

On sets $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ whose infinity follows from the existence in \mathcal{W} of an element which is greater than a threshold number computed for \mathcal{W}

Apoloniusz Tyszka

Abstract

We define computable functions $f, g: \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. For a positive integer n , let Θ_n denote the following statement: if a system $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \{x_i! = x_k : i, k \in \{1, \dots, n\}\} \cup \{x_i \cdot x_j = x_k : i, j, k \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}$ has only finitely many solutions in integers x_1, \dots, x_n greater than 1, then each such solution (x_1, \dots, x_n) satisfies $\min(x_1, \dots, x_n) \leq f(n)$. The statement Θ_9 proves that if there exists an integer $x > f(9)$ such that $x^2 + 1$ (alternatively, $x! + 1$) is prime, then there are infinitely many primes of the form $n^2 + 1$ (respectively, $n! + 1$). The statement Θ_{16} proves that if there exists a twin prime greater than $f(16) + 3$, then there are infinitely many twin primes. We formulate a statement which proves that if $2^{2^n} + 1$ is composite for some integer $n > g(13)$, then $2^{2^n} + 1$ is composite for infinitely many positive integers n .

Key words and phrases: Brocard's problem, Brocard-Ramanujan equation, composite Fermat numbers, composite numbers of the form $2^{2^n} + 1$, prime numbers of the form $n^2 + 1$, prime numbers of the form $n! + 1$, Richert's lemma, twin prime conjecture.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 03B30, 11U09.

1 Introduction

The following observation concerns the theme described in the title of the article.

Observation 1. *If $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathbb{N} \cap [0, n]$, then we take any integer $m \geq n$ as a threshold number for \mathcal{W} . If $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ and \mathcal{W} is infinite, then we take any non-negative integer m as a threshold number for \mathcal{W} .*

We define the set $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ by declaring that a non-negative integer n belongs to \mathcal{U} if and only if $\sin\left(10^{10^{10^{10}}}\right) > 0$. This inequality is practically undecidable, see [5].

Corollary 1. *The set \mathcal{U} equals \emptyset or \mathbb{N} . The statement “ $\mathcal{U} = \emptyset$ ” remains unproven and the statement “ $\mathcal{U} = \mathbb{N}$ ” remains unproven. Every non-negative integer m is a threshold number for \mathcal{U} . For every non-negative integer k , the sentence “ $k \in \mathcal{U}$ ” is only theoretically decidable.*

The first-order language of graph theory contains two relation symbols of arity 2: \sim and $=$, respectively for adjacency and equality of vertices. The term first-order imposes the condition that the variables represent vertices and hence the quantifiers apply to vertices only. For a first-order sentence Λ about graphs, let $\text{Spectrum}(\Lambda)$ denote the set of all positive integers n such that there is a graph on n vertices satisfying Λ . By a graph on n vertices we understand a set of n elements with a binary relation which is symmetric and irreflexive.

Theorem 1. ([12, p. 171]). *If a sentence Λ in the language of graph theory has the form $\exists x_1 \dots x_k \forall y_1 \dots y_l \Upsilon(x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_l)$, where $\Upsilon(x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_l)$ is quantifier-free, then either $\text{Spectrum}(\Lambda) \subseteq [1, (2^k \cdot 4^l) - 1]$ or $\text{Spectrum}(\Lambda) \supseteq [k + l, \infty) \cap \mathbb{N}$.*

Corollary 2. *The number $(2^k \cdot 4^l) - 1$ is a threshold number for $\text{Spectrum}(\Lambda)$.*

The classes of the infinite recursively enumerable sets and of the infinite recursive sets are not recursively enumerable, see [10, p. 234].

Corollary 3. *If an algorithm Al_1 for every recursive set $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ finds a non-negative integer $\text{Al}_1(\mathcal{W})$, then there exists a finite set $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathcal{M} \cap [\text{Al}_1(\mathcal{M}) + 1, \infty) \neq \emptyset$.*

Corollary 4. *If an algorithm Al_2 for every recursively enumerable set $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ finds a non-negative integer $\text{Al}_2(\mathcal{W})$, then there exists a finite set $\mathcal{M} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathcal{M} \cap [\text{Al}_2(\mathcal{M}) + 1, \infty) \neq \emptyset$.*

Let $K = \{j \in \mathbb{N} : 2^{\aleph_j} = \aleph_{j+1}\}$.

