

PRIMITIVE ROOT BIAS FOR TWIN PRIMES

STEPHAN RAMON GARCIA, ELVIS KAHORO, AND FLORIAN LUCA

ABSTRACT. Numerical evidence suggests that for only about 2% of pairs $p, p+2$ of twin primes, $p+2$ has more primitive roots than does p . If this occurs, we say that p is *exceptional* (there are only two exceptional pairs with $5 \leq p \leq 10,000$). Assuming the Bateman–Horn conjecture, we prove that at least 0.47% of twin prime pairs are exceptional and at least 65.13% are not exceptional. We also conjecture a precise formula for the proportion of exceptional twin primes.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let n be a positive integer. An integer coprime to n is a *primitive root* modulo n if it generates the multiplicative group $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^\times$ of units modulo n . A famous result of Gauss states that n possesses primitive roots if and only if n is 2, 4, an odd prime power, or twice an odd prime power. If a primitive root modulo n exists, then n has precisely $\varphi(\varphi(n))$ of them, in which φ denotes the Euler totient function. If p is prime, then $\varphi(p) = p - 1$ and hence p has exactly $\varphi(p - 1)$ primitive roots.

If p and $p + 2$ are prime, then p and $p + 2$ are *twin primes*. The Twin Prime Conjecture asserts that there are infinitely many twin primes. While it remains unproved, recent years have seen an explosion of closely-related work [2, 7, 10]. Let $\pi_2(x)$ denote the number of primes p at most x for which $p + 2$ is prime. The first Hardy–Littlewood conjecture asserts that

$$\pi_2(x) \sim 2C_2 \int_2^x \frac{dt}{(\log t)^2}, \quad (1.1)$$

in which

$$C_2 = \prod_{p \geq 3} \frac{p(p-2)}{(p-1)^2} = 0.660161815 \dots \quad (1.2)$$

is the *twin primes constant* [5]. A simpler expression that is asymptotically equivalent to (1.1) is $2C_2x/(\log x)^2$.

A casual inspection (see Table 1) suggests that if p and $p+2$ are primes and $p \geq 5$, then p has at least as many primitive roots as $p + 2$; that is, $\varphi(p - 1) \geq \varphi(p + 1)$. If this occurs, then p is *unexceptional*. The preceding inequality holds for all twin primes $p, p + 2$ with $5 \leq p \leq 10,000$, except for the pairs 2381, 2383 and 3851, 3853.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 11A07, 11A41, 11N36, 11N37.

Key words and phrases. prime, twin prime, primitive root, Bateman–Horn conjecture, Twin Prime Conjecture, Brun Sieve.

SRG supported by NSF grant DMS-1265973, a David L. Hirsch III and Susan H. Hirsch Research Initiation Grant, and the Budapest Semesters in Mathematics (BSM) Director’s Mathematician in Residence (DMiR) program.

F. L. was supported in part by grants CPRR160325161141 and an A-rated researcher award both from the NRF of South Africa and by grant no. 17-02804S of the Czech Granting Agency.

p	$\varphi(p-1)$	$\varphi(p+1)$	$\delta(p)$	p	$\varphi(p-1)$	$\varphi(p+1)$	$\delta(p)$
5	2	2	0	821	320	272	48
11	4	4	0	827	348	264	84
17	8	6	2	857	424	240	184
29	12	8	4	881	320	252	68
41	16	12	4	1019	508	256	252
59	28	16	12	1031	408	336	72
71	24	24	0	1049	520	240	280
101	40	32	8	1061	416	348	68
107	52	36	16	1091	432	288	144
137	64	44	20	1151	440	384	56
149	72	40	32	1229	612	320	292
179	88	48	40	1277	560	420	140
191	72	64	8	1289	528	336	192
197	84	60	24	1301	480	360	120
227	112	72	40	1319	658	320	338
239	96	64	32	1427	660	384	276
269	132	72	60	1451	560	440	120
281	96	92	4	1481	576	432	144
311	120	96	24	1487	742	480	262
347	172	112	60	1607	720	528	192
419	180	96	84	1619	808	432	376
431	168	144	24	1667	672	552	120
461	176	120	56	1697	832	564	268
521	192	168	24	1721	672	480	192
569	280	144	136	1787	828	592	236
599	264	160	104	1871	640	576	64
617	240	204	36	1877	792	624	168
641	256	212	44	1931	768	528	240
659	276	160	116	1949	972	480	492
809	400	216	184	1997	996	648	348

Table 1. For twin primes $p, p+2$ with $5 \leq p \leq 2000$, the difference $\delta(p) = \varphi(p-1) - \varphi(p+1)$ is nonnegative. That is, p has at least as many primitive roots as does $p+2$.

If $p, p+2$ are primes with $p \geq 5$ and $\varphi(p-1) < \varphi(p+1)$, then p is *exceptional*. We do not regard $p=3$ as exceptional for technical reasons. Let $\pi_e(x)$ denote the number of exceptional primes $p \leq x$; that is,

$$\pi_e(x) = \#\{p \leq x : p \text{ and } p+2 \text{ are prime and } \varphi(p-1) < \varphi(p+1)\}.$$

Computational evidence suggests that approximately 2% of twin primes are exceptional; see Table 2. We make the following conjecture.

Conjecture 1. *A positive proportion of the twin primes are exceptional. That is, $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \pi_e(x)/\pi_2(x)$ exists and is positive.*

We are able to prove Conjecture 1, if we assume the Bateman–Horn conjecture (stated below). Our main theorem is the following.

