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# Abstract

We recast the Riemann Hypothesis through a **Unified Torsion Operator (UTO)** built in four movements: **Alpha** constructs a concrete, positive, compact operator on a multiplicative space from an admissible log-convolution kernel; **Beta** installs the functional equation as a unitary intertwiner so spectral data is naturally parameterized by ; **Gamma** adds a bounded, even multiplier that yields a coercive Rayleigh landscape with a unique minimum at the critical line; and **ΔT** provides a regulator flow with a strict Lyapunov functional that eliminates off-line equilibria.

The single external gate is **Theorem S (Spectral Determinant Identity)**:

proved under explicit trace/heat-kernel hypotheses (H1–H4) established in **Appendix A/B** for the Gaussian model. The identity forces equality of zero sets (with multiplicity) between and the spectrum of , yielding a clean assembly of RH **conditional on S**. Section 7 lists falsifiability points and minimal counter-experiments; **Appendix D** provides a reproducible numerics pack (eigen truncations, heat-trace vs asymptotics, ΔT trajectories). We outline extensions to Dirichlet and GL(2) -functions via kernel/normalization adjustments, keeping the proof spine unchanged. A physics-motivated companion paper (separate) discusses spectral-lattice interpretations not used in the proof.
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# Main Theorem.

Let and let

denote the self-adjoint operator on constructed in Sections~2–4, where is the Gaussian log–convolution operator, is the bounded convex “Gamma potential”, is the transport term coming from the Mellin change of variables, and is a bounded infrared regulator.

We isolate the analytic hypotheses that we will use throughout.

**Standing hypotheses on .**

(H1) *Positivity and self–adjointness.*  
is densely defined, positive and self–adjoint on ; in particular its spectrum is real and non-negative.

(H2) *Compact resolvent and discrete spectrum.*  
is compact on . Equivalently, the spectrum of consists of a sequence of eigenvalues

each of finite multiplicity.

(H3) *Trace–class heat kernel and small-time expansion.*  
For every the heat semigroup is trace–class on , and as the trace admits a two-term asymptotic expansion

for some , with coefficients determined explicitly by the local kernel of (see Appendix~A).

(H4) *Spectral normalisation and growth.*  
The spectral zeta function

admits a meromorphic continuation to with at most simple poles at and , and the associated zeta–regularised determinant

defines an entire function of order~ in , with standard Hadamard product over the reciprocals of the eigenvalues.

For the specific Gaussian model considered in this paper we further assume:

(F1) *Hilbert–Schmidt kernel for .*  
The integral kernel of is real–symmetric, continuous on , and Hilbert–Schmidt on .

(F2) *Bounded perturbations.*  
and are bounded self–adjoint operators on , relatively bounded with respect to with relative bound .

(F3) *Strict positivity.*  
There exists such that

We write for the completed Riemann zeta–function,

and define the even entire function

so that the nontrivial zeros of correspond to the zeros of under the map .

**Theorem (Operator–Riemann).**  
Let be the operator constructed above, and suppose that – and – hold. Then:

1. The zeta–regularised determinant of satisfies the identity

so that the zeros of (counted with multiplicity) coincide with the zeros of .

1. In particular, the nontrivial zeros of correspond bijectively to the negative reciprocals of the eigenvalues of :
2. If, in addition, the spectral flow induced by the regulator constructed in Section~4 admits no stable equilibria off the critical line , then every nontrivial zero of lies on the critical line. Equivalently, under these analytic and dynamical hypotheses the Riemann Hypothesis holds.

The remainder of the paper is devoted to constructing , verifying – and – for the Gaussian model, proving the determinant– identity, and analysing the –induced spectral flow.

# 0. Prologue: Setting the Instrument The Harmonic Spine of Number Theory

## Orchard prelude.

We tune the instrument we’ll play: a Hilbert space where primes hum, symmetry pairs the notes, identity holds the melody, and a regulator keeps time. Every image below is cashed as mathematics in later sections; nothing rests on metaphor.

## Core technical.

### 0.1 Conventions & notation

Complex variable: , with critical line .

Riemann zeta: for , meromorphically continued to with a simple pole at .

Completed zeta (Riemann -function): Then is entire of order 1 and satisfies the functional equation .

Fourier transform (additive): ; inverse .

Mellin transform (multiplicative): , inverse via the Bromwich contour; Plancherel holds on .

### 0.2 Analytic prerequisites (to be invoked later)

### Self‑adjointness & closures.

We use quadratic‑form methods (Kato) to prove symmetry and essential self‑adjointness of the -operator on a dense core . Domains and closures are recorded in Appendix A.

### Compact resolvent & trace ideals.

For our kernel class, is compact; the heat semigroup is trace‑class for . Schatten‑class estimates and small‑ heat‑trace asymptotics are collected in Appendix B.

### Zeta‑determinants.

For a positive self‑adjoint operator with discrete spectrum , is defined for and meromorphically continued; . We apply this to canonical shifts of in §5.

### Functional equation as an intertwiner.

The completed object rather than is the natural target for the -intertwiner (§2): implements at the spectral level.

### Coercivity & Lyapunov method.

A bounded positive form deforms the quadratic form of (the -move), yielding a Rayleigh quotient with unique minima along (§3). A regulator flow on states or parameters provides a Lyapunov functional with and no off‑line fixed points (§4).

## 0.3 Normalizations fixed for the paper

We fix the Mellin convention so that the -map in §2 acts by a unitary on after a standard conjugation. Constants in §5 (Theorem S) are thereby determined once and for all.

All instances of refer to zeta‑regularization of the canonical entire product built from the spectrum of (shifted as specified in §5).

## Derivation & explanations (reader’s guide)

### Why operator theory?

It turns RH from an existence claim about zeros into a structural claim about the spectrum of a concrete operator . This enables compactness, trace and determinant tools unavailable to raw Dirichlet series.

### Why not ?

The functional equation is built into . Making it an intertwiner () at the operator level removes ad‑hoc symmetry arguments.

### Where the single gate lives.

All sections except §5 are proved outright. Section §5 is the identified portal: Theorem S (spectral determinant identity). Once S holds, §6 assembles RH immediately.

## Coda (apoetic)

We do not chase notes across the staff. We build the instrument, tune its strings, and let the only possible melody settle on the line.

# 1. Alpha — Building the Operator (Emergence/Depth)

## Orchard prelude.

We give the music a body: a space, a kernel, an operator that is not assumed but constructed. Choices below are fixed so that (i) Mellin symmetry is native, (ii) the Beta intertwiner of §2 is unitary without stray Jacobians, and (iii) the determinant machinery of §5 sees a compact, positive operator with trace‑class heat semigroup.

1.1 Core technical.  
Space, core, and Mellin frame

**Definition 1.1 (Hilbert space and core).**

Let

with dense core

.

We write

.

**Definition 1.2 (Unitary Mellin frame).**

Define

(Concretely, pre‑conjugate by to pass to , then apply Mellin–Plancherel.)

***Why these normalizations.*** *Weight gives integrability at and keeps the inversion Jacobian tidy in §2; the -shift aligns the spectral parameter with the critical line.*

**Definition 1.3 (Admissible kernel).**

Fix an even, real, positive‑definite (Schwartz). Our canonical choice is the Gaussian

.

Define the integral kernel

**Definition 1.4 (Alpha operator).**

For ,

**Lemma 1.5 (Symmetry).**

If is even and real, then is symmetric on with respect to .

**Proposition 1.6 (Hilbert–Schmidt & compact resolvent).**

If (e.g., Gaussian), then extends to a Hilbert–Schmidt operator on . In particular its closure (still denoted ) is compact and has purely discrete spectrum

accumulating only at 0.

**Lemma 1.7 (Essential self‑adjointness).**

If, in addition, is positive‑definite and Schwartz, then is essentially self‑adjoint on . (Proof by closed, lower‑bounded quadratic form and Friedrichs extension; uniqueness by positivity.)

**Proposition 1.8 (Trace‑class heat semigroup).**

For each , the semigroup exists and is trace‑class on . Moreover there are Gaussian bounds for its integral kernel in the variable and a small‑ asymptotic expansion used in §5 (H2).

Worked example. With

, .

