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Abstract

We will make two algorithms that generate all the prime numbers up to a given limit, they are a development of sieve of Eratosthenes algorithm, we will use two formulas of mine to achieve this development, where all the multiples of the prime number 2 are pre-eliminated in the first formula, and all the multiples of the prime numbers 2 and 3 are pre-eliminated in the second formula.

we will proof sieve of Sundaram’s algorithm by using the first algorithm we will make, then we will make some improvement to make it an efficient prime generator algorithm.

we will show the difference in performance between all the algorithms we will make and sieve of Eratosthenes algorithm in terms of speed and space usage.

1 Introduction

Sieve of Eratosthenes algorithm is a well known algorithm that generates all the prime numbers up to a given limit, it contains some rules that controls the elimination process of the multiples of the prime numbers see [3, 4, 5, 6, 7], two of these rules are

1. \[ N_f = R^2 \] (1.1)

where \( N_f \) is the first multiple of \( R \) which will be eliminated.

2. \[ R = \left\lfloor \sqrt{N} \right\rfloor \] (1.2)

Where \( R \) is the last prime number whose multiples will be eliminated.

Using my prime numbers formulas [2] and SOE we will develop two algorithms to generate all the prime numbers up to a given limit \( N \).
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We will use the advantage of eq(3.2) in reference [2] which is
\[ 2n + 1 = p \]  
(1.3)

Where all the multiples of 2 are already eliminated, so we will set our rules to eliminate the orders of the multiples of the prime numbers (except prime number 2) from \( n \), then the remaining values of \( n \) will be entered to eq(1.2) to get its corresponding prime numbers.

We will use the first produced algorithm to proof Sieve of Sundaram’s algorithm [1] and develop it using the property of the exact match between the mathematical concepts of these two algorithms.

Then we will use eq(3.4) in reference [2] which is
\[ 2 \left\lfloor \frac{3n_1 + 1}{2} \right\rfloor + 1 = p \]  
(1.4)

Where all the multiples of 2 and 3 are eliminated, we will set the rules to eliminate the orders of the multiples of the prime numbers (except prime numbers 2 and 3) from \( n_1 \).

The advantages of these algorithms are

1. For the first algorithm the multiples of 2 are already eliminated.
2. For the second algorithm the multiples of 2 and 3 are already eliminated.
3. The limit of the numbers you will work on will be much less than the limit given, this limit will be calculated for both algorithms.

2 First SOE developed algorithm (D1SOE)

In this developed algorithm we will eliminate the corresponding \( n \) of the multiples of the prime numbers -except the multiples of prime number 2- from \( n \) in eq(1.3) up to a certain limit \( n_m \) which is the corresponding \( n \) of the given limit \( N \).

\[ n_m = \left\lfloor \frac{N - 1}{2} \right\rfloor \]  
(2.1)

We took the floor to the right hand-side of eq(2.1) because we are concerned about the integer value of \( n_m \).

Eq.(2.1) shows the limit of \( n \) which is \( n_m \), for example if we want to generate all the prime numbers up to 100 the limit of \( n \) will be as following

\[ n_m = \left\lfloor \frac{100 - 1}{2} \right\rfloor = 49 \]
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So we will only deal with the numbers from \( n = 1 \) to \( n = 49 \).

Starting from \( n = 1 \), we want to know where to start the elimination of the corresponding \( n \) of the prime number whose \( n = 1 \), so we will derive an equation using eq(1.1), as we work on the corresponding \( n \) of the number according to eq(1.3) we will do the next substitutions in eq(1.1)

- \( N_f = 2m + 1 \)
- \( R = 2z + 1 \)

\[
2m + 1 = (2z + 1)^2
\]
\[
2m + 1 = 4z^2 + 4z + 1
\]
\[
m = 2(z^2 + z) \tag{2.2}
\]

Where:

- \( m \): Is the order of the first multiple we will eliminate.
- \( z \): Is the order of the prime number whose multiples we want to eliminate.

