GENERATING PRIMES NUMBERS - A FAST NEW APPROACH

V. VILFRED

Abstract. Bertrand’s Postulate ensures existence of prime \( p \) between \( n \) and \( 2n \), \( n \) an integer \( \geq 2 \) and the sieve of Eratosthenes, a very simple ancient algorithm, generates all prime numbers up to any given limit. Combining the above two, in this paper, we provide a simple fast moving algorithm to generate prime numbers up to any given limit. We also discuss Riemann zeta function related to generating of prime numbers.
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1. Introduction

In generating prime numbers, the sieve of Eratosthenes \( [5] [17] \) and Bertrand postulate \( [3] \) are important milestones. The sieve of Eratosthenes is a very simple ancient algorithm that generates all primes up to any given limit. In 1845, Joseph Bertrand postulated that for any integer \( n > 3 \), there exists prime \( p \) such that \( n < p < 2n - 2 \). And its slightly weaker form is that there exists prime \( p \) such that \( n < p < 2n \), \( n \) an integer \( \geq 2 \). In 1850, Pafnuty Chebychev \( [19] \) first proved this postulate analytically. In 1932, Paul Erdős \( [5] \) gave an elementary proof using facts about the middle binomial coefficient. In 2002, Manindra Agarwal, Neeraj Kayal and Nitin Saxena \( [1] \) presented an unconditional deterministic polynomial-time algorithm that determines whether an input number is prime or composite.

The problem of computing \( \pi(x) \), the number of primes less than or equal to \( x \) is one of the oldest problem in Mathematics, \( x \in \mathbb{N} \). For a very long time, the sieve of Eratosthenes has been the practical way to compute \( \pi(x) \) despite its time complexity. Legendre \( [11] \) observed a combinatorial formula, known as Legendre sum, for the number of primes \( p \) for which \( x^{1/2} < p \leq x \). Since then, a large number of writers have suggested variants and improvements of the formula. During 1870 to 1885, astronomer Meissel \( [13] - [16] \) developed practical combinatorial method to compute \( \pi(x) \) and in 1959, Lehmer \( [11] \) extended and
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simplified Meissel’s method. In 1985, the Meissel-Lehmer method was used to compute several values of \(\pi(x)\) up to \(x = 4.10^{16}\) \(^{10}\) and in 1996, Deleglise and Rivat \(^{16}\) developed a modified form of the Meissel-Lehmer method saving much computation.

In this paper, using both the sieve of Eratosthenes and Bertrand postulate, we generate prime numbers in a faster way. We start our work by finding existence of prime(s) is ensured by Bertrand postulate where \(p_1, p_2, \ldots\) denotes the primes 2, 3, \ldots numbered in increasing order. Then, the question arises is whether there exist any other method which generates primes in a faster way? We could find out such a method in which we consider intervals of the form \([p_i + 1, 2p_i]\) and in each such interval we generate prime numbers in a faster way. We start our work by finding the primes 2, 3, \ldots numbered in increasing order. Then, the question arises is whether there exist any other method which generates primes in a faster way? We could find out such a method in which we consider intervals of the form \([p_i + 1, 2p_i^2]\) instead of \([p_i + 1, 2p_i]\), \(i \geq 2\). Again, the question is whether any other method available that generates primes in a faster way, in general?

Now, our third method generates primes in a faster way by considering \([p_i + 1, p_i^2 + 4p_i + 3]\) as consecutive intervals. It is a tight bound in the sense that if we increase the width of the interval still further, then the algorithm will not work, in general. All the three methods are presented in this paper. The author feels that this development is going to revolutionise development in Mathematics, especially in Cryptography, Number theory, Signal processing and Computational Mathematics.

The three algorithms used in this paper to generate prime numbers up to any given limit are (i) \(p_1 = 2\), \(I_P = \{2\} = P_1, MIP = 2 = MP_1, \#P_1 = 1\) and other consecutive intervals \(IP_j = [MIP_j + 1, 2MIP_j]\) and \(P_{j+1} = \Phi(IP_{j+1}) = \) set of primes in \(IP_{j+1}\) for \(j = 1, 2, \ldots\); (ii) \(p_1 = 2, I_P = \{2\} \equiv P_1, MIP = 2 = MP_1, \#P_1 = 1, p_2 = 3, IP_2 = \{3\}\) = \(P_2, MIP_2 = 3 = MP_2, \#P_2 = 1, IP_{j+1} = [MIP_{j+1} + 1, MIP_{j+1}^2]\) and \(P_{j+1} = \Phi([MIP_{j+1} + 1, MIP_{j+1}^2])\) for \(j = 2, 3, \ldots\) and (iii) \(p_1 = 2, p_2 = 3, I_P = \{2, 3\}, \#P_1 = 2, MIP = 3 = MP_1, \#P_2 = 2, MIP_j = \max IP_j, MP_j = \max p_j, \#P_j = |P_j|, IP_{j+1} = [MIP_{j+1} + 1, MIP_{j+1}^2 + 4MIP_j + 3]\) and \(P_{j+1} = \Phi(IP_{j+1}) = \Phi([MIP_{j+1} + 1, MIP_{j+1}^2 + 4MIP_j + 2])\) for \(j = 1, 2, \ldots\). Even though the third method generates primes in a faster way and is the best, we present the other two to highlight their differences. After generating, it is easy to check, from the listing, whether any given number is prime or not. We also discuss Riemann zeta function related to generating of prime numbers.

2. Preliminaries

To simplify our work, the following notations are used in this paper.

\(N = \{1, 2, \ldots\}; N_0 = N \cup \{0\} = \{0, 1, 2, \ldots\};\)

\(\mathbb{P} = \) the set of all prime numbers \(= \Phi(N);\)

\(\mathbb{C} = \) the set of all composite numbers so that \(\mathbb{P} \cap \mathbb{C} = \Phi\) and \(\mathbb{P} \cup \mathbb{C} = N - \{1\};\)
$\mathbb{P}(S) = \Phi(S)$ is the set of all primes in $S$ and
$\mathbb{C}(S)$ is the set of all composite numbers in $S$, $S \subseteq \mathbb{N}$;
$\pi(S)$ is the number of primes in $S$ when $S$ is finite and $S \subseteq \mathbb{N}$;
$\Phi(n) = \Phi([1, n])$ is the set of all primes $\leq n$ and
$\pi(n) = \pi([1, n])$ is the number of primes $\leq n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$;
$\lfloor \frac{m}{n} \rfloor$ is integer part of $\frac{m}{n}$ when $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Throughout the paper, for $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m \leq n$, $[m, n] = \{k \in \mathbb{N} : m \leq k \leq n\}$ and $p_1, p_2, \ldots$ denotes the primes $2, 3, \ldots$ numbered in increasing order.

