

RECIPROCITY FOR DEDEKIND SUMS VIA CONICAL ZETA VALUES

YERKO TORRES-NOVA

ABSTRACT. We study reciprocity formulas for Dedekind sums associated with absolutely continuous functions, extending the classical Dedekind-Rademacher reciprocity formula. In particular, we treat the case of periodic Bernoulli functions. Our approach generalizes an integral method and uses Fourier analysis to show that the reciprocity for polynomial-type functions admits a geometric interpretation in terms of conical zeta values.

Keywords: *Dedekind Sums, Reciprocity, Conical Zeta Values, Bernoulli Polynomials.*

MSC2020: *11F20, 11B68, 11M32*

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Preliminaries	2
3. General Reciprocity Formulas	5
4. Zeta Values and Polyhedra	11
5. The Case of Dimension 2.	15
References	18

1. INTRODUCTION

Given positive integers ν_0, ν_1, ν_2 , the classical Dedekind sum is defined as

$$S(\nu_1, \nu_2 | \nu_0) := \sum_{i=1}^{\nu_0-1} b_1\left(\frac{i\nu_1}{\nu_0}\right) b_1\left(\frac{i\nu_2}{\nu_0}\right),$$

where $b_1(x)$ is the *first periodic Bernoulli function*, i.e.,

$$b_1 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad b_1(x) = \{x\} - 1/2,$$

and $\{x\} = x - \lfloor x \rfloor$ denotes the fractional part of x . The Dedekind-Rademacher reciprocity theorem [13, 14] asserts that if ν_0, ν_1, ν_2 are pairwise coprime positive integers, then

$$\mathcal{R}_{b_1}(\boldsymbol{\nu}) := S(\nu_1, \nu_2 | \nu_0) + S(\nu_0, \nu_2 | \nu_1) + S(\nu_1, \nu_0 | \nu_2) = \frac{\nu_0^2 + \nu_1^2 + \nu_2^2}{12\nu_0\nu_1\nu_2} - \frac{1}{4}. \quad (1)$$

This reciprocity law is fundamental in many areas and provides techniques that link arithmetic, geometry, and topology (see, for instance, [11]). Due to its significance, numerous approaches have been developed to study its nature and to derive generalizations in various directions [6, 17]. For our purposes, a key example arises by replacing the function $b_1(x)$ with higher-degree periodic Bernoulli functions,

$$b_q(x) := B_q(\{x\})$$

where $B_q(x)$ denotes the q -th Bernoulli polynomial [2, 10]. In this paper, we study the reciprocity phenomenon from a general perspective. Our main objects of study are the *generalized Dedekind sums* defined by

$$S_{\mathbf{f}}(\boldsymbol{\nu} | \nu_k) = \sum_{i=1}^{\nu_k-1} \prod_{j \neq k} f_j\left(\frac{i\nu_j}{\nu_k}\right), \quad k = 0, \dots, r,$$

for a vector of distinct nonzero positive integers $\boldsymbol{\nu} = (\nu_0, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_r)$ pairwise coprime, and $\mathbf{f} = (f_0, f_1, \dots, f_r) \in \mathcal{S}_1^{r+1}$ where

$$\mathcal{S}_1 := \left\{ f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} : \begin{array}{l} \text{1-periodic,} \\ \text{discontinuities at most in } \mathbb{Z}, \\ \text{absolutely continuous on } (0, 1). \end{array} \right\}.$$

In [Section 2](#) we review the basic facts on integration, Dedekind sums, and conical zeta values. In [Section 3](#), we introduce our reciprocity symbol $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{f}}(\boldsymbol{\nu})$. Using integration by parts, we obtain an *integral reciprocity formula*. As was observed in [\[14\]](#), this gives [Equation \(1\)](#) in a clean way. The integral reciprocity formula can be reformulated in terms of Fourier analysis. Since every function in \mathcal{S}_1 admits a Fourier series, we derive a *Fourier reciprocity formula*, which connects the theory to polyhedral geometry. We end the section by applying this Fourier reciprocity to the case where the functions $f_j \in \mathcal{S}_1$ arise from polynomials of degree $q_j \geq 1$ ([Section 3.3](#)). In this setting, reciprocity is closely related to a class of polyhedral zeta values $\zeta_{k, \boldsymbol{\nu}, \mathbf{q}}$ defined on the lattice $\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\perp}$ of integer vectors orthogonal to $\boldsymbol{\nu}$, where $\mathbf{q} = (q_0, q_1, \dots, q_r)$ is a vector of positive integers. These values provide an explicit reciprocity formula for the Dedekind sums

$$S_{b_{\mathbf{q}}}(\boldsymbol{\nu} | \nu_k) := S_{(b_{q_0} \dots b_{q_r})}(\boldsymbol{\nu} | \nu_k)$$

coming from the periodic Bernoulli functions ([Equation \(12\)](#)). In [Section 4](#), we study a two-step decomposition of $\zeta_{k, \boldsymbol{\nu}, \mathbf{q}}$. First, we establish convergence by comparison with another type of zeta values, denoted $\zeta_{\boldsymbol{\nu}, \mathbf{q}}$. The key point is that $\zeta_{\boldsymbol{\nu}, \mathbf{q}}$ converges for all \mathbf{q} and controls the first decomposition. Next, to simplify the situation, we decompose according to the integer orthants of \mathbb{R}^{r+1} , which leads to a description in terms of conical zeta values [\[3, 9, 15\]](#). This enables us to use desingularization of the cones associated to $\boldsymbol{\nu}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\perp}$ and express the reciprocity formula in terms of conical zeta values of unimodular cones. In [Section 5](#), we specialize to the case $r = 2$, and use the well-known Hirzebruch-Jung algorithm [\[7, Ch.10\]](#), also known as the reversed Euclidean algorithm, to resolve planar clones. This algorithm is used to derive a reciprocity formula for the Dedekind sums $S_{b_{\mathbf{q}}}$ from conical zeta values associated with unimodular cones for each \mathbf{q} .

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Riemann-Stieltjes Integration. Let $f : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a function, and $P = \{t_i \in \mathbb{R} : a = t_0 < t_1 < \dots < t_n = b\}$ a *partition* of the interval $[a, b]$. The *variation* of f over P is the quantity,

$$V(f, P) := \sum_{i=1}^n |f(t_i) - f(t_{i-1})|.$$

Let \mathcal{P}_a^b be the set of all partitions of $[a, b]$. We say that f is of *bounded variation* on $[a, b]$ if

$$V_a^b f = \sup_{P \in \mathcal{P}_a^b} V(f, P) < \infty.$$

There is a well-known classification: a function f is of bounded variation if and only if $\operatorname{Re}(f)$ and $\operatorname{Im}(f)$ can be written as the difference between two increasing functions. As a consequence, functions of bounded variation are differentiable almost everywhere and have at most countably many discontinuities. Thus, we have well-defined two-sided limits,

$$f(x_0^+) := \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0^+} f(x), \quad f(x_0^-) := \lim_{x \rightarrow x_0^-} f(x).$$

The relevance of functions of bounded variation is that they establish a criterion for guaranteeing the existence of the Riemann-Stieltjes integral and the integration by parts formula. Explicitly, set $|P| := \max\{|t_i - t_{i-1}| : i = 1, \dots, n\}$ for any $P \in \mathcal{P}_a^b$. If $f, g : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ are functions of bounded variation and have no common discontinuities, then the limits

$$\int_a^b f(x) dg(x) = \lim_{|P| \rightarrow 0} \sum_{i=1}^n f(x_i)(g(t_i) - g(t_{i-1})),$$

$$\int_a^b g(x)df(x) = \lim_{|P| \rightarrow 0} \sum_{i=1}^n g(x_i)(f(t_i) - f(t_{i-1})),$$

exists for any choice of points $x_i \in [t_{i-1}, t_i]$ of a partition $P = \{t_i\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathcal{P}_a^b$. The following two theorems are well-known (see, for instance, [5, Ch. 6]).

Theorem 2.1 (Integration by Parts). *Let $f, g, h : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be functions of bounded variation with no common discontinuities. Then,*

$$\int_a^b f(x)d(g(x)h(x)) = \int_a^b f(x)g(x)dh(x) + \int_a^b f(x)h(x)dg(x).$$

□

As a corollary, for $f(x) = 1$ we get the classical integration by parts formula:

$$g(x)h(x)|_a^b = g(b)h(b) - g(a)h(a) = \int_a^b g(x)dh(x) + \int_a^b h(x)dg(x).$$

We say that f is *absolutely continuous on an interval I* if for all $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that for any collection of disjoint subintervals $(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_k, y_k) \subset I$ we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^k |x_j - y_j| < \delta \implies \sum_{j=1}^k |f(x_j) - f(y_j)| < \varepsilon.$$

It is known that an absolutely continuous function is of bounded variation. For a function $f : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, let $D(f)$ be the set of discontinuities of f in (a, b) . Assume $D(f)$ finite, we say that f is *pairwise absolutely continuous on I* if f is absolutely continuous on each connected component of $I \setminus D(f)$.

Theorem 2.2. *Let $f, g : [a, b] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be functions of bounded variation. If $D(f) \cap D(g) = \emptyset$, $D(f)$ and $D(g)$ are finite, and g is pairwise absolutely continuous on (a, b) , then*

$$\int_a^b f(x)dg(x) = \int_a^b f(x)g'(x)dx + \sum_{x \in D(g)} f(x)(g(x^+) - g(x^-)),$$

where g' is the derivative of g .

□

2.2. Dedekind Sums. Recall that a function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is *periodic* if there exists a real number $\rho > 0$ such that

$$f(x + \rho) = f(x), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}.$$

In this case, we say that f is ρ -periodic and has *period* ρ . A periodic function f is completely determined by its values in $[0, \rho)$. The open interval $(0, \rho)$ is called the *fundamental domain* of f . We are interested in the following set of periodic functions defined by,

$$\mathcal{S}_\rho := \left\{ f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C} : \begin{array}{l} \rho\text{-periodic,} \\ \text{discontinuities at most in } \rho\mathbb{Z}, \\ \text{absolutely continuous on } (0, \rho). \end{array} \right\}.$$

For any function $f \in \mathcal{S}_\rho$ and any positive integer ν we have the identity

$$\int_0^\rho f(\nu x)dx = \int_0^\rho f(x)dx. \quad (2)$$

To normalize the situation, we fix all results in the sections that follow for functions $f \in \mathcal{S}_1$. Indeed, we have a bijection $\mathcal{S}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_\rho$ given by $f(x) \mapsto g(x) := f(\rho^{-1}x)$.

