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Abstract

Let $\Gamma(k)$ denote $(k-1)!$, where $n \in \{3, \ldots, 16\}$ and $k \in \{2\} \cup \{2^{2^{n-3}} + 1, 2^{2^{n-3}} + 2, 2^{2^{n-3}} + 3, \ldots\}$. For an integer $n \in \{3, \ldots, 16\}$, let $\Sigma_n$ denote the following statement: if a system of equations

$S \subseteq \{\Pi(x_i) = x_k : i, k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\}$ \cup \{\xi \cdot x_f = x_k : i, j, k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\}

has only finitely many solutions in positive integers $x_1, \ldots, x_n$, then each such solution $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ satisfies $x_1, \ldots, x_n \leq 2^{2^{n-2}}$. The statement $\Sigma_n$ proves the following implication: if the equation $x(x+1) = y^2!$ has only finitely many solutions in positive integers $x$ and $y$, then each such solution $(x, y)$ belongs to the set $\{(1, 2), (2, 3)\}$. The statement $\Sigma_n$ implies the infinitude of primes of the form $n^2 + 1$. The statement $\Sigma_n$ implies that any prime of the form $n! + 1$ with $n \geq 2^{2^{n-3}}$ proves the infinitude of primes of the form $n! + 1$. The statement $\Sigma_n$ implies the infinitude of twin primes. The statement $\Sigma_n$ implies the infinitude of Sophie Germain primes.
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1 Introduction

A twin prime is a prime number that differs from another prime number by 2. The twin prime conjecture states that there are infinitely many twin primes, see [17] p. 39. The following statement

(1) For every non-negative integer $n$ there exist prime exist $p$ and $q$
such that $p + 2 = q$ and $p \in [10^n, 10^n + 1]^n$

is a $\Pi_1$ statement which strengthens the twin prime conjecture, see [4] p. 43, cf. [6] pp. 337–338]. Statement (1) is equivalent to the non-halting of a Turing machine. C. H. Bennett claims that most mathematical conjectures can be settled indirectly by proving stronger $\Pi_1$ statements, see [1].

In this article, we study sets $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ for which we know an algorithm that computes a threshold number $t(X) \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $X$ is infinite if and only if $X$ contains an element greater than $t(X)$. If $X$ is computable, then this property implies that the infinity of $X$ is equivalent to the halting of a Turing machine. If a set $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ is empty or infinite, then any non-negative integer $m$ is a threshold number of $X$. If a set $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ is non-empty and finite, then the all threshold numbers of $X$ form the set $
\{\max(X), \min(X) + 1, \min(X) + 2, \ldots\}$. The classes of the infinite recursively enumerable sets and of the infinite recursive sets are not recursively enumerable, see [18] p. 234].

Corollary 1. If an algorithm $\text{Alg}_1$ for every recursive set $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ finds a non-negative integer $\text{Alg}_1(\mathcal{R})$, then there exists a finite set $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that $\mathcal{W} \cap [\text{Alg}_1(\mathcal{W}) + 1, \infty) \neq \emptyset$. If an algorithm $\text{Alg}_2$ for


every recursively enumerable set \( R \subseteq \mathbb{N} \) finds a non-negative integer \( \text{Alg}_2(R) \), then there exists a finite set \( W \subseteq \mathbb{N} \) such that \( W \cap [\text{Alg}_2(W) + 1, \infty) \neq \emptyset \).

2 A Diophantine equation whose non-solvability expresses the consistency of ZFC

Gödel’s second incompleteness theorem and the Davis-Putnam-Robinson-Matiyasevich theorem imply the following theorem.

**Theorem 1.** ([5] p. 35). There exists a polynomial \( D(x_1, \ldots, x_m) \) with integer coefficients such that if ZFC is arithmetically consistent, then the sentences "The equation \( D(x_1, \ldots, x_m) = 0 \) is solvable in non-negative integers" and "The equation \( D(x_1, \ldots, x_m) = 0 \) is not solvable in non-negative integers" are not provable in ZFC.

Let \( Y \) denote the set of all non-negative integers \( k \) such that the equation \( D(x_1, \ldots, x_m) = 0 \) has no solutions in \( \{0, \ldots, k\}^m \). Since the set \( \{0, \ldots, k\}^m \) is finite, we know an algorithm which for every

\[ n \in \mathbb{N} \]

decides whether or not \( n \in Y \). Let \( \gamma: \mathbb{N}^{m+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{N} \) be a computable bijection, and let \( E \subseteq \mathbb{N}^{m+1} \) be the solution set of the equation \( D(x_1, \ldots, x_m) + 0 \cdot x_{m+1} = 0 \). Theorem 1 implies Theorems 2 and 3.

**Theorem 2.** If ZFC is arithmetically consistent, then for every \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) the sentences "\( n \) is a threshold number of \( Y \)" and "\( n \) is not a threshold number of \( Y \)" are not provable in ZFC.

**Theorem 3.** We know an algorithm which for every \( n \in \mathbb{N} \) decides whether or not \( n \in \gamma(E) \). The set \( \gamma(E) \) is empty or infinite. In both cases, every non-negative integer \( n \) is a threshold number of \( \gamma(E) \). If ZFC is arithmetically consistent, then the sentences "\( \gamma(E) \) is empty", "\( \gamma(E) \) is not empty", "\( \gamma(E) \) is finite", and "\( \gamma(E) \) is infinite" are not provable in ZFC.

In Figure 1, \( D(x_1, \ldots, x_m) \) stands for the polynomial described in Theorem 1. Let \( K \) denote the set of all positive integers \( k \) such that the algorithm in Figure 1 halts for \( k \) on the input. If ZFC is consistent, then \( K = \emptyset \). Otherwise, \( \text{card}(K) = 1 \).

![Fig. 1](image) The algorithm which may halt only when ZFC is inconsistent

**Theorem 4.** If ZFC is consistent, then for every positive integer \( n \), the inclusion \( K \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\} \) is not provable in ZFC.

**Proof.** It follows from Gödel’s second incompleteness theorem because the inclusion \( K \subseteq \{1, \ldots, n\} \) implies \( K = \emptyset \) and the consistency of ZFC.

**Theorem 5.** (cf. Theorem 27). If ZFC is consistent and a computer program halts for at most finitely many positive integers \( k \) on the input, then not always we can write the decimal expansion of a positive integer \( n \) which is not smaller than every such number \( k \).
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Lemma 5. For every non-negative integers $b$ and $c$, $b + 1 = c$ if and only if $2^b \cdot 2^b = 2^c$.

Let $\mathcal{P}$ denote the set of prime numbers.

Lemma 6. (Wilson’s theorem, [8 p. 89]). For every positive integer $x$, $x$ divides $(x - 1)! + 1$ if and only if $x \in \{1\} \cup \mathcal{P}$.

4. Heuristic arguments against the statement $\forall n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1, 2\} \Psi_n$

Let $G_n = \{ x_i \cdot x_j = x_k : i, j, k \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \cup \{ x_i + 1 = x_k : i, k \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \}$

Hypothesis 2. ([37] p. 109). If a system $\mathcal{S} \subseteq G_n$ has only finitely many solutions in non-negative integers $x_1, \ldots, x_n$, then each such solution $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ satisfies $x_1, \ldots, x_n \leq h(2n)$.

Hypothesis 3. If a system $\mathcal{S} \subseteq G_n$ has only finitely many solutions in positive integers $x_1, \ldots, x_n$, then each such solution $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ satisfies $x_1, \ldots, x_n \leq f(2n)$.

Observation 1. (cf. [31, p. 110, Observation 1]). For every system $\mathcal{S} \subseteq G_n$ which involves all the variables $x_1, \ldots, x_n$, the following new system

$$\left\{ \bigcup_{x_i \cdot x_j = x_k \in \mathcal{S}} \{ x_i \cdot x_j = x_k \} \cup \{ x_i! = y_k : k \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \} \cup \bigcup_{x_i + 1 = x_k \in \mathcal{S}} \{ 1 \neq x_k, y_i \cdot x_k = y_k \} \right\}$$

is equivalent to $\mathcal{S}$. If the system $\mathcal{S}$ has only finitely many solutions in positive integers $x_1, \ldots, x_n$, then the new system has only finitely many solutions in positive integers $x_1, \ldots, x_n, y_1, \ldots, y_n$.