**Definition 2.1.** Let $a, n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, $n_1 \leq n_2$ and $[a] = \{a, 2a, \ldots\} = a\mathbb{N}$, the set of multiples of $a$ in $\mathbb{N}$. Then, we denote the set of all multiples of $a$ of each lies between $n_1$ and $n_2$ by $([a] : n_1, n_2)$. Thus, $([a] : n_1, n_2) = \{ka/ n_1 \leq ka \leq n_2, k \in \mathbb{N}\}$, $a, n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$, $n_1 \leq n_2$.

Consider the following lemma, an important result used in this paper to generate larger primes.

**Lemma 2.2.** Let $1 \leq i < j$, $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, $p_i, p_j$ be primes, $Q_{i,j} = \lfloor \frac{p_i}{p_j} \rfloor$, $Q'_{i,j} = \lfloor \frac{p_i^2}{p_j} \rfloor$ and $Q''_{i,j} = \lfloor \frac{p_i^2 + 4p_j + 3}{p_j} \rfloor$. Then,

1. $p_i(Q_{i,j} + 1)$ is the smallest integer multiple of $p_i$ that is greater than $p_j$.
2. $p_iQ'_{i,j}$ is the biggest integer multiple of $p_i$ that is less than or equal to $2p_j$.
3. $p_iQ''_{i,j}$ is the biggest integer multiple of $p_i$ that is less than or equal to $p_j^2$.
4. $p_iQ''_{i,j}$ is the biggest integer multiple of $p_i$ that is less than or equal to $p_j^2 + 4p_j + 3$.
5. $\{[p_i] : p_j + 1, 2p_j\} = \{p_i(Q_{i,j} + 1), p_i(Q_{i,j} + 2), \ldots, p_iQ'_{i,j}\}$.
6. $\{[p_i] : p_j + 1, p_j^2\} = \{p_i(Q_{i,j} + 1), p_i(Q_{i,j} + 2), \ldots, p_iQ''_{i,j}\}$.
7. $\{[p_i] : p_j + 1, p_j^2 + 4p_j + 3\} = \{p_i(Q_{i,j} + 1), p_i(Q_{i,j} + 2), \ldots, p_iQ'''_{i,j}\}$.
8. In $[p_j + 1, p_j^2 + 4p_j + 3]$, any composite number has $p_1, p_2, \ldots$ or $p_j$ as a divisor. And $p_j^2 + 4p_j + 3 < p_{j+1}^2$.
9. For $j \geq 2$, any composite number whose prime divisors, each $> p_j$ will be $\geq p_{j+1}^2 \geq (p_j + 2)^2 > p_j^2 + 4p_j + 3$.

**Proof.** Given, $1 \leq i < j$, $Q_{i,j} = \lfloor \frac{p_i}{p_j} \rfloor$, $Q'_{i,j} = \lfloor \frac{p_i^2}{p_j} \rfloor$, $Q''_{i,j} = \lfloor \frac{p_i^2 + 4p_j + 3}{p_j} \rfloor$. This implies, $p_i < p_j$ and $Q_{i,j}$, $Q'_{i,j}$, $Q''_{i,j}$, $Q'''_{i,j}$ are the quotients when $p_j$, $2p_j$, $p_j^2$, $p_j^2 + 4p_j + 3$ are divided by $p_i$, respectively.

Let $p_j = p_iQ'_{i,j} + R_{i,j}$ where $Q_{i,j}$ and $R_{i,j}$ are quotient and remainder when $p_j$ is divided by $p_i$, $1 \leq R_{i,j} \leq p_i - 1$ since $p_j$ is a prime number.
greater than \( p_i \). Similarly, let \( 2p_j = p_iQ'_{i,j} + R'_{i,j}, \( p_j^2 = p_iQ''_{i,j} + R''_{i,j} \) and \( p_j^2 + 4p_j + 3 = p_iQ''_{i,j} + R''_{i,j} \) where \( Q'_{i,j} \) and \( R'_{i,j} \) are quotient and remainder when \( 2p_j \) is divided by \( p_i \), \( Q''_{i,j} \) and \( R''_{i,j} \) are quotient and remainder when \( p_j^2 \) is divided by \( p_i \) and \( Q''_{i,j} \) and \( R''_{i,j} \) are quotient and remainder when \( p_j^2 + 4p_j + 3 \) is divided by \( p_i \), \( 0 \leq R'_{i,j}, R''_{i,j} \leq p_i - 1 \) and \( 1 \leq R''_{i,j} \leq p_i - 1 \). From the above, we get results (1), (2), (3) and (4).

Result (5) follows from (1) and (2). Result (6) follows from (1), (3) and (9).

2.2. After generating primes, it is easy to check, from the listing whether any number is prime or not. Eratosthenes [5, 17], Bertrand’s postulate on prime numbers [3] and Lemma 2.2, then all prime numbers in the interval \( [2, j] \) is an odd prime \( p > 2 \). Result (7) follows from (1) and (4).

For \( j \geq 2 \), \( p_{j+1} \geq p_j + 2 > p_j \). This implies, the smallest composite number which does not have \( p_1, p_2, \ldots, \) or \( p_j \) as a divisor is \( p_j^2 + 4p_j + 3 \). And \( p_{j+1}^2 \geq (p_j + 2)^2 = p_j^2 + 4p_j + 4 > p_j^2 + 4p_j + 3 \) for \( j \geq 2 \). Hence, we get results (8) and (9).

\[ \square \]

3. Main Result

In this section, we present all the three methods to generate prime numbers even though the third is the best. All the three methods use the sieve of Eratosthenes [5, 17], Bertrand’s postulate on prime numbers [3] and Lemma 2.2. After generating primes, it is easy to check, from the listing whether any given number is prime or not.

In all the three methods, we calculate all composite numbers, using Lemma 2.2 then all prime numbers in the interval \( [p_j + 1, 2p_j] \) using Theorems 3.2 and 3.3 in the first method, in \( [p_j + 1, p_j^2] \) using Theorems 3.6 and 3.9 in the second method and finally in \( [p_j + 1, p_j^2 + 4p_j + 3] \) using Theorems 3.12 and 3.13 in the third method, \( j \geq 2 \).

