

The physical limits of computation inspire an open problem that concerns decidable sets $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ and cannot be formalized in mathematics understood as an a priori science because it refers to the current knowledge on X

AGNIESZKA KOZDĘBA, APOLONIUSZ TYSZKA

ABSTRACT. Algorithms always terminate. We explain the distinction between existing algorithms (i.e. algorithms whose existence is provable in *ZFC*) and known algorithms (i.e. algorithms whose definition is constructive and currently known). Assuming that the infiniteness of a set $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ is false or unproven, we define which elements of X are classified as known. No known set $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ satisfies Conditions (1)-(4) and is widely known in number theory or naturally defined, where this term has only informal meaning. (1) A known algorithm with no input returns an integer n satisfying $\text{card}(X) < \omega \Rightarrow X \subseteq (-\infty, n]$. (2) A known algorithm for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ decides whether or not $k \in X$. (3) No known algorithm with no input returns the logical value of the statement $\text{card}(X) = \omega$. (4) There are many elements of X and it is conjectured, though so far unproven, that X is infinite. (5) X is naturally defined. The infiniteness of X is false or unproven. X has the simplest definition among known sets $Y \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ with the same set of known elements. Let \mathcal{P}_{n^2+1} denote the set of primes of the form $n^2 + 1$. Conditions (2)-(5) hold for $X = \mathcal{P}_{n^2+1}$. We discuss a conjecture which implies the conjunction of Conditions (1)-(5) for $X = \mathcal{P}_{n^2+1}$. No set $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ will satisfy Conditions (1)-(4) forever, if for every algorithm with no input, at some future day, a computer will be able to execute this algorithm in 1 second or less. The physical limits of computation disprove this assumption. We present a table that shows satisfiable conjunctions consisting of Conditions (1)-(5) and their negations.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: 03D20.

Key words and phrases: conjecturally infinite set $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, constructively defined integer n satisfies $\text{card}(X) < \omega \Rightarrow X \subseteq (-\infty, n]$, current knowledge on a set $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, distinction between existing algorithms and known algorithms, known elements of a set $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ whose infiniteness is false or unproven, physical limits of computation, primes of the form $n^2 + 1$, X is decidable by a constructively defined algorithm.

1. DEFINITIONS AND THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN EXISTING ALGORITHMS AND KNOWN ALGORITHMS

Algorithms always terminate. Semi-algorithms may not terminate. Examples 1–4 and the proof of Statement 1 explain the distinction between *existing algorithms* (i.e. algorithms whose existence is provable in *ZFC*) and *known algorithms* (i.e. algorithms whose definition is constructive and currently known). A definition of an integer n is called *constructive*, if it provides a known algorithm with no input that returns n . Definition 1 applies to sets $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ whose infiniteness is false or unproven.

Definition 1. We say that a non-negative integer k is a known element of X , if $k \in X$ and we know an algebraic expression that defines k and consists of the following signs: 1 (one), + (addition), - (subtraction), \cdot (multiplication), / (division), \wedge (exponentiation), ! (factorial), ((left parenthesis),) (right parenthesis).

Let t denote the largest twin prime that is smaller than $(((((9!)!)!)!)!)!)!$. The number t is an unknown element of the set of twin primes.

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

Edmund Landau's conjecture states that the set \mathcal{P}_{n^2+1} of primes of the form $n^2 + 1$ is infinite, see [10]–[12]. Let $[\cdot]$ denote the integer part function. By Lemma 1, for every positive integer n ,

$$1 + 1 + \left((n^2)! - (n^2 + 1) \cdot \left[\frac{(n^2)!}{n^2 + 1} \right] \right) \cdot \frac{n^2 - 1}{n^2} = \begin{cases} n^2 + 1, & \text{if } n^2 + 1 \text{ is prime} \\ 2, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Similar identities are unknown for algebraic expressions considered in Definition 1, so Definition 1 seems to be correct.

Definition 2. *Conditions (1)–(5) concern sets $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$.*

(1) *A known algorithm with no input returns an integer n satisfying $\text{card}(X) < \omega \Rightarrow X \subseteq (-\infty, n]$.*

(2) *A known algorithm for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ decides whether or not $k \in X$.*

(3) *No known algorithm with no input returns the logical value of the statement $\text{card}(X) = \omega$.*

(4) *There are many elements of X and it is conjectured, though so far unproven, that X is infinite.*

(5) *X is naturally defined. The infiniteness of X is false or unproven. X has the simplest definition among known sets $\mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ with the same set of known elements.*

Condition (3) implies that no known proof shows the finiteness/infiniteness of X . No known set $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ satisfies Conditions (1)–(4) and is widely known in number theory or naturally defined, where this term has only informal meaning.

