

On the Existence of a Prime Number in the Interval $[n^2, n^2 + n/2]$

Hashem Sazegar
Department of Mathematics
Islamic Azad University Branch of Mashhad, Iran.
email:h.sazegar@gmail.com

Abstract

Oppermann's conjecture states that for every positive integer n , there exists at least one prime number between n^2 and $n^2 + n$. Prior to this, Legendre had conjectured that there is always at least one prime number between n^2 and $(n + 1)^2$. In this paper, we not only claim to prove Oppermann's conjecture but also propose a smaller interval, asserting that there exists at least one prime between n^2 and $n^2 + n/2$.

Keywords: Bertrand–Chebyshev theorem, Landau's problems, Goldbach's conjecture, twin primes.

1 Introduction

Bertrand stated that for every positive integer n , there is always at least one prime between n and $2n$ [1]. The first proof was given by Chebyshev in 1850, now known as the Bertrand–Chebyshev theorem [2]. Ramanujan later provided a simpler proof in 1919 using properties of the Gamma function [3]. In 1932, Erdős gave an elementary proof using the Chebyshev function and binomial properties[4].

Legendre's conjecture states that for every positive integer n , there is at least one prime between n^2 and $(n + 1)^2$ [5, 6]. Landau highlighted this as one of his famous problems [7]. He also presented three other conjectures, forming the so-called “Landau's four problems” [8]:

1. The Twin Prime Conjecture: there exist infinitely many primes p such that $p + 2$ is also prime.
2. Goldbach's Conjecture: every even integer greater than 2 can be written as the sum of two primes [10, 11].
3. There exist infinitely many primes of the form $n^2 + 1$ [9].
4. There is always a prime between two consecutive squares[8].

2 Main Theorem

Theorem. There exists at least one prime number between n^2 and $n^2 + n/2$. **Proposition:** Assume that p and q are consecutive primes:

$$\frac{(x - x/p)}{q} \geq \left\lceil \frac{x - \lfloor \frac{x}{p} \rfloor}{q} \right\rceil$$

2.1 Proof

Let:

$$A = \frac{x - \frac{x}{p}}{q}, \quad B = \frac{x - \lfloor \frac{x}{p} \rfloor}{q}.$$

Then:

$$B - A = \frac{\frac{x}{p} - \lfloor \frac{x}{p} \rfloor}{q}.$$

Since

$$0 \leq \frac{x}{p} - \lfloor \frac{x}{p} \rfloor < 1,$$

it follows that

$$0 \leq B - A < \frac{1}{q}.$$

Because q is prime, we have

$$q \geq 2,$$

and therefore

$$0 \leq B - A < \frac{1}{2} < 1.$$

Hence,

$$B < A + 1.$$

Taking floors gives

$$\lfloor B \rfloor \leq A.$$

Therefore, the inequality is always true for consecutive primes p and q . In fact, the proof only requires $q > 1$.

2.2 Observation

Every composite number belongs to at least one of the following sequences generated by prime numbers:

$$\begin{aligned} &2, 2 \times 2, 2 \times 3, \dots, 2 \times l_1, \dots \\ &3, 3 \times 2, 3 \times 3, \dots, 3 \times l_2, \dots \\ &5, 5 \times 2, 5 \times 3, \dots, 5 \times l_3, \dots \\ &\quad \vdots \\ &q, q \times 2, q \times 3, \dots, q \times l_m, \dots \\ &\quad \vdots \end{aligned}$$

where q ranges over all prime numbers and $l_1, l_2, l_3, \dots, l_m, \dots$ are positive integers.

Since every composite integer has at least one prime divisor, every composite number appears in at least one of the above sequences.

2.3 First Proof

We attempt to prove this statement by induction. For $n = 12$, between 144 and 150 we find the prime 149. Assume the statement holds for $n = k$, and prove it for $n = k + 1$. For convenience, denote $k + 1$ by n . Assume

that all integers in the interval $[n^2, n^2 + n/2]$ are composite. Then the total number of composite numbers in this interval is approximately $[n/2]$, among which $[n/4]$ are even (hence discarded) and the remaining numbers are odd. Among these odd numbers, some are divisible by small primes $3, 5, 7, \dots, q$, where q denotes the largest prime less than or equal to $[n/2]$.

Let $q = p_s$, and set

$$a = \left[\frac{n}{4} \right].$$

- Multiples of 3, $\frac{a}{3}$ numbers, are eliminated, leaving $a \left(1 - \frac{1}{3}\right)$.
- Multiples of 5, $\frac{a \left(1 - \frac{1}{3}\right)}{5}$ numbers, are eliminated.
- Multiples of 7,

$$\frac{a \left(\left(1 - \frac{1}{3}\right) - \frac{1 - \frac{1}{3}}{5} \right)}{7} = \frac{a \left(0.66 - \frac{0.66}{5}\right)}{7},$$

are eliminated.

- Multiples of 11,

$$\frac{a \left(0.53 - \frac{0.53}{7}\right)}{11},$$

are eliminated.