Example 2.3. *The following functions are elements of \mathcal{S}_1 .*

- (1) *The normalized sine and cosine functions $\text{Sin}(x) := \sin(2\pi x)$ and $\text{Cos}(x) := \cos(2\pi x)$. In particular, they have no discontinuities.*
- (2) *The fractional part given by $\{x\} := x - [x]$. Moreover, every function $f \in \mathcal{S}_1$ relates to the fractional part function by $f(\{x\}) = f(x)$.*

(3) Let $F : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be any absolutely continuous function. The function given by $f(x) = F(\{x\})$, belongs to \mathcal{S}_1 . If F is a polynomial, then we call f a periodic polynomial function. \square

Example 2.4. For $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$, each \mathcal{S}_ν has a canonical element given by the residue mod ν function defined as

$$\{x\}_\nu = x - \nu \left\lfloor \frac{x}{\nu} \right\rfloor,$$

for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$. This function has period ν with discontinuities at $\nu\mathbb{Z}$, and is determined completely in the interval $[0, \nu)$. An important property is that

$$\frac{\{x\}_\nu}{\nu} = \left\{ \frac{x}{\nu} \right\}. \quad (3)$$

\square

Definition 2.5. For $r \geq 1$, let $\mathbf{f} = (f_0, f_1, \dots, f_r)$ be a vector of functions in \mathcal{S}_1 . The Dedekind sums associated with this vector are defined as

$$S_{\mathbf{f}}(\boldsymbol{\nu}|\nu_k) := \sum_{i=1}^{\nu_k-1} \prod_{j \neq k} f_j \left(\frac{i\nu_j}{\nu_k} \right),$$

for any vector $\boldsymbol{\nu} = (\nu_0, \nu_1, \dots, \nu_r) \in \mathbb{N}^{r+1}$ of pairwise distinct and pairwise coprime positive integers. When $f_j = f$ for all j , we simply denote S_f instead of $S_{(f, \dots, f)}$. For $r = 0$, we set by convention $S_{f_0}(\boldsymbol{\nu}|\nu_0) = \nu_0 - 1$.

From [Theorem 2.4](#) we obtain

$$S_{\mathbf{f}}(\boldsymbol{\nu}|\nu_k) = S_{\mathbf{f}}(\{\boldsymbol{\nu}\}_{\nu_k}|\nu_k),$$

where $\{\boldsymbol{\nu}\}_{\nu_k} = (\{\nu_0\}_{\nu_k}, \dots, \{\nu_k\}_{\nu_k}, \dots, \{\nu_r\}_{\nu_k})$. Thus, for each fixed ν_k , we may restrict us to integers $0 < \nu_j < \nu_k$ for $j \neq k$.

Example 2.6. Important sums of general interest are the Dedekind sums associated with the fractional part

$$S_{\{x\}}(\boldsymbol{\nu}|\nu_k) := \sum_{i=1}^{\nu_k-1} \prod_{j \neq k} \left\{ \frac{i\nu_j}{\nu_k} \right\}.$$

Using [Equation \(3\)](#), these sums satisfy the identity

$$\nu_k^r S_{\{x\}}(\boldsymbol{\nu}|\nu_k) = \sum_{i=1}^{\nu_k-1} \prod_{j \neq k} \{i\nu_j\}_{\nu_k}.$$

2.3. Conical Zeta Values. Let $C = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\mathbf{v}_1 + \dots + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\mathbf{v}_s \subset \mathbb{R}^r$ be a polyhedral rational cone. For any $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^r$ we define its *conical zeta value* as

$$\zeta(\mathbf{q}, C) := \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in C \cap \mathbb{Z}^r} \frac{1}{\mathbf{n}^{\mathbf{q}}}, \quad \frac{1}{\mathbf{n}^{\mathbf{q}}} := \prod_{j=1}^r n_j^{-q_j},$$

where by convention $0^0 = 1$ and $0^{-q_j} = 0$ when $q_j \geq 1$. The *reduced conical zeta value* is defined by

$$\zeta^*(\mathbf{q}, C) := \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{n} \in C \cap \mathbb{Z}^r \\ \gcd(n_1, \dots, n_r) = 1}} \frac{1}{\mathbf{n}^{\mathbf{q}}}.$$

Both forms are related by

$$\zeta(\mathbf{q}, C) = \zeta(|\mathbf{q}|) \zeta^*(\mathbf{q}, C) \quad (4)$$

where we assume $|\mathbf{q}| := q_1 + \dots + q_r > 1$.

Remark 2.7. For a 1-dimensional cone $C = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\mathbf{v}$ generated by a primitive integer vector $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_r)$ we get

$$\zeta(\mathbf{q}, C) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \prod_{j=1}^r \frac{1}{(v_j n)^{q_j}} = \zeta(|\mathbf{q}|) \prod_{j=1}^r v_j^{-q_j},$$

for $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{N}^r$.

Example 2.8. For the standard positive cone $C = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\mathbf{e}_1 + \dots + \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\mathbf{e}_r$ generated by the canonical basis $\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_r$ of \mathbb{R}^r , we have explicitly

$$\zeta(\mathbf{q}, C) = \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}^r} \frac{1}{n_1^{q_1} \dots n_r^{q_r}} = \sum_{n_1 \geq 1} \frac{1}{n_1^{q_1}} \dots \sum_{n_r \geq 1} \frac{1}{n_r^{q_r}} = \prod_{j=1}^r \zeta(q_j),$$

when $q_j > 1$ for all j . We can write

$$\zeta^*(\mathbf{q}, C) = \frac{1}{\zeta(|\mathbf{q}|)} \prod_{j=1}^r \zeta(q_j).$$

3. GENERAL RECIPROCITY FORMULAS

3.1. The Integral Reciprocity. For a vector of functions $\mathbf{f} = (f_0, f_1, \dots, f_r)$, $f_j \in \mathcal{S}_1$ define,

$$\Delta f_j := f_j(1^-) - f_j(0^+) = f_j(i^-) - f_j(i^+),$$

for each $i \in \mathbb{Z}$ by periodicity, and

$$\Delta \mathbf{f} := \left(\prod_{j=0}^r f_j(1^-) - \prod_{j=0}^r f_j(0^+) \right).$$

The *reciprocity* of \mathbf{f} over any $\boldsymbol{\nu} = (\nu_0, \dots, \nu_r)$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{f}}(\boldsymbol{\nu}) := \sum_{k=0}^r S_{\mathbf{f}}(\boldsymbol{\nu}|\nu_k) \Delta f_k$$

where we reserve the notation $\mathcal{R}_f(\boldsymbol{\nu})$ for the case $\mathbf{f} = (f, \dots, f)$. Note that if the functions f_j are continuous for all j , then $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{f}}(\boldsymbol{\nu}) = 0$. The following is what we refer to as the *integral reciprocity theorem*.

Theorem 3.1. Let $\boldsymbol{\nu} = (\nu_0, \dots, \nu_r)$ be any vector of pairwise distinct and pairwise coprime positive integers. We have,

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{f}}(\boldsymbol{\nu}) = -\Delta \mathbf{f} + \sum_{k=0}^r \nu_k \int_0^1 f'_k(\nu_k x) \prod_{j \neq k} f_j(\nu_j x) dx.$$

Proof. Fix a small $\varepsilon > 0$, and define

$$I_{\varepsilon} := \int_{\varepsilon}^{1-\varepsilon} d \left(\prod_{j=0}^r f_j(\nu_j x) \right) = \prod_{j=0}^r f_j(\nu_j(1-\varepsilon)) - \prod_{j=0}^r f_j(\nu_j \varepsilon).$$

So, observe that

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} I_{\varepsilon} = \left(\prod_{j=0}^r f_j(1^-) - \prod_{j=0}^r f_j(0^+) \right) = \Delta \mathbf{f}.$$

On the other hand, since each f_j is of bounded variation in $[\varepsilon, 1-\varepsilon]$ and the functions $f_j(\nu_j x)$ have no common discontinuities, we can use integration by parts ([Theorem 2.1](#)) to get,

$$I_{\varepsilon} = \sum_{k=0}^r \int_{\varepsilon}^{1-\varepsilon} \prod_{j \neq k} f_j(\nu_j x) df_k(\nu_k x).$$

The discontinuities of $f_k(\nu_k x)$ are of the form i/ν_k for $0 \leq i \leq \nu_k$, so $f_k(\nu_k x)$ is pairwise absolutely continuous on $(0, 1)$. Using [Theorem 2.2](#), we obtain,

$$\int_{\varepsilon}^{1-\varepsilon} \prod_{j \neq k} f_j(\nu_j x) df_k(\nu_k x) = \nu_k \int_{\varepsilon}^{1-\varepsilon} f'_k(\nu_k x) \prod_{j \neq k} f_j(\nu_j x) dx - \sum_{i=1}^{\nu_k-1} \prod_{j \neq k} f_j\left(\nu_j \frac{i}{\nu_k}\right) (f_k(\nu_k^-) - f_k(\nu_k^+)).$$

Using that $(f_k(\nu_k^-) - f_k(\nu_k^+)) = \Delta f_k$, and taking $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ the theorem follows. \square .