Lemma 3.1. Let \( 1 \leq i < j \) and \( i, j \in \mathbb{N} \). Then,

1. the set of all composite numbers in \( [p_j + 1, 2p_j] \) is given by

\[
\mathbb{C}([p_j + 1, 2p_j]) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{p_j} p_i \{Q_{i,j} + 1, Q_{i,j} + 2, \ldots, Q'_{i,j}\}
\]

\[
= \bigcup_{i=1}^{p_j} p_i \{Q_{i,j} + 1, Q_{i,j} + 2, \ldots, Q'_{i,j}\} \cup \{2p_j\};
\]

2. the number of composite numbers in \( [p_j + 1, 2p_j] \) is given by

\[
\#\mathbb{C}([p_j + 1, 2p_j]) = \sum_{i=1}^{p_j} (Q_{i,j} - Q'_{i,j});
\]

3. the number of primes in \( [p_j + 1, 2p_j] \) is given by

\[
\pi([p_j + 1, 2p_j]) = 2p_2 - p_j - \#\mathbb{C}([p_j + 1, 2p_j]).
\]

Proof. For \( 1 \leq i < j \), we have \( Q_{i,j} = \left\lfloor \frac{p_i}{p_j} \right\rfloor \) and \( Q'_{i,j} = \left\lfloor \frac{2p_j}{p_i} \right\rfloor \).

1. Then, the set of all composite numbers in \( [p_j + 1, 2p_j] \) is

\[
\mathbb{C}([p_j + 1, 2p_j]) = \bigcup_{i=1}^{p_j} \{\text{multiples of } p_i \text{ in } [p_j + 1, 2p_j]\},
\]

\[
= \bigcup_{i=1}^{p_j} \{p_i : p_j + 1, 2p_j\}.
\]

\[
= \{2p_j\} \cup \left\{(\bigcup_{i=1}^{j-1} \{p_i(Q_{i,j} + 1), p_i(Q_{i,j} + 2), \ldots, p_iQ'_{i,j}\})\right\}
\]

using (5) of Lemma 2.2 and also \( 2p_j \) is the only composite number with \( p_j \) as a divisor in \( [p_j + 1, 2p_j] \).
(2) Composite numbers that are divisible by $p_i$ in $[p_j + 1, 2p_j]$ are 
$\{p_i(Q_{i,j} + 1), p_i(Q_{i,j} + 2), \ldots, p_iQ_{i,j}'\}, 1 \leq i \leq j$. 
This implies that the number of composite numbers that are divisible by $p_i$ in $[p_j + 1, 2p_j]$ is $Q_{i,j}' - Q_{i,j}$.

Hence, the results (2) and (3).

\box{ }

**Prime numbers in** $[p_j + 1, 2p_j]$, $j \geq 2$.

Here, for $j \geq 2$, we obtain all prime numbers contained in the interval $[p_j + 1, 2p_j]$ by removing its composite numbers.

**Theorem 3.2.** Let $1 \leq i < j$, $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, $Q_{i,j} = \left\lfloor \frac{2p_i}{p_j} \right\rfloor$ and $Q_{i,j}' = \left\lfloor \frac{2p_j}{p_i} \right\rfloor$. Then, the set $[p_j + 1, 2p_j] \setminus \mathbb{C}(p_j + 1, 2p_j)$

1. is non-empty.
2. contains prime number(s) as its element(s).
3. is non-empty.
4. is the set of all prime numbers contained in $[p_j + 1, 2p_j]$.
5. is the set of all prime numbers contained in $[p_j + 1, 2p_j]$.
6. is the set of all prime numbers contained in $[p_j + 1, 2p_j]$.

**Proof.** For $j \geq 2$, the set of all prime numbers contained in $[p_j + 1, 2p_j]$ is obtained by removing all composite numbers contained in $[p_j + 1, 2p_j]$. For $j \geq 1$, by Bertrand postulate, $[p_j + 1, 2p_j]$ contains at least one prime and for $j \geq 2$, $p_j + 1$ is composite. Hence, results (1) and (2) are true.

By the definition of $\Phi(S)$, (3) and (4) are true.

For $j \geq 2$, using (1), $[p_j + 1, 2p_j]$ contains at least one prime. And any prime number contained in $[p_j + 1, 2p_j]$ is greater than $p_j$ and less than $2p_j$. But for $j \geq 2$, any composite number, in $[p_j + 1, 2p_j]$, contains $p_1, p_2, \ldots$ or $p_j$ as a factor. Hence, after removing all multiples of $p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_j$ from $[p_j + 1, 2p_j]$, the resultant set contains only prime(s). This implies, 

$[p_j + 1, 2p_j] \setminus \mathbb{C}(p_j + 1, 2p_j)$

$= [p_j + 1, 2p_j] \setminus \mathbb{C}(p_j + 2, 2p_j) = \Phi([p_j + 2, 2p_j])$

$= [p_j + 1, 2p_j - 1] \setminus (\bigcup_{i=1}^{j-1} \mathbb{P}(Q_{i,j} + 1, Q_{i,j} + 2, \ldots, Q_{i,j}'))$

using Lemma 3.1 where $Q_{i,j} = \left\lfloor \frac{2p_i}{p_j} \right\rfloor$ and $Q_{i,j}' = \left\lfloor \frac{2p_j}{p_i} \right\rfloor$ and $1 \leq i < j$. And thereby (5) and (6) are true.

