ON MINIMA OF SUM OF THETA FUNCTIONS AND MUELLER-HO CONJECTURE

SENPING LUO AND JUNCHENG WEI

ABSTRACT. Let $z = x+iy \in \mathbb{H} := \{z = x+iy \in \mathbb{C} : y > 0\}$ and $\theta(s;z) = \sum_{(m,n)\in\mathbb{Z}^2} e^{-s\frac{\pi}{y}|mz+n|^2}$ be the theta function associated with the lattice $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z} \oplus z\mathbb{Z}$. In this paper we consider the following pair of minimization problems

$$\min_{\mathbb{H}} \theta(2; \frac{z+1}{2}) + \rho\theta(1;z), \quad \rho \in [0,\infty),$$

$$\min_{\mathbb{H}} \theta(1; \frac{z+1}{2}) + \rho\theta(2;z), \quad \rho \in [0,\infty),$$

where the parameter $\rho \in [0,\infty)$ represents the competition of two intertwining lattices. We find that as ρ varies the optimal lattices admit a novel pattern: they move from rectangular (the ratio of long and short side changes from $\sqrt{3}$ to 1), square, rhombus (the angle changes from $\pi/2$ to $\pi/3$) to hexagonal; furthermore, there exists a closed interval of ρ such that the optimal lattices is always square lattice. This is in sharp contrast to optimal lattice shapes for single theta function ($\rho = \infty$ case), for which the hexagonal lattice prevails. As a consequence, we give a partial answer to optimal lattice arrangements of vortices in competing systems of Bose-Einstein condensates as conjectured (and numerically and experimentally verified) by Mueller-Ho [31].

1. INTRODUCTION AND STATEMENT OF MAIN RESULTS

Let $z \in \mathbb{H} := \{z = x + iy \in \mathbb{C} : y > 0\}$ and $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z} \oplus z\mathbb{Z}$ be the lattice in $\mathbb{R}^2$. The theta function associated with the lattice Λ is defined as

$$\theta(s;z) = \sum_{(m,n)\in\mathbb{Z}^2} e^{-s\frac{\pi}{y}|mz+n|^2}. \tag{1.1}$$

In 1988, Montgomery [33] proved the following celebrated result:

Theorem 1.1. *For all $s > 0$ and $z \in \mathbb{H}$,*

$$\theta(s;z) \geq \theta(s;z_0) \tag{1.2}$$

where $z_0 = \frac{1}{2} + i\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$ (the triangular lattice, or called hexagonal lattice). Equality holds if and only if $z = z_0$ (up to the group $\mathcal{G}_1$ (See (3.2), Section 3)).

For the higher dimensional cases, the corresponding minimization problems on lattices was first investigated in Sarnak and Strombergsson [35] and recently by Cohn-Kumar-Miller-Radchenko-Viazovska [14, 15]. For relations with sphere packing problems, see Viazovska [39] and Cohn-Kumar-Miller-Radchenko-Viazovska [14] and the references therein. We mention that minimization problems for Dedekind eta function (equivalent to the theta function (1.1) via Melin transform) also arise in the extremal determinants of Laplace-Beltrami Operators. See Osgood-Phillips-Sarnak [32], Faulhuber [18] and the reference therein.

The celebrated Theorem 1.1 has laid foundations in many optimal lattice problems in number theory and has been frequently used in applied matthematical and physical models such as crystallizations of particle interactions (Blanc-Lewin [12], Bétermin [7, 8], Bétermin-Zhang [6]), Ginzburg-Landau theory in superconductors (Abrikosov [1], Sandier-Serfaty [36, 37], Serfaty [38]), Ohta-Kawasaki models in di-block copolymers (Chen-Oshita [13], Goldman-Muratov-Serfaty [19], Ren-Wei [34]), minimal frame operator norms (Faulhuber [17]) and many others. The related

FIGURE 1. Two lattices with centers at the lattice points and the half lattice points.

minimization of theta fucntions/eta functions on lattices has application to Gross-Pitaeskii theory in superfluids or Bose-Einstein condensates (Aftalion-Blanc-Nier [3], Aftalion-Serfacty [4]), Ohta-Kawasaki models triblock copolymers (Luo-Ren-Wei [29]) and many others.

In this paper, we consider a minimization problem with sum of **two** theta functions, which represent **two** intertwining lattices, one lattice lying at the center of the other lattice. See Figure 1 and the physical explanation in the next section.

Let $\rho > 0$ denote the relative strength of the two lattices. Consider the following functional

$$\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z) := \theta(2; \frac{z+1}{2}) + \rho\theta(1; z). \tag{1.3}$$

It is easy to see that $\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z)$ is invariant under the group (see Section 3)

$$\mathcal{G}_2 : \text{the group generated by } z \mapsto -\frac{1}{z}, \ z \mapsto z + 2, \ z \mapsto -\overline{z}. \tag{1.4}$$

The new minimization problem we consider is the following

$$\min_{z\in\mathbb{H}} \mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z), \ \ \rho \in [0, \infty). \tag{1.5}$$

Our main result is the following theorem which gives a complete characterization of the minimization problem (1.5), as ρ varies:

Theorem 1.2. *The minimization problem* (1.5) *admits a unique minimizer* $z_{1,\rho}$ *which moves continuously on a special curve as the parameter* ρ *varies (up to the group* $\mathcal{G}_2$*). The trajectory curve of the minimizer, denoted by* Ω_e *(see Figure 2), is given by*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Omega_e := \Omega_{ea} \cup \Omega_{eb}, \\
&\Omega_{ea} := \{z : x = 0, 1 \leq y \leq \sqrt{3}\}, \\
&\Omega_{eb} := \{z : |z| = 1, 0 \leq x < \frac{1}{2}\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{1.6}$$

More precisely, there exist two thresholds $\sigma_{1,a} = 0.04016\cdots < \sigma_{1,b} = 0.83972\cdots$ *such that*

(1) *if* ρ *varies in* $[0, \sigma_{1,a}]$*, the minimizer* $z_{1,\rho}$ *moves from top to bottom along the vertical line segment* Ω_{ea}*;*

(2) *if* $\rho \in [\sigma_{1,a}, \sigma_{1,b}]$*, the minimizer* $z_{1,\rho}$ *stays fixed on the corner of the curve* Ω_e*, i.e.,*

$$z_{1,\rho} \equiv i, \ \ \text{if } \rho \in [\sigma_{1,a}, \sigma_{1,b}];$$

(3) *if* ρ *varies in* $[\sigma_{1,b}, \infty)$*, the minimizer* $z_{1,\rho}$ *moves from* i *to* $\frac{1}{2} + i\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$ *along the unit arc,* Ω_{eb}*. Moreover*

$$\text{as } \rho \to \infty, \ \ z_{1,\rho} \to \frac{1}{2} + i\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \ \text{ from left hand side of } \Omega_{eb}.$$

FIGURE 2. The curve Ω_e

Remark 1.1. *In* [29], *with X. Ren, we have studied another minimization problem*

$$\min_{z \in \mathbb{H}} -\left((1-b)\left(\frac{1}{2}\log(\sqrt{y}|\eta(z)|^2)\right) + b\left(\frac{1}{2}\log(\sqrt{y}|\eta(\frac{z+1}{2})|^2)\right)\right), z = x + iy, \quad b \in [0,1], \qquad (1.7)$$

where η is the Dedekind eta function

$$\eta(z) = e^{\frac{\pi}{3}\pi i} \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 - e^{2\pi n z i})^4. \qquad (1.8)$$

When $b = 0$, this is the minimization problem studied by Chen-Oshita [13] *and Sandier-Serfaty* [37]. *While Chen and Oshita used analytical method to prove that the triangular lattice is the optimal, Sander and Serfaty made use of a relation between the Dedekind eta function and the Epstein zeta function (Melin transform), and then Theorem 1.1 to arrive at the same conclusion. When $0 < b < 1$, we have showed a similar transition phenomenon from rectangle lattice to hexagonal lattice to Theorem 1.2 in* [29] *for the functional in* (1.7).

We also consider another minimization problem, which can be viewed as a "conjugate" problem to (1.5)

$$\min_{z \in \mathbb{H}} \mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(z), \quad \rho \in [0,\infty), \quad \text{where } \mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(z) := \theta(1; \frac{z+1}{2}) + \rho\theta(2; z). \qquad (1.9)$$

The precise relation between $\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}$ and $\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}$ can be found in Lemma 3.3. The minimizers of (1.9) can be characterized as follows:

Theorem 1.3. *The minimization problem* (1.9) *admits a unique minimizer $z_{2,\rho}$ which lies on the curve Ω_e* (1.6) *(up to the group $\mathcal{G}_2$*(1.4)*). There exist two thresholds $\sigma_{2,a} = 1.190861337\cdots$, $\sigma_{2,b} = 24.89618074\cdots$ such that*

(1) *if ρ varies from left to right on $[0, \sigma_{2,a}]$, the minimizer $z_{2,\rho}$ moves from top to bottom on the vertical line segment Ω_{ea};*

(2) *if $\rho \in [\sigma_{2,a}, \sigma_{2,b}]$, the minimizer $z_{2,\rho}$ stays fixed on the corner of curve* (1.6), *i.e. $z_{2,\rho} \equiv i$;*

(3) *if ρ moves from left to right on $[\sigma_{2,a}, \infty)$, the minimizer $z_{2,\rho}$ moves from left to right along the unit curve Ω_{eb}. Furthermore*

$$\text{as } \rho \to \infty, \ z_{2,\rho} \to \frac{1}{2} + i\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \ \text{ from left hand side of } \Omega_{eb}.$$

Remark 1.2. *The values of $\sigma_{1,a}, \sigma_{1,b}, \sigma_{2,a}$ and $\sigma_{2,b}$ are given explicitly in terms of Jacobi Theta functions. See Theorem 1.4 below.*

Remark 1.3. *The minimizers of the minimization problems 1.5 and 1.9 admit a novel pattern: they bond together in a very special way and form a nice geometric shape and move with the parameter in a monotone way. The optimal lattices have richer structures than that of Theorem 1.1.*

There are some hidden connections revealed later between the two minimization problems (1.5) and (1.9). They are like "a pair" as shown in Table 1 below. The following theorem gives more qualitative behaviors of minimizers in Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $z_{1,\rho}$ and $z_{2,\rho}$ be the minimizers of (1.5) and (1.9) respectively.*

(1) *Minimizers of (1.5) and (1.9) for each $\rho \in [0,\infty)$ are given in the following Table 1.*

TABLE 1. Minimizers of $\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z), \mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(z)$ for parameter $\rho \in [0,\infty)$

$\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z)$	$\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z)$	$\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(z)$	$\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(z)$
Domain of ρ	**Minimizer**	**Domain of ρ**	**Minimizer**
$\rho \in [\rho_1, 1/\rho_2]$	$z_{1,\rho} \equiv i$	$\rho \in [\rho_2, 1/\rho_1]$	$z_{2,\rho} \equiv i$
$\rho \in (1/\rho_2, \infty)$	$z_{1,\rho} = \frac{y_{2,1/\rho}^2 - 1}{y_{2,1/\rho}^2 + 1} + i\frac{2y_{2,1/\rho}}{y_{2,1/\rho}^2 + 1}$	$\rho \in (0, \rho_2)$	$z_{2,\rho} = iy_{2,\rho} \in \Omega_{ea}$
$\rho \in (0, \rho_1)$	$z_{1,\rho} = iy_{1,\rho} \in \Omega_{ea}$	$\rho \in (1/\rho_1, \infty)$	$z_{2,\rho} = \frac{y_{1,1/\rho}^2 - 1}{y_{1,1/\rho}^2 + 1} + i\frac{2y_{1,1/\rho}}{y_{1,1/\rho}^2 + 1}$

(2) *The thresholds in Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 are given by*

$$\sigma_{1,a} = \frac{1}{\sigma_{2,b}} = \rho_1, \quad \sigma_{1,b} = \frac{1}{\sigma_{2,a}} = \frac{1}{\rho_2},$$

where ρ_1 and ρ_2 are determined explicitly by

$$\rho_1 = -\frac{\mathcal{Y}''(1)}{\mathcal{X}''(1)}, \quad \rho_2 = -1 - \frac{\mathcal{B}''(1)}{\mathcal{A}''(1)}.$$

Here

$$\mathcal{X}(y) := \vartheta_3(y)\vartheta_3(\frac{1}{y}), \qquad \mathcal{Y}(y) := 2\big(\vartheta_3(4y)\vartheta_3(\frac{4}{y}) + \vartheta_2(4y)\vartheta_2(\frac{4}{y})\big)$$

$$\mathcal{A}(y) := \sqrt{2}\vartheta_3(2y)\vartheta_3(\frac{2}{y}), \quad \mathcal{B}(y) := \sqrt{2}\vartheta_2(2y)\vartheta_2(\frac{2}{y})$$

(1.10)

and the Jacobi Theta functions are defined as

$$\vartheta_2(y) = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} e^{-\pi(n-\frac{1}{2})^2 y}, \quad \vartheta_3(y) = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} e^{-\pi n^2 y}, \quad \vartheta_4(y) = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}} (-1)^n e^{-\pi n^2 y}.$$

(1.11)

(3) *The $y_{1,1/\rho}$ and $y_{2,1/\rho}$ in the Table 1 are implicitly determined by*

$$y_{1,1/\rho} \text{ is the unique solution of } \frac{\mathcal{Y}'(y)}{\mathcal{X}'(y)} + 1/\rho = 0,$$

$$y_{2,1/\rho} \text{ is the unique solution of } 1 + \frac{\mathcal{B}'(y)}{\mathcal{A}'(y)} + 1/\rho = 0.$$

(1.12)

Furthermore, there holds

$$\frac{d}{d\rho}y_{1,\rho} < 0, \quad \frac{d}{d\rho}y_{2,\rho} < 0.$$

The existence and uniqueness of $y_{1,1/\rho}, y_{2,1/\rho}$ in the Theorems 1.2 and 1.3 are consequences of the following theorem whose proof will be given by Theorem 6.1 and 7.1. (Here $\mathcal{X}(y), \mathcal{Y}(y)$ and $\mathcal{A}(y), \mathcal{B}(y)$ are defined in (1.10).)

Theorem 1.5.
- *The function $y \mapsto \frac{\mathcal{Y}'(y)}{\mathcal{X}'(y)}, y > 0$ has only one critical point at $y = 1$, and it holds that*

$$\left(\frac{\mathcal{Y}'(y)}{\mathcal{X}'(y)}\right)' < 0, \ \ y \in (0,1) \ and \ \left(\frac{\mathcal{Y}'(y)}{\mathcal{X}'(y)}\right)' > 0, \ \ y \in (1,\infty).$$

- *The function $y \mapsto \frac{\mathcal{B}'(y)}{\mathcal{A}'(y)}, y > 0$ has only one critical point at $y = 1$, and it holds that*

$$\left(\frac{\mathcal{B}'(y)}{\mathcal{A}'(y)}\right)' < 0, \ \ y \in (0,1) \ \ and \ \left(\frac{\mathcal{B}'(y)}{\mathcal{A}'(y)}\right)' > 0, \ \ y \in (1,\infty).$$

Theorem 1.2 has direct applications to the Mueller-Ho functional and Mueller-Ho Conjecture in vortices arrangements for competing systems of Bose-Einstein condensates, as we explain in the next section.

2. Applications to Mueller-Ho conjecture

As we have mentioned in Section 1, the problem of finding optimal lattice shapes arise in many physical models. Besides those examples we mentioned in Section 1, another example is the so-called vortices in Bose-Einstein condensates. Vortices in Bose-Einstein condensates are also called topological defects, correspond to a zero of the order parameter with a circulation of the phase. When they get numerous, these vortices arrange themselves on a lattice. In fact, in rotating Bose Einstein condensates (BEC), vortices were first observed in two component BEC's (Matthews etc [30]): it is observed experimentally that the shape of the lattice can be either hexagonal or square depending on the rotational velocity of the condensate. Since then, following the pioneering work of Mueller-Ho [31], many authors have investigated the lattice shape in two component BEC's and for instance Kasamatsu etc [26, 27]; related works include Keeli–Oktel [24] who numerically calculate the elastic coefficients of the lattice, Aftalion-Mason-Wei [2] who study the system describing the vortex/spike and derive an interaction term. In Kuokanportti etc [25], the authors investigate the case of different masses and attractive interactions.

The ground state of a two component condensate is well described by a Gross Pitaevskii energy depending on the wave functions of each component which are coupled by an interaction term. The construction of the Bose-Einstein condensates with large number of vortices was deduced in Ho [20] (one-component case) and Mueller-Ho [31] (two-component case), with the potential energy given by

$$\mathcal{V} = \frac{1}{2}g_1|\Psi_1|^4 + \frac{1}{2}g_2|\Psi_2|^4 + g_{12}|\Psi_1|^2|\Psi_2|^2$$

where g_{12} represents the competing strength between the two components of Bose gas. We omit the details of the construction of the model here. In Mueller-Ho [31] they have reduced the minimization problems on lattices to the minimization problems for the Mueller-Ho functional

$$\min_{z \in \mathbb{H},(a,b)} \mathcal{E}_{MH}(z;a,b), \alpha \in [-1,1], \ \text{where} \ \mathcal{E}_{MH}(z) := \theta(1;z) + \alpha\mathcal{J}(z;a,b). \tag{2.1}$$

Here $\Lambda = \mathbb{Z} \oplus z\mathbb{Z}$ denotes the lattice of one component Bose gas A, and the theta function $\theta(1;z)$ (defined at (1.1)) represents the self-interaction part of single component of A or B, i.e., the so-called Abrikosov energy. (See Abrikosov [1].) The functional

$$\mathcal{J}(z;a,b) = \sum_{(m,n) \in \mathbb{Z}^2} e^{-\frac{\pi}{y}|mz-n|^2} \cos(2\pi(ma+nb)). \tag{2.2}$$

characterizes the competing strength of two components A and B. $\alpha = \frac{g_{12}}{\sqrt{g_1 g_2}}$ represents the strength of competition between two competing components A and B. The vector (a,b) characterizes the relative position of the these lattice shape. See Figure 1 when $(a,b) = (\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2})$.

It is interesting to compare the two-component case with the single-component case. In the latter system, energy minimization reduces to minimizing $\theta(1;z)$ whose only local minimum is the triangular lattice, where $z = z_0 = e^{i\frac{\pi}{3}}$ and $\theta(1;z_0) = 1.1596$ (by Theorem 1.1); the square

lattice $z = i$ is a saddle point with $\theta(1; i) = 1.1803$. For two-component case, the minimum of $\mathcal{E}_{MH}(z; a, b)$ depends on the relative strength α and the relative position of the lattices, as conjectured by Mueller-Ho [31] (supported by numerical computations and experimental results):

Mueller-Ho Conjecture: For a two-component Bose gas, the most favorable lattice minimizing $\theta(1; z) + \alpha \mathcal{J}(z; a, b)$ are

(a) $\alpha < 0$: the vortices of the two components coincide with each other ($a = b = 0$) to form a triangular lattice ($z = e^{i\frac{\pi}{3}}$).

(b) $0 < \alpha < 0.172$: the vortex lattice in each component remains triangular. However one lattice is displaced to the center of the triangle of the other $a = b = \frac{1}{3}$. The lattice type (characterized by $z = z_0 = e^{i\frac{\pi}{3}}$) remains constant within this interval.

(c) $0.172 < \alpha < 0.373$: (a, b) jumps from the center of the triangle (i.e., half of the unit cell) to the center of the rhombic unit cell $a = b = \frac{1}{2}$. The angle jumps from 60° to 67.95^o at $\alpha = 0.172$, and increases continuously to 90° as α increases to 0.372. As a result, the lattice shape type is no longer fixed and the unit cell is rhombus. The modulus $\frac{b}{a}$, however, remains fixed across this region.

(d) $0.373 < \alpha < 0.926$: the two lattices are "mode locked" into a centered square structure throughout the entire interval ($z = i, a = b = \frac{1}{2}$).

(e) $0.926 < \alpha < 1$: the lattice type again varies continuously with interaction α. Each component's vortex lattice has a rectangular unit cell (angle$= \frac{\pi}{2}$) whose aspect ratio $|z|$ increases with α. At $\alpha = 1$, the aspect ratio is $\sqrt{3}$.

Remark 2.1. *Both Rb^{87} and Na^{23} have interaction parameters with the range (d), i.e., $0.373 < \alpha < 0.926$.*

For more on the vortex shape and Bose-Einstein condensates, including the construction of theoretical models and numerical and experimental results, we refer to [30, 23, 22] and the references therein. In [21] the authors considered Tkachenko modes and verified the same numerical results as in Mueller-Ho Conjecture. It seems that the Mueller-Ho conjecture is a universal phenomenon, as commented by Bétermin [9] that *"the same phenomenon in Mueller-Ho results is also expected in other physical and biological models involving infinite lattices and competitive interactions"*. See also numerical computations in Bétermin-Faulhuber-Knüpfer [11].

To study the minimizer of the Muller-Ho functional $\mathcal{E}_{MH}(z; a, b) = \theta(1; z) + \alpha \mathcal{J}(z; a, b)$ with respect to $(z; a, b)$, we first need to identify the critical points of $\mathcal{E}_{MH}$ which satisfy

$$\nabla_z \theta(1; z) + \alpha \nabla_z \mathcal{J}(z; a, b) = 0, \tag{2.3}$$

$$\nabla_{(a,b)} \mathcal{J}(z; a, b) = 0. \tag{2.4}$$

To consider the global minimum of $\theta(1; z) + \alpha \mathcal{J}(z; a, b)$, a necessary condition is that (a, b) must be a minimum of $\mathcal{J}(z; a, b)$. Thus we first focus on critical point equation (2.4).

