Criterion for the Riemann Hypothesis

Frank Vega

To my mother

Abstract. Let $\Psi(n) = n \cdot \prod_{q \mid n} \left(1 + \frac{1}{q}\right)$ denote the Dedekind Ψ function where $q \mid n$ means the prime q divides n. Define, for $n \geq 3$; the ratio $R(n) = \frac{\Psi(n)}{n \cdot \log \log n}$ where log is the natural logarithm. Let $M_x = \prod_{q \leq x} q$ be the product extending over all prime numbers q that are less than or equal to x. The Riemann hypothesis is the assertion that all non-trivial zeros are complex numbers with real part $\frac{1}{2}$. It is considered by many to be the most important unsolved problem in pure mathematics. We state that if the Riemann hypothesis is false, then there exist infinitely natural numbers x such that the inequality $R(M_x) < \frac{e^{\gamma}}{\zeta(2)}$ holds, where $\gamma \approx 0.57721$ is the Euler-Mascheroni constant and $\zeta(x)$ is the Riemann zeta function. In this note, using our criterion, we prove that the Riemann hypothesis is true.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010). Primary 11M26; Secondary 11A41.

Keywords. Riemann hypothesis, prime numbers, Riemann zeta function, Chebyshev function.

1. Introduction

The Riemann hypothesis is a conjecture that the Riemann zeta function has its zeros only at the negative even integers and complex numbers with real part $\frac{1}{2}$. It was proposed by Bernhard Riemann (1859). The Riemann hypothesis belongs to the Hilbert's eighth problem on David Hilbert's list of twenty-three unsolved problems. This is one of the Clay Mathematics Institute's Millennium Prize Problems. In mathematics, the Chebyshev function $\theta(x)$ is given by

$$\theta(x) = \sum_{q \leq x} \log q$$

with the sum extending over all prime numbers q that are less than or equal to x, where log is the natural logarithm.

Proposition 1.1. *For every* $x \geq 19035709163$ [1, Theorem 1 pp. 2]*:*

$$\left(1 - \frac{0.15}{\log^3 x}\right) \cdot x < \theta(x) < \left(1 + \frac{0.15}{\log^3 x}\right) \cdot x.$$

The following property is based on natural logarithms:

Proposition 1.2. *For* $x > -1$ [8, pp. 1]*:*

$$\frac{x}{x+1} \leq \log(1+x) \leq x.$$

Leonhard Euler studied the following value of the Riemann zeta function (1734) [2].

Proposition 1.3. *We define* [2, (1) pp. 1070]*:*

$$\zeta(2) = \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{q_k^2}{q_k^2 - 1} = \frac{\pi^2}{6},$$

where q_k *is the* k*th prime number. By definition, we have*

$$\zeta(2) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2},$$

where n *denotes a natural number. Leonhard Euler proved in his solution to the Basel problem that*

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^2} = \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{q_k^2}{q_k^2 - 1} = \frac{\pi^2}{6},$$

where $\pi \approx 3.14159$ *is a well-known constant linked to several areas in mathematics such as number theory, geometry, etc.*

The number $\gamma \approx 0.57721$ is the Euler-Mascheroni constant which is defined as

$$\gamma = \lim_{n \to \infty} \left(-\log n + \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{1}{k}\right)$$
$$= \int_{1}^{\infty} \left(-\frac{1}{x} + \frac{1}{\lfloor x \rfloor}\right) dx.$$

Here, $\lfloor \ldots \rfloor$ represents the floor function. Franz Mertens discovered some important results about the constants B and H (1874) [9]. The number $B \approx 0.26149$ is the Meissel-Mertens constant where $\gamma = B + H$ [9].

