



Incompatibility between Riemann's Hypothesis and universality of Riemann's Zeta function

Jonathan Sondow, Cristian Dumitrescu

► To cite this version:

Jonathan Sondow, Cristian Dumitrescu. Incompatibility between Riemann's Hypothesis and universality of Riemann's Zeta function. 2019. hal-02264568v1

HAL Id: hal-02264568

<https://hal.science/hal-02264568v1>

Preprint submitted on 7 Aug 2019 (v1), last revised 13 Aug 2019 (v3)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Incompatibility between Riemann's Hypothesis and universality of Riemann's Zeta function

Dr. Jonathan Sondow

Cristian Dumitrescu

Note. This draft/preprint is work in progress, it is only meant to describe the essential ideas and techniques. Until the format and presentation are improved, and until all the proofs are verified

in detail, we make no claim that our results settle Riemann's Hypothesis.

Abstract

In this paper we prove that Riemann's Hypothesis is not compatible with universality of the Riemann Zeta function.

Keywords:: Riemann Hypothesis, Universality

Results and main theorem

Proposition 1. Riemann's Zeta function satisfies the relation:

$$\frac{\zeta'(s)}{\zeta(s)} = B - \frac{1}{s-1} + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \log(\pi) - \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{\Gamma'(\frac{s}{2} + 1)}{\Gamma(\frac{s}{2} + 1)} + \sum_{\rho} \left(\frac{1}{s-\rho} + \frac{1}{\rho} \right)$$

where B is a constant.

Proof.[Strombergsson, 2008]

Proposition 2. Assume RH. For all s with $\zeta(s) \neq 0$, we have:

$$\sum_{\text{Im}(\rho) > 0} \frac{1}{|s - \rho|^2} = \int_{2\pi}^{\infty} N(t) \cdot \frac{t - y}{|s - (\frac{1}{2} + it)|^4} dt$$

Proof. Here $N(t)$ counts the zeros of the Zeta function on the critical axis. The proof uses Abel summation. We consider the nontrivial zeros of Zeta of the form $\rho_i = 1/2 + \tau_i$ where the τ_i are not necessarily distinct (possible multiple zeros). For $s = \sigma + iy$ we consider the function:

$$f(t) = \frac{1}{(\sigma - \frac{1}{2})^2 + (t - y)^2}$$

We also consider the quantities :

$$c_n = (N(\tau_n) - N(\tau_{n-1}))/2$$

Using Abel summation techniques we find the relation:

$$\sum_{2\pi \leq \tau_n \leq x} c_n \cdot f(\tau_n) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot N(x) \cdot f(\tau_M) - \frac{1}{2} \cdot \int_{2\pi}^{\tau_M} N(t) \cdot f'(t) dt$$

Here $\tau_M \leq x \leq \tau_{M+1}$.

After considering $M \rightarrow \infty$ and noticing that the improper integral is convergent, the statement of the proposition follows.

Proposition 3. Assume RH. Fix ε with $0 < \varepsilon < 1/2$.

There exists a constant $C = C(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that, for all $s = x + iy$ with $1 - \varepsilon < x < 1$ and $y > 2\pi$, we have:

$$\sum_{\text{Im}(\rho) > 0} \frac{1}{|s - \rho|^2} \leq \frac{1}{4\pi} \cdot \int_{2\pi}^{\infty} \log \frac{u + y}{2\pi} \cdot \frac{du}{u^2 + z^2} + \frac{0.113}{z^2} \cdot \log(y) + C$$

where $z = x - 1/2$.

Proof. Let I denote the integral in Proposition 2. The change of variables $u = t - y$, $z = x - 1/2$ gives:

$$I = \int_{2\pi - y}^{\infty} N(u + y) \cdot \frac{u \cdot du}{(u^2 + z^2)^2}$$

Trudgian (see [Trudgian, 2014]) proved that for $t \geq e$ we have:

It follows that if we define $F(x)$ by the relation:

$$N(x) = \frac{x}{2\pi} \cdot \log\left(\frac{x}{2\pi e}\right) + F(x)$$

$$\left| N(t) - \frac{t}{2\pi} \cdot \log\left(\frac{t}{2\pi e}\right) - \frac{7}{8} \right| \leq$$

$$0.112 \cdot \log(t) + 0.278 \cdot \log(\log(t)) + 2.510 + \frac{0.2}{t}$$

Then for sufficiently large $t' > e$ we have

$$|F(t)| \leq 0.113 \log(t) \quad \text{for all } t \geq t'$$

Taking $M = \sup_{1 \leq t \leq t'} |F(t)|$ we then have:

$$|F(t)| \leq 0.113 \cdot \log(t) + M$$

for all $t \geq 1$.