Theorem 1. *Assume that the Bateman–Horn conjecture holds.*

- (a) *The set of twin prime pairs $p, p+2$ for which $\varphi(p-1) < \varphi(p+1)$ has lower density (as a subset of twin primes) at least 0.47%.*
- (b) *The set of twin prime pairs $p, p+2$ for which $\varphi(p-1) \geq \varphi(p+1)$ has lower density (as a subset of twin primes) at least 65.13%.*

p	$\delta(p)$	$\pi_2(p)$	$\pi_e(p)$	$\pi_e(p)/\pi_2(p)$	p	$\delta(p)$	$\pi_2(p)$	$\pi_e(p)$	$\pi_e(p)/\pi_2(p)$
2381	-24	71	1	0.0140845	230861	-2304	2427	51	0.0210136
3851	-72	100	2	0.02	232961	-1952	2447	52	0.0212505
14561	-240	268	3	0.0111194	237161	-784	2486	53	0.0213194
17291	-16	300	4	0.0133333	241781	-4232	2517	54	0.0214541
20021	-680	342	5	0.0146199	246611	-4440	2557	55	0.0215096
20231	-192	344	6	0.0174419	251231	-768	2598	56	0.021555
26951	-576	430	7	0.0162791	259211	-1392	2657	57	0.0214528
34511	-736	532	8	0.0150376	270131	-3256	2755	58	0.0210526
41231	-768	602	9	0.0149502	274121	-5376	2788	59	0.0211621
47741	-1152	672	10	0.014881	275591	-1136	2800	60	0.0214286
50051	-1728	706	11	0.0155807	278741	-6512	2827	61	0.0215776
52361	-2088	731	12	0.0164159	282101	-7632	2853	62	0.0217315
55931	-432	765	13	0.0169935	282311	-720	2855	63	0.0220665
57191	-912	780	14	0.0179487	298691	-3552	2982	64	0.0214621
65171	-552	856	15	0.0175234	300581	-3420	3000	65	0.0216667
67211	-312	876	16	0.0182648	301841	-3840	3012	66	0.0219124
67271	-96	878	17	0.0193622	312551	-4752	3103	67	0.021592
70841	-2492	915	18	0.0196721	315701	-9228	3130	68	0.0217252
82811	-720	1043	19	0.0182167	316031	-5376	3132	69	0.0220307
87011	-2112	1084	20	0.0184502	322631	-7200	3197	70	0.0218955
98561	-2132	1207	21	0.0173985	325781	-6012	3230	71	0.0219814
101501	-228	1235	22	0.0178138	328511	-5440	3259	72	0.0220927
101531	-240	1236	23	0.0186084	330821	-4284	3283	73	0.0222358
108461	-312	1302	24	0.0184332	341321	-2928	3354	74	0.0220632
117041	-4452	1388	25	0.0180115	345731	-5088	3388	75	0.022137
119771	-912	1420	26	0.0183099	348461	-3348	3413	76	0.0222678
126491	-1584	1482	27	0.0182186	354971	-7920	3459	77	0.0222608
129221	-2736	1508	28	0.0185676	356441	-4764	3473	78	0.022459
134681	-3420	1559	29	0.0186017	357281	-6264	3480	79	0.0227011
136991	-1568	1586	30	0.0189155	361901	-10232	3520	80	0.0227273
142871	-2688	1634	31	0.0189718	362951	-4080	3525	81	0.0229787
145601	-2448	1653	32	0.0193587	371141	-2736	3580	82	0.022905
150221	-1688	1703	33	0.0193776	399491	-6048	3800	83	0.0218421
156941	-2196	1772	34	0.0191874	402221	-11064	3818	84	0.022001
165551	-4768	1848	35	0.0189394	404321	-1584	3838	85	0.022147
166601	-1772	1855	36	0.019407	406631	-752	3862	86	0.0222683
167861	-3360	1869	37	0.0197967	410411	-15568	3887	87	0.0223823
173741	-56	1909	38	0.0199057	413141	-3744	3909	88	0.0225122
175631	-3232	1924	39	0.0202703	416501	-4272	3934	89	0.0226233
188861	-2472	2061	40	0.0194081	418601	-12812	3949	90	0.0227906
197891	-1392	2139	41	0.0191678	424271	-20448	3996	91	0.0227728
202931	-3672	2179	42	0.0192749	427421	-1352	4026	92	0.0228515
203771	-720	2190	43	0.0196347	438131	-4576	4114	93	0.0226057
205031	-1136	2204	44	0.0199637	440441	-20088	4120	94	0.0228155
205661	-3288	2208	45	0.0203804	448631	-13536	4184	95	0.0227055
206081	-468	2211	46	0.0208051	454721	-1044	4232	96	0.0226843
219311	-3936	2321	47	0.0202499	464171	-912	4299	97	0.0225634
222041	-1632	2347	48	0.0204516	464381	-2148	4302	98	0.0227801
225611	-5088	2381	49	0.0205796	465011	-9840	4309	99	0.0229752
225941	-432	2385	50	0.0209644	470471	-24336	4341	100	0.0230362

Table 2. The first 100 exceptional p . Here $\delta(p) = \varphi(p-1) - \varphi(p+1)$.




Figure 1. Numerical evidence suggests that $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \pi_e(x)/\pi_2(x)$ exists and is slightly larger than 2%. The horizontal axis denotes the number of exceptional twin prime pairs. The vertical axis represents the ratio π_e/π_2 .

Computations suggest that the value of the limit in Conjecture 1 is approximately 2%; see Figures 1 and 2. A value for the limiting ratio is proposed in Section 5.

It is also worth pointing out that this bias is specific to the twin primes since the set of primes p for which $\varphi(p-1) - \varphi(p+1)$ is positive (respectively, negative) has density 50% as a subset of the primes [3]. That is, if we remove the assumption that $p+2$ is also prime, then the bias completely disappears. Although only tangentially related to the present discussion, it is worth mentioning the exciting preprint [6] which concerns a peculiar and unexpected bias in the primes.

2. THE BATEMAN–HORN CONJECTURE

The proof of Theorem 1 is deferred until Section 4. We first require a few words about the Bateman–Horn conjecture. Let f_1, f_2, \dots, f_m be a collection of distinct irreducible polynomials with positive leading coefficients. An integer n is *prime generating* for this collection if each $f_1(n), f_2(n), \dots, f_m(n)$ is prime. Let $P(x)$ denote the number of prime-generating integers at most x and suppose that $f = f_1 f_2 \cdots f_m$ does not vanish identically modulo any prime. The *Bateman–Horn conjecture* is

$$P(x) \sim \frac{C}{D} \int_2^x \frac{dt}{(\log t)^m},$$

in which

$$D = \prod_{i=1}^m \deg f_i \quad \text{and} \quad C = \prod_p \frac{1 - N_f(p)/p}{(1 - 1/p)^m},$$

where $N_f(p)$ is the number of solutions to $f(n) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ [1].

If $f_1(t) = t$ and $f_2(t) = t + 2$, then $f(t) = t(t + 2)$, $N_f(2) = 1$, and $N_f(p) = 2$ for $p \geq 3$. In this case, Bateman–Horn predicts (1.1), the first Hardy–Littlewood conjecture, which in turn implies the Twin Prime Conjecture.

