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Abstract. A. Boudaoud asked whether every unlimited integer is a sum of a limited integer and a product of two unlimited integers. Assuming Dickson’s Conjecture, the answer is negative.

A. Boudaoud [1, 2] asked whether every large integer is close to a product of two large integers. The question is made precise in the framework of nonstandard analysis by interpreting “large” as unlimited (infinite, nonstandard) and “close” as having a limited (finite, standard) difference:

Is every unlimited integer a sum of a limited integer and a product of two unlimited integers?

Symbolically: If \( \omega \in \mathbb{Z} \) is unlimited, is

\[
\omega = s + \omega_1 \cdot \omega_2
\]

where \( s \in \mathbb{Z} \) is limited and \( \omega_1, \omega_2 \in \mathbb{Z} \) are unlimited?

We show that the question has negative answer assuming Dickson’s Conjecture about primes in arithmetic progressions. Following [1], we use the internal language of axiomatic nonstandard set theory such as IST or BST, but the argument works, with minor modifications, in any model-theoretic framework (ultraproducts, superstructures). Only the most basic ideas of nonstandard analysis are required, and those only for understanding of the conversion of the problem to an equivalent standard one.

First some simple observations. Let \( \omega \) be unlimited and \( \pi_1 \cdot \pi_2 \cdot \ldots \cdot \pi_\nu \) be the prime number decomposition of \( |\omega| \). If at least two of the prime numbers are unlimited, or if \( \nu \) is unlimited, then clearly \( \omega = \omega_1 \cdot \omega_2 \) for some unlimited integers \( \omega_1, \omega_2 \) and (*) holds with \( s = 0 \). Hence a counterexample to (*) has to have the form \( \omega = a \cdot \pi \) where \( \pi \) is an unlimited prime number and \( a \in \mathbb{Z} \) is limited, \( a \neq 0 \). Without loss of generality we can assume that \( \omega > 0 \) and \( \omega \) is a prime number. Indeed, if every unlimited prime number \( \pi \) could be expressed in the form (*) as \( \pi = s + \omega_1 \cdot \omega_2 \), then \( \omega = a \cdot \pi = (a \cdot s) + (a \cdot \omega_1) \cdot \omega_2 \), which would have the required form (*).

If a prime number \( \pi \) is a counterexample to (*), then for each limited \( s \in \mathbb{Z} \) there exist an unlimited prime number \( \pi_s \) and a limited \( a_s \in \mathbb{Z}, a_s > 0 \), such that

\[
\pi - s = a_s \cdot \pi_s.
\]
Noticing that \(a_0 = 1\) and \(\pi = \pi_0\), we rewrite (**) as

\[ (***) \quad a_s \cdot \pi_s - \pi_0 = -s. \]

It follows that, for all limited positive integers \(q, r\), the system of Diophantine equations \(a_s \cdot x_s - x_0 = -s, \quad 0 < |s| \leq q\), has a solution where all \(x_s\) are prime numbers greater than \(r\). By Standardization, we can extend the external sequence \(\langle a_s : s \in \mathbb{Z}, s \text{ limited} \rangle\) to a standard sequence \(\langle a_s : s \in \mathbb{Z} \rangle\). By Transfer we deduce that the existence of a counterexample to Boudaoud’s question implies the following statement \(\mathcal{S}\) of standard number theory:

There is a sequence \(\langle a_s : s \in \mathbb{Z} \rangle\) such that \(a_0 = 1\) and for all positive integers \(q, r\) the system of Diophantine equations

\[ (S_q) \quad a_s \cdot x_s - x_0 = -s, \quad 0 < |s| \leq q \]

has a solution where all \(x_s, |s| \leq q,\) are prime numbers greater than \(r\).

On the other hand, if there is a sequence as in the statement \(\mathcal{S}\), then there is a standard one, by Transfer. Given such standard sequence \(\langle a_s : s \in \mathbb{Z} \rangle\), we can take unlimited \(q\) and \(r\) and the corresponding solution \(\langle x_s : |s| \leq q \rangle\). For each \(s\) limited, \(a_s\) is limited and \(x_s\) is an unlimited prime number satisfying \(x_0 - s = a_s \cdot x_s\); so \(\omega = x_0\) is a counterexample to Boudaoud’s question. Therefore it suffices to construct a sequence \(\langle a_s : s \in \mathbb{Z} \rangle\) as in \(\mathcal{S}\).