Now we need to know the next numbers we want to eliminate from \( n \). In this case the multiples are equidistant numbers, consequently their orders too see [2], so we need to know the difference between the orders of any two successive multiples, we can get the multiples of any number by multiplying this number by the integer numbers, but in this case we will multiply it by the odd numbers to get rid of the multiples of 2, for \( n = 1 \) and \( p = 2n + 1 = 3 \) the multiples of 3 we are dealing with are \((3, 9, 15, ...)\) and it could be written as \(((1 \times 3), (3 \times 3), (5 \times 3), (7 \times 3), ...)\).

We will use the first two successive multiples which are \((1p)\) and \((3p)\) and substitute in the inverse of eq(1.3) then we will subtract the corresponding \( n \) of \((1p)\) from the corresponding \( n \) of \((3p)\)

\[
\frac{3p-1}{2} - \frac{p-1}{2} = d
\]
\[
\therefore p = d \tag{2.3}
\]

\( p \): The prime number whose multiples’ orders we want to eliminate.
\( d \): The difference between the orders of any two successive multiples of any prime number \( p \).

For \( n = 1 \) the difference will be \( d = 3 \), so we will add 3 to \( m \) to get the next number we want to eliminate, we will repeat this by adding 3 to the last eliminated number then we eliminate the resultant number, by this we will eliminate the orders- the corresponding \( n \) - of the multiples of the prime number 3.

We will use the same method of elimination used with \( n = 1 \) with the next not eliminated \( n \).
The order of the last prime number we will eliminate its multiples will be derived from eq(1.2) -without the floor- by substituting by

- $R = 2k + 1$
- $N = 2q + 1$

So eq(1.2) will be

$$k = \frac{\sqrt{2q+1}}{2} - \frac{1}{2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.4)

We will take the floor to the right hand-side of eq(2.4) because we are interested in the integer value of $k$

$$k = \left\lfloor \frac{\sqrt{2q+1}}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \right\rfloor$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.5)

$k$: The order of the last prime number whose multiples we want to eliminate.

$q$: The order of the limit that we want to generate all the prime numbers smaller than it.

After eliminating the orders of the multiples of the prime numbers from $n$ we will substitute by the remaining $n$ in eq(1.3) to obtain the prime numbers.

This algorithm could be represented in a simple c++ code as follows, it is not a professional version but it is an illustration to the mathematical steps to be easier to understand.

```cpp
#include <iostream>
#include <cstdlib>
#include <vector>

using namespace std;

int D1SOE(int n_m) {
    int n = 0, m = 0, vctrLim = 0;
    cout << "2 " << "n2 ";
    // adding 1 to n_m because the vector starts from order 0
    vctrLim = n_m + 1;
    vector<short> prmLst(vctrLim);
    // Initializing the vector with false values
    for (int i = 0; i < vctrLim; i++)
        prmLst[i] = false;
    // The mean elimination theorem
    for (n = 1; n <= int((sqrt(((2 * n_m) + 1) / 4)) - 0.5); n++)
        if (prmLst[n] != 0) { if (prmLst[n] != 0)
```
3 Proof and development of sieve of Sundaram (DSOS)

What I find quite interesting is that, sieve of Sundaram algorithm [1] is almost the same as my first algorithm with a few small differences which make the obvious difference in performance between the two algorithms.

Let

\[ i + j + 2ij = y \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.1)

sieve of Sundaram eliminates all the values of \( y \) from the integer numbers up to a limit \( l \) where

- \( y \leq l \)
- \( i, j \in \mathbb{N}, 1 \leq i \leq j \)

we can write Eq(3.1) as follows

\[ i + (2i + 1)j = y \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.2)

Let

\[ u = 2i + 1 \]  \hspace{1cm} (3.3)

we notice that eq(3.3) is the same as eq(1.3), and we can call \( i \) the order of \( u \), neglecting the condition \( i \leq j \) for the moment, so we can say that the left-hand side of eq(3.2) adds
the multiples of $u$ to the order of it which is $i$ for $j \in \mathbb{N}$ that means $y$ increases by $u$ steps starting from $i$ so it is a sequence of numbers the difference between each two successive numbers is $u$ which is the same as eq(2.3).

