

On the representation of even integers by the sum of prime numbers

Zeraoulia Elhadj

Department of Mathematics, University of Tébessa, (12002), Algeria

E-mail: zelhadj12@yahoo.fr

August 25, 2018

Abstract

The main objective of this short note is prove that some statements concerning the representation of even integers by the sum of prime numbers are equivalent to some true trivial case. This implies that these statements are also true. The analysis is based on a new prime formula and some trigonometric expressions.

Keywords: Prime representation, new prime formula.

AMS 2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 40A05, 11A41, 11A25, Secondary 11A51, 11B34.

1 Introduction

The well known strong Goldbach conjecture [1] states:

Conjecture 1 *Every even integer greater than 2 can be expressed as the sum of two primes.*

Conjecture 1 was verified numerically by several authors [2-3-4-5] but remains unproven as one the oldest unsolved problems in number theory. Some recent progress in this direction were made toward proving Conjecture 1. For example, Ramaré [6] showed that every even natural number can be expressed as the sum of at most six primes. The method of analysis is based

on the Bombieri sieve [13] to obtain a sharp effective bound in the absence of any progress on the Siegel zero problem. However, the obtained constants in [6] are not computable explicitly. In [7], Tao showed that every odd number greater than 1 can be expressed as the sum of at most five primes improving the result of Ramaré [6]. The idea of the proof is based on the circle method of Hardy-Littlewood and Vinogradov [8], together with a variant of Vaughan's identity [9]. In [10-11] Helfgott showed that the ternary Goldbach conjecture is true, i.e., Every odd integer greater than 5 is the sum of three primes.

The main objective of this short note is to prove that Conjecture 1 is equivalent to a true trivial case. The analysis is based on a new prime formula and some trigonometric expressions.

2 Preliminary results

Let $(p_m)_{m \in \mathbb{N}}$ denotes the sequence of odd primes. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}$, then $\lfloor x \rfloor$ denotes the floor function, i.e., the largest integer not greater than x . We have

$$\lfloor x \rfloor = j \Leftrightarrow j \leq x < j + 1$$

and for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we have

$$\lfloor x + j \rfloor = \lfloor x \rfloor + j \tag{1}$$

Let $r \geq 4$ be any positive integer and define

$$\alpha_r = \sum_{m=1}^{+\infty} p_m r^{-m^2} \tag{2}$$

Equality (2) was proposed in [12] as a series defined by primes. We have proved the following result:

Lemma 2 *The series (2) defining α_r is convergent.*

Proof. We have $p_m \leq r^m$ because by induction: $p_1 = 2 < 4 \leq r^1 = r$. Assuming that $m \geq 2$ and $p_m \leq r^m$, then by the Bertrand's Postulate, we have $p_{m+1} < 2 \times p_m < 2 \times r^m < r \times r^m = r^{m+1}$. So the series defining α_r is convergent since via the Cauchy root test we have:

$$\sqrt[m]{\frac{p_m}{r^{m^2}}} < \sqrt[m]{\frac{r^m}{r^{m^2}}} = \frac{1}{r^{m-1}} \leq \frac{1}{4^{m-1}} \leq \frac{1}{4} < 1.$$

■
Let

$$\delta_d = \sum_{m=1}^d p_m r^{-m^2}, d = 1, 2, \dots$$

be the partial sum of the convergent series defining α_r . Then we have

Lemma 3 *The following inequalities*

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} 0 < r^{d^2} \sum_{m=1+d}^{\infty} p_m r^{-m^2} < 1 \\ 0 < r^{d^2} \sum_{m=1+d}^{n-1} p_m r^{-m^2} < 1 \end{array} \right. \quad (3)$$

holds true for all indices $d \geq 1$ and n verifying $n \geq d + 2$.

