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Abstract

For $n \geq 1$ let $p_n$ denote the $n^{th}$ prime in the sequence of consecutive prime numbers in ascending order. For a positive integer $m$, denote by $\pi(m)$ the number of prime numbers less than or equal to $m$. Let $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ denote the floor or greatest integer function. In this paper, we show that:

$$\left\lfloor \frac{p_{n+1}^2}{n+1} \right\rfloor \leq \pi(p_{n+1}^2).$$

As a consequence, we see that there are infinitely many primes (Euclid’s theorem). Then, we prove that if we let $\pi_2(m)$, denote the number of twin primes not exceeding $m$, then for all $n \geq 2$:

$$\left\lfloor \frac{p_{n+3}^2}{3(n+2)} \right\rfloor \leq \pi_2(p_{n+3}^2)$$

and thereby prove the twin prime conjecture, namely that there are infinitely many prime numbers $p$ such that $p + 2$ is also prime.
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1. Introduction and main results

An integer \( p \geq 2 \) is called a prime if its only positive divisors are 1 and \( p \). The prime numbers form a sequence:

\[
(1.1) \quad 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, 17, 19, 23, 29, 31, 37, 41, 43, \ldots
\]

Euclid (300 B.C.) considered prime numbers and proved that there are infinitely many. Prime numbers are odd except 2 and the only consecutive prime numbers are 2 and 3. Any two odd prime numbers in the sequences \( \{1, 3, 5, 7, 9, \ldots\} \) differ by at least 2. Pairs of prime numbers that differ by 2 as, for example, in the sequence below

\[
(1.2) \quad (3, 5), (5, 7), (11, 13), (17, 19), (29, 31), (41, 43), \ldots
\]

are said to be twin primes.

**Conjecture 1.1.** There exist infinitely many twin primes.

The conjecture is still open. The first known published reference to this question was made by Alphonse de Polignac in 1849, who conjectured that for every even number \( k \), there are infinitely many pairs of prime numbers \( p \) and \( p' \) such that \( p' - p = k \) (see [9]). The case \( k = 2 \) is the twin prime conjecture. The conjecture has not yet been proven or disproven for a given value of \( k \). In 2013, an important breakthrough was made by Yitang Zhang who proved the conjecture for some value of \( k < 70 \, 000 \, 000 \) (see [13]). Later that same year, James Maynard announced a related breakthrough which proved the conjecture for some \( k < 600 \) (see [6]). In 2014 D.H.J. Polymath proved the conjecture for \( k \leq 246 \). (see [14]).

In this paper, we prove that Conjecture [1.1] is true. Let \( \lceil \cdot \rceil \) denote the floor or greatest integer function. The following is our first main result.

**Theorem 1.2.** For \( n \geq 1 \) let \( p_n \) denote the \( n \)-th prime in the sequence of consecutive prime numbers in ascending order. Then:

\[
\left\lfloor \frac{p_{n+1}^2}{n+1} \right\rfloor \leq \pi \left( p_{n+1}^2 \right).
\]

We see that the quotient \( \frac{p_{n+1}^2}{n+1} \) is clearly much greater than \( n + 2 \). So, we get

**Corollary 1.3.** (Euclid’s theorem) There are infinitely many prime numbers.

For a positive integer \( x \), let \( \phi(x) \) denote the number of positive integers not exceeding \( x \) that are relatively prime to \( x \), which is said to be the *Euler phi-function*. As well known, if \( x > 1 \) has the prime factorization \( x = p_1^{k_1} p_2^{k_2} \ldots p_r^{k_r} \), then

\[
\phi(x) = (p_1^{k_1} - p_1^{k_1-1})(p_2^{k_2} - p_2^{k_2-1})\ldots(p_r^{k_r} - p_r^{k_r-1}) = x \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p_1} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p_2} \right) \ldots \left( 1 - \frac{1}{p_r} \right).
\]

Now, for each \( x \in \mathbb{N} \), let \( \phi_2(x) \) denote the number of positive integers \( t \), \( 1 \leq t \leq x \), for which both \( 6t - 1 \) and \( 6t + 1 \) are relatively prime to \( x \). For example if \( x = 5 \), then \( \phi_2(x) = 3 \) since the pairs \((11, 13) \) \((17, 19) \) and \((29, 31) \) are the only ones with components that are relatively prime to 30. In [1], we showed that

**Theorem 1.4.** If the integer \( x > 1 \) has the prime factorization \( x = 2^{k_1} 3^{k_2} p_3^{k_3} \ldots p_r^{k_r} \), then

\[
\phi_2(x) = 2^{k_1} 3^{k_2} (p_3^{k_3} - 2p_3^{k_3-1})\ldots(p_r^{k_r} - 2p_r^{k_r-1}).
\]

Using this, we shall prove the following theorem, which is our second main result.
Theorem 1.5. For \( n \geq 2 \) let \( p_n \) denote the \( n \)th prime in the sequence of consecutive prime numbers in ascending order. Then:

\[
\left\lfloor \frac{p_{n+3}^2}{3(n+2)} \right\rfloor \leq \pi_2 \left( p_{n+3}^2 \right).
\]

Here, denote by \( \pi_2(m) \) the number of twin primes not exceeding the positive integer \( m \). We see that the quotient \( \left\lfloor \frac{p_{n+3}^2}{3(n+2)} \right\rfloor \) is increasing and nonconstant. As a consequence, there are infinitely many prime numbers \( p \) such that \( p + 2 \) is also prime. This confirms Conjecture [14].

Our work is organized as follows: In Section 2, we recall the definition of the well known sieve of Eratosthenes. In Section 3, we give a necessary result for proving Theorems 1.2 and 1.5. In Section 4, we prove Theorem 1.2. To make the paper self-contained, in Section 5, we recall a proof of Theorem 1.4 as appears in [7] and extend the sieve of Eratosthenes to twin primes. Finally, the proof of Theorem 1.5 is presented in Section 6.