Definition 3. *Let $\beta = (((24!)!)!)!$.*

Lemma 2. $\log_2(\log_2(\log_2(\log_2(\log_2(\log_2(\log_2(\beta))))))) \approx 1.42298$.

Proof. We ask Wolfram Alpha at <https://wolframalpha.com>. □

Example 1. *The set $X = \mathcal{P}_{n^2+1}$ satisfies Condition (3).*

Example 2. *The set $X = \begin{cases} \mathbb{N}, & \text{if } [\frac{\beta}{\pi}] \text{ is odd} \\ \emptyset, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$ does not satisfy Condition (3) because we*

know an algorithm with no input that computes $[\frac{\beta}{\pi}]$. The set of known elements of X is empty. Hence, Condition (5) fails for X .

Example 3. ([1], [7], [9, p. 9]). *The function*

$$\mathbb{N} \ni n \xrightarrow{h} \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if the decimal expansion of } \pi \text{ contains } n \text{ consecutive zeros} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

is computable because $h = \mathbb{N} \times \{1\}$ or there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$h = (\{0, \dots, k\} \times \{1\}) \cup (\{k+1, k+2, k+3, \dots\} \times \{0\})$$

No known algorithm computes the function h .

Example 4. *The set*

$$\mathcal{X} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{N}, & \text{if the continuum hypothesis holds} \\ \emptyset, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

is decidable. This \mathcal{X} satisfies Conditions (1) and (3) and does not satisfy Conditions (2), (4), and (5). These facts will hold forever.

Definition 4. *Let Φ denote the following unproven statement:*

$$\text{card}(\mathcal{P}_{n^2+1}) < \omega \Rightarrow \mathcal{P}_{n^2+1} \subseteq [2, \beta]$$

Landau's conjecture implies the statement Φ . Theorem 6 heuristically justifies the statement Φ . This justification does not yield the finiteness/infiniteness of \mathcal{P}_{n^2+1} .

Statement 1. *Condition (1) remains unproven for $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{P}_{n^2+1}$.*

Proof. For every set $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, there exists an algorithm $\text{Alg}(\mathcal{X})$ with no input that returns

$$n = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } \text{card}(\mathcal{X}) \in \{0, \omega\} \\ \max(\mathcal{X}), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

This n satisfies the implication in Condition (1), but the algorithm $\text{Alg}(\mathcal{P}_{n^2+1})$ is unknown because its definition is ineffective. \square

Proving the statement Φ will disprove Statement 1. Statement 1 cannot be formalized in mathematics understood as an a priori science because it refers to the current mathematical knowledge. The same is true for Open Problems 1–3 and Statements 2–4.

Definition 5. *We say that an integer n is a threshold number of a set $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, if $\text{card}(\mathcal{X}) < \omega \Rightarrow \mathcal{X} \subseteq (-\infty, n]$.*

If a set $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ is empty or infinite, then any integer n is a threshold number of \mathcal{X} . If a set $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ is non-empty and finite, then the all threshold numbers of \mathcal{X} form the set $[\max(\mathcal{X}), \infty) \cap \mathbb{N}$.

2. THE PHYSICAL LIMITS OF COMPUTATION INSPIRE OPEN PROBLEM 1

Let $f(1) = 2$, $f(2) = 4$, and let $f(n+1) = f(n)!$ for every integer $n \geq 2$.

Statement 2. *The set*

$$\mathcal{X} = \{k \in \mathbb{N} : (10^6 < k) \Rightarrow (f(10^6), f(k)) \cap \mathcal{P}_{n^2+1} \neq \emptyset\}$$

satisfies Conditions (1)–(4). Condition (5) fails for \mathcal{X} .