Proof. To prove the first statement of (3), let $m = d + 1 + l$, then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &< r^{d^2} \sum_{m=1+d}^{\infty} p_m r^{-m^2} < \sum_{m=1+d}^{\infty} r^{d^2+m-m^2} = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} r^{-(l+d+2ld+l^2)} \\ &\leq \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} r^{-(l+d+2ld)} = \frac{r^{2d+1}}{r^d (r^{2d+1} - 1)} < 1. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

because $p_m \leq r^m$ and $d^2 + m - m^2 = -(l + d + 2ld + l^2) \leq -(l + d + 2ld)$ and $r^d (r^{2d+1} - 1) - r^{2d+1} = r^d (r^{d+1} (r^d - 1) - 1) > 0$, so, $\frac{r^{2d+1}}{r^d (r^{2d+1} - 1)} < 1$.

The second statement of (3) follows from the first one since

$$0 < r^{d^2} \sum_{m=1+d}^{n-1} p_m r^{-m^2} < r^{d^2} \sum_{m=1+d}^{\infty} p_m r^{-m^2} < 1$$

The condition $n \geq d + 2$ on the indices d and n implies that the sum $\sum_{m=1+d}^{n-1}$ is well defined and not zero since it contain at least one term.

From (4) we conclude that

$$\begin{cases} \lfloor r^{d^2} \alpha_r \rfloor = r^{d^2} \delta_d, d = 1, 2, \dots \\ \delta_d = \delta_{d-1} + \frac{p_d}{r^{d^2}}, d = 1, 2, \dots \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

Indeed, the first equation of (5) is verified since by (1) we get

$$\lfloor r^{d^2} \alpha_r \rfloor = \left\lfloor r^{d^2} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} p_m r^{-m^2} \right\rfloor = r^{d^2} \delta_d + \left\lfloor r^{d^2} \sum_{m=1+d}^{\infty} p_m r^{-m^2} \right\rfloor = r^{d^2} \delta_d$$

since $r^{d^2} \delta_d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $0 < r^{d^2} \sum_{m=1+d}^{\infty} p_m r^{-m^2} < 1$ by (4). ■

Define the sequence $(H_d)_{d \geq 2}$ by:

$$H_d = \left\lfloor r^{d^2} (\alpha_r - \delta_{d-1}) \right\rfloor \quad (6)$$

Lemma 4 *For all indices $d \geq 2$, we have*

$$H_d = p_d$$

Proof. We have $H_d \in \mathbb{N}$ because it is the integer part of the positive real number $r^{d^2} (\alpha_r - \delta_{d-1})$ since for all $d \geq 2$ we have $\alpha_r > \delta_{d-1}$. It is clear that $H_d = p_d$ because

$$\begin{aligned} H_d &= \left\lfloor r^{d^2} \alpha_r \right\rfloor - r^{d^2} \delta_{d-1} = r^{d^2} \delta_d - r^{d^2} \delta_{d-1} \\ &= r^{d^2} \left(\delta_{d-1} + \frac{p_d}{r^{d^2}} \right) - r^{d^2} \delta_{d-1} = p_d \end{aligned}$$

■

Thus, the sequence (6) is a prime number but written in another equivalent and appropriate form. The new prime formula (6) will be used in the proof of Theorem 9 below.

Lemma 5 *For all $d \geq 2$, the real number $r^{d^2} (\alpha_r - \delta_{d-1})$ is not an integer.*

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
r^{d^2} (\alpha_r - \delta_{d-1}) &= r^{d^2} \left(\sum_{m=1}^{+\infty} p_m r^{-m^2} - \sum_{m=1}^{d-1} p_m r^{-m^2} \right) \\
&= r^{d^2} \left(\sum_{m=d}^{+\infty} p_m r^{-m^2} \right) \\
&= r^{d^2} \left(p_d r^{-d^2} + \sum_{m=1+d}^{+\infty} p_m r^{-m^2} \right) \\
&= p_d + r^{d^2} \sum_{m=1+d}^{+\infty} p_m r^{-m^2}
\end{aligned}$$

is not an integer since $0 < r^{d^2} \sum_{m=1+d}^{\infty} p_m r^{-m^2} < 1$ by Lemma 3. ■

