

Lower Bounds for the Number of Primes in Some Integer Intervals

Ya-Ping Lu

(Drafted on Oct 26, 2020)

Abstract: We showed that there is at least one prime number in the ranges of $(p, p + \pi(p)]$, $(p - \pi(p), p)$, $(n, n + \pi(n)]$ and $(n - \pi(n), n)$, and there are at least three prime numbers in the range of $(p - \pi(p), p + \pi(p)]$.

Theorem 1: *There is at least one prime number in the range of $(p, p + \pi(p)]$, where p is a prime number and $\pi(p)$ is the number of primes less than or equal to p .*

Proof: Let N_p be the number of prime numbers in the range of $(p, p + \pi(p)]$, or

$$N_p := \pi(p + \pi(p)) - \pi(p) \quad (1)$$

To prove Theorem 1, we need to show $N_p \geq 1$.

Dusart ^[1] showed that the number of prime numbers less than or equal to x is bounded by

$$\pi(x) \geq \frac{x}{\log x} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\log x} + \frac{2}{\log^2 x} \right) \quad \text{for } x > 88783 \quad (2a)$$

and

$$\pi(x) \leq \frac{x}{\log x} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\log x} + \frac{2.334}{\log^2 x} \right) \quad \text{for } x > 2953652287. \quad (2b)$$

For $p > 2953652287$, a lower bound of N_p can be determined based on Eqs. 2a and 2b.

$$N_p \geq \pi(p + \pi(p)_{min}) - \pi(p)_{max} \quad (3)$$

where

$$\pi(p)_{min} = \frac{p}{\log p} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\log p} + \frac{a}{\log^2 p} \right) \quad (4a)$$

$$\pi(p)_{max} = \frac{p}{\log p} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\log p} + \frac{b}{\log^2 p} \right) \quad (4b)$$

where $a=2$, $b=2.334$.

Let $q = p + \pi(p)_{min}$. From Eq. 3, we have

$$N_p \geq \pi(q) - \pi(p)_{max} \geq \pi(q)_{min} - \pi(p)_{max} \quad (5)$$

where

$$\pi(q)_{min} = \frac{q}{\log q} \left(1 + \frac{1}{\log q} + \frac{a}{\log^2 q} \right) \quad (6)$$

Substituting Eqs. 6 and 4b into Eq. 5 gives

$$N_p \geq q \left(\frac{1}{\log q} + \frac{1}{\log^2 q} + \frac{a}{\log^3 q} \right) - p \left(\frac{1}{\log p} + \frac{1}{\log^2 p} + \frac{b}{\log^3 p} \right). \quad (7)$$

Since

$$q = p + \pi(p)_{min} = p \left(1 + \frac{1}{\log p} + \frac{1}{\log^2 p} + \frac{a}{\log^3 p} \right), \quad (8)$$

from Eqs. 7 and 8, we have,

$$\frac{N_p}{p} \geq \left[1 + \left(\frac{1}{\log p} + \frac{1}{\log^2 p} + \frac{a}{\log^3 p} \right) \right] \frac{\log^2 q + \log q + a}{\log^3 q} - \left(\frac{1}{\log p} + \frac{1}{\log^2 p} + \frac{b}{\log^3 p} \right) \quad (9)$$

in which

$$\log q = \log p + \log \left(1 + \frac{1}{\log p} + \frac{1}{\log^2 p} + \frac{a}{\log^3 p} \right) < \log p + \frac{1}{\log p} + \frac{1}{\log^2 p} + \frac{a}{\log^3 p} \quad (10)$$

and thus

$$\frac{\log^2 q + \log q + a}{\log^3 q} > \frac{\log^2 p + \log p + (a+2) + \frac{3}{\log p} + \frac{2(a+1)}{\log^2 p} + \frac{a+2}{\log^3 p} + \frac{2a+1}{\log^4 p} + \frac{2a}{\log^5 p} + \frac{a^2}{\log^6 p}}{\left(\log p + \frac{1}{\log p} + \frac{1}{\log^2 p} + \frac{a}{\log^3 p} \right)^3} > \frac{\log^2 p + \log p + (a+2)}{\log^3 p} \quad (11)$$

Substituting Eq. 11 into Eq. 9 we get

$$\frac{N_p}{p} > \left[1 + \left(\frac{1}{\log p} + \frac{1}{\log^2 p} + \frac{a}{\log^3 p} \right) \right] \frac{\log^2 p + \log p + (a+2)}{\log^3 p} - \left(\frac{1}{\log p} + \frac{1}{\log^2 p} + \frac{b}{\log^3 p} \right)$$

or

$$\frac{N_p}{p} > \frac{\log^4 p + (a-b+4) \log^3 p + 3 \log^2 p + 2 \log p - a(a+2)}{\log^6 p} > \frac{1}{\log^2 p} \quad (12)$$

