



**HAL**  
open science

# Many values of the Riemann zeta function at odd integers are irrational

Stéphane Fischler, Johannes Sprang, Wadim Zudilin

► **To cite this version:**

Stéphane Fischler, Johannes Sprang, Wadim Zudilin. Many values of the Riemann zeta function at odd integers are irrational. *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des sciences. Série I, Mathématique*, 2018, 356 (7), pp.707-711. hal-03404344

**HAL Id: hal-03404344**

**<https://hal.science/hal-03404344>**

Submitted on 26 Oct 2021

**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.

# Many values of the Riemann zeta function at odd integers are irrational

## Beaucoup de valeurs aux entiers impairs de la fonction zêta de Riemann sont irrationnelles

Stéphane Fischler, Johannes Sprang and Wadim Zudilin

May 4, 2018

### Abstract

In this note we announce the following result: at least  $2^{(1-\varepsilon)\frac{\log s}{\log \log s}}$  values of the Riemann zeta function at odd integers between 3 and  $s$  are irrational, where  $\varepsilon$  is any positive real number and  $s$  is large enough in terms of  $\varepsilon$ . This improves on the lower bound  $\frac{1-\varepsilon}{1+\log 2} \log s$  that follows from the Ball–Rivoal theorem. We give the main ideas of the proof which is based on an elimination process between several linear forms in odd zeta values with related coefficients.

### Résumé

Dans cette note on annonce le résultat suivant : au moins  $2^{(1-\varepsilon)\frac{\log s}{\log \log s}}$  valeurs de la fonction zêta de Riemann aux entiers impairs compris entre 3 and  $s$  sont irrationnelles, où  $\varepsilon$  est un réel strictement positif et  $s$  un entier impair suffisamment grand en fonction de  $\varepsilon$ . Ceci améliore la borne  $\frac{1-\varepsilon}{1+\log 2} \log s$  qui découle du théorème de Ball–Rivoal. On donne les idées principales de la preuve, qui est fondée sur un procédé d'élimination entre des formes linéaires en les valeurs de zêta aux entiers impairs dont les coefficients sont reliés.

*Math. Subject Classification* : 11J72, 11M06, 33C20.

## Version française abrégée

Dans cette note on annonce le résultat suivant (voir la version anglaise pour un bref historique). On ne donne que les idées principales de la preuve (voir [6] pour la preuve complète).

**Théorème 1.** *Soient  $\varepsilon > 0$ , et  $s \geq 3$  un entier impair suffisamment grand (en fonction de  $\varepsilon$ ). Alors parmi les nombres*

$$\zeta(3), \zeta(5), \zeta(7), \dots, \zeta(s),$$

*au moins*

$$2^{(1-\varepsilon)\frac{\log s}{\log \log s}}$$

*sont irrationnels.*

Soient  $\varepsilon > 0$ , et  $s$  un entier impair suffisamment grand (en fonction de  $\varepsilon$ ). On note  $D$  le produit de tous les nombres premiers inférieurs ou égaux à  $(1 - 2\varepsilon) \log s$ , de telle sorte qu'on a  $D \leq s^{1-\varepsilon}$ . En suivant essentiellement [12], on considère pour tout entier  $n$  la fraction rationnelle

$$R_n(t) = D^{3Dn} n^{s+1-3D} \frac{\prod_{j=0}^{3Dn} (t - n + \frac{j}{D})}{\prod_{j=0}^n (t + j)^{s+1}}$$

et pour tout  $j \in \{1, \dots, D\}$  on pose

$$r_{n,j} = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} R_n\left(m + \frac{j}{D}\right).$$

Rappelons que la fonction zêta de Hurwitz est définie par  $\zeta(i, \alpha) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(n+\alpha)^i}$  pour  $\alpha > 0$  et  $i \geq 2$ . En développant  $R_n(t)$  en éléments simples, on démontre comme dans [12] que

$$r_{n,j} = \rho_{0,j} + \sum_{\substack{3 \leq i \leq s \\ i \text{ impair}}} \rho_i \zeta\left(i, \frac{j}{D}\right).$$

En outre, en notant  $d_n$  le plus petit commun multiple des  $n$  premiers entiers, on montre que  $d_{n+1}^{s+1}$  est un multiple commun des dénominateurs des nombres rationnels  $\rho_{0,j}$  et  $\rho_i$ .

