arXiv:2510.17065v1 [math.GM] 20 Oct 2025

# On the Maximal Gap between Primes

Wang, Cheng-Ting

**Abstract**

In this paper, we show some results about the gap between a prime number and its consecutive prime number for large enough prime numbers. We show that the gap between a prime number $p_n$ and its consecutive prime number is not larger than $2\log^2 p_n$. We also show that the result implies the existence of a prime number in a certain type of interval for large enough numbers as a consequence.

**Keywords:** Prime gaps.

**2020 Mathematics Subject Classification:** 11A41, 11N05

## 1 Introduction

The distribution of prime numbers is a major area of interest in number theory; several conjectures have been proposed for this topic. It has been conjectured by Bertrand(1845) [3] and proved by Chebyshev(1852) [4] that given a positive integer $x$, there is at least one prime number between $x$ and $2x$. The proof for Bertrand's postulate was later simplified by Erdős in 1932. [9]

The result has been improved since then; for example, Ingham(1937) showed that for all sufficiently large $x$, there is at least one prime number between $x^3$ and $(x+1)^3$ [12] and Dudek(2016) showed that Ingham's result holds for all $x \geq e^{e^{33.3}}$ [7], Dudek(2014) also showed that assuming the Riemann Hypothesis, then for all $x \geq 2$, there exists a prime number $p$ such that $x - \frac{4}{\pi}\sqrt{x}\log x < p \leq x$ [6]; besides, Dusart(1998) in his doctoral thesis has shown that for all positive integers $x \geq 3275$, there is a prime $p$ such that $x \leq p < x(1 + \frac{1}{2\log^2 x})$. [8]; furthermore, Baker, Harman and Pintz(2001) have shown that for all sufficiently large $x$, there is at least one prime number between $x - x^{0.525}$ and $x$ [2], and to the author's knowledge, the results of Baker et. al is the best unconditional result in prime gaps so far.

Many conjectures have been made on the upper bounds for prime gaps. For example it has been conjectured by Legendre that given a positive integer $x$, there is at least one prime number between $x^2$ and $(x+1)^2$ [14], Oppermann(1877) made a slightly stronger conjecture that given a positive integer $x$, there is at least one prime number between $x(x-1)$ and $x^2$, and a prime between $x^2$ and $x(x+1)$. [15] Besides, Brocard conjectured that if $p_n$ is the

$n$th prime with $n \geq 2$, than there are at least four primes between $p_n^2$ and $p_{n+1}^2$ [13]; similarly, Andrica(1986) conjectured that if $p_n$ is the $n$th prime, then $\sqrt{p_{n+1}} - \sqrt{p_n} < 1$ [1].

There are even stronger conjectures. For example, Cramér(1936) conjectured that given a prime $p_n$, then $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{p_{n+1}-p_n}{\log^2 p_n} = 1$( [5]); on the other hand, Firoozbakht(1982) conjectured that if $p_n$ is the $n$th prime, then $p_{n+1}^n < p_n^{n+1}$ [17], both of which imply a prime gap stronger than the previous ones. Cramér also proved a much weaker result that if the Riemann hypothesis is true, then the gap between a prime $p$ and the consecutive prime is $O(\sqrt{p}\log p)$. [5] While supported by computational data, Cramér's conjecture that $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{p_{n+1}-p_n}{\log^2 p_n} = 1$ has been challenged in 1995 by Granville( [11]), who pointed out that Cramér's conjecture is inconsistent with Maier's theorem and suggested instead that $\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{p_{n+1}-p_n}{\log^2 p_n} = c$ for some $c \geq \frac{2}{e^\gamma}$, where $\gamma = 0.5772\ldots$ is the Euler-Mascheroni constant.

In this paper, we show that the gap $g_n$ between a prime number $p_n$ and a consecutive prime $p_{n+1}$ is not larger than $2\log^2 p_n$, and we also show the implications of the gap on the existence of a prime number in certain types of intervals. Unless otherwise specified, $p_n$ indicates the nth prime number, $g_n = p_{n+1} - p_n$ indicates the prime gap between the nth prime and its consecutive prime, $\log y$ indicates the natural logarithm of $y$, $\log^c y$ indicates $(\log y)^c$, and $A_k = \frac{1}{k}\sum_{i=1}^{k} g_i = \frac{p_{k+1}-2}{k}$ indicates the arithmetic mean of the prime gap of the first $k$ primes.