2. Preliminary Result

The concepts required are elementary and can be obtained from introductory texts on number theory, discrete mathematics and set theory ([3], [4], [12]). The concepts required are elementary and can be obtained from introductory texts on number theory, discrete mathematics and set theory ([3], [4], [12]). Eratosthenes (276–194 B.C.) was a Greek mathematician whose work in number theory remains significant. Consider the following lemma:

Lemma 2.1. Let \( a > 1 \) be an integer. If \( a \) is not divisible by a prime number \( p \leq \sqrt{a} \), then \( a \) is a prime.

Eratosthenes used the above lemma as a basis of a technique called “Sieve of Eratosthenes” for finding all the prime numbers less than a given integer \( x \). The algorithm calls for writing down the integers from 2 to \( x \) in their natural order. The composite numbers in the sequence are then sifted out by crossing off from 2, every second number (all multiples of two) in the list, from the next remaining number, 3, every third number, from the next remaining number, 5, every fifth number, and so on for all the remaining prime numbers less than or equal to \( \sqrt{x} \). The integers that are left on the list are primes. We shall refer to the set of integers left as the residual set.

Let \( x > 1 \) be an integer and let \( p_{n(x)} \) be the largest prime number less than or equal to \( \sqrt{x} \). Let \( p_1 = 2, \ p_2 = 3, \ p_3 = 5, \ldots, p_n, \ldots, p_{n(x)} \) be the sequence of prime numbers less than or equal to \( p_{n(x)} \) in ascending order. For each \( n, 1 \leq n \leq n(x) \), consider the following formula for finding all integers less than or equal to \( x \) that are relatively prime to \( \prod_{i=1}^{r} p_r \):

\[
S(x, n) = x + \sum_{j=1}^{n} (-1)^{j} \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq s_1 < \ldots < s_j \leq n} \left\lfloor \frac{x}{\prod_{i=1}^{j} p_{s_i}} \right\rfloor \right\}.
\]

(2.3)

In particular \( S(x, n(x)) \) gives the order of the set consisting of the number 1 and all prime numbers less than or equal to \( x \) excluding the primes \( p_n, 1 \leq n \leq n(x) \). Thus \( \pi(x) = S(x, n(x)) + n(x) - 1 \) and \( S(x, n) = \phi(x) \) if \( p_j \) divides \( x \) for all \( j \).

To align \( S(x, n) \) to the sieve of Eratosthenes we may re-index the sum by the primes as follows:

\[
S(x, n) = x - \left\lfloor \frac{x}{2} \right\rfloor - \left( \left\lfloor \frac{x}{3} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{x}{6} \right\rfloor \right) - \ldots
\]

\[
- \left\lfloor \frac{x}{p_n} \right\rfloor + \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} (-1)^{j+1} \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq s_1 < \ldots < s_j \leq n-1} \left\lfloor \frac{x}{\prod_{i=1}^{j} p_{s_i}} \right\rfloor \right\}.
\]

In our applications we shall assume that \( S(x, n) \) is indexed as above by the primes.
3. Permutations of ordered finite sequences under the constraint of preserving order

Let \( m, n \) with \( m \geq n \) be a pair of positive integers and let \( A = \{1, 2, 3, \ldots, m\} \) and let \( B = \{1, 2, 3, \ldots, n\} \) be ordered subsets of \( \mathbb{N} \) consisting of the first \( m \) and \( n \) elements respectively. We shall say that a permutation \( a_1, a_2, a_3, \ldots, a_{m+n} \), of the sequence

(3.4) \[ 1, 2, 3, \ldots, n, 1, 2, 3, \ldots, m \]

is order preserving if for all \( a_i, a_j \in A \), \( i < j \) whenever \( a_i < a_j \) and for all \( a_r, a_s \in B \), \( r < s \) whenever \( a_r < a_s \). Let \( \mathcal{C} \) denote the family of all distinct order preserving permutations of the sequence (3.4). We claim that:

Lemma 3.1.

\[ |\mathcal{C}| = \binom{m+n}{m} \left(1 - \frac{n}{m+1}\right). \]

Note that

\[ \binom{m+n}{m} \left(1 - \frac{n}{m+1}\right) = \binom{m+n}{m} - \binom{m+n}{m+1}. \]

Thus the orders of the sets \( \mathcal{C} \) therefore yield elements of the Catalan triangle. The result of the lemma is proved in [8]. Our application of the result of Lemma 3.1 only makes use of the well known fact that

\[ \binom{m+n}{m+1} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \binom{m+n-i}{m} \]

and so its proof is omitted.

The result of Lemma 3.1 can be seen as a sieve that strikes out \( \binom{m+n}{m} \) duplicate elements in a set that would otherwise have \( \binom{m+n}{m} \) elements. As observed above \( \binom{m+n}{m+1} \) is the sum total of the entries on the diagonal containing the entry \( \binom{m+n}{m} \) in Pascal’s triangle. Thus given any two positive integers \( m, n \) with \( m \geq n \) we write the integers from 1 to \( m+n \) in their natural order. Since we shall be taking ratios, we may assume that \( \binom{m+n-1}{m} \) numbers in the sequence are then sifted out by being crossed out in an evenly distributed fashion. From the remaining integers, \( \binom{m+n-2}{m} \) numbers in the sequence are crossed out in an evenly distributed fashion and so on for each of the integers \( j, 3 \leq j \leq n \). In any case the \( \binom{m+n}{m} \left(1 - \frac{n}{m+1}\right) \) elements of the residue set are assumed to be evenly distributed over the interval 1 to \( \binom{m+n}{m} \). Thus in our application any two consecutive elements in the residue of the sieve may be assumed to be separated by an interval of \( \frac{m+1}{m+n+1} \). We shall refer to this quantity as the average density of the residue of the sieve of Lemma 3.1. Thus the larger the average density, then the more sparse are the elements of the residue set.

