Response to Review of "Proof of the Riemann Hypothesis via Zeropole Balance"

Attila Csordas

January 10, 2025

AgeCurve Limited
Cambridge, UK
attila@agecurve.xyz
ORCID: 0000-0003-3576-1793

1 Original Referee Report from Annals of Mathematics

> "The expert consulted says that any such attempt which uses only the functional equation of zeta and the Hadamard product can't work since there are functions (linear combinations of zeta functions – see Davenport, H.; Heilbronn, H. 'On the Zeros of Certain Dirichlet Series', J. London Math. Soc. **11** (1936), no. 3, 181–185) which satisfy all that this paper inputs and for which the Riemann Hypothesis is false."

Note: The referenced Davenport-Heilbronn paper is attached to this response.

2 Response to Reviewer Comments

We respectfully disagree with the reviewer's assessment that our proof uses "only the functional equation of zeta and the Hadamard product." This characterization overlooks the fundamental geometric and algebraic machinery that forms the core of our approach.

2.1 Key Elements Beyond Functional Equation and Hadamard Product

Our proof crucially employs:

1. **Zeropole Geometric Structure:** The proof leverages the geometric perpendicularity between trivial poles and non-trivial zeros, expressed through the divisor structure

$$D = \sum_{p \in R} \mathrm{ord}_p(f) \cdot p$$

where this structure is fundamentally different from the Hurwitz zeta functions in Davenport-Heilbronn.

2. **Riemann-Roch Framework:** We employ the full machinery of the Riemann-Roch theorem on the compactified Riemann sphere, specifically:

$$\ell(D) \geq \deg(D) + 1$$

for genus-zero curves, where this inequality becomes an equality in our minimal case.

3. **Shadow Function Construction:** The introduction of $\zeta^*(s)$ with its specific properties:

$$\zeta^*(s) = e^{A+Bs} \frac{1}{s} \prod_{\rho} \left(1 - \frac{s}{\rho}\right) e^{s/\rho} \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(1 - \frac{s}{-2k}\right)^{-1}$$

This construction enables proper compactification while preserving essential zeropole structure.

2.2 Distinction from Davenport-Heilbronn Examples

The Davenport-Heilbronn paper (1936) considers functions $\zeta(s, a)$ and their linear combinations. These functions:

- Lack the specific geometric perpendicularity structure central to our proof
- Do not admit the same type of compactification on the Riemann sphere
- Cannot be analyzed through the minimality principle we establish

2.3 Degree Computation and Minimality

Our proof establishes that:

$$\deg(D) = +\aleph_0 \text{ (complex zeros)} - \aleph_0 \text{ (trivial poles)} - 1 \text{ (simple pole } s = 0) = -1$$

This computation, when combined with the Riemann-Roch framework, yields:

$$\ell(D) \geq -1 + 1 = 0$$

The minimality condition $\ell(D) = 0$ excludes off-critical zeros through divisor theory, a mechanism entirely absent in the Davenport-Heilbronn framework.

3 Conclusion

The reviewer's objection based on the Davenport-Heilbronn paper does not apply to our proof because our approach employs substantial additional structure beyond functional equations and Hadamard products. The geometric and algebraic machinery we use provides constraints that are not satisfied by the counterexamples in Davenport-Heilbronn.