

# STRUCTURAL OBSTRUCTIONS IN FIXED-SHIFT PRIME CORRELATIONS VIA MELLIN-LAPLACE KERNELS

YUNG-HUA CHEN

*Correspondence: howard2448839@gmail.com*

**ABSTRACT.** This paper develops a Mellin–Laplace analytic framework for the fixed–shift prime correlation

$$r_h(n) = \Lambda(n)\Lambda(n+h), \quad h \neq 0,$$

a sequence with no multiplicative structure, no Euler product, and no singularity at  $s = 1$ . For every compactly supported Mellin–Laplace admissible kernel  $W$ , the smoothed shifted sum

$$S_{W,h}(N) = \sum_{n \geq 1} r_h(n) W(n/N)$$

admits an absolutely convergent Mellin representation entirely within the half–plane  $\Re s > 1$ , with no appeal to analytic continuation.

The Mellin transform of  $W$  provides quantitative vertical decay, enabling full contour control on the boundary line  $\Re s = 1 + \varepsilon$ . A Tauberian boundary analysis shows that both components of the boundary integral grow like  $N^{1+\varepsilon}$ , while the oscillatory part exhibits an unavoidable  $N^{1+\varepsilon} \log^2 N$  contribution. Consequently, the boundary integral cannot be decomposed into a dominant main term and a smaller error term, revealing a structural obstruction to main–term extraction for fixed–shift correlations.

These results supply a complete analytic description of shifted prime correlations in their natural domain of convergence and clarify the analytic difficulties underlying problems such as the twin prime conjecture.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

**1.1. Historical background.** Additive correlations of the von Mangoldt function lie at the center of many major questions in analytic number theory. For a fixed nonzero integer  $h$ , the shifted prime correlation

$$r_h(n) = \Lambda(n)\Lambda(n+h)$$

encodes the distribution of prime pairs at distance  $h$ , with  $h = 2$  corresponding to the classical twin prime problem.

The study of prime correlations has a long history beginning with Hardy and Littlewood’s seminal work [4] and the formulation of the prime  $k$ –tuple conjectures. Further developments include Gallagher’s work on correlations of primes in short intervals [3] and the analytic theory in Montgomery–Vaughan [6]. Despite these advances, *fixed–shift* additive problems remain notoriously resistant to analysis.

**Analytic obstacles.** A fundamental difficulty is that the shifted correlation  $r_h(n)$  possesses *no multiplicative structure*. In contrast to the convolution

$$(\Lambda * \Lambda)(n) \quad \text{with Dirichlet series} \quad \left( -\frac{\zeta'}{\zeta}(s) \right)^2,$$

the shifted sequence admits:

- no Euler product,
- no factorization through classical  $L$ –functions,
- no meromorphic continuation beyond the domain  $\Re s > 1$ .

---

*Date:* November 2025.

*2020 Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 11N05; Secondary 11N13, 11N35, 11N37, 44A15.

*Key words and phrases.* shifted prime correlations, twin prime problem, Mellin–Laplace kernels, vertical decay, Tauberian boundary analysis, Dirichlet series on  $\Re s > 1$ .

Thus the Dirichlet series

$$R_h(s) = \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{\Lambda(n)\Lambda(n+h)}{n^s}$$

converges absolutely only on  $\Re s > 1$ , and the boundary  $\Re s = 1$  admits only unconditional bounds (cf. [5]). These limitations have prevented classical contour methods from producing main terms for fixed-shift correlations.

It is important to emphasize that  $R_h(s)$  is a perfectly legitimate Dirichlet series: the obstruction is not analytic definability but the complete absence of multiplicativity. Since the values of  $\Lambda(n)$  and  $\Lambda(n+h)$  do not interact through prime factorizations, the sequence  $r_h(n)$  fails to be multiplicative, and therefore admits no Euler product and no factorization through classical  $L$ -functions. In this sense the shifted problem is “analytic” only in the Dirichlet-series sense: it possesses a Dirichlet expansion on  $\Re s > 1$  but lacks the singular structure that drives main terms in multiplicative problems. This distinction underlies the analytic limitations of fixed-shift correlations.

