A SCHUR PINCH THEOREM FOR ARITHMETIC RATIOS: REDUCING THE RIEMANN HYPOTHESIS TO A POSITIVITY CONDITION

JONATHAN WASHBURN AND AMIR RAHNAMAI BARGHI

Abstract. We introduce the *arithmetic ratio* $\mathcal{J}(s) := \det_2(I - A(s))/\zeta(s) \cdot (s-1)/s$, where $\det_2$ is the regularized Fredholm determinant of the prime-diagonal operator on $\ell^2(\mathcal{P})$, and prove that the positivity condition $\operatorname{Re}\mathcal{J}(s) \geq 0$ on $\{\operatorname{Re} s > 1/2\} \setminus Z(\zeta)$ *implies* the Riemann Hypothesis. The proof is a new *Schur Pinch* argument using the Cayley transform, Riemann's removable singularity theorem, and the Maximum Modulus Principle. We verify $\operatorname{Re}\mathcal{J} > 0$ unconditionally in the Euler product region $\{\operatorname{Re} s > 1\}$ and on the full real half-line $\sigma > 1/2$, and establish the precise boundary behavior $\mathcal{J}(s) \to \infty$ at each hypothetical zero. The paper therefore reduces the Riemann Hypothesis to the single analytical condition $\operatorname{Re}\mathcal{J} \geq 0$ on the half-plane.

1. Introduction

Let $\Omega := \{\, s \in \mathbb{C} : \operatorname{Re} s > \frac{1}{2} \,\}$ and let $\mathcal{P}$ denote the set of rational primes. The Riemann Hypothesis (RH) asserts that the Riemann zeta function $\zeta(s)$ has no zeros in Ω.

The purpose of this paper is to establish an *equivalence* between RH and a positivity condition for a meromorphic function naturally attached to ζ.

Structural context: the forced exclusion pipeline. In a companion paper [7], we prove that any correct, finite-data exclusion procedure—given a unique strictly convex cost functional, finite resolution, and conservation—factors *uniquely* as $\mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{R} \to \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{S}$ (obstruction $\to$ reciprocal sensor $\to$ Cayley transform $\to$ Schur certification), and that this order is forced. The present paper is the *arithmetic instantiation* of this pipeline:

Pipeline step	This paper
$\mathcal{O}$: obstruction	$\zeta(s) = 0$ defines the candidate
$\mathcal{R}$: reciprocal sensor	$\mathcal{J} = \det_2(I - A)/\zeta \cdot (s-1)/s$
$\mathcal{C}$: Cayley transform	$\Xi = (2\mathcal{J}-1)/(2\mathcal{J}+1)$ (unique conformal map [7])
$\mathcal{S}$: Schur certification	Removable singularity + Maximum Modulus (Thm 1.2)

The proof structure is therefore not one approach among many; it is the *unique optimal exclusion strategy* applied to this domain.

The arithmetic ratio. For $s \in \Omega$, the prime-diagonal operator $A(s)e_p := p^{-s}e_p$ on $\ell^2(\mathcal{P})$ is Hilbert–Schmidt, and its regularized Fredholm determinant

$$\det_2(I - A(s)) \;=\; \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} (1 - p^{-s})\, e^{p^{-s}} \tag{1}$$

is holomorphic and zero-free on Ω ([3]). Define the *arithmetic ratio*

$$\mathcal{J}(s) \;:=\; \frac{\det_2(I - A(s))}{\zeta(s)} \cdot \frac{s-1}{s}\,, \qquad s \in \Omega \setminus Z(\zeta), \tag{2}$$

where $Z(\zeta) := \{s \in \Omega : \zeta(s) = 0\}$. Since $\det_2(I - A)$ is zero-free on Ω and ζ has a simple pole at $s = 1$ (canceled by the factor $(s-1)/s$), $\mathcal{J}$ is meromorphic on Ω with poles exactly at $Z(\zeta)$.

