

from [garry.herrington@gmail.com](mailto:garry.herrington@gmail.com) , 27 March 2018

## Problem with an Implicitly Claimed Proof of the Riemann Hypothesis > Carella 2008

### § 1 The Claim

Carella 2008 implicitly claims a proof of the Riemann Hypothesis in Theorem 7,

"Let  $N_k = 2 \cdot 3 \cdot 5 \cdots p_k$ . Then  $N_k / \varphi(n_k) > e^\gamma \log \log n_k$  for all sufficiently large integers  $N_k$  "

This implicit claim was noted by G.Caveney (reference below).

Nicolas 1983, Theorem 2(b), proved that if the "Riemann Hypothesis is false" ( $\equiv$  not RH) then "the inequality in Theorem 7 is false for infinitely many  $k$ " ( $\equiv$  P), that is, "not RH  $\longrightarrow$  P".

The contra-positive of "not RH  $\longrightarrow$  P" is "not P  $\longrightarrow$  RH" and Carella 2008 in Theorem 7 claims to have proved "not P" thereby implicitly claiming a proof of the Riemann Hypothesis.

### § 2 A Problem

A problem with the proof of Theorem 7 in Carella 2008 is that it is incomplete.

Immediately following line (10) the proof states,

"Next, since the Chebyshev's function satisfies  $p_k > \vartheta(p_k) = \log N_k$  , and ..."

Grosswald 1967 says it was proved in Schmidt 1903 that there are infinite, divergent sequences  $x_k$  in  $\mathbb{R}(0<)$  on which  $\vartheta(x_k) - x_k$  changes sign infinitely often, where  $\vartheta(x) \equiv \sum_{p \leq x} \log p$  and  $p$  denotes a prime. This was confirmed in Landau 1905 by a different method and in Littlewood 1914 it was proved that  $\vartheta(x_k) - x_k = \Omega_{\pm}(x_k^{1/2} \log \log \log x_k)$ .

It follows from Schmidt 1903 that the sequence  $x_k$  has an infinite, divergent sub-sequence  $x_k'$  on which  $\vartheta(x_k') > x_k'$  . Let  $q_k$  be the largest prime  $\leq x_k'$  then  $x_k' \geq q_k$  and the definition in relation(1) implies  $\vartheta(x_k') \geq \vartheta(q_k)$ . Relations(2,3,4) then imply  $\vartheta(q_k) > q_k$  for infinitely many  $k$ .

The case  $\vartheta(q_k) > q_k$  is not covered in the proof of Theorem 7 in Carella 2008 and hence the proof is incomplete.

## References

1. Carella,N., 'Divisor and Totient Functions Estimates", 2008, at <http://empslocal.ex.ac.uk/people/staff/mrwatkin/zeta/RHproofs>
2. G.Caveney comments are at link above for Carella,N.
3. Grosswald,E., "Oscillation Theorems of Arithmetical Functions", Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. Vol 126, no 1 (Jan 1967), pp 1-28.
4. Landau,E., Math. Ann. 59 (1905), pp 527-550.
5. Littlewood,J., C. R. Acad. Sei. Paris 158 (1914), pp 1862-1872.
6. Nicolas,J-L., "Petites valeurs de la fonction d'Euler", J. Number Theory 17 (1983), no. 3, pp 375-388.
7. Schmidt,E., Math. Ann. 57 (1903), pp 195-204.

**End**