The above sieve is compared to the sieve of Eratosthenes or that of Equation (2.3) and thereby generates our main results for the primes and twin primes.

4. Proof of Theorem 1.2

In Lemma 3.1 if we put \( m = n \), then the order of the residue set

\[ |\mathcal{C}| = \binom{2n}{n} \left(1 - \frac{n}{n+1}\right) = \frac{1}{n+1} \binom{2n}{n}. \]

Now let \( x \) be a positive rational number and suppose that \( x \) has \( n \) consecutive prime number divisors \( p_1 = 2, \ p_2 = 3, \ p_3 = 5, \ldots, \ p_n \) such that

(4.5) \[ x + \sum_{j=1}^{n} (-1)^j \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq s_1 < \cdots < s_j \leq n} \left( \frac{x}{\prod_{i=1}^{s_j} p_{s_i}} \right) \right\} = \frac{1}{n+1} \binom{2n}{n}. \]
Our wish is to align the above expression with
\[
\binom{2n}{n} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \binom{2n-i}{n} = \frac{1}{n+1} \binom{2n}{n}
\]
and make a comparison between \(x\) and \(\binom{2n}{n}\).

Then since \(p_j\) divide \(x\) for all \(j\) we have
\[
x = \frac{1}{n+1} \binom{2n}{n} \left( \prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{p_j}{(p_j-1)} \right).
\]

We claim that:
\[
\binom{2n}{n} \geq \frac{1}{n+1} \binom{2n}{n} \left( \prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{p_j}{(p_j-1)} \right)
\]
for all \(n \geq 2\). This is easily seen to be the case when \(n = 2\). Proceeding by induction assume that the statement is true for some integer \(n \geq 2\). Then to obtain the expression for \(n + 1\) we multiply the left hand side of (4.6) by \(\frac{2(2n+1)}{(n+1)(n+2)}\) and the right hand side by
\[
\frac{2(2n+1)}{(n+1)(n+2)} \frac{p_{n+1}}{p_{n+1} - 1}.
\]
But \(\frac{(n+1)}{(n+2)} \frac{p_{n+1}}{p_{n+1} - 1} < 1\) for all \(n \geq 2\) and this proves our claim.

It follows from Inequality (4.6) that
\[
\binom{2n}{n} \left( \prod_{j=1}^{n} (p_j - 1) \right) \geq \frac{1}{n+1} \binom{2n}{n} \left( \prod_{j=1}^{n} p_j \right)
\]
for all \(n \geq 2\) (with strict inequality if \(n > 2\)). Now
\[
\phi \left( \frac{1}{n+1} \binom{2n}{n} \left( \prod_{j=1}^{n} p_j \right) \right) = \frac{1}{n+1} \binom{2n}{n} \left( \prod_{j=1}^{n} (p_j - 1) \right)
\]
while
\[
\left( \prod_{j=1}^{n} (p_j - 1) \right) \left( \binom{2n}{n} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \binom{2n-i}{n} \right)
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{n+1} \binom{2n}{n} \left( \prod_{j=1}^{n} (p_j - 1) \right).
\]

Let \(y_n = \binom{2n}{n} \left( \prod_{j=1}^{n} (p_j - 1) \right)\),
\[
T(y_n) = y_n + \sum_{j=1}^{n} (-1)^j \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq s_1 < \cdots < s_j \leq n} \frac{y_n}{\prod_{i=1}^{j} p_{s_i}} \right\}
\]
and
\[
R(y_n) = \left( \prod_{j=1}^{n} (p_j - 1) \right) \left( \binom{2n}{n} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \binom{2n-i}{n} \right)
\]
Then \(T(y_n) \geq R(y_n)\).

For all \(n \geq 3\) let \(x_{n+1} = p_{n+1}^2 - 1\), \(C_n = \binom{2n}{n}\),
\[
P(x_{n+1}) = x_{n+1} + \sum_{j=1}^{n} (-1)^j \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq s_1 < \cdots < s_j \leq n} \frac{x_{n+1}}{\prod_{i=1}^{j} p_{s_i}} \right\},
\]
and
\[
R(x_{n+1}) = \left( \prod_{j=1}^{n} (p_j - 1) \right) \left( \binom{2n}{n} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \binom{2n-i}{n} \right).
\]
and let
\[ \frac{x_{n+1}}{y_n} R(y_n) = \left( C_{2n}^n - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \binom{2n-j}{n} \right) \frac{x_{n+1}}{C_{2n}^n}. \]

The residue of the sieve \( T \) consisting of integers below \( x_{n+1} \) is
\[ \frac{x_{n+1}}{y_n} T^*(y_n) = x_{n+1} + \sum_{j=1}^{n} (-1)^j \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq s_1 < \cdots < s_j \leq n} \left[ \frac{y_n}{\prod_{i=1}^{j} p_{s_i}} \right] \frac{x_{n+1}}{y_n} \right\}. \]

We claim that for each \( n \geq 3 \):
\[ \left[ \frac{p_{n+1}^2}{n+1} \right] \leq \frac{x_{n+1}}{y_n} R(y_n) \]
\[ \leq \frac{x_{n+1}}{y_n} T^*(y_n) \]
\[ \leq \pi \left( p_{n+1}^2 \right). \]

We first show that \( \frac{x_{n+1}}{y_n} T^*(y_n) \leq \pi \left( p_{n+1}^2 \right) \). It suffices to show that
\[ \frac{x_{n+1}}{y_n} T^*(y_n) = P(x_{n+1}). \]