Theorem 2. *If ZFC is consistent, then for every non-negative integer n the sentence “ n is a threshold number for K ” is not provable in ZFC.*

Proof. There exists a model \mathcal{E} of ZFC such that

$$\forall i \in \{0, \dots, n + 1\} \mathcal{E} \models 2^{\aleph_i} = \aleph_{i+1}$$

and

$$\forall i \in \{n + 2, n + 3, n + 4, \dots\} \mathcal{E} \models 2^{\aleph_i} = \aleph_{i+2}$$

see [3] and [6, p. 232]. In the model \mathcal{E} , $K = \{0, \dots, n + 1\}$ and n is not a threshold number for K . □

Theorem 3. *If ZFC is consistent, then for every non-negative integer n the sentence " n is not a threshold number for K " is not provable in ZFC.*

Proof. The Generalized Continuum Hypothesis (GCH) is consistent with ZFC, see [6, p. 188] and [6, p. 190]. GCH implies that $K = \mathbb{N}$. Consequently, GCH implies that every non-negative integer n is a threshold number for K . \square

Let $g(1) = 1$, and let $g(n + 1) = 2^{2^{g(n)}}$ for every positive integer n .

Hypothesis 1. ([18]). *If a system*

$$\mathcal{S} \subseteq \{x_i \cdot x_j = x_k : i, j, k \in \{1, \dots, n\}\} \cup \{x_i + 1 = x_k : i, k \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}$$

has only finitely many solutions in non-negative integers x_1, \dots, x_n , then each such solution (x_1, \dots, x_n) satisfies $x_1, \dots, x_n \leq g(2n)$.

Theorem 4. ([18]). *Hypothesis 1 implies that for every $W(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ we can compute a threshold number $b \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ such that any non-negative integers a_1, \dots, a_n which satisfy*

$$(W(a_1, \dots, a_n) = 0) \wedge (\max(a_1, \dots, a_n) > b)$$

guarantee that the equation $W(x_1, \dots, x_n) = 0$ has infinitely many solutions in non-negative integers.

2 Basic lemmas

Let $f(1) = 2$, $f(2) = 4$, and let $f(n + 1) = f(n)!$ for every integer $n \geq 2$. Let \mathcal{V}_1 denote the system of equations $\{x_1! = x_1\}$, and let \mathcal{V}_2 denote the system of equations $\{x_1! = x_1, x_1 \cdot x_1 = x_2\}$. For an integer $n \geq 3$, let \mathcal{V}_n denote the following system of equations:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} x_1! = x_1 \\ x_1 \cdot x_1 = x_2 \\ \forall i \in \{2, \dots, n-1\} x_i! = x_{i+1} \end{array} \right.$$

The diagram in Figure 1 illustrates the construction of the system \mathcal{V}_n .




Fig. 1 Construction of the system \mathcal{V}_n

Lemma 1. For every positive integer n , the system \mathcal{V}_n has exactly one solution in integers greater than 1, namely $(f(1), \dots, f(n))$.

Let

$$H_n = \{x_i! = x_k : i, k \in \{1, \dots, n\}\} \cup \{x_i \cdot x_j = x_k : i, j, k \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}$$

For a positive integer n , let Θ_n denote the following statement: if a system $\mathcal{S} \subseteq H_n$ has at most finitely many solutions in integers x_1, \dots, x_n greater than 1, then each such solution (x_1, \dots, x_n) satisfies $\min(x_1, \dots, x_n) \leq f(n)$. The assumption $\min(x_1, \dots, x_n) \leq f(n)$ is weaker than the assumption $\max(x_1, \dots, x_n) \leq f(n)$ suggested by Lemma 1.

Lemma 2. For every positive integer n , the system H_n has a finite number of subsystems.

Theorem 5. Every statement Θ_n is true with an unknown integer bound that depends on n .

Proof. It follows from Lemma 2. □

Lemma 3. For every integers x and y greater than 1, $x! \cdot y = y!$ if and only if $x + 1 = y$.

Lemma 4. If $x \geq 4$, then $\frac{(x-1)! + 1}{x} > 1$.

Lemma 5. (Wilson's theorem, [4, p. 89]). For every integer $x \geq 2$, x is prime if and only if x divides $(x-1)! + 1$.