## 2 Main Result

**Theorem 2.1.** *For all positive integer* $2 \leq m \leq n$, $\sum_{k=m}^{n} \frac{g_k}{k-1} = A_n - A_{m-1} + \sum_{k=m}^{n} \frac{A_k}{k-1}$ *and* $\frac{g_n}{n} = \sum_{k=m}^{n} \frac{g_k - A_k}{k-1} - \frac{p_n}{n} + A_{m-1} + \frac{2}{n}$

*Proof.* First, for all positive integers $2 \leq k$ and the definition of $A_k$, we have

$$g_k = kA_k - (k-1)A_{k-1} \tag{1}$$

Therefore, for all $2 \leq k$, we have

$$A_{k-1} = \frac{kA_k - g_k}{k-1} \tag{2}$$

By summing up all $A_k$ from $2 \leq m$ to $n$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k=m}^{n} A_{k-1} = \sum_{k=m}^{n} \frac{kA_k - g_k}{k-1} \\ &\implies A_m = \frac{nA_n - g_n}{n-1} + \sum_{k=m}^{n-1} \frac{A_k - g_k}{k-1} = A_n + \sum_{k=m}^{n} \frac{A_k - g_k}{k-1} \qquad (3) \\ &\implies \sum_{k=m}^{n} \frac{g_k}{k-1} = A_n - A_{m-1} + \sum_{k=m}^{n} \frac{A_k}{k-1} \end{aligned}$$

Since $A_n = \frac{p_{n+1}-2}{n} = \frac{p_n+g_n-2}{n}$, we have

$$\frac{g_n}{n} = \sum_{k=m}^{n} \frac{g_k - A_k}{k-1} - \frac{p_n}{n} + A_{m-1} + \frac{2}{n} \tag{4}$$

□

**Theorem 2.2.** *For all positive integer* $463 \leq n$, *we have* $\frac{g_n}{n} < \sum_{k=6}^{n} \frac{g_k}{k(k-1)}$

*Proof.* Assume that $\sum_{k=6}^{n} \frac{g_k}{k(k-1)} \leq \frac{g_n}{n}$ for some $463 \leq n$, then by Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\sum_{k=6}^{n} \frac{g_k}{k(k-1)} \leq \sum_{k=6}^{n} \frac{g_k - A_k}{k-1} - \frac{p_n}{n} + A_5 + \frac{2}{n}. \tag{5}$$

For any positive integer $2 \leq m$ and $m \leq n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=m}^{n} \frac{g_k}{k} &= \frac{p_{m+1}-p_m}{m} + \frac{p_{m+2}-p_{m+1}}{m+1} + \cdots + \frac{p_{n+1}-p_n}{n} \\ &= -\frac{p_m}{m} + (\frac{1}{m} - \frac{1}{m+1})p_{m+1} + \cdots + (\frac{1}{n-1} - \frac{1}{n})p_n + \frac{p_{n+1}}{n} \\ &= \frac{p_{n+1}}{n} - \frac{p_m}{m} + (\sum_{k=m+1}^{n} \frac{p_k}{k(k-1)}). \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Therefore, (5) implies that

$$\frac{p_n}{n} + \sum_{k=6}^{n} \frac{p_{k+1}-2}{k(k-1)} - A_5 - \frac{2}{n} \leq \sum_{k=6}^{n} \frac{g_k}{k} = \frac{p_{n+1}}{n} - \frac{p_6}{6} + \sum_{k=7}^{n} \frac{p_k}{k(k-1)}, \tag{7}$$

and by moving terms, we get

$$\frac{p_6}{6} - A_5 + \frac{p_7-2}{6(6-1)} + \sum_{k=7}^{n} \frac{g_k - 2}{k(k-1)} - \frac{2}{n} \leq \frac{g_n}{n} \tag{8}$$