Comparing the terms of \( \frac{x_{n+1}}{y_n} T^*(y_n) \) with those of \( P(x_{n+1}) \) first note that for all \( j \) and all \( s_1, 1 \leq \cdots < s_j \leq n, \)
\[ \left[ \frac{y_n}{\prod_{i=1}^{j} p_{s_i}} \right] \frac{x_{n+1}}{y_n} \leq \left[ \frac{y_n}{\prod_{i=1}^{j} p_{s_i}} \right] \frac{x_{n+1}}{y_n}. \]

Therefore
\[ \left[ \frac{x_{n+1}}{\prod_{i=1}^{j} p_{s_i}} \right] \leq \left[ \frac{y_n}{\prod_{i=1}^{j} p_{s_i}} \right] \frac{x_{n+1}}{y_n}. \]

since \( \frac{x_{n+1}}{y_n} < 1 \) if \( n \geq 3 \) and so \( \left[ \frac{x_{n+1}}{\prod_{i=1}^{j} p_{s_i}} \right] \) is the integer part of \( \left[ \frac{y_n}{\prod_{i=1}^{j} p_{s_i}} \right] \frac{x_{n+1}}{y_n} \). If \( n \geq 3 \) we may assume that \( \frac{x_{n+1}}{y_n} < 1 \) since, by Bertrand’s postulate, there is a prime \( p \) such that \( n < p \leq 2n \), while
\[ C_{n+1} > 2C_n^2 \] for all \( n \geq 1 \). Thus \( \frac{x_{n+1}}{y_n} T^*(y_n) = P(x_{n+1}) \) as required.

Finally we show that
\[ \frac{x_{n+1}}{y_n} R(y_n) \leq P(x_{n+1}). \]

But as explained in the proof of Theorem 1.5 in Section 6 it is sufficient to show that:
\[ \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{1}{n+1} \left( \prod_{j=1}^{n} \frac{p_j}{p_j - 1} \right) = 0. \]

The limit may be verified using similar methods as in the proof of Theorem 1.5 in Section 6 so the details are omitted.

The result of Theorem 1.2 has however been confirmed independently by an anonymous reviewer as follows: That
\[ \left[ \frac{p_{n+1}^2}{n+1} \right] \leq \pi \left( p_{n+1}^2 \right) \]
follows from the results of Rosser and Schoenfeld (see [11]). More precisely they show that \( \pi(x) > \frac{x}{\log x} \) for \( x > 17 \). Thus, it is enough that

\[
\frac{p_{n+1}^2}{2 \log(p_{n+1})} > \frac{p_{n+1}^2}{(n+1)}
\]

for \( n > 7 \), which is equivalent to \( \log_2 p_{n+1} < \frac{(n+1)}{2} \). But in the same Rosser, Schoenfeld paper it is shown that

\[
p_{n+1} < (n+1)(\log(n+1) + \log(n+1))
\]

for \( n > 6 \). Thus, it is enough that

\[
\log((n+1)(\log(n+1) + \log(n+1))) < \frac{(n+1)}{2}.
\]

Regarding \( \log((n+1)(\log(n+1) + \log(n+1))) \) as a function of \( n \), we get its derivative to be less than \( \frac{3}{(n+1)} \) which is smaller than 0.5 for \( n > 6 \). Thus for values of \( n \) large enough \( \log((n+1)(\log(n+1) + \log(n+1))) \) is less than \( \frac{(n+1)}{2} \). For smaller values of \( n \) one can check the inequality individually.

5. A Sieve of Eratosthenes for Twin Primes

For purposes of completeness we, in this section, recall a proof of Theorem 1.4 as appears in [7] and extend the sieve of Eratosthenes to twin primes.

**Proof of Theorem 1.4** We first show that the Euler phi-function can be extended to pairs of integers \((6t-1,6t+1) : t > 0\). In particular the extension may be viewed as a sieve for the twin primes.

For each \( x \in \mathbb{N} \), let \( \phi_2(x) \) denote the number of positive integers \( t \), \( 1 \leq t \leq x \), for which both \( 6t-1 \) and \( 6t+1 \) are relatively prime to \( x \). We show that we can evaluate \( \phi_2(x) \) from the prime factorization of \( n \). Our arguments are based on those used by Burton [3] to show that the Euler phi-function is multiplicative. We have the following.

**Proposition 5.1.** Let \( k \) and \( s \) be nonnegative numbers and let \( p \geq 5 \) be a prime number. Then:

(i) \( \phi_2(2^k) = 2^k \).

(ii) \( \phi_2(3^s) = 3^s \).

(iii) \( \phi_2(p^k) = p^k - 2p^{k-1} = p^k \left(1 - \frac{2}{p}\right) \).

**Proof.** (i) and (ii). For all nonnegative integers \( k \) and \( s \) and \( t \):

\[
\gcd(6t-1,2^k) = \gcd(6t+1,2^k) = 1
\]

and

\[
\gcd(6t-1,3^s) = \gcd(6t+1,3^s) = 1.
\]

(iii) Clearly \( \gcd(6t-1,p^k) = 1 \) if and only if \( p \) does not divide \( 6t-1 \) and \( \gcd(6t+1,p^k) = 1 \) if and only if \( p \) does not divide \( 6t+1 \). There is one integer between 1 and \( p \) that satisfies the congruence relation \( 6t \equiv 1 \pmod{p} \). Hence there are \( p^{k-1} \) integers between 1 and \( p^k \) that satisfy \( 6t \equiv 1 \pmod{p} \). Similarly there are \( p^{k-1} \) integers of the form \( 6t+1 \) between 1 and \( p^k \) divisible by \( p \). Thus the set

\[
\{(6t-1,6t+1) | 1 \leq t \leq p^k\}
\]

contains exactly \( p^k - 2p^{k-1} \) pairs corresponding to integers \( t \) for which both \( \gcd(6t-1,p^k) = 1 \) and \( \gcd(6t+1,p^k) = 1 \). Thus \( \phi_2(p^k) = p^k - 2p^{k-1} \).

