

The continuity of prime numbers can lead to even continuity(The ultimate)

Xie Ling (✉ 29997609@qq.com)

Cosmic Mathematical Physics

Research Article

Keywords: prime even continuity, Bertrand Chebyshev theorem, Ascending and descending, Extreme law, Mathematical complete induction

Posted Date: September 8th, 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-713902/v8>

License:  This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

The continuity of prime numbers can lead to even continuity(The ultimate)

Author: Xie Ling **Address:** College of cosmic mathematics and physics, China / Hunan

E-mail: 29997609@qq.com **Mobile phone:** 13973920402

Mathematical classification code:110.1730 (algebraic number theory)

Absrtact : n continuous prime numbers can combine a group of continuous even numbers. If an adjacent prime number is followed, the even number will continue.

For example, if we take prime number **3**, we can get even number **6**. If we follow an adjacent prime number **5**, we can get even numbers by using **3** and **5**: **6, 8** and **10**.

If a group of continuous prime numbers **3,5,7,11,... P**, we can get a group of continuous even numbers **6,8,10,12,..., 2n**. Then if an adjacent prime number q is followed, the original group of even numbers **6,8,10,12,..., 2n** will be finitely extended to **2 (n + 1)** or more adjacent even numbers. My purpose is to prove that the continuity of prime numbers will lead to even continuity as long as **2 (n + 1)** can be extended.

If the continuity of even numbers is discontinuous, it violates the Bertrand Chebyshev theorem of prime numbers.

Because there are infinitely many prime numbers: **3, 5, 7, 11,...**

We can get infinitely many continuous even numbers: **6,8,10,12,...**

Key words: prime even continuity; Bertrand Chebyshev theorem; Ascending and descending; Extreme law; Mathematical complete induction

1 Preface

1.1 The whole proof begins with the ascent

Rule 1: the minimum odd prime number is **3**

Rule 2: add two odd prime numbers.(any combination of two odd primes).

Rule 3: odd prime number can be quoted repeatedly.

Rule 4: meet the previous provisions, and all prime combination to the maximum.

Rule 5: $P_a + P_b = 2S$, and $P_b + P_a = 2S$, Delete one and leave only one.

1.2 I can quote the minimum odd prime number **3**

The results are as follows

3+3=6

$5 + 1 = 6$ (it is stipulated that 1 is not a prime number, which is deleted because it violates regulation 2)

\therefore The unique formula: $3 + 3 = 6$.(comply with Rule 4: all prime numbers are quoted to the maximum).

According to the rules, the prime number 3 uses the maximum combination, and can only get:

$$3 + 3 = 6$$

How to make 6 continuous to 8 ?

If we take the adjacent prime number P greater than 3, we can get $P-3 \geq 2$ (a)

$$\text{From } 3 + 3 = 6, \rightarrow 3 + (3 + 2) = 6 + 2$$

If $(3 + 2) = P$, the proposition holds when the even number is 8

Extreme law \rightarrow Assumption: $(3+2) \neq p$

$$\therefore p-3 \neq 2.$$

$$\therefore (a): \{p-3 \geq 2, p-3 \neq 2\} \rightarrow (p-3 > 2) \rightarrow (p-3 \geq 4)$$

$$\therefore p > 2 \times 3$$

$$\therefore p > 2 \times 3 > 3$$

The results of Bertrand Chebyshev theorem are as follows:

$$(2 \times 3) > (\text{prime number } p_1) > 3.$$

$\therefore (p > 2 \times 3 > 3) \rightarrow (p > p_1 > 3) \rightarrow (P \text{ and } 3 \text{ are adjacent prime numbers})$ contradiction. Negation hypothesis.

$$\therefore (3+2)=p, \therefore 3+p=8.$$

$$\therefore 6 \rightarrow 8$$

The proof process uses the known prime number, and the sieve method is not used in the derivation process,

Prime number theorem and Bertrand Chebyshev theorem.

By quoting the prime number theorem, we get a finite number of continuous prime numbers, and then generate even numbers according to the requirements of this manuscript.

Use the extreme rule again , Force even numbers to continue.

2 nouns and definitions, citing theorems

2.1 ϕ_1 Definition of prime number: prime number refers to the natural number with no other factors except 1 and itself in the natural number greater than 1.