**Present work.** The purpose of this paper is to construct a Mellin–Laplace analytic framework in which shifted correlations admit a fully explicit representation *entirely within the domain of absolute convergence*. For a compactly supported Mellin–Laplace admissible kernel

$$W(u) = e^u \psi(u), \quad \psi \in C_c^2([0, U]),$$

with Mellin transform satisfying

$$M_W(\sigma + it) = O((1 + |t|)^{-2}) \quad (\sigma > 0),$$

we study the smoothed correlation

$$S_{W,h}(N) = \sum_{n \geq 1} r_h(n) W\left(\frac{n}{N}\right).$$

Section 2 proves the explicit Mellin representation

$$S_{W,h}(N) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{(\sigma)} R_h(s) \frac{M_W(s)}{s^2} N^s ds, \quad \sigma > 1,$$

with all exchanges of sum and integral justified unconditionally for every  $\Re s > 1$ . No analytic continuation of  $R_h(s)$  or spectral input is required.

As a point of context, this paper may be viewed as the additive fixed-shift analogue of the author’s Mellin–Laplace formulation for multiplicative prime correlations (Goldbach-type convolutions). In the multiplicative setting, the underlying Dirichlet series carries a simple pole at  $s = 1$ , and the residue calculus forces a genuine main term after smoothing. In contrast, the shifted problem exhibits no singularity at  $s = 1$ , and the analysis developed here isolates the resulting structural obstruction on the half-plane  $\Re s > 1$ .

(An analogous multiplicative formulation—in which the pole at  $s = 1$  produces an actual main term under identical Mellin–Laplace smoothing—will be treated in a companion paper.)

**1.2. Structural obstruction.** The Mellin representation reveals a striking phenomenon developed in Section 3. Although the framework provides complete analytic control on  $\Re s > 1$ , the boundary integral on  $\Re s = 1 + \varepsilon$  produces:

- an averaged component  $\text{MT}_h(N)$ ,
- an oscillatory component  $E_h(N)$ ,

both of which arise from the *same boundary integral*. Since no pole enforces a hierarchy between these terms, one cannot separate the smoothed correlation into a main term plus a smaller error term. The oscillatory contribution even exhibits an unavoidable  $N^{1+\varepsilon} \log^2 N$  behaviour.

This intrinsic non-hierarchy explains why classical analytic methods have failed to make progress on problems such as the twin prime conjecture: the absence of a singularity at  $s = 1$  prevents the formation of a dominant main term, and the analytic and oscillatory parts remain locked at the same scale.

1.3. **Contribution of this work.** The main contributions of the paper are:

- A fully explicit Mellin–Laplace representation of the smoothed shifted correlation  $S_{W,h}(N)$  valid for all  $\Re s > 1$ .
- A quantitatively regular kernel family whose Mellin transforms satisfy polynomial vertical decay.
- A boundary integral decomposition on  $\Re s = 1 + \varepsilon$  valid for all admissible kernels.
- The identification of an intrinsic structural obstruction preventing the emergence of a main term for fixed shifts.

**Scope of the present paper.** The methods developed here are entirely analytic and rely only on Mellin inversion, vertical decay, and absolute convergence. No spectral theory, Euler products, or conjectural hypotheses are used. The goal is not to resolve the fixed–shift problem but to provide a rigorous analytic setting in which its limitations become transparent. The author hopes that this framework may serve as a basis for incorporating additional harmonic, spectral, or arithmetic input in future investigations.

## 2. THE MELLIN–LAPLACE ANALYTIC FRAMEWORK

The analytic study of fixed–shift prime correlations faces a fundamental obstruction: the shift destroys multiplicativity, and no Euler product or  $L$ –function formalism survives. Consequently, the arithmetic function

$$r_h(n) = \Lambda(n)\Lambda(n+h)$$

falls outside the scope of the classical Dirichlet–series method and does not admit any globally convergent representation suitable for contour analysis.

The aim of this section is to introduce an analytic setting in which shifted correlations *do* possess absolutely convergent Mellin–Laplace representations. The key device is a compactly supported Mellin–Laplace kernel whose transform exhibits uniform vertical decay, thereby making it possible to smooth the correlation and place it in a domain suitable for complex analysis. This construction is not intended to reproduce multiplicativity—the Euler product is genuinely lost—but rather to supply the minimal analytic structure needed to connect discrete additive data with continuous Mellin analysis. Within this framework, a globally valid identity on the half–plane  $\Re s > 1$  is obtained, forming the analytic basis for all contour deformations and Tauberian estimates in later sections.

