Appendix: Why Trivial Poles Cannot Be Handled as Zeros in the Divisor Structure

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

Attila Csordas

Affiliation: AgeCurve Limited, Cambridge, UK

December 30, 2024

1 Introduction

Historically, the term "trivial zeros" was used for the points $s = -2k$ ($k \in \mathbb{N}^+$) because they arose naturally from the sine term in the functional equation as a cancellation mechanism for the gamma term's trivial poles. While this analytical classification served its purpose, it inadvertently obscured their role in the divisor structure of $\zeta(s)$, leading to a missed opportunity for a simple proof.

The designation "trivial" may also have contributed to their underestimation in the global structure of $\zeta(s)$. This work leverages their true nature as poles (not zeros) to establish the minimality and cancellation necessary for the proof of the Riemann Hypothesis. Below, we address and disprove an alternative view that trivial poles should instead be treated as zeros in the divisor structure.

2 Why Trivial Poles Cannot Be Treated as Zeros

2.1 Conceptual Framework: Distinction Between Zeros and Poles

Trivial poles are explicitly introduced by the gamma factor $\Gamma(1-s)$ in the functional equation, contributing negatively to the divisor structure. They do not arise from the sine term, which introduces zeros to cancel these poles. Treating trivial poles as zeros in the degree computation conflates their distinct roles:

- **Zeros:** Represent enforced constraints on the function.
- **Poles:** Represent allowed singularities that must be balanced.

This distinction is fundamental to the divisor framework. Misclassifying poles as zeros disrupts the balance required to compute degrees and precludes a coherent interpretation of $\zeta(s)$'s meromorphic structure.

2.2 Contradiction with Minimality

The shadow function $\zeta^*(s)$ is explicitly constructed to satisfy:

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

This structure encodes minimality, ensuring that $\zeta^*(s)$ is the unique meromorphic function consistent with the divisor, satisfying $\ell(D) = 0$.

If trivial poles were treated as zeros, the degree would become:

$$\deg(D) = +\aleph_0 \,(\text{non-trivial zeros}) + \aleph_0 \,(\text{trivial zeros/poles}) - 1 = +\aleph_0.$$

This implies $\ell(D) = +\aleph_0$, introducing an infinitely abundant meromorphic space. Such a result contradicts:

- The minimal construction of $\zeta^*(s)$.
- Compactification on the genus-zero Riemann sphere, which restricts meromorphic spaces to finite dimensions.
- The Riemann-Roch framework, which assumes a finite divisor structure.

2.3 Cardinality and Cancellation in the Proof

The bijective correspondence between trivial poles and non-trivial zeros is a crucial aspect of the zeropole framework. It is established through the functional equation, analytic continuation of $\zeta(s)$, Hardy's theorem, and the Hadamard product. This ensures the balance and cancellation mechanism required for the degree computation.

$$\aleph_0 \,(\text{non-trivial zeros}) - \aleph_0 \,(\text{trivial poles}) = 0.$$

No "residual infinity" remains, preserving the integrity of the degree computation. Reinterpreting poles as zeros disrupts this balance, breaking the analytic continuation and invalidating the Hadamard product. For a detailed treatment of the cardinality and bijection arguments, see the appendix: *Addressing Cardinality Concerns in Degree Computation*.

2.4 Topological Perspective

On the genus-zero Riemann sphere, the divisor structure must admit a finite degree to maintain compactification. Misclassifying poles as zeros results in:

$$\deg(D) = +\aleph_0.$$

This contradicts the topology of the sphere and renders the zeropole framework incoherent. The minimal structure of $\zeta^*(s)$ aligns with the topological and analytic constraints of the Riemann sphere.

3 Interpretation

We present two independent arguments against the objection of handling trivial poles as zeros in the divisor structure.

3.1 Breaking Minimality and Uniqueness of the Shadow Function

The shadow function $\zeta^*(s)$ is constructed to be the unique meromorphic function consistent with the divisor structure defined by the zeropole balance. This construction ensures minimality, as encoded by the Riemann inequality, guaranteeing that the function space associated with the divisor has no additional meromorphic functions beyond the shadow function itself.

Treating trivial poles as zeros directly contradicts this explicit construction. The shadow function was carefully designed to achieve minimality and exclude any additional meromorphic functions. Since the shadow function is unique for the divisor structure, reinterpreting trivial poles as zeros destroys this uniqueness and invalidates the proof framework. This argument provides strong mathematical rigor and directly applies to the proof.

3.2 Infinite Degree Breaks Conceptual Finite Divisor Framework

The divisor framework inherently assumes a finite degree, which is essential for applying the Riemann-Roch theorem and ensuring the compactification of the shadow function $\zeta^*(s)$ on the genus-zero Riemann sphere. Interpreting trivial poles as zeros introduces an infinite degree, which is conceptually incompatible with this framework.

The assumption of finite degree underpins the zeropole balance framework and the analytic continuation of $\zeta(s)$. Introducing an infinite degree undermines these principles, breaking the coherence of the divisor structure and precluding the application of established mathematical tools like the Riemann inequality. This further reinforces the necessity of treating trivial poles as poles, not zeros, within the divisor structure.

4 Conclusion

The suggestion to reinterpret trivial poles as zeros in the degree computation fails both mathematically in the proof mechanics and conceptually within the zeropole balance framework. The explicit distinction between zeros and poles is essential for maintaining the integrity of the divisor framework, the shadow function's minimality, and the compactification of $\zeta^*(s)$ on the Riemann sphere.

By correctly identifying trivial poles as poles (not zeros), this work preserves the zeropole cancellation mechanism and ensures the proof's consistency. These poles play a critical role in the zeropole balance framework, which unifies geometric, analytic, and topological perspectives of $\zeta(s)$.

5 License