Lemma 6 *For all non-integer x we have*

$$[x] = -\frac{1}{2} + x + \frac{\arctan(\cot \pi x)}{\pi} \quad (7)$$

Proof. The cotangent function has period π , then the cotangent of πx has period 1. By definition, the arc tangent function is defined from \mathbb{R} to $]-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}[$. Hence, for all x not an integer we have:

$$\frac{\arctan(\cot \pi x)}{\pi} = \frac{\arctan\left(\tan\left(\frac{\pi}{2} - \pi x\right)\right)}{\pi} = \frac{1}{2} - x \bmod 1$$

But, we have

$$-\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} + x - x \bmod 1 = x - \{x\} = [x]$$

■

Lemma 7 For all real x and y we have

$$\arctan x + \arctan y = \begin{cases} \arctan\left(\frac{x+y}{1-xy}\right), & \text{if } xy < 1 \\ \text{or} \\ \pi + \arctan\left(\frac{x+y}{1-xy}\right), & \text{if } x > 0, y > 0, xy > 1 \\ \text{or} \\ -\pi + \arctan\left(\frac{x+y}{1-xy}\right), & \text{if } x < 0, y < 0, xy > 1 \\ \text{or} \\ \frac{\pi}{2}, & \text{if } x > 0, xy = 1 \\ \text{or} \\ -\frac{\pi}{2}, & \text{if } x < 0, xy = 1 \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

Proof. Let $-\frac{\pi}{2} < \gamma = \arctan u < \frac{\pi}{2}$, $-\frac{\pi}{2} < \alpha = \arctan x < \frac{\pi}{2}$, $-\frac{\pi}{2} < \beta = \arctan y < \frac{\pi}{2}$, then we have $\tan \gamma = \tan(\alpha + \beta) = \frac{x+y}{1-xy} = u$. If $xy > 1$, i.e., x and y have the same sign, then we have the two cases:

(a) $x > 0, y > 0 \rightarrow u < 0 \rightarrow \gamma < 0 \rightarrow \alpha + \beta = \gamma + \pi$, i.e., $\arctan x + \arctan y = \arctan\left(\frac{x+y}{1-xy}\right) + \pi$

(b) $x < 0, y < 0 \rightarrow u > 0 \rightarrow \gamma > 0 \rightarrow \alpha + \beta = \gamma - \pi$, i.e., $\arctan x + \arctan y = \arctan\left(\frac{x+y}{1-xy}\right) - \pi$

For the last two formulas: If $x > 0$, then $0 < \arctan x < \frac{\pi}{2}$, and if $t = \arctan x$, then $\cot t = \frac{1}{\tan t} = \frac{1}{x}$, so that $\arctan \frac{1}{x} = \frac{\pi}{2} - t$. If $x > 0$, then $\arctan x + \arctan \frac{1}{x} = \frac{\pi}{2}$. As \arctan is an odd function, if $x < 0$, then $\arctan x + \arctan \frac{1}{x} = -\frac{\pi}{2}$. ■

3 Representation of even integers by the sum of prime numbers

Let us consider the following conjecture (equivalent to Conjecture 1):

Conjecture 8 For all positive integer $k \geq 3$, there exist two primes $p_{\lambda_k} \geq 3, p_{\mu_k} \geq 3$ such that

$$p_{\lambda_k} + p_{\mu_k} = 2k \quad (9)$$

By formula (6), we have

$$\begin{cases} p_{\lambda_k} = \lfloor r^{\lambda_k^2} (\alpha_r - \delta_{\lambda_k-1}) \rfloor \\ p_{\mu_k} = \lfloor r^{\mu_k^2} (\alpha_r - \delta_{\mu_k-1}) \rfloor \end{cases} \quad (10)$$

Define

$$\begin{cases} x_k = r^{\lambda_k^2} (\alpha_r - \delta_{\lambda_k-1}) = p_{\lambda_k} + r^{\lambda_k^2} \sum_{m=1+\lambda_k}^{\infty} p_m r^{-m^2} = p_{\lambda_k} + z_k \\ y_k = r^{\mu_k^2} (\alpha_r - \delta_{\mu_k-1}) = p_{\mu_k} + r^{\mu_k^2} \sum_{m=1+\mu_k}^{\infty} p_m r^{-m^2} = p_{\mu_k} + t_k \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