For the function $\mathcal{J}(z; a, b)$ with respect to (a, b), one sees clearly that

$$\mathcal{J}(z; a + 1, b) = \mathcal{J}(z; a, b), \quad \mathcal{J}(z; a, b + 1) = \mathcal{J}(z; a, b) \tag{2.5}$$

$$\mathcal{J}(z; 1 - a, 1 - b) = \mathcal{J}(z; a, b). \tag{2.6}$$

The periodicity and symmetry imply that $\mathcal{J}(z; a, b)$ with respect to (a, b) has four universal critical points, which are denoted by

$$w_0 := (0, 0), w_1 := (\frac{1}{2}, 0), w_2 := (0, \frac{1}{2}), w_3 := w_1 + w_2 = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}). \tag{2.7}$$

We call "universal" here since they are independent of the lattice structures i.e., z. Clearly, the critical point w_0 is the global maxima of $\mathcal{J}(z; a, b)$ with respect to (a, b). For critical points w_1, w_2, w_3, we have the following partial classification result (the proof will be given in Section 9):

Lemma 2.1. *Let $z = iy, y > 0$. There holds:*

- w_1, w_2 *are the saddle points of* $\mathcal{J}(z; a, b)$ *with respect to* (a, b)*. Explicitly, the Hessian at each point can be expressed by*

$$D^2 J(z; a, b) \mid_{\{z=iy,(a,b)=w_1\}} = 16\pi^2 \vartheta_3(\frac{1}{y})\vartheta_3'(\frac{1}{y})\vartheta_4(y)\vartheta_4'(y) < 0$$

$$D^2 J(z; a, b) \mid_{\{z=iy,(a,b)=w_2\}} = 16\pi^2 \vartheta_3(y)\vartheta_3'(y)\vartheta_4(\frac{1}{y})\vartheta_4'(\frac{1}{y}) < 0.$$

- w_3 *is the local minimum of* $\mathcal{J}(z; a, b)$ *with respect to* (a, b)*. Explicitly, one has the Hessian expression*

$$D^2 J(z; a, b) \mid_{\{z=iy,(a,b)=w_3\}} = 16\pi^2 \vartheta_4(y)\vartheta_4'(y)\vartheta_4(\frac{1}{y})\vartheta_4'(\frac{1}{y}) > 0.$$

For $(a, b) = (0, 0)$, $\mathcal{J}(z; 0, 0) = \theta(1; z)$. Combining Theorem 1.1 and using the fact that w_0 is the global maxima of $\mathcal{J}(z; a, b)$, we have the following proposition which confirms the (a) part of Mueller-Ho Conjecture:

Proposition 2.1. *For* $\alpha \in [-1, 0]$*, the minimizer of the functional* $\mathcal{E}_{MH}(z; a, b) = \theta(1; z) + \alpha\mathcal{J}(z; a, b)$ *is achieved at* $z_0 = \frac{1}{2} + i\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$ *and* $(a, b) = (0, 0)$*.*

Besides the above 4 universal critical points, there may be other additional pair critical points. (Note that by symmetry if (a, b) is a critical point then $(1 - a, 1 - b)$ is also a critical point.) We have

Lemma 2.2. *If* $z = i$*, then* $(a, b) = (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3})$ *is not a critical point of* $\mathcal{J}(z; a, b)$*;while* $(a, b) = (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3})$ *(and* $(a, b) = \frac{2}{3}, \frac{2}{3}$*) is a critical point of* $\mathcal{J}(z; a, b)$ *if* $z = \frac{1}{2} + i\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$*.*

The proof of Lemma 2.2 will be given in Appendix 1.

On the critical point equation (2.4), the numerical simulation suggests the following conjecture:

Conjecture 2.1. *The function* $\mathcal{J}(z; a, b)$ *with respect to the* a, b *has either 4 or 6 critical points depending on modulus of the tori* z*. Let* $\Omega_4(resp. \Omega_6)$ *be the subset of* $\mathbb{H}$ *which corresponds to tori* z *having four (resp. six) critical points. There holds*

a *: Alterative:*
$$\mathbb{H} = \Omega_4 \cup \Omega_6, \quad \Omega_4 \cap \Omega_6 = \emptyset.$$

b *: Rectangular tori has only four critical points and the hexagonal one has six.*
$$i \in \{z \mid: \Re(z) = 0, \Im(z) > 0\} \subset \Omega_4, \frac{1}{2} + i\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \in \Omega_6.$$

c *: Invariance:*
$$z \in \Omega_4 \Rightarrow \Gamma(z) \in \Omega_4; z \in \Omega_6 \Rightarrow \Gamma(z) \in \Omega_6.$$

Here the modular group is

$$\Gamma := SL_2(\mathbb{Z}) = \{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}, ad - bc = 1, a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{Z} \}. \tag{2.8}$$

Remark 2.2. *This conjecture has some similarity to the discovery in Lin-Wang* [28]*, in which they showed surprisingly that the Green function on the two dimensional torus has either 3 or 5 critical points.*

In summary, we we see that $(a, b) = (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3})$ is not always a critical point of $\mathcal{J}(z; a, b)$ for $z \in \mathbb{H}$, while $(a, b) = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ is always the critical point of $\mathcal{J}(z; a, b)$ for all $z \in \mathbb{H}$. Moreover $(a, b) = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ is a local minimum at least for $z = iy, y > 0$.

When $(a, b) = w_3 = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ we can simplify the Mueller-Ho functional using the following (whose proof will be given in Section 9)

Lemma 2.3.
$$\mathcal{J}(z; \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) = 2\theta(2, \frac{z+1}{2}) - \theta(1; z).$$

FIGURE 3. Two-component Bose gas in lattices. First row from left to right: a rectangular lattice and a square lattice. Second row from left to right: a rhombic lattice and a hexagonal lattice.

As a consequence the Mueller-Ho functional becomes

$$\mathcal{E}_{MH}(z; \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) = (1 - \alpha)\theta(1; z) + 2\alpha\theta(2, \frac{z+1}{2}). \tag{2.9}$$

Applying Theorem 1.2 with $\rho = \frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}$, we have the following

Theorem 2.1. *For the Mueller-Ho functional $\mathcal{E}_{MH}(z; \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$, there exists thresholds $\alpha_1 \sim 0.3732155067 \cdots <$ $\alpha_2 \sim 0.9256496973 \cdots$ such that*

(1) *for $\alpha \in [0, \alpha_1]$, the minimizer is rhombic lattice $z = e^{i\theta_\alpha}$ given by*

$$\theta_\alpha = \arctan(\frac{2y_{2, \frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}}}{y^2_{2, \frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}} - 1}),$$

and the angle increases from $\frac{\pi}{3}$ to $\frac{\pi}{2}$;

(2) *for $\alpha \in [\alpha_1, \alpha_2]$, the minimizer is square lattice;*

(3) *for $\alpha \in [\alpha_2, 1]$, the minimizer is rectangular lattice $(iy_{1, \frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}})$ and the ratio of long side and short side increases from 1 to $\sqrt{3}$.*

Here $y_{j, \frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}}, j = 1, 2$ are located precisely in (1.12), and the thresholds $\alpha_j, j = 1, 2$ are expressed explicitly by $\alpha_1 = \frac{\mathcal{B}''(1) + \mathcal{A}''(1)}{\mathcal{B}''(1) - \mathcal{A}''(1)}$, $\alpha_2 = \frac{\mathcal{X}''(1)}{\mathcal{X}''(1) - 2\mathcal{Y}''(1)}$, see $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}$ in (1.10).

Proposition 2.1 and Theorem 2.1 give a partial answer to the (a), (c), (d) and (e) part of Mueller-Ho Conjecture. Theorem 2.1 shows that as the competition strength between the two Bose gases increases the lattice structures moves from hexgonal, rhombus, square to rectangular. See Figure 3.

Finally we discuss the (b) part of Mueller-Ho Conjecture. In the Mueller-Ho Conjecture, the expected lattice structure when α is small is triangular lattice, and the relative position of the two components A, B is characterized by $(a, b) = (\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3})$. To see this, there a clear competition

between $\theta(1; z) + \alpha \mathcal{J}(z; \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ and $\theta(1; z) + \alpha \mathcal{J}(z; \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3})$ when α is small. Thus the upper bound of α preserving the triangular lattice structure is determined by the

$$\alpha_0 := \max_{\alpha \in [0,1]} \{\alpha \mid \theta(1; \frac{1}{2} + i\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}) + \alpha \mathcal{J}(\frac{1}{2} + i\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}; \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}) \leq \min_{z \in \mathbb{H}} (\theta(1; z) + \alpha \mathcal{J}(z; \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}))\}. \quad (2.10)$$

To find α_0, one first uses $\min_{z \in \mathbb{H}} (\theta(1; z) + \alpha \mathcal{J}(z; w_3)) \leq \theta(1; i) + \alpha \mathcal{J}(i; \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})$ to obtain a rough bound

$$\alpha_0 \leq \frac{\theta(1; i) - \theta(1; \frac{1}{2} + i\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2})}{\mathcal{J}(\frac{1}{2} + i\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}; \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) - \mathcal{J}(i; \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2})} := 0.2419435012 \cdots . \quad (2.11)$$

By Theorem 2.1, one deduces that

$$\max_{\alpha \in [0,1]} \{\alpha \mid \theta(1; \frac{1}{2} + i\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}) + \alpha \mathcal{J}(\frac{1}{2} + i\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}; \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}) \leq (\theta(1; e^{i\theta_\alpha}) + \alpha \mathcal{J}(e^{i\theta_\alpha}; \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}))\}. \quad (2.12)$$

In view of (2.11), the upper bound α_0 satisfies the equation

$$\theta(1; \frac{1}{2} + i\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}) + \alpha \mathcal{J}(\frac{1}{2} + i\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}; \frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3}) = \theta(1; e^{i\theta_\alpha}) + \alpha \mathcal{J}(e^{i\theta_\alpha}; \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}). \quad (2.13)$$

Equation (2.13) gives the upper bound in (b) of Mueller-Ho Conjecture which is

$$\alpha_0 = 0.1726645 \cdots, \theta_{\alpha_0} = 1.186248384 \cdots . \quad (2.14)$$

In summary we have a complete proof of Mueller-Ho Conjecture as long as the conjecture on the critical points is proved.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: In Section 3, we collect some basic invariance properties of the functionals $\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z)$ and $\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(z)$ and discuss the intricate relations between these two functionals. In Section 4, we prove a fundamental monotonicity property of the theta function $\theta(s; \frac{z+1}{2})$. The conjugate monotonicity of $\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z)$ and $\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(z)$ are established in Section 5. In Sections 6 and 7, we classify the shape of $\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z)$ and $\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(z)$ on the $y-$axis for all $\rho \in [0, \infty)$ respectively. In Section 8, we prove Theorems 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4, the method of the proof relies on the properties established in Sections 3-7. In Section 9, we prove the properties on Mueller-Ho functional and Theorem 2.1.

In the remaining part of the paper we use the common notation $\sum_{m,n} := \sum_{(m,n) \in \mathbb{Z}^2}$ so that the theta function becomes $\theta(s; z) = \sum_{(m,n)} e^{-s\pi \frac{1}{y}|mz+n|^2}$. We also use the notation:

$$\pi = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \Leftrightarrow \pi(\tau) = \frac{a\tau + b}{c\tau + d}. \quad (2.15)$$

3. SOME PRELIMINARIES

In this section we present some simple symmetries of the two theta functions $\theta(s; z)$ and $\theta(s; \frac{z+1}{2})$ and the associated fundamental domains. As a result we establish the precise connection between $\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z)$ and $\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(z)$.

Let $\mathbb{H}$ denote the upper half plane and Γ denote the modular group (defined at (2.8)).

We use the following definition of fundamental domain which is slightly different from the classical definition (see [33]):

Definition 1. *([page 108, [16]] The fundamental domain associated to group G is a connected domain $\mathcal{D}$ satisfies*

- *For any $z \in \mathbb{H}$, there exists $\pi(z) \in G$ such that $\pi(z) \in \overline{\mathcal{D}}$;*
- *Suppose $z_1, z_2 \in \mathcal{D}$ and $\pi(z_1) = z_2$ for some $\pi \in G$, then $z_1 = z_2$ and $\pi = \pm Id$.*

By Definition 1, the fundamental domain to modular group Γ is

$$\mathcal{D}_\Gamma := \{z \in \mathbb{H} : |z| > 1, -\frac{1}{2} < x < \frac{1}{2}\}. \quad (3.1)$$

which is open. Note that the fundamental domain can be open. (See [page 30, [5]].)

Next we we introduce another two groups related to the functionals $\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}$ and $\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}$. The generators of these groups are given by

$$\mathcal{G}_1 : \text{the group generated by } \tau \mapsto -\frac{1}{\tau}, \ \tau \mapsto \tau + 1, \ \tau \mapsto -\overline{\tau}, \tag{3.2}$$

$$\mathcal{G}_2 : \text{the group generated by } \tau \mapsto -\frac{1}{\tau}, \ \tau \mapsto \tau + 2, \ \tau \mapsto -\overline{\tau}. \tag{3.3}$$

It is easy to see that the fundamental domains to group $\mathcal{G}_j, j = 1, 2$ denoted by $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{G}_1}, \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{G}_2}$ are

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{G}_1} := \{z \in \mathbb{H} : |z| > 1, \ 0 < x < \frac{1}{2}\} \tag{3.4}$$

$$\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{G}_2} := \{z \in \mathbb{H} : |z| > 1, \ 0 < x < 1\}. \tag{3.5}$$

Clearly we have that

$$\mathcal{G}_1 \supseteq \mathcal{G}_2, \ \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{G}_1} \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{G}_2}.$$

As in [33], the fundamental domain for the single theta function $\theta(s; z)$ is $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{G}_1}$. As we will show in this section the fundamental domain for the sum of two theta functions $\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}, \mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}$ is $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{G}_2}$, which is larger.

The follow lemma characterizes the basic symmetries of the theta functions $\theta(s; z)$ and $\theta(s; \frac{z+1}{2})$. The proof is trivial so we omit it.

Lemma 3.1.
- *For any $s > 0$, any $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_1$ and $z \in \mathbb{H}$, $\theta(s; \gamma(z)) = \theta(s; z)$.*
- *For any $s > 0$, any $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_2$ and $z \in \mathbb{H}$, $\theta(s; \frac{\gamma(z)+1}{2}) = \theta(s; \frac{z+1}{2})$.*

A corollary of Lemma 3.1 yields

Lemma 3.2. *For any $\rho \in \mathbb{R}$, $\gamma \in \mathcal{G}_2$ and $z \in \mathbb{H}$,*

$$\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(\gamma(z)) = \mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z), \ \mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(\gamma(z)) = \mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(z).$$

Next, we introduce the nonlinear connection between the two functionals $\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(\tau)$ and $\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(\tau)$. Let $w \in \mathcal{G}_2$ be $w : \tau \mapsto \frac{\tau-1}{\tau+1}$ and its the inverse be $\tau : w \mapsto \frac{1+w}{1-w}$. We have

Lemma 3.3.

$$\theta(s; \frac{\tau+1}{2}) = \theta(s; w), \ \theta(s; \tau) = \theta(s; \frac{w+1}{2}). \tag{3.6}$$

$$\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(\tau) = \rho \cdot \mathcal{W}_{2,1/\rho}(w), \ \mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(\tau) = \rho \cdot \mathcal{W}_{1,1/\rho}(w). \tag{3.7}$$

Or equivalently,

$$\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(w) = \rho \cdot \mathcal{W}_{2,1/\rho}(\tau), \ \mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(w) = \rho \cdot \mathcal{W}_{1,1/\rho}(\tau). \tag{3.8}$$

Proof. We check that $\theta(s; \frac{\tau+1}{2}) = \theta(s; \frac{\frac{1+w}{1-w}+1}{2}) = \theta(s; \frac{1}{1-w}) = \theta(s; w)$ since the map $w \mapsto \frac{1}{1-w} \in \mathcal{G}_1$. Similarly $\theta(s; \frac{w+1}{2}) = \theta(s; \frac{\frac{\tau-1}{\tau+1}+1}{2}) = \theta(s; \frac{\tau}{\tau+1}) = \theta(s; \tau)$ since the map $\tau \mapsto \frac{\tau}{1+\tau} \in \mathcal{G}_1$. This proves (3.6).

(3.7) and (3.8) follows from (3.6).

$\square$

Lemma 3.3 builds a connection between the two functionals $\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(\tau)$ and $\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(\tau)$ via a special element in $\mathcal{G}_2$. As an application of Lemma 3.3, we have the following lemma which transfers the computations on unit circles to straight lines.

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose $|w| = 1, w = w_1 + iw_2$. There holds*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial w_1}\mathcal{W}_{p,\rho}(w) = \rho\frac{\sqrt{1-w_1^2}}{1-w_1}\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_2}\mathcal{W}_{q,1/\rho}(i\frac{\sqrt{1-w_1^2}}{1-w_1})$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial w_2}\mathcal{W}_{p,\rho}(w) = -\rho\frac{w_1}{1-w_1}\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_2}\mathcal{W}_{q,1/\rho}(i\frac{\sqrt{1-w_1^2}}{1-w_1}),$$

where $p \neq q \in \{1, 2\}$.

Proof. Let $\tau = \tau_1 + i\tau_2, w = w_1 + iw_2$. Then we have

$$\tau_1 = \frac{1 - w_1^2 - w_2^2}{(1 - w_1)^2 + w_2^2}, \quad \tau_2 = \frac{2w_2}{(1 - w_1)^2 + w_2^2}.$$

Differentiating the identities in Lemma 3.3, we get

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial w_j} \mathcal{W}_{p,\rho}(w) = \rho \sum_{k=1}^{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_k} \mathcal{W}_{q,1/\rho}(\tau) \frac{\partial \tau_k}{\partial w_j}, j = 1, 2. \tag{3.9}$$

On the other hand, for $|w| = 1$, calculations show

$$\tau_1 = 0, \quad \tau_2 = \frac{\sqrt{1 - w_1^2}}{1 - w_1} \tag{3.10}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \tau_2}{\partial w_1} = \frac{\sqrt{1 - w_1^2}}{1 - w_1}, \quad \frac{\partial \tau_2}{\partial w_2} = -\frac{w_1}{1 - w_1}. \tag{3.11}$$

From Theorem 3.2, $\mathcal{W}_{p,\rho}(-\overline{\tau}) = \mathcal{W}_{p,\rho}(\tau), p = 1, 2$. It follows that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_1} \mathcal{W}_{p,\rho}(i\tau_2) = 0, \quad \forall \tau_2 \in \mathbb{R}, p = 1, 2. \tag{3.12}$$

Plugging (3.10), (3.11) and (3.12) into (3.9), one gets the result.

$\square$

4. Monotonicity of $\theta(s; \frac{z+1}{2})$

The main purpose of this section is to establish the monotonicity of the functional $\theta(s; \frac{z+1}{2})$ on its fundamental domain $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{G}_2}$ (defined at (3.3)), which is the following

Theorem 4.1.   • *For any $s > 0$, there holds*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \theta(s; \frac{z+1}{2}) > 0, \quad \forall z \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{G}_2}.$$

     • *Or equivalently, via the map $z \mapsto \frac{z+1}{2}$, for any $s > 0$,*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \theta(s; z) < 0, \quad \forall z \in \Omega_{\mathcal{C}_1}.$$

    Here

$$\Omega_{\mathcal{C}_1} := \{z \mid 0 < x < \frac{1}{2}, y > \sqrt{x - x^2}\}.$$

Remark 4.1. *In Lemma 1 of* [33] *Montgomery proved that*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \theta(s; z) < 0, \quad \forall z \in \Omega_{\mathcal{C}_0} := \{z \in \mathbb{H} : y > \frac{1}{2}, 0 < x < \frac{1}{2}\} \tag{4.1}$$

Theorem 4.1 improves this result to a larger domain $\Omega_{\mathcal{C}_1}$ as $\Omega_{\mathcal{C}_0} \subset \Omega_{\mathcal{C}_1}$. Furthermore, $\Omega_{\mathcal{C}_1}$ contains a corner at $z = 0$, which makes the proof much more involved. We have to divide $\Omega_{\mathcal{C}_1}$ into four different cases to overcome this difficulty.

We state two corollaries related to the functionals $\mathcal{W}_{j,\rho}(z), j = 1, 2$.

Corollary 4.1. *For any $s > 0$,*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \theta(s; z) > 0, \forall z \in \Omega_{\mathcal{C}_2}.$$

Here

$$\Omega_{\mathcal{C}_2} := \{z \mid \frac{1}{2} < x < 1, y > \sqrt{x - x^2}\}.$$

Proof. Since $z \mapsto 1 - \overline{z} \in \mathcal{G}_1$, by Lemma 3.1, we have $\theta(s; 1 - \overline{z}) = \theta(s; z)$. Thus

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\theta(s; 1 - \overline{z}) = -\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\theta(s; z). \tag{4.2}$$

The result follows by (4.2) and Theorem 4.1.

$\square$

By Theorem 4.1 and Corollary 4.1 we have

Corollary 4.2. *For any $\rho > 0$,*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\mathcal{W}_{j,\rho}(z) > 0, \ \forall z \in \mathcal{R}_L, j = 1, 2.$$

Here

$$\mathcal{R}_L := \Omega_{\mathcal{C}_2} \cap \mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{G}_2} = \{z \mid \frac{1}{2} < x < 1, |z| > 1\}.$$

In the remaining part of this section, we prove Theorem 4.1. To prove Theorem 4.1, we use some delicate analysis of the Jacobi theta function and Poisson summation formula.

We first recall the following well-known Jacob triple product formula:

$$\prod_{n=1}^{\infty}(1 - x^{2m})(1 + x^{2m-1}y^2)(1 + \frac{x^{2m-1}}{y^2}) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} x^{n^2}y^{2n} \tag{4.3}$$

for complex numbers x, y with $|x| < 1$, $y \neq 0$.

The Jacob theta function is defined as

$$\vartheta_J(z; \tau) := \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{i\pi n^2 \tau + 2\pi i n z},$$

and the classical one-dimensional theta function is given by

$$\vartheta(X; Y) := \vartheta_J(Y; iX) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\pi n^2 X}e^{2\pi iY}. \tag{4.4}$$

Hence by the Jacob triple product formula (4.3), we have

$$\vartheta(X; Y) = \prod_{n=1}^{\infty}(1 - e^{-2\pi nX})(1 + e^{-2(2n-1)\pi X} + 2e^{-(2n-1)\pi X}\cos(2\pi Y)). \tag{4.5}$$

The following two Lemmas improve the bounds in Montgomery [33]. We provide the proof of Lemma 4.1 and omit the proof of Lemma 4.2 which is similar.

Lemma 4.1. *Assume $X > \frac{1}{5}$. If $\sin(2\pi Y) > 0$, then*

$$-\overline{\vartheta}(X)\sin(2\pi Y) \leq \frac{\partial}{\partial Y}\vartheta(X; Y) \leq -\underline{\vartheta}(X)\sin(2\pi Y).$$

If $\sin(2\pi Y) < 0$, then

$$-\underline{\vartheta}(X)\sin(2\pi Y) \leq \frac{\partial}{\partial Y}\vartheta(X; Y) \leq -\overline{\vartheta}(X)\sin(2\pi Y).$$

Here

$$\underline{\vartheta}(X) := 4\pi e^{-\pi X}(1 - \mu(X)), \ \ \overline{\vartheta}(X) := 4\pi e^{-\pi X}(1 + \mu(X)),$$

and

$$\mu(X) := \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} n^2 e^{-\pi(n^2-1)X}.$$

Proof. We use the same method as in Lemma 1 of [33]. Taking logarithmic on both sides of (4.5) and differentiating $\frac{\partial}{\partial Y}$, we have

$$-\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial Y}\vartheta(X;Y)}{\sin(2\pi Y)} = 4\pi\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}e^{-(2n-1)\pi X}\frac{\vartheta(X;Y)}{1+e^{-2(2n-1)\pi X}+2e^{-(2n-1)\pi X}\cos(2\pi Y)}$$

$$= 4\pi\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}e^{-(2n-1)\pi X}\prod_{m\neq n, m=1}^{\infty}(1-e^{-2\pi mX})(1+e^{-2(2m-1)\pi X}+2e^{-(2m-1)\pi X}\cos(2\pi Y)).$$

(4.6)

One sees from (4.6) that the function $-\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial Y}\vartheta(X;Y)}{\sin(2\pi Y)}$ has a period 1, is decreasing on $[0,\frac{1}{2}]$ and is an even function for Y.