Example 3.2. (1) *The interesting case is when $\Delta f_j = 1$ for all j . For example, the functions $f_j(x) = \{x\}^{q_j}$ given a collection of integers $q_j \geq 1$. In this case, $f(0^+) = 0$ and $f(1^-) = 1$, so $\Delta \mathbf{f} = 1$ and we have,*

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{f}}(\nu) = \sum_{k=0}^r S_{\mathbf{f}}(\nu | \nu_k) = 1 + \sum_{k=0}^r q_k \nu_k \int_0^1 \{\nu_k x\}^{q_k-1} \prod_{j \neq k} \{\nu_j x\}^{q_j} dx.$$

(2) *Another important case is when $f_j = b_1$ for all $j = 0, \dots, r$. We have $f(0^+) = -1/2$ and $f(1^-) = 1/2$, $\Delta b_1 = 1$. Also, $b'_1(x) = 1$, so the previous integral reciprocity formula applies as*

$$\mathcal{R}_{b_1}(\nu) = \sum_{k=0}^r S_{b_1}(\nu | \nu_k) = \frac{(-1)^{r+1} - 1}{2^{r+1}} + \sum_{k=0}^r \nu_k \int_0^1 \prod_{j \neq k} b_1(\nu_j x) dx. \quad (5)$$

Indeed, for $r = 2$, we can provide a proof of Dedekind-Rademacher's reciprocity, as observed in [\[14, 2.D\]](#). The key result in the proof is the following identity

$$\int_0^1 b_1(mx) b_1(nx) dx = \frac{\gcd(m, n)}{12mn}, \quad \forall m, n \in \mathbb{N},$$

due to J. Franel in [\[8\]](#), from where Rademacher's reciprocity follows directly. In his honour, a Franel integral is any value of the form

$$\int_0^1 b_1(\nu_0 x) \dots b_1(\nu_r x) dx,$$

for any vector of distinct positive integers (ν_0, \dots, ν_r) .

(3) *For a collection $a_0, \dots, a_r \in (0, 1)$ consider $f_j(x) = \{x\} - a_j$, then we have $\Delta f_j = 1$, and,*

$$\Delta \mathbf{f} = \prod_{j=0}^r (1 - a_j) - (-1)^r \prod_{j=0}^r a_j.$$

For $r = 2$, we can obtain a parametric extension of Dedekind-Rademacher's formula. Indeed, using Franel's identity and [Equation \(2\)](#) we get

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 (\{\nu_j x\} - a_j)(\{\nu_k x\} - a_k) dx &= \int_0^1 (b_1(\nu_j x) + 1/2 - a_j)(b_1(\nu_k x) + 1/2 - a_k) dx \\ &= \frac{1}{12\nu_j \nu_k} + (1/2 - a_j)(1/2 - a_k). \end{aligned}$$

So, our reciprocity formula is

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{f}}(\nu) = -1 + \sum_{k=0}^2 a_k - \sum_{j < k} a_j a_k + \sum_{\substack{j < k \\ l \neq j, k}} \nu_l (1/2 - a_j)(1/2 - a_k) + \frac{\nu_0^2 + \nu_1^2 + \nu_2^2}{12\nu_0 \nu_1 \nu_2}. \quad (6)$$

In particular, when $f_j(x) = f(x) = \{x\} - a$, for a fixed $0 < a < 1$ we get

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{f}}(\nu) = \frac{(\nu_0^2 + \nu_1^2 + \nu_2^2)}{12\nu_0 \nu_1 \nu_2} + \left(\frac{1}{2} - a\right)^2 (\nu_0 + \nu_1 + \nu_2) - (1 - 3a + 3a^2).$$

3.2. Fourier Approach. In [4], the authors use the Fourier expansion of the function b_1 to solve a conjecture of McIntosh [12] about Franel integrals of order $r = 3$. We aim to apply these ideas to study our Dedekind sums. The main reason is that functions of bounded variation always admit a Fourier expansion. Explicitly, for a collection of functions $f_0, \dots, f_r \in \mathcal{S}_1$, we can always assume an expansion

$$\mathcal{F}f_j(x) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} c_{j,n} e(nx), \quad c_{j,n} = c_n(f_j) := \int_0^1 f_j(x) e(-nx) dx,$$

where $e(x) := \exp(2\pi i x)$, and i is the imaginary unit with $i^2 = -1$. These expansions are characterized by $f_j(x) = \mathcal{F}f_j(x)$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Z}$ and extending for all $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}$ by

$$\mathcal{F}f_j(\nu) = \frac{f_j(\nu^+) + f_j(\nu^-)}{2}, \quad (7)$$

known as *principal value* of the series. For any $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^{r+1}$ denote

$$c_{k,\mathbf{n}} := \prod_{j \neq k} c_{j,n_j}.$$

In what follows, for any pair of vectors $\mathbf{m} = (m_0, \dots, m_r)$, $\mathbf{n} = (n_0, \dots, n_r) \in \mathbb{R}^{r+1}$ we have the inner product

$$\langle \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n} \rangle = m_0 n_0 + \dots + m_r n_r,$$

defining the orthogonal sets

$$\mathbf{m}^\perp = \{\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{R}^{r+1} : \langle \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{n} \rangle = 0\}.$$

The following subsets will be relevant,

$$\mathbf{m}_\Lambda^\perp := \mathbf{m}^\perp \cap \Lambda^{r+1},$$

for any discrete subset $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{R}$. The previous can be applied to the quantities

$$I(\boldsymbol{\nu} | \nu_k) := \int_0^1 f'_k(\nu_k x) \prod_{j \neq k} f_j(\nu_j x) dx,$$

by interchanging the Fourier expansion with the integral without concern about convergence.

Corollary 3.3 (Fourier Reciprocity). *If $f'_k \in \mathcal{S}_1$ for all k , we have*

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{f}}(\boldsymbol{\nu}) = \sum_{k=0}^r \Delta f_k \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \boldsymbol{\nu}_\mathbb{Z}^\perp} \nu_k c_{k,\mathbf{n}} - \Delta \mathbf{f}.$$

Proof. Since $f'_k \in \mathcal{S}_1$, there exists a Fourier expansion

$$\mathcal{F}f'_k(x) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} c'_{k,n} e(nx).$$

So, we have explicitly

$$\mathcal{F}f'_k(\nu_k x) \prod_{j \neq k} \mathcal{F}f_j(\nu_j x) = \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^{r+1}} c'_{k,n_k} \prod_{j \neq k} c_{j,n_j} e(\langle \boldsymbol{\nu}, \mathbf{n} \rangle x),$$

converging point-wise and uniform for any $x \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Z}$, so integrals can be interchanged. Recall that

$$\int_0^1 e(\langle \boldsymbol{\nu}, \mathbf{n} \rangle x) dx = \begin{cases} 1, & \langle \boldsymbol{\nu}, \mathbf{n} \rangle = 0, \\ 0, & \langle \boldsymbol{\nu}, \mathbf{n} \rangle \neq 0, \end{cases}$$

so we can compute directly,

$$I(\boldsymbol{\nu} | \nu_k) = \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \boldsymbol{\nu}_\mathbb{Z}^\perp} c'_{k,n_k} \prod_{j \neq k} c_{j,n_j}.$$

Therefore, integral reciprocity can be rewritten as follows,

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{f}}(\boldsymbol{\nu}) = \sum_{k=0}^r \Delta f_k S_{\mathbf{f}}(\boldsymbol{\nu} | \nu_k) = -\Delta \mathbf{f} + I(\boldsymbol{\nu}), \quad (8)$$

where

$$I(\boldsymbol{\nu}) := \sum_{k=0}^r \nu_k I(\boldsymbol{\nu}|\nu_k) = \sum_{k=0}^r \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\perp}} \nu_k c'_{k,n_k} \prod_{j \neq k} c_{j,n_j}.$$

Observe that $c'_{k,0} = \Delta f_k$, and for any $n \neq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} c_{k,n} &= \int_0^1 f_k(x) e(-nx) dx = - \frac{f_k(x) e(-nx)}{2\pi i n} \Big|_{x=0}^{x=1} + \frac{1}{2\pi i n} \int_0^1 f'_k(x) e(-nx) dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2\pi i n} (c'_{k,n} - \Delta f_k). \end{aligned}$$

So $c'_{k,n} = (2\pi i n) c_{k,n} + \Delta f_k$ for all n , and now we can rewrite,

$$I(\boldsymbol{\nu}|\nu_k) = \Delta f_k \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\perp}} \prod_{j \neq k} c_{j,n_j} + 2\pi i \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{n} \in \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\perp} \\ n_j \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}}} n_k \prod_{j=0}^r c_{j,n_j}.$$

Summing over $k = 0, \dots, r$, observe that in terms of principal values we have,

$$2\pi i \sum_{k=0}^r \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{n} \in \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\perp} \\ n_j \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}}} \nu_k n_k \prod_{j=0}^r c_{n_j} = 2\pi i \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{n} \in \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\perp} \\ n_j \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}}} \prod_{j=0}^r c_{n_j} \sum_{k=0}^r \nu_k n_k = 0.$$

So, we get the identity

$$I(\boldsymbol{\nu}) = \sum_{k=0}^r \Delta f_k \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\perp}} c_{k,\mathbf{n}}, \quad (9)$$

from where the result follows. □

Remark 3.4. *Important particular cases of the previous result are the following.*

- (1) *Assume that some of the f'_j s in \mathbf{f} are continuous in \mathbb{R} , i.e., $\Delta f_j = 0$. Let us denote $\mathcal{C} = \{j : f_j \text{ is continuous}\}$, so reciprocity looks like*

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{f}}(\boldsymbol{\nu}) = \sum_{k \notin \mathcal{C}} S_{\mathbf{f}}(\boldsymbol{\nu}|\nu_k) \Delta f_k = \sum_{k \notin \mathcal{C}} \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\perp}} \nu_k \Delta f_k c_{k,\mathbf{n}} - \prod_{k \in \mathcal{C}} f_k(0) \Delta \tilde{\mathbf{f}},$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}$ is the vector of discontinuous functions of \mathbf{f} . In particular, if $f_k(x) = \{x\} - a$ for any $a \in \mathbb{R}$ and f_j continuous for all $j \neq k$, then

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{f}}(\boldsymbol{\nu}) = S_{\mathbf{f}}(\boldsymbol{\nu}|\nu_k) = \nu_k \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\perp}} c_{k,\mathbf{n}} - \prod_{j \neq k} f_j(0).$$

- (2) *For any $f \in \mathcal{S}_1$ no constant with $f' \in L^1([0, 1])$ and $f(0^+) \neq f(1^-)$, we have*

$$\sum_{k=0}^r S_f(\boldsymbol{\nu}|\nu_k) = \sum_{k=0}^r \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \boldsymbol{\nu}_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\perp}} \nu_k c_{\mathbf{n}} - \frac{\Delta \mathbf{f}}{\Delta f},$$

where explicitly

$$\frac{\Delta \mathbf{f}}{\Delta f} = \sum_{k=0}^r f(1^-)^k f(0^+)^{r-k}.$$

The previous case can be extended to the case $f(0^+) = f(1^-)$ by assuming that f is continuous at $x = 0$ and that the shifted functions $f_a(x) := f(x + a)$ satisfies $\Delta f_a \neq 0$ for all a in some neighborhood $(-\epsilon, \epsilon) \setminus \{0\}$ with $\lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \Delta f_a = 0$. So, the previous argument works for all f_a , and in the limit $a \rightarrow 0$ we get $\Delta \mathbf{f} / \Delta f = -(r+1)f(0)^{r+1}$.