We have proved the following result:

Theorem 9 *The Conjecture 7 is equivalent to the true trivial case: For all $k \geq 3$, there exist two positive integers $\lambda_k \geq 2, \mu_k \geq 2$ such that*

$$\begin{cases} 0 < t_k + z_k < \frac{1}{2} \text{ or } z_k + t_k = \frac{1}{2} \text{ or } \frac{1}{2} < z_k + t_k < \frac{3}{2} \\ \text{or} \\ z_k + t_k = \frac{3}{2} \text{ or } \frac{3}{2} < t_k + z_k < 2 \end{cases}$$

Proof. The fact that x_k and y_k are not integers by Lemma 5 and from (7) and (9) we get

$$\begin{aligned} p_{\lambda_k} + p_{\mu_k} &= 2k \\ \Leftrightarrow \lfloor x_k \rfloor + \lfloor y_k \rfloor &= 2k \\ \Leftrightarrow -\frac{1}{2} + x_k + \frac{\arctan(\cot \pi x_k)}{\pi} - \frac{1}{2} + y_k + \frac{\arctan(\cot \pi y_k)}{\pi} &= 2k \\ \Leftrightarrow \arctan(\cot \pi x_k) + \arctan(\cot \pi y_k) &= \pi(2k - x_k - y_k + 1) \end{aligned}$$

Here x_k and y_k depends on the positive integers indices $\lambda_k \geq 2, \mu_k \geq 2$. Hence, the Conjecture 8 is equivalent to the case: For all $k \geq 3$, there exist two positive integers $\lambda_k \geq 2, \mu_k \geq 2$ such that

$$\arctan(\cot \pi x_k) + \arctan(\cot \pi y_k) = \pi(2k - x_k - y_k + 1) \quad (12)$$

By definition, the arc tangent function is defined from \mathbb{R} to $]\frac{-\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}[$. We have

$$\arctan u_k + \arctan v_k = \begin{cases} \arctan \left(\frac{u_k + v_k}{1 - u_k v_k} \right), & \text{if } u_k v_k < 1 \\ \text{or} \\ \pi + \arctan \left(\frac{u_k + v_k}{1 - u_k v_k} \right), & \text{if } u_k > 0 \text{ and } v_k > 0 \text{ and } u_k v_k > 1 \\ \text{or} \\ -\pi + \arctan \left(\frac{u_k + v_k}{1 - u_k v_k} \right), & \text{if } u_k < 0 \text{ and } v_k < 0 \text{ and } u_k v_k > 1 \\ \text{or} \\ \frac{\pi}{2}, & \text{if } u_k > 0 \text{ and } v_k = \frac{1}{u_k} \\ \text{or} \\ \frac{-\pi}{2}, & \text{if } u_k < 0 \text{ and } v_k = \frac{1}{u_k} \end{cases}$$

Let $u_k = \cot \pi x_k$, $v_k = \cot \pi y_k$, then we get

$$\begin{cases} \arctan \left(\frac{u_k + v_k}{1 - u_k v_k} \right) = \pi (2k - x_k - y_k + 1), & \text{if } u_k v_k < 1 \\ \text{or} \\ \pi + \arctan \left(\frac{u_k + v_k}{1 - u_k v_k} \right) = \pi (2k - x_k - y_k + 1), & \text{if } u_k > 0 \text{ and } v_k > 0 \text{ and } u_k v_k > 1 \\ \text{or} \\ -\pi + \arctan \left(\frac{u_k + v_k}{1 - u_k v_k} \right) = \pi (2k - x_k - y_k + 1), & \text{if } u_k < 0 \text{ and } v_k < 0 \text{ and } u_k v_k > 1 \\ \text{or} \\ \frac{\pi}{2} = \pi (2k - x_k - y_k + 1), & \text{if } u_k > 0 \text{ and } v_k = \frac{1}{u_k} \\ \text{or} \\ \frac{-\pi}{2} = \pi (2k - x_k - y_k + 1), & \text{if } u_k < 0 \text{ and } v_k = \frac{1}{u_k} \end{cases}$$