On the other hand, since $g_k \leq \frac{p_k}{2\log^2 p_k} < \frac{k\log p_k}{2\log^2 p_k} = \frac{k}{2\log p_k} \leq \frac{k}{2\log 3299}$ and $2 \leq g_k$ for all $463 \leq k($ [8]), we have

$$\frac{g_n}{n} < \frac{n}{2n\log 3299} = \frac{1}{2\log 3299} \tag{9}$$

and

$$\frac{p_6}{6} + \frac{p_7-2}{6\times 5} - A_5 - \frac{2}{n} < \frac{p_6}{6} - A_5 + \frac{p_7-2}{6(6-1)} + \sum_{k=7}^{n} \frac{g_k-2}{k(k-1)} - \frac{2}{n}. \tag{10}$$

Therefore, (8) implies that

$$\frac{13}{6} + \frac{1}{2} - \frac{9}{5} - \frac{2}{n} = \frac{p_6}{6} + \frac{p_7-2}{6\times 5} - A_5 - \frac{2}{n} < \frac{1}{2\log 3299} < \frac{62}{1000}, \tag{11}$$

which implies that $n < 3$, contradicting with the condition that $463 \leq n$. Therefore, for all positive integers $463 \leq n$, we have $\frac{g_n}{n} < \sum_{k=6}^{n} \frac{g_k}{k(k-1)}$. □

Before progressing to the main theorem, we shall prove some additional facts that are used in the proof of the main theorem.

**Lemma 2.1.** *For all real numbers* $0 < x$, $0 < 2x + 20 - 15\log x$

*Proof.* Let $f(x) = 2x + 20 - 15\log x$, then we have $f'(x) = 2 - \frac{15}{x}$, which implies that $x = \frac{15}{2}$ is the single stationary point of $f(x)$.

Since $f''(x) = \frac{15}{x^2}$, we have $0 < f''(\frac{15}{2})$, which implies that $f(x)$ has a minimum at $\frac{15}{2}$.

Since $f(\frac{15}{2}) = 2 \times \frac{15}{2} + 20 - 15\log\frac{15}{2} > 35 - 15 \times 2.1 = 3.5 > 0$ and is the minimum value for $f(x)$, we have $f(x) = 2x + 20 - 15\log x$ being positive for all real numbers $0 < x$. □

**Lemma 2.2.** *For all positive integers* $6 \leq k$, $A_k < \frac{3}{2}\log k + \frac{1}{5}$

*Proof.* First, for all $6 \leq k$, we have( [18])

$$A_k = \frac{p_{k+1} - 2}{k} \leq \frac{(k+1)(\log(k+1) + \log\log(k+1)) - 2}{k} \tag{12}$$

Therefore, if $\frac{3}{2}\log k + \frac{1}{5} \leq A_k$ for some $6 \leq k$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} &15k\log k + 2k + 20 \leq 10p_{k+1} \\ &< 10(k+1)(\log(k+1) + \log\log(k+1)) \\ &< 10(k+1)(\frac{3}{2}\log k) = 15(k+1)\log k \\ &\implies 2k + 20 < 15\log k \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

But by Lemma 2.1 this is impossible for any positive integer $k$.

Therefore, for all positive integers $6 \leq k$, $A_k < \frac{3}{2}\log k + \frac{1}{5}$. □

**Lemma 2.3.** *For all positive integers* $6 \leq k$, $A_k < 2\log(k-1) - \frac{1}{2}$

*Proof.* The case for $k = 6$ and $k = 7$ can be checked by direct calculation as follows:

$$A_6 = \frac{p_7 - 2}{6} = \frac{15}{6} = 2.5 < 2.71 < 2\log(6-1) - \frac{1}{2}$$

.

$$A_7 = \frac{p_8 - 2}{7} = \frac{17}{7} < 2.43 < 3.08 < 2\log 7 - 1) - \frac{1}{2}$$

. Therefore we shall give the proof for the case $8 \leq k$.