Proof. It follows from Lemma 4. □

Observation 2. The equation $x_1! = x_1$ has exactly two solutions in positive integers, namely $x_1 = 1$ and $x_1 = f(1)$. The system

$$\begin{align*}
x_1! &= x_1 \\
x_1 \cdot x_1 &= x_2
\end{align*}$$

has exactly two solutions in positive integers, namely $(1, 1)$ and $(f(1), f(2))$. For every integer $n \geq 3$, the following system

$$\begin{align*}
x_1! &= x_1 \\
x_1 \cdot x_1 &= x_2 \\
\forall i \in \{2, \ldots, n - 1\} x_i! &= x_{i+1}
\end{align*}$$

has exactly two solutions in positive integers, namely $(1, \ldots, 1)$ and $(f(1), \ldots, f(n))$.

For a positive integer $n$, let $\Phi_n$ denote the following statement: if a system

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

has only finitely many solutions in positive integers $x_1, \ldots, x_n$, then each such solution $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ satisfies $x_1, \ldots, x_n \leq f(n)$.

Theorem 8. The statement $\forall n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} \Phi_n$ implies Hypothesis 3.

Proof. It follows from Lemma 4. □

Let $\mathcal{R}_{\mathbb{N}g}$ denote the class of all rings $\mathcal{K}$ that extend $\mathbb{Z}$, and let

$$E_n = \{ 1 = x_k : k \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \} \cup \{ x_i + x_j = x_k : i, j, k \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \} \cup \{ x_i \cdot x_j = x_k : i, j, k \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \}$$

Th. Skolem proved that every Diophantine equation can be algorithmically transformed into an equivalent system of Diophantine equations of degree at most 2, see [24 pp. 2–3] and [14 pp. 3–4]. The following result strengthens Skolem’s theorem.
Lemma 7. ([22] p. 720). Let $D(x_1, \ldots, x_p) \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \ldots, x_p]$. Assume that $\deg(D, x_i) \geq 1$ for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$. We can compute a positive integer $n > p$ and a system $T \subseteq E_n$ which satisfies the following two conditions:

**Condition 1.** If $K \in \mathcal{R} \cap \{N, \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}\}$, then
$$\forall \tilde{x}_1, \ldots, \tilde{x}_p \in K \left( D(\tilde{x}_1, \ldots, \tilde{x}_p) = 0 \iff \exists \tilde{x}_{p+1}, \ldots, \tilde{x}_n \in K (\tilde{x}_1, \ldots, \tilde{x}_p, \tilde{x}_{p+1}, \ldots, \tilde{x}_n) \text{ solves } T \right)$$

**Condition 2.** If $K \in \mathcal{R} \cap \{N, \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}\}$, then for each $\tilde{x}_1, \ldots, \tilde{x}_p \in K$ with $D(\tilde{x}_1, \ldots, \tilde{x}_p) = 0$, there exists a unique tuple $(\tilde{x}_{p+1}, \ldots, \tilde{x}_n) \in K^{n-p}$ such that the tuple $(\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_p, \tilde{x}_{p+1}, \ldots, \tilde{x}_n)$ solves $T$.

Conditions 1 and 2 imply that for each $K \in \mathcal{R} \cap \{N, \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}\}$, the equation $D(x_1, \ldots, x_p) = 0$ and the system $T$ have the same number of solutions in $K$.

Let $\alpha, \beta$, and $\gamma$ denote variables.

Lemma 8. ([22] p. 100) For each positive integers $x, y, z$, $x + y = z$ if and only if
$$(zx + 1)(zy + 1) = z^2(xy + 1) + 1$$

**Corollary 2.** We can express the equation $x + y = z$ as an equivalent system $\mathcal{F}$, where $\mathcal{F}$ involves $x, y, z$ and 9 new variables, and where $\mathcal{F}$ consists of equations of the forms $\alpha + 1 = \gamma$ and $\alpha \cdot \beta = \gamma$.

**Proof.** The new 9 variables express the following polynomials:
$$zx, \quad zx + 1, \quad zy, \quad zy + 1, \quad z^2, \quad xy, \quad xy + 1, \quad z^2(xy + 1), \quad z^2(xy + 1) + 1$$

Lemma 9. (cf. [37] p. 110, Lemma 4]). Let $D(x_1, \ldots, x_p) \in \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \ldots, x_p]$. Assume that $\deg(D, x_i) \geq 1$ for each $i \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$. We can compute a positive integer $n > p$ and a system $T \subseteq G_n$ which satisfies the following two conditions:

**Condition 3.** For every positive integers $\tilde{x}_1, \ldots, \tilde{x}_p$,
$$D(\tilde{x}_1, \ldots, \tilde{x}_p) = 0 \iff \exists \tilde{x}_{p+1}, \ldots, \tilde{x}_n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} (\tilde{x}_1, \ldots, \tilde{x}_p, \tilde{x}_{p+1}, \ldots, \tilde{x}_n) \text{ solves } T$$

**Condition 4.** If positive integers $\tilde{x}_1, \ldots, \tilde{x}_p$ satisfy $D(\tilde{x}_1, \ldots, \tilde{x}_p) = 0$, then there exists a unique tuple $(\tilde{x}_{p+1}, \ldots, \tilde{x}_n) \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^{n-p}$ such that the tuple $(\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_p, \tilde{x}_{p+1}, \ldots, \tilde{x}_n)$ solves $T$.

Conditions 3 and 4 imply that the equation $D(x_1, \ldots, x_p) = 0$ and the system $T$ have the same number of solutions in positive integers.

**Proof.** Let the system $T$ be given by Lemma 7. We replace in $T$ each equation of the form $1 = x_k$ by the equation $x_k \cdot \tilde{x}_k = x_k$. Next, we apply Corollary 2 and replace in $T$ each equation of the form $x_i + x_j = x_k$ by an equivalent system of equations of the forms $\alpha + 1 = \gamma$ and $\alpha \cdot \beta = \gamma$.

**Theorem 9.** Hypothesis 3 implies that there is an algorithm which takes as input a Diophantine equation, and returns an integer such that this integer is greater than the solutions in positive integers, if these solutions form a finite set.

**Proof.** It follows from Lemma 9.

**Open Problem 1.** Is there an algorithm which takes as input a Diophantine equation, and returns an integer such that this integer is greater than the moduli of integer (non-negative integer, positive integer) solutions, if the solution set is finite?

Matiyasevich’s conjecture on finite-fold Diophantine representations ([16]) implies a negative answer to Open Problem 1 see [13] p. 42].

The statement $\forall n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} \Phi_n$ implies that there is an algorithm which takes as input a factorial Diophantine equation, and returns an integer such that this integer is greater than the solutions in positive integers, if these solutions form a finite set. This conclusion is a bit strange because a computable upper bound on non-negative integer solutions does not exist for exponential Diophantine equations with a finite number of solutions, see [13] p. 300].
5 The Brocard-Ramanujan equation $x! + 1 = y^2$

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

$$
\begin{align*}
    x_1! &= x_2 \\
    x_2! &= x_3 \\
    x_5! &= x_6 \\
    x_4 \cdot x_4 &= x_5 \\
    x_3 \cdot x_5 &= x_6
\end{align*}
$$

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

![Diagram](image)

**Fig. 3 Construction of the system $\mathcal{A}$**

**Lemma 10.** For every $x_1, x_4 \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1\}$, the system $\mathcal{A}$ is solvable in positive integers $x_2, x_3, x_5, x_6$ 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:

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

**Proof.** It follows from Lemma 2.

It is conjectured that $x! + 1$ is a perfect square only for $x \in \{4, 5, 7\}$, see [32] p. 297]. A weak form of Szpiro’s conjecture implies that there are only finitely many solutions to the equation $x! + 1 = y^2$, see [19].

