

A Proof to the Riemann Hypothesis Using a Simplified Xi-Function

Xiao Lin¹

CCB Fintech
Shanghai 200120, China

ABSTRACT: The Riemann hypothesis has been of great interest in the mathematics community since it was proposed by Bernhard Riemann in 1859, and makes important implications about the distribution of prime numbers. We have proved the Riemann hypothesis in this paper. First, we briefly reviewed the simplified Riemann $\xi(s)$ function. Then we showed the $\xi(s)$ function has a polynomial decreasing rate, simple zeros and simple stationary points in the critical line. After that, we applied the idea of bisection search to break up the complex domain into several sub-domains, in which the imaginary part of $\xi(s)$ takes different signs. Using the Cauchy-Riemann equations we found that the zeros of the $\xi(s)$ function cannot locate outside the critical line, and thus proved that the Riemann hypothesis is true. At the end, we gave some comments to the Pólya's counterexample.

KEY WORDS: Riemann hypothesis.

1 Introduction

In 1859, Riemann [1] used an analytical continuation method to extend the zeta function $\zeta(s)$ into the following form:

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

¹E-mail: xiao.lin_99@yahoo.com; Finished: 2021-07-21; Last Revised: 2022-02-09.

where, the function $\xi(s)$ can be analytically expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}\xi(s) &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}s(s-1) \int_1^{\infty} \Psi(\tau) \left(\tau^{s/2-1} + \tau^{-(1+s)/2} \right) d\tau, \\ \Psi(\tau) &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\pi n^2 \tau}.\end{aligned}\tag{2}$$

Riemann stated that every zero of the function $\xi(s)$, which is also the non-trivial zero of zeta function $\zeta(s)$, is located in the critical strip $0 \leq \text{Re}(s) \leq 1$. Then, he asserted that all zeros are most likely to lie on the line $\text{Re}(s) = 1/2$. This conjecture later became the so-called Riemann hypothesis which is very fundamental in the study of analytic number theory [2-3]. Due to its importance, in 1900, the Riemann hypothesis was proposed as one of the famous Hilbert problems - number eight of twenty-three. And in 2000, it was selected again as one of the seven Clay Millennium Prize Problems [4-5].

In this paper, we will prove the Riemann hypothesis using a simplified $\xi(s)$ function.

2 Formula transformation

First, we briefly review the simplified formula of Riemann $\xi(s)$ function. The formula was originally made by Riemann in his paper [1] before he put forth the hypothesis. Later, the work was continued by many authors such as Jensen [6], Landau [7], Hardy [8], Wilton [9], Ramanujan [10], Titchmarsh [11], Ingham [12] and others. Here we need to change some notations in the formula in order to conveniently apply the Cauchy-Riemann equations in our work. Starting with (2), we introduce a new complex variable $z \in \mathbb{C}$, $z = x + iy$ to make a transformation

$$s = \frac{1}{2}(z + 1).\tag{3}$$

Then, $\xi(s)$ is rewritten as follows

$$\xi(s) = \Xi(z) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{8}(z^2 - 1) \int_1^{\infty} \Psi(\tau) \tau^{-3/4} (\tau^{z/4} + \tau^{-z/4}) d\tau.\tag{4}$$

By (3), the concerned strip $0 \leq \text{Re}(s) \leq 1$ to search the zeros of the function $\xi(s)$ in the s -plane has been changed to $-1 \leq \text{Re}(z) \leq 1$ in the z -plane for the function $\Xi(z)$, and the

line $\text{Re}(s) = 1/2$ becomes $\text{Re}(z) = x = 0$. Further, we change the integral argument by

$$\tau = e^{4t}, \quad (5)$$

thus,

$$\Xi(z) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}(z^2 - 1) \int_0^\infty \Psi(e^{4t}) e^t (e^{zt} + e^{-zt}) dt, \quad (6)$$

or, using a hyperbolic function $\cosh(w) = (e^w + e^{-w})/2$, we have

$$\Xi(z) = \frac{1}{2} + (z^2 - 1) \int_0^\infty F(t) \cosh(zt) dt, \quad (7)$$

where,

$$F(t) = \Psi(e^{4t}) e^t = \sum_{n=1}^\infty \exp(t - \pi n^2 e^{4t}). \quad (8)$$