The system of equations \((S_q)\) has a solution \(\langle x_s : |s| \leq q \rangle\) if and only if the system of congruences

\[ (R_q) \quad x \equiv s \mod a_s, \quad 0 < |s| \leq q \]

has a solution \(x_0\). The obvious necessary condition for solvability of \((R_q)\) is

\[ (C) \quad (a_s, a_t) | t - s \]

for all \(0 < |s|, |t| \leq q\). It is an easy corollary to the Chinese Remainder Theorem that the condition \((C)\) is also sufficient for the existence of a solution to \((R_q)\); moreover, if \(\bar{x}_0\) is one solution of \((R_q)\), then every solution is given by \(x_0(k) = \bar{x}_0 + A' \cdot k\)

where \(A' = [a_0, \ldots, a_q]\) is the least common multiple of \(a_s, |s| \leq q,\) and \(k \in \mathbb{Z}\). We let \(A'_s = A'/a_s\); returning to the system \((S_q)\) we see that, assuming the condition \((C)\) is satisfied for all \(0 < |s|, |t| \leq q\), the system is solvable and all of its solutions are of the form

\[ x_s(k) = \bar{x}_s + A'_s \cdot k, \quad |s| \leq q \]

where \(\langle \bar{x}_s : |s| \leq q \rangle\) is a particular solution of \((S_q)\) and \(k \in \mathbb{Z}\). We note that the solutions are given by a set of arithmetic progressions. To obtain the desired result, we need to show that, for arbitrarily large \(k\), there are solutions where all \(x_s(k)\) are prime.

Dickson’s Conjecture asserts that there are arbitrarily large \(k\) for which all \(x_s(k), \quad |s| \leq q,\) are prime numbers, provided the following congruence condition is satisfied:

\[ (D) \quad \text{For every prime } p \text{ there is } k \text{ such that } p \nmid x_s(k) \text{ holds for all } |s| \leq q. \]

So it suffices to show that for every prime \(p\) there is a solution \(\langle x_s : |s| \leq q \rangle\) of \((S_q)\) such that \(p \nmid x_s\) holds for all \(|s| \leq q\).
The condition (C), which guarantees solvability of \((R_q)\), and therefore of \((S_q)\), does not imply (D) (consider the possibility \(a_0 = a_1 = 1\)). We formulate a condition that does, for all \(q\).

\((E)\) For every prime number \(p\) and every \(s \in \mathbb{Z}\):

If \(a_s = p^n \cdot a_s'\) with \(p \mid a_s'\), then there is \(r \in \mathbb{Z}\) such that \(p^{n+1} \mid a_r\) and \(r - s = u \cdot p^n\) where \(0 < u < p\).

**Lemma 1.** If the sequence \(\langle a_s : s \in \mathbb{Z} \rangle\) satisfies the conditions (C) (for all \(s, t \in \mathbb{Z}\)) and (E), then for every \(q > 0\) and every prime number \(p\) the system \((S_q)\) has a solution \(\langle x_s : |s| \le q \rangle\) such that \(p \mid x_s\) holds for all \(|s| \le q\).

**Proof.** We fix \(q\) and \(p\). Let \(n\) be the highest exponent such that \(p^n \mid a_s\) for some \(|s| \le q\). Let \(q^* = q + p^{n+1}\). Let \(\langle x_s : |s| \le q^* \rangle\) be a solution of the system \((S_{q^*})\). Since the restriction of this solution to \(|s| \le q\) is a solution of \((S_q)\), it suffices to prove that for this solution \(p \mid x_s\) holds for all \(|s| \le q\).

We fix \(s\) with \(|s| \le q\), write \(a_s = p^n \cdot a_s'\) with \(p \mid a_s'\), take \(r\) as in \((E)\), and notice that \(|r| \le q^*\). The equation \(a_r \cdot x_r - a_s \cdot x_s = r - s\) follows from \((S_{q^*})\). We thus have \(p^{n+1} \cdot a_r' \cdot x_r - p^n \cdot a_s' \cdot x_s = u \cdot p^n\), and after simplifying, \(p \cdot a_r' \cdot x_r - a_s' \cdot x_s = u\). If \(p \mid x_s\), then \(p \mid u\), a contradiction with \(0 < u < p\). \(\square\)

It remains to construct a sequence \(\langle a_s : s \in \mathbb{Z} \rangle\) that satisfies (C) and (E). We describe its terms \(a_s\) by their prime factorization \(\Pi p^{n_p(s)}\). The basic idea is to space those \(a_s\) that are divisible by \(p^n\) exactly \(p^n\) steps apart. (This can be accomplished for \(s \ge 0\) by simply putting \(a_s = s + 1\); however, we need a sequence that has this property and is defined for all \(s \in \mathbb{Z}\).)