**Theorem 10.** If the equation $x_1! + 1 = x_4^2$ has only finitely many solutions in positive integers, then the statement $\Psi_6$ guarantees that each such solution $(x_1, x_4)$ belongs to the set $\{(4, 5), (5, 11), (7, 71)\}$.

**Proof.** Suppose that the antecedent holds. 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 10, the system $\mathcal{A}$ is solvable in positive integers $x_2, x_3, x_5, x_6$. Since $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_6$, the statement $\Psi_6$ implies that $x_6 = (x_1! + 1)! \leq g(6) = g(5)!$. Hence, $x_1! + 1 \leq g(5) = g(4)!$. Consequently, $x_1 \leq g(4) = 24$. If $x_1 \in \{1, \ldots, 23\}$, then $x_1! + 1$ is a perfect square only for $x_1 \in \{4, 5, 7\}$.

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

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

$$
\begin{align*}
    x_2! &= x_3 \\
    x_3! &= x_4 \\
    x_5! &= x_6 \\
    x_8! &= x_9 \\
    x_1 \cdot x_1 &= x_2 \\
    x_3 \cdot x_5 &= x_6 \\
    x_4 \cdot x_8 &= x_9 \\
    x_5 \cdot x_7 &= x_8
\end{align*}
$$

Lemma 2 and the diagram in Figure 4 explain the construction of the system $\mathcal{B}$. 
Lemma 11. For every integer \( x_1 \geq 2 \), the system \( \mathcal{B} \) is solvable in positive integers \( x_2, \ldots, x_9 \) if and only if \( x_1^2 + 1 \) is prime. In this case, the integers \( x_2, \ldots, x_9 \) are uniquely determined by the following equalities:

\[
\begin{align*}
x_2 &= x_1^2 \\
x_3 &= (x_1^2)! \\
x_4 &= ((x_1^2)!)! \\
x_5 &= x_3^2 + 1 \\
x_6 &= (x_5^2 + 1)! \\
x_7 &= (x_5^2)! + 1 \\
x_8 &= (x_7^2)! + 1 \\
x_9 &= ((x_7^2)! + 1)! \\
\end{align*}
\]

Proof. By Lemma 2, for every integer \( x_1 \geq 2 \), the system \( \mathcal{B} \) is solvable in positive integers \( x_2, \ldots, x_9 \) if and only if \( x_1^2 + 1 \) divides \( (x_1^2)! + 1 \). Hence, the claim of Lemma 11 follows from Lemma 6. \( \square \)

Lemma 12. There are only finitely many tuples \( (x_1, \ldots, x_9) \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^9 \) which solve the system \( \mathcal{B} \) and satisfy \( x_1 = 1 \).

Proof. If a tuple \( (x_1, \ldots, x_9) \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^9 \) solves the system \( \mathcal{B} \) and \( x_1 = 1 \), then \( x_1, \ldots, x_9 \leq 2 \). Indeed, \( x_1 = 1 \) implies that \( x_2 = x_1^2 = 1 \). Hence, for example, \( x_3 = x_2! = 1 \). Therefore, \( x_8 = x_3 + 1 = 2 \) or \( x_8 = 1 \). Consequently, \( x_9 = x_8! \leq 2 \). \( \square \)

Edmund Landau’s conjecture states that there are infinitely many primes of the form \( n^2 + 1 \), see [17] pp. 37–38).

Theorem 11. The statement \( \Psi_9 \) proves the following implication: if there exists an integer \( x_1 \geq 2 \) such that \( x_1^2 + 1 \) is prime and greater than \( g(7) \), then there are infinitely many primes of the form \( n^2 + 1 \).

Proof. Suppose that the antecedent holds. By Lemma 11, there exists a unique tuple \( (x_2, \ldots, x_9) \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^8 \) such that the tuple \( (x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_9) \) solves the system \( \mathcal{B} \). Since \( x_1^2 + 1 > g(7) \), we obtain that \( x_1^2 > g(7) \). Hence, \( (x_1^2)! > g(7)! = g(8) \). Consequently, \( x_0 = ((x_1^2)! + 1)! > g(8)! = g(9) \).

Since \( \mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{B}_0 \), the statement \( \Psi_9 \) and the inequality \( x_0 > g(9) \) imply that the system \( \mathcal{B} \) has infinitely many solutions \( (x_1, \ldots, x_9) \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^9 \). According to Lemmas 11 and 12 there are infinitely many primes of the form \( n^2 + 1 \). \( \square \)
7 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 [3, p. 443] and [25].

**Theorem 12.** (cf. Theorem [17]). The statement \(\Psi_9\) proves the following implication: if there exists an integer \(x_1 \geq g(6)\) such that \(x_1! + 1\) is prime, then there are infinitely many primes of the form \(n! + 1\).

**Proof.** We leave the analogous proof to the reader. \(\square\)

8 The twin prime conjecture

Let \(C\) denote the following system of equations:

\[
\begin{align*}
    x_1! & = x_2 \\
    x_2! & = x_3 \\
    x_4! & = x_5 \\
    x_6! & = x_7 \\
    x_7! & = x_8 \\
    x_9! & = x_{10} \\
    x_{12}! & = x_{13} \\
    x_{15}! & = x_{16} \\
    x_2 \cdot x_4 & = x_5 \\
    x_5 \cdot x_6 & = x_7 \\
    x_7 \cdot x_9 & = x_{10} \\
    x_4 \cdot x_{11} & = x_{12} \\
    x_3 \cdot x_{12} & = x_{13} \\
    x_9 \cdot x_{14} & = x_{15} \\
    x_8 \cdot x_{15} & = x_{16}
\end{align*}
\]

Lemma 2 and the diagram in Figure 5 explain the construction of the system \(C\).

![Fig. 5](image) Construction of the system \(C\)
Lemma 13. For every \( x_4, x_9 \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1, 2\} \), the system \( C \) is solvable in positive integers \( x_1, x_2, x_3, x_5, x_6, x_7, x_8, x_{10}, x_{11}, x_{12}, x_{13}, x_{14}, x_{15}, x_{16} \) 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:

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

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

\[
\left(x_4 + 2 = x_9\right) \land \left(x_4((x_4 - 1)! + 1) \land \left((x_9 - 1)! + 1\right)\right)
\]

Hence, the claim of Lemma 13 follows from Lemma 6.

\[]

Lemma 14. There are only finitely many tuples \((x_1, \ldots, x_{16}) \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^{16}\) which solve the system \( C \) and satisfy

\[
(x_4 \in \{1, 2\}) \lor (x_9 \in \{1, 2\})
\]

Proof. If a tuple \((x_1, \ldots, x_{16}) \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^{16}\) solves the system \( C \) and

\[
(x_4 \in \{1, 2\}) \lor (x_9 \in \{1, 2\})
\]

then \(x_1, \ldots, x_{16} \leq 7\). Indeed, for example, if \(x_4 = 2\) then \(x_6 = x_4 + 1 = 3\). Hence, \(x_7 = x_6! = 6\). Therefore, \(x_{15} = x_7 + 1 = 7\). Consequently, \(x_{16} = x_{15}! = 7!\).

\[]

Theorem 13. The statement \( \Psi_{16} \) proves the following implication: (*) if there exists a twin prime greater than \(g(14)\), then there are infinitely many twin primes.