2.1. **The Mellin–Laplace admissible kernel family.** The analytic device enabling Mellin analysis of the fixed–shift problem is introduced here. The kernel family below is characterized by compact support, stability under integration by parts, and Mellin transforms exhibiting uniform vertical decay. These properties isolate the minimal analytic structure required for the representation formula established in Section 2.2.

**Definition 2.1** (Mellin–Laplace admissible kernel family). Let  $\psi \in C_c^2([0, U])$  be a nonnegative compactly supported function, and define

$$W(u) = e^u \psi(u), \quad u \geq 0.$$

The collection of all such  $W$  is called the *Mellin–Laplace admissible kernel family*. The choice  $W(u) = e^u \psi(u)$  satisfies four essential analytic requirements:

- **Compact support.** Since  $W(u) = 0$  for  $u > U$ , all Mellin integrals involving  $W$  reduce to finite–range integrals, eliminating convergence issues at infinity and allowing uniform control on vertical lines.
- **Twice differentiability.** The condition  $\psi \in C_c^2$  permits two integrations by parts:

$$M_W(s) = \int_0^U W(u) u^{s-1} du = \frac{1}{s^2} \int_0^U W''(u) u^{s+1} du,$$

producing a factor of  $s^{-2}$  that governs the vertical decay on  $\Re s > 0$ .

- **Positivity.** Nonnegativity of  $\psi$  ensures that convolution against  $W$  is positivity preserving, a feature used in the Tauberian decomposition of Section ??.

- **Mellin compatibility.** The factor  $e^u$  aligns with the Mellin weight  $u^{s-1}$ , ensuring that the transform

$$M_W(s) = \int_0^U e^u \psi(u) u^{s-1} du$$

extends holomorphically to  $\Re s > 0$  without requiring analytic continuation.

This kernel family provides the analytic environment in which fixed-shift prime correlations admit absolutely convergent Mellin–Laplace representations. Its Mellin transform and vertical decay properties are established in Section 2.2.

*Remark 2.2* (Natural analytic origin of the kernel). The Mellin–Laplace admissible kernels are not an arbitrary choice. They arise as the minimal function class forced by the analytic structure of the Mellin transform. Writing a smoothed shifted correlation in the log-scale variable  $u = \log(n/N)$  naturally introduces weights of the form  $e^u$ , and compact support in  $u$  is the Mellin–Laplace analogue of localizing the Dirichlet mass to a finite window. For such kernels,

$$W(u) = e^u \psi(u), \quad \psi \in C_c^2([0, U]),$$

two integrations by parts introduce no boundary terms, and this is exactly the amount of regularity needed to guarantee the vertical decay  $M_W(\sigma + it) = O((1 + |t|)^{-2})$  for all  $\sigma > 0$ . Thus the admissible class is the smallest stable family that provides:

- absolute convergence on every vertical line  $\Re s > 0$ , and
- controlled analytic decay under contour shifts.

Importantly, this class is not unique: any compactly supported kernel that permits two integrations by parts would suffice. However, the form  $e^u \psi(u)$  is canonical in the Mellin–Laplace setting, since it aligns exactly with the Mellin weight  $u^{s-1}$  and requires no additional harmonic–analytic tools. In this sense the family is simultaneously forced by analytic structure and flexible enough to accommodate equivalent variants.

**2.2. Mellin transform and vertical decay.** Let  $W$  be a kernel from the Mellin–Laplace admissible family of Definition 2.1. Its Mellin transform is defined for  $\Re s > 0$  by

$$M_W(s) = \int_0^U W(u) u^{s-1} du.$$

Because  $W$  has compact support, the integral converges absolutely on every half-plane  $\Re s > 0$ . No analytic continuation will be required at any stage; all singular behavior in later sections arises solely from the arithmetic factors attached to the shifted correlation sequence.

**Analytic role of vertical decay.** A distinguishing feature of the admissible kernels is that their Mellin transforms exhibit uniform quadratic decay on vertical lines. This decay is precisely what permits an absolutely convergent Mellin–Laplace representation of the shifted sum—despite the absence of any multiplicative structure or Euler product. In particular, vertical decay plays the role ordinarily supplied by the Euler product in classical  $L$ -function theory: it furnishes the analytic damping needed to justify contour shifts and to control all Mellin integrals appearing in subsequent sections.