Proof. Condition (4) holds as $\mathcal{X} \supseteq \{0, \dots, 10^6\}$ and the set \mathcal{P}_{n^2+1} is conjecturally infinite. By Lemma 2, due to known physics we are not able to confirm by a direct computation that some element of \mathcal{P}_{n^2+1} is greater than $f(10^6) > f(7) = \beta$, see [5]. Thus Condition (3) holds. Condition (2) holds trivially. Since the set

$$\{k \in \mathbb{N} : (10^6 < k) \wedge (f(10^6), f(k)) \cap \mathcal{P}_{n^2+1} \neq \emptyset\}$$

is empty or infinite, the integer 10^6 is a threshold number of \mathcal{X} . Thus \mathcal{X} satisfies Condition (1). Condition (5) fails for \mathcal{X} as the set of known elements of \mathcal{X} equals $\{0, \dots, 10^6\}$. \square

Let $j = (((((((9!)!)!)!)!)!)!)!$. For $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$, let S_n denote $\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{k^{1+(1/j)}}$.

Lemma 3. $S_{700000} \approx \sum_{k=1}^{700000} \frac{1}{k} \approx 14.04$, $S_{1800000} \approx \sum_{k=1}^{1800000} \frac{1}{k} \approx 14.98$.

Proof. We ask Wolfram Alpha at <https://wolframalpha.com>. □

Lemma 4. A known algorithm takes as inputs $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ and returns the logical value of the inequality $m \leq S_n$. It implies that a known algorithm takes as input $n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ and returns $\lfloor S_n \rfloor$.

Proof. For every positive integer n , S_n is a positive and algebraic number. Now the claims follow from the decidability of real closed fields. □

Let ζ denote Riemann's ζ function.

Lemma 5. $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k^{1+(1/j)}} = \zeta(1 + (1/j)) \approx j + 0.6$. It holds for every positive integer j .

Proof. We ask Wolfram Alpha at <https://wolframalpha.com>. □

Lemma 6. The function

$$\mathbb{N} \ni n \xrightarrow{\delta} \text{the_exponent_of_2_in_the_prime_factorization_of_}\underbrace{n+2}_{\in \mathbb{N}} \in \mathbb{N}$$

takes every non-negative integer value infinitely often.

Lemma 7. The inclusion

$$[700000, 1800000] \cap \{2k+1 : k \in \mathbb{N}\} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$$

holds for

$$\mathcal{X} = \left\{ n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} : \left(\left\lfloor \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{k^{1+(1/j)}} \right\rfloor + \delta(n) \right)^2 + 1 \text{ is prime} \right\}$$

Proof. It follows from Lemma 3 because $14^2 + 1$ is prime. □

Statement 3. Conditions (1)–(4) hold for the above set \mathcal{X} .

Proof. Lemma 4 implies Condition (2). By Lemmas 4 and 5, a known algorithm with no input returns the smallest positive integer n for which

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{k^{1+(1/j)}} \geq j$$

This conclusion and Lemmas 5 and 6 imply that $n-1$ is a threshold number of \mathcal{X} . Thus Condition (1) holds. Since the statement $\mathcal{P}_{n^2+1} \cap [j^2 + 1, \infty) \neq \emptyset$ remains unproven, Condition (3) holds. Lemma 7 and the implication

$$\mathcal{P}_{n^2+1} \cap [j^2 + 1, \infty) \neq \emptyset \implies \text{card}(\mathcal{X}) = \omega$$

show that Condition (4) holds. □

Proving Landau's conjecture will disprove Statements 2 and 3.

Open Problem 1. Is there a set $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ which satisfies Conditions (1)–(5)?

It may be that a modification of Statement 3 will solve Open Problem 1.

Theorem 1. *No set $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ will satisfy Conditions (1)–(4) forever, if for every algorithm with no input, at some future day, a computer will be able to execute this algorithm in 1 second or less.*

Proof. The proof goes by contradiction. We fix an integer n that satisfies Condition (1). Since Conditions (1)–(3) will hold forever, the semi-algorithm in Figure 1 never terminates and sequentially prints the following sentences:

$$(T) \quad n + 1 \notin \mathcal{X}, n + 2 \notin \mathcal{X}, n + 3 \notin \mathcal{X}, \dots$$




Fig. 1 Semi-algorithm that terminates if and only if \mathcal{X} is infinite

The sentences from the sequence (T) and our assumption imply that for every integer $m > n$ computed by a known algorithm, at some future day, a computer will be able to confirm in 1 second or less that $(n, m] \cap \mathcal{X} = \emptyset$. Thus, at some future day, numerical evidence will support the conjecture that the set \mathcal{X} is finite, contrary to the conjecture in Condition (4). \square

The physical limits of computation ([5]) disprove the assumption of Theorem 1.