that is,

$$\begin{cases} \arctan \left(\frac{u_k + v_k}{1 - u_k v_k} \right) = \pi (2k - x_k - y_k + 1), & \text{if } u_k v_k < 1 \\ \text{or} \\ \arctan \left(\frac{u_k + v_k}{1 - u_k v_k} \right) = \pi (2k - x_k - y_k), & \text{if } u_k > 0 \text{ and } v_k > 0 \text{ and } u_k v_k > 1 \\ \text{or} \\ \arctan \left(\frac{u_k + v_k}{1 - u_k v_k} \right) = \pi (2k - x_k - y_k + 2), & \text{if } u_k < 0 \text{ and } v_k < 0 \text{ and } u_k v_k > 1 \\ \text{or} \\ 4k - 2x_k - 2y_k + 1 = 0, & \text{if } u_k > 0 \text{ and } v_k = \frac{1}{u_k} \\ \text{or} \\ 4k - 2x_k - 2y_k + 3 = 0, & \text{if } u_k < 0 \text{ and } v_k = \frac{1}{u_k} \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned}\arctan\left(\frac{u_k + v_k}{1 - u_k v_k}\right) &= \arctan\left(\frac{(\cot \pi x_k) + (\cot \pi y_k)}{1 - (\cot \pi x_k)(\cot \pi y_k)}\right) \\ &= \arctan(\tan(-\pi x_k - \pi y_k)) = -\pi x_k - \pi y_k + j_k \pi\end{aligned}$$

for some integer j_k . Thus, (13) becomes

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} -\pi x_k - \pi y_k + j_k \pi = \pi(2k - x_k - y_k + 1) \in \left(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}\right) \text{ and } u_k v_k < 1 \\ \text{or} \\ -\pi x_k - \pi y_k + j_k \pi = \pi(2k - x_k - y_k) \in \left(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}\right) \text{ and} \\ u_k > 0 \text{ and } v_k > 0 \text{ and } u_k v_k > 1 \\ \text{or} \\ -\pi x_k - \pi y_k + j_k \pi = \pi(2k - x_k - y_k + 2) \in \left(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}\right) \text{ and} \\ u_k < 0 \text{ and } v_k < 0 \text{ and } u_k v_k > 1 \\ \text{or} \\ 4k - 2x_k - 2y_k + 1 = 0, \text{ if } u_k > 0 \text{ and } v_k = \frac{1}{u_k} \\ \text{or} \\ 4k - 2x_k - 2y_k + 3 = 0, \text{ if } u_k < 0 \text{ and } v_k = \frac{1}{u_k} \end{array} \right. \quad (14)$$

So, finding an integer j_k in the first three equations of (14) implies that they are verified. The fact that $\arctan(x) \in \left] \frac{-\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2} \right[$ implies that in the first three cases of (14) we must assume that the corresponding quantity is located in the interval $\left] \frac{-\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2} \right[$:

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} j_k = 2k + 1 \text{ and } \pi(2k - x_k - y_k + 1) \in \left(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}\right) \text{ and } u_k v_k < 1 \\ \text{or} \\ j_k = 2k \text{ and } \pi(2k - x_k - y_k) \in \left(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}\right) \text{ and} \\ u_k > 0 \text{ and } v_k > 0 \text{ and } u_k v_k > 1 \\ \text{or} \\ j_k = 2k + 2 \text{ and } \pi(2k - x_k - y_k + 2) \in \left(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}\right) \text{ and} \\ u_k < 0 \text{ and } v_k < 0 \text{ and } u_k v_k > 1 \\ \text{or} \\ 4k - 2x_k - 2y_k + 1 = 0, \text{ if } u_k > 0 \text{ and } v_k = \frac{1}{u_k} \\ \text{or} \\ 4k - 2x_k - 2y_k + 3 = 0, \text{ if } u_k < 0 \text{ and } v_k = \frac{1}{u_k} \end{array} \right. \quad (15)$$

