

The ideas of step 1 help to 7  
show other results.

Conjecture:  $\forall$  even  $d$ :  $P_{n+1} - P_n = d$  i.o. <sup>(inf. often)</sup>  
(de Polignac) [1849]

Def  $\mathcal{D}_w =$  de Polignac numbers <sup>(1849)</sup>  
in the weaker sense  $p, p+d \in P$  i.o.

Def  $\mathcal{D}_s =$  strong de Polignac  
numbers:  $P_{n+1} - P_n = d$  i.o.

(weak de Polignac numbers could  
be called Kronecker numbers (1901))

Thm G. (GPY)  $\mathcal{D}_w$  has a pos.  
lower density if  $\vartheta > \frac{1}{2}$

Thm H. (GPY).  $|\mathcal{D}_s| \geq 1$  if  $\vartheta > \frac{1}{2}$

Thm 3.  $\mathcal{D}_s$  has a pos. lower density  
if  $\vartheta > \frac{1}{2}$ .

Remark:  $\mathcal{D}_w \neq \{0\} \iff \underline{\lim} (P_{n+1} - P_n) < \infty$

Problem: Thm C asserts that  $\frac{L_8}{L_8}$

$$\forall c > 0 \quad p_{n+1} - p_n < c \log p_n \quad \text{i.e.}$$

However, is this true for  $\forall c > 0$   
for a set of primes with relative  
pos.  
lower density?

Thm I (GY, 200?) If  $c > 1/4$   
the answer is yes.

Thm 4 (GPY, 201?) The answer  
is yes for  $\forall c > 0$

Remark. The answer is no, if  
the fixed  $c > 0$  is substituted  
by any  $g(n) \rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

The strongest hypothesis [9] about the distribution level of primes,  $\vartheta = 1$ , the Elliott-Halberstam conjecture implies

(\*)  $P_{n+1} - P_n \leq 16$  inf. often (GPY) (E) and  $\exists m$ -term AP's with (\*)  $\forall m$  (Th 1)

Problem: does there exist a plausible hypothesis  $\Rightarrow \forall m \exists m$ -term AP of twin primes [Not.  $\theta(n) = \begin{cases} \log p & n=p \\ \text{else} & \end{cases}$ ]

Th 5. Suppose  $\vartheta > 0.724$  is a distribution level for primes AND for  $f(n) = \lambda(n), \lambda(n)\lambda(n+h), \log p \lambda(p+h)$  and  $\lambda(p-h) \log p$ , i.e.  $\forall \varepsilon, A > 0$ :

$$\left[ \sum_{q \leq N} \max_{a \leq n \leq a+q} \left| \sum_{n \equiv a(q)} f(n) \right| \ll \varepsilon, A \frac{N}{\log^A N} \right]$$

Then  $\forall m \exists m$ -term AP of primes  $p$  such that  $p+h$  is prime too

Def Let  $Q = \{q_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  be the set of  $q$ 's which are the products of two different primes, called also semiprimes or  $E_2$ -numbers

Contrast.

Thm I<sup>1</sup> (Chen 1966/73):  $\exists$  inf. many primes  $p$  with  $p+2 \in P_2$   
 $p+2 \in P$  or  $p+2 = p^2 p'' \in Q$

In 2005 it was still open

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{q_{n+1} - q_n}{\log q_n / \log \log q_n} \stackrel{?}{\leq} 0$$

Thm J (GGPY = S.W. Graham + GPY)

$$q_{n+1} - q_n \leq 6 \text{ inf. often}$$

(2008)

PROBLEM: PARITY PHENOMENON

Thm 6  $\exists d = 2, 4$  or  $6$  s.t.  $\forall m$   
 $\exists m$ -term AP of semiprimes  $q$   
 s.t.  $q + d \in \mathbb{Q}$  too

Thm 7. For at least one third  
 of all even numbers:  $\mathcal{D} = \{d_n\}$   
 $\text{dens } \mathcal{D} \geq 1/6$ ,  
 $\forall d_n \forall m \exists m$ -term AP of  $q$ 's  
 s.t.  $q, q + d_n \in \mathbb{Q}$

Thm 8.  $\forall k \exists \mathcal{H} = \{h_i\}_{i=1}^k$  s.t.  
 $\forall m \exists m$ -term AP of  $q$ 's s.t.  
 (Hardy-Littlewood semiprime  $k$ -tuple conj)  
 $q, q + h_1, \dots, q + h_k \in \mathbb{Q}$

Thm 9. If  $|\mathcal{H}| = 3$ ,  $\mathcal{H} = \{h_k\}_{k=1}^3$   
 admissible, then  $\exists i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ ,  $i \neq j$   
 s.t.  $\exists m$ -term AP of  $n$ 's  $n + h_i, n + h_j \in \mathbb{Q}$

# Problems of Erdős

C1: Erdős-Nirsky: Is  $d(n) = d(n+1)$  inf. often?

