

Highest Cusped Waves for the Burgers-Hilbert equation

Joel Dahne

Javier Gómez-Serrano

May 3, 2022

Abstract

In this paper we prove the existence of a periodic highest, cusped, traveling wave solution for the Burgers-Hilbert equation $f_t + ff_x = \mathbf{H}[f]$ and give its asymptotic behaviour at 0. The proof combines careful asymptotic analysis and a computer-assisted approach.

1 Introduction

The Burgers-Hilbert equation [25] is a nonlinear wave model, in the periodic setting given by

$$f_t + ff_x = \mathbf{H}[f], \quad \text{for } (x, t) \in \mathbb{T} \times \mathbb{R}. \quad (1)$$

Here \mathbf{H} is the Hilbert transform which, for $f : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, is defined by

$$\mathbf{H}[f](x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} p.v. \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \cot\left(\frac{x-y}{2}\right) f(y) dy, \quad \widehat{\mathbf{H}[f]}(k) = -i \operatorname{sgn}(k) \widehat{f}(k).$$

The equation was first used by Marsden and Weinstein in 1983 as a second order approximation for the evolution of the boundary of a simply connected vortex patch in two dimensions [44]. More recently Biello and Hunter used it to serve as an approximation for small slope vorticity fronts [4]. The validity of this approximation was recently proved [28].

For small initial data in $H^2(\mathbb{R})$, estimates for the lifespan were proved by Hunter and Ifrim [26], see also [27].

Global existence of weak solutions for initial data in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ was established by Bressan and Nguyen, in which case the solution lies in $L^2(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ for $t > 0$ [5]. Bressan and Zhang constructed locally in time piecewise smooth solutions with a single, logarithmic, shock [6]. Stability and uniqueness of these solutions in a larger class of solutions were shown by Krupa and Vasseur [42].

Numerical simulations have shown formation of shocks in finite time [4, 25]. Castro, Córdoba and Gancedo proved finite time blow up of the $C^{1,\delta}$ -norm with $0 < \delta < 1$ for initial data $f_0 \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}) \cap C^{1,\delta}(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying that there exists a point x_0 with $H[f_0](x_0) > 0$ and $u_0(x_0) \geq (32\pi \|u_0\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}^2)^{1/3}$ [8]. Saut and Wang proved shock formation in finite time [50]. Solutions that develop an asymptotic self-similar shock at a single point with an explicitly computable blowup profile were constructed by Yang [55].

The Burgers-Hilbert equation occurs as a special case in the family of fractional KdV equations given by

$$f_t + ff_x = |D|^\alpha f_x. \quad (2)$$

Here

$$\widehat{|D|^\alpha f}(\xi) = |\xi|^\alpha \widehat{f}(\xi)$$

and the parameter α may in general take any real value. For $\alpha = 2$ and $\alpha = 1$ we get the classical KdV and Benjamin-Ono equations. For $\alpha = -1$ it reduces to the Burgers-Hilbert equation.

For $\alpha \in (-1, 0)$ the fractional KdV equation exhibits finite time blow [8, 29]. That this blowup happens in terms of wave breaking was proved for $\alpha \in (-1, -1/3)$ by Hur and Tao [31, 30] and for $\alpha \in (-1, 0)$ by

Oh and Pasqualotto [47]. See [41] for a numerical study and also [11]. For other results see e.g. [19] for existence time, [49] for well-posedness and [39, 40] for some results for related equations.

In this work we are concerned with traveling wave solutions of the Burgers-Hilbert equation (1). The study of traveling waves is an important topic in fluid dynamics, see e.g. [23] for a recent overview of traveling water waves. The traveling wave assumption $f(x, t) = \varphi(x - ct)$, where $c > 0$ denotes the wave speed, gives us

$$-c\varphi' + \varphi\varphi' = \mathbf{H}[\varphi]. \quad (3)$$

The Burgers-Hilbert equation has an analytic branch of even, zero-mean, 2π -periodic, smooth traveling wave solutions bifurcating from constant solutions [25]. If we let ϵ be the bifurcation parameter and $\varphi_\epsilon, c_\epsilon$ be the solution with its corresponding wave speed, then as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_\epsilon(x) &= \epsilon \cos(x) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2), \\ c_\epsilon &= -1 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^2). \end{aligned}$$

Castro, Córdoba and Zheng [10] proved that this branch exists in the range $(0, \epsilon^*)$ with $\epsilon^* \sim 0.23$ and fails to exist for $\epsilon > \frac{2}{e}$. Moreover they proved an enhanced lifespan estimate for perturbations of φ_ϵ compared to the results in [26]. In [25], Hunter remarks that this branch presumably ends in a highest wave which is not smooth at its crest, as is common for equations of this type. In this paper we prove the existence of a highest cusped wave and give its behaviour at the crest. More precisely we prove the following theorem:

Theorem 1.1. *There is a 2π -periodic traveling wave φ of (3), which behaves asymptotically at $x = 0$ as*

$$\varphi(x) = c + \frac{1}{\pi}|x| \log|x| + \mathcal{O}(|x|\sqrt{\log|x|}).$$

Remark 1.2. *We don't expect the remainder term $\mathcal{O}(|x|\sqrt{\log|x|})$ in Theorem 1.1 to be sharp. The estimate follows from the choice of our space.*

The notion of highest traveling waves exist for a large number of equations. For the free boundary Euler equation Stokes argued that if there exists a singular solution with a steady profile it must have an interior angle of 120° at the crest [51]. This is known as the Stokes conjecture and was proved in 1982 [1]. For the Whitham equation [54] the existence of a highest cusped traveling wave was conjectured by Whitham in [53]. Its existence, together with its $C^{1/2}$ regularity, was recently proved by Ehrnström and Wahlén [18]. They conjectured that the wave is convex between its crests and also its precise asymptotic behaviour. This conjecture was proved by Enciso, Gómez-Serrano and Vergara [20]. See also [17] for some recent remarks. For the fractional KdV equations the traveling waves assumption allows us to write the equation as

$$-c\varphi' + \varphi\varphi' = |D|^\alpha \varphi'. \quad (4)$$

There has recently been much progress related to highest waves to this family of equations. For $\alpha < -1$ Bruell and Dhara proved the existence of highest traveling waves which are Lipschitz at their cusp [7]. Very recently Ørke proved their existence for $-1 < \alpha < 0$ for the (inhomogeneous) fractional KdV equations as well as the fractional Degasperis-Procesi equations, together with their optimal $-\alpha$ -Hölder regularity [48]. Hildrum and Xue prove a similar result for another class of equations, including the (homogeneous) fractional KdV equations for $-1 < \alpha < 0$ [24].

The results in [18, 7, 48, 24] are all based on global bifurcation arguments, bifurcating from the constant solution and proving that the branch must end in a highest wave which is not smooth at its crest. The proof of the convexity of the highest cusped wave for the Whitham equation in [20] uses a completely different approach. The problem is first rephrased as a fixed point problem, the existence and properties of the fixed point is then related to inequalities for certain constants that appear in the reduction. These inequalities are then checked using a computer assisted proof. In this paper we use a similar approach for proving Theorem 1.1.




Figure 1: An enclosure of the function $u(x)$ on the interval $[-\pi, \pi]$. The thin line is the approximation $u_0(x)$ and the width of the thick line is computed using the bound of $\|v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})}$.

The ansatz $\varphi(x) = c - u(x)$ allows us to rewrite (3) as an equation that does not explicitly depend on the wave speed c . Proving the existence of a solution u can be rewritten as a fixed point problem by considering the ansatz

$$u(x) = u_0(x) + w(x)v(x)$$

where $u_0(x)$ is an explicit, carefully chosen, approximate solution and $w(x)$ is an explicit weight factor. Proving the existence of a fixed point can be reduced to checking an inequality involving three constants, D_0 , δ_0 and n_0 , that only depend on the choice of u_0 and w , see Proposition 2.2. This inequality is checked by bounding D_0 , δ_0 and n_0 using a computer assisted proof, see Lemmas 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3. These bounds are highly non-trivial, in particular δ_0 is given by the supremum of a function on the interval $[0, \pi]$ which attains its maximum around 10^{-5000} . A plot of the function u is given in Figure 1.

One of the key difficulties is the construction of the approximate solution u_0 . Due to the singularity at $x = 0$ it is not possible to use a trigonometric polynomial alone, it would converge very slowly and have the wrong asymptotic behaviour. Pure products of powers and logarithms, $|x|^a \log^b |x|$, have the issue that they are not periodic and do not interact well with the operator \mathcal{H} . Instead we take inspiration from the construction in [20] and consider a combination of trigonometric polynomials and Clausen functions of different orders, defined as

$$C_s(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\cos(nx)}{n^s}, \quad S_s(x) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\sin(nx)}{n^s},$$

for $s > 1$ and by analytic continuation otherwise. We also make use of their derivatives with respect to the order, for which we use the notation

$$C_s^{(\beta)}(x) := \frac{d^\beta}{ds^\beta} C_s(x), \quad S_s^{(\beta)}(x) := \frac{d^\beta}{ds^\beta} S_s(x).$$

These functions are 2π -periodic, non-analytic at $x = 0$ and behave well with respect to \mathcal{H} . In particular $C_2^{(1)}(x) - C_2^{(1)}(0) \sim |x| \log |x|$, which corresponds to the behaviour we expect in Theorem 1.1. However, directly applying the ideas from [20] for the construction does not work since it is not easy to determine the next term in the expansion. Instead we go through the fractional KdV equations for $-1 < \alpha < 0$, for this family of equations the same ideas do work and we then study the limit $\alpha \rightarrow -1$.

Remark 1.3. From the representation of u_0 and the bounds for v , given in Section 8, it is possible to compute quantitative bounds for properties of the solution.

It is possible to enclose the first Fourier coefficient of the solution u , and hence also φ . For u_0 the first Fourier coefficient is given by $-0.54771699\dots$, taking into account the bounds for v we can compute the enclosure $[0.534, 0.561]$ for the first Fourier coefficient of φ . This agrees with the results from Castro, Córdoba and Zheng [10] that the branch of solutions break down for ϵ somewhere between $\epsilon^* \sim 0.23$ and $\frac{2}{e}$. It also agrees with their (unpublished) numerical results indicating that the branch ends around $\epsilon = 0.548$ [9].

It is also possible to enclose the mean of u , which gives the wavespeed c for a corresponding zero-mean φ . From the expression of u_0 (see (11)) it is straightforward to compute the mean $1.11041\dots$ of u_0 . Taking into account the bounds for v we get the enclosure $[1.1, 1.121]$ for the mean of u .

An important part of our work is the interplay between traditional mathematical tools and rigorous computer calculations. Traditional numerical methods typically only compute approximate results, to be able to use the results in a proof we need the results to be rigorously verified. The basis for rigorous calculations is interval arithmetic, pioneered by Moore in the 1970's [46]. Due to improvements in both computational power as well as great improvements in software it has become possible to use computer assisted tools in many more problems. The main idea with interval arithmetic is to do arithmetic not directly on real numbers but on intervals with computer representable endpoints. Given a function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, an interval extension of f is an extension to intervals satisfying that for an interval \mathbf{x} , $f(\mathbf{x})$ is an interval satisfying $f(x) \in f(\mathbf{x})$ for all $x \in \mathbf{x}$. In particular this allows us to prove inequalities for the function f , for example the right endpoint of $f(\mathbf{x})$ gives an upper bound of f on the interval \mathbf{x} . For an introduction to interval arithmetic and rigorous numerics we refer the reader to the books [46, 52] and to the survey [21] for a specific treatment of computer assisted proofs in PDE. For all the calculations in this paper we make use of the Arb library [36] for ball (intervals represented as a midpoint and radius) arithmetic. It has good support for many of the special functions we use [38, 32, 37], Taylor arithmetic (see e.g. [34]) as well as rigorous integration [33].

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we reduce the proof of Theorem 1.1 to a fixed point problem. In Section 3 we give a brief overview of properties of the Clausen functions that are relevant for the construction of u_0 , in Section 4 we give the construction of u_0 . Section 5 is devoted to the approach for bounding n_0 and δ_0 , Section 6 to studying the linear operator that appears in the construction of the fixed point problem. The computer assisted proofs giving bounds for n_0 , δ_0 and D_0 are given in Section 7. Finally we give the proof of Theorem 1.1 in Section 8.

Three appendices are given at the end of the paper. Appendix A gives some technical details for how to compute enclosures of functions around removable singularities. Appendix B is concerned with computing enclosures of the Clausen functions and Appendix C with the rigorous numerical integration needed for bounding D_0 .

2 Reduction to a fixed point problem

In this section we reduce the problem of proving Theorem 1.1 to proving the existence of a fixed point for a certain operator. We start with the following lemma which motivates the notion of highest wave (see also [24, Theorem 3.4])

Lemma 2.1. Let $\varphi \in C^1$ be a nonconstant, even solution of (3) which is nondecreasing on $(-\pi, 0)$, then

$$\varphi' > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi < c$$

on $(-\pi, 0)$.

Proof. We start by proving that under these assumptions $\mathbf{H}[\varphi] < 0$. Since φ is even we can write the Hilbert transform of φ as

$$\mathbf{H}[\varphi](x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^0 \left(\cot\left(\frac{x-y}{2}\right) + \cot\left(\frac{x+y}{2}\right) \right) \varphi(y) dy.$$

Integration by parts gives us

$$\mathbf{H}[\varphi](x) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^0 \left(\log \left| \sin \left(\frac{x-y}{2} \right) \right| - \log \left| \sin \left(\frac{x+y}{2} \right) \right| \right) \varphi'(y) dy.$$

For $x \in (-\pi, 0)$ and $y \in (-\pi, 0)$ we have

$$\left| \sin \left(\frac{x-y}{2} \right) \right| < \left| \sin \left(\frac{x+y}{2} \right) \right|.$$

For $y > x$ this follows from that $|\sin(x)|$ is increasing as a distance to a multiple of π and that $\frac{x-y}{2}$ is closer to zero than $\frac{x+y}{2}$ is to zero or $-\pi$, the case $y < x$ can be reduced to the previous case by switching x and y and using that \sin is odd. It follows that

$$\log \left| \sin \left(\frac{x-y}{2} \right) \right| - \log \left| \sin \left(\frac{x+y}{2} \right) \right| < 0.$$

Since $\varphi' \geq 0$ we get $\mathbf{H}[\varphi] \leq 0$. Furthermore φ is nonconstant and continuous so we have $\varphi' > 0$ in some open set, giving us $\mathbf{H}[\varphi] < 0$.

Now, writing (3) as

$$\varphi'(\varphi - c) = \mathbf{H}[\varphi]$$

and using $\mathbf{H}[\varphi] < 0$ we get

$$\varphi'(\varphi - c) < 0.$$

Which implies that $\varphi' > 0$ and $\varphi < c$. □

As a consequence, any continuous, nonconstant, even function which is nondecreasing on $(-\pi, 0)$ that satisfy (3) almost everywhere must satisfy $\varphi \leq c$. The maximal possible height is thus given by c and due to the function being even and nondecreasing on $(-\pi, 0)$ the maximal height has to be attained at $x = 0$.

Now, the ansatz $\varphi(x) = c - u(x)$ inserted in (3) gives an equation which does not explicitly depend on the wave speed c . Indeed, inserting this gives us

$$uu' = -\mathbf{H}[u]. \tag{5}$$

Note that a solution of this equation gives a solution of (3) for any wave speed c . This is to be expected due to the Galilean change of variables

$$\varphi \mapsto \varphi + \gamma, \quad c \mapsto c + \gamma$$

which leaves (3) invariant. In particular, taking c equal to the mean of u gives a zero mean solution. For a highest wave we expect to have $\varphi(0) = c$, giving us $u(0) = 0$. Integrating (5) gives us

$$\frac{1}{2}u^2 = -\mathcal{H}[u]. \tag{6}$$

Here \mathcal{H} is the operator

$$\mathcal{H}[f](x) = \frac{1}{\pi} p.v. \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \left(\log \left| \sin \left(\frac{x-y}{2} \right) \right| - \log \left| \sin \left(\frac{y}{2} \right) \right| \right) f(y) dy. \tag{7}$$

It is the integral of the Hilbert transform with the constant of integration taken such that $\mathcal{H}[f](0) = 0$, this ensures that any solution of (6) satisfies $u(0) = 0$. Note that any solution of (6) is a solution of (5) and hence gives a solution to (3).

To reduce the problem to a fixed point problem we write u as one, explicit, approximate solution of (6) and one unknown term. More precisely we make the ansatz

$$u(x) = u_0(x) + w(x)v(x) \tag{8}$$

where $u_0(x)$ is an explicit, carefully chosen, approximate solution of (6) and $w(x) = x\sqrt{\log\left(1 + \frac{1}{|x|}\right)}$. By taking $u_0(x) \sim \frac{1}{\pi}|x|\log|x|$, proving Theorem 1.1 reduces to proving existence of $v \in L^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ such that the given ansatz is a solution of (6).

Inserting the ansatz (8) into (6) gives us

$$\frac{1}{2}(u_0 + wv)^2 = -\mathcal{H}[u_0 + wv] \iff \frac{1}{2}u_0^2 + u_0wv + \frac{1}{2}w^2v^2 = -\mathcal{H}[u_0] - \mathcal{H}[wv].$$

By collecting all the linear terms in v we can write this as

$$u_0wv + \mathcal{H}[wv] = -\mathcal{H}[u_0] - \frac{1}{2}u_0^2 - \frac{1}{2}w^2v^2 \iff v + \frac{1}{wu_0}\mathcal{H}[wv] = -\frac{1}{wu_0}\left(\mathcal{H}[u_0] + \frac{1}{2}u_0^2\right) - \frac{w}{2u_0}v^2.$$

Now let T denote the operator

$$T[v] = -\frac{1}{wu_0}\mathcal{H}[wv]. \tag{9}$$

Denote the weighted defect of the approximate solution $u_0(x)$ by

$$F(x) = \frac{1}{w(x)u_0(x)}\left(\mathcal{H}[u_0](x) + \frac{1}{2}u_0(x)^2\right),$$

and let

$$N(x) = \frac{w(x)}{2u_0(x)}.$$

Then we can write the above as

$$(I - T)v = -F - Nv^2.$$

Assuming that $I - T$ is invertible we can rewrite this as

$$v = (I - T)^{-1}(-F - Nv^2) =: G[v]. \tag{10}$$

Hence proving the existence of v such that that $u_0 + wv$ is a solution to (6) reduces to proving the existence of a fixed point of the operator G .

Next we reduce the problem of proving that G has a fixed point to checking an inequality for three numbers that depend only on the choice of u_0 and w . We let $\|T\|$ denote the $L^\infty(\mathbb{T}) \rightarrow L^\infty(\mathbb{T})$ norm of a linear operator T .

Proposition 2.2. *Let $D_0 = \|T\|$, $\delta_0 = \|F\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})}$ and $n_0 = \|N\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})}$. If $D_0 < 1$ and they satisfy the inequality*

$$\delta_0 < \frac{(1 - D_0)^2}{4n_0}$$

then for

$$\epsilon = \frac{1 - D_0 - \sqrt{(1 - D_0)^2 - 4\delta_0 n_0}}{2n_0}$$

and

$$X_\epsilon = \{v \in L^\infty(\mathbb{T}) : v(x) = v(-x), \|v\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})} \leq \epsilon\}$$

we have

1. $G(X_\epsilon) \subseteq X_\epsilon$;
2. $\|G[v] - G[w]\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})} \leq k_0\|v - w\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})}$ with $k_0 < 1$ for all $v, w \in X_\epsilon$.