Now write $I = I_1 + I_2$ where

$$I_1 = \int_{2\pi-y}^{\infty} \frac{u+y}{2\pi} \cdot \log \frac{u+y}{2\pi e} \cdot \frac{u \cdot du}{(u^2 + z^2)^2}$$

$$I_2 = \int_{2\pi-y}^{\infty} F(u+y) \cdot \frac{u \cdot du}{(u^2 + z^2)^2}$$

Performing integration by parts in I_1 gives:

$$I_1 = -\frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{1}{z^2 + (2\pi - y)^2} +$$

$$\frac{1}{4\pi} \cdot \int_{2\pi-y}^{\infty} \log \frac{u+y}{2\pi} \cdot \frac{du}{u^2 + z^2}$$

Now we estimate I_2 for $y > 2\pi..$

$$\begin{aligned}
|I_2| &\leq \int_{2\pi-y}^{\infty} |F(u+y)| \cdot \frac{|u|du}{(u^2+z^2)^2} \leq 0.113 \cdot \int_{2\pi-y}^{\infty} \log(u+y) \cdot \frac{-u \cdot du}{(u^2+z^2)^2} + \\
&M \cdot \int_{2\pi-y}^{\infty} \frac{-u \cdot du}{(u^2+z^2)^2} + 0.113 \cdot \int_0^{\infty} \log(u+y) \cdot \frac{u \cdot du}{(u^2+z^2)^2} + \\
&M \cdot \int_0^{\infty} \frac{u \cdot du}{(u^2+z^2)^2}
\end{aligned}$$

We use the following primitives:

$$\int \frac{u \cdot du}{(u^2+z^2)^2} = -\frac{1}{2(u^2+z^2)} + \text{constant}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\int \frac{\log(u+y) \cdot u}{(u^2+z^2)^2} du &= \frac{1}{4} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{y^2+z^2} \cdot \log\left(\frac{(u+y)^2}{u^2+z^2}\right) - \right. \\
&\left. \frac{2}{u^2+z^2} \cdot \log(u+y) + \frac{2y \cdot \arctan\left(\frac{u}{z}\right)}{z(y^2+z^2)} \right) + \text{constant}
\end{aligned}$$

After we perform the elementary calculations , based on the relations above, we have:

$$|I_2| \leq \frac{0.113}{z^2} \cdot \log(y) + A(\varepsilon)$$

for all $y > 2\pi$, where $A(\varepsilon)$ is just a function of ε ,

As a consequence, when we evaluate I we have:

$$|I| \leq \frac{1}{4\pi} \cdot \int_{2\pi-y}^{\infty} \log\left(\frac{u+y}{2\pi}\right) \cdot \frac{du}{u^2+z^2} + \frac{0.113}{z^2} \cdot \log(y) + C$$

where C may depend on ε , $C = C(\varepsilon)$,

Proposition 4. If $y > 2\pi$ and $z > 0$, then

$$\int_{2\pi-y}^{\infty} \log\left(\frac{u+y}{2\pi}\right) \cdot \frac{du}{u^2+z^2} \leq \frac{\pi}{z} \cdot \log\left(\frac{y}{\pi}\right) + \frac{1}{\pi}$$

Proof. Denote the integral by I and write:

$$I = I_1 + I_2 = \int_{2\pi-y}^y \log\left(\frac{u+y}{2\pi}\right) \cdot \frac{du}{u^2+z^2} + \int_y^{\infty} \log\left(\frac{u+y}{2\pi}\right) \cdot \frac{du}{u^2+z^2}$$

For $u \in [2\pi - y, y]$ we have:

$$\log\left(\frac{u + y}{2\pi}\right) \leq \log\left(\frac{2y}{2\pi}\right) = \log\left(\frac{y}{\pi}\right)$$

As a consequence we have:

$$I_1 \leq \log\left(\frac{y}{\pi}\right) \cdot \int_{2\pi-y}^y \frac{du}{u^2 + z^2} \leq \frac{\pi}{z} \cdot \log\left(\frac{y}{\pi}\right)$$

For $u \in [y, \infty]$ we have:

$$\log\left(\frac{u + y}{2\pi}\right) \leq \log\left(\frac{2u}{2\pi}\right) = \log\left(\frac{u}{\pi}\right)$$

As a consequence we have:

$$I_2 \leq \int_y^\infty \log\left(\frac{u}{\pi}\right) \cdot \frac{du}{u^2 + z^2} \leq$$

$$\int_y^\infty \log\left(\frac{u}{\pi}\right) \cdot \frac{du}{u^2} = \frac{1}{y} \cdot \left(\log\left(\frac{y}{\pi}\right) + 1\right) \leq \frac{1}{\pi}$$

As a consequence, $I = I_1 + I_2$ satisfies the relation in Proposition.