Thus, for $p > 2953652287$, N_p , the number of prime numbers in the range of $(p, p + \pi(p)]$, has a lower bound of $\frac{p}{\log^2 p}$, which is greater than 1.

$$N_p > \frac{p}{\log^2 p} > 1 \quad (13)$$

In conclusion, for $n > 2953652287$, there is at least one prime number in the range of $(p, p + \pi(p)]$. It can be verified that, for $2 \leq p \leq 2953652287$, $N_p \geq 1$. Therefore, Theorem 1, $\pi(p + \pi(p)) - \pi(p) \geq 1$, is proved. \square

Corollary 1: *There is at least one prime number in the range of $(n, n + \pi(n)]$, where n is an integer greater than or equal to 2 and $\pi(n)$ is the number of primes less than or equal to n .*

Proof: Let n be an integer such that

$$p_m \leq n < p_{m+1} \quad (14)$$

where p_m is the m -th prime number with $m \geq 1$ and p_{m+1} the next prime number following p_m . By the definition of n ,

$$\pi(n) = m \quad (15)$$

where $n \geq 2$. Theorem 1 tells us there exists at least one prime number in the range of $(p_m, p_m + m]$ and, by definition, there is exactly one prime number in the range $(p_m, p_{m+1}]$. Thus, $p_{m+1} \leq p_m + m$. Combining with Eq. 14, we have

$$p_m \leq n < p_{m+1} \leq p_m + m \quad (16)$$

Since $n \geq p_m$, adding n on both sides of Eq. 15 gives

$$n + \pi(n) = n + m \geq p_m + m \quad (17)$$

As there is at least one prime number in the range of $(p_m, p_m + m]$ and $p_m + m \leq n + \pi(n)$, there must be at least one prime number in the range of $(p_m, n + \pi(n)]$.

By the definition of n , there is no prime number in the range of $(p_m, n]$. It can be concluded that there is at least one prime number in the range of $(n, n + \pi(n)]$, where $n \geq 2$. \square

Corollary 2: *There is at least one prime number between $p - \pi(p)$ and p , where p is a prime number greater than or equal to 3 and $\pi(p)$ is the number of primes less than or equal to p .*

Proof: Let k be the number of prime numbers less than or equal to $p_m - m$, or

$$k = \pi(p_m - m). \quad (18)$$

where $m \geq 2$. Since

$$p_k \leq p_m - m < p_m \quad (19)$$

which means $p_k < p_m$ and, thus, $k < m$. So, we have

$$p_k + k \leq p_m - m + k < p_m \quad (20)$$

According to Theorem 1, there is at least one prime number in the range of $(p_k, p_k + k]$ and, by the definition of k , there is no prime number in the range of $(p_k, p_m - m]$. Thus, there must be at least one prime number in the range of $(p_m - m, p_k + k]$.

Since $p_k + k < p_m$, there must be at least one prime number in the range of $(p_m - m, p_m)$. Let $p = p_m$ with $m \geq 2$. We have $m = \pi(p)$. Therefore, it can be concluded that there is at least one prime number between $p - \pi(p)$ and p , where $p \geq 3$. \square

Corollary 3: *There is at least one prime number between $n - \pi(n)$ and n , where n is an integer greater than or equal to 3 and $\pi(n)$ is the number of primes less than or equal to n .*

Proof: Let n be an integer such that

$$p_{m-1} < n < p_m \quad (21)$$

in which p_m is the m -th prime number with $m > 2$ and p_{m-1} the previous prime number. By the definition of n ,

$$\pi(n) = m - 1 \quad (22)$$

where $n \geq 3$. Since

$$n - \pi(n) = n - (m - 1) = (n + 1) - m < (p_m + 1) - m \leq p_m - m \quad (23)$$

According to Corollary 2, there is at least one prime number in the range of $(p_m - m, p_m)$. So, there must be at least one prime number in the range of $(n - \pi(n), p_m)$.

By the definition of n , there is no prime number in the range of $[n, p_m)$. It can be concluded that there is at least one prime number between $n - \pi(n)$ and n , where $n \geq 3$. \square

Corollary 4: *There are at least three prime numbers in the range of $((p - \pi(p), p + \pi(p))$, where p is a prime number greater than or equal to 3 and $\pi(p)$ is the number of primes less than or equal to p .*

Proof: From Corollary 2 and Theorem 1, we know that there is at least one prime number in the range of $(p - \pi(p), p)$ and $(p, p + \pi(p)]$. Since p is a prime number, there must be at least three prime numbers in the range of $(p - \pi(p), p + \pi(p)]$. \square

References

- [1] P. Dusart, Estimates of some functions over primes without RH, arXiv:1002.0442v1 [math.NT] 2 Feb 2010.