Now we work further on the function $F(t)$. Taking differential to the first and second orders, we have

$$F'(t) = \sum_{n=1}^\infty \exp(t - \pi n^2 e^{4t}) (1 - 4\pi n^2 e^{4t}), \quad (9)$$

$$\begin{aligned} F''(t) &= \sum_{n=1}^\infty \exp(t - \pi n^2 e^{4t}) \left[(1 - 4\pi n^2 e^{4t})^2 - 16\pi n^2 e^{4t} \right] \\ &= F(t) + G(t), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where,

$$G(t) = \sum_{n=1}^\infty \exp(t - \pi n^2 e^{4t}) \left[16\pi^2 n^4 e^{8t} - 24\pi n^2 e^{4t} \right] \quad (11)$$

is called Jensen function [6]. At $t = 0$, we have

$$F(0) = \sum_{n=1}^\infty \exp(-\pi n^2) = \frac{1}{2}(\vartheta(1) - 1), \quad (12)$$

$$F'(0) = \sum_{n=1}^\infty \exp(-\pi n^2) (1 - 4\pi n^2) = -\frac{1}{2}, \quad (13)$$

and at $t \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F(t) \sinh(zt) = 0, \quad \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} F'(t) \cosh(zt) = 0, \quad (14)$$

where the Theta function $\vartheta(1)$ in (12) is a finite value which can be obtained in Whittaker and Watson [13], while (13) and (14) should have been found originally by Riemann [1] because they are indispensable in working for the integral representation of $\xi(s)$ function. With this knowledge, we can simplify (7). Using integration by parts,

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_0^{\infty} F(t) \cosh(zt) dt &= \int_0^{\infty} \frac{1}{z} F(t) d \sinh(zt) \\
&= \frac{1}{z} F(t) \sinh(zt) \Big|_0^{\infty} - \frac{1}{z} \int_0^{\infty} F'(t) \sinh(zt) dt \\
&= -\frac{1}{z^2} F'(t) \cosh(zt) \Big|_0^{\infty} + \frac{1}{z^2} \int_0^{\infty} F''(t) \cosh(zt) dt \\
&= \frac{1}{z^2} F'(0) + \frac{1}{z^2} \int_0^{\infty} [F(t) + G(t)] \cosh(zt) dt. \tag{15}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$(z^2 - 1) \int_0^{\infty} F(t) \cosh(zt) dt = F'(0) + \int_0^{\infty} G(t) \cosh(zt) dt. \tag{16}$$

Substituting (16) into (7), we obtain an integral representation form of the Riemann's $\xi(s)$ function,

$$\Xi(z) = \int_0^{\infty} G(t) \cosh(zt) dt. \tag{17}$$

It is easy to check that the Jensen function $G(t) > 0$ on $0 < t < \infty$, and $G(t) \rightarrow 0$ very fast when $t \rightarrow \infty$. In a two-page note Wintner [14] had proved that $G(t)$ is strictly decreasing, i.e., $G'(t) < 0$. This important property had also been proved independently by Spira [15] in 1971. In his note Wintner had pointed out a property crediting to Jensen, Hurwitz and others: if the definition domain of $G(t)$ is extended to negative t -axis, it is also an even function, i.e., $G(-t) = G(t)$, and $G'(0) = 0$. Since it is not easy to see this property from (11), we briefly repeat the proof as follows. Recall (8),

$$F(t) = \Psi(\tau)e^t, \quad \tau(t) = e^{4t}, \quad \tau'(t) = 4\tau, \quad \tau(-t) = \frac{1}{\tau}, \tag{18}$$




Figure 1: The curve shape of function $G(t)$.

we can calculate

$$G(t) = F''(t) - F(t) = \left[16\tau^2\Psi''(\tau) + 24\tau\Psi'(\tau)\right]e^t. \quad (19)$$

Applying derivatives to the identity of Jacobi that Riemann gave in his paper [1]

$$2\Psi(\tau) + 1 = \tau^{-1/2} \left[2\Psi\left(\frac{1}{\tau}\right) + 1\right], \quad (20)$$

we obtain

$$\left[16\tau^2\Psi''(\tau) + 24\tau\Psi'(\tau)\right]e^t = \left[\frac{16}{\tau^2}\Psi''\left(\frac{1}{\tau}\right) + \frac{24}{\tau}\Psi'\left(\frac{1}{\tau}\right)\right]e^{-t} = G(-t). \quad (21)$$

Thus, $G(t)$ is analogous to a Gaussian function, its bell shape curve is shown in Figure 1. This feature has motivated many researchers to create other similar $G(t)$ functions to study the Riemann hypothesis.

Jensen [16] had also discovered a large number of inequalities that $G(t)$ and its derivatives satisfy. Two of them, for $t \geq 0$, are

$$(2\pi\tau - 3)\pi\tau e^{t-\pi\tau} < \frac{1}{8}G(t) < (2\pi\tau - 3)\pi\tau e^{t-\pi\tau} + 32\pi^2\tau^2 e^{t-4\pi\tau}, \quad (22)$$

and

$$4G(t) < \frac{-G'(t)}{\pi\tau - \pi} < 4G(t) + 8(8\pi - 18)\pi\tau e^{t-\pi\tau}. \quad (23)$$

These two inequalities will plays important roles in our work.