Proposition 1.4. *We have* [4, Lemma 2.1 (1) pp. 359]*:*

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\log\left(\frac{q_k}{q_k - 1}\right) - \frac{1}{q_k}\right) = \gamma - B = H.$$

For $x \geq 2$, the function $u(x)$ is defined as follows [10, pp. 379]:

$$u(x) = \sum_{q>x} \left(\log \left(\frac{q}{q-1} \right) - \frac{1}{q} \right).$$

On the sum of the reciprocals of all prime numbers not exceeding x, we have:

Proposition 1.5. *For $x \geq 2278383$ [5, Theorem 5.6 (1) pp. 243]:*

$$-\frac{0.2}{\log^3 x} \leq \sum_{q \leq x} \frac{1}{q} - B - \log\log x \leq \frac{0.2}{\log^3 x}.$$

In number theory, $\Psi(n) = n \cdot \prod_{q \mid n} \left(1 + \frac{1}{q}\right)$ is called the Dedekind Ψ function where $q \mid n$ means the prime q divides n. For $x \geq 2$, a natural number M_x is defined as

$$M_x = \prod_{q \leq x} q.$$

We define $R(n) = \frac{\Psi(n)}{n \cdot \log\log n}$ for $n \geq 3$. We say that $\mathsf{Dedekind}(x)$ holds provided that

$$R(M_x) \geq \frac{e^{\gamma}}{\zeta(2)}.$$

The well-known asymptotic notation Ω was introduced by Godfrey Harold Hardy and John Edensor Littlewood [6]. In 1916, they also introduced the two symbols Ω_R and Ω_L defined as [7]:

$$f(x) = \Omega_R(g(x)) \textit{ as } x \to \infty \textit{ if } \limsup_{x\to\infty} \frac{f(x)}{g(x)} > 0;$$

$$f(x) = \Omega_L(g(x)) \textit{ as } x \to \infty \textit{ if } \liminf_{x\to\infty} \frac{f(x)}{g(x)} < 0.$$

After that, many mathematicians started using these notations in their works. From the last century, these notations Ω_R and Ω_L changed as Ω_+ and Ω_-, respectively. There is another notation: $f(x) = \Omega_{\pm}(g(x))$ (meaning that $f(x) = \Omega_+(g(x))$ and $f(x) = \Omega_-(g(x))$ are both satisfied). Nowadays, the notation $f(x) = \Omega_+(g(x))$ has survived and it is still used in analytic number theory as [12]:

$$f(x) = \Omega_+(g(x)) \textit{ if } \exists k > 0 \, \forall x_0 \, \exists x > x_0 \colon f(x) \geq k \cdot g(x)$$

which has the same meaning to the Hardy and Littlewood older notation. Putting all together yields a proof for the Riemann hypothesis.

2. Central Lemma

Several analogues of the Riemann hypothesis have already been proved. Many authors expect (or at least hope) that it is true. However, there are some implications in case of the Riemann hypothesis could be false. The following is a key Lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *If the Riemann hypothesis is false, then there exist infinitely natural numbers x for which* $\mathsf{Dedekind}(x)$ *fails (i.e.* $\mathsf{Dedekind}(x)$ *does not hold).*

Proof. The function g is defined as [11, Theorem 4.2 pp. 5]:

$$g(x) = \frac{e^{\gamma}}{\zeta(2)} \cdot \log \theta(x) \cdot \prod_{q \leq x} \left(1 + \frac{1}{q}\right)^{-1}.$$

The Riemann hypothesis is false whenever there exists some natural number $x_0 \geq 5$ such that $g(x_0) > 1$ or equivalent $\log g(x_0) > 0$ [11, Theorem 4.2 pp. 5]. It was proven the following bound [11, Theorem 4.2 pp. 5]:

$$\log g(x) \geq \log f(x) - \frac{2}{x}.$$

For $x \geq 2$, the function f was introduced by Nicolas in his seminal paper as [10, Theorem 3 pp. 376], [3, (5.5) pp. 111]:

$$f(x) = e^{\gamma} \cdot \log \theta(x) \cdot \prod_{q \leq x} \left(1 - \frac{1}{q}\right).$$

