

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 $6n$

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

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

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 exists an upper bound L for M such that, for sufficient large n , L 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 as most on the order of the square of the logarithm of p_k .

Now, let's find a **suitable upper bound L for M**: The inequality (valid for $0 < x < \frac{1}{2}$):

$$\log(1 - x) \geq -x - x^2 \quad \text{with } x=2/p$$

gives:

$$\log\left(1 - \frac{2}{p}\right) \geq -\frac{2}{p} - \frac{4}{p^2}$$

Applying in (1):

$$\log d \geq -2 \sum_{5 \leq p \leq p_k} \frac{1}{p} - 4 \sum_{5 \leq p \leq p_k} \frac{1}{p^2}$$

In turn²:

$$\sum_{5 \leq p \leq x} \frac{1}{p} \leq \log \log x + 1$$

And²

² Of course tighter bounds are available but not necessary at all for the sake of roudness and simplicity.

$$\sum_{p \geq 5} \frac{1}{p^2} \leq 0.1$$

Hence

$$\log d \geq -2 \log \log p_k - 2 - 0.4 = -2 \log \log p_k - 2.4$$

$$d \geq e^{-2.4} (\log p_k)^{-2}$$

$$d \geq \frac{0,09}{(\log p_k)^2}$$

Finally

$$L \leq \frac{1}{d} \leq \frac{1}{0,09} (\log p_k)^2$$

Arriving to the explicit bound:

$$L \leq 11 (\log p_k)^2$$

So for sufficient large k , (let's say for $p_k > 400$) 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*. Comptes Rendus des Sciences de l'Academie des Sciences, 1849.

[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.