

Why was it so difficult to prove the twin prime conjecture?

Óscar E. Chamizo Sánchez.

Redonda Kingdom University, Faculty of Sciences, Department of Mathematics.

Abstract:

The twin prime conjecture, asserting there are infinitely many pairs of primes differing by 2, was popularized by French mathematician Alphonse de Polignac in 1849 [1] [2] We are pleased to present an astounding and overwhelming proof with a classic *reductio ad absurdum* flavour revealing, by the way, a perhaps not so amazing relationship with the Goldbach conjecture and testing, since the core of reasoning is the same, that both statements are strongly connected [3].

Definitions:

From now on, m and n are positive integer numbers, p, q are prime numbers and p_i ($i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, k$) is the prime number sequence beginning with $p_1=5$.

Twin prime conjecture states that there are infinitely many pairs of primes that differ by 2: 11-13; 17-19; 29-31, and so on.

Let's suppose for the sake of contradiction that there is one last pair of twin primes p_k and p_{k-1} so $p_k - p_{k-1} = 2$. Note with respect to the next prime number p_{k+1} that $p_{k+1} - p_k \geq 4$. Now, our goal is to prove that it cannot happen that there is not at least one new pair of twin primes inside the interval $p_k^2 < m < p_{k+1}^2$ where $p_{k+1}^2 \geq (p_k + 4)^2 = p_k^2 + 8(p_k + 2)$.

If q and $q+2$ are twin prime numbers greater than 3 they are of the form $6n \pm 1$ so let's see the conditions that $6n \pm 1$ ($p_k^2 < 6n < p_{k+1}^2$) must fulfill to become twin primes: Obviously $6n \pm 1$ must not be multiple of any prime number less than or equal to p_k

Twin prime conditions for $6n$

$$\begin{array}{ll} 6n \pm 1 \not\equiv 0 \pmod{5} & \text{or} \quad 6n \not\equiv \pm 1 \pmod{5} \\ 6n \pm 1 \not\equiv 0 \pmod{7} & \text{or} \quad 6n \not\equiv \pm 1 \pmod{7} \\ 6n \pm 1 \not\equiv 0 \pmod{11} & \text{or} \quad 6n \not\equiv \pm 1 \pmod{11} \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{lcl}
6n \pm 1 \not\equiv 0 \pmod{13} & \text{or} & 6n \not\equiv \pm 1 \pmod{13} \\
\text{.....} & & \text{.....} \\
6n \pm 1 \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p_k} & \text{or} & 6n \not\equiv \pm 1 \pmod{p_k}
\end{array}$$

Hence for each p_i there are p_i-2 remainders moduli p_i that fullfill the conditions. That amounts up to $(p_1-2)(p_2-2)(p_3-2)\dots(p_k-2)$, id est, $3.5.9.11\dots(p_k-2)$ different systems of linear congruences with prime moduli. The chinese remainder theorem ensures that each one of them has a different and unique solution moduli $5.7.11.13\dots p_k$.

It's necessary then to prove that exists at least a multiple of 6 that fullfills the preceding conditions inside the aforementioned interval:

Let be M the greatest number of consecutive occurrences of $6m$ that do not fullfill the conditions. It is not easy to figure out the value of M , given the unpredictable nature of prime number distribution¹. But we can prove that there is an upper bound for M such that, for sufficient large n , that bound is less than the interval amplitude A :

$$A = 8(p_k+2)/6 = 4(p_k+2)/3$$

k	p_k	M	A
2	7	4	12
4	13	8	20
6	19	15	28

Given a series of S consecutive $6n$'s, each residue class mod p appears about S/p times, so prime p covers roughly $2S/p$ of these S multiples of 6 and hence the density d of multiples not covered by any prime is about:

$$d = \prod_{5 \leq p \leq p_k} \left(1 - \frac{2}{p}\right) \quad (1)$$

Taking advantage of the simplification $\log(1 - x) \approx -x$ for small values of x [4]:

¹ For all those who, like myself, enjoy practical questions that sometimes shed light on some more abstract matter of discussion, the problem to determine an accurate value for M is the same as the following: Suppose you may not work on 2 predetermined days in five, 2 predetermined days in seven, 2 days in 11, 2 in 13 and so on until 2 days in p_k days. What is the maximum number, as a function of p_k , of consecutive days off?

$$\prod_{5 \leq p \leq p_k} \left(1 - \frac{2}{p}\right) \approx \exp\left(-2 \sum_{5 \leq p \leq p_k} \frac{1}{p}\right)$$

Since the series between brackets is the well known partial summation of the reciprocal of the primes[5]:

$$\sum_{p \leq x} \frac{1}{p} \approx \log \log(x)$$

Then:

$$\prod_{5 \leq p \leq p_k} \left(1 - \frac{2}{p}\right) \approx \exp(-2 \log \log p_k) = \frac{1}{\log^2 p_k}$$

And the typical gap between uncovered numbers is $\log^2 p_k$ so the longest run of consecutive multiples of 6 that do not generate a twin prime within the aforementioned interval grows at most on the order of magnitude of the square of the logarithm of p_k .

Now, let's find a **suitable upper bound for M**:

In any block of p_k consecutive numbers:

$$n, n+1, n+2, \dots, n+(p_k - 1)$$

The residues $n \equiv r_0 \pmod{p_k}$, $n+1 \equiv r_1 \pmod{p_k}$, $n+2 \equiv r_2 \pmod{p_k}$, ..., $n+(p_k - 1) \equiv r_{p_k-1} \pmod{p_k}$, constitute a complete set of residues mod p_k . If we call a_i and b_i the corresponding forbidden residues, there must necessarily be at least one with remainder $r \neq a_i$ $r \neq b_i$ for all i .

Proof:

We are looking for a solution to the system $c_i \not\equiv a_i, b_i \pmod{p_i}$ for all i . By the chinese remainder theorem there exists x such that::

$$x \equiv c_i \pmod{p_i} \text{ for all } i$$

Inside any block of p_k consecutive numbers there is some n such that:

$$n \equiv x \pmod{p_k}$$

Then:

$$n \equiv x \equiv c_i \pmod{p_i} \text{ for all } i$$

or:

$$n \not\equiv a_i, b_i \pmod{p_i} \text{ for all } i.$$

That ensures that no streak could be equal to or longer than p_k , hence:
 $M \leq p_k - 1$, that is to say, the largest prime p_k determines by itself the longest streak.

So M is smaller than p_k , while A is always greater.

Now, given twin primes p_{k-1} and p_k , there is always at least a pair of twin primes between p_k^2 and p_{k+1}^2 . Hence it is immediate to conclude that there are infinitely many twin primes.

That completes the demonstration.

March, 4, 2026.

roundkuniversity@gmail.com

PA³.

References:

- [1] Alphonse de Polignac: *Recherches nouvelles sur les nombres premiers.*
- [2] S Nazardoyavi: *Some History about Twin Prime Conjecture.* Arxiv.2012.
- [3] Óscar E. Chamizo Sánchez: *Why was that difficult to prove the Goldbach conjecture.* In <https://rxiverse.org/abs/2602.0044>.
- [4] Apostol, Tom M: *Calculus. Volume I:* 434-437. John Wiley&Sons.1967.
- [5] Pollack, Paul: *Euler and the partial sums of the prime harmonic series.* University of Georgia. Athens. Georgia.