Date: February 11, 2026.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 11M26; Secondary 30H10, 47B35, 30C80.

Key words and phrases. Riemann hypothesis, Schur function, Cayley transform, Euler product, removable singularity, regularized determinant, Herglotz function.

Remark 1.1 (Behavior at infinity). For real $\sigma \to +\infty$, $\det_2(I - A(\sigma))/\zeta(\sigma) \to \prod_p (1-p^{-\sigma})^2 e^{p^{-\sigma}} \to 1$, and $(\sigma-1)/\sigma \to 1$, so $\mathcal{J}(\sigma) \to 1$.

Define the *Cayley field*

$$\Xi(s) \;:=\; \frac{2\mathcal{J}(s)-1}{2\mathcal{J}(s)+1}. \tag{3}$$

Main results. Our two main results are:

Theorem 1.2 (Schur Pinch)**.** *Let $U \subset \Omega$ be a connected open set. Suppose:*

(i) $\operatorname{Re}\mathcal{J}(s) \geq 0$ *for all* $s \in U \setminus Z(\zeta)$*;*
(ii) $\mathcal{J}(s) \to \infty$ *at each* $\rho \in Z(\zeta) \cap U$*;*
(iii) *there exists* $s_* \in U \setminus Z(\zeta)$ *with* $|\Xi(s_*)| < 1$*.*

Then $Z(\zeta) \cap U = \varnothing$: the zeta function has no zeros in U.

Theorem 1.3 (Reduction)**.** *If*

$$\operatorname{Re}\mathcal{J}(s) \;\geq\; 0 \qquad \textit{for all } s \in \Omega \setminus Z(\zeta), \tag{4}$$

then the Riemann Hypothesis holds.

Hypothesis (ii) is unconditional (Lemma 3.1 below). Hypothesis (iii) is satisfied at any point in the Euler product region (Lemma 3.2). Therefore the entire content of RH is concentrated in hypothesis (i): the non-negative real part of the arithmetic ratio.

What this paper does and does not prove.

- We **do** prove the unconditional reduction (4) $\Longrightarrow$ RH (Theorem 1.3).
- We **do** verify (4) unconditionally in the Euler product region $\{\operatorname{Re} s > 1\}$ (Lemma 3.2) and on the full real half-line $\sigma > 1/2$ (Lemma 5.1).
- We **do not** prove the converse (RH $\Longrightarrow$ (4)). A holomorphic function positive on a ray need not have non-negative real part on a half-plane; establishing the converse requires additional structure of $\mathcal{J}$ and is an open question.
- We **do not** prove (4) on the full half-plane Ω. Establishing (4) for $1/2 < \operatorname{Re} s \leq 1$ would close RH and is the subject of a companion paper.

2. The Cayley property

Remark 2.1 (Cayley uniqueness). The transform $\Xi = (2w-1)/(2w+1)$ is the unique normalised conformal bijection $\{\operatorname{Re} w > 0\} \to \mathbb{D}$ satisfying $\Xi(\infty) = 1$ and $\Xi(1/2) = 0$ (up to Möbius equivalence). This is proved in [7] as part of the forced factorisation of the exclusion pipeline; no alternative conformal map achieves the pole-to-boundary correspondence without free parameters.

Lemma 2.2 (Cayley property)**.** *Let $w \in \mathbb{C}$ with $2w+1 \neq 0$ and define $\Xi := (2w-1)/(2w+1)$.*

(a) $\operatorname{Re} w \geq 0$ *if and only if* $|\Xi| \leq 1$*.*
(b) $\operatorname{Re} w > 0$ *if and only if* $|\Xi| < 1$*.*
(c) $|w| \to \infty$ *implies* $\Xi \to 1$*.*

Proof. Expand

$$|2w+1|^2 - |2w-1|^2 = (2w+1)(2\bar{w}+1) - (2w-1)(2\bar{w}-1) = 4(w+\bar{w}) = 8\operatorname{Re} w.$$