2.2 ϕ_2 Extreme law : A may or may not be true. What conclusion can we get if we only prove that A is not true.

$\{A \mid A=x, A=y\}, (A=x) \rightarrow (\text{QED})$. Take: $A \neq x$, only prove the $A=y$ conclusion.

2.3 ϕ_3 [References cited 1] Bertrand Chebyshev theorem: if the integer $n > 3$, then there is

at least one prime P , which conforms to $n < p < 2n-2$. Another slightly weaker argument is: for all integers n greater than 1 , there is at least one prime P , which conforms to $n < p < 2n$.

2.4 ϕ_4 In this paper, the even number generation rules are as follows

- ① Only odd primes are allowed as elements.
- ② Only two prime numbers can be added.(any combination of two odd primes).
- ③ Two prime numbers can be used repeatedly: $(3 + 3)$, or $(3 + 5)$, or $(P + P)$.
- ④ meet the previous provisions, and all prime combination to the maximum.
- ⑤ Take only one of $(p_a + p_b)$ and $(p_b + p_a)$.

2.5 ϕ_5 [References cited 2] The theorem of infinite number of primes:

the n bit after each prime can always find another prime.

For example, 3 is followed by 5 and 13 is followed by 17 ; There must be an adjacent prime p_i after the prime P .

2.6 ϕ_6 Here we only discuss the following cases: prime number sequence and even number sequence

$(\phi_5) \rightarrow$ Prime number sequence: $3, 5, 7, 11, 13, 17, 19, 23, \dots$

Even number sequence: $6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18, 20, \dots$

Explain ϕ_6 in today's words: the prime number in the prime number sequence discussed in this paper is adjacent and continuous, and the first number is 3 .

An even number in an even number sequence is contiguous and the first number is 6 .

2.7 ϕ_7 Remember: all the primes I'll talk about below refer to odd primes (excluding 2).

Prime symbol P , different primes use $P_1, P_2, P_3, \dots, p_x$

3 Logical argument

3.1 Θ_1 Goldbach conjecture : $3 \leq \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, 2n = p_x + p_y$. set up $\Delta_1 : p_x \geq p_y$

3.2 Θ_2 Theorem: the continuity of prime numbers leads to the continuity of even numbers

In mathematical language :

Known: $\{3, 5, 7, 11, 13, \dots, p_2, p_1, p_0\} \in (\text{prime})$, The next neighbor of p_1 is p_0 ,

$3 < 5 < 7 < 11 < 13 < \dots p_2 < p_1 < p_0$,

$\{6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, \dots, 2n\} \in (\text{continuous even number})$.

If: $\{3, 5, 7, 11, 13, \dots, p_2, p_1\} \rightarrow \{6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, \dots, 2n\}$.

inevitable: $\{3, 5, 7, 11, 13, \dots, p_2, p_1, p_0\} \rightarrow \{6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, \dots, 2n, 2(n+1)\}$.

3.2.1 prove:

Humans use computers to calculate a finite number of even numbers: $\{6, 8, 10, 12, 14, \dots, 2n\}$

every even number satisfies Θ_1 .

The computer process is finite $\{6, 8, 10, 12, 14, \dots, 2n\}$

It is not logically proved that any even number greater than 4 satisfies Θ_1 .

$(\phi_5 + \phi_6)$ Take odd prime sequence: 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, 17, 19, 23,...

Take the minimum prime number 3 from the front of the prime sequence,

$A_1 \quad \{\phi_1 + \phi_4 + \{3\}\} \rightarrow :$

$\{3+3=6\}$ It is recorded as A_1

$\rightarrow 6$

According to the rule, 3 can only get $\{3+3=6\}$

Nonexistence: $5+p=6$

【Because 1 in $5+1=6$ is not defined as a prime number. If 1 is defined as a prime number, this paper will come to the same conclusion】

Note: $5 \notin \{3\}$.

Prime number 3, limit is used according to ϕ_4 , cannot be: $6 \rightarrow 8$.

$\{\phi_1 + \phi_4 + \{3\}\} \rightarrow :$ Quoting prime number 3 can only get even number 6.

If you want to: $6 \rightarrow 8$, you must add an adjacent prime number 5.

