Solution 1. Let $n=(m+1)!+1$, where $m!=1 \cdot 2 \cdots \cdots m$ and $m \geq 2$. Observe that for every $i \in\{2, \ldots, m+1\}$, we have $i \mid(m+1)$ !. Hence for every $i \in\{1, \ldots, m\}$, we have $i+1 \mid n+i$. Furthermore, since $m \geq 2$, it follows that $n \geq 2(m+1)+1$, so $\frac{n+i}{i+1} \geq \frac{2(m+1)}{m+1}=2$. Thus $n+i$ cannot be a prime number for any $i \in\{1, \ldots, m\}$. This proves the statement when $m \geq 2$; the case $m=1$ is trivial as one can take any composite integer.

Solution 2. We give three solutions of slightly different flavor. First observe that if we fix the value of $y$, the equation reduces to a quadratic equation in $x$. In particular, this can be solved for any given fixed value of $y$. Looking at small values, it seems that $(3,4)$ and $(4,3)$ are the only solutions.

Since the equation is symmetric in $x$ and $y$, we may assume that $x \geq y$. Hence the right-hand side of the equation is at most $2 x^{2}$, while the growth-speed of the left-hand side is closer to $x^{2} y^{2}$. Thus even when $y=2$, the left-hand side grows much faster. In the first two solutions, we try to formalize this idea into a proper solution.

When $y$ is very small, it is not true that $(x y-7)^{2}$ grows like $x^{2} y^{2}$, so we actually have to consider a few more special cases than just $y=1$. However, solving the equation for given small $y$ 's is substantially easier, so we seek for a way to prove that for every solution, the quantity $\min \{x, y\}$ needs to be small.

Solution 2.1: By symmetry, we may assume that $x \geq y$. If $y \geq 4$, then $x y \geq y^{2} \geq 16>$ $2 \cdot 7$, so we conclude that $\frac{1}{2} x y>7$. In particular, it follows that

$$
(x y-7)^{2}=\left(\frac{1}{2} x y+\frac{1}{2} x y-7\right)^{2}>\left(\frac{1}{2} x y\right)^{2} \geq \frac{1}{4} x^{2} y^{2} \geq 4 x^{2} .
$$

Here we are using the fact that the function $z \rightarrow z^{2}$ is increasing when $z \geq 0$ and the fact that we are assuming that $y \geq 4$. However, this contradicts the fact that $x^{2}+y^{2} \leq 2 x^{2}<4 x^{2}$. Thus we must have $y \leq 3$. It is easy to check that

1. $(x-7)^{2}=x^{2}+1$ has no solutions in positive integers (only solution is $x=\frac{24}{7}$ ).
2. $(2 x-7)^{2}=x^{2}+4$ has no solutions in positive integers (only solutions are irrational).
3. $(3 x-7)^{2}=x^{2}+9$ has solutions $x=4$ and $x=\frac{5}{4}$.

Thus $(x, y)=(4,3)$ is the only solution satisfying $x \geq y$, so all the solutions are $(4,3)$ and $(3,4)$.

Solution 2.2: Again, we assume that $x \geq y$, and we suppose that $y \geq 5$. Observe that the original equation is equivalent to having $y^{2}=(x y-7)^{2}-x^{2}=(x(y-1)-7) \cdot(x(y+1)-7)$. Since $x \geq y \geq 4$, we have

$$
x(y+1)-7 \geq 4 y+x-7 \geq 3 y+1>3 y .
$$

We also have

$$
\frac{1}{4} x(y-1) \geq y-1 \geq \frac{y}{2}
$$

and

$$
\frac{3}{4} x(y-1) \geq \frac{3}{4} \cdot 4 \cdot 3=9>7
$$

thus implying that $x(y-1)-7>\frac{y}{2}$. Combining this with the first inequality implies that $(x(y-1)-7) \cdot(x(y+1)-7)>\frac{3}{2} y^{2}>y^{2}$ whenever $x \geq y \geq 4$, thus giving the desired contradiction. Hence for every solution satisfying $x \geq y$ we must have $y \leq 3$, and the rest of the solution can be concluded as before.

Solution 2.3: This solution differs substantially from the previous two. The idea is to treat $y$ as a constant, and solve the quadratic equation in terms of $x$. The discriminant of this quadratic equation must be a perfect square.

Observe that the original equation is equivalent to $\left(y^{2}-1\right) x^{2}-14 x y+49-y^{2}=0$, which hsa discriminant $D=196 y^{2}-4\left(y^{2}-1\right)\left(49-y^{2}\right)$. Then the solutions of this equation are

$$
x=\frac{14 y \pm \sqrt{D}}{2\left(y^{2}-1\right)} .
$$

If one of these solutions is an integer, then $D=\left(2 x\left(y^{2}-1\right)-14 y\right)^{2}$ is a perfect square, i.e. a square of an integer.