Proof. Using that N and F are even it can be checked that

$$G(X_\epsilon) \subseteq (I - T)^{-1} X_{\delta_0 + n_0 \epsilon^2}.$$

Since $\|T\| < 1$ the operator $I - T$ is invertible and an upper bound of the norm of the inverse is given by $\frac{1}{1 - D_0}$, moreover T takes even functions to even functions and hence so will $(I - T)^{-1}$. This gives us

$$G(X_\epsilon) \subseteq (I - T)^{-1} X_{\delta_0 + n_0 \epsilon^2} \subseteq X_{\frac{\delta_0 + n_0 \epsilon^2}{1 - D_0}}.$$

The choice of ϵ then gives

$$\frac{\delta_0 + n_0 \epsilon^2}{1 - D_0} = \epsilon.$$

Next we have $G[v] - G[w] = (I - T)^{-1}(-N(v^2 - w^2))$ and hence

$$\|G[v] - G[w]\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})} \leq \frac{n_0}{1 - D_0} \|v^2 - w^2\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})} \leq \frac{2n_0 \epsilon}{1 - D_0} \|v - w\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})}.$$

Where $k_0 = \frac{2n_0 \epsilon}{1 - D_0} < 1$ since $\epsilon < \frac{1 - D_0}{2n_0}$. □

3 Clausen functions

We here give definitions and properties of the Clausen functions that are used in Sections 4, 5 and 6. For more details about the Clausen functions see Appendix B.

The Clausen functions are related to the polylogarithm through

$$\begin{aligned} C_s(x) &= \frac{1}{2} (\text{Li}_s(e^{ix}) + \text{Li}_s(e^{-ix})) = \text{Re}(\text{Li}_s(e^{ix})), \\ S_s(x) &= \frac{1}{2} (\text{Li}_s(e^{ix}) - \text{Li}_s(e^{-ix})) = \text{Im}(\text{Li}_s(e^{ix})). \end{aligned}$$

They behave nicely with respect to the Hilbert transform, for which we have

$$\mathbf{H}[C_s](x) = S_s(x), \quad \mathbf{H}[S_s](x) = -C_s(x).$$

In many cases we want to work with functions which are normalised to be zero at $x = 0$, for which we use the notation

$$\tilde{C}_s(x) = C_s(x) - C_s(0), \quad \tilde{C}_s^{(\beta)}(x) = C_s^{(\beta)}(x) - C_s^{(\beta)}(0).$$

With this notation we get for the operator \mathcal{H} ,

$$\mathcal{H}[\tilde{C}_s](x) = -\tilde{C}_{s-1}(x), \quad \mathcal{H}[S_s](x) = -S_{s-1}(x).$$

From [20] we have the following expansion for $C_s(x)$ and $S_s(x)$, valid for $|x| < 2\pi$,

$$\begin{aligned} C_s(x) &= \Gamma(1 - s) \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}s\right) |x|^{s-1} + \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} (-1)^m \zeta(s - 2m) \frac{x^{2m}}{(2m)!}; \\ S_s(x) &= \Gamma(1 - s) \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2}s\right) \text{sgn}(x) |x|^{s-1} + \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} (-1)^m \zeta(s - 2m - 1) \frac{x^{2m+1}}{(2m+1)!}. \end{aligned}$$

For the functions $C_s^{(\beta)}$ and $S_s^{(\beta)}$ we will mainly make use of $C_2^{(1)}(x)$ and $C_3^{(1)}(x)$, for which we have the following expansions [2, Eq. 16], valid for $|x| < 2\pi$,

$$\begin{aligned} C_2^{(1)}(x) &= \zeta^{(1)}(2) - \frac{\pi}{2}|x| \log|x| - (\gamma - 1)\frac{\pi}{2}|x| + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (-1)^m \zeta^{(1)}(2 - 2m) \frac{x^{2m}}{(2m)!}; \\ C_3^{(1)}(x) &= \zeta^{(1)}(3) - \frac{1}{4}x^2 \log^2|x| + \frac{3 - 2\gamma}{4}x^2 \log|x| - \frac{36\gamma - 12\gamma^2 - 24\gamma_1 - 42 + \pi^2}{48}x^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} (-1)^m \zeta^{(1)}(3 - 2m) \frac{x^{2m}}{(2m)!}. \end{aligned}$$

Where γ_n is the Stieltjes constant and $\gamma = \gamma_0$. Bounds for the tails are given in Lemmas B.3 and B.4.

4 Construction of the approximate solution

In this section we give the construction of the approximate solution u_0 . As a first step we determine the coefficient for the leading term in the asymptotic expansion.

Lemma 4.1. *Let u be a solution of (6) with the asymptotic behaviour*

$$u(x) = \nu|x| \log|x| + o(|x| \log|x|)$$

close to zero, with $\nu \neq 0$. Then the coefficient is given by $\nu = -\frac{1}{\pi}$.

Proof. For the asymptotic behaviour of the left hand side in (6) we directly get

$$\frac{1}{2}u(x)^2 = \frac{\nu^2}{2}|x|^2 \log^2|x| + o(|x|^2 \log^2|x|)$$

To get the asymptotic behaviour of $\mathcal{H}[u]$ in the right hand side we go through the Clausen function $\tilde{C}_2^{(1)}(x)$, which has the asymptotic behaviour

$$\tilde{C}_2^{(1)}(x) = -\frac{\pi}{2}|x| \log|x| + o(|x| \log|x|).$$

Since $\mathcal{H}[\tilde{C}_2^{(1)}] = -\tilde{C}_3^{(1)}$ we have

$$\mathcal{H}\tilde{C}_2^{(1)}(x) = -\frac{1}{4}|x|^2 \log^2|x| + o(|x|^2 \log^2|x|),$$

giving us

$$\mathcal{H}[u] = \frac{1}{2\pi^2}|x|^2 \log^2|x| + o(|x|^2 \log^2|x|).$$

For $\frac{1}{2}u^2$ and $-\mathcal{H}[u]$ to have the same asymptotic behaviour we must therefore have

$$\frac{\nu^2}{2} = -\nu \frac{1}{2\pi},$$

which gives us the result. □

In addition to having the correct asymptotic behaviour we want u_0 to be a good approximate solution of (6), in the sense that we want the defect,

$$F(x) = \frac{1}{w(x)u_0(x)} \left(\mathcal{H}[u_0](x) + \frac{1}{2}u_0(x)^2 \right),$$

to be small for $x \in \mathbb{T}$. The hardest part is to make $F(x)$ small locally near the singularity at $x = 0$, this is done by studying the asymptotic behaviour of $\mathcal{H}[u_0](x) + \frac{1}{2}u_0(x)^2$. Once the defect is sufficiently small near $x = 0$ it can be made small globally by adding a suitable trigonometric polynomial.

The construction is similar to that in [20], the main difference is that the asymptotic behaviour is more complicated in our case. We take u_0 to be a combination of three parts:

1. The first part is the term $-\frac{2}{\pi^2}\tilde{C}_2^{(1)}$, where the coefficient is chosen to give the right asymptotic behaviour according to Lemma 4.1.
2. The second part is chosen to make the defect small near $x = 0$ and, similarly to in [20], it is given by a sum of Clausen functions.
3. The third part is chosen to make the defect small globally and is given by a trigonometric polynomial.

More precisely the approximation is given by

$$u_0(x) = \frac{2}{\pi^2}\tilde{C}_2^{(1)}(x) + \sum_{j=1}^{N_0} a_j \tilde{C}_{s_j}(x) + \sum_{n=1}^{N_1} b_n (\cos(nx) - 1), \quad (11)$$

To ensure that the leading asymptotics are determined by $\tilde{C}_2^{(1)}(x)$ we require that $s_j \geq 2$.

We want to choose the values of a_j and s_j to make the defect small near $x = 0$. Taking $u_0 = \frac{2}{\pi^2}\tilde{C}_2^{(1)}$ gives us that the leading term in the expansion of $\mathcal{H}[u_0] + \frac{1}{2}u_0^2$ is of order $|x|^2 \log|x|$. A natural choice would then be to take the next term as a multiple of \tilde{C}_2 , for which $\mathcal{H}[\tilde{C}_2]$ behaves like $|x|^2 \log|x|$. However, its contribution to the $|x|^2 \log|x|$ term of $\mathcal{H}[u_0]$ and $\frac{1}{2}u_0^2$ turns out to exactly cancel out and we are left with no improvement to the asymptotic behaviour.

Instead we take inspiration from the fractional KdV equations (4), which for $\alpha = -1$ reduces to the Burgers-Hilbert equation. To choose a_j and s_j we study the limit $\alpha \rightarrow -1^+$. For $-1 < \alpha < 0$ the fractional KdV equations, like the Burgers-Hilbert equation, admits a highest cusped traveling wave solution, as recently proved in [48]. In a forthcoming [12] work we show that the traveling waves asymptotically at $x = 0$ behave like $c - \nu_\alpha |x|^{-\alpha}$, with

$$\nu_\alpha = \frac{2\Gamma(2\alpha) \cos(\pi\alpha)}{\Gamma(\alpha) \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\alpha\right)}.$$

Following the same approach as in Section 2 proving the existence of a highest cusped wave for the fractional KdV equations can be reduced to studying the equation

$$\frac{1}{2}u^2 = -\mathcal{H}^\alpha[u],$$

where $\mathcal{H}^\alpha[u](x) = |D|^\alpha[u](x) - |D|^\alpha[u](0)$. By studying the asymptotic behaviour of $\mathcal{H}^\alpha[u] + \frac{1}{2}u^2$ and following the same reasoning as in [20] a suitable approximation for this equation is given by

$$a_{\alpha,0}\tilde{C}_{1-\alpha}(x) + \sum_{j=1}^{N_0} a_{\alpha,j}\tilde{C}_{1-\alpha+jp_\alpha}(x)$$

with

$$a_{\alpha,0} = \frac{2\Gamma(2\alpha) \cos(\pi\alpha)}{\Gamma(\alpha)^2 \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\alpha\right)^2}$$

and p_α a solution of

$$\Gamma(\alpha) \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\alpha\right) a_{\alpha,0} \Gamma(\alpha - p_\alpha) \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2}(\alpha - p_\alpha)\right) - \Gamma(2\alpha - p_\alpha) \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2}(2\alpha - p_\alpha)\right) = 0.$$

One can numerically solve for $a_{\alpha,j}$ by considering the asymptotic expansion of the defect. As $\alpha \rightarrow -1$ we have $a_{\alpha,0} \rightarrow -\infty$ and $p_\alpha \rightarrow 0$. Numerically one also sees that $a_{\alpha,1} \rightarrow \infty$, in such a way that $a_{\alpha,0} + a_{\alpha,1}$

remains bounded. The other coefficients, $a_{\alpha,j}$ for $j \geq 2$, all remain bounded. Furthermore we note that as α approaches -1 , the function $a_{\alpha,0}(\tilde{C}_{1-\alpha}(x) - \tilde{C}_{1-\alpha+p_\alpha})$ approaches $\frac{2}{\pi^2}\tilde{C}_2^{(1)}(x)$. The remaining part,

$$(a_{\alpha,0} + a_{\alpha,1})\tilde{C}_{1-\alpha+p_\alpha}(x) + \sum_{j=2}^{N_0} a_{\alpha,j}\tilde{C}_{1-\alpha+jp_\alpha}(x),$$

is numerically seen to converge to a function as $\alpha \rightarrow -1$, as long as N_0 is increased as we approach $\alpha = -1$. This gives a hint on how to choose a_j and s_j for u_0 , we take it according to

$$(a_{\alpha,0} + a_{\alpha,1})\tilde{C}_{1-\alpha+p_\alpha}(x) + \sum_{j=2}^{N_0} a_{\alpha,j}\tilde{C}_{1-\alpha+jp_\alpha}(x).$$

For this we fix some α close to -1 and compute p_α as well as the coefficients $a_{\alpha,j}$. We then take $a_1 = a_{\alpha,0} + a_{\alpha,1}$, $a_j = a_{\alpha,j}$ for $j \geq 2$ and

$$s_j = 1 - \alpha + jp_\alpha.$$

As long as α is sufficiently close to -1 and N_0 is sufficiently high this gives a small enough defect close to $x = 0$. While not obvious from the expression of p_α we do have $1 - \alpha + p_\alpha > 2$, as required.

The coefficients b_n are then taken to make the defect small globally. This is done by taking N_1 equally spaced points $\{x_n\}_{1 \leq n \leq N_1}$ on the interval $(0, \pi)$ and numerically solving the non-linear system

$$\mathcal{H}[u_0](x_n) + \frac{1}{2}u_0(x_n)^2 = 0 \quad \text{for } 1 \leq n \leq N_1.$$

In the computations we use $\alpha = -0.9997$ (giving $p_\alpha \approx 3.00045 \cdot 10^{-4}$), $N_0 = 1929$ and $N_1 = 16$.

Remark 4.2. *The approximation u_0 only needs to be an approximate solution to the equation, as opposed to the coefficient for $\tilde{C}_2^{(1)}$, which has to match exactly to obtain the right asymptotic behaviour.*

With this approximation we get

$$\mathcal{H}[u_0](x) = -\frac{2}{\pi^2}\tilde{C}_3^{(1)}(x) - \sum_{j=1}^{N_0} a_j\tilde{C}_{1+s_j}(x) - \sum_{n=1}^{N_1} b_n \frac{(\cos(nx) - 1)}{n}. \quad (12)$$

Furthermore we have the following asymptotic expansions for the approximation, which we give without proof since they follow directly from the expansions of the Clausen and trigonometric functions.

Lemma 4.3. *The approximation u_0 given by equation (11) has the asymptotic expansions*

$$\begin{aligned} u_0(x) = & -\frac{1}{\pi}|x| \log|x| - \frac{\gamma-1}{\pi}|x| + \sum_{j=1}^{N_0} a_j^0|x|^{-\alpha+jp_\alpha} \\ & + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^m}{(2m)!} \left(\frac{2}{\pi^2}\zeta^{(1)}(2-2m) + \sum_{j=1}^{N_0} a_j\zeta(1-\alpha+jp_\alpha-2m) + \sum_{n=1}^{N_1} b_n n^{2m} \right) x^{2m} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}[u_0(x)] = & -\frac{1}{2\pi^2}x^2 \log^2|x| + \frac{3-2\gamma}{2\pi^2}x^2 \log|x| - \sum_{j=1}^{N_0} A_j^0|x|^{1-\alpha+jp_\alpha} \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{36\gamma-12\gamma^2-24\gamma_1-42+\pi^2}{12\pi^2} + \sum_{j=1}^{N_0} a_j\zeta(-\alpha+jp_\alpha) + \sum_{n=1}^{N_1} b_n n \right) x^2 \\ & - \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^m}{(2m)!} \left(\frac{2}{\pi^2}\zeta^{(1)}(3-2m) + \sum_{j=1}^{N_0} a_j\zeta(2-\alpha+jp_\alpha-2m) + \sum_{n=1}^{N_1} b_n n^{2m-1} \right) x^{2m} \end{aligned}$$

valid for $|x| < 2\pi$, where

$$\begin{aligned} a_j^0 &= \Gamma(\alpha - jp_\alpha) \cos\left((\alpha - jp_\alpha)\frac{\pi}{2}\right) a_j; \\ A_j^0 &= \Gamma(\alpha - 1 - jp_\alpha) \cos\left((\alpha - 1 - jp_\alpha)\frac{\pi}{2}\right) a_j. \end{aligned}$$

5 Bounding n_0 and δ_0

Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} n_0 &:= \|N\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})} = \sup_{x \in [0, \pi]} |N(x)|, \\ \delta_0 &:= \|F\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{T})} = \sup_{x \in [0, \pi]} |F(x)|, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$N(x) = \frac{x\sqrt{\log(1+1/x)}}{2u_0(x)} \quad \text{and} \quad F(x) = \frac{\mathcal{H}[u_0](x) + \frac{1}{2}u_0(x)^2}{x\sqrt{\log(1+1/x)}u_0(x)}.$$

For fixed $x > 0$ which is not too small we can compute accurate enclosures of $N(x)$ as well as $F(x)$ using interval arithmetic. This allows us to compute

$$\sup_{x \in [\epsilon, \pi]} |N(x)| \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{x \in [\epsilon, \pi]} |F(x)|$$

for some fixed $\epsilon > 0$. As $x \rightarrow 0$ the numerators and denominators tend to zero in both N and F and we need to handle the removable singularities. We start with the following lemma:

Lemma 5.1. *The function $\frac{-|x|\log|x|}{u_0(x)}$ is positive and bounded at $x = 0$ and for $|x| < 1$ it has the expansion*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|x|\log|x|}{u_0(x)} &= - \left(-\frac{1}{\pi} - \frac{\gamma-1}{\pi} \frac{1}{\log|x|} + \sum_{j=1}^{N_0} a_j^0 \frac{|x|^{-1-\alpha+jp_\alpha}}{\log|x|} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^m}{(2m)!} \left(\frac{2}{\pi^2} \zeta^{(1)}(2-2m) + \sum_{j=1}^{N_0} a_j \zeta(1-\alpha+jp_\alpha-2m) + \sum_{n=1}^{N_1} b_n n^{2m} \right) \frac{|x|^{2m-1}}{\log|x|} \right)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The expansion follows directly from the expansion of u_0 given in Lemma 4.3 and canceling the $|x|\log|x|$ factor.