Hence $|2w-1|^2 \leq |2w+1|^2$ if and only if $\operatorname{Re} w \geq 0$. Dividing by $|2w+1|^2 > 0$ gives (a); (b) is the strict version. For (c): $\Xi - 1 = -2/(2w+1) \to 0$. □

3. Poles and Euler positivity

Lemma 3.1 (Pole behavior)**.** *At each $\rho \in Z(\zeta)$, $\mathcal{J}(s) \to \infty$ as $s \to \rho$.*

Proof. Since $\det_2(I - A(\rho)) \neq 0$ and $\zeta(\rho) = 0$,

$$|\mathcal{J}(s)| = \frac{|\det_2(I - A(s))|}{|\zeta(s)|} \cdot \frac{|s-1|}{|s|} \to \frac{|\det_2(I - A(\rho))|}{0^+} \cdot \frac{|\rho - 1|}{|\rho|} = +\infty. \qquad \square$$

Lemma 3.2 (Euler positivity)**.** *For real $\sigma > 1$,*

$$\mathcal{J}(\sigma) \;=\; \prod_{p \in \mathcal{P}} (1 - p^{-\sigma})^2 \, e^{p^{-\sigma}} \cdot \frac{\sigma - 1}{\sigma} \;>\; 0.$$

In particular, $\operatorname{Re} \mathcal{J}(\sigma) > 0$ *and* $|\Xi(\sigma)| < 1$.

Proof. For $\sigma > 1$, the Euler product converges absolutely: $\det_2(I - A(\sigma)) = \prod_p (1 - p^{-\sigma}) e^{p^{-\sigma}}$ and $\zeta(\sigma)^{-1} = \prod_p (1 - p^{-\sigma})$. Every factor is real and positive, as is $(\sigma - 1)/\sigma$. The Cayley assertion follows from Lemma 2.2(b). $\square$

4. Proof of the Schur Pinch (Theorem 1.2)

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Define $\Xi_{\mathrm{ext}} : U \to \mathbb{C}$ by

$$\Xi_{\mathrm{ext}}(s) := \begin{cases} \Xi(s), & s \notin Z(\zeta), \\ 1, & s \in Z(\zeta) \cap U. \end{cases}$$

Step 1 (Schur bound). By (i) and Lemma 2.2(a), $|\Xi(s)| \le 1$ on $U \setminus Z(\zeta)$.

Step 2 (Continuity at poles). By (ii) and Lemma 2.2(c), $\Xi(s) \to 1$ as $s \to \rho$ for each $\rho \in Z(\zeta) \cap U$. Hence Ξ_{ext} is continuous at ρ.

Step 3 (Removability). Zeros of ζ in Ω are isolated (they are zeros of the non-constant entire function ζ). On a punctured disc around each ρ, Ξ_{ext} is holomorphic and bounded by 1. By Riemann's removable singularity theorem [1, p. 280], Ξ_{ext} extends holomorphically to all of U with $|\Xi_{\mathrm{ext}}| \le 1$.

Step 4 (Maximum Modulus). Suppose for contradiction that some $\rho \in Z(\zeta) \cap U$ exists. Then $|\Xi_{\mathrm{ext}}(\rho)| = 1$, which is an interior maximum of $|\Xi_{\mathrm{ext}}|$ on the connected open set U. By the Maximum Modulus Principle [1, Theorem 10.24], Ξ_{ext} is constant: $\Xi_{\mathrm{ext}} \equiv 1$. But $|\Xi_{\mathrm{ext}}(s_*)| = |\Xi(s_*)| < 1$ by (iii). Contradiction. $\square$

5. Real-line positivity and proof of the reduction

Before proving the main reduction, we establish positivity on the full real half-line, which extends the Euler product region into the critical strip.

