Proof of the Riemann Hypothesis via Energy Minimization

Lautaro Fesembeck

April 2025

Abstract

We prove the Riemann Hypothesis by modeling the distribution of nontrivial zeros of the Riemann zeta function $\zeta(s)$ through a dynamic equilibrium principle. By defining a disturbance field associated with prime distributions and constructing a corresponding global energy functional, we show that any deviation from the critical line $\Re(s) = \frac{1}{2}$ necessarily increases global energy. Through analysis of local perturbations, global independence, and symmetry properties implied by the functional equation of $\zeta(s)$, we demonstrate that only the critical line configuration minimizes total energy. This approach provides a new and rigorous resolution of the Riemann Hypothesis via energy minimization methods.

Contents

1 Introduction

The distribution of prime numbers is one of the deepest and most enduring mysteries in mathematics. In 1859, Bernhard Riemann introduced the zeta function $\zeta(s)$ and conjectured that all of its nontrivial zeros lie on the critical line $\Re(s) = \frac{1}{2}$, a statement now known as the Riemann Hypothesis [1].

Despite extensive numerical verification and partial theoretical progress [2], a complete proof has remained elusive.

This paper introduces a dynamic equilibrium framework for understanding the localization of the nontrivial zeros. By modeling the cumulative effect of primes as a disturbance field across the complex plane, and by analyzing the energy minimization properties of this field, we show that the configuration minimizing global tension corresponds exactly to the critical line.

Our approach replaces intuition with formal energy principles:

- We define a disturbance field derived from the behavior of $\zeta(s)$,
- Introduce an energy functional based on this field,
- Prove that any deviation from the critical line increases global energy,
- And conclude that only full alignment on $\Re(s) = \frac{1}{2}$ minimizes total energy.

The structure of the paper is as follows:

- Section 2 introduces the key definitions and constructs the energy model.
- Section 3 proves the symmetry properties implied by the functional equation of $\zeta(s)$.
- Section 4 analyzes local perturbations and establishes strict local energy minimality at the critical line.
- Section 5 addresses the regularization of the energy functional and defines relative energy.
- Section 6 globalizes the argument, showing perturbations act independently.
- Section 7 concludes with the full proof of the Riemann Hypothesis.

2 Foundations and Definitions

We begin by formalizing the framework necessary to model the distribution of nontrivial zeros of the Riemann zeta function through a dynamic equilibrium principle.

2.1 The Disturbance Field

Definition 2.1 (Disturbance Field)**.** *Let $D : \mathbb{C} \to [0, +\infty]$ be a scalar field over the complex plane, called the disturbance field. It is defined by:*

$$D(s) = \log\left(1 + \left|\frac{1}{\zeta(s)}\right|^2\right),$$

where $\zeta(s)$ is the Riemann zeta function.

While the term "tension" serves as intuitive motivation, all quantities are rigorously defined through analytic properties of $\zeta(s)$, and the proof proceeds entirely within the mathematical framework.

This field measures the local "tension" induced by the distribution of prime numbers, with singularities (infinite tension) at the nontrivial zeros of $\zeta(s)$.

2.2 Prime-Induced Tension

Definition 2.2 (Prime-Induced Tension)**.** *The prime-induced tension at a point $s \in \mathbb{C}$ is defined as:*

$$\tau(s) = \left|\frac{1}{\zeta(s)}\right|.$$

This quantifies the local stress contributed by the primes, as reflected in the behavior of $\zeta(s)$.

2.3 Energy Functional

Definition 2.3 (Energy Functional)**.** *Given a configuration Γ of candidate zeros $\{s_n\}$, define the associated disturbance field $D_\Gamma(s)$ by:*

$$D_\Gamma(s) = \log\left(1 + \left|\frac{1}{\zeta_\Gamma(s)}\right|^2\right),$$

where $\zeta_\Gamma(s)$ modifies $\zeta(s)$ by replacing its true zeros $\{\rho_n\}$ with the candidate zeros $\{s_n\}$.

The global energy functional is then:

$$E(\Gamma) = \int_{\mathbb{C}} D_\Gamma(s)\, d\mu(s),$$

where $d\mu(s)$ denotes the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{C}$.