We have

$$\begin{cases} u_k = \cot \pi x_k = \cot \pi(p_{\lambda_k} + z_k) = \cot \pi z_k \\ v_k = \cot \pi y_k = \cot \pi(p_{\mu_k} + t_k) = \cot \pi t_k \end{cases}$$

since the cotangent function has period π . Thus, (15) becomes

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} j_k = 2k + 1 \text{ and } \pi(2k - x_k - y_k + 1) \in \left(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}\right) \text{ and } (\cot \pi z_k)(\cot \pi t_k) < 1 \\ \quad \text{or} \\ j_k = 2k \text{ and } \pi(2k - x_k - y_k) \in \left(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}\right) \text{ and } \cot \pi z_k > 0 \text{ and} \\ \quad \cot \pi t_k > 0 \text{ and } (\cot \pi z_k)(\cot \pi t_k) > 1 \\ \quad \text{or} \\ j_k = 2k + 2 \text{ and } \pi(2k - x_k - y_k + 2) \in \left(-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}\right) \text{ and} \\ \quad \cot \pi z_k < 0 \text{ and } \cot \pi t_k < 0 \text{ and } (\cot \pi z_k)(\cot \pi t_k) > 1 \\ \quad \text{or} \\ 2(2k - p_{\lambda_k} - p_{\mu_k}) - 2t_k - 2z_k + 1 = 0, \text{ if } \cot \pi z_k > 0 \text{ and } \cot \pi t_k = \frac{1}{\cot \pi z_k} \\ \quad \text{or} \\ 2(2k - p_{\lambda_k} - p_{\mu_k}) - 2t_k - 2z_k + 3 = 0, \text{ if } \cot \pi z_k < 0 \text{ and } \cot \pi t_k = \frac{1}{\cot \pi z_k} \end{array} \right. \quad (16)$$

We have $\cot(\pi z_k) \cot(\pi t_k) = 1$ if $\cos \pi(z_k + t_k) = 0$, that is, $z_k + t_k = \frac{1}{2}$ or

$z_k + t_k = \frac{3}{2}$ because $0 < z_k < 1$ and $0 < t_k < 1$. Hence, (16) is equivalent to

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} -\frac{\pi}{2} < \pi(2k - x_k - y_k + 1) < \frac{\pi}{2} \text{ and } (\cot \pi z_k)(\cot \pi t_k) < 1 \\ \quad \text{or} \\ -\frac{\pi}{2} < \pi(2k - x_k - y_k) < \frac{\pi}{2} \text{ and } \cot \pi z_k > 0 \text{ and} \\ \quad \cot \pi t_k > 0 \text{ and } (\cot \pi z_k)(\cot \pi t_k) > 1 \\ \quad \text{or} \\ -\frac{\pi}{2} < \pi(2k - x_k - y_k + 2) < \frac{\pi}{2} \text{ and } \cot \pi z_k < 0 \text{ and} \\ \quad \cot \pi t_k < 0 \text{ and } (\cot \pi z_k)(\cot \pi t_k) > 1 \\ \quad \text{or} \\ z_k + t_k = \frac{1}{2}, \text{ if } \cot \pi z_k > 0 \text{ and } z_k + t_k = \frac{1}{2} \\ \quad \text{or} \\ z_k + t_k = \frac{3}{2}, \text{ if } \cot \pi z_k < 0 \text{ and } z_k + t_k = \frac{3}{2} \end{array} \right. \quad (17)$$

We have

$$\cot(\pi z_k) \cot(\pi t_k) > 1 \Leftrightarrow \frac{\cos(\pi z_k) \cos(\pi t_k)}{\sin(\pi z_k) \sin(\pi t_k)} > 1$$