Lemma 5.1 (Real-line positivity)**.** *For all real $\sigma > 1/2$ with $\sigma \neq 1$, $\mathcal{J}(\sigma) > 0$.*

Proof. For $\sigma > 1$, this is Lemma 3.2. For $\sigma \in (1/2, 1)$: $\det_2(I - A(\sigma)) = \prod_p (1 - p^{-\sigma}) e^{p^{-\sigma}} > 0$ (each factor positive). $\zeta(\sigma) < 0$ (the zeta function is negative on $(0, 1)$ since ζ has a simple pole at $s = 1$ with positive residue and $\zeta(0) = -1/2$). $(\sigma - 1)/\sigma < 0$ for $\sigma < 1$. Hence $\mathcal{J}(\sigma) = (\text{positive}) \cdot (\text{negative})^{-1} \cdot (\text{negative}) > 0$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.3. Apply Theorem 1.2 with $U = \Omega$. Hypothesis (i) is (4). Hypothesis (ii) holds by Lemma 3.1. Hypothesis (iii) holds at $s_* = 2$: $\mathcal{J}(2) > 0$ (Lemma 3.2), so $|\Xi(2)| < 1$ (Lemma 2.2(b)). Theorem 1.2 gives $Z(\zeta) \cap \Omega = \varnothing$. $\square$

Remark 5.2 (On the converse direction). An earlier version of this paper claimed the *equivalence* RH $\iff$ (4). The forward direction (RH $\Rightarrow$ (4)) attempted a Maximum Modulus argument, but that argument requires $|\Xi| \le 1$ on the whole region—precisely the conclusion. The forward implication remains an open question: a holomorphic function that is positive on a ray need not have nonnegative real part on a half-plane. Lemma 5.1 establishes positivity on the real half-line $\sigma > 1/2$, but extension to the complex half-plane requires additional analytical structure specific to $\mathcal{J}$.

6. The $\det_2$ log-remainder

We record properties of $\mathcal{J}$ that inform the positivity question (4), although we do not resolve it here.

Proposition 6.1 (Log-remainder decomposition). *For $s \in \Omega \setminus Z(\zeta)$,*

$$\log \mathcal{J}(s) \;=\; \underbrace{\sum_p r_p(s)}_{\textit{(I)}} \;+\; \underbrace{\log \frac{1}{\zeta(s)}}_{\textit{(II)}} \;+\; \underbrace{\log \frac{s-1}{s}}_{\textit{(III)}}, \tag{5}$$

where $r_p(s) := \log(1-p^{-s}) + p^{-s}$ is the $\det_2$ log-remainder satisfying

$$|r_p(s)| \;\le\; \frac{p^{-2\sigma}}{2(1-2^{-\sigma})}, \qquad \sigma := \operatorname{Re} s > \tfrac{1}{2}. \tag{6}$$

Proof. From (1), $\log \det_2(I - A(s)) = \sum_p [\log(1-p^{-s}) + p^{-s}]$. Dividing by $\zeta(s)$ and multiplying by $(s-1)/s$ gives (5). For the bound: $|\log(1-z)+z| \le |z|^2/(2(1-|z|))$ for $|z|<1$, and $|p^{-s}| = p^{-\sigma} \le 2^{-\sigma} < 1$. □

Remark 6.2 (Structure of the positivity question). Term (I) in (5) converges absolutely for $\sigma > 1/2$ and contributes a bounded phase. Term (III) is smooth and has $|\arg((s-1)/s)| < \pi/2$ for $\sigma > 1/2$. Term (II), $\log(1/\zeta(s))$, is the *only* potentially unbounded contribution to $\arg \mathcal{J}$. Therefore the positivity condition (4) is equivalent to controlling the phase of $1/\zeta(s)$:

$$|\arg \mathcal{J}(s)| < \pi/2 \quad \iff \quad \operatorname{Re} \mathcal{J}(s) > 0.$$

Any approach to (4) must tame the oscillatory behavior of $\log(1/\zeta)$ in the critical strip $\{1/2 < \sigma \le 1\}$.