Thus

$$\lim_{Y\to\frac{1}{2}}-\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial Y}\vartheta(X;Y)}{\sin(2\pi Y)} \leq -\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial Y}\vartheta(X;Y)}{\sin(2\pi Y)} \leq \lim_{Y\to 0}-\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial Y}\vartheta(X;Y)}{\sin(2\pi Y)}.$$

(4.7)

By L'Hospital rule we have

$$\frac{1}{2\pi}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial Y^2}\vartheta(X;Y)\mid_{Y=\frac{1}{2}}\leq -\frac{\frac{\partial}{\partial Y}\vartheta(X;Y)}{\sin(2\pi Y)} \leq -\frac{1}{2\pi}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial Y^2}\vartheta(X;Y)\mid_{Y=0}$$

(4.8)

From (4.4), we have that

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial Y^2}\vartheta(X;Y)\mid_{Y=0} = 4\pi e^{-\pi X}(1+\sum_{n=2}^{\infty}n^2 e^{-\pi(n^2-1)X})$$

$$\frac{1}{2\pi}\frac{\partial^2}{\partial Y^2}\vartheta(X;Y)\mid_{Y=\frac{1}{2}} = 4\pi\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(-1)^{n-1}n^2 e^{-n^2\pi X} \geq 4\pi e^{-\pi X}(1-\sum_{n=2}^{\infty}n^2 e^{-\pi(n^2-1)X}).$$

(4.9)

Combining (4.7), (4.8) and (4.9), we obtain the proof of the Lemma.

$\square$

Lemma 4.2. *Assume* $X < \frac{\pi}{2}$. *If* $\sin(2\pi Y) > 0$, *then*

$$-\overline{\vartheta}(X)\sin(2\pi Y) \leq \frac{\partial}{\partial Y}\vartheta(X;Y) \leq -\underline{\vartheta}(X)\sin(2\pi Y).$$

If $\sin(2\pi Y) < 0$, *then*

$$-\underline{\vartheta}(X)\sin(2\pi Y) \leq \frac{\partial}{\partial Y}\vartheta(X;Y) \leq -\overline{\vartheta}(X)\sin(2\pi Y).$$

Here

$$\underline{\vartheta}(X) := X^{-\frac{3}{2}};\quad \overline{\vartheta}(X) := \pi e^{-\frac{\pi}{4X}}X^{-\frac{3}{2}}.$$

In view of (4.4), by Poisson summation formula, one has

$$\vartheta(X;Y) = X^{-\frac{1}{2}}\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}e^{-\frac{\pi(n-Y)^2}{X}}.$$

(4.10)

Thus the two-dimensional theta function can be written in terms of one-dimensional theta function as follows:

$$\theta(s;z) = \sum_{(m,n)\in\mathbb{Z}^2}e^{-s\pi\frac{1}{y}|nz+m|^2} = \sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}e^{-s\pi yn^2}\sum_{m\in\mathbb{Z}}e^{-\frac{s\pi(nx+m)^2}{y}}$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{y}{s}}\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}e^{-s\pi yn^2}\vartheta(\frac{y}{s};-nx) = \sqrt{\frac{y}{s}}\sum_{n\in\mathbb{Z}}e^{-s\pi yn^2}\vartheta(\frac{y}{s};nx)$$

(4.11)

$$= 2\sqrt{\frac{y}{s}}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}e^{-s\pi yn^2}\vartheta(\frac{y}{s};nx).$$

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 4.1.

Proof. By Melin transform, (see [33]), $\theta(\frac{1}{s}; z) = s\theta(s; z)$. Thus we only need to consider the case $s \geq 1$.

From (4.11), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
-\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\theta(s; z) &= -2\sqrt{\frac{y}{s}}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} ne^{-\pi syn^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial Y}\vartheta(\frac{y}{s}; Y)|_{Y=nx} \\
&= 2\sqrt{\frac{y}{s}}\Big(-\sum_{n\leq\frac{1}{2x}} ne^{-\pi syn^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial Y}\vartheta(\frac{y}{s}; Y)|_{Y=nx} - \sum_{n>\frac{1}{2x}} ne^{-\pi syn^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial Y}\vartheta(\frac{y}{s}; Y)|_{Y=nx}\Big) \\
&= 2\sqrt{\frac{y}{s}}\Big(\mathcal{E}_{\alpha,x}^a(z) + \mathcal{E}_{\alpha,x}^b(z)\Big),
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.12}
$$

where

$$
\mathcal{E}_{s,x}^a(z) := -\sum_{n\leq\frac{1}{2x}} ne^{-\pi syn^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial Y}\vartheta(\frac{y}{s}; Y)|_{Y=nx}, \quad \mathcal{E}_{s,x}^b(z) := -\sum_{n>\frac{1}{2x}} ne^{-\pi syn^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial Y}\vartheta(\frac{y}{s}; Y)|_{Y=nx}.
\tag{4.13}
$$

For $\mathcal{E}_{s,x}^a(z)$, by Lemma 4.1, we have that

$$
\mathcal{E}_{s,x}^a(z) \geq \sum_{n\leq\frac{1}{2x}} ne^{-\pi syn^2}\underline{\vartheta}(\frac{y}{s})\sin(2\pi nx) \geq e^{-\pi sy}\underline{\vartheta}(\frac{y}{s})\sin(2\pi x).
\tag{4.14}
$$

Notice that all the terms in the summation of (4.14) are nonnegative.

Let n_0 be the smallest integer such that $n > \frac{1}{2x}$. By Lemma 4.1,

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{E}_{s,x}^b(z)| &\leq \sum_{n>\frac{1}{2x}} ne^{-\pi syn^2}\overline{\vartheta}(\frac{y}{s})|\sin(2\pi nx)| \leq \sum_{n>\frac{1}{2x}} n^2 e^{-\pi syn^2}\overline{\vartheta}(\frac{y}{s})|\sin(2\pi x)| \\
&= n_0^2 e^{-\pi syn_0^2}\overline{\vartheta}(\frac{y}{s})\sin(2\pi x)\cdot\Big(1 + \delta(x)\Big), \text{with } \delta(x) := \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}(1 + \frac{k}{n_0})^2 e^{-\pi sy(2kn_0+k^2)}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.15}
$$

To estimate $\delta(x)$, note that $yn_0 > \frac{\sqrt{1-x}}{2\sqrt{x}}$,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\delta(x) &\leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}(1 + \frac{2k}{n_0} + \frac{k^2}{n_0^2})e^{-2\pi sykn_0} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty}(1 + \frac{2k}{n_0} + \frac{k^2}{n_0^2})e^{-\pi\frac{\sqrt{1-x}}{\sqrt{x}}k} \\
&= \frac{e^{-q(x)}}{1 - e^{-q(x)}} + \frac{2}{n_0}\frac{e^{-q(x)}}{(1 - e^{-q(x)})^2} + \frac{1}{n_0^2}\frac{e^{-q(x)}(1 + e^{-q(x)})}{(1 - e^{-q(x)})^2} \\
&\leq \frac{e^{-q(x)}}{1 - e^{-q(x)}} + 4x\frac{e^{-q(x)}}{(1 - e^{-q(x)})^2} + 4x^2\frac{e^{-q(x)}(1 + e^{-q(x)})}{(1 - e^{-q(x)})^2}
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.16}
$$

with $q(x) := \pi\frac{\sqrt{1-x}}{\sqrt{x}}$. Denote that

$$
\delta_q(x) := \frac{e^{-q(x)}}{1 - e^{-q(x)}} + 4x\frac{e^{-q(x)}}{(1 - e^{-q(x)})^2} + 4x^2\frac{e^{-q(x)}(1 + e^{-q(x)})}{(1 - e^{-q(x)})^2}.
$$

It is easy to see that $\delta_q(x)$ is monotonically increasing on $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$ and hence $\delta(x) \leq \delta_q(\frac{1}{2}) = 0.188822585\cdots < \frac{1}{5}$. Then by (4.15) and (4.16), one has

$$
|\mathcal{E}_{s,x}^b(z)| \leq \frac{6}{5}n_0^2 e^{-\pi syn_0^2}\overline{\vartheta}(\frac{y}{s})\sin(2\pi x).
\tag{4.17}
$$

Combining (4.12), (4.14) with (4.17), one gets

$$
-\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\theta(s; z) \geq 2\sqrt{\frac{y}{s}}\sin(2\pi x)e^{-\pi sy}\overline{\vartheta}(\frac{y}{s})\Big(\frac{\underline{\vartheta}(\frac{y}{s})}{\overline{\vartheta}(\frac{y}{s})} - \frac{6}{5}n_0^2 e^{-\pi sy(n_0^2-1)}\Big),
\tag{4.18}
$$

with $n_0 = [\frac{1}{2x}] + 1$.

Let

$$\mathcal{E}_{s,x}(z) := \frac{\vartheta(\frac{y}{s})}{\overline{\vartheta}(\frac{y}{s})} - \frac{6}{5}n_0^2 e^{-\pi s y(n_0^2 - 1)}. \tag{4.19}$$

By (4.18) it suffices to prove that $\mathcal{E}_{s,x}(z) > 0$.

$\Omega_{\mathcal{C}_1}$ has a corner $z = 0$ which induces the difficulty to get the lower bound estimate for $\mathcal{E}_{s,x}(z)$. Thus we divide the proof into four cases.

Case a: $\frac{y}{s} \leq \frac{1}{2}, x \in (0, \frac{1}{3}]$. In this case, $\frac{s}{y} \geq 2$ and $\frac{\sqrt{1-x}(1-4x^2)}{x^{\frac{3}{2}}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{x-x^2}} > 0$. By Lemma 4.2,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_{s,x}(z) &\geq (\frac{\pi s}{y} - 2)e^{-\frac{\pi s}{4y}} - \frac{6}{5}n_0^2 e^{-\pi s y(n_0^2 - 1)} \\
&\geq (2\pi - 2)e^{-\frac{\pi s}{4\sqrt{x-x^2}}} - \frac{3}{10x^2}e^{-\pi s\sqrt{x-x^2}(\frac{1}{4x^2}-1)} \\
&= \frac{3}{10x^2}e^{-\pi s\sqrt{x-x^2}(\frac{1}{4x^2}-1)}\Big(\frac{20\pi - 20}{3}x^2 e^{\frac{\pi s}{4}(\frac{\sqrt{1-x}(1-4x^2)}{x^{\frac{3}{2}}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{x-x^2}})} - 1\Big) \\
&\geq \frac{3}{10x^2}e^{-\pi s\sqrt{x-x^2}(\frac{1}{4x^2}-1)}\Big(\frac{20\pi - 20}{3}x^2 e^{\frac{\pi}{4}(\frac{\sqrt{1-x}(1-4x^2)}{x^{\frac{3}{2}}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{x-x^2}})} - 1\Big) \\
&> 0
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.20}
$$

where the last inequality follows from elementary calculus because $x \in (0, \frac{1}{3})$.

Case b: $\frac{y}{s} \leq \frac{1}{2}, x \in [\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{2}]$. In this case, $n_0 = [\frac{1}{2x}] + 1 \geq \frac{1}{2x} + \frac{1}{2}$ and we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_{s,x}(z) &\geq (\frac{\pi s}{y} - 2)e^{-\frac{\pi s}{4y}} - \frac{6}{5}n_0^2 e^{-\pi s y(n_0^2 - 1)} \geq (2\pi - 2)e^{-\frac{\pi s}{4y}} - \frac{6}{5}(\frac{1}{2x} + \frac{1}{2})^2 e^{-\pi s y((\frac{1}{2x} + \frac{1}{2})^2 - 1)} \\
&= \frac{3(1+x)^2}{10x^2}e^{-\pi s y((\frac{1}{2x} + \frac{1}{2})^2 - 1)}\Big(\frac{(20\pi - 20)x^2}{9(1+x)^2}e^{\pi s\big(y\frac{(1+x)^2 - 4x^2}{4x^2} - \frac{1}{4y}\big)} - 1\Big) \\
&\geq \frac{3(1+x)^2}{10x^2}e^{-\pi s y((\frac{1}{2x} + \frac{1}{2})^2 - 1)}\Big(\frac{(20\pi - 20)x^2}{9(1+x)^2}e^{\pi s\big(\sqrt{x-x^2}\frac{(1+x)^2 - 4x^2}{4x^2} - \frac{1}{4\sqrt{x-x^2}}\big)} - 1\Big) \\
&\geq \frac{3(1+x)^2}{10x^2}e^{-\pi s y((\frac{1}{2x} + \frac{1}{2})^2 - 1)}\Big(\frac{(20\pi - 20)x^2}{9(1+x)^2}e^{\pi\big(\sqrt{x-x^2}\frac{(1+x)^2 - 4x^2}{4x^2} - \frac{1}{4\sqrt{x-x^2}}\big)} - 1\Big) \\
&> 0
\end{aligned}
$$

where we have used the following elementary inequalities:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{x-x^2}\frac{(1+x)^2 - 4x^2}{4x^2} - \frac{1}{4\sqrt{x-x^2}} &> 0, \quad x \in [0, \frac{1}{2}], \\
\frac{(20\pi - 20)x^2}{9(1+x)^2}e^{\pi\big(\sqrt{x-x^2}\frac{(1+x)^2 - 4x^2}{4x^2} - \frac{1}{4\sqrt{x-x^2}}\big)} - 1 &> 0, \quad x \in [0, \frac{1}{2}].
\end{aligned}
\tag{4.21}
$$

Case c: $\frac{y}{s} \geq \frac{1}{2}, x \in [0, \frac{2}{5}]$. In this case, $ys \geq \frac{s^2}{2} \geq \frac{1}{2}$. By Lemma 4.1,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_{s,x}(z) &\geq \frac{1 - \mu(\frac{y}{s})}{1 + \mu(\frac{y}{s})} - \frac{6}{5}n_0^2 e^{-\pi s y(n_0^2 - 1)} \geq \frac{1 - \mu(\frac{1}{2})}{1 + \mu(\frac{1}{2})} - \frac{3}{10x^2}e^{-\frac{\pi(1-4x^2)}{8x^2}} \\
&\geq \Big(\frac{1 - \mu(\frac{1}{2})}{1 + \mu(\frac{1}{2})} - \frac{3}{10x^2}e^{-\frac{\pi(1-4x^2)}{8x^2}}\Big)\Big|_{x=\frac{2}{5}} = 0.1556238052 > 0.
\end{aligned}
$$

Case d: $\frac{y}{s} \geq \frac{1}{2}, x \in [\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{2}]$. In this case, $n_0 = [\frac{1}{2x}] + 1 \geq \frac{1}{2x} + \frac{1}{2}$ and $y \geq \frac{s^2}{2} \geq \frac{1}{2}$. By Lemma 4.1,

$$\mathcal{E}_{s,x}(z) \geq \frac{1 - \mu(\frac{y}{s})}{1 + \mu(\frac{y}{s})} - \frac{6}{5} n_0^2 e^{-\pi sy(n_0^2 - 1)} \geq \frac{1 - \mu(\frac{1}{2})}{1 + \mu(\frac{1}{2})} - \frac{3(1 + x)^2}{10x^2} e^{-\frac{\pi}{2}\left((\frac{1+x}{2x})^2 - 1\right)}$$

$$\geq \left(\frac{1 - \mu(\frac{1}{2})}{1 + \mu(\frac{1}{2})} - \frac{3(1 + x)^2}{10x^2} e^{-\frac{\pi}{2}\left((\frac{1+x}{2x})^2 - 1\right)} \right) \Big|_{x = \frac{1}{2}} = 0.7866071958\cdots > 0.$$

Combining cases (a)-(d), (4.18) and (4.19), the proof of Theorem 4.1 is completed.

$\square$

5. MONOTONICITY OF $\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z)$ AND $\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(z)$

Let the closure of the left-half fundamental domain corresponding to $\mathcal{G}_2$ be

$$\mathcal{R}_2 = \{z \in \mathbb{H} : 0 \leq x \leq \frac{1}{2}, |z| \geq 1\}.$$

In this section, we aim to establish the following property of the pair $\mathcal{W}_{j,\rho}(z), j = 1, 2$: there exists ρ_* such that for $\forall z \in \mathcal{R}_2$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z) \geq 0$ when $0 \leq \rho \leq \rho_*$, and $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(z) \geq 0$ when $0 \leq \rho \leq \frac{1}{\rho_*}$. (In fact we will choose $\rho_* = \frac{1}{20}$.) This property plays an important role in finding the minimizers and will be proved in Propositions 5.1 and 5.2.

We begin with

Proposition 5.1. *For $0 \leq \rho \leq \rho_* := 1/20$, there holds*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z) \geq 0$$

for $\forall z \in \mathcal{R}_2$. The equality holds only possible when $x = 0$ or $\frac{1}{2}$.

Proof. From (4.11), we obtain that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\left((\frac{y}{4}\sum_n e^{-\pi y n^2}\vartheta(\frac{y}{4}; n\frac{x+1}{2}) + \rho\sqrt{y}\sum_n e^{-\pi y n^2}\vartheta(y; nx) \right)$$

$$= \frac{\sqrt{y}}{2}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n e^{-\pi y n^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial Y}\vartheta(\frac{y}{4}; Y)|_{Y=n\frac{x+1}{2}} + 2\rho\sqrt{y}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n e^{-\pi y n^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial Y}\vartheta(y; Y)|_{Y=nx} \right)$$

$$= \frac{\sqrt{y}}{2}e^{-\pi y}\frac{\partial}{\partial Y}\vartheta(\frac{y}{4}; Y)|_{Y=\frac{x+1}{2}} + \sqrt{y}e^{-4\pi y}\frac{\partial}{\partial Y}\vartheta(\frac{y}{4}; Y)|_{Y=x+1} \quad (5.1)$$

$$+ 2\rho\sqrt{y}e^{-\pi y}\frac{\partial}{\partial Y}\vartheta(y; Y)|_{Y=x} + 4\rho\sqrt{y}e^{-4\pi y}\frac{\partial}{\partial Y}\vartheta(y; Y)|_{Y=2x}$$

$$+ \frac{\sqrt{y}}{2}\sum_{n=3}^{\infty} n e^{-\pi y n^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial Y}\vartheta(\frac{y}{4}; Y)|_{Y=n\frac{x+1}{2}} + 2\rho\sqrt{y}\sum_{n=3}^{\infty} n e^{-\pi y n^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial Y}\vartheta(y; Y)|_{Y=nx}$$

$$\mathcal{W}_{1,x}^a(z) + \mathcal{W}_{1,x}^b(z) + \mathcal{W}_{1,x}^c(z)$$

where $\mathcal{W}_{1,x}^a(z), \mathcal{W}_{1,x}^b(z)$ and $\mathcal{W}_{1,x}^c(z)$ are defined at the last equality.

By Lemma 4.1, we see that

$$\mathcal{W}_{1,x}^a(z) + \mathcal{W}_{1,x}^b(z) \geq \frac{\sqrt{y}}{2}e^{-\pi y}\underline{\vartheta}(\frac{y}{4})\sin(\pi x) - \sqrt{y}e^{-4\pi y}\overline{\vartheta}(\frac{y}{4})\sin(2\pi x)$$

$$- 2\rho\sqrt{y}e^{-\pi y}\overline{\vartheta}(y)\sin(2\pi x) - 4\rho\sqrt{y}e^{-4\pi y}\overline{\vartheta}(y)\sin(4\pi x). \quad (5.2)$$

Since $|\sin(nx)| \leq n|\sin(x)|$ for any $x \in \mathcal{R}_2$, again by Lemma 4.1, we have

$$\mathcal{W}_{1,x}^c(z) \geq -\frac{\sqrt{y}}{4}\sum_{n=3}^{\infty} n^2 e^{-\pi y n^2}\overline{\vartheta}(\frac{y}{4})\sin(2\pi x) - 2\rho\sqrt{y}\sum_{n=3}^{\infty} n^2 e^{-\pi y n^2}\overline{\vartheta}(y)\sin(2\pi x). \quad (5.3)$$

Plugging (5.2) and (5.3) in (5.1), we get

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z) \geq \frac{\sqrt{y}}{2}e^{-\pi y}\underline{\vartheta}(\frac{y}{4})\sin\pi x - \sqrt{y}e^{-4\pi y}\overline{\vartheta}(\frac{y}{4})\sin(2\pi x)\big(1+\frac{1}{4}\sum_{n=3}^{\infty}n^2 e^{-\pi y(n^2-4)}\big)$$

$$- 2\rho\sqrt{y}e^{-\pi y}\overline{\vartheta}(y)\sin(2\pi x)\big(1+\sum_{n=2}^{\infty}n^2 e^{-\pi y(n^2-1)}\big)$$

$$= \sqrt{y}e^{-\pi y}\sin(\pi x)\Big(\frac{1}{2}\underline{\vartheta}(\frac{y}{4}) - 2e^{-3\pi y}\overline{\vartheta}(\frac{y}{4})\cos(\pi x)(1+\sigma_1) - 4\rho\overline{\vartheta}(y)\cos(\pi x)(1+\sigma_2)\Big)$$

$$\geq \sqrt{y}e^{-\pi y}\sin(\pi x)\Big(\frac{1}{2}\underline{\vartheta}(\frac{y}{4}) - 2e^{-3\pi y}\overline{\vartheta}(\frac{y}{4})(1+\sigma_1) - 4\rho\overline{\vartheta}(y)(1+\sigma_2)\Big),$$

(5.4)

where

$$\sigma_1(y) := \frac{1}{4}\sum_{n=3}^{\infty}n^2 e^{-\pi y(n^2-4)}, \quad \sigma_2(y) := \sum_{n=2}^{\infty}n^2 e^{-\pi y(n^2-1)},$$

and $\sigma_1(y), \sigma_1(y)$ are small. (In fact $\sigma_1(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}) \approx 2.781 \cdot 10^{-6}$, $\sigma_2(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}) \approx 1.14105 \cdot 10^{-3}$.)

