Abstract

In this paper we will try to find a solution for the Riemann Zeta function for odd integers.

We will start with \( \zeta(3) \) (the Riemann Zeta function with \( s=3 \)) emulating the “Basel problem”. But instead of using a sine or cosine function, using functions similar to these:

\[
\begin{align*}
    f_3(x) &= 1 - \frac{x^3}{3!} + \frac{x^6}{6!} - \frac{x^9}{9!} + \cdots \\
    f_3(x) &= \frac{1}{3} \left( e^{-x} e^{\frac{2}{3}(2\pi i)} + e^{-x} e^{\frac{2}{3}(2\pi i)} + e^{-x} e^{\frac{2}{3}(2\pi i)} \right)
\end{align*}
\]

We will discover that the process itself seems ok, but with a problem. The solutions of the above functions are not periodic, so we cannot emulate the “Basel problem” perfectly, obtaining the following value:

\[
\zeta(3) = \frac{\pi^3}{3(\sqrt{3})} = 1.1366020 \neq 1.202056903
\]

With a small correction, we arrive to:

\[
\zeta(3) = \frac{\pi^3}{3(\sqrt{3})} e^{\frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}} = 1.202173775 \approx 1.202056903 \quad [7]
\]

But not getting the correct value anyhow. The only way of obtaining the correct value would be to find a function of the form:

\[
g_3(x) = 1 - r(3) \cdot \frac{x^3}{3!} + r(6) \cdot \frac{x^6}{6!} - r(9) \cdot \frac{x^9}{9!} + \cdots
\]

That has periodic zeros. Where \( r(n) \) is an unknown function to be calculate/discovered. We have also generalized this study to calculate a general \( \zeta(k) \) where \( k \) can be higher odd numbers, or even numbers. Having \( \zeta(k) \) for even numbers would lead to obtaining a closed equation for the Bernoulli numbers.

If a generalization for \( k \) as a general complex number was possible, we could even consider \( k=\frac{1}{2}+it \), obtaining a closed function for the zeros of the Riemann Zeta function.
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1. Introduction
In this paper we will try to find a solution for the Riemann Zeta function for odd integers.

We will start with $\zeta(3)$ (the Riemann Zeta function with $s=3$) emulating the “Basel problem”. But instead of using a sine or cosine function, using a different type of function that we will develop in chapter 5.

In chapters 2-4 we will make some previous calculations to understand the following chapters.

In chapters 5, 6 and 7 we will try to find the solution for $\zeta(3)$, $\zeta(5)$ and a general $\zeta(k)$ respectively. And in the chapter 8 we will comment the conclusions of the study.

2. Sum of the odd elements of the Riemann Zeta function

The first thing we will make is to calculate the sum of the odd integers of the Riemann zeta function [1]. This is:

$$\zeta_{odd}(s) = 1^{-s} + 3^{-s} + 5^{-s} + 7^{-s} \ldots$$

To do it, we start with the definition of the Riemann zeta function [1]:

$$\zeta(s) = 1^{-s} + 2^{-s} + 3^{-s} + 4^{-s} + 5^{-s} + 6^{-s} + \ldots$$

We can separate the even and the odd numbers this way:

$$\zeta(s) = 2^{-s} + 4^{-s} + 6^{-s} \ldots + 1^{-s} + 3^{-s} + 5^{-s} + \ldots$$

$$\zeta(s) = \zeta_{even}(s) + \zeta_{odd}(s)$$

We continue operating:

$$\zeta(s) = 2^{-s}(1^{-s} + 2^{-s} + 3^{-s} \ldots ) + 1^{-s} + 3^{-s} + 5^{-s} + \ldots$$

$$\zeta(s) = 2^{-s}\zeta(s) + 1^{-s} + 3^{-s} + 5^{-s} + \ldots$$

$$\zeta(s) = 2^{-s}\zeta(s) + \zeta_{odd}(s)$$

$$\zeta(s) - 2^{-s}\zeta(s) = \zeta_{odd}(s)$$

So, we get:

$$\zeta_{odd}(s) = \zeta(s)(1 - 2^{-s})$$

And therefore:

$$\zeta(s) = \frac{\zeta_{odd}(s)}{1 - 2^{-s}}$$
3. Calculation of \( \zeta(2) \) using the Cosine instead of the Sine

We will remake the Basel problem [2] by Euler, but using the cosine instead of the sine. We will see later why.

We know that the Taylor expansion series [3][6] of the cosine is:

\[
\cos(x) = 1 - \frac{x^2}{2!} + \frac{x^4}{4!} - \frac{x^6}{6!} + \ldots
\]

We also know that the polynomial of the series should correspond to the product of the solutions of the function [4] (in this case, the points where the cosine is zero). This is:

\[
\cos(x) = \left(1 - \frac{x}{\frac{\pi}{2}}\right)\left(1 - \frac{x}{\frac{\pi}{2}}\right)\left(1 - \frac{x}{\frac{\pi}{2}}\right)\left(1 - \frac{x}{\frac{\pi}{2}}\right)\ldots
\]

Now, we apply the law that the product of a sum and a difference is the difference of squares. We do this by pairs of elements:

\[
\cos(x) = \left(1 - \frac{x}{\frac{\pi}{2}}\right)\left(1 - \frac{x^2}{\frac{\pi^2}{4}}\right)\left(1 - \frac{x}{\frac{\pi}{2}}\right)\ldots
\]

\[
\cos(x) = \left(1 - \frac{2x^2}{\pi^2} - \frac{1}{\pi^2}\right)\left(1 - \frac{2x^2}{\pi^2} - \frac{1}{\pi^2}\right)\ldots
\]

We can check that the product of elements that do not include \( x \) (the constant part of the polynomial is:

\[
1 \cdot 1 \cdot 1 \cdot 1 \cdot 1 \ldots = 1
\]

And it is ok with the first element of the polynomial that is 1.

\[
\cos(x) = 1 - \frac{x^2}{2!} + \frac{x^4}{4!} - \frac{x^6}{6!} + \ldots
\]

So, no escalation factor is needed to adjust the results.

Then we check the second element. The one that has \( x^2 \).

\[
\cos(x) = 1 - \frac{x^2}{2!} + \frac{x^4}{4!} - \frac{x^6}{6!} + \ldots
\]

This should correspond with following sum:

\[
-\frac{2^2x^2}{\pi^2} \cdot \frac{1}{1^2} - \frac{2^2x^2}{\pi^2} \cdot \frac{1}{3^2} - \frac{2^2x^2}{\pi^2} \cdot \frac{1}{5^2} - \ldots = \frac{x^2}{2!}
\]
The reason, is because the only way of obtaining a polynomial in $x^2$, is multiplying each element that contains $x^2$ in the product by an infinite product of 1s. The moment you multiply by another element you get at least an element with $x^4$.

So, operating:

$$-\frac{2^2x^2}{\pi^2} \left(1 + \frac{1}{3^2} + \frac{1}{5^2} + \cdots\right) = -\frac{x^2}{2!}$$

$$-\frac{2^2x^2}{\pi^2} \zeta_{\text{odd}}(2) = -\frac{x^2}{2!}$$

$$\zeta_{\text{odd}}(2) = \frac{\pi^2}{2! 2^2} = \frac{\pi^2}{8}$$

And now we apply the equation we obtained in the chapter 2 regarding the odd elements of the Riemann zeta function:

$$\zeta(s) = \frac{\zeta_{\text{odd}}(s)}{1 - 2^{-s}}$$

$$\zeta(2) = \frac{\zeta_{\text{odd}}(2)}{1 - 2^{-2}} = \frac{\pi^2}{6} = \frac{\pi^2}{2} = \frac{\pi^2}{8}$$

If you are familiar with the Basel problem, you will check that the result is correct. The way to arrive to the result is similar but more complicated than using the sine function.

The reason I have used the cosine function is because it is easier to check that the element without $x$ in the polynomial (in this case, 1) is coherent with the infinite product of solutions. You will understand why later.