Although weaker than the Bateman–Horn conjecture, the Brun sieve [8, Thm. 3, Sect. I.4.2] has the undeniable advantage of being proven. It says that there exists




Figure 2. Plots in the xy -plane of ordered pairs $(p, \varphi(p-1))$ (in red) and $(p+2, \varphi(p+1))$ (in cyan) for twin primes $p, p+2$. There are no exceptional pairs visible in Figure 2a; that is, $\varphi(p-1) \geq \varphi(p+1)$ in each case. The exceptional pairs 2381, 2383 and 3851, 3853 are visible in Figure 2b. A smattering of exceptional pairs emerge as more twin primes are considered.

a constant B that depends only on m and D such that

$$P(x) \leq \frac{BC}{D} \int_2^x \frac{dt}{(\log t)^m} = (1 + o(1)) \frac{BC}{D} \frac{x}{(\log x)^m}$$

for sufficiently large x . In particular,

$$\pi_2(x) \leq \frac{Kx}{(\log x)^2}$$

for some constant K and sufficiently large x . The best known K in the estimate above is $K = 4.5$ [9].

3. AN HEURISTIC ARGUMENT

We give an heuristic argument which suggests that $\varphi(p-1) \geq \varphi(p+1)$ for an overwhelming proportion of twin primes $p, p+2$. It also identifies specific conditions under which $\varphi(p-1) < \varphi(p+1)$ might occur. This informal reasoning can be made rigorous under the assumption of the Bateman–Horn conjecture (see Section 4).

Observe that each pair of twin primes, aside from 3, 5, is of the form $6n-1, 6n+1$. Thus, if $p, p+2$ are twin primes with $p \geq 3$, then $2|(p-1)$ and $6|(p+1)$. We use this in the following lemma to obtain an equivalent characterization of (un)exceptionality.

Lemma 2. *If p and $p+2$ are prime and $p \geq 5$, then*

$$\varphi(p-1) \geq \varphi(p+1) \iff \frac{\varphi(p-1)}{p-1} \geq \frac{\varphi(p+1)}{p+1}. \quad (3.1)$$

Proof. The forward implication is straightforward arithmetic, so we focus on the reverse. If the inequality on the right-hand side of (3.1) holds, then

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq p(\varphi(p-1) - \varphi(p+1)) + \varphi(p-1) + \varphi(p+1) \\ &\leq p(\varphi(p-1) - \varphi(p+1)) + \frac{1}{2}(p-1) + \frac{1}{3}(p+1) \\ &< p(\varphi(p-1) - \varphi(p+1)) + \frac{5}{6}p \end{aligned}$$

since $2|(p-1)$ and $6|(p+1)$. For the preceding to hold, the integer $\varphi(p-1) - \varphi(p+1)$ must be nonnegative. \square

In light of (3.1) and the formula (in which q is prime)

$$\frac{\varphi(n)}{n} = \prod_{q|n} \left(1 - \frac{1}{q}\right),$$

it follows that p is exceptional if and only if $p+2$ is prime and

$$\frac{1}{2} \prod_{\substack{q|(p-1) \\ q \geq 5}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{q}\right) < \frac{1}{3} \prod_{\substack{q|(p+1) \\ q \geq 5}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{q}\right) \quad (3.2)$$

because $2|(p-1)$, $3 \nmid (p-1)$ and $6|(p+1)$. The condition (3.2) can occur if $p-1$ is divisible by only small primes. For example, if $5, 7, 11|(p-1)$, then $5, 7, 11 \nmid (p+1)$ and the quantities in (3.2) become

$$\frac{24}{77} \prod_{\substack{q|(p-1) \\ q \geq 13}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{q}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{3} \prod_{\substack{q|(p+1) \\ q \geq 13}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{q}\right).$$

Since

$$\frac{24}{77} \approx 0.3117 < \frac{1}{3} \quad \text{and} \quad 2 \cdot 5 \cdot 7 \cdot 11 = 770,$$

one expects (3.2) to hold occasionally if $p = 770n+1$. Dirichlet's theorem on primes in arithmetic progressions ensures that $p+2 = 770n+3$ is prime $1/\varphi(770) = 1/240 = 0.4167\%$ of the time. Thus, we expect a small proportion of twin prime pairs to satisfy (3.2). For example, among the first 100 exceptional pairs (see Table 2), the following values of p have the form $770n+1$:

3851, 20021, 26951, 47741, 50051, 52361, 70841, 87011, 98561, 117041,
165551, 167861, 197891, 225611, 237161, 241781, 274121, 278741,
301841, 315701, 322631, 345731, 354971, 357281, 361901, 371141,
410411, 424271, 438131, 440441, 470471.

This accounts for 31% of the first 100 exceptional pairs. We now make this heuristic argument rigorous, under the assumption that the Bateman–Horn conjecture holds.

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1

Assume that the Bateman–Horn conjecture holds. We first prove statement (a) of Theorem 1. In what follows, p, q, r denote prime numbers.

Proof of (a). Consider twin primes $p, p+2$ such that $5, 7, 11|(p-1)$. Let $\pi'_2(x)$ be the number of such $p \leq x$.

Step 1. Since $5 \cdot 7 \cdot 11 = 385$, the desired primes are precisely those of the form

$$n = 385k + 1 \leq x \quad \text{such that} \quad n + 2 = 385k + 3 \text{ is prime.}$$

In the Bateman–Horn conjecture, let

$$f_1(t) = 385t + 1, \quad f_2(t) = 385t + 3, \quad \text{and} \quad f = f_1 f_2.$$

Then

$$N_f(p) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } p = 2, \\ 2 & \text{if } p = 3, \\ 0 & \text{if } p = 5, 7, 11, \\ 2 & \text{if } p \geq 13. \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