3. NUMBER-THEORETIC STATEMENTS Ψ_n

Let \mathcal{U}_1 denote the system of equations which consists of the equation $x_1! = x_1$. For an integer $n \geq 2$, let \mathcal{U}_n denote the following system of equations:

$$\begin{cases} x_1! = x_1 \\ x_1 \cdot x_1 = x_2 \\ \forall i \in \{2, \dots, n-1\} x_i! = x_{i+1} \end{cases}$$

Lemma 8. *For every positive integer n , the system \mathcal{U}_n has exactly two solutions in positive integers x_1, \dots, x_n , namely $(1, \dots, 1)$ and $(f(1), \dots, f(n))$.*

Let B_n denote the following system of equations:

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

For every positive integer n , no known system $\mathcal{S} \subseteq B_n$ with a finite number of solutions in positive integers x_1, \dots, x_n has a solution $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^n$ satisfying $\max(x_1, \dots, x_n) > f(n)$. For every positive integer n and for every known system $\mathcal{S} \subseteq B_n$, if the finiteness/infiniteness of the set

$$\{(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^n : (x_1, \dots, x_n) \text{ solves } \mathcal{S}\}$$

is unknown, then the statement

$$\exists x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} ((x_1, \dots, x_n) \text{ solves } \mathcal{S}) \wedge (\max(x_1, \dots, x_n) > f(n))$$

remains unproven.

For a positive integer n , let Ψ_n denote the following statement: *if a system $\mathcal{S} \subseteq B_n$ has at most finitely many solutions in positive integers x_1, \dots, x_n , then each such solution (x_1, \dots, x_n) satisfies $x_1, \dots, x_n \leq f(n)$* . The statement Ψ_n says that for subsystems of B_n with a finite number of solutions, the largest known solution is indeed the largest possible. The statements Ψ_1 and Ψ_2 hold trivially. There is no reason to assume the validity of the statement $\forall n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} \Psi_n$.

Theorem 2. *For every statement Ψ_n , the bound $f(n)$ cannot be decreased.*

Proof. It follows from Lemma 8 because $\mathcal{U}_n \subseteq B_n$. □

Theorem 3. *For every integer $n \geq 2$, the statement Ψ_{n+1} implies the statement Ψ_n .*

Proof. If a system $\mathcal{S} \subseteq B_n$ has at most finitely many solutions in positive integers x_1, \dots, x_n , then for every integer $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ the system $\mathcal{S} \cup \{x_i! = x_{n+1}\}$ has at most finitely many solutions in positive integers x_1, \dots, x_{n+1} . The statement Ψ_{n+1} implies that $x_i! = x_{n+1} \leq f(n+1) = f(n)!$. Hence, $x_i \leq f(n)$. □

Theorem 4. *Every statement Ψ_n is true with an unknown integer bound that depends on n .*

Proof. For every positive integer n , the system B_n has a finite number of subsystems. □

4. A CONJECTURAL SOLUTION OF OPEN PROBLEM 1

Lemma 9. *For every positive integers x and y , $x! \cdot y = y!$ if and only if*

$$(x + 1 = y) \vee (x = y = 1)$$

Let \mathcal{A} 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 9 and the diagram in Figure 2 explain the construction of the system \mathcal{A} .




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

Lemma 10. For every integer $x_1 \geq 2$, the system \mathcal{A} is solvable in positive integers x_2, \dots, x_9 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:

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

Proof. By Lemma 9, for every integer $x_1 \geq 2$, the system \mathcal{A} is solvable in positive integers x_2, \dots, x_9 if and only if $x_1^2 + 1$ divides $(x_1^2)! + 1$. Hence, the claim of Lemma 10 follows from Lemma 1. \square

Lemma 11. There are only finitely many tuples $(x_1, \dots, x_9) \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^9$, which solve the system \mathcal{A} and satisfy $x_1 = 1$. It is true as every such tuple (x_1, \dots, x_9) satisfies $x_1, \dots, x_9 \in \{1, 2\}$.