Le point crucial, comme dans [12], est l'identité suivante valable pour tout diviseur  $d$  de  $D$  et pour tout entier  $i \geq 2$  :

$$\sum_{j=1}^d \zeta\left(i, \frac{jD}{D}\right) = \sum_{j=1}^d \zeta\left(i, \frac{j}{d}\right) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{d^i}{(dn+j)^i} = d^i \zeta(i).$$

En effet, cette relation montre qu'en posant  $\hat{r}_{n,d} = \sum_{j=1}^d r_{n,j} \frac{D}{d}$  on a :

$$\hat{r}_{n,d} = \sum_{j=1}^d \rho_{0,j} \frac{D}{d} + \sum_{\substack{3 \leq i \leq s \\ i \text{ impair}}} \rho_i d^i \zeta(i).$$

Notons  $\mathcal{D}$  l'ensemble des diviseurs de  $D$ . Pour tout  $d \in \mathcal{D}$  et pour tout entier  $n$ , on a donc une combinaison linéaire  $\hat{r}_{n,d}$  de  $1, \zeta(3), \zeta(5), \dots, \zeta(s)$ . Pour tout entier  $i$  impair compris entre 3 et  $s$ , le coefficient de  $\zeta(i)$  est  $\rho_i d^i$  (où le nombre rationnel  $\rho_i$  dépend implicitement de  $n$ , mais pas de  $d$ ). Si des entiers  $w_d, d \in \mathcal{D}$ , vérifient  $\sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} w_d d^i = 0$  pour un certain  $i$ , alors la combinaison linéaire

$$\tilde{r}_n = \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} w_d \hat{r}_{n,d} \tag{0.1}$$

ne fait plus apparaître  $\zeta(i)$ . Le point central de ce procédé d'élimination (mis au point par le troisième auteur [15] pour  $D = 2$ , et généralisé par le deuxième auteur [12]) est que le coefficient  $d^i$  dépend de  $d$  mais pas de  $n$  : on peut choisir les entiers  $w_d$  indépendamment de  $n$ .

Pour démontrer le théorème 1, on suppose que parmi  $\zeta(3), \zeta(5), \dots, \zeta(s)$  le nombre d'irrationnels est inférieur à  $2^{(1-3\varepsilon) \frac{\log s}{\log \log s}}$  ; il est alors inférieur ou égal à  $\delta - 1$ , où  $\delta = \text{Card } \mathcal{D}$  est le nombre de diviseurs de  $D$ . Il existe donc des indices impairs  $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_{\delta-1}$  compris entre 3 et  $s$  tels que toute valeur irrationnelle  $\zeta(i)$ , avec  $i$  impair compris entre 3 et  $s$ , soit l'une des  $\zeta(i_j)$ . On peut choisir des entiers relatifs  $w_d$  non tous nuls (pour  $d \in \mathcal{D}$ ) tels que

$$\sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} w_d d^{i_j} = 0 \quad \text{pour tout } j \in \{1, \dots, \delta - 1\}. \tag{0.2}$$

La relation (0.1) définit alors une suite  $(\tilde{r}_n)_{n \geq 1}$  de nombres réels qui sont des combinaisons linéaires à coefficients rationnels de 1 et des  $\zeta(i)$  pour  $i$  impair,  $3 \leq i \leq s$ . La propriété cruciale est que les  $\zeta(i_j)$  ne figurent plus dans ces combinaisons linéaires, si bien que tous les  $\zeta(i)$  qui y apparaissent avec un coefficient non nul sont par hypothèse des nombres rationnels. En multipliant par un dénominateur commun  $A$  de ces nombres rationnels, et aussi par  $d_{n+1}^{s+1}$  (qui est un dénominateur commun des coefficients  $\rho_i$  et  $\rho_{0,j}$ ), on obtient une suite d'entiers relatifs. Une étude asymptotique