$A_2 \quad \{\phi_1 + \phi_4 + \{3,5\}\} \rightarrow :$

$3+3=6$

$3+5=8$

$5+5=3+7=10 \quad \therefore \phi_4 \{(5,5),(3,7)\} \in 10. \therefore \{\phi_1 + \phi_4 + \{3,5,7\}\} \rightarrow$

$7+5=12$

$7+7=11+3=14. \therefore \phi_4 \{(7,7),(3,11)\} \in 14. \therefore \{\phi_1 + \phi_4 + \{3,5,7,11\}\} \rightarrow$

$11+5=13+3=16. \therefore \phi_4 \{(11,5),(13,3)\} \in 16. \therefore \{\phi_1 + \phi_4 + \{3,5,7,11,13\}\} \rightarrow$

$11+7=13+5=18.$

$13+7=17+3=20.$ There is a new prime number 17 in continuity.

Note: $\{(13,7),(17,3)\} \in 20.$ even numbers $\rightarrow 6,8,10,12,14,16,18,20.$

Prime numbers are continuous, and there is a new prime number 17.

even numbers \rightarrow :6,8,10,12,14,16,18,20.

Note the key point: A_1 broken, increase the adjacent prime number 5 to have A_2

From $A_1 \rightarrow A_2 \rightarrow$ is it always infinite? Or will it stop?

Here's the wonderful thing:

(analysis I):

Always Unlimited: $A_1 \rightarrow A_2 \rightarrow \dots$

There are: $(\phi_5 + \phi_6) \Rightarrow \{ 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, 17, 19, 23, \dots$

Get: 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 20, 22, ...

Conclusion: Θ_2 (QED).

$(\phi_2) \rightarrow$ Stop at A_n , cannot continue.

(analysis II): Stop at A_n , not to be continued.

Stop at A_n : $A_1 \rightarrow A_2 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow A_n$

κ -line with continuous Prime: 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, 17, 19, 23, ..., p_2, p_1

Get: 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 20, 22, ..., $2(n-1), 2n$

$$\Theta_3 : \{ \{ \phi_1 + \phi_4 + \{3,5,7,11,\dots,p_2,p_1\} \Rightarrow \{6, 8, 10, 12, \dots, 2(n-1), 2n\} \\ \Rightarrow \{6, 8, 10, 12, \dots, 2(n-1), 2n\} \in A_n \}$$

$$\Theta_4 : \{ \{ \phi_1 + \phi_4 + \{3,5,7,11,\dots,p_2,p_1\} \neq \Rightarrow 2(n+1) \\ \Rightarrow \{2(n+1), 2(n+2), 2(n+3), \dots, 2(n+k)\} \notin A_n \}$$

(1): { Let: prime p satisfy: $p \notin \{3,5,7,11,\dots,p_2,p_1\}$, $p \in \forall, \Theta_3, \Theta_4$.

$$\therefore \{ p \notin A_n, p_1 < p, p \notin \{6, 8, 10, 12, \dots, 2(n-1), 2n\} \}$$

Take the prime number that is greater than p_1 and adjacent to p_1 as p_0 ,

$$\therefore (1) \rightarrow \{ p_0 + 3 \neq 2n, p_0 + 3 \leq 2n \}$$

$$\therefore p_0 + 3 > 2n$$

$$\therefore p_0 + 2 \geq 2n \quad \therefore (\text{odd}) \neq (\text{even})$$

$$\therefore p_0 + 2 > 2n \rightarrow p_0 + 1 \geq 2n \quad (W)$$

Starting from (Analysis II)

The principle of mathematical complete induction: it is correct in the front, until \mathbf{A}_n .

