

Re: twin prime conjecture

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2006-10/msg03341.html>

- *From:* Gerry Myerson <gerry@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 12 Oct 2006 23:21:45 GMT
-

In article <87fydu6kx3.fsf@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, Phil Carmody <thefatphil_demunged@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Gerry Myerson <gerry@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> writes:

In article <1160567009.355920.117830@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>, "larry.freeman@xxxxxxxx" <larry.freeman@xxxxxxxx> wrote:

OK, here's the solution to one more of your problems (2 more to go):

OK. But you can stop now – you've made your point (unless of course you're enjoying this, in which case, be my guest).

I suspect Larry was unfamiliar with the number of incompetent doofi we get here in sci.math who make bold claims. Almost all of which are unable to demonstrate any ability in the field in which they claim to have made a breakthrough.

Hence your challenge, which I'm sure you didn't expect any sensible replies to, and you'd be right 99% of the time.

So Gerry – are you actually going to waste your time looking at the paper, now that you've wasted Larry's time with those questions? :-D

I would feel obliged to look at the proof, but someone else spared me the effort.

I've not looked at it, but I would be willing to bet that it's "sieve method that doesn't consider error bounds". It

Re: twin prime conjecture

almost always is. There is a standard sieve methods text,
it's almost certainly way above my level:

H. Halberstam and H. E. Richert. (1974). Sieve Methods.
Academic Press, London, 1974. ISBN 0-12-318250-6

If anyone could recommend a text which aims a little lower,
introducing the subject to someone like myself, I'd be very
grateful.

There are a couple of chapters about sieves in Bateman & Diamond,
Analytic Number Theory, An Introductory Course, World Scientific,
2004. Might be worth a look.

—
Gerry Myerson (gerry@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx) (i -> u for email)

.