des suites  $(r_{n,j})_{n \geq 1}$  montre que cette suite d'entiers relatifs tend vers 0, donc est identiquement nulle à partir d'un certain rang; précisément on a quand  $n \rightarrow \infty$  :

$$Ad_{n+1}^{s+1} \tilde{r}_n = \left( \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} w_d d + o(1) \right) Ad_{n+1}^{s+1} r_{n,1}, \quad \text{avec } 0 < \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (Ad_{n+1}^{s+1} r_{n,1})^{1/n} < 1$$

où  $o(1)$  est une suite qui tend vers 0 quand  $n$  tend vers l'infini. Cela impose  $\sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} w_d d = 0$ . Autrement dit, toute famille  $(w_d)_{d \in \mathcal{D}}$  d'entiers relatifs vérifiant (0.2) devrait vérifier aussi  $\sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} w_d d = 0$ . Ce n'est pas le cas, car la matrice  $[d^{ij}]_{d \in \mathcal{D}, 0 \leq j \leq \delta-1}$  (dans laquelle on pose  $i_0 = 1$ ) est inversible : son déterminant est le produit d'un déterminant de Vandermonde et d'un polynôme de Schur, qui est un polynôme à coefficients entiers naturels évalué en la famille des diviseurs de  $D$ .

## 1 Introduction

When  $s \geq 2$  is an even integer, the value  $\zeta(s)$  of the Riemann zeta function is a non-zero rational multiple of  $\pi^s$  and, therefore, a transcendental number. On the other hand, very few results are known on the zeta values  $\zeta(s)$  when  $s \geq 3$  is odd, though we expect them all to be transcendental.

It was only in 1978 when Apéry astonished the mathematics community by his proof [1] of the irrationality of  $\zeta(3)$ , with the next breakthrough in this direction taken in 2000 by Ball and Rivoal [2, 10], who proved the following:

**Theorem 1** (Ball–Rivoal). *Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and  $s \geq 3$  be an odd integer sufficiently large with respect to  $\varepsilon$ . Then*

$$\dim_{\mathbb{Q}} \text{Span}_{\mathbb{Q}}(1, \zeta(3), \zeta(5), \zeta(7), \dots, \zeta(s)) \geq \frac{1 - \varepsilon}{1 + \log 2} \log s.$$

In spite of several refinements [2, 14, 5] for small  $s$ , the lower bound in Theorem 1 has never been improved for large values of  $s$ . The proof of Theorem 1 applies Nesterenko's linear independence criterion [9] to certain linear combinations of odd zeta values. To improve on this bound using the same strategy, one has to find linear combinations that are considerably smaller, with not too large coefficients, — this comes out to be a rather difficult task.

The situation has drastically changed when the third author introduced [15] a new method, which has been generalized by the second author in [12]. For a given integer  $D > 1$  and a certain rational function  $R(t)$  the series

$$\sum_{j=1}^d \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} R\left(t + \frac{j}{d}\right), \quad \text{where } d \mid D,$$

give  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linear combinations of  $1, d^3 \zeta(3), d^5 \zeta(5), \dots, d^s \zeta(s)$  with coefficients independent from  $d$  (except that of 1). This makes it possible to eliminate from the entire collection of these linear combinations essentially as many odd zeta values as the number of divisors of  $D$ . For applications of this idea, see [15, 8, 12, 11].

In this note we sketch the proof of the following result, building upon the approach in [15] and [12]. We refer the interested reader to the full version [6] of the paper for details.

