T) (λs. eval_fds f s * of_real x powr s / s))
  —→ 2 * pi * i * sum_upto (λn. fds_nth f n) x) at_top
  ⟨proof⟩

unbundle no pnt_syntax

end
theory PNT_with_Remainder
imports
  Relation_of_PNTs
  Zeta_Zerofree
  Perron_Formula
begin
unbundle pnt_syntax

```

6 Estimation of the order of $\frac{\zeta'(s)}{\zeta(s)}$

notation *primes_psi* ($\langle \psi \rangle$)

lemma *zeta_div_bound'*:
assumes $1 + \exp(-4 * \ln(14 + 4 * t)) \leq \sigma$
and $13 / 22 \leq t$
and $z \in cball(\text{Complex } \sigma \text{ } t) (1 / 2)$
shows $\|\zeta z / \zeta(\text{Complex } \sigma \text{ } t)\| \leq \exp(12 * \ln(14 + 4 * t))$
(proof)

lemma *zeta_div_bound*:
assumes $1 + \exp(-4 * \ln(14 + 4 * |t|)) \leq \sigma$
and $13 / 22 \leq |t|$
and $z \in cball(\text{Complex } \sigma \text{ } t) (1 / 2)$
shows $\|\zeta z / \zeta(\text{Complex } \sigma \text{ } t)\| \leq \exp(12 * \ln(14 + 4 * |t|))$
(proof)

definition C_2 **where** $C_2 \equiv 319979520 :: \text{real}$

lemma *C2_gt_zero*: $0 < C_2$ *(proof)*

lemma *logderiv_zeta_order_estimate'*:
 $\forall_F t \text{ in } (\text{abs going to at_top}).$
 $\forall \sigma. 1 - 1 / 7 * C_1 / \ln(|t| + 3) \leq \sigma$
 $\rightarrow \|\logderiv \zeta(\text{Complex } \sigma \text{ } t)\| \leq C_2 * (\ln(|t| + 3))^2$
(proof)

definition C_3 **where**

$C_3 \equiv \text{SOME } T. 0 < T \wedge$
 $(\forall t. T \leq |t| \rightarrow$
 $(\forall \sigma. 1 - 1 / 7 * C_1 / \ln(|t| + 3) \leq \sigma$
 $\rightarrow \|\logderiv \zeta(\text{Complex } \sigma \text{ } t)\| \leq C_2 * (\ln(|t| + 3))^2))$

lemma *C3_prop*:

$0 < C_3 \wedge$
 $(\forall t. C_3 \leq |t| \rightarrow$
 $(\forall \sigma. 1 - 1 / 7 * C_1 / \ln(|t| + 3) \leq \sigma$
 $\rightarrow \|\logderiv \zeta(\text{Complex } \sigma \text{ } t)\| \leq C_2 * (\ln(|t| + 3))^2))$
(proof)

lemma *C3_gt_zero*: $0 < C_3$ *(proof)*

lemma *logderiv_zeta_order_estimate*:
assumes $1 - 1 / 7 * C_1 / \ln(|t| + 3) \leq \sigma$ $C_3 \leq |t|$
shows $\|\logderiv \zeta(\text{Complex } \sigma \text{ } t)\| \leq C_2 * (\ln(|t| + 3))^2$
(proof)

definition *zeta_zerofree_region*

where *zeta_zerofree_region* $\equiv \{s. s \neq 1 \wedge 1 - C_1 / \ln(|\text{Im } s| + 2) < \text{Re } s\}$

definition *logderiv_zeta_region*

where *logderiv_zeta_region* $\equiv \{s. C_3 \leq |\text{Im } s| \wedge 1 - 1 / 7 * C_1 / \ln(|\text{Im } s| + 3) \leq \text{Re } s\}$

definition *zeta_strip_region*

where *zeta_strip_region* $\sigma T \equiv \{s. s \neq 1 \wedge \sigma \leq \text{Re } s \wedge |\text{Im } s| \leq T\}$

definition *zeta_strip_region'*

where $\text{zeta_strip_region}' \sigma T \equiv \{s. s \neq 1 \wedge \sigma \leq \text{Re } s \wedge C_3 \leq |\text{Im } s| \wedge |\text{Im } s| \leq T\}$

lemma $\text{strip_in_zerofree_region}:$

assumes $1 - C_1 / \ln(T + 2) < \sigma$

shows $\text{zeta_strip_region } \sigma T \subseteq \text{zeta_zerofree_region}$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $\text{strip_in_logderiv_zeta_region}:$

assumes $1 - 1 / 7 * C_1 / \ln(T + 3) \leq \sigma$

shows $\text{zeta_strip_region}' \sigma T \subseteq \text{logderiv_zeta_region}$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $\text{strip_condition_imp}:$

assumes $0 \leq T 1 - 1 / 7 * C_1 / \ln(T + 3) \leq \sigma$

shows $1 - C_1 / \ln(T + 2) < \sigma$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $\text{zeta_zerofree_region}:$

assumes $s \in \text{zeta_zerofree_region}$

shows $\text{zeta } s \neq 0$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $\text{logderiv_zeta_region_estimate}:$

assumes $s \in \text{logderiv_zeta_region}$

shows $\|\text{logderiv zeta } s\| \leq C_2 * (\ln(|\text{Im } s| + 3))^2$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

definition $C_4 :: \text{real}$ **where** $C_4 \equiv 1 / 6666241$

lemma $C_4_prop:$

$\forall_F x \text{ in at_top}. C_4 / \ln x \leq C_1 / (7 * \ln(x + 3))$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

lemma $C_4_gt_zero: 0 < C_4 \langle \text{proof} \rangle$

definition C_5_prop **where**

$C_5_prop C_5 \equiv$

$0 < C_5 \wedge (\forall_F x \text{ in at_top}. (\forall t. |t| \leq x$

$\longrightarrow \|\text{logderiv zeta } (\text{Complex}(1 - C_4 / \ln x) t)\| \leq C_5 * (\ln x)^2))$

lemma $\text{logderiv_zeta_bound_vertical}':$

$\exists C_5. C_5_prop C_5$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

definition C_5 **where** $C_5 \equiv \text{SOME } C_5. C_5_prop C_5$

lemma

$C_5_gt_zero: 0 < C_5 \text{ (is ?prop_1) and}$

$\text{logderiv_zeta_bound_vertical}:$

$\forall_F x \text{ in at_top}. \forall t. |t| \leq x$

$\longrightarrow \|\text{logderiv zeta } (\text{Complex}(1 - C_4 / \ln x) t)\| \leq C_5 * (\ln x)^2 \text{ (is ?prop_2)}$

$\langle \text{proof} \rangle$

7 Deducing prime number theorem using Perron's formula