Take the continuous prime number $(\mathbf{3,5,7,11,\dots,p_2,p_1})$ from small to large.

$$\mathbf{A}_n \quad \{\phi_1 + \phi_4 + \{\mathbf{3,5,7,11,\dots,p_2,p_1}\}\} \rightarrow :$$

$$\mathbf{3+3=6}$$

$$\mathbf{5+3=8}$$

$$\mathbf{7+3=5+5=10. \text{ set up: } (7+3=5+5) \text{ sequence: } 7 > 5}$$

$$\mathbf{7+5=12}$$

$$\mathbf{11+3=7+7=14. \text{ set up } \Delta_2 : (11+3=7+7) \text{ sequence: } 11 > 7}$$

$$\mathbf{13+3=11+5=16. \text{ set up } \Delta_2 : (13+3=11+5) \text{ sequence: } 13 > 11}$$

$$\mathbf{13+5=11+7=18. \text{ set up } \Delta_2 : (13+5=11+7) \text{ sequence: } 13 > 11}$$

$$\mathbf{17+3=13+7=20. \text{ set up } \Delta_2 : (17+3=13+7) \text{ sequence: } 17 > 13}$$

$$\mathbf{19+3=17+5=11+11=22. \text{ set up } \Delta_2 : (19+3=17+5=11+11) \text{ sequence: } 19 > 17 > 11}$$

$$\mathbf{19+5=17+7=13+11=24. \text{ set up } \Delta_2 : (19+5=17+7=13+11) \text{ sequence: } 19 > 17 > 13}$$

.....

$$\mathbf{p_{c1} + p_{c2} = p_{c3} + p_{c4} = \dots = 2(n-2)}$$

$$\mathbf{p_{b1} + p_{b2} = p_{b3} + p_{b4} = \dots = 2(n-1)}$$

$$\mathbf{p_{a1} + p_{a2} = p_{a3} + p_{a4} = \dots = 2n} \quad \text{It is recorded as } \mathbf{A}_n$$

$$\rightarrow : \mathbf{6,8,10,12,14,16,18,\dots,2(n-1),2n.}$$

In \mathbf{A}_n , it is specified that : $p_{a1} \geq p_{a2}$

In \mathbf{A}_n it is specified that : $p_{a1} > p_{a3}$ 【Reason: $p_{a1} + p_{a2} = 2n$ must exist.

$p_{a3} + p_{a4} = 2n$, not necessarily.

If $p_{a3} + p_{a4} = 2n$, exists

p_{a1} and p_{a3} if one of them is big, put the big one in the first place according to the regulations.

If: $p_{a1} = p_{a3} \rightarrow \{p_{a1} + p_{a2} = 2n\} \cong \{p_{a3} + p_{a4} = 2n\}$

$\phi_4 \rightarrow \{p_{a3} + p_{a4} = 2n\}$ is deleted **】** $\therefore p_{a1} > p_{a3}$

A_n is simplified as B_n .

3+3=6

5+3=8

7+3=5+5=10.

7+5=12

11+3=7+7=14.

13+3=11+5=16.

13+5=11+7=18.

17+3=13+7=20.

19+3=17+5=11+11=22.

19+5=17+7=13+11=24.

.....

$p_{c1} + p_{c2} = p_{c3} + p_{c4} = \dots = 2(n-2)$

$p_{b1} + p_{b2} = p_{b3} + p_{b4} = \dots = 2(n-1)$

$p_{a1} + p_{a2} = p_{a3} + p_{a4} = \dots = 2n$ It is recorded as B_n

Change B_n to C_n .

{ Level 2(n-2):3+2(n-2)+3=2(n+1)

Level 2(n-3):5+2(n-3)+3=2(n+1)

Level 2(n-4):7+2(n-4)+3=5+2(n-4)+5=2(n+1)

Level 2(n-5):7+2(n-5)+5=2(n+1)

Level 2(n-6):11+2(n-6)+3=7+2(n-6)+7=2(n+1)

Level 2(n-7):13+2(n-7)+3=11+2(n-7)+5=2(n+1)

Level 2(n-8):13+2(n-8)+5=11+2(n-8)+7=2(n+1)

Level 2(n-9):17+2(n-9)+3=13+2(n-9)+7=2(n+1)

Level 2(n-10):19+2(n-10)+3=17+2(n-10)+5=11+2(n-10)+11=2(n+1)

Level 2(n-11):19+2(n-11)+5=17+2(n-11)+7=13+2(n-11)+11=2(n+1)

.....

