

A Proof of the Riemann Hypothesis

By Julio Alcántara-Bode

February 6, 2020

Abstract

Using standard results from Hilbert space theory and a variant of the Beurling-Nyman formulation of the Riemann Hypothesis (R.H.), we give a proof of this long standing conjecture.

1 Brief historical background

If $\pi(n)$ denotes the number of prime numbers in the interval $[1, n]$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, it seems that from numerical evidence, Gauss conjectured that $\lim \left[\frac{\pi(n)}{\frac{n}{\ln n}} \right] = 1$. Using elementary methods Chebyshev proved that

$$\frac{\ln 2}{2} \leq \underline{\lim} \frac{\pi(n)}{\frac{n}{\ln n}} \leq 1 \leq \overline{\lim} \frac{\pi(n)}{\frac{n}{\ln n}} \leq 2 \ln 2$$

establishing then that if $\lim \left[\frac{\pi(n)}{\frac{n}{\ln n}} \right]$ exists, it must be equal to 1.

To prove the existence of this limit Riemann suggested the study of the complex variable function

$$\zeta(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{+\infty} n^{-s}, \quad s = \sigma + it, \quad \sigma > 1, \quad t \in \mathbb{R},$$

afterwards known as the Riemann zeta function. He proved that ζ has analytic continuation to $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{1\}$, still denoted by ζ , that has a pole of first order at $s = 1$ with residue 1 and obeys the functional equation $\xi(s) = \xi(1-s)$, where

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

and Γ is the gamma function. If $Z(\zeta)$ denotes the set of zeros of ζ (defined on $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{1\}$), he established the following facts:

$Z(\zeta) \cap \{s : \sigma > 1\} = \phi$, $Z(\zeta) \cap \{s : \sigma < 0\} = \{-2n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and all these zeros, called trivial, are simple; the set $Z(\zeta) \cap \{s : 0 \leq \sigma \leq 1\}$ (all these zeros are called non-trivial) is infinite, symmetric with respect to the lines $\{s : \sigma = \frac{1}{2}\}$ (the critical line), $\{s : t = 0\}$ and $Z(\zeta) \cap \{s : 0 \leq \sigma \leq 1\} \cap \mathbb{R} = \phi$.

Riemann also formulated the now famous RIEMANN HYPOTHESIS (R.H.):

$$Z(\zeta) \cap \{s : 0 \leq \sigma \leq 1\} = Z(\zeta) \cap \{s : \sigma = \frac{1}{2}\}$$

Hardy established that the set $Z(\zeta) \cap \{s : \sigma = \frac{1}{2}\}$ is infinite. Levinson proved that more than $\frac{1}{3}$ of the elements in $Z(\zeta) \cap \{s : 0 \leq \sigma \leq 1\}$ are in $Z(\zeta) \cap \{s : \sigma = \frac{1}{2}\}$ and Conrey showed that in this result $\frac{1}{3}$ could be replaced by $\frac{2}{5}$ [8, 10].

It can be shown that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[\frac{\pi(n)}{\frac{n}{\ln n}} \right] = 1$ if and only if $Z(\zeta) \cap \{s : \sigma = 1\} = \phi$, and Hadamard and Vallée-Poussin, independently, verified this last condition, finally proving the conjecture of Gauss that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left[\frac{\pi(n)}{\frac{n}{\ln n}} \right] = 1$, result now known as the Prime Number Theorem.

The location of the element of $Z(\zeta) \cap \{s : 0 \leq \sigma \leq 1\}$ closest to the line $\{s : \sigma = 1\}$ determines the order of magnitude of the relative error term in the Prime Number Theorem. In some sense this relative error term is minimal if R.H. holds.

The proof or disproof of R.H. is one of the most important unsolved problems in Mathematics. R.H., that originally arose in Analytic Number Theory, can also be reformulated as a problem in several other branches of Mathematics. The following formulation of R.H. as a problem of Functional Analysis will be useful later on [2] (it is a variant of the Beurling-Nyman formulation of R.H.)