Let us check the previous to get some formulas for well-known test functions.

Example 3.5. (1) For the exponential $e(x) = \exp(2\pi i x)$, we have $c_1 = 1$, and $c_n = 0$ for all $n \neq 1$. So, we get

$$\bar{\nu}_k := \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \nu_k^\perp} \nu_k c_{k,\mathbf{n}} = \begin{cases} \nu_k & \text{if } \nu_k \mid \sum_{j \neq k} \nu_j, \\ 0 & \text{if } \nu_k \nmid \sum_{j \neq k} \nu_j. \end{cases}$$

This allows us to write $S_e(\nu|\nu_k) = \bar{\nu}_k - 1$.

(2) For the normalized cosine function $\text{Cos}(x) = \cos(2\pi x)$ we have,

$$\text{Cos}(x) = \frac{e(x) + e(-x)}{2},$$

thus, $c_1 = c_{-1} = 1/2$, and $c_n = 0$ when $|n| \neq 1$. Reciprocity implies,

$$S_{\text{Cos}(x)}(\nu|\nu_k) = \frac{\nu_k}{2^r} \beta_k - 1,$$

where β_k is the cardinality of the set

$$U_k(\nu) = \{\mathbf{u} \in \{-1, 1\}^r : \nu_k \mid \langle \mathbf{u}, \nu^k \rangle\},$$

with $\nu^k = (\nu_0, \dots, \nu_{k-1}, \nu_{k+1}, \dots, \nu_r)$.

(3) For the normalized sine function

$$\text{Sin}(x) = \sin(2\pi x) = \frac{e(x) - e(-x)}{2i},$$

we have $c_1 = 1/2i$, $c_{-1} = -1/2i$, and $c_n = 0$ for $|n| \neq 1$. Any $\mathbf{u} \in U_k(\nu)$ has a sign denoted as $\text{sgn}(\mathbf{u})$ and defined by the product of its coordinates. So,

$$S_{\text{Sin}(x)}(\nu|\nu_k) = \frac{\nu_k}{(2i)^r} \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in U_k(\nu)} \text{sgn}(\mathbf{u}).$$

Since, $-\mathbf{u} \in U_k(\nu)$ and $\text{sgn}(-\mathbf{u}) = (-1)^r \text{sgn}(\mathbf{u})$ we can define

$$\bar{\beta}_k = \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \tilde{U}} \text{sgn}(\mathbf{u}),$$

where \tilde{U} is the quotient of $U_k(\nu)$ by the antipodal map $\mathbf{u} \mapsto -\mathbf{u}$. Now, we can rewrite

$$S_{\text{Sin}(x)}(\nu|\nu_k) = \frac{1 + (-1)^r}{(2i)^r} \bar{\beta}_k \nu_k,$$

observing a vanishing when r is odd. □

3.3. Reciprocity for Polynomial Dedekind Sums. For polynomials $F_0, \dots, F_r \in \mathbb{C}[x]$ of degree $q_j \geq 1$ consider its associated periodic function $f_j \in \mathcal{S}_1$ defined by $f_j(x) := F_j(\{x\})$. Since the study of the Dedekind sums $S_f(\nu|\nu_k)$ is reduced to the Dedekind sums of a basis for $\mathbb{C}[x]$. Then, as a useful basis for $\mathbb{C}[x]$ we use the Bernoulli polynomials $B_q(x)$ defined by the generating function

$$\frac{te^{xt}}{e^t - 1} = \sum_{q \geq 0} B_q(x) \frac{t^q}{q!}.$$

In \mathcal{S}_1 , we have the periodic q -th Bernoulli polynomials $b_q(x) = B_q(\{x\})$, and their Fourier coefficients are computed as

$$c_n(b_q) = \int_0^1 B_q(x) e(-nx) dx = \begin{cases} c_0(b_0) = 1, & c_n(b_0) = 0, n \neq 0, \\ c_0(b_q) = 0, & c_n(b_q) = -\frac{q!}{(2\pi i n)^q}, n \neq 0, q > 0. \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

The relation with the power functions is

$$x^q = \frac{1}{q+1} \sum_{s=0}^q \binom{q+1}{s} B_s(x).$$

For any $\mathbf{q} = (q_0, \dots, q_r) \in (\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0})^{r+1}$ we will denote $S_{\mathbf{q}}$ and $S_{b_{\mathbf{q}}}$ for the Dedekind sums associated to $S_{(\{x\}^{q_0}, \dots, \{x\}^{q_r})}$ and $S_{(b_{q_0}, \dots, b_{q_r})}$ respectively. From the previous relation, it is not too difficult to check that

$$\Delta\{x\}^{q_k} S_{\mathbf{q}}(\nu|\nu_k) = \prod_{j=0}^r \frac{1}{q_j + 1} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{Z}^{r+1} \\ 0 \leq s_j \leq q_j}} A_{\mathbf{s}} \Delta b_{s_k} S_{b_{\mathbf{s}}}(\nu|\nu_k), \quad A_{\mathbf{s}} := \prod_{j=0}^r \binom{q_j + 1}{s_j}.$$

In this way, if $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{q}}(\nu)$ denotes the reciprocity of the sums $S_{\mathbf{q}}$, then in terms of reciprocity we have,

$$\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{q}}(\nu) = \prod_{j=0}^r \frac{1}{q_j + 1} \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{Z}^{r+1} \\ 0 \leq s_j \leq q_j}} A_{\mathbf{s}} \mathcal{R}_{b_{\mathbf{s}}}(\nu). \quad (11)$$

Since the periodic Bernoulli functions are continuous for $q > 1$, we have

$$\Delta b_q = \begin{cases} 1 & q = 1, \\ 0 & q \neq 1, \end{cases}$$

and thus,

$$\mathcal{R}_{b_{\mathbf{q}}}(\nu) = \sum_{k: q_k = 1} S_{b_{\mathbf{q}}}(\nu|\nu_k).$$

In particular, this reduces the index set of the right-side sum in Equation (11) into the set $\{\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{Z}^{r+1} : 0 \leq s_j \leq q_j, \exists s_j = 1\}$. We adopt the notation

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{q}_k &= (q_0, \dots, q_{k-1}, 0, q_{k+1}, \dots, q_r), \quad I_{\mathbf{q},k} := \frac{(-1)^r}{(2\pi i)^{|\mathbf{q}_k|}} \prod_{j \neq k} q_j!, \\ \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{q}} &:= \#\{q_j \in \mathbf{q} : q_j = 1\}, \quad |\bar{\mathbf{q}}| = |\mathbf{q}| - 1, \quad I_{\bar{\mathbf{q}}} = \frac{(-1)^r}{(2\pi i)^{|\bar{\mathbf{q}}|}} \prod_{q_j > 1} q_j!. \end{aligned}$$

From Equation (10), for any $k = 0, \dots, r$ and any $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^{r+1}$ we have explicitly

$$c_{k,\mathbf{n}} = \prod_{j \neq k} c_{n_j}(b_{q_j}) = I_{\mathbf{q},k} \frac{1}{\mathbf{n}^{\mathbf{q}_k}},$$

which motivates the definition of the following quantity

$$\zeta_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q}} := \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \nu_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\perp}} \frac{1}{\mathbf{n}^{\mathbf{q}_k}},$$

called as a *multiple zeta value*. Moreover, observe that $I_{\mathbf{q},k} = I_{\bar{\mathbf{q}}}$ for all k such that $q_k = 1$. From (1) in Theorem 3.4, we summarize the previous discussion into the following.

Corollary 3.6 (Reciprocity for Bernoulli Polynomials). *For any integer positive vector \mathbf{q} , we have*

$$\mathcal{R}_{b_{\mathbf{q}}}(\nu) = I_{\bar{\mathbf{q}}} \sum_{k: q_k = 1} \nu_k \zeta_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q}} - \frac{1 - (-1)^{\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{q}}}}{2^{\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{q}}}} \prod_{q_j \neq 1} B_{q_j}. \quad (12)$$

□

Since the sums $\zeta_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q}}$ come from a Fourier analysis approach, in case of not being absolutely convergent, their value is considered as its principal value. So, if $|\mathbf{q}_k|$ is odd, then the antipodal map $\mathbf{n} \mapsto -\mathbf{n}$ gives,

$$\zeta_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q}} = \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \nu_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\perp} \cap \{n_k \geq 0\}} \frac{1}{\mathbf{n}^{\mathbf{q}_k}} + (-1)^{|\mathbf{q}_k|} \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \nu_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\perp} \cap \{n_k \geq 0\}} \frac{1}{\mathbf{n}^{\mathbf{q}_k}} = 0.$$

The condition $|\mathbf{q}_k|$ being odd for all $k = 0, \dots, r$ implies that r and all the q_j are odd. And since $B_q = 0$ for all odd integers $q > 2$, as a direct consequence, the following holds.