By the lower and upper bound estimates in Lemma 4.1, from (5.4), we see that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z) \geq \sqrt{y}e^{-\pi y}\sin(\pi x)\Big(2\pi(1-\mu(\frac{y}{4}))e^{-\frac{\pi y}{4}} - 8\pi e^{-3\pi y}(1+\mu(\frac{y}{4}))e^{-\frac{\pi y}{4}}(1+\sigma_1)$$

$$- 16\rho\pi(1+\mu(y))e^{-\pi y}(1+\sigma_2)\Big)$$

$$= 4\pi\sqrt{y}e^{-\frac{5\pi y}{4}}\sin(\pi x)\Big(\frac{1}{2}(1-\mu(\frac{y}{4})) - 2(1+\sigma_1)e^{-3\pi y}(1+\mu(\frac{y}{4}))$$

(5.5)

$$- 4\rho(1+\sigma_2)e^{-\frac{3\pi y}{4}}(1+\mu(y))\Big)$$

$$= 4\pi\sqrt{y}e^{-\frac{5\pi y}{4}}\sin(\pi x)\vartheta_{\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}}(y)$$

where $\vartheta_{\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}}(y)$ is defined at the last equality.

It suffices to prove that

$$\vartheta_{\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}}(y) > 0.$$

First it is easy to see that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\rho}\vartheta_{\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}}(y) > 0, \ y > 0. \tag{5.6}$$

Since the functions $\mu(y), \sigma_1, \sigma_2$ are decreasing on $y > 0$, it follows that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\vartheta_{\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}}(y) > 0, \ y > 0. \tag{5.7}$$

A direct calculation gives

$$\vartheta_{\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}}(y)\big|_{y=\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2},\rho=\frac{1}{20}} = 0.1933\cdots > 0$$

which implies

$$\vartheta_{\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}} > 0, \ \text{for } y \geq \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}, \rho \leq \frac{1}{20}$$

by the monotonicity properties (5.6) and (5.7). $\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(y)$ vanishes only possible when $x = 0$ or $\frac{1}{2}$ by (5.5). The proof is completed.

$\square$

We then have a similar monotonicity for $\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(z)$.

Proposition 5.2. *For $\rho \leq \frac{1}{\rho_*} = 20$, there holds*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(z) \geq 0$$

for $\forall z \in \mathcal{R}_2$. The equality holds only possible when $x = 0$ or $\frac{1}{2}$.

Proof. The proof is similar to Proposition 5.1. Using (4.11), we see that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho_\Gamma}(z) = \frac{\partial}{\partial x}\Big(\sqrt{\frac{y}{2}}\sum_n e^{-\frac{1}{2}\pi yn^2}\vartheta(\frac{y}{2};n\frac{x+1}{2}) + \rho\sqrt{\frac{y}{2}}\sum_n e^{-2\pi yn^2}\vartheta(\frac{y}{2};nx)\Big)$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{y}{2}}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} ne^{-\frac{1}{2}\pi yn^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial Y}\vartheta(\frac{y}{2};Y)|_{Y=n\frac{x+1}{2}} + 2\rho\sqrt{\frac{y}{2}}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} ne^{-2\pi yn^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial Y}\vartheta(\frac{y}{2};Y)|_{Y=nx}$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{y}{2}}e^{-\frac{1}{2}\pi y}\frac{\partial}{\partial Y}\vartheta(\frac{y}{2};Y)|_{Y=\frac{x+1}{2}} + 2\sqrt{\frac{y}{2}}e^{-2\pi y}\frac{\partial}{\partial Y}\vartheta(\frac{y}{2};Y)|_{Y=x+1}$$

$$+ 2\rho\sqrt{\frac{y}{2}}e^{-2\pi y}\frac{\partial}{\partial Y}\vartheta(\frac{y}{2};Y)|_{Y=x}$$

$$+ \sqrt{\frac{y}{2}}\sum_{n=3}^{\infty} ne^{-\frac{1}{2}\pi yn^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial Y}\vartheta(\frac{y}{2};Y)|_{Y=n\frac{x+1}{2}} + 2\rho\sqrt{\frac{y}{2}}\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} ne^{-2\pi yn^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial Y}\vartheta(\frac{y}{2};Y)|_{Y=nx}$$

$$= \mathcal{W}_{2,x}^a(z) + \mathcal{W}_{2,x}^b(z) + \mathcal{W}_{2,x}^c(z)$$

(5.8)

where $\mathcal{W}_{2,x}^a(z), \mathcal{W}_{2,x}^b(z)$ and $\mathcal{W}_{2,x}^c(z)$ are defined at the last equality.
By Lemma 4.1, we also have

$$\mathcal{W}_{2,x}^a(z) + \mathcal{W}_{2,x}^b(z) \geq \sqrt{\frac{y}{2}}e^{-\frac{1}{2}\pi y}\underline{\vartheta}(\frac{y}{2})\sin(\pi x) - (2+2\rho)\sqrt{\frac{y}{2}}e^{-2\pi y}\overline{\vartheta}(\frac{y}{2})\sin(2\pi x).$$

Since $|\sin(nx)| \leq n|\sin(x)|$ for any $x \in \mathcal{R}_2$, again by Lemma 4.1, we see that

$$\mathcal{W}_{2,x}^c(z) \geq -\frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{y}{2}}\sum_{n=3}^{\infty} n^2 e^{-\frac{1}{2}\pi yn^2}\overline{\vartheta}(\frac{y}{2})\sin(2\pi x) - \rho\sqrt{\frac{y}{2}}\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} n^2 e^{-2\pi yn^2}\overline{\vartheta}(\frac{y}{2})\sin(2\pi x).$$

Plugging the above inequality into (5.8), we get that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(z) \geq \sqrt{\frac{y}{2}}e^{-\frac{1}{2}\pi y}\underline{\vartheta}(\frac{y}{2})\sin(\pi x) - (2+2\rho+\sigma_3(y)+\rho\sigma_4(y))\sqrt{\frac{y}{2}}e^{-2\pi y}\overline{\vartheta}(\frac{y}{2})\sin(2\pi x)$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{y}{2}}e^{-\frac{1}{2}\pi y}\sin(\pi x)\Big(\underline{\vartheta}(\frac{y}{2}) - (4+4\rho+2\sigma_3(y)+2\rho\sigma_4(y))\cos(\pi x)e^{-\frac{3}{2}\pi y}\overline{\vartheta}(\frac{y}{2})\Big),$$

(5.9)

where

$$\sigma_3(y) := \frac{1}{2}\sum_{n=3}^{\infty} n^2 e^{-\frac{1}{2}\pi y(n^2-4)}, \quad \sigma_4(y) := \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} n^2 e^{-2\pi y(n^2-1)}.$$

$\sigma_3(y), \sigma_4(y)$ are functions with small size. (In fact $\sigma_3(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}) \approx 5.00388 \cdot 10^{-3}$, $\sigma_4(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}) \approx 3.255011 \cdot 10^{-7}$.)
By the lower and upper bound estimates in Lemma 4.1, from (5.9) one deduces that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(z) \geq \sqrt{\frac{y}{2}}e^{-\frac{1}{2}\pi y}\sin(\pi x)\Big(4\pi(1-\mu(\frac{y}{2}))e^{-\frac{\pi y}{2}}$$

$$- 4\pi(4+4\rho+2\sigma_3(y)+2\rho\sigma_4(y))\cos(\pi x)e^{-2\pi y}(1+\mu(\frac{y}{2}))\Big)$$

$$\geq 4\pi\sqrt{\frac{y}{2}}e^{-\pi y}\sin(\pi x)\Big((1-\mu(\frac{y}{2}))$$

$$- (4+4\rho+2\sigma_3(y)+2\rho\sigma_4(y))\cos(\pi x)e^{-\frac{3}{2}\pi y}(1+\mu(\frac{y}{2}))\Big).$$

Let

$$\vartheta_{\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}}(z) := (1-\mu(\frac{y}{2})) - (4+4\rho+2\sigma_3(y)+2\rho\sigma_4(y))\cos(\pi x)e^{-\frac{3}{2}\pi y}(1+\mu(\frac{y}{2})).$$

Then

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(z) \geq 4\pi \sqrt{\frac{y}{2}} e^{-\pi y} \sin(\pi x) \cdot \vartheta_{\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}}(y) \qquad (5.10)$$

It suffices to prove that

$$\vartheta_{\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}}(z) > 0, \ \text{ for } z \in \mathcal{R}_2, \rho \leq \frac{1}{\rho_*} = 20.$$

Now it is easy to see that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} \vartheta_{\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}}(y) < 0; y > 0, \ \text{ and } \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \vartheta_{\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}}(z) > 0; x \in [0, \frac{1}{2}], y > 0. \qquad (5.11)$$

Observe that the functions $\mu(y), \sigma_3, \sigma_4$ are decreasing on $y > 0$. It follows that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y} \vartheta_{\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}}(z) > 0, \ y > 0. \qquad (5.12)$$

To complete the proof, we prove that $\vartheta_{\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}}(z)$ is positive on the following three unbounded rectangular domains:

$$\mathcal{R}_a = \{z \mid x \in [0, \frac{1}{4}], y \geq \frac{\sqrt{15}}{4}\}; \ \mathcal{R}_b = \{z \mid x \in [\frac{1}{4}, \frac{3}{8}], y \geq \frac{\sqrt{55}}{8}\}; \ \mathcal{R}_c = \{z \mid x \in [\frac{3}{8}, \frac{1}{2}], y \geq \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\}.$$

It is clearly that

$$\mathcal{R}_\Gamma \subset \mathcal{R}_a \cup \mathcal{R}_b \cup \mathcal{R}_c. \qquad (5.13)$$

A direct calculation gives

$$\vartheta_{\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}}(z)\big|_{x=0, y=\frac{\sqrt{15}}{4}, \rho=20} = 0.0450964128 \cdots > 0$$

$$\vartheta_{\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}}(z)\big|_{x=\frac{1}{4}, y=\frac{\sqrt{55}}{8}, \rho=20} = 0.1583739562 \cdots > 0$$

$$\vartheta_{\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}}(z)\big|_{x=\frac{3}{8}, y=\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}, \rho=20} = 0.3525036217 \cdots > 0.$$

This yields

$$\vartheta_{\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}}(z) > 0, \ \text{ for } z \in \mathcal{R}_a \cup \mathcal{R}_b \cup \mathcal{R}_c$$

by the monotonicity properties (5.11) and (5.12). Therefore by (5.13)

$$\vartheta_{\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}}(z) > 0, \ \text{ for } z \in \mathcal{R}_2.$$

By (5.10) $\frac{\partial}{\partial x} \mathcal{W}_{2,\rho_*}(z)$ vanishes only at $x = 0$ or $\frac{1}{2}$. This completes the proof. □

6. THE BEHAVIOR OF $\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z)$ ON THE $y-$AXIS

In this section, we study the property of the functional $\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}$ on the $y-$axis. We will prove that on the $y-$axis, depending on ρ, $\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z)$ has either 1 or 3 critical points. This gives the precise characterization of the minimizers of $\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z)$ on the $y-$axis. The proof relies crucially on a novel property of Jacob theta function proved in Theorem 6.1 below.

Proposition 6.1. *There exists a threshold ρ_1 which is the unique solution of $\frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} \mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(yi) \big|_{y=1} = 0$, (in fact, $\rho_1 = -\frac{\mathcal{Y}''(1)}{\mathcal{X}''(1)} \sim 0.04016680351 \cdots$), such that*
1. if $\rho \in [\rho_1, +\infty)$, the function $y \to \mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(yi), y > 0$ admits only one critical point at $y = 1$, and $\frac{\partial}{\partial y} \mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(yi) < 0$ if $y \in (0, 1)$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial y} \mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(yi) > 0$ if $y \in (1, \infty)$;

2. *if $\rho \in [0, \rho_1)$, the function $y \to \mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(yi), y > 0$ admits only three critical points at $y_{1,\rho}$, 1 and $\frac{1}{y_{1,\rho}}$, where $y_{1,\rho} \in (1, \sqrt{3}]$. Moreover*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(yi) < 0 \text{ if } y \in (0, \frac{1}{y_{1,\rho}}),$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(yi) > 0 \text{ if } y \in (\frac{1}{y_{1,\rho}}, 1),$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(yi) < 0 \text{ if } y \in (1, y_{1,\rho}),$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(yi) > 0 \text{ if } y \in (y_{1,\rho}, \infty).$$

The critical point $y_{1,\rho}$ is the unique solution of $\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(yi) = 0$, $y \in (1, \sqrt{3}]$.
   Furthermore if $\rho \in [0, \rho_1]$, then

$$\frac{\partial y_{1,\rho}}{\partial \rho} < 0. \tag{6.1}$$

To prove Proposition 6.1, we need to use some properties of the Jacobi theta functions defined at (1.10)-(1.11). They satisfy the transformation property

$$\vartheta_3(\frac{1}{y}) = \sqrt{y}\vartheta_3(y), \ \vartheta_2(\frac{1}{y}) = \sqrt{y}\vartheta_4(y)$$

$$\vartheta_4(\frac{1}{y}) = \sqrt{y}\vartheta_2(y), \ \ \vartheta_4(y) = \vartheta_3(4y) - \vartheta_2(4y). \tag{6.2}$$

It is easy to see that for $z = yi$

$$\theta(s; yi) = \sum_m \sum_n e^{-s\frac{\pi}{y}(n^2 + m^2 y^2)}, \ \theta(s; \frac{yi+1}{2}) = \sum_m \sum_n e^{-s\frac{\pi}{y}((\frac{m}{2}+n)^2 + \frac{m^2}{4}y^2)}. \tag{6.3}$$

We first express $\theta(s; yi), \theta(s; \frac{yi+1}{2})$ as products of Jacobi theta functions, which is a starting point of our analysis.

Lemma 6.1. *It holds that*

$$\theta(s; yi) = \vartheta_3(sy)\vartheta_3(\frac{y}{s}), \ \theta(s; \frac{yi+1}{2}) = \vartheta_3(sy)\vartheta_3(\frac{y}{s}) + \vartheta_2(sy)\vartheta_2(\frac{s}{y}).$$

Proof. The first one is straightforward:

$$\theta(s; yi) = \sum_n e^{-s\frac{\pi}{y}n^2} \sum_m e^{-s\pi y m^2} = \vartheta_3(sy)\vartheta_3(\frac{s}{y}).$$

For the second one,

$$\theta(s; \frac{yi+1}{2}) = \sum_m \sum_n e^{-s\frac{\pi}{y}((\frac{m}{2}+n)^2 + \frac{m^2}{4}y^2)} = \sum_{p \equiv q(\mod 2)} e^{-\frac{s\pi}{4}(\frac{1}{y}p^2 + yq^2)}$$

$$= \sum_{p=2m', q=2n'} e^{-\frac{s\pi}{4}(\frac{1}{y}p^2 + yq^2)} + \sum_{p=2m'+1, q=2n'+1} e^{-\frac{s\pi}{4}(\frac{1}{y}p^2 + yq^2)}$$

$$= \sum_{m'} e^{-s\pi\frac{1}{y}m'^2} \sum_{n'} e^{-s\pi yn'^2} + \sum_{m'} e^{-\frac{s\pi}{4}\frac{1}{y}(2m'+1)^2} \sum_{n'} e^{-\frac{s\pi}{4}y(2n'+1)^2}$$

$$= \vartheta_3(sy)\vartheta_3(\frac{s}{y}) + \vartheta_2(sy)\vartheta_2(\frac{s}{y}).$$

$\square$

The following Lemma follows from Lemma 3.1. We single it out for the convenience of our analysis here.

Lemma 6.2. *For any $s > 0$, $\theta(s; yi)$ and $\theta(s; \frac{yi+1}{2})$ both satisfy the functional equation*

$$\mathcal{H}(\frac{1}{y}) = \mathcal{H}(y). \tag{6.4}$$

Consequently, $\mathcal{H}'(\frac{1}{y}) = -y^2 \mathcal{H}'(y)$. In particular, $\mathcal{H}'(1) = 0$, that is, $y = 1$ is always a critical point of $\theta(s; yi), \theta(s; \frac{yi+1}{2})$.

For $s = 1$, by Lemma 6.1 and transformation (6.2), we obtain that

Lemma 6.3.

$$\theta(1; yi) = \sqrt{y}\vartheta_3^2(y), \quad \theta(2; \frac{yi+1}{2}) = \frac{\sqrt{y}}{2}\Big(\vartheta_3(4y)\vartheta_3(\frac{y}{4}) + \vartheta_2(4y)\vartheta_4(\frac{y}{4})\Big). \tag{6.5}$$

To prove Proposition 6.1, we first prove a monotonicity property of $\theta(1; yi)$ and $\theta(2; \frac{yi+1}{2})$ in Lemma 6.4, which can be viewed as the particular case of Proposition 6.1. Then we establish the key Theorem 6.1, in which a novel property about the quotient of Jacobi theta functions is proved.

The following Lemma is known in [10, 33].

Lemma 6.4.
- *The function $y \to \theta(s; yi), y > 0$, has only one critical point at $y = 1$. Furthermore*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\theta(s; yi) < 0 \text{ for } y \in (0, 1); \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial y}\theta(s; yi) > 0 \text{ for } y \in (1, \infty).$$

- *For any $s > 0$, the function $y \to \theta(s; \frac{yi+1}{2}), y > 0$, has three critical points at $\frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}$, 1 and $\sqrt{3}$.*

We now state Theorem 6.1 whose proof is much involved. We use a combination of functional equations, error terms analysis and several new observations. Let

$$\mathcal{X}(y) := \vartheta_3(y)\vartheta_3(\frac{1}{y}) = \sqrt{y}\vartheta_3^2(y), \mathcal{Y}(y) := 2\big(\vartheta_3(4y)\vartheta_3(\frac{4}{y}) + \vartheta_2(4y)\vartheta_2(\frac{4}{y})\big) = \sqrt{y}\big(\vartheta_3(4y)\vartheta_3(\frac{y}{4}) + \vartheta_2(4y)\vartheta_4(\frac{y}{4})\big).$$

Theorem 6.1. *The function $y \mapsto \frac{\mathcal{Y}'(y)}{\mathcal{X}'(y)}, y > 0$ has only one critical point at $y = 1$. Furthermore $\left(\frac{\mathcal{Y}'(y)}{\mathcal{X}'(y)}\right)' < 0$ for $y \in (0, 1)$ and $\left(\frac{\mathcal{Y}'(y)}{\mathcal{X}'(y)}\right)' > 0$ for $y \in (1, \infty)$.*

Proof. Denote $\mathcal{Z}(y) := \frac{\mathcal{Y}'(y)}{\mathcal{X}'(y)}$. By Lemma 6.4, the function $\mathcal{Z}(y)$ is well-defined. By Lemma 6.2, we also have

$$\mathcal{X}'(\frac{1}{y}) = -y^2\mathcal{X}'(y), \ \mathcal{Y}'(\frac{1}{y}) = -y^2\mathcal{Y}'(y). \tag{6.6}$$

Hence

$$\mathcal{Z}(\frac{1}{y}) = \mathcal{Z}(y),$$

and

$$\mathcal{Z}'(\frac{1}{y}) = -y^2\mathcal{Z}'(y). \tag{6.7}$$

Consequently, $\mathcal{Z}'(1) = 0$, i.e., $y = 1$ is the critical point of $\mathcal{Z}(y)$.

By (6.7), it suffices to prove that

$$\mathcal{Z}'(y) > 0, \text{ for } y \in (1, \infty). \tag{6.8}$$

By the explicit expression of Jacobi theta functions (1.11) and (6.2), we start with

$$
\mathcal{X}(y) = \sqrt{y}(1 + 2\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\pi n^2 y})^2
$$

$$
= \left(\sqrt{y} + 4\sqrt{y}e^{-\pi y} + 4\sqrt{y}e^{-2\pi y} + 4\sqrt{y}e^{-4\pi y}\right)
$$

$$
+ \left(4\sqrt{y}\sum_{n=3}^{\infty} e^{-\pi n^2 y} + 4\sqrt{y}\left(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\pi n^2 y}\right)^2 + 8\sqrt{y}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\pi(n^2+1)y}\right)
$$

$$
:= \mathcal{X}_a(y) + \mathcal{X}_e(y)
$$

where $\mathcal{X}_a(y)$ and $\mathcal{X}_e(y)$ are defined at the last equality. $\mathcal{X}_a$ is the major part and $\mathcal{X}_e$ is the error part. In fact, we have that for some constant $C > 0$

$$
\|\mathcal{X}_a(y)\|_{C^2} \leq C\sqrt{y}e^{-5\pi y}, \text{ for } y > 1. \tag{6.9}
$$

For $\mathcal{Y}(y)$, again by (1.11) and (6.2), one first has

$$
\sqrt{y}\vartheta_3(4y)\vartheta_3(\frac{y}{4}) = \sqrt{y}(1 + 2\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-4\pi n^2 y})(1 + 2\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{1}{4}\pi n^2 y})
$$

$$
= \sqrt{y} + 2\sqrt{y}e^{-\frac{1}{4}\pi y} + 2\sqrt{y}e^{-\pi y} + 2\sqrt{y}e^{-\frac{9}{4}\pi y} + 4\sqrt{y}e^{-4\pi y}
$$

$$
+ 2\sqrt{y}\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} e^{-4\pi n^2 y} + 2\sqrt{y}\sum_{n=5}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{1}{4}\pi n^2 y} + 4\sqrt{y}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-4\pi n^2 y}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{1}{4}\pi n^2 y}
$$

We regroup the terms as

$$
\sqrt{y}\vartheta_2(4y)\vartheta_4(\frac{y}{4}) = \sqrt{y}\vartheta_2(4y)\big(\vartheta_3(y) - \vartheta_2(y)\big) = \sqrt{y}\vartheta_2(4y)\vartheta_3(y) - \sqrt{y}\vartheta_2(4y)\vartheta_2(y)
$$

$$
= 2\sqrt{y}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\pi(2n-1)^2 y} + 4\sqrt{y}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\pi(2n-1)^2 y}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\pi n^2 y}
$$

$$
- 4\sqrt{y}e^{-\frac{5}{4}\pi y}(1 + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} e^{-\pi((n-\frac{1}{2})^2 - \frac{1}{4})y})(1 + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} e^{-\pi((2n-1)^2-1)y})
$$

$$
= 2\sqrt{y}e^{-\pi y} + 4\sqrt{y}e^{-2\pi y} - 4\sqrt{y}e^{-\frac{5}{4}\pi y} - 4\sqrt{y}e^{-\frac{13}{4}\pi y}
$$

$$
+ 4\sqrt{y}\big(\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} e^{-\pi((2n-1)^2+1)y} + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} e^{-\pi(n^2+1)y} + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} e^{-\pi(2n-1)^2 y}\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} e^{-\pi n^2 y}\big)
$$

$$
- 4\sqrt{y}e^{-\frac{5}{4}\pi y}\big(\sum_{n=3}^{\infty} e^{-\pi((n-\frac{1}{2})^2 - \frac{1}{4})y} + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} e^{-\pi((2n-1)^2-1)y}
$$

$$
+ \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} e^{-\pi((n-\frac{1}{2})^2 - \frac{1}{4})y} \cdot \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} e^{-\pi((2n-1)^2-1)y}\big).
$$

Now let the approximate part of $\mathcal{Y}(y)$ be

$$
\mathcal{Y}_a(y) := \sqrt{y} + 2\sqrt{y}e^{-\frac{1}{4}\pi y} + 4\sqrt{y}e^{-\pi y} + 2\sqrt{y}e^{-\frac{9}{4}\pi y} + 4\sqrt{y}e^{-2\pi y} + 4\sqrt{y}e^{-4\pi y} - 4\sqrt{y}e^{-\frac{5}{4}\pi y} - 4\sqrt{y}e^{-\frac{13}{4}\pi y}
$$

and the error part by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Y}_e(y) :=& 2\sqrt{y}\sum_{n=2}^{\infty}e^{-4\pi n^2 y} + 2\sqrt{y}\sum_{n=5}^{\infty}e^{-\frac{1}{4}\pi n^2 y} + 4\sqrt{y}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}e^{-4\pi n^2 y}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty}e^{-\frac{1}{4}\pi n^2 y}\\
&+ 4\sqrt{y}\Big(\sum_{n=2}^{\infty}e^{-\pi((2n-1)^2+1)y} + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty}e^{-\pi(n^2+1)y} + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty}e^{-\pi(2n-1)^2 y}\sum_{n=2}^{\infty}e^{-\pi n^2 y}\Big)\\
&- 4\sqrt{y}e^{-\frac{5}{4}\pi y}\Big(\sum_{n=3}^{\infty}e^{-\pi((n-\frac{1}{2})^2-\frac{1}{4})y} + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty}e^{-\pi((2n-1)^2-1)y} + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty}e^{-\pi((n-\frac{1}{2})^2-\frac{1}{4})y}\cdot\sum_{n=2}^{\infty}e^{-\pi((2n-1)^2-1)y}\Big).
\end{aligned}
$$

Then

$$
\mathcal{Y}(y) = \mathcal{Y}_a(y) + \mathcal{Y}_e(y) \tag{6.10}
$$

and we have following estimate for $\mathcal{Y}_e(y)$:

$$
\|\mathcal{Y}_e(y)\|_{C^2} \le C\sqrt{y}e^{-\frac{17}{4}\pi y}.
$$

To prove (6.8), we divide the proof into two regions of y: the large y case $y \in [1.1, \infty)$ and the small y case $y \in (1, 1.1)$.

