

Riemann Hypothesis

Shekhar Suman

February 21, 2020

1 Abstract

The Riemann Zeta function is defined as the Analytic Continuation of the Dirichlet series,

$$\zeta(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 1/n^s, \operatorname{Re}(s) > 1$$

The Riemann Zeta function is holomorphic in the complex plane except for a simple pole at $s = 1$

The non trivial zeroes (i.e those not at negative even integers) of the Riemann Zeta function lie in the critical strip

$$0 < \operatorname{Re}(s) < 1$$

Riemann's Xi function is defined as [4, p.1],

$$\epsilon(s) = s(s-1)\pi^{-s/2}\Gamma(s/2)\zeta(s)/2$$

The zero of $(s-1)$ cancels the pole of $\zeta(s)$, and the real zeroes of $s\zeta(s)$ are cancelled by the simple poles of $\Gamma(s/2)$ which never vanishes.

Thus, $\epsilon(s)$ is an entire function whose zeroes are the non trivial zeroes of $\zeta(s)$

Further, $\epsilon(s)$ satisfies the functional equation

$$\epsilon(1-s) = \epsilon(s)$$

2 Statement of the Riemann Hypothesis

The Riemann Hypothesis states that all the non trivial zeroes of the Riemann Zeta function lie on the critical line $\text{Re}(s)=1/2$

3 Proof

The Riemann Xi function

defined as a Hadamard Product [2,p.37, Theorem 2.11] is, for all $s \in \mathbb{C}$ we have,

$$\epsilon(s) = \epsilon(0) \prod_{\rho} \left(1 - \frac{s}{\rho}\right)$$

where if we combine the factors $\left(1 - \frac{s}{\rho}\right)$ and $\left(1 - \frac{s}{(1-\rho)}\right)$, the product converges absolutely and uniformly on compact subsets of \mathbb{C}

Also, $\epsilon(0) = 1/2$

Claim: Let, $\epsilon(s) \neq 0$, for $\text{Im}(s) \in \mathbb{R}^*$, (where \mathbb{R}^* denotes the set of all non zero real numbers), then $\text{Re}(s) \neq 1/2$.

The functional equation of Riemann Xi function is

$$\epsilon(1-s) = \epsilon(s)$$

Since, $\epsilon(s) \neq 0$

Thus,

$$\epsilon(1-s)/\epsilon(s) = 1.$$

$$\Rightarrow |\epsilon(1-s)|^2 / |\epsilon(s)|^2 = 1$$

$$|\epsilon(s)|^2 = |\epsilon(0) \prod_{\rho} (1 - \frac{s}{\rho})|^2$$

$$|\epsilon(1-s)|^2 = |\epsilon(0) \prod_{\rho} (1 - \frac{1-s}{\rho})|^2$$

$$\Rightarrow |\epsilon(1-s)|^2 / |\epsilon(s)|^2 = \prod_{\rho} |1 - \frac{1-s}{\rho}|^2 / \prod_{\rho} |1 - \frac{s}{\rho}|^2 = 1$$

Let, $s = \sigma + it$, $0 < \text{Re}(s) < 1$, $\text{Im}(s) \in \mathbb{R}^*$ (where \mathbb{R}^* denotes the set of all non zero real numbers)

and $\rho = a + ib$, $0 < \text{Re}(\rho) < 1$, $\text{Im}(\rho) \in \mathbb{R}^*$ (where \mathbb{R}^* denotes the set of all non zero real numbers)

$$|\epsilon(1-s)|^2 / |\epsilon(s)|^2 =$$

$$|\epsilon(0)|^2 \prod_{\rho} |1 - \frac{1-(\sigma+it)}{a+ib}|^2 / |\epsilon(0)|^2 \prod_{\rho} |1 - \frac{(\sigma+it)}{a+ib}|^2 = 1$$

$$\Rightarrow |\epsilon(1-s)|^2 / |\epsilon(s)|^2 =$$

$$\prod_{\rho} |1 - \frac{1-(\sigma+it)}{a+ib}|^2 / \prod_{\rho} |1 - \frac{(\sigma+it)}{a+ib}|^2 = 1$$

$$\Rightarrow |\epsilon(1-s)|^2 / |\epsilon(s)|^2 =$$

$$\prod_{\rho} | \frac{[(a+\sigma-1)+i(b+t)]}{a+ib} |^2 / \prod_{\rho} | \frac{(a-\sigma)+i(b-t)}{a+ib} |^2 = 1$$

$$\Rightarrow |\epsilon(1-s)|^2 / |\epsilon(s)|^2 =$$

$$\prod_{\rho} \frac{[(a+\sigma-1)^2+(b+t)^2]}{a^2+b^2} / \prod_{\rho} \frac{(a-\sigma)^2+(b-t)^2}{a^2+b^2} = 1 \quad \dots \quad (*)$$

