Problems and results on the differences of consecutive primes.

By P. ERDŐS in Syracuse (U. S. A.).

Let $p_1 < p_2 < \ldots$ be the sequence of consecutive primes. Put $d_n = p_{n+1} - p_n$. The sequence d_n behaves extremely irregularly. It is well known that $\overline{\lim}\, d_n = \infty$ (since the numbers $n!+2, n!+3, \ldots, n!+n$ are all composite). It has been conjectured that $d_n = 2$ for infinitely many n (i. e. there are infinitely many prime twins). This conjecture seems extremely difficult. In fact not even $\underline{\lim}\; d_n < \infty$, or even $\underline{\lim} \frac{d_n}{\log n} = 0$ has ever been proved. A few years ago I proved[1]) by using Bruns's method that

$$\underline{\lim}\; \frac{d_n}{\log n} < 1. \tag{1}$$

$\underline{\lim} \frac{d_n}{\log n} \leqq 1$ is an immediate consequence of the prime number theorem. WESTZYNTHIUS[2]) proved in the other direction that

$$\overline{\lim}\; \frac{d_n}{\log n} = \infty. \tag{2}$$

In fact he show that for infinitely many n,

$$d_n > \log n \,.\, \log\log\log n / \log\log\log\log n.$$

I proved[3]) using Brun's method that for infinitely many n

$$d_n > c \frac{\log n \,.\, \log\log n}{(\log\log\log n)^2}\,. \tag{3}$$

CHEN[4]) proved (3) very much simpler without using Brun's method,

---

1) *Duke Math. Journal*, Vol. **6** (1940), p. 438—441.

2) *Comm. Phys. Math. Soc. Sci. Fenn.*, Helsingfors, Vol. **5** (1931), No. 25. p. 1—37.

3) *Quarterly Journal of Math.*, Vol. **6** (1935), p. 124—128. In this paper one can find some more litterature on the difference of consecutive primes.

4) Schriften des Math. Seminars und des Instituts für angewandte Math. der Univ. Berlin, **4** (1938), p. 35—55.

and RANKIN[5]) proved that

$$d_n > c\,\frac{\log n \,.\, \log\log n \,.\, \log\log\log\log n}{(\log\log\log n)^2} \tag{4}$$

In the present note I prove the following

Theorem:

$$\overline{\lim}\,\frac{\min(d_n, d_{n+1})}{\log n} = \infty. \tag{5}$$

In other words to every c there exist values of n satisfying the inequalities $d_n > c\log n$, $d_{n+1} > c\log n$.

It can be conjectured that $\overline{\lim}\left(\frac{\min(d_n, d_{n+1}, \ldots, d_{n+k})}{\log n}\right) = \infty$ for every k, but *I* cannot prove this for $k > 1$.

It can also be conjectured that $\underline{\lim}\,\frac{\max(d_n, d_{n+1})}{\log n} < 1$, but *I* cannot prove this either.

Proof of the Theorem[6]). Let n be a large integer, $m = \varepsilon . \log n$, where ε is a small but fixed number, $f(m)$ tends to infinity together with m and $f(m) = o((\log m)^{1/2})$, $N = \prod_{p_i \leq m} p_i$, q_i denotes the primes $\leq (\log m)^2$, r_i the primes of the interval $[(\log m)^2, m^{1/100\log\log m}]$, s_i the primes of the interval $\left(m^{1/100\log\log m}, \frac{m}{2}\right)$, and t_i the primes satisfying $\frac{m}{2} \leqq t_i \leqq m$.

Our aim will be to determine a residue class $x \pmod N$ so that

$$(x+1, N) = 1 \text{ and } (x+k, N) \neq 1 \text{ for all } |k| \leqq m f(m) \text{ and } k \neq +1. \tag{6}$$

Suppose we already determined an x satisfying (6). Then we complete the proof as follows: Consider the arithmetic progression $(x+1) + dN$, $d = 1, \ldots$ Since $(x+1, N) = 1$ it represents infinitely many primes, in fact by a theorem of LINNIK[7]) the least prime it represents does not exceed N^{c_1} where c_1 is an absolute constant independent of N. Now by the prime number theorem, or by the more elementary results of TCHEBICHEFF, we have

$$N^{c_1} = \Big(\prod_{p_i \leqq m} p_i\Big)^{c_1} < e^{2mc_1} = n^{2\varepsilon c_1} < n^{1/2}$$

for $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{4c_1}$, or there exists a prime p_j satisfying

$$p_j < n^{1/2},\ p_j = (x+1) + dN. \tag{7}$$

---

5) *Journal of the London Math. Soc,*, Vol. **13** (1938), p. 242—247. For further results on the difference of consecutive primes see P. ERDŐS and P. TURÁN, *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, Vol. **54** (1948).

6) We use the method of CHEN.

7) On the least prime in an arithmetical progression, I. The basic theorem, *Math. Sbornik*, Vol. **15** (57), No 2, p. 139—178. II. The Deuring—Heilbronn phenomenon, *Math. Sbornik*, Vol. **15** (57), p. 347—368.