Case (a): $y \in [1.1, \infty)$. In this case we have

$$
\mathcal{Z}'(y) = \frac{\mathcal{Y}''(y)\mathcal{X}'(y) - \mathcal{X}''(y)\mathcal{Y}'(y)}{(\mathcal{X}'(y))^2}.
$$

By Lemma 6.4, to prove Case (a) it suffices to prove that

$$
\mathcal{Y}''(y)\mathcal{X}'(y) - \mathcal{X}''(y)\mathcal{Y}'(y) > 0 \ \text{ if } \ y \in (1.1, \infty).
$$

By (6.9) and (6.10), there holds

$$
\mathcal{Y}''\mathcal{X}' - \mathcal{Y}''\mathcal{X}' = \Big(\mathcal{Y}_a''\mathcal{X}_a' - \mathcal{X}_a''\mathcal{Y}_a'\Big) + \Big(\mathcal{Y}_e''\mathcal{X}' - \mathcal{Y}_e'\mathcal{X}'' + \mathcal{Y}_a''\mathcal{X}_e' - \mathcal{X}_e''\mathcal{Y}_a'\Big)
$$

where $\Big(\mathcal{Y}_a''\mathcal{X}_a' - \mathcal{X}_a''\mathcal{Y}_a'\Big)$ and $\Big(\mathcal{Y}_e''\mathcal{X}' - \mathcal{Y}_e'\mathcal{X}'' + \mathcal{Y}_a''\mathcal{X}_e' - \mathcal{X}_e''\mathcal{Y}_a'\Big)$ are the approximate part and the error part of $\mathcal{Y}''\mathcal{X}' - \mathcal{Y}''\mathcal{X}'$ respectively. We shall use the approximate part to control the error part.

To obtain the lower bound of $\Big(\mathcal{Y}_a''\mathcal{X}_a' - \mathcal{X}_a''\mathcal{Y}_a'\Big)$, after subtracting some proper factors, one finds

$$
y \to \frac{16y}{\pi}e^{\frac{1}{4}\pi y}\Big(\mathcal{Y}_a''\mathcal{X}_a' - \mathcal{X}_a''\mathcal{Y}_a'\Big)(y) \tag{6.11}
$$

is monotonically increasing.

For the error part $\Big(\mathcal{Y}_e''\mathcal{X}' - \mathcal{Y}_e'\mathcal{X}'' + \mathcal{Y}_a''\mathcal{X}_e' - \mathcal{X}_e''\mathcal{Y}_a'\Big)$, one has the estimate

$$
\Big|\Big(\mathcal{Y}_e''\mathcal{X}' - \mathcal{Y}_e'\mathcal{X}'' + \mathcal{Y}_a''\mathcal{X}_e' - \mathcal{X}_e''\mathcal{Y}_a'\Big)(y)\Big| \le C\sqrt{y}e^{-\frac{17}{4}\pi y}, \tag{6.12}
$$

which decays to zero very fast.

Combining (6.11) with (6.12), one deduces that

$$
\mathcal{Y}''\mathcal{X}' - \mathcal{X}''\mathcal{Y}' > \quad \text{if } \ y \in [1.1, \infty). \tag{6.13}
$$

The detailed proof of (6.11), (6.12) and (6.13) will be provided in the Appendix 2.

This proves that

$$
\mathcal{Z}'(y) > 0 \ \text{ if } \ y \in [1.1, \infty). \tag{6.14}
$$

Case (b): $y \in (1, 1.1)$. In this case $0 < 1 - y < 0.1$. To prove

$$
\mathcal{Z}'(y) = \Big(\frac{\mathcal{Y}'(y)}{\mathcal{X}'(y)}\Big)' > 0, \text{on } y \in (1, 1.1), \tag{6.15}
$$

it suffices to prove that

$$\left(\frac{\mathcal{Y}''(y)}{\mathcal{X}''(y)}\right)' > 0, \text{ on } y \in (1, 1.1),$$

given that

$$\mathcal{X}'(1) = \mathcal{Y}'(1) = 0 \tag{6.16}$$

which follows from (6.6). In fact, there exists $y_1 \in (1, y)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(\frac{\mathcal{Y}'(y)}{\mathcal{X}'(y)}\right)' &= \frac{\mathcal{Y}''(y)\mathcal{X}'(y) - \mathcal{Y}'(y)\mathcal{X}''(y)}{\mathcal{X}'^2(y)} = \frac{\mathcal{X}''(y)}{\mathcal{X}'(y)}\left(\frac{\mathcal{Y}''(y)}{\mathcal{X}''(y)} - \frac{\mathcal{Y}'(y)}{\mathcal{X}'(y)}\right) \\
&= \frac{\mathcal{X}''(y)}{\mathcal{X}'(y) - \mathcal{X}'(1)}\left(\frac{\mathcal{Y}''(y)}{\mathcal{X}''(y)} - \frac{\mathcal{Y}'(y) - \mathcal{Y}'(1)}{\mathcal{X}'(y) - \mathcal{X}'(1)}\right) \\
&= \frac{\mathcal{X}''(y)}{\mathcal{X}''(y_2)(y-1)}\left(\frac{\mathcal{Y}''(y)}{\mathcal{X}''(y)} - \frac{\mathcal{Y}''(y_1)}{\mathcal{X}''(y_1)}\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{6.17}$$

using (6.16).

We also have that

$$\mathcal{X}''(y) > 0, \text{ if } y \in (1, \infty) \tag{6.18}$$

by the same decomposition method as used above. We omit the details here. (Actually, we only need (6.18) holds for small interval such as $(1, 1.2]$).

Moreover, $\left(\frac{\mathcal{Y}''(y)}{\mathcal{X}''(y)}\right)' > 0$ implies

$$\frac{\mathcal{Y}''(y)}{\mathcal{X}''(y)} - \frac{\mathcal{Y}''(y_1)}{\mathcal{X}''(y_1)} > 0. \tag{6.19}$$

Then the claim follows from (6.19), (6.18) and (6.17).

For the derivative of the quotient of second order derivatives, one has

$$\left(\frac{\mathcal{Y}''(y)}{\mathcal{X}''(y)}\right)' = \frac{\mathcal{Y}'''(y)\mathcal{X}''(y) - \mathcal{Y}''(y)\mathcal{X}'''(y)}{\mathcal{X}''^2(y)}.$$

Define

$$f_{\mathcal{X}\mathcal{Y}}(y) := \mathcal{Y}'''(y)\mathcal{X}''(y) - \mathcal{Y}''(y)\mathcal{X}'''(y).$$

Equivalently, to show (6.15) one needs to show that

$$f_{\mathcal{X}\mathcal{Y}}(y) > 0 \text{ for } y \in (1, 1.1). \tag{6.20}$$

Differrentiating(6.6), the functions $\mathcal{X}(y)$ and $\mathcal{Y}(y)$ both satisfy the following functional equations

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}''(\frac{1}{y}) &= 2y^3\mathcal{H}'(y) + y^4\mathcal{H}''(y) \\
\mathcal{H}'''(\frac{1}{y}) &= -6y^4\mathcal{H}'(y) - 6y^5\mathcal{H}''(y) - y^6\mathcal{H}'''(y).
\end{aligned} \tag{6.21}$$

Plugging $y = 1$ in (6.21) and using (6.16), one deduces

$$\mathcal{X}'''(1) = -3\mathcal{X}''(1), \quad \mathcal{Y}'''(1) = -3\mathcal{Y}''(1). \tag{6.22}$$

From (6.22), one has

$$f_{\mathcal{X}\mathcal{Y}}(1) = 0. \tag{6.23}$$

Then to prove (6.20), by (6.23), it suffices to prove that

$$f'_{\mathcal{X}\mathcal{Y}}(y) > 0 \text{ for } y \in (1, 1.1). \tag{6.24}$$

Proceed by (6.9) and (6.10)

$$\begin{aligned}
f'_{\mathcal{X}\mathcal{Y}} &= \mathcal{Y}''''\mathcal{X}'' - \mathcal{Y}''\mathcal{X}'''' \\
&= \left(\mathcal{Y}''''_a\mathcal{X}''_a - \mathcal{Y}''_a\mathcal{X}''''_a\right) + \left(\mathcal{X}''_e\mathcal{Y}'''' + \mathcal{Y}''''_e\mathcal{X}''_a - \mathcal{X}''''_e\mathcal{Y}'' - \mathcal{Y}''_e\mathcal{X}''''_a\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{6.25}$$

We use $\left(\mathcal{Y}_a''''' \mathcal{X}_a'' - \mathcal{Y}_a'' \mathcal{X}_a'''''\right)$ and $\left(\mathcal{X}_e'' \mathcal{Y}''''' + \mathcal{Y}_e''''' \mathcal{X}_a'' - \mathcal{X}_e''''' \mathcal{Y}'' - \mathcal{Y}_e'' \mathcal{X}_a'''''\right)$ as the approximate and error parts of $f_{\mathcal{X}\mathcal{Y}}'$ respectively.

For the approximate part, after subtracting some proper factor, one finds

$$y \to \frac{512 y^4}{\pi} e^{\frac{1}{4}\pi y} \left(\mathcal{Y}_a''''' \mathcal{X}_a'' - \mathcal{Y}_a'' \mathcal{X}_a'''''\right)(y) \tag{6.26}$$

is monotonically decreasing on $(1, 1.2)$.

For the error part, one has the following estimate

$$\left|\left(\mathcal{X}_e'' \mathcal{Y}''''' + \mathcal{Y}_e''''' \mathcal{X}_a'' - \mathcal{X}_e''''' \mathcal{Y}'' - \mathcal{Y}_e'' \mathcal{X}_a'''''\right)(y)\right| \le C y e^{-5\pi y}, \tag{6.27}$$

which has fast decay.

Combining (6.26), (6.27) and (6.25), we can prove that

$$f_{\mathcal{X}\mathcal{Y}}'(y) > 0 \ \text{ if } \ y \in (1, 1.11]. \tag{6.28}$$

The detailed proof of (6.26), (6.27) and (6.28) will be given in the Appendix 2.
This completes the proof.

$$\square$$

Finally we give the proof of Proposition 6.1.

Proof. By Lemma 6.2, $y = 1$ is a critical point of $\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(yi)$. Furthermore

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y} \mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(\frac{1}{y}i) = -y^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(yi)(y). \tag{6.29}$$

By Lemma 6.4, we have

$$\mathcal{X}'(y) > 0 \ \text{ if } \ y \in (1, \infty) \ \text{ and } \ \mathcal{Y}'(\sqrt{3}) = 0. \tag{6.30}$$

Hence we obtain that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y} \mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(yi) > 0 \ \text{ if } \ y \in (\sqrt{3}, \infty). \tag{6.31}$$

To study the monotonicity of $\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(yi)$ on the interval $(1, \sqrt{3})$, we rewrite $\frac{\partial}{\partial y} \mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(yi)$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(yi) &= \frac{\partial}{\partial y}\left(\theta(2; \frac{yi+1}{2}) + \rho\theta(1; yi)\right) = \mathcal{Y}'(y) + \rho\mathcal{X}'(y) \\ &= \mathcal{X}'(y) \cdot \left(\frac{\mathcal{Y}'(y)}{\mathcal{X}'(y)} + \rho\right). \end{aligned} \tag{6.32}$$

By (6.30), the zeroes of $\frac{\partial}{\partial y} \mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(yi)$ on $(1, \sqrt{3})$ satisfy the following functional equation

$$\frac{\mathcal{Y}'(y)}{\mathcal{X}'(y)} + \rho = 0, \ \ y \in (1, \sqrt{3}). \tag{6.33}$$

Furthermore, by Theorem 6.1, we see that

$$\frac{\mathcal{Y}'(y)}{\mathcal{X}'(y)} + \rho \ \text{ is strictly decreasing on } \ (1, \sqrt{3}). \tag{6.34}$$

(6.34) and (6.33) imply that $\frac{\partial}{\partial y} \mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(yi)$ admits at most one zero point on $(1, \sqrt{3})$. This fact combined with (6.31) yields that $\frac{\partial}{\partial y} \mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(yi)$ admits either one or three critical points on $(0, \infty)$.

Since $\mathcal{X}'(1) = \mathcal{Y}'(1) = 0$, $\frac{\mathcal{Y}'(1)}{\mathcal{X}'(1)} = \frac{\mathcal{Y}''(1)}{\mathcal{X}''(1)}$.

At the other end point $\sqrt{3}$, since $\mathcal{Y}'(\sqrt{3}) = 0$ (see (6.30)), we have that

$$\frac{\mathcal{Y}'(\sqrt{3})}{\mathcal{X}'(\sqrt{3})} + \rho = 0 + \rho > 0, \ \ \rho > 0.$$

By (6.34), we see that the equation (6.33) has a zero point if and only if

$$\frac{\mathcal{Y}''(1)}{\mathcal{X}''(1)} + \rho < 0. \tag{6.35}$$

The condition in (6.35) is

$$\rho < \rho_1 := -\frac{\mathcal{Y}''(1)}{\mathcal{X}''(1)}. \tag{6.36}$$

Combining (6.35),(6.36) with (6.31), one has

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(yi) > 0 \text{ on } (1,\infty) \text{ provided } \rho \geq \rho_1.$$

This and (6.29) give the proof of part 1 of Proposition 6.1. (For the case $\rho = 0$, $y_{1,\rho} = \sqrt{3}$ by (6.30).)

In the case when $\rho \in (0, \rho_1)$, there exists unique root of (6.33) as $y_{1,\rho} \in (1, \sqrt{3})$. By duality (6.29), there exists another root $\frac{1}{y_{1,\rho}} \in (\frac{\sqrt{3}}{3}, 1)$. So part 2 of Proposition 6.1 follows from (6.29) and (6.34).

Finally (6.1) follows from (6.34).

This completes the proof.

$\square$

7. The behavior of $\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(z)$ on the $y-$axis

Let $\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(z) := \theta(1; \frac{z+1}{2}) + \rho\theta(2; z)$ be the conjugate of $\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z)$. In this section we prove similar properties of Section 6 for $\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}$. As in Section 6, $\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(yi)$ admits either 1 or 3 three critical points depending on different vales of ρ. These are stated in Proposition 7.1. The proof relies critically on a novel property of the classical theta functions proved in Theorem 7.1.

Proposition 7.1. *There exists a threshold ρ_2 which is the unique solution of*

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2}\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(yi) \mid_{y=1}= 0$$

(in fact $\rho_2 = -1 - \frac{\mathcal{B}''(1)}{\mathcal{A}''(1)}$, numerically, $\rho_2 = 1.190861337\cdots$) such that
1. when $\rho \in [0, \rho_2)$, the function $y \to \mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(yi), y > 0$ admits only three critical points at $y_{2,\rho}$, 1 and $\frac{1}{y_{2,\rho}}$, where $y_{2,\rho} \in (1, \sqrt{3}]$. Furthermore we have $\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(yi) < 0$ if $y \in (0, \frac{1}{y_{2,\rho}})$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(yi) > 0$ if $y \in (\frac{1}{y_{2,\rho}}, 1)$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(yi) < 0$ if $y \in (1, y_{2,\rho})$, and $\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(yi) > 0$ if $y \in (y_{2,\rho}, \infty)$

The critical point $y_{2,\rho}$ is the unique solution of $\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(yi) = 0$, $y \in (1, \sqrt{3}]$.
Moreover, if $\rho \in (0, \rho_2)$, then

$$\frac{\partial y_{2,\rho}}{\partial \rho} < 0. \tag{7.1}$$

2. when $\rho \in [\rho_2, +\infty)$, the function $y \to \mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(yi), y > 0$ admits only one critical point at 1, and we have $\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(yi) < 0$ if $y \in (0, 1)$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(yi) > 0$ if $y \in (1, \infty)$.

As in Section 6, by Lemma 6.1 and transformation (6.2), we have that

Lemma 7.1.

$$\theta(2; yi) = \sqrt{\frac{y}{2}}\vartheta_3(2y)\vartheta_3(\frac{y}{2}), \quad \theta(1; \frac{yi+1}{2}) = \sqrt{\frac{y}{2}}\big(\vartheta_3(2y)\vartheta_3(\frac{y}{2}) + \vartheta_2(2y)\vartheta_4(\frac{y}{2})\big).$$

Recall by (1.11) and (6.2),

$$\mathcal{A}(y) := \sqrt{2}\vartheta_3(2y)\vartheta_3(\frac{2}{y}) = \sqrt{y}\vartheta_3(2y)\vartheta_3(\frac{y}{2}), \quad \mathcal{B}(y) := \sqrt{2}\vartheta_2(2y)\vartheta_2(\frac{2}{y}) = \sqrt{y}\vartheta_2(2y)\vartheta_4(\frac{y}{2}).$$

Next we state Theorem 7.1, which provides the key argument to prove Proposition 7.1.

Theorem 7.1. *The function $y \mapsto \frac{\mathcal{B}'(y)}{\mathcal{A}'(y)}, y > 0$ has only one critical point at $y = 1$, and furthermore $\left(\frac{\mathcal{B}'(y)}{\mathcal{A}'(y)}\right)' < 0, \ y \in (0,1)$ and $\left(\frac{\mathcal{B}'(y)}{\mathcal{A}'(y)}\right)' > 0, \ y \in (1,\infty)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 6.2,

$$\mathcal{A}'(\frac{1}{y}) = -y^2 \mathcal{A}'(y), \ \mathcal{B}'(\frac{1}{y}) = -y^2 \mathcal{B}'(y). \tag{7.2}$$

Let

$$\mathcal{C}(y) := \frac{\mathcal{B}'(y)}{\mathcal{A}'(y)}.$$

Then

$$\mathcal{C}(\frac{1}{y}) = \mathcal{C}(y).$$

Hence

$$\mathcal{C}'(\frac{1}{y}) = -y^2 \mathcal{C}'(y). \tag{7.3}$$

In particular, $\mathcal{C}'(1) = 0$, i.e., $y = 1$ is the critical point of $\mathcal{C}(y)$. This, combining with Lemma 6.4, shows that the $\mathcal{C}(y)$ by the quotient form is well defined.

By (7.3), it suffices to prove that

$$\mathcal{C}'(y) > 0 \ \ y \in (1,\infty).$$

To prove this, we need to divide it into two parts of y: the small case $y \in [k,\infty)$ and the large case $y \in (1,k)$, where the parameter k is sightly bigger than 1 and will be determined later. (In fact $k = 1.05$.)

Case (a): $y \in [k,\infty)$ One has

$$\mathcal{C}'(y) = \frac{\mathcal{B}''(y)\mathcal{A}'(y) - \mathcal{A}''(y)\mathcal{B}'(y)}{(\mathcal{A}'(y))^2}.$$

Then we need to estimate the lower bound of $\mathcal{B}''(y)\mathcal{A}'(y) - \mathcal{A}''(y)\mathcal{B}'(y)$.