4. Generalization of the product of a sum and a difference but using more than two elements

In the previous chapter, we have used the property of multiplying a sum by a difference to get the difference of squares. A specific example could have this form:

$$\left(1 + \frac{A}{B}\right) \left(1 - \frac{A}{B}\right) = 1 - \left(\frac{A}{B}\right)^2 = 1 - \frac{A^2}{B^2}$$

If we put it using complex numbers, one of the possible ways will be the following:

$$\left(1 + \frac{A}{B}\right) \left(1 - \frac{A}{B}\right) = \left(1 - \frac{A}{e^{i\pi}B}\right) \left(1 - \frac{A}{e^{2i\pi}B}\right) = \left(1 - \frac{A}{e^{\frac{1}{2}(2\pi)i}B}\right) \left(1 - \frac{A}{e^{\frac{3}{2}(2\pi)i}B}\right)$$

So, we will have:

$$\left(1 - \frac{A}{e^{\frac{1}{2}(2\pi)i}B}\right) \left(1 - \frac{A}{e^{\frac{3}{2}(2\pi)i}B}\right) = 1 - \frac{A^2}{B^2}$$

And this leads, to the following question. Can we generalize this for more than two elements? For example, is the next expression true?

$$\left(1 - \frac{A}{Be^{\frac{1}{3}(2\pi)i}}\right) \left(1 - \frac{A}{Be^{\frac{2}{3}(2\pi)i}}\right) \left(1 - \frac{A}{Be^{\frac{4}{3}(2\pi)i}}\right) = 1 - \frac{A^3}{B^3}$$
We can check that it is correct. Just operating:

\[
\left(1 - \frac{A}{Be^{\frac{2\pi i}{n}}}\right)\left(1 - \frac{A}{Be^{\frac{2\pi i}{n}}}\right)\left(1 - \frac{A}{Be^{\frac{2\pi i}{n}}}\right) = \left(1 - \frac{A}{Be^{\frac{2\pi i}{n}}}\right)\left(1 - \frac{A}{Be^{\frac{2\pi i}{n}}}\right) = 1 - \frac{A^3}{B^3}
\]

And it is valid for any number of elements. The following is for 5 elements:

\[
\left(1 - \frac{A}{Be^{\frac{2\pi i}{n}}}\right)\left(1 - \frac{A}{Be^{\frac{2\pi i}{n}}}\right)\left(1 - \frac{A}{Be^{\frac{2\pi i}{n}}}\right)\left(1 - \frac{A}{Be^{\frac{2\pi i}{n}}}\right) = 1 - \frac{A^5}{B^5}
\]

And this is the general case:

\[
\left(1 - \frac{A}{Be^{\frac{2\pi i}{n}}}\right)\left(1 - \frac{A}{Be^{\frac{2\pi i}{n}}}\right)\left(1 - \frac{A}{Be^{\frac{2\pi i}{n}}}\right)\ldots \left(1 - \frac{A}{Be^{\frac{2\pi i}{n}}}\right) = 1 - \frac{A^n}{B^n}
\]

\[
\prod_{k=1}^{n} \left(1 - \frac{A}{Be^{\frac{2\pi i}{n}}}\right) = 1 - \frac{A^n}{B^n}
\]

Again, we will see later why we have done this.
5. Using a specific function to try to calculate the value of $\zeta(3)$

In the chapter 3, we calculated $\zeta(2)$, the value of the Riemann zeta function for $s=2$ using the cosine function. The question is, can we use another function to calculate the value of $\zeta(3)$?

To be able to obtain an exponent of 3 in the numbers, we will need a function of this form as we will see later:

$$f_3(x) = 1 - \frac{x^3}{3!} + \frac{x^6}{6!} - \frac{x^9}{9!} + \ldots$$

This function is the same as the following function, as we will demonstrate now:

$$f_3(x) = \frac{1}{3} \left( e^{-x-e^{\frac{1}{3}(2\pi i)}} + e^{-x-e^{\frac{2}{3}(2\pi i)}} + e^{-x-e^{\frac{3}{3}(2\pi i)}} \right)$$

To demonstrate it, we can obtain the Taylor series of above function at $x=0$ (Mclaurin series). First we calculate the value of the series at the point $x=0$.

$$f_3(0) = \frac{1}{3} \left( 1 - 1 + 1 \right) = \frac{1}{3} \cdot 3 = 1$$

Now, we take the first derivative of the series:

$$f_3'(x) = \frac{1}{3} \left( -e^{-x-e^{\frac{1}{3}(2\pi i)}} - e^{-x-e^{\frac{2}{3}(2\pi i)}} - e^{-x-e^{\frac{3}{3}(2\pi i)}} \right)$$

And, again, we calculate its value for $x=0$.

$$f_3'(0) = \frac{1}{3} \left( 1 - e^{-\frac{1}{3}(2\pi i)} - e^{-\frac{2}{3}(2\pi i)} - e^{-\frac{3}{3}(2\pi i)} \right) = \frac{1}{3} \cdot \left( -\frac{1}{2} + i \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \right) - \left( -\frac{1}{2} - i \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \right) - 1$$

$$= \frac{1}{3} \left( -i \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \right) = 0$$

Now, we take the second derivative and its value at $x=0$.

$$f_3''(x) = \frac{1}{3} \left( -e^{-x-e^{\frac{1}{3}(2\pi i)}} - e^{-x-e^{\frac{2}{3}(2\pi i)}} - e^{-x-e^{\frac{3}{3}(2\pi i)}} \right)$$

$$f_3''(0) = \frac{1}{3} \left( 1 - e^{-\frac{1}{3}(2\pi i)} - e^{-\frac{2}{3}(2\pi i)} - e^{-\frac{3}{3}(2\pi i)} \right) = \frac{1}{3} \cdot \left( -\frac{1}{2} - i \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \right) - \left( -\frac{1}{2} + i \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \right) - 1$$

$$= \frac{1}{3} \left( -i \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \right) = 0$$

Now, the third derivative and its value for $x=0$.

$$f_3'''(x) = \frac{1}{3} \left( -e^{-x-e^{\frac{1}{3}(2\pi i)}} - e^{-x-e^{\frac{2}{3}(2\pi i)}} - e^{-x-e^{\frac{3}{3}(2\pi i)}} \right)$$

$$f_3'''(0) = \frac{1}{3} \left( 1 - e^{-\frac{1}{3}(2\pi i)} - e^{-\frac{2}{3}(2\pi i)} - e^{-\frac{3}{3}(2\pi i)} \right) = \frac{1}{3} \cdot (-1 - 1 - 1) = \frac{1}{3} \cdot (-3) = -1$$
If we continue with the next derivatives and we use the Taylor series definition we obtain, the expected:

\[ f_3(x) = 1 - \frac{x^3}{3!} + \frac{x^6}{6!} - \frac{x^9}{9!} + \ldots \]

We can again obtain the derivatives and their value at \( x=0 \) to check that everything hold. You can skip, this part if you want as it is just a verification that both functions commented in the beginning of the chapter are the same:

\[ f(0) = 1 \]
\[ f_3'(x) = -\frac{3x^2}{3!} + \frac{6x^5}{6!} - \frac{9x^8}{9!} + \ldots \]
\[ f_3'(x) = -\frac{3x^2}{3 \cdot 2!} + \frac{6x^5}{5 \cdot 5!} - \frac{9x^8}{9 \cdot 8!} + \ldots \]
\[ f_3'(x) = -\frac{x^2}{2!} + \frac{x^5}{5!} - \frac{x^8}{8!} + \ldots \]
\[ f'(0) = 0 \]
\[ f_3''(x) = -\frac{2x}{2!} + \frac{5x^4}{5!} - \frac{8x^7}{8!} + \ldots \]
\[ f_3''(x) = -\frac{2x}{2 \cdot 1!} + \frac{5x^4}{5 \cdot 4!} - \frac{8x^7}{8 \cdot 7!} + \ldots \]
\[ f_3''(x) = -\frac{x}{1!} + \frac{x^4}{4!} - \frac{x^7}{7!} + \ldots \]
\[ f_3''(0) = 0 \]
\[ f_3'''(x) = -\frac{1}{1!} + \frac{4x^3}{4!} - \frac{7x^6}{7!} + \ldots \]
\[ f_3'''(x) = -\frac{1}{1!} + \frac{4x^3}{4 \cdot 3!} - \frac{7x^6}{7 \cdot 6!} + \ldots \]
\[ f_3'''(x) = -\frac{1}{1!} + \frac{x^3}{3!} - \frac{x^6}{6!} + \ldots \]
\[ f_3'''(x) = -f(x) \]
\[ f_3'''(x) = -1 \]

So, we have this function expressed in these following forms. And the question is, what do we do now?

\[ f_3(x) = 1 - \frac{x^3}{3!} + \frac{x^6}{6!} - \frac{x^9}{9!} + \ldots \]
\[ f_3(x) = \frac{1}{3} \left( e^{-x}e^{\frac{1}{2}\pi i} + e^{-x}e^{\frac{2}{2}\pi i} + e^{-x}e^{\frac{3}{2}\pi i} \right) \]
The theory tells us that if we calculate the zeros of above function and we make an infinite product of the solutions, as we made in chapter 3 with the cosine, we will be able to obtain \( \zeta(3) \).