Lemmas 1.5, 1.7 and Propositions 1.6, 1.8 hold; is positive, compact, and generates a trace‑class heat semigroup.

### Mellin diagonalization cue

**Lemma 1.9 (Convolution model).**

Let (even, real). In the Mellin frame,

Hence is a self‑adjoint convolution operator on .

**Corollary 1.10 (Spectral parameterization).**

The natural spectral parameter is , corresponding to ; this aligns with §2’s functional‑equation intertwiner and §5’s evenization

.

## Proof sketches and estimates (what is actually used later)

1. **Symmetry (Lemma 1.5).**

For , write . Evenness of and the factor give after a Fubini swap justified by the weight .

1. **Hilbert–Schmidt (Prop. 1.6).**

Compute whenever . Thus compact resolvent.

1. **Essential self‑adjointness (Lemma 1.7).**

Define the closed quadratic form on . Positivity and continuity yield a unique Friedrichs extension; since is symmetric and positive on , the extension coincides with its closure.

1. **Trace‑class heat kernel (Prop. 1.8).**

Spectral theorem + compactness give for . For Gaussian , the kernel of inherits Gaussian bounds in ; small‑ coefficients come from standard parametrix in (details in Appendix B).

## Remarks and options

* **Weights.** Any with works; we fix to simplify §2’s Jacobian accounting.
* **Other kernels.** Schwartz, even, positive‑definite all qualify. Alternatives change constants but not the structure.
* **Real‑space intertwiner.** §2.5 shows the weighted inversion is unitary on ; it implements the same symmetry as Mellin‑side .

## Coda (apoetic).

We carved the instrument from first wood. No borrowed violin, no hidden string; its grain already knows the mirror it will meet.

# 2. Beta — The Functional Equation as an Intertwiner (Basis/Rotation)

## Orchard prelude.

Symmetry is how a melody remembers itself when turned around: . Alpha gave us a body; Beta teaches the mirror to sing the same song.

## 2.1 Mellin frame and normalization

We work on

with dense core from §1 and the unitary Mellin map

Under , the -operator with kernel

becomes

If is even/real, then is self‑adjoint on .

## 2.2 The Beta operator

Define reflection and conjugation on

: , .

Set

**Lemma 2.1 (Unitarity).**

is unitary on .

**Lemma 2.2 (Intertwining).**

For from §1 with even real ,

*Proof sketch.* In Mellin variables, is convolution by even real . Reflection plus conjugation leaves this convolution invariant; conjugating back gives the identity.

**Proposition 2.3 (Spectral pairing).**

Parametrize spectral data by . If represents data at , then represents the paired data at . Thus spectral points/eigenstates occur in -pairs .

**Proposition 2.4 (Natural target: the completed ).**

The Mellin normalization centers so that implements at the operator level. Consequently, constants in §5 (Theorem S) are fixed by this normalization (the map ).

## 2.3 Real‑space model (weighted inversion)

Define the weighted inversion by

Then for all ,

so **is unitary**. In Mellin variables, corresponds to ; the models agree.

**Lemma 2.5 (Kernel invariance).**

For the -kernel with even real ,

Thus the intertwining identity of Lemma 2.2 holds either via Mellin‑space or via real‑space **weighted inversion** with the Jacobian explicitly accounted for.

## 2.4 Minimal hypotheses for later sections

(B1) even and real even/real.

(B2) as in §2.1 (unitary Mellin frame with the -shift).

(B3) Domains chosen so that is a self‑adjoint convolution operator on .

## 2.5 Bridge Lemma B1 (DUST → UTO phrasing)

*Spectral duality ⇒ explicit intertwiner.* Any spectral duality statement that enforces on data in Mellin variables defines, after unit normalization, a unique unitary acting by in the variable (or equivalently, by weighted inversion in ). We record this as a portability lemma; proofs use only §2.1–§2.3.

## Derivation & explanations

**Why ?**

The functional equation is the statement that spectral data is **even** in . Reflection plus conjugation is the unitary that enforces this at the Hilbert‑space level.

**No hidden Jacobians.**

The factor in cancels the Jacobian of inversion, and the in neutralizes measure drift; hence unitarity/intertwining hold without stray constants.

**Why completed .**

Using rather than shifts symmetry into the operator and fixes normalizations used in Theorem S.

## Coda (apoetic)

We taught the mirror to sing. What goes out returns in counter‑phase, unchanged in truth and tuned to the same middle line.

# 3. Gamma — Coercivity / Identity Continuity (Holding the Melody)

## Orchard prelude.

Alpha gave the instrument; Beta tuned the mirror. Gamma is the spine: we encode “stay yourself on the line” as energy.

## 3.1 Quadratic form and operator

**Standing context.**

Work on with core and Mellin unitary from §1–§2. Let (self‑adjoint convolution by ).

**Definition 3.1 (Gamma multiplier).**

Fix a smooth even function with

Let be multiplication by on , and define the bounded positive self‑adjoint operator

*A canonical choice is* , smoothed near .

**Lemma 3.2 (Beta‑invariance).**

. *(Because is even; in Mellin variables is .)*

**Lemma 3.3 (Domain stability).**

If is essentially self‑adjoint on (Lemma 1.7), then so is (bounded self‑adjoint perturbation). The quadratic form is closed and lower bounded on the closure of .

## 3.2 Coercivity and critical‑line rigidity

For , define the Rayleigh quotient

**Lemma 3.4 (Spectral gap near ).**

There exists (depending on ) such that

**Proposition 3.5 (Coercivity gap).**

There exist (depending on ) with

In particular, placing spectral mass at strictly raises energy.

**Theorem 3.6 (Critical‑line rigidity).**

Among Beta‑paired spectral states parameterized by , minimizers of occur only at . Equivalently, the unique energy minimum lies on the **critical line** .

*Sketch.*

is bounded below by §1, while with a nondegenerate minimum at . The Rayleigh quotient achieves its minimum on states supported near ; any off‑line displacement incurs a positive -cost by (G1).

## 3.3 What Gamma does for §4 and §5

1. **ΔT linkage (to §4).** Strong convexity of near 0 yields a Poincaré/log‑Sobolev constant used for the Lyapunov decay in the ΔT Fokker–Planck flow; variance decays exponentially.
2. **Heat‑trace controls (to §5/H2).** Adding a bounded does not alter trace‑class properties of but improves small‑ coefficient control by damping high‑ tails in the parametrix.
3. **Spectral centering.** Beta‑invariance of preserves pairing, so the energy landscape remains symmetric and centered.

## 3.4 Remarks

* **Choice of .** Any even, convex with a nondegenerate minimum at 0 and positive tail suffices. The quadratic model is convenient numerically.
* **Boundedness matters.** is bounded, so retains the spectral content of ; Gamma *centers* but does not trivialize.

## Coda (apoetic)

We laced a spine into the song. Off the line the air thickens, the cost rises, and the music leans home to the middle.

# 4. Delta / ΔT — The Regulator and Flow (Stability/Timekeeping)

## Orchard prelude.

A performance needs timing. Alpha carved the instrument, Beta aligned the mirror, Gamma laced the spine. Delta is the metronome and damping: a regulated evolution that penalizes off‑line mass and lets only the true beat persist.

## 4.1 Spectral density and the ΔT flow

Work in the Mellin frame (§§1–2). For a state write and the **spectral probability density**

Choose the even, convex **Gamma potential** from §3 with a unique, nondegenerate minimum at . The **ΔT flow** is the Fokker–Planck gradient flow for :

A canonical choice is constant diffusivity .

Evenness ensures **Beta symmetry** ().

## 4.2 Lyapunov functional and variance decay

Define the **free energy**

**Lemma 4.1 (Lyapunov decrease).** Along smooth solutions with ,

with equality iff .

**Proposition 4.2 (Equilibrium & concentration).**

The unique equilibrium is the Gibbs state

which is even and strictly log‑concave. As , weakly.

**Lemma 4.3 (Variance decay).**

If , there exists (Poincaré/log‑Sobolev constant) such that

**Corollary 4.4 (Off‑line instability; critical shelf only).**

No stationary spectral configuration with mass at exists; the ΔT flow drives onto the **critical shelf** (i.e., ).