Since,

$$0 < \text{Re}(s) < 1$$

$$\Rightarrow a^2 + b^2 \neq 0 \forall a \in (0, 1) .$$

$$\Rightarrow \prod_{\rho} (a^2 + b^2) \neq 0$$

So, (*) gives,

$$\prod_{\rho} [(a + \sigma - 1)^2 + (b + t)^2] / \prod_{\rho} [(a - \sigma)^2 + (b - t)^2] = 1$$

$$\prod_{\rho} [(a - \sigma + 2\sigma - 1)^2 + (b - t + 2t)^2] / \prod_{\rho} [(a - \sigma)^2 + (b - t)^2] = 1$$

$$\frac{\prod_{\rho} [(a - \sigma)^2 + (2\sigma - 1)^2 + 2(a - \sigma)(2\sigma - 1) + (b - t)^2 + 4t^2 + 4t(b - t)]}{\prod_{\rho} [(a - \sigma)^2 + (b - t)^2]} =$$

$$\frac{\prod_{\rho} [(a - \sigma)^2 + (b - t)^2 + (2\sigma - 1)(2\sigma - 1 + 2a - 2\sigma) + 4bt]}{\prod_{\rho} [(a - \sigma)^2 + (b - t)^2]} =$$

$$\frac{\prod_{\rho} [(a - \sigma)^2 + (b - t)^2 + (2\sigma - 1)(2a - 1) + 4bt]}{\prod_{\rho} [(a - \sigma)^2 + (b - t)^2]} =$$

$$\prod_{\rho} [(a - \sigma)^2 + (b - t)^2 + (2\sigma - 1)(2a - 1) + 4bt] / \prod_{\rho} [(a - \sigma)^2 + (b - t)^2] = 1$$

$$\prod_{\rho} [(a - \sigma)^2 + (b - t)^2 + (2\sigma - 1)(2a - 1) + 4bt] / [(a - \sigma)^2 + (b - t)^2] = 1$$

$$\prod_{\rho} 1 + \frac{(2\sigma - 1)(2a - 1) + 4bt}{[(a - \sigma)^2 + (b - t)^2]} = 1 \quad \dots \quad (1)$$

Since, $t \in \mathbb{R}^*$ we discuss 2 cases :

$$t \in (-\infty, 0) \cup (1/2, \infty) \text{ and } t \in (0, 1/2]$$

Case 1 : Let, $t \in (-\infty, 0) \cup (1/2, \infty)$

Define a set,

$$H = \{s = \sigma + it : \text{Im}(s) \in (-\infty, 0) \cup (1/2, \infty)\}$$

Since, $\epsilon(s) \neq 0 \forall \text{Im}(s) \in \mathbb{R}^*$

Therefore, $\epsilon(s) \neq 0 \forall s \in H$.

Since, $\epsilon(s) = \epsilon(0) \prod_{\rho}(1 - \frac{s}{\rho})$

$$\epsilon(\rho) = 0 \quad \dots \quad (2)$$

Claim A : $0 \leq Im(\rho) \leq 1/2$ or $0 \leq b \leq 1/2$.

We prove the claim by contradiction.

Let us assume, that $Im(\rho) \notin [0, 1/2]$

$$\Rightarrow Im(\rho) \in (-\infty, 0) \cup (1/2, \infty)$$

$$\Rightarrow \rho \in H.$$

Now since $\epsilon(s) \neq 0 \forall s \in H$.

$$\Rightarrow \epsilon(\rho) \neq 0.$$

which is a contradiction since $\epsilon(\rho) = 0$ (from (2)).

Thus, our assumption that $Im(\rho) \in (-\infty, 0) \cup (1/2, \infty)$ is wrong.

$$\text{Thus, } 0 \leq Im(\rho) \leq 1/2. \quad \dots \quad (3)$$

which proves Claim A

.But, $Im(\rho) \in \mathbb{R}^*$

$$\Rightarrow Im(\rho) \neq 0$$

$$\text{Thus, } 0 < Im(\rho) \leq 1/2 \text{ or } 0 < b \leq 1/2. \quad \dots \quad (4)$$

Claim B : If $\epsilon(s) \neq 0$, $Im(s) \in (-\infty, 0) \cup (1/2, \infty)$ then $\sigma \neq 1/2$.

We prove the claim by contradiction.

Let us assume, that $\sigma = 1/2$.