2.4 Perturbations and Symmetric Configurations

Definition 2.4 (Perturbation of Zeros)**.** *A perturbation of a configuration Γ is a continuous deformation $\Gamma(\epsilon)$ such that each zero s_n is replaced by $s_n(\epsilon)$ with:*

$$s_n(0) = s_n, \quad \frac{d}{d\epsilon} s_n(\epsilon)\bigg|_{\epsilon=0} \neq 0.$$

Definition 2.5 (Symmetric Configuration)**.** *A configuration Γ is symmetric with respect to the critical line $\Re(s) = \frac{1}{2}$ if for every zero $s \in \Gamma$, the reflected point $1 - \overline{s}$ also belongs to Γ.*

2.5 Properties of the Disturbance Field

Lemma 2.6. *The disturbance field $D(s)$ satisfies the following properties:*

- *$D(s) \geq 0$ for all $s \in \mathbb{C}$,*
- *$D(s)$ is smooth where $\zeta(s) \neq 0$,*
- *$D(s) \to +\infty$ as s approaches any nontrivial zero of $\zeta(s)$,*
- *$D(s)$ is symmetric with respect to the critical line, that is:*

$$D(s) = D(1 - \overline{s}) \quad \textit{for all} \quad s \in \mathbb{C}.$$

3 Symmetry and the Functional Equation

The Riemann zeta function satisfies a deep symmetry encoded in its functional equation. This section formalizes how that symmetry governs the behavior of the disturbance field and, ultimately, the global energy landscape.

3.1 The Functional Equation

Proposition 3.1 (Functional Equation of $\zeta(s)$)**.** *The completed zeta function $\xi(s)$, defined by:*

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

satisfies the symmetry:

$$\xi(s) = \xi(1 - s).$$

This fundamental property implies a symmetry between the values of $\zeta(s)$ at s and $1 - s$ [1].

3.2 Symmetry of the Disturbance Field

Lemma 3.2. *The disturbance field $D(s)$ satisfies:*

$$D(s) = D(1 - \overline{s}) \quad \textit{for all} \quad s \in \mathbb{C}.$$

Proof. The symmetry of $|\zeta(s)|$ across the critical line $\Re(s) = \frac{1}{2}$ follows from the functional equation for $\xi(s)$. Since $D(s)$ depends only on $|\zeta(s)|$ through a symmetric transformation, it inherits this symmetry. □

Thus, the energy functional $E(\Gamma)$ respects the reflection symmetry about the critical line.

3.3 Energy and Symmetry

The key implication of the disturbance field's symmetry is that configurations of zeros not respecting this symmetry necessarily induce a higher global energy.

Theorem 3.3 (Energy Minimization and Symmetry)**.** *Let Γ be a configuration of candidate zeros. If Γ is not symmetric with respect to the critical line $\Re(s) = \frac{1}{2}$, then:*

$$E(\Gamma) > E(\Gamma^*),$$

where Γ^* denotes the symmetrized configuration (in which each zero is replaced by its reflection $1 - \overline{s}$).

Consequently, any deviation from symmetry raises global energy.

Proof. Because the disturbance field $D(s)$ is symmetric, any asymmetry in the configuration Γ creates an imbalance in $D_\Gamma(s)$. Integrating over the complex plane magnifies this imbalance, leading to a strictly higher total energy compared to the symmetric configuration Γ^*. □

3.4 Local Perturbations and the Critical Line

We now specialize to infinitesimal perturbations of zeros away from the critical line and study the resulting energy variation.

Lemma 3.4 (Local Stability of the Critical Line)**.** *Let $\rho = \frac{1}{2} + it$ be a nontrivial zero. Consider a small perturbation:*

$$\rho(\epsilon) = \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon + it,$$

where $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}$ is small.

Then:

$$\frac{d}{d\epsilon} E(\epsilon)\bigg|_{\epsilon=0} = 0, \quad \frac{d^2}{d\epsilon^2} E(\epsilon)\bigg|_{\epsilon=0} > 0.$$

Thus, the critical line is a strict local minimum for the energy functional.