Corollary 3.7. *If $\mathbf{q} = (q_0, \dots, q_r)$ satisfy $q_k > 1$ for all k or $|q|_k$ is odd for all $k = 0, \dots, r$, then $\mathcal{R}_{b_{\mathbf{q}}}(\nu) = 0$.*

□

4. ZETA VALUES AND POLYHEDRA

From the previous section, the reciprocity $\mathcal{R}_{b_{\mathbf{q}}}$ for $r = 1$ is nontrivial when we assume $\mathbf{q} = (1, q)$ where q is a positive integer. Then, we have explicitly

$$\mathcal{R}_{b_{\mathbf{q}}}(\nu_0, \nu_1) = -\frac{\nu_0 q!}{(2\pi i)^q} \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \nu_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\perp}} \frac{1}{n_1^q} - \delta(q) \frac{\nu_1}{(2\pi i)} \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \nu_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\perp}} \frac{1}{n_0} - B(q),$$

where

$$\delta(q) = \begin{cases} 1 & q = 1, \\ 0 & q > 1, \end{cases} \quad B(q) = \begin{cases} 0 & q = 1, \\ B_q & q > 1. \end{cases}$$

The set

$$\nu_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\perp} = \{(n_0, n_1) : \nu_0 n_0 + \nu_1 n_1 = 0\},$$

have well-known solutions given by $(n_0, n_1) = n(\nu_1, -\nu_0)$ for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. So, reciprocity becomes

$$\mathcal{R}_{b_{\mathbf{q}}}(\nu_0, \nu_1) = -\frac{(-1)^q q!}{\nu_0^{q-1} (2\pi i)^q} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{1}{n^q} - \delta(q) \frac{1}{(2\pi i)} \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{1}{n} - B(q).$$

Recall that

$$\sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{1}{n^q} = \begin{cases} 0 & q \text{ odd}, \\ 2\zeta(q) & q \text{ even}, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\zeta(q) := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{1}{n^q},$$

is the Riemann zeta function. The remarkable identity

$$\zeta(q) = (-1)^{\frac{q}{2}+1} \frac{B_q (2\pi)^q}{2q!},$$

holds for all q even. Therefore, reciprocity for $r = 1$ is

$$\mathcal{R}_{b_{\mathbf{q}}}(\nu_0, \nu_1) = \begin{cases} -B(q) & q \text{ odd}, \\ \frac{(-1)^{1+\frac{q}{2}} q!}{\nu_0^{q-1} 2^{q-1} \pi^q} \zeta(q) - B(q) & q \text{ even}. \end{cases} = \begin{cases} -B(q) & q \text{ odd}, \\ B_q \left(\frac{1}{\nu_0^{q-1}} - 1 \right) & q \text{ even}. \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

In what follows, we treat the case $r \geq 2$ for the multiple zeta values $\zeta_{k, \nu, \mathbf{q}}$. This will lead us into a reciprocity formula for $r = 2$ in the next section.

4.1. The Multiple zeta values. Denote

$$\nu_{\mathbb{Z}}^{k, \perp} := \nu_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\perp} \cap \{n_k = 0\} \cong (\nu^k)_{\mathbb{Z}}^{\perp},$$

where $\nu^k = (\nu_0, \dots, \nu_{k-1}, \nu_{k+1}, \dots, \nu_r)$, thus we can decompose $\zeta_{k, \nu, \mathbf{q}} = Y_{k, \nu, \mathbf{q}} + Z_{k, \nu, \mathbf{q}}$ with,

$$Y_{k, \nu, \mathbf{q}} := \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \nu_{\mathbb{Z}^{\times}}^{\perp}} \frac{1}{\mathbf{n}^{\mathbf{q}_k}}, \quad Z_{k, \nu, \mathbf{q}} := \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \nu_{\mathbb{Z}}^{k, \perp}} \frac{1}{\mathbf{n}^{\mathbf{q}_k}}.$$

Observe that in both cases their principal values are zero for $|\mathbf{q}_k|$ odd, so we assume this value is an even number in the rest of the section. Unfortunately, the values $Y_{k, \nu, \mathbf{q}}$ do not converge on their own if $q_j = 1$ for some $j \neq k$. However, the right side of [Theorem 3.6](#) tells us the right way of how these sums agree with convergence. For this purpose, define the following multiple zeta value

$$\zeta_{\nu, \mathbf{q}} := \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \nu_{\mathbb{Z}^{\times}}^{\perp}} \frac{1}{\mathbf{n}^{\mathbf{q}}}.$$

Theorem 4.1. *The sums $\zeta_{\nu, \mathbf{q}}$ converge absolutely for all $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{N}^{r+1}$. Furthermore,*

$$Z_{k, \nu, \mathbf{q}} = \zeta_{\nu^k, \mathbf{q}^k},$$

$$\sum_{k: q_k=1} \nu_k Y_{k, \nu, \mathbf{q}} = - \sum_{k: q_k > 1} \nu_k \zeta_{\nu, \mathbf{q} - \mathbf{e}_k}.$$

Proof. For any $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{N}^{r+1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\zeta_{\nu, \mathbf{q}}| &\leq \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \nu_{\mathbb{Z}^\times}^\perp} \left| \frac{1}{\mathbf{n}^{\mathbf{q}}} \right| = \sum_{n_k \in \mathbb{Z}^\times} \frac{1}{|n_k|^{q_k}} \sum_{\substack{(n_j)_{j \neq k} \in (\mathbb{Z}^\times)^r \\ \sum_{j \neq k} \nu_j n_j = -\nu_k n_k}} \prod_{j \neq k} \frac{1}{|n_j|^{q_j}} \\ &= \nu_l^{-q_l} \sum_{n_k \in \mathbb{Z}^\times} \frac{1}{|n_k|^{q_k}} \sum_{\substack{(n_j)_{j \neq k, l} \in (\mathbb{Z}^\times)^{r-1} \\ \sum_{j \neq l} \nu_j n_j \neq 0}} \frac{1}{|\sum_{j \neq l} \nu_j n_j|^{q_l}} \prod_{j \neq k, l} \frac{1}{|n_j|^{q_j}}, \end{aligned}$$

for some $l \neq k$. For any $l' \neq k, l$, we denote $M_{l'} = \sum_{j \neq l', l} \nu_j n_j$ and differentiate between three cases:

(1) If $|\nu_{l'} n_{l'}| \leq |M_{l'}|/2$, then

$$\left| \sum_{j \neq l} \nu_j n_j \right| = |\nu_{l'} n_{l'} + M_{l'}| \geq |M_{l'}| - |\nu_{l'} n_{l'}| \geq \frac{|M_{l'}|}{2}.$$

So, we have

$$\sum_{\substack{n_{l'} \neq 0 \\ |\nu_{l'} n_{l'}| \leq |M_{l'}|/2}} \frac{1}{|\sum_{j \neq l} \nu_j n_j|^{q_l} |n_{l'}|^{q_{l'}}} \leq \frac{2^{q_l}}{|M_{l'}|^{q_l}} \sum_{\substack{n_{l'} \neq 0 \\ |\nu_{l'} n_{l'}| \leq |M_{l'}|/2}} \frac{1}{|n_{l'}|^{q_{l'}}} = \begin{cases} O(\log(|M_{l'}|) |M_{l'}|^{-q_l}) & q_{l'} = 1, \\ O(|M_{l'}|^{-q_{l'}}) & q_{l'} > 1. \end{cases}$$

(2) If $|M_{l'}|/2 < |\nu_{l'} n_{l'}| < 2|M_{l'}|$, then

$$||\nu_{l'} n_{l'}| - |M_{l'}|| \leq |M_{l'}|.$$

So, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{n_{l'} \neq 0 \\ |M_{l'}|/2 < |\nu_{l'} n_{l'}| < 2|M_{l'}|}} \frac{1}{|\sum_{j \neq l} \nu_j n_j|^{q_l} |n_{l'}|^{q_{l'}}} &\leq \frac{2^{q_{l'}}}{|M_{l'}|^{q_{l'}}} \sum_{\substack{n_{l'} \neq 0 \\ |M_{l'}|/2 < |\nu_{l'} n_{l'}| < 2|M_{l'}|}} \frac{1}{|\nu_{l'} n_{l'} + M_{l'}|^{q_l}} \\ &\leq \frac{2^{q_{l'}}}{|M_{l'}|^{q_{l'}}} \sum_{\substack{n_{l'} \neq 0 \\ 0 < |k| < |M_{l'}|}} \frac{1}{|k|^{q_l}} \\ &= \begin{cases} O(\log(|M_{l'}|) |M_{l'}|^{-q_{l'}}) & q_l = 1, \\ O(|M_{l'}|^{-q_{l'}}) & q_l > 1. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

(3) If $|\nu_{l'} n_{l'}| \geq 2|M_{l'}|$, then

$$\left| \sum_{j \neq l} \nu_j n_j \right| = |\nu_{l'} n_{l'} + M_{l'}| \geq |\nu_{l'} n_{l'}| - |M_{l'}| \geq \frac{|\nu_{l'} n_{l'}|}{2}.$$

So, we have

$$\sum_{\substack{n_{l'} \neq 0 \\ |\nu_{l'} n_{l'}| \geq 2|M_{l'}|}} \frac{1}{|\sum_{j \neq l} \nu_j n_j|^{q_l} |n_{l'}|^{q_{l'}}} \leq \frac{2^{q_l}}{\nu_{l'}^{q_{l'}}} \sum_{\substack{n_{l'} \neq 0 \\ |\nu_{l'} n_{l'}| \geq 2|M_{l'}|}} \frac{1}{|n_{l'}|^{q_{l'} + q_l}} \leq \frac{2^{q_l + 1}}{\nu_{l'}^{q_{l'}}} \zeta(q_{l'} + q_l) < \infty.$$