Thm K (Heath-Brown 1984): Yes also for  $\Omega(n)$  instead of  $d(n)$

But, due to the parity problem the common value or even the parity of the common value could not be given in advance

Thm L (Schlage-Puchta, 2003/5)

$\omega(n) = \omega(n+1)$  inf. often

In joint work with GGPT we could prove this where the common value could be given in advance almost arbitrarily

Def: the exponent pattern (12a)  
of  $n = \prod_{i=1}^k p_i^{\alpha_i}$  is the  
multiset  $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_k\}$

Question 1: Do we have any given <sup>a-priori</sup>  
exponent pattern  $\mathcal{A}$  such that  
 $n$  and  $n+1$  have e.p.  $\mathcal{A}$   
infinitely often?

Question 2: Do we have any given <sup>a priori</sup>  
e.p.  $\mathcal{A}$  such that there exist  
arbitrarily long AP's of  $n$  such  
that  $n$  and  $n+1$  have e.p.  $\mathcal{A}$   
for elements <sup>"</sup>of the AP's?

Theorem 9A. The answer for Q2  
is yes for any  $\mathcal{A}$  if  $(1, 1, 1, 2) \in \mathcal{A}$

Thm 10.  $\forall m \exists m$ -term AP of  $n$ -values such that simultaneously

(i)  $\omega(n) = 4+B$ ,  $\Omega(n) = 5+B$ ,  
 $d(n) = 24 \cdot 2^B$  and

$\omega(n) = \omega(n+1)$ ,  $\Omega(n) = \Omega(n+1)$ ,  $d(n) = d(n+1)$

with any  $B \geq 0$  or

(ii)  $\omega(n) = 4$ ,  $\Omega(n) = 5+B$ ,  $d(n) = 24(B+1)$   
 $\omega(n) = \omega(n+1)$ ,  $\Omega(n) = \Omega(n+1)$ ,  $d(n) = d(n+1)$

Thm 11  $\forall m \exists m$ -term AP of  $n$ -values with  $\omega(n) = \omega(n+1) = 3$

Thm 12  $\forall m \exists m$ -term AP of  $n$ -values with  $\Omega(n) = \Omega(n+1) = 4$

Thm 13: The number of  $n$ 's below  $N$  satisfying the above conditions is  
 $\rightarrow \approx N / (\log N)^3$  [Exp.  $c \log^2 N (\log_2 N)^c$ ]



Proof of Thm 11 in the weaker 14

form that  $\omega(n) = \omega(n+1) = 3$  inf. o.

or in the original form using Thm 9

Let  $L_1(n) = 6m+1$ ,  $L_2(n) = 8m+1$

and  $L_3(m) = 9m+1$ . Then

$$3L_1 = 2L_3 + 1, \quad 4L_1 = 3L_2 + 1, \quad 9L_2 = 8L_3 + 1$$

If for example the are arbitra-

rily long AP's of ~~inf.~~ semiprimes

~~with~~  $L_1(m)$  and  $L_2(m)$  (i.e. arb.

long AP's of  $m_v$  values s.t.

$L_1(m_v), L_2(m_v) \in \mathbb{Q}$ ) then

$$\omega(3L_1) = 3, \quad \omega(2L_3) = 3, \quad 3L_1 = 2L_3 + 1$$

Proof of Thm 11 in the weaker [14

form that  $\omega(n) = \omega(n+1) = 3$  inf. o.  
or in the original form using Thm 9

Let  $L_1(n) = 6n+1$ ,  $L_2(n) = 8n+1$

and  $L_3(n) = 9n+1$ . Then

$$3L_1 = 2L_3 + 1, \quad 4L_1 = 3L_2 + 1, \quad 9L_2 = 8L_3 + 1$$

If for example the are arbitra-

rily long AP's of ~~inf.~~ semiprimes

~~with~~  $L_1(n)$  and  $L_2(n)$  (i.e. arb.

long AP's of  $n_v$  values s.t.

$L_1(n_v), L_2(n_v) \in \mathbb{Q}$ ) then

$$\omega(9L_1) = 3, \quad \omega(2L_3) = 3, \quad 3L_1 = 2L_3 + 1$$