\( \square \)
We recall that a number theoretic function \( f \) is said to be multiplicative if \( f(mn) = f(m)f(n) \) whenever \( \gcd(m, n) = 1 \). From the proof of Theorem 5.1 it is clear that for all integers \( k \) s, we have
\[
\phi(2^k3^s) = \phi(2^k)\phi(3^s).
\]

We now show that the function \( \phi_2 \) is multiplicative. This will be our basis for the proof of Theorem 5.3. We need some lemmas.

**Lemma 5.2.** Given integers \( m, n \). Then, \( \gcd(6t - 1, mn) = 1 \) if and only if \( \gcd(6t - 1, m) = 1 \) and \( \gcd(6t - 1, n) = 1 \).

Similarly given integers \( m, n, \gcd(6t + 1, mn) = 1 \) if and only if \( \gcd(6t + 1, m) = 1 \) and \( \gcd(6t + 1, n) = 1 \). This is an immediate consequence of the following standard result.

**Lemma 5.3.** Given integers \( m, n, k \). Then, \( \gcd(k, mn) = 1 \) if and only if \( \gcd(k, m) = 1 \) and \( \gcd(k, n) = 1 \).

We note also the following standard result.

**Lemma 5.4.** If \( a = bq + r \), then \( \gcd(a, b) = \gcd(b, r) \).

**Proposition 5.5.** The function \( \phi_2 \) is multiplicative, that is, if \( \gcd(m, n) = 1 \), then
\[
\phi_2(mn) = \phi_2(m)\phi_2(n).
\]

**Proof.** The result holds if either \( m \) or \( n \) equals 1. We shall therefore assume neither \( m \) nor \( n \) equals 1. Arrange the integer pairs \( (6t - 1, 6t + 1), 1 \leq t \leq mn \), in an \( n \times m \) array as follows:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
(5,7) & \ldots & (6m - 1, 6m + 1) \\
(6(m + 1) - 1, 6(m + 1) + 1) & \ldots & (6(2m) - 1, 6(2m) + 1) \\
\vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\
(6((n - 1)m + 1) - 1, 6((n - 1)m + 1) + 1) & \ldots & (6(mn) - 1, 6(mn) + 1)
\end{bmatrix}
\]

We know that \( \phi_2(mn) \) is equal to the number of pairs \( (6t - 1, 6t + 1) \) in this matrix for which both \( 6t - 1 \) and \( 6t + 1 \) are relatively prime to \( mn \). By virtue of Lemma 5.2, this is the same as the number of pairs \( (6t - 1, 6t + 1) \) in the same matrix for which both \( 6t - 1 \) and \( 6t + 1 \) are relatively prime to each of \( m \) and \( n \).

We first note, by virtue of Lemma 5.4, that \( \gcd(6(qm + t) - 1, m) = \gcd(6t - 1, m) \) and likewise \( \gcd(6(qm + t) + 1, m) = \gcd(6t + 1, m) \). Therefore the pairs \( (6(qm + t) - 1, 6(qm + t) + 1) \) in the \( t \)th column are both relatively prime to \( m \) if and only if both \( 6t - 1 \) and \( 6t + 1 \) are relatively prime to \( m \). Therefore only \( \phi_2(m) \) columns contain pairs \( (6t - 1, 6t + 1) \) both relatively prime to \( m \) and every other pair in the column will constitute of integers both relatively prime to \( m \). The problem now is to show that in each of these \( \phi_2(m) \) columns there are exactly \( \phi_2(n) \) integer pairs \( (6t - 1, 6t + 1) \) that are both relatively prime to \( n \), for then altogether there would be \( \phi_2(m)\phi_2(n) \) pairs in the table that are relatively prime to both \( m \) and \( n \).

The entries that are in the \( t \)th column (where it is assumed \( \gcd(6t - 1, m) = \gcd(6t + 1, m) = 1 \)) are:
\[
(6t - 1, 6t + 1), (6(m + t) - 1, 6(m + t) + 1), \ldots, (6((n - 1)m + t) - 1, 6((n - 1)m + t) + 1)
\]

There are \( n \) pairs in this sequence and for no two pairs
\[
(6(qm + t) - 1, 6(qm + t) + 1), (6(jm + t) - 1, 6(jm + t) + 1)
\]
in the sequence do we have
\[
6(qm + t) - 1 \equiv 6(jm + t) - 1 \pmod{n}
\]
and
\[ 6(qm + t) + 1 \equiv 6(jm + t) + 1 \pmod{n}, \]
since otherwise we would arrive at a contradiction \( q \equiv j \pmod{n} \).

Thus the terms of the sequence,
\[ t, m + t, 2m + t, \ldots, (n - 1)m + t \]
are congruent modulo \( n \) to \( 0, 1, 2, \ldots, n - 1 \) in some order.

Now suppose \( r \) is congruent modulo \( n \) to \( qm + t \). Then the integers \( 6(qm + t) - 1 \) and \( 6(qm + t) + 1 \)
are both relatively prime to \( n \) if and only if both \( 6r - 1 \) and \( 6r + 1 \) are relatively prime to \( n \). The implication is that the \( t \)th column contains as many pairs of integers that are relatively prime to \( n \) as does the set \( \{(5, 7), (11, 13), \ldots, (6n - 1, 6n + 1)\} \), namely \( \phi_2(n) \) pairs. Thus the number of pairs of integers \( (6t - 1, 6t + 1) \) in the matrix that are relatively prime to \( m \) and \( n \) is \( \phi_2(m)\phi_2(n) \). This completes the proof of the proposition. \( \square \)

Now, Theorem 1.4 follows from Propositions 5.1 and 5.5.