Theorem 1.1. *Let*

$$[A_\rho f](\theta) = \int_0^1 \rho\left(\frac{\theta}{x}\right) f(x) dx,$$

where $\rho(x) = x - [x]$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $[x] \in \mathbb{Z}$, $[x] \leq x < [x] + 1$, be considered as an integral operator on $L^2(0,1)$. Then R.H. holds if and only if $\ker A_\rho = \{0\}$ or if and only if $h \notin R(A_\rho)$ where $h(x) = x$.

For more detailed information about R.H. see [5, 6, 8, 9, 10].

Early this year we proved that the set $Z(\zeta) \cap \{s : \sigma > \frac{1}{2}\}$ is at most finite [3], but using the same methods of that work we are now able to prove that the set $Z(\zeta) \cap \{s : \sigma > \frac{1}{2}\}$ is empty, which proves that R.H. holds true. For the sake of completeness and convenience of the reader there is some overlap between the present work and [3]

2 Proof of R.H.

First we begin with a recollection of some facts that will be used in this section. If $\{s_j\}_{1 \leq j \leq n} \subset \{s : \sigma > -\frac{1}{2}\}$ and $s_i \neq s_j$ if $i \neq j$, then the set $\{h^{s_j}\}_{1 \leq j \leq n} \subset L^2(0, 1)$ is linearly independent, since its Gram's determinant $G(h^{s_1}, \dots, h^{s_n}) = \det(< h^{s_i}, h^{s_j} >)_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ is strictly positive [1, p.19]. It is proven in [2, 4] that if $s = \sigma + it$, $\sigma > -\frac{1}{2}$, $t \in \mathbb{R}$, then $A_\rho h^s = \frac{h}{s} - \frac{\zeta(s+1)}{s+1} h^{s+1}$, and therefore $A_\rho(s h^s) = h$ if $\zeta(s+1) = 0$.

The following result will be used recurrently.

Lemma 2.1. *Let K be a closed set in $L^2(0, 1)$ such that $A_\rho f = h$, $\forall f \in K$, $\bar{f} \in K$ if $f \in K$ and $\lambda f_1 + (1 - \lambda)f_2 \in K$, $\forall \lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ if $\{f_1, f_2\} \subset K$. If g is the unique element of minimum norm of K [11, p. 202, Theorem 3] let's assume that:*

- i) $g \in C^1([0, 1])$, and $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0^+} x g^2(x) = 0$;
- ii) if $\alpha \in]0, 1]$, $g(\alpha) \neq 0$ and $\hat{g}_\alpha(x) = \alpha x g'(\alpha x)$ then $\frac{1}{g(\alpha)} \hat{g}_\alpha \in K$,
but if $g(\alpha) = 0$ then $g + \lambda \hat{g}_\alpha \in K$, $\forall \lambda \in \mathbb{C}$

$$\text{then } \|g\|^2 = \frac{g^2(1)}{1 + 2g(1)}$$

Proof: By uniqueness we have $g = \bar{g}$. It will be proven now that if $f = \bar{f} \in K$ then $< g, f - g > = 0$. If $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, then $g + \lambda(f - g) \in K$, and therefore

$$\|g + \lambda(f - g)\|^2 = \|g\|^2 + 2\lambda < g, f - g > + \lambda^2 \|f - g\|^2 \geq \|g\|^2$$

and since this inequality holds $\forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, it follows that $< g, f - g > = 0$ or $< g, f > = \|g\|^2$. As $A_\rho g = h$, we have by definition that

$$\int_0^1 \rho\left(\frac{\theta}{x}\right) g(x) dx = \theta, \quad \forall \theta \in [0, 1]$$

Take now $\alpha \in]0, 1]$ and let's evaluate

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^1 \rho\left(\frac{\theta}{x}\right) g(\alpha x) dx &= \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_0^1 \rho\left(\frac{\alpha\theta}{\alpha x}\right) g(\alpha x) d(\alpha x) \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_0^\alpha \rho\left(\frac{\alpha\theta}{y}\right) g(y) dy \\ &= \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_0^1 \rho\left(\frac{\alpha\theta}{y}\right) g(y) dy - \frac{1}{\alpha} \int_\alpha^1 \rho\left(\frac{\alpha\theta}{y}\right) g(y) dy \\ &= \theta \left[1 - \int_\alpha^1 \frac{g(y)}{y} dy \right] \end{aligned}$$

which finally gives us

$$\int_0^1 \rho \left(\frac{\theta}{x} \right) g(\alpha x) dx = \theta \left[1 - \int_\alpha^1 \frac{g(y)}{y} dy \right]$$

