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Abstract

Numerical analysis of the behavior of line segments originating inside the critical strip for the Dirichlet Eta function provide strong visual evidence for why the Riemann hypothesis is most likely true. A modified version of the reflection principle is used. It is also shown how and why the Riemann hypothesis could be false. The results presented in this paper were made possible using Wolfram Mathematica 12.
Introduction

The Riemann hypothesis remains one of the outstanding problems in analytic number theory after almost 160 years [1]. It is concerned with the distribution of prime numbers and is encapsulated by the Riemann zeta function and an equivalent expression written exclusively in terms of primes found by Euler [2] much earlier (for real s).

\[ \zeta(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^s} = \prod_{p \text{ prime}} \frac{1}{1 - p^{-s}} \]

in which \( s = \sigma + ti \), a complex number with real part \( \sigma \) and imaginary part coefficient \( t \). The expressions above are valid for \( \sigma > 1 \) and are absolutely convergent there. In [1] Riemann used analytic continuation to extend the zeta function into the regime \( 0 < \sigma < 1 \) (and into \( \sigma < 0 \)) and found the Dirichlet eta function equation (conjectured by Euler in 1749)

\[ \eta(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{n-1}}{n^s} = (1 - 2^{1-s})\zeta(s) \]

This result involves conditionally convergent series and must be handled with care. In the form

\[ \zeta(s) = \frac{1}{(1 - 2^{1-s})} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{n-1} \frac{1}{n^s} = \frac{1}{(1 - 2^{1-s})} \eta(s) \]

it provides a way of computing the zeta function for \( 0 < \sigma < 1 \) in terms of the alternating eta series. The eta series is the difference between even \( n \) terms and odd \( n \) terms. If these terms are summed separately, the sub-series of all odd \( n \) and the sub-series of all even \( n \) diverge.

Also in [1] Riemann established the reflection formula for \( 0 < \sigma < 1 \)

\[ \zeta(s) = 2^s \pi^{s-1} \sin \left( \frac{\pi s}{2} \right) \Gamma(1 - s) \zeta(1 - s) \]
Using this equation together with the equation just above it yields the reflection formula for the eta function

\[ \eta(s) = 2^s \pi^{s-1} \sin \left( \frac{\pi s}{2} \right) \Gamma(1-s) \frac{(1-2^{1-s})}{(1-2^s)} \eta(1-s) \]

There are zeroes of zeta and eta of three kinds. There are some so-called trivial zeroes for \( s = \sigma = -2, -4, \ldots \) caused by the sine term. There are also trivial zeroes associated with the factor \( \frac{(1-2^{1-s})}{(1-2^s)} \). These are of the form

\[ 1 - i \frac{k \pi}{\ln(2)} \]

for integer \( k \). The remaining non-trivial zeroes of zeta are also non-trivial zeroes for eta and \textit{visa versa}. The critical strip defined by \( 0 < \sigma < 1 \) and \( -\infty < t < \infty \) contains these non-trivial zeroes. The Riemann hypothesis is: \( \sigma = 0.5 \) for all non-trivial zeroes. In 2004, Gourdon [3] verified the hypothesis for the first \( 10^{13} \) zeroes using an algorithm invented by Odlyzko [4].

**A modified reflection formula**

The reflection formulas for zeta and eta given in the introduction are most useful when considering zeroes of zeta/eta. The trivial zeroes account for all zeroes due to factors other than zeta/eta in the reflection equations. Only the non-trivial zeroes remain to be studied strictly inside the critical strip. The other factors do not vanish inside the critical strip. Here we will focus attention directly on the eta function. Two results will be of use later in the paper. The first result is

**Lemma 1**: if \( s_0 \) is a zero of eta then so is \( s_0^* \).

For general analytic functions, \( F \), it is very easy to construct a counter-example to the statement that if \( z \) is a zero of \( F \), then so is \( z^* \). The structure of eta, however, makes the statement of Lemma 1 true.

\[ \eta(s_0) = 0 \rightarrow \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{n-1} \frac{1}{n^{s_0}} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{n-1} \frac{1}{n^{\sigma_0}} \text{Exp}[-it_0 \ln(n)] \]

\[ = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{n-1} \frac{1}{n^{\sigma_0}} \cos[t_0 \ln(n)] - i \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^{n-1} \frac{1}{n^{\sigma_0}} \sin[t_0 \ln(n)] = 0 \]
Since both the real and the imaginary parts must vanish separately, one is free to replace the \(-i\) by \(+i\) in the last line and that implies \(\eta(s_0^*) = 0\).