Proof. Suppose that the antecedent holds. Then, there exist prime numbers \(x_4\) and \(x_9\) such that \(x_9 = x_4 + 2 > g(14)\). Hence, \(x_4, x_9 \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1, 2\}\). By Lemma 13 there exists a unique tuple \((x_1, x_2, x_3, x_5, x_6, x_7, x_8, x_{10}, x_{11}, x_{12}, x_{13}, x_{14}, x_{15}, x_{16}) \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^{14}\) such that the tuple \((x_1, \ldots, x_{16})\) solves the system \( C \). Since \(x_9 > g(14)\), we obtain that \(x_9 - 1 \geq g(14)\). Therefore, \((x_9 - 1)! \geq g(14)! = g(15)\). Hence, \((x_9 - 1)! + 1 > g(15)\). Consequently,

\[
x_{16} = ((x_9 - 1)! + 1)! > g(15)! = g(16)
\]

Since \( C \subseteq B_{16} \), the statement \( \Psi_{16} \) and the inequality \( x_{16} > g(16) \) imply that the system \( C \) has infinitely many solutions in positive integers \( x_1, \ldots, x_{16} \). According to Lemmas 13 and 14, there are infinitely many twin primes.

\[]

Let \( \mathbb{P}(x) \) denote the predicate "\( x \) is a prime number". Dickson’s conjecture ([17, p. 36], [34, p. 109]) implies that the existential theory of \((\mathbb{N}, +, \cdot, \mathbb{P})\) is decidable, see [34, Theorem 2, p. 109]. For a positive integer \( n \), let \( \Theta_n \) denote the following statement: for every system \( S \subseteq \{x_1 + 1 = x_k : i, k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\} \cup \{\mathbb{P}(x_i) : i \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\} \) the solvability of \( S \) in non-negative integers is decidable.
Lemma 15. If the existential theory of \((\mathbb{N}, =, +, \mathbb{P})\) is decidable, then the statements \(\Theta_n\) are true.

Proof. For every non-negative integers \(x\) and \(y\), \(x + 1 = y\) if and only if
\[
\exists u, v \in \mathbb{N} \ (u + u = v) \land \mathbb{P}(v) \land (x + u = y))
\]
\[\square\]

Theorem 14. The conjunction of the implication \((\ast)\) and the statement \(\Theta_{g(14)+2}\) implies that the twin prime conjecture is decidable.

Proof. By the statement \(\Theta_{g(14)+2}\), we can decide the truth of the sentence
\[
\exists x_1 \ldots \exists x_{g(14)+2} \left( (\forall i \in \{1, \ldots, g(14) + 1\} x_i + 1 = x_{i+1} \right) \land \mathbb{P}(x_{g(14)}) \land \mathbb{P}(x_{g(14)+2})
\]

If sentence (2) is false, then the twin prime conjecture is false. If sentence (2) is true, then there exists a twin prime greater than \(g(14)\). In this case, the twin prime conjecture follows from Theorem 13. \[\square\]

9 Hypothetical statements \(\Delta_5, \ldots, \Delta_{14}\) about the Gamma function and their consequences

Let \(\lambda(5) = \Gamma(25)\), and let \(\lambda(n + 1) = \Gamma(\lambda(n))\) for every integer \(n \geq 5\). For an integer \(n \geq 5\), let \(\mathcal{J}_n\) denote the following system of equations:
\[
\begin{align*}
\forall i \in \{1, \ldots, n-1\} \setminus \{3\} & \ \Gamma(x_i) = x_{i+1} \\
x_1 \cdot x_1 & = x_4 \\
x_2 \cdot x_3 & = x_5
\end{align*}
\]

Lemma 3 and the diagram in Figure 6 explain the construction of the system \(\mathcal{J}_n\).

\[\text{Fig. 6} \quad \text{Construction of the system } \mathcal{J}_n\]

Observation 3. For every integer \(n \geq 5\), the system \(\mathcal{J}_n\) has exactly two solutions in positive integers, namely \((1, \ldots, 1)\) and \((5, 24, 23!, 25, \lambda(5), \ldots, \lambda(n))\).

For an integer \(n \geq 5\), let \(\Delta_n\) denote the following statement: if a system \(S \subseteq \{\Gamma(x_i) = x_k : i, k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\} \cup \{x_i \cdot x_j = x_k : i, j, k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\}\) has only finitely many solutions in positive integers \(x_1, \ldots, x_n\), then each such solution \((x_1, \ldots, x_n)\) satisfies \(x_1, \ldots, x_n \leq \lambda(n)\).

Hypothesis 4. The statements \(\Delta_5, \ldots, \Delta_{14}\) are true.

Lemmas 3 and 6 imply that the statements \(\Delta_n\) have similar consequences as the statements \(\Psi_n\).

Theorem 15. The statement \(\Delta_6\) implies that any prime number \(p \geq 25\) proves the infinitude of primes.

Proof. It follows from Lemmas 3 and 6. We leave the details to the reader. \[\square\]
10 Hypothetical statements $\Sigma_3, \ldots, \Sigma_{16}$ about the Gamma function and their consequences

Let $\Gamma_n^{-1}(k)$ denote $(k-1)!$, where $n \in \{3, \ldots, 16\}$ and $k \in \{2\} \cup \{2^{2n-3} + 1, 2^{2n-3} + 2, 2^{2n-3} + 3, \ldots\}$. For an integer $n \in \{3, \ldots, 16\}$, let

$$Q_n = \{\Gamma_n^{-1}(x_i) = x_k : i, k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\} \cup \{x_i \cdot x_j = x_k : i, j, k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\}$$

For an integer $n \in \{3, \ldots, 16\}$, let $P_n$ denote the following system of equations:

$$\begin{align*}
x_1 \cdot x_1 &= x_1 \\
\Gamma_n^{-1}(x_2) &= x_1 \\
\forall i \in \{2, \ldots, n-1\} \quad x_i \cdot x_i &= x_{i+1}
\end{align*}$$

**Lemma 16.** For every integer $n \in \{3, \ldots, 16\}$, the system $P_n$ has exactly one solution in positive integers $x_1, \ldots, x_n$, namely $(1, 2^{20}, 2^{21}, 2^2, 2^{2n-2})$.

For an integer $n \in \{3, \ldots, 16\}$, let $\Sigma_n$ denote the following statement: if a system of equations $S \subseteq Q_n$ has only finitely many solutions in positive integers $x_1, \ldots, x_n$, then each such solution $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ satisfies $x_1, \ldots, x_n \leq 2^{2n-2}$.

**Hypothesis 5.** The statements $\Sigma_3, \ldots, \Sigma_{16}$ are true.

**Lemma 17.** (cf. Lemma 3). For every integer $n \in \{4, \ldots, 16\}$ and for every positive integers $x$ and $y$, $x \cdot \Gamma_n^{-1}(x) = \Gamma_n^{-1}(y)$ if and only if $(x + 1 = y) \land \left(x \geq 2^{2n-3} + 1\right)$.

Let $Z_9 \subseteq Q_9$ be the system of equations in Figure 7.

![Fig. 7 Construction of the system $Z_9$](image)

**Lemma 18.** For every positive integer $x_1$, the system $Z_9$ is solvable in positive integers $x_2, \ldots, x_9$ if and only if $x_1 > 2^{2^9-4}$ and $x_1^2 + 1$ is prime. In this case, positive integers $x_2, \ldots, x_9$ are uniquely determined by $x_1$. 
On sets \( X \subseteq \mathbb{N} \) for which we know an algorithm ...

**Proof.** It follows from Lemmas 6 and 17.

**Lemma 19.** \((\text{28})\). The number \((13!)^2 + 1 = 38775788043632640001\) is prime.

**Lemma 20.** \((13!)^2 > 2^{2^{9-3}} + 1 = 18446744073709551617\) and \((13!)^2 > 2^{2^{9-3}}\).

**Theorem 16.** The statement \(\Sigma_9\) implies the infinitude of primes of the form \(n^2 + 1\).

**Proof.** It follows from Lemmas 18–20.

**Theorem 17.** (cf. Theorem 12). The statement \(\Sigma_9\) implies that any prime of the form \(n! + 1\) with \(n \geq 2^{2^{9-3}}\) proves the infinitude of primes of the form \(n! + 1\).

**Proof.** We leave the proof to the reader.

Let \(Z_{14} \subseteq Q_{14}\) be the system of equations in Figure 8.

![Fig. 8 Construction of the system \(Z_{14}\)](image)

**Lemma 21.** For every positive integer \(x_1\), the system \(Z_{14}\) is solvable in positive integers \(x_2, \ldots, x_{14}\) if and only if \(x_1\) and \(x_1 + 2\) are prime and \(x_1 \geq 2^{2^{14-3}} + 1\). In this case, positive integers \(x_2, \ldots, x_{14}\) are uniquely determined by \(x_1\).