If we write the same equation for β instead of α and then subtract both of them we get

$$\int_0^1 \rho \left(\frac{\theta}{x} \right) [g(\alpha x) - g(\beta x)] dx = \theta \int_\beta^\alpha \frac{g(y)}{y} dy$$

If $\alpha \neq \beta$ we divide the last equation by $\alpha - \beta$ and then take the limit $\beta \rightarrow \alpha$ to get from [11, p. 129, Theorem 5] that

$$\int_0^1 \rho \left(\frac{\theta}{x} \right) \alpha x g'(\alpha x) dx = \theta g(\alpha), \quad \forall \alpha \in]0, 1]$$

If $g(\alpha) \neq 0$ we get from the first part of **ii)** that

$$\langle g, \widehat{g}_\alpha \rangle = g(\alpha) \|g\|^2$$

If $g(\alpha) = 0$ we get from the second part of **ii)** that $\langle g, \widehat{g}_\alpha \rangle = 0$ and therefore $\forall \alpha \in]0, 1]$ it holds that

$$\langle g, \widehat{g}_\alpha \rangle = g(\alpha) \|g\|^2$$

or

$$\int_0^1 \alpha x g'(\alpha x) g(x) dx = g(\alpha) \|g\|^2$$

If in the last equation we take $\alpha = 1$ and integrate by parts, taking into account the second part of **i)** we get

$$\frac{g^2(1)}{2} - \frac{\|g\|^2}{2} = g(1) \|g\|^2$$

or finally

$$\|g\|^2 = \frac{g^2(1)}{1 + 2g(1)},$$

which proves the lemma.

If $s = \sigma + it$, $\sigma > -\frac{1}{2}$, $t > 0$, $\zeta(s+1) = 0$, let's apply the lemma to the set

$$K_s = \{\lambda s h^s + (1 - \lambda) \overline{s} h^{\overline{s}} : \lambda \in \mathbb{C}\}$$

If g_s is the element of minimum norm of K_s , then $g_s = \overline{g}_s$ and therefore

$$g_s = \left(\frac{1}{2} + i\gamma_s \right) s h^s + \left(\frac{1}{2} - i\gamma_s \right) \overline{s} h^{\overline{s}}, \quad \text{where } \gamma_s \in \mathbb{R}$$

Minimizing $\|g_s\|^2$ with respect to γ_s we get

$$\gamma_s = \frac{1}{2t} \frac{(\sigma^2 + t^2 + \sigma)(2\sigma + 1)}{2(\sigma^2 + t^2 + \sigma) + 1} \quad (1)$$

$$g_s(1) = \sigma - 2\gamma_s t = -\frac{\sigma^2 + t^2}{2(\sigma^2 + t^2 + \sigma) + 1} < 0$$

and

$$\|g_s\|^2 = \frac{g_s(1)^2}{1 + 2g_s(1)} = \frac{\frac{(\sigma^2 + t^2)^2}{2\sigma + 1}}{2(\sigma^2 + t^2) + 2\sigma + 1} \quad (2)$$

We compute now $\|g_s\|^2$ explicitly, and compare it to the value given above in (2). It is clear from the definition of g_s that

$$\langle g_s, s h^s - \bar{s} h^{\bar{s}} \rangle = 0$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \|g_s\|^2 &= \langle g_s, \frac{1}{2} (s h^s + \bar{s} h^{\bar{s}}) \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} + i\gamma_s \right) \frac{|s|^2}{2\sigma + 1} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} + i\gamma_s \right) \frac{s^2}{2s + 1} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} - i\gamma_s \right) \frac{|s|^2}{2\sigma + 1} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} - i\gamma_s \right) \frac{\bar{s}^2}{2\bar{s} + 1} \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \left(\frac{2|s|^2}{2\sigma + 1} + \frac{s^2}{2s + 1} + \frac{\bar{s}^2}{2\bar{s} + 1} \right) + \frac{1}{2} i\gamma_s \left(\frac{s^2}{2s + 1} - \frac{\bar{s}^2}{2\bar{s} + 1} \right) \end{aligned}$$