If the Riemann hypothesis is false then there exists a real number b with $0 < b < \frac{1}{2}$ such that, as $x \to \infty$ [10, Theorem 3 (c) pp. 376], [3, Theorem 5.29 pp. 131],

$$\log f(x) = \Omega_{\pm}(x^{-b}).$$

Actually Nicolas proved that $\log f(x) = \Omega_{\pm}(x^{-b})$, but we only need to use the notation Ω_{+} in this proof under the domain of natural numbers. According to the Hardy and Littlewood definition, this would mean that

$$\exists k > 0, \forall y_0 \in \mathbb{N}, \exists y \in \mathbb{N}\ (y > y_0) \colon\ \log f(y) \geq k \cdot y^{-b}.$$

That inequality is equal to $\log f(y) \geq \left(k \cdot y^{-b} \cdot \sqrt{y}\right) \cdot \frac{1}{\sqrt{y}}$, but we notice that

$$\lim_{y \to \infty} \left(k \cdot y^{-b} \cdot \sqrt{y}\right) = \infty$$

for every possible values of $k > 0$ and $0 < b < \frac{1}{2}$. Now, this implies that

$$\forall y_0 \in \mathbb{N}, \exists y \in \mathbb{N}\ (y > y_0) \colon\ \log f(y) \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{y}}.$$

Note that, the variable k disappears in our previous expression when we do not need it anymore. In this way, if the Riemann hypothesis is false, then there exist infinitely many natural numbers x such that $\log f(x) \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{x}}$. Since $\frac{1}{\sqrt{x_0}} > \frac{2}{x_0}$ for $x_0 \geq 5$, then it would be infinitely many natural numbers x_0 such that $\log g(x_0) > 0$. □

https://doi.org/10.33774/coe-2023-hfgk7 **ORCID:** https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8210-4126 Content not peer-reviewed by Cambridge University Press. **Licen**

3. Main Insight

This is the main insight.

Lemma 3.1. *The inequality* $\frac{\prod_{q \leq x} \left(\frac{q}{q-1}\right)}{\log \theta(x)} \geq \left(\frac{e^{\gamma}}{\zeta(2)}\right)^{7}$ *holds for large enough* $x \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. By Proposition 1.4, the inequality

$$\frac{\prod_{q \leq x} \left(\frac{q}{q-1}\right)}{\log \theta(x)} \geq \left(\frac{e^{\gamma}}{\zeta(2)}\right)^{7}$$

is the same as

$$\sum_{q \leq x} \log \left(\frac{q}{q-1}\right) - B - \log \log \theta(x) \geq H + 6 \cdot \gamma - 7 \cdot \log(\zeta(2))$$

after of applying the logarithm to the both sides and distributing the terms. In addition,

$$\begin{aligned}
\log \log \theta(x) &< \log \log \left(\left(1 + \frac{0.15}{\log^3 x}\right) \cdot x\right) \\
&= \log \left(\log \left(1 + \frac{0.15}{\log^3 x}\right) + \log x\right) \\
&= \log \left((\log x) \cdot \left(1 + \frac{\log \left(1 + \frac{0.15}{\log^3 x}\right)}{\log x}\right)\right) \\
&= \log \log x + \log \left(1 + \frac{\log \left(1 + \frac{0.15}{\log^3 x}\right)}{\log x}\right) \\
&\leq \log \log x + \frac{\log \left(1 + \frac{0.15}{\log^3 x}\right)}{\log x} \\
&\leq \log \log x + \frac{0.15}{\log^4 x}
\end{aligned}$$

by Propositions 1.1 and 1.2. So,

$$\sum_{q \leq x} \log \left(\frac{q}{q-1}\right) - B - \log \log x - \frac{0.15}{\log^4 x} \geq H + 6 \cdot \gamma - 7 \cdot \log(\zeta(2)).$$

That is

$$\sum_{q \leq x} \log \left(\frac{q}{q-1}\right) - B - \log \log x - \frac{0.15}{\log^4 x} - u(x) \geq H - u(x) + 6 \cdot \gamma - 7 \cdot \log(\zeta(2)).$$

after subtracting $u(x)$ to the both sides of the inequality. By Proposition 1.4, we can see that

$$\sum_{q \leq x} \left(\frac{1}{q}\right) - B - \log \log x - \frac{0.15}{\log^4 x} - u(x) \geq 6 \cdot \gamma - 7 \cdot \log(\zeta(2)).$$

https://doi.org/10.33774/coe-2023-hfgk7 **ORCID:** https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8210-4126 Content not peer-reviewed by Cambridge University Press. **Licen**