Since $p \leq x$, we must have $k \leq (x-1)/385$. For sufficiently large x , the Bateman–Horn conjecture predicts that the number of such k is

$$\begin{aligned} \pi'_2(x) &= (1 + o(1)) \frac{(x-1)/385}{(\log((x-1)/385))^2} \prod_{p \geq 2} \left(\frac{1 - N_f(p)/p}{(1-1/p)^2} \right) \\ &= (1 + o(1)) \left(\frac{2x}{385(\log x)^2} \right) \prod_{p \geq 3} \left(\frac{1 - N_f(p)/p}{(1-1/p)^2} \right) \\ &= (1 + o(1)) \left(\frac{2x}{385(\log x)^2} \right) \prod_{p=5,7,11} \left(\frac{1}{(1-1/p)^2} \right) \prod_{\substack{p \geq 13 \\ \text{or } p=3}} \left(\frac{1-2/p}{(1-1/p)^2} \right) \\ &= (1 + o(1)) \left(\frac{2x}{385(\log x)^2} \right) \prod_{p \geq 3} \left(\frac{1-2/p}{(1-1/p)^2} \right) \prod_{p=5,7,11} (1-2/p)^{-1} \\ &= (1 + o(1)) \left(\frac{2x}{385(\log x)^2} \right) \prod_{p \geq 3} \left(\frac{p(p-2)}{(p-1)^2} \right) \frac{5 \cdot 7 \cdot 11}{(5-2)(7-2)(11-2)} \\ &= (1 + o(1)) \frac{2C_2 x}{135(\log x)^2} \\ &= (1 + o(1)) \frac{\pi_2(x)}{135} \\ &> 0.00740740 \pi_2(x). \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

Step 2. Fix a prime $r \geq 13$. Let $\pi'_{2,r}(x)$ be the number of primes $p \leq x$ such that $p, p+2$ are prime, $5, 7, 11 | (p-1)$, and $r | (p+1)$. The desired primes are precisely those of the form

$$n = 385k + 1 \leq x \quad \text{such that} \quad n + 2 = 385k + 3 \text{ is prime and } r | (385k + 2).$$

In particular, k must be of the form

$$k = k_0 + r\ell,$$

in which k_0 is the smallest positive integer with $k_0 \equiv -2(385)^{-1} \pmod{r}$. Let $b_r = 385k_0 + 1$. Then

$$n = 385r\ell + b_r \quad \text{and} \quad n + 2 = 385r\ell + (b_r + 2), \quad (4.3)$$

are both prime, $n \leq x$, and

$$\ell \leq \frac{x - b_r}{385r}.$$

In the Bateman–Horn conjecture, let

$$f_1(t) = 385rt + b_r, \quad f_2(t) = 385rt + (b_r + 2), \quad \text{and} \quad f = f_1 f_2.$$

Then $N_f(p)$ is as in (4.1) except for $p = r$, in which case $N_f(r) = 0$. Indeed,

$$f_1(t) \equiv b_r \equiv 385k_0 + 1 \equiv -1 \pmod{r} \quad \text{and} \quad f_2(t) \equiv b_r + 2 \equiv 1 \pmod{r}$$

for all t . As $x \rightarrow \infty$, the Bateman–Horn conjecture predicts that the number of such ℓ is

$$\begin{aligned} \pi'_{2,r}(x) &= (1 + o(1)) \frac{(x - b_r)/(385r)}{(\log((x - b_r)/(385r)))^2} \prod_{p \geq 2} \left(\frac{1 - N_f(p)/p}{(1 - 1/p)^2} \right) \\ &= (1 + o(1)) \frac{x}{385r(\log x)^2} \prod_{p \geq 2} \left(\frac{1 - N_f(p)/p}{(1 - 1/p)^2} \right) \\ &= (1 + o(1)) \frac{2x}{385r(\log x)^2} \prod_{p \geq 3} \left(\frac{1 - N_f(p)/p}{(1 - 1/p)^2} \right) \\ &= (1 + o(1)) \frac{2x}{385r(\log x)^2} \prod_{p=5,7,11,r} \left(\frac{1}{(1 - 1/p)^2} \right) \prod_{p=5,7,11,r} \left(\frac{1 - 2/p}{(1 - 1/p)^2} \right) \\ &= (1 + o(1)) \left(\frac{2x}{385r(\log x)^2} \right) \prod_{p \geq 3} \left(\frac{p(p-2)}{(p-1)^2} \right) \frac{5 \cdot 7 \cdot 11 \cdot r}{(5-2)(7-2)(11-2)(r-2)} \\ &= (1 + o(1)) \frac{2C_2x}{135(r-2)(\log x)^2} \\ &= (1 + o(1)) \frac{\pi_2(x)}{135(r-2)}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

Step 3. Suppose that p is counted by $\pi'_2(x)$; that is, suppose that $p, p+2$ are prime and that $5, 7, 11 | (p-1)$. Then $6 | (p+1)$, $5, 7, 11 \nmid (p+1)$, and

$$\frac{\varphi(p-1)}{p-1} \leq \prod_{q=2,5,7,11} \left(1 - \frac{1}{q} \right) = \frac{24}{77}.$$

If the pair p is unexceptional, then Lemma 2 ensures that

$$\frac{1}{3} \prod_{\substack{r|(p+1) \\ r \geq 13}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{r} \right) = \frac{\varphi(p+1)}{p+1} \leq \frac{\varphi(p-1)}{p-1} \leq \frac{24}{77}.$$

Consequently,

$$\prod_{\substack{r|(p+1) \\ r \geq 13}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{r-1} \right) \geq \frac{77}{72},$$

in which r is prime. Let

$$F(p) = \sum_{\substack{r|(p+1) \\ r \geq 13}} \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{r-1} \right).$$

Step 4. We want to count the twin primes pairs $p, p+2$ with $p \leq x$, $F(p) \geq \log(77/72)$, and $5, 7, 11 | (p-1)$. To do this, we sum up $F(p)$ over all twin primes p counted by $\pi'_2(x)$ and change the order of summation to get

$$A(x) = \sum_{\substack{p \text{ counted by} \\ \pi'_2(x)}} F(p)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 &= \sum_{r \geq 13} \pi'_{2,r}(x) \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{r-1} \right) \\
 &\leq \sum_{13 \leq r \leq z} \pi'_{2,r}(x) \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{r-1} \right) \\
 &\quad + \sum_{z < r \leq (\log x)^3} \pi'_{2,r}(x) \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{r-1} \right) \\
 &\quad + \sum_{(\log x)^3 < r \leq x} \pi_{2,r'}(x) \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{r-1} \right) \\
 &= A_1(x) + A_2(x) + A_3(x), \tag{4.5}
 \end{aligned}$$

in which z is to be determined later. We bound the three summands separately.