3 Brocard's problem

A weak form of Szpiro's conjecture implies that there are only finitely many solutions to the Brocard-Ramanujan equation $x! + 1 = y^2$, see [11]. It is conjectured that $x! + 1$ is a square only for $x \in \{4, 5, 7\}$, see [19, p. 297].

Let \mathcal{A} denote the following system of equations:

$$\begin{cases} x_1! = x_2 \\ x_2! = x_3 \\ x_5! = x_6 \\ x_4 \cdot x_4 = x_5 \\ x_3 \cdot x_5 = x_6 \end{cases}$$

Lemma 3 and the diagram in Figure 2 explain the construction of the system \mathcal{A} .




Fig. 2 Construction of the system \mathcal{A}

Lemma 6. *For every integers x_1 and x_4 greater than 1, the system \mathcal{A} is solvable in integers x_2, x_3, x_5, x_6 greater than 1 if and only if $x_1! + 1 = x_4^2$. In this case, the integers x_2, x_3, x_5, x_6 are uniquely determined by the following equalities:*

$$\begin{aligned} x_2 &= x_1! \\ x_3 &= (x_1!)! \\ x_5 &= x_1! + 1 \\ x_6 &= (x_1! + 1)! \end{aligned}$$

and $x_1 = \min(x_1, \dots, x_6)$.

Proof. It follows from Lemma 3. □

Theorem 6. *The statement Θ_6 proves the following implication: if the equation $x_1! + 1 = x_4^2$ has only finitely many solutions in positive integers, then each such solution (x_1, x_4) satisfies $x_1 \leq f(6)$.*

Proof. Let positive integers x_1 and x_4 satisfy $x_1! + 1 = x_4^2$. Then, $x_1, x_4 \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1\}$. By Lemma 6, there exists a unique tuple $(x_2, x_3, x_5, x_6) \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1\})^4$ such that the tuple (x_1, \dots, x_6) solves the system \mathcal{A} . Lemma 6 guarantees that $x_1 = \min(x_1, \dots, x_6)$. By the antecedent and Lemma 6, the system \mathcal{A} has only finitely many solutions in integers x_1, \dots, x_6 greater than 1. Therefore, the statement Θ_6 implies that $x_1 = \min(x_1, \dots, x_6) \leq f(6)$. □

Hypothesis 2. *The implication in Theorem 6 is true.*

Corollary 5. *Assuming Hypothesis 2, a single query to an oracle for the halting problem decides the problem of the infinitude of the solutions of the equation $x! + 1 = y^2$.*

4 Are there infinitely many prime numbers of the form $n^2 + 1$?

Edmund Landau’s conjecture states that there are infinitely many primes of the form $n^2 + 1$, see [9, pp. 37–38]. Let \mathcal{B} denote the following system of equations:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} x_2! = x_3 \\ x_3! = x_4 \\ x_5! = x_6 \\ x_8! = x_9 \\ x_1 \cdot x_1 = x_2 \\ x_3 \cdot x_5 = x_6 \\ x_4 \cdot x_8 = x_9 \\ x_5 \cdot x_7 = x_8 \end{array} \right.$$

Lemma 3 and the diagram in Figure 3 explain the construction of the system \mathcal{B} .




Fig. 3 Construction of the system \mathcal{B}

Lemma 7. *For every integer $x_1 \geq 2$, the system \mathcal{B} is solvable in integers x_2, \dots, x_9 greater than 1 if and only if $x_1^2 + 1$ is prime. In this case, the integers x_2, \dots, x_9 are uniquely determined by the following equalities:*

$$\begin{aligned}
x_2 &= x_1^2 \\
x_3 &= (x_1^2)! \\
x_4 &= ((x_1^2)!)! \\
x_5 &= x_1^2 + 1 \\
x_6 &= (x_1^2 + 1)! \\
x_7 &= \frac{(x_1^2)! + 1}{x_1^2 + 1} \\
x_8 &= (x_1^2)! + 1 \\
x_9 &= ((x_1^2)! + 1)!
\end{aligned}$$

and $\min(x_1, \dots, x_9) = x_1$.