3 The Proof

We now use (17) to study the Riemann hypothesis. Let $z = x + iy$, the function $\Xi(z)$ is divided into the real and imaginary parts,

$$\begin{aligned}\Xi(z) &= u(x, y) + iv(x, y) \\ &= \int_0^{\infty} G(t) \cosh(xt) \cos(yt) dt + i \int_0^{\infty} G(t) \sinh(xt) \sin(yt) dt,\end{aligned}\quad (24)$$

then, $\Xi(z) = 0$ is equivalent to $u(x, y) = v(x, y) = 0$. Our proof will be carried out through five theorems. We start the work from the critical line $x = 0$, where $v(0, y) = 0$ and

$$\Xi(iy) = u(0, y) = \int_0^{\infty} G(t) \cos(yt) dt =: U(y).\quad (25)$$

Theorem 1: The function $U(y)$ has a form of

$$U(y) = \frac{1}{P(y)} \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(1 - \frac{y^2}{y_k^2}\right),\quad (26)$$

where, $P(y)$ is a polynomial of finite order, and y_k are zeros of the $\Xi(z)$ function in the y -axis.

Proof: According to the Riemann-Lebesgue lemma,

$$\lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} U(y) = \lim_{y \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^{\infty} G(t) \cos(yt) dt = 0.\quad (27)$$

Since $U(y)$ is the real part of the analytic function $\Xi(z)$, it is sufficient smooth and differentiable. Thus, $U(y)$ has the form

$$U(y) = \frac{e^{-\kappa(y)}}{P(y)} \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(1 - \frac{y^2}{y_k^2}\right),\quad (28)$$

where, $\kappa(y) \geq 0$ is the exponential decreasing rate function, $P(y)$ is a polynomial of finite order and has no zeros in the y -axis, and y_k are zeros of the $\Xi(z)$ function in y -axis. According to Hardy [8], $U(y)$ has infinite number of zeros lying on the y -axis. Since $U(y)$ is an even function, the zeros come in pair $\pm y_k$.

We apply the Hadamard product formula [17] to the Riemann $\xi(s)$ function (1),

$$\xi(s) = \frac{1}{2} e^{-Bs} \prod_{\rho} \left(1 - \frac{s}{\rho}\right) e^{s/\rho}, \quad (29)$$

where, $B > 0$ is a constant, and ρ are the zeros of $\zeta(s)$ that are in the critical strip $0 \leq \text{Re}(s) \leq 1$. Let ρ_1, ρ_2, \dots be the zeros with positive imaginary part, and $\bar{\rho}_1, \bar{\rho}_2, \dots$ be their conjugates. Then (29) is rewritten as

$$\xi(s) = \frac{1}{2} e^{Cs} \prod_k \left(1 - \frac{s}{\rho_k}\right) \left(1 - \frac{s}{\bar{\rho}_k}\right). \quad (30)$$

where C is a real constant,

$$C = -B + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{\rho_k} + \frac{1}{\bar{\rho}_k}\right). \quad (31)$$

Set $s = (iy + 1)/2$ in (30), and compare the exponential function part $e^{iCy/2}$ with $e^{-\kappa(y)}$ in (28), then we get $\kappa(y) = 0$. Due to $U(y)$ is an even function, the polynomial $P(y)$ is at least of order 2. \square

Theorem 2: The function $U(y)$ in (25) has only simple zeros.

Proof: We differentiate $U(y)$ in (25), and then take an integration by parts,

$$yU'(y) + U(y) = - \int_0^{\infty} G'(t)t \cos(yt) dt. \quad (32)$$

We further differentiate $U(y)$ to the second-order,

$$U''(y) = - \int_0^{\infty} G(t)t^2 \cos(yt) dt. \quad (33)$$

These two equations motivate us to set up a relationship between $G'(t)t$ and $G(t)t^2$. From the left-hand part inequality in (22), we have

$$\pi\tau e^{t-\pi\tau} < \frac{1}{8(2\pi\tau - 3)} G(t), \quad (34)$$

which is substituted into the right-hand part inequality in (23). Then,

$$4G(t) < \frac{-G'(t)}{\pi\tau - \pi} < 4G(t) + \frac{8\pi - 18}{2\pi\tau - 3} G(t). \quad (35)$$

Since

$$\tau = e^{4t} = 1 + 4t + \frac{1}{2!}(4t)^2 + \dots, \quad (36)$$

we rearrange (35) as

$$16\pi t G(t) < -G'(t) < 4\pi(e^{4t} - 1) \left[1 + \frac{4\pi - 9}{4\pi e^{4t} - 6} \right] G(t). \quad (37)$$

This equation implies that $-G'(t)/t$ is at least 16π multiple more higher than $G(t)$. Figure 2 has showed the three curves for a comparison.




Figure 2: The relation between functions $-G'(t)/t$ and $G(t)$.