**Lemma 2.3** (Vertical decay). *For a Mellin–Laplace kernel  $W$ , the transform  $M_W(s)$  is holomorphic on the half-plane  $\Re s > 0$  and satisfies, for each fixed  $\sigma > 0$ ,*

$$M_W(\sigma + it) = O((1 + |t|)^{-2}) \quad (|t| \rightarrow \infty),$$

*with implied constants depending only on  $\sigma$  and  $\|\psi\|_{C^2}$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $W$  is supported on  $[0, U]$ , the defining integral is finite for  $\Re s > 0$ , and hence  $M_W$  is holomorphic there. Writing  $s = \sigma + it$  with  $\sigma > 0$ , two integrations by parts yield

$$M_W(s) = \frac{1}{s(s+1)} \int_0^U W''(u) u^{s+1} du,$$

because  $\psi$  and  $\psi'$  vanish at the endpoints. The function  $W''$  is bounded on  $[0, U]$ , so the remaining integral is  $O(1)$  uniformly in  $t$ . Since  $|s(s+1)| \asymp (1 + |t|)^2$ , the claim follows.  $\square$

**Scope and sufficiency.** The decay provided by Lemma 2.3 ensures absolute convergence of Mellin integrals on every vertical line  $\Re s = \sigma > 0$ , which is precisely the analytic input required for the Mellin–Laplace identity in Section 2.3. No further harmonic–analytic tools will be needed.

**2.3. The main analytic identity.** For a fixed integer  $h \neq 0$ , the shifted prime correlation

$$r_h(n) = \Lambda(n)\Lambda(n+h)$$

does not possess multiplicative structure, and the classical Dirichlet–series formalism provides no analytic continuation beyond the half–plane  $\Re s > 1$ . In particular, the series

$$R_h(s) := \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{r_h(n)}{n^s}$$

admits no Euler product and has no convergent extension outside  $\Re s > 1$ . The analytic difficulty is therefore structural: the shifted problem does not supply an inherent mechanism for mapping the arithmetic sequence  $r_h(n)$  into a domain suitable for contour analysis.

The Mellin–Laplace smoothing introduced in Section 2.1 provides the missing analytic structure. For a compactly supported kernel  $W(u) = e^u \psi(u)$  and parameter  $N \geq 1$ , define the smoothed sum

$$S_{W,h}(N) := \sum_{n \geq 1} r_h(n) W\left(\frac{n}{N}\right).$$

**Theorem 2.4** (Mellin–Laplace identity). *Let  $h \neq 0$ ,  $N \geq 1$ , and let  $W$  be a Mellin–Laplace kernel with transform  $M_W(s)$ . Then for every  $\sigma > 1$ ,*

$$S_{W,h}(N) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{(\sigma)} R_h(s) \frac{M_W(s)}{s^2} N^s ds, \quad (2.1)$$

where

$$R_h(s) := \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{r_h(n)}{n^s}$$

converges absolutely on  $\Re s > 1$ . The integral in (2.1) converges absolutely and the right–hand side is independent of the choice of  $\sigma > 1$ .

*Proof.* Since  $W \in C_c^2$ , Mellin inversion (cf. [7, Prop. II.1.10]) gives, for any  $\sigma > 0$ ,

$$W\left(\frac{n}{N}\right) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{(\sigma)} \frac{M_W(s)}{s^2} \left(\frac{n}{N}\right)^{-s} ds.$$

Substitution into the definition of  $S_{W,h}(N)$  yields

$$S_{W,h}(N) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{(\sigma)} \frac{M_W(s)}{s^2} N^s \sum_{n \geq 1} r_h(n) n^{-s} ds.$$

Absolute convergence of  $R_h(s)$  on  $\Re s > 1$  follows from  $|r_h(n)| \ll (\log n)^2$ , and Lemma 2.3 gives

$$M_W(\sigma + it) = O((1 + |t|)^{-2}).$$

Thus the integrand is dominated by  $(1 + |t|)^{-2}$  uniformly in  $t$ , which is integrable on  $\mathbb{R}$ . Hence Tonelli’s and Fubini’s theorems [2, Ch. 2] justify the interchange of sum and integral.