**Theorem 2.** *Let  $\varepsilon > 0$ , and  $s \geq 3$  be an odd integer sufficiently large with respect to  $\varepsilon$ . Then among the numbers*

$$\zeta(3), \zeta(5), \zeta(7), \dots, \zeta(s),$$

*at least*

$$2^{(1-\varepsilon) \frac{\log s}{\log \log s}}$$

*are irrational.*

In comparison, Theorem 1 gives only  $\frac{1-\varepsilon}{1+\log 2} \log s$  irrational odd zeta values, but they are linearly independent over the rationals, whereas Theorem 2 ends up only with their irrationality.

Our proof of Theorem 2 follows the above-mentioned strategy from [15] and [12]. The main new ingredient, compared to the proof in [12], is taking  $D$  large (about  $s^{1-2\varepsilon}$ ) and equal to the product of the first prime numbers (the so-called primorial) — such a number has asymptotically the largest possible number of divisors with respect to its size.

## 2 Small linear forms in values of the Hurwitz zeta function

Let  $s$  and  $D$  be positive integers such that  $s$  is odd and  $s \geq 3D$ . Let  $n$  be a positive integer, such that  $Dn$  is even. We consider the following rational function:

$$R_n(t) = D^{3Dn} n!^{s+1-3D} \frac{\prod_{j=0}^{3Dn} (t - n + \frac{j}{D})}{\prod_{j=0}^n (t + j)^{s+1}}$$

which, of course, depends also on  $s$  and  $D$ , and for  $j \in \{1, \dots, D\}$  we let

$$r_{n,j} = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} R_n\left(m + \frac{j}{D}\right).$$

We write  $d_n$  for  $\text{lcm}(1, 2, \dots, n)$ . Expanding  $R_n(t)$  into partial fractions yields the following  $\mathbb{Q}$ -linear combinations of values of the Hurwitz zeta function.

**Lemma 1.** *For each  $j \in \{1, \dots, D\}$ , we have*

$$r_{n,j} = \rho_{0,j} + \sum_{\substack{3 \leq i \leq s \\ i \text{ odd}}} \rho_i \zeta\left(i, \frac{j}{D}\right)$$

with

$$d_n^{s+1-i} \rho_i \in \mathbb{Z} \quad \text{for } i \in \{3, 5, \dots, s\} \quad \text{and} \quad d_{n+1}^{s+1} \rho_{0,j} \in \mathbb{Z} \quad \text{for any } j \in \{1, \dots, D\}.$$

We point out that the coefficient  $\rho_i$  of  $\zeta(i, \frac{j}{D})$  in the linear form  $r_{n,j}$  does not depend on  $j$ . The expansion of  $r_{n,j}$  is very classical; only odd zeta values appear because of the symmetry phenomenon from [2]. The proof that  $d_n^{s+1-i} \rho_i \in \mathbb{Z}$  for odd  $i$  follows that of [4, Lemma 4.5]. The last assertion, namely  $d_{n+1}^{s+1} \rho_{0,j} \in \mathbb{Z}$ , is proved as in [12, Lemma 1.4].

An important feature of the linear forms  $r_{n,j}$  is that they are simultaneously very small: even when multiplied by a common denominator of the rational coefficients, they still tend to 0.

**Lemma 2.** *Assume that  $\frac{s}{D \log D}$  larger than some effectively computable absolute constant. Then we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} r_{n,j}^{1/n} = g(x_0) < 3^{-(s+1)} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{r_{n,j'}}{r_{n,j}} = 1 \quad \text{for any } j, j' \in \{1, \dots, D\},$$

where

$$g(x) = D^{3D} \frac{(x+3)^{3D} (x+1)^{s+1}}{(x+2)^{2(s+1)}}$$

and  $x_0$  is the unique positive root of the polynomial  $(X+3)^D (X+1)^{s+1} - X^D (X+2)^{s+1}$ .

The following elementary lemma about the non-vanishing of generalized Vandermonde determinants is used to get rid of unwanted irrational odd zeta values (in §3 below).

