

Re: Q:About primes?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2006-01/msg00692.html>

- *From:* "Joseph Fagan" <noemailplease@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 6 Jan 2006 11:39:52 +0000 (UTC)
-

"Phil Carmody" <thefatphil_demunged@xxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:87irsxk45d.fsf@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

> Dan <30pack@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> writes:

>> Q:About primes?

>>

>> Why does a certain large prime require much more
>> processing time to verify its primality than one that
>> is more than 60 times its size?

>>

>> e.g.

>>

>> This prime below with 749 digits required 17+ hours to
>> establish its primality.

>>

> ...

>>

>> Whereas this prime below with 751 digits that is more
>> than 60 times the size of the above prime

>

> What on earth are you gibbering on about?

>

> A 751-digit prime is roughly 1.0026 times the size of a 749-digit number.

>

> Phil

Eh?

$10^{751} / 10^{749} = 10^2$

Joe

.

- *Follow-Ups:*
 - ◆ [*Re: Q:About primes?*](#)
 - ◇ *From:* Pubkeybreaker
 - ◆ [*Re: Q:About primes?*](#)

Re: Q:About primes?

◇ *From:* Phil Carmody

• **References:**

◆ **[Q:About primes?](#)**

◇ *From:* Dan

◆ **[Re: Q:About primes?](#)**

◇ *From:* Phil Carmody

- Prev by Date: **[Re: Integer solutions](#)**
- Next by Date: **[Re: Asymptote from a set of data](#)**
- Previous by thread: **[Re: Q:About primes?](#)**
- Next by thread: **[Re: Q:About primes?](#)**
- Index(es):
 - ◆ **[Date](#)**
 - ◆ **[Thread](#)**