The inequality $\sin(\pi t) > 0$ is verified for all $0 < t < 1$. Then

$$\cot(\pi z_k) \cot(\pi t_k) > 1 \Leftrightarrow \cos(\pi z_k) \cos(\pi t_k) - \sin(\pi z_k) \sin(\pi t_k) = \cos \pi(z_k + t_k) > 0$$

that is,

$$0 < z_k + t_k < \frac{1}{2} \text{ or } \frac{3}{2} < z_k + t_k < 2$$

Also,

$$\begin{aligned} \cot(\pi z_k) \cot(\pi t_k) < 1 &\Leftrightarrow \frac{\cos(\pi z_k) \cos(\pi t_k)}{\sin(\pi z_k) \sin(\pi t_k)} < 1 \\ &\Leftrightarrow \cos \pi(z_k + t_k) < 0 \Leftrightarrow \frac{1}{2} < z_k + t_k < \frac{3}{2} \end{aligned}$$

Also, $\cot(\pi t) > 0$, if $0 < t < \frac{1}{2}$ and $\cot(\pi t) < 0$, if $\frac{1}{2} < t < 1$. Thus, (17) becomes

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} -\frac{1}{2} < 2k - p_{\lambda_k} - p_{\mu_k} - t_k - z_k + 1 < \frac{1}{2} \text{ and } \frac{1}{2} < z_k + t_k < \frac{3}{2} \\ \text{or} \\ -\frac{1}{2} < 2k - p_{\lambda_k} - p_{\mu_k} - t_k - z_k < \frac{1}{2} \text{ and } \cot \pi z_k > 0 \text{ and } \cot \pi t_k > 0 \text{ and} \\ \quad 0 < z_k + t_k < \frac{1}{2} \text{ or } \frac{3}{2} < z_k + t_k < 2 \\ \text{or} \\ -\frac{1}{2} < 2k - p_{\lambda_k} - p_{\mu_k} - t_k - z_k + 2 < \frac{1}{2} \text{ and } \cot \pi z_k < 0 \text{ and } \cot \pi t_k < 0 \text{ and} \\ \quad 0 < z_k + t_k < \frac{1}{2} \text{ or } \frac{3}{2} < z_k + t_k < 2 \\ \text{or} \\ z_k + t_k = \frac{1}{2} \text{ and } \cot \pi z_k > 0 \text{ and } z_k + t_k = \frac{1}{2} \\ \text{or} \\ z_k + t_k = \frac{3}{2} \text{ and } \cot \pi z_k < 0 \text{ and } z_k + t_k = \frac{3}{2} \end{array} \right.$$

By using (9) we get

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{1}{2} < z_k + t_k < \frac{3}{2} \text{ and } \frac{1}{2} < z_k + t_k < \frac{3}{2} \\ \text{or} \\ 0 < t_k + z_k < \frac{1}{2} \text{ and } 0 < z_k < \frac{1}{2} \text{ and } 0 < t_k < \frac{1}{2} \text{ and} \\ \quad 0 < z_k + t_k < \frac{1}{2} \text{ or } \frac{3}{2} < z_k + t_k < 2 \\ \text{or} \\ \frac{3}{2} < t_k + z_k < \frac{5}{2} \text{ and } \frac{1}{2} < z_k < 1 \text{ and } \frac{1}{2} < t_k < 1 \text{ and} \\ \quad 0 < z_k + t_k < \frac{1}{2} \text{ or } \frac{3}{2} < z_k + t_k < 2 \\ \text{or} \\ z_k + t_k = \frac{1}{2} \text{ and } 0 < z_k < \frac{1}{2} \text{ and } z_k + t_k = \frac{1}{2} \\ \text{or} \\ z_k + t_k = \frac{3}{2} \text{ and } \frac{1}{2} < z_k < 1 \text{ and } z_k + t_k = \frac{3}{2} \end{array} \right.$$

i.e.,

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} 0 < t_k + z_k < \frac{1}{2} \text{ and } 0 < z_k < \frac{1}{2} \text{ and } 0 < t_k < \frac{1}{2} \\ \text{or} \\ z_k + t_k = \frac{1}{2} \text{ and } 0 < z_k < \frac{1}{2} \\ \text{or} \\ \frac{1}{2} < z_k + t_k < \frac{3}{2} \\ \text{or} \\ z_k + t_k = \frac{3}{2} \text{ and } \frac{1}{2} < z_k < 1 \\ \text{or} \\ \frac{3}{2} < t_k + z_k < 2 \text{ and } \frac{1}{2} < z_k < 1 \text{ and } \frac{1}{2} < t_k < 1 \end{array} \right. \quad (18)$$