Setting $q_{ll'} = \min\{q_l, q_{l'}\}$, the prove of the convergence of $|\zeta_{\nu, \mathbf{q}}|$ is reduce to check the convergence of

$$\sum_{n_k \in \mathbb{Z}^\times} \frac{1}{|n_k|^{q_k}} \sum_{\substack{(n_j)_{j \neq k, l, l'} \in (\mathbb{Z}^\times)^{r-2} \\ \sum_{j \neq l, l'} \nu_j n_j \neq 0}} \frac{1}{|M_{l'}|^{q_{ll'} + \varepsilon}} \prod_{j \neq k, l, l'} \frac{1}{|n_j|^{q_j}},$$

for every $\varepsilon > 0$ by the fact that we always can compare $\log(x) \sim x^\varepsilon$. This process can be done analogously for a $l'' \neq k, l, l'$ with a $M_{l''} = \sum_{j \neq l, l', l''} \nu_j n_j$. We end reducing the convergence of $|\zeta_{\nu, \mathbf{q}}|$ into the convergence of

$$\sum_{n_k \in \mathbb{Z}^\times} \frac{1}{|n_k|^{q_k} |\nu_k n_k|^{\min\{q_j : j \neq k\} + \varepsilon}} = 2\nu_k^{-\min\{q_j : j \neq k\} - \varepsilon} \zeta(q_k + \min\{q_j : j \neq k\} + \varepsilon).$$

Since, $q_k + q_{k'} > 1$ for all $0 \leq k, k' \leq r$ the convergence is assured. The identity for $Z_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q}}$ is direct by definition. For the last identity, without loss of generality, let us assume that $q_1, q_2, \dots, q_s > 1$ and $q_k = 1$ for $k > s$. Now we can write,

$$\sum_{k:q_k=1} \nu_k Y_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q}} = \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \nu_{\mathbb{Z}^\times}^\perp} \sum_{k=s+1}^r \frac{\nu_k}{\mathbf{n}^{\mathbf{q}_k}} = \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \nu_{\mathbb{Z}^\times}^\perp} \frac{1}{\mathbf{n}^{\mathbf{q}}} \sum_{k=s+1}^r \nu_k n_k.$$

Since $\langle \nu, \mathbf{n} \rangle = 0$, the sum is modified into

$$\sum_{k:q_k=1} \nu_k \zeta_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q}} = - \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \nu_{\mathbb{Z}^\times}^\perp} \frac{1}{\mathbf{n}^{\mathbf{q}}} \sum_{k=1}^s \nu_k n_k = - \sum_{k:q_k>1} \nu_k \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \nu_{\mathbb{Z}^\times}^\perp} \frac{1}{\mathbf{n}^{\mathbf{q}}} = - \sum_{k:q_k>1} \nu_k \zeta_{\nu,\mathbf{q}-\mathbf{e}_k}.$$

□

Remark 4.2. (1) The previous discussion says that in the case $\mathbf{q} = (1, \dots, 1)$ we must have

$$\sum_{k=0}^r \nu_k Y_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q}} = 0.$$

Thus, we get explicitly

$$\sum_{k=0}^r \nu_k \zeta_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q}} = \sum_{k=0}^r \nu_k Z_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q}}. \quad (14)$$

(2) For all $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{N}^{r+1}$ we have

$$Z_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q}} = (-1)^{|q_k|} \prod_{j \neq k} \frac{(2\pi i)^{q_j}}{q_j!} I(k, \nu, \mathbf{q}),$$

where

$$I(k, \nu, \mathbf{q}) := \int_0^1 \prod_{j \neq k} b_{q_j}(\nu_j x) dx.$$

Moreover, $Z_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q}}$ is a rational multiple of $(2\pi)^{|\mathbf{q}_k|}$. This follows directly from the proof of [Theorem 3.3](#) when we assume $q_k = 1$. Since the b_{q_j} are defined from rational polynomials, the integrals $I(k, \nu, \mathbf{q})$ must be rational numbers.

The following reduction will be useful for explicit computations in the next section. Let us translate the situation into the first orthant \mathbb{N}^{r+1} . For each $\mathbf{u} = (u_0, u_1, \dots, u_r) \in \{-1, 1\}^{r+1}$ the Hadamard product with ν is just $\mathbf{u}\nu := (u_0\nu_0, \dots, u_r\nu_r)$. We have a bijection,

$$\bigsqcup_{\mathbf{u} \in \{-1, 1\}^{r+1}} \mathbf{u}\nu_{\mathbb{N}}^\perp \rightarrow \nu_{\mathbb{Z}^\times}^\perp, \quad (n_0, \dots, n_r) \in (\mathbf{u}\nu)_{\mathbb{N}}^\perp \mapsto \mathbf{u}\mathbf{n} = (u_0 n_0, \dots, u_r n_r).$$

Thus, we get

$$Y_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q}} = \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \{-1, 1\}^{r+1}} \sigma_k(\mathbf{u}) Y_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q},\mathbf{u}}, \quad Y_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q},\mathbf{u}} = \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathbf{u}\nu_{\mathbb{N}}^\perp} \frac{1}{\mathbf{n}^{\mathbf{q}_k}},$$

where $\sigma_k(\mathbf{u}) = \prod_{j \neq k} u_j^{q_j}$. The same can be done for $Z_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q}}$, however using the identification $\nu_{\mathbb{Z}^\times}^{k,\perp} \cong (\nu^k)_{\mathbb{Z}^\times}^\perp$ we can rewrite,

$$Z_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \{-1, 1\}^{r+1}} \sigma_k(\mathbf{u}) Z_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q},\mathbf{u}}, \quad Z_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q},\mathbf{u}} = \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in (\mathbf{u}\nu^k)_{\mathbb{N}}^\perp} \frac{1}{\mathbf{n}^{\mathbf{q}_k}},$$

where the 2^{-1} comes from avoiding repeated sums since the variable n_k is avoided. Indeed, it is possible to remove the 2^{-1} factor redefining the sum over the $\mathbf{u} \in \{-1, 1\}^r$. As above, the cases $q_j = 1$ make the sums $Y_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q},\mathbf{u}}$ diverge. However, we can combine them as in [Theorem 4.1](#) to establish convergence. Therefore, in what follows, we treat them as a single value without regard to convergence. When $q_j > 1$ for all j , we get the following estimates.

Proposition 4.3. *If $\nu_l = \min\{\nu_j : j \neq k\}$, then the following holds,*

$$Z_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q},\mathbf{u}} \leq \prod_{j \neq k} \zeta(q_j), \quad Y_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q},\mathbf{u}} \leq 2\nu_l^{q_l} \prod_{j \neq k} \zeta(q_j),$$

for all $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{N}_{>1}^{r+1}$.

Proof. We have

$$Z_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q},\mathbf{u}} = \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in (\mathbf{u}\nu)^{\perp}_{\mathbb{N}}} \prod_{j \neq k} \frac{1}{n_j^{q_j}} \leq \sum_{(n_j)_{j \neq k} \in \mathbb{N}^r} \prod_{j \neq k} \frac{1}{n_j^{q_j}} = \prod_{j \neq k} \zeta(q_j).$$

For $\mathbf{n} = (n_0, \dots, n_r) \in (\mathbf{u}\nu)^{\perp}_{\mathbb{N}}$ choose an $l \neq k$ and write $u_l \nu_l n_l = -\sum_{j \neq l} u_j \nu_j n_j$. Then, we get

$$Y_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q},\mathbf{u}} = \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in (\mathbf{u}\nu)^{\perp}_{\mathbb{N}}} \frac{1}{\mathbf{n}^{\mathbf{q}}} = (-u_l \nu_l)^{q_l} \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in (\mathbf{u}\nu)^{\perp}_{\mathbb{N}}} \left(\frac{1}{\sum_{j \neq l} u_j \nu_j n_j} \right)^{q_l} \prod_{j \neq k,l} \frac{1}{n_j^{q_j}}.$$

Then, we have

$$Y_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q},\mathbf{u}} \leq \nu_l^{q_l} \sum_{(n_j)_{j \neq k} \in \mathbb{N}^r} \left| \frac{1}{\sum_{j \neq l} u_j \nu_j n_j} \right|^{q_l} \prod_{j \neq k,l} \frac{1}{n_j^{q_j}}.$$

For any fixed $\mathbf{n} = (n_j)_{j \neq k,l} \in \mathbb{N}^{r-1}$, the correspondence

$$n_k \in \mathbb{N} \mapsto \sum_{j \neq l} u_j \nu_j n_j \in \mathbb{Z}$$

is injective, so we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q},\mathbf{u}} &\leq \nu_l^{q_l} \sum_{(n_j)_{j \neq k,l} \in \mathbb{N}^{r-1}} \prod_{j \neq k,l} \frac{1}{n_j^{q_j}} \sum_{n_k \geq 1} \left| \frac{1}{\sum_{j \neq l} u_j \nu_j n_j} \right|^{q_l} \\ &\leq \nu_l^{q_l} \sum_{(n_j)_{j \neq k,l} \in \mathbb{N}^{r-1}} \prod_{j \neq k,l} \frac{1}{n_j^{q_j}} \sum_{n_k \in \mathbb{Z}^{\times}} \frac{1}{|n_k|^{q_l}} \\ &= 2\nu_l^{q_l} \zeta(q_l) \sum_{(n_j)_{j \neq k,l} \in \mathbb{N}^{r-1}} \prod_{j \neq k,l} \frac{1}{n_j^{q_j}} \\ &\leq 2\nu_l^{q_l} \prod_{j \neq k} \zeta(q_j). \end{aligned}$$

Choosing ν_l as the minimum of the ν_j with $j \neq k$, the result follows. □

As a direct corollary, summing all contributions of $\mathbf{u} \in \{-1, 1\}^{r+1}$ yields the following.

Corollary 4.4. *If $\nu_l = \min\{\nu_j : j \neq k\}$, then the following estimate holds,*

$$|\zeta_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q}}| \leq 2^r (1 + 4\nu_l^{q_l}) \prod_{j \neq k} \zeta(q_j),$$

for all $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{N}_{>1}^{r+1}$.