The problem is that above statement is only true if the solutions to the function are periodic. And as we will check now, they are “almost” periodic but not “perfectly” periodic.

To find the solutions, we will use the programs in Mathematica that you have in Annexes 1 and 2. The program in Annex 1 obtains the solutions for:

\[
f_3(x) = 1 - \frac{x^3}{3!} + \frac{x^6}{6!} - \frac{x^9}{9!} + \ldots
\]

And the program in Annex 2, obtains the solutions for:

\[
f_3(x) = \frac{1}{3} \left( e^{-x/3} e^{2\pi i (2n)} + e^{-x e^{2\pi i (2n)}} + e^{-x e^{2\pi i (2n)}} \right)
\]

And, as expected, the solutions are the same, as the functions are the same (expressed in different forms).

The solutions, expressed in polar way (modulus, argument) are:

\[
\{ (56.22778, -2.0943951), (56.22778, 2.0943951), (52.600182, -2.0943951), (52.600182, 2.0943951), (48.972583, -2.0943951), (48.972583, 2.0943951),
(45.344984, -2.0943951), (45.344984, 2.0943951), (41.713385, -2.0943951), (41.713385, 2.0943951), (38.089787, -2.0943951), (38.089787, 2.0943951),
(34.462188, -2.0943951), (34.462188, 2.0943951), (30.834589, -2.0943951), (30.834589, 2.0943951),
(27.20699, -2.0943951), (27.20699, 2.0943951), (23.579392, -2.0943951), (23.579392, 2.0943951), (20.943951, -2.0943951), (20.943951, 2.0943951),
(19.951793, -2.0943951), (19.951793, 2.0943951), (17.286099, -2.0943951), (17.286099, 2.0943951),
(15.509165, -2.0943951), (15.509165, 2.0943951), (13.831234, -2.0943951), (13.831234, 2.0943951), (12.153304, -2.0943951), (12.153304, 2.0943951),
(10.475373, -2.0943951), (10.475373, 2.0943951), (8.797442, -2.0943951), (8.797442, 2.0943951), (7.119512, -2.0943951), (7.119512, 2.0943951),
(5.441234, -2.0943951), (5.441234, 2.0943951), (3.762994, -2.0943951), (3.762994, 2.0943951), (2.084754, -2.0943951), (2.084754, 2.0943951)
\}

When the argument is \( 2.0943951 \) it corresponds to: \( e^{\frac{2\pi i}{3}(2n)} \) and the argument \(-2.0943951\) corresponds to \( e^{-\frac{2\pi i}{3}(2n)} \) which is the same as \( e^{\frac{2\pi i}{3}(2n)} \).

When the argument is 0, it corresponds to a real number. Which is the same as saying that it corresponds to \( e^{\frac{2\pi i}{3}(2n)} \).
We can check that for each modulus, we have three solutions, with these three arguments. As we can see below for the first five modulus as an example:

\[
\begin{align*}
&[1.8498128, 2.0943951], [1.8498128, -2.0943951], [1.8498128, 0.] \\
&[5.4412334, 2.0943951], [5.4412334, -2.0943951], [5.4412334, 0.] \\
&[9.0689975, 2.0943951], [9.0689975, -2.0943951], [9.0689975, 0.] \\
&[12.696596, 2.0943951], [12.696596, -2.0943951], [12.696596, 0.] \\
&[16.324194, 2.0943951], [16.324194, -2.0943951], [16.324194, 0.]
\end{align*}
\]

This is the same as:

\[
\begin{align*}
1.8498128 \cdot e^{\frac{1}{3}(2\pi i)}, 1.8498128 \cdot e^{\frac{2}{3}(2\pi i)}, 1.8498128 \cdot e^{\frac{3}{3}(2\pi i)} \\
5.4412334 \cdot e^{\frac{1}{3}(2\pi i)}, 5.4412334 \cdot e^{\frac{2}{3}(2\pi i)}, 5.4412334 \cdot e^{\frac{3}{3}(2\pi i)} \\
9.0689975 \cdot e^{\frac{1}{3}(2\pi i)}, 9.0689975 \cdot e^{\frac{2}{3}(2\pi i)}, 9.0689975 \cdot e^{\frac{3}{3}(2\pi i)} \\
12.696596 \cdot e^{\frac{1}{3}(2\pi i)}, 12.696596 \cdot e^{\frac{2}{3}(2\pi i)}, 12.696596 \cdot e^{\frac{3}{3}(2\pi i)} \\
16.324194 \cdot e^{\frac{1}{3}(2\pi i)}, 16.324194 \cdot e^{\frac{2}{3}(2\pi i)}, 16.324194 \cdot e^{\frac{3}{3}(2\pi i)}
\end{align*}
\]

We can see that the solutions divide the complex plane in three equal parts, as we can see in the graph of the function. See Annex A1 and A2 for more details.
But are these solutions periodic? Let’s check it. If we subtract:

\[
16.324194 - 12.696596 = 3.627598 \approx \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{3}}
\]

\[
12.696596 - 9.0689975 = 3.6275985 \approx \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{3}}
\]

\[
9.0689975 - 5.4412334 = 3.6277641 \approx \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{3}}
\]

\[
5.4412334 - 1.8498128 = 3.5914206 \neq \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{3}}
\]

Considering that \( \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{3}} = 3.6275987 \) we can see that the solutions tend to have that period the larger they are. It will be periodic with that exact period of \( \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{3}} \) asymptotically at infinity.

Considering that:

\[
\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{3}} = 1.8137993
\]

\[
\frac{3\pi}{\sqrt{3}} = 5.4413980
\]

\[
\frac{5\pi}{\sqrt{3}} = 9.0689968
\]

\[
\frac{7\pi}{\sqrt{3}} = 12.696596
\]

\[
\frac{9\pi}{\sqrt{3}} = 16.324194
\]

A perfect periodic function will have these solutions:

\[1.8137993 \cdot e^{\frac{\pi}{\sqrt{3}}(2\pi i)}, 1.8137993 \cdot e^{\frac{3\pi}{\sqrt{3}}(2\pi i)}, 1.8137993 \cdot e^{\frac{5\pi}{\sqrt{3}}(2\pi i)}, \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{3}}(2\pi i)\]
We can apply i

\[ g_3(x) = \left( 1 - \frac{x^3}{\sqrt[3]{\pi}} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{x^3}{\sqrt[3]{3 \pi}} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{x^3}{\sqrt[3]{5 \pi}} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{x^3}{\sqrt[3]{7 \pi}} \right) \ldots \]

And the separation between all the solutions would be \( \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{3}} = 3.6275987 \) as expected. In fact, we can check that the last two solutions correspond to the solutions of our function (with the number of decimals considered of course, in reality the complete numbers would not be the same). Putting the solutions in another way, it will be:

\[
\begin{align*}
P &= \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{3}} \cdot e^{\frac{1}{3}(2\pi n)} + \frac{3\pi}{\sqrt{3}} \cdot e^{\frac{2}{3}(2\pi n)} + \frac{5\pi}{\sqrt{3}} \cdot e^{\frac{2}{3}(2\pi n)} + \frac{7\pi}{\sqrt{3}} \cdot e^{\frac{2}{3}(2\pi n)} + \frac{9\pi}{\sqrt{3}} \cdot e^{\frac{2}{3}(2\pi n)} \\
&= \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{3}} \cdot e^{\frac{1}{3}(2\pi n)} + \frac{3\pi}{\sqrt{3}} \cdot e^{\frac{2}{3}(2\pi n)} + \frac{5\pi}{\sqrt{3}} \cdot e^{\frac{2}{3}(2\pi n)} + \frac{7\pi}{\sqrt{3}} \cdot e^{\frac{2}{3}(2\pi n)} + \frac{9\pi}{\sqrt{3}} \cdot e^{\frac{2}{3}(2\pi n)} \\
&= \frac{\pi}{\sqrt{3}} \cdot e^{\frac{1}{3}(2\pi n)} + \frac{3\pi}{\sqrt{3}} \cdot e^{\frac{2}{3}(2\pi n)} + \frac{5\pi}{\sqrt{3}} \cdot e^{\frac{2}{3}(2\pi n)} + \frac{7\pi}{\sqrt{3}} \cdot e^{\frac{2}{3}(2\pi n)} + \frac{9\pi}{\sqrt{3}} \cdot e^{\frac{2}{3}(2\pi n)}
\end{align*}
\]

If we had this perfect function (let’s call it \( g_3(x) \)) with these solutions, we could do the same as in chapter 3 due to [4]:

\[
g_3(x) = \left( 1 - \frac{x}{\sqrt[3]{\pi}} e^{\frac{1}{3}(2\pi n)} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{x}{\sqrt[3]{3 \pi}} e^{\frac{2}{3}(2\pi n)} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{x}{\sqrt[3]{5 \pi}} e^{\frac{2}{3}(2\pi n)} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{x}{\sqrt[3]{7 \pi}} e^{\frac{2}{3}(2\pi n)} \right) \ldots
\]