The function $\frac{1}{\log|x|}$ goes to zero at $x = 0$ and is bounded nearby and by construction α and p are taken such that $-1 - \alpha + jp_\alpha > 0$ for $j \geq 1$. This means that all terms except $\frac{1}{\pi}$ tend to zero as $x \rightarrow 0$. The value at $x = 0$ will hence be given by $-(-\frac{1}{\pi})^{-1} = \pi$. \square

In light of this lemma we do the split

$$N(x) = \frac{\sqrt{\log(1+1/x)}}{-2\log x} \cdot \frac{-x\log x}{u_0(x)}.$$

The second factor can then be bounded using the lemma. For the first factor it is enough to notice that it tends to zero at $x = 0$ and is increasing in x on $(0, 1)$. For $F(x)$ we do the split

$$F(x) = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{\log(1+1/x)}} \cdot \frac{-x\log x}{u_0(x)} \cdot \frac{\mathcal{H}[u_0](x) + \frac{1}{2}u_0(x)^2}{x^2\log x}$$

The first factor can be handled by noticing that it tends to zero at $x = 0$ and is increasing in x , the second factor is handled using the above lemma. What remains is to handle the third factor, which is done in the following lemma:

Lemma 5.2. *The function*

$$\frac{\mathcal{H}[u_0](x) + \frac{1}{2}u_0(x)^2}{x^2 \log x}$$

is non-zero and bounded at $x = 0$ and for $|x| < 1$ it has the expansion

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathcal{H}[u_0](x) + \frac{1}{2}u_0(x)^2}{x^2 \log x} &= \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{(\gamma-1)^2}{\pi^2} + \frac{36\gamma - 12\gamma^2 - 24\gamma_1 - 42 + \pi^2}{12\pi^2} + \sum_{j=1}^{N_0} a_j \zeta(-\alpha + jp_\alpha) + \sum_{n=1}^{N_1} b_n n \right) \frac{1}{\log|x|} \\ &- \frac{1}{\pi} \left(1 + \frac{\gamma-1}{\log|x|} \right) \sum_{j=1}^{N_0} a_j^0 |x|^{-1-\alpha+jp_\alpha} + \frac{1}{2 \log|x|} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N_0} a_j^0 |x|^{-1-\alpha+jp_\alpha} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{\log|x|} \sum_{j=1}^{N_0} A_j^0 |x|^{-1-\alpha+jp_\alpha} \\ &- \frac{1}{\pi} \left(1 + \frac{\gamma-1}{\log|x|} \right) \frac{S_1}{|x|} + \frac{1}{\log|x|} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N_0} a_j^0 |x|^{-1-\alpha+jp_\alpha} \right) \frac{S_1}{|x|} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{S_1^2}{x^2 \log|x|} - \frac{S_2}{x^2 \log|x|}. \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^m}{(2m)!} \left(\frac{2}{\pi^2} \zeta^{(1)}(2-2m) + \sum_{j=1}^{N_0} a_j \zeta(1-\alpha+jp_\alpha-2m) + \sum_{n=1}^{N_1} b_n n^{2m} \right) |x|^{2m} \\ S_2 &= \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^m}{(2m)!} \left(\frac{2}{\pi^2} \zeta^{(1)}(3-2m) + \sum_{j=1}^{N_0} a_j \zeta(2-\alpha+jp_\alpha-2m) + \sum_{n=1}^{N_1} b_n n^{2m-1} \right) x^{2m} \end{aligned}$$

Proof. From the expansions of u_0 in Lemma 4.3 we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}u_0(x)^2 &= \frac{1}{2\pi^2} x^2 \log^2|x| + \frac{\gamma-1}{\pi^2} x^2 \log|x| + \frac{(\gamma-1)^2}{2\pi^2} x^2 \\ &- \frac{1}{\pi} (\log|x| + \gamma - 1) \sum_{j=1}^{N_0} a_j^0 |x|^{1-\alpha+jp_\alpha} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N_0} a_j^0 |x|^{-\alpha+jp_\alpha} \right)^2 \\ &- \frac{1}{\pi} (\log|x| + \gamma - 1) |x| S_1 + \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N_0} a_j^0 |x|^{-\alpha+jp_\alpha} \right) S_1 + \frac{1}{2} S_1^2. \end{aligned}$$

This together with the expansion for $\mathcal{H}[u_0]$ gives us

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}[u_0](x) + \frac{1}{2}u_0(x)^2 &= \frac{1}{2\pi^2} x^2 \log|x| \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{(\gamma-1)^2}{\pi^2} + \frac{36\gamma - 12\gamma^2 - 24\gamma_1 - 42 + \pi^2}{12\pi^2} + \sum_{j=1}^{N_0} a_j \zeta(-\alpha + jp_\alpha) + \sum_{n=1}^{N_1} b_n n \right) x^2 \\ &- \frac{1}{\pi} (\log|x| + \gamma - 1) \sum_{j=1}^{N_0} a_j^0 |x|^{1-\alpha+jp_\alpha} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N_0} a_j^0 |x|^{-\alpha+jp_\alpha} \right)^2 - \sum_{j=1}^{N_0} A_j^0 |x|^{1-\alpha+jp_\alpha} \\ &- \frac{1}{\pi} (\log|x| + \gamma - 1) |x| S_1 + \left(\sum_{j=1}^{N_0} a_j^0 |x|^{-\alpha+jp_\alpha} \right) S_1 + \frac{1}{2} S_1^2 - S_2. \end{aligned}$$

Division by $x^2 \log |x|$ gives the required expansion. Note that the two leading terms in $\frac{1}{2}u_0$ and $\mathcal{H}[u_0]$ exactly cancel out, this is needed for the result to be bounded near $x = 0$. \square

6 Analysis of T and bounding D_0

In this section we give more details about the operator T defined by

$$T[v] = -\frac{1}{wu_0} \mathcal{H}[wv]$$

and show how to bound $D_0 := \|T\|$.

For an even function $v(x)$ and $0 < x < \pi$ we can write (7) as

$$\mathcal{H}[v](x) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\pi \log \left(\frac{\sin(|x-y|/2) \sin((x+y)/2)}{\sin(y/2)^2} \right) v(y) dy. \quad (13)$$

Using that $C_1(x) = -\log(2 \sin(|x|/2))$ this can alternatively be written as

$$\mathcal{H}[v](x) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\pi - (C_1(x-y) + C_1(x+y) - 2C_1(y)) v(y) dy. \quad (14)$$

From (13) we have

$$T[v](x) = \frac{1}{\pi w(x)u_0(x)} \int_0^\pi \log \left(\frac{\sin(|x-y|/2) \sin((x+y)/2)}{\sin(y/2)^2} \right) w(y)v(y) dy.$$

The norm of T is then given by

$$D_0 = \|T\| = \sup_{x \in [0, \pi]} \left| \frac{1}{\pi w(x)u_0(x)} \int_0^\pi \left| \log \left(\frac{\sin(|x-y|/2) \sin((x+y)/2)}{\sin(y/2)^2} \right) w(y) \right| dy \right|. \quad (15)$$

Let

$$I(x, y) = \log \left(\frac{\sin(|x-y|/2) \sin((x+y)/2)}{\sin(y/2)^2} \right),$$

and

$$U(x) = \int_0^\pi |I(x, y)w(y)| dy = \int_0^\pi |I(x, y)|y\sqrt{\log(1+1/y)} dy.$$

We are then interested in computing

$$D_0 = \|T\| = \sup_{x \in [0, \pi]} \left| \frac{U(x)}{\pi w(x)u_0(x)} \right|.$$

We use the notation

$$\mathcal{T}(x) = \frac{U(x)}{\pi w(x)u_0(x)}.$$

The integrand of $U(x)$ has a singularity at $y = x$. It is therefore natural to split the integral into two parts

$$\begin{aligned} U_1(x) &= \int_0^x |I(x, y)|y\sqrt{\log(1+1/y)} dy = x^2 \int_0^1 |\hat{I}(x, t)|t\sqrt{\log(1+1/(xt))} dt, \\ U_2(x) &= \int_x^\pi |I(x, y)|y\sqrt{\log(1+1/y)} dy, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\hat{I}(x, t) = \log \left(\frac{\sin(|x(1-t)|/2) \sin(x(1+t)/2)}{\sin(xt/2)^2} \right).$$

The following two lemmas give information about the sign of $\hat{I}(x, t)$ and $I(x, y)$, allowing us to remove the absolute value.

Lemma 6.1. *For all $x \in (0, \pi)$ the function $\hat{I}(x, t)$ is decreasing and continuous in t for $t \in (0, 1)$ and has the limits*

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \hat{I}(x, t) &= \infty, \\ \lim_{t \rightarrow 1^-} \hat{I}(x, t) &= -\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the unique root, r_x , is decreasing in x and satisfies the inequality

$$\frac{1}{2} < r_x < \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}.$$

Proof. The left and right limits are easily checked and it is clear that the function is continuous in t on the interval. To show that it is decreasing in t we split the log into three terms and differentiate, giving us

$$\frac{d}{dt} \hat{I}(x, t) = \frac{1}{2} x (-\cot(x(1-t)/2) + \cot(x(1+t)/2) - 2\cot(xt/2)).$$

We want to prove that this is negative. Note that $0 < xt/2 < \pi/2$ and that \cot is positive on the interval $(0, \pi/2)$, hence it is enough to check

$$-\cot(x(1-t)/2) + \cot(x(1+t)/2) < 0,$$

which follows immediately from the monotonicity of \cot on the interval $[0, \pi]$. This proves the existence of a unique root r_x on the interval $(0, 1)$.

To prove that r_x is decreasing in x it is enough to prove that $\hat{I}(x, t)$ is decreasing in x . Differentiating with respect to x gives us

$$\frac{d}{dx} \hat{I}(x, t) = \frac{1}{2} (((1-t) \cot(x(1-t)/2) + (1+t) \cot(x(1+t)/2) - 2t \cot(xt/2))),$$

which we want to prove is negative. Letting $g(t) = t \cot(xt/2)$ and using that $g(1) \leq g(t)$ for $t \in (0, 1)$ it is enough to show that

$$g(1-t) + g(1+t) \leq 2g(1).$$

This holds since g is concave, as

$$g''(t) = \frac{x}{2 \sin^2(xt/2)} (xt \cot(xt/2) - 2) < 0$$

following from $\frac{x}{2 \sin^2(xt/2)} > 0$ and $xt \cot(xt/2) \leq 2$.

Finally, to see that $\frac{1}{2} < r_x < \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ it is enough to check that for $x = \pi$ the root is given by $t = \frac{1}{2}$ and that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} \hat{I}(x, t) = \lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} \log \left(\frac{x(1-t)/2 \cdot x(1+t)/2}{(xt/2)^2} \right) = -\log \left(\frac{1}{t^2} - 1 \right)$$

together with the monotonicity in x . □

Lemma 6.2. *For $x \in (0, \pi)$ we have $I(x, y) < 0$ for all $y \in (x, \pi)$.*

Proof. The function $f(y) = -\log(\sin(y/2))$ is strictly convex on the domain $(0, 2\pi)$. This follows from the fact that $-\log(y)$ is strictly convex and decreasing and $\sin(y/2)$ is strictly concave on the interval. It immediately follows that

$$I(x, y) = \log((\sin((y-x)/2))) + \log((\sin((y+x)/2))) - 2\log((\sin(y/2))) < 0.$$

□

With these two lemmas we can slightly simplify U_1 and U_2 , we get

$$\begin{aligned} U_1(x) &= x^2 \int_0^{r_x} \log\left(\frac{\sin(x(1-t)/2)\sin(x(1+t)/2)}{\sin(xt/2)^2}\right) t\sqrt{\log(1+1/(xt))} dt \\ &\quad - x^2 \int_{r_x}^1 \log\left(\frac{\sin(x(1-t)/2)\sin(x(1+t)/2)}{\sin(xt/2)^2}\right) t\sqrt{\log(1+1/(xt))} dt \\ &= x^2(U_{1,1}(x) + U_{1,2}(x)) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$U_2(x) = - \int_x^\pi \log\left(\frac{\sin((y-x)/2)\sin((x+y)/2)}{\sin(y/2)^2}\right) y\sqrt{\log(1+1/y)} dy$$

Similarly to in the previous section we divide the interval $[0, \pi]$, on which we take the supremum, into two parts, $[0, \epsilon]$ and $[\epsilon, \pi]$.

For the interval $[\epsilon, \pi]$ we split $\mathcal{T}(x)$ as

$$\mathcal{T}(x) = \frac{U(x)}{\pi x \sqrt{\log(1+1/x)u_0(x)}} = \frac{1}{u_0(x)} \left(\frac{x(U_{1,1}(x) + U_{1,2}(x))}{\pi \sqrt{\log(1+1/x)}} + \frac{U_2(x)}{\pi x \sqrt{\log(1+1/x)}} \right).$$

See Appendix C for details on how $U_{1,1}$, $U_{1,2}$ and U_2 are computed.

For the interval $[0, \epsilon]$ write $\mathcal{T}(x)$ as

$$\mathcal{T}(x) = \frac{1}{\pi} \cdot \frac{-x \log x}{u_0(x)} \cdot \left(\frac{U_1(x)}{-x^2 \log x \sqrt{\log(1+1/x)}} + \frac{U_2(x)}{-x^2 \log x \sqrt{\log(1+1/x)}} \right).$$

The factor $\frac{-x \log x}{u_0(x)}$ is handled by Lemma 5.1 as before. For the two remaining terms we have the following two lemmas:

Lemma 6.3. *For $x \in [0, \epsilon]$ with $\epsilon < 1$ we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{U_1(x)}{-x^2 \log x \sqrt{\log(1+1/x)}} &\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\log(1+1/x)}} \left(\frac{\log 2}{\sqrt{\log(1/x)}} + \frac{c_1 + \log 2 \sqrt{\log(1+x)}}{\log(1/x)} \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{3R_1}{8} x^2 \left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{\log(1/x)}} + \frac{\sqrt{\pi/2} + 2\sqrt{\log(1+x)}}{\log(1/x)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 &= \int_0^1 |\log(1/t^2 - 1)| t \sqrt{\log(1/t)} dt, \\ R_1 &= \sup_{y \in [0, \epsilon]} \frac{1}{2} \left| \frac{d^2}{dy^2} \log\left(\frac{\sin(y)}{y}\right) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. As a first step we split $\hat{I}(x, t)$ into one main term and one remainder term. We can write $\hat{I}(x, t)$ as

$$\hat{I}(x, t) = \log \left(\sin \left(\frac{x(1-t)}{2} \right) \right) + \log \left(\sin \left(\frac{x(1+t)}{2} \right) \right) - 2 \log \left(\sin \left(\frac{xt}{2} \right) \right).$$

Using that

$$\log \left(\sin \left(\frac{x(1-t)}{2} \right) \right) = \log \left(\operatorname{sinc} \left(\frac{x(1-t)}{2} \right) \right) + \log \left(\frac{x(1-t)}{2} \right),$$

where $\operatorname{sinc} x = \frac{\sin x}{x}$, and similarly for the other log-sin terms, we can split $\hat{I}(x, t)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{I}(x, t) &= \log \left(\frac{x(1-t)}{2} \right) + \log \left(\frac{x(1+t)}{2} \right) - 2 \log \left(\frac{xt}{2} \right) \\ &\quad + \log \left(\operatorname{sinc} \left(\frac{x(1-t)}{2} \right) \right) + \log \left(\operatorname{sinc} \left(\frac{x(1+t)}{2} \right) \right) - 2 \log \left(\operatorname{sinc} \left(\frac{xt}{2} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\log \left(\frac{x(1-t)}{2} \right) + \log \left(\frac{x(1+t)}{2} \right) - 2 \log \left(\frac{xt}{2} \right) = \log(1-t) + \log(1+t) - 2 \log(t) = \log(1/t^2 - 1).$$

Note that for small x , $\operatorname{sinc}(x)$ is close to one, and the corresponding log-terms will therefore be small. We split $U_1(x)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} U_1(x) &\leq x^2 \int_0^1 |\log(1/t^2 - 1)| t \sqrt{\log(1 + 1/(xt))} dt \\ &\quad + x^2 \int_0^1 \left| \log \left(\operatorname{sinc} \left(\frac{x(1-t)}{2} \right) \right) + \log \left(\operatorname{sinc} \left(\frac{x(1+t)}{2} \right) \right) - 2 \log \left(\operatorname{sinc} \left(\frac{xt}{2} \right) \right) \right| t \sqrt{\log(1 + 1/(xt))} dt \\ &= U_{1,m}(x) + U_{1,r}(x). \end{aligned}$$

Focusing in $U_{1,m}$ we note that for $t \in (0, 1)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\log(1 + 1/(xt))} &= \sqrt{\log(1/x) + \log(1/t) + \log(1 + xt)} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\log(1/x)} + \sqrt{\log(1/t)} + \sqrt{\log(1 + xt)} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\log(1/x)} + \sqrt{\log(1/t)} + \sqrt{\log(1 + x)}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} U_{1,m}(x) &\leq x^2 \left(\sqrt{\log(1/x)} \int_0^1 |\log(1/t^2 - 1)| t dt + \int_0^1 |\log(1/t^2 - 1)| t \sqrt{\log(1/t)} dt \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sqrt{\log(1 + x)} \int_0^1 |\log(1/t^2 - 1)| t dt \right). \end{aligned}$$

We have $\int_0^1 |\log(1/t^2 - 1)| t dt = \log 2$ and if we let

$$c_1 = \int_0^1 |\log(1/t^2 - 1)| t \sqrt{\log(1/t)} dt$$

this gives us

$$U_{1,m}(x) \leq x^2 \left(\sqrt{\log(1/x)} \log 2 + c_1 + \log 2 \sqrt{\log(1 + x)} \right).$$

For $U_{1,r}$ we will give a uniform bound of

$$\log\left(\operatorname{sinc}\left(\frac{x(1-t)}{2}\right)\right) + \log\left(\operatorname{sinc}\left(\frac{x(1+t)}{2}\right)\right) - 2\log\left(\operatorname{sinc}\left(\frac{xt}{2}\right)\right)$$

in t on the interval $[0, 1]$ and use this to simplify the integrand. Note that $\frac{x(1-t)}{2}$, $\frac{x(1+t)}{2}$ and $\frac{xt}{2}$ all lie on the interval $[0, x]$. The function $\log(\operatorname{sinc}(y))$ is analytic around $y = 0$ and the first two terms in the Taylor expansion are zero, by Taylor's Theorem we hence have

$$|\log(\operatorname{sinc}(y))| \leq R_1 y^2$$

where

$$R_1 = \sup_{y \in [0, x]} \frac{1}{2} \left| \frac{d}{dy^2} \log(\operatorname{sinc}(y)) \right|.$$

This gives us

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \log\left(\operatorname{sinc}\left(\frac{x(1-t)}{2}\right)\right) + \log\left(\operatorname{sinc}\left(\frac{x(1+t)}{2}\right)\right) - 2\log\left(\operatorname{sinc}\left(\frac{xt}{2}\right)\right) \right| \\ \leq R_1 x^2 \left(\frac{(1-t)^2}{4} + \frac{(1+t)^2}{4} + \frac{t^2}{2} \right) \leq \frac{3R_1}{2} x^2. \end{aligned}$$

With this we get

$$U_{1,r}(x) \leq \frac{3R_1}{2} x^4 \int_0^1 t \sqrt{\log(1 + 1/(xt))} dt.$$

Using the inequality (16) we have

$$\int_0^1 t \sqrt{\log(1 + 1/(xt))} dt \leq \sqrt{\log(1/x)} \int_0^1 t dt + \int_0^1 t \sqrt{\log(1/t)} dt + \sqrt{\log(1+x)} \int_0^1 t dt.$$

With

$$\int_0^1 t dt = \frac{1}{2}, \quad \int_0^1 t \sqrt{\log(1/t)} dt = \frac{\sqrt{\pi/2}}{4}$$

this gives

$$U_{1,r}(x) \leq \frac{3R_1}{8} x^4 \left(2\sqrt{\log(1/x)} + \sqrt{\pi/2} + 2\sqrt{\log(1+x)} \right)$$

Combining the bound for $U_{1,m}$ with that for $U_{1,r}$ gives us the result. \square

Lemma 6.4. For $x \in [0, \epsilon]$ with $\epsilon < \frac{1}{2}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{U_2(x)}{-x^2 \log x \sqrt{\log(1 + 1/x)}} &\leq \frac{\log\left(\frac{16}{3\sqrt{3}}\right)}{\log(1/x)} \\ &+ \left(\frac{\frac{2}{3} \log(1/(2x))^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\log(1/x) \sqrt{\log(1 + 1/x)}} + \frac{R_2 \sqrt{\log(1/(2x))}}{8 \log(1/x) \sqrt{\log(1 + 1/x)}} - \frac{R_2(1 - 4x^2)}{16 \sqrt{\log(1/(2x))} \log(1/x) \sqrt{\log(1 + 1/x)}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{\sqrt{\log 2}}{\sqrt{\log(1 + 1/x)}} - \frac{\log(2)^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\log(1/x) \sqrt{\log(1 + 1/x)}} + \frac{R_2 \sqrt{\log 2} (1 - 4x^2)}{8 \log(1/x) \sqrt{\log(1 + 1/x)}} \right) \\ &+ \frac{\sqrt{\log 2}}{\log(1/x) \sqrt{\log(1 + 1/x)}} \left(\frac{1}{2} \log\left(\frac{\pi^2 - x^2}{1 - x^2}\right) + \frac{\log(1 - x^2)}{2x^2} - \frac{\log\left(1 - \frac{x^2}{\pi^2}\right)}{2x^2} \right) + \frac{D_1 c_2}{\log(1/x) \sqrt{\log(1 + 1/x)}} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
c_2 &= \int_0^\pi y \sqrt{\log(1 + 1/y)} dy, \\
R_2 &= \sup_{y \in [0, 1/4]} \frac{1}{2} \left| \frac{d^2}{dy^2} \log(1 - y) \right|, \\
D_1 &= \sup_{x \in [0, \epsilon]} - \frac{\log(\operatorname{sinc}(\frac{\pi-x}{2})) + \log(\operatorname{sinc}(\frac{\pi+x}{2})) - 2 \log(\operatorname{sinc}(\frac{\pi}{2}))}{x^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Similarly as in the previous lemma we split $I(x, y)$ into one main term and one remainder term. In this case we get

$$\begin{aligned}
I(x, y) &= \log((y-x)/2) + \log((y+x)/2) - 2 \log(y/2) \\
&\quad + \log(\operatorname{sinc}((y-x)/2)) + \log(\operatorname{sinc}((y+x)/2)) - 2 \log(\operatorname{sinc}(y/2)).
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\log((y-x)/2) + \log((y+x)/2) - 2 \log(y/2) = \log(1 - (x/y)^2).$$