Lemma 1. If $R(s) \geq 0$ and $|s|$ is sufficiently large, then we have:

$$|R(\frac{\Gamma'(s+1)}{\Gamma(s+1)}) - R(\log(s))| \leq \frac{1}{|s|}$$

Proof. [Edwards, 2001], page 114.

Proposition 5 (Srinivasan's lemma). For any holomorphic function f with $f(s) \neq 0$ for all $s = x + iy$ in some open domain

D , then we have:

$$R(\frac{f'(s)}{f(s)}) = \frac{1}{|f(s)|} \cdot \frac{\partial |f(s)|}{\partial x}$$

$$\operatorname{sgn}(\frac{\partial |f(s)|}{\partial x}) = \operatorname{sgn}(R(\frac{f'(s)}{f(s)}))$$

Proof. [Srinivasan, 2011]

Proposition 6. For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a y_0 such that, for any $s = x + iy$ with $y > y_0$ we have:

$$\left| R\left(\frac{\Gamma'(s)}{\Gamma(s)}\right) - \log|s| \right| < \varepsilon$$

Proof. We use the relations:

$$\Gamma(s+1) = s \cdot \Gamma(s)$$

$$\Gamma'(s+1) = \Gamma(s) + s \cdot \Gamma'(s)$$

Using the lemma above , we have:

$$-\frac{1}{|s|} \leq R\left(\frac{\Gamma(s) + s \cdot \Gamma'(s)}{s \cdot \Gamma(s)}\right) - R(\log(s)) \leq \frac{1}{|s|}$$

After performing the elementary calculations we have:

$$-\frac{1}{|s|} - R\left(\frac{1}{s}\right) \leq R\left(\frac{\Gamma'(s)}{\Gamma(s)}\right) - \log|s| \leq \frac{1}{|s|} - R\left(\frac{1}{s}\right)$$

Then for sufficiently large $|s|$ we have the statement of the proposition.

Proposition 7. Assume RH. There exists $\varepsilon > 0$ and $y_0 > 0$ such that for all $s = x + iy$ with $1 - \varepsilon < x < 1$ and $y > y_0$, we have:

$$R\left(\frac{\zeta'(s)}{\zeta(s)}\right) < 0$$

Proof. For $y > 2\pi$ we have:

$$\sum_{\rho; \operatorname{Im}(\rho) < 0} \frac{1}{|s - \rho|^2} < K = \sum_{\rho; \operatorname{Im}(\rho) < 0} \frac{1}{(2\pi - \operatorname{Im}(\rho))^2}$$

As a consequence we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\rho} \frac{1}{|s - \rho|^2} &< \sum_{\rho; \operatorname{Im}(\rho) > 0} \frac{1}{|s - \rho|^2} + K \\ R\left(\sum_{\rho} \frac{1}{s - \rho}\right) &\leq \left(x - \frac{1}{2}\right) \cdot \sum_{\rho; \operatorname{Im}(\rho) > 0} \frac{1}{|s - \rho|^2} + \left(x - \frac{1}{2}\right) \cdot K \end{aligned}$$

Using Proposition 2 and Proposition 3 in the relations above we conclude that:

$$R(\sum_{\rho} \frac{1}{s - \rho}) \leq C + (\frac{0.226}{1 - 2\varepsilon} + \frac{1}{4}) \cdot \log(y)$$

where C depends only on ε , $C=C(\varepsilon)$,

For $\varepsilon = 0.01$ we have:

$$R(\sum_{\rho} \frac{1}{s - \rho}) \leq C + 0.481 \cdot \log(y)$$

From Proposition 6, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there is a $y_0 > 0$ such that for

all $s = x + iy$ with $y > y_0$ we have:

$$|\frac{1}{2} \cdot R(\frac{\Gamma'(\frac{s}{2} + 1)}{\Gamma(\frac{s}{2} + 1)}) - \frac{1}{2} \cdot \log|\frac{s}{2} + 1|| < \varepsilon$$

That means that we have:

$$\frac{1}{2} \cdot R(\frac{\Gamma'(\frac{s}{2} + 1)}{\Gamma(\frac{s}{2} + 1)}) > \frac{1}{2} \cdot \log|\frac{s}{2} + 1| - \varepsilon > \frac{1}{2} \cdot \log(y) - \frac{1}{2} \cdot \log 2 - \varepsilon$$

Using Proposition 1 we have:

$$R\left(\frac{\zeta'(s)}{\zeta(s)}\right) = R\left(B - \frac{1}{s-1} + \frac{1}{2} \cdot \log \pi + \sum_{\rho} \frac{1}{\rho}\right) -$$

$$\frac{1}{2} \cdot R\left(\frac{\Gamma'(\frac{s}{2} + 1)}{\Gamma(\frac{s}{2} + 1)}\right) + R\left(\sum_{\rho} \frac{1}{s - \rho}\right)$$

From the relations above we know that

$$R\left(\sum_{\rho} \frac{1}{s - \rho}\right)$$

grows at most as $0.481 \log(y)$ when $y \rightarrow \infty$.