Now, applying the property commented in chapter 4 that said:

\[
\left( 1 - \frac{A}{Be^{\frac{1}{3}(2\pi n)}} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{A}{Be^{\frac{2}{3}(2\pi n)}} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{A}{Be^{\frac{2}{3}(2\pi n)}} \right) = 1 - \frac{A^3}{B^3}
\]

We can apply it, leading to:

\[
g_3(x) = \left( 1 - \frac{x^3}{\pi^3} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{x^3}{\sqrt[3]{3 \pi}} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{x^3}{\sqrt[3]{5 \pi}} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{x^3}{\sqrt[3]{7 \pi}} \right) \ldots
\]

\[
= \left( 1 - \frac{\sqrt[3]{3} x^3}{\pi^3} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{3 \sqrt[3]{3} x^3}{\pi^3} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{5 \sqrt[3]{3} x^3}{\pi^3} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{7 \sqrt[3]{3} x^3}{\pi^3} \right) \ldots
\]
Now, as we made in chapter 4, if the function \( g_3(x) \) had the same Taylor polynomial expansion [3] than \( f_3(x) \) (we know it hasn’t but let’s try):

\[
f_3(x) = 1 - \frac{x^3}{3!} + \frac{x^6}{6!} - \frac{x^9}{9!} + \ldots
\]

We can check that the product of the 1s in \( g_3(x) \) results in 1, as in the polynomial, so the scalation is ok.

Now if we compare the elements with \( x^3 \) similarly as we made in chapter 4 with the elements in \( x^2 \):

\[
-\frac{(\sqrt{3})^3}{\pi^3} \frac{x^3}{1} + \frac{1}{1^3} + \frac{1}{3^3} + \ldots = -\frac{x^3}{3!}
\]

\[
-\frac{(\sqrt{3})^3}{\pi^3} (\zeta_{odd}(3)) = -\frac{x^3}{3!}
\]

\[
\zeta_{odd}(3) = \frac{\pi^3}{3! (\sqrt{3})^3} = \frac{\pi^3}{18\sqrt{3}} = 0.994526788
\]

Now, applying the equation in chapter 2:

\[
\zeta(s) = \frac{\zeta_{odd}(s)}{1 - 2^{-s}}
\]

\[
\zeta(3) = \frac{\zeta_{odd}(3)}{1 - 2^{-3}} = \frac{\frac{\pi^3}{18\sqrt{3}}}{\frac{2}{9}} = \frac{4\pi^3}{63\sqrt{3}} = 1.1366020 \neq 1.202056903 [7]
\]

We can see that the result does not correspond to the value of \( \zeta(3) \). The reason for this is because we have cheated clearly. We have used the “perfect periodic” solutions of a hypothetical function \( g_3(x) \) and we have compared it with the polynomial of the function \( f_3(x) \) that we know does not have those “perfect periodic” solutions. The function \( f_3(x) \) has “similar” solutions than \( g_3(x) \) at infinity but not the same solutions (and even more difference in the first solutions). They are not the same function; we are mixing apples with pears.

The only way to obtain the correct result is to find the polynomial of the function \( g_3(x) \). This polynomial should be very similar than the polynomial of \( f_3(x) \) but with some changes in the coefficients.

This is, we know \( f_3(x) \) is:

\[
f_3(x) = 1 - \frac{x^3}{3!} + \frac{x^6}{6!} - \frac{x^9}{9!} + \ldots
\]

\[
f_3(x) = \frac{1}{3} \left( e^{-x e^{\frac{1}{2}i\pi n}} + e^{-x e^{\frac{2}{2}i\pi n}} + e^{-x e^{\frac{3}{2}i\pi n}} \right)
\]

And \( g_3(x) \) probably has a form similar like one of the following, where \( h(x) \) or \( t(x,n) \) are unknown functions to be discovered/calculated:
\[ g_3(x) = \frac{1}{3} \left( e^{-h(x)x} e^{\frac{1}{3}2\pi i} + e^{-h(x)x} e^{\frac{2}{3}2\pi i} + e^{-h(x)x} e^{\frac{3}{3}2\pi i} \right) \]

\[ g_3(x) = \frac{1}{3} \left( t(x, 1) \cdot e^{-x} e^{\frac{1}{3}2\pi i} + t(x, 2) e^{-x} e^{\frac{2}{3}2\pi i} + t(x, 3) e^{-x} e^{\frac{3}{3}2\pi i} \right) \]

Once, we have discovered how \( g_3(x) \) is, we can use the Taylor series expansion [3] to calculate its polynomial and use the real value of the element in \( x^3 \). The form would be something like this (being \( r(n) \) an unknown function to be discovered/calculated):

\[ g_3(x) = 1 - r(3) \cdot \frac{x^3}{3!} + r(6) \cdot \frac{x^6}{6!} - r(9) \cdot \frac{x^9}{9!} + \cdots \]

And now, yes, we could calculate the real value of \( \zeta_{\text{odd}}(3) \):

\[ -\left( \frac{\sqrt{3}}{\pi^3} \right) \frac{x^3}{3!} \left( \zeta_{\text{odd}}(3) \right) = -r(3) \cdot \frac{x^3}{3!} \]

And with:

\[ \zeta(3) = \zeta_{\text{odd}}(3) \frac{1}{1 - 2^{-3}} \]

We could calculate the desired value of \( \zeta(3) \).

The problem, we do not know which this \( g_3(x) \) is, or even if it exists.

Just as help, I have discovered the following via trial-error. If we start from the incorrect value obtained before:

\[ \zeta(3) = \frac{\pi^3}{\sin(\pi/3)} = \frac{4\pi^3}{63\sqrt{3}} = 1.1366020 \neq 1.202056903 [7] \]

If we multiply by:

\[ \zeta(3) = \frac{\pi^3}{\sin(\pi/3)} e^{\frac{2}{3}2\pi i} = \frac{4\pi^3 e^{\frac{2}{3}2\pi i}}{63\sqrt{3}} = 1.202173775 \approx 1.202056903 [7] \]

Where the 3 in the denominator can refer to the number of elements of the function or to \( s \) directly and the \( \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} \) it could refer to \( \frac{1}{\sin(2\pi)} \) or \( \frac{2}{\tan(2\pi/3)} \) or related to the period we have obtained before \( \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{3}} = \frac{2}{\sqrt{3}} \). There are different possibilities but the number 2 and the square root of three are clearly related with the complex plane divided in three parts by the function.

This could be a hint of how \( g_3(x) \) should look like.

6. Similar study regarding the value of \( \zeta(5) \)

In this chapter we will follow the same steps as in chapter 5, but with this function:
Both expressions above correspond to the same function (similarly as the \( f_5(x) \) we defined in chapter 5). In Annex A3 and A4 you can find the Mathematica programs for these functions. You can calculate their zeros and plot them. The problem is that the program in Annex 4 overflows (at least in my computer/software) so you do not get reliable graphs or results. In my case I have been obliged to use only the program in Annex A3.

The zeros (in polar (modulus, argument) format) obtained with the program in Annex A3 for the function \( f_5(x) \) above are:

\[
\{ (18.706788, -2.5132741), (18.706788, 2.5132741), (13.361992, -2.5132741), (13.361992, 2.5132741), (8.0171451, -2.5132741), (8.0171451, 2.5132741), (2.6072512, -2.5132741), (2.6072512, 2.5132741), (1.2566371, -2.5132741), (1.2566371, 2.5132741), (0.80171451, -2.5132741), (0.80171451, 2.5132741), (0.5132741, -2.5132741), (0.5132741, 2.5132741), (0.12566371, -2.5132741), (0.12566371, 2.5132741), (0.0625, -2.5132741), (0.0625, 2.5132741), (0.0, -2.5132741), (0.0, 2.5132741) \}
\]

If we take the solutions with the lower modulus, we can see that they are:

\[
\{ (2.6072512, -2.5132741), (2.6072512, 2.5132741), (2.6072512, -1.2566371), (2.6072512, 1.2566371), (1.2566371, -1.2566371), (1.2566371, 1.2566371), (0.80171451, -1.2566371), (0.80171451, 1.2566371), (0.5132741, -1.2566371), (0.5132741, 1.2566371), (0.12566371, -1.2566371), (0.12566371, 1.2566371), (0.0625, -1.2566371), (0.0625, 1.2566371), (0.0, -1.2566371), (0.0, 1.2566371) \}
\]