The assumption $0 < t_k + z_k < \frac{1}{2}$ implies that $0 < z_k < \frac{1}{2}$ and $0 < t_k < \frac{1}{2}$. The assumption $z_k + t_k = \frac{1}{2}$ implies that $0 < z_k < \frac{1}{2}$ and $0 < t_k < \frac{1}{2}$. The assumption $z_k + t_k = \frac{3}{2}$ implies that $\frac{1}{2} < z_k < 1$ and $\frac{1}{2} < t_k < 1$. The assumption $\frac{3}{2} < t_k + z_k < 2$ implies that $\frac{1}{2} < z_k < 1$ and $\frac{1}{2} < t_k < 1$ since we have $0 < t_k < 1$ and $0 < z_k < 1$. Otherwise all these implications are not true. Thus, (18) can be reduced to:

$$0 < t_k + z_k < \frac{1}{2} \text{ or } z_k + t_k = \frac{1}{2} \text{ or } \frac{1}{2} < z_k + t_k < \frac{3}{2} \text{ or } z_k + t_k = \frac{3}{2} \quad (19)$$

$$\text{or } \frac{3}{2} < t_k + z_k < 2$$

The last statement (19) is true for all $k \geq 3$ since $0 < t_k < 1$ and $0 < z_k < 1$ and it is a trivial case as it presents all the locations of the real number $z_k + t_k$. ■

References

- [1] K. G. Richard, Unsolved problems in number theory, third edition, Springer-Verlag, 2004.
- [2] M. K. Sinisalo, Checking the Goldbach conjecture up to 4×10^{11} , Mathematics of Computation, 61 (204), 931-934, 1993.
- [3] J. Richstein, Verifying the Goldbach conjecture up to 4×10^{14} , Mathematics of Computation, 70 (236), 1745-1749, 2000.

- [4] A. Granville, J. van de Lune, and H. J. J. te Riele, Checking the Goldbach conjecture on a vector computer, in *Number Theory and Applications*, R. A. Mollin (ed.), pp. 423-433, Kluwer Academic Press, 1989.
- [5] T. Oliveira e Silva, S. Herzog, and S. Pardi, Empirical verification of the even Goldbach conjecture and computation of prime gaps up to 4×10^{18} , *Mathematics of Computation*, 83 (288), 2033-2060, 2014.
- [6] O. Ramaré, On Bombieri's asymptotic sieve, *J. Number Theory*, 130 (5) 1155-1189, 2010.
- [7] T. Tao, Every odd number greater than 1 is the sum of at most five primes, *Mathematics of Computation*, 83 (286), 997–1038, 2014.
- [8] I. M. Vinogradov, Representation of an odd number as a sum of three primes, *C. R. (Doklady) Acad. Sci. USSR*, 15, 191–294, 1937.
- [9] R. C. Vaughan, Sommes trigonometriques sur les nombres premiers, *C.R. Acad. Sci. Paris, Ser A*, 981-983, 1977.
- [10] H. A. Helfgott, Major arcs for Goldbach's problem, arXiv:1305.2897v4 [math.NT], 2014.
- [11] H. A. Helfgott, The ternary Goldbach conjecture is true, arXiv:1312.7748v2 [math.NT], 2014.
- [12] G. H. Hardy and E.M.Wright, *An introduction to the theory of numbers*, Oxford University Press (1960), § 22.3, 4th edition, pp, 343-345.
- [13] E. Bombieri, H. Davenport, On the large sieve method, *Abh. aus Zahlentheorie und Analysis zur Erinnerung an Edmund Landau*, Deut. Verlag Wiss., Berlin, 1122, 1968.