

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/338701495>

Fermat Numbers

Preprint · January 2020

DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.31221.73449

CITATIONS

0

READS

1,945

1 author:



Mercedes Orús-Lacort

Universitat Autònoma de Bsrcelona - UAB

239 PUBLICATIONS 33 CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Children's books of educational games [View project](#)



Anachronisms in History of Mathematics and Physics [View project](#)

Fermat numbers are not prime numbers for $n \geq 5$

Mercedes Orús–Lacort
Online teacher of College Mathematics

January 20, 2020

Abstract

In this paper we show a demonstration which allow us to prove how the Fermat numbers $2^{2^n} + 1$ are not prime numbers for $n \geq 5$. In particular, using Édouard Lucas result, we show that for $n \geq 5$, $2^{2^n} + 1$ can be written as $(k_1 \cdot 2^{n+2} + 1) \cdot k_2$ for k_1 and k_2 positive integer numbers.

Key Words: Number theory, Fermat Numbers.

AMS Classification: 11–02

1 Introduction

In mathematics are well known Fermat numbers, being Pierre the Fermat the first who studied them.

These numbers can be written as:

$$F_n = 2^{2^n} + 1 \text{ for } n \in \mathbb{N}$$

Fermat numbers were first studied by Pierre de Fermat, who conjectured that all Fermat numbers are prime.

The first five Fermat numbers F_0, \dots, F_4 are prime. However, the conjecture was refuted by Leonhard Euler in 1732 when he showed that:

$$F_5 = 2^{2^5} + 1 = 4294967297 = 641 \cdot 6700417$$

Euler proved that every factor of F_n must have the form $k \cdot 2^{n+1} + 1$, and later it was improved by Édouard Lucas to $k \cdot 2^{n+2} + 1$, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

F_n for $n < 5$ are prime numbers, and it seems that there are no other known Fermat primes F_n with $n \geq 5$. However, little is known about Fermat numbers with large n [1].

In fact, each of the following was an open problem:

- Is F_n composite for all $n > 4$?

- Are there infinitely many Fermat primes? (Eisenstein 1844) [2].
- Are there infinitely many composite Fermat numbers?.

As of 2014, it is known that F_n is composite for $5 \leq n \leq 32$, although only is known the complete factorizations of F_n for $0 \leq n \leq 11$, and there are no known prime factors for $n = 20$ and $n = 24$ [3]. The largest Fermat number known to be composite is $F_{3329780}$, and its prime factor $193 \cdot 23329782 + 1$, a megaprime, was discovered by the PrimeGrid collaboration in July 2014 [3] [4].

The distributed computing project Fermat Search is searching for new factors of Fermat numbers [5]. The set of all Fermat factors is A050922 (or, sorted, A023394) in OEIS.

It seemed then possible that the only primes of this form are 3, 5, 17, 257 and 65, 537. Indeed, Boklan and Conway published in 2016 a very precise analysis suggesting that the probability of the existence of another Fermat prime is less than one in a billion [6].

In this paper we show a demonstration which allow us to prove how the Fermat numbers $2^{2^n} + 1$ are not prime numbers for $n \geq 5$. In particular, using Édouard Lucas result, we show that for $n \geq 5$, $2^{2^n} + 1$ can be written as $(k_1 \cdot 2^{n+2} + 1) \cdot k_2$ for k_1 and k_2 positive integer numbers.

The paper is organized as follows: in Sec.2 we show a demonstration which allow us to prove how the Fermat numbers $2^{2^n} + 1$ are not prime numbers for $n \geq 5$. In Sec.3 we wrap up our conclusions.

2 Fermat numbers $2^{2^n} + 1$ are not prime numbers for $n \geq 5$

It is well known that $F_n = 2^{2^n} + 1$ is a prime number for $0 \leq n \leq 4$, but it seems that for $n \geq 5$ are not prime numbers.

Lucas showed that if F_n is not a prime number, then every factor must have the form $k \cdot 2^{n+2} + 1$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k > 0$.

Hence, we will show what condition must satisfy n , so that, F_n can be factored as $2^{2^n} + 1 = (k_1 \cdot 2^{n+2} + 1) \cdot k_2$, for k_1 and k_2 natural numbers greater than zero.

Let $f(x) = F_x = 2^{2^x} + 1$ and $g(x) = (k_1 \cdot 2^{x+2} + 1) \cdot k_2$ be two functions both from \mathbb{R} to \mathbb{R} .