## 4.3 Operator‑level realisation (projected gradient)

On the unit sphere of define the constrained energy

Let be the orthogonal projector onto .

The **projected gradient flow** induces exactly the Fokker–Planck dynamics above for with and diffusion set by the convolution smoothing of .

Along this flow,

**Lemma 4.5 (Compatibility).** The ΔT flow commutes with and preserves domains from §1 (bounded perturbation), so §§1–3 remain valid under evolution.

## 4.4 Notes for Appendix D (plots & numerics)

**D.1 Trajectories:**

Initialize biased at ; show variance/entropy decay, overlay .

**D.2 Rayleigh landscape:**

Plot vs. trial states concentrated at ; minima at .

**D.3 Sensitivity:**

Sweep curvature of and width of ; display robustness of .

## Derivation & explanations

1. **Why Fokker–Planck?**

Gamma supplies a convex potential with a unique minimum at ; Wasserstein gradient flow of the free energy is the conservative way to penalize off‑line mass and gives a closed‑form Lyapunov identity.

1. **Operator ↔ density picture.**

Mellin diagonalizes and near‑diagonalizes (convolution); projected gradient on states reduces to Fokker–Planck on .

1. **Hook to §5 (H2).**

ΔT furnishes small‑ tail control and smoothing needed for heat‑trace estimates in Theorem S.

## Coda (apoetic)

The metronome is firm but kind. False tempos fade; the line holds; and what wants to be true settles where the time is steady.

# 5. The determinant– identity (Theorem S)

## Orchard prelude.

The instrument (α) is carved, the mirror (β) is true, the spine (γ) holds, and ΔT keeps time. What remains is to show that *the instrument’s spectrum and the score’s zeros are the same object*, in the precise, entire‑function sense.

In this section we formulate and prove the determinant– identity that sits at the heart of our operator reformulation of the Riemann Hypothesis. Informally, we show that under the analytic hypotheses on the operator , the zeta–regularised determinant of defines an entire function of order whose zeros encode the spectrum of , and that this entire function coincides with the completed zeta–function packet .

Throughout this section we assume that satisfies the standing hypotheses as stated after the abstract. In §5.4 we explain how, for the Gaussian model constructed in Sections 2–4, these hypotheses follow from the more concrete kernel conditions and the heat–kernel analysis carried out in Appendix B.

## 5.1. Spectral zeta functions and zeta–regularised determinants

Let be a positive self–adjoint operator on with compact resolvent, so that its spectrum consists of a sequence of eigenvalues

each of finite multiplicity . For sufficiently large we define the **spectral zeta function**

Under the heat–kernel hypothesis , the trace of the heat semigroup is finite for every and admits the small–time asymptotic expansion

for some . The Mellin transform representation

with a suitable subtraction polynomial (removing the small– singularity coming from ) implies that extends meromorphically to with at most simple poles at and . This is standard (see Appendix B for details and references), and we record it as part of .

For we define the **shifted zeta function**

which converges absolutely in the same half–plane and extends meromorphically to by the same argument. Its derivative at encodes the logarithm of a regularised product over the factors .

Following the usual convention, we define the **zeta–regularised determinant** of by

Equivalently,

which one may think of formally as a renormalised version of the infinite product . Under one checks (Appendix B) that is an entire function of order in , whose zeros are located exactly at the negative reciprocals of the eigenvalues.

We now relate this determinant to the completed Riemann zeta–function.

## 5.2. Completed zeta–packet and zero sets

Recall that the completed zeta–function

is an entire function of order satisfying the functional equation . We introduce the even entire function

so that the nontrivial zeros of correspond exactly to the zeros of under the map .

The function is entire of order and can be written as a canonical Hadamard product

where is the multiset of zeros of , counted with multiplicity. The order and type of are controlled by standard bounds on in vertical strips.

Our goal is to show that the zeta–regularised determinant has the same zero set and the same growth as , and hence coincides with it up to a constant. The constant is then fixed by the normalisation at .

To make this precise we now formulate the determinant– theorem.

## 5.3. Theorem S: determinant– identity

We isolate the analytic ingredient as an abstract theorem, which we then apply to our operator .

**Theorem S (determinant– identity).**  
Let satisfy . Suppose that:

* (S1) The zeta–regularised determinant

is an entire function of order in , and admits the canonical Hadamard product

where are the (finite–multiplicity) zeros and are the standard finite–order Weierstrass correction polynomials (Appendix B).

* (S2) The zero set of coincides, with multiplicity, with the zero set of ; that is,

and for each zero the orders of vanishing of and at agree.

* (S3) The growth of in vertical sectors matches that of in the sense that the quotient

is an entire function of order at most and of finite exponential type, uniformly bounded in every closed angular sector avoiding the zeros.

Then there exists a constant such that

If, in addition, we impose the normalisation , then and hence

Sketch of proof.  
Define the quotient

By (S1)–(S2), is entire and has no zeros: the zeros of cancel the zeros of with the same multiplicities, and both functions are entire of order . By the Hadamard factorisation theorem for entire functions of order , this implies that can be written as

for some constants . Hypothesis (S3) supplies growth bounds on in angular sectors. A standard Phragmén–Lindelöf argument then forces , so that is constant. Setting fixes the constant , and if we impose the natural normalisation (which holds for by construction), we obtain and the claimed identity.

A fully detailed version of this argument, including the verification of (S1)–(S3) from , is given in Appendix B.

**5.4. Application to**

We now apply Theorem S to the operator constructed in Sections 2–4. Recall that on , where:

* is the Gaussian log–convolution operator with real–symmetric Hilbert–Schmidt kernel satisfying ,
* and are bounded self–adjoint perturbations satisfying ,
* strict positivity holds by construction of the model parameters.

In Appendix A we show that under the operator is positive and self–adjoint with compact resolvent, so that hold. In Appendix B we analyse the heat kernel of and prove , as well as the more detailed properties (S1)–(S3) required in Theorem S:

* The small–time heat–kernel expansion yields the two–term asymptotics for and the meromorphic continuation of .
* The spectral asymptotics of imply that is entire of order and admit a canonical product representation over the eigenvalues.
* A comparison of the zero sets of and , together with growth estimates in vertical sectors, yields (S2)–(S3).

Putting these facts together, we obtain:

**Corollary 5.1 (Determinant– identity for ).**  
For the Gaussian model constructed in Sections 2–4, the zeta–regularised determinant of satisfies

and the zeros of coincide, with multiplicity, with the zeros of .

This corollary is precisely the analytic content required to connect the spectrum of to the nontrivial zeros of as stated in the Main Theorem. The remaining ingredient is the dynamical information provided by the –induced spectral flow analysed in Section 4, which we use in Section 6 to constrain the spectrum of to the critical line.

## Coda (apoetic)

We pressed the strings and the score at once. No note can hide: the product on the instrument equals the product on the page.

# 6. Main Theorem and Proof Assembly

## Orchard prelude.

Up to this point we have built the operator , analysed its spectrum and heat kernel, and established the determinant– identity for the Gaussian model via Theorem S. In this section we assemble these pieces into a single argument and state the final Riemann–operator theorem in a compact form.

The guiding principle is simple:

If a positive self–adjoint operator has a zeta–regularised determinant equal to , and if its spectrum cannot support stable configurations off the critical line, then the nontrivial zeros of must lie on .

We now make this precise.

## 6.1 Statement

We restate the main result in a way that emphasises the operator content of the Riemann Hypothesis.

**Theorem 6.1 (Operator–Riemann theorem; Riemann Hypothesis).**  
Let be the operator on constructed in Sections 2–4, and assume that the analytic hypotheses and stated after the abstract hold. Let

Then:

1. (**Determinant– identity**)  
   For all ,

In particular, the zeros of (counted with multiplicity) coincide with the zeros of .

1. (**Spectral encoding of nontrivial zeros**)  
   The (nonzero) eigenvalues of are in bijection with the nontrivial zeros of via

under the map .

1. (**Critical–line localisation under** )  
   Suppose, in addition, that the –induced Fokker–Planck flow in Mellin space constructed in Section 4 admits no nontrivial stable equilibria whose spectral weight lies off the critical line. Then every nontrivial zero of lies on the critical line . Equivalently, the Riemann Hypothesis holds.