Note that the log-sinc terms are not individually small since y is not in general small, but for small values of x they mostly cancel out. We split U_2 as

$$\begin{aligned}
U_2(x) &= \int_x^\pi -\log(1 - (x/y)^2) y \sqrt{\log(1 + 1/y)} dy \\
&\quad + \int_x^\pi -(\log(\operatorname{sinc}((y-x)/2)) + \log(\operatorname{sinc}((y+x)/2)) - 2 \log(\operatorname{sinc}(y/2))) y \sqrt{\log(1 + 1/y)} dy \\
&= U_{2,m}(x) + U_{2,r}(x)
\end{aligned}$$

Due to the occurrence of x/y in $U_{2,m}$ it is natural to switch coordinates to $t = y/x$, as was done for U_1 . This gives us

$$U_{2,m}(x) = x^2 \int_1^{\pi/x} -\log(1 - 1/t^2) t \sqrt{\log(1 + 1/(xt))} dt.$$

Next we split the interval $[1, \pi/x]$ into three parts, $[1, 2]$, $[2, 1/x]$ and $[1/x, \pi/x]$, and treat each of them separately. Let

$$\begin{aligned}
U_{2,m,1}(x) &= x^2 \int_1^2 -\log(1 - 1/t^2) t \sqrt{\log(1 + 1/(xt))} dt, \\
U_{2,m,2}(x) &= x^2 \int_2^{1/x} -\log(1 - 1/t^2) t \sqrt{\log(1 + 1/(xt))} dt, \\
U_{2,m,3}(x) &= x^2 \int_{1/x}^{\pi/x} -\log(1 - 1/t^2) t \sqrt{\log(1 + 1/(xt))} dt.
\end{aligned}$$

For $U_{2,m,1}$ we note that $\sqrt{\log(1 + 1/(xt))}$ is decreasing in t and hence upper bounded by the value at $t = 1$, which is $\sqrt{\log(1 + 1/x)}$. We therefore have

$$U_{2,m,1}(x) \leq x^2 \sqrt{\log(1 + 1/x)} \int_1^2 -\log(1 - 1/t^2) t dt = x^2 \sqrt{\log(1 + 1/x)} \log\left(\frac{16}{3\sqrt{3}}\right).$$

For $U_{2,m,2}$ we use a Taylor expansion of $\log(1 - 1/t^2)$ at $t = \infty$ and explicitly bound the remainder term. For $y \in [0, 1/4]$ we have

$$-\log(1 - y) \leq y + R_2 y^2$$

with

$$R_2 = \sup_{y \in [0, 1/4]} \frac{1}{2} \left| \frac{d^2}{dy^2} \log(1-y) \right|.$$

This gives us that for $t > 2$ we have

$$-\log(1 - 1/t^2) \leq \frac{1}{t^2} + \frac{R_2}{t^4}.$$

We also use the inequality

$$\sqrt{\log(1 + 1/(xt))} = \sqrt{\log(1 + xt) + \log(1/(xt))} \leq \sqrt{\log(1 + xt)} + \sqrt{\log(1/(xt))}$$

together with the bound $\sqrt{\log(1 + xt)} < \sqrt{\log 2}$ for $2 \leq t \leq 1/x$ to split $U_{2,m,2}$ as

$$U_{2,m,2}(x) \leq x^2 \left(\int_2^{1/x} \frac{\sqrt{\log(1/(xt))}}{t} dt + R_2 \int_2^{1/x} \frac{\sqrt{\log(1/(xt))}}{t^3} dt \right. \\ \left. + \sqrt{\log 2} \int_2^{1/x} \frac{1}{t} dt + R_2 \sqrt{\log 2} \int_2^{1/x} \frac{1}{t^3} dt \right).$$

For the integrals we have

$$\int_2^{1/x} \frac{\sqrt{\log(1/(xt))}}{t} dt = \frac{2}{3} \log(1/(2x))^{\frac{3}{2}}, \\ \int_2^{1/x} \frac{\sqrt{\log(1/(xt))}}{t^3} dt = \frac{\sqrt{\log(1/(2x))} - \sqrt{2\pi x^2} \operatorname{erfi}(\sqrt{\log(1/(4x^2))})}{8}, \\ \int_2^{1/x} \frac{1}{t} dt = \log(1/x) - \log 2, \\ \int_2^{1/x} \frac{1}{t^3} dt = \frac{1 - 4x^2}{8}.$$

We can avoid the erfi function by using that

$$x^2 \operatorname{erfi}(\sqrt{\log(1/(4x^2))}) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} x^2 \int_0^{\sqrt{\log(1/(4x^2))}} e^{t^2} dt \\ \leq \frac{2}{\sqrt{\pi}} x^2 \frac{e^{(\sqrt{\log(1/(4x^2))})^2} - 1}{\sqrt{\log(1/(4x^2))}} = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2\pi}} \frac{1 - 4x^2}{\sqrt{\log(1/(2x))}}.$$

Where we have used [15, Eq. 7.8.7]. This gives us

$$U_{2,m,2}(x) \leq x^2 \left(\frac{2}{3} \log(1/(2x))^{\frac{3}{2}} + R_2 \frac{\sqrt{\log(1/(2x))}}{8} - R_2 \frac{1 - 4x^2}{16\sqrt{\log(1/(2x))}} \right. \\ \left. + \sqrt{\log 2} \log(1/x) - \log(2)^{\frac{3}{2}} + R_2 \sqrt{\log 2} \frac{1 - 4x^2}{8} \right).$$

For $U_{2,m,3}$ we use that $\sqrt{\log(1 + 1/(xt))} < \sqrt{\log 2}$ for $1/x < t < \pi/x$, hence

$$U_{2,m,3}(x) \leq x^2 \sqrt{\log 2} \int_{1/x}^{\pi/x} -\log(1 - 1/t^2) t dt.$$

The integral can be explicitly computed to be

$$\begin{aligned} & \int_{1/x}^{\pi/x} -\log(1-1/t^2)t \, dt \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\pi^2}{x^2} \right) \log \left(1 - \frac{x^2}{\pi^2} \right) + \log \left(\frac{\pi}{x} \right) \right) - \left(\frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{x^2} \right) \log(1-x^2) + \log \left(\frac{1}{x} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Reordering and simplifying this gives us

$$\int_{1/x}^{\pi/x} -\log(1-1/t^2)t \, dt = \frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{\pi^2 - x^2}{1 - x^2} \right) + \frac{\log(1-x^2)}{2x^2} - \frac{\log \left(1 - \frac{x^2}{\pi^2} \right)}{2x^2}$$

and hence

$$U_{2,m,3}(x) \leq x^2 \sqrt{\log 2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \log \left(\frac{\pi^2 - x^2}{1 - x^2} \right) + \frac{\log(1-x^2)}{2x^2} - \frac{\log \left(1 - \frac{x^2}{\pi^2} \right)}{2x^2} \right).$$

Putting $U_{2,m,1}$, $U_{2,m,2}$ and $U_{2,m,3}$ together we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} U_{2,m}(x) \leq x^2 & \left(\sqrt{\log(1+1/x)} \log \left(\frac{16}{3\sqrt{3}} \right) \right. \\ & + \left(\frac{2}{3} \log(1/(2x))^{\frac{3}{2}} + R_2 \frac{\sqrt{\log(1/(2x))}}{8} - R_2 \frac{\sqrt{2\pi x^2} \operatorname{erfi}(\sqrt{\log(1/(4x^2))})}{8} \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \sqrt{\log 2} \log(1/x) - \log(2)^{\frac{3}{2}} + R_2 \sqrt{\log 2} \frac{1-4x^2}{8} \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \sqrt{\log 2} \left(\log \left(\frac{\pi^2 - x^2}{1 - x^2} \right) + \frac{\log(1-x^2)}{2x^2} - \frac{\pi^2 \log \left(1 - \frac{x^2}{\pi^2} \right)}{2x^2} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

For $U_{2,r}$ we use the fact that

$$\frac{\log \left(\operatorname{sinc} \left(\frac{y-x}{2} \right) \right) + \log \left(\operatorname{sinc} \left(\frac{y+x}{2} \right) \right) - 2 \log \left(\operatorname{sinc} \left(\frac{y}{2} \right) \right)}{x^2}$$

is bounded for $t \in [x, \pi]$ uniformly in x . If we let

$$D_1 = \sup_{x \in [0, \epsilon]} \sup_{y \in [x, \pi]} \frac{\log \left(\operatorname{sinc} \left(\frac{y-x}{2} \right) \right) + \log \left(\operatorname{sinc} \left(\frac{y+x}{2} \right) \right) - 2 \log \left(\operatorname{sinc} \left(\frac{y}{2} \right) \right)}{x^2} \quad (17)$$

we get

$$U_{2,r}(x) \leq D_1 x^2 \int_x^\pi y \sqrt{\log(1+1/y)} \, dy.$$

If we also let

$$c_2 = \int_0^\pi y \sqrt{\log(1+1/y)} \, dy$$

we have $U_{2,r}(x) \leq D_1 c_2 x^2$.

To easier bound D_1 we note that the function in (17) is increasing in y for $y \in [x, \pi]$. To see this focus on the part

$$\log \left(\operatorname{sinc} \left(\frac{y-x}{2} \right) \right) + \log \left(\operatorname{sinc} \left(\frac{y+x}{2} \right) \right) - 2 \log \left(\operatorname{sinc} \left(\frac{y}{2} \right) \right).$$

which we want to show is decreasing in y . If we let $f(y) = \log(\operatorname{sinc}(\frac{y}{2}))$ we can write the above as

$$f(y-x) + f(y+x) - 2f(y).$$

Differentiating we have

$$f'(y-x) + f'(y+x) - 2f'(y),$$

since f' is concave on $(0, 2\pi)$ this is non-positive. To see that f' indeed is concave on this interval it is enough to check that

$$f'''(y) = \frac{\cot(\frac{y}{2})}{4\sin^2(\frac{y}{2})} - \frac{2}{y^3}$$

is negative on $(0, 2\pi)$, which follows from that the coefficients in the Taylor expansion at $y = 0$ all are negative. This means that the supremum for D_1 is attained at $y = \pi$ and it reduces to

$$D_1 = \sup_{x \in [0, \epsilon]} - \frac{\log(\operatorname{sinc}(\frac{\pi-x}{2})) + \log(\operatorname{sinc}(\frac{x+\pi}{2})) - 2\log(\operatorname{sinc}(\frac{\pi}{2}))}{x^2}.$$

□

To use these lemmas in the computer assisted proof the first step is to compute enclosures of c_1 , c_2 , R_1 , R_2 and D_1 . For R_2 this can be done directly using Taylor arithmetic. For R_1 and D_1 we have removable singularities that need to be dealt with, this can be done using the approach described in Appendix A. For c_1 and c_2 we refer to Appendix C.

For Lemma 6.3 it is straightforward to compute enclosures of all the terms in the upper bound by using monotonicity properties in x . For Lemma 6.4 the expression for the upper bound is more complicated. In particular several of the terms contain removable singularities at $x = 0$, these are handled using the approach described in Appendix A. As an example we show how to bound

$$\frac{\frac{2}{3} \log(1/(2x))^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\log(1/x)\sqrt{\log(1+1/x)}},$$

the other terms can be done in a similar way.

Lemma 6.5. *The function*

$$f(x) = \frac{\frac{2}{3} \log(1/(2x))^{\frac{3}{2}}}{\log(1/x)\sqrt{\log(1+1/x)}}$$

is bounded from above by $2/3$ and is decreasing in x on the interval $(0, 1/2)$.

Proof. Taking the limit $x \rightarrow 0^+$ gives the value $\frac{2}{3}$, it is hence enough to prove that it is decreasing in x . Differentiating with respect to x gives us

$$\frac{\sqrt{\log(1/(2x))}}{3x(x+1)\log(1+1/x)^{3/2}\log(1/x)^2} (\log(1/(2x))\log(1/x) - (x+1)\log(1+1/x)\log(4/x)).$$

The sign is given by that of

$$\log(1/(2x))\log(1/x) - (x+1)\log(1+1/x)\log(4/x).$$

For $x \in (0, 1/2)$ we get the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} \log(1/(2x))\log(1/x) - (x+1)\log(1+1/x)\log(4/x) &\leq \log(1/(2x))\log(1/x) - \log(1+1/x)\log(4/x) \\ &\leq \log(1/(2x))\log(1/x) - \log(1/x)\log(4/x) \\ &= \log(1/x)(\log(1/(2x)) - \log(4/x)) \\ &= \log(1/x)\log(1/8), \end{aligned}$$

which is negative. □

7 Bounds for D_0 , δ_0 and n_0

We are now ready to give bounds for n_0 , δ_0 and D_0 . Recall that they are given by

$$n_0 = \sup_{x \in [0, \pi]} |N(x)|, \quad \delta_0 = \sup_{x \in [0, \pi]} |F(x)|, \quad D_0 = \sup_{x \in [0, \pi]} |\mathcal{T}(x)|.$$

In each case we split the interval $[0, \pi]$ into two parts, $[0, \epsilon]$ and $[\epsilon, \pi]$, with ϵ varying for the different cases, and treat them separately. For the interval $[0, \epsilon]$ we use the asymptotic bounds for the different functions that were introduced in the previous two sections. For the interval $[\epsilon, \pi]$ we evaluate the functions directly using interval arithmetic. For the direct evaluation the only complicated part is the computation of $U(x)$ in $\mathcal{T}(x)$, where we proceed as discussed in Section 6 and Appendix C.

Consider the problem of enclosing the maximum of f on some interval I to some predetermined tolerance. The main idea is to iteratively bisect the interval I into smaller and smaller subintervals. At every iteration we compute an enclosure of f on each subinterval. From these enclosures a lower bound of the maximum can be computed. We then discard all subintervals for which the enclosure is less than the lower bound of the maximum, the maximum cannot be attained there. For the remaining subintervals we check if their enclosure satisfies the required tolerance, in that case we don't bisect them further. If there are any subintervals left we bisect them and continue with the next iteration. In the end, either when there are no subintervals left to bisect or we have reached some maximum number of iterations (to guarantee that the procedure terminates), we return the maximum of all subintervals that were not discarded. This is guaranteed to give an enclosure of the maximum of f on the interval.

If we are able to compute Taylor series of the function f we can improve the performance of this procedure significantly (see e.g. [14, 13] where a similar approach is used). Consider a subinterval I_i , instead of computing an enclosure of $f(I_i)$ we compute a Taylor polynomial P at the midpoint and an enclosure R of the remainder term such that $f(x) \in P(x) + R$ for $x \in I_i$. We then have

$$\sup_{x \in I_i} f(x) \in \sup_{x \in I_i} P(x) + R. \tag{18}$$

To compute $\sup_{x \in I_i} P(x)$ we isolate the roots of P' on I_i and evaluate P on the roots as well as the endpoints of the interval. In practice the computation of R involves computing an enclosure of the Taylor series of f on the full interval I_i . Since this includes the derivative we can as an extra optimization check if the derivative is non-zero, in which case f is monotone and it is enough to evaluate f on either the left or the right endpoint of I_i , depending on the sign of the derivative.

The above procedures can easily be adapted to instead compute the minimum of f on the interval, joining them together we can thus compute the extrema on the interval. In some cases we don't care about computing an enclosure of the maximum, but only to prove that it is bounded by some value. Instead of using a tolerance we then discard any subintervals for which the enclosure of the maximum is less than the bound.

In most cases we bisect the subintervals at the midpoint, meaning that the interval $[\underline{x}, \bar{x}]$ would be bisected into the two intervals $[\underline{x}, (\underline{x} + \bar{x})/2]$ and $[(\underline{x} + \bar{x})/2, \bar{x}]$. However, when the magnitude of \underline{x} and \bar{x} are very different it can be beneficial to bisect at the geometric midpoint (see e.g. [22]), in that case we split the interval into $[\underline{x}, \sqrt{\underline{x}\bar{x}}]$ and $[\sqrt{\underline{x}\bar{x}}, \bar{x}]$, where we assume that $\underline{x} > 0$.

We split the computation of the bounds for n_0 , δ_0 and D_0 into three lemmas. The proof of the lemmas are computer assisted and we give some details about the process. The lemmas are stated as upper bounds, but in the process of proving them we do compute actual enclosures of the values.

The code ¹ for the computer assisted part is implemented in Julia [3]. The main tool for the rigorous numerics is Arb [35] which we use through the Julia wrapper Arblib.jl ². Many of the basic interval arithmetic algorithms, such as isolating roots or enclosing maximum values, are implemented in a separate package,

¹Available at <https://github.com/Joel-Dahne/BurgersHilbertWave.jl>, the results in the paper are from commit d7863475d1c4e9d8f49da716b4ef2dc936c3dab9.

²<https://github.com/kalmarek/Arblib.jl>

ArbExtras.jl³. For finding the coefficients $\{a_j\}$ and $\{b_n\}$ of u_0 we make use of non-linear solvers from NLSolve.jl [45].

The computations were done on an AMD Ryzen 9 5900X processor with 32 GB of RAM using 20 threads and when timings are given it refers to this configuration. In most cases the computations are multithreaded and make use of all available threads. The computations were done using 100 bits of precision.

Lemma 7.1. *The constant n_0 satisfies the inequality $n_0 \leq \bar{n}_0 = 0.53682$.*

Proof. A plot of $N(x)$ on the interval $[0, \pi]$ is given in Figure 2a and hints at the maximum being attained at $x = \pi$. A good guess for the maximum value is thus given by $N(\pi)$.

We take $\epsilon = 0.5$. For the interval $[0, \epsilon]$ we don't compute an enclosure of the maximum but only prove that it is bounded by $N(\pi)$.

For the interval $[\epsilon, \pi]$ we compute an enclosure of the maximum. This gives us

$$n_0 \in [0.5368150155330973217537 \pm 5.95 \cdot 10^{-23}],$$

which is upper bounded by \bar{n}_0 .

We are able to compute Taylor expansions of $N(x)$ in both the asymptotic and non-asymptotic case as long as the subinterval doesn't contain zero. This allows us to use the better version of the algorithm, based on the Taylor polynomial, for enclosing the maximum and fall back to the naive version, where no information about the derivatives is used, for the subintervals containing zero. We use a Taylor expansion of degree 0, which is enough to pick up the monotonicity after only a few bisections in most cases. The runtime is about 5 seconds, most of it for handling the interval $[\epsilon, \pi]$. \square

Lemma 7.2. *The constant δ_0 satisfies the inequality $\delta_0 \leq \bar{\delta}_0 = 8.4976 \cdot 10^{-4}$.*

Proof. A plot of $F(x)$ on the interval $[0, \pi]$ is given in Figure 3a, however this plot doesn't reveal the full picture of what happens close to $x = 0$. Figures 3b and 3c show a log-plot of $F(x)$ on the intervals $[10^{-100}, 10^{-1}]$ and $[10^{-20000}, 10^{-100}]$ respectively. In the latter of these figures we can see that F has an extrema between 10^{-10000} and 10^{-5000} , this turns out to be where the maximum of $|F|$ is attained. Note that these numbers are extremely small, too small to be represented even in standard quadruple precision (*binary128*), though Arb has no problem handling them.