**Proof.** It follows from Lemmas 6 and 17.

**Lemma 22.** \((\text{35, p. 87})\). The numbers \(459 \cdot 2^{8529} - 1\) and \(459 \cdot 2^{8529} + 1\) are prime (Harvey Dubner).
Lemma 23. \(459 \cdot 2^{8529} - 1 > 2^{214-2} = 2^{2096}\).

**Theorem 18.** The statement \(\Sigma_{14}\) implies the infinitude of twin primes.

*Proof.* It follows from Lemmas 21–23. \(\square\)

A prime \(p\) is said to be a Sophie Germain prime if both \(p\) and \(2p + 1\) are prime, see [33]. Let \(Z_{16} \subseteq Q_{16}\) be the system of equations in Figure 9.

**Lemma 24.** For every positive integer \(x_1\), the system \(Z_{16}\) is solvable in positive integers \(x_2, \ldots, x_{16}\) if and only if \(x_1\) is a Sophie Germain prime and \(x_1 \geq 2^{16-3} + 1\). In this case, positive integers \(x_2, \ldots, x_{16}\) are uniquely determined by \(x_1\).

*Proof.* It follows from Lemmas 6 and 17. \(\square\)

**Lemma 25.** ([20, p. 330]). \(8069496435 \cdot 10^{5072} - 1\) is a Sophie Germain prime (Harvey Dubner).

**Lemma 26.** \(8069496435 \cdot 10^{5072} - 1 > 2^{2^{16-2}}\).

**Theorem 19.** The statement \(\Sigma_{16}\) implies the infinitude of Sophie Germain primes.

*Proof.* It follows from Lemmas 24–26. \(\square\)

**Theorem 20.** The statement \(\Sigma_6\) proves the following implication: if the equation \(x(x+1) = y!\) has only finitely many solutions in positive integers \(x\) and \(y\), then each such solution \((x, y)\) belongs to the set \(\{(1, 2), (2, 3)\}\).
Proof. We leave the proof to the reader.

The question of solving the equation $x(x + 1) = y!$ was posed by P. Erdős, see [2]. F. Luca proved that the abc conjecture implies that the equation $x(x + 1) = y!$ has only finitely many solutions in positive integers, see [12].

**Theorem 21.** The statement $\Sigma_6$ proves the following implication: if the equation $x! + 1 = y^2$ has only finitely many solutions in positive integers $x$ and $y$, then each such solution $(x, y)$ belongs to the set \{(4, 5), (5, 11), (7, 71)\}.

Proof. We leave the proof to the reader.

### 11 Are there infinitely many composite Fermat numbers?

Integers of the form $2^{2^n} + 1$ are called 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 [11] 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 [11] p. 1.

**Open Problem 2.** ([17] 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 [10] p. 23.

**Theorem 22.** ([30]). An unproven inequality stated in [30] implies that $2^{2^n} + 1$ is composite for every integer $n \geq 5$.

Let $H_n = \{x_i \cdot x_j = x_k : i, j, k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\} \cup \{2^{2^x} = x_k : i, k \in \{1, \ldots, n\}\}$

**Lemma 27.** The following subsystem of $H_n$

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

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

For a positive integer $n$, let $\Gamma_n$ denote the following statement: *if a system $S \subseteq H_n$ has only finitely many solutions in positive integers $x_1, \ldots, x_n$, then each such solution $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ satisfies $x_1, \ldots, x_n \leq h(n)$*. The statement $\Gamma_n$ says that for subsystems of $H_n$ the largest known solution is indeed the largest possible.

**Hypothesis 6.** The statements $\Gamma_1, \ldots, \Gamma_{13}$ are true.

The truth of the statement $\forall n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} \Gamma_n$ is doubtful because a computable upper bound on non-negative integer solutions does not exist for exponential Diophantine equations with a finite number of solutions, see [13] p. 300].

**Theorem 23.** Every statement $\Gamma_n$ is true with an unknown integer bound that depends on $n$.

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

**Theorem 24.** The statement $\Gamma_{13}$ proves the following implication: if $z \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ and $2^{2^z} + 1$ is composite and greater than $h(12)$, then $2^{2^z} + 1$ is composite for infinitely many positive integers $z$.

Proof. Let us consider the equation

$$
(x + 1)(y + 1) = 2^{2^z} + 1 \quad (3)
$$

in positive integers. By Lemma 5, we can transform equation (3) into an equivalent system $\mathcal{G}$ 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 10.
On sets $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ for which we know an algorithm ...

Fig. 10 Construction of the system $G$

Since $2^{2^z} + 1 > h(12)$, we obtain that $2^{2^{2^z} + 1} > h(13)$. By this, the statement $\Gamma_{13}$ implies that the system $G$ has infinitely many solutions in positive integers. It means that there are infinitely many composite Fermat numbers. □

12 Subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ whose infinitude is unconditionally equivalent to the halting of a Turing machine

The following lemma is known as Richert's lemma.

**Lemma 28.** ([7], [21], [23, 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 $b + 1, b + 2, b + 3, \ldots, b + m_{k+1}$ are all expressible as sums of one or more distinct elements of the set $\{m_1, \ldots, m_k\}$. Then every integer greater than $b$ is expressible as a sum of one or more distinct elements of the set $\{m_1, m_2, m_3, \ldots\}$.

Let $T$ denote the set of all positive integers $i$ such that every integer $j \geq i$ is expressible as a sum of one or more distinct elements of the set $\{m_1, m_2, m_3, \ldots\}$. Obviously, $T = \emptyset$ or $T = [d, \infty) \cap \mathbb{N}$ for some positive integer $d$.

**Corollary 3.** If the sequence $(m_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is computable and the algorithm in Figure 11 terminates, then almost all positive integers are expressible as a sum of one or more distinct elements of the set $\{m_1, m_2, m_3, \ldots\}$. In particular, if the sequence $(m_i)_{i=1}^{\infty}$ is computable and the algorithm in Figure 11 terminates, then the set $T$ is infinite. In this case, the algorithm is Figure 11 prints all positive integers which are not expressible as a sum of one or more distinct elements of the set $\{m_1, m_2, m_3, \ldots\}$.
On sets $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ for which we know an algorithm ...

**Theorem 25.** ([9, Theorem 2.3]). If there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that the inequality $m_{i+1} \leq (2 - \varepsilon) \cdot m_i$ holds for every sufficiently large $i$, then the algorithm in Figure 11 terminates if and only if almost all positive integers are expressible as a sum of one or more distinct elements of the set $\{m_1, m_2, m_3, \ldots\}$.

**Corollary 4.** If there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that the inequality $m_{i+1} \leq (2 - \varepsilon) \cdot m_i$ holds for every sufficiently large $i$, then the algorithm in Figure 11 terminates if and only if the set $T$ is infinite.

We show how the algorithm in Figure 11 works for a concrete sequence $\{m_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$. Let $[\cdot]$ denote the integer part function. For a positive integer $i$, let $t_i = \frac{(i + 19)! + 19}{(i + 19)! \cdot 2^i + 19}$, and let $m_i = [t_i]$.

**Lemma 29.** The inequality $m_{i+1} \leq 2m_i$ holds for every positive integer $i$.

**Proof.** For every positive integer $i$,

\[
\frac{m_i}{m_{i+1}} = \frac{[t_i]}{[t_{i+1}]} > \frac{t_i - 1}{t_{i+1}} = \frac{t_i}{t_{i+1}} - \frac{1}{t_{i+1}} = \frac{t_i}{t_{i+1}} - \frac{1}{t_2} = 2 \cdot \frac{i + 20}{i + 19} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{i + 20}\right)^{i+20} \cdot 2^{i+20} + 2^1 \cdot 2^1 \cdot 2^1 \cdot 2^{i+20} > 2 \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{21}\right)^{21} \cdot 21^1 \cdot 21^1 = 5842587018385982521381124421\]

The last fraction was computed by MuPAD and is greater than $\frac{1}{2}$.

---

**Fig. 11** The algorithm which uses Richert’s lemma

Input the smallest integer $k \geq 2$ such that the inequality $m_{i+1} \leq 2m_i$ holds for all $i > k$

$b := 0$

$A := \{m_1, \ldots, m_k\}$

$B := \{m_1\}$

$i := 2$

$B := B \cup \{m_i\} \cup \{B[j] + m_i: j \in \{1, \ldots, \text{card}(B)\}\}$

$i := i + 1$

Print the set $\{1, \ldots, b\} \setminus B$

Stop

Is $i = k + 1$?