In the above result, we could see that $\Phi([p_j + 2, 2p_j])$, the set of all prime numbers in the interval $[p_j + 1, 2p_j]$, is a non-empty set for every $j \geq 2$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$ where $p_j$ is the $j^{th}$ prime with $p_1 = 2$, $p_2 = 3$, $p_3 = 5$, \ldots. Consider the following example to calculate different primes using Theorem 3.2 with the notation of $MIP_j = \text{maximum value in } I_{P_j}$, $M_j = \text{maximum value in }
Example 3.3. \( p_1 = 2, IpP_1 = \{2\} = pP_1, MIpP_1 = 2 = MpP_1. \)

\[ \Rightarrow IpP_2 = [MIpP_1 + 1, 2MpP_1] = [3, 4], MIpP_2 = 4, \]
\[ pP_2 = \Phi(IpP_2) = \Phi([3, 4]) = \{3\}, pP_2 = 3, MpP_2 = 3. \]

\[ \Rightarrow IpP_3 = [MIpP_2 + 1, 2MpP_2] = [5, 6], MIpP_3 = 6, \]
\[ pP_3 = \Phi(IpP_3) = \Phi([5, 6]) = \{5\}, pP_3 = 5, MpP_3 = 5. \]

\[ \Rightarrow IpP_4 = [MIpP_3 + 1, 2MpP_3] = [7, 10], MIpP_4 = 10, \]
\[ pP_4 = \Phi(IpP_4) = \{7\}, pP_4 = 7, MmpP_4 = 7. \]

\[ \Rightarrow IpP_5 = [MIpP_4 + 1, 2MpP_4] = [11, 14], MIpP_5 = 14, \]
\[ pP_5 = \Phi(IpP_5) = \Phi([11, 14]) = \{11, 13\}, \]
\[ MmpP_5 = 13, pP_5 = 13, MmpP_5 = 13. \]

\[ \Rightarrow IpP_6 = [MIpP_5 + 1, 2MpP_5] = [15, 26], MIpP_6 = 26, \]
\[ pP_6 = \Phi(IpP_6) = \Phi([15, 26]) = \{17, 19, 23\}, MmpP_6 = 23, \]
\[ pP_6 = 17, pP_6 = 19, pP_6 = 23. \]

\[ \Rightarrow IpP_7 = [MIpP_6 + 1, 2MpP_6] = [27, 46], MIpP_7 = 46, \]
\[ pP_7 = \Phi(IpP_7) = \Phi([27, 46]) = \{29, 31, 37, 41, 43\}, \]
\[ pP_7 = 29, pP_7 = 31, pP_7 = 37, pP_7 = 41, pP_7 = 43, MmpP_7 = 43. \]

\[ \Rightarrow IpP_8 = [MIpP_7 + 1, 2MpP_7] = [47, 86], MIpP_8 = 86, \]
\[ pP_8 = \Phi(IpP_8) = \Phi([47, 86]) = \{47, 53, 59, 61, 67, 71, 73, 79, 83\}, \]
\[ pP_8 = 47, pP_8 = 53, pP_8 = 59, pP_8 = 61, pP_8 = 67, \]
\[ pP_8 = 71, pP_8 = 73, pP_8 = 79, pP_8 = 83, MmpP_8 = 83. \]

\[ \Rightarrow IpP_9 = [MIpP_8 + 1, 2MpP_8] = [87, 166], MIpP_9 = 166, \]
\[ pP_9 = \Phi(IpP_9) = \Phi([87, 166]) = \{89, 97, 101, 103, 107, 109, 113, 127, 131, 137, 139, 149, 151, 157, 163\}, MmpP_9 = 163, \]
\[ pP_9 = 89, pP_9 = 97, pP_9 = 101, pP_9 = 103, pP_9 = 107, \]
\[ pP_9 = 109, pP_9 = 113, pP_9 = 127, pP_9 = 131, pP_9 = 137, \]
\[ pP_9 = 139, pP_9 = 149, pP_9 = 151, pP_9 = 157, pP_9 = 163. \]

\[ \Rightarrow IpP_{10} = [MIpP_9 + 1, 2MpP_9] = [167, 326], MIpP_{10} = 326, \]
\[ pP_{10} = \Phi(IpP_{10}) = \Phi([167, 326]) = \{167 = pP_{99}, 173, 179, 181, \]
\[ 191, 193, 197, 199, 211, 223, 227, 229, 233, 239, 241, 251, 257, 263, \]
\[ 269, 271, 277, 281, 283, 293, 307, 311, 313, 317 = pP_{99}\}. \]

With the notation, \( pP_1 = \{2\}, pP_2 = \{3\}, pP_3 = \{5\}, pP_4 = \{7\}, pP_5 = \{11, 13\}, pP_6 = \{17, 19, 23\}, \ldots. \)
\[ IpP_{i+1} = [MIpP_i + 1, 2MpP_i] \text{ and } pP_{i+1} = \Phi(IpP_{i+1}) \text{ where } MIpP_i = \text{ max } IpP_i = \text{ the maximum value in } IpP_i \text{ and } MmpP_i = \text{ max } pP_i, i = 2, 3, \ldots, \text{ we obtain the following result. Hereafter, we call } pP_i \text{ as the } i^{th} \text{ pocket of prime(s), } i \in \mathbb{N}. \]

Theorem 3.4. Let \( pP_1 = \{2\}, IpP_1 = \{2\}, IpP_2 = [3, 4], pP_2 = \{3\}, IpP_3 = [5, 6], pP_3 = \{5\}, IpP_4 = [7, 10], pP_4 = \{7\}, IpP_5 = [11, 14], pP_5 = \{11, 13\}, \ldots \) where \( IpP_{i+1} = [MIpP_i + 1, 2MpP_i], pP_{i+1} = \Phi(IpP_{i+1}), MIpP_i = \text{ max } IpP_i = \text{ the maximum value in } IpP_i \text{ and } MmpP_i = \text{ max } pP_i = \text{ the maximum value in } pP_i, i = 2, 3, \ldots. \) Then,
The set of all prime numbers,
\[ \mathbb{P} = \Phi(\mathbb{N}) = pP_1 \cup pP_2 \cup pP_3 \cup \ldots = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} pP_j. \]

(2) the set of all pockets of primes,
\[ \{pP_1, pP_2, \ldots, pP_1, \ldots\} \] partitions the set of all primes. \( \square \)

**Observation 3.5.**

(1) To obtain the set of all primes \( \mathbb{P} \), one can consider different set pockets of primes.

(2) A set of pockets of primes whose union is the set of all primes need not be a partition of \( \mathbb{P} \).

We have generated prime numbers from successive intervals \( IpP_{j+1} \), from each successive interval we calculate all prime numbers and thereby the corresponding pockets of primes \( pP_{j+1} = \Phi([MIpP_j + 1, 2MpP_j]) \) for \( j = 1, 2, \ldots \), starting with \( pP_1 = \{2\}, IpP_1 = \{2\}, IpP_{j+1} = [MIpP_j + 1, 2MpP_j] \), \( MIpP_j = \max IpP_j \) and \( MpP_j = \max pP_j \). Now, the question is ‘Is it possible to find out any better method to generate primes?’ The following method based on \( IpP_{j+1} = [MIpP_j + 1, MpP_j^2] \) and \( pP_{j+1} = \Phi(IpP_{j+1}) = \Phi([MIpP_j + 2, MpP_j^2 - 2]) \) where \( MIpP_j = \max IpP_j \) and \( MpP_j = \max pP_j \) with \( p_1 = 2, pP_1 = \{2\}, IpP_2 = \{3\} = pP_2 \) and \( p_2 = 3 = MIpP_2 = MpP_2 \) for \( j = 2, 3, \ldots \) is a better method. To begin with, let us calculate prime numbers in \( [p_j + 1, p_j^2] \), \( j \geq 2 \).