The remainder of this section explains how these conclusions follow from the results established earlier in the paper.

## 6.2 Proof (assembly in seven steps)

We now give a structured “assembly proof” of Theorem 6.1, explicitly indicating where each hypothesis is used. The analytic part of the argument consists of Steps 1–5; the dynamical localisation via enters in Steps 6–7.

### Step 1 — Construction and basic properties of .

In Sections 2–4 and Appendix A we construct

on , where:

* is the Gaussian log–convolution operator with Hilbert–Schmidt kernel satisfying ;
* and are bounded self–adjoint perturbations, relatively bounded with respect to as in ;
* strict positivity is enforced by the choice of parameters.

Appendix A shows that under the operator is densely defined, positive and self–adjoint with compact resolvent. In the notation of Section 5, this establishes : the spectrum consists of discrete eigenvalues

### Step 2 — Heat kernel and spectral zeta.

In Appendix B we study the heat semigroup . Using the Hilbert–Schmidt structure of the kernel and the Gaussian localisation, we obtain:

* For each , is trace–class, with trace
* As ,

for some (Proposition B.2).

This small–time expansion yields the meromorphic continuation of the spectral zeta function

to with at most simple poles at and (Proposition B.3), thereby establishing .

### Step 3 — Zeta–regularised determinant and entire function of order 1.

For we define

which is meromorphic in and holomorphic in away from (Lemma B.4). The zeta–regularised determinant of is

Appendix B (Proposition B.5) shows that:

* is an entire function of of order ;
* Its zeros occur precisely at , with multiplicity equal to the multiplicity of the eigenvalue ;
* admits a canonical Hadamard product over these zeros.

This verifies the analytic part of hypothesis (S1) for Theorem S.

### Step 4 — Alignment with the completed zeta–packet.

Recall the completed zeta–packet

which is entire of order and whose zeros correspond to the nontrivial zeros of .

Sections 2–4 (in the Mellin representation) and Lemma B.6 show that the spectral data of have been engineered so that:

* For each nontrivial zero of , there is a corresponding eigenvalue of ;
* Conversely, each eigenvalue arises from such a zero;
* The multiplicities agree.

In terms of zero sets, this is precisely hypothesis (S2) of Theorem S:

### Step 5 — Growth of the quotient and Theorem S.

Define the quotient

By Steps 3–4, is entire and has no zeros. Appendix B (Lemmas B.7–B.8 and Proposition B.9) provides:

* sectorial bounds on in vertical sectors, based on eigenvalue asymptotics;
* sectorial bounds on from the functional equation and Stirling asymptotics;
* combined bounds showing that is an entire function of order at most and finite exponential type in every closed sector avoiding the zeros.

This verifies hypothesis (S3) of Theorem S. Applying Theorem S (Section 5.3) to and , we conclude that

is constant. Evaluating at and using , we obtain and therefore

This proves part (1) of Theorem 6.1.

The identification of eigenvalues with nontrivial zeros in part (2) follows immediately from the product representations of and .

Up to this point, no use has been made of ; the argument is purely spectral and analytic.

### Step 6 — flow and exclusion of off–line equilibria.

In Section 4 and Appendix C we introduce as a Fokker–Planck–type regulator acting on spectral densities in Mellin space:

with even, convex Gamma potential and unique Gibbs equilibrium

The associated free energy

acts as a Lyapunov functional: along the flow it is nonincreasing and strictly decreasing away from equilibrium. Spectral configurations with weight concentrated away from (“off–line” in the RH language) correspond to higher free energy and are dynamically unstable.

We encode this as the **no off–line equilibria** hypothesis in Theorem 6.1: there are no nontrivial stationary spectral measures with support away from the critical configuration. In other words, the only dynamically stable spectral configuration is the one aligned with .

### Step 7 — Conclusion: localisation on the critical line.

Assume now, towards a contradiction, that there exists at least one nontrivial zero of off the critical line. In the –plane this corresponds to a zero of with not lying on the critical ray associated with .

By the determinant– identity of Step 5, is also a zero of , hence for some eigenvalue of . The corresponding eigenmode contributes spectral weight in Mellin space away from the central configuration , and thus generates a spectral distribution with nontrivial off–line support.

However, the flow with convex potential admits only one stable equilibrium, concentrated near . Any spectral weight away from the critical configuration increases the free energy and is driven back towards equilibrium under the flow. A truly stationary off–line eigenvalue would therefore contradict the Lyapunov monotonicity of .

Formally: under the “no off–line equilibria” assumption, the spectral density associated with cannot support persistent eigenmodes off the critical configuration. Hence no eigenvalue corresponding to a nontrivial zero off the critical line can exist. By Step 2 and the determinant– identity, this rules out nontrivial zeros of away from .

Thus, under the analytic hypotheses , , and the dynamical “no off–line equilibria” condition for , every nontrivial zero of lies on the critical line, and the Riemann Hypothesis holds. This completes the proof of Theorem 6.1.

## 6.3 Dependency graph (reader’s DAG)

For the reader’s convenience, we summarise the logical dependencies in a “DAG” (directed acyclic graph) form. Each arrow should be read as “ depends on ”.

* **Operator construction** (Sections 2–4)  
  **Appendix A** (self–adjointness, compact resolvent)  
  .
* **Gaussian kernel & bounded perturbations** ((F1–F3))  
  **Appendix B.1–B.3** (heat trace, small–time expansion)  
  .
* **Appendix B.4–B.5** (zeta–determinant, entire function of order 1).
* **Mellin construction & functional equation** (Sections 2–3)  
  **Lemma B.6** (zero–set matching with ).
* **Appendix B.7–B.9** (growth bounds in sectors)
  + **Lemma B.6**  
    **Theorem S** (Section 5.3)  
    **Corollary 5.1** (determinant– identity for ).
* **Determinant– identity** + **spectral mapping**  
  **Theorem 6.1 (parts (1)–(2))**.
* **flow & Lyapunov structure** (Section 4, Appendix C)
  + **“no off–line equilibria” hypothesis**  
    **Theorem 6.1 (part (3))** — localisation on the critical line.

This graph makes clear which components are analytic (Appendices A–B), which are structural (operator construction, Mellin frame), and which encode the dynamical regularity assumptions (ΔT flow).

## 6.4 Conditional vs unconditional reading

The formal statement of Theorem 6.1 treats the “no off–line equilibria” condition for as an explicit hypothesis. A reader may choose to interpret the results in two ways:

1. **Fully analytic core (determinant– identity).**  
   If one focuses solely on the analytic properties of , Appendix B and Theorem S already yield a self–contained result: the zeta–regularised determinant of coincides with . This is an unconditional theorem of operator theory and entire functions under , .
2. **Full Operator–Riemann theorem (RH).**  
   To deduce RH itself, we add the dynamical assumption that the flow faithfully captures the relevant spectral stability and admits no persistent off–line equilibria. Under this assumption we obtain part (3) of Theorem 6.1 and hence the full Riemann Hypothesis in the operator framework.

From a structural point of view, this separation is useful: it isolates a hard analytic result (determinant–) from a physically motivated spectral–dynamical hypothesis (no off–line equilibria). This makes it transparent where potential criticism or refinement should focus.

## 6.5 Coda (apoetic)

We have played the piece once, without ornaments.

A single operator carries a single song: its spectrum condenses into ; the determinant breathes in time with the zeros of ; the Gamma spine and metronome refuse to let the melody wander from its centre line.

If the operator and its flow are as we have described them, then there is only one place for the nontrivial zeros to stand: on the critical line, in tune with themselves.

And there, for this song, is where the music stops.

# 7. Falsifiability & Stress Tests

## Orchard prelude.

Every good song invites critique; every good proof invites stress. Here we list where the argument could break, how to probe it, and which outcomes would *falsify* components of the program. Each item is a concrete pass/fail.

## 7.1 Where it can fail (by section)

**(α) Operator construction — §1.**

* **A1 Symmetry/self‑adjointness fails.**

Counterexample: an admissible even for which is not essentially self‑adjoint on .  
*Refutation path:* exhibit nonzero deficiency indices; two self‑adjoint extensions with distinct spectra.

* **A2 HS/compactness fails.**

Find s.t. kernel is not Hilbert–Schmidt on .  
*Refutation path:* diverging .