```

locale prime_number_theorem =
  fixes c ε :: real
  assumes Hc: 0 < c and Hc': c * c < 2 * C4 and Hε: 0 < ε 2 * ε < c
begin
  notation primes_psi (ψ)
  definition H where H x ≡ exp (c / 2 * (ln x) powr (1 / 2)) for x :: real
  definition T where T x ≡ exp (c * (ln x) powr (1 / 2)) for x :: real
  definition a where a x ≡ 1 - C4 / (c * (ln x) powr (1 / 2)) for x :: real
  definition b where b x ≡ 1 + 1 / (ln x) for x :: real
  definition B where B x ≡ 5 / 4 * ln x for x :: real
  definition f where f x s ≡ x powr s / s * logderiv zeta s for x :: real and s :: complex
  definition R where R x ≡
    x powr (b x) * H x * B x / T x + 3 * (2 + ln (T x / b x))
    * (∑ n | x - x / H x ≤ n ∧ n ≤ x + x / H x. ∥fds_nth(fds_mangoldt_complex) n∥) for x :: real
  definition Rc' where Rc' ≡ O(λx. x * exp (-(c / 2 - ε) * ln x powr (1 / 2)))
  definition Rc where Rc ≡ O(λx. x * exp (-(c / 2 - 2 * ε) * ln x powr (1 / 2)))
  definition z1 where z1 x ≡ Complex (a x) (- T x) for x
  definition z2 where z2 x ≡ Complex (b x) (- T x) for x
  definition z3 where z3 x ≡ Complex (b x) (T x) for x
  definition z4 where z4 x ≡ Complex (a x) (T x) for x
  definition rect where rect x ≡ cbox (z1 x) (z3 x) for x
  definition rect' where rect' x ≡ rect x - {1} for x
  definition Pt where Pt x t ≡ linepath (Complex (a x) t) (Complex (b x) t) for x t
  definition P1 where P1 x ≡ linepath (z1 x) (z4 x) for x
  definition P2 where P2 x ≡ linepath (z2 x) (z3 x) for x
  definition P3 where P3 x ≡ Pt x (- T x) for x
  definition P4 where P4 x ≡ Pt x (T x) for x
  definition Pr where Pr x ≡ rectpath (z1 x) (z3 x) for x

