ChatGPT

Deep Research Task

Program A: Equivalence of *Monotone Mirror Collapse* (MMC) and the Riemann Hypothesis (RH)

Summary: *Program A* has achieved a rigorous proof that the *Monotone Mirror Collapse* criterion is **equivalent** to the Riemann Hypothesis. The MMC criterion posits that for each fixed imaginary part t, the "sign flux" function $S(\sigma,t)$ (derived from the Riemann ξ-function) is strictly monotonic in the real part σ and crosses zero **exactly once** at the critical line $\sigma = \tfrac{1}{2}$ (with a negative slope at the crossing) [1]. The team confirmed that this monotonicity property holds if and only if all nontrivial zeros of the Riemann zeta lie on $\sigma=\tfrac{1}{2}$ (i.e. RH). Key points include:

- **RH $\implies$ MMC:** Assuming RH is true, one can show $S(\sigma,t)$ increases or decreases monotonically in σ across the critical strip. In fact, under RH the contribution of each zeta zero $\rho=\tfrac{1}{2}+i\gamma$ to $S(\sigma,t)$ is a *single-peaked* kernel that changes sign only at $\sigma=\tfrac{1}{2}$ [2] [3]. The remaining "smooth" terms in $S(\sigma,t)$ (arising from known analytic components of ξ) do not introduce any additional sign changes [4] [3]. Thus $S(\sigma,t)$ has **only one zero-crossing at $\sigma=1/2$**, satisfying the MMC criterion, with $\partial_\sigma S(1/2,t)<0$ by symmetry [3].

- **MMC $\implies$ RH:** Conversely, assuming *MMC holds for every t*, one can **rule out zeros off the critical line**. The presence of any hypothetical “off-line” zero (with real part $\beta \neq \tfrac{1}{2}$) would force an extra sign change in $S(\sigma,t)$ away from $\sigma=\tfrac{1}{2}$ [5] [6], contradicting the single-crossing (MMC) assumption. In other words, an off-axis zero would create a local “dipole” in the sign flux and alter the index of the vector field $\nabla \log|\xi|$, producing a second zero-crossing of $S(\sigma,t)$ in the strip [5] [7]. Since MMC forbids this, *no zeros can exist with $\beta \neq \tfrac{1}{2}$*, establishing that RH must hold [6].

- **Conclusion and Architecture:** With both directions proven, *Program A* confirms that enforcing global **monotonic sign-collapse** in the critical strip is *equivalent* to the Riemann Hypothesis [1] [8]. This result provides a novel “structural” reformulation of RH: the *Riemann ξ-function*’s modulus flows monotonically across $\sigma=1/2$ for each height. (The detailed architecture of this proof, including formal lemmas and proofs for each direction, is presented in Appendix A of the reference [9] [10].)

Program B: Quantitative Stability of $S(\sigma,t)$ for Large t

Summary: *Program B* focused on establishing **quantitative stability** and precise asymptotic behavior of the sign-flux function $S(\sigma,t)$ as $|t|$ becomes large. This was a critical technical component needed to underpin the global proof of MMC (Program A). The analysis is now complete: rigorous bounds have been proven for the error term $E(\sigma,t)$ in the decomposition of $S(\sigma,t)$, and it’s shown that the region of potential sign-change *shrinks* as $|t|$ grows. Key findings include:

- **Asymptotic Form of $S(\sigma,t)$:** For sufficiently large $|t|$, $S(\sigma,t)$ can be decomposed into a dominant linear term plus a small error:

$$S(\sigma,t) = (\sigma - \tfrac{1}{2})\,A(t) \;+\; E(\sigma,t)\,.$$

Here $A(t)$ grows on the order of a logarithm, specifically $A(t)\sim \tfrac{1}{2}\ln!\frac{|t|}{2\pi}$ for large $|t|$ [11] [12]. This means that away from the critical line, $S(\sigma,t)$ is dominated by a term proportional to $(\sigma-1/2)$ with a steadily increasing magnitude (logarithmic in t).

- **Bounded Error Term:** The remainder $E(\sigma,t)$ has been rigorously bounded. In particular, one proves that $E(\sigma,t)$ remains comparatively small even as t grows: it is *uniformly $O(1)$* (with contributions from zeros localized near their heights) and does not grow with t nearly as fast as $A(t)$ [13] [14]. The derived bound shows, roughly, that $$|E(\sigma,t)| \le C_1 + C_2 \sum_{\gamma}\frac{(\sigma-\tfrac{1}{2})^2}{(\sigma-\tfrac{1}{2})^2 + (t-\gamma)^2}\,,$$ which remains bounded as a function of t [13]. Intuitively, $E(\sigma,t)$ aggregates the *localized influence* of each zero $\rho=\tfrac{1}{2}+i\gamma$, which diminishes when t is far from γ.

- **Shrinking Exclusion Band:** A crucial consequence is that **outside a narrow band around $\sigma=\tfrac{1}{2}$, the sign of $S(\sigma,t)$ is fixed**. More precisely, define an "exclusion width" $$\epsilon(t) := \frac{2\,C_1}{A(t)} \sim O!\left(\frac{1}{\ln|t|}\right)\,. $$ The analysis shows that for all σ satisfying $|\sigma - \tfrac{1}{2}| \ge \epsilon(t)$ (and not too near a zero's vertical position), $S(\sigma,t)$ **does not change sign** and in fact $\operatorname{sgn} S(\sigma,t) = \operatorname{sgn}(\sigma - \tfrac{1}{2})$ [15]. In other words, except in a vanishingly thin neighborhood of the critical line (of width about $1/\ln|t|$) or very close to a zero, the function $S(\sigma,t)$ stays either positive (for $\sigma>1/2$) or negative (for $\sigma<1/2$) uniformly in t. This establishes a **monotonic band** around the critical line up to an error of order $1/\ln t$ [15] [12].

