

1. Suppose  $a$  and  $b$  are positive integers. Show that if  $a^3|b^2$  then  $a|b$ . Can we also conclude that  $a|b$  if instead we are instead told that  $a^2|b^3$ ?

**ANSWER:** Write the prime factorizations of  $a$  and  $b$  as  $a = \prod p^{e_p}$  and  $b = \prod p^{f_p}$  respectively. Here the products run over *all* primes, with the exponents  $e_p$  and  $f_p$  being zero for almost all primes (e.g.  $9 = 2^0 3^2 5^0 \dots$ ). Then the assertion that  $a^3|b^2$  can be restated as the fact that for every prime  $p$ ,  $3e_p \leq 2f_p$  (using here the Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic). But then each  $e_p$  is no larger than  $\frac{2}{3}f_p$ , which in turn is less than or equal to  $f_p$  itself. Then since  $e_p \leq f_p$  for every  $p$ , it follows that  $a|b$ .

With the exponents the other way around the statement is false, e.g.  $8^2|4^3$  but obviously  $8 \nmid 4$ .

2. For each positive integer  $n$ , let us write  $M_n$  for the  $n$ th Mersenne number, that is,  $M_n = 2^n - 1$ .

(a) Show that whenever  $k|n$  then  $M_k|M_n$ .

(b) Show that if  $d$  divides two Mersenne numbers  $M_k$  and  $M_n$  with  $k < n$ , then it divides  $M_{n-k}$ .

I won't assign it but you might accept the following challenge: show that  $\gcd(M_r, M_s) = M_{\gcd(r,s)}$ .

**ANSWER:** For part (a), if  $n = kd$  then  $2^n - 1 = (2^k)^d - 1$ . But  $X - 1$  divides  $X^d - 1$  for every  $X$ , and when  $X = 2^k$  this means  $M_k|M_n$ .

For part (b) note that  $d$  would certainly divide  $M_n - M_k = 2^n - 2^k = 2^k \cdot (2^{n-k} - 1)$ . But the Mersenne numbers are all odd, so their divisors  $d$  are as well, i.e. they are coprime to 2 (and its powers). Thus  $d$  would have to divide the other factor  $2^{n-k} - 1 = M_{n-k}$ . (We can also reverse the reasoning: if  $d$  divides both  $M_{n-k}$  and  $M_k$  then it divides  $M_n$ . Thus any pair among these three Mersenne numbers has the same gcd.)

For the challenge note that if  $n = kq + r$ , then by applying part (b)  $q$  times we conclude  $\gcd(M_n, M_k) = \gcd(M_k, M_r)$ . Thus we can carry out the very steps used in the Euclidean Algorithm, always finding pairs  $k_i, n_i$  such that  $\gcd(M_{n_i}, M_{k_i}) = \gcd(M_n, M_k)$ , terminating only when  $k_i|n_i$ , at which point we know  $k_i = \gcd(n, k)$ .

3. Suppose  $a$  and  $b$  are coprime integers, and that one of them is even and the other is odd. Show that  $a - b$  and  $a^3 + b^3$  are also coprime.

**ANSWER:** If these two integers have a common factor  $d$  then, modulo  $d$ , we have both  $a \equiv b$  and  $a^3 \equiv -b^3$ . But of course if  $a \equiv b$  then  $a^3 \equiv b^3$ , so by transitivity we would also have  $b^3 \equiv -b^3$ , or  $2b^3 \equiv 0$ . Now, since  $a$  and  $b$  have different parity, it follows that  $a - b$  is odd, and so its divisor  $d$  must be as well. Thus 2 has an inverse mod  $d$  and we conclude  $b^3 \equiv 0$ .

In particular, if  $p$  is any prime divisor of  $d$ , then  $p$  divides  $b^3$  and hence  $b$  itself. But since  $p|d|(a - b)$ , that would mean  $p$  also divides  $a$ , which contradicts the assumption that  $a$  and  $b$  are coprime. So there is no such  $p$ , which means  $d = 1$ , i.e.  $a - b$  and  $a^3 + b^3$  are coprime.

4. *Twin primes* are primes  $p$  and  $q$  which differ by 2. For example 11 and 13 are twin primes. Prove that there are infinitely many primes which are NOT part of a twin-prime pair.

**ANSWER:** See answers to Homework 5.

5. A vague but important question is: how far apart are the primes? That is, if we number the primes in order,

$$p_1 = 2, \quad p_2 = 3, \quad p_3 = 5, \quad p_4 = 7, \quad p_5 = 11, \quad \dots$$

then can we estimate how big the gap  $p_{n+1} - p_n$  is, compared to  $p_n$  itself? Obviously the size of that gap will vary: for example, if it turns out that the Twin Prime Conjecture is true, then there will be infinitely many values of  $n$  for which  $p_{n+1} - p_n$  is just 2. On the other hand, there can be arbitrarily long gaps between the primes (see Theorem 3.5). But the size of the gap from  $p_n$  to  $p_{n+1}$  can be bounded by the size of  $p_n$ :

(a) Find Bertrand's Conjecture in the book. (This conjecture is known to be true.)

Use it to show that  $p_{n+1} - p_n < p_n$ ,

(b) Find Legendre's Conjecture in the book. (This conjecture is NOT yet known to be true.) Show that if it's true, then  $p_{n+1} - p_n < 4\sqrt{p_n} + 2$ .

(Researchers think that the gaps are *never* even close to the sizes shown in this problem; it's probably true that the gaps are never more than roughly  $\log(p_n)^2$ .)

**ANSWER:** Bertrand's Conjecture states (as a theorem) that for every integer  $k > 1$  there is a prime between  $k$  and  $2k$ . Taking  $k = p_n$  shows us that the next prime,  $p_{n+1}$  is less than  $2p_n$ , so that  $p_{n+1} - p_n < p_n$ , as desired.

If Legendre's Conjecture turns out to be true, then we would argue as follows: let  $k^2$  be the largest perfect square which is less than  $p_n$ . The Conjecture would guarantee that there is another prime between  $(k+1)^2$  and  $(k+2)^2$ , and it can't be as large as  $(k+2)^2 - 1 = (k+1)(k+3)$  because that number is composite! So the gap between  $p_n$  and  $p_{n+1}$  would be smaller than the gap between  $k^2$  and  $(k+2)^2$ ; more precisely we would have  $p_{n+1} - p_n \leq [(k+2)^2 - 2] - [k^2 + 1] = 4k + 1 < 4\sqrt{p_n} + 1$ .