Assume that $2\log(k-1) - \frac{1}{2} \leq A_k$ for some $8 \leq k$, then since $A_k < \frac{3}{2}\log k + \frac{1}{5}$ by Lemma 2.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &2\log(k-1) - \frac{1}{2} \leq A_k \leq \frac{3}{2}\log k + \frac{1}{5} \\ &< \frac{3}{2}\log(k-1) + \frac{3}{2(k-1)} + \frac{1}{5} \\ &\implies \log(k-1) < 1 + \frac{2}{5} + \frac{3}{k-1} < 1 + \frac{2}{5} + \frac{3}{8-1}. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

However, (14) implies that $k \leq e^{(1+\frac{2}{5}+\frac{3}{8-1})} + 1 < 7.225 \implies k \leq 7$, contradicting with the condition that $8 \leq k$.

Therefore, for all positive integers $6 \leq k$, $A_k < 2\log(k-1) - \frac{1}{2}$. □

**Theorem 2.3.** *For all* $5 \leq n$, $g_n < 2\log p_n$

*Proof.* The case for $5 \leq n \leq 462$ can be checked by calculation.

For the case $463 \leq n$, since $463 \leq n$, we have the following inequality from Theorem 2.2:

$$\frac{g_n}{n} < \sum_{k=6}^{n} \frac{g_k}{k(k-1)}. \tag{15}$$

By applying summation by parts to the right hand side of (15), we have

$$\frac{g_n}{n} < \sum_{k=6}^{n} \frac{g_k}{k(k-1)} = \frac{1}{n}B_n + \sum_{k=6}^{n-1} \frac{B_k}{k(k+1)}. \tag{16}$$

where $B_k = \sum_{i=6}^{k} \frac{g_i}{i-1}$.

Since we have $A_k < 2\log(k-1) - \frac{1}{2}$ for all $6 \leq k$ by Lemma 2.3, (16) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} B_k &= \sum_{i=6}^{k} \frac{g_i}{i-1} = A_k - A_5 + \sum_{i=6}^{k} \frac{A_i}{i-1} \\ &< A_k - A_5 + \sum_{i=2}^{k} \frac{2\log(i-1) - \frac{1}{2}}{i-1} - \sum_{i=2}^{5} \frac{2\log(i-1) - \frac{1}{2}}{i-1} \\ &< A_k - A_5 + \int_1^k \frac{2\log x - \frac{1}{2}}{x} dx - \sum_{i=2}^{5} \frac{2\log(i-1) - \frac{1}{2}}{i-1} \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

By calculation, we have $1 < 1.077 < \sum_{i=2}^{5} \frac{2\log(i-1)-\frac{1}{2}}{i-1}$, Using this fact, $A_5 = \frac{p_6-2}{5} = \frac{11}{5}$ and Lemma 2.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} B_k &= A_k - A_5 + \int_1^k \frac{2\log x - \frac{1}{2}}{x} dx - \sum_{i=2}^{5} \frac{2\log(i-1) - \frac{1}{2}}{i-1} \\ &< \frac{3}{2}\log k + \frac{1}{5} - \frac{11}{5} + \int_1^k \frac{2\log x - \frac{1}{2}}{x} dx - 1 \\ &= \frac{3}{2}\log k + \frac{1}{5} - \frac{11}{5} + \log^2 x - \frac{\log x}{2} - 1 = \log^2 k + \log k - 3, \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=6}^{n-1} \frac{B_k}{k(k+1)} &< \sum_{k=6}^{n-1} \frac{\log^2 k + \log k - 3}{k^2} \\ &< \int_n^1 \frac{\log^2 k + \log k - 3}{k^2} dk = \frac{\log^2 n}{n} + \frac{3\log n}{n}. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