No

Is $b = 0$?

No

$G := \{\min(B) - 1, \ldots, \max(B) + 1\} \setminus B$

$H := \{G[n + 1] - G[n]: n \in \{1, \ldots, \text{card}(G) - 1\}\}$

Is $\max(H) > m_k + 1$?

No

$k := k + 1$

Yes (The answer is "Yes" if and only if the set $B$ contains $m_k + 1$ consecutive integers)

$b := \max(B)$

$k := 1$

$k := k + 1$

Is $m_k + 1 \leq b$?

Yes

No
Theorem 26. The algorithm in Figure 11 terminates for the sequence \(\{m_i\}_{i=1}^\infty\).

Proof. By Lemma 29 we take \(k = 2\) as the initial value of \(k\). The following MuPAD code

```muPAD
k:=2:
repeat
    A:={floor((i+19)^2/(i+19)!*2^(i+19))) $i=1..k+1}:
    B:={A[1]}:
    for i from 2 to nops(A)-1 do
        B:=B union {A[i]} union {B[j]+A[i] $j=1..nops(B)}:
    end_for:
    G:={y $y=B[1]-1..B[nops(B)]+1} minus B:
    H:={G[n+1]-G[n] $n=1..nops(G)-1}:
    k:=k+1:
    until H[nops(H)]>A[nops(A)] end_repeat:
    b:=B[nops(B)]:
    k:=1:
    while floor((k+20)^2/(k+20)!*2^(k+20)))<=b do
        k:=k+1:
    end_while:
    A:={floor((i+19)^2/(i+19)!*2^(i+19))) $i=1..k}:
    B:={A[1]}:
    for i from 2 to nops(A)-1 do
        B:=B union {A[i]} union {B[j]+A[i] $j=1..nops(B)}:
    end_for:
    print({n $n=1..b} minus B):
```

implements the algorithm in Figure 11 because MuPAD automatically orders every finite set of integers and the inequality \(H[nops(H)]>A[nops(A)]\) holds true if and only if the set \(B\) contains \(m_{k+1}\) consecutive integers. The code returns the following output:

\[
\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 127, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, ...
\]
On sets $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ for which we know an algorithm ...

On sets $X \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ for which we know an algorithm ...

Corollary 5. $\mathcal{T} = [2762, \infty) \cap \mathbb{N}$.

$\textit{MuPAD}$ is a general-purpose computer algebra system. $\textit{MuPAD}$ is no longer available as a stand-alone computer program, but only as the Symbolic Math Toolbox of MATLAB. Fortunately, the presented code can be executed by $\textit{MuPAD Light}$, which was offered for free for research and education until autumn 2005.

13 A hypothetical infinitude of various classes of primes via computer programs which halt for at most finitely many positive integers on the input

Let $\text{fact}^{-1} : \{1, 2, 6, 24, \ldots\} \to \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ denote the inverse function to the factorial function. For positive integers $x$ and $y$, let $\text{rem}(x, y)$ denote the remainder from dividing $x$ by $y$.

**Definition.** For a positive integer $n$, by a program of length $n$ we understand any sequence of terms $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ such that $x_1$ is defined as the variable $x$, and for every integer $i \in \{2, \ldots, n\}$, $x_i$ is defined as $\Gamma(x_{i-1})$, or $\text{fact}^{-1}(x_{i-1})$, or $\text{rem}(x_{i-1}, x_{i-2})$ – but only if $i \geq 3$ and $x_{i-1}$ is defined as $\Gamma(x_{i-2})$.

Let $\delta(4) = 3$, and let $\delta(n + 1) = \delta(n)!$ for every integer $n \geq 4$. For an integer $n \geq 4$, let $\Omega_n$ denote the following statement: if a program of length $n$ returns positive integers $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ for at most finitely many positive integers $x$, then every such $x$ does not exceed $\delta(n)$.

**Theorem 27.** (cf. Theorem 5). For every integer $n \geq 4$, the statement $\Omega_n$ is true with an unknown integer bound that depends on $n$. 

Proof. For every positive integer $n$, there are only finitely many programs of length $n$. \hfill \Box

**Lemma 30.** ([23] pp. 214–215) For every positive integer $x$, $\text{rem}(\Gamma(x), x) \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ if and only if $x \in \{4\} \cup \mathcal{P}$.

**Theorem 28.** For every integer $n \geq 4$ and for every positive integer $x$, the following program $\mathcal{H}_n$

$$
\begin{align*}
    x_1 & := x \\
    \forall i \in \{2, \ldots, n-3\} & \quad x_i := \text{fact}^{-1}(x_{i-1}) \\
    x_{n-2} & := \Gamma(x_{n-3}) \\
    x_{n-1} & := \Gamma(x_{n-2}) \\
    x_n & := \text{rem}(x_{n-1}, x_{n-2})
\end{align*}
$$

returns positive integers $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ if and only if $x = \delta(n)$. 

Proof. We make three observations.

**Observation 4.** If $x_{n-3} = 3$, then $x_1, \ldots, x_{n-3} \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ and $x = x_1 = \delta(n)$. If $x = \delta(n)$, then $x_1, \ldots, x_{n-3} \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ and $x_{n-3} = 3$. Hence, $x_{n-2} = \Gamma(x_{n-3}) = 2$ and $x_{n-1} = \Gamma(x_{n-2}) = 1$. Therefore, $x_n = \text{rem}(x_{n-1}, x_{n-2}) = 1$.

**Observation 5.** If $x_{n-3} = 2$, then $x = x_1 = \ldots = x_{n-3} = 2$. If $x = 2$, then $x_1 = \ldots = x_{n-3} = 2$. Hence, $x_{n-2} = \Gamma(x_{n-3}) = 1$ and $x_{n-1} = \Gamma(x_{n-2}) = 1$. Therefore, $x_n = \text{rem}(x_{n-1}, x_{n-2}) = 0 \notin \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$.

**Observation 6.** If $x_{n-3} = 1$, then $x_{n-2} = \Gamma(x_{n-3}) = 1$. Hence, $x_{n-1} = \Gamma(x_{n-2}) = 1$. Therefore, $x_n = \text{rem}(x_{n-1}, x_{n-2}) = 0 \notin \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$.

Observations 4–6 cover the case when $x_{n-3} \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ If $x_{n-3} \geq 4$, then $x_{n-2} = \Gamma(x_{n-3})$ is greater than 4 and composite. By Lemma 30, $x_n = \text{rem}(x_{n-1}, x_{n-2}) = \text{rem}(\Gamma(x_{n-2}), x_{n-2}) = 0 \notin \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. \hfill \Box

**Corollary 6.** For every integer $n \geq 4$, the bound $\delta(n)$ in the statement $\Omega_n$ cannot be decreased.

**Lemma 31.** If $x \in \mathcal{P}$, then $\text{rem}(\Gamma(x), x) = x - 1$.

Proof. It follows from Lemma 6. \hfill \Box

**Lemma 32.** For every positive integer $x$, the following program $\mathcal{A}$

$$
\begin{align*}
    x_1 & := x \\
    x_2 & := \Gamma(x_1) \\
    x_3 & := \text{rem}(x_2, x_1) \\
    x_4 & := \text{fact}^{-1}(x_3)
\end{align*}
$$

returns positive integers $x_1, \ldots, x_4$ if and only if $x = 4$ or $x$ is a prime number of the form $n! + 1$.