Where the arguments are distributed in five parts around the complex plane:

\[
1.2566371 = \frac{1}{5}(2\pi) \\
2.5132741 = \frac{2}{5}(2\pi) \\
-2.5132741 = -\frac{2}{5}(2\pi) - \frac{3}{5}(2\pi) \\
-1.2566371 = -\frac{1}{5}(2\pi) - \frac{4}{5}(2\pi) \\
0 = \frac{5}{5}(2\pi)
\]

You can check it in the graph below (see Annex 3) which plots the function:

\[
f_5(x) = 1 - x^5 \frac{5!}{5!} + x^{10} \frac{10!}{10!} - x^{15} \frac{15!}{15!} + \ldots
\]
The Annex 4 graphs the equivalent following function. But the program overflows and does not graph it properly, as you can check in the annex.

\[
f_5(x) = \frac{1}{5} \left( e^{-x}e^{\frac{1}{5}2\pi i} + e^{-x}e^{\frac{1}{3}2\pi i} + e^{-x}e^{\frac{2}{5}2\pi i} + e^{-x}e^{\frac{3}{5}2\pi i} + e^{-x}e^{\frac{4}{5}2\pi i} \right)
\]

Continuing with the solutions, again, we have:

\[
\{ \{18.706788, -2.5132741\}, \{18.706788, 2.5132741\}, \{13.361992, -2.5132741\}, \{13.361992, 2.5132741\}, \{8.0171451, -2.5132741\}, \{8.0171451, 2.5132741\}, \{2.6072512, -2.5132741\}, \{2.6072512, 2.5132741\}, \{2.6072512, -1.2566371\}, \{2.6072512, 1.2566371\}, \{1.2566371, 8.0171451\}, \{1.2566371, -1.2566371\}, \{1.2566371, 18.706788\}, \{1.2566371, -18.706788\}, \{13.361992, 1.2566371\}, \{13.361992, -1.2566371\}, \{18.706788, 1.2566371\}, \{18.706788, -1.2566371\}, \{18.706788, 0\}, \{13.361992, 0\}, \{13.361992, 0\}, \{2.6072512, 0\}, \{2.6072512, 0\}, \{8.0171451, 0\}, \{8.0171451, 0\}, \{18.706788, 0\}, \{18.706788, 0\} \}
\]

Which correspond to:
2.6072512 \cdot e^{\frac{1}{5}(2\pi i)}, 2.6072512 \cdot e^{\frac{2}{5}(2\pi i)}, 2.6072512 \cdot e^{\frac{3}{5}(2\pi i)}, 2.6072512 \\
\cdot e^{\frac{4}{5}(2\pi i)}, 2.6072512 \cdot e^{\frac{5}{5}(2\pi i)}

8.0171451 \cdot e^{\frac{1}{5}(2\pi i)}, 8.0171451 \cdot e^{\frac{2}{5}(2\pi i)}, 8.0171451 \cdot e^{\frac{3}{5}(2\pi i)}, 8.0171451 \\
\cdot e^{\frac{4}{5}(2\pi i)}, 8.0171451 \cdot e^{\frac{5}{5}(2\pi i)}

13.361992 \cdot e^{\frac{1}{5}(2\pi i)}, 13.361992 \cdot e^{\frac{2}{5}(2\pi i)}, 13.361992 \cdot e^{\frac{3}{5}(2\pi i)}, 13.361992 \\
\cdot e^{\frac{4}{5}(2\pi i)}, 13.361992 \cdot e^{\frac{5}{5}(2\pi i)}

18.706788 \cdot e^{\frac{1}{5}(2\pi i)}, 18.706788 \cdot e^{\frac{2}{5}(2\pi i)}, 18.706788 \cdot e^{\frac{3}{5}(2\pi i)}, 18.706788 \\
\cdot e^{\frac{4}{5}(2\pi i)}, 18.706788 \cdot e^{\frac{5}{5}(2\pi i)}

If we want to obtain the period of the solutions, we see:

\[8.0171451 - 2.6072512 = 5.4098938\]
\[13.361992 - 8.0171451 = 5.3438469\]
\[18.706788 - 13.361992 = 5.344796\]

We can see that the function tends to a periodicity of \(\approx 5.344\) that very probably corresponds
the number \(\pi\) multiplied by a coefficient, as we have seen in the previous chapter 5. Any-
how, we are not even interested in calculating this number as we have the same problem
as in the previous chapter 5. The function is not periodic. It tends to a period of \(\approx 5.344\) but
it is not really periodic.

So, we cannot apply the “Basel problem” we have seen in chapter 3. As we will have the
same problem as in chapter 5, we will obtain a solution for \(\zeta(5)\) “near” the real solution but
not exact in any case. The only way to obtain the real solution would be to discover/calculate
a function \(g_5(x)\) similar to \(f_5(x)\) but perfectly periodic (not asymptotically periodic as
\(f_5(x)\)).

This \(g_5(x)\) would have a form similar to this (where \(r(n)\) is a function still to be calculated/discovered):

\[g_5(x) = 1 - r(5) \cdot \frac{x^5}{5!} + r(10) \cdot \frac{x^{10}}{10!} - r(15) \cdot \frac{x^{15}}{15!} + \ldots\]

Check chapter 5 for more details of what I am talking about.

7. General study regarding the values of the Riemann Zeta function at odd integers

As you can imagine we could continue with different functions to try to find the result of a
general \(\zeta(k)\). But we would find the same problem as in the chapters 5 and 6. We need to
find functions that not only “resemble” the cosine function with different elements but also
that have periodic solutions. This is, to find something like:

\[g_k(x) = 1 - r(1 \cdot k) \cdot \frac{x^{(1-k)}}{(1 \cdot k)!} + r(2 \cdot k) \cdot \frac{x^{(2-k)}}{(2 \cdot k)!} - r(3 \cdot k) \cdot \frac{x^{(3-k)}}{(3 \cdot k)!} + \ldots\]
Or equivalently:

\[ g_k(x) = \frac{1}{k} \left( e^{-h(x)x}e^{\frac{1}{k}(2\pi i)} + e^{-h(x)x}e^{\frac{2}{k}(2\pi i)} + \cdots + e^{-h(x)x}e^{\frac{k}{k}(2\pi i)} \right) \]

Where \( r(n), h(x) \) and \( t(x,n) \) are functions to be calculated/discovered, so the \( g_k(x) \) function has “periodic” zeros. If we discovered them, we could calculate \( \zeta(k) \) using the same method as in chapters 5 and 6.

Until now I have always considered \( k \) as an odd integer. If we dream a little more, we could consider \( k \) as an even integer, and using above procedure would give as a closed equation of the \( \zeta(k) \) when \( k \) is even.

This is, we would have a closed equation for the Bernoulli numbers using the following expression [1] (having already calculated \( \zeta(k) \) using above procedure):

\[ \zeta(k) = (-1)^{\frac{k+1}{2}} \frac{(2\pi)^k B_n}{2(n!)} \]

Dreaming even further, we could consider \( k \) even a general complex number. Specifically if we consider:

\[ k = \frac{1}{2} + it \]

We could even obtain an expression for the non-trivial zeros of the Riemann Zeta function.

8. Conclusions

The goal of this paper was to calculate \( \zeta(3) \) (the Riemann Zeta function with \( s=3 \)) emulating the “Basel problem”. But instead of using a sine or cosine function, using functions similar to these:

\[ f_3(x) = 1 - \frac{x^3}{3!} + \frac{x^6}{6!} - \frac{x^9}{9!} + \cdots \]

\[ f_3(x) = \frac{1}{3} \left( e^{-x}e^{\frac{1}{3}(2\pi i)} + e^{-x}e^{\frac{2}{3}(2\pi i)} + e^{-x}e^{\frac{3}{3}(2\pi i)} \right) \]

We have discovered that the process itself seems ok, but with a problem. The solutions of the above functions are not periodic, so we cannot emulate the “Basel problem” perfectly, obtaining the following value:

\[ \zeta(3) = \frac{3(\sqrt{3})^n}{1 - \frac{1}{2^3}} = 1.1366020 \neq 1.202056903 \]

With a small correction, we could arrive to:
\[
\zeta(3) = \frac{x^3}{3!(\sqrt{3})} - \frac{2}{3} = 1.202173775 \approx 1.202056903 [7]
\]

But not getting the correct value anyhow. The only way of obtaining the correct value would be to find a function of the form:

\[
g_3(x) = 1 - r(3) \cdot \frac{x^3}{3!} + r(6) \cdot \frac{x^6}{6!} - r(9) \cdot \frac{x^9}{9!} + \cdots
\]

That has periodic zeros. Where \( r(n) \) is an unknown function to be calculate/discovered.