By Proposition 1.5, we deduce that

$$-\frac{0.2}{\log^3 x} - \frac{0.15}{\log^4 x} - u(x) \geq 6 \cdot \gamma - 7 \cdot \log(\zeta(2)).$$

It is a fact that the inequality

$$-\frac{0.2}{\log^3 x} - \frac{0.15}{\log^4 x} - u(x) \geq 6 \cdot \gamma - 7 \cdot \log(\zeta(2))$$

holds for large enough $x \in \mathbb{N}$ due to $6 \cdot \gamma - 7 \cdot \log(\zeta(2)) < 0$ is a negative real constant and

$$\lim_{x \to \infty} \left(-\frac{0.2}{\log^3 x} - \frac{0.15}{\log^4 x} - u(x) \right) = 0. \qquad \square$$

4. Main Theorem

This is the main theorem.

Theorem 4.1. Dedekind(x) *always holds for large enough* $x \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.1, the inequality

$$\frac{\prod_{q \leq x} \left(\frac{q}{q-1}\right)}{\log \theta(x)} \geq \left(\frac{e^{\gamma}}{\zeta(2)}\right)^7$$

holds for large enough $x \in \mathbb{N}$. By Propositions 1.2 and 1.4, the inequality

$$\frac{\prod_{q \leq x} \left(\frac{q}{q-1}\right)}{\log \theta(x)} \geq \left(\frac{e^{\gamma}}{\zeta(2)}\right)^7$$

is equivalent to

$$e^{H - u(x)} \cdot R(M_x) \geq \left(\frac{e^{\gamma}}{\zeta(2)}\right)^7.$$

Certainly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\prod_{q \leq x} \left(\frac{q}{q-1}\right)}{\log \theta(x)} &\geq \left(\prod_{q \leq x} \frac{\left(\frac{q}{q-1}\right)}{e^{\frac{1}{q}}}\right) \cdot \frac{\prod_{q \leq x} \left(1 + \frac{1}{q}\right)}{\log \theta(x)} \\
&= e^{H - u(x)} \cdot \frac{\prod_{q \leq x} \left(1 + \frac{1}{q}\right)}{\log \theta(x)} \\
&= e^{H - u(x)} \cdot \frac{M_x \cdot \prod_{q \mid M_x} \left(1 + \frac{1}{q}\right)}{M_x \cdot \log \log M_x} \\
&= e^{H - u(x)} \cdot \frac{\Psi(M_x)}{M_x \cdot \log \log M_x} \\
&= e^{H - u(x)} \cdot R(M_x)
\end{aligned}$$

using the Propositions 1.2 and 1.4 such that $e^{\frac{1}{q}} \geq \left(1 + \frac{1}{q}\right)$ for every prime q. Consequently, we would have

$$\frac{e^{H-u(x)}}{\left(\frac{e^{\gamma}}{\zeta(2)}\right)^{6}} \cdot R(M_x) \geq \frac{e^{\gamma}}{\zeta(2)}.$$

We only need to prove that

$$\frac{e^{H-u(x)}}{\left(\frac{e^{\gamma}}{\zeta(2)}\right)^{6}} \leq 1$$

holds for large enough $x \in \mathbb{N}$ to confirm that $\mathsf{Dedekind}(x)$ also holds. Hence, it is enough to show that

$$\frac{e^{H}}{\left(\frac{e^{\gamma}}{\zeta(2)}\right)^{6}} < 1$$

because of

$$\lim_{x \to \infty} u(x) = 0.$$

Next,

$$-B + 6 \cdot \log(\zeta(2)) - 5 \cdot \gamma < 0$$

after applying the logarithm to the both sides of the inequality. Finally, we obtain that

$$\frac{6}{5} < \frac{\gamma + \frac{B}{5}}{\log(\zeta(2))}.$$

Using a simple numerical calculation, we can check that

$$\frac{\gamma + \frac{B}{5}}{\log(\zeta(2))} > 1.26483 > 1.2 = \frac{6}{5}$$

and therefore, the proof is done. □

5. Main Result

This is the main result.