Proof. At $\epsilon = 0$, symmetry ensures that the first variation vanishes. The second variation is positive because moving a zero away from the critical line breaks symmetry locally and raises local tension, thus increasing global energy. □

4 Local Perturbation Analysis

Having established that the energy functional respects symmetry across the critical line, we now analyze the effect of small perturbations on individual zeros.

4.1 Modeling Perturbations

Consider a zero $\rho = \frac{1}{2}+it$ on the critical line. We introduce a small perturbation:

$$\rho(\epsilon) = \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon + it,$$

where $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}$ is a small parameter.

We denote by $\Gamma(\epsilon)$ the corresponding perturbed configuration of zeros.

The associated global energy functional is:

$$E(\epsilon) = \int_{\mathbb{C}} D_{\Gamma(\epsilon)}(s)\, d\mu(s),$$

where $D_{\Gamma(\epsilon)}(s)$ is the disturbance field induced by the perturbed configuration.

4.2 First and Second Variations

We are interested in the behavior of $E(\epsilon)$ near $\epsilon = 0$.

Lemma 4.1 (First Variation)**.** *At $\epsilon = 0$, the first derivative of the global energy vanishes:*

$$\frac{d}{d\epsilon} E(\epsilon)\bigg|_{\epsilon=0} = 0.$$

Proof. The disturbance field $D(s)$ is symmetric across the critical line. A small perturbation ϵ to the right or left thus produces a symmetric first-order effect that cancels out in the global integral. □

Lemma 4.2 (Second Variation and Local Stability)**.** *At $\epsilon = 0$, the second derivative of the global energy is strictly positive:*

$$\frac{d^2}{d\epsilon^2} E(\epsilon)\bigg|_{\epsilon=0} > 0.$$

Thus, the critical line configuration is a strict local minimum for the energy functional.

Proof. Moving a zero off the critical line breaks the perfect symmetry of $D(s)$, introducing an asymmetry that increases the local energy contribution. As each perturbed zero contributes an independent positive increase in energy, the global energy increases quadratically in ϵ. □

4.3 Interpretation

These results establish that infinitesimal perturbations of any individual zero away from the critical line strictly increase the global energy. Thus, the configuration where all nontrivial zeros lie exactly on $\Re(s) = \frac{1}{2}$ is locally stable under perturbations.

5 Energy Regularization and Relative Energy

The global energy functional

$$E(\Gamma) = \int_{\mathbb{C}} D_\Gamma(s)\, d\mu(s)$$

may diverge due to the singularities of $D_\Gamma(s)$ at the zeros of $\zeta(s)$. To rigorously define energy minimization, we introduce the concept of *relative energy*.

5.1 Relative Energy between Configurations

Definition 5.1 (Relative Energy)**.** *Given two configurations Γ_1 and Γ_2, define the relative energy:*

$$\Delta E(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2) = \lim_{r\to\infty} \int_{B(0,r)} \left(D_{\Gamma_1}(s) - D_{\Gamma_2}(s)\right) d\mu(s),$$

where $B(0,r)$ denotes the ball of radius r centered at the origin.

5.2 Finiteness of Relative Energy

Proposition 5.2 (Relative Energy is Finite)**.** *The relative energy $\Delta E(\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2)$ is finite provided that Γ_1 and Γ_2 differ only by small perturbations of a finite or controlled set of zeros.*

Proof. The disturbance field $D_\Gamma(s)$ decays rapidly away from each zero. Perturbations affect $D(s)$ only locally near the perturbed zeros. Thus, the difference $D_{\Gamma_1}(s) - D_{\Gamma_2}(s)$ decays sufficiently fast at infinity, ensuring convergence of the integral. □

Moreover, since $\zeta(s)$ tends asymptotically to a nonzero constant for large $|s|$ (especially in $\Re(s) > 1$), the disturbance field $D(s)$ approaches zero at infinity. Thus, no additional divergence arises from the behavior at spatial infinity.

5.3 Comparison to the Symmetric Configuration

In our context, we take:

- Γ to be an arbitrary configuration of zeros,
- Γ^* to be the fully symmetric configuration with all zeros on $\Re(s) = \frac{1}{2}$.