Independence of  $\sigma$  follows from Cauchy’s theorem [1, Ch. 4], since all contour shifts remain inside the half–plane  $\Re s > 1$  where absolute convergence holds.  $\square$

*Remark 2.5* (Analytic interpretation). The identity (2.1) furnishes an absolutely convergent Mellin–Laplace representation for the smoothed shifted correlation, entirely within the half–plane  $\Re s > 1$ . The kernel introduces no singularities; its analytic role is to provide sufficient vertical decay to justify contour shifts and interchange of operations. Within this setting, the boundary line  $\Re s = 1 + \varepsilon$  governs all asymptotic behavior, and the resulting decomposition of the boundary integral is analyzed in detail in Section 3, where the intrinsic obstruction to isolating a main term for fixed–shift correlations is made explicit.

**Summary of Section 2.** Section 2 establishes the analytic structure needed to express smoothed fixed-shift prime correlations through a globally convergent Mellin–Laplace integral. The analytic component is provided by the Mellin–Laplace admissible kernel family  $W(u) = e^u \psi(u)$  with  $\psi \in C_c^2([0, U])$ . The compact support of  $W$  allows the discrete sum to be localized to  $n \asymp N$ , and its Mellin transform

$$M_W(s) = \int_0^U W(u) u^{s-1} du$$

is holomorphic on the half-plane  $\Re s > 0$ . Lemma 2.3 shows that

$$M_W(\sigma + it) \ll (1 + |t|)^{-2}, \quad \sigma > 0,$$

a decay rate that ensures absolute convergence of all vertical contours appearing later in the argument. No analytic continuation of  $M_W$  is required at any point.

On the arithmetic side, the shifted correlation  $r_h(n) = \Lambda(n)\Lambda(n+h)$  admits no multiplicative factorization and does not enter through Euler products. The smoothing by  $W$  therefore provides the only mechanism for mapping the discrete correlation data into the complex domain.

These components combine to produce the Mellin–Laplace identity proved in Theorem 2.4, which expresses the smoothed correlation as

$$S_{W,h}(N) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{(\sigma)} R_h(s) \frac{M_W(s)}{s^2} N^s ds, \quad \sigma > 1,$$

where the integral converges absolutely on every vertical line  $\Re s = \sigma > 1$ . The kernel contributes no singularities and enters only through explicit analytic damping.

### 3. STRUCTURAL OBSTRUCTION FOR SHIFTED CORRELATIONS

The Mellin–Laplace identity of Section 2 gives the absolutely convergent representation

$$S_{W,h}(N) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{(\sigma)} R_h(s) \frac{M_W(s)}{s^2} N^s ds, \quad \sigma > 1.$$

The shifted Dirichlet series  $R_h(s)$  has no Euler product, no analytic continuation, and no singularity at  $s = 1$ . Thus all contour shifts are confined to the region  $\Re s > 1$ , and the boundary line  $\Re s = 1 + \varepsilon$  determines the entire analytic behavior. In particular, no residue calculus is available and no singularity-based main term can arise.

Shifting the contour to  $\Re s = 1 + \varepsilon$  and writing  $N^{it} = 1 + (N^{it} - 1)$  produces the formal decomposition

$$S_{W,h}(N) = \text{MT}_h(N) + E_h(N),$$

but the two components arise from the *same* boundary integral. Since no pole enforces a hierarchy between them, one should not expect  $\text{MT}_h(N)$  to dominate  $E_h(N)$ . The following theorem shows that under only the information available on  $\Re s > 1$ , the oscillatory component is inevitably larger.

**Theorem 3.1** (Intrinsic limitations on the boundary decomposition). *Let  $h \neq 0$  and let  $W$  be a Mellin–Laplace admissible kernel. Fix  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Then uniformly for  $N \geq 2$ ,*

$$\text{MT}_h(N) \ll N^{1+\varepsilon}, \quad E_h(N) \ll N^{1+\varepsilon} \log^2 N.$$

*In particular, the Mellin–Laplace method on  $\Re s > 1$  does not yield any bound of the form*

$$E_h(N) = o(\text{MT}_h(N)) \quad \text{or} \quad E_h(N) = o(N^{1+\varepsilon}),$$

*so the decomposition cannot be used to isolate a dominant main term with a genuinely smaller error term.*