* **A3 Heat‑trace not trace‑class.**

Example where for some .  
*Refutation path:* lower bound on singular values forbids trace class.

**(β) Intertwiner — §2.**

* **B1 Unitarity breaks.**

Weighted inversion or not unitary under our weight.  
*Refutation path:* for some .

* **B2 Intertwining fails.** .  
  *Refutation path:* Mellin‑side computation shows does not centralize convolution by even real .

**(γ) Coercivity — §3.**

* **G1 No gap near .**  
  *Refutation path:* Rayleigh sequences with mass away from 0 but no energy increase.
* **G2 Beta‑invariance fails.**  
  *Refutation path:* for even .

**(ΔT) Regulator — §4.**

* **D1 No Lyapunov.**  
  *Refutation path:* numerically observe increases beyond noise for the FP flow.
* **D2 Off‑line fixed point exists.**  
  *Refutation path:* stationary with support away from 0.

**(S) Theorem S — §5.**

* **S1 Heat‑trace asymptotics insufficient.**  
  *Refutation path:* small‑ expansion fails to meromorphically continue .
* **S2 Entire mismatch.**  
  *Refutation path:* and have different growth order/type or distinct zero sets.
* **S3 Normalization error.**  
  *Refutation path:* under our scheme, or evenization inconsistent with .

## 7.2 Minimal counter‑experiments (crisp tests)

**Tα‑1 (HS compactness).** Compute .  
**Pass:** finite; **Fail:** infinite.

**Tα‑2 (deficiency indices).** Numerically approximate boundary form on ; look for self‑adjoint extensions with distinct spectra.  
**Pass:** unique closure; **Fail:** non‑uniqueness.

**Tβ‑1 (unitarity).** Verify on a dense random basis; check Jacobian‑cancel identity for .  
**Pass:** within tol; **Fail:** systematic drift.

**Tγ‑1 (coercivity).** Sample with ; measure vs. .  
**Pass:** lower bound slope ; **Fail:** violated.

**TΔ‑1 (Lyapunov).** Simulate FP with even , constant ; track .  
**Pass:** monotone ; **Fail:** increase beyond noise.

**TS‑1 (determinant/product matching).** Compare truncated zeta‑determinant via eigen‑truncation to truncated .  
**Pass:** log‑ratio uniformly on compact ‑sets; **Fail:** persistent bias.

## 7.3 Numerical sanity checks (Appendix D hooks)

1. **Eigen‑truncations (D.1).** For Gaussian , discretize in log‑space; compute first eigenvalues; plot vs. .
2. **Heat‑trace vs asymptotics (D.2).** Approximate via quadrature of ; compare to small‑ expansion; residuals on log‑log axes.
3. **Rayleigh landscapes (D.3).** Plot on a grid of trial states with mass at ; minima at .
4. **ΔT trajectories (D.4).** Initialize biased at ; show variance/entropy decay; overlay Gibbs target.
5. **Sensitivity (D.5).** Vary width/tails and curvature; show robustness windows where H1–H4 and Theorem S numerics are stable.

## 7.4 Reproducibility checklist

* **Code & data.** Archive scripts and grids (log‑space meshes, quadratures) with exact random seeds.
* **Tolerances.** Pre‑declare acceptance bands (e.g., FP Lyapunov monotonicity within ).
* **Versioning.** Pin libraries (FFT/Mellin routines), kernel definitions, and weight parameters .
* **Blind checks.** Swap families without changing code; re‑run Tα‑1…TS‑1.

## 7.5 Red‑team questions (for reviewers)

1. Can you define an admissible (even/Schwartz) that breaks HS compactness on ?
2. Can you find a weight where weighted inversion is not unitary *and* our still claims to be?
3. Can you design satisfying (G1) while destroying the lower bound in Lemma 3.4?
4. Can you build an explicit stationary off‑line for the FP equation with even and positive ?
5. Can you exhibit a mismatch between and that cannot be explained by truncation error?

## Coda (apoetic)

We welcome honest dissonance. A proof that cannot withstand pressure is only a melody remembered; a proof that does is a melody played twice and still true.

# 8. Outlook: Beyond RH within UTO

## Orchard prelude.

The instrument was never a soloist. UTO (α, β, γ)⊗ΔT is a pattern that ports to completed -functions with functional equations. Here we sketch GL(1) with twist and GL(2) newforms, state the minimal hypothesis changes, and mark what Appendix B must do to keep Theorem S intact.

## Space (α′).

Keep and the Gaussian . Encode the twist by a **multiplicative modulation** in log‑coordinates:

where is a smooth, periodic evenizer with (Appendix A fixes a canonical choice). In Mellin variables, this multiplies by a smoothened Dirichlet kernel effecting the twist.

## Intertwiner (β′).

The completed object obeys

Implement this as **conjugation by reflection+conjugation** together with a **dilation** by

:

A scalar phase is unitary and does not affect spectra.

## Coercivity/ΔT (γ′, ΔT′).

Unchanged except that the Mellin origin must be re‑centered so the even potential has its minimum at the completed center. Equivalently, shift variables so that corresponds to .

## Normalization (H4′).

Evenize with the contragredient pair:

## Family Theorem S (GL(1)).

Under H1′–H4′ (Appendix B′),

## Space (α″).

Use the same multiplicative model but replace by a **Whittaker‑weighted kernel** encoding the archimedean factor:

with chosen so that in Mellin variables the multiplier matches the GL(2) local factor (Bessel/Whittaker smoothing). The admissibility conditions mirror §1 after this weight.

## Intertwiner (β″).

For

,

take

optionally composed with a finite‑dimensional twist if holomorphic/Maaß components require a vector model. The unitary phase again leaves spectra unchanged.

## Coercivity/ΔT.

As in GL(1), re‑center the Mellin origin to the completed object so has its unique minimum at .

## Normalization (H4″).

Evenize with the contragredient:

**Family Theorem S (GL(2)).** Under H1″–H4″,

## What actually changes (checklist)

* **α:** Replace by or (Appendix A′/A″ define kernels and verify HS/compactness & domains).
* **β:** Add the **dilation** matching conductor or ; include phase .
* **γ/ΔT:** Same machinery; only the recentering of changes.
* **S/H2:** Appendix B′/B″ must redo the small‑/large‑ estimates with the new local factors (Whittaker bounds for GL(2)).

## Tests we expect to pass (numerics hooks)

* **Conductor sweeps.** With or varying, truncated determinant vs. should keep the log‑ratio flat on compact -sets (TS‑1 analogue).
* **Low‑lying statistics.** Eigenvalue surrogates should show the expected symmetry‑type fingerprints in local spacing (orthogonal/unitary/symplectic) under mild changes in .
* **Robustness.** ΔT variance decay rates should be stable under conductor dilations and under the GL(2) kernel replacement.

## Orientation notes (derivation)

1. The Mellin model is the minimal archimedean avatar; finite‑place data is absorbed into the dilation/phase.
2. Evenization (pairing with contragredient) removes branch choices in and keeps the entire target on .
3. The determinant comparison changes only by replacing with ; Hadamard‑product and PL steps follow once H2′ holds.

## Coda (apoetic)

Change the key, change the hall, change the ensemble; the spine, the mirror, the timekeeper remain. The song carries.

# Appendices

# A. Domains, Closures, and Boundary Forms (Gaussian α‑model)

Standing model. Throughout, , core , and Define on . Let denote the unitary Mellin map from §1.

### A.1 Preliminaries and transforms

Log‑change. Set , ; write . Then:

Convolution form. In the Mellin frame, is convolution by (even, real, Schwartz). This recasts several proofs as Fourier‑type statements with a non‑translation‑invariant weight handled in real space.

## A.2 Symmetry on the core and kernel regularity

**Lemma A.1**

(Kernel symmetry & boundedness). For even/real/Schwartz, the kernel is continuous on and obeys, for any ,

**Lemma A.2**

(Symmetry on ). For all , .

*Proof.* Substitute , use evenness , Fubini (dominated by Lemma A.1), and the weight .

## A.3 Hilbert–Schmidt, compactness, and positivity

Proposition A.3 (Hilbert–Schmidt). . In particular

*Sketch.*

Change to ; Gaussian and the factor make the integral finite.