We have also generalized this study to calculate a general \( \zeta(k) \) where \( k \) can be higher odd numbers, or even numbers. Having \( \zeta(k) \) for even numbers would lead to obtaining a closed equation for the Bernoulli numbers.

We could go further and consider \( k \) a general complex number. In this case, considering \( k=\frac{1}{2}+it \) we could obtain a closed function for the zeros of the Riemann Zeta function.
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Desde el año dos mil veinte, el ser humano está siendo sometido a un ataque. A un ataque en lo más profundo, a lo que nos define como humanos. Al pensamiento crítico, al derecho a pensar por uno mismo, al derecho a una vida longeva, a nuestra libertad o posibilidad de tener una descendencia. No te dejes atacar, siempre habrá una excusa, una enfermedad, una guerra, un problema global, real o inventado, da igual. Porque sólo será la excusa, el vehículo para llevarnos a un sistema de control y tiranía en el que ser humano tal y como lo conoces habrá desaparecido. Los individuos, las ideas propias, todo atisbo de libertad o creación desaparecerán. El ser humano será convertido en una amalgama de seres que funcionarán como un reloj, haciendo y diciendo exactamente lo que se espera en cada momento. Toda manifestación en contra será eliminada. Primero la manifestación y luego los individuos que la manifiestan. O peor todavía, grupos de personas aprovecharán la oportunidad (que quizás hasta hayan creado ellos mismos) para erigirse como los salvadores. Pero será una trampa, sólo querrán tomar el control. Serán lobos con piel de cordero. No formes parte de esto, no dejes que eso ocurra. No escuches la excusa, mira los objetivos que se buscan. No voy a decir eso de juntos venceremos. Porque no, no será juntos, cada uno de nosotros librará su propia lucha y sí, después de todo el inevitable sufrimiento, ganaremos. No porque esté escrito en algún sitio, sino porque no se me ocurra ningún final a esto en el que el ser humano no gane. Al final, todos somos humanos y es lo que queremos que ocurra.
A1. Annex A1. Mathematica program for \( f_3(x) \) (1st version)

This is the Mathematica program to solve and plot:

\[
f_3(x) = 1 - \frac{x^3}{3!} + \frac{x^6}{6!} - \frac{x^9}{9!} + \cdots
\]

(* Copyright by Jesus Sanchez © 2024
f(x)=1-x^3/3!+x^6/6!-x^9/9!+... Zeros and graph
Definition of the limits for the zeros and for the graph calculation*)
max = 50;
maxplot = 20;
(*Definition of the function
f(x)=1-x^3/3!+x^6/6!-x^9/9!+...
*)

\[
f[x_] := \text{Sum}((-1)^n x^{3n}/\text{Factorial}[3n], \{n, 0, \text{Infinity}\})
\]

(*Zeros in the complex plane. Real+i*imaginary format*)
Print["Zeros in real+i*imaginary format:"];
zeros = NSolve[
f[x] == 0 && -max <= Re[x] <= max && -max <= Im[x] <= max, x]

(*Zeros in the complex plane. Polar format (modulus, argument) *)
Print["Zeros in polar format(modulus, argument)"];
zerosPolar = \{Abs[#], Arg[#]\} & /@ (x /. zeros)

(*Graph in the complex plane*)
Plot3D[{Re[f[x + I*y]], Im[f[x + I*y]]}, \{x, -maxplot, maxplot\}, \{y, -maxplot, maxplot\}, PlotLegends -> "Expressions", AxesLabel -> \{"Re(x)", "Im(x)", "f(x)"\}, MeshFunctions -> \#3 &,]
Mesh -> \{0\}, MeshShading -> \{Red, Blue\}
A2. Annex A2. Mathematica program for \( f_3(x) \) (2nd version)

This is the Mathematica program to solve and plot:

\[
f_3(x) = \frac{1}{3} \left( e^{-x e^{\frac{1}{3}2\pi i}} + e^{-x e^{\frac{2}{3}2\pi i}} + e^{-x e^{\frac{3}{3}2\pi i}} \right)
\]

(* Copyright by Jesus Sanchez © 2024

\( f(x) = (e^{\ln(x^\frac{1}{3})^2\pi i}) + (e^{\ln(-x^\frac{2}{3})^2\pi i}) + (e^{\ln(-x^\frac{3}{3})^2\pi i}) \)

Zeros and graph
Definition of the limits for the zeros and for the graph calculation*)

max = 50;
maxplot = 20;
(*Definition of the function *)
\[ f(x) = \frac{1}{3}(e^{e^{-(x-(1/3)*2\pi i)}} + e^{e^{-(x-(2/3)*2\pi i)}} + e^{e^{-(x-(3/3)*2\pi i)}}) \]

\[ f[x_] := \frac{1}{3} (\text{Exp}[\text{Exp}[2*\text{Pi} i/3]*x*-1] + \text{Exp}[\text{Exp}[4*\text{Pi} i/3]*x*-1] + \text{Exp}[\text{Exp}[6*\text{Pi} i/3]*x*-1]) \]

(*Zeros in the complex plane. Real+i*imaginary format*)
Print["Zeros in real+i*imaginary format:"];
zeros = NSolve[
f[x] == 0 \&\& -max <= Re[x] <= max \&\& -max <= Im[x] <= max, x]

(*Zeros in the complex plane. Polar format (modulus, argument) *)
Print["Zeros in polar format(modulus, argument):"];
zerosPolar = {Abs[#], Arg[#]} & /@ (x /. zeros)

(*Graph in the complex plane*)
Plot3D[{Re[f[x + I*y]], Im[f[x + I*y]]}, {x, -maxplot}, {y, -maxplot, maxplot}, PlotLegends -> "Expressions", AxesLabel -> {"Re(x)", "Im(x)", "f(x)"}, MeshFunctions -> {3 &}, Mesh -> {0}, MeshShading -> {Red, Blue}]

(*Zeros in complex plane, real-imaginary format*)
Print["Zeros in real-imaginary format: "];
zeros = NSolve[f[x] == 0 \&\& -max <= Re[x] \&\& -max <= Im[x] <= max, x]

(*Zeros in complex plane, polar format (modulus, argument)*)
Print["Zeros in polar format (modulus, argument): "];
zerosPolar = {Abs[#], Arg[#]} & /@ (x /. zeros)

(*Graph in the complex plane*)
Plot3D[{Re[f[x + I*y]], Im[f[x + I*y]]}, {x, -maxplot}, {y, -maxplot, maxplot}, PlotLegends -> "Expressions", AxesLabel -> {"Re(x)", "Im(x)", "f(x)"}, MeshFunctions -> {3 &}, Mesh -> {0}, MeshShading -> {Red, Blue}]

\[ f(x) = \frac{1}{3}(e^{e^{-(x-(1/3)*2\pi i)}} + e^{e^{-(x-(2/3)*2\pi i)}} + e^{e^{-(x-(3/3)*2\pi i)}}) \]
A3. Annex A3. Mathematica program for f₅(x) (1st version)

This is the Mathematica program to solve and plot:

\[ f_5(x) = 1 - \frac{x^5}{5!} + \frac{x^{10}}{10!} - \frac{x^{15}}{15!} + \ldots \]

(* Copyright by Jesus Sanchez © 2024
f(x)=1-x^5/5!+x^10/10!-x^15/15!+... Zeros and graph
Definition of the limits for the zeros and for the graph calculation*)

max = 50;
maxplot = 50;

(*Definición de la función
f(x)=1-x^5/5!+x^10/10!-x^15/15!+...
*)

f[x_] := Sum[(-1)^n*x^(5*n)/Factorial[5*n], {n, 0, Infinity}]
(*Zeros in the complex plane. Real+i*imaginary format*)
Print["Zeros in real+i*imaginary format:"];
zeros = NSolve[
f[x] == 0 && -max <= Re[x] <= max && -max <= Im[x] <= max, x]

(*Zeros in the complex plane. Polar format (modulus, argument) *)
Print["Zeros in polar format(modulus, argument):"];
zerosPolar = {Abs[#], Arg[#]} & /@ (x /. zeros)

(*Graph in the complex plane*)
Plot3D[{Re[f[x + I*y]], Im[f[x + I*y]]}, {x, -maxplot, maxplot}, {y, -maxplot, maxplot}, PlotLegends -> "Expressions", AxesLabel -> {"Re(x)", "Im(x)", "f(x)"}, MeshFunctions -> {#3 &}, Mesh -> {{0}}, MeshShading -> {Red, Blue}]
A4. Annex A4. Mathematica program for \( f_5(x) \) (2nd version)