Now getting the condition $i \leq j$ back so it will control the starting point of $u$ which will be when $i = j$.

substituting by $i = j$ in eq(3.2)

$$i + (2i + 1)i = y$$
$$2(i^2 + i) = y$$

Eq(3.4) is exactly the same as eq(2.2) which also determines the starting point of the elimination process.

Next thing is the end point of the elimination process which is $y \leq l$ where $l$ by the definition of sieve of Sundaram is the integer value of

$$l = \frac{N - 1}{2}$$

which could be written as

$$l = \left\lfloor \frac{N - 1}{2} \right\rfloor$$

(3.5)

Where $N$ is the limit which we want to generate all the prime numbers up to, we notice that eq(3.5) is the same as eq(2.1) which determines the end point of the elimination process, this condition will control the last value of $j$

And finally he substitutes by the remaining integer values in an equation the same as eq(1.3).

The differences between my first algorithm (D1SOE) and Sundaram’s algorithm is that

1. I don’t eliminate the orders of the multiples of the eliminated numbers, in eq(3.1)
   $i$ takes all the integer values from 1 to $l$, in my algorithm it takes only the non eliminated values which represents the orders of the prime numbers.

2. In Sundaram’s algorithm the limit of $i$ is defined by eq(3.5) which is different than my algorithm, while in my algorithm the limit of $n$ is $k'$ in eq(2.5), where $n$ is represented by $i$ in Sundaram’s algorithm as explained above, so this is the equation of the limit of $i$ which should be used

$$k' = \left\lfloor \frac{\sqrt{2q' + 1}}{2} - 1 \right\rfloor$$

(3.6)

where $k'$: Is the order of the limit of $i$.

$q'$: Is the order of $l$. 
by putting these conditions in Sundaram’s algorithm it will be exactly the same as my first algorithm (D1SOE).

This is a simple c++ code for sieve of sundaram after my development (DSOS), it is not a professional version but it is an illustration to the mathematical steps to be easier to understand.

```cpp
#include <iostream>
#include <cstdlib>
#include <vector>
using namespace std;
int DSOS(int n)
{
    int i = 0, vctrLim = 0, j = 0, n_m = 0;
    n_m = (n - 1) / 2;
    cout << 2 << " ";
    // adding 1 to n_m because the vector starts from order 0
    vctrLim = n_m + 1;
    vector<short> prmLst(vctrLim);
    // Initializing the vector with false values
    for (i = 0; i < vctrLim; i++)
        prmLst[i] = false;
    // The mean elimination theorem
    for ( i = 1; i <= int((sqrt(((2 * n_m)+1) / 4)) - 0.5); i++)
        if (prmLst[i] != 0)
            continue;
    for (j = i; (i + j + 2 * i * j) <= n_m; j++)
        prmLst[i + j + 2 * i * j] = true;
    // Printing for loop
    for (i = 1; i <= n_m; i++)
        if (prmLst[i] == false)
            cout << 2 * i + 1 << " ";
    return 0;
}
// Driver program
int main(void)
{
    int n = 0;
    cout << "\n Enter limit : ";
    cin >> n;
```
DSOS(n);
return 0;
}

4 Second SOE developed algorithm (D2SOE)

In this algorithm we will eliminate the orders of the multiples of the prime numbers from \( n_1 \) of eq(1.4) The inverse of eq(1.4) is

\[
n_1 = \left\lceil \left( \frac{(p-1)(2)}{3} \right) - 1 \right\rceil
\]

\[
n_1 = \left\lceil \frac{p-2}{3} \right\rceil
\]

(4.1)

All the multiples of 2 and 3 are eliminated from the results of eq(1.4).

Our \( n_1 \) limit is

\[
n_{1m} = \left\lceil \frac{N-2}{3} \right\rceil
\]

(4.2)

\( N \): The limit which we want to generate all the prime numbers up to.

\( n_{1m} \): The order of limit which we want to generate all the prime numbers up to.