Proof. The equality $x_1 = 1$ implies that $x_2 = x_1 \cdot x_1 = 1$. Hence, $x_3 = x_2! = 1$. Therefore, $x_4 = x_3! = 1$. The equalities $x_5! = x_6$ and $x_5 = 1 \cdot x_5 = x_3 \cdot x_5 = x_6$ imply that $x_5, x_6 \in \{1, 2\}$. The equalities $x_8! = x_9$ and $x_8 = 1 \cdot x_8 = x_4 \cdot x_8 = x_9$ imply that $x_8, x_9 \in \{1, 2\}$. The equality $x_5 \cdot x_7 = x_8$ implies that $x_7 = \frac{x_8}{x_5} \in \left\{\frac{1}{1}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{2}{1}, \frac{2}{2}\right\} \cap (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}) = \{1, 2\}$. \square

Conjecture 1. The statement Ψ_9 is true when is restricted to the system \mathcal{A} .

Theorem 5. Conjecture 1 proves the following implication: if there exists an integer $x_1 \geq 2$ such that $x_1^2 + 1$ is prime and greater than $f(7)$, then the set \mathcal{P}_{n^2+1} is infinite.

Proof. Suppose that the antecedent holds. By Lemma 10, there exists a unique tuple $(x_2, \dots, x_9) \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^8$ such that the tuple (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_9) solves the system \mathcal{A} . Since $x_1^2 + 1 > f(7)$, we obtain that $x_1^2 \geq f(7)$. Hence, $(x_1^2)! \geq f(7)! = f(8)$. Consequently,

$$x_9 = ((x_1^2)! + 1)! \geq (f(8) + 1)! > f(8)! = f(9)$$

Conjecture 1 and the inequality $x_9 > f(9)$ imply that the system \mathcal{A} has infinitely many solutions $(x_1, \dots, x_9) \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^9$. According to Lemmas 10 and 11, the set \mathcal{P}_{n^2+1} is infinite. \square

Theorem 6. *Conjecture 1 implies the statement Φ .*

Proof. It follows from Theorem 5 and the equality $f(7) = (((24!)!)!)!$. \square

Theorem 7. *The statement Φ implies Conjecture 1.*

Proof. By Lemmas 10 and 11, if positive integers x_1, \dots, x_9 solve the system \mathcal{A} , then

$$(x_1 \geq 2) \wedge (x_5 = x_1^2 + 1) \wedge (x_5 \text{ is prime})$$

or $x_1, \dots, x_9 \in \{1, 2\}$. In the first case, Lemma 10 and the statement Φ imply that the inequality $x_5 \leq (((24!)!)!)! = f(7)$ holds when the system \mathcal{A} has at most finitely many solutions in positive integers x_1, \dots, x_9 . Hence, $x_2 = x_5 - 1 < f(7)$ and $x_3 = x_2! < f(7)! = f(8)$. Continuing this reasoning in the same manner, we can show that every x_i does not exceed $f(9)$. \square

Statement 4. *Conditions (2)–(5) hold for $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{P}_{n^2+1}$. The statement Φ implies that Condition (1) holds for $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{P}_{n^2+1}$.*

Proof. The set \mathcal{P}_{n^2+1} is conjecturally infinite. There are 2199894223892 primes of the form $n^2 + 1$ in the interval $[2, 10^{28})$, see [11]. These two facts imply Condition (4). By Lemma 2, due to known physics we are not able to confirm by a direct computation that some element of \mathcal{P}_{n^2+1} is greater than $f(7) = (((24!)!)!)! = \beta$, see [5]. Thus Condition (3) holds. Conditions (2) and (5) hold trivially. The statement Φ implies that Condition (1) holds for $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{P}_{n^2+1}$ with $n = \beta = (((24!)!)!)!$. \square

Proving Landau's conjecture will disprove Statement 4.

Conjecture 2. *(Conditions (1)–(5) hold for $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{P}_{n^2+1}) \wedge \Phi$.*

Conjecture 2 implies that every known proof of the statement Φ does not yield the finiteness/infiniteness of \mathcal{P}_{n^2+1} .

5. A NEW HEURISTIC ARGUMENT FOR THE INFINITENESS OF \mathcal{P}_{n^2+1}

The system \mathcal{A} contains four factorials and four multiplications. Let \mathcal{F} denote the family of all systems $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_9$ which contain at most four factorials and at most four multiplications.