Proof. By Lemmas 3 and 4, for every integer $x_1 \geq 2$, the system \mathcal{B} is solvable in integers x_2, \dots, x_9 greater than 1 if and only if $x_1^2 + 1$ divides $(x_1^2)! + 1$. Hence, the claim of Lemma 7 follows from Lemma 5. \square

Theorem 7. *The statement Θ_9 proves the following implication: if there exists an integer $x_1 > f(9)$ such that $x_1^2 + 1$ is prime, then there are infinitely many primes of the form $n^2 + 1$.*

Proof. Assume that an integer x_1 is greater than $f(9)$ and $x_1^2 + 1$ is prime. By Lemma 7, there exists a unique tuple $(x_2, \dots, x_9) \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1\})^8$ such that the tuple (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_9) solves the system \mathcal{B} . Lemma 7 guarantees that $\min(x_1, \dots, x_9) = x_1$. Since $\mathcal{B} \subseteq H_9$, the statement Θ_9 and the inequality $\min(x_1, \dots, x_9) = x_1 > f(9)$ imply that the system \mathcal{B} has infinitely many solutions $(x_1, \dots, x_9) \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1\})^9$. According to Lemma 7, there are infinitely many primes of the form $n^2 + 1$. \square

Hypothesis 3. *The implication in Theorem 7 is true.*

Corollary 6. *Assuming Hypothesis 3, a single query to an oracle for the halting problem decides the problem of the infinitude of primes of the form $n^2 + 1$.*

Let \mathcal{P} denote the set of prime numbers. For a non-negative integer n , let $\Omega(n)$ denote the following statement: $\exists m \in \mathbb{N} \cap (n, \infty) m^2 + 1 \in \mathcal{P}$. By Theorem 7, assuming the statement Θ_9 , we can infer the statement $\forall n \in \mathbb{N} \Omega(n)$ from any statement $\Omega(n)$ with $n \geq f(9)$. A similar situation holds for inference by the so called "super-induction method", see [20]–[23]. In section 8, we present a theorem whose computer-assisted proof is based on the super-induction method.

5 Are there infinitely many prime numbers of the form $n! + 1$?

It is conjectured that there are infinitely many primes of the form $n! + 1$, see [1, p. 443] and [15]. Let \mathcal{G} denote the following system of equations:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} x_1! = x_2 \\ x_2! = x_3 \\ x_3! = x_4 \\ x_5! = x_6 \\ x_8! = x_9 \\ x_3 \cdot x_5 = x_6 \\ x_4 \cdot x_8 = x_9 \\ x_5 \cdot x_7 = x_8 \end{array} \right.$$

Lemma 3 and the diagram in Figure 4 explain the construction of the system \mathcal{G} .




Fig. 4 Construction of the system \mathcal{G}

Lemma 8. *For every integer $x_1 \geq 2$, the system \mathcal{G} is solvable in integers x_2, \dots, x_9 greater than 1 if and only if $x_1! + 1$ is prime. In this case, the integers x_2, \dots, x_9 are uniquely determined by the following equalities:*

$$\begin{aligned}
x_2 &= x_1! \\
x_3 &= (x_1!)! \\
x_4 &= ((x_1!)!)! \\
x_5 &= x_1! + 1 \\
x_6 &= (x_1! + 1)! \\
x_7 &= \frac{(x_1!)! + 1}{x_1! + 1} \\
x_8 &= (x_1!)! + 1 \\
x_9 &= ((x_1!)! + 1)!
\end{aligned}$$

and $\min(x_1, \dots, x_9) = x_1$.

Proof. By Lemmas 3 and 4, for every integer $x_1 \geq 2$, the system \mathcal{G} is solvable in integers x_2, \dots, x_9 greater than 1 if and only if $x_1! + 1$ divides $(x_1!)! + 1$. Hence, the claim of Lemma 8 follows from Lemma 5. \square

Theorem 8. *The statement Θ_9 proves the following implication: if there exists an integer $x_1 > f(9)$ such that $x_1! + 1$ is prime, then there are infinitely many primes of the form $n! + 1$.*