For \(p > 2\) we let the “anchor” \(s(p, n) = (p^n + 1)/2\); we also let \(s(2, n) = (1 - (-2)^n)/3 = \Sigma_{i=0}^{n-1} (-2)^i\).

**Lemma 2.** If \(m < n\), then \(s(p, n) \equiv s(p, m) \mod p^m\).

**Proof.** For \(p > 2\) this is obvious from \(s(p, n) - s(p, m) = (p^n - p^m)/2 = p^m \cdot (p^{n-m} - 1)/2\). Also \(s(2, n) - s(2, m) = \Sigma_{i=m}^{n-1} (-2)^i = \pm 2^m \cdot \Sigma_{i=0}^{n-m-1} (-2)^i\). \(\square\)

For every \(s\), we let \(n_p(s)\) be the highest exponent \(n\) for which \(s \equiv s(p, n) \mod p^n\).

We note that, for \(p > 2\), \(s(p, n) = (p^n + 1)/2 > 0\) and \(s(p, n) - p^n = -(p^n - 1)/2 < 0\); hence for all \(n\) such that \(|s| < (p^n - 1)/2\) we have \(s \not\equiv s(p, n) \mod p^n\). Similarly, for all \(n\) such that \(|s| < |1 - (-2)^{n-1}|/3\) we have \(s \not\equiv s(2, n) \mod 2^n\). These observations show that \(n_p(s)\) is well defined. Taking \(n = 1\) establishes that for \(p > 2|s| + 1\) we have \(n_p(s) = 0\), so the coefficients \(a_s = \Pi p^{n_p(s)}\) are well-defined. A table of \(a_s\) for \(|s| \le 12\) is computed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>-12</th>
<th>-11</th>
<th>-10</th>
<th>-9</th>
<th>-8</th>
<th>-7</th>
<th>-6</th>
<th>-5</th>
<th>-4</th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a_s)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2 \cdot 3</td>
<td>3 \cdot 7</td>
<td>2^2 \cdot 19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2 \cdot 3 \cdot 5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2^3 \cdot 11</td>
<td>3^2</td>
<td>2 \cdot 7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2^2 \cdot 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(n)</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a_n)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2^2 \cdot 5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2 \cdot 3^2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2^3 \cdot 13</td>
<td>3 \cdot 5</td>
<td>2 \cdot 17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2^2 \cdot 3 \cdot 7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Let us fix $s, t \in \mathbb{Z}$ and a prime number $p$. By definition of $n_p(s)$, $s \equiv s(p, n_p(s)) \mod p^{n_p(s)}$, and by definition of $a_s$, $n_p(s)$ is the highest exponent $n$ for which $p^n \mid a_s$. Similarly, $t \equiv s(p, n_p(t)) \mod p^{n_p(t)}$, and $n_p(t)$ is the highest exponent $n$ for which $p^n \mid a_t$. By Lemma 2, for $m = \min(n_p(s), n_p(t))$ we have $s(p, n_p(s)) \equiv s(p, m) \equiv s(p, n_p(t)) \mod p^m$; hence $s \equiv t \mod p^m$. Thus, for every prime $p$ the highest power of $p$ that divides both $a_s$ and $a_t$ also divides $t - s$. From this the condition (C), to wit, $(a_s, a_t) \mid t - s$, readily follows.

Let us now fix $s \in \mathbb{Z}$ and a prime number $p$ so that $a_s = p^n \cdot a_s'$ and $p \nmid a_s'$; by the construction of $a_s$, $n = n_p(s)$. There is a unique $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $s(p, n+1)+k \cdot p^{a+1} \leq s < s(p, n+1)+(k+1) \cdot p^{a+1}$; we let $r = s(p, n+1)+k \cdot p^{a+1}$. The $p^{a+1} \mid a_r$, so in particular $r \neq s$, and $0 < s - r < p^{a+1}$. As $s(p, n+1) \equiv s(p, n) \mod p^n$, we have $r \equiv s(p, n) \equiv s \mod p^n$. Hence $s - r = u \cdot p^n$ and necessarily $0 < u < p$. This proves the condition (E) and concludes our argument.