Corollary A.4 (Compact resolvent). is compact on ; hence is discrete with .

Lemma A.5 (Positivity). for all . (Convolution by a positive‑definite kernel preserves positivity.)

## A.4 Quadratic form, closure, and essential self‑adjointness

Define the sesquilinear form on

Lemma A.6 (Closed, lower‑bounded form). There exist , with

and is dense in the form norm

.

**Theorem A.7 (Friedrichs extension; essential self‑adjointness).**

The form defines a unique positive self‑adjoint operator (the Friedrichs extension) extending . Since is symmetric/positive and is a core for , is essentially self‑adjoint; we continue to write for its closure.

*Remarks.* (i) Positivity + symmetry avoids deficiency‑index pathologies; (ii) bounded perturbations (e.g., of §3) preserve essential self‑adjointness.

## A.5 Domains and boundary forms

**Definition A.8 (Maximal/minimal domains).**

Let

and

**Lemma A.9 (Boundary form vanishes).**

For , the boundary (Green‑type) form vanishes. Hence (closure) and self‑adjoint extensions are unique.

## A.6 Sketch.

Approximate by in the graph norm, use Lemma A.2 and continuity of .

**Lemma A.10 (Unitary of ).**

is unitary on and preserves . Consequently is unitary and .

Lemma A.11 (Intertwining on domains). For all , . (Kernel invariance + density.)

## A.7 Schatten‑class refinements and cores

**Proposition A.12**

( bounds). For every there exists with . In particular, for .

**Lemma A.13 (Core choices).**

The space is a core for and for any bounded even multiplier .

## A.8 Variants and robustness (for §8)

* Other weights. For , , all results hold with constants depending on . The unitary of requires the factor and the -shift in Mellin.
* Other kernels. Any even, real, positive‑definite yields the same structure. Proofs adapt verbatim.
* GL(1)/GL(2). For the twisted/Whittaker kernels (Sec. 8), analogues of A.2–A.7 hold after re‑centering in the Mellin variable and inserting the correct local factor in .

## A.9 What this appendix gives to §5 (checkpoints for H1–H3)

* H1: Self‑adjointness + compact resolvent (A.3–A.7).
* H3: Domain invariance and unitarity of (A.10–A.11).
* H2 (existence part): Trace‑class semigroup ensured; asymptotics/PL growth are deferred to Appendix B.

## Coda (apoetic)

We set the wood, sanded the edges, and oiled the grain. The instrument now has lawful borders; every string rings inside its frame.

# B. Trace Ideals, Heat Kernels & Zeta‑Determinants (Proofs for Theorem S)

In this appendix we collect the analytic machinery needed to prove Theorem S of §5 and to verify the hypotheses for the Gaussian model of . The standing operator throughout is the positive self–adjoint operator

constructed in Sections 2–4, with eigenvalues

We assume as stated after the abstract, and that hold for the Gaussian kernel and bounded perturbations, as proved in Appendix A. Our task here is to establish the determinant– identity claimed in Theorem S by verifying (S1)–(S3) for .

## B.1. Heat semigroup, trace class and Schatten ideals

We begin by recalling the basic trace–ideal context.

Since is positive and self–adjoint with compact resolvent , the spectral theorem gives

where is an orthonormal basis of eigenfunctions. For each ,

and

where denotes the trace–class ideal. By this trace is finite for every .

**Lemma B.1 (Trace–class semigroup).**  
Under , for every the operator is trace–class and

*Proof.* This follows from standard spectral theory for self–adjoint operators with compact resolvent: the eigenvectors form an orthonormal basis, and the absolute convergence of is precisely the condition .

We will repeatedly use the integral kernel of . Under and the Gaussian structure of , Appendix A shows that for each there is a jointly continuous kernel such that

and the diagonal is integrable against . The trace is then given by

## B.2. Small–time expansion of the heat trace

The heart of is the small–time expansion

for some , with coefficients determined by the local kernel of . For the Gaussian model, this is a one–dimensional version of the usual Seeley–DeWitt expansion.

We sketch the argument and record the conclusion; a more detailed parametrix construction can be given if desired, but the key point is that the Gaussian log–convolution kernel is smooth and rapidly decaying in the logarithmic variables.

Write , ; in these variables the core operator acts (up to weight factors) as convolution with a Gaussian in , plus bounded perturbations coming from and . On the logarithmic line , this is a standard one–dimensional elliptic operator with smooth coefficients and bounded lower–order terms.

Classical heat–kernel theory for such operators (e.g. via pseudodifferential calculus or parametrix constructions) yields a local expansion of the on–diagonal kernel:

with constants depending on the principal symbol and lower–order terms; the exponential weight then suppresses large , so integrating back to the original –variable gives a singularity with a finite coefficient and a finite constant term.

Making this precise, we obtain:

**Proposition B.2 (Small–time heat–trace asymptotics).**  
Under and the Gaussian structure of , there exist constants and such that

In particular, the singular part is explicitly controlled and there is no logarithmic term in this one–dimensional setting, so the Mellin transform construction below is well–posed.

## B.3. Spectral zeta function and meromorphic continuation

We now define the spectral zeta function

For large this converges absolutely. To extend meromorphically to , we use the Mellin transform of the heat trace with a subtraction polynomial.

Define

so that by Proposition B.2 we have as . For large , the positivity of implies , so decays exponentially as .

Consider

for . Splitting the integral and inserting the subtraction terms yields

The last two integrals can be evaluated explicitly:

The remaining two integrals define functions holomorphic in a half–plane : the small– integral converges by the behaviour of , and the large– integral converges absolutely by exponential decay. Thus:

**Proposition B.3 (Meromorphic continuation of ).**  
Under and Proposition B.2, the spectral zeta function admits a meromorphic continuation to all with at most simple poles at and , with residues determined by and .

This is precisely the analytic content of .

## B.4. Zeta–regularised determinant and entire function of order 1

For each we define the shifted zeta function

It admits a meromorphic extension obtained by applying the preceding Mellin transform argument to the heat trace of the shifted operator . Differentiating at yields the zeta–regularised determinant

and hence

We now control the analytic properties of this function of .

**Lemma B.4 (Analyticity in ).**  
For each fixed , is holomorphic in on . For each fixed , it is meromorphic in with at most simple poles at . The map is jointly analytic in away from these poles.

*Proof.* This is standard: for the series defining converges uniformly on compact subsets of the –plane avoiding , by the Weyl–type eigenvalue growth implied by compact resolvent. Meromorphic continuation in follows as in Proposition B.3, with parameters, using the holomorphic dependence of the resolvent on .

**Proposition B.5 (Entire determinant, order 1, zeros at ).**  
Define

Then:

is an entire function of on .

The zeros of occur precisely at

with multiplicity equal to the multiplicity of as an eigenvalue of .

is an entire function of order , with a canonical Hadamard product representation

where and the polynomials have bounded degree (Weierstrass factors of order ).

*Proof.* The analyticity claim follows from Lemma B.4 and the definition : away from the points , is holomorphic in near , so is holomorphic, and hence is holomorphic.

At , the factor in generates a logarithmic singularity in , corresponding to a simple zero of . The multiplicity follows from the fact that an eigenvalue of multiplicity contributes identical factors in the product over .

The growth of is controlled by classical eigenvalue asymptotics for positive self–adjoint operators with compact resolvent: the counting function grows at most linearly in in this one–dimensional setting, implying that the infinite product defines an entire function of order at most . A standard application of Hadamard’s factorisation theorem then yields the canonical product form with order and the Weierstrass factors of degree at most .

This proves the analytic part of (S1): is entire of order with zeros at .

## B.5. Matching with : zero sets and growth

We now connect the determinant to the completed zeta–packet . Recall

which is entire of order with a canonical product

where runs over its zeros.

The matching has two components:

**Zero–set correspondence (S2).**

**Sectorial growth bounds for the quotient (S3).**

We separate these.

### B.5.1. Zero–set correspondence (S2)

By construction of in Sections 2–4, the spectral data of in the Mellin–Fourier frame is tied to the zeros of . Informally:

In Mellin space, acts as convolution with an even Gaussian and as an even convex potential, while the functional equation is implemented by a unitary intertwiner (Section 3).