7. Discussion

Comparison with existing approaches. The equivalence in Theorem 1.3 provides a new *operator-theoretic* formulation of RH: rather than asking about the location of zeros of an entire function, one asks about the sign of the real part of a meromorphic function built from the Euler product. The Cayley transform converts the sign question into a Schur-class membership question, which is the natural domain of Nevanlinna–Pick interpolation theory [4] and bounded-real (KYP) certification from control theory [5].

The Schur Pinch mechanism (removable singularity + Maximum Modulus) is elementary but, to our knowledge, has not been applied to the arithmetic ratio $\mathcal{J}$ in this form.

The positivity condition as a research program. Theorem 1.3 suggests a research program: *establish* $\operatorname{Re} \mathcal{J} \ge 0$ *on progressively wider subsets of* Ω. Each verified region is a zero-free region for ζ. Known unconditional zero-free regions (e.g. Vinogradov–Korobov [2]) can be reinterpreted as partial positivity results for $\mathcal{J}$.

Relation to the cost-functional characterization. The form of $\mathcal{J}$ is motivated by the *reciprocal convex cost* framework developed in [6], where the functional $J(x) = \frac{1}{2}(x + x^{-1}) - 1$ is characterized as the unique mismatch penalty satisfying a d'Alembert-type composition identity. The arithmetic ratio $\mathcal{J}$ is the natural "sensor" in this framework: its poles detect zeros of ζ, and its real part controls the Cayley field.

This paper as a domain instantiation. The Exclusion Theorem [7] proves that the four-step pipeline $\mathcal{O} \to \mathcal{R} \to \mathcal{C} \to \mathcal{S}$ is the unique optimal exclusion strategy given a unique strictly convex cost and finite resolution. This paper instantiates that pipeline for the zeta function. The Euler-positivity check (Lemma 3.2, $\mathcal{J}(2) > 0$ hence $|\Xi(2)| < 1$) discharges the nontriviality hypothesis of the pipeline, and the Schur Pinch (Theorem 1.2) is exactly the $\mathcal{S}$-step. The remaining open content is the positivity condition (4), which is the *domain adapter*: the theorem connecting this specific arithmetic Cayley field to the cost-contracting realization class. The companion paper [8] derives this positivity condition from the RS bandwidth argument.

Acknowledgments. The authors thank the anonymous referees for comments that improved the accuracy and clarity of this work.

References

[1] W. Rudin, *Real and Complex Analysis*, 3rd ed., McGraw–Hill, 1987.
[2] E. C. Titchmarsh, *The Theory of the Riemann Zeta-Function*, 2nd ed., revised by D. R. Heath-Brown, Oxford University Press, 1986.
[3] B. Simon, *Trace Ideals and Their Applications*, 2nd ed., American Mathematical Society, 2005.
[4] M. Rosenblum and J. Rovnyak, *Hardy Classes and Operator Theory*, Oxford University Press, 1985.
[5] K. Zhou, J. C. Doyle, and K. Glover, *Robust and Optimal Control*, Prentice Hall, 1996.
[6] J. Washburn and A. Rahnamai Barghi, Reciprocal convex costs for ratio matching: functional-equation characterization and decision geometry, submitted to *Entropy*, 2026.
[7] J. Washburn, The Exclusion Theorem: the unique impossibility certificate forced by canonical cost, RS preprint, 2026.
[8] J. Washburn and A. Rahnamai Barghi, Positivity of the arithmetic ratio from the canonical reciprocal cost: a Recognition Science derivation, RS preprint, 2026.
[9] J. Washburn, The Coercive Projection Theorem: the unique certification strategy forced by canonical cost, RS preprint, 2026.

Austin, TX, USA
Email address: jon@recognitionphysics.org

Email address: arahnamab@gmail.com