By applying (18) and (19) to (16), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{g_n}{n} &< \sum_{k=6}^{n} \frac{g_k}{k(k-1)} = \frac{1}{n} B_n + \sum_{k=6}^{n-1} \frac{B_k}{k(k+1)} \\
&< \frac{\log^2 n + \log n - 3}{n} + \frac{\log^2 n + 3\log n}{n} \\
&= \frac{2\log^2 n + 4\log n - 3}{n} = \frac{2(\log n + 1)^2 - 5}{n} \\
&\implies g_n < 2(\log n + 1)^2 - 5
\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Since $\log p_n \leq \log n + 1$ would imply that $\log n + \log\log n = \log(n \log n) < \log p_n \leq \log n + 1 \implies \log\log n < 1 \implies n < e^e < 16$, we have $\log n + 1 < \log p_n$, which implies that $g_n < 2(\log n + 1)^2 - 5 < 2\log^2 p_n$, and this complets the proof. □

**Corollary 2.1.** *If $5 \leq M \leq n$ is a positive integer such that $g_M = \max\{g_1, g_2, \cdots, g_n\}$, then $g_M < 2\log^2 p_n$.*

*Proof.* By Theorem 2.3, we have $g_M < 2\log^2 p_M \leq 2\log^2 p_n$. □

# 3 Additional Results

**Theorem 3.1.** *If $2 \leq a$ is a positive integer, then there's a prime number between $a(a-1)$ and $a^2$, and a prime number between $a^2$ and $a(a+1)$*

*Proof.* The case for $2 \leq a \leq 240$ can be checked by calculation. Therefore we shall discuss the case for $241 \leq a$

Suppose that for some $241 \leq a$, there is no prime number between $a(a-1)$ and $a^2$, then we have $p_n < a(a-1)$ and $a^2 < p_{n+1}$.

Since $a = a^2 - a(a-1) < p_{n+1} - p_n = g_n$, we have

$$a < g_n < 2\log^2 n < 2\log^2 p_n < 2\log^2 a^2 < 8\log^2 a \tag{21}$$

But this implies that $a \leq 240$, which contradicts with the assumption that $241 \leq a$

Likewise, suppose that for some $241 \leq a$, there's no prime number between $a(a-1)$ and $a^2$, then we have $p_n < a(a-1)$ and $a^2 < p_{n+1}$.

Since $a = a(a+1) - a^2 < p_{n+1} - p_n = g_n$, we have

$$a < g_n < 2\log^2 n < 2\log^2 p_n < 2\log^2 a^2 < 8\log^2 a \tag{22}$$

But this again implies that $a \leq 240$, which again contradicts with the assumption that $241 \leq a$.

Therefore for all positive integers $241 \leq a$, there's at least a prime number between $a(a-1)$ and $a^2$, and at least a prime number between $a^2$ and $a(a+1)$.

Since the conjecture holds for all $2 \leq a \leq 240$ as well by calculation, This implies that there is at least one prime number between $a(a-1)$ and $a^2$, and

at least one prime number between $a^2$ and $a(a+1)$ for all positive integers $2 \leq a$. □

**Corollary 3.1.** *For all positive integers* $31 \leq n$, $g_n < \sqrt{p_n}$

*Proof.* By calculation, $\sqrt{p_n} \leq 2\log^2 p_n$ implies that $p_n < 57827$, which in turn implies that $n \leq 5858$; therefore, for all $5859 \leq n$, we have $g_n < 2\log^2 p_n < \sqrt{p_n}$ The case for $31 \leq n \leq 5858$ can be checked by direct calculations. □

**Theorem 3.2.** *For all positive integers* $31 \leq n$, $\sqrt{p_{n+1}} - \sqrt{p_n} < \frac{1}{2}$

*Proof.* Since we have $p_{n+1} - p_n < 2\log^2 p_n < \sqrt{p_n}$ for $31 \leq n$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &(\sqrt{p_{n+1}} - \sqrt{p_n})(\sqrt{p_{n+1}} + \sqrt{p_n}) = p_{n+1} - p_n < \sqrt{p_n} \\ &\implies \sqrt{p_{n+1}} - \sqrt{p_n} < \frac{\sqrt{p_n}}{\sqrt{p_{n+1}} + \sqrt{p_n}} < \frac{1}{2} \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

□

# References


[1] Andrica, D. (1986). "Note on a conjecture in prime number theory". *Studia Univ. Babes–Bolyai Math.* 31 (4): 44–48. ISSN 0252-1938. Zbl 0623.10030.