(a) If $13 \leq r \leq z$, then (4.4) asserts that

$$\pi'_{2,r}(x) = (1 + o(1)) \frac{\pi_2(x)}{135(r-2)}$$

uniformly for $r \in [13, z]$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$. For sufficiently large x we have¹

$$\begin{aligned}
 A_1(x) &\leq (1 + o(1)) \frac{\pi_2(x)}{135} \left(\sum_{13 \leq r \leq z} \frac{1}{(r-2)} \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{r-1} \right) \right) \\
 &\leq (1 + o(1)) \frac{\pi_2(x)}{135} \left(\sum_{r \geq 13} \frac{1}{(r-2)} \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{r-1} \right) \right) \\
 &\leq (1 + o(1)) \frac{0.0241504}{135} \pi_2(x) \\
 &< 0.000178892 \pi_2(x).
 \end{aligned}$$

(b) If $z < r \leq (\log x)^3$, we use the Brun sieve and manipulations similar to those used to obtain (4.4) to find an absolute constant K such that

$$\pi'_{2,r}(x) \leq \frac{K(x/(135r))}{(\log(x/(135r)))^2}$$

for sufficiently large x . Since $r \leq (\log x)^3$,

$$\log(x/(135r)) \geq \log(x^{1/2}) \geq (\log x)/2$$

holds if $x \geq 10^{14}$. Then (1.1) ensures that

$$\pi'_{2,r}(x) \leq \frac{4Kx}{135r(\log x)^2} \leq \frac{5K\pi_2(x)}{135(r-2)}$$

for sufficiently large x . Now we fix z such that $5K/(135(z-2)) < 10^{-9}$. Since $\log(1+t) < t$ for $t > 0$, for sufficiently large x we obtain

$$A_2(x) = \sum_{z < r \leq (\log x)^3} \pi'_{2,r}(x) \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{r-1} \right)$$

¹Since $\log(1+t) \leq t$ for $t > 0$, the terms of the series are $O(1/r^2)$ and hence it converges rapidly enough for reliable numerical evaluation. `Mathematica` provides the value 0.0241503330316.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{5K\pi_2(x)}{135} \sum_{r>z} \frac{1}{r-2} \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{r-1} \right) \\
&< \frac{5K\pi_2(x)}{135} \sum_{r>z} \frac{1}{(r-2)(r-1)} \\
&= \frac{5K\pi_2(x)}{135} \sum_{r>z} \left(\frac{1}{r-2} - \frac{1}{r-1} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{5K\pi_2(x)}{135(z-2)} \\
&< 10^{-9} \pi_2(x).
\end{aligned}$$

(c) Suppose that $(\log x)^3 < r \leq x$. By (4.3), the primes counted by $\pi'_{2,r}(x)$ lie in an arithmetic progression modulo $385r$. Thus, their number is at most

$$\pi_{2,r}(x) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{x}{385r} \right\rfloor + 1 \leq \frac{x}{385r} + 1.$$

Since $\log(1+t) < t$, for sufficiently large x we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
A_3(x) &= \sum_{(\log x)^3 < r \leq x} \pi_{2,r'}(x) \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{r-1} \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{(\log x)^3 < r \leq x} \frac{1}{(r-1)} \left(\frac{x}{385r} + 1 \right) \\
&\leq \frac{x}{385} \sum_{r > (\log x)^3} \frac{1}{r(r-1)} + \sum_{(\log x)^3 < r \leq x} \frac{1}{r-1} \\
&\leq \frac{x}{385} \sum_{r > (\log x)^3} \left(\frac{1}{r-1} - \frac{1}{r} \right) + \int_{(\log x)^3-2}^x \frac{dt}{t} \\
&\leq \frac{x}{385((\log x)^3 - 1)} + \left(\log t \Big|_{t=(\log x)^3-2}^{t=x} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{2x}{385(\log x)^3} + \log x \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{385C_2 \log x} + \frac{(\log x)^3}{2C_2 x} \right) \frac{2C_2 x}{(\log x)^2} \\
&= (1 + o(1)) \left(\frac{1}{385C_2 \log x} + \frac{(\log x)^3}{2C_2 x} \right) \pi_2(x) \\
&< 10^{-9} \pi_2(x).
\end{aligned}$$

Step 5. Returning to (4.5) and using the preceding three estimates, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
A(x) &= A_1(x) + A_2(x) + A_3(x) \\
&< 0.000178892 \pi_2(x) + 10^{-9} \pi_2(x) + 10^{-9} \pi_2(x) \\
&< 0.000179 \pi_2(x).
\end{aligned}$$

for sufficiently large x .

Step 6. Let $\mathcal{U}(x)$ be the set of primes p counted by $\pi'_2(x)$ that are unexceptional; that is, $\varphi(p-1)/(p-1) \geq \varphi(p+1)/(p+1)$ by Lemma 2. As we have seen, if

$p \in \mathcal{U}(x)$, then $F(p) \geq \log(77/72)$. Thus,

$$0 \leq \#\mathcal{U}(x) \log(77/72) \leq \sum_{p \in \mathcal{U}(x)} F(p) \leq A(x) \leq 0.000179 \pi_2(x),$$

from which we deduce that

$$\#\mathcal{U}(x) \leq \left(\frac{0.000179}{\log(77/72)} \right) \pi_2(x) < 0.002667 \pi_2(x).$$

The primes p counted by $\pi'_2(x)$ which are not in $\mathcal{U}(x)$ are exceptional; that is $\varphi(p-1)/(p-1) < \varphi(p+1)/(p+1)$. By (4.2) and the preceding calculation, for large x there are at least

$$\begin{aligned} \pi'_2(x) - \#\mathcal{U}(x) &> (0.00740740 - 0.002667) \pi_2(x) \\ &> 0.0047 \pi_2(x) \end{aligned}$$

such primes. This completes the proof of statement (a) from Theorem 1.