**Lemma 3.** *For  $t \geq 1$ , let  $x_1, \dots, x_t$  be pairwise distinct positive real numbers and  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_t$  pairwise distinct non-negative integers. Then the matrix  $[x_j^{\alpha_i}]_{1 \leq i, j \leq t}$  has non-zero determinant.*

### 3 Elimination of odd zeta values

Take  $0 < \varepsilon < \frac{1}{3}$ , and let  $s$  be odd and sufficiently large with respect to  $\varepsilon$ . We let  $D$  be the product of all primes less than or equal to  $(1 - 2\varepsilon) \log s$ , so that  $D \leq s^{1-\varepsilon}$ . Notice that  $D$  has  $\delta = 2^{\pi((1-2\varepsilon) \log s)}$  divisors, with  $\log \delta \geq (1-3\varepsilon)(\log 2) \frac{\log s}{\log \log s}$ . Assume that the number of irrational odd zeta values between  $\zeta(3)$  and  $\zeta(s)$  is less than or equal to  $\delta - 1$ . Let  $3 = i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_{\delta-1} \leq s$  be odd integers such that if  $\zeta(i) \notin \mathbb{Q}$  and  $i$  is odd,  $3 \leq i \leq s$ , then  $i = i_j$  for some  $j$ . Moreover, we let  $i_0 = 1$ , and consider the set  $\mathcal{D}$  of all divisors of  $D$ , so that  $\text{Card } \mathcal{D} = \delta$ . Lemma 3 shows that the matrix  $[d^{ij}]_{d \in \mathcal{D}, 0 \leq j \leq \delta-1}$  is invertible. Therefore, there exist integers  $w_d \in \mathbb{Z}$ , where  $d \in \mathcal{D}$ , such that

$$\sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} w_d d^{ij} = 0 \quad \text{for any } j \in \{1, \dots, \delta - 1\} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} w_d d \neq 0. \quad (3.1)$$

The crucial point (as in [12, §3]) is that for any  $d \in \mathcal{D}$  and any  $i \geq 2$ ,

$$\sum_{j=1}^d \zeta\left(i, \frac{jD}{d}\right) = \sum_{j=1}^d \zeta\left(i, \frac{j}{d}\right) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^d \frac{d^i}{(dn+j)^i} = d^i \zeta(i).$$

Lemma 1 implies that the quantities  $\hat{r}_{n,d} = \sum_{j=1}^d r_{n,j \frac{D}{d}}$  are linear forms in the odd zeta values:

$$\hat{r}_{n,d} = \sum_{j=1}^d \rho_{0,j \frac{D}{d}} + \sum_{\substack{3 \leq i \leq s \\ i \text{ odd}}} \rho_i d^i \zeta(i), \quad (3.2)$$

while Lemma 2 leads to the following asymptotics:

$$\hat{r}_{n,d} = (d + o(1))r_{n,1} \quad \text{with} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} r_{n,1}^{1/n} = g(x_0). \quad (3.3)$$

We shall use now the integers  $w_d$  to eliminate  $\delta - 1$  odd zeta values, including all irrational ones, as in [15] and [12]. For that, introduce  $\tilde{r}_n = \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} w_d \hat{r}_{n,d}$ . Eqns. (3.1)–(3.3) imply that

$$\tilde{r}_n = \left( \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} w_d \sum_{j=1}^d \rho_{0,j \frac{D}{d}} \right) + \sum_{i \in I} \rho_i \left( \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} w_d d^i \right) \zeta(i) = \left( \sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} w_d d + o(1) \right) r_{n,1},$$

where  $I = \{3, 5, 7, \dots, s\} \setminus \{i_1, \dots, i_{\delta-1}\}$ . In particular, no irrational zeta value  $\zeta(i)$ , where  $3 \leq i \leq s$ , appears in this linear combination, and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\tilde{r}_n|^{1/n} = g(x_0) < 3^{-(s+1)}$  since  $\sum_{d \in \mathcal{D}} w_d d \neq 0$ . Denoting by  $A$  a common denominator of the (rational) numbers  $\zeta(i)$ ,  $i \in I$ , we deduce from Lemma 1 that  $Ad_{n+1}^{s+1} \tilde{r}_n$  is an integer. Now the prime number theorem implies that  $d_{n+1}^{1/n} \rightarrow e$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , hence from Lemma 2 we conclude that the sequence of integers satisfies

$$0 < \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |Ad_{n+1}^{s+1} \tilde{r}_n|^{1/n} = e^{s+1} g(x_0) < \left(\frac{e}{3}\right)^{s+1} < 1.$$

This contradiction implies the truth of Theorem 2.