It follows form (6) that

(8) $$p_{j+1}-p_j \geqq mf(m),\ p_j-p_{j-1} \geqq mf(m).$$

Thus from (7) and (8)

(9) $$\frac{p_{j+1}-p_j}{\log p_j} \geqq \frac{mf(m)}{\log n} = \varepsilon f(m) \to \infty, \quad \frac{p_j-p_{j-1}}{\log p_j} \geqq \frac{mf(m)}{\log n} = \varepsilon f(m) \to \infty,$$

which proves (5) and our Theorem is proved.

Now we only have to find an x satisfying (6). Put

(10) $$x \equiv 0 \pmod{q_i},\ x \equiv 0 \pmod{s_i}.$$

Let $|k| \leqq mf(m)$, have no factor among the q's and s's. Then we assert that k is either ± 1 or a prime $> \frac{m}{2}$ or has all its prime factors among the r's. For if not then k would be greater than the product of the least r and the least t, i. e.

$$k \geqq \frac{m}{2}(\log m)^2 > mf(m);\ (f(m) = o(\log m))$$

an evident contradiction.

Denote by $u_2, u_2, \ldots, u_\xi$ the integers $\leqq |mf(m)|$ all whose prime factors are r's. We estimate ξ as follows: We split the u's into two classes. In the first class are the u's which have less than $10 . \log\log m$ different prime factors. The number of these u's is clearly less than

(11) $$(m^{1/100 \log\log m} . \log m)^{10 \log\log m} < m^{2/3}$$

(since the number of integers of the form p^α, $p^\alpha < mf(m)$, $p < m^{1/100 \log\log m}$ is less than $m^{1/100 \log\log m} . \log m$).

For the u's of the second class $v(u) \geqq 10 . \log\log m$ ($v(u)$ denotes the number of different prime factors of u). Thus from

$$\sum 2^{v(u)} < 2 \sum_{b=1}^{mf(m)} 2^{v(b)} < cmf(m) . \log m < m(\log m)^2$$

we obtain that the number of the u's of the second class is less than

(12) $$\frac{m(\log m)^2}{2^{10 \log\log m}} < \frac{m}{(\log m)^2}.$$

Hence finally from (11) and (12)

(13) $$\xi = o\left(\frac{m}{\log m}\right).$$

Denote now by $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_\eta$ the integers of absolute value $\leqq mf(m)$ which do not satisfy the congruence (10). Then the v's are either -1 or are u's, or of the form $\pm p$, $\frac{m}{2} < p \leqq mf(m)$. Thus by (13) and the results of TCHEBICHEFF about primes

(14) $$\eta < c\frac{mf(m)}{\log m}.$$

Suppose we already determined for $i<j$ a residue class $\lambda^{(i)} \pmod{r_i}$ so that

(15) $$x \equiv \lambda^{(i)} \pmod{r_i}, \quad \lambda^{(i)} \not\equiv -1, \qquad i=1,2,\ldots,(j-1).$$

Denote by $v_1^{(j)},\ldots,v_{\eta_j}^{(j)}$ the v's which do not satisfy any of the congruences (15). There clearly exists a residue class mod r_j which contains at least η_j/r_j of the v's. Denote this residue class by $\lambda_1^{(j)}$. If $\lambda_1^{(j)} \not\equiv -1 \pmod{r_j}$ we put

(16) $$x \equiv \lambda_1^{(j)} \pmod{r_j}.$$

If on the other hand $\lambda_1^{(j)} \equiv -1 \pmod{r_j}$ we distinguish two cases: In the first case the residue class $\lambda_1^{(j)} \pmod{r_j}$ contains less than $\frac{1}{2}\eta_j$ of the $v^{(j)}$'s. Then there clearly exists a residue class $\lambda_2^{(j)} \not\equiv \lambda_1^{(j)} \pmod{r_j}$ which contains more than $\eta_j/2r_j$ of the $v^{(j)}$'s. Put for these r_j's

(17) $$x \equiv \lambda_2^{(j)} \pmod{r_j}.$$

We continue this operation for all the r's and let us first assume that for every r_j either $\lambda_1^{(j)} \not\equiv -1 \pmod{r_j}$ or that the first case occurs. Denote by $V_1, V_2, \ldots, V_\varrho$ the v's which do not satisfy the congruences (16) and (17). Clearly

(18) $$\varrho \leqq \eta \Pi\left(1-\frac{1}{2r_j}\right) < c\,\frac{mf(m)\log\log m}{(\log m)^{3/2}} = o\left(\frac{m}{\log m}\right)$$

since

$$\frac{c_1}{\sqrt{\log z}} < \prod_{p \leqq z}\left(1-\frac{1}{2p}\right) < \frac{c_2}{\sqrt{\log z}}.$$

Put now

(19) $$x \equiv -V_i \pmod{t_i}, \qquad 1 \leqq i \leqq \varrho,$$

where t_i is chosen so that $V_i - 1 \not\equiv 0 \pmod{t_i}$ and the different V_i correspond different t_i. This is always possible since the number of prime factors of $V_i - 1$ is less than $c\log m$ and number of t's equals $\pi(2m)-\pi(m)$, and we have by (18) and the results of TCHEBICHEFF

$$\pi(2m)-\pi(m) > c_1\frac{m}{\log m} > \varrho + c\log m.$$

For the t's not used in (19) we put

(20) $$x \equiv 0 \pmod{t_i}.$$

The congruences (10), (16), (17) and (10) determine $x \pmod{N}$ so that (6) is clearly satisfied, which proves our Theorem in case the second case never occurs.