Proof. Assume that an integer x_1 is greater than $f(9)$ and $x_1! + 1$ is prime. By Lemma 8, there exists a unique tuple $(x_2, \dots, x_9) \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1\})^8$ such that the tuple (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_9) solves the system \mathcal{G} . Lemma 8 guarantees that $\min(x_1, \dots, x_9) = x_1$. Since $\mathcal{G} \subseteq H_9$, the statement Θ_9 and the inequality $\min(x_1, \dots, x_9) = x_1 > f(9)$ imply that the system \mathcal{G} has infinitely many solutions $(x_1, \dots, x_9) \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1\})^9$. According to Lemma 8, there are infinitely many primes of the form $n! + 1$. \square

Hypothesis 4. *The implication in Theorem 8 is true.*

Corollary 7. *Assuming Hypothesis 4, a single query to an oracle for the halting problem decides the problem of the infinitude of primes of the form $n! + 1$.*

6 The twin prime conjecture

A twin prime is a prime number that is either 2 less or 2 more than another prime number. The twin prime conjecture states that there are infinitely many twin primes, see [9, p. 39].

Let C denote the following system of equations:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} x_1! = x_2 \\ x_2! = x_3 \\ x_4! = x_5 \\ x_6! = x_7 \\ x_7! = x_8 \\ x_9! = x_{10} \\ x_{12}! = x_{13} \\ x_{15}! = x_{16} \\ x_2 \cdot x_4 = x_5 \\ x_5 \cdot x_6 = x_7 \\ x_7 \cdot x_9 = x_{10} \\ x_4 \cdot x_{11} = x_{12} \\ x_3 \cdot x_{12} = x_{13} \\ x_9 \cdot x_{14} = x_{15} \\ x_8 \cdot x_{15} = x_{16} \end{array} \right.$$

Lemma 3 and the diagram in Figure 5 explain the construction of the system C .




Fig. 5 Construction of the system C

Lemma 9. *If $x_4 = 2$, then the system C has no solutions in integers x_1, \dots, x_{16} greater than 1.*

Proof. The equality $x_2 \cdot x_4 = x_5 = x_4!$ and the equality $x_4 = 2$ imply that $x_2 = 1$. \square

Lemma 10. *If $x_4 = 3$, then the system C has no solutions in integers x_1, \dots, x_{16} greater than 1.*

Proof. The equality $x_4 \cdot x_{11} = x_{12} = (x_4 - 1)! + 1$ and the equality $x_4 = 3$ imply that $x_{11} = 1$. \square

Lemma 11. *For every $x_4 \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ and for every $x_9 \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1\}$, the system C is solvable in integers $x_1, x_2, x_3, x_5, x_6, x_7, x_8, x_{10}, x_{11}, x_{12}, x_{13}, x_{14}, x_{15}, x_{16}$ greater than 1 if and only if x_4 and x_9 are prime and $x_4 + 2 = x_9$. In this case, the integers $x_1, x_2, x_3, x_5, x_6, x_7, x_8, x_{10}, x_{11}, x_{12}, x_{13}, x_{14}, x_{15}, x_{16}$ are uniquely determined by the following equalities:*

$$\begin{aligned}
x_1 &= x_4 - 1 \\
x_2 &= (x_4 - 1)! \\
x_3 &= ((x_4 - 1)!)! \\
x_5 &= x_4! \\
x_6 &= x_9 - 1 \\
x_7 &= (x_9 - 1)! \\
x_8 &= ((x_9 - 1)!)! \\
x_{10} &= x_9! \\
x_{11} &= \frac{(x_4 - 1)! + 1}{x_4} \\
x_{12} &= (x_4 - 1)! + 1 \\
x_{13} &= ((x_4 - 1)! + 1)! \\
x_{14} &= \frac{(x_9 - 1)! + 1}{x_9} \\
x_{15} &= (x_9 - 1)! + 1 \\
x_{16} &= ((x_9 - 1)! + 1)!
\end{aligned}$$

and $\min(x_1, \dots, x_{16}) = x_1 = x_9 - 3$.