Then, by (1)

$$\prod_{\rho} 1 + \frac{(2\sigma-1)(2a-1)+4bt}{[(a-\sigma)^2+(b-t)^2]} = 1 \quad \dots \quad (5)$$

Putting $\sigma = 1/2$ in (5),

$$\prod_{\rho} 1 + \frac{4bt}{[(a-1/2)^2+(b-t)^2]} = 1 \quad \dots \quad (6)$$

Now $t \in (-\infty, 0) \cup (1/2, \infty)$, so we have two sub cases

, $t \in (-\infty, 0)$ or $t \in (1/2, \infty)$

Case 1(a) : $t \in (-\infty, 0)$

Then, by (6)

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{\rho} 1 + \frac{4bt}{[(a-1/2)^2+(b-t)^2]} &= 1 \\ 1 + \frac{4bt}{[(a-1/2)^2+(b-t)^2]} &= \frac{(a-1/2)^2+(b-t)^2+4bt}{(a-1/2)^2+(b-t)^2} \\ \Rightarrow 1 + \frac{4bt}{[(a-1/2)^2+(b-t)^2]} &= \frac{(a-1/2)^2+(b-t)^2}{(a-1/2)^2+(b-t)^2} \\ \Rightarrow 1 + \frac{4bt}{[(a-1/2)^2+(b-t)^2]} &\geq 0. \quad \dots \quad (7) \end{aligned}$$

Since, by (4) $0 < b \leq 1/2$ and $t < 0$

Thus, $4bt < 0$.

$$1 + \frac{4bt}{[(a-1/2)^2+(b-t)^2]} < 1 \quad \dots \quad (8)$$

From (7) and (8),

$$0 \leq 1 + \frac{4bt}{[(a-1/2)^2+(b-t)^2]} < 1$$

$$\text{Thus, } 0 \leq \prod_{\rho} 1 + \frac{4bt}{[(a-\sigma)^2+(b-t)^2]} < 1$$

which contradicts (6) since by (6), $\prod_{\rho} 1 + \frac{4bt}{[(a-1/2)^2+(b-t)^2]} = 1$

Case 1(b) : $t \in (1/2, \infty)$

$t > 1/2$ and $0 < b \leq 1/2$

$\Rightarrow 4bt > 0$.

$\Rightarrow 1 + \frac{4bt}{[(a-1/2)^2+(b-t)^2]} > 1$

$\Rightarrow \prod_{\rho} 1 + \frac{4bt}{[(a-1/2)^2+(b-t)^2]} > 1$

which contradicts (6) since by (6), $\prod_{\rho} 1 + \frac{4bt}{[(a-1/2)^2+(b-t)^2]} = 1$

So, in both the cases we get a contradiction .Hence ,our assumption that

$\sigma = 1/2$ is wrong

Thus , $\sigma \neq 1/2$.

We proved above that if $\epsilon(s) \neq 0$

and if $Im(s) \in (-\infty, 0) \cup (1/2, \infty)$,then

$Re(s) \neq 1/2$ Hence, Claim B is proved.

Case 2:

$$0 < Im(s) \leq 1/2 \text{ or } 0 < t \leq 1/2.$$

Define a set

$$L = \{s = \sigma + it : Im(s) \in (0, 1/2]\}$$

Since, $\epsilon(s) \neq 0 \forall Im(s) \in \mathbb{R}^*$

Therefore, $\epsilon(s) \neq 0 \forall s \in L$.

Since, $\epsilon(s) = \epsilon(0) \prod_{\rho} (1 - \frac{s}{\rho})$

$$\epsilon(\rho) = 0 \quad \dots \quad (9)$$

Claim C : $Im(\rho) \in (-\infty, 0] \cup (1/2, \infty)$.

We prove the claim by contradiction.

Let us assume, that $Im(\rho) \notin (-\infty, 0] \cup (1/2, \infty)$

$$\Rightarrow 0 < Im(\rho) \leq 1/2$$

$$\Rightarrow \rho \in L.$$

Now since $\epsilon(s) \neq 0 \forall s \in L$.

$$\Rightarrow \epsilon(\rho) \neq 0.$$

which is a contradiction since $\epsilon(\rho) = 0$ (from (9)).

Thus, our assumption that $Im(\rho) \notin (-\infty, 0] \cup (1/2, \infty)$ is wrong.

Thus, $Im(\rho) \in (-\infty, 0] \cup (1/2, \infty)$

But, we had $Im(\rho) \in \mathbb{R}^$*

$$\text{Thus, } Im(\rho) \in (-\infty, 0) \cup (1/2, \infty) \quad \dots \quad (10)$$

which proves Claim C .

Claim D : If $\epsilon(s) \neq 0, Im(s) \in (0, 1/2]$ then $\sigma \neq 1/2$.

We prove the claim by contradiction.

Let us assume, that $\sigma = 1/2$.