## Acknowledgements

We thank Michel Waldschmidt for his advice, and Ole Warnaar for his comments on an earlier draft of the paper.

## References

- [1] R. APÉRY – “Irrationalité de  $\zeta(2)$  et  $\zeta(3)$ ”, in *Journées Arithmétiques (Luminy, 1978)*, Astérisque, no. 61, 1979, p. 11–13.

- [2] K. BALL & T. RIVOAL – “Irrationalité d’une infinité de valeurs de la fonction zêta aux entiers impairs”, *Invent. Math.* **146** (2001), no. 1, p. 193–207.
- [3] N. G. DE BRUIJN – *Asymptotic methods in analysis*, Dover Publications, 1981.
- [4] — , “Shidlovsky’s multiplicity estimate and irrationality of zeta values”, preprint arXiv 1609.09770 [math.NT], J. Austral. Math. Soc., to appear.
- [5] S. FISCHLER & W. ZUDILIN – “A refinement of Nesterenko’s linear independence criterion with applications to zeta values”, *Math. Ann.* **347** (2010), p. 739–763.
- [6] S. FISCHLER, J. SPRANG & W. ZUDILIN – “Many odd zeta values are irrational”, preprint arXiv:1803.08905 [math.NT], 2018.
- [7] C. KRATTENTHALER – “Advanced determinant calculus”, *Sém. Lotharingien Combin.* **42** (1999), 67 pp.
- [8] C. KRATTENTHALER & W. ZUDILIN – “Hypergeometry inspired by irrationality questions”, preprint arXiv:1802.08856 [math.NT], 2018.
- [9] Y. NESTERENKO – “On the linear independence of numbers”, *Vestnik Moskov. Univ. Ser. I Mat. Mekh. [Moscow Univ. Math. Bull.]* **40** (1985), no. 1, p. 46–49 [69–74].
- [10] T. RIVOAL – “La fonction zêta de Riemann prend une infinité de valeurs irrationnelles aux entiers impairs”, *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser. I* **331** (2000), no. 4, p. 267–270.
- [11] T. RIVOAL & W. ZUDILIN – “A note on odd zeta values”, preprint arXiv:1803.03160 [math.NT], 2018.
- [12] J. SPRANG – “Infinitely many odd zeta values are irrational. By elementary means”, preprint arXiv:1802.09410 [math.NT], 2018.
- [13] W. ZUDILIN – “One of the numbers  $\zeta(5)$ ,  $\zeta(7)$ ,  $\zeta(9)$ ,  $\zeta(11)$  is irrational”, *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk [Russian Math. Surveys]* **56** (2001), no. 4, p. 149–150 [774–776].
- [14] — , “Irrationality of values of the Riemann zeta function”, *Izvestiya Ross. Akad. Nauk Ser. Mat. [Izv. Math.]* **66** (2002), no. 3, p. 49–102 [489–542].
- [15] — , “One of the odd zeta values from  $\zeta(5)$  to  $\zeta(25)$  is irrational. By elementary means”, preprint arXiv:1801.09895 [math.NT], 2018.

Stéphane Fischler, Laboratoire de Mathématiques d’Orsay, Univ. Paris-Sud, CNRS, Université Paris-Saclay, 91405 Orsay, France

Johannes Sprang, Fakultät für Mathematik, Universität Regensburg, 93053 Regensburg, Germany

Wadim Zudilin, Department of Mathematics, IMAPP, Radboud University, PO Box 9010, 6500 GL Nijmegen, Netherlands;

School of Mathematical and Physical Sciences, The University of Newcastle, Callaghan, NSW 2308, Australia