Proof of (b). This is similar to the preceding, although it is much simpler. As before, p, q, r denote primes. If $p, p+2$ are prime and p is exceptional, then

$$\frac{1}{2} \prod_{\substack{r|(p-1) \\ r \geq 5}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{r}\right) = \frac{\varphi(p-1)}{p-1} \leq \frac{\varphi(p+1)}{p+1} \leq \frac{1}{3}$$

since $3 \nmid (p-1)$ and $6|(p+1)$. If we let

$$G(p) = \sum_{\substack{r|(p-1) \\ r \geq 5}} \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{r-1}\right),$$

then $G(p) \geq \log(3/2)$ holds for all exceptional primes p . Let $\pi_e(x)$ denote the number of exceptional primes $p \leq x$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_e(x) \log(3/2) &\leq \sum_{\substack{p \text{ counted} \\ \text{by } \pi_2(x)}} G(p) \\ &= \sum_{\substack{p \text{ counted} \\ \text{by } \pi_2(x)}} \sum_{\substack{r \geq 5 \\ r|(p-1)}} \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{r-1}\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{5 \leq r \leq x} \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{r-1}\right) \sum_{\substack{p \text{ counted by } \pi_2(x) \\ p \equiv 1 \pmod{r}}} 1 \\ &\leq (1 + o(1)) \pi_2(x) \sum_{r \geq 5} \frac{1}{(r-2)} \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{r-1}\right) \\ &< 0.14137 \pi_2(x), \end{aligned}$$

which shows that there are at least

$$\pi_2(x) - \pi_e(x) \geq \pi_2(x) \left(1 - \frac{0.14137}{\log(3/2)}\right) > 0.6513 \pi_2(x)$$

unexceptional primes at most x . □

5. CONJECTURED DENSITY

Below we conjecture a value for the density of the exceptional primes relative to the twin primes. In what follows, we let $P(n)$ denote the largest prime factor of n and let $p(n)$ denote the smallest. We let μ denote the Möbius function and remind the reader that $\mu^2(n) = 1$ if and only if $n = 1$ or n is the product of distinct primes.

Conjecture 2. *The density of the exceptional twin primes is*

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\pi_e(x)}{\pi_2(x)} = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \prod_{5 \leq q \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}} \left(\frac{q-4}{q-2} \right) \left(\sum_{\substack{a,b \\ \mu^2(ab)=1 \\ 5 \leq p(ab) \leq P(ab) \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \\ \frac{\varphi(a)}{2a} \leq \frac{\varphi(b)}{3b}}} \prod_{p|ab} \left(\frac{1}{p-4} \right) \right). \quad (5.1)$$

A few remarks about the imposing expression (5.1) are in order. First of all, for each fixed $\varepsilon > 0$, the sum involves only finitely many pairs a, b . Indeed, the condition $\mu^2(ab) = 1$ ensures that ab is a product of distinct prime factors. The restriction $5 \leq p(ab) \leq P(ab) \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$ implies that only finitely many prime factors are available to form a and b . In principle, the right-hand side of (5.1) can be evaluated to arbitrary accuracy by taking ε sufficiently small. Unfortunately, the number of terms involved in the sum grows rapidly as ε shrinks and we are unable to obtain a reliable numerical estimate from (5.1).

As a brief “sanity check,” we also remark that the limit in (5.1), if it exists, is at most 1. Without the condition

$$\frac{\varphi(a)}{2a} \leq \frac{\varphi(b)}{3b},$$

the inner sum in (5.1) is

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{a,b \\ \mu^2(ab)=1 \\ 5 \leq p(ab) \leq P(ab) \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}}} \prod_{p|ab} \left(\frac{1}{p-4} \right) &= \sum_{\substack{n \\ \mu^2(n)=1 \\ 5 \leq p(n) \leq P(n) \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}}} 2^{\omega(n)} \prod_{p|n} \left(\frac{1}{p-4} \right) \\ &= \prod_{5 \leq p \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}} \left(1 + \frac{2}{p-4} \right) \\ &= \prod_{5 \leq p \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}} \left(\frac{p-2}{p-4} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which precisely offsets the first product in (5.1).

To proceed, we need to generalize the functions F and G that appeared in the proof of Theorem 1. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and define

$$F_\varepsilon(p) = \sum_{\substack{r|(p+1) \\ r \geq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}}} \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{r-1} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad G_\varepsilon(p) = \sum_{\substack{r|(p-1) \\ r \geq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}}} \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{r-1} \right).$$

Particular instances of these functions have appeared in the proof of Theorem 1 with $\varepsilon = 1/5$ for F_ε (called F) and $\varepsilon = 1/13$ for G_ε (called G), respectively.

Lemma 3. *For $\varepsilon > 0$, the number of twin primes $p \leq x$ such that $F_\varepsilon(p) > \varepsilon$ is $O((\log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}))^{-1} \pi_2(x))$. The same conclusion holds with F_ε replaced by G_ε .*

Proof. The argument is essentially already in the proof of Theorem 1. We do it only for $F_\varepsilon(p)$ since the argument for $G_\varepsilon(p)$ is similar. We sum $F_\varepsilon(p)$ for $p \leq x$ with $p, p+2$ prime and use the fact that $\log(1+t) \leq t$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p, p+2 \text{ prime}}} F_\varepsilon(p) &\leq \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p, p+2 \text{ prime}}} \sum_{\substack{q|(p-1) \\ q > \frac{1}{\varepsilon}}} \frac{1}{q-1} \\ &= \sum_{q > \frac{1}{\varepsilon}} \frac{1}{q-1} \sum_{\substack{p, p+2 \text{ prime} \\ p \equiv 1 \pmod{q}}} 1 \\ &= \sum_{q > \frac{1}{\varepsilon}} \frac{\pi_2(x, q, 1)}{q-1}, \end{aligned}$$

in which $\pi_2(x; q, 1)$ denotes the number of primes $p \leq x$ with $p, p+2$ prime and $p \equiv 1 \pmod{q}$. By the usual argument, the number of twin primes $p, p+2$ with $p \leq x$ and $p \equiv 1 \pmod{q}$ equals the number of $t \leq x/q$ such that $qt+1$ and $qt+3$ are prime. The number of them is, by the Brun sieve,

$$\pi_2(x; q, 1) \ll \frac{x}{(q-1)(\log x)^2}.$$

The Prime Number Theorem and Abel summation reveal that

$$\sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p, p+2 \text{ prime}}} F_\varepsilon(p) \ll \frac{x}{(\log x)^2} \sum_{q > \frac{1}{\varepsilon}} \frac{1}{(q-1)^2} \ll \frac{\varepsilon \pi_2(x)}{\log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon})}.$$

If we let

$$\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon = \{p : p, p+2 \text{ prime and } F_\varepsilon(p) > \varepsilon\},$$

then

$$\#\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon(x) \varepsilon \leq \sum_{\substack{p \leq x \\ p, p+2 \text{ prime}}} F_\varepsilon(p) \ll \varepsilon \left(\log \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right) \right)^{-1} \pi_2(x),$$

which gives $\#\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon(x) = O((\log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}))^{-1} \pi_2(x))$. \square