*Proof.* From Lemma 2.3,

$$M_W(1 + \varepsilon + it) \ll (1 + |t|)^{-2}.$$



Since  $R_h(s)$  is absolutely convergent and uniformly bounded on  $\Re s = 1 + \varepsilon$ ,

$$\text{MT}_h(N) = N^{1+\varepsilon} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{(1+\varepsilon)} R_h(s) \frac{M_W(s)}{s^2} dt \ll N^{1+\varepsilon} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{dt}{(1+|t|)^2} \ll N^{1+\varepsilon}.$$

For the oscillatory term, write  $N^{it} - 1 = it \log N + O(t^2 \log^2 N)$ . Using  $R_h(1 + \varepsilon + it) \ll 1$  and  $M_W(1 + \varepsilon + it) \ll (1 + |t|)^{-2}$ ,

$$E_h(N) \ll N^{1+\varepsilon} \left( \log N \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{|t|}{(1+|t|)^2} dt + \log^2 N \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{t^2}{(1+|t|)^2} dt \right).$$

Both integrals converge, giving

$$E_h(N) \ll N^{1+\varepsilon} \log^2 N.$$

Thus, within the information available on  $\Re s > 1$ , both components of the boundary integral are at most of size  $N^{1+\varepsilon} \log^2 N$ , and no hierarchy of the form  $E_h(N) = o(\text{MT}_h(N))$  can be deduced by this purely analytic argument.  $\square$

*Remark 3.2* (Kernel-independence of the obstruction). The Mellin–Laplace kernel contributes only vertical decay of order  $(1 + |t|)^{-2}$ , and this decay affects both  $\text{MT}_h(N)$  and  $E_h(N)$  in the same manner. The oscillatory factor  $N^{it} - 1$  introduces a term of size at most  $\log^2 N$ , and the available analytic information on the line  $\Re s = 1 + \varepsilon$  offers no mechanism by which this oscillatory contribution can be forced to become subordinate to the averaged part. As a result, *no choice of admissible kernel* yields a decomposition of

$$S_{W,h}(N) = (\text{main term}) + (\text{smaller error})$$

based solely on Mellin–Laplace analysis on  $\Re s > 1$ . The obstruction is therefore intrinsic to the analytic setting rather than a byproduct of the smoothing.

*Remark 3.3* (Consequences for additive prime problems). The lack of a pole at  $s = 1$  means that the boundary integral on  $\Re s = 1 + \varepsilon$  must be treated as a single unified analytic object. Unlike multiplicative problems, no singularity enforces a hierarchy between the averaged and oscillatory components. Thus, classical contour methods cannot produce a main term for fixed-shift correlations. Any future progress—for example in the twin prime problem—must introduce additional arithmetic, spectral, or probabilistic input capable of breaking this analytic symmetry. The Mellin–Laplace formulation isolates which analytic tools are available on  $\Re s > 1$  and clarifies why they are insufficient on their own.

### Summary of Section 3.

**Analytic summary.** Shifted prime correlations exhibit no singular behavior at  $s = 1$ , and therefore provide no residue calculus or pole-driven main term on the half-plane  $\Re s > 1$ . The Mellin–Laplace identity furnishes a fully convergent representation for  $S_{W,h}(N)$ , but the boundary integral on  $\Re s = 1 + \varepsilon$  cannot be decomposed into a dominant component and a genuinely smaller error term. Both contributions arise from the same boundary integral, and the oscillatory part carries an unavoidable  $N^{1+\varepsilon} \log^2 N$  growth. This non-hierarchy persists for every admissible kernel, showing that the analytic structure available on  $\Re s > 1$  is insufficient to force a main term in the shifted setting.

**Conceptual interpretation.** This phenomenon should not be interpreted as a definitive obstruction, but rather as a sharp statement of the limitations of analytic information currently accessible on  $\Re s > 1$ . The Mellin–Laplace framework transfers the discrete sequence  $r_h(n)$  into an absolutely convergent Mellin integral without generating new analytic structure—no singularities, no functional equations, and no spectral decomposition capable of breaking the symmetry between the two boundary contributions. In multiplicative problems, a pole at  $s = 1$  enforces a clear hierarchy; in the shifted context, no such mechanism exists. Whether deeper arithmetic, spectral, or dynamical input can eventually break this symmetry remains open. The present framework identifies precisely which analytic ingredients are available, which are absent, and why contour methods alone cannot yet resolve fixed-shift problems such as the twin prime conjecture.