We assume that the ratio of $-G'(t)/t$ to $G(t)$ can be expressed by a function $a(t)$. Since both $G(t)$ and $-G'(t)/t$ are even functions, $a(t)$ is also an even function. We express $a(t)$ by a series,

$$a(t) = \frac{-G'(t)}{tG(t)} = a_0 + a_2t^2 + a_4t^4 + a_6t^6 + \dots. \quad (38)$$

Let $t = 0$, we have

$$a_0 = \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{-G'(t)}{tG(t)} = -\frac{G''(0)}{G(0)} \approx 74.903 > 0. \quad (39)$$

From (35) we know there exists a smooth function $b(t)$ such that

$$a(t) = \frac{-G'(t)}{tG(t)} = 4\pi \frac{(e^{4t} - 1)}{t} \left[1 + b(t) \frac{4\pi - 9}{4\pi e^{4t} - 6} \right], \quad (40)$$

where, by a calculation from the data in Figure 2 we get $0.9026 \approx b(0) < b(t) < 1$. We then take a Taylor expansion on (40), and compare it with (38). Thus, we determine the magnitude of coefficients in $a(t)$ function as

$$|a_{2k}| \leq 16\pi \left[1 + b(\hat{t}_k) \frac{4\pi - 9}{4\pi - 6} \right] \frac{4^{2k}}{(2k + 1)!}, \quad (k = 1, 2, \dots), \quad (41)$$

where, $b(0) < b(\hat{t}_k) < 1$.

With the $a(t)$ function,

$$-G'(t)t = G(t)t^2 a(t), \quad (42)$$

we combine (32) and (33) as

$$\begin{aligned} yU'(y) + U(y) &= - \int_0^\infty G'(t)t \cos(yt) dt = \int_0^\infty G(t)t^2 a(t) \cos(yt) dt \\ &= \int_0^\infty G(t) \left(a_0 t^2 + a_2 t^4 + a_4 t^6 + a_6 t^8 + \dots \right) \cos(yt) dt. \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Using the definition equation of the higher order derivatives

$$U^{(2k)}(y) = (-1)^k \int_0^\infty G(t)t^{2k} \cos(yt) dt, \quad (44)$$

we obtain

$$yU'(y) + U(y) = -a_0 U''(y) + a_2 U^{(4)}(y) - a_4 U^{(6)}(y) + a_6 U^{(8)}(y) - \dots \quad (45)$$

Now, according to Hardy [8], $U(y)$ has infinite zeros lying on $0 < y < \infty$. Let y_0 be a zero, and let $y = y_0 + \delta$, where $\delta > 0$ is sufficient small. Assume that y_0 is a zero of order 2. According to Theorem 1, in the neighborhood of y_0 , $U(y)$ can be expressed as

$$U(y) = \frac{(y - y_0)^2}{P(y)} \prod_{j \neq 0} (y - y_j) = A(y)(y - y_0)^2, \quad (46)$$

where, $P(y)$ is a polynomial of finite order denoted by m such that $A(y) \approx y^{-m}$ when y becomes large. Then $A(y)$ has the following derivative property in the neighbourhood of y_0 :

$$A^{(k)}(y) = (-1)^k \frac{(k + m - 1)! A(y)}{(m - 1)! y^k} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{(k + m - 2)! A(y)}{(m - 1)! y^{k-1}}\right). \quad (47)$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
U'(y) &= 2A(y)(y - y_0) + A'(y)(y - y_0)^2 \\
&= 2A(y)(y - y_0) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\delta^2}{y}A(y)\right), \\
U''(y) &= 2A(y) + 4A'(y)(y - y_0) + A''(y)(y - y_0)^2 \\
&= 2A(y) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\delta}{y}A(y)\right), \\
U^{(2k+2)}(y) &= (2k+2)(2k+1)\frac{(2k+m-1)!A(y)}{(m-1)!y^{2k}} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\delta A(y)}{y^{2k+1}}\right), \\
&\quad (k = 1, 2, 3, \dots). \tag{48}
\end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| a_2U^{(4)}(y) - a_4U^{(6)}(y) + \dots \right| \\
&\leq c \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{4^{2k}}{(2k+1)!} (2k+2)(2k+1) \frac{(2k+m-1)!|A(y)|}{(m-1)!y^{2k}} \\
&\leq c|A(y)| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(2k+2)(2k+1)(2k+m-1)^{m-2}}{(m-1)!} \left(\frac{4}{y}\right)^{2k} \\
&\rightarrow \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{A(y)}{y^2}\right), \quad (\text{assume } y > 4), \tag{49}
\end{aligned}$$

where c is a constant. Therefore, in the neighbourhood of y_0 , (45) becomes

$$yU'(y) + U(y) = -a_0U''(y) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{U''(y)}{y^2}\right). \tag{50}$$

For $y = y_0 + \delta$, according to (46) and (48), if $U(y) > 0$, we have $U'(y) > 0$ and $U''(y) > 0$; otherwise if $U(y) < 0$, we have $U'(y) < 0$ and $U''(y) < 0$. But both these two cases contradict to (50).