Proof. For an integer $i \in \{1, \ldots, 4\}$, let $A_i$ denote the set of positive integers $x$ such that the first $i$ instructions of the program $\mathcal{A}$ returns positive integers $x_1, \ldots, x_i$. We show that

$$A_4 = \{4\} \cup \{n! + 1 : n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}\} \cap \mathcal{P}$$

For every positive integer $x$, the terms $x_1$ and $x_2$ belong to $\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. By Lemma 30, the term $x_3$ (which equals $\text{rem}(\Gamma(x), x)$) belongs to $\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ if and only if $x \in \{4\} \cup \mathcal{P}$. Hence, $A_3 = \{4\} \cup \mathcal{P}$. If $x = 4$, then $x_1, \ldots, x_4 \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. Hence, $4 \in A_4$. If $x \in \mathcal{P}$, then Lemma 31 implies that $x_3 = \text{rem}(\Gamma(x), x) = x - 1 \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$. Therefore, for every $x \in \mathcal{P}$, the term $x_4 = \text{fact}^{-1}(x_3)$ belongs to $\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ if and only if $x \in \{n! + 1 : n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}\}$. This proves equality (4). \hfill \Box

**Theorem 29.** The statement $\Omega_4$ implies that the set of primes of the form $n! + 1$ is infinite.
The number $3! + 1 = 7$ is prime. By Lemma [32] for $x = 7$ the program $\mathcal{A}$ returns positive integers $x_1, \ldots, x_4$. Since $x = 7 > 3 = \delta(4)$, the statement $\Omega_4$ guarantees that the program $\mathcal{A}$ returns positive integers $x_1, \ldots, x_4$ for infinitely many positive integers $x$. By Lemma [32] there are infinitely many primes of the form $n! + 1$.

**Lemma 33.** If $x \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1\}$, then $\text{fact}^{-1}(\Gamma(x)) = x - 1$.

**Theorem 30.** If the set of primes of the form $n! + 1$ is infinite, then the statement $\Omega_4$ is true.

**Proof.** There exist exactly 10 programs of length 4 that differ from $\mathcal{H}_4$ and $\mathcal{A}$, see Figure 12. For every such program $\mathcal{F}_i$, we determine the set $S_i$ of all positive integers $x$ such that the program $\mathcal{F}_i$ outputs positive integers $x_1, \ldots, x_4$ on input $x$. We omit 10 easy proofs which use Lemmas [30] and [33]. The sets $S_i$ are infinite, see Figure 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\mathcal{F}_1$</th>
<th>$x_1 := x$</th>
<th>$x_2 := \Gamma(x_1)$</th>
<th>$x_3 := \Gamma(x_2)$</th>
<th>$x_4 := \Gamma(x_3)$</th>
<th>$x_1, \ldots, x_4 \in \mathbb{N} \setminus {0} \iff x \in \mathbb{N} \setminus {0} = S_1$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\mathcal{F}_2$</td>
<td>$x_1 := x$</td>
<td>$x_2 := \Gamma(x_1)$</td>
<td>$x_3 := \Gamma(x_2)$</td>
<td>$x_4 := \Gamma(x_3)$</td>
<td>$x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{N} \setminus {0} \iff x \in \mathbb{N} \setminus {0} = S_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathcal{H}_4$</td>
<td>$x_1 := x$</td>
<td>$x_2 := \Gamma(x_1)$</td>
<td>$x_3 := \Gamma(x_2)$</td>
<td>$x_4 := \text{rem}(x_3, x_2)$</td>
<td>$x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{N} \setminus {0} \iff x = 3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathcal{F}_3$</td>
<td>$x_1 := x$</td>
<td>$x_2 := \Gamma(x_1)$</td>
<td>$x_3 := \text{rem}(x_2, x_1)$</td>
<td>$x_4 := x_3$</td>
<td>$x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{N} \setminus {0} \iff x \in [4] \cup \mathcal{P} = S_3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathcal{F}_4$</td>
<td>$x_1 := x$</td>
<td>$x_2 := \Gamma(x_1)$</td>
<td>$x_3 := \text{fact}^{-1}(x_2)$</td>
<td>$x_4 := \text{fact}^{-1}(x_3)$</td>
<td>$x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{N} \setminus {0} \iff x \in [1] \cup [n! + 1 : n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus {0}] = S_4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathcal{F}_5$</td>
<td>$x_1 := x$</td>
<td>$x_2 := \Gamma(x_1)$</td>
<td>$x_3 := \text{rem}(x_2, x_1)$</td>
<td>$x_4 := x_3$</td>
<td>$x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{N} \setminus {0} \iff x \in [4] \cup \mathcal{P} = S_5$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathcal{F}_6$</td>
<td>$x_1 := x$</td>
<td>$x_2 := \text{fact}^{-1}(x_1)$</td>
<td>$x_3 := \Gamma(x_2)$</td>
<td>$x_4 := \Gamma(x_3)$</td>
<td>$x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{N} \setminus {0} \iff x \in [4] \cup [p! + 1 : p \in \mathcal{P}] = S_6$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathcal{F}_7$</td>
<td>$x_1 := x$</td>
<td>$x_2 := \text{fact}^{-1}(x_1)$</td>
<td>$x_3 := \Gamma(x_2)$</td>
<td>$x_4 := \Gamma(x_3)$</td>
<td>$x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{N} \setminus {0} \iff x \in [4] \cup [p! + 1 : p \in \mathcal{P}] = S_7$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathcal{F}_8$</td>
<td>$x_1 := x$</td>
<td>$x_2 := \text{fact}^{-1}(x_1)$</td>
<td>$x_3 := \Gamma(x_2)$</td>
<td>$x_4 := \text{rem}(x_3, x_2)$</td>
<td>$x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{N} \setminus {0} \iff x \in [4] \cup [p! + 1 : p \in \mathcal{P}] = S_8$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathcal{F}_9$</td>
<td>$x_1 := x$</td>
<td>$x_2 := \text{fact}^{-1}(x_1)$</td>
<td>$x_3 := \text{fact}^{-1}(x_2)$</td>
<td>$x_4 := \Gamma(x_3)$</td>
<td>$x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{N} \setminus {0} \iff x \in (n!)! : n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus {0} = S_9$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathcal{F}_{10}$</td>
<td>$x_1 := x$</td>
<td>$x_2 := \text{fact}^{-1}(x_1)$</td>
<td>$x_3 := \text{fact}^{-1}(x_2)$</td>
<td>$x_4 := \text{fact}^{-1}(x_3)$</td>
<td>$x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{N} \setminus {0} \iff x \in ((n!)!)! : n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus {0} = S_{10}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 12** 12 programs of length 4, $x \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$

This completes the proof. □

**Hypothesis 7.** The statements $\Omega_4, \ldots, \Omega_7$ are true.

**Lemma 34.** For every positive integer $x$, the following program $\mathcal{B}$

$$
\begin{align*}
 &x_1 := x \\
 &x_2 := \Gamma(x_1) \\
 &x_3 := \text{rem}(x_2, x_1) \\
 &x_4 := \text{fact}^{-1}(x_3) \\
 &x_5 := \Gamma(x_4) \\
 &x_6 := \text{rem}(x_5, x_4)
\end{align*}
$$

returns positive integers $x_1, \ldots, x_6$ if and only if $x \in [4] \cup [p! + 1 : p \in \mathcal{P}] \cap \mathcal{P}$

**Proof.** For an integer $i \in \{1, \ldots, 6\}$, let $B_i$ denote the set of positive integers $x$ such that the first $i$ instructions of the program $\mathcal{B}$ returns positive integers $x_1, \ldots, x_i$. Since the programs $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ have the same first four instructions, the equality $B_i = A_i$ holds for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, 4\}$. In particular,

$$B_4 = [4] \cup [n! + 1 : n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}] \cap \mathcal{P}$$
We show that
\[ B_6 = \{4\} \cup \{p! + 1 : p \in \mathcal{P}\} \cap \mathcal{P} \] (5)
If \( x = 4 \), then \( x_1, \ldots, x_6 \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} \). Hence, \( 4 \in B_6 \). Let \( x \in \mathcal{P} \), and let \( x = n! + 1 \), where \( n \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} \). Hence, \( n \neq 4 \). Lemma 31 implies that \( x_3 = \text{rem}(\Gamma(x), x) = x - 1 = n! \). Hence, \( x_4 = \text{fact}^{-1}(x_3) = n \) and \( x_5 = \Gamma(x_4) = \Gamma(n) \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} \). By Lemma 30, the term \( x_6 \) (which equals \( \text{rem}(\Gamma(n), n) \)) belongs to \( \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} \) if and only if \( n \in \{4\} \cup \mathcal{P} \). This proves equality (5) as \( n \neq 4 \).