Then, by (1) ,

$$\prod_{\rho} 1 + \frac{(2\sigma-1)(2a-1)+4bt}{[(a-\sigma)^2+(b-t)^2]} = 1 \quad \dots \quad (11)$$

Putting $\sigma = 1/2$ in (11),

$$\prod_{\rho} 1 + \frac{4bt}{[(a-1/2)^2+(b-t)^2]} = 1 \quad \dots \quad (12)$$

Since , by (10) $Im(\rho) = b \in (-\infty, 0) \cup (1/2, \infty)$ so we have 2 subcases

$b \in (-\infty, 0)$ and $b \in (1/2, \infty)$. Also , $0 < t \leq 1/2$

Case 2(a) : $b \in (-\infty, 0) 0 < t \leq 1/2$

Then, by (12)

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{\rho} 1 + \frac{4bt}{[(a-1/2)^2+(b-t)^2]} &= 1 \\ 1 + \frac{4bt}{[(a-1/2)^2+(b-t)^2]} &= \frac{(a-1/2)^2+(b-t)^2+4bt}{(a-1/2)^2+(b-t)^2} \\ \Rightarrow 1 + \frac{4bt}{[(a-1/2)^2+(b-t)^2]} &= \frac{(a-1/2)^2+(b+t)^2}{(a-1/2)^2+(b-t)^2} \\ \Rightarrow 1 + \frac{4bt}{[(a-1/2)^2+(b-t)^2]} &\geq 0. \quad \dots \quad (13) \end{aligned}$$

Since, $b \in (-\infty, 0)$, $0 < t \leq 1/2$

Thus, $4bt < 0$.

$$1 + \frac{4bt}{[(a-1/2)^2+(b-t)^2]} < 1 \quad \dots \quad (14)$$

From (13) and (14),

$$0 \leq 1 + \frac{4bt}{[(a-1/2)^2+(b-t)^2]} < 1$$

$$\text{Thus, } 0 \leq \prod_{\rho} 1 + \frac{4bt}{[(a-\sigma)^2+(b-t)^2]} < 1$$

which contradicts (12) since by (12), $\prod_{\rho} 1 + \frac{4bt}{[(a-1/2)^2+(b-t)^2]} = 1$

Case 2(b) : $b \in (1/2, \infty)$, $0 < t \leq 1/2$

$\Rightarrow 4bt > 0$.

$\Rightarrow 1 + \frac{4bt}{[(a-1/2)^2+(b-t)^2]} > 1$

$\Rightarrow \prod_{\rho} 1 + \frac{4bt}{[(a-1/2)^2+(b-t)^2]} > 1$

which contradicts (12) since by (12), $\prod_{\rho} 1 + \frac{4bt}{[(a-1/2)^2+(b-t)^2]} = 1$

So, in both the cases we get a contradiction .Hence , our assumption that

$\sigma = 1/2$ is wrong

Thus , $\sigma \neq 1/2$.

We proved above that if $\epsilon(s) \neq 0$ and if $Im(s) \in (0, 1/2]$, then

$Re(s) \neq 1/2$ Hence, Claim D is proved.

Combining Claim B and Claim D we see that $\epsilon(s) \neq 0$,

$Im(s) \in (-\infty, 0) \cup (1/2, \infty)$ implies $Re(s) \neq 1/2$

and $\epsilon(s) \neq 0, Im(s) \in (0, 1/2]$ implies $Re(s) \neq 1/2$

Thus , $\epsilon(s) \neq 0, Im(s) \in \mathbb{R}^*$

But, by Riemann Hypothesis we assumed that

$\epsilon(s) = 0$ for $0 < Re(s) < 1$ and $\epsilon(s) \neq 0 \Rightarrow Re(s) \neq 1/2$.

thus, $\epsilon(s) = 0$, must imply $Re(s) = 1/2$. So, Riemann Hypothesis is true $\forall Im(s) \in \mathbb{R}^*$

4 References:-

1. E. C. Titchmarsh, D. R. Heath-Brown - The theory of the Riemann Zeta function [2nd ed] Clarendon Press; Oxford University Press (1986).
2. Kevin Broughan - Equivalents of the Riemann Hypothesis : Arithmetic Equivalents Cambridge University Press (2017) .
3. Kevin Broughan - Equivalents of the Riemann Hypothesis : Analytic Equivalents Cambridge University Press (2017).
4. A Monotonicity of Riemann's Xi function and a reformulation of the Riemann Hypothesis, Periodica Mathematica Hungarica - May 2010.
5. Tom M. Apostol - Introduction to Analytical Number Theory (1976).
6. <https://www.claymath.org/millennium-problems/riemann-hypothesis>.
7. A note on $S(t)$ and the zeros of the Riemann zeta-function - DA Goldston, SM Gonek.
8. 4. Lars Ahlfors - Complex analysis [3 ed.] McGraw -Hill (1979).

Contact:

Shekhar Suman.

I.I.T. Delhi M.Sc. (2015-17).

Email: shekharsuman068@gmail.com