Now we assume that y_0 is a zero of order 3. Then in the neighborhood of y_0 , $U(y)$ can be expressed as

$$U(y) = \frac{(y - y_0)^3}{P(y)} \prod_{j \neq 0} (y - y_j) = A(y)(y - y_0)^3, \tag{51}$$

where, $P(y)$ is a polynomial of order m such that the function $A(y)$ still have the property of (47). Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
U'(y) &= 3A(y)(y - y_0)^2 + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\delta^3}{y}A(y)\right), \\
U''(y) &= 6A(y)(y - y_0) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\delta^2}{y}A(y)\right), \\
U'''(y) &= 6A(y) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\delta}{y}A(y)\right), \\
U^{(2k+3)}(y) &= -(2k+3)(2k+2)(2k+1)\frac{(2k+m-1)!}{(m-1)!}\frac{A(y)}{y^{2k}} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\delta A(y)}{y^{2k+1}}\right), \\
&\quad (k = 1, 2, 3, \dots).
\end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

We differential (45) with respect to y ,

$$yU''(y) + 2U'(y) = -a_0U'''(y) + a_2U^{(5)}(y) - a_4U^{(7)}(y) + a_6U^{(9)}(y) - \dots \tag{53}$$

The sum of higher order terms is still bounded,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| a_2U^{(5)}(y) - a_4U^{(7)}(y) + \dots \right| \\
&\leq c \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{4^{2k}}{(2k+1)!} (2k+3)(2k+2)(2k+1) \frac{(2k+m-1)!}{(m-1)!} \frac{|A(y)|}{y^{2k}} \\
&\leq c|A(y)| \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{(2k+3)(2k+2)(2k+1)(2k+m-1)^{m-2}}{(m-1)!} \left(\frac{4}{y}\right)^{2k} \\
&\rightarrow \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{A(y)}{y^2}\right), \quad (\text{when } y > 4).
\end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

Then, in the neighbourhood of y_0 , (53) becomes

$$yU''(y) + 2U'(y) = -a_0U'''(y) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{U'''(y)}{y^2}\right). \tag{55}$$

For $y = y_0 + \delta$, according to (51) and (52), if $U(y) > 0$, we will have $U'(y) > 0$, $U''(y) > 0$ and $U'''(y) > 0$; otherwise if $U(y) < 0$, we have $U'(y) < 0$, $U''(y) < 0$ and $U'''(y) < 0$. Then again, both these two cases contradict to (55).

If $U(y)$ has a zero y_0 of higher order $n > 3$, we will differential (45) several times,

$$yU^{(n-1)}(y) + (n-1)U^{(n-2)}(y) = -a_0U^{(n)}(y) + a_2U^{(n+2)}(y) - \dots, \tag{56}$$

and using the same process to get contradictions. Thus, $U(y)$ has only simple zeros. \square

Theorem 3: The function $U(y) := u(0, y)$ in (25) has only one stationary point y_m between every two consecutive zeros, where $U'(y_m) = 0$, which makes $U(y_m)$ as either a positive local maximum or a negative local minimum.

Proof: From Theorem 2, all zeros of $U(y)$ are simple. According to Rolle's theorem, there is at least a y_m between every two consecutive zeros to make $U'(y_m) = 0$. Then, in the neighbourhood region $|y - y_m| < \delta$, $U'(y)$ can be expressed as

$$U'(y) = A(y)(y - y_m)^n, \quad (57)$$

where the function $A(y)$ is still related to a polynomial and has the property of (47) in the neighbourhood of y_m . If $n \geq 2$, we will reach a set of formulas similar to (52) and get contradictions. Thus, $n = 1$, we come to the formulas similar to (48). Therefore, in the neighborhood of y_m (45) becomes

$$yU'(y) + U(y) = -a_0U''(y) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{U''(y)}{y^2}\right), \quad (58)$$

which is the same as (50) but $U'(y)$ is determined. Since $U'(y_m) = 0$, if $U(y_m) > 0$, then $U''(y_m) < 0$, which shows $U(y_m)$ is a positive local maximum; otherwise if $U(y_m) < 0$, then $U''(y_m) > 0$, it becomes a negative local minimum. This also indicates that both positive local minimum and negative local maximum cannot occur, i.e, the count of stationary point y_m between the two consecutive zeros is 1. \square

Theorem 4: For any given y , there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that in the two neighbourhoods of the critical line $0 < |x| < \varepsilon$, the function $\Xi(z)$ has no zero.

Proof: From (24), $v(0, y) = 0$, and $v(x, y)$ is an odd function of x , i.e., $v(-x, y) = -v(x, y)$. Thus, for any (x, y) , if $v_x(0, y) \neq 0$, there exists a $\varepsilon_1 > 0$, when $0 < |x| < \varepsilon_1$, we have $v(x, y) = v_x(0, y)x + \mathcal{O}(x^2) \neq 0$.

If (x, y) is close to a point $(0, y_m)$ where $v_x(0, y_m) = 0$, from the Cauchy-Riemann equation,

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial y} = -\frac{\partial v}{\partial x}, \quad (59)$$

$u_y(0, y_m) = -v_x(0, y_m) = 0$. From Theorem 3, the curve $u(0, y)$ gets a local max/min value at point $(0, y_m)$ such that $u(0, y_m) \neq 0$. Since $u(x, y)$ is continuous, there exists a $\varepsilon_2 > 0$, when $\sqrt{x^2 + (y - y_m)^2} < \varepsilon_2$, we have $u(x, y) \neq 0$.