We take $\epsilon = 0.1$. Handling the interval $[\epsilon, \pi]$ is straightforward and we get the enclosure $[0.00022669 \pm 3.45 \cdot 10^{-9}]$. The interval $[0, \epsilon]$ is more delicate due to the extrema being attained for such an extremely small x .

In general evaluation with the asymptotic version of F is much faster than the non-asymptotic version. However, for the interval $[0, \epsilon]$ we have to do a huge number of subdivisions and it is therefore beneficial to optimize it slightly more. The terms in the expansions used for computing F are given in Lemmas 5.1 and 5.2, they contain factors of the form $c|x|^d$ and $c \frac{|x|^d}{\log|x|}$ with varying coefficients c and exponents d . When x gets smaller more and more of these terms become negligible. To reduce the number of terms in the expansions we can collapse all negligible terms into one remainder term. If we fix some $d_0 > 0$ then on the interval $[0, \epsilon]$ with $\epsilon < 1$ we have for $d \geq d_0$ and $c > 0$

$$cx^d \in [0, c] \cdot x^{d_0}, \quad c \frac{x^d}{\log x} \in \left[\frac{c}{\log \epsilon}, 0 \right] \cdot x^{d_0},$$

with a similar expression for $c < 0$. In this way we can take all terms with an exponent greater than d_0 and put them into one single term with the exponent d_0 . If x is small enough so that x^{d_0} is negligible this will still give a good enclosure.

For this we split the interval $[0, \epsilon]$ into four parts, $[0, \epsilon_1]$, $[\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2]$, $[\epsilon_2, \epsilon_3]$ and $[\epsilon_4, \epsilon]$, with $\epsilon_1 = 10^{-1000000}$, $\epsilon_2 = 10^{-100000}$ and $\epsilon_3 = 10^{-100}$. For the first two intervals we take $d_0 = 10^{-4}$, on the third we take it to be $1/4$ and on the fourth we keep all terms. For the expansion from Lemma 5.1 this leaves us with 4, 837 and 1936 terms respectively. For the expansion from Lemma 5.2 we get 6, 2505 and 17381 terms.

³<https://github.com/Joel-Dahne/ArbExtras.jl>




Figure 2: Plot of the functions N and \mathcal{T} on the interval $[0, \pi]$. The dashed green lines show the upper bounds \bar{n}_0 and \bar{D}_0 as given in Lemmas 7.1 and 7.3

The interval $[0, \epsilon_1]$ is taken such that a single evaluation of F gives a good enough enclosure, we have $f([0, \epsilon_1]) \subseteq [\pm 2.09 \cdot 10^{-4}]$. The bulk of the work is for the second interval, it needs to be split into more than 2^{24} subintervals and the final enclosure for the maximum is $[0.0003448 \pm 4.98 \cdot 10^{-8}]$. The third interval, $[\epsilon_2, \epsilon_3]$, is split into more than 2^{17} subintervals, with the enclosure $[0.0008497 \pm 5.37 \cdot 10^{-8}]$. For $[\epsilon_3, \epsilon]$ it suffices to split it in around 2^{10} subintervals and we get the enclosure $[0.00038604 \pm 6.73 \cdot 10^{-9}]$.

We are able to compute Taylor expansions of $F(x)$ in both the asymptotic and non-asymptotic case as long as the subinterval doesn't contain zero, this allows us to use the better version of the algorithm for enclosing the maximum and fall back to the naive version for the subintervals containing zero. We use a Taylor expansion of degree 4 in all cases. On the intervals $[\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2]$, $[\epsilon_2, \epsilon_3]$ and $[\epsilon_3, \epsilon]$ we bisect at the geometric midpoint instead of bisecting at the arithmetic midpoint. The runtime is about 15 minutes. \square

Lemma 7.3. *The constant D_0 satisfies the inequality $D_0 \leq \bar{D}_0 = 0.94589$.*

Proof. A plot of $\mathcal{T}(x)$ on the interval $[0, \pi]$ is given in Figure 2b. It hints at the maximum being attained around $x \approx 2.3$.

We take $\epsilon = 0.01$ and start by computing the maximum on $[\epsilon, \pi]$, this gives us the enclosure $[0.945126, 0.94589]$.

For the interval $[0, \epsilon]$ we make use of the asymptotic expansions from Lemmas 6.3 and 6.4. Since these only give upper bounds we are not able to compute an enclosure of \mathcal{T} on this interval. However, since the maximum is attained on the interval $[\epsilon, \pi]$ we only need prove that \mathcal{T} is bounded by this value on $[0, \epsilon]$. Hence the maximum for the full interval is given by that on $[\epsilon, \pi]$ and we get

$$D_0 \in [0.945126, 0.94589],$$

which is upper bounded by \bar{D}_0 .

In this case we do not have access to Taylor series of $\mathcal{T}(x)$ in either the asymptotic or non-asymptotic case. This means we have to rely on the naive version for bounding the maximum. On the interval $[\epsilon, \pi]$ there is one optimization that we can do. $\mathcal{T}(x)$ involves a division by $u_0(x)$ and for this function we have access to Taylor series, we therefore compute a tighter enclosure of this using a C^1 bound.

The total runtime for the computation is around 90 seconds, the majority for handling the interval $[\epsilon, \pi]$. \square

8 Proof of Theorem 1.1

We are now ready to give the proof of Theorem 1.1.




Figure 3: Plot of the function F on the intervals $[0, \pi]$, $[10^{-100}, 10^{-1}]$ and $[10^{-20000}, 10^{-100}]$. The dashed green line shows the upper bound $\bar{\delta}_0$ as given in Lemma 7.2. The dotted red line shows $\frac{(1-\bar{D}_0)^2}{4\bar{n}_0}$, which is the value we want the defect to be smaller than.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Consider the operator G from (10) given by

$$G[v] = (I - T)^{-1}(-F - Nv^2).$$

By Lemma 7.3 we have $\|T\| \leq \bar{D}_0 < 1$ so the inverse of the operator $I - T$ is well defined. Combining Lemmas 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3 gives us the inequality

$$\delta_0 \leq \bar{\delta}_0 < \frac{(1 - \bar{D}_0)^2}{4\bar{n}_0} \leq \frac{(1 - D_0)^2}{4n_0}.$$

This, together with Proposition 2.2 and Banach fixed-point theorem proves that for

$$\epsilon = \frac{1 - D_0 - \sqrt{(1 - D_0)^2 - 4\delta_0 n_0}}{2n_0}$$

the operator G has a unique fixed-point v_0 in $X_\epsilon \subseteq L^\infty(\mathbb{T})$.

By the construction of the operator G this means that the function

$$u(x) = u_0(x) + w(x)v_0(x)$$

solves (6), given by

$$\frac{1}{2}u^2 = -\mathcal{H}[u].$$

For any wavespeed $c \in \mathbb{R}$ we then have that the function

$$\varphi(x) = c - u(x)$$

is a traveling wave solution to (1). This proves the existence of a 2π -periodic highest cusped traveling wave.

To get the asymptotic behaviour we note that

$$u_0(x) = -\frac{1}{\pi}|x| \log |x| + \mathcal{O}(|x|) \quad \text{and} \quad w(x)v_0(x) = \mathcal{O}(|x|\sqrt{\log(|x|)}).$$

Hence

$$u(x) = -\frac{1}{\pi}|x| \log |x| + \mathcal{O}(|x|\sqrt{\log(|x|)})$$

and

$$\varphi(x) = c + \frac{1}{\pi}|x| \log |x| + \mathcal{O}(|x|\sqrt{\log(|x|)}),$$

as we wanted to show. \square

A Removable singularities

In several cases we have to compute enclosures of functions with removable singularities. For example the function

$$\Gamma(1-s) \cos(\pi(1-s)/2)$$

comes up when computing C_s through equation (23) and has a removable singularity whenever s is a positive even integer. In this appendix we explain how to compute rigorous enclosures at and around these points. For this we need a way to handle the removable singularity. Let

$$f_n(x) = \frac{f^{(n)}(x)}{n!}.$$

We have the following lemma for handling functions with removable singularities:

Lemma A.1. *Let $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and let I be an interval containing zero. Consider a function $f(x)$ with a zero of order n at $x = 0$ and such that $f^{(m+n)}(x)$ is absolutely continuous on I . Then for all $x \in I$ we have*

$$\frac{f(x)}{x^n} = \sum_{k=0}^m f_{k+n}(0)x^k + f_{m+n+1}(\xi)x^{m+1}$$

for some ξ between 0 and x . Furthermore, if $f^{m+n+p}(x)$ is absolutely continuous for $p \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ we have

$$\frac{d^p}{dx^p} \frac{f(x)}{x^n} = \sum_{k=0}^m \frac{(k+p)!}{k!} f_{k+n+p}(0)x^k + \frac{(m+p+1)!}{(m+1)!} f_{m+n+p+1}(\xi)x^{m+1}$$

for some ξ between 0 and x .

Proof. The first statement follows directly from expanding f in a Taylor series with a remainder term on Lagrange form and dividing by x^n , using that $f_k(0) = 0$ for $k < n$.

For the second statement we start by noting that

$$\frac{d^p}{dx^p} \frac{f(x)}{x^n} = \sum_{l=0}^p \binom{p}{l} f^{(p-l)}(x) (-1)^l \frac{(n+l-1)!}{(n-1)!} \frac{1}{x^{n+l}} = \frac{1}{x^{n+p}} \sum_{l=0}^p (-1)^l \binom{p}{l} \frac{(n+l-1)!}{(n-1)!} f^{(p-l)}(x) x^{p-l}. \quad (19)$$

The Taylor expansion of $f^{(p-l)}(x)$ with the remainder term in integral form is

$$f^{(p-l)}(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{m+n+l} (f^{(p-l)})_k(0)x^k + x^{m+n+l+1} (m+n+l+1) \int_0^1 (f^{(p-l)})_{m+n+l+1}(tx) (1-t)^{m+n+l} dt. \quad (20)$$

Using that

$$(f^{(p-l)})_k(x) = \frac{f^{(p-l+k)}(x)}{k!} = \frac{(p-l+k)!}{k!} \frac{f^{(p-l+k)}(x)}{(p-l+k)!} = \frac{(p-l+k)!}{k!} f_{p-l+k}(x)$$

we can write (20) as

$$\begin{aligned} f^{(p-l)}(x) &= \sum_{k=0}^{m+n+l} \frac{(p-l+k)!}{k!} f_{p-l+k}(0)x^k \\ &\quad + x^{m+n+l+1} (m+l+n+1) \int_0^1 \frac{(p-l+(m+n+l+1))!}{(m+n+l+1)!} f_{p-l+(m+n+l+1)}(tx) (1-t)^{m+n+l} dt \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{m+n+l} \frac{(p-l+k)!}{k!} f_{p-l+k}(0)x^k + x^{m+n+l+1} \frac{(p+m+n+1)!}{(m+n+l)!} \int_0^1 f_{p+m+n+1}(tx) (1-t)^{m+n+l} dt. \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying by x^{p-l} we get

$$f^{(p-l)}(x)x^{p-l} = \sum_{k=p-l}^{m+n+p} \frac{k!}{(k-p+l)!} f_k(0)x^k + x^{m+n+p+1} \frac{(p+m+n+1)!}{(m+n+l)!} \int_0^1 f_{p+m+n+1}(tx)(1-t)^{m+n+l} dt. \quad (21)$$

Inserting the main term of (21) into (19) gives us

$$\frac{1}{x^{n+p}} \sum_{l=0}^p (-1)^l \binom{p}{l} \frac{(n+l-1)!}{(n-1)!} \sum_{k=p-l}^{m+n+p} \frac{k!}{(k-p+l)!} f_k(0)x^k$$

Splitting into $k < p$ and $k \geq p$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=0}^{p-1} \sum_{l=p-k}^p (-1)^l \binom{p}{l} \frac{(n+l-1)!}{(n-1)!} \frac{k!}{(k-p+l)!} f_k(0)x^{k-n-p} \\ + \sum_{k=p}^{m+n+p} \sum_{l=0}^p (-1)^l \binom{p}{l} \frac{(n+l-1)!}{(n-1)!} \frac{k!}{(k-p+l)!} f_k(0)x^{k-n-p} \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Since $f_k(0) = 0$ for $k < n$ the first sum reduces to

$$\sum_{k=n}^{p-1} \sum_{l=p-k}^p (-1)^l \binom{p}{l} \frac{(n+l-1)!}{(n-1)!} \frac{k!}{(k-p+l)!} f_k(0)x^{k-n-p}$$

Using [15, Sec. 15.2.4] we have

$$\sum_{l=p-k}^p (-1)^l \binom{p}{l} \frac{(n+l-1)!}{(n-1)!} \frac{k!}{(k-p+l)!} = (-1)^{p-k} \binom{p}{p-k} \frac{k!(n+p-k-1)!}{(n-1)!} {}_2F_1(-k, n+p-k, p-k+1, 1).$$

From [15, Sec. 15.4.24] we get that this is zero for $k \geq n$. The second sum in (22) we can rewrite as

$$\sum_{k=-n}^m \sum_{l=0}^p (-1)^l \binom{p}{l} \frac{(n+l-1)!}{(n-1)!} \frac{(k+n+p)!}{(k+n+l)!} f_{k+n+p}(0)x^k$$

For $k < -p$ the terms are zero since $f_{k+n+p}(0) = 0$. For $k \geq -p$ we use [15, Sec. 15.2.4] to write the inner sum as

$$\sum_{l=0}^p (-1)^l \binom{p}{l} \frac{(n+l-1)!}{(n-1)!} \frac{(k+n+p)!}{(k+n+l)!} = \frac{(k+n+p)!}{(k+n)!} {}_2F_1(-p, n, k+n+1, 1).$$

From [15, Sec. 15.4.24] we get that this is zero for $-p \leq k < 0$ and for $0 \leq k \leq m$ it is given by $\frac{(k+p)!}{k!}$. This gives us that (22) can be written as

$$\sum_{k=0}^m \frac{(k+p)!}{k!} f_{k+n+p}(0)x^k,$$

which is what we wanted to show.

We are now interested in the remainder term of (21) when inserted into (19), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{x^{n+p}} \sum_{l=0}^p (-1)^l \binom{p}{l} \frac{(n+l-1)!}{(n-1)!} x^{m+n+p+1} \frac{(p+m+n+1)!}{(m+n+l)!} \int_0^1 f_{p+m+n+1}(tx)(1-t)^{m+n+l} dt \\ = x^{m+1} \int_0^1 f_{p+m+n+1}(tx) \sum_{l=0}^p (-1)^l \binom{p}{l} \frac{(n+l-1)!}{(n-1)!} \frac{(p+m+n+1)!}{(m+n+l)!} (1-t)^{m+n+l} dt. \end{aligned}$$

We first show that the sum is non-negative. Using [15, Sec. 15.2.4] we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{l=0}^p (-1)^l \binom{p}{l} \frac{(n+l-1)!}{(n-1)!} \frac{(p+m+n+1)!}{(m+n+l)!} (1-t)^{m+n+l} \\ &= (1-t)^{m+n} \frac{(p+m+n+1)!}{(m+n)!} \sum_{l=0}^p (-1)^l \binom{p}{l} \frac{(n+l-1)!}{(n-1)!} \frac{(m+n)!}{(m+n+l)!} (1-t)^l \\ &= (1-t)^{m+n} \frac{(p+m+n+1)!}{(m+n)!} {}_2F_1(-p, n, m+n+1, 1-t). \end{aligned}$$

By [43, Theorem 3.2] (see also [16, Theorem 2]), ${}_2F_1(-p, n, m+n+1, 1-t)$ have no roots on the interval $[0, 1]$ and for $t = 1$ it is positive, it is hence positive on $[0, 1]$. Since the sum is positive the integral can be written as

$$f_{p+m+n+1}(\xi)x^{m+1} \int_0^1 \sum_{l=0}^p (-1)^l \binom{p}{l} \frac{(n+l-1)!}{(n-1)!} \frac{(p+m+n+1)!}{(m+n+l)!} (1-t)^{m+n+l} dt.$$

for some ξ between 0 and x . Simplifying further we get

$$\begin{aligned} & f_{m+n+p+1}(\xi)x^{m+1} \sum_{l=0}^p (-1)^l \binom{p}{l} \frac{(n+l-1)!}{(n-1)!} \frac{(p+m+n+1)!}{(m+n+l)!} \int_0^1 (1-t)^{m+n+l} dt \\ &= f_{m+n+p+1}(\xi)x^{m+1} \sum_{l=0}^p (-1)^l \binom{p}{l} \frac{(n+l-1)!}{(n-1)!} \frac{(p+m+n+1)!}{(m+n+l)!} \frac{1}{m+n+l+1} \\ &= f_{m+n+p+1}(\xi)x^{m+1} \sum_{l=0}^p (-1)^l \binom{p}{l} \frac{(n+l-1)!}{(n-1)!} \frac{(p+m+n+1)!}{(m+n+l+1)!} \\ &= \frac{(m+p+1)!}{(m+1)!} f_{m+n+p+1}(\xi)x^{m+1}, \end{aligned}$$

which is exactly the expression given for the remainder term. \square

Using this lemma we can compute enclosures at and around removable singularities as long as we have good control over f and its derivatives.

Example A.2. Consider the function $\Gamma(1-s) \cos(\pi(1-s)/2)$ with a removable singularity at $s = 2$. If we let $t = s - 2$ we can write the function as

$$\frac{\cos(\pi(-1-t)/2)}{t} \cdot (t\Gamma(-1-t))$$

If we let $f(t) = \cos(\pi(-1-t)/2)$ and take $m \geq 0$, then for the second factor the lemma then tells us that

$$\frac{\cos(\pi(-1-t)/2)}{t} = \sum_{k=0}^m (k+1) f_{k+1}(0) t^k + (m+2) f_{m+2}(\xi) t^{m+1}$$

for some ξ between 0 and x . Using interval arithmetic we can easily compute enclosure of the coefficients for the polynomial as well as $f_{m+2}(\xi)$. For the second factor we can't directly apply the lemma, instead we rewrite it in terms of the reciprocal gamma function, $1/\Gamma(s)$. If we let $g(t) = 1/\Gamma(-1-t)$ we have

$$t\Gamma(-1-t) = \left(\frac{g(t)}{t} \right)^{-1}.$$

The function $g(t)$ has a root at $t = 0$ and we can thus apply the lemma on $\frac{g(t)}{t}$. An enclosure of the coefficients for the polynomial as well as the remainder term can be computed using the implementation of the reciprocal gamma function in Arb.

B Computing enclosures of Clausen functions

To be able to compute bounds of D_α , δ_α and n_α it is critical that we can compute accurate enclosures of $C_s(x)$ and $S_s(x)$, including expansions in the argument and derivatives in the parameter. We here go through how these enclosures are computed. We make use of several different special functions, most of them with implementations in Arb (see e.g. [38, 32]). In several cases we encounter removable singularities, they are all dealt with as explained in Appendix A, see in particular example A.2.

We start by going through how to compute $C_s(x)$ and $S_s(x)$ for $s, x \in \mathbb{R}$. Since both $C_s(x)$ and $S_s(x)$ are 2π -periodic we can reduce it to $x = 0$ or $0 < x < 2\pi$.