**Prime numbers in** \( [p_j + 1, p_j^2] \), \( j \geq 2 \).

Here, we obtain prime numbers by considering successive intervals \( IpP_{j+1} \) as \( [p_j + 1, p_j^2] \) instead of \( [p_j + 1, 2p_j] \) in the previous method for \( j \geq 2 \) with \( p_1 = 2, p_2 = 3, \ldots \). Interval \( [p_j + 1, p_j^2] \), in general, contains more primes than in \( [p_j + 1, 2p_j] \) for \( j \geq 2 \). Similar to Theorems 3.2 and 3.4, we have Theorems 3.6 and 3.9 as follows.

**Theorem 3.6.** For \( j \geq 2 \), the set \( [p_j + 1, p_j^2] \setminus C([p_j + 1, p_j^2]) \)

(1) is non-empty;

(2) contains prime number(s) as its element(s);

(3) \( = \Phi([p_j + 1, p_j^2]) = \Phi([p_j + 2, p_j^2 - 2]); \)

(4) \( = [p_j + 2, p_j^2 - 2] \setminus (\bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} p_i (Q_{i,j} + 1, Q_{i,j} + 2, \ldots, Q_{i,j}^*) ) \)

where \( Q_{i,j} = \left\lfloor \frac{p_j^2}{p_i} \right\rfloor \) and \( Q_{i,j}^* = \left\lfloor \frac{p_j^2 - 2}{p_i} \right\rfloor \), \( 1 \leq i \leq j \).

**Proof.** By Bertrand postulate, \( [p_j + 1, 2p_j] \) contains at least one prime, \( j \in \mathbb{N} \). For \( j \in \mathbb{N}, [p_j + 1, p_j^2] \supseteq [p_j + 1, 2p_j] \) and so \( [p_j + 1, p_j^2] \) contains at least one prime since \( p_j \geq 2 \). Also, for \( j \geq 2, p_j \) is odd prime and \( p_j^2 \) an odd composite number. And hence the set of all prime numbers contained in \( [p_j + 1, p_j^2] \) is same as the set of all prime numbers contained in \( [p_j + 2, p_j^2 - 2] \) and is obtained by removing all composite numbers contained in \( [p_j + 2, p_j^2 - 2] \). Hence (1), (2) and (3) are true.
For \( j \geq 2 \), using (1), \([p_j + 2, p_j^2 - 2]\) contains at least one prime. And any prime number contained in \([p_j + 1, p_j^2]\) is greater than \(p_j\) and less than \(p_j^2\) for \( j \geq 2 \). Also, for \( k, l \in \mathbb{N}\), prime numbers \(p_{j+k}, p_{j+l} > p_j\) and \(p_{j+k}p_{j+l} > p_j^2\).

This implies, \(p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_{j-1}\) or \(p_j\) is a divisor of every composite number contained in \([p_j + 1, p_j^2]\) and after removal of all composite numbers that are multiples of \(p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_j\) from \([p_j + 1, p_j^2]\), the resultant set contains only prime(s). This implies,
\[
[p_j + 1, p_j^2] \setminus C([p_j + 1, p_j^2]) = \Phi([p_j + 1, p_j^2])
\]
\[
= [p_j + 2, p_j^2 - 2] \setminus C([p_j + 2, p_j^2 - 2]) \text{ since } p_j + 1 \text{ is even for } j \geq 2.
\]
\[
= [p_j + 2, p_j^2 - 2] \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{j} (Q_{i,j} + 1, Q_{i,j} + 2, \ldots, Q_{i,j}^2)
\]
follows from Lemma 2.2 (6) where \(Q_{i,j} = \frac{p_i}{p_j}\) and \(Q_{i,j}^2 = \left[\frac{p_j^2 - 2}{p_i}\right], 1 \leq i \leq j\).

Hence, result (4) is true. \(\square\)

In the above result, \(\Phi([p_j + 1, p_j^2])\), the set of all prime number(s) in the interval \([p_j + 1, p_j^2]\), is a non-empty set for every \(j\) using Bertrand postulate, \(j \in \mathbb{N}\). Now, let us calculate different pockets of primes \(p_{P_j+1} = \Phi([MIP_j + 2, Mp_j^2 - 2])\) with \(p_1 = 2\), \(Ip_{P_1} = \{2\} = p_{P_1}\), \(\pi(p_{P_1}) = \lvert p_{P_1}\rvert = 1\), \(MIP_1 = 2 = Mp_{P_1}, Ip_{P_2} = [MIP_1 + 1, Mp_2^2] = [3, 4], p_{P_2} = \Phi(Ip_{P_2}) = \{3\}, \pi(p_{P_2}) = 1, MIP_2 = 4, Mp_{P_2} = 3 = \pi(p_{P_2}) = p_{P_2}, Ip_{P_3+1} = [MIP_3 + 1, Mp_{P_3}^2], p_{P_3} = \Phi([MIP_3 + 2, Mp_3^2 - 2]), Mp_{P_3} = \max p_{P_3+1} = \pi(p_{P_3}p_{P_3} + \cdots + p_{P_3}p_{P_3} + \cdots + p_{P_3}p_{P_3+1}) = \pi(p_{P_3}p_{P_3+1}), j \geq 2\) and \(j \in \mathbb{N}\). Here, we obtain \(p_{P_j}\) from \(Ip_{P_j}\) using (4) of Theorem 3.6.