Proof. By Lemmas 3 and 4, for every $x_4 \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ and for every $x_9 \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1\}$, the system C is solvable in integers $x_1, x_2, x_3, x_5, x_6, x_7, x_8, x_{10}, x_{11}, x_{12}, x_{13}, x_{14}, x_{15}, x_{16}$ greater than 1 if and only if

$$(x_4 + 2 = x_9) \wedge (x_4 | ((x_4 - 1)! + 1)) \wedge (x_9 | ((x_9 - 1)! + 1))$$

Hence, the claim of Lemma 11 follows from Lemma 5. \square

Theorem 9. *The statement Θ_{16} proves the following implication: if there exists a twin prime greater than $f(16) + 3$, then there are infinitely many twin primes.*

Proof. Assume that the antecedent holds. Then, there exist prime numbers x_4 and x_9 such that $x_9 = x_4 + 2 > f(16) + 3$. Hence, $x_4 \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$. By Lemma 11, there exists a unique tuple $(x_1, x_2, x_3, x_5, x_6, x_7, x_8, x_{10}, x_{11}, x_{12}, x_{13}, x_{14}, x_{15}, x_{16}) \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1\})^{14}$ such that the tuple (x_1, \dots, x_{16}) solves the system C . Lemma 11 guarantees that $\min(x_1, \dots, x_{16}) = x_1 = x_9 - 3 > f(16)$. Since $C \subseteq H_{16}$, the statement Θ_{16} and the inequality $\min(x_1, \dots, x_{16}) > f(16)$ imply that the system C has infinitely many solutions in integers x_1, \dots, x_{16} greater than 1. According to Lemmas 9–11, there are infinitely many twin primes. \square

Hypothesis 5. *The implication in Theorem 9 is true.*

Corollary 8. (cf. [2]). *Assuming Hypothesis 5, a single query to an oracle for the halting problem decides the twin prime problem.*

7 Are there infinitely many composite Fermat numbers?

Primes of the form $2^{2^n} + 1$ are called Fermat primes, as Fermat conjectured that every integer of the form $2^{2^n} + 1$ is prime, see [8, p. 1]. Fermat correctly remarked that $2^{2^0} + 1 = 3$, $2^{2^1} + 1 = 5$, $2^{2^2} + 1 = 17$, $2^{2^3} + 1 = 257$, and $2^{2^4} + 1 = 65537$ are all prime, see [8, p. 1].

Open Problem. ([8, p. 159]). *Are there infinitely many composite numbers of the form $2^{2^n} + 1$? Most mathematicians believe that $2^{2^n} + 1$ is composite for every integer $n \geq 5$, see [7, p. 23].*

Theorem 10. ([17]). *An unproven inequality stated in [17] implies that $2^{2^n} + 1$ is composite for every integer $n \geq 5$.*

Lemma 12. ([8, p. 38]). *For every positive integer n , if a prime number p divides $2^{2^n} + 1$, then there exists a positive integer k such that $p = k \cdot 2^n + 1 + 1$.*

Corollary 9. *Since $k \cdot 2^n + 1 + 1 \geq 2^n + 1 + 1 \geq n + 3$, for every positive integers x, y , and n , the equality $(x + 1)(y + 1) = 2^{2^n} + 1$ implies that $\min(n, x, x + 1, y, y + 1) = n$.*

Let

$$G_n = \{x_i \cdot x_j = x_k : i, j, k \in \{1, \dots, n\}\} \cup \{2^{2^{x_i}} = x_k : i, k \in \{1, \dots, n\}\}$$

Lemma 13. *The following subsystem of G_n*

$$\begin{cases} x_1 \cdot x_1 = x_1 \\ \forall i \in \{1, \dots, n-1\} 2^{2^{x_i}} = x_{i+1} \end{cases}$$

has exactly one solution $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^n$, namely $(g(1), \dots, g(n))$.

For a positive integer n , let Ψ_n denote the following statement: if a system $S \subseteq G_n$ has at most finitely many solutions in positive integers x_1, \dots, x_n , then each such solution (x_1, \dots, x_n) satisfies $\min(x_1, \dots, x_n) \leq g(n)$. The assumption $\min(x_1, \dots, x_n) \leq g(n)$ is weaker than the assumption $\max(x_1, \dots, x_n) \leq g(n)$ suggested by Lemma 13.

Lemma 14. *For every positive integer n , the system G_n has a finite number of subsystems.*

Theorem 11. *Every statement Ψ_n is true with an unknown integer bound that depends on n .*

Proof. It follows from Lemma 14. □

Lemma 15. *For every non-negative integers b and c , $b + 1 = c$ if and only if $2^{2^b} \cdot 2^{2^b} = 2^{2^c}$.*

Theorem 12. *The statement Ψ_{13} proves the following implication: if $2^{2^n} + 1$ is composite for some integer $n > g(13)$, then $2^{2^n} + 1$ is composite for infinitely many positive integers n .*

Proof. Let us consider the equation

$$(x + 1)(y + 1) = 2^{2^z} + 1 \tag{1}$$

in positive integers. By Lemma 15, we can transform equation (1) into an equivalent system \mathcal{F} which has 13 variables (x, y, z , and 10 other variables) and which consists of equations of the forms $\alpha \cdot \beta = \gamma$ and $2^{2^\alpha} = \gamma$, see the diagram in Figure 6.