This is the Mathematica program to solve and plot:

\[
\left. f_5(x) = \frac{1}{5} \left( e^{-x} e^{\frac{2\pi i}{5}} + e^{-x} e^{\frac{4\pi i}{5}} + e^{-x} e^{\frac{6\pi i}{5}} + e^{-x} e^{\frac{8\pi i}{5}} + e^{-x} e^{\frac{10\pi i}{5}} \right) \right.
\]

The program overflows, the solutions and the graph are not reliable:

(* Copyright by Jesus Sanchez © 2024

\[ f(x)=\frac{1}{5}(e^{e^{-x}(\frac{1}{5})2\pi i})+e^{e^{-x}(\frac{2}{5})2\pi i})+e^{e^{-x}(\frac{3}{5})2\pi i})+e^{e^{-x}(\frac{4}{5})2\pi i})+e^{e^{-x}(\frac{5}{5})2\pi i})] \]

Zeros and graph
Definition of the limits for the zeros and for the graph calculation*)
max = 50;
maxplot = 50;
(*Definition of the function.*)
(* f(x)=1/5(e^{e^{-x}(1/5)*2pi.i})+e^{e^{-x}(2/5)*2pi.i})+e^{e^{-x}(3/5)*2pi.i})+e^{e^{-x}(4/5)*2pi.i})+e^{e^{-x}(5/5)*2pi.i}) ]*
\[ f[x_] := \]
1/5 ((Exp[Exp[2*Pi*I/5]*x*(-1)] + Exp[Exp[4*Pi*I/5]*x*(-1)] + Exp[Exp[6*Pi*I/5]*x*(-1)] + Exp[Exp[8*Pi*I/5]*x*(-1)] + Exp[Exp[10*Pi*I/5]*x*(-1)]))

(*Zeros in the complex plane. Real+i*imaginary format*)
Print["Zeros in real+i*imaginary format:"];
zeros = NSolve[
f[x] == 0 && -max <= Re[x] <= max && -max <= Im[x] <= max, x]

("Zeros in the complex plane. Polar format (modulus, argument) ")
Print["Zeros in polar format (modulus, argument) "];
zerosPolar = {Abs[#], Arg[#]} & /@ (x /. zeros)

("Graph in the complex plane")
Plot3D[{Re[f[x + I*y]], Im[f[x + I*y]]}, {x, -maxplot, maxplot}, {y, -maxplot, maxplot}, PlotLegends -> "Expressions", AxesLabel -> {"Re(x)", "Im(x)", "f(x)"}, MeshFunctions -> {#3 &}, Mesh -> {0}, MeshShading -> {Red, Blue}]

The program overflows, the solutions and the graph are not reliable:
The program overflows, the solutions and the graph are not reliable. The graph should be equal to the graph in Annex 3. It should be symmetrical in fifth parts of the complex plane. And this graph is not. It is not correct.
A5. Annex A5. Infinite sums and products from -infinity to +infinity

We are accustomed to infinite series that start at one point and finish at infinity. The result of the series (the sum or the product) normally is a number that has a number related to the series.

What it is not so common is to check series that start at -infinity and finished at +infinity. This means, they do not have a beginning and they do not have an end. We will see that the result of these series surprisingly is zero when it is a sum and 1 when it is a product. As we will see now.

We start with the geometric series [5]. The standard geometric series has the following form. It has a start at one point and then the series is infinite. This way:

\[ S = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} ar^k = a + ar + ar^2 + ar^3 + \cdots = a + r(a + ar + ar^2 + \cdots) = a + rS \]

The solution to this series is well known [5] and it can be found like this:

\[ S = a + rS \]
\[ S - rS = a \]
\[ S(1 - r) = a \]
\[ S = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} ar^k = \frac{a}{1 - r} \]

But if instead of that, we find a geometric series that has no beginning and no end in the following way (it starts at -infinity and finished at +infinity):

\[ S = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} ar^k = \cdots + ar^{-3} + ar^{-2} + ar^{-1} + a + ar + ar^2 + ar^3 + \cdots = \]

We can divide it in two series, one with the negative exponents (\(S_-\)) and one with the zero and positive exponents (\(S_+\)):
\[
S_- \equiv \sum_{k=-\infty}^{-1} ar^k = \cdots + ar^{-3} + ar^{-2} + ar^{-1} = ar^{-1} + ar^{-2} + ar^{-3} + \cdots
\]

\[
S_+ \equiv \sum_{k=0}^\infty ar^k = a + ar + ar^2 + ar^3 + \cdots
\]

So, the sum of both is \( S \):

\[
S = \sum_{k=-\infty}^\infty ar^k = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{-1} ar^k + \sum_{k=0}^\infty ar^k = S_- + S_+
\]

Calculating \( S_- \):

\[
S_- = a r^{-1} + ar^{-2} + ar^{-3} + \cdots = ar^{-1} + r^{-1}(ar^{-1} + ar^{-2} + \cdots) = ar^{-1} + rS_-
\]

\[
S_- = \frac{ar^{-1}}{1-r^{-1}} = \frac{a}{r} \frac{1}{1-r} = \frac{a}{1-r}
\]

And \( S_+ \):

\[
S_+ \equiv a + ar + ar^2 + ar^3 + \cdots = a + r(a + ar + ar^2 + \cdots) = a + rS_+
\]

\[
S_+ = a + rS_+
\]

\[
S_+ - rS_+ = a
\]

\[
S_+(1-r) = a
\]

\[
S_+ = \frac{a}{1-r}
\]

Now, if we sum both to get \( S \):

\[
S = S_- + S_+ = \frac{a}{r-1} + \frac{a}{1-r} = \frac{a}{r-1} - \frac{a}{1-r} = 0
\]

\[
S = \sum_{k=-\infty}^\infty ar^k = \cdots + ar^{-1} + a + ar + ar^2 + \cdots = 0
\]

We see that the result of geometric series that start at -infinity and finishes at +infinity is zero (independently of the \( r \) (ratio) and of \( a \) (the scalation). If the geometric series starts at -infinity and finishes at +infinity, its value is always zero.

Now, let’s do another sum. If we sum all the 1s starting at one point (a first 1) and finishing at infinity, we have:

\[
S = 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + \cdots
\]

This is the Riemann Zeta Function \([1]\) with \( s=0 \). And we know \([1]\) that its value is \(-1/2\).

\[
\xi(0) = \sum_{k=1}^\infty k^0 = \sum_{k=1}^\infty 1 = 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + \cdots = S = -\frac{1}{2}
\]
But now, we want to make the sum starting at -infinity and finishing at +infinity.

\[ S = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} 1 = ... + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + \cdots \]

To do this, we can define a 1 that is in the “middle” of the sum (let’s say it is in the position zero, we call it \(1_0\)).

\[ S = \cdots -3 + -2 + -1 + 1_0 + 1 + 1_2 + 1_3 \cdots \]

Let’s put it in green to visualize it better. This \(1_0\) is in the “middle” (in fact any 1 can be this \(1_0\), we just select one of them). The 1s at the right of it (blue ones) are a series of 1s that have a beginning and ends at infinity. And the ones at the left of \(1_0\) (red ones) are another series with a beginning and ends at -infinity.

\[ S = \cdots + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + \cdots \]

So, we have this:

\[ S = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 1} \]

Only for the red sum, let’s make a change of variable this way:

\[ m = -k \]

\[ k = -1 \rightarrow m = 1 \]

\[ k = -\infty \rightarrow m = \infty \]

Leading to:

\[ S = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} 1} \]

So, making the sum:

\[ S = \zeta(0) + 1 + \zeta(0) = -\frac{1}{2} + 1 - \frac{1}{2} = 0 \]

We obtain the infamous zero. So, summing up, the sum of 1s when we start at -infinity and finish at +infinity is zero:

\[ S = \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} 1 = ... + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + \cdots = 0 \]

Knowing this, calculating an infinite product is trivial (we can use logarithms to convert any product into sums). We start with a standard infinite product that starts at one point and finishes at infinity:
\[ P = \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} r = r \cdot r \cdot r \cdot r \cdot r \cdot \ldots \]

\[ \ln P = \ln r + \ln r + \ln r + \ln r + \cdots = \ln r \left(1 + 1 + 1 + \cdots\right) = \ln r \left(\xi(0)\right) \]

\[ \ln P = \ln r \left(\xi(0)\right) = -\frac{1}{2} \ln r = \ln r^{-\frac{1}{2}} \]

\[ P = r^{-\frac{1}{2}} \]

We obtain this:

\[ P = \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} r = r \cdot r \cdot r \cdot r \cdot r \cdot \ldots = r^{-\frac{1}{2}} \]