First, we will analyze what condition must satisfy x so that $f'(x) = g'(x)$.

$$\begin{aligned}
f'(x) &= 2^{2^x} \cdot 2^x \cdot (\ln(2))^2 \\
g'(x) &= 4 \cdot k_1 \cdot k_2 \cdot 2^x \cdot \ln(2) \\
2^{2^x} \cdot 2^x \cdot (\ln(2))^2 &= 4 \cdot k_1 \cdot k_2 \cdot 2^x \cdot \ln(2) \\
2^{2^x} \cdot \ln(2) &= 4 \cdot k_1 \cdot k_2 \\
2^{2^x} &= \frac{4 \cdot k_1 \cdot k_2}{\ln 2} \\
2^x \cdot \ln(2) &= \ln\left(\frac{4 \cdot k_1 \cdot k_2}{\ln 2}\right) \\
2^x &= \frac{\ln\left(\frac{4 \cdot k_1 \cdot k_2}{\ln 2}\right)}{\ln(2)} \\
x \cdot \ln(2) &= \ln\left(\frac{\ln\left(\frac{4 \cdot k_1 \cdot k_2}{\ln 2}\right)}{\ln(2)}\right) \\
x &= \frac{\ln\left(\frac{\ln\left(\frac{4 \cdot k_1 \cdot k_2}{\ln 2}\right)}{\ln(2)}\right)}{\ln(2)}
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

Since $F_5 = 4294967297$, then $k_1 > 1$, and if we consider $k_1 = 2$ and $n = 5$, then $(2 \cdot 2^7 + 1) = 257$, hence $k_2 > 10000$, for instance.

Hence, using these conditions for k_1 and k_2 , we have:

$$x = \frac{\ln\left(\frac{\ln\left(\frac{4 \cdot k_1 \cdot k_2}{\ln 2}\right)}{\ln(2)}\right)}{\ln(2)} \geq \frac{\ln\left(\frac{\ln\left(\frac{80000}{\ln 2}\right)}{\ln(2)}\right)}{\ln(2)} = 4.07... \tag{2}$$

That is, if $x \geq 4.07...$ we have $f'(x) = g'(x)$, that is, $f(x) + C = g(x) + D$, and since $F_5 = 4294967297 = f(5) + C = 2^{2^5} + 1 + C$ and $4294967297 = 2^{2^5} + 1$, this implies $C = 0$, and on the other hand since $F_5 = 4294967297 = f(5) = g(5) + D$ and $4294967297 = 641 \cdot 6700417 = (5 \cdot 2^7 + 1) \cdot 6700417 = g(2)$, this implies $D = 0$.

Hence $C = D = 0$, and then, if x is greater or equal to $4.07...$ we have $f(x) = g(x)$.

And if we consider now $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ over the natural numbers, we have: If n is greater or equal to 5 then $f(n) = g(n)$ for $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Therefore, if n is greater or equal to 5, F_n is not prime, it can be factored as $2^{2^n} + 1 = (k_1 \cdot 2^{n+2} + 1) \cdot k_2$ for k_1 and k_2 natural numbers.

3 Conclusions

We have shown how to prove that Fermat numbers $2^{2^n} + 1$ are not prime numbers for $n \geq 5$. In particular, using Édouard Lucas result, we show that for $n \geq 5$, $2^{2^n} + 1$ can be written as $(k_1 \cdot 2^{n+2} + 1) \cdot k_2$ for k_1 and k_2 positive integer numbers.

Acknowledgements: we acknowledge Roman Orus and Christophe Jouis for proposing the dissemination of this result.

References

- [1] Grytczuk, A.; Luca, F. and Wójtowicz, M. (2001), "Another note on the greatest prime factors of Fermat numbers", *Southeast Asian Bulletin of Mathematics*, 25 (1): 111–115, doi:10.1007/s10012-001-0111-4
- [2] Guy, Richard K. (2004), *Unsolved Problems in Number Theory*, Problem Books in Mathematics, 1 (3rd ed.), New York: Springer Verlag, pp. A3, A12, B21, ISBN 978-0-387-20860-2
- [3] Křížek, Michal; Luca, Florian and Somer, Lawrence (2001), *17 Lectures on Fermat Numbers: From Number Theory to Geometry*, CMS books in mathematics, 10, New York: Springer, ISBN 978-0-387-95332-8 - This book contains an extensive list of references.
- [4] Křížek, Michal; Luca, Florian and Somer, Lawrence (2002), "On the convergence of series of reciprocals of primes related to the Fermat numbers" (PDF), *Journal of Number Theory*, 97 (1): 95–112, doi:10.1006/jnth.2002.2782
- [5] Luca, Florian (2000), "The anti-social Fermat number", *American Mathematical Monthly*, 107 (2): 171–173, doi:10.2307/2589441, JSTOR 2589441
- [6] Ribenboim, Paulo (1996), *The New Book of Prime Number Records* (3rd ed.), New York: Springer, ISBN 978-0-387-94457-9

Email: mercedes.orus@gmail.com