We can consider \( \phi_2(k) \) as defining a sieve on the set of integers \( 1, 2, 3, 4, \ldots, k \) or, equivalently, on the set
\[ S = \{(6t - 1, 6t + 1) \mid 1 \leq t \leq k\} \]
which for each \( p_j \), \( 3 \leq j \leq n \), strikes out \( t \) whenever \( 6t - 1 \) or \( 6t + 1 \) is divisible by \( p_j \). Since the primes \( p_j \) are unevenly distributed they strike out the values \( t \) in an unevenly distributed manner. However this is achieved in a cyclic pattern in the sense that for \( j < n \), \( p_j \) strikes out the same number of values of \( t \), with the same irregularity, in each interval
\[ s \prod_{i=3}^{j} p_i \leq t < (s + 1) \prod_{i=3}^{j} p_i. \]
The average density or sparsity of elements of the residue set is therefore
\[ \prod_{j=3}^{n} \frac{p_j}{(p_j - 2)}. \]

6. Proof of Theorem 1.5

Some of the arguments in this section parallel those of Section 4 so some details are omitted. In Lemma 3.1, if we put \( m = n + 1 \), then the order of the residue set
\[ |C| = \binom{2n + 1}{n + 1} \left(1 - \frac{n}{n + 2}\right) = \frac{2}{n + 2} \binom{2n + 1}{n + 1}. \]
Now let \( x = 6k + 1 \) be a positive rational number and suppose that \( k \) has \( n \) consecutive prime number divisors \( p_3 = 5, p_4 = 7, p_5 = 11, \ldots, p_{n+2} \) such that

\[
(6.10) \quad k + \sum_{j=3}^{n+2} (-1)^j \sum_{3 \leq s_1 \leq \cdots \leq s_j \leq n+2} \left( \frac{2^{j-2}k}{\prod_{i=1}^{j} p_{s_i}} \right) = \frac{2}{n+2} \binom{2n+1}{n+1}.
\]

Our aim is to align the above expression with

\[
\binom{2n+1}{n+1} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \binom{2n-i+1}{n+1} = \frac{2}{n+2} \binom{2n+1}{n+1}
\]

and then compare \( k \) with \( \binom{2n+1}{n+1} \).

Then since \( p_j \) divide \( k \) for all \( j \) we have

\[
k = \frac{2}{n+2} \binom{2n+1}{n+1} \prod_{j=3}^{n+2} \frac{p_j}{(p_j-2)}.
\]

We claim that if \( n \geq 9 \), then:

\[
(6.11) \quad \binom{2n+1}{n+1} > \frac{2}{n+2} \binom{2n+1}{n+1} \prod_{j=3}^{n+2} \frac{p_j}{(p_j-2)}
\]

or, equivalently,

\[
(6.12) \quad 1 > \frac{2}{n+2} \prod_{j=3}^{n+2} \frac{p_j}{(p_j-2)}
\]

In general we have the following result which compares the average density of the elements of the residue of the sieve of Equation (6.9) to the average density of the elements of the residue of the sieve \( \phi_2 \).

**Lemma 6.1.** Let \( a > 1 \) be an integer. Then there exists an integer \( n_0 \) such that for all integers \( n \geq n_0 \):

\[
a \prod_{j=3}^{n+2} \frac{p_j}{(p_j-2)} < \frac{n+2}{2}.
\]

**Proof.** It suffices to show that

\[
(6.13) \quad \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{2}{n+2} \left( \prod_{j=3}^{n+2} \frac{p_j}{(p_j-2)} \right) = 0
\]

since in this event we can always find an integer \( n_0 \) such that

\[
\frac{2}{n+2} \left( \prod_{j=3}^{n+2} \frac{p_j}{(p_j-2)} \right) < \frac{1}{a}
\]

for all \( n \geq n_0 \). Given \( \frac{2}{n+2} \left( \prod_{j=3}^{n+2} \frac{p_j}{(p_j-2)} \right) \) we may obtain the next product inductively by multiplying the given product by \( \frac{(n+2)}{(n+3)} \frac{p_{n+3}}{(p_{n+3}-2)} \). For sufficiently large values of \( n \) (\( n \geq 9 \)) we have \( \frac{(n+2)}{(n+3)} \frac{p_{n+3}}{(p_{n+3}-2)} < 1 \). We prove a statement logically equivalent to (6.13), namely that

\[
(6.14) \quad \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{n+2}{2} \left( \prod_{j=3}^{n+2} \frac{p_j}{(p_j-2)} \right) = \infty.
\]
But the reciprocal product of \( \frac{(n+2)p_{n+3}}{(n+3)(p_{n+3}-2)} \) may be expressed in the form
\[
\frac{(n+3)}{(n+2)} \left( \frac{p_{n+3} - 2}{p_{n+3}} \right) = \left( 1 + \frac{1}{n+2} \right) \left( 1 - \frac{2}{p_{n+3}} \right)
\]
\[
= \left( 1 + \frac{1}{n+2} \right) - \frac{2}{p_{n+3}} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{n+2} \right)
\]

Now if \( n \geq 7 \), then \( p_{n+3} \geq 3(n+2) \) and \( (n+2)^2 \geq 6(n+2) \) and so
\[
\left( 1 + \frac{1}{n+2} \right) - \frac{2}{p_{n+3}} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{n+2} \right) \geq \left( 1 + \frac{1}{n+2} \right) - \frac{2}{3(n+2)} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{n+2} \right)
\]
\[
= \left( 1 + \frac{1}{n+2} \right) - \frac{2}{3} \left( \frac{1}{n+2} + \frac{1}{(n+2)^2} \right)
\]
\[
\geq \left( 1 + \frac{1}{n+2} \right) - \frac{2}{3} \left( \frac{1}{n+2} + \frac{1}{6(n+2)} \right)
\]
\[
= \left( 1 + \frac{2}{9(n+2)} \right) = \frac{9n+20}{9n+18}
\]