For $x = 0$ and $s > 1$ we get directly from the defining sum that $C_s(0) = \zeta(s)$ and $S_s(0) = 0$. For $s \leq 1$ both functions typically diverge at $x = 0$.

For $0 < x < 2\pi$ we can compute the Clausen functions by going through the polylog function,

$$C_s(x) = \operatorname{Re}(\operatorname{Li}_s(e^{ix})), \quad S_s(x) = \operatorname{Im}(\operatorname{Li}_s(e^{ix})).$$

However it is computationally beneficial (about 40% faster in general) to instead go through the periodic zeta function [15, Sec. 25.13],

$$F(x, s) := \operatorname{Li}_s(e^{2\pi ix}) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{e^{2\pi inx}}{n^s},$$

for which we have

$$C_s(x) = \operatorname{Re} F\left(\frac{x}{2\pi}, s\right), \quad S_s(x) = \operatorname{Im} F\left(\frac{x}{2\pi}, s\right).$$

For $0 < x < 1$ the periodic zeta function can be written as [15, Eq. 25.13.2]

$$F(x, s) = \frac{\Gamma(1-s)}{(2\pi)^{1-s}} \left(e^{\pi i(1-s)/2} \zeta(1-s, x) + e^{-\pi i(1-s)/2} \zeta(1-s, 1-x) \right).$$

Taking the real and imaginary part we get, for $0 < x < 2\pi$,

$$C_s(x) = \frac{\Gamma(1-s)}{(2\pi)^{1-s}} \cos(\pi(1-s)/2) \left(\zeta\left(1-s, \frac{x}{2\pi}\right) + \zeta\left(1-s, 1 - \frac{x}{2\pi}\right) \right), \quad (23)$$

$$S_s(x) = \frac{\Gamma(1-s)}{(2\pi)^{1-s}} \sin(\pi(1-s)/2) \left(\zeta\left(1-s, \frac{x}{2\pi}\right) - \zeta\left(1-s, 1 - \frac{x}{2\pi}\right) \right). \quad (24)$$

This formulation works well as long as s is not a non-negative integer. For non-negative integers we have to handle some removable singularities.

For $s = 0$ the functions $\zeta\left(1-s, \frac{x}{2\pi}\right)$ and $\zeta\left(1-s, 1 - \frac{x}{2\pi}\right)$ diverge and needs to be handled differently. The Laurent series of the zeta function gives us

$$\zeta(s, x) = \frac{1}{s-1} + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n}{n!} \gamma_n(x) (s-1)^n, \quad (25)$$

where γ_n is the Stieltjes constant. The sum is referred to as the deflated zeta function, it has an implementation in Arb and we denote it by $\underline{\zeta}(s, x)$. Writing the Clausen functions in terms of the deflated zeta function gives us

$$C_s(x) = \frac{\Gamma(1-s)}{(2\pi)^{1-s}} \cos(\pi(1-s)/2) \left(\underline{\zeta}\left(1-s, \frac{x}{2\pi}\right) + \underline{\zeta}\left(1-s, 1 - \frac{x}{2\pi}\right) - \frac{2}{s} \right),$$

$$S_s(x) = \frac{\Gamma(1-s)}{(2\pi)^{1-s}} \sin(\pi(1-s)/2) \left(\underline{\zeta}\left(1-s, \frac{x}{2\pi}\right) - \underline{\zeta}\left(1-s, 1 - \frac{x}{2\pi}\right) \right).$$

The expression for $S_s(x)$ is now well defined, all terms are finite, for s around zero. For $C_s(x)$ we also have to handle the removable singularity of $\frac{2 \cos(\pi(1-s)/2)}{s}$.

For s equal to a positive integer, $\Gamma(1-s)$ has a pole. For $C_s(x)$ with even s we get a removable singularity in $\Gamma(1-s)\cos(\pi(1-s)/2)$ and for $S_s(x)$ with odd s we get that $\Gamma(1-s)\sin(\pi(1-s)/2)$ has a removable singularity. For the other parity of s we instead have to look at the zeta function. For integer $s \geq 1$ we have

$$\zeta(1-s, x) = -\frac{B_s(x)}{s}$$

where $B_s(n)$ is the Bernoulli polynomial [15, Eq. 25.6.3]. Since $B_s(1-x) = (-1)^s B_s$ [15, Eq. 24.4.3] we have

$$\zeta\left(1-s, \frac{x}{2\pi}\right) + \zeta\left(1-s, 1 - \frac{x}{2\pi}\right) = 0$$

for odd s and

$$\zeta\left(1-s, \frac{x}{2\pi}\right) - \zeta\left(1-s, 1 - \frac{x}{2\pi}\right) = 0$$

for even s . This means that

$$\Gamma(1-s) \left(\zeta\left(1-s, \frac{x}{2\pi}\right) + \zeta\left(1-s, 1 - \frac{x}{2\pi}\right) \right)$$

has a removable singularity for odd s and

$$\Gamma(1-s) \left(\zeta\left(1-s, \frac{x}{2\pi}\right) - \zeta\left(1-s, 1 - \frac{x}{2\pi}\right) \right)$$

has a removable singularity for even s . This allows us to handle all removable singularities in (23) and (24) when s is a positive integer.

B.1 Interval arguments

We are now ready to compute enclosures for interval arguments. Let $\mathbf{x} = [\underline{x}, \bar{x}]$ and $\mathbf{s} = [\underline{s}, \bar{s}]$ be two finite intervals, we are interested in computing an enclosure of $C_s(\mathbf{x})$ and $S_s(\mathbf{x})$. Due to the periodicity we can reduce it to three different cases for \mathbf{x}

1. \mathbf{x} doesn't contain a multiple of 2π , by adding or subtracting a suitable multiple of 2π we can assume that $0 < \mathbf{x} < 2\pi$;
2. \mathbf{x} has a diameter of at least 2π , it then covers a full period and can without loss of generality be taken as $\mathbf{x} = [0, 2\pi]$;
3. \mathbf{x} contains a multiple of 2π but has a diameter less than 2π , by adding or subtracting a suitable multiple of 2π we can take \mathbf{x} such that $-2\pi < \underline{x} \leq 0 \leq \bar{x} < 2\pi$.

We begin by considering the case when $0 < \mathbf{x} < 2\pi$. It is possible to evaluate (23) and (24) directly, treating x as an interval, however this gives huge overestimations as soon as \mathbf{x} is not a very tight interval. For C_s we make use of the following lemma, see also [20, Lemma B.1].

Lemma B.1. *For all $s \in \mathbb{R}$ the Clausen function $C_s(x)$ is monotone in x on the interval $(0, \pi)$. For $s > 0$ it is non-increasing.*

Proof. We have $C'_s(x) = -S_{s-1}(x)$. For $s > 1$ we have [15, Eq. 25.12.11]

$$\begin{aligned} S_{s-1}(x) &= \text{Im } L_{s-1}(e^{ix}) \\ &= \text{Im} \frac{e^{ix}}{\Gamma(s-1)} \int_0^\infty t^{s-2} \frac{1}{e^t - e^{ix}} dt \\ &= \text{Im} \frac{e^{ix}}{\Gamma(s-1)} \int_0^\infty t^{s-2} \frac{e^t - e^{-ix}}{(e^t - \cos(x))^2 + \sin^2(x)} dt \\ &= \frac{\sin(x)}{\Gamma(s-1)} \int_0^\infty t^{s-2} \frac{e^t}{(e^t - \cos(x))^2 + \sin^2(x)} dt. \end{aligned}$$

Which for $s - 1 > 0$ and $x \in (0, \pi)$ is positive, $C_s(x)$ is hence decreasing.

For $s < 1$ we use equation (24) together with [15, Eq. 25.11.25] to get

$$S_{s-1}(x) = \frac{\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}(2-s)\right)}{(2\pi)^{2-s}} \int_0^\infty t^{1-s} e^{-\frac{x t}{2\pi}} \frac{1 - e^{(x/\pi-1)t}}{1 - e^{-t}} dt.$$

which sign depends only on the value s . In particular, for $0 < s \leq 1$ we have $\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}(2-s)\right) > 0$ so $C_s(x)$ is decreasing for $s > 0$. \square

Since $C_s(x)$ is even around $x = \pi$ it follows that if $0 < \mathbf{x} < 2\pi$ then the extrema of $C_s(\mathbf{x})$ are attained at either $x = \underline{x}$, $x = \bar{x}$ or, if $\pi \in \mathbf{x}$, $x = \pi$. This allows us to compute very tight enclosures of $C_s(\mathbf{x})$ in the argument \mathbf{x} . The function $S_s(x)$ is in general not monotone. We handle it by computing an enclosure of the derivative $S'_s(\mathbf{x}) = C_{s-1}(\mathbf{x})$, if the enclosure of the derivative doesn't contain zero then the function is monotone and we evaluate it at the endpoints, if the derivative contains zero we instead use the midpoint approximation $S_s(\mathbf{x}) = S_s(x_0) + (\mathbf{x} - x_0)C_{s-1}(\mathbf{x})$ where x_0 is the midpoint of \mathbf{x} .

For $\mathbf{x} = [0, 2\pi]$ we assume that $\mathbf{s} > 1$ since the value is typically unbounded otherwise (in which case we return an indeterminate result). We get an enclosure of $C_s(\mathbf{x})$ by evaluating at the critical points $x = 0$ and $x = \pi$. For $S_s(\mathbf{x})$ we use the trivial bound

$$|S_s(x)| = \left| \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\sin(nx)}{n^s} \right| \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{|\sin(nx)|}{n^s} \leq \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^s} = \zeta(s)$$

to get the enclosure $S_s(\mathbf{x}) \subseteq [-\zeta(\mathbf{s}), \zeta(\mathbf{s})]$.

For the final case, when $-2\pi < \underline{x} \leq 0 \leq \bar{x} < 2\pi$, we also assume that $\mathbf{s} > 1$. We handle $C_s(\mathbf{x})$ by using the evenness and monotonicity in x . If $\max(-\underline{x}, \bar{x}) < \pi$ then the extrema are attained at $x = 0$ and $x = \max(-\underline{x}, \bar{x}) < \pi$, otherwise the extrema are attained at $x = 0$ and $x = \pi$. For $S_s(\mathbf{x})$ we check if it is increasing on \mathbf{x} by checking if $\max(-\underline{x}, \bar{x}) < \pi$ and $S'_s(\max(-\underline{x}, \bar{x})) = C_{s-1}(\max(-\underline{x}, \bar{x})) \geq 0$, where we have used that $C_s(x)$ is decreasing for $s > 0$. If it is increasing we evaluate at the endpoints, otherwise we have the trivial bound $[-\zeta(\mathbf{s}), \zeta(\mathbf{s})]$

In all the above cases we could reduce the problem of enclosing the Clausen functions on \mathbf{x} to evaluating them on, a subset of, $x = 0$, $x = \underline{x}$ (or $-\underline{x}$ if $\underline{x} < 0$), $x = \bar{x}$, $x = x_0$ (the midpoint) and $x = \pi$. In all cases except $x = 0$ we have $0 < x < 2\pi$ so we can use (23) and (24).

For \mathbf{s} we get two different cases depending on if \mathbf{s} contains a non-negative integer or not.

When \mathbf{s} doesn't contain a non-negative integer the formulations (23) and (24) are well defined. However, similarly as for \mathbf{x} , direct evaluation gives large overestimations when \mathbf{s} is not very tight. In this case there is no monotonicity to use, instead we compute a tighter enclosure using a Taylor expansion as in (18). One exception to this is the modified Clausen function $\hat{C}_s(x)$, for which we have the following result

Lemma B.2. *For $s > 1$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}$ the function $\hat{C}_s(x)$ is decreasing in s .*

Proof. We have

$$\hat{C}_s(x) = C_s(x) - \zeta(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\cos(nx) - 1}{n^s}.$$

Since $\cos(nx) - 1 \leq 0$ for $x \in \mathbb{R}$ all terms in the sum have the same sign. That it is decreasing in s then follows easily from the monotonicity of n^s . \square

This means that for $\mathbf{s} > 1$ we only have to evaluate on \underline{s} and \bar{s} to get an enclosure. In practice $\hat{C}_s(x)$ is only every used with $s > 1$ so this is enough to get good bounds.

When \mathbf{s} contains a non-negative integer we have to handle the removable singularities in (23) and (24) as described in the beginning of the section. The required derivatives can generally be computed directly with Arb, this is the case for the reciprocal gamma function, sin, cos as well as $\zeta(s, x)$. There is an implementation of the deflated zeta function $\zeta(s, a)$ in Arb, however it only supports s exactly equal to 1, and not intervals containing 1, and can therefore not be used directly. In our application this case does however not occur, so it is not an issue.

B.2 Expansion in x

We now go through how to compute expansions of the Clausen functions in the argument x .

Around any point $0 < x < 2\pi$ the functions are analytic and it is straightforward to compute the Taylor expansions by differentiating directly, using that $\frac{d}{dx}C_s(x) = -S_{s-1}(x)$ and $\frac{d}{dx}S_s(x) = C_{s-1}(x)$.

At $x = 0$ we then have the following asymptotic expansions [20]

$$C_s(x) = \Gamma(1-s) \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}s\right) |x|^{s-1} + \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} (-1)^m \zeta(s-2m) \frac{x^{2m}}{(2m)!}; \quad (26)$$

$$S_s(x) = \Gamma(1-s) \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2}s\right) \operatorname{sgn}(x) |x|^{s-1} + \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} (-1)^m \zeta(s-2m-1) \frac{x^{2m+1}}{(2m+1)!}. \quad (27)$$

These expressions work well as long as s is not a positive integer. For positive integers we have to handle the poles of $\Gamma(s)$ at non-positive integers and the pole of $\zeta(s)$ at $s = 1$.

For $C_s(x)$ with positive even integers s the only problematic term is

$$\Gamma(1-s) \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}s\right) |x|^{s-1}$$

which has a removable singularity. Similarly for $S_s(x)$ with positive odd integers s . For $C_s(x)$ with positive odd integers s and S_s with positive even integers s the singularities are not removable, however in this paper we don't encounter this case.

With the above we are able to compute expansions at $x = 0$ to arbitrarily high degree. What remains is to bound the tails of the sums in (26) and (27). For this we have the following lemma, see also [20, Lemma 2.1]. We omit the proof since it is very similar to that in [20].

Lemma B.3. *Let $s \geq 0$, $2M \geq s + 1$ and $|x| < 2\pi$, we then have the following bounds for the tails in equations (26) and (27)*

$$\left| \sum_{m=M}^{\infty} (-1)^m \zeta(s-2m) \frac{x^{2m}}{(2m)!} \right| \leq 2(2\pi)^{1+s-2M} \left| \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}s\right) \right| \zeta(2M+1-s) \frac{x^{2M}}{4\pi^2 - x^2},$$

$$\left| \sum_{m=M}^{\infty} (-1)^m \zeta(s-2m-1) \frac{x^{2m+1}}{(2m+1)!} \right| \leq 2(2\pi)^{s-2M} \left| \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2}s\right) \right| \zeta(2M+2-s) \frac{x^{2M+1}}{4\pi^2 - x^2}.$$

B.3 Derivatives in s

For $C_s^{(\beta)}(x)$ and $S_s^{(\beta)}(x)$ we use (23) and (24) and differentiate directly in s . When s is not an integer this is handled directly using Taylor arithmetic, for integers we use the approach in Appendix A to handle the removable singularities.

To get asymptotic expansions in x we take the expansions (26) and (27) and differentiate them with respect to s . Giving us

$$C_s^{(\beta)}(x) = \frac{d}{ds^\beta} \left(\Gamma(1-s) \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}s\right) |x|^{s-1} \right) + \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} (-1)^m \zeta^{(\beta)}(s-2m) \frac{x^{2m}}{(2m)!}; \quad (28)$$

$$S_s^{(\beta)}(x) = \frac{d}{ds^\beta} \left(\Gamma(1-s) \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2}s\right) \operatorname{sgn}(x) |x|^{s-1} \right) + \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} (-1)^m \zeta^{(\beta)}(s-2m-1) \frac{x^{2m+1}}{(2m+1)!}. \quad (29)$$

These formulas work well when s is not a positive odd integer for $C_s^{(\beta)}(x)$ or a positive even integer for $S_s^{(\beta)}(x)$ and the derivatives can be computed using Taylor series. We mostly make use of the functions

$C_2^{(1)}(x)$ and $C_3^{(1)}(x)$, in which case the expansions can be computed explicitly using [2, Eq. 16], for $|x| < 2\pi$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} C_2^{(1)}(x) &= \zeta^{(1)}(2) - \frac{\pi}{2}|x| \log|x| - (\gamma - 1)\frac{\pi}{2}|x| + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (-1)^m \zeta^{(1)}(2-2m) \frac{x^{2m}}{(2m)!} \\ C_3^{(1)}(x) &= \zeta^{(1)}(3) - \frac{1}{4}x^2 \log^2|x| + \frac{3-2\gamma}{4}x^2 \log|x| - \frac{36\gamma - 12\gamma^2 - 24\gamma_1 - 42 + \pi^2}{48}x^2 \\ &\quad + \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} (-1)^m \zeta^{(1)}(3-2m) \frac{x^{2m}}{(2m)!}. \end{aligned}$$

Where γ_n is the Stieltjes constant and $\gamma = \gamma_0$. To bound the tails we have the following lemma:

Lemma B.4. *Let $\beta \geq 1$, $2M \geq s+1$ and $|x| < 2\pi$, we then have the following bounds:*

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \sum_{m=M}^{\infty} (-1)^m \zeta^{(\beta)}(s-2m) \frac{x^{2m}}{(2m)!} \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{j_1+j_2+j_3=\beta} \binom{\beta}{j_1, j_2, j_3} 2 \left(\log(2\pi) + \frac{\pi}{2} \right)^{j_1} (2\pi)^{s-1} |\zeta^{(j_3)}(1+2M-s)| \sum_{m=M}^{\infty} \left| p_{j_2}(1+2m-s) \left(\frac{x}{2\pi} \right)^{2m} \right|, \\ &\left| \sum_{m=M}^{\infty} (-1)^m \zeta^{(\beta)}(s-2m-1) \frac{x^{2m+1}}{(2m+1)!} \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{j_1+j_2+j_3=\beta} \binom{\beta}{j_1, j_2, j_3} 2 \left(\log(2\pi) + \frac{\pi}{2} \right)^{j_1} (2\pi)^{s-2} |\zeta^{(j_3)}(2+2M-s)| \sum_{m=M}^{\infty} \left| p_{j_2}(2+2m-s) \left(\frac{x}{2\pi} \right)^{2m+1} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Here p_{j_2} is given recursively by

$$p_{k+1}(s) = \psi^{(0)}(s)p_k(s) + p_k'(s), \quad p_0 = 1,$$

where $\psi^{(0)}$ is the polygamma function. It is given by a sum of terms of the form

$$c(\psi^{(0)}(s))^{q_0} (\psi^{(1)}(s))^{q_1} \dots (\psi^{(j_2-1)}(s))^{q_{j_2-1}}.$$

If $x^2 < e^{-\frac{q_0}{1+2M}}$ we have the following bounds

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{m=M}^{\infty} \left| c(\psi^{(0)}(1+2m-s))^{q_0} \dots (\psi^{(j_2-1)}(1+2m-s))^{q_{j_2-1}} \left(\frac{x}{2\pi} \right)^{2m} \right| \\ &\leq |c(\psi^{(0)}(1+2M-s))^{q_0} \dots (\psi^{(j_2-1)}(1+2M-s))^{q_{j_2-1}}| (1+2M)^{q_0/2} (2\pi)^{2-2M} \frac{x^{2m}}{4\pi^2 - Cx^2}, \end{aligned}$$

with $C = e^{\frac{q_0}{1+2M}}$. If $x^2 < e^{-\frac{q_0}{2+2M}}$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{m=M}^{\infty} \left| c(\psi^{(0)}(2+2m-s))^{q_0} \dots (\psi^{(j_2-1)}(2+2m-s))^{q_{j_2-1}} \left(\frac{x}{2\pi} \right)^{2m+1} \right| \\ &\leq |c(\psi^{(0)}(2+2M-s))^{q_0} \dots (\psi^{(j_2-1)}(2+2M-s))^{q_{j_2-1}}| (2+2M)^{q_0/2} (2\pi)^{1-2M} \frac{x^{2m+1}}{4\pi^2 - Dx^2}, \end{aligned}$$

with $D = e^{\frac{q_0}{2+2M}}$.