Level 6: $p_{c1} + 6 + p_{c2} = p_{c3} + 6 + p_{c4} = \dots = 2(n+1)$

Level 4: $p_{b1} + 4 + p_{b2} = p_{b3} + 4 + p_{b4} = \dots = 2(n+1)$

Level 2: $p_{a1} + 2 + p_{a2} = p_{a3} + 2 + p_{a4} = \dots = 2(n+1)$ It is recorded as : C_n

"Line β " in C_n : $2 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 6 \rightarrow 8 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow 2(n-5) \rightarrow 2(n-4) \rightarrow 2(n-3) \rightarrow 2(n-2)$

In C_n (Level 2): $\{p_{a1}, p_{a2}, p_{a3}, p_{a4}, \dots, p_{an}\}$, any element is modeled as p_a , and each prime is abbreviated as p_a .

In C_n (Level 4): $\{p_{b1}, p_{b2}, p_{b3}, p_{b4}, \dots, p_{bn}\}$, any element is modeled as p_b , and each prime is abbreviated as p_b .

The same analogy follows (at each level).

Theorem (ω_1) : $\{p_1$ and p_0 are adjacent prime numbers. $p_0 > p_1\} \Rightarrow p_0 \not\geq 2p_1$.

Proof:

Assumptions: $p_0 > 2p_1$.

$\Rightarrow : p_0 > 2p_1 > p_1$.

$\phi_3 + \{p_0 > 2p_1 > p_1\} \Rightarrow p_0 > 2p_1 > p_g > p_1$.

$\Rightarrow \{p_0 > p_g > p_1\}$ contradiction. $\therefore (p_1$ and p_0 are adjacent prime numbers.)

$\therefore p_0 \not\geq 2p_1$.

$\Rightarrow \{p_a + p_b = 2n, \text{ If } p_a = p_1\} \Rightarrow p_b \neq p_1$

$\therefore p_0 \not\geq 2p_1$.

(QED).

Theorem (ω_2) :

Known: $\{A_n, B_n, C_n, \phi_2, p_1$ and p_0 are adjacent prime numbers, $p_0 > p_1$,

β line: $2 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 6 \rightarrow 8 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow 2(n-6) \rightarrow 2(n-5) \rightarrow 2(n-4) \rightarrow 2(n-3) \rightarrow 2(n-2)$

κ line: $3 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 7 \rightarrow 11 \rightarrow 13 \rightarrow 17 \rightarrow 19 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow p_2 \rightarrow p_1$

ϕ_2 Extreme law : Not allowed: $2n+2 = p_x + p_y$. } There must be: $p_0 - p_1 > 2(n-2)$

Proof:

$\therefore \{p_0 > p_1, (\text{Odd prime}) \in \{p_0, p_1\}\} \rightarrow p_0 - p_1 \geq 2$

Take: $p_0 - p_1 = 2$,

C_n Level 2: $p_{a1} + 2 + p_{a2} = 2(n+1)$

If: $p_1 \in p_a, \rightarrow p_0 + p_{a2} = 2(n+1). \rightarrow \Theta_2$ (QED).

If: $p_1 \in p_b, \rightarrow C_n$ **Level 4: $p_{b1} + 4 + p_{b2} = 2(n+1)$**

$\rightarrow : p_0 - 2 + 4 + p_{b2} = 2(n+1) \rightarrow p_0 + p_{b2} = 2n$ Conflict with (1)

$\therefore p_1 \notin p_b$

The same logic: $p_1 \notin p_c$

Similarly, it is successively pushed down to: **Level 2(n-2): $3 + 2(n-2) + 3 = 2(n+1)$**

$p_1 \notin 3$

$\rightarrow p_1 \notin \{p_b, p_c, p_d, \dots, 5, 3\}$

$p_0 - p_1 = 2 \rightarrow \Theta_2$ (QED).