The second result is the modified reflection formula

\[
\text{Lemma 2: if } s_0 \text{ is a zero of eta then so is } 1 - s_0^*.
\]

If \(s_0\) is a zero of eta then the eta reflection formula implies that \(1 - s_0\) is also a zero of eta. By Lemma 1 this means that \(1 - s_0^*\) is also a zero of eta.

The modified reflection formula can be expressed: if \(\sigma_0 + t_0i\) is a zero of eta then so is \(1 - \sigma_0 + t_0i\). These two expressions have the same imaginary parts and that is key to what follows.

**Visualization of the genesis of zeroes**

Displaying the behavior of eta visually greatly enhances our ability to understand how and why the non-trivial zeroes of eta (zeta) occur for \(\sigma = 0.5\). We begin by restricting the argument of eta to the real axis of the critical strip. For \(\sigma \in (0, 1)\) we find \(\eta(\sigma) \in (0.5, \ln(2))\). The unit interval for \(\sigma\) is compressed by \(\eta\) into an interval of length 0.193…. Because \(\eta\) is continuous and infinitely differentiable in both \(\sigma\) and \(t\), we expect that small variations in \(t\) will create small variations in \(\eta\). We know that the first zero of eta has an imaginary part slightly bigger than 14. Therefore we will begin by looking at what happens to a set of points for \(\sigma = .02, .04, .08, ..., .98\) (steps of .02) and for a fixed value of \(t\).
For users of Mathematica 12 this figure is the output of a manipulation of the program written as

\[
\text{Table}[(((-1)^{(n - 1)})*(1/((\text{Exp}[-t*\text{Log}[n]*i]}{\text{n, 1, }\infty})], \{\text{sig, .02, .98, .02}, \{t, 1, 14, 1}\}
\]

There is a lot of information in this figure. Each line segment (I allow a line segment to have curvature, a slight amount in this figure, and much more in later figures) is labeled by \( t \) and is made up of the values of eta for \( t \) and for 49 evenly spaced values of \( \sigma \) with the 25\(^{th} \) value equal to 0.5. There are 14 line segments in the figure corresponding to 14 values of \( t \) from 1, 2, 3, … , to 14. The \( t = 1 \) line segment is located near the 1 on the abscissa at about 10 o’clock. It is the shortest line segment in the plot, slightly larger than 0.193 (the arc length for the case \( t = 0 \)). As we go clock-wise we see the line segments for \( t = 2, 3, 4, 5, \) and 6. Clearly they are getting longer in arc length and are moving away from the origin. Line segment 6 appears below
the abscissa at about 4 o’clock. The points on the line segments are arranged with the small values of $\sigma$ distal to the 1 on the abscissa and the larger values of $\sigma$ proximal to the 1 on the abscissa. Since the eta values for uniformly spaced $\sigma$’s are not uniformly spaced the $\sigma = 0.5$ value of eta is not halfway along the line segment. By enlarging the figure the location of this special $\sigma$ can be found. The 9th and the 14th line segments are close to each other just before 9 o’clock. The 9th segment is the shorter of the two. It’s $\sigma = 1$ value (actually 0.98 in this plot) is closest to the origin. It looks like a slight adjustment in the $t$ value would put the $\sigma = 1$ right on the origin. Indeed, $t = 9.0647…$ does do so. This corresponds precisely with a trivial zero given above by $1 - i \frac{k^2\pi}{\ln(2)}$ for the case of $k = 1$. Similarly the 14th segment looks like an adjustment of its $t$ value would possibly put $\sigma = 0.5$ on the origin. Let us try $t = 14.134725…. This is plotted below.
The lower line segment is the \( t = 14 \) line segment from the previous plot. The difference in apparent slope is the result of different aspect ratios in the two plots. The upper curve is for \( t = 14.134725 \), the imaginary part of first non-trivial zero for eta. Moreover, \( \sigma = 0.5 \) corresponds with the 25\(^{th} \) dot in the 49 dot representation of the \( \sigma \) interval (it can be located by counting from the left). As you can see the typical value for a dot is a real part in the tenths and an imaginary part in the tenths as well. However the 25\(^{th} \) \( \sigma \) dot has the value \( 1.62123 \times 10^{-6} - 2.6635 \times 10^{-7} \) \( i \). Since we have expressed the \( t \) for the first zero of eta to only one part in \( 10^{-6} \) we cannot expect to get “zero” to any better precision. The smaller values of \( \sigma \) produce the points to the left in the figure and the larger values of \( \sigma \) produce the points to the right in the figure.