Continuing this process, at stage p_{s+1} , we would have

$$\frac{al - al/p_s}{p_{s+1}},$$

which must vanish if all numbers were composite.

However, we obtain

$$0 = \frac{al \left(1 - \frac{1}{p_s}\right)}{p_{s+1}} > \frac{al \left(1 - \frac{1}{p_s}\right)}{2p_s}.$$

Therefore, the assumption that all numbers in the interval are composite is false, and hence there must exist at least one prime in the interval $[n^2, n^2 + n/2]$.

2.4 Second proof

Let $a = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$ and let $p_{s+1} \leq n$ be the greatest prime number in $[n^2, n^2 + \frac{n}{2}]$. We prove similar to the previous proof. We begin by p_{s+1} until to prime factor 3. Therefore

p_{s+1} : $\frac{a}{p_{s+1}}$ numbers are removed.

p_s : $\frac{a - \frac{a}{p_{s+1}}}{p_s}$ numbers are removed.

p_{s-1} : $\frac{(a - \frac{a}{p_{s+1}}) - \frac{(a - \frac{a}{p_{s+1}})}{p_s}}{p_{s-1}}$ numbers are removed.

⋮

3: $\frac{al_1(1 - \frac{1}{5})}{3}$ numbers are removed.

2: $\frac{al'_1(1 - \frac{1}{3})}{2}$ numbers are removed.

Note that $\frac{al'_1(1 - \frac{1}{3})}{2}$ is not equal to zero, since $a, l'_1 > 0$. Therefore there exists at least a prime number between n^2 and $n^2 + n/2$.

2.5 Third proof

Let $z = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$, given the second proof, in each interval, by dividing by 3, 5, up to (P_{s+1}) , we arrive at smaller sub-intervals of the form $(z - \frac{z}{p})$, i.e.

$$z \longrightarrow z\left(1 - \frac{1}{p_{s+1}}\right) \longrightarrow z\left(1 - \frac{1}{p_{s+1}}\right)\left(1 - \frac{1}{p_s}\right) \longrightarrow z\left(1 - \frac{1}{p_{s+1}}\right)\left(1 - \frac{1}{p_s}\right)\dots\left(1 - \frac{1}{3}\right)$$

Therefore, in each step m is transformed to $m - \frac{m}{p}$.

The formula

$$\prod_{p < z} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) = \frac{e^{-(c_0 + c_1)}}{\log z} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\log z}\right)\right)$$

is a refined form of **Mertens' Third Theorem** [page 66 of [12]]. More commonly, it is written as

$$\prod_{p < z} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) = \frac{e^{-\gamma}}{\log z} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\log z}\right)\right),$$

where γ denotes the Euler–Mascheroni constant. In some texts, $\gamma = c_0 + c_1$, giving the stated form.

According to the above mentioned proposition and Mertens' Third Theorem we have:

$$z \prod_{p < z, p > 2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) = \frac{2ze^{-\gamma}}{\log z} \left(1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\log z}\right)\right) < z - \left[\frac{z}{p_{s+1}}\right] - \left[\frac{z - \left[\frac{z}{p_{s+1}}\right]}{p_s}\right] - \dots = 0 \text{ or } 1$$

Otherwise:

$$z \prod_{p < z, p > 2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) - (a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_r) < (z - \left[\frac{z}{p_{s+1}}\right] \dots) - (a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_r) = 0 \text{ or } 1$$

Then we have:

$$z \prod_{p < z, p > 2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right) < (a_1 + a_2 + \dots + a_r) < z$$

This is a contradiction because a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k are composite, which contradicts the induction hypothesis.

Note that all numbers in the interval $[n^2, n^2 + n/2]$, under the assumption of a composite contradiction, are composite; therefore, each must have a prime factor smaller than (n) .

Based on this method, it can be shown that there exists at least a prime number in intervals $[n^2, n^2 + n/2], [n^2, n^2 + n/3], \dots, [n^2, n^2 + \epsilon n]$ for $\epsilon > 0$

3 Example

Consider $n = 30$. Between 30^2 and $30^2 + 30$, we find several primes:

$$900 = 2 \times 450,$$

$$901 = 17 \times 53,$$

$$903 = 3 \times 301,$$

$$905 = 5 \times 181,$$

907 is prime,

$$909 = 3 \times 301 + 3 \times 2,$$

911 is prime,

$$913 = 11 \times 83,$$

$$915 = 3 \times 301 + 3 \times 4,$$

$$917 = 7 \times 131,$$

919 is prime,

$$921 = 3 \times 301 + 3 \times 6,$$

$$923 = 13 \times 71,$$

$$925 = 5 \times 181 + 5 \times 4,$$

$$927 = 3 \times 301 + 3 \times 8.$$

929 is prime,

In order for a number in the interval to be composite, it must have a prime divisor not exceeding

$$q = \sqrt{30^2 + 30} \approx \sqrt{930}.$$

Hence, it suffices to check primes up to $q \leq 30$, where q is a prime factor.