By (1.11),

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}(y) &= \sqrt{y}\Big(1 + 2\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-2\pi n^2 y}\Big)\Big(1 + 2\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{\pi}{2} n^2 y}\Big) \\
&= \Big(\sqrt{y} + 2\sqrt{y}e^{-\frac{\pi y}{2}} + 4\sqrt{y}e^{-2\pi y} + 4\sqrt{y}e^{-\frac{5}{2}\pi y} + 4\sqrt{y}e^{-4\pi y} + 2\sqrt{y}e^{-\frac{9}{2}\pi y} + 2\sqrt{y}\big(\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} e^{-2\pi n^2 y} + \sum_{n=4}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{\pi}{2}n^2 y}\big)\Big) \\
&\quad + \Big(4\sqrt{y}e^{-\frac{5}{2}\pi y}\big(\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\pi(n^2-1)y} + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} e^{-2\pi(n^2-1)y} + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\pi(n^2-1)y} \cdot \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} e^{-2\pi(n^2-1)y}\big)\Big) \\
&:= \mathcal{A}_a(y) + \mathcal{A}_e(y)
\end{aligned}
\tag{7.4}
$$

where $\mathcal{A}_a(y)$ and $\mathcal{A}_e(y)$ are defined at the last equality. $\mathcal{A}_e(y)$ is the error part which will be proved to satisfy

$$\|\mathcal{A}_e\|_{C^2} \le C\sqrt{y}e^{-\frac{13}{2}\pi y}.$$

For $\mathcal{B}(y)$, by (1.11), we rewrite as

$$\mathcal{B}(y) = \sqrt{y}\vartheta_2(2y)\Big(\vartheta_3(2y) - \vartheta_2(2y)\Big)$$

$$= 2\sqrt{y}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-2\pi y(n-\frac{1}{2})^2} + 4\sqrt{y}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-2\pi y(n-\frac{1}{2})^2}\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-2\pi n^2 y} - 4\sqrt{y}\Big(\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-2\pi y(n-\frac{1}{2})^2}\Big)^2$$

$$= \Big(2\sqrt{y}e^{-\frac{1}{2}\pi y} + 4\sqrt{y}e^{-\frac{5}{2}\pi y} + 2\sqrt{y}e^{-\frac{9}{2}\pi y} - 4\sqrt{y}e^{-\pi y}\Big)$$

$$+ \Big(2\sqrt{y}\sum_{n=3}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(2n-1)^2\pi y} + 4\sqrt{y}e^{-\frac{5}{2}\pi y}\Big(\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{1}{2}((2n-1)^2-1)\pi y} + \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} e^{-2(n^2-1)\pi y}$$

$$+ \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{1}{2}((2n-1)^2-1)\pi y}\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} e^{-2(n^2-1)\pi y}\Big) - 8\sqrt{y}\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(2n-1)^2\pi y}$$

$$- 4\sqrt{y}(\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(2n-1)^2\pi y})^2\Big)$$

$$:= \mathcal{B}_a(y) + \mathcal{B}_e(y)$$

where $\mathcal{B}_a(y)$ and $\mathcal{B}_e(y)$ are defined at the last equality. That is, we have

$$\mathcal{B}(y) = \mathcal{B}_a(y) + \mathcal{B}_e(y), \tag{7.5}$$

where $\mathcal{B}_a(y), \mathcal{B}_e(y)$ is the approximate part and the error part of $\mathcal{B}(y)$ respectively.

We have the following estimate

$$\|\mathcal{B}_e\|_{C^2} \leq C\sqrt{y}e^{-\frac{13}{2}\pi y}, \quad y \geq 1.$$

To prove that

$$\mathcal{C}'(y) > 0 \text{ if } y \in (k, \infty), \tag{7.6}$$

it suffices to prove that

$$\mathcal{B}''(y)\mathcal{A}'(y) - \mathcal{A}''(y)\mathcal{B}'(y) > 0 \text{ if } y \in (k, \infty).$$

By (7.4), there holds

$$\mathcal{B}''\mathcal{A}' - \mathcal{A}''\mathcal{B}' = \Big(\mathcal{B}_a''\mathcal{A}_a' - \mathcal{A}_a''\mathcal{B}_a'\Big) + \Big(\mathcal{B}_e''\mathcal{A}' - \mathcal{B}_e'\mathcal{A}'' + \mathcal{B}_a''\mathcal{A}_e' - \mathcal{A}_e''\mathcal{B}_a'\Big).$$

Here $\Big(\mathcal{B}_a''\mathcal{A}_a' - \mathcal{A}_a''\mathcal{B}_a'\Big)$ and $\Big(\mathcal{B}_e''\mathcal{A}' - \mathcal{B}_e'\mathcal{A}'' + \mathcal{B}_a''\mathcal{A}_e' - \mathcal{A}_e''\mathcal{B}_a'\Big)$ are the approximate and error part of $\mathcal{B}''\mathcal{A}' - \mathcal{A}''\mathcal{B}'$ respectively.

To estimate the approximate part, we use the monotonicity of a weighted function, i.e.

$$y \to \frac{4y}{\pi}e^{\frac{1}{2}\pi y}\Big(\mathcal{B}_a''\mathcal{A}_a' - \mathcal{A}_a''\mathcal{B}_a'\Big)(y) \tag{7.7}$$

is strictly increasing.

For the error term, we have the following control

$$\Big|\Big(\mathcal{B}_e''\mathcal{A}' - \mathcal{B}_e'\mathcal{A}'' + \mathcal{B}_a''\mathcal{A}_e' - \mathcal{A}_e''\mathcal{B}_a'\Big)(y)\Big| \leq C\sqrt{y}e^{-\frac{13}{2}\pi y}, \quad y \geq 1 \tag{7.8}$$

which decays fast.

Combining (7.7) and (7.8), one deduces that

$$\Big(\mathcal{B}''\mathcal{A}' - \mathcal{A}''\mathcal{B}'\Big)(y) > \text{ if } y \in [1.05, \infty). \tag{7.9}$$

This proves that

$$\mathcal{C}'(y) > 0 \text{ if } y \in [1.05, \infty). \tag{7.10}$$

The detailed proofs of (7.7), (7.8) and (7.9) will be given in the Appendix 2.

Case (b): $y \in (1, k)$

To prove

$$\Big(\frac{\mathcal{B}'(y)}{\mathcal{A}'(y)}\Big)' > 0, \text{on } y \in (1, k), \tag{7.11}$$

by (6.17), it suffices to prove that

$$\Big(\frac{\mathcal{B}''(y)}{\mathcal{A}''(y)}\Big)' > 0, \text{on } y \in (1, k),$$

given that

$$\mathcal{A}'(1) = \mathcal{B}'(1) = 0 \tag{7.12}$$

which follows from (7.2). Here as in (6.18), we need $\mathcal{A}''(y) > 0$ in small interval such as $(1, 1.2]$ (we omit the details here).

To proceed, we notice that

$$\Big(\frac{\mathcal{B}''(y)}{\mathcal{A}''(y)}\Big)' = \frac{\mathcal{B}'''(y)\mathcal{A}''(y) - \mathcal{B}''(y)\mathcal{A}'''(y)}{\mathcal{A}''^2(y)}. \tag{7.13}$$

Define

$$f_{\mathcal{AB}}(y) := \mathcal{B}'''(y)\mathcal{A}''(y) - \mathcal{B}''(y)\mathcal{A}'''(y).$$

Same as (6.23), we see that

$$f_{\mathcal{AB}}(1) = 0. \tag{7.14}$$

Then to prove (7.11), it suffices to prove that

$$f'_{\mathcal{AB}}(y) > 0 \text{ for } y \in (1, k). \tag{7.15}$$

Now by (7.4) and (7.5) we can write as

$$\begin{aligned} f'_{\mathcal{AB}} &= \mathcal{B}''''\mathcal{A}'' - \mathcal{B}''\mathcal{A}'''' \\ &= \Big(\mathcal{B}''''_a\mathcal{A}''_a - \mathcal{B}''_a\mathcal{A}''''_a\Big) + \Big(\mathcal{B}''''_e\mathcal{A}'' - \mathcal{B}''_e\mathcal{A}'''' + \mathcal{B}''''_a\mathcal{A}''_e - \mathcal{A}''''_e\mathcal{B}''_a\Big). \end{aligned} \tag{7.16}$$

The main part is $\Big(\mathcal{B}''''_a\mathcal{A}''_a - \mathcal{B}''_a\mathcal{A}''''_a\Big)$ which is is not monotonically decreasing or increasing. Instead, a weighted

$$y \to \frac{32y^4}{\pi}e^{\frac{1}{2}\pi y}\Big(\mathcal{B}''''_a\mathcal{A}''_a - \mathcal{B}''_a\mathcal{A}''''_a\Big)(y) \tag{7.17}$$

is strictly decreasing on $(1, \infty)$.

For the error part in (7.16), one deduces the following upper bound estimate,

$$\Big|\Big(\mathcal{B}''''_e\mathcal{A}'' - \mathcal{B}''_e\mathcal{A}'''' + \mathcal{B}''''_a\mathcal{A}''_e - \mathcal{A}''''_e\mathcal{B}''_a\Big)(y)\Big| \le C\sqrt{y}e^{-\frac{13}{2}\pi y}, y \ge 1 \tag{7.18}$$

which decays very fast.

Combining (7.17), (7.18) and (7.16), we can show that

$$f'_{\mathcal{AB}}(y) > 0 \text{ if } y \in (1, 1.12]. \tag{7.19}$$

The detailed proof of (7.17), (7.18) and (7.19) is tedious and will be given in the Appendix 2. This completes the proof.

$\square$

Finally we give the proof of Proposition 7.1.

Proof. By Lemma 6.2, the functional $\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(yi)$ satisfies the functional equations

$$\mathcal{H}'(\frac{1}{y}) = -y^2\mathcal{H}'(y). \tag{7.20}$$

Hence $\mathcal{H}'(1) = 0$, i.e., $y = 1$ is a critical point of $\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(yi)$.

By (7.20), we just need to consider the functional $\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(yi)$ on $(1,\infty)$. For this, one uses Theorem 7.1 by rewriting $\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(yi)$ as

$$\sqrt{2}\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(yi) = \frac{\partial}{\partial y}\Big(\sqrt{2}\theta(1;\frac{yi+1}{2}) + \rho\sqrt{2}\theta(2;yi)\Big) = \mathcal{A}'(y) + \mathcal{B}'(y) + \rho\mathcal{A}'(y)$$
$$= \mathcal{A}'(y)\cdot\Big(1 + \frac{\mathcal{B}'(y)}{\mathcal{A}'(y)} + \rho\Big). \tag{7.21}$$

By Lemma 6.4, we see that

$$\mathcal{A}'(y) > 0 \ \ y \in (1,\infty) \ \ \text{and} \ \ 1 + \frac{\mathcal{B}'(\sqrt{3})}{\mathcal{A}'(\sqrt{3})} = 0. \tag{7.22}$$

By Theorem 7.1, there holds

$$\frac{d}{dy}\Big(1 + \frac{\mathcal{B}'(y)}{\mathcal{A}'(y)} + \rho\Big) > 0, \ \ y \in (1,\infty). \tag{7.23}$$

From (7.23), in view of (7.21) and (7.22), we infer that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(yi) \ \text{admits at most one zero point on} \ (1,\infty).$$

By (7.22), we see that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(yi) > 0 \ \text{if} \ y \in (\sqrt{3},\infty). \tag{7.24}$$

Then one further concludes that the admissible zero point of $\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(yi)$ must lie on $(1,\sqrt{3}]$ (if exists).

Next we consider the function $1 + \frac{\mathcal{B}'(y)}{\mathcal{A}'(y)} + \rho$ for $\rho > 0 \in (1,\sqrt{3})$. At the end point $\sqrt{3}$, we have that

$$\Big(1 + \frac{\mathcal{B}'(y)}{\mathcal{A}'(y)} + \rho\Big)\big|_{y=\sqrt{3}} = 0 + \rho = \rho > 0 \tag{7.25}$$

because of (7.22).

Since $\mathcal{A}'(1) = \mathcal{B}'(1)$, at the other end point 1, one evaluates

$$\Big(1 + \frac{\mathcal{B}'(y)}{\mathcal{A}'(y)} + \rho\Big)\big|_{y=1} = 1 + \rho + \lim_{y\to 1}\frac{\mathcal{B}'(y)}{\mathcal{A}'(y)} = 1 + \rho + \lim_{y\to 1}\frac{\mathcal{B}''(y)}{\mathcal{A}''(y)}$$
$$= 1 + \rho + \frac{\mathcal{B}''(1)}{\mathcal{A}''(1)} \tag{7.26}$$

by L'Hospital's rule.

In view of (7.25) and (7.26), one deduces from (7.23) that

$$\Big(1 + \frac{\mathcal{B}'(y)}{\mathcal{A}'(y)} + \rho\Big) \ \text{admits one zero point on} \ (1,\sqrt{3})$$
$$\Leftrightarrow 1 + \rho + \frac{\mathcal{B}''(1)}{\mathcal{A}''(1)} < 0 \tag{7.27}$$

which implies that

$$\rho < \rho_2 := -1 - \frac{\mathcal{B}''(1)}{\mathcal{A}''(1)}.$$

It follows that by (7.21) and (7.27), for $\rho \geq \rho_2$, $\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(yi)$ admits no zero point on $(1,\infty)$ Therefore the part 2 of Proposition 7.1 follows from (7.20).

For $\rho \in (0,\rho_2)$, we denote the zero root of $\Big(1 + \frac{\mathcal{B}'(y)}{\mathcal{A}'(y)} + \rho\Big)$ (and hence also of $\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(yi)$) as $y_{2,\rho}$. Then by (7.27) $y_{2,\rho} \in (1,\sqrt{3})$. Thus by (7.20) there is another zero point $\frac{1}{y_{2,\rho}} \in (\frac{\sqrt{3}}{3},1)$ of $\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(yi)$. By (7.24), (7.20), (7.23) and (7.21), the part 1 of Proposition 7.1 is proved.

Finally from (7.23), we have that

$$\frac{d}{d\rho}y_{2,\rho} < 0.$$

This proves (7.1). (For $\rho = 0$, one has $y_{2,\rho} = \sqrt{3}$ by (7.22)). The proof is thus completed.

$\square$

8. PROOFS OF THEOREMS 1.2 1.3 AND 1.4

In this section, we are ready to finish the proof of the main results of Theorems 1.2 1.3 and 1.4. To make the presentation clear, we introduce the following notations to denote various geometric sets:

$$\mathbb{H} := \{z \mid y > 0\},$$

$$\Omega_a := \{z \mid |z| \geq 1, 0 \leq x < 1\},$$

$$\Omega_b := \{z \mid |z| \geq 1, 0 \leq x \leq \frac{1}{2}\} \cup \{z \mid |z| = 1, \frac{1}{2} \leq x < 1\},$$

$$\Omega_c := \{z \mid |z| \geq 1, 0 \leq x \leq \frac{1}{2}\},$$

$$\Omega_d := \{z \mid |z| = 1, 0 \leq x \leq \frac{1}{2}\} \cup \{z \mid x = 0, 1 \leq y < \infty\},$$

$$\Omega_e := \{z \mid |z| = 1, 0 \leq x \leq \frac{1}{2}\} \cup \{z \mid x = 0, 1 \leq y \leq \sqrt{3}\},$$

$$\Omega_{ea} := \{z \mid x = 0, 1 \leq y \leq \sqrt{3}\},$$

$$\Omega_{eb} := \{z \mid |z| = 1, 0 \leq x < \frac{1}{2}\}.$$

We divide the proof into the following steps:

Step 1: Reducing minimization problem from $\mathbb{H}$ to $\rightarrow \Omega_a$.

This is a consequence of Theorem 3.2 and the properties of the fundamental group (3.3) and fundamental domain (3.5):

$$\min_{z \in \mathbb{H}} \mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z) \equiv \min_{z \in \Omega_a} \mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z), \ \min_{z \in \mathbb{H}} \mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(z) \equiv \min_{z \in \Omega_a} \mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(z). \tag{8.1}$$

Step 2: Reducing minimization problem from Ω_a to Ω_b.

This follows from Corollary 4.2:

$$\min_{z \in \Omega_a} \mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z) \equiv \min_{z \in \Omega_b} \mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z), \ \min_{z \in \Omega_a} \mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(z) \equiv \min_{z \in \Omega_b} \mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(z).$$

Step 3: Reducing minimization problem from Ω_b to Ω_c.

We first show that

$$\min_{z \in \{z \mid |z| = 1, \frac{1}{2} \leq x < 1\}} \mathcal{W}_{j,\rho}(z) \equiv \mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(\frac{1}{2} + i\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}), j = 1, 2. \tag{8.2}$$

One can further conclude that the minimizer $\frac{1}{2} + i\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$ is unique by the monotonicity shown below. In fact, by Propositions 6.1 and 7.1, we see that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y}\mathcal{W}_{j,\rho}(yi) > 0, \ y \in [\sqrt{3}, \infty), j = 1, 2. \tag{8.3}$$

By the special map $z \mapsto w := \frac{z-1}{z+1}$, the set $\{yi, y \in [\sqrt{3}, \infty)\}$ is mapped bijectively to $\{|z| = 1, \frac{1}{2} \leq \Re(z) < 1\}$. By Lemma 3.4 and (8.3) we see that both $\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z)$ and $\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(z)$ are monotonically decreasing along the set $\{|z| = 1, \frac{1}{2} \leq x < 1\}$. This proves (8.2).

By (8.2), we conclude that
$$\min_{z\in\Omega_b}\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z)\equiv\min_{z\in\Omega_c}\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z),\ \min_{z\in\Omega_b}\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(z)\equiv\min_{z\in\Omega_c}\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(z).$$

Step 4: Reducing minimization problem from Ω_c to Ω_d.

In this case, let $\rho_*=\frac{1}{20}$ be as in Propositions 5.1. For $\rho\in[0,\rho_*]$, Proposition 5.1 implies that
$$\min_{z\in\Omega_c}\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z)\equiv\min_{z\in\Omega_d}\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z),\rho\in[0,\rho_*].$$

For $\rho\in(\rho_*,\infty)$, using Lemma 3.3, Lemma 5.2, and (8.2), we get that
$$\min_{z\in\Omega_c}\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z)\equiv\rho\min_{w\in\Omega_c}\mathcal{W}_{2,1/\rho}(w),1/\rho\in(0,1/\rho_*)$$
$$\equiv\rho\min_{w\in\Omega_d}\mathcal{W}_{2,1/\rho}(w),1/\rho\in(0,1/\rho_*)$$
$$\equiv\min_{z\in\Omega_d}\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z),\rho\in(\rho_*,\infty).$$

Therefore, we obtain that
$$\min_{z\in\Omega_c}\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z)\equiv\min_{z\in\Omega_d}\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z),\rho\in[0,\infty). \tag{8.4}$$

By Theorem 3.3, (8.2) and (8.4), we have that
$$\min_{z\in\Omega_c,\rho\in[0,\infty)}\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(z),\equiv\rho\min_{w\in\Omega_c,1/\rho\in[0,\infty)}\mathcal{W}_{1,1/\rho}(w),$$
$$\equiv\rho\min_{w\in\Omega_d,1/\rho\in[0,\infty)}\mathcal{W}_{1,1/\rho}(w), \tag{8.5}$$
$$\equiv\min_{z\in\Omega_d,\rho\in[0,\infty)}\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(z).$$

Step 5: Reducing minimization problem from Ω_d to Ω_e.

The follows from (8.3).

In summary, from Steps 1-5, we conclude that
$$\min_{z\in\mathbb{H}}\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z)\equiv\min_{z\in\Omega_e}\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z),\ \min_{z\in\mathbb{H}}\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(z)\equiv\min_{z\in\Omega_e}\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(z). \tag{8.6}$$

From (8.6), we just need to find the minimizer in a much smaller curve Ω_e. But this gives no information about uniqueness or multiplicity of the minimizers. In fact, one can further rule out the possible minimizers of $\min_{z\in\Omega_a}\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z)$, $\min_{z\in\Omega_a}\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(z)$ in a large set. Namely, for $z\in\Omega_a\backslash\Omega_e$, there is no any possible minimizer for $\min_{z\in\Omega_a}\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z)$, $\min_{z\in\Omega_a}\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(z)$. The possible multiplicity of minimizer is admitted only in Step 1, see (8.1). But up the group transformation $\mathcal{G}_2$, the possible minimizer in (8.1) is unique. Therefore, one can conclude the reduction in (8.6) is unique up to the group transformation $\mathcal{G}_2$. In the next step we will show that $\min_{z\in\Omega_e}\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z)$, $\min_{z\in\Omega_e}\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(z)$ exists , is unique and can be located precisely.

Let w be the map $w(z)=\frac{z-1}{z+1}$ whose inverse is $z(w)=\frac{1+w}{1-w}$. Under this map we have $z=yi\in\Omega_{ea}\mapsto w=\frac{y^2-1}{y^2+1}+i\frac{2y}{y^2+1}\in\Omega_{eb},w=u+iv\in\Omega_{eb}\mapsto z=i\frac{\sqrt{1-u^2}}{1-u}\in\Omega_{ea}$.

We note that
$$\rho_1<1/\rho_2<\rho_2<1/\rho_1.$$

See in Propositions 6.1 and 7.1.

Now we consider the minimizer of $\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z)$ on Ω_e. We divide into three cases.

Case 1. $\rho\in[\rho_1,1/\rho_2]$.

In this case, $\rho\geq\rho_1,1/\rho\geq\rho_2$. Then by Propositions 6.1 and 7.1, both $\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z)$ and $\mathcal{W}_{2,\rho}(z)$ are monotonically increasing on Ω_{ea} along positive y axis direction. Then it follows that $\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z)$ is monotonically increasing on Ω_{eb} clockwise. Therefore, the minimizer of of $\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z)$ on Ω_e is uniquely achieved at $y=i$.

Case 2. $\rho\in(0,\rho_1)$.

In this case, $1/\rho > 1/\rho_1 > \rho_2$. Then by Proposition 7.1, $\mathcal{W}_{2,1/\rho}(z)$ is monotonically increasing on Ω_{ea} along positive y axis direction. It follows from Lemma 3.4 or Theorem 3.3 that $\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z)$ is monotone increasing on Ω_{eb} clockwise. On the other hand, by Proposition 6.1, $\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z)$ admits a unique minimizer at $y = iy_{1,\rho} \in i(1,\sqrt{3})$ on Ω_{ea}. We conclude that $\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z)$ has a unique minimizer at $z_{1,\rho} = iy_{1,\rho} \in (1,\sqrt{3})$ on Ω_e.

Case 3. $\rho \in (1/\rho_2, \infty)$.

In this case, since $1/\rho < \rho_2$, by Proposition 7.1, $\mathcal{W}_{2,1/\rho}(z)$ has a unique minimizer at $y = y_{2,1/\rho} \in (1,\sqrt{3})$ on Ω_{ea}. Then by Theorem 3.3 or Lemmas 3.4, $\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(\cdot)$ has a unique minimizer

$$z_{1,\rho} = \frac{y_{2,1/\rho}^2 - 1}{y_{2,1/\rho}^2 + 1} + i\frac{2y_{2,1/\rho}}{y_{2,1/\rho}^2 + 1} \in \text{inner points of } \Omega_{eb}. \tag{8.7}$$

On the other side, one has $\rho > 1/\rho_2 > \rho_1$. Then by Proposition 6.1, $\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z)$ is monotone increasing on Ω_{ea} along the positive y axis direction. Therefore, (8.7) gives the minimizer of $\mathcal{W}_{1,\rho}(z)$ on Ω_e.