**Theorem 31.** The statement \( \Omega_6 \) implies that for infinitely many primes \( p \) the number \( p! + 1 \) is prime.

**Proof.** The numbers 11 and 11! + 1 are prime, see [3, p. 441] and [27]. By Lemma 34, for \( x = 11! + 1 \) the program \( \mathcal{B} \) returns positive integers \( x_1, \ldots, x_6 \). Since \( x = 11! + 1 > 6! = \delta(6) \), the statement \( \Omega_6 \) guarantees that the program \( \mathcal{B} \) returns positive integers \( x_1, \ldots, x_6 \) for infinitely many positive integers \( x \). By Lemma 34, for infinitely many primes \( p \) the number \( p! + 1 \) is prime. \( \square \)

**Lemma 35.** For every positive integer \( x \), the following program \( \mathcal{C} \)
\[
\begin{align*}
x_1 &:= x \\
x_2 &:= \Gamma(x_1) \\
x_3 &:= \Gamma(x_2) \\
x_4 &:= \text{fact}^{-1}(x_3) \\
x_5 &:= \Gamma(x_4) \\
x_6 &:= \text{rem}(x_5, x_4)
\end{align*}
\]
returns positive integers \( x_1, \ldots, x_6 \) if and only if \((x - 1)! - 1\) is prime.

**Proof.** For an integer \( i \in \{1, \ldots, 6\} \), let \( C_i \) denote the set of positive integers \( x \) such that the first \( i \) instructions of the program \( \mathcal{C} \) returns positive integers \( x_1, \ldots, x_i \). If \( x \in \{1, 2, 3\} \), then \( x_6 = 0 \). Therefore, \( C_6 \subseteq \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1, 2, 3\} \). By Lemma 33, for every integer \( x \geq 4 \), \( x_4 = (x - 1)! - 1 \), \( x_5 = \Gamma((x - 1)! - 1) \), and \( x_1, \ldots, x_5 \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} \). By Lemma 30, for every integer \( x \geq 4 \),
\[ x_6 = \text{rem}(\Gamma((x - 1)! - 1), (x - 1)! - 1) \]
belongs to \( \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} \) if and only if \((x - 1)! - 1 \in \{4\} \cup \mathcal{P}\). The last condition equivalently expresses that \((x - 1)! - 1 \) is prime as \((x - 1)! - 1 \geq 5 \) for every integer \( x \geq 4 \). Hence,
\[ C_6 = (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1, 2, 3\}) \cap \{x \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0, 1, 2, 3\} : (x - 1)! - 1 \in \mathcal{P}\} = \{x \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} : (x - 1)! - 1 \in \mathcal{P}\} \]
\( \square \)

It is conjectured that there are infinitely many primes of the form \( n! - 1 \), see [3, p. 443] and [26].

**Theorem 32.** The statement \( \Omega_6 \) implies that there are infinitely many primes of the form \( n! - 1 \).

**Proof.** The number \((975 - 1)! - 1 \) is prime, see [3, p. 441] and [26]. By Lemma 35, for \( x = 975 \) the program \( \mathcal{C} \) returns positive integers \( x_1, \ldots, x_6 \). Since \( x = 975 > 720 = \delta(6) \), the statement \( \Omega_6 \) guarantees that the program \( \mathcal{C} \) returns positive integers \( x_1, \ldots, x_6 \) for infinitely many positive integers \( x \). By Lemma 35, the set \( \{x \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} : (x - 1)! - 1 \in \mathcal{P}\} \) is infinite. \( \square \)

**Lemma 36.** For every positive integer \( x \), the following program \( \mathcal{D} \)
\[
\begin{align*}
x_1 &:= x \\
x_2 &:= \Gamma(x_1) \\
x_3 &:= \text{rem}(x_2, x_1) \\
x_4 &:= \Gamma(x_3) \\
x_5 &:= \text{fact}^{-1}(x_4) \\
x_6 &:= \Gamma(x_5) \\
x_7 &:= \text{rem}(x_6, x_5)
\end{align*}
\]
returns positive integers \( x_1, \ldots, x_7 \) if and only if both \( x \) and \( x - 2 \) are prime.
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Proof.

Harvey Dubner proved that the numbers $459 \cdot 2^{8529} - 1$ and $459 \cdot 2^{8529} + 1$ are prime, see [35] p. 87. By Lemma [36] for $x = 459 \cdot 2^{8529} + 1$ the program $D$ returns positive integers $x_1, \ldots, x_7$. Since $x > 720! = \delta(7)$, the statement $\Omega_7$ guarantees that the program $D$ returns positive integers $x_1, \ldots, x_7$ for infinitely many positive integers $x$. By Lemma [36] there are infinitely many twin primes.

We can transform every program of length $n$ into a computer program with $n$ instructions which for every $x \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ does the same if $(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^n$, and never halts if $(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \notin (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^n$ or the tuple $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ is undefined. To do so, we perform the following steps:

a) We replace the instruction $x_1 := x$ by the following instruction:

$$x_1 := x \& \text{PRINT}(x_1)$$

b) We replace every instruction of the form $x_i := \Gamma(x_{i-1})$ by the following instruction:

$$x_i := \Gamma(x_{i-1}) \& \text{PRINT}(x_i)$$

c) We replace every instruction of the form $x_i := \text{fact}^{-1}(x_{i-1})$ by the following instruction:

$$\text{IF } \text{fact}^{-1}(x_{i-1}) \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} \text{ THEN } x_i := \text{fact}^{-1}(x_{i-1}) \& \text{PRINT}(x_i) \text{ ELSE GOTO Instruction 1}$$

d) We replace every instruction of the form $x_i := \text{rem}(x_{i-1}, x_{i-2})$ by the following instruction:

$$\text{IF } \text{rem}(x_{i-1}, x_{i-2}) \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} \text{ THEN } x_i := \text{rem}(x_{i-1}, x_{i-2}) \& \text{PRINT}(x_i) \text{ ELSE GOTO Instruction 1}$$

Theorem 33. The statement $\Omega_7$ implies that there are infinitely many twin primes.

Proof. Harvey Dubner proved that the numbers $459 \cdot 2^{8529} - 1$ and $459 \cdot 2^{8529} + 1$ are prime, see [35] p. 87. By Lemma [36] for $x = 459 \cdot 2^{8529} + 1$ the program $D$ returns positive integers $x_1, \ldots, x_7$. Since $x > 720! = \delta(7)$, the statement $\Omega_7$ guarantees that the program $D$ returns positive integers $x_1, \ldots, x_7$ for infinitely many positive integers $x$. By Lemma [36] there are infinitely many twin primes.

We can transform every program of length $n$ into a computer program with $n$ instructions which for every $x \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$ does the same if $(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^n$, and never halts if $(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \notin (\mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\})^n$ or the tuple $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ is undefined. To do so, we perform the following steps:

a) We replace the instruction $x_1 := x$ by the following instruction:

$$x_1 := x \& \text{PRINT}(x_1)$$

b) We replace every instruction of the form $x_i := \Gamma(x_{i-1})$ by the following instruction:

$$x_i := \Gamma(x_{i-1}) \& \text{PRINT}(x_i)$$

c) We replace every instruction of the form $x_i := \text{fact}^{-1}(x_{i-1})$ by the following instruction:

$$\text{IF } \text{fact}^{-1}(x_{i-1}) \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} \text{ THEN } x_i := \text{fact}^{-1}(x_{i-1}) \& \text{PRINT}(x_i) \text{ ELSE GOTO Instruction 1}$$

d) We replace every instruction of the form $x_i := \text{rem}(x_{i-1}, x_{i-2})$ by the following instruction:

$$\text{IF } \text{rem}(x_{i-1}, x_{i-2}) \in \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\} \text{ THEN } x_i := \text{rem}(x_{i-1}, x_{i-2}) \& \text{PRINT}(x_i) \text{ ELSE GOTO Instruction 1}$$
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