Rational Symmetry Function

by Sven Nilsen, 2025

In this paper I introduce a framework for studying primes that are motivated by symmetries in rational numbers. I give axioms for rational symmetry functions and show that this is a unique and well defined strongly normalization function. I show associated fix-point sequence is square free. Finally, I show that this function can be used to describe equations relevant for prime research.

A rational symmetry function `f` has the following axioms:

```
\begin{split} f(0) &= 0 & f(1) &= 1 & f(x) &= f(1/x) & f(x \cdot y) &= f(x) \cdot f(y) \\ f &: \mathbb{Q} \to \mathbb{N} & f(\mathbb{N}) &: f(\mathbb{N}) &= f(\mathbb{N}) & ava\_idem(f) \end{split}
```

when x != 0

Notice that `f` returns a natural number and is idempotent over natural numbers. Furthermore, it is avatar idemponent which means that for any irreducible representation `n`, `f(n) = n`.

For example:

 $f(x^2) = 1$

```
Proof:

f(x^2) = 1
f(x \cdot x) = 1
f(x) \cdot f(x) = 1
f(x) \cdot f(x) = 1
f(x) \cdot f(1/x) = 1
f(x \cdot 1/x) = 1
f(x/x) = 1
f(x/x) = 1
f(x/x) = 1
f(1) = 1
```

One can use this theorem to prove the following:

 $f(x^2 \cdot y) = f(y)$

```
Proof:

f(x^2 \cdot y) = f(y)
f(x^2) \cdot f(y) = f(y)
1 \cdot f(y) = f(y)
f(y) = f(y)
f(y) = f(y)
true
true
```

when x != 0

Since `f` is idempotent over natural numbers, it can not map natural numbers to other natural numbers than given by minimal reduction. This follows from this proof:

```
f(f(x)) = f(x) 	 f(x) = y
f(y) = y 	 using f(x) = y
```

Avatar idempotency implies that the above proof using idempotency applies to all primes, because primes are irreducible representations by the given axioms, except `ava_idem(f)`:

```
f(2) = 2 f(3) = 3 f(5) = 5 f(7) = 7 f(11) = 11 ...
```

From the definition of primes, it follows that any composite number with unique primes, which means all prime powers by factorization equals 1, are irreducible:

```
f(x) = x  <=> uniq primes(x)
```

This property is the most fundamental property for this framework of studying primes that arises from the rational symmetry function. I name it `rsf` to distinguish it from other contexts where `f` is used to describe some unknown function.

```
rsf(x) = x \ll uniq primes(x)
```

With other words, the fix-points of 'rsf' are natural numbers with unique primes.

The 'rsf' function has a natural number sequence where for any 'n', 'rsf(n) = n':

```
0, 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, 26, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35
```

Except the first number `0`, this sequence is given by A005117 in The On-line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences (https://oeis.org/A005117).

Now, the reason the `rsf` function is interesting is because it allows equations using fix-points:

```
 \begin{array}{ll} : & \text{rsf}(n \cdot (n+1)) = n \cdot (n+1) \\ : & \text{rsf}(n) \cdot \text{rsf}(n+1) = n \cdot (n+1) \end{array}
```

There is no known solution to this equation where rsf(n) != n. Very often, this can simplify problems about primes that are composed together to produce new primes, such as primbixes:

One research question is whether there is some solution to this equation that is not a fix-point.

Here, I did not use non-existence of the unknown solutions of rsf(n) != n, because I already know that r, s are primes and hence rsf(r) = r and rsf(s) = s. However, the approach is similar in both cases. It is about simplifying the equation. This way, the rsf function can describe lots of constraints at the same time, packing a lot of information into the same equation.

However, as useful as this sounds, this is far from solving open problems about primbixes. The first equation, $\operatorname{rsf}(2 \cdot r \cdot s \cdot (2 \cdot r \cdot s + 1)) = 2 \cdot r \cdot s \cdot (2 \cdot r \cdot s + 1)$ where r , s are primes, has no known solution without a fix-point and implies the second equation $\operatorname{rsf}(2 \cdot r \cdot s + 1) = 2 \cdot r \cdot s + 1$. Naturally, the second equation describes a fix-point. So, from r , s being prime and the first equation one can infer that $\operatorname{re}(2 \cdot r \cdot s + 1)$ contains only unique primes. However, if the first equation does not hold, then one can easily find a counter-example $\operatorname{r} = 2$, $\operatorname{s} = 11$ where $\operatorname{re}(2 \cdot r \cdot s + 1) = 2 \cdot 2 \cdot 11 + 1 = 3^2 \cdot 5$. The answer has not unique primes since the prime power of $\operatorname{re}(3)$ is $\operatorname{re}(2)$.

In general, a statement $rsf(r \cdot y) = r \cdot y$ can be reduced to r(y) = y when r has unique primes.

For primbix research, the hypothesis $rsf(2 \cdot r \cdot s + 1) = 2 \cdot r \cdot s + 1$ implying that r, s are primes can be disproved by the counter-example r = 2, s = 4, since $2 \cdot r \cdot s + 1 = 2 \cdot 2 \cdot 4 + 1 = 17$ which is a prime. There is no simple structure of primbixes, shown using the counter-examples in both direction.