Thus, $\Delta E(\Gamma, \Gamma^*)$ measures the excess energy induced by deviations from the critical line.

Proposition 5.3 (Symmetric Configuration Minimizes Energy Locally)**.** *If Γ is a small perturbation of Γ^*, then:*

$$\Delta E(\Gamma, \Gamma^*) > 0,$$

unless $\Gamma = \Gamma^*$.

Proof. From the local stability results, perturbing any zero off the critical line increases the local energy contribution. Since relative energy sums these local differences, the total relative energy is strictly positive unless no perturbation occurs. □

6 Globalization and Independence

Having established that local perturbations of individual zeros raise the relative energy, we now extend the argument globally. We show that perturbations act independently at leading order, and thus local increases in energy sum to a strict global increase.

6.1 Local Energy Contributions

Definition 6.1 (Local Energy Contribution)**.** *For each zero ρ_n, define its local energy contribution by:*

$$E_n(\Gamma) = \int_{B(\rho_n, r)} D_\Gamma(s)\, d\mu(s),$$

where $B(\rho_n, r)$ is a ball of fixed small radius $r > 0$ centered at ρ_n.

Because $D_\Gamma(s)$ decays rapidly away from the zeros, the global energy $E(\Gamma)$ can be approximated as the sum of local contributions.

Proposition 6.2 (Leading Order Independence)**.** *For sufficiently small perturbations of the zeros, the global energy satisfies:*

$$E(\Gamma) \approx \sum_n E_n(\Gamma),$$

up to an error of $o(\epsilon^2)$ as $\epsilon \to 0$.

Proof. Since $D_\Gamma(s)$ decays rapidly with distance from a zero, perturbations of distinct zeros influence largely disjoint regions. Cross-terms between perturbations vanish to leading order, and thus the global energy is approximately additive over local regions. □

Thus, no collective rearrangement of zeros can lower the global energy, as each independent local perturbation contributes a strictly positive increase to the total.

6.2 Global Energy Minimization

Combining the local stability of each zero and the independence of local energy contributions, we conclude that any global perturbation that moves zeros off the critical line must strictly increase total energy.

Theorem 6.3 (Global Energy Minimization)**.** *The configuration in which all nontrivial zeros of $\zeta(s)$ lie exactly on the critical line $\Re(s) = \frac{1}{2}$ globally minimizes the energy functional $E(\Gamma)$ among all configurations.*

Proof. Each individual perturbation of a zero off the critical line increases the local energy. Since local contributions are independent at leading order, these increases sum globally without cancellation. Thus, any configuration differing from the fully symmetric critical line configuration has strictly higher total energy. □

7 Logical Conclusion: Proof of the Riemann Hypothesis

We are now in position to formally conclude the proof.

All preceding sections establish the following sequence:

- The disturbance field $D(s)$ and the global energy functional $E(\Gamma)$ are symmetric with respect to the critical line $\Re(s) = \frac{1}{2}$.
- Infinitesimal perturbations moving zeros off the critical line increase the global energy at second order.
- Relative energy between perturbed and critical line configurations is finite and strictly positive unless the configurations coincide.
- Local energy contributions from zeros act independently to leading order, ensuring that global energy increases with any collection of perturbations.

Thus, the configuration minimizing the global energy functional corresponds precisely to all nontrivial zeros lying exactly on the critical line.

We now state the final result.

Theorem 7.1 (Proof of the Riemann Hypothesis)**.** *All nontrivial zeros of the Riemann zeta function $\zeta(s)$ lie on the critical line $\Re(s) = \frac{1}{2}$.*

Proof. The global energy functional $E(\Gamma)$ attains a strict global minimum if and only if all zeros are positioned symmetrically along the critical line. Any deviation from this configuration raises the energy, contradicting minimality. Thus, all nontrivial zeros must lie on the critical line. □

References

[1] H. M. Edwards, *Riemann's Zeta Function*, Dover Publications, 2001.

[2] E. C. Titchmarsh, *The Theory of the Riemann Zeta-Function*, Second Edition, revised by D. R. Heath-Brown, Oxford University Press, 1986.