This proves Theorems 1.2 and 1.4. Theorem 1.3 follows from Theorem 1.2 and Lemma 3.3.

9. Proof of Mueller-Ho functional and Mueller-Ho conjecture

Proof of Lemma 2.1. Since the computation is elementary, we omit the details here.
Proof of Lemma 2.3.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{J}(z; \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) &= \sum_{m,n} e^{-\frac{\pi}{y}|mz-n|^2} \cos((m+n)\pi) \\
&= \sum_{m,n} e^{-\frac{\pi}{y}|mz-n|^2}\left(1 + \cos((m+n)\pi)\right) - \sum_{m,n} e^{-\frac{\pi}{y}|mz-n|^2} \\
&= \sum_{m,n} e^{-\frac{\pi}{y}|mz-n|^2} 2\cos^2\left(\frac{(m+n)\pi}{2}\right) - \theta(1;z) = \sum_{m+n=2k, k\in\mathbb{Z}} 2e^{-\frac{\pi}{y}|mz+n|^2} - \theta(1;z) \\
&= 2\sum_{m,k} e^{-\frac{\pi}{y}|m(z+1)-2k|^2} - \theta(1;z) = 2\sum_{m,k} e^{-\frac{2\pi}{\Im(\frac{z+1}{2})}|m\frac{z+1}{2}-k|^2} - \theta(1;z) \\
&= 2\theta(2; \frac{z+1}{2}) - \theta(1;z).
\end{aligned}
$$

Proof of Theorem 2.1. This follows by Theorems 1.2, 1.3 and 1.4, by the relation $\rho = \frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha}$.

10. Appendix 1: Proof of Lemma 2.2

Recall that

$$\mathcal{J}(z; a, b) = \sum_{(m,n)\in\mathbb{Z}^2} e^{-\frac{\pi}{y}|mz-n|^2} \cos(2\pi(ma+nb)). \tag{10.1}$$

In this appendix we show that when the lattice is square type, then $(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{3})$ is not a critical point while when the lattice is hexagonal (or triangular) it is a critical point.

First we show that

Lemma 10.1.

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial a}\mathcal{J}(z; a, b)|_{z=i,(a,b)=(\frac{1}{3},\frac{1}{3})} = \frac{\partial}{\partial b}\mathcal{J}(z; a, b)|_{z=i,(a,b)=(\frac{1}{3},\frac{1}{3})} < 0. \tag{10.2}$$

This implies that $\mathcal{J}(z; a, b)$ is not always critical point for any lattice shape.

Proof.

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial a}\mathcal{J}(z;a,b)|_{z=i,(a,b)=(\frac{1}{3},\frac{1}{3})} = -2\pi\sum_{m,n}me^{-\pi(m^2+n^2)}\sin(\frac{2\pi(m+n)}{3})$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial a}\mathcal{J}(z;a,b)|_{z=i,(a,b)=(\frac{1}{3},\frac{1}{3})} = -2\pi\sum_{m,n}ne^{-\pi(m^2+n^2)}\sin(\frac{2\pi(m+n)}{3}). \tag{10.3}$$

It is clear that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial a}\mathcal{J}(a,b;z)|_{z=i,(a,b)=(\frac{1}{3},\frac{1}{3})} = \frac{\partial}{\partial b}\mathcal{J}(a,b;z)|_{z=i,(a,b)=(\frac{1}{3},\frac{1}{3})}.$$

Let

$$A := \sum_{m,n}e^{-\pi(m^2+n^2)}\sin(\frac{2\pi(m+n)}{3})m.$$

Equivalently, we show that

$$A > 0.$$

Grouping by $m+n = 3k+j, j=0,1,2$, we have

$$\frac{A}{\sin(\frac{\pi}{3})} = \sum_{m+n\equiv 1(\mod 3)}me^{-\pi(m^2+n^2)} - \sum_{m+n\equiv 2(\mod 3)}me^{-\pi(m^2+n^2)}. \tag{10.4}$$

For the first part in (10.4), splitting the summation by $m>0$ or $m<0$, we have (dropping the mod 3)

$$\sum_{m+n\equiv 1}e^{-\pi(m^2+n^2)}m = \sum_{m>0,m+n\equiv 1}me^{-\pi(m^2+n^2)} - \sum_{m>0,m+n\equiv 2}me^{-\pi(m^2+n^2)} \tag{10.5}$$

For the second part in (10.4), similarly, one has

$$\sum_{m+n\equiv 2}e^{-\pi(m^2+n^2)}m = \sum_{m>0,m+n\equiv 2}me^{-\pi(m^2+n^2)} - \sum_{m>0,m+n\equiv 1}me^{-\pi(m^2+n^2)}. \tag{10.6}$$

By (10.5) and (10.6), we have

$$\sum_{m+n\equiv 2}me^{-\pi(m^2+n^2)} = -\sum_{m+n\equiv 1}me^{-\pi(m^2+n^2)}$$

and by (10.4)

$$\frac{A}{2\sin(\frac{\pi}{3})} = \sum_{m>0,m+n\equiv 1}me^{-\pi(m^2+n^2)} - \sum_{m>0,m+n\equiv 2}me^{-\pi(m^2+n^2)}. \tag{10.7}$$

Notice that $e^{-\pi}$ is one term in the first summation in (10.7), it suffices to prove that

$$\sum_{m>0,m+n\equiv 2}me^{-\pi(m^2+n^2)} < e^{-\pi}.$$

Now we have

$$\sum_{m>0,m+n\equiv 2}e^{-\pi(m^2+n^2)}m = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty}\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}me^{-\pi(m^2+(3k+2)^2)}$$

$$= \sum_{m=1}^{\infty}me^{-\pi m^2}\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}e^{-\pi(3k+2)^2} < (e^{-\pi}+4e^{-4\pi})(e^{-\pi}+2e^{-4\pi}) < e^{-\pi}.$$

This completes the proof. □

Next we show that $(a,b) = (\frac{1}{3},\frac{1}{3})$ is a critical point when $z = \frac{1}{2}+i\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$.

Proof. We first claim that

$$\sum_{(m,n)\in\mathbb{Z}^2} e^{-x(m^2+n^2-mn)} m \sin(\frac{2\pi(m+n)}{3}) = 0, \quad \text{for} \ \forall x > 0. \tag{10.8}$$

To prove (10.8), it suffices to prove that

$$\sum_n e^{-x(m^2+n^2-mn)} \sin(\frac{2\pi(m+n)}{3}) = 0, \quad \text{for} \ \forall x > 0. \tag{10.9}$$

In fact,

$$\sum_n e^{-x(m^2+n^2-mn)} \sin(\frac{2\pi(m+n)}{3})$$
$$= -e^{-\frac{3}{4}xm^2} \sum_n e^{-\frac{x}{4}(2n-m)^2} \sin\frac{\pi(2n-m)}{3} \tag{10.10}$$
$$= 0.$$

In the last equality, one uses $2n - m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ and takes all the even or odd integers when m is even or odd.

By simple calculation, now the second part of Lemma 2.2 is equivalent to

$$\sum_{m,n} e^{-\frac{\pi}{2y}\left((m-n)^2 y^2 + (m+n)^2\right)} m \sin\frac{2\pi(m+n)}{3} = 0, \quad \text{if} \ y = \sqrt{3} \tag{10.11}$$

which is of consequence of (10.8). This completes the proof.

$\square$

11. Appendix 2: The rest of proof in Theorem 6.1 and Theorem 7.1

In this appendix, we finish the technical proofs of Theorems 6.1 and 7.1.

Throughout this appendix we frequently use the following Lemma whose proof is straightforward calculus and is omitted:

Lemma 11.1. *Let $f(y)^{(j)}$ denote $\frac{d^j}{dy^j}f(y)$. For $, j = 1, 2, 3 \cdots$, there holds*

- *For $a > 0, b > 0$,*

$$\left(y^b e^{-ay}\right)' < 0, \ \text{if} \ y > \frac{b}{a}; \ \left(y^b e^{-ay}\right)'' > 0, \ \text{if} \ y > \frac{b+\sqrt{b}}{a}.$$

- *For $a > 0$,*

$$(-1)^j \left(\sqrt{y} e^{-ay}\right)^{(j)} > 0, \ \text{if} \ y > f_j(a).$$

Here

$$f_1(a) = \frac{1}{2a}, f_2(a) = \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{2a}, f_3(a) = \frac{1}{a}, f_4(a) = \frac{1}{2a}.$$

- *For $y \geq 1$ and $a_n > 0$*

$$\left|\left(\sum_{n=k}^{\infty} \sqrt{y} e^{-a_n y}\right)^{(j)}\right| \leq (1 + \sigma_{j,k})\sqrt{y}(a_k)^j e^{-a_k y}, \ \sigma_{j,k} = \sum_{n=k+1}^{\infty} (\frac{a_n}{a_k})^j e^{-(a_n-a_k)}.$$

The structure of this appendix is organized as follows. (6.11)$\Leftrightarrow$ Lemma 11.2; (6.12)$\Leftrightarrow$ Lemma 11.3; (6.13)$\Leftrightarrow$ Lemma 11.4; (6.26)$\Leftrightarrow$ Lemma 11.5; (6.27)$\Leftrightarrow$ Lemma 11.6; (6.25)$\Leftrightarrow$ Lemma 11.7; (7.7)$\Leftrightarrow$ Lemma 11.8; (7.8)$\Leftrightarrow$ Lemma 11.9; (7.9)$\Leftrightarrow$ Lemma 11.10; (7.17)$\Leftrightarrow$ Lemma 11.11; (7.18)$\Leftrightarrow$ Lemma 11.12; (7.19)$\Leftrightarrow$ Lemma 11.13.

11.1. The rest of proof in Theorem 6.1.

Lemma 11.2. $y \mapsto \frac{16y}{\pi} e^{\frac{1}{4}\pi y} \left(\mathcal{Y}_a'' \mathcal{X}_a' - \mathcal{X}_a'' \mathcal{Y}_a' \right)(y), y \in [1, \infty)$ *is monotonically increasing.*

Proof. Calculating and grouping the terms, we get

$$\frac{16y}{\pi} e^{\frac{1}{4}\pi y} \left(\mathcal{Y}_a'' \mathcal{X}_a' - \mathcal{X}_a'' \mathcal{Y}_a' \right)(y)$$

$$= \Big(\pi y - 2496 e^{-7\pi y} \pi^2 y^2 - 144 e^{-7\pi y} - 700 e^{-6\pi y} \pi y - 1440 e^{-5\pi y} \pi^2 y^2 - 288 e^{-5\pi y} - 2176 e^{-4\pi y} \pi y$$

$$\quad - 840 e^{-3\pi y} \pi^2 y^2 - 108 e^{-3\pi y} - 243 e^{-2\pi y} \pi y - 110 e^{-\pi y} \pi y - 6 \Big)$$

$$+ \Big(696 e^{-7\pi y} \pi y + 2016 e^{-6\pi y} \pi^2 y^2 + 168 e^{-6\pi y} + 1008 e^{-5\pi y} \pi y + 2208 e^{-4\pi y} \pi^2 y^2 + 768 e^{-4\pi y}$$

$$\quad + 234 e^{-3\pi y} \pi y + 192 e^{-2\pi y} \pi^2 y^2 + 162 e^{-2\pi y} + 24 e^{-\pi y} \pi^2 y^2 + 132 e^{-\pi y} \Big)$$

$$\tag{11.12}$$

Denote the terms in first and second brackets of $\frac{16y}{\pi} e^{\frac{1}{4}\pi y} \left(\mathcal{Y}_a'' \mathcal{X}_a' - \mathcal{X}_a'' \mathcal{Y}_a' \right)(y)$ by $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{X}\mathcal{Y}}^+$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{X}\mathcal{Y}}^-$ respectively. One has $\frac{16y}{\pi} e^{\frac{1}{4}\pi y} \left(\mathcal{Y}_a'' \mathcal{X}_a' - \mathcal{X}_a'' \mathcal{Y}_a' \right)(y) = \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{X}\mathcal{Y}}^+(y) + \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{X}\mathcal{Y}}^-(y)$ by (11.12). It remains to prove that $\left(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{X}\mathcal{Y}}^+ + \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{X}\mathcal{Y}}^- \right)' > 0, \ \ y \in [1, \infty)$.

It is clear that the leading order term is πy, this gives that $\left(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{X}\mathcal{Y}}^+ + \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{X}\mathcal{Y}}^- \right)' > 0$ when y is large. By Lemma 11.1, one has

$$\left(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{X}\mathcal{Y}}^+ \right)' > \pi, \ \ \left(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{X}\mathcal{Y}}^- \right)' < 0, \ \ \left(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{X}\mathcal{Y}}^+ \right)'' < 0, \ \ \left(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{X}\mathcal{Y}}^- \right)'' > 0 \ \text{if} \ y \geq 1. \tag{11.13}$$

Direct calculation shows that $\left(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{X}\mathcal{Y}}^- \right)' |_{y=2.2} = -3.012967072 \cdots$. Then by (11.13)

$$\left(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{X}\mathcal{Y}}^+ + \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{X}\mathcal{Y}}^- \right)'(y) > \pi - 3.012967072 \cdots > 0, \ \ \text{if} \ y \geq 2.2. \tag{11.14}$$

Next we prove that

$$\left(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{X}\mathcal{Y}}^+ + \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{X}\mathcal{Y}}^- \right)'(y) > 0, \ \ \text{for} \ y \in [1, 2.2]. \tag{11.15}$$

To prove this, we regroup the terms by

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{X}\mathcal{Y}}^+(y) + \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{X}\mathcal{Y}}^-(y)$$

$$= (\pi y - 6) + e^{-\pi y}(-110\pi y + 24\pi^2 y^2 + 132) + e^{-2\pi y}(-243\pi y + 192\pi^2 y^2 + 162)$$

$$\quad + e^{-3\pi y}(-840\pi^2 y^2 - 108 + 234\pi y) + e^{-4\pi y}(-2176\pi y + 2208\pi^2 y^2 + 768)$$

$$\quad + e^{-5\pi y}(-1440\pi^2 y^2 - 288 + 1008\pi y) + e^{-6\pi y}(-700\pi y + 2016\pi^2 y^2 + 168)$$

$$\quad + e^{-7\pi y}(-2496\pi^2 y^2 - 144 + 696\pi y). \tag{11.16}$$

To prove this, one divides the interval $[1, 2.2]$ into, say, ten subintervals, $[1, 2.2) = \cup_{i=0}^9 [a_i, a_{i+1})$. In each intervals, by careful calculations, we can show that the function is positive on each interval. $\square$

Lemma 11.3. *The estimates hold:* $\left| \left(\mathcal{Y}_e'' \mathcal{X}' - \mathcal{Y}_e' \mathcal{X}'' + \mathcal{Y}_a'' \mathcal{X}_e' - \mathcal{X}_e'' \mathcal{Y}_a' \right)(y) \right| \leq (44\pi^2 + 18\pi + 36\pi y) e^{-\frac{17}{4}\pi y}$.

Remark 11.1. *The coefficient of the bound is not sharp, but the exponential term captures the main feature.*

Proof. By Lemma 11.1, one infers that

$$|\mathcal{Y}_e'(y)| \leq 18\pi\sqrt{y} e^{-\frac{17}{4}\pi y}, |\mathcal{Y}_e''(y)| \leq \frac{290\pi^2}{4} \sqrt{y} e^{-\frac{17}{4}\pi y}, |\mathcal{X}_e'(y)| \leq 41\pi\sqrt{y} e^{-5\pi y}, |\mathcal{X}_e''(y)| \leq 201\pi^2 \sqrt{y} e^{-5\pi y}$$

For $\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{X}'', \mathcal{Y}'_a, \mathcal{Y}''_a$, by their expressions, one has

$$|\mathcal{X}'(y)| \le \frac{3}{5\sqrt{y}}, |\mathcal{X}''(y)| \le (\frac{1}{4y^{3/2}} + 2\sqrt{y}), |\mathcal{Y}'_a(y)| \le (\frac{1}{\sqrt{y}} + 2\sqrt{y}), |\mathcal{Y}'_a(y)| \le (\frac{1}{4y^{3/2}} + 2\sqrt{y}).$$

Thus, one can get the result.

$\square$

Lemma 11.4. *There holds* $\left(\mathcal{Y}''\mathcal{X}' - \mathcal{Y}''\mathcal{X}'\right)(y) > 0, \ \ y \in [1.1, \infty)$.

Proof. It remains to prove that $\frac{16y}{\pi} e^{\frac{1}{4}\pi y} \left(\mathcal{Y}''\mathcal{X}' - \mathcal{Y}''\mathcal{X}'\right)(y) > 0, \ \ y \in [1.1, \infty)$.
By Lemmas 11.2 and 11.3,

$$\frac{16y}{\pi} e^{\frac{1}{4}\pi y} \left(\mathcal{Y}''\mathcal{X}' - \mathcal{Y}''\mathcal{X}'\right)(y)$$
$$= \frac{16y}{\pi} e^{\frac{1}{4}\pi y} \left(\mathcal{Y}''_a\mathcal{X}'_a - \mathcal{X}''_a\mathcal{Y}'_a\right)(y) + \frac{16y}{\pi} e^{\frac{1}{4}\pi y} \left(\mathcal{Y}''_e\mathcal{X}' - \mathcal{Y}'_e\mathcal{X}'' + \mathcal{Y}''_a\mathcal{X}'_e - \mathcal{X}''_e\mathcal{Y}'_a\right)(y)$$
$$\ge \frac{16y}{\pi} e^{\frac{1}{4}\pi y} \left(\mathcal{Y}''_a\mathcal{X}'_a - \mathcal{X}''_a\mathcal{Y}'_a\right)(y) - \frac{16y}{\pi}(44\pi^2 + 18\pi + 36\pi y)e^{-4\pi y}$$
$$\ge \left(\frac{16y}{\pi} e^{\frac{1}{4}\pi y} \left(\mathcal{Y}''_a\mathcal{X}'_a - \mathcal{X}''_a\mathcal{Y}'_a\right)(y) - 16y(44\pi + 18 + 36y)e^{-4\pi y}\right)|_{y=1.1} = 0.001671778\cdots, y \in [1.1, \infty)$$
$$> 0, \quad y \in [1.1, \infty).$$

In the second last step, one uses the fact that $y \mapsto -16y(44\pi + 18 + 36y)e^{-4\pi y}, y > 1$ is strictly increasing.

$\square$

Lemma 11.5. $y \to \frac{512y^4}{\pi} e^{\frac{1}{4}\pi y} \left(\mathcal{Y}''''_a\mathcal{X}''_a - \mathcal{Y}''_a\mathcal{X}''''_a\right)(y)$ *is monotonically decreasing on* $(1, 1.2)$.

Proof. By direct calculations, one regroups the terms by

$$\frac{512y^4}{\pi} e^{\frac{1}{4}\pi y} \left(\mathcal{Y}''''_a\mathcal{X}''_a - \mathcal{Y}''''_a\mathcal{X}''''_a\right)(y)$$
$$= -\pi^3y^3 + 8\pi^2y^2 + 84\pi y - 144$$
$$\quad + e^{-\pi y}\Big(-240\pi^5y^5 - 9240\pi y - 6320\pi^2y^2 + 1392\pi^4y^4 + 350\pi^3y^3 + 3168\Big)$$
$$\quad + e^{-2\pi y}\Big(-11232\pi^5y^5 - 14877\pi^3y^3 - 20412\pi y - 32856\pi^2y^2 + 36096\pi^4y^4 + 3888\Big)$$
$$\quad + e^{-3\pi y}\Big(-348240\pi^4y^4 - 2592 + 178854\pi^3y^3 + 209040\pi^5y^5 + 19656\pi y + 91536\pi^2y^2\Big)$$
$$\quad + e^{-4\pi y}\Big(-804576\pi^5y^5 - 121856\pi^3y^3 - 472576\pi^2y^2 - 182784\pi y + 1465533\pi^4y^4 + 18432\Big)$$
$$\quad + e^{-5\pi y}\Big(-140064\pi 64y^4 - 6912 + 160272\pi^3y^3 + 685440\pi^5y^5 + 84672\pi y + 284544\pi^2y^2\Big)$$
$$\quad + e^{-6\pi y}\Big(-570500\pi^3y^3 - 3628800\pi^5y^5 - 58800\pi y - 301280\pi^2y^2 + 3100608\pi^4y^4 + 4032\Big)$$
$$\quad + e^{-7\pi y}\Big(-5236608\pi^4y^4 - 3456 + 862344\pi^3y^3 + 7527936\pi^5y^5 + 361152\pi^2y^2 + 58464\pi y\Big).$$
$$\tag{11.17}$$

The rest is careful calculations by taking derivatives.

$\square$

Lemma 11.6. *There has* $\left|\left(\mathcal{Y}''''_e\mathcal{X}'' - \mathcal{Y}''_e\mathcal{X}'''' + \mathcal{Y}''''_a\mathcal{X}''_e - \mathcal{X}''''_e\mathcal{Y}''_a\right)(y)\right| \le 16(\frac{17}{4}\pi)^4 \sqrt{y}e^{-\frac{17}{4}\pi y}, \ \ y \ge 1$.

Remark 11.2. *The coefficient of the bound is rather rough but is enough to get our result. The exponential power captures the main feature.*

Proof. By Lemma 11.1, one infers that

$$|\mathcal{Y}_e''(y)| \le 4(\frac{17}{4}\pi)^2(1 + \sigma_{\mathcal{Y}_e,2})\sqrt{y}e^{-\frac{17}{4}\pi y}, |\mathcal{Y}_e''''(y)| \le 4(\frac{17}{4}\pi)^4(1 + \sigma_{\mathcal{Y}_e,4})\sqrt{y}e^{-\frac{17}{4}\pi y} \qquad (11.18)$$

and

$$|\mathcal{X}_e''(y)| \le 8(5\pi)^2(1 + \sigma_{\mathcal{X}_e,2})\sqrt{y}e^{-5\pi y}, |\mathcal{X}_e''''(y)| \le 8(5\pi)^4(1 + \sigma_{\mathcal{X}_e,4})\sqrt{y}e^{-5\pi y}. \qquad (11.19)$$

Here $\sigma_{\mathcal{X}_e,j}, \sigma_{\mathcal{Y}_e,j}, j = 2, 4$ are small and can be bounded by $\frac{1}{4}$. For $\mathcal{X}'', \mathcal{X}'''', \mathcal{Y}_a''$ and $\mathcal{Y}_a''''$, by their explicit expressions, one has

$$|\mathcal{X}''''(y)| \le 10, \quad |\mathcal{X}''(y)| \le 1.2, |\mathcal{Y}_a''''(y)| \le \frac{1}{10}, \quad |\mathcal{Y}_a''(y)| \le 1, \quad y \ge 1. \qquad (11.20)$$

Combining (11.18), (11.19) with (11.20), one gets the estimate.