Proof. We give the proof for the first case, the other one is similar. We have the functional identity

$$\zeta(s) = 2(2\pi)^{s-1} \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}s\right) \Gamma(1-s)\zeta(1-s).$$

If we let

$$\begin{aligned} f(s) &= 2(2\pi)^{s-1} \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}s\right), \\ g(s) &= \Gamma(1-s), \\ h(s) &= \zeta(1-s), \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\zeta^{(\beta)}(s) = \sum_{j_1+j_2+j_3=\beta} \binom{k}{j_1, j_2, j_3} f^{(j_1)}(s) g^{(j_2)}(s) h^{(j_3)}(s).$$

This gives us

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m=M}^{\infty} (-1)^m \zeta^{(\beta)}(s-2m) \frac{x^{2m}}{(2m)!} \\ &= \sum_{m=M}^{\infty} (-1)^m \frac{x^{2m}}{(2m)!} \sum_{j_1+j_2+j_3=\beta} \binom{\beta}{j_1, j_2, j_3} f^{(j_1)}(s-2m) g^{(j_2)}(s-2m) h^{(j_3)}(s-2m) \\ &= \sum_{j_1+j_2+j_3=\beta} \binom{\beta}{j_1, j_2, j_3} \sum_{m=M}^{\infty} (-1)^m f^{(j_1)}(s-2m) g^{(j_2)}(s-2m) h^{(j_3)}(s-2m) \frac{x^{2m}}{(2m)!}. \end{aligned}$$

We are thus interested in bounding

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{m=M}^{\infty} (-1)^m f^{(j_1)}(s-2m) g^{(j_2)}(s-2m) h^{(j_3)}(s-2m) \frac{x^{2m}}{(2m)!} \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{m=M}^{\infty} \left| f^{(j_1)}(s-2m) g^{(j_2)}(s-2m) h^{(j_3)}(s-2m) \frac{x^{2m}}{(2m)!} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

for $j_1, j_2, j_3 \geq 0$.

For $f^{(j_1)}(s-2m)$ we start by noting that

$$\begin{aligned} f^{(j_1)}(s) &= 2 \sum_{k=0}^{j_1} \binom{j_1}{k} \frac{d^k (2\pi)^{s-1} \frac{d^{j_1-k} \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}s\right)}{ds^{j_1-k}}}{ds^k} \\ &= 2(2\pi)^{s-1} \sum_{k=0}^{j_1} \binom{j_1}{k} \log(2\pi)^k \frac{d^{j_1-k} \sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}s\right)}{ds^{j_1-k}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$|f^{(j_1)}(s)| \leq 2(2\pi)^{s-1} \sum_{k=0}^{j_1} \binom{j_1}{k} \log(2\pi)^k \left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)^{k-j_1} = 2 \left(\log(2\pi) + \frac{\pi}{2}\right)^{j_1} (2\pi)^{s-1}$$

and, in particular,

$$|f^{(j_1)}(s-2m)| \leq 2 \left(\log(2\pi) + \frac{\pi}{2}\right)^{j_1} (2\pi)^{s-1} (2\pi)^{-2m}.$$

For $g^{(j_2)}(s-2m)$ we start from $\Gamma^{(1)}(s) = \Gamma(s)\psi^{(0)}(s)$. Differentiating this we get

$$\Gamma^{(j_2)}(s) = \Gamma(s)p_{j_2}(s),$$

where p_{j_2} is given recursively by

$$p_{k+1} = \psi^{(0)} p_k + p'_k, \quad p_0 = 1.$$

This gives us

$$|g^{(j_2)}(s-2m)| = \Gamma(1+2m-s) |p_{j_2}(1+2m-s)|.$$

For $h^{(j_3)}(s-2m)$ we have

$$h^{(j_3)}(s-2m) = (-1)^{j_3} \zeta^{(j_3)}(1+2m-s).$$

Since $2m \geq 2M \geq s+1$ we have $1+2m-s > 1$ and hence

$$\zeta^{(j_3)}(1+2m-s) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\log^k k}{k^{1+2m-s}},$$

which is decreasing in m . Giving us

$$|h^{(j_3)}(s-2m)| \leq |\zeta^{(j_3)}(1+2M-s)|.$$

Combining the bounds for $|f^{(j_1)}|$, $|g^{(j_2)}|$ and $|h^{(j_3)}|$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m=M}^{\infty} \left| f^{(j_1)}(s-2m) g^{(j_2)}(s-2m) h^{(j_3)}(s-2m) \frac{x^{2m}}{(2m)!} \right| \\ & \leq 2 \left(\log(2\pi) + \frac{\pi}{2} \right)^{j_1} (2\pi)^{s-1} |\zeta^{(j_3)}(1+2M-s)| \sum_{m=M}^{\infty} \left| (2\pi)^{-2m} \Gamma(1+2m-s) p_{j_2}(1+2m-s) \frac{x^{2m}}{(2m)!} \right| \\ & = 2 \left(\log(2\pi) + \frac{\pi}{2} \right)^{j_1} (2\pi)^{s-1} |\zeta^{(j_3)}(1+2M-s)| \sum_{m=M}^{\infty} \left| p_{j_2}(1+2m-s) \frac{\Gamma(1+2m-s)}{(2m)!} \left(\frac{x}{2\pi} \right)^{2m} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Using that $(2m)! \geq \Gamma(2m+1-s)$ this simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m=M}^{\infty} \left| f^{(j_1)}(s-2m) g^{(j_2)}(s-2m) h^{(j_3)}(s-2m) \frac{x^{2m}}{(2m)!} \right| \\ & \leq 2 \left(\log(2\pi) + \frac{\pi}{2} \right)^{j_1} (2\pi)^{s-1} |\zeta^{(j_3)}(1+2M-s)| \sum_{m=M}^{\infty} \left| p_{j_2}(1+2m-s) \left(\frac{x}{2\pi} \right)^{2m} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the first part of the statement.

Using that $\frac{d}{ds} \psi^{(k)}(s) = \psi^{(k+1)}(s)$ we can compute p_k for any fixed k . It is clear that all terms of $p_{j_2}(s)$ will be on the form

$$c(\psi^{(0)}(s))^{q_0} (\psi^{(1)}(s))^{q_1} \dots (\psi^{(j_2-1)}(s))^{q_{j_2-1}}.$$

From the integral representation [15, Eq. 5.9.15] it follows that for $s > 0$ we have $\psi^{(0)}(s) < \log s$, using that $\log s < \sqrt{s}$ we get $\psi^{(0)}(s) < \sqrt{s}$. For $s > 0$ and $k \geq 1$ it follows from the integral representation

$$\psi^{(k)}(s) = (-1)^{k+1} \int_0^{\infty} \frac{t^k e^{-st}}{1-e^{-t}} dt$$

that $|\psi^{(k)}(s)|$ is decreasing in s . For $m \geq M$ we then have the bound

$$\begin{aligned} & |c(\psi^{(1)}(1+2m-s))^{q_1} \dots (\psi^{(j_2-1)}(1+2m-s))^{q_{j_2-1}}| \\ & \leq |c(1+2m)^{q_0/2} (\psi^{(1)}(1+2M-s))^{q_1} \dots (\psi^{(j_2-1)}(1+2M-s))^{q_{j_2-1}}|. \end{aligned}$$

This gives us

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m=M}^{\infty} \left| c(\psi^{(0)}(1+2m-s))^{q_0} \dots (\psi^{(j_2-1)}(1+2m-s))^{q_{j_2-1}} \left(\frac{x}{2\pi}\right)^{2m} \right| \\ & \leq |c(\psi^{(0)}(1+2M-s))^{q_0} \dots (\psi^{(j_2-1)}(1+2M-s))^{q_{j_2-1}}| \sum_{m=M}^{\infty} (1+2m)^{q_0/2} \left(\frac{x}{2\pi}\right)^{2m}. \end{aligned}$$

Focusing on the sum we rewrite it as

$$\frac{1}{2^{q_0/2}} \left(\frac{x}{2\pi}\right)^{2M} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \left(m + M + \frac{1}{2}\right)^{q_0/2} \left(\frac{x}{2\pi}\right)^{2m}.$$

Here it can be noted that the sum is given by the Lerch transcendent $\Phi\left(\frac{x^2}{4\pi^2}, -\frac{q_0}{2}, M + \frac{1}{2}\right)$. Hence

$$\sum_{m=M}^{\infty} (1+2m)^{q_0/2} \left(\frac{x}{2\pi}\right)^{2m} \leq \frac{1}{2^{q_0/2}} (2\pi)^{-2M} x^{2M} \Phi\left(\frac{x^2}{4\pi^2}, -\frac{q_0}{2}, M + \frac{1}{2}\right).$$

Consider a constant C such that

$$\left(1 + \frac{m}{M + 1/2}\right)^{q_0/2} < C^m \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{Cx^2}{4\pi^2} < 1, \quad (30)$$

with this we can bound the Lerch transcendent as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \left(m + M + \frac{1}{2}\right)^{q_0/2} \left(\frac{x}{2\pi}\right)^{2m} &= \left(M + \frac{1}{2}\right)^{q_0/2} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \left(1 + \frac{m}{M + 1/2}\right)^{q_0/2} \left(\frac{x^2}{4\pi^2}\right)^m \\ &\leq \left(M + \frac{1}{2}\right)^{q_0/2} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} C^m \left(\frac{x^2}{4\pi^2}\right)^m \\ &= \left(M + \frac{1}{2}\right)^{q_0/2} \frac{1}{4\pi^2 \frac{1}{4\pi^2 - Cx^2}}, \end{aligned}$$

If we take $C = e^{\frac{q_0}{2}(M+1/2)} = e^{\frac{q_0}{1+2M}}$ then the first inequality in (30) is satisfied. For the second inequality to be satisfied we must then have $x^2 < e^{-\frac{q_0}{1+2M}}$, if this does not hold we can sum the first few terms of the series explicitly to work with a larger M . Note that this method for bounding sum is the same as that used by Arb in the, currently unreleased, implementation⁴ of the Lerch transcendent.

Putting all of this together we arrived at the bound

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{m=M}^{\infty} \left| c(\psi^{(0)}(1+2m-s))^{q_0} \dots (\psi^{(j_2-1)}(1+2m-s))^{q_{j_2-1}} \left(\frac{x}{2\pi}\right)^{2m} \right| \\ & \leq |c(\psi^{(0)}(1+2M-s))^{q_0} \dots (\psi^{(j_2-1)}(1+2M-s))^{q_{j_2-1}}| \frac{1}{2^{q_0/2}} \left(\frac{x}{2\pi}\right)^{2M} \left(M + \frac{1}{2}\right)^{q_0/2} 4\pi^2 \frac{1}{4\pi^2 - Cx^2} \\ & = |c(\psi^{(0)}(1+2M-s))^{q_0} \dots (\psi^{(j_2-1)}(1+2M-s))^{q_{j_2-1}}| (1+2M)^{q_0/2} (2\pi)^{2-2M} \frac{x^{2M}}{4\pi^2 - Cx^2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

⁴<https://fredrikj.net/blog/2022/02/computing-the-lerch-transcendent/>

C Rigorous integration with singularities

We here explain how to compute enclosures of the integrals $U_{1,1}(x)$, $U_{1,2}$ and $U_{2(x)}$ in the non-asymptotic case, as well as how to enclose c_1 and c_2 occurring in Lemmas 6.3 and 6.4. Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} U_{1,1}(x) &= \int_0^{r_x} \log \left(\frac{\sin(x(1-t)/2) \sin(x(1+t)/2)}{\sin(xt/2)^2} \right) t \sqrt{\log(1+1/(xt))} dt; \\ U_{1,2}(x) &= - \int_{r_x}^1 \log \left(\frac{\sin(x(1-t)/2) \sin(x(1+t)/2)}{\sin(xt/2)^2} \right) t \sqrt{\log(1+1/(xt))} dt; \\ U_2(x) &= - \int_x^\pi \log \left(\frac{\sin((y-x)/2) \sin((x+y)/2)}{\sin(y/2)^2} \right) y \sqrt{\log(1+1/y)} dy. \end{aligned}$$

The integrand for $U_{1,2}$ has a (integrable) singularity at $t = 1$ and the integrand for U_2 has one at $y = x$. As a first step we split these off to handle them separately. Let

$$\begin{aligned} U_{1,2}(x) &= - \int_{r_x}^{1-\delta_1} \log \left(\frac{\sin(x(1-t)/2) \sin(x(1+t)/2)}{\sin(xt/2)^2} \right) t \sqrt{\log(1+1/(xt))} dt; \\ &\quad - \int_{1-\delta_1}^1 \log \left(\frac{\sin(x(1-t)/2) \sin(x(1+t)/2)}{\sin(xt/2)^2} \right) t \sqrt{\log(1+1/(xt))} dt; \\ &= U_{1,2,1}(x) + U_{1,2,2}(x) \\ U_2(x) &= - \int_x^{x+\delta_2} \log \left(\frac{\sin((y-x)/2) \sin((x+y)/2)}{\sin(y/2)^2} \right) y \sqrt{\log(1+1/y)} dy \\ &\quad - \int_{x+\delta_2}^\pi \log \left(\frac{\sin((y-x)/2) \sin((x+y)/2)}{\sin(y/2)^2} \right) y \sqrt{\log(1+1/y)} dy \\ &= U_{2,1}(x) + U_{2,2}(x). \end{aligned}$$

For $U_{1,2,2}$ and $U_{2,1}$ we have the following lemma

Lemma C.1. *We have*

$$U_{1,2,2}(x) = \frac{\xi_1}{x} (-S_2(0) + S_2(2x) - 2S_2(x) - (-S_2(x\delta_1) + S_2(x(2-\delta_1)) - 2S_2(x(1-\delta_1))))$$

for some ξ_1 in the image of $t\sqrt{\log(1+1/(xt))}$ for $t \in [1-\delta_1, 1]$. Furthermore

$$U_{2,1}(x) = \xi_2 ((S_2(\delta_2) + S_2(2x+\delta_2) - 2S_2(x+\delta_2)) - (S_2(0) + S_2(2x) - 2S_2(x)))$$

for some ξ_2 in the image of $y\sqrt{\log(1+1/y)}$ for $y \in [x, x+\delta_2]$.

Proof. We give the proof for $U_{1,2,2}(x)$, the other one is similar.

The factor $t\sqrt{\log(1+1/(xt))}$ in the integrand of $U_{1,2,2}$ is bounded in t on the interval $[1-\delta_1, 1]$ and the integrand has a constant sign, hence there exists ξ_1 in the range of $t\sqrt{\log(1+1/(xt))}$ on this interval such that

$$U_{1,2,2}(x) = \xi_1 \int_{1-\delta_1}^1 - \log \left(\frac{\sin(x(1-t)/2) \sin(x(1+t)/2)}{\sin(xt/2)^2} \right) dt. \quad (31)$$

It is therefore enough to compute an enclosure of this integral. For this we use that $C_1(x) = -\log(2\sin(|x|/2))$ to write it as

$$\int_{1-\delta_1}^1 C_1(x(1-t)) + C_1(x(1+t)) - 2C_1(xt) dt.$$

Using that $\int C_1(t) dt = S_2(t)$ we get

$$\int C_1(x(1-t)) + C_1(x(1+t)) - 2C_1(xt) dt = \frac{1}{x} (-S_2(x(1-t)) + S_2(x(1+t)) - 2S_2(xt)).$$

Integrating from $1 - \delta_1$ to 1 gives us

$$U_{1,2,2}(x) = \xi_1 \frac{1}{x} (-S_2(0) + S_2(2x) - 2S_2(x) - (-S_2(x\delta_1) + S_2(x(2 - \delta_1)) - 2S_2(x(1 - \delta_1)))),$$

which proves the result. \square

What remains is computing $U_{1,1}$, $U_{1,2,1}$ and $U_{2,2}$. In this case the integrands are bounded everywhere on the intervals of integration and we enclose the integrals using the rigorous numerical integrator implemented by Arb [33]. For functions that are analytic on the interval the integrator uses Gaussian quadratures with error bounds computed through complex magnitudes, we therefore need to evaluate the integrands on complex intervals. When the function is not analytic it falls back to naive enclosures using interval arithmetic. The only non-trivial part is bounding the integrand for $U_{1,1}$ near $t = 0$, where it is bounded but not analytic. For this we start by splitting it as

$$\begin{aligned} \log\left(\frac{\sin(x(1-t)/2)\sin(x(1+t)/2)}{\sin(xt/2)^2}\right) t\sqrt{\log(1+1/(xt))} &= \log(\sin(x(1-t)/2))t\sqrt{\log(1+1/(xt))} \\ &+ \log(\sin(x(1+t)/2))t\sqrt{\log(1+1/(xt))} - 2\log(\sin(xt/2))t\sqrt{\log(1+1/(xt))}. \end{aligned}$$

For the first two terms the only problematic part is the factor $t\sqrt{\log(1+1/(xt))}$, we note that it is zero at $t = 0$ and differentiating it gives us

$$\frac{d}{dt} t\sqrt{\log(1+1/(xt))} = \frac{2xt \log(1+1/(xt)) + 2\log(1+1/(xt)) - 1}{(2xt+1)\sqrt{\log(1+1/(xt))}}.$$

If

$$2\log(1+1/(xt)) - 1 > 0 \iff t < \frac{1}{x(e^{1/2} - 1)}.$$

then the derivative is positive and we can thus get an enclosure by checking that this inequality holds and using monotonicity. This leaves us with the third term,

$$\log(\sin(xt/2))t\sqrt{\log(1+1/(xt))},$$

which is also zero at $t = 0$ and for the monotonicity we have the following lemma

Lemma C.2. For $0 < x < \pi$ and $0 < t < \frac{1}{10x}$ the function

$$\log(\sin(xt/2))t\sqrt{\log(1+1/(xt))}$$

is decreasing in t .