We restate the final result in the language of model theory.

**Theorem 1.** Let $(\mathbb{Z}, <, +, \times, 0, 1)$ be an elementary extension of $(\mathbb{Z}, <, +, \times, 0, 1)$ with $\mathbb{Z} \subset \mathbb{Z}$. Assuming Dickson’s Conjecture, there exist $\omega \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \mathbb{Z}$ such that every integer in the galaxy of $\omega$, defined as $G(\omega) = \{\omega - s \mid s \text{ limited}\}$, factors as $\omega - s = a_s \cdot \pi_s$ where $a_s \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\pi_s$ is an unlimited prime number. In the example constructed above, the galaxy $G(\omega)$ contains a unique prime number $\omega = \pi_0$.

**Proof.** The sequence $\langle a_s : s \in \mathbb{Z} \rangle$ constructed above is first-order definable in the language of $(\mathbb{Z}, <, +, \times, 0, 1)$. The elementary extension assumption is sufficient to conclude that there are $q, r \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \mathbb{Z}$ for which the system $(S_q)$ has a solution where all $x_s$ are prime numbers greater than $r$.

According to the construction, the coefficient $a_s$ is divisible by an odd prime $p$ if and only if $s = (p + 1)/2 + k \cdot p$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ if and only if $2s - 1 = p \cdot (2k + 1)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$. Thus at least one such $p$ exists, except when $s = 1$ and $s = 0$. The coefficient $a_1 = 2$. We conclude that all $\omega_s = a_s \cdot \pi_s$ in $G(\omega)$ are composite except for $\omega_0 = \pi_0$. \[\square\]

The proofs that the sequence $\langle a_s : s \in \mathbb{Z} \rangle$ satisfies (C) and (E) do not depend on the values chosen for the “anchors” $s(p, n)$, as long as the sequence is well defined. One can choose $s(p, n)$ so as to make the galaxy $G(\omega)$ contain (1) no prime numbers or (2) infinitely many prime numbers.

(1) The following values of $s(p, n)$ guarantee that $a_s \neq 1$ holds for all $s \in \mathbb{Z}$, and hence that $G(\omega)$ contains no prime numbers. Let $p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_t, \ldots$ be the increasing enumeration of odd primes. We set $s(2, 0) = 1$, $s(2, 1) = 0$, $s(2, n) = 2^{n-1}$ for $n > 1$; $s(p_i, 0) = 1$, $s(p_{2i}, 1) = i$, $s(p_{2i+1}, 1) = -i$, and $s(p, n) = s(1^p, 1) + p^{n-1}$ for all odd $p$ and all $n > 1$.

(2) Dickson’s Conjecture implies that there exist sequences of prime numbers $\langle c + i \cdot (i + 1) : 0 \leq i < \ell \rangle$, for any $\ell$. For $\ell = 2$ they are just the prime twins $\langle c, c + 2 \rangle$. A remarkable example is the sequence $\langle 41 + i \cdot (i + 1) : 0 \leq i < 40 \rangle$ of 40 primes. We construct $G(\omega)$ where $\omega + i \cdot (i + 1)$ is a prime number for every $i \geq 0$. This requires that, for every prime number $p$, $s(p, 1) \neq -i \cdot (i + 1)$ mod $p$ holds for all $i \geq 0$. As $i \cdot (i + 1)$ is even, the condition is guaranteed for $p = 2$ by choosing $s(2, 1) = 1$. For odd primes $p$ the condition is equivalent to
\[(2i + 1)^2 \neq 1 - 4s(p, 1) \mod p\], and thus holds for all \(i \geq 0\) whenever \(1 - 4s(p, 1)\) is a quadratic nonresidue \(\mod p\). As there are \((p - 1)/2\) equivalence classes \(\mod p\) of quadratic nonresidues, and hence also of possible values for \(s(p, 1)\), we can choose \(s(p, 1)\) so that \((p - 1)/4 \leq s(p, 1) \leq (p - 1)/2\). This last condition guarantees that the coefficients \(a_s\) are well defined [if we also let \(s(2, n) = (1 - (-2)^n)/3\) and \(s(p, n) = s(p, 1) + p^{n-1}\) for \(n > 1\)].
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