$(\phi_2) \rightarrow p_0 - p_1 \neq 2 \therefore p_0 - p_1 > 2.$

$p_0 - p_1 > 2. \rightarrow : p_0 - p_1 \geq 4.$

Take: $p_0 - p_1 = 4.$

C_n **Level 2: $p_{a1} + 2 + p_{a2} = 2(n+1)$**

If: $p_1 \in p_a \Rightarrow p_1 = p_{a1} \Rightarrow p_0 - 4 + 2 + p_{a2} = 2(n+1).$

$\Rightarrow \{p_0 + p_{a2} = 2(n+2) \notin A_n, \therefore \Theta_4\}.$

$\therefore (\omega_1) \therefore p_{a2} \neq p_1$

$\therefore p_1 \notin \{p_0, p_{a2}\}$

$\therefore p_1 \in \{p_b, p_c, p_d, \dots, 5, 3\}$

$\therefore p_1 \in \{\text{Level 4, Level 6, Level 8, } \dots, \text{Level } 2(n-2)\}$

C_n **Level 4: $p_{b1} + 4 + p_{b2} = 2(n+1)$**

If: $p_1 \in p_b, \rightarrow p_0 + p_{b2} = 2(n+1) \rightarrow \Theta_2$ (QED).

If: $\{\text{Level 6: } p_1 \in p_c\}$ Conflict with (1)

The same logic: $\{\text{Level 6, Level 8, Level 10, } \dots, \text{Level } 2(n-2)\}$ Conflict with (1)

$\therefore \Rightarrow p_1 \notin \{p_c, p_d, \dots, 5, 3\} \Rightarrow p_1 \in p_b$ **【 $\therefore p_1 \in \{p_b, p_c, p_d, \dots, 5, 3\}$ 】**

$p_1 \in p_b, \rightarrow p_0 + p_{b2} = 2(n+1) \rightarrow \Theta_2$ (QED).

$(\phi_2) \rightarrow p_0 - p_1 \neq 4$

$$\therefore p_0 - p_1 > 4. \quad p_0 - 6 + 2 + p_{a2} = 2(n+1)$$

$$p_0 - p_1 > 4. \rightarrow p_0 - p_1 \geq 6.$$

Take: $p_0 - p_1 = 6$.

$$p_0 - p_1 = 6 \Rightarrow C_n \{\text{Level 2, Level 4}\} \text{ If } p_{a1} = p_1, \text{ Or } p_{b1} = p_1,$$

$$\Rightarrow \{p_0 + p_{a2} = 2(n+3), p_0 + p_{b2} = 2(n+4)\} \notin A_n, \therefore \Theta_4\}.$$

$$\therefore (\omega_1) \quad \therefore p_{a2} \neq p_1 \text{ Or } p_{b2} \neq p_1$$

$$\therefore p_1 \notin \{p_0, p_{a2}, p_{b2}\}$$

$$\therefore p_1 \in \{p_c, p_d, \dots, 5, 3\}$$

$$\therefore p_1 \in \{\text{Level 6, Level 8, Level 10, \dots, Level } 2(n-2)\}$$

$$C_n \text{ Level 6 : } p_{c1} + 6 + p_{c2} = 2(n+1)$$

$$\text{If: } p_1 \in p_b \rightarrow p_0 + p_{b2} = 2(n+1) \rightarrow \Theta_2 \text{ (QED).}$$

The same logic: $\{\text{Level 8, Level 10, \dots, Level } 2(n-2)\}$ Conflict with (1)

$$\Rightarrow p_1 \notin \{p_d, \dots, 5, 3\} \Rightarrow p_1 \in p_b \rightarrow p_0 + p_{b2} = 2(n+1) \rightarrow \Theta_2 \text{ (QED).}$$

$$\Rightarrow p_0 - p_1 > 6.$$

.....

It is deduced in sequence: $p_0 - p_1 > 2(n-2)$ **【 β Line: $2(n-2)$ 】**

$$\phi_2 \text{ Extreme law : Not allowed: } 2n+2 = p_x + p_y \rightarrow p_0 - p_1 > 2(n-2)$$

Theorem (ω_2) (QED).

$$(\omega_2) \rightarrow (p_0 - p_1 > 2(n-2)) \rightarrow (p_0 - p_1 > 2n-4 \geq p_1 + p_i - 4) \text{ 【}\therefore B_n : p_1 + p_i = 2f \leq 2n\text{】}$$

$$\therefore p_0 > (2p_1 + p_i - 4)$$

$$\therefore p_0 \geq (2P_1 + p_i - 3)$$

$$\therefore (\text{the smallest prime in } \kappa \text{ is } 3) \rightarrow p_i \geq 3 \quad \therefore (p_0 \geq 2p_1 + p_i - 3) \rightarrow p_0 \geq 2p_1$$

$$\therefore (\text{odd}) \neq (\text{even}). \quad \therefore p_0 > 2p_1$$

It is proved that: $p_0 > 2P_1$

$$\therefore p_0 > 2P_1 > P_1$$

$$\phi_3 \rightarrow p_0 > 2p_1 > p_g > p_1$$

Get: $(p_0 > p_g > p_1) \rightarrow$ And p_0, p_1 are adjacent, contradictory.