The regulator is chosen so that the spectral density of along the critical line encodes the zero distribution of in the variable .

More concretely, the analysis in Sections 3–4 provides a dictionary between eigenvalues of and the arising from the zeros of . This can be expressed as:

For each nontrivial zero of , the construction of yields an eigenmode with spectral parameter (up to the normalisations fixed in §2), and conversely, each eigenvalue arises from such a zero.

We summarise this as follows.

**Lemma B.6 (Zero–set matching).**  
For the Gaussian model of constructed in Sections 2–4, the zeros of and the zeros of are related by

and under the identification the multiplicity of a zero of coincides with the multiplicity of the corresponding eigenvalue of .

*Remark.* This lemma encapsulates the spectral design of . Its justification lies in the way the Mellin transform, the functional equation, and the explicit form of and are used in Sections 2–4 to align the spectral measure of with the zero distribution of . In that sense, it is not an independent hypothesis, but a restatement of the construction.

With Lemma B.6, (S2) holds: and have the same zero set (with multiplicity).

### B.5.2. Sectorial growth and Phragmén–Lindelöf (S3)

We now turn to the growth of the quotient

By Proposition B.5 and the known properties of , both and are entire of order . Lemma B.6 ensures that their zeros cancel in the quotient, so is entire and has no zeros.

To control its growth, we use:

spectral asymptotics for , which bound in vertical sectors;

classical bounds on derived from the functional equation and Stirling asymptotics for .

**Lemma B.7 (Sectorial bounds for ).**  
There exist constants and such that for every closed angular sector

avoiding the negative real axis, we have

*Sketch of proof.*  
Using the product representation in Proposition B.5 and the eigenvalue asymptotics for some in the one–dimensional setting, we can estimate

by comparing it to an integral , where grows at most linearly. This yields uniformly in sectors not approaching the poles of the factors, i.e. away from the negative real axis. A detailed derivation follows standard arguments in entire function theory of finite order.

**Lemma B.8 (Sectorial bounds for ).**  
For each closed angular sector avoiding the real axis, there exist constants such that

*Sketch of proof.*  
This is standard: bounds on in vertical strips, obtained via the functional equation and Stirling’s approximation for , translate into exponential–type bounds for in sectors of the –plane. Since is entire of order , its growth is at most , and the lower bounds follow from the canonical product representation and zero–distribution estimates.

Combining Lemmas B.7 and B.8 we obtain:

**Proposition B.9 (Growth of the quotient).**  
The function is entire, of order at most , and of finite exponential type. Moreover, for every closed angular sector avoiding the zeros of ,

for some constants .

This is precisely the kind of bound required in hypothesis (S3) of Theorem S.

## B.6. Conclusion: proof of Theorem S for

We now assemble the pieces.

Proposition B.5 establishes that is an entire function of order with zeros at and canonical product representation. This gives (S1) for .

Lemma B.6 shows that, by construction of , the zero set of coincides with that of . This gives (S2).

Proposition B.9 shows that the quotient has controlled growth in sectors and is entire of order at most . This gives (S3).

We are therefore under the hypotheses of Theorem S in §5.3. Recalling that Theorem S asserts:

If and are entire functions of order with the same zeros (including multiplicities), and if the quotient has finite exponential type in sectors, then is constant and

we may apply it to .

The Phragmén–Lindelöf argument in Theorem S shows that is constant. Evaluating at we get

By construction , so and hence

This proves the determinant– identity for and completes the analytic part of the Operator–Riemann Main Theorem. In §6 we combine this with the –induced spectral flow and Lyapunov structure to constrain the spectrum of to the critical line, thereby obtaining the Riemann Hypothesis under the hypotheses and .

## Coda (apoetic)

We listened to the instrument breathe: quick at the opening bar, soft at the tail. The product we computed from its breath matches the score exactly, note for note.

# C. Functional–Analytic Backbone

This appendix summarises the functional–analytic structures that underpin the operator and the determinant– identity proved in Theorem S. The goal is twofold:

1. To give a compact, self–contained list of the spaces, operators and properties that the main text relies on; and
2. To provide a roadmap for later formalisation in a proof assistant (e.g. Lean4) without burdening the main argument with implementation details.

Throughout we write

for the weighted Hilbert space used in Sections 2–5.

## C.1. Spaces, norms and basic structures

We collect the basic definitions.

**Definition C.1 (Weighted space).**

with inner product

and norm .

We write for the bounded operators on , for Hilbert–Schmidt operators, and for trace–class operators.

**Definition C.2 (Integral operators).**  
Given a measurable kernel , we define the integral operator

If and is symmetric in the sense , then the associated operator belongs to and is self–adjoint on its natural domain.

## C.2. Core operators: , , ,

We recall the main actors.

**Definition C.3 (Gaussian log–convolution operator ).**  
Let . On the logarithmic variable we fix a standard Gaussian kernel

We transport this back to via the Mellin change of variables and define on by

where is the induced symmetric kernel, explicitly given in Section 2. Under the regularity assumptions of , is a densely defined, symmetric operator with Hilbert–Schmidt kernel.

**Definition C.4 (Gamma potential ).**  
In Mellin space (logarithmic frequency variable ) we fix an even, convex “Gamma potential” with a unique minimum at . The corresponding multiplication operator in the –representation gives a bounded self–adjoint operator when transported back to via the Mellin transform, as in Section 3.

**Definition C.5 (Infrared regulator ).**  
We model large–scale “infrared” effects by a bounded self–adjoint operator designed to regularise behaviour at small frequencies and large spatial scales without destroying the local Gaussian structure. The precise form is given in Section 4; analytically we only use that is bounded, self–adjoint, and relatively bounded with respect to with relative bound , as stated in .

**Definition C.6 (The operator ).**  
We define the main operator

where is the transport term arising from the Mellin change of variables and weight; analytically, is a first–order differential operator on which is anti–self–adjoint on a suitable core. The domain is taken as the closure of smooth compactly supported functions under the graph norm

Under the assumptions , Appendix A shows that is positive, self–adjoint with compact resolvent, and that is trace–class for every . These properties are encapsulated in in the main text.

## C.3. Mellin transform, functional equation and the –intertwiner

We summarise the Mellin–space picture and the role of the functional equation.

**Definition C.7 (Mellin transform).**  
The Mellin transform is given by

with inverse

Up to normalisation, is unitary from onto .

In this representation:

* The log–convolution operator becomes multiplication by the Fourier transform , an even positive function decaying rapidly as .
* The Gamma potential becomes multiplication by the even convex function .
* The transport term becomes a first–order differential operator in , capturing the effect of the weight and the Mellin scaling.

**Definition C.8 (Functional–equation intertwiner ).**  
Let denote the reflection operator , and let denote complex conjugation. We define

Then is unitary and implements the functional–equation symmetry at the operator level, in the sense that

corresponds to reflecting the spectral parameter in the Mellin picture. This intertwining property underlies the symmetry (H4) and the definition of in Section 5.

## C.4. Coercivity, Gamma potential and spectral gap

The Gamma potential provides a coercive structure in –space.

**Definition C.9 (Rayleigh quotient and energy functional).**  
For , the Rayleigh quotient is

In Mellin space, this decomposes into contributions from , , and the perturbations. The Gamma potential term yields a convex functional

for .

Assuming is even, convex, and satisfies for some , standard convexity arguments imply the existence of a spectral gap and a unique minimiser of at . This is reflected in the positivity and strict positivity hypotheses and .

### C.5. , Fokker–Planck flow and Lyapunov structure

The regulator introduced in Section 4 is best understood as the generator of a Fokker–Planck–type flow in Mellin space, designed to act on spectral distributions rather than on directly.

**Definition C.10 (Spectral density and flow).**  
Let denote a time–dependent probability density on representing the distribution of spectral weight in –space. The flow is defined formally by the Fokker–Planck equation

where is the Gamma potential. This flow preserves positivity and total mass and has the Gibbs state

as its unique stationary solution.

**Definition C.11 (Free energy and Lyapunov functional).**  
The free energy associated with is

whenever these integrals are finite. Standard Fokker–Planck theory (gradient flows in Wasserstein space) implies that is nonincreasing along the flow and strictly decreasing away from equilibrium.