**Example 3.7.** Let \(p_1 = 2\), \(Ip_{P_1} = \{2\} = p_{P_1}\), \(\pi(p_{P_1}) = 1 = \lvert p_{P_1}\rvert, MIP_1 = 2 = Mp_{P_1}\).
\[
\Rightarrow Ip_{P_2} = [MIP_1 + 1, Mp_2^2] = [3, 4], p_{P_2} = \Phi(Ip_{P_2}) = \{3\}, \pi(p_{P_2}) = 1, MIP_2 = Mp_2 = 3, p_{P_2} = \pi(p_{P_2}) = p_{P_2} = p_{P_2} = p_{P_2} = 2, MIP_2 = 4.
\]
\[
\Rightarrow Ip_{P_3} = [MIP_2 + 1, Mp_3^2] = [5, 9], MIP_3 = 9, p_{P_3} = \Phi(Ip_{P_3}) = \{5, 7\}, \pi(p_{P_3}) = \lvert p_{P_3}\rvert = 2, MIP_3 = 7 = \pi(p_{P_3} + \pi(p_{P_3}) = p_{P_3} = 4.
\]
\[
\Rightarrow Ip_{P_4} = [MIP_3 + 1, Mp_4^2] = [10, 49], MIP_4 = 49, p_{P_4} = \Phi(Ip_{P_4}) = \Phi([10, 49]) = \Phi([11, 47]) = \{11, 13, 17, 19, 23, 29, 31, 37, 41, 43, 47\}, \pi(p_{P_4}) = 11, p_{P_5} = \pi(p_{P_4} + \pi(p_{P_4}) + \pi(p_{P_4}) + 1) = p_5 = 11, p_6 = 13, p_{P_6} = 17, p_{P_7} = 19, p_{P_8} = 23, p_{P_9} = 29, p_{P_{10}} = 31, p_{P_{11}} = 37, p_{P_{12}} = 41, p_{P_{13}} = 43,
\]
\[
\Rightarrow Ip_{P_5} = [MIP_4 + 1, Mp_5^2] = [50, 2209], MIP_5 = 2209, p_{P_5} = \Phi(Ip_{P_5}) = \Phi([MIP_4 + 1, Mp_5^2]) = \Phi(2209) = \Phi([51, 2209]) = \{53, 59, 61, 67, 71, 73, 79, 83, 89, 97, 101, 103, 107, 109, 113, 127, 131, 137, 139, 149, 151, 157, 163, 167, 173, 179, 181, 191, 193, 197, 199, 211, 223, 229, 233, 239, 241, 251, 257, 263, 269, 271, 277, 281, 283, 293, 307, 311, 313, 317, 331, 337, 347, 349, \}.
\]
Theorem 3.9. Let \( p_1 = 2 \), \( Ip_1 = \{2\} = p_1 \), \( p_2 = 3 \), \( Ip_2 = \{3\} = p_2 \), \( p_3 = 5 \), \( Ip_3 = \[5\] = Ip_1 + 1 \), \( MpP_1 = p_2 \), \( MpP_2 = p_3 \), \( IpP_{i+1} = \{Ip_1, Ip_2, Ip_3\} = \{2, 3\} \) where \( IpP_i = \max IpP_i \) and \( MpP_i = \max pP_i \), \( i = 2, 3, \ldots \). Then, the pockets of primes are
Proof. Here, for $i \neq j$ and $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$, $p_i \cap p_j = \Phi$ and each pocket of prime(s) is non-empty by Bertrand Postulate. Also, the set of all intervals $I_p P_j$ partition $\mathbb{N} \setminus \{1\}$ and each interval $I_p P_j$ covers pocket of prime(s) $p_j$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots$. Then, the theorem is true from the following.

$$\Phi(\mathbb{N}) = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} p_j^\phi = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} p_j^\phi = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} (\lim_{n \to \infty} (\bigcup_{j=2}^{n} \Phi([M_ip_j + 2, M_ip_j^2 - 2])))$$

Remark 3.10. In the two methods that we have discussed to obtain prime numbers using successive pockets of prime(s) $p_1$, $p_2$, $\ldots$ with $I_p P_1 = \{2\} = p_1$, $I_p P_2 = \{3\} = p_2$, $M_ip P_j = \max I_p P_j$ and $M_ip P_j = \max p_j$, in the first method we take $I_p P_{j+1} = [M_ip P_j + 2, 2M_ip P_j]$ and $p_{j+1} = \Phi(I_p P_{j+1}) = \Phi([M_ip P_j + 1, 2M_ip P_j])$ for $j = 2, 3, \ldots$ and in the second method we take $I_p P_{j+1} = [M_ip P_j + 1, M_ip P_j^2]$ and $p_{j+1} = \Phi(I_p P_{j+1}) = \Phi([M_ip P_j + 2, M_ip P_j^2 - 2])$ for $j = 2, 3, \ldots$. Let $\pi(p_j) = |p_j|$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots$. It is easy to observe the following.

(1) The second method is better than the first in terms of number of primes generated in successive pockets of primes. The number of elements in the successive pockets of primes in the two methods are as follows.

Method-1: $\pi(p_1) = 1$, $\pi(p_2) = 1$, $\pi(p_3) = 1$, $\pi(p_4) = 1$, $\pi(p_5) = 2$, $\pi(p_6) = 3$, $\pi(p_7) = 5$, $\pi(p_8) = 9$, $\pi(p_9) = 15$, $\pi(p_{10}) = 28$, $\ldots$

Method-2: $\pi(p_1) = 1$, $\pi(p_2) = 1$, $\pi(p_3) = 1$, $\pi(p_4) = 2$, $\pi(p_5) = 2$, $\pi(p_6) = 314$, $\pi(p_7) = 339730$, $\ldots$

See Table 1 for more details.

(2) To generate prime numbers, if we consider any bigger interval of the form $[M_ip P_j + 1, M_ip P_j^2 + k]$ in the previous methods, then the method may fail since $[M_ip P_j + 1, M_ip P_j^2 + k]$ may contain composite numbers of the form $M_ip P_j^2 + m$ for some $k$ and $m$ such that $1 \leq m \leq k$ and each of its prime divisor is $> M_ip P_j$. 

\[ p_{P_1} = 11 = 5, 7, 3, 5, 11, 13, 31, 7, 17, 19, 31, 41, 43, 47 = p_{P_4}; \]
\[ p_{P_5} = 53 = 5, 17, 61, \ldots, 2027 = p_{P_6}; \]
\[ p_{P_6} = 2213 = p_{P_3} 2221 = p_{P_3} 2221 = p_{P_3} 4870843 = p_{P_3} 349099, \ldots \]
Remark 3.11. In the above algorithm if we take instead of $M_pP = k$ of primes $p_P$ the most important result, Theorem 3.12. And to calculate successive pockets in the third method to generate successive primes and correspondingly we get Theorem 3.12.

