

An open letter concerning

A Simple Proof of the Riemann Hypothesis

Leon Oiler, John Grauss, Joe Lagrunge, John Dirishlay, and Joe Fouray

In our paper we provided a simple proof of the Riemann hypothesis, along with an extension of this result illustrating that $P = NP$. While we feel that this is an important result, and should be of interest to the community, our paper did not received a warm welcome by the reviewers.

One reviewer called our paper “bipolar”, pointing to the fact that Section 2 purported to offer a simple proof of the Riemann hypothesis, while Section 3 constructed a counterexample. In response to this comment, we initially considered splitting these sections of the manuscript into separate papers. However, we find it interesting that none of the reviewers pointed out any flaw in either section when viewed individually. Based on this positive aspect of the reviews (and despite the prejudicial *ad hominem* attacks of the reviewer questioning our mental capacities), we are unwavering in our confidence that our results are correct.

Furthermore, one reviewer suggested that our proof that $P = NP$ should be omitted since it would not be of interest to the same community. However, we feel that this result is so tightly connected to the Riemann hypothesis that presenting these proofs separately would eliminate one of the chief contributions of this paper. Consequently, we have elected to retain this proof even though it is of secondary consequence to the main result of the paper.

We are frankly perplexed as to why the reviewers struggled to identify the significant contributions of our manuscript. The editor-in-chief rejecting our manuscript ensured us that the reviewers were experts in number theory. We (humbly) conclude that the writing in our original manuscript must have been unclear and difficult to follow. We have made several edits to our manuscript to fix this flaw, including the addition of Figure 1 to provide a graphical illustration of our proof technique and a change in terminology to conform to the standards already established in the literature (e.g., the title Section 4.2).

While we believe that this paper contains results that are interesting to the mathematical community, we simply do not have the time or the patience to continue working with the manuscript to resubmit it to another journal. We have therefore submitted it to *Rejecta Mathematica* so we can move on the more important mathematical problems that lay ahead of us. We hope this community finds it to be a valuable contribution.