To justify our conjecture, we look at the $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}$ -part of $p^2 - 1$. We first let $\varepsilon \leq 0.5$. We note that $2|(p-1)$, $2|(p+1)$ and $3|(p+1)$ for all twin primes $p \geq 5$. For two coprime square-free numbers a, b with $5 \leq p(ab) \leq P(ab) \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$, we say that the twin prime p is of $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}$ -type (a, b) if

$$p-1 = 2^\alpha \prod_{q|a} q^{\alpha_q} \prod_{q > \frac{1}{\varepsilon}} q^{\gamma_q} \quad \text{and} \quad p+1 = 2^\beta 3^\gamma \prod_{q|b} q^{\beta_q} \prod_{q > \frac{1}{\varepsilon}} q^{\delta_q}$$

for some positive $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \alpha_q$ and β_q for $q | ab$ and nonnegative γ_q, δ_q for $q \geq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$. That is, the prime factors of $p-1$ that are $\leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$ are exactly the ones dividing $2a$ and the prime factors of $p+1$ that are $\leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$ are exactly the ones dividing $6b$.

Given ε and (a, b) , let

$$c_{a,b} = \prod_{\substack{5 \leq q \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \\ q \nmid ab}} q.$$

Note that

$$\frac{\varphi(p-1)}{p-1} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\varphi(a)}{a} \prod_{\substack{q|(p-1) \\ q > \frac{1}{\varepsilon}}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{q}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\varphi(p+1)}{p+1} = \frac{1}{3} \frac{\varphi(b)}{b} \prod_{\substack{q|(p+1) \\ q > \frac{1}{\varepsilon}}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{q}\right).$$

Since

$$e^{-2y} < 1 - y < e^{-y} \quad \text{for } y < \frac{1}{2},$$

it follows that

$$1 - 4\varepsilon < e^{-2\varepsilon} < e^{-F_\varepsilon(p)} = \prod_{\substack{q|(p-1) \\ q > \frac{1}{\varepsilon}}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{q}\right)$$

hold for all twin primes $p \leq x$ except the ones in $\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon(x)$, a set of cardinality $O((\log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}))^{-1}\pi_2(x))$. Consequently,

$$(1 - 4\varepsilon) \frac{\varphi(a)}{2a} \leq \frac{\varphi(p-1)}{p-1}$$

holds for all but $O((\log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}))^{-1}\pi_2(x))$ twin primes $p \leq x$. Thus, the inequality

$$\frac{\varphi(p-1)}{p-1} \leq \frac{\varphi(p+1)}{p+1}$$

implies that

$$\frac{\varphi(a)}{2a} \leq (1 - 4\varepsilon)^{-1} \frac{\varphi(b)}{3b}.$$

Let us consider twin primes for which

$$\frac{\varphi(b)}{3b} < \frac{\varphi(a)}{2a} < (1 - 4\varepsilon)^{-1} \frac{\varphi(b)}{3b} \tag{5.2}$$

occurs. Since

$$\frac{\varphi(a)}{2a} = \frac{\varphi(p-1)}{p-1} (1 + O(\varepsilon)) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\varphi(b)}{3b} = \frac{\varphi(p+1)}{p+1} (1 + O(\varepsilon))$$

for all $p \leq x$ with $O((\log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}))^{-1}\pi_2(x))$ exceptions, it follows that twin primes $p \leq x$ for which (5.2) holds have the additional property that

$$\left| \frac{\varphi(p-1)}{p-1} - \frac{\varphi(p+1)}{p+1} \right| = O(\varepsilon). \tag{5.3}$$

Let \mathcal{B}_ε be the set of twin primes for which (5.3) holds. We make the following additional assumption.

Additional assumption: *The number of twin primes $p \leq x$ for which (5.3) holds is $O(h(\varepsilon)\pi_2(x))$ for some function $h(y)$ with $h(y) \rightarrow 0$ as $y \rightarrow 0$.*

The assumption (5.3) has been shown to hold when p is only a prime [3]. That is, the number of primes $p \leq x$ such that (5.3) holds is at most $O(h(\varepsilon)\pi(x))$, where $h(\varepsilon)$ tends to zero when $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. In fact, this was a crucial step in showing that $\varphi(p-1) - \varphi(p+1)$ has no bias if only p is assumed to be prime.

Proving this for primes uses the Turan–Kubilius theorem about the number of prime factors $q \leq y$ of $p \pm 1$ when p is prime as the parameter y tends to infinity and also Sperner’s theorem from combinatorics. With some nontrivial effort, which involves proving first a Turan–Kubilius estimate for the number of distinct primes $q \leq 1/\varepsilon$ of $p-1$ and $p+1$ when p ranges over twin primes up to x , the same

program can be applied to prove that the additional assumption holds under the Bateman–Horn conjectures. We do not give further details here.

Assume that the additional assumption holds. Then the set of twin primes $p \leq x$ such that

$$\frac{\varphi(p-1)}{p-1} < \frac{\varphi(p+1)}{p+1}$$

is within a set of cardinality $O(h(\varepsilon)\pi_2(x))$ from the set of primes for which

$$\frac{\varphi(a)}{2a} < \frac{\varphi(b)}{3b}. \quad (5.4)$$

With this assumption, we proceed as in [3, Sect. 2.11]. Fix $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}$, a , b , and $c = c_{a,b}$. We also fix a residue class for p modulo c which is not $\{0, \pm 1, -2\}$. In this case we need to count natural numbers of the form

$$abct + \kappa,$$

in which κ is fixed such that

- $abct + \kappa \leq x$,
- $abct + \kappa$ and $abct + \kappa + 2$ are prime,
- $abct + \kappa - 1$ are divisible by all primes in a and coprime to cb ,
- $abct + \kappa + 1$ is divisible by all primes in b (and coprime to ca).