  lemma Rc_eq_rem_est:
    Rc = rem_est (c / 2 - 2 * ε) (1 / 2) 0
    ⟨proof⟩

  lemma residue_f:
    residue (f x) 1 = - x
    ⟨proof⟩

  lemma rect_in_strip:
    rect x - {1} ⊆ zeta_strip_region (a x) (T x)
    ⟨proof⟩

  lemma rect_in_strip':
    {s ∈ rect x. C3 ≤ |Im s|} ⊆ zeta_strip_region' (a x) (T x)
    ⟨proof⟩

  lemma
    rect'_in_zerofree: ∀ F x in at_top. rect' x ⊆ zeta_zerofree_region and
    rect_in_logderiv_zeta: ∀ F x in at_top. {s ∈ rect x. C3 ≤ |Im s|} ⊆ logderiv_zeta_region
    ⟨proof⟩

  lemma zeta_nonzero_in_rect:
    ∀ F x in at_top. ∀ s. s ∈ rect' x → zeta s ≠ 0
    ⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma zero_notin_rect:  $\forall_F x \text{ in } at\_top. 0 \notin rect' x$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma f_analytic:
 $\forall_F x \text{ in } at\_top. f x \text{ analytic\_on } rect' x$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma path_image_in_rect_1:
assumes  $0 \leq T x \wedge a x \leq b x$ 
shows  $\text{path\_image}(P_1 x) \subseteq \text{rect } x \wedge \text{path\_image}(P_2 x) \subseteq \text{rect } x$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma path_image_in_rect_2:
assumes  $0 \leq T x \wedge a x \leq b x \wedge t \in \{-T x..T x\}$ 
shows  $\text{path\_image}(P_t x t) \subseteq \text{rect } x$ 
⟨proof⟩

definition path_in_rect' where
path_in_rect' x ≡
 $\text{path\_image}(P_1 x) \subseteq \text{rect}' x \wedge \text{path\_image}(P_2 x) \subseteq \text{rect}' x \wedge$ 
 $\text{path\_image}(P_3 x) \subseteq \text{rect}' x \wedge \text{path\_image}(P_4 x) \subseteq \text{rect}' x$ 

lemma path_image_in_rect':
assumes  $0 < T x \wedge a x < 1 \wedge 1 < b x$ 
shows  $\text{path\_in\_rect}' x$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma asymp_1:
 $\forall_F x \text{ in } at\_top. 0 < T x \wedge a x < 1 \wedge 1 < b x$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma f_continuous_on:
 $\forall_F x \text{ in } at\_top. \forall A \subseteq \text{rect}' x. \text{continuous\_on } A (f x)$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma contour_integrability:
 $\forall_F x \text{ in } at\_top.$ 
 $f x \text{ contour\_integrable\_on } P_1 x \wedge f x \text{ contour\_integrable\_on } P_2 x \wedge$ 
 $f x \text{ contour\_integrable\_on } P_3 x \wedge f x \text{ contour\_integrable\_on } P_4 x$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma contour_integral_rectpath':
assumes  $f x \text{ analytic\_on } (\text{rect}' x) 0 < T x \wedge a x < 1 \wedge 1 < b x$ 
shows  $\text{contour\_integral}(P_r x) (f x) = -2 * pi * i * x$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma contour_integral_rectpath:
 $\forall_F x \text{ in } at\_top. \text{contour\_integral}(P_r x) (f x) = -2 * pi * i * x$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma valid_paths:
 $\text{valid\_path}(P_1 x) \text{ valid\_path}(P_2 x) \text{ valid\_path}(P_3 x) \text{ valid\_path}(P_4 x)$ 
⟨proof⟩

