

# RIEMANN HYPOTHESIS IN SPECIAL CASES

MEHDI HASSANI

ABSTRACT. In this note, we show that the Riemann Hypothesis is true in some special cases.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The Riemann zeta-function is defined for  $Re(s) > 1$  by

$$\zeta(s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n^s},$$

and extended by analytic continuation to the complex plan with one singularity at  $s = 1$ ; in fact a simple pole with residues 1. The Riemann hypothesis [1] states that the non-real zeros of the Riemann zeta-function all lie on the line  $Re(s) = \frac{1}{2}$ . Now, let  $\sigma(n)$  denote the sum of positive divisors of  $n$ ; in 2002 Lagarias [3] showed that Riemann hypothesis holds if and only if

$$(1) \quad \sigma(n) \leq H_n + e^{H_n} \ln H_n,$$

for every  $\mathbb{N}$ , where  $H_n = 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} + \dots + \frac{1}{n}$ .

In this note we show that the inequality (1) holds, when  $n$  is a power of a prime number and for some sufficiently large square free values of  $n$ ; by square free integer we mean one that in its factoring to primes, the power of factors all are equal to 1.

## 2. MAIN RESULTS

Let  $\mathbb{P}$  be the set of all primes and  $H_n = \sum_{k=1}^n 1/k$ . It is easy to see that

$$(2) \quad H_n > \ln n \quad (n \in \mathbb{N}).$$

**Theorem 1.** *The inequality (1) holds for all  $n \in \mathbb{P}$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $p \in \mathbb{P}$  and  $p \geq 17$ . since  $17 > e^e$ , we have  $p \ln \ln p > p$  and  $\ln p > 1$ . Thus,  $\ln p + p \ln \ln p > p + 1 = \sigma(p)$  and combining this with (2) yields result for  $p \geq 17$ . For  $p < 17$ , we obtain the result by a simple calculation.  $\square$

---

1991 Mathematics Subject Classification. 11M26, 11S40, 11A41, 62G07.

Key words and phrases. Riemann Hypothesis, Zeta-function, Primes, Density, ABC conjecture.

**Theorem 2.** *The inequality (1) holds for all  $n = p^a$ , in which  $p \in \mathbb{P}$  and  $a \in \mathbb{N}$ .*

*Proof.* We know that

$$(3) \quad \sigma(p^a) = \sum_{t=0}^a p^t = \frac{p^{a+1} - 1}{p - 1} < 2p^a,$$

and by (2) we have

$$H_{p^a} > \ln p^a = a \ln p.$$

So,

$$(4) \quad H_{p^a} + e^{H_{p^a}} \ln H_{p^a} > a \ln p + p^a \ln \ln p^a.$$

For  $p^a \geq 1619 > e^{(e^2)}$ , we have  $\ln \ln p^a > 2$  and  $a \ln p > 0$ , so

$$p^a (\ln \ln p - 2) + a \ln p > 0,$$

combining this inequality with (3) and (4) yields (1) for  $n = p^a \geq 1619$ . For  $p^a \leq 1618$ , if  $a = 1$  then (1) holds by previous theorem. The other possible cases are:  $(a = 2, p = 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, 17, 19, 23, 29, 31, 37)$ ,  $(a = 3, p = 2, 3, 5, 7, 11)$ ,  $(a = 4, p = 2, 3, 5)$ ,  $(a = 5, 6, p = 2, 3)$  and  $(a = 7, 8, 9, 10, p = 2)$ , which in all of them, (1) follow by a simple calculation.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.** *The inequality (1) holds for some sufficiently large square free values of  $n$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose  $n = p_1 p_2 \cdots p_k$  in which  $p_i \in \mathbb{P}$  and  $2 \leq p_1 < p_2 < \cdots < p_k$ . Since  $\sigma(n) = (p_1 + 1)(p_2 + 1) \cdots (p_k + 1)$  and

$$\frac{\sigma(n)}{n} = \left(1 + \frac{1}{p_1}\right) \left(1 + \frac{1}{p_2}\right) \cdots \left(1 + \frac{1}{p_k}\right) < \left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\right) \left(1 + \frac{1}{3}\right) \cdots \left(1 + \frac{1}{k}\right) = \frac{k+2}{2},$$

we obtain

$$\sigma(n) < \left(1 + \frac{k}{2}\right)n.$$

Now, for  $n > e^{(e^{1+\frac{k}{2}})}$  we yield  $\ln \ln n > 1 + \frac{k}{2}$  and  $n \ln \ln n > \left(1 + \frac{k}{2}\right)n > \sigma(n)$ .

Combining this with relation (2) yields (1) for  $n > e^{(e^{1+\frac{k}{2}})}$  and  $n$  square free with  $k$  distinct prime factors.  $\square$

**Note 1.** In the theorem 3,  $n = p_1 p_2 \cdots p_k > k! > \Gamma(k)$  and so,

$$k < \Gamma^{-1}(n).$$

**Corollary 1.** *The inequality (1) holds for all  $n = pq$ , in which  $p, q \in \mathbb{P}$  and  $2 \leq p < q$ .*

*Proof.* For  $n > e^{(e^2)}$  or  $n \geq 1619$ , use Theorem 3, and for  $n \leq 1618$  check it by a computer.  $\square$

**Corollary 2.** *For proving (1) for  $n = pqr$ , we should check it for  $n \leq 195339$  and the other cases yield by Theorem 3.*

**Note 2.** We guess that if we consider the ABC-conjecture [4](or [5]), then we can yield the inequality (1) at least for all sufficiently large square free integers and since the density of them is  $\frac{6}{\pi^2}$  [2], we may yield that the probability that the Riemann hypothesis be true is more than 60%.

## REFERENCES

- [1] J.B. Conrey, *The Riemann Hypothesis*, Notices of the AMS, **51**(2003)341-353.
- [2] M. Hassani, "Self Sharpening Inequality", *RGMA Research Report Collection*, **6**(4), Article 1, 2003.
- [3] J. Lagarias, *An Elementary Problem Equivalent to the Riemann Hypothesis*, Amer. Math. Monthly, **109**(2002)534-543.
- [4] <http://mathworld.wolfram.com/abcConjecture.html>
- [5] <http://www.math.unicaen.fr/~nitaj/abc.html>

INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDIES IN BASIC SCIENCES  
*E-mail address:* `mhassani@iasbs.ac.ir`