Observe that $D$ can be written as

$$
D=4 y^{4}-4 y^{2}+196=\left(2 y^{2}-1\right)^{2}+195 .
$$

Our aim is to prove that for $y$ sufficiently large, $D$ is strictly contained between two perfect squares, and hence cannot itself be a perfect square. The equation above certainly implies that $D>\left(2 y^{2}-1\right)^{2}$. On the other hand, for $y>7$ we have $4 y^{2}>14^{2}=196$, thus implying that $D<4 y^{4}=\left(2 y^{2}\right)^{2}$. Hence for $y>7$ we have

$$
\left(2 y^{2}-1\right)^{2}<D<\left(2 y^{2}\right)^{2}
$$

thus implying that $D$ cannot be a perfect square. Thus we must have $y \leq 7$
Note that unlike in the previous solutions, we did not make any assumptions regarding which one of the variables is larger. Hence a similar argument proves that $x \leq 7$. One could then go on and check all 49 possible candidates for a solution; or write down the discriminant for each 7 possible values of $y$, check which ones are perfect squares (this occurs when $y \in\{1,3,4,7\}$ ), find the appropriate values of $x$ for those discriminants and conclude that $(3,4)$ and $(4,3)$ are the only solutions.

Solution 3. Let $n=25$ denote the number of people and $m$ denote the number of clubs. There are $\frac{25 \cdot 24}{2}=25 \cdot 12=300$ possible pairs of people, and each club of 5 people covers $\frac{5 \cdot 4}{2}=10$ such pairs. Since no pair of people is contained in two or more distinct clubs, we must have $10 m \leq 300$, thus implying that $m \leq 30$.

To prove that $m=30$ can be attained, we place 25 people into $5 \times 5$ grid whose coordinates are labeled with $\{0,1,2,3,4\}$, and we identify each individual with an unique pair $(i, j) \in$ $\{0,1,2,3,4\} \times\{0,1,2,3,4\}$. We consider six sets of groups $A_{i, j}$ for $i \in\{0,1,2,3,4\}$ and $j \in\{0,1,2,3,4\}$, and $B_{i}$ for $i \in\{0,1,2,3,4\}$ defined as follows:

1. The group $A_{i, j}$ consists of those individuals $(u, v)$ satisfying $u+i \cdot v \equiv j(\bmod 5)$
2. The group $B_{i}$ consists of those individuals $(u, v)$ satisfying $v=i$.

Geometrically speaking, the groups $B_{i}$ are the columns of the $5 \times 5$ grid, the groups $A_{0, j}$ are the rows of the $5 \times 5$ grid, while the groups $A_{1, j}$ and $A_{4, j}$ are the shifted diagonals of the $5 \times 5$ grid (for $A_{1, j}$, the diagonals go from top left to bottom right; for $A_{4, j}$ the diagonals go from bottom left to top right). The groups $A_{2, j}$ and $A_{3, j}$ are slightly harder to visualize, but they can be attained by considering a chess knight hopping on the $5 \times 5$ grid down to rows; below is a grid demonstrating the sets $A_{2, j}$ (cells marked with a given $j$ belong to the set $A_{2, j}$ ).

| 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 3 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 2 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 1 |

Observe that the sets $B_{i}$ clearly contain exactly 5 members: indeed, each column has 5 individuals. Similarly, every set $A_{i, j}$ contains exactly 5 members as for any $v \in\{0,1,2,3,4\}$, the value of $u$ has to be congruent to $j-i \cdot v$ modulo 5 , so it is uniquely determined.

Now we are left to check that there is no pair of people $(u, v)$ and $\left(u_{1}, v_{1}\right)$ that is contained in two distinct groups. It is easy to check that for $i \neq 0$, the sets $A_{i, j}$ contain exactly one point from each row and column (this is because multiplicative inverses exist modulo 5: that is, for every $i \in\{1,2,3,4\}$ there exists $i_{1} \in\{1,2,3,4\}$ so that $\left.i \cdot i_{1} \equiv 1(\bmod 5)\right)$. Thus we may assume that $u \neq u_{1}$ and $v \neq v_{1}$, and hence this pair of people does not belong to any set $B_{j}$. If they both belong to a set $A_{i, j}$, then we must have

$$
\begin{cases}u+i v \equiv j & (\bmod 5) \\ u_{1}+i v_{1} \equiv j & (\bmod 5)\end{cases}
$$

Subtracting gives us $i\left(v-v_{1}\right) \equiv u-u_{1}(\bmod 5)$. Since $v \neq v_{1}$, we have $v-v_{1} \in\{1,2,3,4\}$. As noted above, it is easy to check that multiplicative inverses exist modulo 5: that is, there exists $\alpha \in\{1,2,3,4\}$ so that $\alpha\left(v-v_{1}\right) \equiv 1(\bmod 5)$. Multiplying both sides of the equation $i\left(v-v_{1}\right) \equiv u-u_{1}(\bmod 5)$ by $\alpha$, we conclude that $i \equiv \alpha\left(u-u_{1}\right)(\bmod 5)$. In particular, the value of $i$ is uniquely determined by $(u, v)$ and $\left(u_{1}, v_{1}\right)$. But given the value of $i$, the value of $i$ is uniquely determined as $j \equiv u+i v(\bmod 5)$. Thus there can be only one such set $A_{i, j}$, which completes the proof.