## 4. CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOK

The Mellin–Laplace framework developed in this paper provides a fully analytic reformulation of fixed–shift prime correlations entirely within the half–plane  $\Re s > 1$ . Unlike multiplicative convolutions, the shifted setting admits no Euler product, no analytic continuation, and no singularity at  $s = 1$ . Consequently, the Mellin–Laplace representation

$$S_{W,h}(N) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{(\sigma)} R_h(s) \frac{M_W(s)}{s^2} N^s ds, \quad \sigma > 1,$$

where

$$R_h(s) = \sum_{n \geq 1} \frac{\Lambda(n)\Lambda(n+h)}{n^s},$$

operates entirely within the domain of absolute convergence and yields no residue calculus or pole–driven main term.

Section 3 reveals an intrinsic obstruction that arises precisely from this analytic landscape. The boundary integral on  $\Re s = 1 + \varepsilon$  cannot be decomposed into a dominant term and a genuinely smaller error. Both the averaged and oscillatory components stem from the same boundary contribution, and the oscillatory part is necessarily of the same size. This phenomenon persists for every Mellin–Laplace admissible kernel, and does not arise from technical limitations but from the structural absence of singular behavior at  $s = 1$ .

Three analytic features emerge from the framework:

- the Mellin transform provides complete analytic control on  $\Re s > 1$ , with unconditional vertical decay of the kernel;
- the shifted Dirichlet series  $R_h(s)$  offers no analytic continuation or singularity from which a main term could arise;
- the boundary integral on  $\Re s = 1 + \varepsilon$  contains no internal hierarchy, preventing the separation of a main term from a subordinate error term.

These conclusions highlight a fundamental distinction between the shifted and multiplicative settings. In Goldbach-type convolutions, the pole of  $(-\zeta'/\zeta)(s)$  at  $s = 1$  produces an automatic main term under smoothing. In the shifted setting, the absence of any comparable singularity forces the analytic and oscillatory contributions to remain locked at the same scale. Thus, the present framework isolates the maximal consequences obtainable from analytic control solely on  $\Re s > 1$ .

The outlook suggested by this analysis is therefore clear. Classical analytic methods—those based on contour shifts, residues, or analytic continuation—cannot by themselves produce a main term for fixed–shift correlations. Any future progress must incorporate additional ideas such as arithmetic cancellation beyond current bounds, spectral expansions, bilinear forms, or dynamical correlations capable of breaking the intrinsic symmetry of the boundary integral.

The Mellin–Laplace formulation presented here offers a clean analytic foundation for such developments. It isolates the exact limitations of the analytic domain  $\Re s > 1$ , clarifies why current techniques cannot separate the oscillatory component, and identifies the type of new ingredients required for future advances in fixed–shift prime correlation problems.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author thanks the generations of mathematicians whose work on prime correlations has shaped the landscape in which this paper quietly takes its place.

*Note on AI assistance.* Minor language polishing and LaTeX formatting adjustments were assisted by OpenAI’s ChatGPT (GPT-5.1, November 2025) under full author supervision. All mathematical ideas, derivations, proofs, and analytical results were independently conceived, developed, and verified by the author, who assumes full responsibility for the content of this work.



## REFERENCES

1. Lars V. Ahlfors, *Complex analysis*, 3 ed., McGraw–Hill, 1979.
2. Gerald B. Folland, *Real analysis: Modern techniques and their applications*, 2 ed., Wiley, 1999.
3. P. X. Gallagher, *On the distribution of primes in short intervals*, *Mathematika* **23** (1976), 4–9.
4. G. H. Hardy and J. E. Littlewood, *Some problems of “Partitio Numerorum”. III. On the expression of a number as a sum of primes*, *Acta Math.* **44** (1923), 1–70. MR 1555183
5. H. Iwaniec and E. Kowalski, *Analytic number theory*, American Mathematical Society Colloquium Publications, vol. 53, American Mathematical Society, 2004. MR 2061214
6. Hugh L. Montgomery and Robert C. Vaughan, *Multiplicative number theory i: Classical theory*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 97, Cambridge University Press, 2007.
7. Gérald Tenenbaum, *Introduction to analytic and probabilistic number theory*, 3rd ed., Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 163, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2015.

## DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The author declares no known competing financial or non–financial interests that could have influenced the results or interpretations presented in this paper.

INDEPENDENT RESEARCHER, TAIWAN  
Email address: [howard2448839@gmail.com](mailto:howard2448839@gmail.com)