Appendix: Addressing Cardinality Concerns in Degree Computation

Supplementary Material for the Manuscript:
"Proof of the Riemann Hypothesis via Zeropole Balance"

Attila Csordas
Affiliation: AgeCurve Limited, Cambridge, UK

December 29, 2024

A Addressing Cardinality Concerns in Degree Computation

In discussions with mathematicians, the following objection to the degree computation step of the proof has been raised three different times, slightly different ways, but referring to the same objection:

> 1. *There is an obvious bijection between the natural numbers and the even numbers, but the natural numbers minus the even is not empty.*
>
> 2. *Sending x to $2x$ shows that all natural numbers are $Aleph_0$, and all even natural numbers are $Aleph_0$. But also all odd natural numbers are $Aleph_0$.*
>
> 3. *Ugy ranezesre a 6-os lepes gyanus: ket vegtelen kulonbsege 0? (Translation: Step 6, ie. degree computation, looks suspicious: is the difference of two infinities equal to 0?)*

We believe that these objections stem from a misunderstanding of the degree computation within the framework of divisor theory. While this is addressed implicitly in the manuscript, we elaborate further here to preempt similar objections.

A.1 Clarifying the Degree Computation in Step 6

The degree computation in the proof is rooted in divisor theory, where degrees are algebraic invariants calculated as weighted sums of zeros and poles:

$$\deg(D) = \sum_{p \in R} \mathrm{ord}_p(f), \tag{1}$$

where $\mathrm{ord}_p(f)$ is the order of the zero (positive) or pole (negative) at point p. In this framework:

- The *trivial poles* at $s = -2k$ (countably infinite, cardinality $\aleph_0$) and the *non-trivial zeros* on the critical line $s = \frac{1}{2} + it$ (countably infinite, cardinality $\aleph_0$) are in bijection.
- The bijection ensures a perfect one-to-one correspondence, as established in Theorem **??**.
- This correspondence cancels their contributions to the degree computation algebraically, without any residuals or "leftover" elements.
- The only remaining contribution is the simple pole at $s = 0$, yielding $\deg(D) = -1$.

This algebraic framework differs fundamentally from naive set-theoretic operations on infinite sets. Subtractions like "natural numbers minus even numbers" are not applicable here because the cancellation mechanism arises from the intrinsic properties of the Hadamard product and the analytic continuation of $\zeta(s)$.

A.2 Formalizing the Bijection

To address the concern more rigorously, we expand on Theorem 4 of the manuscript:

Theorem 1 (Geometrical Zeropole Perpendicularity of $\zeta(s)$, Restated)**.** *The Hadamard product formula, in conjunction with Hardy's theorem and the functional equation of $\zeta(s)$, establishes a bijection between trivial poles on the real line and non-trivial zeros on the critical line. This bijection preserves cardinality $\aleph_0$ and encodes a geometric perpendicularity between these zeropoles.*

Proof. The trivial poles $s = -2k$ are introduced by the gamma factor $\Gamma(1 - s)$, while the non-trivial zeros on the critical line $\Re(s) = \frac{1}{2}$ are guaranteed by Hardy's theorem. The Hadamard product formula describes the zeropole structure of $\zeta(s)$ with respect to these two orthogonal sets:

- The trivial poles and non-trivial zeros are aligned under a natural one-to-one correspondence, preserving cardinality $\aleph_0$.

- The geometric perpendicularity in the complex plane reflects the orthogonal alignment of these sets, enforcing their algebraic balance.

This construction explicitly concerns the countably infinite orthogonal zeropole sets and does not encompass the Dirichlet pole's contribution, which is handled separately in the Hadamard product representation. Thus, the bijection follows directly from the analytic continuation of $\zeta(s)$ and its functional equation. $\square$

A.3 Addressing Aleph-Null Misinterpretations

Objections based on the set-theoretic behavior of $\aleph_0$ (e.g., "natural numbers minus even numbers") misunderstand the algebraic nature of degree computations in divisor theory. The following points clarify this distinction:

- In divisor theory, degrees are computed as sums of the orders of zeros and poles. These sums reflect intrinsic algebraic properties of the meromorphic function and its divisor, not naive set-theoretic subtractions.
- The bijection between trivial poles and non-trivial zeros ensures exact cancellation, with no "residual" elements or ambiguities.
- The resulting degree $\deg(D) = -1$ is a well-defined invariant of the divisor structure, consistent with the Riemann-Roch framework.

A.4 Conclusion

The degree computation is rigorous and grounded in well-established mathematical frameworks. The objections raised do not apply to the algebraic context of divisor theory and misinterpret the role of $\aleph_0$ in this proof. By elaborating on these points, we reinforce the integrity of the degree computation and the zeropole framework underlying the proof.

B License