[2] Baker, R. C., Harman, G., Pintz, J. (2001), "The Difference Between Consecutive Primes, II", *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, 83 (3), Wiley: 532–562, doi: 10.1112/plms/83.3.532

[3] Bertrand, Joseph (1845), "Mémoire sur le nombre de valeurs que peut prendre une fonction quand on y permute les lettres qu'elle renferme.", *Journal de l'École Royale Polytechnique* (in French), 18 (Cahier 30): 123–140.

[4] Tchebychev, P. (1852), "Mémoire sur les nombres premiers.", *Journal de mathématiques pures et appliquées*, Série 1 (in French): 366–390.

[5] Cramér, Harald (1936), "On the order of magnitude of the difference between consecutive prime numbers" , *Acta Arithmetica*, 2: 23–46, doi: 10.4064/aa-2-1-23-46

[6] Dudek, A. W. (2014). On the Riemann hypothesis and the difference between primes. *International Journal of Number Theory*, 11(03), 771-778, doi: 10.1142/S1793042115500426

[7] Dudek, A. W. (2016). An explicit result for primes between cubes. *Functiones et Approximatio Commentarii Mathematici*, 55(2), 177-197, doi: 10.7169/facm/2016.55.2.3

[8] Dusart, P. (1998). Autour de la fonction qui compte le nombre de nombres premiers. (PhD thesis)

[9] Erdős, P. (1932). Beweis eines satzes von tschebyschef. *Acta Scientifica Mathematica*, 5, 194-198.

[10] Ford, Kevin; Green, Ben; Konyagin, Sergei; Maynard, James; Tao, Terence (2018). "Long gaps between primes". *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*. 31: 65–105. arXiv:1412.5029. doi:10.1090/jams/876

[11] Granville, A. (1995). Harald Cramér and the distribution of prime numbers. Scandinavian Actuarial Journal, 1995(1), 12–28. doi: 10.1080/03461238.1995.10413946

[12] Ingham, A. E. (1937). "On The Difference Between Consecutive Primes". *The Quarterly Journal of Mathematics*. os-8 (1): 255–266. doi: 10.1093/qmath/os-8.1.255. ISSN 0033-5606.

[13] Weisstein, Eric W. "Brocard's Conjecture." From *MathWorld*–A Wolfram Web Resource. https://mathworld.wolfram.com/BrocardsConjecture.html.

[14] Legendre, Adriene Marie (1808). *Essai sur la Théorie des Nombres* (in French) (2 ed.). Paris: Chez Courcier. pp. 405–406.

[15] Oppermann, L. (1882), "Om vor Kundskab om Primtallenes Mængde mellem givne Grændser", *Oversigt over Det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskabs Forhandlinger og Dets Medlemmers Arbejder*: 169–179

[16] Rankin, R. A. (December 1938). "The difference between consecutive prime numbers". *J. London Math. Soc.* 13 (4): 242–247. doi:10.1017/S0013091500025633

[17] Ribenboim, Paulo (2004). *The Little Book of Bigger Primes* (Second ed.). Springer-Verlag. p. 185. ISBN 978-0-387-20169-6.

[18] Rosser, B. (1941). Explicit Bounds for Some Functions of Prime Numbers. American Journal of Mathematics, 63(1), 211–232. https://doi.org/10.2307/2371291

[19] Topsøe, Flemming. Some bounds for the logarithmic function.In Yeol Je Cho, Jong Kyu Kim, and Sever S. Dragomir, editors, Inequality Theory and Applications, volume 4, pages 137–151. Nova Science Publishers, New York, United States, 2007.ISBN 13 978-1-59454-874-1.

[20] Westzynthius, E. (1931), "Über die Verteilung der Zahlen die zu den $n$ ersten Primzahlen teilerfremd sind", *Commentationes Physico-Mathematicae Helsingsfors* (in German), 5 (5): 1–37, JFM 57.0186.02, Zbl 0003.24601