Thus, for any $z = x + iy$, assuming $z_m = 0 + iy_m$ being its closest point where $v_x(0, y_m) = 0$, we take $\varepsilon = \max(\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2)$, when $0 < |x| < \varepsilon$, $u(x, y)$ and $v(x, y)$ cannot be 0 at the same time. Therefore, $\Xi(z) \neq 0$. \square

Theorem 5: The function $\Xi(z)$ has no zero in the region $|x| > 0$.

Proof: Due to the symmetry of the function $\Xi(z)$, we will consider only the half-plane $x > 0$. From Theorem 4, there is an ε -domain $\omega = \{(x, y) : 0 < x < \varepsilon\}$, depending on whether $v_x(0, y) > 0$ or $v_x(0, y) < 0$, ω can be divided into several sub-domains ω_k , ($k = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$), in which if $v(x, y) > 0$ in ω_k , then $v(x, y) < 0$ in ω_{k+1} , and the boundary between ω_k and ω_{k+1} is a curve $y = \varphi_k(x)$, in which $v(x, \varphi_k(x)) = 0$, i.e.,

$$\omega_k = \{(x, y) : 0 < x < \varepsilon, \varphi_{k-1}(x) < y < \varphi_k(x), (-1)^k v(x, y) > 0\}. \quad (60)$$

Since $v(x, y)$ is analytic (continuous and differentiable) in $x > 0$, we extend every sub-domain ω_k to fill the whole half-plane,

$$\Omega_k = \{(x, y) : x > 0, \varphi_{k-1}(x) < y < \varphi_k(x), (-1)^k v(x, y) > 0\}. \quad (61)$$

The boundary of Ω_k and Ω_{k+1} is still denoted by $y = \varphi_k(x)$, in which $v(x, \varphi_k(x)) = 0$.

We first assume all curves $y = \varphi_k(x)$ will neither join nor bifurcate in the half-plane $x > 0$. A general scenario can be expressed by Figure 3. In the sub-domain Ω_{2k} , $v(x, y) > 0$. Thus, on the left boundary $x = 0$, there is $-u_y = v_x > 0$, and $u(0, y)$ reaches a minimum $u_{\min} < 0$ at the corner of Ω_{2k} and Ω_{2k+1} , which is the starting point of the curve $y = \varphi_{2k}(x)$. Denote two directional vectors along and perpendicular to the curve by

$$\mathbf{e}_1 = (1, \varphi'_{2k}(x)), \quad \mathbf{e}_2 = (-\varphi'_{2k}(x), 1). \quad (62)$$

Since $v(x, y) < 0$ in the next sub-domain Ω_{2k+1} , using the Cauchy-Riemann equations,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 > \nabla v \cdot \mathbf{e}_2 &= \left(\frac{\partial v}{\partial x}, \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} \right) \cdot (-\varphi'_{2k}(x), 1) = -\varphi'_{2k}(x) \frac{\partial v}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial v}{\partial y} \\ &= \varphi'_{2k}(x) \frac{\partial u}{\partial y} + \frac{\partial u}{\partial x} = \nabla u \cdot \mathbf{e}_1. \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$




Figure 3: Sub-domains of Ω_k showing values of function $v(x, y)$.

Thus, along the curve, $u(x, \varphi_{2k}(x)) < u_{\min} < 0$. In the same way, it can be showed that along the next curve, $u(x, \varphi_{2k+1}(x)) > u_{\max} > 0$. As a conclusion, for any $z = x + iy$ where $x > 0$, if (x, y) is in one of Ω_k , there is $v(x, y) \neq 0$; otherwise, (x, y) must be on a curve $y = \varphi_k(x)$ where $u(x, y) \neq 0$. Thus, $\Xi(z) \neq 0$.




Figure 4: Sub-domains of Ω_k showing two curves joining at point P .

Now assume two curves, say $y = \varphi_{2k}(x)$ and $y = \varphi_{2k+1}(x)$, join at a point P , as shown in Figure 4. From the previous work we know along the curve $y = \varphi_{2k}(x)$, $u(x, y) < u_{\min} < 0$;




Figure 5: Sub-domains of Ω_k showing one curve bifurcating.

and along the curve $y = \varphi_{2k+1}(x)$, $u(x, y) > u_{\max} > 0$. Thus, the joining point P becomes a singular point of $u(x, y)$. This contradicts $\Xi(z)$ being analytic. Thus, any two curves will not join.

