

Re: A possible argument for no more Fermat primes.

# Re: A possible argument for no more Fermat primes.

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2008-08/msg01171.html>

---

- *From:* amy666 <tommy1729@xxxxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Sun, 10 Aug 2008 18:03:20 EDT
- 

You seem to be looking for primes of the form  $2^n +$

1

No

or  $2^{(4n)} + 1$ .

yes

But your results are a consequence of the fact that

if  $n=rs$  where  $s$  is

odd

Nothing is odd except after  $(+1)$

then  $2^{n+1}$  can be divided by  $2^{r+1}$ .

So for example,  $2^{96} + 1$  is divisible by  $2^{32} + 1$

Yes---

The search for bigger Fermat primes (or a proof that no more exist) can be restricted to those of the form  $2^{(2^n)} + 1$ .

Re: A possible argument for no more Fermat primes.

Henry,

I am just showing the pattern of all  $2^{2^n+1}$  where (n) will always be divisible by 4.

Its in this pattern that if ever another Fermat prime is found it will throw off this pattern.

$2^{36+1}$  = has as one of its factors (17)  
 $2^{40+1}$  = " " " " " (257)  
 $2^{44+1}$  = " (17)  
 $2^{48+1}$  = " (65537)  
 $2^{52+1}$  = " (17)  
 $2^{56+1}$  = " (257)  
 $2^{60+1}$  = " (17)  
 $2^{64+1}$  = Has 2 prime factors and none are Fermat primes.

I will skip too  $2^{100}$  for the sake of simplicity but this pattern is consistent.

(")= has as one of its prime factors

$2^{100+1}$  = (" (17)  
 $2^{104+1}$  = (" (257)  
 $2^{108+1}$  = (" (17)  
 $2^{112+1}$  = (" (65537)  
 $2^{116+1}$  = (" (17)  
 $2^{120+1}$  = (" (257)  
 $2^{124+1}$  = (" (17)  
 $2^{128+1}$  = (" a composite with no Fermat primes as factors.

My point is, say at some very large (n) where  $2^{(2^n)+1}$  = a prime, making it the 6th Fermat prime.

The cyclic pattern =

$2^{(2^{(n-28)+1})}$  = (" 17  
 $2^{(2^{(n-24)+1})}$  = (" 257  
 $2^{(2^{(n-20)+1})}$  = (" 17  
 $2^{(2^{(n-16)+1})}$  = (" 65537  
 $2^{(2^{(n-12)+1})}$  = (" 17  
 $2^{(2^{(n-8)+1})}$  = (" 257  
 $2^{(2^{(n-4)+1})}$  = (" 17  
 $2^{(2^n)+1}$  = the 6th Fermat prime.

Will any later cycles include the 6th Fermat prime

Re: A possible argument for no more Fermat primes.

as one of the (8) composite factors shown above?

Right now the cycle picks up the last 3 Fermat primes 17,257,65537, as one of the factors in 7 of these composites.

Will there now be 4 Fermat primes after the sixth Fermat prime is found and it would only fit in the last position of the cycle?

Dan

look at the none-fermat prime factors of  $2^n + 1$ .

.