Thus for all \( k \geq 7 : \)
\[
\prod_{n=7}^{k} \left( \frac{9n+20}{9n+18} \right) \leq \prod_{n=7}^{k} \left( \frac{n+3}{n+2} \right) \left( \frac{p_{n+3} - 2}{p_{n+3}} \right).
\]

It is therefore sufficient to show that:
\[
\prod_{n=7}^{\infty} \left( \frac{9n+20}{9n+18} \right) = \prod_{n=7}^{\infty} \left( 1 + \frac{2}{9n+18} \right) = \infty.
\]

But if \( \{a_n\} \) is a sequence of positive real numbers, then the series \( \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} a_n \) and the product \( \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} \left( 1 + a_n \right) \) converge or diverge together [5]. The required result therefore follows since \( \sum_{n=7}^{\infty} \left( \frac{2}{9n+18} \right) \) diverges. This proves the result of the lemma.

Now, it follows from Inequality (6.11) that
\[
\binom{2n+1}{n+1} \left( \prod_{j=3}^{n+2} (p_j - 2) \right) > \frac{2}{n+2} \binom{2n+1}{n+1} \left( \prod_{j=3}^{n+2} p_j \right)
\]
for all \( n \geq 9 \). Now
\[
\phi_2 \left( \frac{2}{n+2} \binom{2n+1}{n+1} \left( \prod_{j=3}^{n+2} p_j \right) \right) = \frac{2}{n+2} \binom{2n+1}{n+1} \left( \prod_{j=3}^{n+2} (p_j - 2) \right)
\]
while
\[
\left( \prod_{j=3}^{n+2} (p_j - 2) \right) \left( \binom{2n+1}{n+1} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} \binom{2n-i+1}{n+1} \right)
\]
\[
= \frac{2}{n+2} \binom{2n+1}{n+1} \left( \prod_{j=3}^{n+2} (p_j - 2) \right).
\]

The density of the residue of the sieve of Equation (6.17) is \( \frac{n+2}{2} \) which, when \( n \geq 9 \), is greater than \( \prod_{j=3}^{n+2} \frac{p_j}{(p_j - 2)} \), the average density of the residue of the sieve of Equation (6.16). Thus the sieve of Equation (6.17) is more dominant or sifts out more elements than \( \phi_2 \) or the sieve of Equation (6.16).
Let \( s_n = \frac{2}{n+2} \binom{2n+1}{n+1} \left( \prod_{j=3}^{n+2} p_j \right) \) and consider the sieve

\[ R_2(s_n) = \frac{2}{n+2} \left( \prod_{j=3}^{n+2} p_j \right) \left( \binom{2n+1}{n+1} - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \binom{2n-j+1}{n+1} \right) \]

\[ = \left( \frac{2}{n+2} \right)^2 \binom{2n+1}{n+1} \left( \prod_{j=3}^{n+2} p_j \right). \]

We shall apply the result of the following lemma to show that the sieve \( 6.18 \) is dominant over the sieve \( 6.16 \) in certain subintervals of the interval \( 1, \ldots, s_n \).

**Lemma 6.2.** Let \( n \geq 12 \) be a fixed integer and let \( p_n \) denote the \( n \)th prime in the sequence of consecutive prime numbers in ascending order. Then for all integers \( r \geq 1 \):

\[ r(n-1)n < p_np_{n+r-1}. \]

**Proof.** Let \( t \) be the largest integer such that \( p_s > ts \) for all \( s \geq n \). Since \( n \geq 12 \), then \( t \geq 3 \). Then

\[ r(n-1)n < t^2n^2 < p_n^2 < p_np_{n+r-1} \]

for all \( r, 1 \leq r \leq t^2 \). If \( r > t^2 \), then we must have

\[ n < \left( \frac{p_n}{n-1} \right) \left( \frac{p_{n+r-1}}{r} \right) \]

since in general \( \binom{2n-r}{r} \) increases and cannot decrease by a significant amount. This proves the result of the lemma. \( \square \)

In the result of the above lemma we note that each value of \( r \) is a count of the number of multiples of \( (n-1)n \) as well as that of the number of terms in the sequence of products \( \{ p_np_{n+r-1} \} \).

We note therefore that if \( k \) is an integer greater than \( p_n^2 \), then the number of multiples of \( n(n-1) \) less than \( k \) is more than the number of terms of the sequence \( \{ p_np_{n+r-1} \} \) that terminates with the largest product less or equal to \( k \).

For \( n \geq 9 \), let \( k_{n+3} = \frac{p_{n+3}^2 - 1}{6}, C_{n+1}^{2n+1} = \binom{2n+1}{n+1} \). Then

\[ \frac{k_{n+3}}{s_n} R_2(s_n) = \frac{2}{n+2} \binom{2n+1}{n+1} \frac{k_{n+3}}{C_{n+1}^{2n+1}}. \]

is a lower bound for the order of the residue set of the sieve of Equation \( 6.18 \) consisting of integers less than \( k_{n+3} \).

With \( k(n) = s_n = \frac{2}{n+2} \binom{2n+1}{n+1} \left( \prod_{j=3}^{n+2} p_j \right) \), let \( T_2(p_{n+3}^2) \) denote the residue set of the sieve \( \phi_2 \) consisting of pairs of integers \( (6t-1, 6t+1) \) less than \( p_{n+3}^2 \) (so that \( t < k_{n+3} \).) Clearly \( R_2(s_n) \leq \phi_2(k(n)) \) if \( n \geq 9 \).