At last, we assume one curve, say $y = \varphi_{2k}(x)$, bifurcates at a point P and generates a new curve $y = \hat{\varphi}_{2k}(x)$, and two new sub-domains in which $v(x, y)$ takes different signs in values, as shown in Figure 5. We know $v(x, y) > 0$ in Ω_{2k} , where, from (24),

$$v(x, y) = \int_0^{\infty} G(t) \sinh(xt) \sin(yt) dt. \quad (64)$$

And on the lower boundary $u(x, \varphi_{2k-1}(x)) > u_{\max} > 0$ and upper boundary $u(x, \varphi_{2k}(x)) < u_{\min} < 0$, we also know $v_x(x, y) = -u_y(x, y) > 0$. Thus, $v(x, y)$ strictly increasing in Ω_{2k} . Therefore, from the Ω_{2k} side to approach the new curve $y = \hat{\varphi}_{2k}(x)$, there is

$$v(x, \hat{\varphi}_{2k}(x)) > 0. \quad (65)$$

But across the new curve $y = \hat{\varphi}_{2k}(x)$, we have $v(x, y) < 0$. This means the function $v(x, y)$ is discontinuous on the curve $y = \hat{\varphi}_{2k}(x)$, which contradicts $\Xi(z)$ being analytic. Thus, $y = \varphi_{2k}(x)$ cannot bifurcate, and we complete the proof. \square

Thereby, the Riemann hypothesis is proved!

4 A Counterexample

After the death of J.L.W.V. Jensen, Pólya was given access to his Nachlass and published a fundamental article [16] in German in a Danish journal, which unfortunately had not been well known. There, he gave detailed proofs of all the interesting properties of the Riemann $\xi(s)$ function that were found by Jensen. At the end, Pólya was left with deciding whether Jensen had ever found a proof of the Riemann hypothesis, or if Jensen's contributions could lead to a successful proof to the hypothesis. To settle this issue, he produced a devastating example of an entire function that had almost all the properties of the Riemann $\xi(s)$ function investigated by Jensen, but had zeros off the critical line. Since then, any proofs to the Riemann hypothesis using the Jensen function would have been treated as invalid, if they are applied equally well to the Pólya's counterexample which is an analogue of the Riemann hypothesis fails.

Being equivalent to (17), Pólya's counterexample is a linear combination of two equalities,

$$e^{\frac{1}{2}z^2}(\cosh(z) + \alpha) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{2\pi e}} \int_0^{\infty} e^{-\frac{1}{2}t^2} (\cosh(t) + \alpha\sqrt{e}) \cosh(zt) dt, \quad (66)$$

where, α in $(-1, 1]$ is a parameter. When $\alpha < 1$, the function $e^{\frac{1}{2}z^2}(\cosh(z) + \alpha)$ has only infinite simple zeros on the y -axis, which behaves as same as the Riemann $\xi(s)$ function. But when $\alpha = 1$, since

$$\cosh(iy) + 1 = \cos(y) + 1 = 2 \cos^2\left(\frac{y}{2}\right), \quad (67)$$

it has infinite double zeros on the y -axis, i.e., $y_k = (2k + 1)\pi$, for $k = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$. And when $\alpha > 1$, the function $\cosh(z) + \alpha$ has no zeros on the y -axis any more. Instead, the zeros appear in the region $x \neq 0$. Thus, it is necessary to verify if the double zeros in Pólya's example would break the Theorem 2 of this paper.

First, we show that when $\alpha \rightarrow 1$, the Pólya's function in y -axis

$$U(y) = e^{-\frac{1}{2}y^2}(\cos(y) + \alpha) \quad (68)$$

will no longer satisfy the simple zero condition of (45). In fact,

$$U'(y) = -yU(y) - e^{-\frac{1}{2}y^2} \sin(y), \quad (69)$$

$$U'''(y) = (y^2 - 1)U(y) + e^{-\frac{1}{2}y^2}(2y \sin(y) + \alpha). \quad (70)$$

Then a critical value of α_c that makes $U(y) \rightarrow 0+$, $U'(y) > 0$, $U''(y) < 0$ can be found by solving the following equations

$$\begin{aligned} \cos(y) + \alpha &= 0, \\ -\sin(y) &\geq 0, \\ 2y \sin(y) + \alpha &\leq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

It turns out that $\alpha_c \approx 0.98617$. This indicates that if $\alpha > \alpha_c$, there already exists a different property between the Pólya's function and the Riemann's $\xi(s)$ function. Figure 6 and 7 show the two different curve patterns around a zero.




Figure 6: A section of $U(y)$ curve from the Pólya's function, with $\alpha = 0.99$.

The dispute to Jensen's work mainly came from the Jensen's function $G(t)$ in (11) which is a Gaussian type function with a bell shape curve as the Figure 1. In the Pólya's example, the $G(t)$ function

$$G(t) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{2\pi e}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}t^2} \left(\cosh(t) + \alpha\sqrt{e} \right) \quad (72)$$




Figure 7: A section of $U(y)$ curve from the Riemann's $\xi(s)$ function.

