# Primes Are Rather Elusive From Primes To Riemann

Tariq Rashid

January 17, 2021

## Simple Pattern, Simple Formula

- A simple pattern in the primes would mean a simple generating formula.
- Eg the triangle numbers 1,3,6,10,15,... are  $\frac{1}{2}n(n+1)$

## Polynomials<sup>1</sup>

Polynomials are both simple and rather flexible.

$$P(n) = a + bn + cn^2 + dn^3 + \ldots + \alpha n^{\beta}$$

- Can a polynomial generate the n<sup>th</sup> prime?
  - Are primes simple enough to be modelled by a polynomial?

$$P(n) = a + bn + cn^2 + dn^3 + \ldots + \alpha n^{\beta}$$

- Simple polynomial:
  - coefficients  $a, b, c \dots \alpha$  are whole numbers.
  - also  $b, c, d, \dots \alpha$  are not all zero  $\rightarrow$  to avoid eg P(n) = 7

- Proof by contradition .. again!
- Assume P(n) does generates only primes.
- So when n=1, it generates a prime, which we can call  $p_1$

$$p_1 = P(1) = a + b + c + d + \ldots + \alpha$$

• Now let's try  $n = (1 + p_1)$ 

$$P(1+p_1) = a + b(1+p_1) + c(1+p_1)^2 + d(1+p_1)^3 + \dots$$

- Looks scary but .. if we expand, we'll have terms with  $p_1$  and those without.
- Let's collect all those p<sub>1</sub> terms and call them X

$$P(1+p_1) = (a+b+c+d+e+...\alpha) + p_1 \cdot X$$

• That  $(a+b+c+d+e+\ldots\alpha)$  is actually  $p_1$ .

$$P(1 + p_1) = p_1 + p_1 \cdot X$$
  
=  $p_1(1 + X)$ 

- This is divisible by  $p_1$  ... and it shouldn't be because P(n) is supposed to generate only primes!
- Contradiction means assumption P(n) only generates primes is wrong.

# Stronger Proof Than Intended

- We wannted to prove
  - "P(n) can't generate  $n^{th}$  prime".
- We proved
  - "P(n) can't generate only primes"

#### What about Rational Coefficients?

• This time we'll consider  $n = (1 + k \cdot p_1)$ 

$$P(1 + k \cdot p_1) = a + b(1 + k \cdot p_1) + c(1 + k \cdot p_1)^2 + \dots$$
  
=  $p_1 + k \cdot p_1 \cdot X$   
=  $p_1(1 + k \cdot X)$ 

- X contains terms that are combinations of rational coefficients a, b, c . . . α multiplied together.
- We can choose a k which cancels all the denominators of the rational coefficients leaving  $k \cdot X$  as an integer.
- .. and the proof continues as before.