$\square$

Lemma 11.7. *There holds* $\left(\mathcal{Y}''''\mathcal{X}'' - \mathcal{Y}''\mathcal{X}''''\right)(y) > 0, \quad y \in [1, 1.11]$.

Proof. It suffices to prove that
$\frac{512y^4}{\pi}e^{\frac{1}{4}\pi y}\left(\mathcal{Y}''''\mathcal{X}'' - \mathcal{Y}''\mathcal{X}''''\right)(y) > 0, \quad y \in [1, 1.11]$. By the decomposition and Lemmas 11.5 and 11.6, we obtain that

$$\frac{512y^4}{\pi}e^{\frac{1}{4}\pi y}\left(\mathcal{Y}''''\mathcal{X}'' - \mathcal{Y}''\mathcal{X}''''\right)(y)$$

$$=\frac{512y^4}{\pi}e^{\frac{1}{4}\pi y}\left(\mathcal{Y}_a''''\mathcal{X}_a'' - \mathcal{Y}_a''\mathcal{X}_a''''\right)(y) + \frac{512y^4}{\pi}e^{\frac{1}{4}\pi y}\left(\mathcal{Y}_e''''\mathcal{X}'' - \mathcal{Y}_e''\mathcal{X}'''' + \mathcal{Y}_a''''\mathcal{X}_e'' - \mathcal{X}_e''''\mathcal{Y}_a''\right)(y)$$

$$\ge\frac{512y^4}{\pi}e^{\frac{1}{4}\pi y}\left(\mathcal{Y}_a''''\mathcal{X}_a'' - \mathcal{Y}_a''\mathcal{X}_a''''\right)(y) - \frac{72}{5}\cdot 17^4\pi^3 y^{9/2}e^{-4\pi y}$$

$$\ge\frac{512y^4}{\pi}e^{\frac{1}{4}\pi y}\left(\mathcal{Y}_a''''\mathcal{X}_a'' - \mathcal{Y}_a''\mathcal{X}_a''''\right)(y)\mid_{y=1.11} - \frac{72}{5}\cdot 17^4\pi^3 y^{9/2}e^{-4\pi y}\mid_{y=1}, y \in [1, 1.11]$$

$$=158.4646175\cdots - 130.0476135\cdots$$

$$>0.$$

$$(11.21)$$

$\square$

11.2. **The rest of proof in Theorem 7.1.**

Lemma 11.8. *The function* $y \to \frac{4y}{\pi}e^{\frac{1}{2}\pi y}\left(\mathcal{B}_a''\mathcal{A}_a' - \mathcal{A}_a''\mathcal{B}_a'\right)(y), y > 1$ *is monotone increasing.*

Proof. By direct calculations, one regroups the terms by

$$\frac{4y}{\pi}e^{\frac{1}{2}\pi y}\left(\mathcal{B}_a''\mathcal{A}_a' - \mathcal{A}_a''\mathcal{B}_a'\right)(y)$$

$$=\left(\pi y - 3 - 288e^{-8\pi y}\pi^2 y^2 - 12e^{-8\pi y} - 144e^{-\frac{9}{2}\pi y} - 72e^{-3\pi y} - 48e^{-\frac{5}{2}\pi y} - 84e^{-5\pi y} - 12\pi e^{-\pi y}y\right.$$

$$- 8\pi e^{-\frac{1}{2}\pi y}y - 768\pi^2 e^{-\frac{9}{2}\pi y}y^2 - 128\pi^2 e^{-\frac{5}{2}\pi y}y^2 - 240y^2 e^{-3\pi y}\pi^2 - 504e^{-5\pi y}\pi^2 y^2 - 52e^{-6\pi y}\pi y$$

$$\left.- 99e^{-4\pi y}\pi y - 10e^{-2\pi y}\pi y\right)$$

$$+\left(68e^{-8\pi y}\pi y + 240e^{-6\pi y}\pi^2 y^2 + 12e^{-\frac{1}{2}\pi y} + 12e^{-6\pi y} + 33e^{-4\pi y} + 6e^{-2\pi y} + 12e^{-\pi y} + 96\pi e^{-\frac{5}{2}\pi y}y\right.$$

$$\left.+ 480\pi e^{-\frac{9}{2}\pi y}y + 8\pi^2 e^{-\pi y}y^2 + 168ye^{-3\pi y}\pi + 64e^{-4\pi y}\pi^2 y^2 + 48e^{-2\pi y}\pi^2 y^2 + 308e^{-5\pi y}\pi y\right)$$

$$(11.22)$$

Denote the terms in the first and second bracket of (11.22) by $\mathcal{P}_{AB}^+$ and $\mathcal{P}_{AB}^-$. Then

$$\frac{4y}{\pi}e^{\frac{1}{2}\pi y}\left(\mathcal{B}_a''\mathcal{A}_a' - \mathcal{A}_a''\mathcal{B}_a'\right)(y) = \mathcal{P}_{AB}^+(y) + \mathcal{P}_{AB}^-(y). \qquad (11.23)$$

It remains to prove that $\mathcal{P}_{AB}^+(y) + \mathcal{P}_{AB}^-(y) > 0, \quad y > 1$.

By Lemma 11.1,

$$\left(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{AB}}^{+}(y)\right)'(y) > \pi, \quad \left(\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{AB}}^{+}(y)\right)''(y) < 0, \quad \left(\mathcal{P}_{\overline{\mathcal{AB}}}^{-}(y)\right)'(y) < 0, \quad \left(\mathcal{P}_{\overline{\mathcal{AB}}}^{-}(y)\right)''(y) > 0 \qquad (11.24)$$

Since $\left(\mathcal{P}_{\overline{\mathcal{AB}}}^{-}(y)\right)'(y)\mid_{y=1.82} = -3.051954266\cdots$, one has

$$\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{AB}}^{+}(y) + \mathcal{P}_{\overline{\mathcal{AB}}}^{-}(y) \geq \pi - 3.051954266\cdots, y \in [1.82, \infty) > 0. \qquad (11.25)$$

It remains to prove that $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{AB}}^{+}(y) + \mathcal{P}_{\overline{\mathcal{AB}}}^{-}(y) > 0$ on the bounded interval $(1, 1.82]$. To this end, we divide the interval $(1, 1.82]$ into 10 smaller subintervals, and compute the derivatives on each interval to arrive the result.

$\square$

Lemma 11.9. *There holds:* $\left|\left(\mathcal{B}_e''\mathcal{A}' - \mathcal{B}_e'\mathcal{A}'' + \mathcal{B}_a''\mathcal{A}_e' - \mathcal{A}_e''\mathcal{B}_a'\right)(y)\right| \leq 8(\frac{13}{8}\pi)^2 \sqrt{y}e^{-\frac{13}{2}\pi y}, \quad y \geq 1.$

By Lemma 11.1, one has for $j = 1, 2, \cdots$

$$|\mathcal{A}_e^{(j)}(y)| \leq 4(1 + \sigma_{\mathcal{A}_e, j})(\frac{13}{2}\pi)^j \sqrt{y}e^{-\frac{13}{2}\pi y}, \quad |\mathcal{B}_e^{(j)}(y)| \leq 4(1 + \sigma_{\mathcal{B}_e, j})(\frac{13}{2}\pi)^j \sqrt{y}e^{-\frac{13}{2}\pi y}. \qquad (11.26)$$

Here the $\sigma_{\mathcal{A}_e, j}, \sigma_{\mathcal{B}_e, j}$ are small and can be bounded by $\frac{1}{2}$. For $\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{A}', \mathcal{B}_a', \mathcal{B}_a''$, by their explicit expressions, one deduces that

$$|\mathcal{A}'(y)| \leq 0.3, \quad |\mathcal{A}''(y)| \leq \frac{1}{2}, \quad |\mathcal{B}_a'(y)| \leq \frac{1}{5}, \quad |\mathcal{B}_a''(y)| \leq \frac{1}{5}. \qquad (11.27)$$

Combining (11.26) and (11.27), one gets the estimate.

Lemma 11.10. *There holds* $\left(\mathcal{B}''\mathcal{A}' - \mathcal{A}''\mathcal{B}'\right)(y) > 0$ *if* $y \in [1.05, \infty)$.

Proof. Equivalently, it suffice to prove that $\frac{4y}{\pi}e^{\frac{1}{2}\pi y}\left(\mathcal{B}''\mathcal{A}' - \mathcal{A}''\mathcal{B}'\right)(y) > 0$ if $y \in [1.05, \infty)$. By Lemmas 11.8 and 11.9, we deduce that

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\frac{4y}{\pi}e^{\frac{1}{2}\pi y}\left(\mathcal{B}''\mathcal{A}' - \mathcal{A}''\mathcal{B}'\right)(y) \\
=&\frac{4y}{\pi}e^{\frac{1}{2}\pi y}\left(\mathcal{B}_a''\mathcal{A}_a' - \mathcal{A}_a''\mathcal{B}_a'\right)(y) + \frac{4y}{\pi}e^{\frac{1}{2}\pi y}\left(\mathcal{B}_e''\mathcal{A}' - \mathcal{B}_e'\mathcal{A}'' + \mathcal{B}_a''\mathcal{A}_e' - \mathcal{A}_e''\mathcal{B}_a'\right)(y) \\
\geq&\frac{4y}{\pi}e^{\frac{1}{2}\pi y}\left(\mathcal{B}_a''\mathcal{A}_a' - \mathcal{A}_a''\mathcal{B}_a'\right)(y) - 1352\pi y^{3/2}e^{-6\pi y} \\
\geq&\left(\frac{4y}{\pi}e^{\frac{1}{2}\pi y}\left(\mathcal{B}_a''\mathcal{A}_a' - \mathcal{A}_a''\mathcal{B}_a'\right)(y) - 1352\pi y^{3/2}e^{-6\pi y}\right)\mid_{y=1.05} = 0.001189906301\cdots \\
>&0.
\end{aligned}
\qquad (11.28)
$$

Here we use the fact that $y \mapsto -y^{3/2}e^{-6\pi y}, y > 1$ is strictly increasing in the second last inequality.

$\square$

Lemma 11.11. $y \to \frac{32y^4}{\pi}e^{\frac{1}{2}\pi y}\left(\mathcal{B}_a''''\mathcal{A}_a'' - \mathcal{B}_a''\mathcal{A}_a''''\right)(y)$ *is strictly decreasing on* $(1, 1.12)$.

Proof. By Direct calculations, one regroups the terms by

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{32y^4}{\pi} & e^{\frac{1}{2}\pi y}\Big(\mathcal{B}_a''''' \mathcal{A}_a'' - \mathcal{B}_a'''' \mathcal{A}_a'''' \Big)(y) \\
= & -\pi^3 y^3 + 4\pi^2 y^2 + 21\pi y - 18 \\
& + e^{-\frac{1}{2}\pi y}(32\pi^3 y^3 + 72 - 64\pi^2 y^2 - 168\pi y) \\
& + e^{-\pi y}(176\pi^4 y^4 + 72 - 48\pi^5 y^5 - 252\pi y - 304\pi^2 y^2 - 132\pi^3 y^3) \\
& + e^{-2\pi y}(2784\pi^4 y^4 + 36 - 960\pi^5 y^5 - 2150\pi^3 y^3 - 1160\pi^2 y^2 - 210\pi y) \\
& + e^{-\frac{5}{2}\pi y}(6144\pi^5 y^5 + 4224\pi^3 y^3 + 2016\pi y + 4864\pi^2 y^2 - 11264\pi^4 y^4 - 288) \\
& + e^{-3\pi y}(8568\pi^3 y^3 + 16800\pi^5 y^5 + 9504\pi^2 y^2 + 3528\pi y - 28320\pi^4 y^4 - 432) \\
& + e^{-4\pi y}(2007\pi^3 y^3 + 28800\pi^5 y^5 + 8708\pi^2 y^2 + 3213\pi y - 32320\pi^4 y^4 - 306) \\
& + e^{-5\pi y}(99792\pi^5 y^5 + 18172\pi^3 y^3 + 23632\pi^2 y^2 + 6468\pi y - 140112\pi^4 y^4 - 504) \\
& + e^{-6\pi y}(49660\pi^3 y^3 + 336960\pi^5 y^5 + 27920\pi^2 y^2 + 5460\pi y - 295200\pi^4 y^4 - 360).
\end{aligned}
\tag{11.29}
$$

Using the explicit expression in (11.29) and dividing the interval $(1, 1.12)$ into 10 smaller intervals and calculating the derivatives on each interval, we obtain the result. $\qquad\square$

Lemma 11.12. *The error estimate holds:*
$$
\Big|\Big(\mathcal{B}_e''''' \mathcal{A}'' - \mathcal{B}_e'' \mathcal{A}'''' + \mathcal{B}_a''''' \mathcal{A}_e'' - \mathcal{A}_e'''' \mathcal{B}_a'' \Big)(y)\Big| \le 8\Big(\frac{13}{2}\pi\Big)^4 \sqrt{y} e^{-\frac{13}{2}\pi y}.
\tag{11.30}
$$

Remark 11.3. *The coefficient of the bound is rather rough but is enough to get our result. The exponential power captures the main feature.*

Proof. Using the explicit expressions of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}_a$, after tedious estimates, we arrive at
$$
|\mathcal{A}''''(y)| \le 8, \quad |\mathcal{B}_a''''(y)| \le 5.
\tag{11.31}
$$
This, combining with (11.26) and (11.27), gives the estimate. $\qquad\square$

Lemma 11.13. *There holds*
$$
\Big(\mathcal{B}''''' \mathcal{A}'' - \mathcal{B}'' \mathcal{A}'''' \Big)(y) > 0, y \in [1, 1.12].
\tag{11.32}
$$

Proof. It is equivalent to proving that $\frac{32y^4}{\pi} e^{\frac{1}{2}\pi y}\Big(\mathcal{B}''''' \mathcal{A}'' - \mathcal{B}'' \mathcal{A}''''\Big)(y) > 0, y \in [1, 1.12]$. By Lemmas 11.11 and 11.12, we have that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{32y^4}{\pi} & e^{\frac{1}{2}\pi y}\Big(\mathcal{B}''''' \mathcal{A}'' - \mathcal{B}'' \mathcal{A}''''\Big)(y) \\
= & \frac{32y^4}{\pi} e^{\frac{1}{2}\pi y}\Big(\mathcal{B}_a''''' \mathcal{A}_a'' - \mathcal{B}_a'' \mathcal{A}_a''''\Big)(y) + \frac{32y^4}{\pi} e^{\frac{1}{2}\pi y}\Big(\mathcal{A}_2'' \mathcal{B}''''' + \mathcal{B}_2''''' \mathcal{A}_a'' - \mathcal{A}_2'''' \mathcal{B}'' - \mathcal{B}_2'' \mathcal{A}_a''''\Big)(y) \\
\ge & \frac{32y^4}{\pi} e^{\frac{1}{2}\pi y}\Big(\mathcal{B}_a''''' \mathcal{A}_a'' - \mathcal{B}_a'' \mathcal{A}_a''''\Big)(y) - 26^4 \pi^3 y^{9/2} e^{-6\pi y} \\
\ge & \frac{32y^4}{\pi} e^{\frac{1}{2}\pi y}\Big(\mathcal{B}_a''''' \mathcal{A}_a'' - \mathcal{B}_a'' \mathcal{A}_a''''\Big)(y) \mid_{y=1.12} -26^4 \pi^3 y^{9/2} e^{-6\pi y} \mid_{y=1} \\
= & 49.93918473\cdots - 0.09227517899\cdots \\
> & 0.
\end{aligned}
\tag{11.33}
$$

$\qquad\square$

References

[1] A. A. Abrikosov, Nobel Lecture: Type-II superconductors and the vortex lattice. *Reviews of modern physics* 76(2004), no.3, p. 975.

[2] A. Aftalion, P. Mason, and J. Wei, Vortex-peak interaction and lattice shape in rotating two-component Bose-Einstein condensates. *Physical Review A*, (2012), 85(3), 033614.

[3] A. Aftalion, X. Blanc, and F. Nier, Lowest Landau level functional and Bargmann spaces for BoseEinstein condensates, *Journal of Functional Analysis*, (2006), 241(2), 661-702.

[4] A. Aftalion, and S. Serfaty, Lowest Landau level approach in superconductivity for the Abrikosov lattice close to H_{c_2}, *Selecta Mathematica*, (2007), 13(2), 183.

[5] T. M. Apostol. Modular functions and Dirichlet series in number theory. Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 1976.

[6] L. Bétermin and P. Zhang. Minimization of energy per particle among Bravais lattices in $\mathbb{R}^2$ Lennard-Jones and Thomas-Fermi cases. *Commun. Contemp. Math.*, 17(6) (2015), 1450049.

[7] L. Bétermin, Two-dimensional theta functions and crystallization among Bravais lattices, *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 48(5) (2016), 32363269.

[8] L. Bétermin, Local variational study of 2d lattice energies and application to Lennard-Jones type interactions, *Nonlinearity*, 31(9) (2018), 3973-4005.

[9] L. Bétermin, Minimizing lattice structures for Morse potential energy in two and three dimensions, *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 60(10) (2019), 102901.

[10] L. Bétermin and M. Petrache, Dimension reduction techniques for the minimization of theta functions on lattices. *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, 58(7)(2017), 071902.

[11] L. Bétermin, M. Faulhuber and H. Knüpfer On the optimality of the rock-salt structure among lattices with charge distributions, arXiv:2004.04553.

[12] X. Blanc and M. Lewin. The Crystallization Conjecture: A Review. *EMS Surveys in Mathematical Sciences, EMS* 2(2)2015, 255-306.

[13] X. Chen and Y. Oshita. An application of the modular function in nonlocal variational problems. *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.*, 186(1) (2007), 109132.

[14] H. Cohn, A. Kumar, S.D. Miller, D. Radchenko, M. Viazovska, The sphere packing problem in dimension 24, *Annals of Mathematics* 2017, 1017-1033.

[15] H. Cohn, A. Kumar, S. D. Miller, D. Radchenko, M. Viazovska, Universal optimality of the E_8 and Leech lattices and interpolation formulas, arXiv:1902.05438.

[16] R. Evans. A fundamental region for Heckes modular group. *J. Number Theory*, 5(2) (1973), 108115.

[17] M. Faulhuber. Minimal Frame Operator Norms via Minimal Theta Functions. *Journal of Fourier Analysis and Applications*, 24(2)(2018), 545-559.

[18] M. Faulhuber. Extremal determinants of Laplace-Beltrami operators for rectangular tori. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, March 2020 (online first).

[19] D. Goldman, C. B. Muratov, and S. Serfaty. The Gamma-limit of the two-dimensional Ohta-Kawasaki energy. I. droplet density. *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.* 210(2)(2013), 581613.

[20] T.L. Ho, Bose-Einstein condensates with large number of vortices. *Physical Review Letters* 87(2001), 604031-604034.

[21] M. Keeli, M.O. Oktel, Tkachenko modes and structural phase transitions of the vortex lattice of a two-component Bose-Einstein condensate, *Physical Review A*, (2006), 73(2), 023611.

[22] K. Kasamatsu, M. Tsubota, and M. Ueda, Vortex phase diagram in rotating two-component Bose-Einstein condensates. Physical review letters, 91(15), (2003), 150406.

[23] K. Kasamatsu, M. Tsubota, and M. Ueda, Vortices in multicomponent Bose-Einstein condensates. *International Journal of Modern Physics B*, 19(11), (2005) 1835-1904.

[24] M. Keeli, M.O. Oktel, Tkachenko modes and structural phase transitions of the vortex lattice of a two-component Bose-Einstein condensate, *Physical Review A*, (2006), 73(2), 023611.

[25] P. Kuopanportti, J.A. Huhtamki, and M. Mttnen, Exotic vortex lattices in two-species Bose-Einstein condensates, *Physical Review A*, (2012), 85(4), 043613.

[26] K. Kasamatsu, M. Tsubota, and M. Ueda, Vortex phase diagram in rotating two-component Bose-Einstein condensates. Physical review letters, 91(15), (2003), 150406.

[27] K. Kasamatsu, M. Tsubota, and M. Ueda, Vortices in multicomponent Bose-Einstein condensates. *International Journal of Modern Physics B*, 19(11), (2005) 1835-1904.

[28] C.S. Lin and C.L. Wang, Elliptic functions, Green functions and the mean field equation on tori, *Annals of Mathematics*, 172 (2010), 911-954.

[29] S. Luo, X. Ren and J. Wei, Non-hexagonal lattices from a two species interacting system, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, 52(2) (2020), 1903-1942.

[30] M. R. Matthews, B. P. Anderson, P. C. Haljan, D. S. Hall, C. E. Wieman, and E. A. Cornell Vortices in a Bose-Einstein condensate. *Physical Review Letters*, 83(13) (1999), 2498.

[31] E.J. Mueller and T.L. Ho, Two-component Bose-Einstein condensates with a large number of vortices *Physical review letters*, 88 (2002), 180403.

[32] B. Osgood, R. Phillips, and P. Sarnak, Extremals of determinants of Laplacians, *Journal of functional analysis* 80(1988), 148-211.

[33] H. Montgomery, Minimal theta functions. *Glasgow Math. J.* 30 (1988), 75-85.

[34] X. Ren and J. Wei. A double bubble assembly as a new phase of a ternary inhibitory system. *Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal.* 215(3) (2015), 9671034.

[35] P. Sarnak and A. Strmbergsson, Minima of Epstein's zeta function and heights of flat tori. *Invent. Math.* 165(2006), 115151.

[36] E. Sandier and S. Serfaty, Vortex patterns in Ginzburg-Landau minimizers. *XVIth International Congress on Mathematical Physics*, 246-264, World Sci. Publ., 2010.

[37] E. Sandier and S. Serfaty, From the Ginzburg-Landau model to vortex lattice problems. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 313(2012), 635-743.

[38] S. Serfaty, Ginzburg-Landau vortices, Coulomb Gases and Abrikosov lattices, *Comptes-Rendus Physique* 15(2014), No. 6.

[39] M.S. Viazovska, The sphere packing problem in dimension 8, *Annals of Mathematics* 2017, 991-1015.

(S. Luo) Department of Mathematics, Jiangxi Normal University, Nanchang, 330022, China

(S. Luo) Department of Mathematics, University of Cincinnati, OH, 45221, USA

(J. Wei) Department of Mathematics, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C., Canada, V6T 1Z2

E-mail address, S. Luo: `luosp1989@163.com or luosg@ucmail.uc.edu`

E-mail address, J. Wei: `jcwei@math.ubc.ca`