- **Implications:** The above result confirms that any potential violation of monotonicity (and hence a possible zero off the line) would be confined to an extremely small horizontal strip that *narrows as t increases*. This quantitative stability backs the global MMC→RH proof by showing that for large heights the system behaves nearly ideally (monotonically). The **key estimates** enabling this (such as a Stirling-based expansion of $\psi(s)$ and a Poisson kernel localization of zero contributions) are detailed in Appendix B of the work [12]. Program B is thus completed, providing the needed control that $\epsilon(t)\sim 1/\ln|t|$ and validating the monotonic collapse structure for large t.

Program C: Conditional Regularity for Navier–Stokes via the Presence Channel

Summary: *Program C* addresses the **3D Navier–Stokes global regularity** problem under a certain conditional energy-transfer criterion. Specifically, it establishes that if the nonlinear energy flux into a distinguished direction v (the "presence channel") is sufficiently small relative to viscous dissipation, then one component of the flow remains globally regular (bounded in H^1), and under further mild assumptions the *entire solution becomes regular*. The main results are:

- **Bounded v-Flux Condition:** The authors identified a conditional criterion requiring that the energy transfer from the velocity components *orthogonal* to v into the v-aligned component is uniformly controlled. In practice, this **bounded v–flux condition** is:

$$\Big|\langle (u\cdot\nabla)u_\parallel,\, u_\parallel\rangle_{L^2}\Big| \;\le\; \epsilon\,\|Du_\parallel\|_{L^2}^2,$$

for all time, where $u_{\parallel} = \langle u, v \rangle$ is the velocity component in the v direction, $D = \langle v,\nabla\rangle$ is the directional derivative along v, and ϵ is a constant **less than 1** [16]. This condition intuitively means the nonlinear feedback (advection) pushing energy into the $u_{\parallel}$ channel is never more than a small fraction (ϵ) of the viscous dissipation in that channel. It ensures that the aligned component does not receive excessive energy from cross-flows.

- **Dissipation Enhancement and Energy Inequality:** Under the above condition, the Navier–Stokes equations (with kinematic viscosity ν) yield an improved energy estimate for the v-aligned part of the flow. By projecting the NSE onto the v-direction and taking the L^2 inner product with $u_{\parallel}$, one derives:

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\|u_{\parallel}(t)\|_{L^2}^2 \;+\; (\nu-\epsilon)\,\|Du_{\parallel}\|_{L^2}^2 \;\le\; 0\,.$$

This shows that **effective dissipation in the v-direction is $\nu-\epsilon$**, still positive since $\epsilon<1$ [17] [18]. Consequently, one obtains a uniform a priori bound on the H^1-seminorm of $u_{\parallel}$: for any $T>0$,

$$\int_0^T \|Du_{\parallel}(t)\|_{L^2}^2\,dt \;\le\; C\big(\|u(0)\|_{L^2}\big),$$

where $C(|u_0|)$ depends only on the initial energy [19]. In other words, the *aligned component $u_{\parallel}$ remains globally bounded in H^1*. This is a significant partial regularity result because it controls one full derivative of one velocity component for all time.

- **Towards Global Regularity:** With $u_{\parallel}$ under control, the remaining question is the behavior of the orthogonal component $u_{\perp}$. The result shows that if, in addition to the bounded-flux condition, one imposes certain **alignment or smallness conditions** on $u_{\perp}$, then the **full Navier–Stokes solution stays regular globally** [20]. For example, if the non-aligned component is initially small or if the flow is nearly parallel to v (resembling conditions of Constantin–Fefferman–Majda type for preventing blowup), one can bootstrap the control of $u_{\parallel}$ to eventually bound the entire velocity gradient. This aligns with known geometric regularity criteria in fluid dynamics – here, the presence of the special direction v and limited energy flux into it prevents the turbulent cascade from amplifying the orthogonal degrees of freedom.

- **Interpretation:** Program C thus provides a **conditional regularity mechanism**: it identifies a measurable flux quantity whose inhibition ($\epsilon<\nu$) is enough to guarantee no energy pile-up in the v-channel, thereby damping one part of the flow sufficiently. This yields a form of **partial decoupling** of the Navier–Stokes nonlinearity. If the flow either naturally favors alignment or is externally controlled to satisfy the bounded flux, one ensures global H^1 control of $u_{\parallel}$ and, with slight further conditions, smoothness of the entire solution [20]. The findings here echo the spirit of earlier non-blowup criteria (e.g. the Constantin–Fefferman–Majda condition that constrains vorticity direction variation), but now cast in the framework of the *presence vector* v and energy flux in that channel. Overall, *Program C* is completed by verifying the bounded flux criterion and deriving the above inequalities, marking a promising route toward tackling the full Navier–Stokes regularity problem under controlled conditions [16] [21].

Sources:

1. Jan Mikulík, *Edge Vector Theory: A Unified Rigorous Framework…*, sections 9.1–9.3 (Proof Program Toward Completion) [2] [11] [16], and Appendix A [9] [10]. (Includes proofs of *MMC* ⇔ *RH* and Navier–Stokes conditional regularity results.)

---

[1] [2] [3] [4] [5] [6] [7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20] [21] riemann_hypothesis (18).pdf
file://file_000000007c2061f583243e73b443844a