is also the Gaussian type function. However, since

$$\begin{aligned}
 -G'(t) &= tG(t) - \frac{2}{\sqrt{2\pi e}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}t^2} \sinh(t) \\
 &= tG(t) - \frac{\sinh(t)}{\cosh(t) + \alpha\sqrt{e}} G(t),
 \end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

this equation shows an apparent gap to (37), in which $-G'(t)/t$ is even lower than $G(t)$. This means that the Jensen's $G(t)$ decreases to 0 much faster than the Pólya's $G(t)$. In other words, the Jensen's $G(t)$ is much highly concentrated about the midpoint $t = 0$ than the Pólya's $G(t)$. If we define the dispersion of $G(t)$ function by

$$D(G) = \left(\int_0^{\infty} t^2 |G(t)|^2 dt \right) / \left(\int_0^{\infty} |G(t)|^2 dt \right), \tag{74}$$

then, the dispersion of the Jensen's $G(t)$ is much less than that of the Pólya's $G(t)$. By the definition in (25), $U(y)$ is the Fourier cosine transform of $G(t)$, then we have the Heisenberg uncertainty principle [18] to connect the dispersion of $G(t)$ and that of $U(y)$:

$$D(G)D(U) \geq \frac{1}{16\pi^2}, \tag{75}$$

where, the dispersion of $U(y)$ function is defined in the same way,

$$D(U) = \left(\int_0^{\infty} y^2 |U(y)|^2 dy \right) / \left(\int_0^{\infty} |U(y)|^2 dy \right). \quad (76)$$

According to (75), if the Jensen's $G(t)$ decreases to 0 much faster than the Pólya's $G(t)$, then the Jensen's $U(y)$ decreases to 0 much slower than the Pólya's $U(y)$. This is just what we have shown in Theorem 1, where, the Jensen's $U(y)$ has a polynomial decreasing rate, while in (68) the Pólya's $U(y)$ has an exponential decreasing rate. As we have already seen, the type of decreasing rate is very important to the proof of the Theorem 2.

In conclusion, the Pólya's $U(y)$ function has a different property than that of Jensen's. Therefore, the Pólya's counterexample does not contradict to the Theorem 2.

Acknowledgement: The author would like to thank his colleague XUE Jian at the CCB Fintech for his helpful validation to this paper. The author greatly thanks Dr. Jacques Gélinas from Ottawa, Canada for his invaluable comments to this paper and providing many useful references, especially, his reading notes which contains the Jensen's inequalities (22), (23) and the Pólya's counterexample have played a decisive role in proving the Theorem 2. The author also thanks Professor YANG Bicheng from the Guangdong University of Education, China for his suggestions to improve the paper.

Reference

1. Riemann B.: Ueber die Anzahl der Primzahlen unter einer gegebenen Grösse, *Monatsberichte der Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaft zu Berlin* aus der Jahre 1859 (1860), 671-680; also, *Gesammelte math. Werke und wissensch. Nachlass*, 2. Aufl. 1892, 145-155.
2. Apostol T. M.: *Introduction to Analytic Number Theory*, Springer. 5th printing 1998 Edition, (1976).
3. Newman D. J.: *Analytic Number Theory (Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Vol. 177)*, Springer Verlag, (1997).

4. Bombieri E.: Problems of the Millennium: the Riemann Hypothesis. In the web-site of the Clay Mathematics Institute: <http://www.claymath.org>, (2000).
5. Sarnak P.: Problems of the Millennium: The Riemann Hypothesis. In the web-site of the Clay Mathematics Institute: <http://www.claymath.org>, (2004).
6. Jensen J.L.W.V.: Recherches sur la théorie des équations. *Acta Mathematica*, 36 (1913) 181-195. Traduction de la conférence du 29 et 30 août (1911).
7. Landau E.: *Handbuch der Lehre von der Verteilung der Primzahlen*. B. G. Teubner, Leipzig, (1909) p288.
8. Hardy G.H.: Sur les zéros de la fonction $\zeta(s)$ de Riemann. *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Sciences*, 158 (1914) 1012-1014.
9. Wilton J.H.: Note on the zeros of Riemann's zeta-function. *Messenger of Mathematics*, 45 (1915) 180-183.
10. Ramanujan S.: New expressions for Riemann's functions $\xi(s)$ and $\Xi(t)$. *Quarterly Journal of Mathematics*, 46 (1915) 253-260.
11. Titchmarsh E.C.: *The Zeta-Function of Riemann*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, (1930) p3.
12. Ingham A.: *The Distribution of Prime Numbers*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, (1932) p46.
13. Whittaker E.T. and Watson G.N.: *A Course of Modern Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, (1927) p524.
14. Wintner A.: A note on the Riemann ξ -function. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 10 (1935) 82-83.
15. Spira R.: The integral representation of the Riemann xi-function. *Journal of Number Theory*, 3 (1971) 498-501.

16. Pólya G.: *Ueber die algebraisch-funktionentheoretischen Untersuchungen von J.L.W.V. Jensen*, Kgl. Danske Vid. Sel. Math.-Fys. Medd. 7, (1927), 10-11.
17. Davenport H.: *Multiplicative Number Theory*, 2nd ed., revised by H. L. Montgomery, Graduate Texts in Mathematics **74**, Springer-Verlag, New York - Berlin, (1980) p80.
18. Prinsky M.A: *Introduction to Fourier Analysis and Wavelets*. The Brooks/Cole Series in Advanced Mathematics (2022) 131-133.