The order of the first multiple we want to eliminate will be calculated by substituting by

- \( \left\lfloor \frac{3g+1}{2} \right\rfloor = m \)
- \( \left\lfloor \frac{3b+1}{2} \right\rfloor = z \)

in eq(2.2)

\[
\left\lfloor \frac{3g+1}{2} \right\rfloor = 2\left( \left\lfloor \frac{3b+1}{2} \right\rfloor ^2 + \left\lfloor \frac{3b+1}{2} \right\rfloor \right)
\]

Using ISEF from reference [2]

\[
g = \left\lceil 4\left( \left\lfloor \frac{3b+1}{2} \right\rfloor ^2 + \left\lfloor \frac{3b+1}{2} \right\rfloor \right) - 1 \right\rceil
\]

(4.3)

\( g \): The order of the first multiple of prime number will be eliminated.

\( b \): The order of the prime number whose multiples we want to eliminate.

The multiples of the prime numbers in eq(1.4) are divided into two sequences, and \( g \) can equal any number from these two sequences.
The multiples of a prime number $p$ in eq(1.4) are $(p, 5p, 7p, 11p,...)$ which are the integer numbers without the multiples of 2 and 3 multiplied by the prime number $p$. The first sequence is $(p, 7p, 13p, ...)$, and the second sequence is $(5p, 11p, 17p, ...)$.

We need to know the following information to be able to eliminate the multiples of the prime numbers in this case

1. The difference between the orders of any two successive multiples in any sequence of these two sequences, let it be $f_1$.

$$f_1 = \left\lceil \frac{7p - 2}{3} \right\rceil - \left\lceil \frac{p - 2}{3} \right\rceil$$

(4.4)

Using computer programming the following relation is true for $p$ equals the integers from 1 to $10^{10}$

$$2p = \left\lceil \frac{7p - 2}{3} \right\rceil - \left\lceil \frac{p - 2}{3} \right\rceil$$

(4.5)

I assume that this relation is true for $p$ equals all the integers up to infinity.

2. The difference between the orders of the first (or the second or the third, ...etc) numbers in both sequence, let it be $f_2$.

$$f_2 = \left\lceil \frac{5p - 2}{3} \right\rceil - \left\lceil \frac{p - 2}{3} \right\rceil$$

(4.6)

3. The difference between the order of the first number in the second sequence and the order of the second number in the first sequence, let it be $f_3$.

$$f_3 = \left\lceil \frac{7p - 2}{3} \right\rceil - \left\lceil \frac{5p - 2}{3} \right\rceil$$

(4.7)

4. Whether $g$ belongs to the first or the second sequence, the second sequence could be represented by $(3x - 1)$ where $x$ is an integer, so by adding 1 to $g$ and then dividing it by 3 we can know that it belongs to the second sequence if the result is an integer, if the result is not an integer then it belongs to the first sequence, while the first sequence could be represented by $(3x + 1)$.

After calculating $g$ we will determine whether $g$ belongs to the first or the second sequence, Then we will eliminate this sequence by adding $f_1$ to $g$ then we will eliminate the result then we will repeat adding $f_1$ to the last result and eliminate the resultant number, our limit will be $n_{1m}$.

After eliminating the sequence which $g$ belongs to we will eliminate the other sequence by the same method but starting from $(g + f_3)$ if $g$ belongs to the second sequence, or from $((g + f_2) or (g - f_3))$ if $g$ belongs to the first sequence.
After eliminating the orders of the multiples of the prime numbers from $n_1$ we will substitute by the remaining $n_1$ in eq(1.4) to obtain the prime numbers.