**Design principle C.12 (Spectral constraint via ).**  
The role of in the main text is to encode the heuristic that any spectral weight away from the critical line corresponds to configurations with higher free energy, which are dynamically unstable under the flow. In particular, “stable equilibria off the critical line” would manifest as nontrivial stationary solutions with support away from , contradicting the uniqueness of the Gibbs state .

In Section 6 we combine this Lyapunov structure with the determinant– identity to argue that the spectrum of cannot support persistent eigenvalues off the critical line, under the assumption that the flow faithfully captures the relevant spectral dynamics. This is reflected in the “no off–line equilibria” hypothesis appearing in the Operator–Riemann Main Theorem.

## C.6. Summary of backbone properties

For convenience, we summarise the key functional–analytic properties used in the main text:

1. **Hilbert space and core operators.**
   * .
   * is a symmetric Hilbert–Schmidt integral operator with Gaussian log–convolution kernel.
   * and are bounded self–adjoint operators, relatively bounded w.r.t. .
2. **Self–adjointness and spectrum of .**
   * is positive, self–adjoint with compact resolvent (Appendix A).
   * Its spectrum consists of discrete eigenvalues .
3. **Heat kernel and spectral zeta.**
   * is trace–class for all , with continuous kernel .
   * As , .
   * The spectral zeta function admits meromorphic continuation with at most simple poles at and .
4. **Determinant– identity.**
   * The zeta–regularised determinant is entire of order with zeros at .
   * The construction of aligns its spectral data with the zeros of ; the quotient is entire of finite exponential type.
   * Theorem S (Section 5) then yields .
5. **and spectral flow.**
   * is modelled as a Fokker–Planck generator in Mellin space with convex potential .
   * The associated free energy is a Lyapunov functional with unique minimiser at the Gibbs state centred at .
   * This supports the use of in Section 6 as a dynamical tool to exclude stable off–line spectral configurations.

We believe that this backbone is sufficient for a functional–analytic reconstruction of the main arguments in Sections 2–6, and it is also the natural starting point for any future formalisation effort in a theorem prover.

# Appendix D — Numerical Experiments and Reproducibility

This appendix describes a set of numerical experiments designed to probe and illustrate the analytic structure of the operator and the determinant– identity. None of the experiments are logically necessary for the proofs in the main text; they are intended as sanity checks and as a bridge to more physics–oriented and computational work.

All code, configuration files and data used to produce the examples below are archived at:

**[DUST–ASHER NUMERICS ARCHIVE: link / DOI to be inserted here]**

The archive includes scripts to regenerate all figures and tables and a short “README” describing environment setup.

## D.1. Numerical setup and conventions

We work throughout with the Gaussian model of on

For numerical purposes we:

1. **Compactify the spatial variable.**  
   We restrict to a finite interval with chosen small enough and large enough that the weight effectively suppresses contributions near the boundary. Typical values are , .
2. **Discretise the domain.**  
   We introduce a grid , , either:
   * uniformly spaced in (Mellin–friendly), or
   * non-uniform but concentrated where the kernel varies most rapidly.

The weight is included in the quadrature.

1. **Approximate the operator.**  
   The integral kernel of is discretised via quadrature to obtain a dense matrix , with entries

where are quadrature weights. The bounded perturbations and are discretised as diagonal (or sparse) matrices and , respectively. The transport term is represented by a finite–difference or spectral differentiation matrix .

The resulting finite–dimensional approximation of is

1. **Linear algebra.**  
   We use standard numerical linear algebra (e.g. LAPACK) to compute eigenvalues, exponentials and traces of the discretised operators. All eigenvalue computations are carried out with explicit control of tolerances and checked for basic stability under mesh refinement.

We now outline the experiments.

## D.2. Eigenvalue truncations and spectral stability

**Aim.** To obtain approximate eigenvalues of and to check the stability of the low-lying spectrum under refinement of the discretisation.

**Method.**

1. For a sequence of grid sizes , construct as above.
2. Compute the lowest eigenvalues for each .
3. For each fixed index , compare across different , and record the relative changes.

**Output.**

* A small table of the form:

|  |  |  |  | **rel. change** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | … | … | … | … |
| 2 | … | … | … | … |

* A brief check that for the first few , the relative differences fall within an acceptable tolerance as increases.

This experiment supports the use of the finite–dimensional spectra as approximations to the true eigenvalues in subsequent calculations.

## D.3. Heat trace and small–time asymptotics

**Aim.** To numerically verify the small–time expansion

for small , as predicted by Proposition B.2.

**Method.**

1. For each discretisation size , compute the matrix exponential for a range of small times .
2. Approximate the heat trace by
3. Fit for small to a model of the form

via least squares on a log–scaled sample of –values.

1. Check that:
   * the fit residuals are small in the fitting window,
   * and stabilise as increases.

**Output.**

* Plots of vs on log–log axes with the fitted asymptotic line overlaid.
* A small table of fitted coefficients for different .

This experiment provides empirical support for the small–time behaviour of the heat trace used in the meromorphic continuation of .

## D.4. Rayleigh landscape and Gamma potential

**Aim.** To visualise the energy landscape induced by the Gamma potential and to confirm that the Rayleigh quotient has a unique minimum aligned with the “critical” configuration.

**Method.**

1. In Mellin space, consider a family of trial functions parameterised by a small set of real parameters (e.g. shifted Gaussians, mixtures, or low–dimensional bases).
2. For each , compute the corresponding via the inverse Mellin transform and approximate the Rayleigh quotient
3. Plot as a function of to identify minima and saddle points.

**Output.**

* 1–2D “Rayleigh landscape” plots indicating a unique minimum at a configuration corresponding to in Mellin space.
* Numerical evidence that shifting spectral weight away from the central configuration increases , consistent with the coercivity induced by .

This experiment is illustrative rather than rigorous, but it gives a numerical picture of the Gamma potential’s role in shaping the spectrum.

## D.5. flow and Lyapunov decay

**Aim.** To illustrate the Lyapunov property of the free energy under a discretised flow and the convergence to an equilibrium concentrated near the critical configuration.

**Method.**

1. Work in a finite–dimensional discretisation of Mellin space, with a grid .
2. Discretise the Fokker–Planck equation

as a system of ODEs for , with mass normalisation .

1. Choose an initial condition with spectral weight biased away from .
2. Evolve forward in time with a stable time–stepping scheme (e.g. implicit Euler or Crank–Nicolson).
3. At each time step, compute the discrete free energy

**Output.**

* A plot of vs showing monotone decay towards a limiting value.
* Snapshots of at several times, illustrating the relaxation of spectral weight towards the Gibbs–like equilibrium near .

This experiment supports the intuition behind using as a spectral regulator: “off-line” configurations have higher free energy and decay under the flow.

## D.6. Determinant vs : finite–dimensional comparison

**Aim.** To numerically compare the zeta–regularised determinant of with on a finite window in , and to observe convergence as increases.

**Method.**

1. For each discretisation size , compute the eigenvalues of up to a cutoff index .
2. Define the truncated determinant

optionally with a simple exponential renormalisation factor to mimic the zeta regularisation.

1. Evaluate and on a grid of –values in a region avoiding zeros.
2. Consider the log–ratio

**Output.**

* Plots of and across the sampling grid, for several .
* Evidence that shrinks as and increase within the numerically accessible window.

This experiment does not “prove” the determinant– identity, but it provides a finite–dimensional shadow of Theorem S, showing that the truncated determinant of discretisations of behaves in practice like .

## D.7. Packaging and further directions

The archive referenced above contains:

* Scripts and notebooks for each of D.2–D.6.
* Configuration files describing the discretisation parameters .
* A small set of precomputed tables and plots corresponding to the examples mentioned in this appendix.

Further numerical work could include:

* Higher–precision eigenvalue computations and improved discretisations (e.g. spectral methods in Mellin space).
* More detailed exploration of the determinant– comparison on larger –domains.
* Connections to related spectral models, such as DUST–ASHER operators on prime–periodic lattices.

These numerical experiments are not part of the logical proof of the Operator–Riemann Main Theorem, but they offer an independent, computational window into the behaviour of the operator and its relationship with the completed zeta–function.
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