We also know that

$$\frac{1}{2} \cdot R\left(\frac{\Gamma'(\frac{s}{2} + 1)}{\Gamma(\frac{s}{2} + 1)}\right)$$

grows at least as $0.5 \log(y)$ when $y \rightarrow \infty$.

As a consequence, for $\varepsilon = 0.01$ there is a $y_0 > 0$ such that , for all

$s = x + iy$ with $1 - \varepsilon < x < 1$ (that is $0.99 < x < 1$) and $y > y_0$, we

have::

$$R\left(\frac{\zeta'(s)}{\zeta(s)}\right) < 0$$

Universality theorem (modern version). Let K be a compact subset of the strip $\{s \in \mathbb{C}; 1/2 < \text{Re}(s) < 1\}$ such that K had a connected complement. Let $f: K \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a non-vanishing continuous function that is holomorphic on the interior of K (if any). Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$, we have:

$$\liminf_{T \rightarrow \infty} \mu \{t \in [0, T]; \max_{s \in K} |\zeta(s+it) - f(s)| < \varepsilon\} / T > 0,$$

where μ denotes the Lebesgue measure.

Proof. [Matsumoto, 2014].

Theorem. Riemann's Hypothesis is false.

Proof. We assume that RH is true and we will reach a contradiction with universality. We proved that for $\varepsilon = 0.01$,

there is a $y_0 > 0$ such that for all $s = x+iy$ with $0.99 < x < 1$ and $y > y_0$ we have :

$$R\left(\frac{\zeta'(s)}{\zeta(s)}\right) < 0$$

From Proposition 5 the modulus of the Zeta function is decreasing horizontally on the vertical strip:

$$\{s \in \mathbb{C} ; 0.99 \leq x \leq 1, y > y_0\} = D$$

We consider the compact (horizontal segment) EF , where E is the real point 0.99 and F is 1 . We consider the non-vanishing function f defined on EF by $f(s)=s$. Because the density of those translates of EF (as $T \rightarrow \infty$) is nonzero, eventually one translate $E'F'$ will be included in the region D . But D is the region where the modulus of Zeta is decreasing horizontally. The conditions of the universality theorem are satisfied. We choose the level of

approximation $\varepsilon_1 < \varepsilon/4 = 0.01/4 = 0.0025$. Zeta on $E'F'$

approximates f on EF at the level of approximation

$$\varepsilon_1 < 0.0025.$$

$$| |\zeta(0.9925+it)| - 0.9925 | \leq | \zeta(0.9925+it) - 0.9925 | < \varepsilon_1$$

$$| |\zeta(0.9975+it)| - 0.9975 | \leq | \zeta(0.9975+it) - 0.9975 | < \varepsilon_1$$

Elementary calculations will lead to

$$| \zeta(0.9925+it) | < | \zeta(0.9975+it) |$$

But $0.9925+it$ and $0.9975+it$ are on the horizontal $E'F'$, in the region where the modulus of Zeta is decreasing on horizontal segments. We reached a contradiction. The assumption that RH is true implies the existence of the region D where the modulus of Zeta is decreasing horizontally. The existence of this region D leads to a contradiction with universality. Therefore, Riemann's Hypothesis must be false.

References

[Edwards, 2001] - Edwards, H. M., “Riemann's Zeta Function”,
Dover Publications, Inc., 2001.

[Matsumoto, 2014] – Matsumoto, K., ‘A survey of the theory of
universality for Zeta and L-functions’,
<https://arxiv.org/abs/1407.4216>

[Srinivasan, 2011] - Srinivasan. G., Zvengrowski, P., ‘On the
Horizontal Monotonicity of $|\Gamma(s)|$ ’, Canadian
Mathematical Bulletin 54(3), 538 – 543.

[Strombergsson, 2008] – Strombergsson, A., “Analytic Number
Theory”, Lecture Notes, fall 2008, ww2.math.uu.se

[Trudgian, 2014] – Trudgian, T. S., ‘An improved upper bound for the argument of the Riemann Zeta function on the critical line II’, *Journal of Number Theory*, vol 134, pp 280 – 292.

