

Review of: "The smallest gap between primes"

Machiel Van Frankenhuijsen

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

This paper proves the twin prime conjecture,
that there are infinitely many prime numbers such that $p_{k+1} = p_k + 2$,
where
the primes are numbered

$$p_1 = 2, \quad p_2 = 3, \quad p_3 = 5, \quad p_4 = 7, \quad \dots$$

A central role is played by the function

$$H_a(x) = \log\left(\frac{x}{x-1}\right) - \frac{1}{x+a} + \log\left(\frac{x^2 - \log(x) + 1}{x^2}\right).$$

The root in this formula can be understood as follows,

$$\log(x) + 1 \sqrt{x} = e^{\frac{\log x}{1 + \log x}} = e \cdot \exp\left(-\frac{1}{1 + \log x}\right).$$

I do not understand the role of this function in the proof.

In particular,

could it be replaced by a constant?

It is a bounded function for $x \geq 1$,

slowly increasing from 1 to e .

It follows that

$$H_a(x) \approx \frac{1}{x^2} \left(\frac{1}{2} + a - e \right), \quad \text{as } x \rightarrow \infty.$$

In particular,

$H_2(x) < 0$ for large x and $H_4(x) > 0$.

The main insight of the paper is Lemma 5,

$$\sum_{p_k \geq p_n} \left(\log \left(\frac{p_k}{p_k - 1} \right) - \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{p_{k+1}} \right) \right) = \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{p_n} \right) + \log \left(\prod_{p_k \geq p_n} \frac{p_k^2}{p_k^2 - 1} \right).$$

This could be verified directly,

but in the paper it is proved by an appeal to the Euler product for $\zeta(2)$,

$$\frac{\pi^2}{6} = \prod_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{p_k^2}{p_k^2 - 1}.$$

If the twin prime conjecture were false then $p_{k+1} \geq p_k + 4$ for $k \geq n$,

where p_n is a prime number after the last twin prime.

This makes the connection with H_4 ,

and a contradiction is derived with the positivity of H_4 .

The proof of this starts with a computation that could be formulated as a separate lemma:

for p_n large enough,

$$\frac{p_n + 1}{p_n} \cdot \prod_{p_k \geq p_n} \frac{p_k^2}{p_k^2 - 1} \leq \prod_{p_k \geq p_n} \frac{p_k^2}{p_k^2 - \frac{\log(p_k) + 1}{\sqrt{p_k}}}.$$

The proof of this lemma ends with the statement that it is implied by the inequality

$$2 \cdot \left(1 - \prod_{p_k > p_n} \frac{p_k^2 - 1}{p_k^2} \right) > \log \zeta(2).$$

The left-hand side is close to 0 for large n ,

whereas the right-hand side is a positive number.

The inequalities from this point in the paper are in the opposite direction,

and there is no contradiction.