Among known systems $\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{F}$, the following system \mathcal{C}

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

attains the greatest solution in positive integers x_1, \dots, x_9 and has at most finitely many solutions in $(\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^9$. Only the tuples $(1, \dots, 1)$ and $(2, 2, 4, 16, 256, 256!, (256!)!, ((256!)!)!, 1)$ solve \mathcal{C} and belong to $(\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^9$.

For every known system $\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{F}$, if the finiteness of the set

$$\{(x_1, \dots, x_9) \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^9 : (x_1, \dots, x_9) \text{ solves } \mathcal{S}\}$$

is unproven and conjectured, then the statement

$$\exists x_1, \dots, x_9 \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} ((x_1, \dots, x_9) \text{ solves } \mathcal{S}) \wedge (\max(x_1, \dots, x_9) > ((256!)!))$$

remains unproven.

Let Γ denote the statement: *if the system \mathcal{A} has at most finitely many solutions in positive integers x_1, \dots, x_9 , then each such solution (x_1, \dots, x_9) satisfies $x_1, \dots, x_9 \leq ((256!)!)$. The number $46^{512} + 1$ is prime ([6]) and greater than $256!$, see also [8, p. 239] for the primality of $150^{2048} + 1$. Hence, the statement Γ is equivalent to the infiniteness of \mathcal{P}_{n^2+1} . It heuristically justifies the infiniteness of \mathcal{P}_{n^2+1} in a sophisticated way.*

6. SATISFIABLE CONJUNCTIONS WHICH CONSIST OF CONDITIONS 1-5 AND THEIR NEGATIONS

The set $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{P}_{n^2+1}$ satisfies the conjunction

$$\neg(\text{Condition 1}) \wedge (\text{Condition 2}) \wedge (\text{Condition 3}) \wedge (\text{Condition 4}) \wedge (\text{Condition 5})$$

The set $\mathcal{X} = \{0, \dots, f(7)\} \cup \mathcal{P}_{n^2+1}$ satisfies the conjunction

$$\neg(\text{Condition 1}) \wedge (\text{Condition 2}) \wedge (\text{Condition 3}) \wedge (\text{Condition 4}) \wedge \neg(\text{Condition 5})$$

The set $\mathcal{X} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{N}, & \text{if } (f(9^8), f(9^9)) \cap \mathcal{P}_{n^2+1} \neq \emptyset \\ \{0, \dots, 10^6\}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$ satisfies the conjunction

$$(\text{Condition 1}) \wedge (\text{Condition 2}) \wedge \neg(\text{Condition 3}) \wedge (\text{Condition 4}) \wedge \neg(\text{Condition 5})$$

Open Problem 2. *Is there a set $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ that satisfies the conjunction*

$$(\text{Condition 1}) \wedge (\text{Condition 2}) \wedge \neg(\text{Condition 3}) \wedge (\text{Condition 4}) \wedge (\text{Condition 5})?$$

The numbers $2^{2^k} + 1$ are prime for $k \in \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$. It is open whether or not there are infinitely many primes of the form $2^{2^k} + 1$, see [4, p. 158] and [8, p. 74]. It is open whether or not there are infinitely many composite numbers of the form $2^{2^k} + 1$, see [4, p. 159] and [8, p. 74]. Most mathematicians believe that $2^{2^k} + 1$ is composite for every integer $k \geq 5$, see [3, p. 23].

The set

$$\mathcal{X} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{N}, & \text{if } (f(9^8), f(9^9)) \cap \mathcal{P}_{n^2+1} \neq \emptyset \\ \{0, \dots, 10^6\} \cup \{n \in \mathbb{N} : n \text{ is the sixth prime number of the form } 2^{2^k} + 1\}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

satisfies the conjunction

$$\neg(\text{Condition 1}) \wedge (\text{Condition 2}) \wedge \neg(\text{Condition 3}) \wedge (\text{Condition 4}) \wedge \neg(\text{Condition 5})$$

Open Problem 3. *Is there a set $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ that satisfies the conjunction*

$$\neg(\text{Condition 1}) \wedge (\text{Condition 2}) \wedge \neg(\text{Condition 3}) \wedge (\text{Condition 4}) \wedge (\text{Condition 5})?$$

It is possible, although very doubtful, that at some future day, the set $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{P}_{n^2+1}$ will solve Open Problem 2. The same is true for Open Problem 3. It is possible, although very doubtful, that at some future day, the set $\mathcal{X} = \{k \in \mathbb{N} : 2^{2^k} + 1 \text{ is composite}\}$ will solve Open Problem 1. The same is true for Open Problems 2 and 3.