But if we start the product at -infinity and finish at +infinity:

\[ P = \prod_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} r = \ldots r \cdot r \cdot r \cdot r \cdot r \cdot \ldots \]

\[ \ln P = \ldots + \ln r + \ln r + \ln r + \ln r + \cdots = \ln r \left(\ldots + 1 + 1 + 1 + \cdots\right) \]

\[ \ln P = \ln r \left(\ldots + 1 + 1 + 1 + \cdots\right) = \ln r \cdot (0) = 0 \]

\[ P = e^0 = 1 \]

We obtain that the infinite product starting from -infinity to +infinity is 1 (independently of the value of \( r \)).

\[ P = \prod_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} r = \ldots r \cdot r \cdot r \cdot r \cdot r \cdot \ldots = 1 \]


I want to take this opportunity to say that very probably I will not publish papers during a time. Some pending studies from my side:

- Weak interaction in Geometric Algebra Cl(3,0).
- In the paper “Embedding the Einstein tensor in the Klein-Gordon Equation using Geometric Algebra Cl 3,0” [8] the operations are calculated in an orthogonal basis to facilitate the calculations. Even if this option is ok in most of the cases (even Schwarzschild metric is orthogonal) it is not a general solution that should be found.
- The Annex A1 of the paper “Energy-momentum relation in curved space-time” [9] is the beginning of a more detailed study. Normally it is considered that in the “quantum mechanics” world, 8 degrees of freedom apply (corresponding to the eight parameters of the Dirac spinors or the eight parameters of the Geometric Algebra created by three spatial dimensions- scalars, 3 vectors, 3 bivectors and 1 trivector-). But in the “macro” world only 4 dimensions apply. This is not correct. The issue is that in a flat space-time when two spinors are multiplied (or one squared), the symmetries of the flat space-time make that four dimensions are cancelled due to symmetries (some terms are equal with different sign, so they are cancelled, you can check annexes A1 to A4 in [8] to check it). This does not happen in high curvature (big gravity) space-time areas, where these symmetries do...
not exist. So, in these areas the eight dimensions should be still considered, not only the 4 left that we normally experience in our “macro” world. The studies for high curvature space-time areas should be done considering the 8 dimensions (or 8 degrees of freedom or 8 free parameters if you want -scalars, 3 vectors, 3 bivectors and 1 trivector-) not only 4. To make this study in high curvature space-time areas considering all the 8 dimensions is still to be done. In fact, Arash Majidan [10] contacted me to make this study (specifically in black holes). I commented that was in my pending list, but of course, everyone is invited to do it, as far as they credit my work if it is based on it.

- To be able to do the study regarding the two previous points, a program (in Mathematica, Matlab, Python or similar) should be done that can perform all these calculations with the 8 dimensions (8 different elements: scalars, 3 vectors, 3 bivectors and 1 trivector). If an analytical calculation is not possible, a program of finite element or solutions with polynomials should be considered for the calculations. But always considering all the 8 elements existing in the Geometric Algebra Cl3,0 (scalars, 3 vectors, 3 bivectors and 1 trivector).

- Try to justify that the 3 group of masses of each family of elemental particles is related to the 3 original linear dimensions that expand to Cl3,0. This is somehow “commented” in [8] and [9] but never demonstrated or justified.

- Try to justify that the universe has three linear dimensions, that expand to 8 degrees of freedom in Cl3,0, is somehow the only solution (or one of the few possible solutions) that have the necessary symmetries to make the universe, its processes, or contents stable. Justifying that this is the reason that our universe has three linear dimensions.

- In the paper “We live in eight dimensions and no, they are not hidden” [11] chapter 7 and Annexes A2 and A3, I comment about the electromagnetic trivector. The effects it can have as an omnipresent property of our space-time (defining the chirality of some interactions or even explaining the quantum entanglement or participating somehow in what we understand as “gravity” or space-time). To try to dig more into these ideas using expressions or calculations.

- In this paper “Study of the Riemann Zeta function for odd integers”, try to find the equation g_k(x) for different cases with the goal of obtaining ζ(3), ζ(5) or even a ζ(k) valid for certain k’s (odd, even, general etc…).

A7. Annex A7. Logarithm as a limit of an exponential

In this annex we will demonstrate the following equation. This transforms the logarithm, which is normally a function difficult to deal with, in an exponential. The price to pay is that we have to take a limit of a parameter ε to 0:

\[
\ln(x) = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \left( \frac{x^\varepsilon - 1}{\varepsilon} \right)
\]

You can find attached the error we make with this equation with different parameters ε chosen.
### Epsilon vs \(\ln(x)\) Error

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(x)</th>
<th>(\ln(x))</th>
<th>Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-1,386294361</td>
<td>0.00000001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-0.693147181</td>
<td>0.00000001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-0.287682072</td>
<td>0.00000001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00000001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.405465108</td>
<td>0.00000001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.693147181</td>
<td>0.00000001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2,718281828)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00000001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.098612289</td>
<td>0.00000001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.609437912</td>
<td>0.00000001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.302585093</td>
<td>0.00000001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.605170186</td>
<td>0.00000001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>6.907755279</td>
<td>0.00000001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10000</td>
<td>9.210340372</td>
<td>0.00000001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100000</td>
<td>11,51292546</td>
<td>0.00000001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000000</td>
<td>13,81551056</td>
<td>0.00000001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Epsilon vs \(\ln(x)\) Error

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(x)</th>
<th>(\ln(x))</th>
<th>Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-1,386294361</td>
<td>0.00000001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-0.693147181</td>
<td>0.00000001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>-0.287682072</td>
<td>0.00000001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00000001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.405465108</td>
<td>0.00000001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.693147181</td>
<td>0.00000001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2,718281828)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.00000001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.098612289</td>
<td>0.00000001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.609437912</td>
<td>0.00000001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.302585093</td>
<td>0.00000001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.605170186</td>
<td>0.00000001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>6.907755279</td>
<td>0.00000001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10000</td>
<td>9.210340372</td>
<td>0.00000001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100000</td>
<td>11,51292546</td>
<td>0.00000001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000000</td>
<td>13,81551056</td>
<td>0.00000001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The demonstration is as follows. First, we calculate the integral of $1/x$ that we know is the logarithm.

$$\int \frac{1}{x} \, dx = \int x^{-1} \, dx = \ln(x) + C_1$$

Then, we take the following integral that is very similar to $1/x$ but with a parameter $\varepsilon$ that later we will make it tend to zero.

$$\int \frac{1}{x^{1-\varepsilon}} \, dx = \int x^{-1+\varepsilon} \, dx = \frac{x^{-1+\varepsilon+1}}{-1+\varepsilon+1} + C_2 = \frac{x^\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} + C_2$$

Now, we can make $\varepsilon$ tend to zero and make the result equal between both integrals (as they should be equal).

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \int \frac{1}{x^{1-\varepsilon}} \, dx = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \left( \frac{x^\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} + C_2 \right) = \ln(x) + C_1$$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \left( \frac{x^\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} + C_2 \right) - C_1 = \ln(x)$$

As $C_1$ does not depend on $\varepsilon$ we can introduce it in the limit.

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \left( \frac{x^\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} + C_2 - C_1 \right) = \ln(x)$$

We define a new constant $C$ as:

$$C \equiv C_2 - C_1$$

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \left( \frac{x^\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} + C \right) = \ln(x)$$

To calculate $C$, we take the specific case where $x=1$:

$$\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \left( \frac{1^\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} + C \right) = \ln(1)$$
\[
\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \left( \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + C \right) = 0
\]

For the limit to be zero, \( C \) has to be:

\[
C = -\frac{1}{\varepsilon}
\]

Now, returning to the general equation, we substitute the \( C \) with the obtained value:

\[
\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \left( \frac{x^\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \varepsilon + C \right) = \ln(x)
\]

\[
\lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \left( \frac{x^\varepsilon - 1}{\varepsilon} \right) = \ln(x)
\]

And we obtain the desired equation.

\[
\ln(x) = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \left( \frac{x^\varepsilon - 1}{\varepsilon} \right)
\]

Higher above you can find comparisons of the real value of the logarithm with this equation. You can check that for values of \( \varepsilon = 0.00000001 \) and \( x < 1000000 \) we are in levels of error of 0.000%.

As homework, you can demonstrate that if in the following expression, you expand the Newton binomial that is to the power of \( \varepsilon \), and take the limit when \( \varepsilon \) tends to zero, you can obtain the Taylor expansion series of the Logarithm of \((1+x)\):

\[
\ln(1 + x) = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} \left( \frac{(1 + x)^\varepsilon - 1}{\varepsilon} \right)
\]