Observe that κ is uniquely determined modulo abc once it is determined modulo c . By the Bateman–Horn conjecture, this number is

$$(1 + o(1))\pi_2(x) \prod_{p|abc} \frac{1}{(p-2)}.$$

We next sum this over all $q-4$ progressions modulo q for which $abct + \kappa$ is not congruent modulo q to some member of $\{0, \pm 1, -2\}$ and for all $q \mid c$ getting an amount of

$$(1 + o(1))\pi_2(x) \prod_{p|ab} \left(\frac{1}{p-2}\right) \prod_{p|c} \left(\frac{q-4}{q-2}\right) = (1 + o(1)) \prod_{5 \leq q \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}} \left(\frac{q-4}{q-2}\right) \prod_{q|ab} \left(\frac{1}{q-4}\right).$$

We now sum up over all pairs a, b with

$$\frac{\varphi(a)}{2a} < \frac{\varphi(b)}{3b},$$

which yields a proportion of

$$(1 + o(1)) \prod_{5 \leq q \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon}} \left(\frac{q-4}{q-2}\right) \sum_{\substack{a, b \\ 5 \leq p(ab) \leq P(ab) \leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \\ \frac{\varphi(a)}{2a} < \frac{\varphi(b)}{3b}}} \mu^2(ab) \prod_{p|ab} \left(\frac{1}{p-4}\right)$$

of $\pi_2(x)$ with a number of exceptions $p \leq x$ of counting function $O(h(\varepsilon)\pi_2(x))$. This supports Conjecture 2.

6. COMMENTS

We did not need the full strength of the Bateman–Horn conjecture, just the case $r = 2$ and $D = 1$ for certain specific pairs of linear polynomials $f_1(t)$ and $f_2(t)$. Under this conjecture, we have seen that $\varphi(p-1) \leq \varphi(p+1)$ for a substantial majority of twin prime pairs $p, p+2$.

There are a few twin primes $p, p+2$ for which

$$\varphi(p-1) = \varphi(p+1). \quad (6.1)$$

For only such $p \leq 100,000,000$ are

$$\begin{aligned} &5, \quad 11, \quad 71, \quad 2591, \quad 208,391, \quad 16,692,551, \quad 48,502,931, \quad 92,012,201, \\ &249,206,231, \quad 419,445,251, \quad 496,978,301. \end{aligned}$$

The following result highlights the rarity of these twin primes.

Theorem 4. *The number of primes $p \leq x$ with $p+2$ prime and $\varphi(p-1) = \varphi(p+1)$ is $O(x/\exp((\log x)^{1/3}))$.*

Proof. Suppose that j and $j+k$ have the same prime factors, let $g = (j, j+k)$, and suppose that

$$\frac{j}{g}r+1 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{j+k}{g}r+1 \quad (6.2)$$

are primes that do not divide j . Then

$$n = j \left(\frac{j+k}{g}r+1 \right) \quad (6.3)$$

satisfies $\varphi(n) = \varphi(n+k)$ [4, Thm. 1]. For k fixed, the number of solutions $n \leq x$ to $\varphi(n) = \varphi(n+k)$ which are not of the form (6.3) is less than $x/\exp((\log x)^{1/3})$ for sufficiently large x [4, Thm. 2].

We are interested in the case $k = 2$ and $n = p-1$, in which $p, p+2$ are prime. If j and $j+2$ have the same prime factors, then they are both powers of 2. Thus, $j = 2$ and $j+k = 4$, so $g = 2$. From (6.2) we see that r is such that

$$r+1 \quad \text{and} \quad 2r+1$$

are prime. Then $n = 2(2r+1) = p-1$, from which it follows that $p = 4r+3$ and $p+2 = 4r+5$ are prime. Consequently,

$$r+1, \quad 2r+1, \quad 4r+3, \quad \text{and} \quad 4r+5,$$

are prime. However, this occurs only for $r = 2$ since otherwise one of the preceding is a multiple of 3 that is larger than 3. \square

In particular, the number of primes $p \leq x$ for which $p+2$ is prime and $\varphi(p-1) = \varphi(p+1)$ is $o(x/(\log x)^2)$. Assuming the first Hardy–Littlewood conjecture, it follows that the set of such primes has density zero in the twin primes.

Acknowledgments. We thank Tomás Silva for independently computing the ratio $\pi_e(x)/\pi_2(x)$ for large x . We also thank the anonymous referee for suggesting the approach of Section 5.

REFERENCES

- [1] Paul T. Bateman and Roger A. Horn. A heuristic asymptotic formula concerning the distribution of prime numbers. *Math. Comp.*, 16:363–367, 1962.
- [2] Wouter Castryck, Étienne Fouvry, Gergely Harcos, Emmanuel Kowalski, Philippe Michel, Paul Nelson, Eytan Paldi, János Pintz, Andrew V. Sutherland, Terence Tao, and Xiao-Feng Xie. New equidistribution estimates of Zhang type. *Algebra Number Theory*, 8(9):2067–2199, 2014.
- [3] S.R. Garcia and F. Luca. On the difference in values of the euler totient function near prime arguments. *Irregularities in the Distribution of Prime Numbers – Research Inspired by Maier’s Matrix Method*. arXiv link!
- [4] S. W. Graham, Jeffrey J. Holt, and Carl Pomerance. On the solutions to $\varphi(n) = \varphi(n+k)$. In *Number theory in progress, Vol. 2 (Zakopane-Kościelisko, 1997)*, pages 867–882. de Gruyter, Berlin, 1999.
- [5] G. H. Hardy and J. E. Littlewood. Some problems of ‘Partitio numerorum’; III: On the expression of a number as a sum of primes. *Acta Math.*, 114(3):215–273, 2004.
- [6] R. Lemke Oliver and K Soundararajan. Unexpected biases in the distribution of consecutive primes. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1603.03720>.
- [7] James Maynard. Small gaps between primes. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 181(1):383–413, 2015.
- [8] Gérald Tenenbaum. *Introduction to analytic and probabilistic number theory*, volume 163 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, third edition, 2015. Translated from the 2008 French edition by Patrick D. F. Ion.
- [9] Jie Wu. Chen’s double sieve, Goldbach’s conjecture and the twin prime problem. *Acta Arith.*, 114(3):215–273, 2004.
- [10] Yitang Zhang. Bounded gaps between primes. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 179(3):1121–1174, 2014.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, POMONA COLLEGE, 610 N. COLLEGE AVE., CLAREMONT, CA 91711

E-mail address: stephan.garcia@pomona.edu

URL: <http://pages.pomona.edu/~sg064747>

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF THE WITWATERSRAND, PRIVATE BAG 3, WITS 2050, JOHANNESBURG, SOUTH AFRICA, MAX PLANCK INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICS, VIVATGASSE 7, 53111 BONN, GERMANY, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF OSTRAVA, 30 DUBNA 22, 701 03 OSTRAVA 1, CZECH REPUBLIC

E-mail address: Florian.Luca@wits.ac.za