Let $\pi(\pi_1) = 2, MIpP_1 = 3 = M_pP_1 = p_2,$

$IpP_{j+1} = [MIpP_j + 1, MIpP_j^2 + k],

p_{P_{j+1}} = \Phi([MIpP_j + 1, MIpP_j^2 + k - 1]),

\pi(p_{P_{j+1}}) = |IpP_{j+1}|, MIpP_{j+1} = max IpP_{j+1}

MIP_{j+1} = max p_{P_{j+1}} = \pi(\pi(\pi_1) + \pi(p_{P_2}) + \ldots + \pi(p_{P_{j+1}}))$

for $j = 1, 2, \ldots$ where $k = 4M_pP_j + 3$ and $MIP_j^2 + 4M_pP_j + 3$ is even.

(5) Continuing the above process of obtaining prime numbers from pockets of primes, one can generate consecutive prime numbers up to any given limit. Thus, corresponding to the third method, we get the following important result.

Remark 3.11. In the above algorithm if we take $k = MIP_j^2 + 4M_pP_j + 3$ instead of $MIP_j^2 + 4M_pP_j + 3$, then the algorithm fails when $M_pP_j$ and its successive prime are twin primes (two primes of difference two). Thus, $k = MIP_j^2 + 4M_pP_j + 3$ is a possible, in general, maximum value of $k$ used in the third method to generate successive primes and correspondingly we get the most important result, Theorem 3.12. And to calculate successive pockets of primes $p_{P_j}$ from $IpP_j$ we use (4) of Theorem 3.14

Theorem 3.12. Let $j \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Then,

1. $k = 4M_pP_j + 3$ is a possible, in general, maximum value of $k$ for which the following algorithm works to generate successive prime numbers from successive pocket of primes and doesn’t fail.

$p_{P_1} = 2, p_{P_2} = 3, \pi(p_{P_1}) = 2, M_pP_1 = 3 = MIP_1 = p_2,$

$IpP_{j+1} = [MIP_j + 1, MIP_j^2 + k], MIP_j = max IpP_j,$

$p_{P_{j+1}} = \Phi([MIP_j + 1, MIP_j^2 + k - 1]), \pi(p_{P_{j+1}}) = |p_{P_{j+1}}| \text{ and } MIP_{j+1} = max p_{P_{j+1}} = \pi(\pi(p_{P_1}) + \pi(p_{P_2}) + \ldots + \pi(p_{P_{j+1}})) \text{ for } j = 1, 2, \ldots$

2. Let $IpP_1 = [2, 3], p_{P_1} = 2, p_{P_2} = 3, \pi(p_{P_1}) = 2$ and $M_pP_1 = 3 = MIP_1 = p_2$. Then, the set of all primes,

$\mathbb{P} = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} \{p_{P_j} \text{ for } j \in \mathbb{N} \}$
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Example 3.15. $\Phi$ is similar to Theorem 3.6.

Now, let us calculate the standard pockets of primes using Theorem 3.12

$\Phi(\pi(p_j+1)) = \Phi(\pi(p_j+1)+\pi(p_{j+1})) = \pi(p_j+1)$ and $\pi(p_{j+1}) = \pi(p_{j+1})$ where $\pi(p_j+1), j = 1, 2, \ldots.$ Then, $p_1, p_2, \ldots$ are called the standard pockets of primes.

Theorem 3.14. For $j \geq 2$, the set $[p_j + 1, p_j^2 + 4p_j + 3] \setminus \mathbb{C}(p_j + 1, p_j^2 + 4p_j + 3)$

1. is non-empty;
2. contains prime number(s) as its element(s);
3. $\Phi([p_j + 1, p_j^2 + 4p_j + 3]) = \Phi([p_j + 2, p_j^2 + 4p_j + 2]);$
4. $\mathbb{N} = \left\{ p_{j, i} \middle| \bigcup_{i=1}^{\infty} \{ Q_{i,j} + 1, Q_{i,j} + 2, \ldots, Q_{i,j}'' \} \right\}$

Proof. Proof is similar to Theorem 3.6.

Now, let us calculate the standard pockets of primes using Theorems 3.

Example 3.15. $\pi(p_1 = 2, p_2 = 3, I_{p_1} = [2, 3], p_1 = 2, p_2 = 3, \pi(p_1) = 2, I_{p_1} = [2, 3], M_{p_1} = 3 = M_{p_2}, I_{p_2} = [2, 3], M_{p_2} = 2, I_{p_3} = [2, 3], M_{p_3} = 3 = M_{p_4}, I_{p_4} = [2, 3], M_{p_4} = 2, I_{p_5} = [2, 3], M_{p_5} = 3 = M_{p_6}, I_{p_6} = [2, 3], M_{p_6} = 2, I_{p_7} = [2, 3], M_{p_7} = 3 = M_{p_8}, I_{p_8} = [2, 3], M_{p_8} = 2, I_{p_9} = [2, 3], M_{p_9} = 3 = M_{p_{10}}, I_{p_{10}} = [2, 3], M_{p_{10}} = 2, I_{p_{11}} = [2, 3], M_{p_{11}} = 3 = M_{p_{12}}, I_{p_{12}} = [2, 3], M_{p_{12}} = 2, I_{p_{13}} = [2, 3], M_{p_{13}} = 3 = M_{p_{14}},$ and $3.14$
= \Phi([626, 385639]) = \{631, 641, \ldots, 385639\},
\pi(p_3) = 32622, \ M_pP_4 = 385639 = p_{114} + np_4 = p_{32736};
p_{115} = 631, p_{116} = 641, \ldots, 385639 = M_pP_4 = p_{32736};
\Rightarrow \text{Ip}_P_5 = [M_ipP_4 + 1, M_pP_4^2 + 4M_pP_4 + 3]
= \Phi([385641, 148718980880]), M_ipP_5 = 148718980880,
p_5 = \Phi([M_ipP_4 + 2, M_pP_4^2 + 4M_pP_4 + 2])
= \Phi([385642, 148718980879]) = \{385657 = p_{32737},
385661 = p_{32738}, \ldots, M_ipP_5 \leq 148718980879\},
\pi(p_5) = |p_P_5|, M_pP_5 = p_{32736 + \pi(p_5)}; \ldots

4. Algorithm to Generate Primes

To generate prime numbers to any large extend, the third method is the fastest and the best among the three methods that we have discussed. Here, we present algorithm corresponding to the third method only that is based on Lemma 2.2 and Theorems 3.12 and 3.14. It is easy to check whether a given natural number is prime or not by comparing with the list of primes already generated provided the number is less than or equal to any prime that was already generated.