Fig. 6 Construction of the system \mathcal{F}

Assume that $2^{2^n} + 1$ is composite for some integer $n > g(13)$. By this and Corollary 9, equation (1) has a solution $(x, y, z) \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^3$ such that $z = n$ and $z = \min(z, x, x + 1, y, y + 1)$. Hence, the system \mathcal{F} has a solution in positive integers such that $z = n$ and n is the smallest number in the solution sequence. Since $n > g(13)$, the statement Ψ_{13} implies that the system \mathcal{F} has infinitely many solutions in positive integers. Therefore, there are infinitely many positive integers n such that $2^{2^n} + 1$ is composite. \square

Hypothesis 6. *The implication in Theorem 12 is true.*

Corollary 10. *Assuming Hypothesis 6, a single query to an oracle for the halting problem decides whether or not the set of composite Fermat numbers is infinite.*

8 Every integer greater than 223 is expressible as a sum of distinct squares greater than 4

Lemma 16. ([13], [14, p. 152]). *Let $\{m_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ be an increasing sequence of positive integers such that for some positive integer k the inequality $m_{i+1} \leq 2m_i$ holds for all $i > k$. Suppose there exists a non-negative integer b such that the numbers $b + 1, b + 2, b + 3, \dots, b + m_{k+1}$ are all expressible as sums of distinct elements of the set $\{m_1, \dots, m_k\}$. Then every integer greater than b is expressible as a sum of distinct elements of the set $\{m_1, m_2, m_3, \dots\}$.*

Every integer greater than 128 can be expressed as a sum of distinct squares, see [16].

Theorem 13. *223 is the largest integer which cannot be expressed as the sum of distinct squares greater than 4.*

Proof. The execution of the following MuPAD code

```
A:={n^2 $n=3..13}:
B:={A[1]}:
for i from 2 to nops(A) do
B:=B union {A[i]} union {B[j]+A[i] $j=1..nops(B)}:
end_for:
{m $m=248+1..248+14^2} minus B;
```

gives the following output

{}

The empty set {} on the output indicates that each of the integers

$$248 + 1, 248 + 2, 248 + 3, \dots, 248 + 14^2$$

is expressible as a sum of distinct elements of the set $\{3^2, 4^2, 5^2, \dots, 13^2\}$. Thus, if we apply Lemma 16 with $m_i = (i + 2)^2$, $k = 11$, and $b = 248$, we conclude that every integer greater than 248 is expressible as a sum of distinct squares greater than 4. The execution of the following MuPAD code

```

A:={n^2 $n=3..15}:
B:={A[1]}:
for i from 2 to nops(A) do
B:=B union {A[i]} union {B[j]+A[i] $j=1..nops(B)}:
end_for:
{m $m=1..248} minus B;

```

gives the following output

```

{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22,
23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44,
46, 47, 48, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 62, 63, 66, 67, 68, 69, 71,
72, 75, 76, 78, 79, 82, 84, 87, 88, 91, 92, 93, 95, 96, 102, 103, 104,
107, 108, 111, 112, 118, 120, 123, 124, 127, 128, 132, 140, 143, 148,
156, 159, 168, 172, 176, 184, 187, 188, 192, 223}

```

Since $16^2 > 248$, the set on the output consists of all positive integers which cannot be expressed as the sum of distinct squares greater than 4. \square

MuPAD is a general-purpose computer algebra system. The commercial version of *MuPAD* is no longer available as a stand-alone product, but only as the *Symbolic Math Toolbox* of *MATLAB*. Fortunately, the presented codes can be executed by *MuPAD Light*, which was offered for free for research and education until autumn 2005.