Corollary 5.1. *The Riemann hypothesis is true.*

Proof. By Lemma 2.1, if the Riemann hypothesis is false, then there exists an infinite sequence of natural numbers x_i such that $\mathsf{Dedekind}(x_i)$ fails. This contradicts the fact that $\mathsf{Dedekind}(x)$ always holds for large enough $x \in \mathbb{N}$ according to the Theorem 4.1. By Reductio ad absurdum, the Riemann hypothesis must be true as a direct consequence of Lemma 2.1 and Theorem 4.1. □

https://doi.org/10.33774/coe-2023-hfgk7 **ORCID:** https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8210-4126 Content not peer-reviewed by Cambridge University Press. **Licen**

6. Conclusions

Practical uses of the Riemann hypothesis include many propositions that are considered to be true under the assumption of the Riemann hypothesis and some of them that can be shown to be equivalent to the Riemann hypothesis. Indeed, the Riemann hypothesis is closely related to various mathematical topics such as the distribution of primes, the growth of arithmetic functions, the Lindelöf hypothesis, the Large Prime Gap Conjecture, etc. A proof of the Riemann hypothesis could spur considerable advances in many mathematical areas, such as number theory and pure mathematics in general.

Acknowledgment

Many thanks to Patrick Solé and Michel Planat for their support.

References

[1] Axler, C.: New Estimates for Some Functions Defined Over Primes. Integers **18** (2018)

[2] Ayoub, R.: Euler and the Zeta Function. The American Mathematical Monthly **81**(10), 1067–1086 (1974). https://doi.org/10.2307/2319041

[3] Broughan, K.: Euler's Totient Function, Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, vol. 1, pp. 94–143. Cambridge University Press (2017). https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108178228.007

[4] Choie, Y., Lichiardopol, N., Moree, P., Solé, P.: On Robin's criterion for the Riemann hypothesis. Journal de Théorie des Nombres de Bordeaux **19**(2), 357–372 (2007). https://doi.org/10.5802/jtnb.591

[5] Dusart, P.: Explicit estimates of some functions over primes. The Ramanujan Journal **45**, 227–251 (2018). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11139-016-9839-4

[6] Hardy, G.H., Littlewood, J.E.: Some problems of diophantine approximation: Part II. The trigonometrical series associated with the elliptic ϑ-functions. Acta mathematica **37**(1), 193–239 (1914)

[7] Hardy, G.H., Littlewood, J.E.: Contributions to the theory of the Riemann zeta-function and the theory of the distribution of primes. Acta Mathematica **41**, 119–196 (1916)

[8] Kozma, L.: Useful Inequalities. Kozma's Homepage, Useful inequalities cheat sheet. `http://www.lkozma.net/inequalities_cheat_sheet/ineq.pdf` (2011), Accessed 13 November 2023

[9] Mertens, F.: Ein Beitrag zur analytischen Zahlentheorie. J. reine angew. Math. **1874**(78), 46–62 (1874). https://doi.org/10.1515/crll.1874.78.46

[10] Nicolas, J.L.: Petites valeurs de la fonction d'Euler. Journal of Number Theory **17**(3), 375–388 (1983). https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-314X(83)90055-0

[11] Solé, P., Planat, M.: Extreme values of the Dedekind ψ function. Journal of Combinatorics and Number Theory **3**(1), 33–38 (2011)

[12] Tenenbaum, G.: Introduction to Analytic and Probabilistic Number Theory, vol. 163. American Mathematical Soc. (2015)

Frank Vega
NataSquad
10 rue de la Paix
FR 75002 Paris
France
e-mail: vega.frank@gmail.com

Submitted: November 13, 2023.