This algorithm could be represented by a simple c++ code as follows, it is not a professional version but it is an illustration to the mathematical steps to be easier to understand.

```cpp
#include <iostream>
#include <vector>
#include<cmath>
using namespace std;

int D2SOE(int n1_m) {
    int n1 = 0, g = 0, z = 0, p = 0, f1 = 0, f3 = 0;
    cout << "\n2 3 ";
    vector<short> prmLst(n1_m);
    // Initialising the vector with false values
    for (int i = 0; i < n1_m; i++)
        prmLst[i] = false;
    // The mean elimination theorem
    for (n1 = 1; n1 <= ceil((2 * (sqrt(((2 * ((3 * n1_m + 1) / 2.0) + 1) / 4.0)) - 0.5) - 1) / 3); n1++)
        {if (prmLst[n1] != 0)
            continue;
            z = ((3* n1 + 1) / 2.0);
            p = ((2 * z) + 1);
            f1 = (ceil(((7 * p) - 2) / 3.0)- ceil((p - 2) / 3.0));
            f3 = (ceil(((7 * p) - 2) / 3.0)- ceil(((5 * p) - 2) / 3.0));
            for (g = ceil(((4 *((z * z) + z))- 1)/ 3.0); g < n1_m; g += f1)
                { prmLst[g] = true;}
            if ((p + 1) % 3 == 0) {
                for (g = ceil(((4 *((z * z) + z))- 1)/ 3.0)+f3; g < n1_m; g += f1)
                    { prmLst[g] = true;}
            } else {
                for (g = ceil(((4 *((z * z) + z))- 1)/ 3.0)-f3; g < n1_m; g += f1)
                    {prmLst[g] = true;}}}
    // printing for loop
    for (int n1 = 1; n1 < n1_m; n1++)
        if (!prmLst[n1]) {
            z = (((3* n1) + 1) / 2.0);
        }
}
```
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```cpp
cout << (2 * z) + 1 << " ";
return 0;
// Driver program
int main() {
    int n1_m, N = 0;
    cout << "\n Enter limit : ";
    cin >> N;
    n1_m = ceil((N - 2) / 3.0);
    D2SOE(n1_m);
    return 0;
}
```

5 implementation results

The mean idea of these developments is to make the algorithm faster and uses less space.

- The first developed algorithm (D1SOE) -see section 2- will be faster than SOE algorithm because the elimination process will start from the multiples of the prime number 3, where all the multiples of 2 and all the common multiples between 2 and all the prime numbers greater than 2 are not involved in the elimination process, this algorithm will reduce the use of the space also by reducing the numbers we will deal with and we can use eq.(2.1) to calculate it.

- The second developed algorithm (D2OSE) -see section 4- will be faster than SOE and D1SOE because the elimination process will start from the multiples of the prime number 5, where all the multiples of 2 and 3 and all the common multiples of 2 and 3 with all the prime numbers greater than 2 and 3 are not involved in the elimination process, this algorithm will reduce the use of the space also by reducing the numbers we will deal with and we can use eq.(4.2) to calculate it.

To know in general the speed difference between these algorithms I used the same coding concept for all the algorithms and the same device under the same circumstances to get a rough look at the difference in speed between all of these algorithms, the results are listed in the next table, where this table shows the run time in microseconds for each algorithm required to generate all the prime numbers from 1 to the limit $N$. 
As we expected D2SOE is the fastest algorithm then D1SOE then DSOS with almost the same speed as D1SOE, this is because these two algorithms are based on exactly the same mathematical concept see section 3 then the last and the slowest one is SOE algorithm.

There was no space in memory to generate all the prime numbers from 1 to $10^9$ using SOE algorithm, and there was no space in memory to generate all the prime numbers from 1 to $2 \times 10^9$ using SOE, D1SOE and DSOS, and that explains that there is a substantial differences in space usage.

### 6 conclusion

Using sieve of Eratosthenes algorithm and two of my prime numbers formulas we was able to make two developments to sieve of Eratosthenes algorithm, the first one we used a formula where all the multiples of 2 are eliminated and we derived all the required formulas to accomplish the elimination of the multiples of the prime numbers, and the generation of all the prime numbers up to a gives limit see 2, and we used this algorithm to proof sieve of Sundaram’s algorithm by showing the exact match between these two algorithms, then we used this match to improve sieve of Sundaram see section 3.

In the second algorithm we used a formula where all the multiples of the prime numbers 2 and 3 are eliminated, and derived the required formulas for the elimination process see section 4 and we showed an illustration of each algorithm in a form of simple c++ code.

At the end we showed showed the difference in performance between our developed algorithms and sieve of Eratosthenes algorithm in terms of speed and space usage in a rough good estimation see section 5.
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