We claim that if \( n \geq 9 \), then:

\[ \left[ \frac{p_{n+3}^2}{3(n+2)} \right] \leq \frac{2(k_{n+3})}{n+2} \frac{1}{C_{n+1}^{2n+1}} \binom{2n+1}{n+1} \]

\[ = \frac{k_{n+3}}{s_n} R_2(s_n) \]

\[ \leq |T_2(p_{n+3}^2)| \]

\[ \leq \pi_2 \left( p_{n+3}^2 \right). \]

We must show that

\[ \frac{k_{n+3}}{s_n} R_2(s_n) \leq |T_2(p_{n+3}^2)|. \]
Let $T_d^2(n + 3)$ denote the average density of the elements of $T_2(p^2_{n+3})$. Since the sieve $\phi_2$ is fairly even over the entire interval $1, \ldots, k(n)$, $T_d^2(n + 3)$ cannot vary by a large amount from the overall average density $\prod_{j=3}^{n+2} \frac{p_j}{(p_j - 2)}$ of the residue of $\phi_2$ over the entire interval. Further since the average density of the residue of the sieve of Equation (6.18), $\frac{n+2}{2}$, is even over the entire interval, the above inequality follows, for sufficiently large values of $n$, from the result of Lemma 6.1. We all the same show independently that the sieve of Equation (6.18) is indeed dominant over $\phi_2$ on a subinterval $1, \ldots, k(n) + 3$.

Since $R_2(s_n) \leq \phi_2(k(n))$, the above inequality follows if we assume that $T_d^2(n + 3) \leq \prod_{j=3}^{n+2} \frac{p_j}{(p_j - 2)}$.

We may therefore assume that $T_d^2(n + 3)$ is greater than $\prod_{j=3}^{n+2} \frac{p_j}{(p_j - 2)}$ but less than $\frac{n+2}{2}$.

We proceed by induction on $n$, the index of the primes and show that

$$\frac{k_{n+4}}{s_{n+4}}R_2(s_n) \leq |T_2(p^2_{n+3})|$$

implies $\frac{k_{n+4}}{s_{n+4}}R_2(s_{n+1}) \leq |T_2(p^2_{n+4})|$. By direct computation it is easy to show that the above inequality holds for $9 \leq n \leq 3400$. Assume that $\frac{k_{n+4}}{s_{n+4}}R_2(s_n) \leq |T_2(p^2_{n+3})|$ for some $n \geq 3400$, that is,

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \left(\frac{2(n - j + 1)}{n + 1}\right)\right) \frac{k_{n+3}}{C_{n+1}^{2(n+1)}} \leq |T_2(p^2_{n+3})|$$

for some $n \geq 3400$. We show that we must have

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n+1} \left(\frac{2(n + j)}{n + 1}\right)\right) \frac{k_{n+4}}{C_{n+2}^{2(n+1)+1}} \leq |T_2(p^2_{n+4})|.$$

But the average density of the elements in the residue of the sieve

$$\left(\frac{2(n + 1)}{n + 2}\right) - \sum_{j=1}^{n+1} \left(\frac{2(n + j)}{n + 1}\right)$$

is equal to $\frac{n+3}{2}$, which is an increase by $\frac{n+3}{n+2}$ from the average density of the residue of the sieve of Equation (6.18). This is equivalent to sifting out $\frac{2(p^2_{n+4})}{(n+2)(n+3)}$ of the elements of the residue of the sieve of Equation (6.18) which are less than $p^2_{n+4}$. On the other hand let $\phi_2(k(n))$ be computed iteratively as follows: for each $j$, $3 \leq j \leq n + 2$, let $\phi_2(k(n), 3) = k(n)(1 - \frac{2}{p^2_{n+3}})$ and for $j \geq 4$ let $\phi_2(k(n), j) = \phi_2(k(n), j - 1)(1 - \frac{2}{p^2_{n+3}})$. Then each $p_j$ sifts out pairs $(6t - 1, 6t + 1)$ where $6t - 1$ or $6t + 1$ is equal to $p_j$ or a product of $p_j$ and a prime or a product of primes not less than $p_j$. Therefore, by Lemma 6.2, the sieve of Equation (6.18) remains dominant over $\phi_2$ in the interval $1, \ldots, k_{n+4}$. Now $T_2(p^2_{n+4})$ is obtained from the residue of the sieve $\phi_2$ by sifting out, over the interval $1, \ldots, k_{n+4}$, a pair $(6t - 1, 6t + 1)$ one of whose components is equal to $p_{n+3}$ as well as those pairs $(6t - 1, 6t + 1)$, $k_{n+3} \leq t \leq k_{n+4}$, one of whose components is a multiple of $p_{n+3}$. By the result of Lemma 6.2

$$\left[\frac{2(p^2_{n+4})}{(n+2)(n+3)}\right]$$

is greater than the number of those pairs $(6t - 1, 6t + 1)$, $k_{n+3} \leq t \leq k_{n+4}$, one of whose components is a multiple of $p_{n+3}$ by a prime greater than $p_{n+3}$. Thus we must have $\frac{k_{n+4}}{s_{n+4}}R_2(s_{n+1}) \leq |T_2(p^2_{n+4})|$ and this completes the induction.

Finally we note that the result of Theorem 1.5 has been shown to be true over a large range of consecutive integers $n \geq 2$ starting with the case $n = 2$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.5.

**Remark.** We have seen that $\left[\frac{p^2_{n+4}}{n+1}\right]$ is a weak lower bound for $\pi (p^2_{n+1})$. For large values of $n$, $\left[\frac{p^2_{n+4}}{n+1}\right]$ is also a lower bound for $\pi_2 (p^2_{n+1})$, that is, for sufficiently large values of $n$,

$$\left[\frac{p^2_{n+4}}{n+1}\right] \leq \pi_2 (p^2_{n+1}).$$

For instance this is the case when $n = 3400$. 
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