If we take into account (1) and (2) we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{\sigma^2 + t^2}{2\sigma + 1} + \frac{(\sigma^2 + t^2 + \sigma)(2\sigma - 1) + \sigma}{(2\sigma + 1)^2 + 4t^2} \right\} \\ &\quad - \frac{2(\sigma^2 + t^2 + \sigma)^2(2\sigma + 1)}{[2(\sigma^2 + t^2 + \sigma) + 1][(2\sigma + 1)^2 + 4t^2]} = \frac{\frac{(\sigma^2 + t^2)^2}{2\sigma + 1}}{2(\sigma^2 + t^2 + \sigma) + 1} \end{aligned}$$

moving the first term on the left to the right hand side, then giving common denominator on the left hand side and finally getting rid of common factors we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{-(4\sigma + 6)(\sigma^2 + t^2 + \sigma)^2 + (4\sigma - 1)(\sigma^2 + t^2 + \sigma) + \sigma}{4(\sigma^2 + t^2 + \sigma) + 1} \\ &= -(\sigma^2 + t^2 + \sigma) + \sigma \end{aligned}$$

which finally gives us

$$-(4\sigma + 2)(\sigma^2 + t^2 + \sigma)^2 = 0$$

therefore $\sigma = -\frac{1}{2}$, a contradiction since $\sigma > -\frac{1}{2}$ or $\sigma^2 + t^2 + \sigma = 0$, which is the same as $\left(\sigma + \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 + t^2 = \frac{1}{4}$, and implies that the Riemann zeta function has zeros on the circumference with center $\left(\frac{1}{2}, 0\right)$ and radius $\frac{1}{2}$, a contradiction since it is known that [10]

$$Z(\zeta) \cap \{s : 0 \leq \sigma \leq 1, |t| \leq 14\} = \phi$$

These contradictions prove R.H.

3 Final Comments

It is possible that the argument given here could be extended to other zeta functions. To do that one would need something like Theorem 1.1, that is essentially a variant of the Beurling-Nyman condition for R.H. In [7] there are given Beurling-Nyman criteria for functions in the Selberg class, that for instance could be useful to try to extend these results to Dirichlet L-functions.

4 Acknowledgements

I would like to thank M. González-Ulloa for preparing the manuscript for publication. I dedicate this work to the memory of my beloved parents Julio Tomás and Georgina.

PONTIFICIA UNIVERSIDAD CATÓLICA DEL PERÚ

and

INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICA Y CIENCIAS AFINES

e-mail address: jalcant@pucp.edu.pe

References

- [1] N.I. Achieser, *Theory of approximation*, Dover, New York, (1992)
- [2] J. Alcántara-Bode, *An integral equation formulation of the Riemann hypothesis*, J. Integral Equations and Operator Theory **17**, (1993), 151-168.
- [3] J. Alcántara-Bode, *The Riemann zeta function has at most a finite number of non trivial zeros off the critical line*, submitted to Annals of Mathematics on January 12th, 2009.
- [4] A. Beurling, *A closure problem related to the Riemann zeta function*, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. **41**, (1955), 312-314.

- [5] E. Bombieri, *Problems of the millennium: The Riemann hypothesis*, CLAY(2000)
- [6] B. Conrey, *The Riemann hypothesis*, Notices of the AMS, March, 2003, 341-353
- [7] A. de Roton, *Généralisation du critère de Beurling-Nyman pour l'hypothèse de Riemann*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **12** (2007), 6111-6126.
- [8] A.A. Karatsuba and S.M. Voronin, *The Riemann zeta function*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 1992
- [9] P. Sarnak, *Problems of the millennium: The Riemann hypothesis*, CLAY(2004)
- [10] E.C. Titchmarsh, *The theory of the Riemann zeta function*, 2nd ed., revised by R.D. Heath-Brown, Oxford Univ. Press, 1986
- [11] A.C. Zaanen, *Integration*, 2nd ed., North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1967.