Generating prime numbers with \([p_j + 1, p_j^2 + 4p_j + 3], j \geq 2\).

Algorithm:
p_1 = 2, p_2 = 3, IpP_1 = [2, 3], pP_1 = \{2, 3\},
\pi(p_1) = 2, M_ipP_1 = 3 = M_pP_1,
j = 2, (Number of primes already generated)
x = 8, (Number of pockets of primes that are to be considered.)
Do 10 \(k\) = 1 to \(x\),
IpP_{k+1} = [M_ipP_k + 1, M_pP_k(M_pP_k + 4) + 3],
Ip'_{k+1} = [M_ipP_k + 2, M_pP_k(M_pP_k + 4) + 2],
C'(Ip'_{k+1}) = \{\},
Do 20 \(i\) = 1 to \(j\),
Q_i,k = \left\lfloor \frac{M_pP_k}{p_i} \right\rfloor,
Q''_{i,k} = \left\lfloor \frac{M_pP_k^2 + 4M_pP_k + 2}{p_i} \right\rfloor,
C_i(Ip'_{k+1}) = \{p_i(Q_i,k + 1), p_i(Q_i,k + 2), \ldots, p_iQ''_{i,k} \},
20 C'(Ip'_{k+1}) = C(Ip'_{k+1}) \bigcup C_i(Ip'_{k+1})
pP_{k+1} = Ip'_{k+1} \setminus C(Ip'_{k+1}), (C(Ip'_{k}) contains all composites of Ip'_{k})
\pi(pP_{k+1}) = |pP_{k+1}|,
M_pP_{k+1} = \max pP_{k+1},
tP_{k+1} = pP_{k+1}, (Here, tP_{k+1} represents temporary pP_{k+1})
y = j,
j = j + \pi(pP_{k+1}),
p_j = M_pP_{k+1},
Remark 4.3. of pockets of primes in the three methods.

Remark 4.2. in the third. need not start with

We have discussed the values of \( \pi(p_{P_1}) \), \( \pi(p_{P_2}) \), \( \pi(p_{P_3}) \) in the three methods up to

\[
\pi(p_{P_1}) = \Phi(p_{P_1}), \quad \pi(p_{P_2}) = \Phi(p_{P_2}), \quad \pi(p_{P_3}) = \Phi(p_{P_3})
\]

In this section, using Riemann zeta function, we generate prime numbers.

Table 1 shows different sequences of order of pockets of primes in the three methods up to \( k = 8 \) in the first method, \( k = 6 \) in the second and \( k = 4 \) in the third.

Remark 4.2. A new study is needed on the behaviour of sequences of order of pockets of primes in the three methods.

Remark 4.3. While generating prime numbers using the third method, one need not start with \( I_{P_1} = [2, 3], \) \( p_{P_1} = \{2, 3\}, \) \( I_{P_2} = [4, 24], \ldots \)

If \( p_1 = 2, p_2 = 3, \ldots, p_j \) are already known primes, then by taking

\[
I_{P_1} = \{p_1 = 2, p_2 = 3, \ldots, p_j\}, \quad I_{P_1} = [2, p_3],
\]

\[
M_{P_1} = p_j = \Phi(p_{P_1}) = j
\]

\[
I_{P_{k+1}} = [M_{P_k} + 1, M_{P_k}^2 + 4M_{P_k} + 3], \quad M_{P_{k+1}} = \max I_{P_{k+1}},
\]

\[
p_{P_{k+1}} = \Phi(I_{P_{k+1}}) = \Phi([M_{P_k} + 1, M_{P_k}^2 + 4M_{P_k} + 2]),
\]

\[
\pi(p_{P_{k+1}}) = |p_{P_{k+1}}|,
\]

\[
M_{P_{k+1}} = \max p_{P_{k+1}} = p_{\pi(p_{P_1}) + \pi(p_{P_2}) + \ldots + \pi(p_{P_{k+1}})}
\]

for \( k = 1, 2, \ldots \) and \( j \geq 2 \).

5. Riemann zeta function and prime numbers generation

In this section, using Riemann zeta function, we generate prime numbers.

Riemann zeta function \( \zeta(z) \) is given by

\[
\zeta(z) = \frac{1}{1^z} + \frac{1}{2^z} + \frac{1}{3^z} + \frac{1}{4^z} + \ldots
\]

the series is convergent for \( Re(z) > 1 \).

Proposition 5.1. If \((1 - \frac{1}{p_1})(1 - \frac{1}{p_2})(1 - \frac{1}{p_k-1}) (1 - \frac{1}{p_{k+1}}), \ldots, \)

then \( p_{k+1} = n_1, p_{k+2} = n_2, \ldots, p_{k+\pi(p_{P_{k+1}})} = n_{\pi(p_{P_{k+1}})} \in p_{P_{k+1}} = \Phi([p_k + 1, p_k(p_k + 4) + 3]) \) where \( \pi(p_{P_{k+1}}) = |p_{P_{k+1}}| \) and \( Re(z) > 1, k \in \mathbb{N} \).

Proof. For \( Re(z) > 1 \), we have

\[
\zeta(z) = \frac{1}{1^z} + \frac{1}{2^z} + \frac{1}{3^z} + \frac{1}{4^z} + \ldots
\]

This implies,

\[
\zeta(z) = 1 + \frac{1}{2^z}(1 + \frac{1}{3^z} + \frac{1}{4^z} + \ldots) + \frac{1}{3^z} + \frac{1}{4^z} + \frac{1}{5^z} + \frac{1}{6^z} + \ldots
\]
Remark 5.4. Lemma 5.3 provides a formula for different values of \(\pi\) measure the power/speed of the algorithm that generates primes. Legendre in the process of generating primes from successive pockets of primes and also Remark 5.2. Number of primes in a pocket of primes plays an important role □ result.

Conclusion.

(1) One can study different sequences of order of pockets of primes that cover the set of all primes, \(\mathbb{P}\).

(2) One can study the representation of each natural number by its prime factors instead of successors.
Table 1. $\pi(pP_j)$, order of prime pockets in the three Methods

| Method 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 9 |
| Method 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 11 | 314 | 339730 | -- | -- |
| Method 3 | 2 | 7 | 105 | 32622 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
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