Proof. Indeed, we have $|\zeta_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q}}| \leq |Y_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q}}| + |Z_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q}}|$ with

$$|Y_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q}}| \leq \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \{-1, 1\}^{r+1}} Y_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q},\mathbf{u}} \leq 2^{r+2} \nu_l^{q_l} \prod_{j \neq k} \zeta(q_j),$$

$$|Z_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q}}| \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mathbf{u} \in \{-1, 1\}^{r+1}} Z_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q},\mathbf{u}} \leq 2^r \prod_{j \neq k} \zeta(q_j),$$

from where the result follows. □

Remark 4.5. *Some general properties related to the previous sums are as follows. We have*

$$Y_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q},(1,\dots,1)} = Z_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q},(1,\dots,1)} = Y_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q},(-1,\dots,-1)} = Z_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q},(-1,\dots,-1)} = 0. \quad (15)$$

Moreover, the symmetry by the antipodal map $\mathbf{u} \rightarrow -\mathbf{u}$ gives

$$Y_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q},-\mathbf{u}} = Y_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q},\mathbf{u}}, \quad Z_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q},-\mathbf{u}} = Z_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q},\mathbf{u}}. \quad (16)$$

The first identity follows directly from the fact that the equations $\langle \mathbf{u}\nu, \mathbf{n} \rangle = 0$ and $\langle \mathbf{u}\nu^k, \mathbf{n} \rangle = 0$ have no nonzero solutions of the same sign, i.e., $\mathbf{u}\nu_{\mathbb{N}}^{\perp}$ and $(\mathbf{u}\nu^k)_{\mathbb{N}}^{\perp}$, are empty for $\mathbf{u} = \pm(1, \dots, 1)$. The second one follows from

$$(\mathbf{u}\nu)_{\mathbb{N}}^{\perp} = \{\mathbf{n} : \langle \mathbf{n}, \mathbf{u}\nu \rangle = 0\} = \{\mathbf{n} : \langle \mathbf{n}, -\mathbf{u}\nu \rangle = 0\} = (-\mathbf{u}\nu)_{\mathbb{N}}^{\perp}.$$

4.2. Desingularization Algorithms for Polyhedra. Coming back to the sums $Y_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q},\mathbf{u}}$ and $Z_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q},\mathbf{u}}$, we know they depend on the sets $(\mathbf{u}\nu)_{\mathbb{N}}^{\perp}$ and $(\mathbf{u}\nu^k)_{\mathbb{N}}^{k,\perp}$ which are the nonnegative solutions to linear systems. By Gordan's lemma [1, 7], these are normal affine semigroups with a finite set of minimal generators, called a Hilbert basis. As a consequence, $(\mathbf{u}\nu)_{\mathbb{N}}^{\perp}$ and $(\mathbf{u}\nu^k)_{\mathbb{N}}^{k,\perp}$ are sets of positive integer points of polyhedral cones. Hence, we may assume that $(\mathbf{u}\nu)_{\mathbb{N}}^{\perp} = C_{\mathbf{u}} \cap \mathbb{Z}^{r+1}$ and $(\mathbf{u}\nu^k)_{\mathbb{N}}^{k,\perp} = C_{\mathbf{u}}^k \cap \mathbb{Z}^{r+1}$ where $C_{\mathbf{u}}$ and $C_{\mathbf{u}}^k$ are polyhedral cones with,

$$\dim C_{\mathbf{u}}^k = \dim C_{\mathbf{u}} - 1 = r - 1,$$

whose generators lie in \mathbb{Z}^{r+1} . For computational purposes, Hilbert bases are not completely satisfactory since they do not generate the semigroups freely, i.e., representations are not unique, and computing a Hilbert basis becomes increasingly difficult as the dimension r grows. We can avoid this problem by refining the cones $C_{\mathbf{u}}$ and $C_{\mathbf{u}}^k$ into unimodular cones, i.e., by taking a *desingularization of the cones*. Concretely, there exist finite collections of simplicial cones

$$C_{\mathbf{u},0}, C_{\mathbf{u},1}, \dots, C_{\mathbf{u},s} \subset C_{\mathbf{u}}, \quad C_{\mathbf{u},0}^k, C_{\mathbf{u},1}^k, \dots, C_{\mathbf{u},s_k}^k \subset C_{\mathbf{u}}^k,$$

whose unions cover the larger cones and which are all of multiplicity one, that is, the primitive generators of each subcone form a \mathbb{Z} -basis of the lattice of integer points in its linear span. These subdivisions define fans $\Sigma_{\mathbf{u}}$ and $\Sigma_{\mathbf{u},k}$, respectively. Denote by $\Sigma_{\mathbf{u}}^{(d)}$ and $\Sigma_{\mathbf{u},k}^{(d)}$ the set of d -dimensional cones of each fan. We denote their elements by F , and we refer to them as faces of the fans. Denote as $F_{\mathbb{N}}$ the set of positive integer points of each face in the relative interior of F . Then, we have

$$(\mathbf{u}\nu)_{\mathbb{N}}^{\perp} = \bigcup_{d=1}^r \bigcup_{F \in \Sigma_{\mathbf{u}}^{(d)}} F_{\mathbb{N}}, \quad (\mathbf{u}\nu^k)_{\mathbb{N}}^{k,\perp} = \bigcup_{d=1}^{r-1} \bigcup_{F \in \Sigma_{\mathbf{u},k}^{(d)}} F_{\mathbb{N}}. \quad (17)$$

Therefore, the previous discussion is summarized as follows.

Lemma 4.6. *Under the previous hypothesis we have*

$$Y_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q},\mathbf{u}} = \sum_{d=1}^r \sum_{F \in \Sigma_{\mathbf{u}}^{(d)}} \zeta(\mathbf{q}_k, F), \quad Z_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q},\mathbf{u}} = \sum_{d=1}^{r-1} \sum_{F \in \Sigma_{\mathbf{u},k}^{(d)}} \zeta(\mathbf{q}_k, F).$$

□

This statement is known as an *open subdivision relation* [9, Lemma 2.7].

5. THE CASE OF DIMENSION 2.

In what follows, we will work the case $r = 2$ using the previous results. From Theorem 4.5 we know that,

$$Y_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q},\mathbf{u}} = Y_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q},-\mathbf{u}}, \quad Z_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q},\mathbf{u}} = Z_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q},-\mathbf{u}},$$

$$Y_{k,\nu,(1,1,1),\mathbf{u}} = Z_{k,\nu,(1,1,1),\mathbf{u}} = 0,$$

for $\mathbf{u} \in \{-1, 1\}^3$. Therefore, our computations are reduced to the vectors

$$\mathbf{u}_0 = (1, -1, -1), \mathbf{u}_1 = (1, -1, 1), \mathbf{u}_2 = (1, 1, -1),$$

with

$$Z_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q}} = \sum_{l=0}^2 \sigma_{k,l} Z_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q},\mathbf{u}_l}, \quad Y_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q}} = 2 \sum_{l=0}^2 \sigma_{k,l} Y_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q},\mathbf{u}_l}, \quad \sigma_{k,l} := \sigma_k(\mathbf{u}_l).$$

Since we are assuming $|\mathbf{q}_k|$ even, observe that $\sigma_{k,k} = 1$. As a first step, observe that we have the following cone descriptions,

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{u}_0\nu)_{\mathbb{N}}^{\perp} &= C(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2) \cap \mathbb{N}^3, \\ (\mathbf{u}_1\nu)_{\mathbb{N}}^{\perp} &= C(\mathbf{v}_2, \mathbf{v}_0) \cap \mathbb{N}^3, \\ (\mathbf{u}_2\nu)_{\mathbb{N}}^{\perp} &= C(\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{v}_1) \cap \mathbb{N}^3, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathbf{v}_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \nu_2 \\ \nu_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{v}_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \nu_2 \\ 0 \\ \nu_0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{v}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \nu_1 \\ \nu_0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

following the orientation of the vectors. In this case, we can compute directly

$$\nu^{k,\perp} = \mathbb{Z}\mathbf{u}_l\nu_k, \quad l \neq k,$$

so, analog to [Theorem 2.7](#) we get the following.

Lemma 5.1. *We have*

$$Z_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q}} = \frac{\zeta(|\mathbf{q}_k|)}{\mathbf{v}_k^{\mathbf{q}_k}} \sum_{l \neq k} \sigma_{k,l}.$$

□

For the value $Y_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q},\mathbf{u}_l}$ we can give a geometric interpretation using the *Hirzebruch-Jung algorithm* for plane cones (for instance, see [7, Ch. 10] or [16, Sec. 2.4]). For any pair $(m_0, m_1) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ with $m_0 > m_1$, there is a sequence of pairs

$$[m_0/m_1] := \left\{ (m_i, \bar{m}_i) : \begin{array}{l} m_0 > m_1 > \dots > m_s = 1 > m_{s+1} = 0 \\ \bar{m}_0 = 0 < \bar{m}_1 = 1 < \dots < \bar{m}_s < \bar{m}_{s+1} = m_0 \end{array} \right\},$$

defined recursively by

$$\begin{aligned} m_1 \bar{m}_s &\equiv 1 \pmod{m_0} \\ m_{i+1} &= m_i k_i - m_{i-1}, \quad \bar{m}_{i+1} = \bar{m}_i k_i - \bar{m}_{i-1} \end{aligned}$$

where the $k_i \geq 2$ are positive integers. We have $(\mathbf{u}_l\nu)_{\mathbb{N}}^{\perp} = C(\mathbf{v}_{l'}, \mathbf{v}_{l''}) \cap \mathbb{N}^3$ where the cone $C(\mathbf{v}_{l'}, \mathbf{v}_{l''})$ have multiplicity ν_l for each l . The desingularization algorithm is initialized as follows. Let $0 < \epsilon_l < \nu_l$ the unique integer such that

$$\frac{\mathbf{v}_{l'}\epsilon_l + \mathbf{v}_{l''}}{\nu_l} \in \mathbb{N}^3.$$

Consider the sequences of vectors $(m_{l,i}, \bar{m}_{l,i}) \in [v_l/\epsilon_l]$ with $i = 0, \dots, s_l + 1$. Thus, the semi-groups $(\mathbf{u}_l\nu)_{\mathbb{N}}^{\perp}$ are generated minimally by $\{\mathbf{v}_{0,l}, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{s_l+1,l}\} \in \mathbb{N}^3$ defined recursively by

$$\mathbf{v}_{i,l} = \frac{1}{v_l} (\mathbf{v}_{l'} m_{i,l} + \mathbf{v}_{l''} \bar{m}_{i,l}).$$

For each $l = 0, 1, 2$ denote by Σ the fan defined by the 2-cones

$$C_{l,i} = C(\mathbf{v}_{l,i}, \mathbf{v}_{l,i+1}).$$

Note that $\Sigma^{(1)}$ is simply the set of ray cones defined by each $\mathbf{v}_{l,i}$. Then, we have the following.