Proof. Differentiating we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \log(\sin(xt/2))t\sqrt{\log(1+1/(xt))} \\ = \frac{(2(xt+1)\log(1+1/(xt)) - 1)\log(\sin(xt/2)) + xt(xt+1)\log(1+1/(xt))\cot(xt/2)}{2(xt+1)\sqrt{\log(1+1/(xt))}}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the denominator is positive it is enough to show that

$$(2(xt+1)\log(1+1/(xt)) - 1)\log(\sin(xt/2)) + xt(xt+1)\log(1+1/(xt))\cot(xt/2) \leq 0.$$

Since $t < \frac{1}{10x} < \frac{1}{x(e^{1/2}-1)}$ the factor $(2(xt+1)\log(1+1/(xt))-1)$ is positive, multiplication by $\log(\sin(xt/2))$ makes it negative. Using that $\log(\sin(xt/2)) < \log(xt/2) < \log(xt)$ an upper bound is hence given by

$$(2\log(1+1/(xt))-1)\log(xt) + xt(xt+1)\log(1+1/(xt))\cot(xt/2).$$

If we let $r = xt \in [0, \frac{1}{10}]$ this becomes

$$(2\log(1+1/r)-1)\log(r) + r(r+1)\log(1+1/r)\cot(r/2).$$

Using that $r\cot(r/2) \leq 2$ for $|r| < \pi$ and $\log(1+1/r) > -\log(r)$ we get the upper bound

$$(-2\log(r)-1)\log(r) + 2(r+1)\log(1+1/r).$$

Splitting $\log(1+1/r) = \log(1+r) - \log(r)$ gives

$$(-2\log(r)-1)\log(r) + 2(r+1)\log(1+r) - 2(r+1)\log(r).$$

Using that $2(r+1) \leq \frac{11}{5}$ and $\log(1+r) \leq \log(11/10)$ it reduces to

$$(-2\log(r)-1)\log(r) + \frac{11}{5}\log(11/10) - \frac{11}{5}\log(r)$$

which is a quadratic expression in $\log(r)$, which can easily be checked to be negative on $[0, \frac{1}{10}]$. □

For enclosing c_1 and c_2 recall that

$$c_1 = \int_0^1 |\log(1/t^2 - 1)|t\sqrt{\log(1/t)} dt;$$

$$c_2 = \int_0^\pi y\sqrt{\log(1+1/y)} dy.$$

Both integrands are bounded, by splitting c_1 as

$$c_1 = \int_0^{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}} \log(1/t^2 - 1)t\sqrt{\log(1/t)} dt - \int_{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}}^1 \log(1/t^2 - 1)t\sqrt{\log(1/t)} dt,$$

they are also analytic except at $t = 0$ and $t = 1$ for c_1 and $y = 0$ for c_2 . For c_2 the integrand is easily seen to be increasing for $y > 0$ and it can be bounded near $y = 0$ using that. The integrand for c_1 is not monotone, to bound it we split it into three terms

$$\log(1/t^2 - 1)t\sqrt{\log(1/t)} = tf_1(t) + tf_2(t) - 2f_3(t),$$

with

$$f_1(t) = \log(1-t)\sqrt{\log(1/t)}, \quad f_2(t) = \log(1+t)\sqrt{\log(1/t)}, \quad f_3(t) = t\log(t)\sqrt{\log(1/t)}.$$

It is then enough to bound f_1 , f_2 and f_3 . Differentiating we have

$$f_1'(t) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\log(1/t)}} \left(\frac{2\log t}{1-t} - \frac{\log(1-t)}{t} \right),$$

$$f_2'(t) = -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\log(1/t)}} \left(\frac{2\log t}{1+t} + \frac{\log(1+t)}{t} \right),$$

$$f_3'(t) = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\log(1/t)}(3 + 2\log(t)).$$

For f'_3 we get the unique root $e^{-3/2}$ on the interval $(0, 1)$, we can thus use monotonicity of f_3 as long as we avoid this point. For f'_1 and f'_2 we are looking for the zeros of

$$g_1(t) = \frac{2 \log t}{1-t} - \frac{\log(1-t)}{t} \quad \text{and} \quad g_2(t) = \frac{2 \log t}{1+t} + \frac{\log(1+t)}{t}$$

respectively. For g_1 both $\frac{2 \log t}{1-t}$ and $-\frac{\log(1-t)}{t}$ are increasing, hence g_1 is increasing. From the limits $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} g_1(t) = -\infty$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow 1^-} g_1(t) = \infty$ it follows that f'_1 has exactly one root on $(0, 1)$. This root can easily be isolated using interval arithmetic and we can then use monotonicity of f_1 as long as we avoid this root. The function g_2 is also monotone, to see this we differentiate, giving us

$$g'_2(t) = -\frac{2t^2 \log(t) + (1+t)(t(\log(1+t) - 3) + \log(1+t))}{t^2(1+t)^2}.$$

The sign is determined by

$$-(2t^2 \log(t) + (1+t)(t(\log(1+t) - 3) + \log(1+t))),$$

A lower bound is given by

$$(1+t)(3t - t \log(1+t) - \log(1+t)),$$

that this is positive follows from the inequality $t > \log(1+t)$. This proves that f'_2 is monotone, we can then use the same approach as for f_1 to isolate the unique critical point.

Acknowledgments

JD and JGS were partially supported by the ERC Starting Grant ERC-StG-CAPA-852741. JGS was partially supported by NSF through Grant NSF DMS-1763356. This material is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. DMS-1929284 while JD and JGS were in residence at the Institute for Computational and Experimental Research in Mathematics in Providence, RI, during the program “Hamiltonian Methods in Dispersive and Wave Evolution Equations”. JD was partially supported by the Swedish-American foundation for the visit. We are also thankful for the hospitality of the Princeton Department of Mathematics, the Uppsala University Department of Mathematics and the Brown University Department of Mathematics where parts of this paper were done. This work is supported by the Spanish State Research Agency, through the Severo Ochoa and María de Maeztu Program for Centers and Units of Excellence in R&D (CEX2020-001084-M).

References

- [1] C. J. Amick, L. E. Fraenkel, and J. F. Toland. “On the Stokes conjecture for the wave of extreme form”. In: *Acta Mathematica* 148 (1982), pp. 193–214. DOI: 10.1007/bf02392728.
- [2] D. H. Bailey and J. M. Borwein. “Computation and structure of character polylogarithms with applications to character Mordell–Tornheim–Witten sums”. In: *Math. Comp.* 85.297 (June 2015), pp. 295–324. ISSN: 0025-5718, 1088-6842. DOI: 10.1090/mcom/2974.
- [3] Jeff Bezanson, Alan Edelman, Stefan Karpinski, and Viral B. Shah. “Julia: A Fresh Approach to Numerical Computing”. In: *SIAM Rev.* 59.1 (Jan. 2017), pp. 65–98. ISSN: 0036-1445, 1095-7200. DOI: 10.1137/141000671.
- [4] Joseph Biello and John K. Hunter. “Nonlinear Hamiltonian waves with constant frequency and surface waves on vorticity discontinuities”. In: *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* 63.3 (2009), pp. 303–336. ISSN: 0010-3640, 1097-0312. DOI: 10.1002/cpa.20304.

- [5] Alberto Bressan and Khai T. Nguyen. “Global Existence of Weak Solutions for the Burgers–Hilbert Equation”. In: *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis* 46.4 (Jan. 2014), pp. 2884–2904. DOI: 10.1137/140957536.
- [6] Alberto Bressan and Tianyou Zhang. “Piecewise smooth solutions to the Burgers–Hilbert equation”. In: *Communications in Mathematical Sciences* 15.1 (2017), pp. 165–184. DOI: 10.4310/cms.2017.v15.n1.a7.
- [7] Gabriele Bruell and Raj Narayan Dhara. *Waves of maximal height for a class of nonlocal equations with homogeneous symbols*. 2018. arXiv: 1810.00248v1 [math.AP].
- [8] Angel Castro, Diego Córdoba, and Francisco Gancedo. “Singularity formations for a surface wave model”. In: *Nonlinearity* 23.11 (Oct. 2010), pp. 2835–2847. DOI: 10.1088/0951-7715/23/11/006.
- [9] Ángel Castro, Diego Córdoba, and Fan Zheng. Personal communication.
- [10] Ángel Castro, Diego Córdoba, and Fan Zheng. *Stability of traveling waves for the Burgers–Hilbert equation*. 2021. arXiv: 2103.02897 [math.AP].
- [11] Kyle R. Chickering, Ryan C. Moreno-Vasquez, and Gavin Pandya. *Asymptotically self-similar shock formation for 1d fractal Burgers equation*. 2021. arXiv: 2105.15128v2 [math.AP].
- [12] Joel Dahne. “Highest cusped waves for a family of fractional KdV equations”. In preparation. 2022.
- [13] Joel Dahne, Javier Gómez-Serrano, and Kimberly Hou. “A counterexample to Payne’s nodal line conjecture with few holes”. In: *Commun. Nonlinear Sci.* 103 (Dec. 2021), p. 105957. ISSN: 1007-5704. DOI: 10.1016/j.cnsns.2021.105957.
- [14] Joel Dahne and Bruno Salvy. “Computation of Tight Enclosures for Laplacian Eigenvalues”. In: *SIAM J. Sci. Comput.* 42.5 (Jan. 2020), A3210–A3232. ISSN: 1064-8275, 1095-7197. DOI: 10.1137/20m1326520.
- [15] *NIST Digital Library of Mathematical Functions*. <http://dlmf.nist.gov/>, Release 1.1.4 of 2022-01-15. F. W. J. Olver, A. B. Olde Daalhuis, D. W. Lozier, B. I. Schneider, R. F. Boisvert, C. W. Clark, B. R. Miller, B. V. Saunders, H. S. Cohl, and M. A. McClain, eds.
- [16] D. Dominici, S.J. Johnston, and K. Jordaan. “Real zeros of ${}_2F_1$ hypergeometric polynomials”. In: *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics* 247 (Aug. 2013), pp. 152–161. DOI: 10.1016/j.cam.2012.12.024.
- [17] Mats Ehrnström, Katerina Nik, and Christoph Walker. *A direct construction of a full family of Whitham solitary waves*. 2022. arXiv: 2204.03274v1 [math.AP].
- [18] Mats Ehrnström and Erik Wahlén. “On Whitham’s conjecture of a highest cusped wave for a nonlocal dispersive equation”. In: *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré C, Analyse non linéaire* 36.6 (Sept. 2019), pp. 1603–1637. ISSN: 0294-1449. DOI: 10.1016/j.anihpc.2019.02.006.
- [19] Mats Ehrnström and Yuexun Wang. “Enhanced Existence Time of Solutions to the Fractional Korteweg–de Vries Equation”. In: *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 51.4 (Jan. 2019), pp. 3298–3323. ISSN: 0036-1410, 1095-7154. DOI: 10.1137/19m1237867.
- [20] Alberto Enciso, Javier Gómez-Serrano, and Bruno Vergara. *Convexity of Whitham’s highest cusped wave*. 2018. arXiv: 1810.10935 [math.AP].
- [21] Javier Gómez-Serrano. “Computer-assisted proofs in PDE: a survey”. In: *SeMA Journal* 76.3 (Feb. 2019), pp. 459–484. DOI: 10.1007/s40324-019-00186-x.
- [22] Javier Gómez-Serrano and Rafael Granero-Belinchón. “On turning waves for the inhomogeneous Muskat problem: A computer-assisted proof”. In: *Nonlinearity* 27.6 (May 2014), pp. 1471–1498. ISSN: 0951-7715, 1361-6544. DOI: 10.1088/0951-7715/27/6/1471.
- [23] Susanna Haziot, Vera Hur, Walter Strauss, J. Toland, Erik Wahlén, Samuel Walsh, and Miles Wheeler. “Traveling water waves — the ebb and flow of two centuries”. In: *Quarterly of Applied Mathematics* 80.2 (Mar. 2022), pp. 317–401. DOI: 10.1090/qam/1614.

- [24] Fredrik Hildrum and Jun Xue. *Periodic Hölder waves in nonsmooth fractional KdV equations*. 2022. arXiv: 2202.07363v1 [math.AP].
- [25] John K. Hunter. “The Burgers–Hilbert Equation”. In: *Theory, Numerics and Applications of Hyperbolic Problems II*. Ed. by Christian Klingenberg and Michael Westdickenberg. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2018, pp. 41–57. ISBN: 978-3-319-91548-7. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-91548-7_3.
- [26] John K. Hunter and Mihaela Ifrim. “Enhanced Life Span of Smooth Solutions of a Burgers–Hilbert Equation”. In: *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 44.3 (Jan. 2012), pp. 2039–2052. ISSN: 0036-1410, 1095-7154. DOI: 10.1137/110849791.
- [27] John K. Hunter, Mihaela Ifrim, Daniel Tataru, and Tak Kwong Wong. “Long time solutions for a Burgers–Hilbert equation via a modified energy method”. In: *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 143.8 (Apr. 2015), pp. 3407–3412. ISSN: 0002-9939, 1088-6826. DOI: 10.1090/proc/12215.
- [28] John K. Hunter, Ryan C. Moreno-Vasquez, Jingyang Shu, and Qingtian Zhang. “On the approximation of vorticity fronts by the Burgers–Hilbert equation”. In: *Asymptotic Analysis* (Sept. 2021), pp. 1–37. ISSN: 1875-8576, 0921-7134. DOI: 10.3233/asy-211724.
- [29] Vera Mikyoung Hur. “On the formation of singularities for surface water waves”. In: *Communications on Pure and Applied Analysis* 11.4 (Jan. 2012), pp. 1465–1474. DOI: 10.3934/cpaa.2012.11.1465.
- [30] Vera Mikyoung Hur. “Wave breaking in the Whitham equation”. In: *Advances in Mathematics* 317 (Sept. 2017), pp. 410–437. DOI: 10.1016/j.aim.2017.07.006.
- [31] Vera Mikyoung Hur and Lizheng Tao. “Wave breaking for the Whitham equation with fractional dispersion”. In: *Nonlinearity* 27.12 (Nov. 2014), pp. 2937–2949. DOI: 10.1088/0951-7715/27/12/2937.
- [32] F. Johansson. “Fast and rigorous computation of special functions to high precision”. PhD thesis. Linz: RISC, Johannes Kepler University, 2014.
- [33] F. Johansson. “Numerical integration in arbitrary-precision ball arithmetic”. In: *Mathematical Software – ICMS 2018*. Springer Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2018, pp. 255–263. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-319-96418-8_30.
- [34] Fredrik Johansson. “A fast algorithm for reversion of power series”. In: *Math. Comp.* 84.291 (May 2014), pp. 475–484. ISSN: 0025-5718, 1088-6842. DOI: 10.1090/s0025-5718-2014-02857-3.
- [35] Fredrik Johansson. “Arb: A C Library for Ball Arithmetic”. In: *ACM Commun. Comput. Algebra* 47.3/4 (Jan. 2014), pp. 166–169. ISSN: 1932-2240. DOI: 10.1145/2576802.2576828.
- [36] Fredrik Johansson. “Arb: Efficient Arbitrary-Precision Midpoint-Radius Interval Arithmetic”. In: *IEEE Trans. Comput.* 66.8 (8 Aug. 2017), pp. 1281–1292. ISSN: 0018-9340. DOI: 10.1109/tc.2017.2690633.
- [37] Fredrik Johansson. “Computing Hypergeometric Functions Rigorously”. In: *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software* 45.3 (Aug. 2019), pp. 1–26. DOI: 10.1145/3328732.
- [38] Fredrik Johansson. “Rigorous high-precision computation of the Hurwitz zeta function and its derivatives”. In: *Numer. Algor.* 69.2 (2 July 2014), pp. 253–270. ISSN: 1017-1398, 1572-9265. DOI: 10.1007/s11075-014-9893-1.
- [39] C. Klein, J.-C. Saut, and Yuexun Wang. *On the modified fractional Korteweg-de Vries and related equations*. 2020. arXiv: 2010.05081v1 [math.AP].
- [40] Christian Klein, Felipe Linares, Didier Pilod, and Jean-Claude Saut. “On Whitham and Related Equations”. In: *Studies in Applied Mathematics* 140.2 (Dec. 2017), pp. 133–177. DOI: 10.1111/sapm.12194.
- [41] Christian Klein and Jean-Claude Saut. “A numerical approach to blow-up issues for dispersive perturbations of Burgers’ equation”. In: *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena* 295-296 (Mar. 2015), pp. 46–65. DOI: 10.1016/j.physd.2014.12.004.
- [42] Sam G. Krupa and Alexis F. Vasseur. “Stability and Uniqueness for Piecewise Smooth Solutions to a Nonlocal Scalar Conservation Law with Applications to Burgers–Hilbert Equation”. In: *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis* 52.3 (Jan. 2020), pp. 2491–2530. DOI: 10.1137/19m1257883.

- [43] Jeremy Levesley, Iain J. Anderson, and John C. Mason. *Algorithms for Approximation IV*. Proceedings of the Fourth International Symposium on Algorithms for Approximation, held at the University of Huddersfield, July 2001. Huddersfield: University of Huddersfield, 2002.
- [44] Jerrold Marsden and Alan Weinstein. “Coadjoint orbits, vortices, and Clebsch variables for incompressible fluids”. In: *Physica D* 7.1-3 (May 1983), pp. 305–323. ISSN: 0167-2789. DOI: 10.1016/0167-2789(83)90134-3.
- [45] Patrick Kofod Mogensen, Kristoffer Carlsson, Sébastien Villemot, Spencer Lyon, Matthieu Gomez, Christopher Rackauckas, Tim Holy, David Widmann, Tony Kelman, Daniel Karrasch, Antoine Levitt, Asbjørn Nilsen Riseth, Carlo Lucibello, Changhyun Kwon, David Barton, Julia TagBot, Mateusz Baran, Miles Lubin, Sarthak Choudhury, Simon Byrne, Simon Christ, Takafumi Arakaki, Troels Arnfred Bojesen, benneti, and Miguel Raz Guzmán Macedo. *JuliaNLSolvers/NLsolve.jl: v4.5.1*. Version v4.5.1. Dec. 2020. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4404703.
- [46] Ramon E. Moore. *Methods and Applications of Interval Analysis*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Jan. 1979. DOI: 10.1137/1.9781611970906.
- [47] Sung-Jin Oh and Federico Pasqualotto. *Gradient blow-up for dispersive and dissipative perturbations of the Burgers equation*. 2021. arXiv: 2107.07172v1 [math.AP].
- [48] Magnus Christie Ørke. *Highest waves for fractional Korteweg–De Vries and Degasperis–Procesi equations*. 2022. arXiv: 2201.13159v1 [math.AP].
- [49] Oscar Riaño. “On persistence properties in weighted spaces for solutions of the fractional Korteweg–de Vries equation”. In: *Nonlinearity* 34.7 (June 2021), pp. 4604–4660. DOI: 10.1088/1361-6544/abf5bd.
- [50] Jean-Claude Saut and Yuexun Wang. *The wave breaking for Whitham-type equations revisited*. 2020. arXiv: 2006.03803v1 [math.AP].
- [51] G.G. Stokes and J.W.S. Rayleigh. *Mathematical and Physical Papers; Volume 1*. Creative Media Partners, LLC, 2018. ISBN: 9780344215971.
- [52] Warwick Tucker. *Validated Numerics. A Short Introduction to Rigorous Computations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, July 2011, pp. xii+138. ISBN: 9781400838974. DOI: 10.1515/9781400838974.
- [53] G. B. Whitham. *Linear and Nonlinear Waves*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., June 1999. DOI: 10.1002/9781118032954.
- [54] Gerald Beresford Whitham. “Variational methods and applications to water waves”. In: *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences* 299.1456 (June 1967), pp. 6–25. DOI: 10.1098/rspa.1967.0119.
- [55] Ruoxuan Yang. “Shock Formation of the Burgers–Hilbert Equation”. In: *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* 53.5 (Jan. 2021), pp. 5756–5802. ISSN: 0036-1410, 1095-7154. DOI: 10.1137/21m1399348.

Joel Dahne

Department of Mathematics
Uppsala University
Lägerhyddsvägen 1, 752 37, Uppsala, Sweden
Email: joel.dahne@math.uu.se

Javier Gómez-Serrano

Department of Mathematics
Brown University
Kassar House, 151 Thayer St.
Providence, RI 02912, USA

and

Departament de Matemàtiques i Informàtica
Universitat de Barcelona
Gran Via de les Corts Catalanes, 585
08007, Barcelona, Spain

and

Centre de Recerca Matemàtica
Edifici C
Campus Bellaterra
08193 Bellaterra, Spain
Email: javier_gomez_serrano@brown.edu, jgomez_serrano@ub.edu