For $n = 30$, the number of odd integers in the interval is 15. By eliminating multiples of small primes:

Multiples of 3: $[15/3] = 5$,

Multiples of 5: $[(15 - 5)/5] = 2$,

Multiples of 7: $[(15 - 7)/7] = 1$,

Multiples of 11: 1,

Multiples of 13: 1.

Thus, out of 15 odd numbers, four numbers are primes.

Our Methodology

We compute the successive elimination of multiples of primes as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Multiples of 3 : } & \frac{15}{3} = 5, \\ \text{Multiples of 5 : } & \frac{15 - 5}{5} = 2, \\ \text{Multiples of 7 : } & \frac{15 - 7}{7} = 1.14, \\ \text{Multiples of 11 : } & \frac{15 - 8.14}{11} = 0.623, \\ \text{Multiples of 13 : } & \frac{15 - 8.76}{13} = 0.479, \\ \text{Multiples of 17 : } & \frac{15 - 9.242}{17} = 0.338, \\ \text{Multiples of 19 : } & \frac{15 - 9.58}{19} = 0.282, \\ \text{Multiples of 23 : } & \frac{15 - 9.862}{23} = 0.223, \\ \text{Multiples of 29 : } & \frac{15 - 10.085}{29} = 0.169. \end{aligned}$$

From these calculations, we observe that the successive elimination of prime multiples never reaches zero. Therefore, the assumption that all numbers in the interval are composite leads to a contradiction. It follows that there must exist at least one prime in the interval.

This reasoning can be extended similarly to the intervals $[n^2, n^2 + n/2]$, and beyond.

Our Second Methodology In order for a number in the interval to be composite, it must have a prime divisor not exceeding

$$q = \sqrt{30^2 + 30} \approx \sqrt{930}.$$

Hence, it suffices to check primes up to $q \leq 30$, where q is a prime factor.

Multiples of 29: $[30/29] = 1$,
 Multiples of 23: $[29/23] = 1$,
 Multiples of 19: $[28/19] = 1$,
 Multiples of 17: $[27/17] = 1$,
 Multiples of 13: $[26/13] = 2$,
 Multiples of 11: $[24/11] = 2$,
 Multiples of 7: $[22/7] = 3$,
 Multiples of 5: $[19/5] = 3$,
 Multiples of 3: $[16/3] = 5$,
 Multiples of 2: $[11/2] = 5$.

Second method

Multiples of 29 : $\frac{30}{29} = 1.034$,
 Multiples of 23 : $\frac{28.996}{23} = 1.26$,
 Multiples of 19 : $\frac{27.676}{19} = 1.46$,
 Multiples of 17 : $\frac{26.216}{17} = 1.54$,
 Multiples of 13 : $\frac{24.676}{13} = 1.898$,
 Multiples of 11 : $\frac{22.778}{11} = 2.0707$,
 Multiples of 7 : $\frac{20.707}{7} = 2.958$,
 Multiples of 5 : $\frac{17.749}{5} = 3.55$,
 Multiples of 3 : $\frac{14.299}{3} = 4.733$,
 Multiples of 2 : $\frac{9.466}{2} = 4.733$.

Also, this method does not tend to zero.

Declarations

Data Availability Statement: The data supporting the findings of this study are available within the article.

Conflict of Interest: The author declares no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this paper.

Funding: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

References

- [1] Nagell, T. Introduction to Number Theory. 163. American Mathematical Soc., 2021.
- [2] Chebyshev, P. L. “Mémoire sur les nombres premiers.” *Journal de Mathématiques Pures et Appliquées* 17 (1850): 366–390.
- [3] Ramanujan, S. “A Proof of Bertrand’s Postulate.” *Journal of the Indian Mathematical Society* 11 (1919): 181–182.
- [4] Erdős, P. “Beweis eines Satzes von Tschebyschef.” *Acta Litt. Sci. Szeged* 5 (1932): 194–198.
- [5] Legendre, A. M. *Essai sur la théorie des nombres*. Courcier, 1808.
- [6] Dudley, U. *Elementary Number Theory*. Courier Corporation, 2008.
- [7] Landau, E. *Handbuch der Lehre von der Verteilung der Primzahlen*. Teubner, 1909.
- [8] Guy, R. *Unsolved Problems in Number Theory*. Vol. 1. Springer Science & Business Media, 2004.
- [9] Hardy, G. H., & Wright, E. M. *An Introduction to the Theory of Numbers*. Oxford university press, 1979.
- [10] Goldbach, C. “Letter to Euler.” 20/31 July 1730, in: *Nosceumus Wiki*.
- [11] Montgomery, H. L., & Vaughan, R. C. *Multiplicative Number Theory I: Classical Theory*. No. 97. Cambridge university press, 2007.

- [12] Cojocaru , A. C., & Murty, M. R. An Introduction to Sieve Methods and Their Applications. Cambridge university press, 2005.