The following table shows satisfiable conjunctions consisting of Conditions (1)–(5) and their negations.

	(Condition 2) \wedge (Condition 3) \wedge (Condition 4)	(Condition 2) \wedge \neg (Condition 3) \wedge (Condition 4)
(Condition 1) \wedge (Condition 5)	Open Problem 1 (conjecturally solved with $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{P}_{n^2+1}$)	Open Problem 2
(Condition 1) \wedge \neg (Condition 5)	$\mathcal{X} = \{k \in \mathbb{N} : (10^6 < k) \Rightarrow$ $(f(10^6), f(k)) \cap \mathcal{P}_{n^2+1} \neq \emptyset\}$	$\mathcal{X} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{N}, & \text{if } (f(9^8), f(9^9)) \cap \mathcal{P}_{n^2+1} \neq \emptyset \\ \{0, \dots, 10^6\}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$
\neg (Condition 1) \wedge (Condition 5)	$\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{P}_{n^2+1}$	Open Problem 3
\neg (Condition 1) \wedge \neg (Condition 5)	$\mathcal{X} = \{0, \dots, f(7)\} \cup \mathcal{P}_{n^2+1}$	$\mathcal{X} = \begin{cases} \mathbb{N}, & \text{if } (f(9^8), f(9^9)) \cap \mathcal{P}_{n^2+1} \neq \emptyset \\ \{0, \dots, 10^6\} \cup \{n \in \mathbb{N} : n \text{ is} \\ \text{the sixth prime number of} \\ \text{the form } 2^{2^k} + 1\}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

Acknowledgement. Agnieszka Kozdęba prepared two diagrams. Apoloniusz Tyszka wrote the article.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Case and M. Ralston, *Beyond Rogers' non-constructively computable function*, in: *The nature of computation*, Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci., 7921, 45–54, Springer, Heidelberg, 2013, https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-642-39053-1_6.
- [2] M. Erickson, A. Vazzana, D. Garth, *Introduction to number theory*, 2nd ed., CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 2016.
- [3] J.-M. De Koninck and F. Luca, *Analytic number theory: Exploring the anatomy of integers*, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2012.
- [4] M. Křížek, F. Luca, L. Somer, *17 lectures on Fermat numbers: from number theory to geometry*, Springer, New York, 2001.
- [5] S. Lloyd, *Ultimate physical limits to computation*, Nature 406 (2000), 1047–1054, <https://doi.org/10.1038/35023282>.
- [6] X. M. Pi, *Searching for generalized Fermat primes* (Chinese), J. Math. (Wuhan) 18 (1998), no. 3, 276–280.
- [7] R. Reitzig, *How can it be decidable whether π has some sequence of digits?*, <https://cs.stackexchange.com/questions/367/how-can-it-be-decidable-whether-pi-has-some-sequence-of-digits>.
- [8] P. Ribenboim, *The little book of bigger primes*, 2nd ed., Springer-Verlag, New York, 2004.
- [9] H. Rogers, Jr., *Theory of recursive functions and effective computability*, 2nd ed., MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1987.
- [10] N. J. A. Sloane, *The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences*, A002496, *Primes of the form $n^2 + 1$* , <https://oeis.org/A002496>.
- [11] N. J. A. Sloane, *The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences*, A083844, *Number of primes of the form $x^2 + 1 < 10^n$* , <https://oeis.org/A083844>.
- [12] Wolfram MathWorld, *Landau's Problems*, <https://mathworld.wolfram.com/LandausProblems.html>.

Agnieszka Kozdęba
Faculty of Environmental Engineering and Land Surveying
Hugo Kołłątaj University
Balicka 253C, 30-198 Kraków, Poland
Institute of Mathematics
Jagiellonian University
Łojasiewicza 6, 30-348 Kraków, Poland
E-mail address: *Agnieszka.Kozdeba@im.uj.edu.pl*

Apoloniusz Tyszka
Technical Faculty
Hugo Kołłątaj University
Balicka 116B, 30-149 Kraków, Poland
E-mail address: *rtyszka@cyf-kr.edu.pl*