Lemma 5.2. *If we denote,*

$$\mathcal{Q}_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q}} := \sum_{l=0}^2 \sigma_{k,l} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{s_l} \frac{1}{\mathbf{v}_{l,i}^{\mathbf{q}_k}} + \sum_{i=0}^{s_l} \zeta^*(\mathbf{q}_k, C_{l,i}) \right),$$

then we have,

$$\sum_{k:q_k=1} Y_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q}} = 2\zeta(|\bar{\mathbf{q}}|) \sum_{k:q_k=1} \mathcal{Q}_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q}}.$$

Proof. Assume that the nonzero coordinates of \mathbf{q}_k are $q_{k'}, q_{k''}$. Explicitly we have

$$Y_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q},\mathbf{u}_l} = \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in (\mathbf{u}_l \nu)_{\mathbb{N}}^{\perp}} \frac{1}{n_j^{q_{k'}} n_{j'}^{q_{k''}}}.$$

By the previous discussion the sets $(\mathbf{u}_l \nu)_{\mathbb{N}}^{\perp}$ can be described as a union

$$(\mathbf{u}_l \nu)_{\mathbb{N}}^{\perp} = \bigcup_{i=0}^{s_l} C_{l,i} \cap \mathbb{N}^3.$$

Since each cone $C_{l,i}$ has multiplicity one, from [Theorem 4.6](#) we have

$$Y_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q},\mathbf{u}_l} = \sum_{i=0}^{s_l} \zeta(\mathbf{q}_k, C_{l,i}) + \sum_{i=1}^{s_l} \zeta(\mathbf{q}_k, \mathbf{v}_{l,i}).$$

From [Theorem 2.7](#) with the fact that $\zeta(\mathbf{q}_k, C_{l,i}) = \zeta(|\mathbf{q}_k|) \zeta^*(\mathbf{q}_k, C_{l,i})$ we obtain

$$Y_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q},\mathbf{u}_l} = \zeta(|\mathbf{q}_k|) \left(\sum_{i=0}^{s_l} \zeta^*(\mathbf{q}_k, C_{l,i}) + \sum_{i=1}^{s_l} \frac{1}{\mathbf{v}_{l,i}^{\mathbf{q}_k}} \right).$$

Therefore, we put all together with [Theorem 4.1](#) to assure convergence and replacing $|\mathbf{q}_k| = |\bar{\mathbf{q}}|$ for all k such that $q_k = 1$. □

Corollary 5.3. *For all $\mathbf{q} \in \mathbb{N}^3$ reciprocity for Bernoulli polynomials is*

$$\mathcal{R}_{b_{\mathbf{q}}}(\nu) = -\frac{B_{|\bar{\mathbf{q}}|}}{|\bar{\mathbf{q}}|!} \prod_{q_k > 1} q_j! \sum_{k: q_k=1} \nu_k \left(\frac{1}{\mathbf{v}_k^{\mathbf{q}_k}} \sum_{k \neq l} \frac{\sigma_{k,l}}{2} + \mathcal{Q}_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q}} \right) - \frac{1 - (-1)^{\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{q}}}}{2^{\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{q}}}} \prod_{q_k > 1} B_{q_k}.$$

Proof. From [Theorem 3.6](#) we know that

$$\mathcal{R}_{b_{\mathbf{q}}}(\nu) = I_{\bar{\mathbf{q}}} \sum_{k: q_k=1} \nu_k \zeta_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q}} - \frac{1 - (-1)^{\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{q}}}}{2^{\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{q}}}} \prod_{q_k > 1} B_{q_k}, \quad I_{\mathbf{q}} := \frac{(-1)^{|\bar{\mathbf{q}}|/2}}{(2\pi)^{|\bar{\mathbf{q}}|}} \prod_{q_k > 1} q_j!,$$

for $|\bar{\mathbf{q}}|$ even. The previous two lemmas give

$$\sum_{k: q_k=1} \zeta_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q}} = 2\zeta(|\bar{\mathbf{q}}|) \sum_{k: q_k=1} \left(\frac{1}{\mathbf{v}_k^{\mathbf{q}_k}} \sum_{k \neq l} \frac{\sigma_{k,l}}{2} + \mathcal{Q}_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q}} \right).$$

and the identity

$$\zeta(|\bar{\mathbf{q}}|) = (-1)^{\frac{|\bar{\mathbf{q}}|}{2}+1} \frac{B_{|\bar{\mathbf{q}}|}(2\pi)^{|\bar{\mathbf{q}}|}}{2^{|\bar{\mathbf{q}}|} |\bar{\mathbf{q}}|!},$$

we get the desired identity. □

Remark 5.4. *In the case \mathbf{q} satisfying $q_k = 1$ and $q_{k'} = q_{k''} = q$ for $q \geq 1$ we have $\sigma_{k,l} = (-1)^q$ for all $k \neq l$. Then, the previous identity reduces to*

$$\mathcal{R}_{b_{\mathbf{q}}}(\nu) = S_{b_{\mathbf{q}}}(\nu|\nu_k) = -\frac{B_{2q} q!^2 \nu_k}{(2q)!} \left(\frac{(-1)^q}{\nu_{k'}^q \nu_{k''}^q} + \mathcal{Q}_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q}} \right) - B_q^2,$$

for $q > 1$. For $q = 1$ we know that $\sum_{k=0}^2 \nu_k \mathcal{Q}_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q}} = 0$, so our expression simplifies to

$$\mathcal{R}_{b_{\mathbf{q}}}(\nu) = \frac{\nu_0^2 + \nu_1^2 + \nu_2^2}{12\nu_0\nu_1\nu_2} - \frac{1}{4}$$

which is just Dedekind-Rademacher's reciprocity. In the case $q > 1$, observe that the identity for $S_{b_{\mathbf{q}}}(\nu|\nu_k)$ can be summed for each $k = 0, 1, 2$. Therefore, denoting $\mathcal{Q}_{\nu,\mathbf{q}} = \sum_{k=0}^2 \nu_k \mathcal{Q}_{k,\nu,\mathbf{q}}$, we have an analogue to Dedekind-Rademacher's reciprocity as follows

$$\sum_{k=0}^2 S_{b_{\mathbf{q}}}(\nu|\nu_k) = -\frac{B_{2q} q!^2}{(2q)!} \left(\frac{\nu_0^{q+1} + \nu_1^{q+1} + \nu_2^{q+1}}{\nu_0^q \nu_1^q \nu_2^q} (-1)^q + \mathcal{Q}_{\nu,\mathbf{q}} \right) - 3B_q^2.$$

This shows how the study of reciprocities

$$\sum_{k=0}^r S_{\mathbf{f}}(\nu|_{\nu_k}),$$

where \mathbf{f} is composed of continuous functions in \mathcal{S}_1 , is reduced to the study of $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbf{f}}(\nu) = S_{\mathbf{f}}(\nu|_{\nu_k})$ replacing f_k by b_1 .

REFERENCES

- [1] N. Alon and K.A. Berman. Regular hypergraphs, gordon's lemma, steinitz' lemma and invariant theory. *Journal of Combinatorial Theory, Series A*, 43(1):91–97, 1986. ISSN 0097-3165.
- [2] T. M. Apostol. Generalized Dedekind sums and transformation formulae of certain Lambert series. *Duke Math. J.*, 17:147–157, 1950. ISSN 0012-7094.
- [3] H. Bekki. On the conical zeta values and the Dedekind zeta values for totally real fields. *Acta Arith.*, 216(2):177–196, 2024. ISSN 0065-1036.
- [4] B. C. Berndt, L. Xie, and A. Zaharescu. Proofs of McIntosh's conjecture on Franel integrals and two generalizations. *Adv. Math.*, 423:25, 2023. ISSN 0001-8708. Id/No 109041.
- [5] J. C. Burkill and H. Burkill. A second course in mathematical analysis. *Cambridge: At the University Press. VII*, 526 p. (1970)., 1970.
- [6] L. Carlitz. A reciprocity and four-term relation for generalized Dedekind sums. *Nederl. Akad. Wet., Proc., Ser. A*, 77:413–422, 1974. ISSN 0023-3358.
- [7] T. Cox, J. Little, and H. Schenck. *Toric Varieties*, volume 124. AMS, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 2011.
- [8] J. Franel. Les suites de farey et le problème des nombres premiers. *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Mathematisch-Physikalische Klasse*, 1924:198–201, 1924.
- [9] L. Guo, S. Paycha, and B. Zhang. Conical zeta values and their double subdivision relations. *Adv. Math.*, 252:343–381, 2014. ISSN 0001-8708.
- [10] R. R. Hall, J. C. Wilson, and D. Zagier. Reciprocity formulae for general Dedekind-Rademacher sums. *Acta Arith.*, 73(4):389–396, 1995. ISSN 0065-1036.
- [11] A. S. Sikora M. Beck, P. Gunnells. Dedekind sums in geometry, topology, and arithmetic. *Report on BIRS workshop 09W5102*, 2009.
- [12] R. McIntosh. Franel integrals of order four. *Journal of The Australian Mathematical Society - J AUST MATH SOC*, 60, 04 1996.
- [13] H. Rademacher. Generalization of the reciprocity formula for dedekind sums. *Duke Mathematical Journal* 21: 391–397, 1954.
- [14] H. Rademacher and E. Grosswald. *Dedekind sums*, volume 16 of *Carus Math. Monogr.* Mathematical Association of America, Washington, DC, 1972.
- [15] T. Terasoma. Rational convex cones and cyclotomic multiple zeta values. *arXiv math.AG 0410306*, 2004.
- [16] Y. Torres-Nova. On the geography of 3-folds via asymptotic behavior of invariants. *arXiv, math.AG 2307.10516*, 2023.
- [17] D. Zagier. Higher dimensional Dedekind sums. *Math. Ann.*, 202:149–172, 1973.

Email address: yerko.torres@usm.cl

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICA, UNIVERSIDAD TÉCNICA FEDERICO SANTA MARÍA, VALPARAÍSO, CHILE.