References

- [1] C. K. Caldwell and Y. Gallot, *On the primality of $n! \pm 1$ and $2 \times 3 \times 5 \times \cdots \times p \pm 1$* , *Math. Comp.* 71 (2002), no. 237, 441–448, <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0025-5718-01-01315-1>.
- [2] F. G. Dorais, *Can the twin prime problem be solved with a single use of a halting oracle?* July 23, 2011, <https://mathoverflow.net/questions/71050>.

- [3] W. B. Easton, *Powers of regular cardinals*, Ann. Math. Logic 1 (1970), 139–178.
- [4] M. Erickson, A. Vazzana, D. Garth, *Introduction to number theory*, 2nd ed., CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 2016.
- [5] J. van der Hoeven, *Undecidability versus undecidability*, Bull. Symbolic Logic 5 (1999), no. 1, 75, <https://dx.doi.org/10.2307/421141>.
- [6] T. Jech, *Set theory*, Springer, Berlin, 2003.
- [7] J.-M. De Koninck and F. Luca, *Analytic number theory: Exploring the anatomy of integers*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2012.
- [8] M. Křížek, F. Luca, L. Somer, *17 lectures on Fermat numbers: from number theory to geometry*, Springer, New York, 2001.
- [9] W. Narkiewicz, *Rational number theory in the 20th century: From PNT to FLT*, Springer, London, 2012.
- [10] P. Odifreddi, *Classical recursion theory: the theory of functions and sets of natural numbers*, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1989.
- [11] M. Overholt, *The Diophantine equation $n! + 1 = m^2$* , Bull. London Math. Soc. 25 (1993), no. 2, 104, <https://doi.org/10.1112/blms/25.2.104>.
- [12] O. Pikhurko and O. Verbitsky, *Logical complexity of graphs: a survey*; in: *Model theoretic methods in finite combinatorics*, Contemp. Math. 558, 129–179, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2011, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1090/conm/558>.
- [13] H.-E. Richert, *Über Zerlegungen in paarweise verschiedene Zahlen*, Norsk Mat. Tidsskr. 31 (1949), 120–122.
- [14] W. Sierpiński, *Elementary theory of numbers*, 2nd ed. (ed. A. Schinzel), PWN – Polish Scientific Publishers and North-Holland, Warsaw-Amsterdam, 1987.
- [15] N. J. A. Sloane, *The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences*, A002981, *Numbers n such that $n! + 1$ is prime*, <https://oeis.org/A002981>.
- [16] R. Sprague, *Über Zerlegungen in ungleiche Quadratzahlen*, Math. Z. 51 (1948), 289–290.

- [17] A. Tyszka, *Is there a computable upper bound for the height of a solution of a Diophantine equation with a unique solution in positive integers?*, Open Comput. Sci. 7 (2017), no. 1, 17–23, <https://doi.org/10.1515/comp-2017-0003>.
- [18] A. Tyszka, *A hypothetical upper bound on the heights of the solutions of a Diophantine equation with a finite number of solutions*, Open Comput. Sci. 8 (2018), in online printing, <https://www.cyf-kr.edu.pl/~rttyzka/ocs.pdf>.
- [19] E. W. Weisstein, *CRC Concise Encyclopedia of Mathematics*, 2nd ed., Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, FL, 2002.
- [20] A. A. Zenkin, *Superinduction: a new method for proving general mathematical statements with a computer*, Dokl. Math. 55 (1997), no. 3, 410–413.
- [21] A. A. Zenkin, *Superinduction method: logical acupuncture of mathematical infinity* (in Russian), in: *Infinity in mathematics: philosophical and historical aspects* (ed. A. G. Barabashev), Janus-K, Moscow, 1997, 152–168, 173–176.
- [22] A. A. Zenkin, *The generalized Waring problem: estimation of the function $G(m, r)$ in terms of the function $g(m - 1, r)$ by the superinduction method*, Dokl. Math. 56 (1997), no. 1, 597–600.
- [23] A. A. Zenkin, *Super-induction method: logical acupuncture of mathematical infinity*, paper presented at the Twentieth World Congress of Philosophy, Boston, MA, August 10–15, 1998, <https://www.bu.edu/wcp/Papers/Logi/LogiZenk.htm>.

Apoloniusz Tyszka
 University of Agriculture
 Faculty of Production and Power Engineering
 Balicka 116B, 30-149 Kraków, Poland
 E-mail: rttyzka@cyf-kr.edu.pl