lemma integral_rectpath_split:

```

```

assumes  $f x \text{ contour\_integrable\_on } P_1 x \wedge f x \text{ contour\_integrable\_on } P_2 x \wedge$ 
 $f x \text{ contour\_integrable\_on } P_3 x \wedge f x \text{ contour\_integrable\_on } P_4 x$ 
shows  $\text{contour\_integral}(P_3 x)(f x) + \text{contour\_integral}(P_2 x)(f x)$ 
 $- \text{contour\_integral}(P_4 x)(f x) - \text{contour\_integral}(P_1 x)(f x) = \text{contour\_integral}(P_r x)(f x)$ 
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma  $P_2\_\text{eq}:$ 
 $\forall_F x \text{ in at\_top}. \text{contour\_integral}(P_2 x)(f x) + 2 * pi * i * x$ 
 $= \text{contour\_integral}(P_1 x)(f x) - \text{contour\_integral}(P_3 x)(f x) + \text{contour\_integral}(P_4 x)(f x)$ 
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma  $\text{estimation\_}P_1:$ 
 $(\lambda x. \|\text{contour\_integral}(P_1 x)(f x)\|) \in Rc$ 
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma  $\text{estimation\_}P_t':$ 
assumes  $h:$ 
 $1 < x \wedge \max 1 C_3 \leq T x \wedge a x < 1 \wedge 1 < b x$ 
 $\{s \in \text{rect } x. C_3 \leq |\text{Im } s|\} \subseteq \text{logderiv\_zeta\_region}$ 
 $f x \text{ contour\_integrable\_on } P_3 x \wedge f x \text{ contour\_integrable\_on } P_4 x$ 
and  $Ht: |t| = T x$ 
shows  $\|\text{contour\_integral}(P_t x t)(f x)\| \leq C_2 * \exp 1 * x / T x * (\ln(T x + 3))^2 * (b x - a x)$ 
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma  $\text{estimation\_}P_t:$ 
 $(\lambda x. \|\text{contour\_integral}(P_3 x)(f x)\|) \in Rc \wedge$ 
 $(\lambda x. \|\text{contour\_integral}(P_4 x)(f x)\|) \in Rc$ 
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma  $\text{Re\_path\_}P_2:$ 
 $\bigwedge z. z \in \text{path\_image}(P_2 x) \implies \text{Re } z = b x$ 
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma  $\text{estimation\_}P_2:$ 
 $(\lambda x. \|1 / (2 * pi * i) * \text{contour\_integral}(P_2 x)(f x) + x\|) \in Rc$ 
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma  $\text{estimation\_}R:$ 
 $R \in Rc$ 
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma  $\text{perron\_psi}:$ 
 $\forall_F x \text{ in at\_top}. \|\psi x + 1 / (2 * pi * i) * \text{contour\_integral}(P_2 x)(f x)\| \leq R x$ 
⟨proof⟩

```

```

lemma  $\text{estimation\_perron\_psi}:$ 
 $(\lambda x. \|\psi x + 1 / (2 * pi * i) * \text{contour\_integral}(P_2 x)(f x)\|) \in Rc$ 
⟨proof⟩

```

```

theorem  $\text{prime\_number\_theorem}:$ 
 $\text{PNT\_3}(c / 2 - 2 * \varepsilon) (1 / 2) 0$ 
⟨proof⟩

```

```

no_notation  $\text{primes\_psi}(\langle \psi \rangle)$ 
end

```

```

unbundle prime_counting_syntax

theorem prime_number_theorem:
  shows ( $\lambda x. \pi x - Li x$ )  $\in O(\lambda x. x * \exp(-1 / 3653 * (\ln x) \text{ powr} (1 / 2)))$ 
   $\langle proof \rangle$ 

hide_const (open) C3 C4 C5
unbundle no prime_counting_syntax and no pnt_syntax

end

```