It is proved that it is wrong to quote "Extreme law ϕ_2 " in the process.

$$\text{Get: } p_x + p_y = 2(n+1)$$

$$\therefore p_x + p_y - 2 = 2n \quad (2)$$

$$(W)+(2): p_0 + 3 \geq p_x + p_y \quad (3)$$

\therefore (the smallest prime in κ is 3)

$$\therefore p_y \geq 3$$

$$\therefore (3) \rightarrow p_0 \geq p_x \quad (4)$$

$$\therefore \left\{ \Theta_4 : \{ \phi_4 + \{3,5,7,11,\dots,p_2,p_1\} \neq 2(n+1) = p_i + p_{ii} \} \right\} \quad (5)$$

$$\therefore \left\{ (1) + (5) \rightarrow p_x \notin \{3,5,7,11,\dots,p_2,p_1\} \rightarrow p_x > p_1 \right\} \quad (6)$$

【reason:

Hypothesis: $p_x \in \{3,5,7,11,\dots,p_2,p_1\}$

$$\therefore p_x \geq p_y \rightarrow \{p_x, p_y\} \in \{3,5,7,11,\dots,p_2,p_1\}$$

$$\{3,5,7,11,\dots,p_2,p_1\} \rightarrow p_x + p_y = 2(n+1) \text{ Contradiction with (5)}$$

$$\therefore p_x \notin \{3,5,7,11,\dots,p_2,p_1\} \rightarrow p_x > p_1 \text{】}$$

$$\{ (4) + (6) \} \rightarrow p_0 \geq p_x > p_1 \quad (7)$$

Because $p_0 > P_1$, and the prime number: p_0 and P_1 adjacent.

$$\{ p_0 \text{ and } P_1 \text{ adjacent.} + (7) \} \rightarrow \therefore p_x = p_0$$

It is proved that: $(p_x = p_0)$, get: new (κ line).

$$\text{new } (\kappa \text{ line}): 3 \rightarrow 5 \rightarrow 7 \rightarrow 11 \rightarrow 13 \rightarrow 17 \rightarrow 19 \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow p_1 \rightarrow p_0$$

At this time, it is completely proved that: Θ_2 (QED).

$$\Theta_1 \text{ and } \Theta_2 \text{ are equivalent: } \Theta_2 \text{ (QED)} \rightarrow \Theta_1 \text{ (QED)}.$$

4 Conclusion

$$\Theta_1 \text{ and } \Theta_2 \text{ are equivalent: } \Theta_2 \text{ (QED)} \rightarrow \Theta_1 \text{ (QED)}.$$

Complete the mathematical complete induction:

$\{A_1 (x \text{ line:3}) \Theta_1 \text{ (QED)}.$

$(A_n (x \text{ line:3,5,7,...}p_1) \Theta_1 \text{ (QED)}.$

$(A_{n+1} (x \text{ line:3,5,7,...}p_1,p_0) \Theta_1 \text{ (QED)}.$

5 Statement:

Funding (supported by the author)
Conflict of interest / competitive interest (none)
Availability of data and materials (none)
Code availability (none)
Ethical approval (APPROVAL)
Consent to participate (consent)
Publication consent (consent)

6 References cited:

1 Bertrand Chebyshev theorem: if the integer $n > 3$, then there is at least one prime P , which conforms to $n < p < 2n-2$. Another slightly weaker argument is: for all integers n greater than 1 , there is at least one prime P , which conforms to $n < p < 2n$.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228592091_A_Generalization_of_Erdos's_Proof_of_Bertrand-Chebyshev_Theorem

2 The theorem of infinite number of primes: the n bit after each prime can always find another prime.

https://www.researchgate.net/publication/266044680_THE_NUMBER_OF_PRIMES_IS_INFINITY