The question that shouts out from this account is why does the line segment intersect the origin at \( \sigma = 0.5 \) ?!?!? This is where the modified reflection formula comes into play.

**Theorem:**
A line segment labeled by \( t \) can intersect the origin only for \( \sigma = 0.5 \).

Suppose that a line segment labeled by \( t' \) does intersect the origin for the value \( \sigma' \). Therefore \( \sigma' + t'i \) is a zero of eta. The modified reflection formula states that \( 1 - \sigma' + t'i \) is also a zero. Since these two zeros have the same \( t' \) they are on the same line segment. No line segment can intersect a point (the origin) more than once. Thus the two points must be the same point: \( \sigma' + t'i = 1 - \sigma' + t'i \) which implies \( \sigma' = 0.5 \).

There is one possibility that would invalidate this conclusion. What happens if the line segment intersects itself? That is suppose that \( \sigma' + t'i \) and \( 1 - \sigma' + t'i \) are zeroes of eta. Then the line segment intersects itself at the origin producing a loop there. Thus the Riemann hypothesis would be false. To investigate this possibility further we will have to look at the behavior of line segments for much larger values of \( t \).

**Complexity of line segments for large \( t \)**

Let us begin our study of large \( t \) line segments with the value 
\[ t = 267653395648.8475231278 \] 
This has 22 digits, 12 to the left of the decimal point and 10 to the right. We have it on good authority that this is
the imaginary part of a zero [3]. If we compute the eta values for all 49 \( \sigma \) points and for this value of \( t \) then we get

Note the scale. The arc length is more than 14,000. The point distal to the origin is the eta value for \( \sigma = .02 \). After the first 7 discrete points the remaining 42 points are a smear. By restricting \( \sigma \) to the values (.42, .44, .46, .48, .5, .52, .54, .56, .58) we obtain a blow-up of the region around the origin. The point at the origin has the value \( 0.000939283 + 0.00431777i \) which is incredibly small compared to the other values of points in the plot.
The small values of $\sigma$ make up the points on the left branch whereas the large values of $\sigma$ make up the points on the right branch. Unlike before it appears that the large $\sigma$ values of eta are receding from the origin like the small $\sigma$ values but in a different direction. This is incorrect as can be seen by including more points. If we include $\sigma$ values from .38 to .98 in steps of .02 then we get
The right branch does not go very far out but instead turns inward making the whole plot a kind of logarithmic spiral. You can count the 24 dots to the right of the origin. On the left there are 22 more dots unseen because they are too far out for the scale of this plot (they can be seen in the first plot for this value of $t$).

Note that we have referred to $t = 267653395648.8475231278$ as a large value of $t$. That is a matter of perspective. Clearly there are still larger values with zillions of digits. What do the line segments look like for such larger values, that are still finite and therefore not really so big. Does the logarithmic spiral like structure seen above develop more turns but remain non-self-intersecting, implying that the Riemann hypothesis is true, or do self-intersections begin to occur for some large threshold value of $t$, implying that the Riemann hypothesis is false? Have I merely found another statement equivalent to the still undecided Riemann hypothesis?
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